Rate of formation and dissolution of mercury sulfide nanoparticles: The dual role of natural organic matter
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Abstract

Mercury is a global contaminant of concern due to its transformation by microorganisms to form methylmercury, a toxic species that accumulates in biological tissues. The effect of dissolved organic matter (DOM) isolated from natural waters on reactions between mercury(II) (Hg) and sulfide (S(-II)) to form HgS(s) nanoparticles across a range of Hg and S(-II) concentrations was investigated. Hg was equilibrated with DOM, after which S(-II) was added. Dissolved Hg (Hg aq) was periodically quantified using ultracentrifugation and chemical analysis following the addition of S(-II). Particle size and identity were determined using dynamic light scattering and X-ray absorption spectroscopy. S(-II) reacts with Hg to form 20 to 200 nm aggregates consisting of 1–2 nm HgS(s) subunits that are more structurally disordered than metacinnabar in the presence of 2/10^5 to 8 × 10^-6 M Hg and 10 (mg C) L^-1 DOM. Some of the HgS(s) nanoparticle aggregates are subsequently dissolved by DOM and (re)precipitated by S(-II) over periods of hours to days. At least three fractions of Hg–DOM species were observed with respect to reactivity toward S(-II): 0.3 μmol reactive Hg per mmol C (60 percent), 0.1 μmol per mmol C (20 percent) that are kinetically hindered, and another 0.1 μmol Hg per mmol C (20 percent) that are inert to reaction with S(-II). Following an initial S(-II)-driven precipitation of HgS(s), HgS(s) was dissolved by DOM or organic sulfur compounds. HgS(s) formation during this second phase was counterintuitively favored by lower S(-II) concentrations, suggesting surface association of DOM moieties that are less capable of dissolving HgS(s). DOM partially inhibits HgS(s) formation and mediates reactions between Hg and S(-II) such that HgS(s) is susceptible to dissolution. These findings indicate that Hg accessibility to microorganisms could be controlled by kinetic (intermediate) species in the presence of S(-II) and DOM, undermining the premise that equilibrium Hg species distributions should correlate to the extent or rate of Hg methylation in soils and sediments.

Published by Elsevier Ltd.

1. INTRODUCTION

Organic matter performs several functions in the biogeochemical transport and transformation of mercury, including methylation by microorganisms in water, soils, and sediments (Ravichandran, 2004; Fitzgerald et al., 2007). Methylmercury can accumulate in low trophic-level organisms such as phytoplankton and zooplankton and magnify up the food chain. For example, Stewart et al. (2008) found that a reservoir containing at most 0.04 ng L^-1 of filterable methylmercury (MeHg) was inhabited by zooplankton containing 4–77 (ng MeHg) (g biomass)^-1 and bass containing 1500 (ng MeHg) (g biomass)^-1. Magnification of methylmercury can expose humans to unhealthy amounts of methylmercury through fish consumption, possibly causing teratogenic effects, increased risk of heart attack, and endocrine disruption (Mergler et al., 2007). Methylmercury can also cause neurological, behavioral, and reproductive effects and death in wildlife (Schuhammer et al., 2007; Eagles-Smith and Ackerman, 2009).

Predicting the reactivity of a small, yet ecologically worrisome, amount of inorganic mercury(II) (Hg) with respect to methylation has proven difficult. Certain Hg species are assumed to be more accessible to microorganisms, either by...
diffusive or active transport across cell membranes (Schaefer and Morel, 2009). The amount of bioaccessible Hg is believed to correlate to the extent or rate of Hg methylation (Merritt and Amirthahman, 2009). Mercury methylation has been found to occur under anaerobic, and therefore, typically organic rich, conditions in which some species of sulfate and Fe(III)-reducing bacteria (SRB and FeRB) are active (King et al., 2001; Fleming et al., 2006; Han et al., 2008b; Windham-Myers et al., 2009). Organic matter in soils and sediments includes dissolved organic molecules that are exuded by plant roots and microorganisms, derived from the biological degradation of plant tissues (Hedges and Oades, 1997), and that accumulate in anaerobic porewater (Kalbitz et al., 2000) typically in excess of Hg by a factor of 10^6 (Hall et al., 2008; Marvin-DiPasquale et al., 2009). Thus, S(-II), dissolved organic matter (DOM), and Fe(II) are some of the constituents that may affect the accessibility of Hg to microorganisms and therefore, the extent to which microorganisms methylate Hg.

Aquatic DOM complexes Hg (Haitzer et al., 2002), mediates reactions between Hg and S(-II) (Ravichandran et al., 1999; Deonarine and Hsu-Kim, 2009), and dissolves HgS(s) (Ravichandran et al., 1998; Waples et al., 2005). Aquatic DOM consists of thousands of analogous, but not identical, less than 1000 Da hydrophilic molecules (Aiken and Malcolm, 1987; Chin et al., 1994; Lead et al., 2000a; Reemtsma et al., 2008). Hg^{2+}, a soft, or B-type, metal cation, reacts readily with soft bases, of which inorganic sulfide (S(-II)) and organic thiolate (RS^-) are most favorable (Haitzer et al., 2002). Weaker associations between Hg^{2+} and harder bases such as nitrogen- and oxygen-bearing organic functional groups (RCN^- and RCOO^-) can also form (Skyllberg, 2008). Hg–DOM complex stability—as an average of an ensemble of chemically heterogeneous species (K = [HgDOM]/[Hg^{2+}][DOM])—decreases as Hg saturates strongly binding ligands (e.g., Hg(RS)_2) and progressively saturates weaker ligands at higher Hg/DOM ratios (Haitzer et al., 2002). Hg–DOM stability is also affected by pH and the duration Hg^{2+} coexists with DOM (Haitzer et al., 2003; Gasper et al., 2007).

The occurrence of HgS(s) has been documented for mines and industrial sites (Barnett et al., 1997; Kim et al., 2000, 2004; Slowey et al., 2005a,b; Liu et al., 2006) but is uncertain in more diffusely contaminated systems such as the Florida Everglades and the Arctic (Gilmour et al., 2000, 2004; Slowey et al., 2005a,b; Liu et al., 2006) but is uncertain in more diffusely contaminated systems such as the Florida Everglades and the Arctic (Gilmour et al., 2000, 2004; Slowey et al., 2005a,b; Liu et al., 2006). The amount of bioaccessible Hg is believed to correlate to the extent or rate of Hg methylation (Merritt and Amirthahman, 2009). Mercury methylation has been found to occur under anaerobic, and therefore, typically organic rich, conditions in which some species of sulfate and Fe(III)-reducing bacteria (SRB and FeRB) are active (King et al., 2001; Fleming et al., 2006; Han et al., 2008b; Windham-Myers et al., 2009). Organic matter in soils and sediments includes dissolved organic molecules that are exuded by plant roots and microorganisms, derived from the biological degradation of plant tissues (Hedges and Oades, 1997), and that accumulate in anaerobic porewater (Kalbitz et al., 2000) typically in excess of Hg by a factor of 10^6 (Hall et al., 2008; Marvin-DiPasquale et al., 2009). Thus, S(-II), dissolved organic matter (DOM), and Fe(II) are some of the constituents that may affect the accessibility of Hg to microorganisms and therefore, the extent to which microorganisms methylate Hg.

Haitzer et al. (2002) quantified HgS(s) formation, but the extent of HgS(s) formation in the presence of DOM remains elusive and yet is more relevant to most soils and sediments. Electron diffraction and chemical extraction studies indicate that metacinnabar (β-HgS) nanoparticles in contaminated soils are poorly crystalline and more soluble in strong acid than synthetic HgS(s) minerals (Barnett et al., 1997; Han et al., 2008a).

To summarize, the importance of HgS(s) to Hg methylation in most natural systems remains unclear due to inconclusive thermodynamic interpretations of field data and limited understanding of the effect of DOM on the reaction between Hg and S(-II) and the stability of HgS(s). This study extends previous research (Ravichandran et al., 1999; Deonarine and Hsu-Kim, 2009) by quantifying dissolved Hg (Hg_DOM) with lower particle size exclusion (>5 nm), in situ S(-II) quantification, and parallel particle sizing and identification using dynamic light scattering and X-ray absorption spectroscopy. Experiments included low S(-II)/Hg to investigate HgS(s) formation and stability under conditions that are apparently conducive to Hg.

\[
\text{HgS(s)} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{HOHgSH}_\text{aq}
\]  
(1)

The occurrence of HgS(s) has been documented for mines and industrial sites (Barnett et al., 1997; Kim et al., 2000, 2004; Slowey et al., 2005a,b; Liu et al., 2006) but is uncertain in more diffusely contaminated systems such as the Florida Everglades and the Arctic (Gilmour et al., 1998; Oifrer and Siciliano, 2009). The occurrence of HgS(s) in soils and sediments on the basis of Hg species distribution models depends on what HgS(s) formation/dissolution reactions are considered. The reaction

\[
\text{HgS(s)} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{HOHgSH}_\text{aq}
\]  
(1)

has been frequently included in Hg species distribution models with an estimated log \(K = -10\), implying that HgS(s) is 10^{-10} to 10^{+10} times more soluble than if it underwent other proposed dissolution reactions:

\[
\text{HgS(s)} + \text{H}^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{Hg}^{+2} + \text{HS}^- \quad \log K = -36.4
\]  
(2)

\[
\text{HgS(s)} + \text{HS}^- + 2(\text{S}_2\text{O}_3)^{-2} \rightleftharpoons \text{HgS}_2\text{O}_3\text{aq} \quad \log K = -11.7
\]  
(3)

(Paquette and Helz, 1997; Jay et al., 2000), assuming for simplicity that the activities of H^+ and HS^- are equal. As

explained by Skyllberg (2008), experimental evidence undermines the plausibility of HOHgSH (or HgS_2H_2O or HgS^2-) (Daskalakis and Helz, 1993). Even if HgS^0 did exist, the log \(K\) value of reaction (1) could range from -22.3 to -10.0 (Skyllberg, 2008). Inclusion of reaction (1) in a model and choice of an implausibly high log \(K\) could erroneously suggest that HgS(s) is absent. HgS(s) formation is sometimes suppressed in a model, based on the assumption that Hg forms inert Hg–thiol complexes with DOM and soil humus prior to being exposed to S(-II) (Skyllberg, 2008). However, little data are available to evaluate whether DOM or soil humus inhibits the formation of HgS(s) in soils.

Depending on Hg concentration, dissolved thiol and hydrophobic organic ligands can inhibit the formation and particle growth of HgS(s) (Ravichandran et al., 1999). While this research was the first to quantify the extent to which DOM affects Hg reactivity toward S(-II), phase separation was approximate and particle size was not measured, such that the formation and temporal stability of HgS(s) nanoparticles less than approximately 20 nm was not determined. Without time-resolved data, the physicochemical stability of HgS(s) remained poorly understood following the work of Ravichandran et al. (1999). Using similar laboratory systems, Deonarine and Hsu-Kim (2009) show that increasing concentrations of DOM can progressively slow the growth, but not inhibit the formation, of HgS(s). Unresolved questions from these studies include the degree to which Hg and S(-II) control the rate and extent of HgS(s) formation in the presence of DOM. In addition, neither study obtained time-resolved quantitative chemical data to monitor HgS(s) dissolution subsequent to or coincident with HgS(s) formation, which other studies suggest may also affect Hg reactivity in soils and sediments.

While HgS(s) is likely more prevalent in aquatic ecosystems than previously thought based on updated formation/dissociation constants, it would also be more soluble than predicted by models that neglect HgS(s) dissolution by DOM. While DOM can dissolve micrometer-sized cinnabar (α-HgS) (Ravichandran et al., 1998; Waples et al., 2005), the most stable form of HgS(s), the solubility of HgS(s) that originally forms in the presence of DOM remains elusive and yet is more relevant to most soils and sediments. Electron diffraction and chemical extraction studies indicate that metacinnabar (β-HgS) nanoparticles in contaminated soils are poorly crystalline and more soluble in strong acid than synthetic HgS(s) minerals (Barnett et al., 1997; Han et al., 2008a).

To summarize, the importance of HgS(s) to Hg methylation in most natural systems remains unclear due to inconclusive thermodynamic interpretations of field data and limited understanding of the effect of DOM on the reaction between Hg and S(-II) and the stability of HgS(s). This study extends previous research (Ravichandran et al., 1999; Deonarine and Hsu-Kim, 2009) by quantifying dissolved Hg (Hg_DOM) with lower particle size exclusion (>5 nm), in situ S(-II) quantification, and parallel particle sizing and identification using dynamic light scattering and X-ray absorption spectroscopy. Experiments included low S(-II)/Hg to investigate HgS(s) formation and stability under conditions that are apparently conducive to Hg.
methylolation (Hammerschmidt et al., 2008; Mitchell and Gilmour, 2008; Hollweg et al., 2009; Marvin-DiPasquale et al., 2009). I also build on the work of Ravichandran et al. (1998) and Waples et al. (2005) by quantifying Hg\textsubscript{aq} during and immediately after Hg\textsubscript{S(s)} formed in the presence of DOM in systems containing lower Hg/DOM ratios. Hg\textsubscript{aq} was also monitored over nearly two weeks to determine whether Hg–DOM–S(−II) systems reach equilibrium. The results clarify the importance of DOM, not just as a group of Hg-binding ligands, but also as a mediator of Hg\textsubscript{aq}−S(−II) reactions and Hg\textsubscript{S(s)} nanoparticle dissolution.

2. METHODS

2.1. Materials

Water used in experiments was deionized (18 MΩ cm), UV-irradiated, and pumped through a 10,000 Da filter (Barnstead Nanopure). Water was deoxygenated by boiling, purging with ultrahigh-purity (UHP) N\textsubscript{2} and storage in a 98 percent N\textsubscript{2}, 2 percent H\textsubscript{2} Coy glove box (chamber for at least 18 h and sequentially rinsed with 0.1 N HNO\textsubscript{3} tent and soaked in 2 percent v/v BrCl at room temperature. Fuge tubes were separated according to prior mercury content, purged with ultrahigh-purity (UHP) N\textsubscript{2} and storage in a 98 percent N\textsubscript{2}, 2 percent H\textsubscript{2} Coy glove box. For H\textsubscript{2}S(g) amendments, Na\textsubscript{2}S was mixed with piperazine-N,N′-bis(2-ethanesulfonic acid) (PIPES) in a gas washing bottle to carry H\textsubscript{2}S(g) into the enclosed headspace of an enclosed vessel. For Na\textsubscript{2}S amendments, Na\textsubscript{2}S/boric acid (H\textsubscript{3}BO\textsubscript{3}) (pH 8.3) was added to 40-mL Hg–DOM solutions in glass serum bottles to reach an initial concentration of 140 μM, equivalent to 20 mole-percent of dissolved organic carbon. Each serum bottle was closed with a butyl rubber stopper and quiescently stored in an oxygen-free glove box. For H\textsubscript{2}S\textsubscript{aq} amendments, Na\textsubscript{2}S was mixed with bicarbonate (NaHCO\textsubscript{3}) and perchloric acid (H\textsubscript{3}BO\textsubscript{3}): solutions were buffered to pH 7.0 ± 0.2 with 10 mM sodium bicarbonate (NaHCO\textsubscript{3}) and perchloric acid (H\textsubscript{3}BO\textsubscript{3}) (pH 8.3), and iodicometrically standardized with a NIST potassium dichromate-standardized, alkaline-stabilized thiosulfate solution. Na\textsubscript{2}S stock solutions were buffered to avoid severe alkaline perturbation of experimental systems. Boric acid was used to buffer Na\textsubscript{2}S because other acids volatilized H\textsubscript{2}S\textsubscript{aq} when added to Na\textsubscript{2}S stock solutions.

Suwannee River fulvic acid (SRFA), Suwannee River huminic acid (SRHA), and Pony Lake fulvic acid (PLFA) (Malcolm et al., 1994; Brown et al., 2004) were obtained from the International Humic Substances Society, weighed using a microbalance, and dissolved in glass bottles with deoxygenated water to 10.0 ± 0.1 (mg C) L\textsuperscript{−1} (0.83 ± 0.009 (mmol C) L\textsuperscript{−1} an intermediate concentration compared to typical surface waters and organic-rich soil pore waters (Thurman, 1985). The mass of isolate was computed based on its carbon content: 0.5234 (g C) (g SRFA\textsuperscript{−1}, 0.5263 (g C) (g SRHA\textsuperscript{−1}, 0.5247 (g C) (g PLFA\textsuperscript{−1} e.g., 10 (mg C) L\textsuperscript{−1} is equivalent to 19.1 (mg DOM) L\textsuperscript{−1}. The Hg content of dissolved SRFA, SRHA, and PLFA solutions was measured in 10 (mg C) L\textsuperscript{−1} DOM solutions amended with 1 percent v/v BrCl and found to be 0.18, 0.34, and 0.04 μM, respectively. On the basis of these measurements, the freeze-dried AOM isolates of SRFA, SRHA, and PLFA, contain 1.8, 3.6, and 0.42 (μg Hg) (g dry DOM)\textsuperscript{−1} Dissolved organic matter (DOM) solutions were refrigerated at 5 °C and used within two weeks.

2.2. Time-resolved mercury phase-distribution experiments

All experiments were conducted at 22 ± 2 °C. DOM solutions were buffered to pH 7.0 ± 0.2 with 10 mM sodium bicarbonate (NaHCO\textsubscript{3}) and perchloric acid (H\textsubscript{3}BO\textsubscript{3}): 9.5 mM for SRFA, 6.9 mM for SRHA, and 7.0 mM for PLFA, determined on the basis of pH measurements of DOM containing a range of H\textsubscript{3}BO\textsubscript{3} concentrations over two weeks. DOM was amended with the specified amount of H\textsubscript{3}BO\textsubscript{3} and allowed to rest for one day to ensure consistency and amphoteric stability prior to adding Hg. Hg(NO\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2} was added to DOM at five concentrations ranging over five orders of magnitude (0.001–10 μM) giving mass ratios of 0.01–100 (μg Hg) (mg DOM)\textsuperscript{−1} and allowed to react at room temperature for at least 1 h to form bonds between Hg and less abundant yet stronger organic ligands (Gasper et al., 2007). Prior to adding S(−II), samples were collected and later measured for Hg. Hg\textsubscript{aq} recovered from these samples was less than what was added to the batch reactors, indicating that Hg adhered to the walls of the glass serum bottles (see Electronic annex (EA) for details).

After equilibrating the Hg–DOM solutions, S(−II) was added either as an instantaneous dose of aqueous sodium sulfide (Na\textsubscript{2}S) or by flowing H\textsubscript{2}S\textsubscript{aq} through the headspace of an enclosed vessel. For Na\textsubscript{2}S amendments, Na\textsubscript{2}S/boric acid (H\textsubscript{3}BO\textsubscript{3}) (pH 8.3) was added to 40-mL Hg–DOM solutions in glass serum bottles to reach an initial concentration of 140 μM, equivalent to 20 mole-percent of dissolved organic carbon. Each serum bottle was closed with a butyl rubber stopper and quiescently stored in an oxygen-free glove box. For H\textsubscript{2}S\textsubscript{aq} amendments, Na\textsubscript{2}S was mixed with piperazine-N,N’-bis(2-ethanesulfonic acid) (PIPES) in a gas washing bottle (pH 7). S(−II) amendment commenced by bubbling 5 mL min\textsuperscript{−1} UHP nitrogen through a diffuser in the gas washing bottle to carry H\textsubscript{2}S\textsubscript{aq} into the enclosed headspace of a 100 mL glass vessel initially containing 50 mL of stirred Hg–DOM solution. CO\textsubscript{2} (1 mL min\textsuperscript{−1}) was concurrently flowed through the headspace of the reactor to maintain pH 7.1 ± 0.2 in all but one experiment. Buffering pH against S(−II)-related alkaline perturbation is required to not suddenly weaken Hg–DOM interactions that could induce rapid Hg\textsubscript{S(s)} formation and aggregation.

Each batch reactor was swirled by hand prior to pipetting 1 mL samples into 1.5 mL, 11 × 34 mm polycarbonate tubes, tilted at 30° from vertical in a rotor (TLA-120.2.) and ultracentrifuged at 60,000 rpm (98,800–157,000 rcf (×g) across a 24.5–38.9 mm radius from the axis of rotation) for 30 min (Beckman Coulter Optima TLX ultracentrifuge) to separate >5 nm particles from liquid while minimizing perturbations to DOM (e.g., molecular weight distribution) and avoiding filtration-induced aggregation (Buffe and Leppard, 1995). After ultracentrifugation, 0.8 mL of supernatant was withdrawn from the tube over about 20 s and transferred to a 1.5 mL plastic tube, amended with 3 percent v/v BrCl, tightly capped, stored at room temperature for 1 day, then refrigerated at 5 °C until analyzed for mercury. Control experiments indicate that ultracentrifugation
obtains an optimal fit to \( G_{\text{Ag|AgCl|3 M KCl|0.1 M NaNO}_3} \) reference electrode, voltammetry (Davison and Gabbutt, 1979; Krznaric´ and Ciglenec´-Jusˇic´, 2005). An Autolab PGSTAT12 potentiostat was used for all voltammetric measurements (Eco Chemie, Utrecht). Method details and quality assurance are provided in the Electronic annex.

2.3.2. Sulfide

During mercury phase-distribution experiments using \( H_{2}S_{(g)} \), S(-II) was measured in situ with a solid-state 100 μm-diameter \( Hg/Au \) amalgam electrode, a double-junction \( Ag(AgCl)[3 M KCl][0.1 M NaNO_3 \) reference electrode, and a glassy carbon auxiliary electrode using stripping voltammetry (Davison and Gabbutt, 1979; Krznaric´ and Ciglenec´-Jusˇic´, 2005). An Autolab PGSTAT12 potentiostat was used for all voltammetric measurements (Eco Chemie, Utrecht). Method details and quality assurance are provided in the Electronic annex.

2.4. Particle characterization

Dynamic light scattering (DLS) was measured at 20 °C with a Malvern Zetasiser nanoZS equipped with a 4 mW, 633 nm He–Ne laser and an avalanche photodiode detector oriented at 173° from the incoming path of the laser. Scattered photon intensity measurements were averaged over 10 s and convoluted into an intensity autocorrelation function \( G_2(\tau) \), where \( \tau \) is the delay time of the digital correlator. Sixteen autocorrelation functions were collected and averaged per measurement.

Intensity autocorrelation functions were interpreted using a cumulants fit to a 3rd-order expansion of a quadratically weighted \( G_2(\tau) \) (Finsy, 1994). A second approach was to determine the distribution of particle sizes that optimally describes the DLS data using the CONTIN inversion-regularization algorithm (Provencher, 1979, 1982). CONTIN obtains an optimal fit to \( G_2(\tau) \) by compromising a least-squares minimization of fit residuals with a minimization of the curvature of the particle size distribution. The latter constraint is implemented using a regularizer \((\sigma)\) (Ruf, 1993).

2.5. Mercury speciation by X-ray absorption spectroscopy

Aqueous solutions of 10 μM Hg, 10 (mg C) L\(^{-1}\) DOM, and 160 μM S(-II) were allowed to react for 3–30 h. After these periods, samples were ultracentrifuged, then 80 percent of the liquid was removed and the remaining sample sonicated for 1 min to resuspend particles. These concentrates were transferred onto Kapton film sitting on a block of dry ice to slow further chemical reactions. The frozen concentrates were freeze-dried, smeared on the film with a spatula, and covered with Kapton tape for Hg-I\(^{119}\) edge extended X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS) spectroscopic analysis. EXAFS was measured at room temperature on wiggler end-station 7-3 at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource (SSRL), a 3 GeV synchrotron operated at 100 mA. A harmonic rejection mirror was used to allow full tuning of the Si(2 2 0) monochromator. Fluorescence-yield data were collected with a 30-element solid-state germanium detector. The sample concentration procedure enabled sufficient signal-to-noise to obtain discernible EXAFS to \( k = 12 \) Å\(^{-1}\) by averaging 9–16 scans, \( k^2\)-weighting detector count times from 1 to 20 s across the EXAFS region \( (k \text{ is the photoelectron momentum}) \). EXAFS spectra were extracted from the averaged data files by pre-edge subtraction followed by spline fitting using xafsX (Winterer, 1996).

The identity and molecular structure of mercury was determined from EXAFS by fitting Hg–S atomic pair correlations calculated using the \textit{ab initio} code FEFF 7 (Zabinsky et al., 1995) to inverse-Fourier transforms of the first apparent Hg coordination shell. The amplitude reduction factor \((S_0^2)\) was fixed at 0.855 for all fits on the basis of the intersection of regressions of fitted Debye-Waller factors \((\sigma^2)\) versus \(S_0^2\) performed across multiple \( k \) weights of the EXAFS of metacinnabar. Four types of structural models were fit to the EXAFS spectra: (1) the standard harmonic model, (2) a split shell harmonic model, consisting of two overlapping pair correlations, (3) a cumulant expansion of the harmonic model, and (4) a model incorporating an asymmetric pair distribution function (Crozier et al., 1988). The harmonic and cumulant expansion models were fit using Artemis, a graphical interface for IFEFFIT (Ravel and Newville, 2005), whereas the analytical asymmetric model was fit using xafsX.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Phase distribution of mercury after sulfide addition to dissolved organic matter

3.1.1. Apparent rate of sulfide-induced mercury precipitation and stability of \( HgS_{(s)} \)

A general rate expression for the change in dissolved Hg (\( Hg_{(aq)} \)) activity in the Hg–DOM–S(-II) system would be

\[
\frac{d(Hg_{(aq)})}{dt} = -k_1(HS^-)^n \prod_j (Hg - DOM)_j^{n_j} + k_3(HgS_{(s)})^{m} \prod_j (DOM)_j^{m_j} (4)
\]
where \( t \) is the time since S(II) amendment (seconds); \( k_f \) and \( k_b \) are the forward and backward rate coefficients of the reaction

\[
\text{Hg} + \text{DOM}_i + \text{HS}^- \xrightleftharpoons[k_f]{k_b} \text{HgS}_{(s)} + \text{DOM}_i + \text{H}^+ \tag{5}
\]

the indices \( i \) and \( j \) represent one of \( n \) or \( n' \) types of \( \text{Hg} \)-DOM complexes or \( \text{HgS}_{(s)} \)-dissolving DOM molecules; and \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \) and \( \eta \) are reaction coefficients. In these exploratory experiments, multiple constituents varied with time, and the stoichiometry of reactions between \( \text{Hg}^{2+} \), DOM components, \( \text{Hg} \)-DOM complexes, and S(II) are unknown. Assuming negligible \( \text{HgS}_{(s)} \) dissolution \( (k_b = 0) \), the initial apparent rate at which \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) was lost from solution was computed on the basis of a simplified, closed-form rate expression:

\[
\frac{d[\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}]}{dt} = -k'(\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}) - [\text{Hg}_{\text{non-labile}}] \tag{6}
\]

\[
[\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}] = ([\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}] - [\text{Hg}_{\text{non-labile}}]) \exp(-k't) \tag{7}
\]

where \( k' \) is a provisional first-order rate coefficient \((\text{s}^{-1})\), \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) is the initial concentration of \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) (assumed to be complexed by DOM), and \( \text{Hg}_{\text{non-labile}} \) is the portion of \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) that does not readily react with S(II).

\( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) decreased approximately 80 percent over 1 h following the addition of 140 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Na}_2\text{S} \) to 0.83 \( \text{mmol C L}^{-1} \) SRFA solutions initially equilibrated with \( 2.28 \times 10^{-3} \mu \text{M} \) and 0.482 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Hg} \) (Fig. 1 and Table 1B and C). The initial pH of the \( \text{Hg} \)-SRFA solution was 7.0 and rose to pH 7.3 at the end of the experiment (Table 1). The rate \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) decreased upon addition of 140 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Na}_2\text{S} \) to 0.482 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Hg} \) and SRFA is not statistically different at the 90 percent confidence level from the rate observed during the same S(II) amendment to 1.0 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Hg} \) in the absence of DOM, on the basis of rate coefficients fit to the data using Eq. (7) (Table 1, experiments A and B). The initial \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) concentration did, however, significantly affect rates of \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) decrease: \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) decreased more slowly when \( 2.28 \times 10^{-3} \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Hg} \) was initially present compared to 0.482 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Hg} \) (Table 1A versus B and C). The \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) fraction that persisted \( (\text{Hg}_{\text{non-labile}} \text{ in Eq. (7)}) \) 1–7 h following sulfide amendment was 1.6–1.8 times higher when SRFA was present, after which the \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) fraction remained unchanged at 0.19 or 0.22—defined as \( \text{Hg}_{\text{non-labile}} \) in Eqs. (6) and (7)—while it declined in the absence of DOM to 0.04 after 23 h (Fig. 1).

Results from two experiments in which less sulfide (as \( \text{H}_2\text{S}_{(g)} \)) was added to mixtures of 0.83 \( \text{mmol C L}^{-1} \) SRFA and similar initial \( \text{Hg} \) concentrations (0.482–0.645 \( \mu \text{M} \)) are compared to the 140 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Na}_2\text{S} \) amendment in Fig. 2. The pH of the reactors rose by as much as 0.3 as \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) partitioned into the aqueous phase (Table 1). S(II) increased as \( \text{H}_2\text{S}_{(g)} \) partitioned into the aqueous phase.

---

**Fig. 1.** Fraction of \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) following the addition of 140 \( \mu \text{M} \) \( \text{Na}_2\text{S} \) in the presence of 0.83 \( \text{mM C} \) as Suwannee River fulvic acid. The letters in parentheses refer to experiment indices listed in Table 1. All data are normalized by the \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) measured in a sample taken just prior to adding S(II), indicated by the arrows. Estimated variability in \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) recovery would plot smaller than the size of the symbols.

**Table 1**

Experimental conditions of the time-resolved Hg phase-distribution experiments, apparent rate of \( \text{HgS}_{(s)} \) formation upon sulfide amendment to 0.83 \( \text{mM C} \) as Suwannee River fulvic acid (unless otherwise indicated), and the concentration of persistent dissolved Hg. \( k^* \) values are first-order rate coefficients during S(II)-driven precipitation, after which the slopes of linear regressions and average \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) concentrations during a second reaction phase are listed (i.e., \( \text{Hg}_{\text{non-labile}} \) in Eq. (7)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} ) ((t = 0) ) ((\mu \text{M}) )</th>
<th>( \text{S(II)} )</th>
<th>( \text{DOM} )</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>( \text{Hg}_{\text{non-labile}} ) ((1 \mu \text{M}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>( k^* \pm 90% ) C.I. ((\text{s}^{-1}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Aqueous Na}_2\text{S amendments} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>no DOM</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.03</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>SRFA</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.01</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28( \times 10^{-3} )</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>SRFA</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.04</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H}_2\text{S} ) gas amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>80 ( \mu \text{M h}^{-1} \rightarrow 120 \mu \text{M} )</td>
<td>SRFA</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.05</td>
<td>–0.02 ± 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>26 ( \mu \text{M h}^{-1} \rightarrow 25 \mu \text{M} )</td>
<td>SRFA</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.05 ± 0.01</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>11 ( \mu \text{M h}^{-1} \rightarrow 6 \mu \text{M} )</td>
<td>SRFA</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.03</td>
<td>–0.16 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>12 ( \mu \text{M h}^{-1} \rightarrow 9 \mu \text{M} )</td>
<td>no DOM</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.01</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>1.6 ( \mu \text{M h}^{-1} \rightarrow 1 \mu \text{M} )</td>
<td>SRFA</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.02</td>
<td>–0.47 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plateaued as partitioning and consumption balanced, and decreased primarily due to depletion of \(H_2S(g)\) in the carrier gas as the S(-II) reservoir was depleted (Fig. 2b). The rate of S(-II) increase and its quasi-steady-state concentrations are listed in Table 1. In experiment D, \(H_{\text{aq}}\) decreased significantly more slowly compared to when 140 \(\mu\text{M}\) \(Na_2S\) was instantaneously added and, again, significantly more slowly in experiment E than D, on the basis of the 90-percent confidence intervals of fitted rate coefficients (Table 1). \(H_{\text{aq}}\) concentrations between 2 and 6 h following the introduction of \(H_2S(g)\) were, respectively, 1.9 and 2.2 times higher than that of the same period following 140 \(\mu\text{M}\) \(Na_2S\) amendment (Table 1B, D and E), with approximately 40 percent \(H_{\text{aq}}\) persisting (Fig. 2) as \(H_{\text{non-labile}}\) (Eq. (7)).

In the previous two sets of experiments, S(-II) instantly or quickly exceeded \(Hg\) on the order of 10–100 times on a mole basis. A third set of experiments was conducted using \(H_2S(g)\) at S(-II)-limited and near-limited conditions with similar SRFA and initial \(Hg\) concentrations. In experiment H, \(H_{\text{aq}}\) decreased by 50 percent while S(-II) remained undetectable (<0.1 \(\mu\text{M}\)) for almost 30 min (Fig. 3). \(H_{\text{aq}}\) temporarily stabilized at 0.27 \(\mu\text{M}\) while S(-II) reached 1 \(\mu\text{M}\), after which S(-II) exceeded \(H_{\text{aq}}\) and \(H_{\text{aq}}\) more gradually decreased at 0.47 ± 0.09 \(\mu\text{M} \text{s}^{-1}\). The pH of the reactor decreased from 7.3 to 5.9 because the lower \(H_2S\) concentration fed into the reactor was overcompensated by the concurrent \(CO_2\) amendment of the reactor headspace.

In experiment F, where S(-II) exceeded \(Hg\) within 30 min and reached a S(-II)/\(Hg\) mole-ratio of 6, the initial rate at which \(H_{\text{aq}}\) decreased is similar to experiment H (Fig. 3, open circles and diamonds). However, between 1 and 6 h after S(-II) introduction, \(H_{\text{aq}}\) decreased at 0.16 ± 0.02 \(\mu\text{M} \text{s}^{-1}\) in experiment F (6 \(\mu\text{M}\) peak S(-II)). That value is one third the rate observed when less S(-II) was in the reactor during experiment H (1 \(\mu\text{M}\) peak S(-II)). Under similar \(H_2S(g)\) amendment conditions as experiment F, the rate of \(H_{\text{aq}}\) decrease was significantly faster in the absence of SRFA, with only two percent of \(H_{\text{aq}}\) persisting (\(H_{\text{non-labile}}\) in Eq. (7)) 1 h beyond the introduction of \(H_2S(g)\) (experiment G in Table 1 and Fig. 3a).

### 3.1.2. Long term stability of mercury

\(H_{\text{aq}}\) was periodically quantified for almost two weeks following the addition of 140 \(\mu\text{M}\) \(Na_2S\) to 0.83 (mmol C) L\(^{-1}\) solutions with Suwannee River fulvic and humic acid (SRFA and SRHA) and Pony Lake fulvic acid (PLFA). Five \(Hg\) concentrations over five orders of magnitude were studied for all three DOM isolates to determine how the \(Hg/\text{DOM}\) ratio—and therefore the strength of \(Hg\)-DOM association—would affect the solubility of \(Hg\) when \(Na_2S\) was added.

In all fifteen cases (i.e., three DOM isolates by five \(Hg\) concentrations), \(H_{\text{aq}}\) declined rapidly within 1 h following \(Na_2S\) amendments, regardless of \(Hg\) concentration or type of DOM (Fig. 4). After this initial decline, however, \(H_{\text{aq}}\) concentrations increased to varying degrees that are apparently sensitive to \(Hg\) concentration and type of DOM. For example, in the presence of 0.83 (mmol C) L\(^{-1}\) SRFA and 518 nM \(Hg\), \(H_{\text{aq}}\) decreased by 85 percent 3 h after \(Na_2S\) amendment but then almost tripled to 40 percent of the initial \(H_{\text{aq}}\) 30 h later (Fig. 4a, second curve from the top). Starting with 1.11 nM \(Hg\), an 80 percent \(H_{\text{aq}}\) decline over 3 h was followed by complete dissolution of \(Hg\) (Fig. 4a, bottom curve), suggesting that the \(HgS\) in this system dissolved to a greater extent than systems containing more \(Hg\). Interestingly, in these and other cases, \(H_{\text{aq}}\) declined again following dissolution. Staying with these same examples—518 and 1.11 nM \(Hg\) with SRFA and 140 \(\mu\text{M}\) S(-II)—\(H_{\text{aq}}\) declined to 30 and 40 percent of their respective maxima at 30–40 h. \(H_{\text{aq}}\) fluctuated during experiments with all DOM types and total \(Hg\) concentrations studied, cyclically in many cases. The pH of the reactors rose from pH 7 to
7.8–7.9 in 1 day and pH 8.4–8.6 after 13 days, likely due to bisulfide buffering and DOM hydrolysis (Ritchie and Perdue, 2003). \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) appears to have stabilized in about 12 of the 15 experiments, while three experiments suggest continual fluctuation after almost two weeks following \( \text{Na}_2\text{S} \) amendment. Apparently stable \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) fractions ranged

---

**Fig. 3.** (a) Fraction of \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) following addition of \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) in the presence of 0.83 mM C as Suwannee River fulvic acid under sulfide-limited and near-limited conditions relative to the initial concentration of \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) (from bottom to top, the initial \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) measured in samples collected prior to adding \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) was 0.907 mM (experiment G), 0.709 mM (experiment H), and 0.620 mM (experiment F), which all data were normalized by, (b) aqueous \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) concentration during these \( \text{H}_2\text{S(g)} \)-amendment experiments; \( \text{H}_2\text{S(g)} \) that partitioned into the aqueous phase was initially consumed (up to 30 min), presumably by reaction with \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) and/or DOM, after which \( \text{H}_2\text{S(g)} \) continued to partition into the aqueous phase, causing \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) to increase. In experiments F and G, \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) peaked and then decreased primarily due to depletion of \( \text{H}_2\text{S(g)} \) in the carrier gas as the \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) reservoir was depleted. In experiment H, the \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) reservoir was not depleted; \( \text{S}(-\text{II}) \) was controlled instead by reactions with \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) and/or DOM. Estimated variability in \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) recovery would plot smaller than the size of the symbols.

**Fig. 4.** \( \text{Hg} \) solubility over nearly two weeks following the addition of 140 mM \( \text{Na}_2\text{S} \) to 0.83 mM C solutions of (a) Suwannee River fulvic acid, (b) Suwannee River humic acid, and (c) Pony Lake fulvic acid, equilibrated with \( \text{Hg(NO}_3\text{)}_2 \). Curves are offset for clarity. \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) concentrations measured prior to adding \( \text{Na}_2\text{S} \), which all data are normalized by, are indicated by the arrows. \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) fractions at the end of each experiment are also indicated. The scale bar to the left of panel (a) indicates a 50-percent change in the \( \text{Hg(II)}_{\text{aq}} \) fraction. Unless indicated otherwise, estimated variability in \( \text{Hg}_{\text{aq}} \) recovery would plot smaller than the size of the symbols.
from 0.02 to 0.35 (0.10 on average), depending on, but not systematically varying with, DOM type and total Hg concentration (Fig. 4). Since the solubility of HgS\(_{\text{S(-II)}}\) significantly increases above pH 8 (Clever et al., 1985), I cannot rule out enhanced Hg solubility due to elevated pH beyond 1 day following Na\(_2\)S/H\(_3\)BO\(_3\) amendment.

### 3.2. Mercury speciation and colloidal properties

Mercury L\(_{\text{III}}\)-edge EXAFS analysis of freeze-dried ultracentrifugates of 10 \(\mu\)M Hg, 0.83 (mmol C) L\(^{-1}\) DOM, and 160 \(\mu\)M S(-II) mixtures indicate that Hg atoms are predominantly bonded to sulfur in condensed phases. Conceivable Hg–oxygen pair correlations overestimate amplitude in the 2–9 Å\(^{-1}\) region and so were not considered further. As shown in Fig. 5, the EXAFS amplitudes of Hg–S species formed in the presence of SRFA, SRHA, and, to a lesser extent, PLFA are less than that of crystalline metacinnabar (β-HgS). In addition, Fourier transformed EXAFS reveal lower frequencies for Hg–S–DOM samples compared to β-HgS (Fig. 5b). The harmonic EXAFS structural model suggests that Hg atoms are surrounded on average by \(\bar{N}=2.5\) sulfur atoms at interatomic distances ranging from \(R=2.34\) to 2.37 Å in three out of four Hg–S–DOM spectra, compared to 4 sulfurs at 2.53 Å for β-HgS (Table 2). Smaller coordination numbers and shorter interatomic distances are characteristic of the harmonic EXAFS model of disordered materials (Combes et al., 1989; Frenkel et al., 2001), as are higher Debye-Waller factors (\(\sigma^2\)), which in the present study were 30% and 140% higher for the Hg–S pair correlation of Hg–S–DOM data compared to β–HgS. Three alternate models were employed to directly evaluate the disorder of the HgS\(_{\text{S(-II)}}\) species identified by EXAFS. For β–HgS, a split shell harmonic model consisting of two overlapping Hg–S pair correlations improved the reduced \(\chi^2 (\chi^2)\). The third cumulant (\(C_3\)) of the expanded version of the harmonic model of β-HgS was zero within its standard deviation, reducing back to the standard harmonic model. The analytical asymmetric model of β-HgS produced the highest \(\chi^2\), meaning the asymmetry parameter (\(h\)) is unjustified. The split shell harmonic model of β-HgS closely matches its crystallographic structure and includes a \(\sigma^2\) value that is more typical of minerals, suggesting that the β-HgS sample is slightly disordered, which is conceivable for a heavy element in a specimen obtained from a mineral deposit. The least-squares optimized structural parameters of the cumulant expansion and analytical asymmetric models of β-HgS are in excellent agreement with crystallographic data (Table 2). Thus, while these latter two models are not statistically justified for β-HgS, they did not produce spurious structural parameters and so can be used to reliably assess the structure of HgS\(_{\text{S(-II)}}\) species formed in the presence of DOM.

Time of the reaction between 10 \(\mu\)M Hg and 160 \(\mu\)M S(-II) in the presence of SRFA improved EXAFS signal-to-noise (especially 9–12 Å\(^{-1}\); Fig. 5). The analytical asymmetric model of the Hg–S pair correlation was optimal for the sample quenched 3 h after S(-II) addition, considering the noise in the data and the plausibility of fitted \(\sigma^2\) and other structural variables (Table 2). After 30 h of reaction, the split shell harmonic model fit is both reasonable and statistically optimal (Table 2). The analytical asymmetric model of the 3-h quenched sample suggests that Hg–S interatomic distances are initially broadly distributed and skewed upon S(-II) addition (Fig. 6) but then become shorter and less skewed after 30 h. The 3-h sample’s Hg–S centroidal average interatomic distance (\(R\)) is similar to that of
β-HgS. $R$ of the 30-h sample’s Hg–S pair correlation is shorter ($2.41 \pm 0.04 \text{ Å}$) than β-HgS. While this interatomic distance resembles nearest neighbor sulfur atoms in cinabar (α-HgS), an α-HgS Hg–S pair correlation fits the experimental EXAFS data poorly, further distinguishing the HgS$_\text{S(α)}$ formed in the presence of SRFA from crystalline analogs. In addition, despite being more thermodynamically stable than β-HgS, α-HgS does not form at room temperature (Hepler and Olofsson, 1975; Paquette and Helz, 1997). The 30-h sample’s sulfur coordination number is significantly less than that of β-HgS. These results suggest that, upon S(−II) addition, Hg is primarily tetrahedrally coordinated by sulfur atoms with appreciable disorder on the molecular scale. As reactions between Hg, DOM, and S(−II) continued, the distribution of Hg–S interatomic distances narrowed while the weighted average Hg–S coordination number ($N$) decreased.

This evolution of $R$ and $N$ is consistent with homogenization of the molecular structure of HgS$_4$ monomers through limited polymerization; that is, polymerization was likely interrupted in the nanometer regime and did not attain the long-range structural order of crystalline β-HgS. Undercoordinated metal ions at particle surfaces (e.g., S–Hg–S) comprise a higher fraction of the total metal ions in nanoparticles (Frenkel et al., 2001). Assuming a spherical assemblage of HgS$_4$ monomers as in β-HgS, the 30-h reacted SRFA sample’s coordination number ($N = 2.9 \pm 0.5$) is consistent with a 1–2 nm HgS$_\text{S(α)}$ polymer, which would have an average 2.5–3.2 sulfurs per Hg atom. Particle size determination on the basis of first shell EXAFS fitting is highly uncertain. Unfortunately, attempts to measure HgS$_\text{S(α)}$ particle size in Hg–S–SRFA specimens with transmission electron microscopy were unsuccessful, probably due to volatilization of mercury, which I observed when examining synthetic β-HgS nanoparticles. Hg–S distances shorter than β-HgS could be due to surface and interior deformities caused by the presence of SRFA during HgS$_\text{S(α)}$ precipitation, which has only been documented for
Table 2
First-shell fit results of Hg-L\textsubscript{II} edge extended X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS) of 10 (mg C)/L dissolved organic matter, 10 \uM Hg(II) mixtures amended with 160 \uM sulfide after ultracentrifugation and lyophilization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(R) (\AA) (a)</th>
<th>(\sigma^2) (\AA\textsuperscript{2})</th>
<th>(C_1) (\AA\textsuperscript{3} \times 10\textsuperscript{-4})</th>
<th>(C_4) (\AA\textsuperscript{4} \times 10\textsuperscript{-4})</th>
<th>(h) (b)</th>
<th>(\Delta E_0) (eV)</th>
<th>(\chi^2) (\times 10\textsuperscript{-2d})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacinnabar ((\beta)-HgS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic</td>
<td>4(5)</td>
<td>2.51(1)</td>
<td>0.010(1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split harmonic (b)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>2.54(6)</td>
<td>0.007(3)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>4.4(3)</td>
<td>2.54(1)</td>
<td>0.007(1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.048(9)</td>
<td>1.5(7)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwannee River fulvic acid, quenched 3 h after adding S(-II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic</td>
<td>4.2(7)</td>
<td>2.43(1)</td>
<td>0.017(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulant</td>
<td>3.9(5)</td>
<td>2.48(1)</td>
<td>0.016(2)</td>
<td>9(3)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>4.5(6)</td>
<td>2.50(3)</td>
<td>0.009(1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.085(2)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwannee River fulvic acid, quenched 30 h after adding S(-II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic</td>
<td>2.5(3)</td>
<td>2.37(1)</td>
<td>0.010(1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split harmonic</td>
<td>2.9(5)</td>
<td>2.41(4)</td>
<td>0.007(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulant</td>
<td>2.5(3)</td>
<td>2.41(1)</td>
<td>0.009(1)</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulant</td>
<td>3.3(3)</td>
<td>2.41(1)</td>
<td>0.015(1)</td>
<td>6.0(7)</td>
<td>1.4(3)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>3.7(2)</td>
<td>2.50(1)</td>
<td>0.003(4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.098(4)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwannee River humic acid, quenched 30 h after adding S(-II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>2.37(1)</td>
<td>0.012(6)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split harmonic</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>2.4(2)</td>
<td>0.012(4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulant</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.011(3)</td>
<td>7(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>2.6(1)</td>
<td>0.004(1)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.12(2)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pony Lake fulvic acid, quenched 30 h after adding S(-II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic</td>
<td>2.9(3)</td>
<td>2.34(2)</td>
<td>0.009(6)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9(4)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split harmonic</td>
<td>3.8(5)</td>
<td>2.38(1)</td>
<td>0.009(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulant</td>
<td>2.6(5)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.008(2)</td>
<td>5.7(8)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>4.2(4)</td>
<td>2.52(1)</td>
<td>0.0014(5)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.109(6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviations are listed in parentheses, representing the errors in the last digit.

\(a\) Coordination number (\(N\)) and weighted average interatomic distance (\(R\)), based on FEFF 7 Hg-S path generated from the \(\beta\)-HgS crystal structure.

\(b\) Two harmonic paths, \(N = N_1 + N_2\); \(R = \frac{R(N_1 + R N_2)}{N_1 + N_2}\).

\(c\) Asymmetry parameter.

\(d\) Reduced \(\chi^2\) goodness-of-fit parameter: \(\chi^2 = \frac{\sum_{\text{fit}}(k^2|\hat{\chi}(k) - \hat{\chi}_{\text{fit}}(k)|)^2}{\text{ndip}}\), where \(\text{ndip}\) is the number of independent points \(\frac{2\Delta E_0}{\epsilon} \), \(\epsilon\) is the degree of freedom of the fit \(\nu = \text{ndip} - \text{variables} \), \(n\) is the total number of data points, \(\hat{\chi}(k)\) and \(\hat{\chi}_{\text{fit}}(k)\) are the inverse Fourier transformed experimental data and fit, respectively, and \(k\) is the photoelectron momentum.

Metal-sulfide nanoparticles produced with synthetic organic ligands (Gilbert and Banfield, 2005). To my knowledge, these data provide the first direct evidence for aggregated, DOM-coated Hg\textsubscript{S\textsubscript{(a)}} nanoparticles since this model was proposed over 10 years ago (Ravichandran et al., 1999).

EXAFS analysis of the sample quenched 30 h after adding 160 \uM S(-II) to 10 \uM Hg and Suwannee River humic acid (SRHA) indicates the formation of a condensed Hg\textsubscript{S\textsubscript{(a)}} phase having similar weighted average \(N\) and \(R\) as that formed in the presence of the fulvic acid isolate from the same natural water. However, the Hg–S–SRHA sample is best fit by the cumulant model, which implies greater structural disorder than the split shell model that optimally fitted the Hg–S–SRFA sample. An average coordination number of \(N = 3 \pm 1\) suggests that Hg\textsubscript{S\textsubscript{(a)}} formed in the presence of SRHA may consist of small nanometer-scale polymers, but this finding is considerably uncertain given the 33% standard deviation of \(N\).

Like the Hg–S–SRFA sample quenched 30 h after S(-II) addition, the similarly quenched Hg–S–Pony Lake fulvic acid (PLFA) sample’s EXAFS is best fit by a split shell harmonic model with \(N = 3.8\), similar to \(\beta\)-HgS, and \(R = 2.38\) \AA, which is significantly shorter than that of \(\beta\)-HgS and similar (within error) to \(R\) of the Hg–S–SRFA sample (Table 2). The single harmonic and cumulant fits also produced \(R\) values at least 0.16 \AA shorter than their corresponding values of \(\beta\)-HgS fits, suggesting a distinct Hg\textsubscript{S\textsubscript{(a)}} structure formed in the presence of PLFA.

Dynamic light scattering intensities for 0.83 (mmol C) \textsuperscript{-1} DOM, 10 mM NaHCO\textsubscript{3}, and 7–9 mM HClO\textsubscript{4} (pH 7) solutions were 25, 45, and \(35 \pm 5\) kcps for SRFA, SRHA, and PLFA solutions, compared to 10 kcps for water alone. The addition of 10 \uM Hg(NO\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2} to any of these DOM solutions (aged for several weeks) did not significantly change scattered photon intensities. For a few hours following the addition of 140 \uM Na\textsubscript{2}S to these Hg–DOM solutions, scattered photon intensities increased by a few to as much as 10 kcps (Table EA2). Unlike DOM or Hg–DOM solutions, the DLS intensity autocorrelation functions of S(-II)-amended samples had flat baselines, suggesting the formation of particles as confirmed by ultracentrifugation/chemical analysis and EXAFS.
Cumulants analysis of the autocorrelation functions excluded noisy data at short delay times, as shown by the left-most dotted lines in Fig. EA2. Chi-squared ($\chi^2$) cumulants fit errors starting at those delay times and carried out until $G_2(\tau)$ decayed to 0.1 of its initial value were, on average (±1 in the last digit), 0.009(2), 0.016(8), and 0.008(3) for SRFA, SRHA, and PLFA, respectively. An error $\leq 0.005$ indicates a good fit, according to Malvern Instruments. Accordingly, I fit a truncated range of $G_2(\tau)$ such that the fit error was approximately 0.005, yielding first cumulants in the colloidal size range with high polydispersity indices that preclude meaningful particle size determination. Particle size distributions (PSD) determined by the CONTIN algorithm for these DLS data are nano-to-colloidal in size (10–500 nm), do not corroborate first cumulants results, and suggest that particles were removed from the laser path by settling or adhesion to cuvette walls (Fig. EA2 and Table EA2).

DLS signal-to-noise improved substantially from Hg–DOM samples that were reacted with S(-II) for one day and inverted by hand immediately prior to DLS analysis (Fig. 7a). The first cumulants and dimensionless polydispersity indices (in parentheses) of the 10 μM Hg(II) and 180 μM S(-II)-bearing SRFA, SRHA, and PLFA solutions are 28 nm (0.27), 20 nm (0.001), and 22 nm (0.31), respectively. Cumulants fit $\chi^2$ values were 0.002 or less. CONTIN particle size distributions, shown in Fig. 7b, include sizes indicated by first cumulants, but suggest a broader size distribution including particles as large as 200 nm.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Recovery of dissolved mercury

The initial rate at which Hg$_{aq}$ is removed from solution primarily corresponds to the rate of HgS$_{(s)}$ formation. On the basis of EXAFS spectroscopy, the formation of HgS$_{(s)}$ phases of varying structural disorder is unequivocal for systems containing 10 μM Hg (Fig. 5 and Table 2). HgS$_{(s)}$ formation in systems containing less Hg is inferred from the...
similar rates at which Hg$_{aq}$ was lost from solution as the initial Hg$_{aq}$ concentration decreased across five orders of magnitude (Table 1 and Figs. 1–4). In addition to the precipitation of Hg$_{aq}$ as HgS$_{ox}$, the decline of Hg$_{aq}$ shown in Figs. 1–4 could include adhesion of Hg$_{aq}$ to the walls of ultracentrifuge tubes, sorption of Hg$_{aq}$ onto HgS$_{ox}$ surfaces, and settling by ultracentrifugation. The extent of adhesion in the absence of S(-II) is 30 ± 2%g, with an additional 5 ± 5% Hg$_{aq}$ removed by ultracentrifugation from SRFA (details are provided in Annex). S(-II) likely outcompeted glass and polycarbonate for Hg$_{aq}$, so Hg$_{aq}$ likely adhered less during the S(-II)-amended experiments. Even the greatest possible extent of Hg$_{aq}$ adhesion, as measured in the absence of S(-II), does not account for most of the observed changes in Hg$_{aq}$. In addition, Hg$_{aq}$ recoveries by ultracentrifugation and chemical analysis from Hg–DOM solutions varied by 2–5% (2σ), on the basis of triplicate control experiments (Table EA1). Changes in excess of this variability can be assumed, then, to be primarily due to the precipitation or dissolution of HgS$_{ox}$. The remainder of the discussion examines how DOM, Hg concentration, and S(-II) concentration affect changes in Hg$_{aq}$ and HgS$_{ox}$ formation and stability over timescales of hours to days, after which the importance of experimental parameters is discussed.

4.2. Effect of Suwannee River fulvic acid and initial mercury concentration on HgS$_{ox}$ formation

The initial rate of HgS$_{ox}$ formation is statistically indistinguishable in the presence or absence of SRFA upon addition of a 290-fold molar excess of S(-II) (140 μM) to Hg at 0.58 μmol Hg (mmol C)$^{-1}$ (Fig. 1, experiment B). SRFA did, however, double the apparent solubility of Hg 1–7 h following Na$_2$S$_2$O$_3$ addition (Fig. 1, experiments B and C versus A). Twenty percent of Hg persisted in the dissolved phase for nearly a day in the presence of SRFA, while Hg$_{aq}$ declined to 4 percent over the same period in the absence of SRFA. The 20 percent of persistent Hg$_{aq}$ (0.1 μM) is less than half the organic reduced sulfur in SRFA (0.46 μM) (Waples et al., 2005). Therefore, this non-reactive fraction could consist of Hg–thiol complexes (e.g., Hg(RS)$_2$).

The initial rate of HgS$_{ox}$ formation is slower upon addition of the same amount of S(-II) (140 μM) to SRFA-containing Hg$_{aq}$, which is statistically indistinguishable from SRFA containing Hg$_{aq}$ following more S(-II) (Fig. 1, experiments C and B), indicating that DOM can slow the initial reaction between S(-II) and Hg$_{aq}$ at lower S(-II)/Hg ratios. DOM can significantly reduce the initial rate of HgS$_{ox}$ formation if Hg$_{aq}$/SRFA ratios are on the order of 10$^{-1}$ μmol Hg (mmol C)$^{-1}$, but not when this ratio is on the order of 0.1. Regardless of the Hg$_{aq}$/DOM ratio, SRFA prevented as much as 0.1 μmol Hg (mmol C)$^{-1}$ from precipitating over a 1-day period following addition of a 102-fold molar excess of S(-II) to Hg$_{aq}$, indicating that SRFA can form Hg$_{aq}$/complexes that are inert to S(-II) under these conditions (Fig. 1, experiments B and C versus A). These findings demonstrate that greater Hg–DOM complex stability at lower Hg/DOM ratios (Haitzer et al., 2002) limits Hg reactivity toward S(-II). This limitation, while observable, is not so great as to reasonably expect complete inhibition of HgS$_{ox}$ formation by aquatic DOM in natural interstitial waters, which might contain 10$^{-6}$ μM Hg, compared to the 10$^{-3}$ to 1 μM Hg used in the current experiments. That is, HgS$_{ox}$ is likely to form in the presence of aquatic DOM and S(-II) in natural systems, even in remote aquatic habitats contaminated solely by atmospheric Hg deposition.

4.3. Effect of sulfide concentration on HgS$_{ox}$ formation

Comparison of time-resolved Hg$_{aq}$ concentrations under variable S(-II) amendments reveals an additional type of Hg$_{aq}$ species with respect to reactivity toward S(-II). Across a wide range of S(-II)/Hg ratios—290-fold excess down to equimolar S(-II)/Hg—approximately 60 percent, or 0.45–0.51 μmol Hg per mmol C, reacts to form HgS$_{ox}$ (Figs. 2 and 3). Invariance in the extent to which HgS$_{ox}$ is formed upon addition of a wide range of S(-II) confirms that the Hg–SRFA complexes can react with S(-II), as would be expected thermodynamically across the range of observed Hg–DOM stability (Haitzer et al., 2002). Another set of Hg species, approximately 20 percent, or 0.1 μmol Hg per mmol C, is evident from higher persistent Hg$_{aq}$ concentrations during gradual versus instantaneous S(-II) addition (upper 2 curves in Figs. 2a and 3a (experiments D, E, F, and H) versus the bottom curve in Fig. 2a (experiment B). SRFA hindered these Hg species from reacting with S(-II) to an extent dependent on S(-II) concentration. This dependency is consistent with a continuum of Hg–DOM complex stability as has been determined for Hg and other metals (Filella et al., 1990; Buffe and Filella, 1995; Haitzer et al., 2002). In summary, Hg$_{aq}$ can be divided into three species with respect to its reactivity toward S(-II): 0.5 μmol Hg per mmol C (60 percent) that are reactive, 0.1 μmol Hg per mmol C (20 percent) that are kinetically hindered, and another 0.1 μmol Hg per mmol C (20 percent) that are inert to reaction with S(-II).

4.4. Stability of HgS$_{ox}$ formed in the presence of dissolved organic matter

4.4.1. Short term stability of HgS$_{ox}$

One to two hours following sulfide addition, Hg solubility was determined not only by S(-II)-driven formation of HgS$_{ox}$ but increasingly by HgS$_{ox}$ dissolution, on the basis of differences in Hg$_{aq}$ across a lower range of S(-II) amendments. These differences in Hg$_{aq}$ amounting to at least 10$^{-4}$ M, cannot be accounted for solely by S(-II)-promoted HgS$_{ox}$ dissolution, which thermodynamic modeling suggests would produce 10$^{-11}$ M Hg$_{aq}$ in equilibrium with metacinnabar. Therefore, Hg$_{aq}$ was dissolved primarily by DOM or organic sulfur compounds. As shown in Fig. 2 (experiments D versus E), Hg$_{aq}$ was less beyond 1.5 h when more S(-II) was present (approaching 120 μM compared to 25 μM). Notwithstanding this finding, Hg$_{aq}$ data at lower S(-II)/Hg ratios—1 to 6 μmol S(-II) per μmol Hg (Fig. 3, experiments F and H)—indicate a contrary trend in which Hg is more soluble in the presence of more S(-II) during the second phase following the initial S(-II)-driven HgS$_{ox}$ formation. S(-II)/Hg
rations less than 2 resulted in a more steady and rapid decline of $\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}$ from 1.5 to 5 h than when $\text{S(II)}$ reached 120 $\mu$M over the same period (Table 1, experiments D versus H). $\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}$ sampled while $\text{S(II)}$ more rapidly reached a 6-fold $\text{S(II)}/\text{Hg}$ ratio is consistent with this counterintuitive trend (Fig. 3, experiments F and H). While the initial and final pH of experiments D and F are comparable (7.1 and 7.4 $\pm$ 0.2), the low $\text{H}_2\text{S(g)}$ amendment in experiment H was overcompensated by $\text{CO}_2$, acidifying the reactor by 1.4 pH units (Table 1), possibly stabilizing $\text{HgS}_n$. Experiments D and F alone suggest that $\text{Hg}$ is more soluble after $\text{HgS}_n$ forms in 100-fold excess $\text{S(II)}$ compared to $\text{HgS}_n$ formed in 6-fold excess $\text{S(II)}$.

One hypothesis for why $\text{HgS}_n$ appears to be more soluble in the presence of more $\text{S(II)}$ is that $\text{HgS}_n$ formed in the presence of higher $\text{S(II)}$ is subsequently dissolved more by SRFA or organic sulfur compounds formed by reactions between $\text{S(II)}$ and SRFA. EXAFS spectroscopy (Fig. 5) indicates that $\text{HgS}_n$ nucleated in the presence of SRFA is more disordered than $\beta$-$\text{HgS}$ and suggests that it consists of 1–2 nm particles. DLS further suggests that these $\text{HgS}_n$ particles are subunits within 20–200 nm aggregates. The ability of DOM moieties to stabilize or dissolve $\text{HgS}_n$ in the molecular vicinity of nucleation sites may control the extent and rate of $\text{HgS}_n$ dissolution after its initial rapid precipitation. Higher $\text{S(II)}$ concentrations will react with stronger Hg–DOM complexes (Fig. 2), detaching $\text{Hg}^{2+}$ and freeing strongly binding ligands temporarily. Opportunistic adsorption of strong organic ligands such as hydrophobic moieties is expected to promote $\text{HgS}_n$ disaggregation and dissolution (Ravichandran et al., 1998, 1999; Waples et al., 2005). Conversely, $\text{HgS}_n$ formation driven by less $\text{S(II)}$ would limit reactions to more labile Hg–DOM complexes, limiting DOM adsorption to weaker ligands in the diffusion layer around $\text{HgS}_n$ particles that are not associated with hydrophobic moieties. These weakly interacting ligands dissolve $\text{HgS}_n$, less, resulting in greater aggregation and lower apparent Hg solubility.

### 4.4.2. Long term stability of $\text{HgS}_n$

Periodic $\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}$ fluctuations observed on timescales of days (Fig. 4) reflect slow transformations of constituents that promote or hinder $\text{HgS}_n$ dissolution. These transformations may have included addition of $\text{S(II)}$ into DOM to form organic polysulfides (Heitmann and Blodau, 2006), as suggested by suppressed $\text{S(II)}$ concentrations in the presence of SRFA (Fig. 3b, experiments F versus G). Organic molecules that hinder $\text{HgS}_n$ dissolution (Waples et al., 2005) may have competed with HS$^-$ for $\text{HgS}_n$ surface sites, limiting the extent to which $\text{S(II)}$ dissolved $\text{HgS}_n$ (Jay et al., 2000). The apparent effect of total Hg concentration and source of DOM on the magnitude of $\text{Hg}_{\text{aq}}$ fluctuations is likely controlled by the size of $\text{HgS}_n$, aggregates and abundance of dissolution-enhancing DOM components. While EXAFS and DLS suggest $\text{HgS}_n$ nanoparticles form aggregates on the order of 100 nm, greater $\text{HgS}_n$ dissolution in systems containing 0.001 $\mu$M versus higher concentrations of Hg suggests that $\text{HgS}_n$ nanoparticle aggregates were unstable, releasing $\text{HgS}_n$ nanoparticles that are readily dissolved by DOM.

Dissolved-phase and interfacial reactions between Hg, DOM, and S(II) introduce significant variability among findings of model-system research. For instance, DLS intensities in my experiments were less than those of Deonarine and Hsu-Kim (2009) even though concentrations of Hg and S(II) were, respectively, three and 50 times higher in the current study. The lower DLS intensities in the present study might have been due to the formation of smaller or more polydisperse aggregates. Aside from different Hg and S(II) concentrations, Hg was allowed to react with DOM for at least 11 h prior to adding S(II) compared to 5 min in experiments by Deonarine and Hsu-Kim (2009). The apparent thermodynamic stability of Hg(II) has been shown to increase (Gasper et al., 2007) and reactivity decrease (Miller et al., 2009) over several hours, presumably as stronger, less abundant Hg$^{2+}$-binding ligands (e.g., thiols) replace weaker carboxyls. The importance of these strong Hg–DOM interactions to $\text{HgS}_n$ instability is underscored by EXAFS evidence of structural and colloidal transformation in the $\text{HgS}_n$–SRFA systems quenched 3 and 30 h following S(II) addition. Arguably, in near-surface sediments prone to redox fluctuation and found to favor methylmercury production (Hollweg et al., 2009), Hg(II) will bind with strong DOM ligands as sulfur is transformed.

### 5. CONCLUSIONS

Investigations of metal reactivity towards assessing metal bioavailability in soils and sediments are increasingly considering DOM. Compared to soil organic matter, there are few studies of the properties of aquatic DOM. The properties of soil organic matter are sometimes appropriated into conceptual models of metal–organic interactions in aquatic systems, ignoring important physicochemical differences between soils and aquatic organic matter resulting from, for example, preferential adsorption of aromatic and hydrophobic moieties by sediments (McKnight et al., 1992; Ochs et al., 1994) and the difference between the isolation of soil versus aquatic organic matter. To extract organic matter, soil is typically mixed with a strong hydroxide solution (Swift, 1996), whereas natural waters are acidified to pH 2, passed over chromatographic resin, and then eluted with 0.1 N NaOH (Aiken et al., 1992). A variety of techniques have been able to identify structural properties of soil organic matter because of its ability to form clusters (Sutton and Sposito, 2005), albeit when concentrations were, in some cases, unnaturally high (0.2–10 (g C) L$^{-1}$). Studies of aquatic DOM, however, have provided no evidence for aggregation beyond 1–2 nm (Lead et al., 2000a,b; Reemtsma et al., 2008), even at concentrations as high as 10 (g C) L$^{-1}$ (Aiken and Malcolm, 1987). $\text{HgS}_n$ nanoparticles formed in my experiments may have adsorbed organic moieties to heteroaggregate SRFA, SRHA, and PLFA molecules, but this process is not likely to be measurable at $\mu$mol Hg per mmol C ratios.

There is a disconnect between studies of overall Hg–DOM complexation and the properties of the tiny fractions of DOM that apparently affect Hg reactivity at $\text{HgS}_n$ nucleation sites. We know that certain fractions of DOM...
promote while others hinder cinnabar dissolution (Waples et al., 2005). We also know that S(-II) may chemically alter DOM (Heitmann and Blodau, 2006) and therefore should affect its reactivity with HgS(s). A Hg species distribution model needs to consider the stoichiometry of Hg-DOM reactions, which would require the ability to quantify specific DOM moieties. The stoichiometry of Hg reactions with soil organic matter ligands has been estimated on the basis of EXAFS spectroscopy (Skylberg, 2008), but no such spectroscopic evidence is likely forthcoming for dissolved Hg complexes with aquatic DOM. Reentsma et al. (2008) derive compositions and structures using mass spectrometry following fractionation of soil and aquatic DOM by size-exclusion chromatography, but the proposed compounds do not contain nitrogen or sulfur, which should dominate Hg bulk species in organic-rich interstitial waters (Haitzer et al., 2002; Skylberg, 2008).

Next-generation species distribution models would also need to parameterize the effect of formation conditions on the kinetic or equilibrium coefficients of HgS(s) dissolution reactions. The EXAFS results clearly suggest that DOM not only limits HgS(s) particle growth to the nanometer regime, but also causes structural disorder. There is little basis to use metacinnabar as the dominant HgS(s) species in a precipitation model to predict Hg methylation under organic-rich, sulfate-reducing conditions.

Mercury uptake by bacterial cells as a necessary precursor to methylation are more likely to be controlled by kinetic (intermediate), not equilibrium, species. Although the rate of HgS(s) formation depends on Hg/DOM and S(-II)/Hg ratios, it appears to be rapid enough to expect that S(-II) produced by sulfate-reducing bacteria will limit the amount of Hg accessible for methylation (Gilmour et al., 1998; Hammerschmidt et al., 2008; Mitchell and Gilmour, 2008). However, my results also show that up to 40 percent of Hg species (0.3 μmol Hg per mmol C) can be hindered or prevented by DOM from reacting with S(-II) over several hours. The accessibility of these Hg-DOM species to methlyating microorganisms remains unknown. Subsequent to initial S(-II)-driven HgS(s) formation, HgS(s) is susceptible to dissolution by DOM or organic sulfur species produced by addition of S(-II) to DOM, which could sustain levels of bioaccessible Hg that should be of ecological concern. Although not addressed in this study, cations such as Ca 2+, Mg 2+, and Al 3+ can inhibit DOM-promoted HgS(s) dissolution (Ravichandran et al., 1998, 1999). This emerging kinetic conceptual model undermines the premise that the rate or extent of Hg methylation correlates to equilibrium Hg-species distributions.
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