Reduction kinetics of aqueous U(VI) in acidic chloride brines to uraninite by methane, hydrogen or C-graphite under hydrothermal conditions: Implications for the genesis of unconformity-related uranium ore deposits
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Abstract

The formation of hydrothermal uranium ore deposits involves the reduction of dissolved U(VI)_{aq} to uraninite. However, the nature of the reducing agent and the kinetics of such a process are currently unknown. These questions are addressed through dedicated experiments performed under conditions relevant for the genesis of unconformity-related uranium (URU) deposits. We tested the efficiency of the following potential reductants supposed to be involved in the reaction: H_{2}, CH_{4}, C-graphite and dissolved Fe(II). Results demonstrate the great efficiency of H_{2}, CH_{4} and C-graphite to reduce U(VI)_{aq} into uraninite in acidic chloride brines, unlike dissolved Fe(II). Times needed for H_{2} (1.4 bar), CH_{4} (2.4 bar) and C-graphite (water/carbon mass ratio = 10) to reduce 1 mM of U(VI)_{aq} in an acidic brine (1 m LiCl, pH fixed by HCl) to uraninite at 200 °C are 12 h, 3 days and 4 months, respectively. The effects of temperature (T) between 100 °C and 200 °C, H_{2} partial pressure (0.14, 1.4, and 5.4 bar), salinity (0.1, 1 and 3.2 m LiCl) and pH at 25 °C (0.8 and 3.3) on the reduction rate were also investigated. Results show that increasing temperature and H_{2} partial pressure increase the reaction rate, whereas increasing salinity or pH have the reverse effect. The reduction of uranyl to uraninite follows an apparent zero-order with respect to time, whatever the considered electron donor. From the measured rate constants, the following values of activation energy (E_a), depending on the nature of the electron donor, have been derived: E_{a,C-graphite} = 155 ± 3 kJ mol^{-1}, E_{a,CH_{4}} = 143 ± 6 kJ mol^{-1}, and E_{a,H_{2}} = 124 ± 15 kJ mol^{-1} at T < 150 °C and 32 ± 6 kJ mol^{-1} at T > 150 °C. An empirical relationship between the reaction rate, the hydrogen partial pressure, the uranyl speciation, and the temperature is also proposed. This allows an estimation of the time of formation of a giant U ore deposit such as McArthur River (Canada). The duration of the mineralizing event is controlled both by the U concentration in the ore-forming fluids and the dynamics of gaseous reductants input, and not by the kinetics of U(VI)_{aq} reduction itself. Focused flow of mobile electron donors (H_{2}, CH_{4}) along quasi vertical fractured zones into U(VI)_{aq}-bearing oxidized fluids may explain the large volume and high concentrations of uranium in the URU deposits.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
1. INTRODUCTION

Uranium is a redox sensitive element and its accumulation under hydrothermal conditions is a precious indicator of the redox state of fluids and their host rocks (Dubessy et al., 1988; Cuney, 2009). Hydrothermal uranium deposits are the main resources of uranium in the world and account for more than 75% of world uranium production (IAEA, 2009). The formation of these deposits implies: (1) the circulation of hydrothermal fluids of varying temperature and salinity through sedimentary and igneous rocks; (2) uranium transport in a hexavalent U(VI) (aq) form as the uranyl ion (UO$_2^{2+}$) or its associated complexes, and (3) uranium deposition in a tetravalent U(IV) form as uraninite (UO$_2$). These issues mean that fluctuations of redox conditions are critical for uranium transport and deposition (Dubessy et al., 1988; Cuney, 2009). The three major types of hydrothermal uranium deposits in terms of uranium tonnage are: (1) Roll front deposits (Finch and Davis, 1985; Cai et al., 2007), (2) Iron Oxide Copper–Gold (IOCG) deposits (Hitzman and Valenta, 2005; Williams et al., 2005; Skirrow and Australia, 2009), (3) unconformity-related uranium (URU) deposits (Hoeve and Sibbald, 1978; Jefferson et al., 2007; Kyser and Cuney, 2008b). URU deposits combine spectacularly high grade and large tonnage (up to 200 kt of pure U with an average grade of 20 wt% U at McArthur River, Canada) and have been extensively studied for genetic and economic aspects.

URU deposits are unique to a restricted number of Proterozoic basins including the Athabasca and Thelon basins of Canada and the Kombolgie Basin of Northern Australia (Jefferson et al., 2007; Kyser and Cuney, 2008b). Uranium mineralization as UO$_2$, is present at the unconformity between an Archean to Paleoproterozoic crystalline basement and a Paleo- to Mesoproterozoic sandstone cover and frequently associated with basement-rooted graphite-rich faults. Uranium mineralization is surrounded by an illite + sudoite (di-tri-octahedral Mg-chlorite) ± dravite (Mg-tourmaline) alteration halo. These deposits are thought to have formed from large-scale circulation of basinal brines at temperatures of 120–200 °C that percolated between sedimentary basins and underlying crystalline basement rocks (e.g. Hoeve and Sibbald, 1978; Derome et al., 2005; Boiron et al., 2010; Richard et al., 2013a). Analysis of fluid inclusions genetically linked with the uranium mineralization by microthermometry, LA-ICP-MS, synchrotron-ESRF and XANES have shown that these brines have salinities of 25–35 wt% NaCl equivalent, with highly variable Na/Ca ratios from NaCl-rich (Na > Ca > Mg > K) to CaCl$_2$-rich (Ca > Mg > Na > K) end-members (Pagel et al., 1980; Kotzer and Kyser, 1995; Derome et al., 2003a,b, 2005; Richard et al., 2013b), and with U(VI)$_{\text{aq}}$ contents up to 600 ppm (Richard et al., 2010, 2012). Solubility measurements of U(VI)$_{\text{aq}}$ (uranium trioxide: UO$_3$(H$_2$O)$_n$) in synthetic NaCl brines as a function of pH at 155 °C and vapor saturation pressure have shown that such Cl-rich brines can only transport such high uranium concentrations under acidic conditions: pH < 4 (Rozsypal, 2009; Richard et al., 2012). Experimental studies by Raman spectroscopy of U(VI)$_{\text{aq}}$-bearing Cl-rich brines have shown that the speciation of U(VI)$_{\text{aq}}$ is dominated by uranyl chloride complexes with high Cl numbers in the equatorial plane, (UO$_2^-$)$_n$Cl$_2$ where n = 4 or 5) at temperatures relevant to URU deposits (Dargent et al., 2013). The deposition of UO$_2$ requires the reduction of the uranyl complexes. However, it exists a long-standing debate concerning the nature of the electrons donor (Yeo and Potter, 2010).

Alteration of graphitic metasediments by basinal brines is widespread in the vicinity of URU deposits. This alteration results in partial to complete dissolution with corrosion pits (Wang et al., 1989) and remobilization of graphite along faults (Kyser et al., 1989). Graphite has been invoked as a direct reducing agent based on the observation of UO$_2$ occurrence at the place where graphite was consumed (e.g. Alexandre et al., 2005).

Hoeve and Sibbald (1978) hypothesized that CH$_4$ was the dominant product of hydrothermal alteration of graphite. Bray et al. (1988) proposed that interaction of basinal brines with sulfide-bearing graphitic metasediments could have produced CO$_2$ ± CH$_4$ ± H$_2$S ± H$_2$. Indeed, traces of reduced gases such as CH$_4$, C$_2$H$_6$, or H$_2$ were detected by Raman spectroscopy in fluid inclusions from URU deposits (Wilde et al., 1989; Derome et al., 2003a,b, 2005). Hydrogen sulfide, from alteration of sulfide minerals, is also a potential reducing agent of U(VI)$_{\text{aq}}$ (Spirakis, 1981; Cheney, 1985; Beyer et al., 2010). Therefore, the migration of reducing agents (especially CH$_4$) has been tentatively suggested since the 80’s as a process for the reduction of U(VI)$_{\text{aq}}$ to U(IV)$_{\text{aq}}$ and subsequent uranium deposition. The reduction of mobile U(VI)$_{\text{aq}}$ to sparingly soluble UO$_2$ induced by Fe(II)-bearing minerals (e.g. pyrite, chlorite) has also been proposed (Alexandre et al., 2005; Alexandre and Kyser, 2005; Derome et al., 2005). This reaction is possible in the aqueous phase (Privalov et al., 2003), but it is strongly enhanced in the presence of solid surfaces acting as catalysts (Liger et al., 1999; Jeon et al., 2005).

Hydrogen must also be taken into account as a potential reducing agent at the origin of the formation of URU deposits. Molecular hydrogen, together with oxygen, is known to form as a by-product of water radiolysis induced by U decay at the contact of the mineralization (Kish and Cuney, 1982; Dubessy et al., 1988; Krylova et al., 2002, 2008; Lin et al., 2005a,b). Nevertheless, the associated production of oxygen (strong oxidant), causing post-mineralization hematitization, probably prevents any efficient self-induced reduction process at this stage. As there is no evidence of hydrogen presence as a primary reagent, it has thus been overlooked by geologists up to now. However, significant potential hydrogen sources have to be considered in the formation of URU deposits such as hydrothermal alteration of Fe(II)-bearing minerals present in the crystalline bedrock (Hawkes, 1972; Salvi and Williams-Jones, 1997; Sherwood Lollar et al., 2002, 2008), reactions of ferrous minerals with H$_2$S (Drobner et al., 1990; Wächtershäuser, 1990, 1993; Graham and Ohmoto, 1994; Rickard, 1997), or metamorphism of graphitic rocks (French, 1966; Levinson, 1977; Dubessy, 1984; Connolly and Cesare, 1992).
The nature of the reducing agent and the kinetics of U(VI)$_{aq}$ to U(IV) reduction and UO$_2$ deposition have remained among the least understood aspects in U ore deposits genesis (Jefferson et al., 2007; Kyser and Cuney, 2008b). Currently, experimental studies testing the capability of the reducing agents mentioned above, in conditions of URU deposits genesis, are very limited. Moreover, the kinetics of the associated reduction processes is poorly known. Concerning organic matter, Nakashima et al. (1999) have demonstrated the possible U(VI)$_{aq}$ reduction into uraninite at around 200 °C under acidic conditions using three types of lignites having different maturities as reducing agents. In the framework of spent nuclear fuel repository, Ekeroth et al. (2004) have experimentally reduced U(VI)$_{aq}$ under high hydrogen pressure (40 bar) and 90%Ar–10% CH$_4$ mol kg$^{-1}$ at 150 °C, showing the ability of Fe(II) to reduce U(VI) to U(IV). However experiments have been performed at room temperature and pH 7.2. Using reactive mass transport modeling, Aghbelagh and Yang (2014) have evaluated by two different reactions involving either methane as reducing agent or a decrease of oxygen fugacity for the precipitation of uraninite in a typical URU deposit. They concluded that both mechanisms might precipitate uraninite, but they pointed out that only methane is able to explain the massive precipitation of uraninite around the faulted graphite zone. However, these numerical simulations rely on a limited set of thermodynamic (especially for uranyl-chloride complexes) and kinetic data selected from EQ3/6 database (Wolery, 1992; Raffensperger and Garven, 1995), most of these data do not rely on measured experimental values. Therefore, laboratory experiments are needed to constrain these reactive transport models, and to provide the required thermodynamic and kinetic data sets. This question is specifically addressed in this paper through dedicated experiments.

The present work aims first to test the capability and efficiency of some species mentioned above as geological reducing agents under representative conditions for URU deposits genesis. The electron donors investigated in this experimental study are H$_2$, CH$_4$, C-graphite and aqueous Fe(II). In addition, the effects of different parameters (temperature, concentration of reductant, chlorinity and pH) on the reduction rate and mechanism are evaluated, and a rate law involving these parameters is proposed. Finally, the derived kinetic parameters are applied to estimate the time scale of U deposition and the quantity of uraninite precipitated under the conditions of URU deposits formation.

2. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

2.1. Uranyl chloride solutions

Experimental UO$_2^{2+}$-bearing solutions were obtained from uranyl acetate powder (99.95% pure from Prolabo). This phase was heated during three days at 500 °C in order to obtain UO$_3$ powder, which was subsequently dissolved in concentrated HCl (31 wt%) at 150 °C. The solution was evaporated to obtain solid UO$_2$Cl$_2$·nH$_2$O and then dissolved in H$_2$O at room temperature. The U(VI)$_{aq}$ concentration in the experimental solution was around 10$^{-3}$ mol kg$^{-1}$. The chloride concentration was adjusted by addition of LiCl (0.1, 1.0, and 3.2 mol kg$^{-1}$). The use of LiCl electrolyte instead of a more representative Na, Ca brine (Derome et al., 2005; Richard et al., 2010), does not induce any change on the uranyl speciation as demonstrated by Dargent (2014) at 150 °C-Psat under acidic conditions (pH$_{LS, CO}_2$ = 1). Therefore the choice of the chloride-bearing electrolyte has no effect on the measured reaction rate under our experimental conditions.

Concerning the experiment carried out with Fe(II)$_{aq}$ as the reducing agent, we added FeCl$_2$·4H$_2$O (from VWR, 99.9% purity) to provide known amounts of Fe(II)$_{aq}$ in solution. Each solutions was acidified by HCl at 0.1 mol kg$^{-1}$ (pH ≤ 1) to avoid uranmate precipitation (Rozsypal, 2009). To evaluate the effect of pH on the reduction rate, one experiment was performed at pH 3.3 (as measured at room temperature) by adding known amount of 1 mol kg$^{-1}$ NaOH to the uranyl stock solution.

2.2. Reactor design and experimental procedure

The experiments in the presence of gaseous reductants (H$_2$/CH$_4$) or aqueous Fe(II) were carried out in a Parr® stirred autoclave (titanium grade 4, internal volume of 450 ml), loaded with 250 mL of aqueous solution for each experiment. The nominal maximum temperature and pressure of the reactor is 300 °C and 100 bars, respectively. The reactor was equipped with several capillary tubings that enable periodic sampling of the experimental fluid to monitor reaction progress, and adjustment of the working pressure to a constant value during each run. The vessel and all internal tubings were fitted with Teflon® liners, so that the solution was not in contact with any metallic parts, avoiding corrosion of titanium or potential catalytic effect of the TiO$_2$ coating of the vessel. The autoclave was loaded and sealed in a glove box ([O$_2$] < 5 ppm). In addition, an argon flow was bubbled in the filled autoclave during 20 min to remove dissolved O$_2$. Finally, 3 cycles of Ar injection (50 bar) and flushing were performed to remove the last traces of oxygen prior to heating. Both H$_2$ and CH$_4$ were loaded as gaseous mixtures of 90%Ar–10% H$_2$ and 90%Ar–10% CH$_4$, respectively.

The Ti autoclave contained a Teflon® bowl together with many additional connections (dip tube, stirring, pressure gauge, etc) that represented potential location for C-graphite adhesion, C-graphite being extremely sticky. In addition, it cannot be removed easily by chemical washing. Therefore, the use of the Ti-autoclave with C-graphite would have induced a long lasting contamination. Thus, the experiments in the presence of C-graphite were performed in individual stainless steel autoclaves (Parr® bombs) fitted with Teflon® bowls (15 ml) that were easier to clean, and that can be replaced at a limited cost. In this case, each measurement corresponds to an individual batch experiment (one Parr bomb per experiments). Graphite powder (particles of 5–10 μm in size) and 10 mL of uranyl chloride stock solution (water/rock mass ratio (W/R$_C$) equal to 10)
were loaded in anoxic glove box. Experiments were performed at saturated vapor pressure. At the end of experiments, autoclaves were quenched in cold water. A summary of experimental conditions for each run is given in Table 1.

It is important to note that the Teflon® parts of the autoclaves may contain entrapped atmospheric O₂ in the micro porosity. Thus, to ensure anoxic conditions, all Teflon® bowls and liners were pretreated before the series of experiments with a hydrazine solution (N₂H₄ 2HCl and rinsed with milliQ-water prior to use. The pH values were measured at 25°C during 24 h. Dissolved and occluded O₂ was removed according to the following reaction:

\[ \text{O}_2(\text{gas}) + \text{N}_2\text{H}_4(\text{aq}) = 2\text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{aq}) + \text{N}_2(\text{gas}) \]  

(1)

The reactor and the Teflon® parts were carefully cleaned in the glove box using 1 mol kg⁻¹ HCl and rinsed with milliQ-water prior to use.

2.3. Sampling and analytical techniques

During each Ti-autoclave experiment, solution samples were periodically taken for dissolved uranium concentration analyses. Each time, 2 separate aliquots were sampled for a total volume of 5 mL. The first aliquot was the purge of the sampling line. The second aliquot was immediately diluted in HNO₃ (2 wt%). After each stainless steel autoclave experiment, solution was centrifuged, filtered (0.2 μm) to remove graphite particles, and immediately diluted in HNO₃ (wt 2%). Analyses for U concentration were performed by ICP-OES with a precision of 5% at the 95% confidence level (detection limit at 5 ppb). The pH values were measured at 25 °C in the remaining undiluted solution.

The total amount of sampled solution (i.e., 11–12 samples of 5 mL volume each) did not exceed 25% of the initial volume of solution. Necessary corrections were made to calculate the total amounts of uranium by taking into account the volume of solution sampled and the remaining volume of solution in the reactor at each step. After each run, the autoclaves were quenched in cold water and opened. Solids were immediately transferred into a glove box, rinsed with Milli-Q water, dried and stored in a glove box before conducting structural and mineralogical analyses by scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Concerning experiments performed in Parr-bombs with C-graphite, each
dissolved uranium concentration measurement corresponded to an individual batch experiment.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Validation of the experimental procedure

To demonstrate the absence of the reactivity of Teflon® vis-a-vis uranyl solutions, a blank experiment was performed at 200 °C with experimental solution (no electron donor) in the titanium autoclave under argon atmosphere. The evolution of \([\text{U}]_0/\text{U}\) ratio versus elapsed time is displayed in Fig. 1 (where \([\text{U}]_0\) is the initial U concentration and \([\text{U}]\) is the concentration at each sampling step). For comparison, a similar experiment was also performed at 200 °C in the presence of 14 bar Ar-10% \(\text{H}_2\) gas mixture (i.e. 1.4 bar \(\text{H}_2\)).

The results of the blank experiment showed that \([\text{U}]_0/\text{U}\) ratio remains constant as a function of time demonstrating that no loss of \(\text{U}\) from solution occurred and that Teflon® and the bulk autoclave were inert under the conditions of this study. In contrast, in the presence of \(\text{H}_2\), \(\text{U}\) concentration in solution decreased below the detection limit (5 ppb) in less than 12 h. At the end of the experiment, a fine black powder was observed in the Teflon® bowl. This powder was analyzed by SEM and TEM. Images showed square bipyramid crystals of 1–10 μm size (Fig. 2a, b). Electron diffraction pattern and EDS analysis of particles (Fig. 2c, d) demonstrated that the solid precipitated in the experiment was pure uraninite, thus demonstrating the reduction of dissolved uranyl to \(\text{UO}_2\) by hydrogen. These results validated the experimental procedure used in the present study, and demonstrated that \(\text{H}_2\) is an efficient electron donor for \(\text{U(VI)}\) reduction. In the following sections, we present a complete kinetic parametric investigation using \(\text{H}_2\) as the electron donor. The influence of temperature, reductant concentration, chlorinity and pH on the reduction rate was evaluated using \(\text{H}_2\), and subsequently compared punctually with experiments involving methane, C-graphite or Fe(II) as the reducing agents.

3.2. Experiments with hydrogen as reducing agent

3.2.1. Effect of temperature

To study the influence of temperature on \(\text{U(VI)}\) reduction rate, experiments were performed in the presence of \(\text{H}_2\) from 100 °C to 200 °C in 1 m LiCl solution at 14 bar Ar-10% \(\text{H}_2\) gas mixture. At temperatures ranging from 130 °C to 200 °C, the \([\text{U}]_0/\text{U}\) ratio rapidly decreased as a function of time (Fig. 3a). Almost 80% of the total \(\text{U}\) amount in solution was reduced and precipitated in less than 6 h at 200 °C, whereas more than 10 days were required at 130 °C to reach the same reaction yield. At 100 °C, no \(\text{U(VI)}\) reduction have been evidenced even after 22 days. Therefore, increasing temperature enhanced the rate of \(\text{U(VI)}\) reduction with time. Another important observation was the presence of an initial \(\text{U}\) concentration plateau prior to the reduction, for experiments conducted at temperatures below 150 °C. The duration of this initial lag time was also dependent upon temperature (e.g., about 24 h at 150 °C and 54 h at 130 °C). At 170 °C and 200 °C, no initial lag time was observed, and after 48 h elapsed time the remaining \(\text{U}\) concentration in solution was below the ICP-OES detection limit (i.e. 5 ppb).

3.2.2. Effect of chlorinity

The influence of chloride concentration on the reduction rate of \(\text{U(VI)}\) was investigated for three different chlorinities: 0.1, 1.0 and 3.2 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl (Fig. 3b). At 150 °C and at 0.1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl, 95% of \(\text{U}\) concentration in solution was reduced in less than 24 h, whereas at 3.2 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl, only 70% of \(\text{U(VI)}\) was reduced after 8 days at the same temperature. The same trend, i.e. a decrease of \(\text{U(VI)}\) reduction rate with increasing chlorinity, was also observed at 100 °C and 130 °C. For example, the reduction of \(\text{U(VI)}\) occurred at 100 °C and 0.1 m LiCl after an initial activation period of 6 days, whereas no reduction was observed at 100 °C and 1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl even after 22 days of reaction. The reduction rate of \(\text{U(VI)}\) at 100 °C and 0.1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl remained very slow (20% \(\text{U(VI)}\) reduced in 1 month) compared to the reduction rate at 150 °C or 130 °C for the same chlorinity. It is interesting to note that the duration of the activation period also increased with chlorinity, at 150 °C. Therefore, increasing chloride concentration increased the duration of the activation period and decreased the reduction rate.

3.2.3. Effect of pH

Fig. 3c shows the effect of pH on uranyl reduction rate. At a pH value of 0.8 at room temperature, the reduction of uranyl into uraninite occurred and was completed after 2 days elapsed time at 150 °C, whereas 5 days were required for a total reduction of the same amount of \(\text{U(VI)}\) at pH 3.3. Therefore, low pH values increase the reaction rate. In
order to avoid the precipitation of U(VI)\textsubscript{(aq)} bearing minerals, no experiments were performed at pH values greater than 3.3. Indeed, the solubility of uranate compounds decreases by 4 orders of magnitude between pH 3 and 4.5 in chloride brines at 150°C (Rozsypal, 2009; Richard et al., 2012).

3.2.4. Effect of PH\textsubscript{2}

The effect of H\textsubscript{2} partial pressure was examined using 3 different pressures (0.14, 1.4 and, 5.4 bar) at 150°C and at 2 different pressures (0.14 and 1.4 bar) at 170°C (1 mol kg\textsuperscript{-1} LiCl). The amount of U(VI)\textsubscript{(aq)} reduced to uraninite increased with the increase of H\textsubscript{2} partial pressure as shown in Fig. 3d. Following Henry’s law, aqueous H\textsubscript{2} concentration is proportional to P\textsubscript{H\textsubscript{2}} (9.5 × 10\textsuperscript{-5}, 9.5 × 10\textsuperscript{-4} and, 4.8 × 10\textsuperscript{-3} mol kg\textsuperscript{-1} respectively for 0.14, 1.4 and, 5.4 bar at 150°C), and the observed increase of U(VI)\textsubscript{(aq)} reduction rate with P\textsubscript{H\textsubscript{2}} rise was therefore expected.

3.3. Experiments with methane as reducing agent

The reactivity of U(VI)\textsubscript{(aq)} in the presence of 2.4 bar methane partial pressure (dissolved aqueous CH\textsubscript{4} concentration is 1.9 × 10\textsuperscript{-3} mol kg\textsuperscript{-1} at 200°C, i.e. similar to H\textsubscript{2} dissolved concentration in H\textsubscript{2}-experiments for sake of consistency), was investigated at 150°C, 170°C and 200°C. Results, plotted in Fig. 4a, showed the same trends as those observed in the presence of H\textsubscript{2}, i.e. the reaction rate increased with temperature. An initial activation period was also observed below 170°C. However, at comparable dissolved gas concentrations, the reaction rates were lower in the presence of CH\textsubscript{4} compared to H\textsubscript{2}. A qualitative analysis of the vapor phase composition by gas chromatography has shown traces of CO\textsubscript{2}. This observation points out to a partial oxidation of CH\textsubscript{4} into CO\textsubscript{2}, in agreement with the corresponding reduction of U(VI)\textsubscript{(aq)} to UO\textsubscript{2}(s).

3.4. Experiments with C-graphite as reducing agent

Fig. 4b shows the results of experiments in the presence of C-graphite. At 200°C, only 30% of the dissolved U was reduced after 1 month. For kinetic reasons, experiments in the presence of C-graphite were carried out at higher temperature than for CH\textsubscript{4} and H\textsubscript{2}-bearing experiments. Like other electron donors tested in this study, the reaction rate increased with temperature. However, the reaction rate for U(VI)\textsubscript{(aq)} reduction in the presence of C-graphite was clearly lower than the one measured in the presence of H\textsubscript{2} or CH\textsubscript{4}. The slight scattering of the data was likely due to loading and sampling uncertainties (see Section 2.2 above).

3.5. Experiment with dissolved Fe(II) as reducing agent

One experiment was performed in the presence of dissolved Fe(II) (0.1 mol kg\textsuperscript{-1} FeCl\textsubscript{2}) at 150°C and 1 mol kg\textsuperscript{-1} LiCl (Run #22, Table 1). Under such conditions, the speciation of Fe(II)\textsubscript{(aq)} as calculated with Phreeqc software (V.2.18: Parkurst and Appelo, 1999) using the LLNL database (Johnson et al., 2000) was dominated by three species: the free ion Fe\textsuperscript{2+} (50%), and two iron chloride
complexes, FeCl\(^{+}\)(26\%) and FeCl\(^{2-}\)(24\%). A constant dissolved U concentration was monitored over 18 days, and no uraninite was recovered at the end of the experiment. Thus Fe\(^{2+}\) was not able to reduce U(VI)\(_{\text{aq}}\) in the present experimental conditions. This result was supported by thermodynamic calculations performed with Phreeqc software together with the LLNL database, showing that U(VI)\(_{\text{aq}}\) was not reduced by dissolved Fe\(^{2+}\) at 150°C in acidic brine at pH equal to 1.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Efficiency of the tested reducing agents: H\(_2\), CH\(_4\), C-graphite and Fe(II)\(_{\text{aq}}\)

The different sets of experiments performed in this study allow a comparison of the efficiency of several electron donors for uranyl reduction in chloride-bearing acidic solution under hydrothermal conditions. Except for Fe(II)\(_{\text{aq}}\), hydrogen, methane and C-graphite appear to be efficient reducing agents for U(VI)\(_{\text{aq}}\) at temperatures representative of URU deposits formation. The redox reactions between uranyl and the different electron donors can be written as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{UO}_2^{2+} + C(s) + H_2O_{\text{aq}} &= \text{UO}_2^{2+} + CO_{\text{aq}} + 2H^+_{\text{aq}} \\
2\text{UO}_2^{2+} + C(s) + 2H_2O_{\text{aq}} &= 2\text{UO}_2^{2+} + CO_{\text{aq}} + 4H^+_{\text{aq}}
\end{align*}
\]

3UO\(_2^{2+}\) + CH\(_4^{\text{aq}}\) + H\(_2O_{\text{aq}}\) = 3UO\(_2^{2+}\) + CO\(_{\text{aq}}\) + 6H\(_{\text{aq}}^+\)  
4UO\(_2^{2+}\) + CH\(_4^{\text{aq}}\) + 2H\(_2O_{\text{aq}}\) = 4UO\(_2^{2+}\) + CO\(_2^{\text{aq}}\) + 8H\(_{\text{aq}}^+\)  
UO\(_2^{2+}\) + H\(_2\)\(_{\text{aq}}\) = UO\(_2^{2+}\) + 2H\(_{\text{aq}}^+\)

The consideration of the reduction potential is a classical and straightforward way to evaluate the direction of spontaneous reactions and the magnitude of the driving force behind them. In our case, it is possible to rank the reactivity of electron donors following their reduction potential in the order H\(_2\) > CH\(_4\) > C with E(H\(_2^+/H_2\)) = 0.007 V, E(CO\(_2^{2-}/CH_4\)) = 0.192 V, and E(CO\(_2^{2-}/C\)) = 0.228 V, respectively at 200°C and at saturated vapor pressure (as calculated from the Gibbs free energies of formation at 200°C and P\(_{\text{sat}}\) given by Oelkers et al., 1995).

No uranyl reduction has been observed in the presence of dissolved Fe\(^{2+}\), under the same conditions as those tested for the other reducing agents. This result is also in good agreement with the thermodynamic predictions made for uranyl reactivity in the presence of 0.1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) Fe(II)\(_{\text{aq}}\) at pH 1. Such a conclusion does not preclude the possible reduction of uranyl by ferrous compounds under less acidic conditions. Indeed, thermodynamic calculation indicates that U(VI)\(_{\text{aq}}\) can be reduced into uraninite at pH 3 in the presence of Fe(II)\(_{\text{aq}}\). Such a reaction process requires further experimental investigation.
However, this simple consideration based on thermodynamic data at 200 °C and saturated vapor pressure does not give any information about kinetics or reaction mechanisms (e.g. non-equilibrium reaction, presence of multiple redox couples, speciation, interface processes, inert redox couples, temperature, and pH effect). Consequently, the direct use of the reduction potentials as indicator of reaction processes must be done with caution.

After an activation period evidenced in the experiments performed with H\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4} (Figs. 3a and 4a), uranyl concentration decreases linearly with time. Therefore, the reduction of uranyl into uraninite follows an apparent zero order rate law with respect to time, whatever the considered electron donor. These zero order rate constants derived from the slope of the regression line corresponding to the linear part of uranium concentration decrease (Figs. 3a and 4a and b) are reported in Table 1.

Fig. 5 compares in an Arrhenius plot our rate measurements for experiments conducted with hydrogen, methane or C-graphite in chloride-bearing aqueous solutions from 100 to 250 °C. Regardless of the temperature and chlorinity, hydrogen is by far the most efficient reducing agent. Uranyl reduction rates measured in the presence of hydrogen and methane are about 2 orders of magnitude higher than those measured in the presence of C-graphite at 200 °C. These results allow ranking the reducing agents efficiency for uranyl reduction in the order: H\textsubscript{2} > CH\textsubscript{4} >> C-graphite, which is in good agreement with the basic reduction potential considerations made previously. This tendency is also reflected by the activation energy values (Ea) of the overall reaction, the lowest energy input required for the reaction to occur being the one measured in the presence of H\textsubscript{2} at T > 150 °C. Indeed, the temperature dependence of the rate corresponds to an apparent activation energy of 32 ± 6 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} for H\textsubscript{2}-experiments, 143 ± 6 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} for CH\textsubscript{4}-experiments and 155 ± 3 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} for C-graphite experiments in the 150-250 °C temperature range. In addition, two different activation energies can be derived for H\textsubscript{2} experiments at 1 m LiCl depending on the temperature regime considered: at T above 150 °C, Ea = 32 ± 6 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} and at T below 150 °C, Ea = 137 ± 23 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1}. This latter activation energy value at T below 150 °C is close to the one found by Ekeroth et al. (2004) at T ranging from 74 to 100 °C (130 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1}) in carbonate bearing solutions using 40 bar H\textsubscript{2} partial pressure. Ekeroth et al. (2004) have chosen an apparent first order rate law to describe their experimental data. This choice can be debated given the linear relationship between U(VI)\textsubscript{aq} concentration versus time of most of their data. In addition, the initial U(VI)\textsubscript{aq} concentration was 2 orders of magnitude lower in Ekeroth et al. (2004) experiments than in ours: 10\textsuperscript{-5} mol kg\textsuperscript{-1} versus 10\textsuperscript{-3} mol kg\textsuperscript{-1}. Such a low U(VI)\textsubscript{aq} concentration minimizes the collision probability between the reactants, and may
thus affect the order of the reaction rate. In any case, this wide range of activation energies derived from experiments with H$_2$, CH$_4$, and C-graphite as electron donors probably reflects different reaction mechanisms. Therefore, the reaction rate is most likely controlled by the oxidation of the reducing agent and not by the reduction of uraninite into uraninite. Thus, the nature of the electron donor is an important parameter controlling the reaction rate and mechanism. Indeed, H$_2$ and CH$_4$ are dissolved species unlike solid C-graphite. Reduction of uranyl by C-graphite involves either a series of steps on the surface by adsorption of U(VI)$_{aq}$, or the dissolution of graphite associated with generation of CH$_4$, H$_2$, CO and CO$_2$. In addition, the speciation of U(VI)$_{aq}$ may also control the reaction mechanism as demonstrated by the different activation energies measured in presence of H$_2$ at various temperature range, or at various chlorinity. Indeed, at 1 m LiCl the free uranyl ion UO$_2^{2-}$ predominates in the solution below 150 °C, whereas, the UO$_2$Cl$_{2-n}$ complexes control the uranyl speciation above 150 °C (Dargent et al., 2013). The predominance of UO$_2$Cl$_{2-n}$ complexes above 150 °C probably imposes new steric and energetic constraints for the reaction to occur, and therefore modify the activation energy of the overall reaction. The slow uranyl reduction rate in the presence of C-graphite and CH$_4$ below 150 °C makes it difficult to derive activation energies in this temperature domain and therefore to confirm the above mentioned effect of uranyl speciation on the reaction mechanism for other electron donor. Concerning the effect of chlorinity, we provide also an estimation of the activation energy at 0.1 mol kg$^{-1}$ LiCl in the presence of H$_2$: $E_a = 110 ± 6$ kJ mol$^{-1}$. This later value is slightly lower than the one measured at 1 mol kg$^{-1}$ LiCl (137 ± 23 kJ mol$^{-1}$) indicating the reaction is facilitated at low chlorinity when the speciation of U(VI)$_{aq}$ is dominated by the free uranyl ion. The role of uranyl speciation on the reaction mechanism is further discussed below. An average value of activation energy can be given from data below 150 °C in presence of H$_2$: 124 ± 15 kJ mol$^{-1}$.

In any case, the reduction rate of uraninite induced by hydrogen, or methane, or C-graphite appears to be relatively fast at T above 100 °C, and is probably not a limiting parameter given the geological time scale of the formation of URU ore deposits.

4.2. Reaction kinetics model: experiments with H$_2$

4.2.1. Reduction rate

The reduction rate of U(VI)$_{aq}$ to uraninite increases with temperature and hydrogen partial pressure, but decreases with chlorinity and pH. The plot of the reduction rate $k$ versus $P_{H_2}$ in log scale suggests a reaction order of 1 with respect to $P_{H_2}$ (Fig. 6a), which is in agreement with the linear increase of $H_2_{aq}$ concentration with the increase of hydrogen partial pressure (Henry’s law), and the simple H–H bond breaking required for electron transfer between uranyl ion and H$_2$. Chlorinity is another major factor influencing the reduction rate of uranyl. In Fig. 6b showing the uranyl reduction rate as a function of chlorinity, we superimpose the uranyl speciation as measured by Dargent et al. (2013) at 150 °C. At 0.3 mol kg$^{-1}$ LiCl and 1 mol kg$^{-1}$ LiCl, the uranyl speciation is dominated by a mixture of complexes UO$_2$Cl$_{2-n}$ ($n$ from 0 to 4), whereas at 3.2 m LiCl, the reaction rate decreases drastically with the formation of UO$_2$Cl$_n^{2-}$ complexes with $n$ above 4. This suggests that UO$_2$Cl$_n^{2-}$ complexes are more easily reduced than UO$_2$Cl$_5^{2-}$ and higher chloride ligation number uranyl complexes. This may reflect the high stability of these high chloride number complexes. In addition, it may also reflect some steric constraints imposed by the presence of 4 or 5 chloride ligands in the equatorial plane of the complex, that hamper the electron transfer between UO$_2^{2+}$ and H$_2$ for U(VI)$_{aq}$ reaction. Similarly, at pH 3.3 (Fig. 3c), uranyl hydroxyl complexes are dominant at least at room temperature (Nguyen-Trung et al., 2000). The stability of these complexes at higher temperature could explain the decrease of reaction rate observed with increasing pH. In the absence of experimental data, this question remains open.

In an attempt to determine the rate of uranyl reduction, we fitted our data by an empirical relationship between the reaction rate $k$ (mmol kg$^{-1}$ day$^{-1}$), the hydrogen partial pressure (bar), the activation energy (kJ mol$^{-1}$), and the contribution (in%, see Fig. 6b) of UO$_2$Cl$_n^{2-}$ complexes ($0 \leq n \leq 4$) for a given chlorinity derived from thermodynamic constants given by Dargent et al. (2013). The rate expression has the form (Eq. (8)):

$$k = a \times \exp\left(\frac{-E_a}{RT}\right) \times (P_{H_2})^b \times \left(\sum_{n=0}^{4} \% \text{UO}_2\text{Cl}_{2-n}^{2-}\right)^c$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)
where $a$ is a constant, $b$ and $c$ the reaction orders with respect to hydrogen partial pressure and the contribution of $\text{UO}_2\text{Cl}_2^{2-}$ complexes. $E_a$ is the activation energy, $R$ is the gas constant ($8.314 \times 10^3 \, \text{kJ mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}$) and $T$ is the temperature in the Kelvin scale. The Gibbs free energy ($\Delta G$) between reactants and products (i.e., chemical affinity) does not appear in the rate expression. Indeed, the $(1 - e^\frac{\Delta G}{RT})$ term, that appears in the classical expression for the overall rate $(k)$ of an elementary reaction in the Transition State Theory $(k = r_\text{f} \cdot (1 - \exp(\Delta G/RT))$ where $r_\text{f}$ stands to the forward reaction rate; e.g. Lasaga, 1981), approaches 1 because the solution is far from equilibrium with respect to uraninite under our experimental conditions.

The fitting method was based on non-linear regression of Eq. (8) using XLSAT software. We discriminate two different sets of fitting parameters depending on the temperature range (above or below 150 °C). This choice is justified by the complex evolution of the reaction rate and mechanism as a function of temperature as demonstrated by the change in activation energy and by the influence of uranyl-chloride complexation. The results are gathered in Table 2. Activation energies obtained by fitting are in a good agreement with experimental values. It should be noted that the integration of all variables in the data analysis fits quite well with the values found independently with the consideration of each parameter taken one by one (the plot of the calculated rate constants versus the measured ones is a straight line having a correlation coefficient of 0.98).

### 4.2.2. Lag time period

The initial lag time period observed in experiments performed with methane or hydrogen (Table 1) can be assimilated to an induction period $t_{\text{ind}}$ (day) reflecting the elapsed time required to nucleate the first uraninite crystals (Kashchiev and van Rosmalen, 2003). In the present study, it is assumed that the first crystal formation corresponds to the time at which U concentration starts to decrease. As shown in Fig. 7, log $t_{\text{ind}}$ increases linearly with $1/T$. A relation between induction time and experimental temperature can be approximated through the following equation:

$$t_{\text{ind}} = B \exp \left( \frac{E_{\text{ind}}}{RT} \right)$$

where $B$ (day$^{-1}$) is a constant and $R$ is the ideal gas constant ($8.314 \times 10^{-3} \, \text{kJ mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}$). In log scale, the slope of the linear relation gives indirectly the nucleation activation energy value of $140 \pm 3 \, \text{kJ mol}^{-1}$ at 1.4 bar $H_2$ and 1 mol kg$^{-1}$ LiCl.

### 5. Geological Implications for Uraninite Genesis: Constraints on the Mineralizing Event

The formation of giant URU ore deposits in relatively short periods of time of 0.1–1 Myr (Raffensperger and Garven, 1995) results from the combination of sustained uranium flux and efficient uraninite precipitation. In the absence of precise geochronological data (Kyser and Cuney, 2008a), calculation of the time necessary to form these massive uraninite orebodies requires the knowledge of numerous parameters, most of them being poorly constrained. The consideration of parameters such as (i) structural setting, (ii) fluid flow rate, (iii) uranium concentration in mineralizing fluid, and (iv) precipitation rate of uraninite, are required to infer the duration of the mineralizing event.

In the following discussion we evaluate the time required to form a uranium ore deposit equivalent to McArthur River (Athabasca, Canada), through two different simple scenarii corresponding to two possible limiting parameters: either (1) the flux of uranium percolating in a given volume; or (2) the rate of uraninite precipitation considering hydrogen, methane or C-graphite as potential reducing agents.

**Scenario #1:** The mineralizing event is controlled by the dynamics of uranium input assuming that all the incoming $U(VI)$ ([U]) is reduced in a given volume.

Following this scenario, the ore deposition rate can be calculated as a function of (i) uranium concentration in the mineralizing fluid $\left[ U_{\text{in}} \right]$ (mol kg$^{-1}$), (ii) fluid velocity $\mu$ (m yr$^{-1}$), (iii) area of the fluid input section $A_{\text{inlet}}$ (m$^2$), and (iv) the fluid density $\rho$ (kg m$^{-3}$). It is assumed that the flow of mineralizing fluid is horizontal and unidirectional. The rate law of uranium deposition $R_{\text{flux}}$ (ton yr$^{-1}$) is given by the flux of uranium entering in the mineralization zone:

$$R_{\text{flux}} = \left[ U_{\text{in}} \right] \times \mu \times A_{\text{inlet}} \times \rho \times M_{\text{U}} \times 10^{-6}$$

with $M_{\text{U}}$ the molar mass of U (238 g mol$^{-1}$).
The selected parameters are listed in Table 3 and the results are shown in Fig. 8a for three different uranium concentrations in the mineralizing fluid: 0.1, 1 and 10 ppm. This range of uranium concentration covers the range of uranium content of brines preserved in naturally occurring fluid inclusions from the McArthur River ore deposit (Richard et al., 2010). The calculated times needed to form the McArthur River ore deposit which contained around 192 kt U, are around 0.85 Myr, 8.5 Myr and 85 Myr with ore-forming brines having an uranium concentration of 10, 1 and 0.1 ppm, respectively.

These first-order approximations are in agreement with U–Pb geochronology of primary mineralization giving times range from 50 to 200 Myr in Athabasca basin (Kyser et al., 2000). This first simple model demonstrates that U concentration in ore-forming fluids is a key parameter to take into account when discussing the kinetic of URU ore genesis. However, the choice of the fluid velocity in this model is also critical. The chosen fluid velocity of 1 m yr\(^{-1}\) is an average value for a sandstone layer, but the structural setting of URU deposits can also control the fluid circulation both in terms of flow and direction (Raffensperger and Garven, 1995; Baudemont and Pacquet, 1999). Indeed, for example, the intersections between the graphitic faults and the unconformity can facilitate fluid circulations, increasing the permeability with flow velocity up to 7 m yr\(^{-1}\) (Cui et al., 2012). Thus, the calculated duration for the mineralizing event following scenario #1 may be much shorter (e.g. 0.1 Myr with velocity fluid at 7 m yr\(^{-1}\) and U concentration in mineralizing fluid at 10 ppm).

**Scenario #2:** the mineralizing event is controlled by uraninite precipitation rate assuming that the reducing agent supply is not the limiting factor.

As described above, the reduction of uranyl to uraninite by hydrogen, methane or C-graphite follows an apparent zero order rate law with respect of time. Assuming that the concentration of the reductant is constant and supplied in excess with respect to uranyl at the site of deposition, the rate law \( R_\text{s} \) (ton yr\(^{-1}\)) is defined by:

\[
R_\text{s} = k \times V_{\text{fluid}} \times \rho \times M_\text{U} \times 10^{-6}
\]

with \( V_{\text{fluid}} \) (m\(^3\)) the volume of fluid in the box, which is equal to the porosity times the volume of the box (Table 3). The rate constant \( k \) represents moles of U reduced per kilogram of fluid per year. Multiplying \( k \) by the number of years, the mass of U-bearing fluid, and converting moles of U to tons, gives the mass of U precipitated in a given number of years. Calculation are performed using the rate constants measured or extrapolated from our experiments at 150 °C and 3.2 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl with \( \text{H}_2 \), and at 150 °C and 1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl with \( \text{CH}_4 \) and C-graphite as the reducing agents.

Times obtained to form an ore deposit having the size of Mac Arthur River (192 kt U) are in order of 10 years, 650 years, and 130,000 years respectively with \( \text{H}_2 \), \( \text{CH}_4 \), and C-graphite (Fig. 8b), which are a very short duration and, probably, unrealistic period of mineralization time compared to the values calculated following scenario #1.

It must be stated that these estimations represent minimum durations applicable to mineralizing fluids having a chlorinity around 1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) such as those encountered in Northern Australian deposits (Derome et al., 2003b). However, they may be extended by one order of magnitude in fluids having a higher chlorinity such as those of the Athabasca Basin in Canada (up to 9.6 mol kg\(^{-1}\) chlorinity).

---

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box volume(a) (m(^3))</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet area (m(^2))</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porosity(b)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velocity(c) (m yr(^{-1}))</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density(d) (kg m(^{-3}))</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid volume in the box (m(^3))</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Jefferson et al. (2007).

\(b\) Cui et al. (2012).

---

Fig. 8. Tons of U precipitated as a function of time assuming that the mineralizing event is controlled by: (a) the flux of uranium in a given volume with \([\text{U}/\text{V}_{\text{fluid}}]\) at 0.1, 1 and 10 ppm in the U-bearing fluid, and (b) by the uranium reduction rate in the presence of 1.4 bar \( \text{H}_2 \) (3.2 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl), 2.4 bar \( \text{CH}_4 \) (1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl) and C-graphite (1 mol kg\(^{-1}\) LiCl) at 150 °C. Rate constants are from Table 3. Tonnage of McArthur River deposit is plotted as an example.
These estimations are based on reaction rates obtained under very acidic conditions that are probably well below the expected pH of the mineralizing fluids 3 < pH < 4, (Richard et al., 2012). However, the reaction rate decreases only by a factor of 8 (Table 1) from pH = 2.5 to pH = 3.3. Such a weak effect of pH on the reaction rate implies that our estimations remain valid under the expected conditions of URU formation.

In any case, these two boundary scenarios demonstrate that neither the dynamics of uranium supply nor the kinetics of uranyl reduction are limiting parameters for the ore deposition. All these calculations assume that the reducing agents are continuously supplied at the site of ore deposition, which may not be the case. Although experiments performed in this study attest of graphite efficiency as electron donor, the reduction process of U(VI) (aq) by graphite involves heterogeneous surface reactions which cannot explain alone the massive mineralization characteristics of URU deposits. Moreover, mineralized orebodies are not systematically in contact with graphite and the large alteration haloes surrounding the mineralization is an evidence of syn-ore fluids flowing from the basement upward toward the sandstone cover (Kister et al., 2006).

The trace element chemistry of aluminum-phosphate-sulfate minerals (Gaboreau et al., 2007), the clay mineralogy (ferrous chlorite and illite) and the iron depletion of the sandstone above the mineralization (Bruneton, 1987; Pacquet and Weber, 1993) are evidence for the percolation of a highly reducing fluid driven by the basement-rooted faults and impacting the sedimentary formation far above the unconformity (up to 400 m above). Therefore, the consideration of mobile reducing agents, such as CH₄ or H₂, may explain these observations. The mechanisms of production of reduced fluids carrying H₂ or CH₄ and the way they are supplied to the mineralization site are the key constraints.

Hydrogen is the most efficient investigated reductant. Hydrogen observed in fluid inclusions is interpreted as the product of post-mineralization water radiolysis (Dubessy et al., 1988; Derome et al., 2003a). However, hydrothermal alteration of Fe(II)-bearing minerals in the basement ( siderite, chlorite, biotite) into Fe(III)-bearing minerals is also a possible source of H₂ (Berndt et al., 1996; Seyfried Jr. et al., 2007; McCollom and Bach, 2009; Salvi and Williams-Jones, 1997, 2006). Concerning methane, its generation by hydrothermal alteration of graphite was the first hypothesis invoked for the reduction of dissolved U(VI)(aq) to U(IV)(aq) and UO₂ deposition (Hoeve and Sibbald, 1978). The crystalline basement is also a potential source of abiogenic CH₄ (Sherwood Lollar et al., 1993, 2002, 2006, 2008; Potter et al., 2004; Proskurowski et al., 2008; Taran et al., 2010). Recent investigations have also demonstrated that the occurrences of bitumen in uranium deposits of Athabasca are due to abiogenic synthesis (Sangély et al., 2007). The most widely invoked pathway for the abiogenic formation of methane and other hydrocarbons in geologic environments is the Fischer–Tropsch-type (FTT) synthesis (Salvi and Williams-Jones, 1997; McCollom, 2013 for a review; McCollom and Seewald, 2001).
This study definitely shows that H₂ and CH₄ are efficient as reducing agents due to their reactivity to precipitate U(VI)ₐq and also their high mobility. The mixing of H₂ and CH₄-rich fluids with an U(VI)ₐq-rich brine migrating at the unconformity could have triggered uraninite precipitation. The numerous faults deeply rooted in the graphitic metapelites in URU deposits may represent both efficient flow paths for fluids and gases, and important structural constraints for the geometry of the mineralized orebodies (Fig. 9). By this way, the mineralization can be located in the basement (Eagle Point deposit), above the unconformity (McArthur River deposit), or as perched ores (Cigar Lake deposit) depending on the localization of the intersection of the CH₄ or H₂ plume of with the flow of oxidizing U-rich brines percolating around the unconformity (Raffensperger and Garven, 1995; Cui et al., 2012). This model of circulation of mobile and efficient reductants driven by fault systems could be at the origin of the extremely focused and massive character of ore in URU deposits (Fig. 9).

Further investigation of H₂ and CH₄ production both in terms of quantity of generated gas and kinetic, under conditions relevant for URU ore deposit genesis, are required to provide better constraints on the timing of the mineralizing event.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The most important finding from this experimental study is summarized below:

- H₂, CH₄ and C-graphite are efficient reducing agents for dissolved U(VI)ₐq reduction to uraninite in chloride-bearing acidic fluids at temperature ranging from 100 to 250 °C. Dissolved Fe(II) does not reduce U(VI)ₐq under the same conditions.
- The reduction rate of U(VI)ₐq to uraninite increases with temperature and hydrogen partial pressure, but decreases with increasing chlorinity and pH. Uranyl precipitation plays an important role on the reaction rate and mechanism.
- Activation energy values (Ea) for dissolved U(VI)ₐq reduction to uraninite derived from our kinetic measurements are the following: \( \text{Ea}(\text{C-graphite}) = 155 \pm 3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \), \( \text{Ea} (\text{CH}_4) = 143 \pm 6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \), \( \text{Ea} (\text{H}_2) = 124 \pm 15 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \) at \( T < 150 ^\circ \text{C} \) (average value) and \( 32 \pm 6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \) at \( T > 150 ^\circ \text{C} \).
- Calculations demonstrate that the duration of the mineralizing event is controlled by the U concentration in the ore-forming fluid and the generation of gaseous reductants rather than by the kinetics of U(VI)ₐq reduction to uraninite.
- As dissolved or gaseous H₂ and CH₄ species, are very mobile electron donors, their mixing with an U(VI)ₐq-rich brine migrating at the unconformity could have induced uraninite precipitation. The high mobility of these strong reducing agents coupled with the efficient circulation system driven by graphitic faults deeply rooted in the basement may explain the massive and focused mineralization in URU ore deposits.

Both experimental and field investigations are still needed to better constrain the origin of methane and hydrogen at the conditions of URU deposit genesis. In particular, the potential for hydrogen generation through Fe(II)-bearing minerals hydrothermal alteration and the occurrence of Fischer–Tropsch-type reactions must be carefully assessed.
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