Nanoscale gold clusters in arsenopyrite controlled by growth rate not concentration: Evidence from atom probe microscopy
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ABSTRACT

Auriferous sulfides, most notably pyrite (FeS₂) and arsenopyrite (FeAsS), are among the most important economic minerals on Earth because they can host large quantities of gold in many of the world's major gold deposits. Here we present the first atom probe study of gold distribution in arsenopyrite to characterize the three-dimensional (3D) distribution of gold at the nanoscale and provide data to discriminate among competing models for gold incorporation in refractory ores. In contrast to models that link gold distribution to gold concentration, gold incorporation in arsenopyrite is shown to be controlled by the rate of crystal growth, with slow growth rate promoting the formation of gold clusters and rapid growth rate leading to homogeneous gold distribution. This study yields new information on the controls of gold distribution and incorporation in sulfides that has important implications for ore deposit formation. More broadly this study reveals new information about crystal-fluid interface dynamics that determine trace element incorporation into growing mineral phases.
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INTRODUCTION

Gold nanoparticles in undeformed arsenian pyrite and arsenopyrite have been inferred to form through four different mechanisms. Phase immiscibility during sulfide precipitation has been inferred from the correlation of gold particles with highly enriched domains (Reich et al. 2005), whereas the association of gold with randomly orientated polycrystalline sulfide is inferred to reflect post-crystallization gold exsolution during metamorphism (Palenik et al. 2004). Both of these models are strongly tied to the maximum gold solubility in arsenic-bearing sulfides. Above the maximum solubility limit, excess gold will precipitate as gold nanoparticles, while below the limit, gold will form a solid solution within the crystal lattice. In arsenopyrite, the maximum solubility for gold in solid solution has been estimated as ~2 wt% using $C_{As} = 0.02C_{Au} + (4 \times 10^{-3})$ where $C_{As}$ and $C_{Au}$ represent the concentration of gold and arsenic, respectively (Reich et al. 2005). The maximum gold solubility will decrease as temperature decreases, so exsolution of gold may take place during cooling and exhumation of the host rock (Palenik et al. 2004; Velásquez et al. 2014).

Observations by TEM of triangular gold nanoplates in supergene gold deposit indicate that colloidal nanoparticle solution is an active mechanism for gold transportation (Hough et al. 2011). Hence, the formation of gold nanoparticles at depth, subsequent transportation in a fluid phase, and precipitation on the surface of sulfide minerals has been invoked as a potential mechanism for gold incorporation in arsenopyrite (Saunders 1990; Hough et al. 2011). A fourth model relies on the electrochemical and semiconducting properties of the sulfide surface and the ability for gold to adsorb from solution (Widler and Seward 2002; Mikhlin et al. 2006; Becker et al. 2010). Gold adsorbed on to the host mineral surface, which initially bonds with the sulfide matrix, may diffuse and create covalent bonds with other gold atoms from neighboring adsorption sites or dissolved in solution. This process may lead to the formation of nanoparticles (Becker et al. 2010).

Discriminating between these different models has been difficult because the spatial and textural relationships among gold and sulfide phases at the nanoscale remains cryptic. X-ray absorption near-edge structure (XANES) analysis has demonstrated that gold atoms either bond with the crystal lattice as Au⁺ or exist as clusters in metallic Au₄ form (Genkin et al. 1998; Simon et al. 1999; Cabri et al. 2000). High-resolution transmission electron microscopy combined with energy-dispersive X-ray analysis (TEM-EDX) studies have recorded the occurrence and two-dimensional shape and distribution of metallic gold nanoparticles (Reich et al. 2005; Ciobanu et al. 2011; Deditius et al. 2011). However, the inability of older TEM-EDX systems to detect trace elements at low concentrations compromises the measurement of lattice-bound gold.

To address this issue and discriminate between the four competing models we have undertaken a combined synchrotron X-ray fluorescence microscopy (XFM) and atom probe microscopy study of gold-bearing arsenopyrite from the giant Paleoproterozoic Obuasi gold deposit, Ghana (Fougerouse et al. 2016b). Our results constrain the 3D distribution of gold at the nanoscale and provide new insights into the mechanisms of gold incorporation.
The arsenopyrite crystals are hosted in sheared metasedimentary rocks composed of muscovite, quartz, chlorite, and ankerite. Synchrotron XFM shows that gold is distributed in cyclic and concentric bands that mimic the boundaries of the arsenopyrite crystals (Fig. 1). Secondary nickel-enriched replacement domains (up to 2880 ppm nickel) cutting across the gold concentric zoning are developed around healed microfractures and grain boundaries and are the result of post-crystallization fluid-rock interactions. The depth penetration of the synchrotron XFM analysis reveals large metallic gold inclusions (~1 μm diameter) in the sub-surface of the sample often associated with micro-fractures. In an undeformed grain, both nickel-rich domains and large gold metallic inclusions were avoided during the atom probe sample preparation to specifically target the primary gold distribution.

The atom probe results indicate that the arsenopyrite composition is non-stoichiometric, being depleted in As and enriched in Fe and S (Table 1). The major element composition of specimen 1 is relatively homogeneous across the length of the data set. Specimen 1 has an average gold concentration of 724 ppm with the gold being segregated in isolated clusters up to 7 nm in diameter (Fig. 2). The clusters are oblate and spheroidal and follow the curvature of the evolving sample surface. The distribution of the clusters is heterogeneous across the specimen, with about 70 individual clusters imaged in the data set. Clusters are spaced ~10 to 15 nm from each other. They are composed of several hundred atoms for the bigger clusters and only of 10 atoms for the smaller ones. The centermost of the largest cluster is composed of 46.7 wt% gold. No other trace elements were found to be present in the clusters.

Specimen 2 comprises distinct compositional variations between two sub-domains separated by a continuous, sharp planar boundary (Fig. 2). A gold-rich (2169 ppm) domain has a similar sulfur composition than sample 1, whereas a gold-poor domains (213 ppm) is arsenic-enriched and sulfur-depleted compared to the other domains analyzed (Table 1; Supplementary Fig. 2).
ions to diffuse on the crystal surface and the sulfide matrix (Mikhlin et al. 2006; Becker et al. 2010). As a result, Au+ ions have the ability to diffuse at the crystal surface, or “hop,” from adsorption sites to form Au+ dimers, initiating clusters that coarsen with time (Becker et al. 2010). In this case, the expectation is that most gold would be distributed in nanoparticulate form and that increasing gold concentrations would be associated with increasing nanoparticle size. This is not consistent with the absence of gold nanoparticles in the high-concentration area of specimen 2, and another control on the ability of gold to diffuse on the crystal surface must be significant. One possible control is growth rate since slow crystal growth rate increases the residence time of Au+ ions at the sulfide surface, and thus increases the ability of Au+ ions to diffuse on the crystal surface from one adsorption site to another. As a result, more energetically favorable Au-Au bonds can form, leading to the growth of in situ Au-Au bonds and Au-Au bonds are more energetically favorable than bonds between Au+ and the sulfide matrix (Mikhlin et al. 2006; Becker et al. 2010). As a result, Au+ ions have the ability to diffuse at the crystal surface, or “hop,” from adsorption sites to form Au+ dimers, initiating clusters that coarsen with time (Becker et al. 2010). In this case, the expectation is that most gold would be distributed in nanoparticulate form and that increasing gold concentrations would be associated with increasing nanoparticle size. This is not consistent with the absence of gold nanoparticles in the high-concentration area of specimen 2, and another control on the ability of gold to diffuse on the crystal surface must be significant. One possible control is growth rate since slow crystal growth rate increases the residence time of Au+ ions at the sulfide surface, and thus increases the ability of Au+ ions to diffuse on the crystal surface from one adsorption site to another. As a result, more energetically favorable Au-Au bonds can form, leading to the growth of in situ Au+ nanoparticles (Becker et al. 2010). Conversely, a fast growth rate and short residence time for the Au+ ions at the sulfide surface limits the diffusion of Au+ ions on the sulfide surface and promotes the gold trapping and encapsulation within the growing arsenopyrite (Fig. 3). The presented data are consistent with a model in which formation of gold nanoparticles is controlled by crystal growth rate. Analogous mechanisms for variation of trace element concentration occurring as spherical metallic nanoparticles (Au0). Therefore, domains containing gold nanoparticles (Au0) and others where gold is homogeneously distributed in the sulfide lattice, most likely as Au+ species (Cabri et al. 2000), are reported in a single arsenopyrite crystal only a few micrometers apart. The absence of clusters in specimen 2 is inconsistent with gold being transported in hydrothermal fluids as colloidal gold nanoparticles (Saunders 1990; Hough et al. 2011).

**Figure 2.** Atom probe results. Gold atoms are displayed as red spheres. (a) Specimen 1. Gold atoms are segregated in clusters. (b) 5 nm slice through the largest gold cluster. (c) Interpretative diagram showing the apparent local magnification of the data, arising from trajectory aberrations around high-evaporation field nanoparticles, which protrude from the surface of the sample. (d) Specimen 2. The distribution of gold atoms is divided in two domains. The gold within each domain is homogeneously distributed. remobilization of gold due to changing gold solubility during exhumation (Palenik et al. 2004). The lack of a temperature control on the formation of gold nanoclusters highlights a need for caution when using nanoparticle occurrence and size as an indicator of formation temperature (Reich et al. 2006).

**TABLE 1.** Table of major and trace element compositions measured by atom probe microscopy from all arsenopyrite domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Fe (wt%)</th>
<th>As (wt%)</th>
<th>S (wt%)</th>
<th>Au (ppm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specimen 1 bulk</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen 2 gold-rich domain</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen 2 gold-poor domain</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each sub-domain of sample 2, the gold atoms are homogenously distributed and not clustered.

**Discussion**

The fine, epitaxial gold oscillatory zoning is interpreted to represent growth zones during a hydrothermal event rather than variation in the bulk fluid composition from separate hydrothermal events (Barker et al. 2009; Fougerouse et al. 2016b). The zones of higher gold concentration are associated with lower arsenic and higher sulfur contents, however the relationship between major element composition and gold incorporation remains unclear from our data set. All analyzed arsenopyrite has gold concentrations less than the gold solubility limit in arsenopyrite of 2-200 ppm. Therefore, the gold trapping and encapsulation within the growing arsenopyrite limits the diffusion of Au+ ions at the sulfide surface, and thus increases the ability of Au+ ions to diffuse on the crystal surface from one adsorption site to another. As a result, more energetically favorable Au-Au bonds can form, leading to the growth of in situ Au+ nanoparticles (Becker et al. 2010). Conversely, a fast growth rate and short residence time for the Au+ ions at the sulfide surface limits the diffusion of Au+ ions on the sulfide surface and promotes the gold trapping and encapsulation within the growing arsenopyrite (Fig. 3). The presented data are consistent with a model in which formation of gold nanoparticles is controlled by crystal growth rate. Analogous mechanisms for variation of trace element concentration occurring as spherical metallic nanoparticles (Au0). Therefore, domains containing gold nanoparticles (Au0) and others where gold is homogeneously distributed in the sulfide lattice, most likely as Au+ species (Cabri et al. 2000), are reported in a single arsenopyrite crystal only a few micrometers apart. The absence of clusters in specimen 2 is inconsistent with gold being transported in hydrothermal fluids as colloidal gold nanoparticles (Saunders 1990; Hough et al. 2011).

Gold clusters in specimen 1 are only associated with intermediate concentrations (724 ppm) an order of magnitude below the gold solubility limit in arsenopyrite of 20 000 ppm. Therefore, the phase immiscibility model (Reich et al. 2005), though potentially explaining the formation of gold nanoparticles above the gold solubility limit in solid-solution with arsenic-bearing sulfides, is not consistent with the formation of nanoparticles in specimen 1. In addition, both gold-enriched (2169 ppm) and gold-poor (213 ppm) domains of specimen 2 are cluster free. These data show that there is no systematic relationship between the presence of gold clusters and gold concentration in arsenopyrite and there is no evidence for the formation of gold nanoparticles being controlled by the maximum gold solubility in arsenopyrite (Reich et al. 2005).

The atom probe specimens come from only a few micrometers apart and therefore are assumed to have experienced a common metamorphic history. Hence, the difference in gold distribution is unlikely to be a result of temperature-controlled post-crystallization of topography at the specimen surface and this introduces trajectory aberrations manifest as dilution and magnification of the nanoparticles in the 3D reconstruction (Vurpillot et al. 2000) (Fig. 2c). The shape and composition of the gold clusters observed in the arsenopyrite specimen reported here are consistent with gold occurring as spherical metallic nanoparticles (Au0). Therefore, domains containing gold nanoparticles (Au0) and others where gold is homogeneously distributed in the sulfide lattice, most likely as Au+ species (Cabri et al. 2000), are reported in a single arsenopyrite crystal only a few micrometers apart. The absence of clusters in specimen 2 is inconsistent with gold being transported in hydrothermal fluids as colloidal gold nanoparticles (Saunders 1990; Hough et al. 2011).

Gold clusters in specimen 1 are only associated with intermediate concentrations (724 ppm) an order of magnitude below the gold solubility limit in arsenopyrite of 20 000 ppm. Therefore, the phase immiscibility model (Reich et al. 2005), though potentially explaining the formation of gold nanoparticles above the gold solubility limit in solid-solution with arsenic-bearing sulfides, is not consistent with the formation of nanoparticles in specimen 1. In addition, both gold-enriched (2169 ppm) and gold-poor (213 ppm) domains of specimen 2 are cluster free. These data show that there is no systematic relationship between the presence of gold clusters and gold concentration in arsenopyrite and there is no evidence for the formation of gold nanoparticles being controlled by the maximum gold solubility in arsenopyrite (Reich et al. 2005).

The atom probe specimens come from only a few micrometers apart and therefore are assumed to have experienced a common metamorphic history. Hence, the difference in gold distribution is unlikely to be a result of temperature-controlled post-crystallization
with crystal growth rate have been reported for experimental data in calcite (Watson 2004; Barker and Cox 2011).

In this study, synchrotron XFM multi-element mapping has provided the textural framework for detailed analysis of gold distribution at the nanoscale. The innovative use of atom probe microscopy has captured variations in the distribution of gold that are far more complex than previously reported and allows testing of competing models for nanoscale gold cluster formation in arsenopyrite. The atom probe data are only consistent with a growth rate control on gold distribution in arsenopyrite such that faster growth rates promote homogeneous gold incorporation while slower rates induce the formation of nanoparticles by surface diffusion. Our results illustrate that a systematic atom probe investigation of the crystal chemistry of arsenopyrite has the potential to reveal the nanoscale distribution of gold and resolve the mechanisms responsible for these distributions. Such information has the potential to enhance gold recovery and improve the optimization of the mineral processing workflow from refractory ores. The results may also have importance for understanding the mechanisms of trace element incorporation in other crystallizing minerals. More generally, our results illustrate that the further development and application of atom probe microscopy has the potential to provide the constraints needed to discriminate among contentious geochemical processes in a range of geological materials.
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