This article was downloaded by: On: 18 January 2011 Access details: Access Details: Free Access Publisher Taylor & Francis Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37- 41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



To cite this Article Backes, C. A. and Tipping, E.(1987) 'An Evaluation of the Use of Cation-Exchange Resin for the Determination of Organically-Complexed Al in Natural Acid Waters', International Journal of Environmental Analytical Chemistry, 30: 1, 135 — 143

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/03067318708075461 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03067318708075461>

# PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use:<http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

*Intern. J. Enuiron. Anal. Chem.,* **1987, Vol.** *30, pp.* **135-143 Photocopying permitted by license only**  *0* **1987 Gordon and Breach, Science Publishers, Inc. Printed in Great Britain** 

# An Evaluation of the Use of Cation-Exchange Resin for the Determination of Organically-Complexed Al in Natural Acid Waters

## C. A. BACKES and E. TlPPlNGt

*Fresh water Biological Association, The Ferry House, Arnbleside, Curnbria LA22 OL P. U. K.* 

*(Received August 6, 1986; in final form January 12, 1987)* 

The estimation of organically-complexed monomeric Al  $(Al<sub>org</sub>)$  using the cationexchange method developed by Driscoll was evaluated by comparison with equilibrium-dialysis measurements on solutions containing A1 and isolated aquatic humic substances at pH 4-5.3. The cation-exchange method underestimates  $[A]_{\alpha\beta}$  by up to 25%, the extent of the discrepancy increasing with v (mol Al bound/g humic substances). An empirical equation that allows the correction of  $[A]_{\text{org}}$  estimated by cation-exchange is given.

**KEY WORDS:** Aluminium, cation-exchange, acid waters, complexation, organics, humic substances.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Soluble aluminium is commonly present in acid waters at concentrations of up to  $1 \text{ mg/l}.^{1-3}$  The metal can be present in various chemical forms. Inorganic monomeric aluminium species consist of **A13** + and its complexes with hydroxide, fluoride and sulphate.

<sup>?</sup>To whom correspondence should **be** addressed.

#### 136 **C. A. BACKES AND E. TIPPING**

Organic monomeric aluminium is that bound by organic ligands, the most important of which are likely to be humic substances. Colloidal and particulate forms of A1 can also exist, ranging from polymerized hydrolyzed aluminium to aluminosilicate particles.

Probably the most widely-used (see e.g. refs. 3-5) method for determining monomeric organic Al—and thereby obtaining, by difference, estimates of monomeric inorganic Al-is the cationexchange method of Driscoll.<sup>6</sup> Inorganic monomeric species in acid waters are cationic, and are assumed to be adsorbed by the resin, while organic monomeric species, which are anionic, are assumed not to be adsorbed. The method is convenient, reproducible and can be used in the field. However application of the method requires that organically complexed A1 in the original solution remains complexed during passage through the resin column, and this is questionable, column residence times being in the range  $10-50$  seconds. It is therefore important to evaluate the cation-exchange technique by comparison with an equilibrium analytical method.

An attempt at such evaluation was made by Driscoll,<sup>6</sup> who compared, for field samples, A1 speciation estimated using cationexchange with that estimated via measurements with a fluoridespecific electrode. In the latter approach, free fluoride activity and total fluoride concentration were measured using the electrode, and the activity of  $Al^{3+}$  was calculated from established equilibrium constants for Al-F complexation, assuming that all the bound fluoride was bound by Al. From the  $Al^{3+}$  activity, concentrations of hydroxyl and sulphate complexes of A1 were calculated, and finally organic monomeric A1 was calculated by subtracting the computed total inorganic monomeric A1 from the total monomeric **Al.** By this procedure it was found that at organic A1 concentrations greater than ca. 100  $\mu$ g/l the fluoride electrode method gave estimates of organic A1 greater than those obtained by cation exchange, the values obtained differing by up to a factor of two. Because of the indirectness of the fluoride electrode method, and its inherent assumptions, we do not know whether it overestimated organic A1 or the cation-exchange method underestimated organic Al. We therefore considered it necessary to evaluate the cation-exchange method by comparison with a more direct method.

In the work reported here we compared organic A1 concentrations estimated by cation-exchange with those obtained by equilibrium dialysis. Experiments were carried out on synthetic solutions containing various amounts of Al, isolated aquatic humic substances (HS), and added base, having compositions similar to those encountered in natural acid waters. The **HS** chosen had been fractionated in order to remove molecules of lower molecular size that would have passed the dialysis membrane.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

#### **Humic substances**

Fulvic acid was extracted from the sediment of a small stream (Mosedale Beck, Cumbria, England) by the method described by Schnitzer and Khan<sup>7</sup> for soil fulvic acid. The isolate was dialysed exhaustively against  $10^{-3}$  M HNO<sub>3</sub> in order to remove as much material of low molecular size as possible. The material used is referred to as MBFA.

Aquatic humic substances were isolated from a stream at Lochard Forest (Central Region, Scotland) by XAD-8 adsorption<sup>8</sup> and from Penwhirn Reservoir (Galloway, Scotland) by XAD-2 adsorption.<sup>9</sup> A large molecular size fraction was obtained from each of the resinisolated humic preparations by gel chromatography on Sephadex G-75 eluted with  $0.01$  M NaOH under N<sub>2</sub>. The fractions are referred to as LFHS and PRHS respectively.

#### **Determination of Al**

The procedure of Dougan and Wilson<sup>10</sup> as modified by Seip *et al.*<sup>3</sup> was followed, scaled down so that a  $4 \text{ cm}^3$  sample could be used, and omitting the Fe reduction step, there being negligible Fe in the solutions used. It was found necessary to correct for interference by HS.

#### **Fractionation of Al by cation-exchange**

Two sizes of column were used to perform the fractionations. Most work was done with a resin volume of  $2.1 \text{ cm}^3$ , in a scaled-down version of the original method of Driscol16 (Freshwater Fisheries

#### **138 C. A. BACKES AND E. TIPPING**

Laboratory, Pitlochry, Scotland: unpublished). A larger column (volume  $10 \text{ cm}^3$ ) was also employed, as in the original method. Samples and eluant were passed through the columns by gravity or by means of peristaltic pumps. In some experiments (nos. 1-22: see Table I) fractionations were performed with  $10^{-3}$  M NaCl (pH 5.3) as eluant and also, on the same sample, with  $2 \times 10^{-3}$  M NaNO<sub>3</sub> adjusted to the pH of the experiment (4.0 or **4.5)** with HNO,. There were no systematic differences between the results with the different eluants. All the reported results refer to  $10^{-3}$  M NaCl as eluant.

### **Equilibrium dialysis**

Experiments with MBFA and LFHS were performed as follows. Solutions (800 or 1000 cm<sup>3</sup>) of HS (20 mg/l),  $2 \times 10^{-3}$  M HNO<sub>3</sub> and, initially,  $150 \mu g/l$  Al as  $Al(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>$ , were adjusted to pH 4 or 4.5 with NaOH. A pair of bags made from thoroughly cleaned Visking dialysis tubing was added, each bag containing *5* or 8cm3 of  $2 \times 10^{-3}$  M HNO, adjusted to the appropriate pH with NaOH. After stirring overnight-a time previously established as adequate for inorganic monomeric Al to reach dialysis equilibrium---the pH was checked, and the two dialysis bags together with  $100 \text{ cm}^3$  of outside-bag solution were removed for the determination of A1 concentrations and for fractionation by cation-exchange (outside-bag solution only), all in duplicate. The experiment was continued by adding a small volume of  $Al(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>$  solution, readjusting the pH if necessary and adding two new dialysis bags. This was done until results for a range of total Al concentrations  $(150-850 \,\mu g/l)$  had been obtained.

Experiments with **PRHS** were performed similarly, except that only 250 cm<sup>3</sup> of outside-bag solution was employed, and a fresh solution was prepared for each experiment.

For the dialysis technique to work perfectly, no humic material should pass the membrane. However in the experiments described above it was found that after equilibration of A1 small amounts of **HS** had passed the membrane to give inside-bag concentrations of up to  $3 \text{ mg/l}$ , although in most cases the concentration was  $\leq 1 \text{ mg/l}$ . Corrections for this effect were made as follows. At equilibrium the inorganic A1 concentration **is** the same on both sides of the membrane. If *A* represents the outside-bag solution then, with square

brackets denoting concentrations, we have, for monomeric A1

$$
[total \text{ Al}]_A = [inorganic \text{ Al}]_A + [organic \text{ Al}]_A \tag{1}
$$

$$
= \left[ \text{inorganic Al} \right]_{A} + v_{A} \left[ \text{HS} \right]_{A} \tag{2}
$$

where  $v_A = A1$  bound/unit weight of HS. Similarly for the inside-bag solution, represented by *B;* 

$$
[total AI]_B = [inorganic AI]_B + v_B [HS]_B.
$$
 (3)

At equilibrium, the inorganic A1 concentrations inside and outside the bag are equal, and if it is assumed that  $v_A = v_B$  then

[organic Al]<sub>A</sub> = 
$$
\frac{\text{[total Al]}_A - \text{[total Al]}_B}{1 - \text{[HS]}_B / \text{[HS]}_A}
$$
. (4)

The ratio  $[HS]_B/[HS]_A$  was in nearly all cases  $\lt 0.1$  (it would be zero for no leakage of **HS):** 

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

When minimal passage of humic substances through the dialysis membrane occurs, equilibrium dialysis is a suitable technique for determining organically bound and inorganic (dialysable) **Al.** With membranes of suficiently small pore size, the method can be used on natural samples,<sup>11</sup> although there may be problems due to Donnan effects and adsorption of A1 onto the dialysis membrane or container walls, especially at  $pH > 5<sup>12</sup>$  In the present study Donnan effects were rendered negligible by working at an ionic strength of  $2 \times 10^{-3}$  M: calculations, based on a study<sup>12</sup> of Al complexation by an aquatic humic fraction, showed that in our experiments the difference in A1 concentrations across the membrane due to the charge on the **HS** would have been less than 1%. Loss of A1 due to adsorption would not have affected our results, since it was the A1 speciation at equilibrium (i.e. after any adsorption had taken place) that was determined.

The optimal flow rate for the large  $(10 \text{ cm}^3)$  cation-exchange

# 140 **C. A. BACKES AND E. TIPPING**

columns was **4** cm3/min/cm3 resin, in agreement with Driscoll.6 For the small  $(2.1 \text{ cm}^3)$  column, an optimum rate of  $1.5 \text{ cm}^3/\text{min}/\text{cm}^3$ resin was found. These flow rates were determined for solutions in which the Al/HS ratio was relatively low (see below).

The complete set of experimental results is presented in Table **I.** In nearly all cases the cation-exchange method gave lower values of  $[A]_{\text{ore}}$  than did equilibrium-dialysis. The discrepancy between the results from the two methods depends on the value of  $\nu$  (mol Al bound/gHS), as shown in Figure 1. The discrepancy worsens as  $\nu$ increases. From Table I (experiments 23-35) it can be seen that the smaller column gives somewhat lower estimates of  $[A]_{\text{org}}$  than does the larger. The results from equilibrium-dialysis and cation-exchange can be related by the empirical expression



$$
v_{ED} = v_{CE} + kv_{CE}^2. \tag{5}
$$

Figure 1 Comparison of values of  $\nu$  (mol Al bound/gHS) estimated by equilibrium-**PRHS.** 

**Table I Organic A1 determined by equilibrium-dialysis (ED) and by cation-exchange (CE). The subscripts** *m* **and org refer to total monomeric and organically-complexed Al. Note that a humic concentration of** 1 **mg/l corresponds approximately to** 0.5 **mg/l dissolved organic carbon** 

Expt.	Type of HS	[HS], mg/l	pH	$[Al_m], \mu M$	$[Alorg], \mu M$		
					<b>ED</b>	CE(small)	CE(large)
$\mathbf{1}$	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.0	5.6	5.2	4.5	$\sim$
$\overline{\mathbf{c}}$	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.0	11.9	10.0	8.1	
3	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.0	16.7	10.7	8.7	
4	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.0	22.6	13.3	10.1	
5	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.0	31.5	17.4	10.9	
6	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.5	5.6	4.4	4.7	
7	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.5	11.9	10.7	9.4	
8	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.5	16.3	12.6	10.4	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$
9	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.5	21.5	17.4	13.7	$\overline{\phantom{a}}$
10	<b>LFHS</b>	20	4.5	28.9	22.2	15.6	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$
11	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.0	5.6	5.1	4.2	
12	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.0	11.5	10.3	7.4	
13	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.0	17.8	13.7	10.1	
14	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.0	21.9	15.5	12.5	
15	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.0	27.0	17.0	14.3	
16	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.0	30.4	18.5	14.9	
17	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.5	5.6	4.8	4.1	
18	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.5	11.5	10.8	8.2	
19	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.5	17.8	16.4	12.3	-
20	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.5	21.1	18.6	14.3	
21	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.5	27.4	22.5	17.0	
22	<b>MBFA</b>	20	4.5	29.6	23.7	18.1	
23	<b>PRHS</b>	10	4.5	14.0	7.0	5.7	5.7
24	<b>PRHS</b>	10	4.6	7.3	6.0	5.3	5.3
25	<b>PRHS</b>	10	4.6	14.3	7.9	5.4	6.2
26	<b>PRHS</b>	10	4.6	15.0	6.3	5.4	6.2
27	<b>PRHS</b>	10	4.7	12.6	7.4	5.6	5.3
28	<b>PRHS</b>	10	5.3	6.2	5.9	4.9	5.1
29	<b>PRHS</b>	20	4.1	35.2	13.6	12.0	13.4
30	<b>PRHS</b>	20	4.2	34.0	14.3	11.6	13.0
31	<b>PRHS</b>	20	4.5	26.2	13.0	11.6	12.8
32	<b>PRHS</b>	20	4.7	7.4	7.2	6.1	6.4
33	<b>PRHS</b>	20	5.1	6.7	6.6	6.0	6.0
34	<b>PRHS</b>	30	4.5	6.4	6.2	5.7	5.8
35	<b>PRHS</b>	30	5.1	6.3	5.9	5.6	5.8

For the large column  $k = 2.2 \times 10^5$  gHS/mol Al (13 points,  $r = 0.93$ ), for the small column  $k = 4.0 \times 10^5$  gHS/mol A1 (35 points,  $r = 0.98$ ). If values of  $[A]_{\text{org}}$  obtained by equilibrium-dialysis are assumed to be the true ones, then **Eq.** (5) can be used to correct values obtained by cation-exchange, given an estimate of [HS].

A probable explanation for the discrepancies described above is provided by the results shown in Figure 2. These refer to experiments with the cation-exchange columns in which the effect of flow rate was examined as a function of v. It is seen that although satisfactory performances are given by both large and small columns at low *v,* at higher values of v it becomes impossible to obtain a plateau region in the plot of  $[A]_{\text{org}}$  against flow rate. The difficulty cannot be overcome simply by increasing the flow rate because of the "breakthrough" of inorganic Al at flow rates  $> 6 \text{ cm}^3/\text{min}/\text{cm}^3$ 



**Figure 2** Effect of column flow rate on the estimation of  $[AI_{org}]$  at different values of v. The results are for  $10 \text{ mg/l}$  *(O)* or  $20 \text{ mg/l}$  **(@)** PRHS, at pH $\sim$ 4.5. The left-hand plots refer to a 10cm<sup>3</sup> volume of resin, with values of  $v_{CE}$  (bottom-to-top) as follows: 0.34, 0.24, 0.67, 1.00, **1.13.** The right-hand plots refer to a 2.1 **cm3** volume of resin with values of  $v_{CE}$  of 0.25, 0.21, 0.47, 0.65.

(large column) or  $2.2 \text{ cm}^3/\text{min/cm}^3$  (small column). The behaviour at high v most likely reflects A1 binding to weaker humic complexing sites, not occupied at lower values of v. Published data<sup>4</sup> on  $\lceil A \rceil_{\text{on}}$ and dissolved organic carbon concentrations indicate that in natural waters, v can be as high as  $10^{-3}$  mol Al/gHS; therefore poor column performance at high v can certainly be of practical significance.

In conclusion we can state that the cation-exchange method is a useful indicator of  $[Al_{org}]$ , but that at high values of v appreciable underestimation of  $[A]_{\text{ore}}$  may occur. This however, can be corrected for with **Eq.** (5). If enough sample is available, a large cationexchange column is preferable to a smaller one.

#### **Acknowledgements**

We thank R. Harriman, (Freshwater Fisheries Laboratory, Pitlochry) for help with preliminary experiments, discussions and comments on the manuscript. T. J. Sullivan (Northrop Services, Corvallis, Oregon) also made useful comments on the manuscript. We are grateful to J. Hawksford for typing the manuscript. This work was carried out under EEC contract ENV.865.UK. Additional support came from the Royal Society Surface Waters Acidification Project and the Natural Environment Research Council.

#### **References**

- 1. C. T. Driscoll, J. P. Baker, J. J. Bisogni and C. L. Schofield, *Nature 284,* 161 (1980).
- 2. C. L. Schofield, *Acid RainlFisheries* (R. E. Johnson, ed.) (Amer. Fish. *SOC.,*  Bethesda, Maryland, 1982), pp 57-67.
- **3.** H. M. Seip, **L.** Muller and A. Naas, *Water Air Soil Poll. 23,* 81 (1984).
- 4. N. M. Johnson, **C.** T. Driscoll, J. **S.** Eaton, **G.** E. Likens and W. H. McDowell, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **45,** 1421 (1981).
- *5.* R. **F.** Wright and 0. **K.** Skogheim, *Vatten* **39,** 301 (1983).
- 6. *C.* T. Driscoli, *Intern. J. Enuiron. Anal. Chem.* **16,** 267 (1984).
- 7. M. Schnitzer and **S. U.** Khan, *Humic Substances in the Environment* (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1972).
- 8. E. M. Thurman and R. **L.** Malcolm, *Enuiron. Sci. Technol.* **15,** 464 (1981).
- 9. R. F. C. Mantoura and **J.** P. Riley, *Anal. Chim. Acta 76,* 97 (1975).
- 10. W. **K.** Dougan and A. L. Wilson, *Analyst 99,* 413 (1974).
- 11. B. D. LaZerte, *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **41,** 766 (1984).
- 12. C. **A.** Backes and E. Tipping, *Water Res.* **21,** 211 (1987).