Arsenic sequestration by metallic iron under strongly reducing conditions
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The objective of this study was to elucidate the mechanism of arsenic sequestration by metallic iron in strongly reducing conditions. Contacting arsenic with metallic iron in anaerobic batch systems showed considerable reduction in dissolved arsenic concentration. Scanning electron micrographs of the metallic iron surface after contact with arsenic showed evidence of surface deposits. X-ray diffraction patterns of such surfaces showed evidence for the presence of iron arsenide (FeAs and FeAs₂) phases, and arsenopyrite (FeAsS) and orpiment (As₂S₃) phases respectively, in the absence and presence of dissolved sulphate. Theoretical chemical speciation studies supported the above experimental results. It was thus concluded that strong reducing conditions produced in the vicinity of the anaerobically corroding metallic iron surface result in arsenic sequestration.
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Several recent investigations⁴ have shown metallic iron to be an efficient adsorbent for both arsenic (III) and arsenic (V) under aerobic conditions. The mechanism of sequestration in such cases appears to be the adsorption of arsenic (III) and arsenic (V) on iron oxide minerals, i.e. rust formed on the metallic iron surface as a result of metallic iron corrosion reaction in aerobic conditions⁶, according to eqs (1) and (2):

Aerobic iron corrosion:

\[
2\text{Fe}(0) + \text{O}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{Fe}^{2+} + 4\text{OH}^- , \quad (1)
\]

\[
4\text{Fe}^{2+} + \text{O}_2 + 10\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 4\text{Fe(OH)}_3(s) + 8\text{H}^+ . \quad (2)
\]

Goldberg and Johnston⁷, based on macroscopic measurements, vibrational spectroscopy and surface complexation modelling, reported that arsenic (V) forms inner-sphere complexes with amorphous ferric oxide surface, while arsenic (III) forms both inner- and outer-sphere complexes.

In highly reduced environments and in the presence of iron, arsenic is present as iron–arsenide minerals, e.g. westerveldite⁸ and in presence of sulphur arsenic is predominantly sequestered in association with sulphides⁹. The common arsenic-bearing sulphidic minerals that are cited as natural sources of arsenic are arsenopyrite (FeAsS), realgar (AsS), enargite (Cu₃AsS₅)⁹ and orpiment (As₂S₃)⁹.

With arsenopyrite being the most common¹⁰. Through experiments carried out in anaerobic conditions, Su and Puls¹¹ presented strong evidence for reduction of arsenic (V) near metallic iron surface. Ramaswami et al.¹² reported arsenic sequestration by metallic iron under anaerobic conditions, and in the presence of sulphate. It was hypothesized that during metallic iron corrosion under anaerobic conditions (eq. (3)), conditions near the vicinity of the iron surface may be sufficiently reducing for the formation of iron–arsenide and iron–arsenic–sulphide phases on the surface of anaerobically corroding metallic iron.

Anaerobic iron corrosion:

\[
\text{Fe}(0) + 2\text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{Fe}^{2+} . \quad (3)
\]

The objective of the present study was to present evidence in support of the above mechanism.

Iron filings used for arsenic sequestration contained 94.54% iron, 2.34% carbon, 0.031% copper and 0.349% manganese by weight. Surface area of the iron filings was determined to be 0.586 m²g⁻¹ (BET surface analyzer, Coulter SA 3100, USA). Before use, iron filings were pre-treated for elimination of any oxide coating that may have formed due to prior exposure to the atmosphere.

To determine the extent of arsenic incorporation on the metallic iron surface, 0.75 g of iron filings was taken in 300 ml bottles, which were then filled to the brim with de-aerated de-ionized water, such that no headspace existed. These bottles were maintained for 48 h to ensure initiation of anaerobic iron corrosion. De-aerated stock solution of arsenic (III) was added to the bottles with a syringe, such that arsenic concentration in the bottles was 1000 μg/l. In some bottles, de-aerated sulphate stock solution was added in addition to arsenic (III), such that the sulphate concentration was 250 mg/l in these bottles. The sealed bottles
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were maintained in agitated condition (end-over shaker) for 4 h. Aqueous samples taken from the bottles were analysed for dissolved arsenic (III) content by anodic stripping differential pulse voltammetry (ASDPV). Suitable blanks, i.e. bottles with no metallic iron, but added arsenic and sulphate were simultaneously analysed. Initial sample pH, measured just after arsenic addition, was 7.5–7.7 during such experiments. These experiments were carried out at room temperature, which was 25 ± 3°C during the experimental duration.

In experiments designed for determination of change in surface properties of metallic iron due to arsenic incorporation, 0.6 g of iron filings was taken in 60 ml plastic bottles, which were then filled to the brim with de-aerated deionized water, such that no headspace existed. The bottles were maintained in this condition for 48 h to ensure initiation of anaerobic iron corrosion. Water was extracted from the bottle with a syringe and replaced with equal volume of de-aerated stock solution containing 1 M arsenic (III) or arsenic (V). Sulphate (1 M) was also added to some bottles. Initial solution pH, measured just after arsenic addition, was 7.5–7.7. All bottles were maintained in agitated condition (end-over shaker) for 48 h. These experiments were carried out at room temperature, which was 25 ± 3°C during the experimental duration. The samples were then centrifuged at 10,000 rpm (REMI C 24, Remi, India) for 15 min to separate the solid phase. The solid sample was dried in nitrogen atmosphere and stored in vacuum desiccators, and subsequently analysed by X-ray diffractometry (XRD) for determination of phase composition and by scanning electron microscopy (SEM) for microstructural analysis.

Dissolved arsenic (III) concentration in aqueous samples was measured by ASDPV (VA Trace 757, Metrohm, Switzerland). Scanning electron micrographs of iron filing samples were obtained using a SEM (Model JXA 840, JEOL, Japan). XRD analyses were performed using X-ray powder diffractometer (Model ISO-Debyeflex...
Samples analysed by SEM were also analysed using XRD. Comparative XRD patterns of samples A, B and C, i.e. only iron, iron with arsenic (III), and iron with arsenic (V) respectively, are presented in Figure 3. The XRD pattern of sample A (Figure 3) showed the matching peaks with iron (Fe) (JCPDF 1-1267). The probable phases identified in sample B were iron (Fe) (JCPDF 1-1267), iron arsenide (orthorhombic, FeAs₉) (JCPDF 79-251), and iron arsenide (orthorhombic, FeAs) (JCPDF 76-458). The phases identified in sample C (Figure 3) were the same as those in sample B. This suggests that the arsenic incorporation mechanism on the metallic iron surface is similar in samples B and C, and involves arsenic reduction near the iron surface, followed by the deposition of reduced arsenic-bearing phases on the iron surface. No peaks corresponding to iron oxides were noticed in any case, suggesting little or no rust formation under the prevalent anaerobic conditions. Comparative XRD patterns of samples A, D and E, i.e. only iron, iron with arsenic (III) and sulphate, and iron with arsenic (V) and sulphate respectively, are presented in Figure 4. The probable phases identified in sample D were iron (Fe) (JCPDF 1-1267), arsenopyrite/arsenic iron sulphide (AsFeS) (JCPDF 2-946) and orpiment (monoclinic, As₂S₃) (JCPDF 19-84). The phases identified in sample E were the same as those in sample D. This suggests that the arsenic incorporation mechanism in both samples D and E was the deposition of arsenopyrite and orpiment phases on the metallic iron surface. As earlier, no peaks corresponding to iron oxides were noticed in any of the above cases.

![Figure 3. Comparative X-ray diffraction patterns for samples A–C.](image-url)

![Figure 4. Comparative X-ray diffraction patterns for samples A, D and E.](image-url)
Theoretical calculations (not reported here) indicate that when metallic iron is contacted with water in anaerobic conditions in the pH range of 7–9, the pE at the metallic iron surface is likely to be between −13 and −9. Theoretical speciation studies with arsenic, iron and sulphur were carried out in the same pH and pE ranges, using MINEQL+, a chemical speciation software. Total species concentrations used were 10^{-6} M for arsenic, and 5 \times 10^{-5} M for iron and sulphur, which are representative of conditions expected near the metallic iron surface. Calculations show that at pE below −11, all arsenic is present in a precipitated form as FeAsS (arsenopyrite) in the pH range of 6 to 10. Speciation calculations in the pH range of 6 to 10 and pE value of −11 (Figure 5a) show that all arsenic is present in the precipitated form, mainly as FeAsS, with transformation of FeAsS to As2S3 (orpiment) noticeable beyond pH 9.5. Speciation calculation at pE −10 (Figure 5b) also shows that all arsenic is present in precipitated form, however, only As2S3 precipitate is observed beyond pH 9.75. Calculations at pE −9 (Figure 6a) indicate FeAsS precipitation up to pH 8.75 and complete solubilization of arsenic at pH greater than 9.75. Calculations at pE −8 (Figure 6b) show no evidence of FeAsS precipitation; however, arsenic is present in precipitated form as As2S3 up to pH 9, after which complete solubilization of arsenic is observed. In conclusion, results of Figures 5 and 6 taken in totality provide theoretical support for experimental results presented in Figure 4, i.e. arsenic precipitation as either FeAsS or As2S3 is expected on anaerobically corroding metallic iron surface in systems containing sulphate.

The main objective of this study was to elucidate the mechanism for arsenic sequestration by metallic iron under anaerobic conditions. The results presented indicate that:

- Contacting arsenic with metallic iron in anaerobic conditions, both in the presence and absence of sulphate resulted in considerable reduction in dissolved arsenic concentration, which suggested arsenic sequestration by the metallic iron surface.
- SEM of the metallic iron surface after contact with arsenic in anaerobic systems showed evidence of surface depositions.
- XRD patterns of surfaces both before and after arsenic incorporation showed no evidence of iron oxide phases, thus eliminating arsenic adsorption on iron oxide as the mechanism for arsenic sequestration.

![Figure 5](image1.png)

**Figure 5.** Equilibrium chemical speciation and precipitate formation in a system containing 1 μM arsenic, 500 μM iron and 500 μM sulphur at (a) pE = −11 and (b) pE = −10; temperature, 25°C.
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**Figure 6.** Equilibrium chemical speciation and precipitate formation in a system containing 1 μM arsenic, 500 μM iron and 500 μM sulphur at (a) pE = −9 and (b) pE = −8; temperature, 25°C.
XRD patterns of metallic iron surfaces after arsenic incorporation showed presence of iron arsenide (FeAs and FeAsS) phases when no sulphur was present, and presence of arsenopyrite (FeAsS) and oripiment (As$_2$S$_3$) when sulphur was present.

Based on the similarity of XRD patterns irrespective of whether arsenic (III) or arsenic (V) was contacted with the metallic iron surface, it was concluded that arsenic incorporation on the metallic iron surface involved arsenic reduction near the iron surface, followed by deposition of reduced arsenic-bearing phases on the iron surface.

Theoretical chemical speciation studies of a system containing arsenic, iron and sulphur showed precipitation of arsenic-bearing sulphide phases, i.e. FeAsS (arsenopyrite) and As$_2$S$_3$ (oripiment) under strongly reducing conditions expected in the vicinity of anaerobically corroding metallic iron surface.

In conclusion, these results indicate that adsorption columns and in situ reactive barriers containing metallic iron may potentially be efficient in removing dissolved arsenic from water under strongly reducing conditions.
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This communication describes the detection of Camptothecin (CPT) in an endophytic fungus and application of gradient reverse phase HPLC method with diode array and MS/MS detection for quantification of the said compound. The extract of fungus *Enterophoresis infrequens* isolated from the inner bark of *Nothapodytes foetida* plant was chromatographed on a Merck (250 × 4.6 mm, 5 μm) column, maintained at 30°C, and analysed by positive mode electrospray ionization tandem mass spectrometry on a mass spectrometer in a single reaction monitoring system. The mobile phase consisted of a linear gradient of water, acetonitrile from 10 to 98% in 35 min. The quantity of CPT in the extract was estimated on the basis of linear calibration curves obtained in the concentration range of 5 to 50 ng with standard CPT. Fungus grown under culture method accumulated 40 mg CPT/kg dry cell mass, which is far lower than that present in the plant source from where the organism was isolated. This report on the accumulation of CPT in a fungus may be a starting point for improving the productivity of CPT in this isolate.
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CAMPOTHECIN, often abbreviated as CPT (Figure 1), and its analogues are naturally occurring group of quinoline alkaloids depicting profound cytotoxic activity. Various plant species such as *Camptotheca acuminata*, *Ophiopogon mungo*, *Ervatamia hyneana* and *Nothapodytes foetida* are known sources of this phytotoxic compound. The supply of CPT depends primarily on the abundant availability of plants such as *C. acuminata*. Many parts of this plant can be used to extract CPTs. The overexploitation of this source rendered the plant as an endangered species all over the globe, especially in China. The gene pool of this plant is very small in countries like USA. Literature survey on camptothecin revealed that the molecule occupies an important position among the plant-based anti-cancer drugs. In order to conserve the germplasm, a need was felt to look for alternate sources for this class of natural products. Sustained search in this direction led to the isolation of an
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