Speciation and sorption structure of diphenylarsinic acid in soil clay mineral fractions using sequential extraction and EXAFS spectroscopy
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Abstract

Purpose The mobility of arsenic (As) in soils is fundamentally affected by the clay mineral fraction and its composition. Diphenylarsinic acid (DPAA) is an organoarsenic contaminant derived from chemical warfare agents. Understanding how DPAA interacts with soil clay mineral fractions will enhance understanding of the mobility and transformation of DPAA in the soil-water environment. The objective of this study was to investigate the speciation and sorption structure of DPAA in the clay mineral fractions.

Materials and methods Twelve soils were collected from nine Chinese cities which known as chemical weapons burial sites and artificially contaminated with DPAA. A sequential extraction procedure (SEP) was employed to elucidate the speciation of DPAA in the clay mineral fractions of soils. Pearson’s correlation analysis was used to derive the relationship between DPAA sorption and the selected physicochemical properties of the clay mineral fractions. Extended X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS) LIII-edge As was measured using the beamline BL14W1 at Shanghai Synchrotron Radiation Facility (SSRF) to identify the coordination environment of DPAA in clay mineral fractions.

Results and discussion The SEP results showed that DPAA predominantly existed as specifically fraction (18.3–52.8%). A considerable amount of DPAA was also released from non-specifically fraction (8.2–46.7%) and the dissolution of amorphous, poorly crystalline, and well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides (20.1–46.2%). A combination of Pearson’s correlation analysis and SEP study demonstrated that amorphous and poorly crystalline Fe (hydr)oxides contributed most to DPAA sorption in the clay mineral fractions of soils. The EXAFS results further demonstrated that DPAA formed inner-sphere complexes on Fe (hydr)oxides, with As-Fe distances of 3.18–3.25 Å. It is likely that the steric hindrance caused by phenyl substitution and hence the instability of DPAA/Fe complexes explain why a substantial amount of DPAA presented as weakly bound forms.

Conclusions DPAA in clay mineral fractions predominantly existed as specifically, amorphous, poorly crystalline, and crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides associated fractions. Amorphous/poorly crystalline Fe rather than total Fe contributed more to DPAA sorption and DPAA formed inner-sphere complexes on Fe (hydr)oxides.
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1 Introduction

Clark I (diphenylchloroarsine) and Clark II (diphenylcyanoarsine) were widely produced during World Wars I and II as chemical warfare agents. Subsequently, these agents were disposed of in China, Europe, and Japan primarily by earth-burying and sea-dumping (Deng and Evans 1997; Garnaga et al. 2006; Daus et al. 2010). Leaching of diphenylarsinic acid (DPAA) (Fig. S1, Electronic Supplementary Material—ESM), a degradation product of Clark I and Clark II, from munitions to soil and from soil to groundwater has gained increasing attention (Hanaoka et al. 2005a, b) due to its high persistence in the soil-water environment (Hempel et al. 2009); a factor exacerbated by its high bioaccessibility (Arao et al. 2009) and mobility (Maejima et al. 2011), as well as its high cytotoxic and genotoxic effects (Ochi et al. 2004). To evaluate the potential environmental and health risks of DPAA, it is essential to fully understand its sorption behavior and mobility in soils. A study indicates that DPAA is specifically adsorbed onto soil minerals rather than by hydrophobic interaction with soil organic matter (SOM) (Maejima et al. 2011), and Fe (hydr)oxide is understood to be the primary component responsible for DPAA sorption in soil (Wang et al. 2013), but no direct evidence has been provided. More chemical and molecular information are still urgently required to elucidate the interactions between DPAA and soil minerals.

Sequential extraction procedure (SEP) has been applied for a long time to characterize the interactions of arsenic (As) with soil minerals, and the following speciations of As are determined: non-specifically sorbed, specifically sorbed, amorphous and poorly crystalline Fe/Al (hydr)oxides associated, well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides associated, and residual phases (Girouard and Zagury 2009; Wang et al. 2015). van Herreweghe et al. (2003) used a SEP to extract As from industrially contaminated soils and found that the majority of As was released after NaOH extraction; this fraction accounts for As bound to the surface of Fe-rich minerals according to Manful (1992). Although SEP is a relatively simple method to determine As speciation, several constraints to this technique have been reported, such as limited precision, selectivity, and redistribution of analytes among phases during extraction (Bacon and Davidson 2008; Wang and Mulligan 2008). Most importantly, SEP results should be considered only in operational defined fractions; it provides no information relevant to the sorption structure of As. To overcome these limitations, it is necessary to combine SEP with other characterization techniques.

Extended X-ray absorption fine structure (EXAFS) spectroscopy is a powerful technique that directly determines chemically bound forms and local coordination environment of As in soils. Arçon et al. (2005) identified that, in a contaminated soil, Fe and Al atoms occurred in the next neighbor coordination shells around As, with an As-Fe distance at 3.34 Å and As-Al distance at 2.54 Å, suggesting that As was mainly present as Fe- and Al-bound forms. Cancès et al. (2005) used EXAFS to investigate an As-contaminated soil from a former pesticide plant. They observed that 0.7–1.9 Fe atoms were located at As-Fe distances of ca. 3.3 Å, corresponding to As linked to Fe (hydr)oxides by double-cornering sharing. However, although considerable EXAFS work has been devoted to study the coordination environment of inorganic As in soil, much less is known for organoarsenic compounds.

The molecular environment of organoarsenical compounds in the soil environment is primarily provided by their interactions with Fe (hydr)oxides (Fu et al. 2016). Shimizu et al. (2011) investigated the sorption structure of monomethylarsenate (MMA) and dimethylarsenate (DMA) on goethite and found that both compounds formed bidentate binuclear cornering sharing (\( \text{2C} \)) bonds. Tanaka et al. (2014) observed that both DPAA and phenylarsenic acid (PAA) (Fig. S1—ESM) formed \( \text{2C} \) and monodentate mononuclear corner-sharing (\( \text{1V} \)) bonds on ferrihydrite. More recently, we identified both inner-sphere \( \text{2C} \) complexes and out-sphere complexes for DPAA sorption on ferrihydrite, goethite and hematite (Zhu et al. 2019). However, no EXAFS work has been devoted to the sorption of DPAA, and other phenyl arsenic compounds, to soil, which may be due to the weak retention of these compounds, and thus low signal value and high background noise.

The majority of active sites responsible for As sorption in soils are in the clay mineral fractions (<2-μm diameter) (Lombi et al. 2000). Their increased retention of As compared with the whole soil will ease the application of EXAFS technique. Thus, by using these fractions, the problems of low signal and high background noise could be overcome, making this a good model to use EXAFS. The objective of this study was to determine the specific speciation and local coordination environment of DPAA in clay mineral fractions using a combination of SEP and EXAFS techniques. The SEP and EXAFS data in this study is compared with the available literature data of inorganic, methyl, and phenyl arsenicals and discussed in terms of group substitution. The results deepen our understanding in the sorption, partitioning, and mobility of DPAA and also throw lights on risk assessment and the development of remediation strategies for DPAA in the soil-water environment.
2 Materials and methods

2.1 Soil samples and clay mineral fraction isolation

Twelve soils were collected from nine Chinese cities where chemical weapons burial sites have been found according to Deng and Evans (1997). The soil types were classified according to Gong (2007). Soil properties were analyzed mainly according to the methods of Lu (2000). Briefly, soil pH was determined in soil/water ratio 1:2.5. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) was measured using sodium acetate–ammonium acetate extraction. Point of zero charge (PZC) was analyzed using salt titration method (Sakurai et al. 1988). SOM was measured using dichromate oxidation. Fe was extracted using dithionite-citrate-bicarbonate (DCB), ammonium oxalate, and HF-HCl solutions separately (Pretorius et al. 2006), representative of the free Fe forms (Fe$_{2}$O$_{3}$DCB) and the total Fe (Fe$_{\text{total}}$), respectively. The extracted Fe was analyzed using o-phenanthroline photometric method. Al was extracted using DCB and HF-HNO$_{3}$-HCl solutions separately, representative of the free Al oxides (Al$_{2}$O$_{3}$DCB) and the total Al (Al$_{\text{total}}$), respectively. The extracted Al was measured by inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectroscopy (ICP-OES, Optima 7000 DV, Perkin Elmer Co., USA). Si extracted by HF-HNO$_{3}$-HClO$_{4}$ solution (Si$_{\text{total}}$) was also determined by ICP-OES. Soil particle composition was determined by a laser particle analyzer (Marlvern Mastersizer 2000F, Malvern Instruments Ltd., UK). The concentrations of total As in soils were determined using atomic fluorescence spectrometry (AFS-930, Beijing Jitian Instrument Co., China) after HCl-HNO$_{3}$ digestion (GB/T 22105.2-2008).

All soil samples were air dried and sieved to obtain a particle size ≤2-mm diameter, then treated repeatedly with H$_{2}$O$_{2}$ according to Zhang and Gong (2012) until all organic matter was completely removed. Briefly, 30 g of soil was placed in a 1 L tall beaker and 300 mL of 30% H$_{2}$O$_{2}$ dissolved inedi (v/v = 1:1) was added. The soil was allowed to proceed at room temperature overnight and then at 60–70 °C in an electric stove. The treatment was repeated until no visible reaction could be detected by addition of more H$_{2}$O$_{2}$. The clay mineral fractions were then obtained by sedimentation after removing carbonate (Jackson 1975). To remove extra HCl introduced in carbonate elimination step, the clay mineral fraction was washed with ultra-pure water and freeze-dried before the sorption experiment. Selected physicochemical properties of the whole soils and their clay mineral fractions are presented in Table S1 (ESM) and Table 1, respectively. The mineralogy of the clay mineral fractions was verified by X-ray diffraction (XRD, Ultima IV, Rigaku) and the results are listed in Table S2 (ESM).

2.2 DPAA sorption

A DPAA solution (100 mg L$^{-1}$) was prepared in 0.01 mol L$^{-1}$ NaNO$_{3}$ as the background solution. The sorption experiments were carried out using a sorbent concentration of 50 g L$^{-1}$ in 50-mL Teflon tubes and performed in triplicate. The pH was adjusted to 6.0 with a 0.1 mol L$^{-1}$ HNO$_{3}$ or NaOH solution. All tubes were shaken at 150 rev min$^{-1}$ for 24 h at 25 ± 1 °C in the dark. Solids were harvested by centrifugation at 3000 rev min$^{-1}$ for 10 min. Two parallels were subjected directly to SEP analysis and one parallel was rinsed carefully with 0.01 mol L$^{-1}$ NaNO$_{3}$ to remove DPAA solution remaining in the sample; the wet paste, sealed in tubes, was used for EXAFS analysis.

2.3 Sequential extraction procedure

A five-step (i to v) SEP modified from Wenzel et al. (2001) was adopted for this study. In order to avoid DPAA oxidation, HNO$_{3}$-HCl instead of HNO$_{3}$-H$_{2}$O$_{2}$ was employed to extract residual DPAA. Step i, non-specifically sorbed DPAA was extracted with 0.05 mol L$^{-1}$ (NH$_{4}$)$_{2}$SO$_{4}$; step ii, specifically sorbed DPAA was extracted using 0.05 mol L$^{-1}$ (NH$_{4}$)$_{2}$H$_{2}$PO$_{4}$; step iii, DPAA associated with amorphous and poorly-crystalline Fe/Al (hydr)oxides was extracted using a 0.2 mol L$^{-1}$ NH$_{4}$-oxalate buffer (pH 3.25); step iv, DPAA bound to the well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides was extracted using 0.2 mol L$^{-1}$ NH$_{4}$-oxalate and 0.1 mol L$^{-1}$ ascorbic acid (pH 3.25) and step v, residual DPAA was dissolved using HNO$_{3}$-HCl (v/v = 1:1). Following these steps, two additional wash steps were performed using NH$_{4}$-oxalate to remove residual DPAA from the solution, as described by Wenzel et al. (2001). Extracts from each step were analyzed for DPAA content using a high-performance liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry (HPLC-MS/MS) method with low matrix effect (102–107%), detection limit (0.01 μg L$^{-1}$), and intra- and interday previsions (<5%) (Zhu et al. 2016a). The amount of DPAA sorbed ($Q_{\text{ads}}$, mg kg$^{-1}$ dry clay mineral fractions) was calculated as the sum of the DPAA extracted in the five-step SEP.

2.4 EXAFS data collection and analysis

Only four types of clay mineral fractions were selected for a detailed EXAFS analysis due to limited synchrotron time availability. All slurry samples were mounted in Kapton tape, then tightly sealed. The EXAFS data were collected at Shanghai Synchrotron Radiation Facility (SSRF) using the beamline BL14W1 equipped with a Si(111) double-crystal monochromator. During the measurement, the synchrotron was operated at energy of 3.5 GeV and 150 to 200 mA. All spectra were collected in fluorescence mode with 32-element Ge semiconductor detector, from −150 to 800 eV relative to...
the As-K edge of 11,867 eV. Each EXAFS spectrum represented the average of three scans and each scan took 30–60 min to collect depending on exposure time. The obtained EXAFS spectra were analyzed using Artemis from the IFEFFIT software package (Nevville 2001) and the procedure detailed in Zhu et al. (2019). Briefly, the EXAFS data were first background subtracted, averaged, normalized, and Fourier transformed, then back-transformed and fitted with the predicted function in which the coordination numbers (CN), their distances (R), Debye-Waller (σ²), and threshold energies (ΔE₀) were varied to give the best fit. The R factor, which is defined as the mean square difference between the fit and the data on a point-by-point basis, was also reported and the value less than 0.05 accepted as a reasonable fit (Kelly et al. 2008).

2.5 Statistical analysis

Pearson’s correlation analysis was used to derive the relationship between DPAA sorption and the selected physicochemical properties of the clay mineral fractions. SPSS version 20.0 was used to perform the Pearson’s correlation analysis.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Correlation between DPAA sorption and properties of clay mineral fractions

The level of sorption of DPAA on clay mineral fractions from the 12 soil types is shown in Fig. 1. All clay mineral fractions studied had sorbed significant amounts of DPAA after 24 h equilibration (Fig. 1). Pearson’s correlation matrix on the physicochemical properties of clay mineral fractions and DPAA sorption is listed in Table 2. It can be seen that the correlation coefficient between Q_ads and Fe_total was negative (r = −0.190) (Table 2), which is contrary to the previous observation that Acrisol soil had a stronger sorption capacity toward DPAA than Phaeozem soil due to its higher content of Fe (Wang et al. 2013). The results show that the total Fe content was not the key factor determining DPAA sorption in clay mineral fractions. A substantially higher positive correlation between Q_ads and FeO3(oxalate) (r = 0.440) (Table 2) indicates that amorphous and poorly crystalline Fe (hydr)oxides could contribute more to DPAA sorption. This finding provides evidence of the importance of Fe speciation, rather than the total Fe content for DPAA sorption in clay mineral fractions. Similar results have been found for inorganic As (Palumbo-Roe et al. 2015). The Q_ads was also found to be positively correlated with CEC (r = 0.354, p > 0.05) (Table 2), suggesting that not only coordination mechanisms but also electrostatic attraction as well as interactions with Al₂O₃ or aluminosilicate could contribute to DPAA sorption in clay mineral fractions. The coexistence of multiple sorption mechanisms also has been reported for roxarsone, p-arsanilic acid (pAsA) (Fig. S1—ESM) and PAA sorption on soils (Arroyo-Abad et al. 2011) and may thereby explain the reduced Pearson correlation between Q_ads and FeO3(oxalate).

3.2 DPAA speciation in clay mineral fractions

The results for solid phase speciation of DPAA using a SEP are shown in Fig. 1. The percentage difference between the total recovery (the sum of the five-step SEP) and the expected value (the total amount obtained by sorption experiment) was systematically lower than 13%. This deviation justifies the use of this SEP method. The non-specifically fraction (step i) constituted less than 30% of the total DPAA in the clay mineral
fractions of eight soils, except for those of Orthic Acrisol soil, Brown soil (30–40%), Latosol-1, and Latosol-2 soils (>40%), where the values up to 46.7% were found (Fig. 1). This fraction accounts for DPAA bound to the solid surface by electrostatic force and is indicative of out-sphere DPAA complexes. The higher non-specifically fractions from the two Latosol soils might due to their higher contents of Fe$_2$O$_3$DCB and Al$_2$O$_3$DCB (Table 1), which are the main sources of positive charge in soils (Goldberg 1989) and might thereby increase DPAA sorption through van der Waals attraction. Significant Pearson’s correlation between the non-specifically fraction and Fe$_2$O$_3$oxalate ($p < 0.05$) or Al$_2$O$_3$DCB ($p < 0.01$) (Table 2) further strengthens this hypothesis.

The specifically fraction (step ii) was the dominant phase and it constituted 18.3–52.8% of the total DPAA (Fig. 1). This fraction represents an estimation of inner-sphere surface complexes (Wenzel et al. 2001) and is useful in providing a relative measure of DPAA that can be potentially mobilized due to changes in pH or phosphate addition (Violante et al. 2010). This result is consistent with the previous study that found DPAA can be effectively desorbed from both Acrisol and Phaeozem soils by addition of phosphate (Wang et al. 2013). Additionally, non-specifically and specifically fractions are likely to constitute the majority of bioaccessible As (Tang et al. 2007). In the case of DPAA, these two fractions constituted more than 46% of the total DPAA in the clay mineral fractions of all soils, except for the Gleyic Acrisol soil (27.7%) (Fig. 1). This proportion is significant higher compared with those previously reported for inorganic As (<23%) (Taggart et al. 2004; Krysiak and Kareczewska 2007), suggesting that DPAA in soil might be more labile and bioaccessible than inorganic As.

The DPAA recovered upon the dissolution of amorphous and poorly crystalline Fe/Al (hydr)oxides (step iii) constituted 15.5–36.9% of the total DPAA in the clay mineral fractions of all soils, except for those of Latosol-1 and Latosol-2 (<13%) (Fig. 1). For both Latosol soils, higher DPAA fractions were released in the first two steps of the SEP (Fig. 1). This finding may be explained by the higher contents of Fe$_2$O$_3$DCB versus lower contents of Fe$_2$O$_3$oxalate (Table 1) for these Latosol soils. The significant correlation of DPAA fractions extracted in the step iii with Fe$_2$O$_3$oxalate Content ($r = 0.669$, $p < 0.05$) (Table 2) further demonstrates this point.

The DPAA released from the dissolution of well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides (step iv) decreased considerably compared with that from amorphous and poorly-crystalline Fe/Al (hydr)oxides (step iii), and it constituted less than 17% of the total DPAA (Fig. 1). A relatively strong association of DPAA with amorphous and poorly crystalline Fe (hydr)oxides compared with well-crystallized ones is also supported by the Pearson’s correlation (Table 2). Our previous study also found that amorphous ferrihydrite exhibited stronger sorption capacity toward DPAA compared with crystallized goethite and hematite (Zhu et al. 2019). This stronger sorption capacity could be due to the higher specific surface area, and hence sorption site density, of amorphous and poorly crystalline Fe (hydr)oxides (Dixit and Herings 2003).

The DPAA recovered from the dissolution of amorphous, poorly crystalline, and well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides in steps iii–iv constituted 20.1–46.2% of the total DPAA (Fig. 1), which is significantly lower compared with values reported for inorganic As (>50%) (Cancès et al. 2005; Niazi et al. 2011; Marabottini et al. 2013). It can be expected that Fe/Al (hydr)oxides in soil may exhibit lower sorption capacity toward DPAA compared with inorganic As. A similar trend has been observed for DMA (Sarkar et al. 2005; Nagar et al. 2014), in which only 15–25% of the total DMA was found to be associated with Fe/Al (hydr)oxides in soils, even after several months of equilibration. This result might be explained by the steric hindrance from two methyl substituents (Lafferty and Loeppert 2005). Inspection of Table 2 and the correlation matrix demonstrated that DPAA fractions extracted both in the step iii ($r = 0.843$, $p < 0.01$) and in steps iii–iv ($r = 0.698$, $p < 0.05$) were significantly correlated with $Q_{ads}$. These results provide a means of estimating the DPAA sorption capacity of clay mineral fractions on the basis of DPAA fractions associated with amorphous, poorly crystalline, and well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides. It should also be noted that DPAA extracted in steps iii–iv could be a potential source of DPAA contamination during the dissolution of Fe (hydr)oxides in flooded soils (Zhu et al. 2016b). According to our SEP data, a substantial amount of DPAA in the clay mineral fractions from the Gleyic Acrisol soil (46.2%) was presented in this potentially available form (Fig. 1), highlighting the need to consider the potential DPAA release in iron-rich paddy soil.
Table 2  Pearson correlation matrix of DPAA sorption with selected physico-chemical properties of clay mineral fractions (n = 12)

|          | $Q_{ads}$ | $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3\text{oxalate}$ | $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3\text{DCB}$ | $\text{Fe}_{\text{total}}$ | $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{DCB}$ | $\text{Al}_{\text{total}}$ | $\text{pH}$ | $\text{PZC}$ | $\text{CEC}$ | $\text{Si}_{\text{total}}$ | Step i | Step ii | Step iii | Step iv | Step v | Steps ii–iv | Steps iii–iv | Steps iv–v |
|----------|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------|--------|----------|---------|--------|------------|------------|----------|
| $Q_{ads}$| 1         |                                      |                                   |                             |                                   |                             |           |             |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3\text{oxalate}$ | 0.440     | 1                                    |                                   |                             |                                   |                             |           |             |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3\text{DCB}$ | -0.245    | -0.041                               | 1                                 |                             |                                   |                             |           |             |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{Fe}_{\text{total}}$ | -0.190    | 0.881**                             | 1                                 |                             |                                   |                             |           |             |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{DCB}$ | 0.230     | -0.297                               | 0.739**                          | 0.773**                     | 1                                 |                             |           |             |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{Al}_{\text{total}}$ | 0.069     | -0.347                               | 0.130                             | 0.291                       | -0.090                            | 1                             |           |             |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{pH}$ | 0.061     | -0.042                               | 0.820**                          | 0.829**                     | 0.746**                          | 0.229                         | 1         |             |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{PZC}$ | -0.308    | 0.140                                | 0.776**                          | -0.782**                    | 0.699**                          | 0.122                         | 0.792** | 1           |             |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{CEC}$ | 0.354     | 0.037                                | -0.841**                         | -0.635**                    | -0.511                           | 0.173                         | -0.582** | -0.444      | 1           |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| $\text{Si}_{\text{total}}$ | 0.399     | 0.084                                | 0.172                            | -0.118                      | -0.140                           | -0.366                         | -0.148   | 0.091       | -0.385      |                             |        |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| Step i  | -0.084    | -0.434                               | 0.630*                           | -0.819**                    | 0.677**                          | 0.335                         | 0.529    | 0.367       | -0.518      | 0.058                      | 1      |        |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| Step ii | 0.458     | 0.467                                | -0.423                           | -0.344                      | -0.533                           | 0.410                         | -0.255   | -0.375      | -0.566      | -0.399                     | -0.424 | 1      |          |         |        |            |            |          |
| Step iii| 0.843**   | 0.669**                              | -0.502                           | -0.513                      | -0.320                           | -0.236                         | -0.257   | -0.423      | 0.538       | -0.218                     | 0.529  | 0.572 | 1           |         |        |            |            |          |
| Step iv | 0.452     | -0.017                               | 0.059                            | -0.470                      | 0.419                            | -0.449                         | 0.248    | 0.052       | -0.127      | -0.129                    | -0.042 | 0.494 | 0.290        |         |        |            |            |          |
| Step v  | 0.371     | -0.045                               | -0.085                           | -0.260                      | 0.113                            | -0.349                         | 0.081    | -0.071      | -0.030      | -0.041                    | -0.143 | -0.465 | 0.263        | 0.891** | 1      |            |            |          |
| Steps ii–iv | 0.698*   | 0.562                                | -0.478                           | -0.558                      | -0.177                           | -0.531                         | -0.253   | -0.337      | 0.447       | -0.147                    | -0.582* | 0.233 | 0.901**      | 0.577** | 0.527 | 1           |            |          |
| Steps iii–iv | 0.364    | 0.545                                | -0.598*                          | -0.603*                     | -0.649*                          | 0.049                         | -0.428   | -0.398      | 0.643*       | -0.233                    | -0.770* | 0.882** | 0.691*       | -0.354 | -0.286 | 0.482       | 1           |          |

*Significant level at $p < 0.05$

**Significant level at $p < 0.01$
The residual DPAA (step v) was only of minor importance and contributed to less than 10% of the total DPAA in the clay mineral fractions from all soils, except for those of Gleyic Acrisol soil (26.1%) and Brown soil-1 (18.1%) (Fig. 1). This fraction represents As hosted by phyllosilicate and aluminosilicate minerals (Fang and Chen 2015; Kim et al. 2014) and is generally considered as the least mobility for As (Lo and Yang 1998). The highest residual DPAA fraction in the clay mineral fractions of Gleyic Acrisol soil might be explained by its highest concentrations of extracted Al in step v (Fig. S2—ESM), suggesting that more DPAA can reach the interlayers of aluminosilicate.

For all soils, the greatest proportions of added DPAA appeared in steps ii–iv and varied from 45.2 to 88.7% (Fig. 1). Pearson analysis demonstrated that these fractions were significantly correlated with CEC \( (r = 0.643, p < 0.05) \) (Table 2). These results suggest that a major part of DPAA present in these clay mineral fractions would have been, on the one hand, sorbed onto the surface hydroxyl groups at layer silicate edges, onto Fe/Al (hydr)oxides, and onto aluminosilicates via surface complexation, and on the other hand, complexed and/or precipitated embedded inside the Fe/Al (hydr)oxides. The difference is that the former surface interaction causes DPAA to be easily released by specific replacement by phosphate without total dissolution of the mineral particles (Cai et al. 2002).

### 3.3 Sorption structure of DPAA in clay mineral fractions

The \( k^3 \)-weighted EXAFS spectra of DPAA-sorbed samples and their radical distribution functions (RDFs) are displayed in Fig. 2a, b, respectively. Fourier back-transformed \( k^3 \)-weighted EXAFS functions of the first, second and third shells are presented in Fig. 3a, b, respectively. Fitting the first, second, and third shells separately (Fig. 3a, b) yielded results similar to those obtained by fitting the whole EXAFS spectra (Fig. 2a, b, Table 3).

All spectra were dominated by the contribution of As-O and As-C\(_1\) (Fig. S1—ESM) mixed in the first shell. The inter-atomic distances of As-O and As-C\(_1\) were 1.71–1.73 and 1.87–1.91 Å (Table 3), respectively. A broad peak in the RDF at 2.3–3.3 Å was observed in all samples, but was different from that of the DPAA standard (Fig. 3c), the peak was then fitted with As-C\(_2\) (Fig. S1—ESM) and As-Fe pairs. The second-neighbor contribution to the EXAFS spectra was fitted using As-C\(_2\) at various distances. Four C atoms were located at As-C\(_2\) distances of 2.80–2.86 Å (Table 3). The third coordination shell surrounding As was satisfactorily fitted by 1.32–1.51 Fe atoms at As-Fe distances of 3.18–3.25 Å (Fig. 2b, Table 3). These results provide direct evidence that DPAA sorption in clay mineral fractions can mainly be ascribed to the contribution of Fe (hydr)oxides, which agrees with the notion that DPAA interacts with Fe (hydr)oxides either through surface complexation or through complexation embedded within the Fe (hydr)oxides. Additionally, the fitted As-O, As-C\(_1\), and As-C\(_2\) bond distances from this study are in agreement with previous EXAFS investigations (Tanaka et al. 2014).

Inclusion of another, longer, As-Fe contribution at about 3.5 Å and As-Al contribution did not improve the fit for all samples, and the values of \( \Delta E_0 \) were unreasonably large when including the additional Fe or Al shell (data not shown). A multiple scattering (MS) As-O-O-As path was also added but did not improve the goodness-of-fit parameters according to the \( R \) factors (data not shown). Thus, the MS path was finally not included in all fittings in order to reduce the adjustable variables (Paktunc et al. 2004). The fitted As-Fe distances are in reasonable agreement with previous EXAFS data of inorganic (Beaulieu and Savage 2005) and methyl (Shimizu et al. 2005) DPAA.
arsenic, and also correspond well with those of the earlier study, which calculated As-Fe distances of inner-sphere DPAA complexes using density functional theory (DFT) method (Tanaka et al. 2014). It should also be noted that the obtained CNs of As-Fe paths were smaller than 2.0 (Table 3) which indicated that DPAA can form 2C and/or 1V complexes on Fe (hydr)oxides in clay mineral fractions. Possible inner-sphere complexes of As formed on Fe (hydr)oxides can be classified into 1V, 2C, and bidentate mononuclear edge-sharing ($^2E$) (Fendorf et al. 1997). A shorter As-Fe distance (2.8–3.0 Å) corresponded to a controversial $^2E$ structure which has been argued to be energetically unstable and usually misinterpreted (Sherman and Randall 2003). This shorter As-Fe distance was absent in the present study. The fitted As-Fe distances of 3.18–3.25 Å are too close for As-Fe 1V complexes, which is 3.46 Å based on EXAFS studies and 3.52 Å based on DFT calculations (Tanaka et al. 2014). This longer As-Fe distance (3.5–3.6 Å) was also found to be absent in DPAA-sorbed clay mineral fractions but has been found to contribute significantly for DPAA sorption on ferrihydrite (Tanaka et al. 2014). There is a possibility that the signal of longer As-Fe path at distances of 3.5–3.6 Å might be masked by the dominance of As-Fe path at distances of 1.32–1.51 Å (Waychunas et al. 1993) due to the low signal-to-noise ratio in the measured spectra. Therefore, despite of no evidence of DPAA 1V complexes, it was impossible to exclude them based on the present study. Considering the different crystalline structure of Fe (hydr)oxides, and the complicated environmental conditions in clay mineral fractions, different types of inner-sphere DPAA complexes may form. Additionally, the EXAFS technique used in this study cannot verify out-sphere complex formation (Catalano et al. 2008); however, the combination of SEP and EXAFS techniques together demonstrate the simultaneous formation of inner-sphere and out-sphere complexes for DPAA sorption on clay mineral fractions.

3.4 Comparison with previous studies for methyl and phenyl arsenics

It is well-recognized that increased methyl substitution results in decreased As sorption by Fe (hydr)oxides (Zhang et al. 2007). This can be explained by the following reasons: (i) the number of hydroxyl groups available for complexation decreases with increasing methyl group substitution, and the larger size of the methyl group compared with the hydroxyl group could increase steric hindrance (Lafferty and Loeppert 2005) and hence weaken Fe-O-As bonds; (ii) the steric hindrance caused by methyl group could make neighboring sites on Fe (hydr)oxides inaccessible for further complexation (Adamescu et al. 2010), thus decreasing the availability of hydroxyl groups. Similarly, the formation of inner-sphere complexes could also put stress on the geometry of DPAA, the steric hindrance may thereby make DPAA/Fe complexes unstable, and the number of DPAA molecules/ions that can sorb to Fe (hydr)oxides is reduced. This effect may explain why a substantial amount of DPAA in clay mineral fractions existed as labile forms (Fig. 1) and the reduced Pearson correlation between $Q_{ads}$ and Fe total, Fe$_2$O$_3$oxalate, or Fe$_2$O$_3$DCB (Table 2).

Group substitution could also affect the complexation environment of organoarsenic. Our EXAFS results demonstrate
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Partial $k^3$-weighted $\chi(k)$ EXAFS functions of first (a), second and third (b) shells for DPAA-sorbed clay mineral fractions. $k^3$-weighted EXAFS spectra of DPAA standard (solid) and contributions of first and second shells (c). Fourier back-transformed data was obtained using a Hanning window between 1.1 and 2.3 for the first-shell peak and between 2.3 and 3.7 for the second- and third-shell peaks. Experimental and calculated spectra were displayed as dashed and solid lines, respectively.
the formation of DPAA $^2C$ and/or $^1V$ complexes on clay mineral fractions. Such inner-sphere bonds are partly coincident with our previous observation for DPAA $^2C$ complexes on ferrihydrite, goethite, and hematite, and partly coincident with those observed by Tanaka et al. (2014), who found both DPAA $^2C$ and $^1V$ complexes on ferrihydrite. The discrepancy may lie on the different surface coverage of As on Fe (hydr)oxides (Fendorf et al. 1997). It was suggested that DPAA2 $^2C$ complexes may be favored at low surface coverage, while both $^2C$ and $^1V$ complexes are at a relatively high surface coverage, with the formation of the $^1V$ complexes possibly conserving the sorption site. Similar phenomena can be discerned for DMA sorption on Fe (hydr)oxides according to the results from Shimizu et al. (2011) and Tanaka et al. (2013). However, for pAsA, only the $^1V$ bond was found to be prevalent on Fe (hydr)oxides (Chabot et al. 2009; Adamescu et al. 2014). This result can be explained partly by the steric effect derived from the substituents (Depalma et al. 2008), and also by the charge balance resulting from the resonance between uncomplexed As = O and As-OH groups when formed $^1V$ bond (Arts et al. 2013). However, the charge balance for DMA cannot be achieved in the same way due to its increased organic substituents. On the other hand, the steric hindrance makes two methyl substituents difficult to move closer to fulfill the charge imbalance of As$^+$-O$^-$ bond when forms $^2C$ complexes, the remaining O atom therefore has to move closer to As atom, which may contribute to the formation of DMA $^2C$ complexes (Shimizu et al. 2010). According to these results, similar $^2C$ and $^1V$ complexes can be expected for DPAA due to its similar molecular structure with pAsA and DMA. More experimental data and theory calculations are still needed to investigate which types of inner-sphere DPAA complexes are more favorable on various solid surfaces found in the soil-water environment.

### 3.5 Environmental relevancy of the findings

The current study reveals that DPAA concentrations of labile fractions including non-specifically and specifically ones are of particular concern as they occupy substantial parts of the total DPAA in clay mineral fractions, and that natural attenuation might be inadequate to control the mobility and thereby bioaccessibility of DPAA in soils. A substantial amount of DPAA was also associated with amorphous, poorly-crystalline and well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides. Pearson’s correlation analysis and EXAFS results further indicate that the formation of inner-sphere DPAA complexes on Fe (hydr)oxides, especially amorphous and poorly crystalline ones, contributes most to DPAA sorption in clay mineral fractions. This observation suggests that the speciation of Fe (hydr)oxides should be considered when predicting the fate, mobility, and bioaccessibility of DPAA in the soil-water environment, especially in paddy soil where the transformation of Fe mineralogy always accompanies the mobilization of As (Yamaguchi et al. 2011).

### Table 3 Summary of As shell-by-shell fitting results for DPAA-sorbed clay mineral fractions

| Sample          | Ligand | CN  | R (Å)     | $\Delta E_0$ (eV) | $\sigma^2$ (Å²) | R factor |
|-----------------|--------|-----|-----------|------------------|----------------|----------|
| DPAA standard   | As-O   | 2.00| 1.70 (± 0.02) | 8.10             | 0.0030         | 0.009    |
|                 | As-C₁  | 2.00| 1.99 (± 0.03) | –                | 0.0000         |          |
|                 | As-C₂  | 4.00| 2.87 (± 0.06) | –                | 0.0010         |          |
| Orthic Acrisol  | As-O   | 2.00| 1.73 (± 0.06) | – 10.18          | 0.0030         | 0.041    |
|                 | As-Fe  | 1.44 (± 0.27) | 3.25 (± 0.13) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₁  | 2.00| 1.91 (± 0.22) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₂  | 4.00| 2.81 (± 0.22) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
| Gleyic Acrisol  | As-O   | 2.00| 1.71 (± 0.02) | 3.92             | 0.0017         | 0.022    |
|                 | As-Fe  | 1.51 (± 0.45) | 3.24 (± 0.10) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₁  | 2.00| 1.91 (± 0.17) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₂  | 4.00| 2.84 (± 0.17) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
| Phaeozem-1      | As-O   | 2.00| 1.73 (± 0.05) | 5.32             | 0.0010         | 0.013    |
|                 | As-Fe  | 1.36 (± 0.47) | 3.19 (± 0.14) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₁  | 2.00| 1.87 (± 0.16) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₂  | 4.00| 2.86 (± 0.16) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
| Phaeozem-2      | As-O   | 2.00| 1.71 (± 0.03) | 15.26            | 0.0011         | 0.035    |
|                 | As-Fe  | 1.32 (± 1.07) | 3.18 (± 0.16) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₁  | 2.00| 1.89 (± 0.13) | –                | 0.0030         |          |
|                 | As-C₂  | 4.00| 2.80 (± 0.13) | –                | 0.0030         |          |

All parameter values indicated by (−) were linked to the parameter value placed above in the table. Numbers in parentheses represent deviations. CN values for As-O, As-C₁, and As-C₂ were fixed to theoretical values. As-C₁ and As-C₂ paths shared one $\sigma^2$ during the fitting process.
4 Conclusions

This study investigated the speciation and sorption structure of DPAA in soil clay mineral fractions. The results showed that DPAA in clay mineral fractions predominantly existed as specifically, amorphous, poorly crystalline and well-crystallized Fe/Al (hydr)oxides associated fractions, and amorphous/poorly crystalline Fe rather than total Fe contributed more to DPAA sorption. EXAFS data provided direct evidence that DPAA formed inner-sphere complexes on Fe (hydr)oxides. A combination of SEP and EXAFS results demonstrated that DPAA interacted with clay mineral fractions via (1) electrostatic attraction; (2) surface complexation, mainly on Fe (hydr)oxides; (3) complexation embedded inside the Fe (hydr)oxides; and (4) reaching the interlays of aluminosilicate. It was suggested that the steric hindrance caused by phenyl substitution can, on the one hand, make DPAA/Fe complexes unstable and decrease the number of sorbed DPAA molecules/ions, and on the other hand, change the way the central As atom maintains its charge balance. This may explain why a certain amount of DPAA in clay mineral fractions still presented as weakly bound forms and the formation of DPAA $^{2}\text{C}$ and/or $^{1}\text{V}$ complexes, respectively.
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