Influence of clay colloids, humic acid and water chemistry on the
stability, aggregation and deposition of nanoscale titanium dioxide

(nTiO$_2$)

by

© Zhong Tang

A Thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Department of Earth Sciences

Memorial University of Newfoundland

December 2017

St. John’s Newfoundland
Fate and transport of engineered nanoscale titanium dioxide (nTiO₂) have received much attention during the past decade. The stability, concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO₂ in water with complicated components, however, have not been fully examined. The objective of this thesis was to determine the individual and synergistic effect of pH, cation valence, humic acid, Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coatings and clay colloids on nTiO₂ stability, aggregation and deposition, and elucidate the related mechanisms. We conducted systematic laboratory experiments to determine nTiO₂ stability, aggregation and deposition onto a quartz sand in NaCl and MgCl₂ solutions, both in the absence and presence of humic acid and clay colloids. Results showed that nTiO₂ formed hetero-aggregates and the hetero-aggregates may either deposit or remain suspended depending on their interactions with quartz sand and Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coatings. Humic acid was found to make nTiO₂ stable to prevent nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition under most conditions.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview

1.1 Environmental risks of engineered titanium dioxide nanoparticle

Titanium dioxide nanoparticles (nTiO₂), one of the most extensively used nanoscale materials, have been universally utilized in products, including sunscreens (Gondikas et al., 2014), paints (Al-Kattan et al., 2014), coatings (Santos et al., 2014), photocatalysts (Morales-Torres et al., 2012) and environmental catalysts (Tada et al., 2014). The increasing use of nTiO₂ in industrial and household application will inevitably lead to the release of such materials into the environment, which poses a potential threat to the environment (Coll et al., 2015). When nTiO₂ enters natural aquatic systems, it could cause contamination issues to the water resource. It has been revealed that nTiO₂ could facilitate the transport of some pollutants such as Cu in natural aquatic systems (Fang et al., 2011). The toxicity of nTiO₂ to aquatic organisms and microorganisms has been elucidated by some studies showing that nTiO₂ could either enter the cells or be in intimate contact with the cell walls to cause toxicity (Aruoja et al., 2009; Heinlaan et al., 2008). Moreover, environmental factors such as humic acid (HA) and ionic strength (IS) are very influential to the toxicity of nTiO₂ in aquatic environment according to a study illustrating that the HA and IS both could protect aquatic organisms from oxidative stress of nTiO₂ (Fang et al., 2015). Studying the fate of nTiO₂ in subsurface systems is essential for evaluating the environmental risks of nTiO₂.
1.2 Aggregation and deposition of nTiO$_2$ in aquatic environments

When nTiO$_2$ is released into aquatic systems, the stability and mobility of nTiO$_2$ govern its fate in aquatic systems (Nawack and Bucheli, 2007). Some water chemistries (pH, IS etc.) and co-existence nanoparticles could boost particle - particle or particle - surface interactions which lead to aggregations or depositions onto collectors, while some water chemistries and co-existence nanoparticles could enhance nTiO$_2$ stability (Fatisson et al., 2009; Thio et al., 2011). Natural water physicochemical characteristics such as ions, pH, temperature, IS all have important impact on interactions among simultaneously existing nanoparticles and collectors (Zhao et al., 2012; Gallego-Urrea et al., 2014). When water pH is lower than the point of zero charge (PZC) of nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$ carries positive surface charge and the surface charge density (and therefore the stability of the suspended nTiO$_2$ particles) increases when pH decreases. When pH is higher than the PZC, nTiO$_2$ has negative surface charge and the surface charge density (and therefore the stability of the suspended nTiO$_2$ particles) increases when pH increases (Loosli et al., 2015). When pH values are close to PZC, the surface charge of nTiO$_2$ is low and the van der Waals attraction overcomes the repulsive electrostatic force, resulting in nTiO$_2$ agglomeration (French et al., 2009). IS is another important factor that impacts the behaviour of nTiO$_2$ in aquatic systems. It was demonstrated that the magnitude of surface charge decreased with an increase in IS either in monovalent or divalent ion electrolytes, due to the electrostatic double layer compression (Chen et al., 2011). When IS increases, the compression effects on the electrostatic double layer become stronger, and at high IS, the repulsive force between nanoparticles reduces to the degree where nTiO$_2$ aggregates (Solovitch et al., 2010).
Clay particles, such as kaolinite, montmorillonite, illite, and chlorite, are the most abundant inorganic colloids in aquatic systems (Wilson et al., 2014), and they could strongly influence the fate of engineered nanoparticles in aquatic system (Cai et al., 2014). Zhou et al. (2012) found that the impact of montmorillonite on nTiO$_2$ stability is pH dependent. At pH 4, montmorillonite reduced the stability of nTiO$_2$ nanoparticles because the positively charged nTiO$_2$ particles bridged the negatively charged montmorillonite particles through electrostatic attraction. While at pH 8, montmorillonite did not influence the stability of nTiO$_2$ since both montmorillonite and nTiO$_2$ were negatively charged.

Natural organic matter (NOM) is ubiquitous in nature (Nebbioso and Piccolo, 2013) and plays a critical role in the stability and mobility of colloidal particles and nanoparticles (Aiken et al., 2011). Humic acid is the main component of NOM and it has been observed that the presence of HA normally enhanced the stability and transport of nTiO$_2$ via electrostatic and steric effects (Chen et al., 2012; Erhayem and Sohn., 2014; Jung et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013). The presence of HA has influence on nTiO$_2$, clay and sand grains interactions. HA was an important component of natural organic matter (NOM) and has strong ability to modify nTiO$_2$ surface characteristics by attaching onto nTiO$_2$ surface, therefore influencing nTiO$_2$ aggregation and deposition (Thio et al., 2011).

1.3 Thesis objectives

Although much progress has been made to understand the behaviors of nTiO$_2$ in aquatic environment, stability, and concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO$_2$ in natural water, especially in water with complicated components, have not been fully
examined. Moreover, mechanisms of particle stability, aggregation and deposition in the presence of divalent cations and co-existing clay colloids and NOM need to be elucidated. Systematic laboratory experiments were conducted to determine nTiO$_2$ stability, aggregation and deposition in NaCl and MgCl$_2$ solutions, both in the absence and presence of HA and clay colloids. Zeta potential (ZP) and hydrodynamic diameter (HDD) were measured to obtain information on electrical charges and particle aggregation. Furthermore, interaction energy profiles were calculated to provide theoretical explanation and insight into the experimental results.

The objectives of this study were to better understand (1) the individual and synergistic effect of cation valence, HA, and illite colloids on nTiO$_2$ stability and aggregation, and ascertain the mechanisms involved in nTiO$_2$ aggregation and stability in the presence of multiple components; (2) the influence of pH, HA, and Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coatings on concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO$_2$ in the presence of clay colloids
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Chapter 2: Stability and aggregation of nanoscale titanium dioxide particle (nTiO₂): Effect of cation valence, humic acid, and clay colloids

Abstract

Fate and transport of engineered nanoscale titanium dioxide (nTiO₂) have received much attention during the past decade. The aggregation and stability of nTiO₂ in water with complicated components, however, have not been fully examined. The objective of this study was to determine the individual and synergistic effects of cation valence, humic acid, and clay colloids on nTiO₂ stability and aggregation, and elucidate the related mechanisms. Systematic laboratory experiments were conducted to determine nTiO₂ stability and aggregation in NaCl and MgCl₂ solutions, both in the absence and presence of humic acid and illite colloids. Results showed that Mg²⁺, in comparison to Na⁺, could make the zeta potential of nTiO₂ more positive, and shift the point of zero charge of nTiO₂ (pH$_{pzc,TiO₂}$) towards higher pH. nTiO₂ were destabilized by illite colloids at pH < pH$_{pzc,TiO₂}$ through formation of illite-nTiO₂ hetero-aggregates, but were not interfered by illite colloids at higher pH. HA was found to make nTiO₂ stable via electrostatic and steric effects, both in the absence and presence of illite colloids. Calculated interaction energy based on Derjaguin-Landau-Verwey-Overbeek (DLVO) theory revealed that instability of the nTiO₂ suspensions was mainly caused by primary minima, and that secondary minima normally do not destabilize the suspension, even though they are found to promote aggregation.

Keywords: nanoscale titanium dioxide (nTiO₂); divalent cation; humic acid (HA); illite colloid; zeta potential; hydrodynamic diameter; DLVO interaction energy
2.1 Introduction

Nanoscale titanium dioxide (nTiO$_2$) materials have been synthesized and introduced into the environment due to the production, usage, and disposal of nTiO$_2$ containing products (Boncagin et al., 2009; Al-Kattan et al., 2014; Gondikas et al., 2014). Although addition of nTiO$_2$ to some materials enhances the quality and performance of the product, many studies have shown that nTiO$_2$ could be toxic to aquatic microorganisms and organisms, and may cause environmental problems (Aruoja et al., 2008; Heinlaan et al., 2008; Coll et al., 2015). Similar to naturally-occurring submicron-sized particulate matters like clay colloids, nTiO$_2$ was found to adsorb solute contaminants such as heavy metals and may influence their movement in groundwater (Fang et al., 2011). Therefore, fate and transport of nTiO$_2$ has been an interesting research topic due to its relevance to water quality and contaminant transport in subsurface environment.

nTiO$_2$ particles are mobile in soil and groundwater when they remain suspended in water and not attach to the immobile soil and sediment grains. To stay suspended, nTiO$_2$ particles must be small enough, so that they are not susceptible to gravity sedimentation. Besides, repulsive forces between particles must be high enough so that the particles do not attract to each other to form large aggregates. Aggregation not only influences particle stability but also particle transport in aquatic systems (Nowack et al., 2007; Chowdhury et al., 2011). Interactive forces between particles, which govern the aggregation and stability of nTiO$_2$, are controlled largely by the electrical charge of the particle, and affected by water chemical conditions such as pH, ionic strength (IS), and ion composition (Dosmingos et al., 2009; French et al., 2009; Erhayem and Sohn et al., 2014; Gallego-Urrea et al., 2014).
nTiO$_2$ particle develops its electrical charges via protonation/deprotonation of surface functional groups, and adsorption of charged ions to the electrical double layer (Ludwig and Schindler, 1995). Surface charge of nTiO$_2$, and therefore its aggregation and stability, are pH dependent and influenced by co-existing cations and anions. Substantial increase in nTiO$_2$ size was found when pH approaching the point of zero charge (PZC) of nTiO$_2$ (i.e., the pH at which the surface is neutral and carries no net charges) (Loosli et al., 2013; Wu and Cheng, 2016), and nTiO$_2$ aggregation was observed in water with higher IS due to the greater compression of the electrical double layer, which reduced repulsive forces (Chen et al., 2011).

Aggregation and stability of nTiO$_2$ in natural water are complicated by the presence of divalent cations (e.g., Ca$^{2+}$ and Mg$^{2+}$), dissolved organic matter (DOM), and clay colloids. Many studies showed that natural DOM adsorbed to colloid and nanoparticle surface and enhanced the stability of the particle via electrostatic and steric effects (Liu et al., 2010, 2011; Aiken et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2012; Nebbioso and Piccolo, 2013; Wang et al., 2013; Erhayem and Sohn., 2014; Jung et al., 2014). Wu and Cheng (2016), however, observed that humic acid (HA), an important type of NOM, may promote aggregation and destabilize nTiO$_2$ by neutralizing surface charges. It was found that divalent cations could promote aggregation and destabilize nTiO$_2$ by adsorbing to the particle (Loosli et al. 2015). Divalent cations were also found to increase DOM adsorption to nTiO$_2$ via bridging effect, in which the cation connected carboxylic group of DOM with surface sites on nTiO$_2$ (Liu et al., 2010, 2011; Erhayem and Sohn, 2014). Zhang et al. (2009) reported that Ca$^{2+}$ could destabilize NOM-coated nanoparticles via bridging effect.
Clay colloids, the most abundant inorganic particles in aquatic systems (Wilson et al., 2014), may interact with and influence the aggregation and stability of co-existing particles (Jiang et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2012; Amirianshoja et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015). The nature of the interaction between clay particle and other particles depends on water chemistry and property of the particles. Clay colloids and nTiO₂ could have different PZC, hence, within in certain pH range, clay colloids and nTiO₂ may carry opposite charges, leading to hetero-aggregation (i.e., formation of clay-nTiO₂ aggregates). Zhou et al. (2012) found that the impact of montmorillonite on nTiO₂ stability is pH dependent, since surface charges of the particles changed with pH. Cai et al. (2014) showed that clay particles may either facilitate, hinder, or not influence the stability and mobility of engineered nanoparticles depending on pH, IS, and type and properties of the clay particle. Divalent cations were reported to promote hetero-aggregation between clay particle and engineered nanoparticle through bridging effect (Torkzaban et al., 2012).

Although much progress has been made to understand the behaviors of nTiO₂ in aquatic environment, aggregation and stability of nTiO₂ in natural water, especially in water with complicated components, have not been fully examined. For example, divalent cation, DOM, and clay colloids often co-exist, however, very few studies investigated their combined effects (e.g., Lee et al., 2016). Moreover, mechanisms of particle aggregation and stability in the presence of divalent cations and co-existing colloids and DOM need to be elucidated. The objective of this study was to determine the individual and synergistic effect of cation valence, HA, and illite colloids on nTiO₂ stability and aggregation, and ascertain the mechanisms involved in nTiO₂ aggregation and stability in the presence of
multiple components. Systematic laboratory experiments were conducted to determine nTiO$_2$ stability in NaCl and MgCl$_2$ solutions, both in the absence and presence of HA and illite colloids. Zeta potential (ZP) and hydrodynamic diameter (HDD) were measured to obtain direct information on electrical charges and particle aggregation. Furthermore, interaction energy profiles were calculated to provide theoretical explanation and insight into the experimental results.

2.2 Materials and Methods

2.2.1 Preparation of materials

All the chemicals were certified ACS grade and purchased from VWR International Co. Nanopure water, with resistivity >18.2 MΩ-cm and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) concentration < 0.02 mg/L, was used for preparation of all the solutions and particle suspensions.

Nanoscale titanium dioxide (nTiO$_2$) powder (Aeroxide™ TiO$_2$ P25) with > 99.5% purity (Fisher Scientific) was used to prepare nTiO$_2$ particle suspensions. The specific surface area of the powder is 35–65 m$^2$/g according to the manufacturer, and X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis showed that the powder is a mixture of anatase (90%) and rutile (10%) with primary particle size of 23 and 40 nm respectively (Wu and Cheng, 2016).

nTiO$_2$ particle suspension. nTiO$_2$ powder was weighed using an analytical balance and suspended in background solution to achieve the desired nTiO$_2$ concentration. The nTiO$_2$ suspension was then sonicated using a Branson Digital Sonifier (Crystal Electronics) for 30 min with 120 W power to disperse the particles and get a homogeneous suspension.
HA stock solution. 100 mg HA powder (Alfa Aesar) was dissolved in 100 mL nanopure water to achieve a HA concentration of 1000 mg/L. The HA stock solution was stored in darkness at 4 °C in a fridge for all our experiments.

Illite colloid stock suspension. 4 g illite powder (IMt-2 Illite-Cambrianshale, The Clay Mineral Society) was mixed with 1000 mL nanopure water and sonicated using a Branson Digital Sonifier for 30 min with 120 W power to disperse the illite particles. The mixture was then let stand for 24 hours to remove large particles before the supernatant from the mixture was carefully transferred into a high-density polyethylene (HDPE) bottle for storage. Illite colloid stock thus prepared was used in subsequent experiments for preparation of particle suspensions. To determine illite concentration of the illite colloid stock, 100 mL stock suspension was filtered through a 0.1 μm polyethersulfone membrane filter (Pall Life Sciences) and the filter was oven dried at 60 °C. The weight difference before and after the filtration divided by the volume (100 mL) equaled illite concentration. The procedure was performed in triplicate and the mean value was taken as the illite concentration of the stock suspension.

2.2.2 Stability test

To investigate how clay colloids and HA interact with and influence the stability of nTiO₂ particles, five types of particle suspension (nTiO₂, illite, nTiO₂+illite, nTiO₂+HA, and nTiO₂+HA+illite) were prepared, and their stability in 4 types of background solutions (i.e., 1 mM NaCl, 10 mM NaCl, 0.5 mM MgCl₂, and 1 mM MgCl₂) at different pH (5, 7, and 9) was examined (Table 1).
Table 1. nTiO$_2$, illite, and humic acid (HA) concentrations in the suspensions for the stability tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension type$^*$</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>nTiO$_2$ concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>Illite concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>HA concentration (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Illite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + illite</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + HA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + illite + HA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^*$Each type of suspension was prepared in four types of background solution (i.e., 1 mM NaCl, 10 mM NaCl, 0.5 mM MgCl$_2$, and 1 mM MgCl$_2$), and for each type of background solution, three pH (i.e., 5, 7 and 9) were tested.

nTiO$_2$ suspensions were prepared following the procedure described in Section 2.2.1, and illite colloid suspensions were made by diluting the illite colloid stock suspension. nTiO$_2$+illite, nTiO$_2$+HA, and nTiO$_2$+HA+illite suspensions were prepared by mixing nTiO$_2$, illite, and HA suspensions/solutions at appropriate ratios. When preparing the nTiO$_2$+HA+illite suspensions, nTiO$_2$ and HA were well mixed before illite stock suspension was added. To adjust IS of the sample, NaCl or MgCl$_2$ powder was weighted using an analytical balance and added to the suspensions. After IS adjustment, the samples were sonicated for 30 min with 120 W power in order to mix and disperse the particles. pH of the suspensions was adjusted using small volumes of 0.1 M NaOH and/or HCl solutions.

Once prepared, light absorbance of the suspensions was measured using an UV-Vis spectrophotometer (Genesys 10S UV-Vis, Thermo Scientific) to determine the initial absorbance ($A_0$). Then the suspensions were tightly capped and let stand on the bench. Every 30 minutes, supernatant from each suspension was taken for light absorbance ($A$) measurement until the last sample was taken at $t = 360$ minutes. All the tests were performed in duplicate.
To maximize sensitivity, a wavelength of 280 nm was used for measuring light absorbance of the illite suspensions (Suspension Type 2, Table 1). A wavelength of 600 nm was used for measuring light absorbance of the pure and mixed nTiO$_2$ suspensions (i.e., Suspension Type 1, 3, 4, and 5, Table 1). Cai et al. (2014) showed that at a wavelength of 600 nm, absorbance of clay particle suspensions and HA was low, but absorbance was sensitive to suspended nTiO$_2$ concentration. Our preliminary tests confirmed that by using a wavelength of 600 nm, light absorbance of the illite colloid suspension and HA was negligible, while light absorbance of nTiO$_2$ was still substantial (Figure A1).

2.2.3 Zeta potential (ZP) and hydrodynamic diameter (HDD) measurement

Samples for ZP and HDD measurement were prepared using the same procedures as those used for the stability tests. ZP and HDD of the suspensions were measured using a Zetasizer (Zetasizer Nano ZS, Malvern) two hours after the samples were being prepared, which allowed aggregation to occur in unstable suspensions. All the ZP and HDD measurements were performed in triplicate.

2.2.4 Calculation of the interactive energy between particles

Derjaguin-Landau-Verwey-Overbeek (DLVO) theory (Van Olphen, 1963) was employed to study the interactions between particles. By assuming sphere–sphere geometry, Equation (1) and (2) were used to calculate the London-van der Waals (LW) force and electric double layer (EDL) force between two particles (Gregory, 1981, Chen et al., 2011). The overall DLVO force is the sum of the LW and EDL forces. Although the assumption of sphere geometry is not perfect for layer clays such as illite colloids, it enables us to make approximate estimations of the DLVO energy.
\[ \phi_{\text{LW}} = -\frac{AR_1R_2}{6D(R_1+R_2)} \left[ 1 - \frac{5.32D}{\lambda} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\lambda}{5.32D} \right) \right]^{-1} \]  
\[ \phi_{\text{EDL}} = \frac{2\pi R_1 R_2 n_\infty k_B T}{(R_1+R_2) \kappa^2} \left( \psi_c^2 + \psi_s^2 \right) \left[ \frac{2\psi_c \psi_s}{\psi_c^2 + \psi_s^2} \ln \left( \frac{1 + \exp(-\kappa D)}{1 - \exp(-\kappa D)} \right) + \ln \left( 1 - \exp(-2\kappa D) \right) \right] \]  

where \( A \) (J) is Hamaker constant, \( R \) (m) is particle radius, \( D \) (m) is separation distance, \( \lambda \) is the characteristic wavelength of interaction (10\(^{-7}\) m), \( n_\infty \) is number concentration of the bulk ion, \( \kappa \) (m\(^{-1}\)) is the Debye–Hückel reciprocal length, and \( \kappa = 2.32 \times 10^9 (\Sigma C_i Z_i^2)^{1/2}, \) where \( C_i \) is the concentration of ion \( i \) and \( Z_i \) is the valency value. \( \psi_c \) (V) and \( \psi_s \) (V) are surface potential of the particles. In our calculation zeta potential was used to approximate surface potential.

In the \( \text{nTiO}_2 \)+illite systems, the ZP and HDD measured by a zetasizer reflected the overall properties of the mixed particles and therefore ZP and HDD of the individual particle were not known. Under these circumstances, ZP and HDD were measured in the individual system (i.e., \( \text{nTiO}_2 \) and illite system) to approximate the properties of \( \text{nTiO}_2 \) and illite in the mixed systems. Similarly, in the \( \text{nTiO}_2 \)+illite+HA systems, ZP and HDD were taken from the individual measured results (i.e., results from the \( \text{nTiO}_2 \)+HA systems, and the illite systems). HA is known to adsorb to \( \text{nTiO}_2 \) particle and influence the ZP and HDD of the particle. However, HA adsorption to illite particles is negligibly low since both illite and HA are negatively charged. A number of studies have shown low adsorption of humic substances to clay minerals (e.g., Rashid et al., 1972; Dumat and Staunton, 1999). As a result, we assumed that HA adsorption and its influence on the ZP and HDD of \( \text{nTiO}_2 \) particles in the \( \text{nTiO}_2 \)+illite+HA systems were similar to those in the \( \text{nTiO}_2 \)+HA systems.

The Hamaker constant (A) of the \( \text{nTiO}_2 \)-water-\( \text{nTiO}_2 \) system is 3.5\( \times \)10\(^{-20}\) J (Gómez-Merino et al., 2007), and is 2.2\( \times \)10\(^{-20}\) J for the illite-water-illite system (Long et al., 2006).
The Hamaker constant of the nTiO2-water-illite system is calculated as $3.6 \times 10^{-20}$ J, using Equation (3) (Hiemenz, 1997).

$$A_{132} = (\sqrt{A_{11}} - \sqrt{A_{33}})(\sqrt{A_{22}} - \sqrt{A_{33}})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where 1 is nTiO2, 2 is illite, and 3 is water, and the following constants: $A_{\text{TiO2-TiO2}} = 1.53 \times 10^{-19}$ J (Bergström, 1997), $A_{\text{H2O-H2O}} = 3.7 \times 10^{-20}$ J (Israelachvili, 2011), and $A_{\text{illite-illite}} = 1.4 \times 10^{-19}$ J (Novich & Ring, 1984).

2.3 Results and Discussion

2.3.1 nTiO2 stability

In 1 mM NaCl and 10 mM NaCl solutions, the relative absorbance ($A/A_0$) of the nTiO2 particle suspension was stable ($A/A_0 \approx 1$) at pH 5 and 9 up to 360 minutes, but decreased from 1.0 to 0.37 at pH 7 (Figure 1a and 1b), indicating that the suspension was stable at pH 5 and 9, but unstable at pH 7.

At pH 5 and 9, the stability was due to the repulsive electrostatic forces between nTiO2 particles. nTiO2 particles were positively charged at pH 5, with zeta potential of 24.5 to 30.7 mV (Figure 2a). While at pH 9, nTiO2 particles were negatively charged with zeta potential of -34.1 to -38.9 mV (Figure 2a). The charges at these pH resulted in high energy
Table 2. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in NaCl solutions, and the Energy Barrier ($\phi_{max}$), Secondary Minimum ($\phi_{2min}$) Calculated for the particle-particle interaction based on DLVO theory. *N/A means not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>NaCl (mM)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>ZP</th>
<th>HDD</th>
<th>Hamaker Constant ($10^{-20}$ J)</th>
<th>Energy Barrier ($k_BT$)</th>
<th>Secondary Minimum ($k_BT$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>269.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>3033.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-38.9</td>
<td>522.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>193.0 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>6779.7</td>
<td>3.5 N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-34.1</td>
<td>661.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>175.6 -2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-24.4</td>
<td>324.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>41.7 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-27.6</td>
<td>355.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>62.6 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-29.4</td>
<td>311.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>64.4 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-29.4</td>
<td>483.8</td>
<td>2.2 99.9 -1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-29.9</td>
<td>327.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>70.6 -0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nTiO₂ + illite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2351.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5550.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3 -0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-34.6</td>
<td>419.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>221.8 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>4808.3</td>
<td>3.6 N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-36.1</td>
<td>1258.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>270.3 -1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nTiO₂ + HA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-38.6</td>
<td>254.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>92.2 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-39.3</td>
<td>255.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>97.0 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-38.9</td>
<td>250.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>92.5 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-39.0</td>
<td>833.1</td>
<td>3.5 309.9 -3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-42.4</td>
<td>718.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>326.7 -0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nTiO₂ + HA + illite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-36.7</td>
<td>268.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>85.8 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-39.0</td>
<td>264.9</td>
<td>3.6 98.6 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-39.6</td>
<td>246.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>95.0 -0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-44.4</td>
<td>692.2</td>
<td>3.6 350.3 -2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-43.7</td>
<td>508.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>247.8 -1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
barrier between particles. The calculated energy barrier were 29.7 $k_B T$ (pH 5) and 193.0 $k_B T$ (pH 9) respectively in 1 mM NaCl solution, and 115.7 $k_B T$ (pH 5) and 175.6 $k_B T$ (pH 9) respectively in 10 mM NaCl solution (Table 2). The high energy barrier prevented the particles from aggregating and kept the suspensions stable.

At pH 7, ZP of nTiO$_2$ was near neutral (i.e., -2.8 and -2.1 mV respectively in 1 mM and 10 mM NaCl solution) (Figure 2a), therefore the electrostatic repulsive force was weak, and the calculated DLVO energy profile showed no energy barrier (Table 2), indicating particle aggregation and unstable suspension.

In MgCl$_2$ solutions, nTiO$_2$ was stable at pH 5 but unstable at pH 7 and 9 (Figure 1c, 1d). ZP measurements showed that ZP of nTiO$_2$ in MgCl$_2$ solutions were similar to those in NaCl solutions at pH 5, but very different from those in NaCl solutions at pH 7 and 9. At pH 7 and 9, ZP of nTiO$_2$ in MgCl$_2$ solution were mostly positive (Figure 2f), as opposed to the negative ZP in NaCl solutions (Figure 2a). Unlike monovalent ions such as Na$^+$, which influenced ZP mainly through screening effect, divalent ions such as Mg$^{2+}$ adsorbed to the surface sites on nTiO$_2$ and changed the ZP of nTiO$_2$ particles from negative to positive (Loosli et al., 2015). Ludwig and Schindler (1995) showed that protonation/deprotonation of surface hydroxyl groups controls the surface charge of nTiO$_2$, and divalent cations can adsorb to TiO$_2$ via formation of surface complexes with hydroxyl groups. Our ZP measurement results showed that Mg$^{2+}$ adsorption was strong at pH 7 and 9, due to the attractive electrostatic forces between nTiO$_2$ and Mg$^{2+}$. At pH 5, however, adsorption was weak, since nTiO$_2$ carried positive charge and repelled the like-charged Mg$^{2+}$. 
Figure 1. Stability of the suspensions at pH 5, 7, and 9 in 1 mM NaCl (a, e, i, m, q), 10 mM NaCl (b, f, j, n, r), 0.5 mM MgCl₂ (c, g, k, o, s), and 1 mM MgCl₂ (d, h, l, p, t) solutions. Data is expressed as mean ± standard deviation of duplicate experiment.
At pH 5, ZP of nTiO$_2$ was around +30 mV in MgCl$_2$ solutions (Figure 2f), and the stability of the suspension was caused by the repulsive electrostatic forces between nTiO$_2$ particles. DLVO calculation results confirmed the presence of high energy barriers at pH (40.6 $k_B$T and 75.0 $k_B$T in 0.5 and 1 mM MgCl$_2$, respectively) (Table 3). At pH 7 and 9, net charges on nTiO$_2$ were low (ZP < 15 mV), and DLVO calculation results showed no energy barriers between particles in either 0.5 or 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solutions (Table 3), indicating unstable suspensions, in agreement with the stability test results.

### 2.3.2 Illite particle stability

In NaCl solutions, illite was stable throughout the whole duration of the experiment for all the pH and IS (Figure 1e, 1f). It was also found that IS and pH had minimum influence on the ZP of illite under the tested conditions (Figure 2b), i.e., the ZP were -24.4 mV, -27.6 mV and -29.4 mV respectively at pH 5, 7, and 9 in 1 mM NaCl solution, and -29.3 mV, -29.4 mV and -29.9 mV respectively in 10 mM NaCl solution. DLVO calculation results showed that the energy barrier between illite particles were high (> 41 $k_B$T), indicating stable suspension (Table 2).

In MgCl$_2$ solutions, illite was also stable for all the pH and IS tested (Figure 1g, 1h). Unlike nTiO$_2$, which became positively charged in 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solutions, illite particles were negatively charged in the MgCl$_2$ solutions, with ZP ranging from -12 to -17 mV (Figure 2g), less negative than those in NaCl solutions (~ -30mV) (Figure 2b). While metal oxides such as nTiO$_2$ adsorb metal ions via specific surface sites, clay minerals like illite adsorb via cation exchange process, and the binding strength of clay minerals for metal ions is usually weaker than that of metal oxides (Bradl, 2004; Alessi et al., 2010). The
negative ZP of illite vs. the positive ZP of nTiO₂ in the MgCl₂ solutions under our experimental conditions indicated lower Mg²⁺ adsorption capacity of illite relative to that of nTiO₂. The less negative ZP of illite in MgCl₂ solutions vs. those in NaCl solutions was attributable to the stronger adsorption and screening effect of Mg²⁺ in comparison to Na⁺.

The HDD of illite in MgCl₂ solutions were larger than those in NaCl solutions (Figure 3g vs. 3b), which was attributable to the lower repulsive forces in MgCl₂ solutions, and potentially the “bridging effect”. Divalent cations were reported to promote aggregation by connecting clay particles via cation exchange sites (Torkzaban et al., 2012). DLVO calculation showed that energy barriers between illite particles for all pH in MgCl₂ solutions are lower compared to those in NaCl solution, but high enough (>25 k_BT) to sustain stable suspensions (Table 3), consistent with the stability test results.

### 2.3.3 nTiO₂ stability with co-existing illite particles

In NaCl solutions, when illite was present, nTiO₂ was unstable at pH 5 and 7 (Figure 1i, 1j). At pH 5 in 1 mM and 10 mM NaCl solutions, illite was negatively charged (-24.4 mV and -27.6 mV), but nTiO₂ was positively charged (24.5 mV and 30.7 mV), therefore no energy barrier existed between nTiO₂ and illite particles, resulting in aggregation. At pH 7, nTiO₂ was unstable by itself (Figure 1a and 1b), and adding illite did not prevent aggregation, as indicated by the close-to-neutral ZP of the nTiO₂+illite mixture (i.e., 0.2 mV and -6.0 mV respectively in 1 mM and 10 mM NaCl solution) (Figure 2c). The calculated DLVO profiles showed either no energy barrier or low energy barrier (1.3 k_BT) at pH 5 and 7, consistent with the stability test results.
Figure 2. Zeta potential (ZP) of the suspensions at pH 5, 7, and 9 in 1 mM NaCl (blank), 10 mM NaCl (spotted), 0.5 mM MgCl₂ (grey), and 1 mM MgCl₂ (grey spotted) solutions. Data is expressed as mean ± standard deviation of triplicate measurement.
Table 3. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in MgCl\textsubscript{2} solutions, and the Energy Barrier (\(\Phi_{max}\)) and Secondary Minimum (\(\Phi_{2min}\)) calculated for the particle-particle interaction based on DLVO theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>MgCl\textsubscript{2} (mM)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>ZP (mV)</th>
<th>HDD (nm)</th>
<th>A (* 10\textsuperscript{20} J)</th>
<th>(\Phi_{max}) (k\textsubscript{B}T)</th>
<th>(\Phi_{2min}) (k\textsubscript{B}T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nTiO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>275.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6099.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>6973.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>7217.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4803.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-13.9</td>
<td>1054.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td>668.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-13.9</td>
<td>557.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-17.2</td>
<td>1044.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-17.3</td>
<td>1009.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nTiO\textsubscript{2} + illite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>5840.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3112.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>3814.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5183.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3758.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nTiO\textsubscript{2} + HA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-16.2</td>
<td>259.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-16.2</td>
<td>252.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-17.3</td>
<td>251.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-15.4</td>
<td>311.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-16.8</td>
<td>322.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nTiO\textsubscript{2} + HA + illite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-16.2</td>
<td>520.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-17.2</td>
<td>765.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>485.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>595.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
<td>723.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At pH 9, the suspension was stable in 1 mM NaCl solution (Figure 1i), but unstable in 10 mM NaCl solution after 200 minutes (Figure 1j). In 1 mM NaCl solution, both illite and nTiO\textsubscript{2} were negatively charged (-29.4 mV and -38.9 mV), resulting in high energy
barrier (221.8 $k_B T$) and electrostatic repulsion (Table 2). In 10 mM NaCl solution, illite and nTiO2 were also negatively charged (-29.9 mV and -34.1 mV), and the energy barrier was even higher (270.3 $k_B T$), which seemed to contradict the results of the stability test. The instability in 10 mM NaCl solution at pH 9 can be explained by the secondary minimum (-1.9 $k_B T$) (Table 2), which made HDD larger (1259 nm) and the suspension unstable. The effect of secondary minimum is discussed in detail in Section 3.7.

In MgCl2 solutions, when illite and nTiO2 co-existed, nTiO2 exhibited instability at all pH (Figure 1k, 1l). At pH 5, the illite+nTiO2 suspensions became unstable due to the attractive electrostatic forces between negatively-charged illite (-13.9 mV, Figure 2g) and positively-charged nTiO2 ($\sim +30$ mV, Figure 2f). At pH 7 and 9 in MgCl2 solutions, as discussed previously, nTiO2 suspensions themselves were unstable due to the low surface charge (Figure 2f). When negatively charged illite particles were mixed with these positively charged nTiO2, the suspensions became even more unstable (Figure 1k, 1l). DLVO calculations confirmed no energy barriers between nTiO2 and illite particles for all the pH (Table 3).

2.3.4 nTiO2 stability in the presence of HA

In the presence of HA, in both 1 mM and 10 mM NaCl solutions, nTiO2 was stable at all pH (Figure 1m, 1n). Unlike nTiO2 suspensions, whose ZP at pH 5 and 7 were positive or near neutral, ZP of the nTiO2+HA suspensions at pH 5 and 7 were negative ($< -30$ mV) (Figure 2d). At pH 9, ZP of the nTiO2+HA suspension was negative, similar to that of the nTiO2 suspension ($< -30$ mV) (Figure 2a and 2d). The negative ZP at pH 5 and 7 in the presence of HA was attributable to HA adsorption to nTiO2. Previous studies showed that
at pH < pH_{pcz, TiO2}, nTiO2 have high affinity for HA, and adsorption of HA to nTiO2 changes particle zeta potential from positive to negative, while at pH > pH_{pcz, TiO2}, nTiO2 and HA both carry negative charges, and HA does not adsorb or influence the ZP of nTiO2 (Wu and Cheng, 2016). DLVO calculations indicated that the energy barriers between nTiO2 particles in the presence of HA were high (> 92 k_B T) (Table 2), in good agreement with the stability test results.

In MgCl2 solutions, the presence of HA made nTiO2 stable at all pH (Figure 1o, 1p). As discussed previously, nTiO2 suspension in MgCl2 solution was stable at pH 5 by itself due to the repulsive electrostatic forces between nTiO2 particles, while at pH 7 and 9 nTiO2 suspension was unstable due to the low net surface charges (Figure 2f). When HA was mixed with nTiO2, all the nTiO2 suspensions become negatively charged (-16 to -17 mV) (Figure 2i), attributable to HA adsorption to nTiO2 (Erhayem and Sohn, 2014; Wu and Cheng, 2016). The calculated energy barriers between nTiO2 particles in the nTiO2+HA suspensions were low, ranging from 5.8 to 7.5 k_B T in 0.5 mM MgCl2 solutions, and from 2.0 to 4.1 k_B T in 1 mM MgCl2 solutions (Table 3). These energy barriers were only slightly higher than the kinetic energy of colloidal particles, but the suspensions showed good stability. Besides the calculated energy barriers, steric forces between HA-covered nTiO2 particles can substantially enhance the repulsive forces (Chen et al., 2012), but were not included in the DLVO calculations. Thus the actual energy barriers could be higher than the calculated values.

2.3.5 nTiO2 stability with co-existing illite particle and HA

In NaCl solutions, when both HA and illite particle were present together with nTiO2,
the suspensions were stable for all the pH and IS (Figure 1q, 1r), and the ZP of the nTiO₂+HA+illite suspensions were all negative and comparable to those of the nTiO₂+HA suspensions (Figure 2e and 2d). As discussed previously, when HA and nTiO₂ were co-present, HA adsorption to nTiO₂ stabilized nTiO₂ particles, and made the ZP of nTiO₂ at pH 5 and 7 negative. When nTiO₂ particles became negatively charged, the attractive electrostatic forces between nTiO₂ and illite (as in the case of the nTiO₂+illite mixture) vanished, which prevented the formation of nTiO₂−illite aggregates and stabilized the suspension in the nTiO₂+HA+illite suspensions. DLVO calculations indicated high energy barriers in all the nTiO₂+HA+illite systems, consistent with the stability test results.

In MgCl₂ solutions, the nTiO₂+illite+HA mixtures were stable under all the tested conditions (Figure 1s, 1t). As discussed previously, HA adsorption to the positively-charged nTiO₂ changed the ZP of nTiO₂ from positive to negative (Figure 2i vs. Figure 2f), and therefore the interactive force between illite and nTiO₂ became repulsive. Compared to the ZP of the nTiO₂+illite+HA suspensions in the NaCl solutions (Figure 2e), the ZP in the MgCl₂ solutions (Figure 2j) were less negative, presumably due to higher adsorption and stronger screening effect of Mg²⁺. The calculated energy barriers in the MgCl₂ solutions were also lower, but still high enough to maintain the stability of the suspension, i.e., the energy barriers were 12.0 to 22.4 kT in 0.5 mM MgCl₂ solutions, and 5.0 to 6.7 kT in 1 mM MgCl₂ solutions (Table 3). It should be noted again that steric force, which provided additional repulsion between particles, was not included in the calculation. Therefore the actual energy barrier should be higher than the calculated values.

It is also noted that nTiO₂ by itself carried positive charges in most of the MgCl₂ solutions (Figure 2f) and in NaCl solutions at pH 5 (Figure 2a), while both HA and illite
carried negative charges in these solutions (Figure 2b and 2g). Therefore, illite may compete against HA for nTiO2 to form nTiO2-illite aggregates, leading to unstable suspensions. However, all the nTiO2+HA+illite suspensions were found stable, indicating that nTiO2 in the mixed suspensions were mostly associated with HA. This is reasonable since HA adsorbs to nTiO2 via chemical bonds, which are much stronger than the DLVO interactive forces. Additionally, when preparing the nTiO2+HA+illite suspensions, nTiO2 and HA were mixed before illite addition, which made the nTiO2 negatively charged and prevented nTiO2-illite association.

2.3.6 Particle size
The measured particle size (HDD) (Figure 3) in all cases were consistent with the results of the stability test and the DLVO calculated interaction energies, i.e., under the conditions where the suspensions were stable with large energy barrier between particles, the measured HDD were small (i.e., <1000 nm). For example, in NaCl solutions, the HDD of nTiO2 were small at pH 5 (269 nm and 779 nm) and pH 9 (523 nm and 661 nm) (Figure 3a), indicating low degree of aggregation and stable suspension, in agreement with the stability test results (Figure 1a, 1b). Conversely, under the conditions where the suspensions were unstable with low or no energy barrier between particles, the HDD were large (i.e., >2000 nm). For example, when nTiO2 were mixed with illite in the MgCl2 solutions, the suspensions were unstable (Figure 1k, 1l) and the HDD were all very large (Figure 3h). The HDD were all small when HA was present (Figure 3d, 3e, 3i, 3j), attributable to the low degree of aggregation due to electrostaic and steric repulsion between HA-covered particles.
2.3.7 Role of secondary minimum

DLVO calculation indicated presence of secondary minimum under the conditions in some stability tests (mainly in 10 mM NaCl solutions, Table 2). E.g., the secondary minimum between nTiO$_2$ particles at pH 5 and 9 in 10 mM NaCl solution in the absence of HA and illite were -3.7 and -2.9 $k_B$T respectively. The magnitudes of these secondary minima were larger than the mean kinetic energy of colloidal particles (~1.5 $k_B$T) (Treumann et al., 2014) and therefore might cause particle aggregation and unstable suspension. However, our stability test showed that for all the cases where a secondary minimum was calculated, the suspensions were actually stable, except for the case of the nTiO$_2$+illite suspension at pH 9 in 10 mM NaCl solution.

It was noted that the HDD of the particles in these 10 mM NaCl solutions with a secondary minimum were larger than the HDD in 1 mM NaCl solutions with no secondary minimum. E.g., the HDD of nTiO$_2$ particles at pH 5 and 9 in 10 mM NaCl solution in the absence of HA and illite were 779 and 661 nm respectively, larger than those in 1 mM NaCl solutions (269 and 523 nm respectively at pH 5 and 9) (Figure 3a). The higher HDD in the 10 mM solutions confirmed particle aggregation in the presence of a secondary minimum. Furthermore, the HDD results showed that the particle aggregates in 10 mM NaCl solutions were small enough to remain suspended, therefore the suspensions were stable during the timespan of the experiment (Figure 1b). For the nTiO$_2$+illite suspension at pH 9 in 10 mM NaCl solution, the HDD was larger (1259 nm) (Figure 3c), and the suspension became unstable only after $t > 200$ minutes (Figure 1j). Due to the low magnitude of these secondary minima, the attractive forces caused by the secondary minimum are lower compared to those by the primary minima (i.e., the cases where there
is low or no energy barrier), therefore sizes of the aggregates were smaller and the suspensions were less unstable.
Figure 3. Hydrodynamic diameter (HDD) of the suspensions at pH 5, 7, and 9 in 1 mM NaCl (blank), 10 mM NaCl (spotted), 0.5 mM MgCl₂ (grey), and 1 mM MgCl₂ (grey spotted) solutions. Data is expressed as mean ± standard deviation of triplicate measurement.
2.4. Summary

Results from this study showed that in the absence of illite colloids and HA, ZP of nTiO$_2$ were generally more positive in MgCl$_2$ solutions than that in NaCl solutions at the same pH. This was caused by higher Mg$^{2+}$ adsorption and stronger screening effect, both of which are due to the higher valence of Mg$^{2+}$. The cation valence effect was important at pH 7 and 9 where nTiO$_2$ became positive-charged in MgCl$_2$ solutions. When illite colloids and nTiO$_2$ particles co-existed, nTiO$_2$ were destabilized at pH $<$ pH$_{pzc,TiO_2}$ by illite colloids through formation of illite-nTiO$_2$ hetero-aggregates as a result of electrostatic attraction. At pH $>$ pH$_{pzc,TiO_2}$, illite colloids did not interfere with like-charged nTiO$_2$. Point of zero charge of nTiO$_2$ in MgCl$_2$ solution was higher than that in NaCl solution, and therefore hetero-aggregation in MgCl$_2$ solution occurred even at high pH. In both MgCl$_2$ and NaCl solutions, the presence of HA made nTiO$_2$ particles stable both in the absence and presence of illite colloids. This was caused by HA adsorption to positively-charged nTiO$_2$ particles, which made nTiO$_2$ surface negatively charged, and thus prevented the formation nTiO$_2$–nTiO$_2$ or illite–nTiO$_2$ aggregates. The measured HDD were in agreement with the stability test results, showing high degree aggregation (i.e., large HDD) in unstable suspensions and low degree aggregation in stable suspensions. The calculated interaction energy revealed that instability of the nTiO$_2$ suspensions was mainly caused by attractive electrostatic forces, which diminished energy barriers and resulted in rapid aggregation and sedimentation. Our results also
showed that secondary minima may exist in solutions with higher IS, and HDD measurement confirmed aggregation, however, the attractive forces caused by these secondary minima were low and therefore the suspensions were mostly stable during the timeframe of the tests. This study demonstrated that divalent cations, HA, and clay colloids all may interact with and remarkably influence the aggregation and stability of nTiO$_2$ particles, and their individual and synergistic effects must be considered for the specific chemical condition (e.g., pH, IS) in order to predict the fate and transport of nTiO$_2$ particles in natural aquatic environment.
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Chapter 3: Concurrent aggregation and deposition of nanoscale titanium dioxide (nTiO₂) in the presence of clay colloids

Abstract

Although extensive research has been conducted to investigate nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition, concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO₂, which has important implications to the fate and transport of nTiO₂ in groundwater, has received only limited attention. The objective of this study is to investigate how pH, dissolved organic matter, and Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coatings influence aggregation and simultaneous deposition of nTiO₂. Experiments were performed to examine nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition onto a quartz sand with co-present illite, kaolinite, and montmorillonite colloids under various geochemical conditions. Results showed that nTiO₂ formed hetero-aggregates (i.e., nTiO₂-clay aggregates) when nTiO₂ and the clay colloids carried opposite charges, and the hetero-aggregates may either deposit or remain suspended depending on their interactions with quartz sand and Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coatings. Deposition of nTiO₂ and/or nTiO₂+clay aggregates occurred when there were Mg²⁺ bridging, electrostatic attraction, or secondary minimum. Humic acid was found to prevent nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition under most conditions. In MgCl₂ solutions, however, it facilitated deposition by adsorbing to nTiO₂ and Fe/Al oxyhydroxides and thereby enabling Mg²⁺ bridging. This study demonstrated the important and complex role clay colloids may play in concurrent aggregation and transport of nTiO₂.
Keywords: Nanoscale titanium dioxide (nTiO₂); Clay colloids; Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coated quartz sand; Concurrent aggregation and deposition; Zeta potential (ZP) and hydrodynamic diameter (HDD); DLVO interaction energy
3.1. Introduction

Nanoscale titanium dioxide particles (nTiO$_2$) is a widely used engineered nano-material and extensive research has been conducted to understand its fate and transport in the environment due to the potential risks nTiO$_2$ may pose to ecosystems and human health (Skocaj et al., 2011). Deposition is a primary process that controls nTiO$_2$ transport in groundwater (Godinez and Darnault, 2011; Cai et al., 2014), by which nTiO$_2$ is attached to sediment grain and removed from water. Aggregation is another important process that influence nTiO$_2$ transport, by which smaller particles attract to each other to form larger aggregates that are susceptible to gravity sedimentation and physical straining (Chen et al., 2011). It is well established that water chemistry and components could have remarkable influence on nTiO$_2$ aggregation and deposition. While neutral pH, high ionic strength, and multivalent cations are found to promote homo-aggregation of nTiO$_2$ (Chen et al., 2011; Loosli et al., 2013; Wu and Cheng, 2016; Tang and Cheng, 2018), dissolved natural organic matter (DOM) normally hinders nTiO$_2$ aggregation via absorbing onto nTiO$_2$ and intensifying the negative charges on particle surface (Erhayem and Sohn, 2014; Wu and Cheng, 2016; Tang and Cheng, 2018). nTiO$_2$ deposition in porous media is also affected by water chemistry. High pH, low ionic strength, and DOM generally impede nTiO$_2$ deposition, while low pH, high ionic strength, and multivalent cations (e.g., Ca$^{2+}$, Mg$^{2+}$) are found to enhance deposition (Chen et al., 2011; Han et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2017).
Water-borne clay colloids, a common groundwater component, could have significant effect on nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition. Clay minerals carry negative charges in natural groundwater due to their low point of zero charge (PZC) (Sposito, 1984refs). nTiO₂, in contrast, has a PZC near neutral pH (Tang and Cheng, 2018; Wu and Cheng, 2016), and carry positive charges in low pH water. Under conditions where nTiO₂ and clay are oppositely charged, hetero-aggregates between nTiO₂ and water-borne clay colloids will form (Zhou et al., 2012; Valera-Zaragoza et al., 2014; Tang and Cheng, 2018). Particle surface charge is influenced by pH, ionic strength, cation valence, and DOM, therefore the formation of nTiO₂-clay aggregates is affected by all the above factors. It is reported that low pH, high ionic strength, and multivalent cations (e.g., Ca²⁺ and Mg²⁺) promote the formation of nTiO₂-clay aggregates, and high pH, low ionic strength, and DOM hinders such aggregation (Tang and Cheng, 2018).

Although much work has been conducted to investigate nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition, concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO₂ have been examined only in a few studies. In porous media, nanoparticles may form aggregates during transport, and the formation of aggregates could further alter nanoparticle deposition and transport (Wiesner and Bottero 2007). Solovitch et al. (2010) found that the rate of nTiO₂ homo-aggregation in pore water may comparable to that of deposition, and formation of the aggregates enhances nTiO₂ deposition. However, the aggregates that are not deposited will move faster than the smaller nTiO₂ due to size
exclusion effect. Cai et al. (2014) reported that in dilute NaCl solutions, mobility of nTiO₂ in quartz sand column is enhanced in the co-presence of suspended bentonite and kaolinite colloids. This higher mobility is attributable to the formation of nTiO₂-bentonite and nTiO₂-kaolinite hetero-aggregates, which have lower deposition rate and therefore higher mobility compared to nTiO₂. In contrast, the mobility of nTiO₂ in dilute CaCl₂ solutions with the co-presence of suspended kaolinite colloids is lower than nTiO₂ alone, which is attributable to the straining of the larger but less negatively charged nTiO₂-kaolinite aggregates. The aforementioned studies have shown the important implications of concurrent aggregation and deposition to the fate and transport of nTiO₂, and provided valuable insights into the mechanisms involved in such process. However, a number of critical issues have not been addressed. pH and DOM are two key factors that control nTiO₂ hetero-aggregation in the presence of clay colloids (Tang and Cheng, 2018), yet, their influence on concurrent aggregation and deposition has not been examined. Fe and Al oxyhydroxide coatings are common constituents of sediment grains and may substantially alter nanoparticle deposition (Liu et al., 2012). Yet, deposition of nTiO₂ homo- and hetero-aggregates has not been studied using media other than pure quartz sand.

This study was designed to fill the gaps by studying the influence of pH, DOM, and Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coatings on concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO₂ in the presence of clay colloids. Batch experiments were performed to study nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition onto a
quartz sand with trace amount of metal oxyhydroxide coatings. Illite, kaolinite, and montmorillonite colloids were chosen as representing clay colloids due to their abundance in natural groundwater and the disparity in their surface charge density (Wainipee et al., 2013). Three background electrolyte solutions (3 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM and 1 mM MgCl₂) at pH 5 and 9 were tested to elucidate the effect of pH and cation valance and concentration. Based on the experimental measurements and the interaction energy calculated using DLVO (Derjaguin-Landau-Verwey-Overbeek) theory, mechanisms of concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO₂ under different geochemical conditions were proposed.

3.2. Materials and Methods

3.2.1. Materials

Particle suspensions. To prepare nTiO₂ suspension, Aeroxide™ TiO₂ P25 powder with >99.5+ purity (Fisher Scientific) was weighed using an analytical balance, and suspended in background solution prepared using ACS reagent grade NaCl or MgCl₂ (VWR Internal) and nanopure water. The nTiO₂ suspension was sonicated using a Branson Digital Sonifier (Crystal Electronics) for 30 min with 120 W power. pH of the suspension was measured by a pH meter (Orion star A211, Thermo Scientific) and adjusted to 5 or 9 by adding small volumes of 0.1 M NaOH and 0.1 M HCl.
Clay colloid stock suspensions were prepared by suspending 4-gram clay powder (The Clay Mineral Society) in 1000 mL nanopure water and sonicating using a Branson Digital Sonifier for 60 min with 200 W power. The suspensions were then let stand for 24 hours to allow large particles to settle before the supernatant was carefully transferred to a high-density polyethylene bottle. To determine particle concentration in the suspension, 100 mL well mixed suspension was filtered through a 0.1 μm polyethersulfone membrane filter (Pall Life Sciences). The filter was oven dried at 60 °C and the weight difference of the filter before and after filtration was used to calculate particle concentration.

To prepare humic acid (HA) stock solution, 100 mg HA powder (Alfa Aesar) was weighed and dissolved in 100 mL nanopure water, and stored in darkness at 4 °C for subsequent use.

Quartz sand. Quartz sand (U.S. Silica) was sieved to a size range of 0.250-0.355 mm, soaked in 0.1 M NaOH and 0.1 M HCl solutions respectively overnight, rinsed with nanopure water multiple times, and dried in oven at 100 °C. According to the manufacturer, the sand is predominantly composed of pure quartz, with trace levels of impurities like Fe and Al oxyhydroxides. SEM-EDX analysis was used to confirm the mineralogy, and SEM-EDX used to determine trace elements (if any) in the sand. Acid digestion plus ICP-MS analysis was used to quantify metal concentration (if any) of the sand.
To measure zeta potential of the quartz sand, the sand was crushed into powder and 4-grams sand powder was suspended in 1000 mL 3 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM and 1 mM MgCl₂ background solution respectively and sonicated for 60 min with 200 W power. Then the suspensions were let stand for 24 hours to settle down large particles, and supernatant samples were taken and diluted using background solutions. HA was added to some of the samples to achieve a HA concentration of 3 mg/L. pH of the samples was adjusted the to 5 and 9 by adding small volumes of 0.1 M NaOH or 0.1 M HCl before zeta potential was measured on a zetasizer (Zetasizer Nano ZS, Malvern).

3.2.2. nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition

nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition. Batch experiments were conducted to study nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition. The components (nTiO₂, clay particle, and HA) and their concentrations in the experiments are shown in Table 4 (Suspension type 1–8). In each experiment, clay stock suspension and HA stock solution were mixed with freshly prepared nTiO₂ suspension to achieve the desired concentration. The mixed suspensions were sonicated for 30 min with 120 W power to disperse the particles, and pH of the sample was adjusted by adding small volumes of 0.1 M NaOH and 0.1 M HCl solution.

After pH adjustment, 100 mL suspension was immediately mixed with 75 g quartz sand in 125 mL high-density polyethylene bottles, and pH was adjusted again to 5 or 9. Then the bottles were shaken at a speed of 120 rpm for 4 hours on a standard analog shaker (VWR International).
Table 4. nTiO₂, clay colloids, and humic acid (HA) concentration in the particle suspensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suspension type*</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>nTiO₂ concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>Illite concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>Kaolinite concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>Montmorillonite concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>HA concentration (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂+HA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite+HA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>illite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>kaolinite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>montmorillonite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each type of suspension was prepared in three types of background solution (i.e., 3 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM MgCl₂, and 1 mM MgCl₂), and for each type of background solution, two pH (i.e., 5 and 9) were tested.
All the experiments were performed in duplicate. The absorbance of the particle suspensions was measured at $t = 0, 30, 60, 120, 180,$ and 240 minutes using a UV-Vis spectrophotometer (Genesys 10S UV-Vis, Thermo Scientific). During the experiment, small volumes of 0.1 M NaOH or HCl were added into the bottles when necessary to maintain the pH at 5 or 9. For each measurement, the bottle was removed from the shaker and let stand for 30 seconds to allow the sand grains to settle before supernatant sample was taken for absorbance measurement. A wavelength of 600 nm was used for measuring the absorbance, since at this wavelength, light absorbance is high for nTiO$_2$ but low for clay colloids and HA (Cai et al., 2014; Tang and Cheng, 2018). Our preliminary tests confirmed that, for the clay colloids, nTiO$_2$, and HA concentrations used in the experiments, the absorbance of clay colloids and HA was negligible at this wavelength (Fig. S1, SI).

**Sand blank control.** Sand blank control experiments were performed using the same procedure as described above. In the control experiments, no sand was used, and concentrations of nTiO$_2$, clay colloids, and HA, and the background electrolyte type and pH were the same as those for nTiO$_2$ aggregation and deposition experiments (Suspension type 1–8, Table 1).

**Hydrodynamic diameter (HDD) and zeta potential (ZP) measurement.** Particle suspensions (Suspension type 1–11, Table 1) were prepared using the same protocol as that in the sand blank control experiments. After 2 hours shaking, hydrodynamic diameter (HDD) and zeta potential (ZP) of the particle suspensions were measured on a zetasizer (Zetasizer Nano ZS, Malvern).
3.2.3. Calculation of interaction energy

DLVO (Derjaguin-Landau-Verwey-Overbeek) theory (Van Olphen, 1963) was used to calculate the DLVO forces between particle and particle and between particle and quartz sand. By assuming sphere geometry for particles, Equation (1) and (2) can be used to calculate the London-van der Waals (LW) force and electric double layer (EDL) force between two particles, and Equation (3) and (4) to calculate the LW and EDL forces between a particle and sand surface (Gregory, 1981, Chen et al., 2011). The overall DLVO force is the sum of the LW and EDL forces.

\[ \varphi_{LW} = -\frac{AR_1R_2}{6D(R_1+R_2)}\left[1 - \frac{5.32D}{\lambda} \ln(1 + \frac{\lambda}{5.32D})\right]^{-1} \]  

\[ \varphi_{EDL} = \frac{2\pi R_1R_2n_\infty k_BT}{(R_1+R_2)\kappa^2} \left(\psi_1^2 + \psi_2^2\right) \left(\frac{2\psi_1\psi_2}{\psi_1^2 + \psi_2^2} \ln \left[\frac{1+\exp(-\kappa D)}{1-\exp(-\kappa D)}\right] + \ln[1 - \exp(-2\kappa D)]\right) \]  

\[ \varphi_{LW} = -\left(\frac{AR}{6D}\right)[1 + \left(\frac{14D}{\lambda}\right)]^{-1} \]  

\[ \varphi_{EDL} = \pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r R \left(2\psi_c \psi_s \ln \left[\frac{1+\exp(-\kappa D)}{1-\exp(-\kappa D)}\right] + \left(\psi_c^2 + \psi_s^2\right) \ln[1 - \exp(-2\kappa D)]\right) \]  

where A (J) is Hamaker constant, R, R and R (m) are particle radius, D (m) is separation distance, \( \lambda \) is the characteristic wavelength of interaction (10^{-7} m), \( \varepsilon_0 \) (8.85 × 10^{-12} C^2J^{-1}m^{-1}) is the permittivity of vacuum, \( \varepsilon_r \) (80) is the relative dielectric constant of the medium, \( n_\infty \) is number concentration of the bulk ion, \( \kappa \) (m^{-1}) is the Debye–Hückel reciprocal length, and \( \kappa = 2.32 \times 10^9 \left(\Sigma C_i Z_i^2\right)^{1/2} \), where \( C_i \) is the concentration of ion i (L^{-1}) and \( Z_i \) is the valency value. \( \psi_1 \) (V), \( \psi_2 \) (V) and \( \psi_c \) (V) are zeta potential of the particles, and \( \psi_s \) (V) is zeta potential of quartz surface.
To estimate the DLVO forces between nTiO$_2$ and clay colloids in nTiO$_2$+clay suspensions with no HA, ZP and HDD measured on nTiO$_2$ and clay suspensions in the same background solution and pH were used. To calculate the DLVO forces between nTiO$_2$ and clay colloids in nTiO$_2$+clay+HA suspensions, ZP and HDD measured on nTiO$_2$+HA suspensions, and ZP and HDD measured on clay suspensions were used, since adsorption of humic substances to nTiO$_2$ is high and therefore ZP and HDD of nTiO$_2$ are influenced by HA (Tang and Cheng, 2018). In contrast, adsorption of humic substances to clay colloids is negligibly low (Feng et al., 2005) and hence ZP and HDD of clay colloids are not affected by HA.

The Hamaker constant (A) used for nTiO$_2$-water-nTiO$_2$ was $3.5 \times 10^{-20}$ J (Gómez-Merino et al., 2007), and for nTiO$_2$-water-kaolinite, nTiO$_2$-water-illite, and nTiO$_2$-water- montmorillonite were $3.9 \times 10^{-20}$ J, $3.6 \times 10^{-20}$ J, and $3.3 \times 10^{-20}$ J respectively, calculated using Equation (5) (Hiemenz, 1997).

$$A_{132} = (\sqrt{A_{11}} - \sqrt{A_{33}})(\sqrt{A_{22}} - \sqrt{A_{33}})$$

(5)

where 1 is nTiO$_2$, 2 is clay, and 3 is water. And the following constants, $A_{\text{TiO}_2-\text{TiO}_2} = 1.53 \times 10^{-19}$ J (Bergström, 1997), $A_{\text{H}_2\text{O}-\text{H}_2\text{O}} = 3.7 \times 10^{-20}$ J (Israelachvili, 2011), $A_{\text{kaolinite-kaolinite}} = 1.5 \times 10^{-19}$ J, $A_{\text{illite-illite}} = 1.4 \times 10^{-19}$ J, $A_{\text{montmorillonite-montmorillonite}} = 1.3 \times 10^{-19}$ J (Novich & Ring, 1984), was used as $A_{22}$.
For the particle-water-quartz systems, $A_{n\text{TiO}_2-H_2O-\text{quartz}} = 1.4 \times 10^{-20}$ J (Butt et al., 2005) was used to quantify the DLVO forces between nTiO$_2$ and quartz surface. The Hamaker constants for calculating the DLVO forces between nTiO$_2$-clay aggregates and quartz surface are difficult to constrain, therefore we used two end members, i.e., $A_{n\text{TiO}_2-H_2O-\text{quartz}} = 1.4 \times 10^{-20}$ J and $A_{\text{clay-H}_2O-\text{quartz}} = 0.55 \times 10^{-20}$ J (Israelachvili, 2011), to estimate the range. According to Israelachvili (2011), a uniform Hamaker constant $A_{\text{clay-H}_2O-\text{quartz}} = 0.55 \times 10^{-20}$ J can be used for different types of clays. The ZP and HDD measured on the nTiO$_2$+clay and nTiO$_2$+clay+HA suspensions were used as the ZP and HDD the nTiO$_2$+clay aggregates in the calculation.
3.3. Results and Discussion

3.3.1. nTiO₂ aggregation

3.3.1.1. nTiO₂ aggregation in the absence of HA

In 3 mM NaCl solution. The nTiO₂+kaolinite, nTiO₂+illite, and nTiO₂+montmorillonite suspensions with no HA at pH 5 showed very large HDD (>3000 nm) (Figure 4b), suggesting particle aggregation. The aggregation in these suspensions was caused by the attractive electrostatic forces between positively charged nTiO₂ and negatively charged clay colloids (Figure 5a). DLVO calculation confirmed no energy barriers between nTiO₂ and each of the clay particles (Table 5), suggesting that hetero-aggregates should form.

For the nTiO₂ suspension with no HA at pH 5, and for all the four suspensions with no HA at pH 9, the HDD was small (<900 nm) (Figure 4a & 4b), indicating stable suspensions. This was consistent with the measured ZP, which showed that the particles in these suspensions were either positively charged (nTiO₂ suspension at pH 5) (Figure 5a), or negatively charged (all the suspensions at pH 9) (Figure 5a). Therefore, repulsive electrostatic forces existed between the nTiO₂ particles and between nTiO₂ and clay particles. DLVO calculation confirmed high energy barriers and no secondary minima in these suspensions (Table 5), indicating that the net force between particles was repulsive and the suspensions should be stable.

In 0.1 mM MgCl₂ solution. In the absence of HA, high HDD (>3000 nm) was observed for the nTiO₂+illite and nTiO₂+montmorillonite suspensions at pH 5, and all the suspensions at pH 9
The aggregation at pH 5 was caused by the formation of nTiO$_2$-clay hetero-aggregates, as the nTiO$_2$ and clay colloids carried opposite charges in these suspensions (Figure 5d), and DLVO calculation showed no energy barriers between nTiO$_2$ and illite or montmorillonite particles (Table 6). At pH 9, DLVO calculation showed no energy barriers between nTiO$_2$ particles in the nTiO$_2$ suspension (Table 6). This was due to the weak electrostatic charges (ZP = -9.4 mV) of nTiO$_2$, which resulted in weak electrostatic repulsive force that was lower than the van der waals force. As a result, the net force was always attractive between the nTiO$_2$ particles. Additionally, due to the high affinity of TiO$_2$ for cations at high pH (Tamura et al., 1996), it is very likely that Mg$^{2+}$ could bridge negatively charged nTiO$_2$ particles and promote aggregation. For the nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, nTiO$_2$+illite, and nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspensions at pH 9, nTiO$_2$ and each of the clay colloids carried negative charges (Figure 5d), and DLVO calculation showed energy barriers between nTiO$_2$ and clay particle (Table 6), suggesting that no hetero-aggregation should occur. The large HDD observed in these suspensions, therefore, was the result of homo-aggregation of the nTiO$_2$ particles.

For the nTiO$_2$ suspension at pH 5, its ZP was positive (ZP = 36.1 mV) and DLVO calculation showed high energy barrier (160.4 $k_B T$) between nTiO$_2$ particles (Table 6), indicating no aggregation, which was consistent with the small HDD observed (624 nm). For the nTiO$_2$+kaolinite suspension at pH 5, the nTiO$_2$ and kaolinite carried opposite charges (Figure 5d),
and DLVO calculation showed no energy barriers between nTiO$_2$ and kaolinite particle. Therefore, hetero-aggregation was expected. However, the HDD of the nTiO$_2$+kaolinite suspension was small (295 nm), suggesting no aggregation. The discrepancy between DLVO calculation and experimental results was probably caused by the hydrodynamic forces during shaking. Due to the weak negative charges on kaolinite ($ZP = -6.1$ mV), the attractive force between nTiO$_2$ and kaolinite was low, and therefore, its effect on particle aggregation could be offset by the relatively strong hydrodynamic forces in agitated batch systems.

**In 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution.** In the absence of HA, large HDD (>4000 nm) was observed for the nTiO$_2$+illite and nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspensions at pH 5 (Figure 4h), and all the four suspensions at pH 9 (Figure 4h). The mechanisms of aggregation at pH 5 was similar to those in 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution. i.e., positively charged nTiO$_2$ and negatively charged clay colloid (Figure 5g) attracted to each other and formed hetero-aggregates. At pH 9, aggregation mechanisms were also similar to that in 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, i.e., due to the weak charges on nTiO$_2$ ($ZP = 3.5$ mV) (Figure 5g), no energy barrier existed between nTiO$_2$ particles (Table 7), resulting in homo-aggregation. In 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution at pH 9, the nTiO$_2$ was positively charged (Figure 5g), therefore bridging of nTiO$_2$ by Mg$^{2+}$ was not likely. However, the positively charged nTiO$_2$ could be attracted by the negatively charged clay colloids (Figure 5g) to form hetero-aggregates.
Figure 4. Hydrodynamic diameter (nm) of mixing and solo NPs & Clay at pH 5 & 9 in 3 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM and 1 mM MgCl₂ solutions. *Kaolin means kaolinite, and mont means montmorillonite. The data of nTiO₂ are presented in ‘Solo nTiO₂ and Clay’ section as well as ‘nTiO₂ & Clay’.
Figure 5. Zeta potential (mV) of quartz sand, mixing and solo NPs & Clay at pH 5 & 9 in 3 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM and 1 mM MgCl₂ solutions. *Kaolin means kaolinite, and mont means montmorillonite. The data of nTiO₂ are presented in ‘Solo nTiO₂ and Clay’ section as well as ‘nTiO₂ & Clay’.
Table 5. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in 3mM NaCl solutions, and the Energy Barrier ($\phi_{\text{max}}$) and Secondary Minimum ($\phi_{2\text{min}}$) calculated for the particle-particle interaction based on DLVO theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>ZP of nTiO$_2$ (clay) (mV)</th>
<th>HDD of nTiO$_2$ (clay) (nm)</th>
<th>Hamaker Constant ($\times 10^{-20}$ J)</th>
<th>$\phi_{\text{max}}$ ($k_B T$)</th>
<th>$\phi_{2\text{min}}$ ($k_B T$)</th>
<th>ZP of nTiO$_2$ clay mixture (mV)</th>
<th>HDD of nTiO$_2$ clay mixture (nm)</th>
<th>A/A$_0$ (t=240 min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$</td>
<td>24.2±0.4</td>
<td>576±12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>20.2±0.9</td>
<td>3966±405</td>
<td>1.01±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + kaolinite</td>
<td>24.2±0.4 (-21.0±0.2)</td>
<td>576±12 (1135±10)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20.2±0.9</td>
<td>3966±405</td>
<td>1.15±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + illite</td>
<td>24.2±0.4 (-30.2±0.6)</td>
<td>576±12 (506±10)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6.4±1.4</td>
<td>4664±1015</td>
<td>1.12±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + montmorillonite</td>
<td>24.2±0.4 (-33.2±1.2)</td>
<td>576±12 (466±4)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-33.7±0.2</td>
<td>3049±14</td>
<td>1.13±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$</td>
<td>-28.1±1.0</td>
<td>522±8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>888±7</td>
<td>1.06±0.03</td>
<td>0.99±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + kaolinite</td>
<td>-28.1±1.0 (-30.9±1.4)</td>
<td>522±8 (465±4)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>493±18</td>
<td>1.03±0.02</td>
<td>1.03±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + illite</td>
<td>-28.1±1.0 (-31.8±1.2)</td>
<td>522±8 (397±2)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>493±18</td>
<td>1.03±0.02</td>
<td>1.03±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$ + montmorillonite</td>
<td>-28.1±1.0 (-34.4±0.4)</td>
<td>522±8 (460±1)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>514±5</td>
<td>1.03±0.03</td>
<td>1.03±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+HA</td>
<td>-38.2±0.4</td>
<td>231±4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>238±2</td>
<td>1.01±0.01</td>
<td>1.01±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-38.2±0.4 (-21.0±0.2)</td>
<td>231±4 (1135±10)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-36.5±0.4</td>
<td>238±2</td>
<td>1.01±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+illite+HA</td>
<td>-38.2±0.4 (-30.2±0.6)</td>
<td>231±4 (506±10)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-36.9±0.3</td>
<td>237±6</td>
<td>1.01±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-38.2±0.4 (-33.2±1.2)</td>
<td>231±4 (466±4)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-37.2±0.3</td>
<td>233±4</td>
<td>1.01±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+HA</td>
<td>-39.9±0.9</td>
<td>230±11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>235±5</td>
<td>1.00±0.01</td>
<td>1.00±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-39.9±0.9 (-30.9±1.4)</td>
<td>230±11 (465±4)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-41.8±0.5</td>
<td>235±5</td>
<td>1.02±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+illite+HA</td>
<td>-39.9±0.9 (-31.8±1.2)</td>
<td>230±11 (397±2)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-38.4±0.5</td>
<td>232±5</td>
<td>1.02±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-39.9±0.9 (-34.4±0.4)</td>
<td>230±11 (460±1)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-40.4±0.7</td>
<td>229±3</td>
<td>1.01±0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: not applicable.
Table 6. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solutions, and the Energy Barrier ($\Phi_{\text{max}}$) and Secondary Minimum ($\Phi_{\text{2min}}$) calculated for the particle-particle interaction based on DLVO theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>ZP of nTiO$_2$ (clay) (mV)</th>
<th>HDD of nTiO$_2$ (clay) (nm)</th>
<th>Hamaker Constant ($\times 10^{-20}$ J)</th>
<th>$\Phi_{\text{max}}$ (k$_B$T)</th>
<th>$\Phi_{\text{2min}}$ (k$_B$T)</th>
<th>ZP of nTiO$_2$ clay mixture (mV)</th>
<th>HDD of nTiO$_2$ clay mixture (nm)</th>
<th>A/A$_0$ (t=240 min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$</td>
<td>36.1±0.2</td>
<td>624±4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>160.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.09±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+kaolinite</td>
<td>36.1±0.2 (-6.1±0.7)</td>
<td>624±4 (754±95)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11.9±1.2</td>
<td>295±3</td>
<td>1.06±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+illite</td>
<td>36.1±0.2 (-14.4±0.1)</td>
<td>624±4 (623±11)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25.9±0.2</td>
<td>3467±683</td>
<td>0.99±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite</td>
<td>36.1±0.2 (-30.9±0.6)</td>
<td>624±4 (256±3)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-17.8±1.0</td>
<td>5446±1254</td>
<td>1.02±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$</td>
<td>-9.4±0.4</td>
<td>5346±638</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.07±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+kaolinite</td>
<td>-9.4±0.4 (-19.7±0.5)</td>
<td>5346±638 (433±13)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-8.9±0.5</td>
<td>7135±655</td>
<td>1.06±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+illite</td>
<td>-9.4±0.4 (-15.3±0.4)</td>
<td>5346±638 (396±8)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-9.7±0.3</td>
<td>4844±72</td>
<td>1.07±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite</td>
<td>-9.4±0.4 (-35.2±0.7)</td>
<td>5346±638 (261±3)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-15.1±0.2</td>
<td>6003±1131</td>
<td>1.07±0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+HA</td>
<td>-18.7±0.3</td>
<td>235±1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-18.7±0.3 (-6.1±0.7)</td>
<td>235±1 (754±95)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-14.2±1.2</td>
<td>301.7±2</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+illite+HA</td>
<td>-18.7±0.3 (-14.4±0.1)</td>
<td>235±1 (623±11)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-16.0±0.6</td>
<td>254±1.4</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-18.7±0.3 (-30.9±0.6)</td>
<td>235±1 (256±3)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-19.3±0.1</td>
<td>317.3±3</td>
<td>0.99±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+HA</td>
<td>-18.8±0.2</td>
<td>234±3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-18.8±0.2 (-19.7±0.5)</td>
<td>234±3 (433±13)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-18.5±0.6</td>
<td>270.1±1</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+illite+HA</td>
<td>-18.8±0.2 (-15.3±0.4)</td>
<td>234±3 (396±8)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-18.6±0.3</td>
<td>255.0±1</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-18.8±0.2 (-35.2±0.7)</td>
<td>234±3 (261±3)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-18.6±0.3</td>
<td>319.6±5</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: not applicable.
Table 7. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in 1 mM MgCl₂ solutions, and the Energy Barrier (Ø_max) and Secondary Minimum (Ø_2min) calculated for the particle-particle interaction based on DLVO theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>ZP of nTiO₂ (clay) (mV)</th>
<th>HDD of nTiO₂ (clay) (nm)</th>
<th>Hamaker Constant (×10⁻²⁰ J)</th>
<th>Ø_max (k_BT)</th>
<th>Ø_2min (k_BT)</th>
<th>ZP of nTiO₂ clay mixture (mV)</th>
<th>HDD of nTiO₂ clay mixture (nm)</th>
<th>A/A₀ (t=240 min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>37.1±0.1</td>
<td>301±5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>31.2±0.7</td>
<td>358±1</td>
<td>1.07±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite</td>
<td>37.1±0.1 (-3.8±0.1)</td>
<td>301±5 (1759±151)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25.4±0.1</td>
<td>4488±146</td>
<td>1.05±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite</td>
<td>37.1±0.1 (-14.0±0.2)</td>
<td>301±5 (1223±43)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-9.5±0.2</td>
<td>6322±983</td>
<td>1.06±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite</td>
<td>37.1±0.1 (-16.4±0)</td>
<td>301±5 (1530±0)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-9.5±0.2</td>
<td>6322±983</td>
<td>1.01±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>3.5±0.7</td>
<td>5426±549</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.6±0.5</td>
<td>5493±648</td>
<td>1.15±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite</td>
<td>3.5±0.7 (-2.0±0.2)</td>
<td>5426±549 (1422±212)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12.2±0.2</td>
<td>4884±207</td>
<td>1.02±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite</td>
<td>3.5±0.7 (-14.8±0.7)</td>
<td>5426±549 (1780±81)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-11.3±0.2</td>
<td>6726±170</td>
<td>1.06±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite</td>
<td>3.5±0.7 (-18.2±0.7)</td>
<td>5426±549 (1570±47)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-11.3±0.2</td>
<td>6726±170</td>
<td>1.02±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂+HA</td>
<td>-14.7±0.2</td>
<td>472±8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-11.7±0.7</td>
<td>944±17</td>
<td>1.16±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-14.7±0.2 (-3.8±0.1)</td>
<td>472±8 (1759±151)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-13.6±0.5</td>
<td>901±28</td>
<td>1.12±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite+HA</td>
<td>-14.7±0.2 (-14.0±0.2)</td>
<td>472±8 (1223±43)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-13.6±0.5</td>
<td>901±28</td>
<td>1.10±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-14.7±0.2 (-16.4±0)</td>
<td>472±8 (1530±0)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-15.0±0.7</td>
<td>1436±12</td>
<td>1.13±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO₂+HA</td>
<td>-15.4±0.2</td>
<td>1757±57</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>15.1±0.2</td>
<td>1966±74</td>
<td>1.13±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-15.4±0.2 (-2.0±0.2)</td>
<td>1757±57 (1422±212)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-14.9±0.3</td>
<td>1525±67</td>
<td>1.17±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite+HA</td>
<td>-15.4±0.2 (-14.8±0.7)</td>
<td>1757±57 (1780±81)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-14.9±0.3</td>
<td>1525±67</td>
<td>1.07±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-15.4±0.2 (-18.2±0.7)</td>
<td>1757±57 (1570±47)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-14.4±0.4</td>
<td>2211±124</td>
<td>1.16±0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: not applicable.
Similar to that in 0.1 mM MgCl₂ solution, the HDD was very small (<360 nm) for the nTiO₂ and nTiO₂+kaolinite suspensions in 1 mM MgCl₂ solution at pH 5, indicating no aggregation. Stability of the nTiO₂ suspension was due to the high energy barrier between nTiO₂ particles (Table 7), as a result of the strong electrostatic charges of nTiO₂ (ZP = 37.1 mV) (Figure 5g). The small HDD of the nTiO₂+kaolinite suspension was inconsistent with the DLVO prediction (Table 7), and was likely caused by the hydrodynamic forces as discussed previously.

### 3.3.1.2. Effect of HA

HA was found to substantially hinder nTiO₂ aggregation. In the presence of 3 mg/L HA, no aggregation was observed, as evidenced by the small HDD (<320 nm) of the nTiO₂ and nTiO₂+clay suspensions under all the conditions in 3 mM NaCl and 0.1 mM MgCl₂ solutions (Figure 4c & 4f). In 1 mM MgCl₂ solution, the HDD of the nTiO₂ and nTiO₂+clay suspensions were relatively large (470–2200 nm) (Figure 4i). However, these HDD were comparable to those of the nTiO₂ and clay only suspensions in 1 mM MgCl₂ solution (Figure 4g), therefore the large HDD of the nTiO₂ and nTiO₂+clay suspensions was due to the large nTiO₂ and clay colloid size in 1 mM MgCl₂ solution, rather than aggregation.

HA stabilized the suspensions by adsorbing to nTiO₂ and changed the ZP of nTiO₂. At pH 5 in all the electrolyte solutions, and at pH 9 in 1 mM MgCl₂ solution, ZP of nTiO₂ changed from positive (Figure 5a, 5d, & 5g) to negative due to HA adsorption (Figure 5c, 5f, & 5i). At pH 9, ZP of the nTiO₂ became more negative in the presence of HA (Figure 5c, 5f, & 5i vs. Figure 5a, 5d,
The change in ZP of the nTiO$_2$ in the presence of HA diminished the attractive forces between nTiO$_2$ particles, and the attractive forces between nTiO$_2$ and clay colloids, and therefore prevented aggregation. DLVO calculation showed that in the presence of HA, energy barriers existed between particles under all the conditions (Table 5, 6, and 7), indicating no aggregation, consistent with the observed small HDD. It was noted that in 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, secondary minima were present (-2.4 to -3.5 $k_B T$) (Table 7). However, aggregation was not observed under these conditions, presumably due to the hydrodynamic forces during shaking that acted against the secondary minima.

3.3.2. nTiO$_2$ deposition

In the presence of quartz sand, the absorbance (A/A$_0$) of the particle suspensions was either unchanged or substantially decreased during shaking (Figure 6). The absorbance of the same particle suspensions in the absence of the quartz sand, however, was either unchanged or slightly increased (Figure A4, Appendix 3). Therefore, the decrease of absorbance in systems with sand was attributable to nTiO$_2$ and/or nTiO$_2$–clay aggregates deposition to sand.

In 3 mM NaCl solution. In 3 mM NaCl solution at pH 5, the absorbance of the nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, and nTiO$_2$+illite suspensions decreased to near zero within the first hour of mixing (Figure 6a), and the absorbance of the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension decreased to ~0.5 after 4 hours mixing. In all the experiments, the quartz sand carried negative charges (Figure
5b), however, the nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, and nTiO$_2$+illite suspensions in 3 mM NaCl solution were all positively charged at pH 5 (Figure 5b), and therefore no energy barriers existed between these particles (i.e., nTiO$_2$ and nTiO$_2$+clay aggregates) and the quartz sand (Table 8), resulting in deposition and decrease in light absorbance (Figure 6a). For the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension, its ZP was negative (-34 mV) (Figure 5b), and DLVO calculation showed high energy barrier between nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite aggregate and the quartz sand, suggesting no deposition. The decrease of absorbance in this system was presumably due to direct nTiO$_2$ deposition onto the sand. When montmorillonite and quartz sand co-exist, they compete against each other for the positively charged nTiO$_2$, and some of the nTiO$_2$ may deposit onto the quartz sand without forming nTiO$_2$-montmorrillonite aggregates. For those nTiO$_2$ that formed nTiO$_2$-montmorrillonite aggregates, some may still attach to quartz sand via secondary minimum (-1.1 to -2.6 $k_B T$) (Table 8).

At pH 9, all the four suspensions were negatively charged (Figure 5b), and absorbance of the suspensions remained unchanged during mixing (Figure 6b), consistent with DLVO calculation results showing high energy barriers (>460 $k_B T$) and no secondary minima between particle and the quartz sand (Table 8).
Figure 6. Relative absorbance (A/A₀) of the suspensions in the presence of quartz sand. Data is expressed as mean ± standard deviation of duplicate experiment.
Table 8. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in 3mM NaCl solutions, and the Energy Barrier (\(\Phi_{max}\)) and Secondary Minimum (\(\Phi_{2min}\)) calculated for the particle-sand interaction based on DLVO theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>ZP(mV)</th>
<th>HDD (nm)</th>
<th>Hamaker Constant ((\times 10^{20} \text{ J}))</th>
<th>(\Phi_{max}) ((k_BT))</th>
<th>(\Phi_{2min}) ((k_BT))</th>
<th>A/A₀ ((t=240 \text{ min}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>24.2±0.4</td>
<td>576±12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.01±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite</td>
<td>20.2±0.9</td>
<td>3966±405</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.01±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite</td>
<td>6.4±1.4</td>
<td>4664±1015</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.01±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite</td>
<td>-33.7±0.2</td>
<td>3049±14</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>9498.0 (5680.1)</td>
<td>-2.6 (-1.1)</td>
<td>0.53±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>-28.1±1.0</td>
<td>522±8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>646.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.97±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite</td>
<td>-19.4±0.0</td>
<td>888±7</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>558.2 (626.2)</td>
<td>-1.0 (-0.3)</td>
<td>0.93±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite</td>
<td>-24.2±0.8</td>
<td>493±18</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>463.0 (524.7)</td>
<td>-0.5 (-0.2)</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite</td>
<td>-32.7±3.5</td>
<td>514±5</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>812.3 (910.5)</td>
<td>-0.5 (-0.2)</td>
<td>0.98±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+HA</td>
<td>-38.2±0.4</td>
<td>231±4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>398.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.94±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-36.5±0.4</td>
<td>238±2</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>387.1 (449.5)</td>
<td>-0.2 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.91±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite+HA</td>
<td>-36.9±0.3</td>
<td>237±6</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>390.1 (451.4)</td>
<td>-0.2 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.99±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-37.2±0.3</td>
<td>233±4</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>388.2 (449.9)</td>
<td>-0.2 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.97±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+HA</td>
<td>-39.9±0.9</td>
<td>230±11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>488.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.99±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-41.8±0.5</td>
<td>235±5</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>536.0 (610.1)</td>
<td>-0.2 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.98±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite+HA</td>
<td>-38.4±0.5</td>
<td>232±5</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>463.6 (535.6)</td>
<td>-0.2 (-0.1)</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-40.4±0.7</td>
<td>229±3</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>489.2 (568.2)</td>
<td>-0.2 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.97±0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: not applicable.
Table 9. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in 0.1 mM MgCl₂ solutions, and the Energy Barrier ($\phi_{max}$) and Secondary Minimum ($\phi_{2min}$) calculated for the particle-sand interaction based on DLVO theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>ZP(mV)</th>
<th>HDD (nm)</th>
<th>Hamaker Constant ($\times 10^{-20}$ J)</th>
<th>$\phi_{max}$ ($k_B T$)</th>
<th>$\phi_{2min}$ ($k_B T$)</th>
<th>A/A₀ (t=240 min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>36.1±0.2</td>
<td>624±4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.03±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite</td>
<td>11.9±1.2</td>
<td>295±3</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>0.03±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite</td>
<td>25.9±0.2</td>
<td>3467±683</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>0.03±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite</td>
<td>-17.8±1.0</td>
<td>5446±1254</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>1900.1 (2110.8)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.26±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>-9.4±0.4</td>
<td>5346±638</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.15±0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite</td>
<td>-8.9±0.5</td>
<td>7135±655</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>1017.0 (1031.6)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.19±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite</td>
<td>-9.7±0.3</td>
<td>4844±72</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>812.8 (889.0)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.17±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite</td>
<td>-15.1±0.2</td>
<td>6003±1131</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>1997.0 (2210.3)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.94±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂+HA</td>
<td>-18.7±0.3</td>
<td>235±1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>127.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.73±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-14.2±1.2</td>
<td>301.7±2</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>104.4 (106.1)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.87±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite+HA</td>
<td>-16.0±0.6</td>
<td>254±1.4</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>107.5 (108.1)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.79±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-19.3±0.1</td>
<td>317±3</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>112.1 (114.9)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.90±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO₂+HA</td>
<td>-18.8±0.2</td>
<td>234±3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.93±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+kaolinite+HA</td>
<td>-18.5±0.6</td>
<td>270±1</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>145.3 (155.7)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+illite+HA</td>
<td>-18.6±0.3</td>
<td>255±1</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>137.2 (148.9)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>0.95±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂+montmorillonite+HA</td>
<td>-18.6±0.3</td>
<td>320±5</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>172.2 (187.8)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-0.1)</td>
<td>1.00±0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: not applicable.
Table 10. The pH, Zeta Potential (ZP), and Hydrodynamic Diameter (HDD) of the suspensions in 1 mM MgCl₂ solutions, and the Energy Barrier ($\Phi_{max}$) and Secondary Minimum ($\Phi_{2min}$) calculated for the particle-sand interaction based on DLVO theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
<th>ZP(mV)</th>
<th>HDD (nm)</th>
<th>Hamaker Constant ($\times 10^{-20}$ J)</th>
<th>$\Phi_{max}$ ($k_BT$)</th>
<th>$\Phi_{2min}$ ($k_BT$)</th>
<th>A/A₀ (t=240 min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>37.1±0.1</td>
<td>301±5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.02±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + kaolinite</td>
<td>31.2±0.7</td>
<td>358±1</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>0.03±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + illite</td>
<td>25.4±0.1</td>
<td>4488±146</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>0.02±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + montmorillonite</td>
<td>-9.5±0.2</td>
<td>6322±983</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>630.1 (856.5)</td>
<td>-10.7 (-3.5)</td>
<td>0.26±0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO₂</td>
<td>3.5±0.7</td>
<td>5426±549</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.04±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + kaolinite</td>
<td>4.6±0.5</td>
<td>5493±648</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>0.05±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + illite</td>
<td>12.2±0.2</td>
<td>4884±207</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>N/A (N/A)</td>
<td>0.06±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + montmorillonite</td>
<td>-11.3±0.2</td>
<td>6726±170</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>884.1 (1350.8)</td>
<td>-11.2 (-3.6)</td>
<td>0.63±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nTiO₂ + HA</td>
<td>-14.7±0.2</td>
<td>472±8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.66±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + kaolinite + HA</td>
<td>-11.7±0.7</td>
<td>944±17</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>135.9 (201.2)</td>
<td>-1.5 (-0.5)</td>
<td>0.73±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + illite + HA</td>
<td>-13.6±0.5</td>
<td>901±28</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>175.9 (238.2)</td>
<td>-1.4 (-0.5)</td>
<td>0.73±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + montmorillonite + HA</td>
<td>-15.0±0.7</td>
<td>1436±12</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>334.7 (449.6)</td>
<td>-2.1 (-0.7)</td>
<td>0.58±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nTiO₂ + HA</td>
<td>-15.4±0.2</td>
<td>1757±57</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>381.9</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>0.74±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + kaolinite + HA</td>
<td>-15.1±0.2</td>
<td>1966±74</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>410.9 (565.5)</td>
<td>-3.0 (-1.0)</td>
<td>0.68±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + illite + HA</td>
<td>-14.9±0.3</td>
<td>1525±67</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>311.4 (438.7)</td>
<td>-2.4 (-0.7)</td>
<td>0.82±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nTiO₂ + montmorillonite + HA</td>
<td>-14.4±0.4</td>
<td>2211±124</td>
<td>1.4 (0.55)</td>
<td>425.6 (590.7)</td>
<td>-3.4 (-1.1)</td>
<td>0.81±0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the presence of 3 mg/L HA, at both pH 5 and 9, all the suspensions showed stable absorbance of $A/A_0 \approx 1.0$ during mixing (Figure 6c & 6d), indicating no deposition. ZP of the suspensions were all very negative ($< -35$ mV) (Figure 5c), attributable to HA adsorption to nTiO$_2$, consistent with previous reports (Tang and Cheng, 2018; Wu and Cheng, 2016). HA is well known for its ability to stabilize fine particles via electrostatic and steric effects (Aiken et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2011). DLVO calculations confirmed high energy barriers and no secondary minima between nTiO$_2$ (and nTiO$_2$-clay aggregates) and the quartz sand, due to the strong repulsive electrostatic forces (Table 8).

**In 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution.** In the absence of HA, in 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution at pH 5, the absorbance of the nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, and nTiO$_2$+illite suspensions decreased to near zero in less than 150 minutes, and the absorbance of the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension reduced to 0.26 after 240 minutes (Figure 4e). The complete removal of nTiO$_2$ from water in the nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, and nTiO$_2$+illite suspensions was due to the attractive electrostatic forces between nTiO$_2$ (and the nTiO$_2$+clay aggregates) and the quartz sand. At pH 5, all these three suspensions carried positive charges (Figure 5e), therefore no energy barriers existed and the particles were attracted to the quartz sand. In the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension, negatively charged quartz sand and montmorillonite competed against each other for the positively charged nTiO$_2$, and a fraction of the nTiO$_2$ were attracted to the sand via electrostatic attraction without
forming aggregates with montmorillonite. The nTiO$_2$-montmorillonite aggregates carried negative charges (ZP = -17.8 mV) (Figure 5e) and were repelled by the sand, hence the nTiO$_2$ in the aggregates remained in water. DLVO calculations confirmed high energy barrier and no secondary minimum between the nTiO$_2$-montmorillonite aggregate and the sand (Table 9).

At pH 9, the absorbance of the nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, and nTiO$_2$+illite suspensions decreased to 0.15-0.19 after 240 minutes, indicating particle deposition. However, the absorbance of the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension remained unchanged (A/A$_0$≈~1.0) throughout the experiment, indicating no deposition. ZP of all the four suspensions were negative at pH 9 (Figure 5e), and the DLVO calculation showed high energy barriers and no secondary minima (Table 9), suggesting no particle attachment to the sand. The DLVO results were consistent with the observations in the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension, but contradicted the results observed in the nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, and nTiO$_2$+illite suspensions. Particle deposition in these three suspensions is likely caused by the bridging effect of Mg$^{2+}$, which connects negatively charged particles with the negatively charged sand surface. Due to the low affinity of quartz for Mg$^{2+}$, Mg$^{2+}$ is unlikely to adsorb to quartz surface (Allen et al., 2017). The bridging effect is more likely caused by Mg$^{2+}$ adsorption to Fe/Al oxyhydroxides, which have high affinity for cations at near neutral and alkaline pH (Fisher-Power et al., 2016; Mizutani et al., 2017). Both ICP-MS and SEM-EDX analyses confirmed the presence of Fe/Al oxyhydroxides in the sand. ICP-MS results indicated Fe
and Al concentration of 85 and 131 mg/kg respectively in the sand, and SEM-EDX results showed patch-wise Fe and Al oxyhydroxide coatings on sand surface (Figure A3, Appendix 2). The point of zero charge (PZC) of Fe and Al oxyhydroxides are usually around pH 7-8 (Tombácz, 2009). Therefore, Fe and Al oxyhydroxides presumably carried negative charges at pH 9 and strongly attract Mg$^{2+}$, which serves as a bridge between negatively charged particle and the Fe and Al oxyhydroxide coatings. In the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension, the bridging effect does not seem important, probably because of the much higher energy barrier ($\sim$2000 $k_{BT}$) between the particle and sand compared to that of other suspensions ($\sim$1000 $k_{BT}$) (Table 9).

In the presence of 3 mg/L HA, the absorbance of all the suspensions was high, e.g., the absorbance after 240 minutes was in the range of 0.73-0.90 at pH 5 and 0.93-1.00 at pH 9 (Figure 6g & 6h), indicating most of the particles remained suspended in water. DLVO calculation indicated high energy barriers and no secondary minima between particle and the sand, consistent with the experimental results. The low deposition was caused by HA adsorption to nTiO$_2$, which changed the ZP of nTiO$_2$ to negative at pH 5 (Figure 5f) and prevented nTiO$_2$ deposition. At pH 5, the removal of a small but substantial fraction of nTiO$_2$ (0.10-0.27) (Figure 6g) from water was likely due to the bridging effect of Mg$^{2+}$. nTiO$_2$ and Fe/Al oxyhydroxides are positively charged at pH 5 and have high affinity for HA (Wu and Cheng, 2016). Therefore, HA would adsorb to nTiO$_2$ and the Fe/Al oxyhydroxides on the sand, and Mg$^{2+}$ could act as a “bridge” between HA
covered nTiO$_2$ and Fe/Al oxyhydroxides. At pH 9, nTiO$_2$ and Fe/Al oxyhydroxides are negatively charged, and their affinity for HA is low (Wu and Cheng, 2016). Therefore, HA adsorption should be low and the bridging effect was negligible.

**In 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution.** At pH 5, in the absence of HA, the absorbance of all the suspensions substantially decreased during the experiments (Figure 6i), indicating a large fraction of the particles deposited. The deposition mechanisms were similar to those in 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, i.e., the attractive electrostatic forces between the positively charged particles and the negatively charged quartz sand (Figure 5h). For the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension, formation of negatively charged nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite aggregates (Figure 5h) helped to keep some nTiO$_2$ remain in water. It should be noted that at this high MgCl$_2$ concentration, a deep secondary minimum existed (-3.5$\sim$10.7 $k_B T$, Table 10) and it may also contribute to nTiO$_2$ deposition.

At pH 9, absorbance of all the suspensions decreased in the 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution (Figure 6j), indicating deposition. In the 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution at pH 9, deposition was attributed to Mg$^{2+}$ bridging. In the 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, however, ZP of the nTiO$_2$, nTiO$_2$+kaolinite, and nTiO$_2$+illite suspensions were all positive (Figure 5h), therefore energy barriers did not exist (Table 10) and deposition in these suspensions was caused by the attractive electrostatic forces between the particle and quartz surface. For the nTiO$_2$+montmorillonite suspension in 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, some nTiO$_2$ would deposit to the sand via attractive electrostatic forces instead of
forming nTiO$_2$-montmorillonite aggregates. Additionally, for the nTiO$_2$ that formed the negatively charged nTiO$_2$-montmorillonite aggregates, they could deposit via a secondary minimum (-3.6 to -11.2 $k_B T$) (Table 10), and this may contribute to the lower absorbance in the 1 mM mgCl$_2$ (0.63) vs. that in 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution (0.94).

Similar to its effect in the 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, HA in the 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution substantially increased the absorbance at both pH 5 and 9 (Figure 6k and 6l vs. Figure 6i and 6j), indicating that HA reduced deposition. The lower deposition was caused by HA adsorption to nTiO$_2$, which changed the ZP of nTiO$_2$ to negative at pH 5 (Figure 5i) and prevented nTiO$_2$ deposition. Similar to the 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution situation, DLVO calculation showed high energy barriers between particle and sand in the 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, which explains why most of the particles remained suspended. The mechanisms of particle deposition in the 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution in the presence of HA were also similar to that in the 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, i.e., Mg$^{2+}$ served as a bridge to connect the HA that adsorbed to nTiO$_2$ and Fe/Al oxyhydroxides. Compared to the 0.1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution, a larger fraction of particles deposited in 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution (Figure 6k and 6l vs. Figure 6g and 6h). This could be attributable to the higher Mg$^{2+}$ concentration and therefore, stronger bridging effect, and the secondary minima presented in the 1 mM MgCl$_2$ solution.
3.4. Summary

This study showed that nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition may occur simultaneously when negatively charged clay colloids compete against like-charged quartz sand for positively charged nTiO₂. Clay colloids and nTiO₂ formed hetero-aggregates (i.e., nTiO₂-clay aggregates) at pH 5 in 1 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM and 1 mM MgCl₂ solutions where nTiO₂ and clay colloid carried opposite charges. Clay colloids did not influence nTiO₂ aggregation at pH 9 in 3 mM NaCl and 0.1 mM MgCl₂ solutions due to the repulsive electrostatic forces between negatively charged nTiO₂ and clay colloids. In 1 mM MgCl₂ solution, however, nTiO₂ became positively charged at pH 9, and the negatively charged clay colloids promoted nTiO₂ aggregation by forming hetero-aggregates. The hetero-aggregates formed between nTiO₂ and clay may either deposit or remain suspended, depending on their interactions with quartz sand. In 3 mM NaCl and 0.1 mM MgCl₂ solution at pH 5, nTiO₂-kaolinite and nTiO₂-illite aggregates, along with nTiO₂, deposited onto quartz sand due to the electrostatic attraction. However, nTiO₂-montmorillonite aggregates remained in water due to electrostatic repulsion. At pH 9, in 3 mM NaCl solution, deposition did not occur due to electrostatic repulsion. However, in 0.1 mM and 1 mM MgCl₂ solution, deposition of nTiO₂ and/or nTiO₂+clay aggregates could be substantial due to Mg²⁺ bridging, electrostatic attraction, and secondary minimum. The presence of 3 mg/L HA was found to prevent nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition by changing the zeta potential of nTiO₂ in all the solutions at pH 5 and 9. In MgCl₂ solutions, however, HA can facilitate deposition via adsorbing to nTiO₂ and Fe/Al oxyhydroxides,
which enabled Mg$^{2+}$ bridging. This study demonstrated that clay colloids may significantly affect nTiO$_2$ aggregation and deposition, and the effect of clay colloids is governed by the DLVO forces and Mg$^{2+}$ bridging, which are influenced by pH, cation valance and concentration, co-existing HA, mineral type of the clay, and Fe/Al oxyhydroxide coatings on sand grains.
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Chapter 4. Conclusions

nTiO$_2$, one of the most extensively used nanoscale materials, have been universally utilized in products. nTiO$_2$ could easily be released into aquatic systems and cause environmental risks. Studying the fate of nTiO$_2$ in subsurface systems is essential for evaluating the environmental risks of nTiO$_2$. This thesis researched the influence of HA, clay colloids and water chemistry on nTiO$_2$ stability, aggregation and deposition onto quartz sand.

To ascertain the effect of cation valence, humic acid, and clay colloids on stability and aggregation of nTiO$_2$, batch experiments were conducted by mixing nTiO$_2$ with HA, or illite colloids or both in varying background solutions (Chapter 2). Results showed that in the absence of clay colloids and HA, ZP of nTiO$_2$ were generally more positive in MgCl$_2$ solutions than that in NaCl solutions at the same pH. When illite colloids and nTiO$_2$ particles co-existed, nTiO$_2$ were destabilized at pH < pH$_{pzc,TiO_2}$ by illite colloids through formation of illite-nTiO$_2$ hetero-aggregates as a result of electrostatic attraction. At pH > pH$_{pzc,TiO_2}$, illite colloids did not interfere with like-charged nTiO$_2$. Point of zero charge of nTiO$_2$ in MgCl$_2$ solution was higher than that in NaCl solution, and therefore hetero-aggregation in MgCl$_2$ solution occurred even at high pH. In both MgCl$_2$ and NaCl solutions, the presence of HA made nTiO$_2$ particles stable both in the absence and presence of illite colloids.
To ascertain how the presence of clay colloids, HA influence concurrent aggregation and deposition of nTiO₂ in varying background solutions, batch experiments were conducted by mixing nTiO₂, nTiO₂ & HA, nTiO₂ & clay colloids and nTiO₂ & HA & clay colloids with quartz sand in varying background solutions (Chapter 3). Results showed that nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition may occur simultaneously when negatively charged clay colloids compete against like-charged quartz sand for positively charged nTiO₂. The hetero-aggregates formed between nTiO₂ and clay may either deposit or remain suspended, depending on their interactions with quartz sand. In 3 mM NaCl and 0.1 mM MgCl₂ solution at pH 5, nTiO₂-kaolinite and nTiO₂-illite aggregates, along with nTiO₂, deposited onto quartz sand due to the electrostatic attraction. However, nTiO₂-montmorillonite aggregates remained in water due to electrostatic repulsion. At pH 9, in 3 mM NaCl solution, deposition did not occur due to electrostatic repulsion. However, in 0.1 mM and 1 mM MgCl₂ solution, deposition of nTiO₂ and/or nTiO₂+clay aggregates could be substantial due to Mg²⁺ bridging, electrostatic attraction, and secondary minimum. The presence of 3 mg/L HA was found to prevent nTiO₂ aggregation and deposition by changing the zeta potential of nTiO₂ in all the solutions at pH 5 and 9. In MgCl₂ solutions, however, HA can facilitate deposition via adsorbing to nTiO₂ and Fe/Al oxyhydroxides, which enabled Mg²⁺ bridging.
Appendix 1: Measuring light absorbance of the nTiO2 suspensions: wavelength selection

A UV-Vis spectrophotometer (Genesys 10S UV-Vis, Thermo Scientific) was used to measure light absorbance of the nTiO2 suspensions. The UV-Vis spectra of nTiO2 suspension (50 mg/L), and illite colloid suspension (10 mg/L illite) with 10 mg/L humic acid (HA) are shown in Figure A1. It is noted that absorbance of the nTiO2 suspension is higher than that of the illite + HA mixture throughout the wavelength range of 200 to 800 nm. Additionally, at long wavelength, absorbance of the illite + HA mixture becomes negligibly low, but absorbance of the nTiO2 suspension is still substantial. Based on this, a wavelength of 600 nm was chosen for measuring absorbance of the nTiO2 suspensions to eliminate the influence of illite colloids and/or HA.

Figure A1. UV-Vis spectra of nTiO2 suspension (50 mg/L), and illite + HA mixture (illite colloid = 10 mg/L, HA = 10 mg/L).
Figure A2. UV-Vis spectra of nTiO₂ (50 mg/L), illite (10 mg/L), montmorillonite (10 mg/L), kaolinite (10 mg/L) and humic acid (HA) (3 mg/L) in deionized water.
Appendix 2: SEM-EDX results

Fig. A3. SEM-EDX results of the quartz sand used in nTiO$_2$ deposition experiments.

*Four spots were checked by EDX. Spot 1 and 2 showed notable difference in surface features (panel (a)), and Fe and Al were detected by EDX (panel (b) and (c)). Spot 3 and 4 showed regular surface features (panel (a)), and only Si and O were detected by EDX (panel (d) and (e)).
Appendix 3: Shaking Stability
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Figure A4. Relative absorbance (A/A₀) of the suspensions in the absence of quartz sand.