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Probing the hydrolytic degradation of UF₄ in humid air


This manuscript describes the chemical transformations that occur during hydrolysis of uranium tetrafluoride (UF₄) due to its storage in humid air (85% and 50% relative humidity) at ambient temperatures. This hydrolysis was previously reported to proceed slowly or not at all (depending on the percent relative humidity); however, previous reports relied primarily on X-ray diffraction methods to probe uranium speciation. In our report, we employ a battery of physiochemical probing techniques to explore potential hydrolysis, including Raman spectroscopy, powder X-ray diffraction, nuclear magnetic resonance, scanning electron microscopy, and focused ion beam microscopy with energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy. Of these, only Raman spectroscopy proved to be particularly useful at observing chemical changes to UF₄. It was found that anhydrous UF₄ slightly oxidizes over the course of thirteen days to Schoepite-like uranium complexes and possibly UO₃. In contrast, UF₄ exposed to 50% relative humidity slightly decomposes into UO₂F₂, Schoepite-like uranium complexes, and possibly a high order uranium oxide that eluded chemical assignment (UₓOᵧ). Despite the rich chemical speciation observed in our Raman spectroscopy measurements, X-ray diffraction and ¹⁹F NMR measurements on the same material showed no changes. Microscopy measurements suggest that the observed reactions between UF₄ and water occur primarily on the surface of UF₄ particulates via a method that is visually similar to surface corrosion of metals. Therefore, we postulate that NMR spectroscopy and X-ray diffraction, which are well-suited for bulk analysis, are less suited than Raman spectroscopy to observe the surface-based reactions that occur to UF₄ when exposed to humid air. Considering the importance of UF₄ in the production of nuclear fuel and weapons, the results presented herein are widely applicable to numerous nuclear science fields where uranium detection and speciation in humid environments is of value, including nuclear nonproliferation and nuclear forensics.

Introduction

Advancing the understanding of nuclear material synthesis and degradation pathways is vital to furthering nuclear nonproliferation efforts, environmental remediation, and nuclear forensics analysis.¹,² Specific interests have been placed on understanding the behaviour of UF₄ when exposed to environmental elements (e.g., ultraviolet radiation, heat, and water).³ Of these environmental factors, water is by far the most ubiquitous. As such, water-induced UF₄ degradation is of particular interest to the nuclear community, and recently, our group published two articles on the hydrolysis of anhydrous UF₄. These articles, anhydrous UF₄ was submerged in water and the resulting formation of UF₄(H₂O)₂.⁵ was observed using a variety of characterization techniques.⁴,⁵ Since UF₄ is a common chemical form used in the production of oxides for nuclear fuel, impurities in the UF₄ material, such as UO₂F₂, UO₃, U₃O₈, etc. are highly relevant to the production of high-quality UO₂ for use as nuclear fuel. Therefore, reaction of UF₄ with water has important implications in the area of applied nuclear science.

In most storage scenarios, UF₄ will be kept indoors away from rain, sun, and excessive heat/cold. This leaves ambient moisture (i.e., relative humidity) as the most likely environmental factor encountered by UF₄.³⁶⁶²⁷³⁸⁹ Hydrogen induced degradation of various U-bearing nuclear fuel-related compounds have been studied previously.⁶ However, to the best of our knowledge, there are only four published reports that have analyzed the degradation of UF₄ due to ambient moisture.⁷ Of these four manuscripts, only one focused on chemical transformations of UF₄ in air with less than 100% relative humidity (RH) and no outside chemical interference.⁷⁸ That report, by Pastoor et al., utilized thermogravimetric analysis and X-ray diffraction measurements to show that UF₄ remains stable in air at ≤ 75% RH for up to 9 months. However, under high humidity conditions (>90% RH), UF₄ was reported to form UF₄ hydrates within 30 days of humidity exposure. This contrasts with a report by Pointurier et al. that used micro-Raman spectroscopy to study the hydrolysis of UF₄ microparticles exposed to 100% RH in both air and argon.⁷⁶⁷⁹ Pointurier and co-workers documented that UF₄ particles are stable to air, heat, and UV irradiation in the absence of moisture. However, UF₄ exposed to 100% RH was reported to undergo rapid transformation to uranyl hydroxide (Schoepite) and an undetermined compound. Importantly, no UF₄ hydrates...
were observed after 3 months of exposure to air and argon at 100% RH.

Considering the differences in chemical transformations observed by micro-Raman spectroscopic analysis compared to X-ray diffraction on the same material, we were motivated to further explore the possibility of humidity-induced degradation of UF₄ on a bulk scale, at <100% RH, and using Raman spectroscopy and microscopy as our primary interrogation tools.

We found that UF₄ does degrade under both 85% and 50% RH conditions in air. While it is difficult to definitively assign chemical species to the Raman bands of the degradation products due to multiple uranium-bearing complexes exhibiting Raman bands at similar energies, we tentatively ascribe degradation products to UO₂F₂, UO₃, U₃O₈, and “Schoepite-like” uranium complexes. Degradation products were found to be different depending on the relative humidity environment (85% RH vs 50% RH). These results, when combined with previous studies of humidity-induced degradation of UF₄, suggest that UF₄ hydrolysis involves a complex interplay between chemical, kinetic, and thermodynamic factors, which are perhaps best studied by vibrational spectroscopy, and which still warrant further investigation.

Results and Discussion

Commercially purchased anhydrous UF₄ was first characterized for its baseline properties by Raman spectroscopy (Figure S1), powder X-ray diffraction (pXRD; Figure S2), and scanning electron microscopy (SEM; Figure S3). Characterization data were consistent with previous reports on anhydrous UF₄. Following baseline characterization, anhydrous UF₄ was segregated into five separate samples with ~10 mg of powder per sample. The first sample was placed in an incubation system which exposed the sample to ambient-temperature air at 85% relative humidity (RH) while daily in-situ Raman measurements were acquired. The second sample was placed in a similar incubation system and was exposed to ambient-temperature air at 50% RH while daily in-situ Raman measurements were conducted. The third sample was placed in a humidity chamber at ambient temperature and 85% RH while daily in-situ pXRD measurements were acquired. The fourth sample was placed in a humidity chamber at ambient temperature and 50% RH while daily in-situ pXRD measurements were conducted. The fifth sample was placed in a lab-made nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) probe that permitted in-situ ¹⁹F NMR measurements while exposing the sample to a saturated solution of KCl at 20 °C which results in a relative humidity environment of 85% with only a small variation of less than 1% per 5 °C.

The Raman spectrum of anhydrous UF₄ prior to humidity exposure showed multiple bands between 100 – 400 cm⁻¹ (Figure 1). Raman spectra acquired after one week at 85% RH showed the characteristic UF₄ spectrum plus slight in-growth of a broad band near 840 cm⁻¹; the intensity of this band increased with time. The broadness of this band may indicate the presence of different uranyl hydroxide and uranium oxide species. Uranium complexes that exhibit Raman bands in this range are collectively referred to as “Schoepite-like” and can be described by many different formulæ. For example, UO₂(OH)₂•H₂O,¹⁰ UO₂•2(H₂O),¹¹ UO₂•(2+x)H₂O (x < 1),¹² or (UO₂)xO(OH)₆•(H₂O)₆.¹³ Observation of the 840 cm⁻¹ broad band is consistent with previously reported data from the hydrolysis of UO₂F₂, where a broad band centered at 846 cm⁻¹ was resolved into three different uranium complexes (uranyl fluoride hydrate, uranyl hydroxide, and uranyl peroxide) after several months of water exposure.²⁰ Because our experiment did not proceed for months, such resolution of the broad band at 840 cm⁻¹ observed in our Raman spectra, whether achievable or not, was precluded.

Starting around day five, the characteristic UF₄ bands centered at ~130 cm⁻¹ and ~170 cm⁻¹ increased in intensity (denoted by the asterisks in Figure 1) Additionally, a shoulder peak appeared to grow in near 150 cm⁻¹ and a broad band emerged at 750 cm⁻¹. This spectral evolution is shown in Figure 1 (Top). It is unclear what led to the relative intensity increase of the 130 cm-1 and 170 cm-1 bands; however, we believe the growth may be attributable to ingrowth of uranyl fluoride hydrate.¹⁴ As shown in Table S1, UO₂F₂ hydrate has a vibrational mode at 174 cm⁻¹, which is quite close to 170 cm⁻¹. However, UO₂F₂ hydrate also exhibits an intense Raman band at 867 cm⁻¹ which was not observed in these spectra, although the 867 cm⁻¹ region is largely obscured by the broad band centered near 840 cm⁻¹.

The broad band centered near ~750 cm⁻¹ became very evident after 11 days of exposure to 85% RH. As shown in Table S1, a band near 750 - 768 cm⁻¹ has been previously observed in Raman spectra of both U₃O₈ and UO₃. To assign the chemical origin of our 750 cm⁻¹ band, it is necessary to look for the presence or absence of other characteristic Raman bands for suspected compounds and to consider the relative intensities of those bands. While Butler et al. show that U₃O₈ produces a Raman band at 752 cm⁻¹, they also show that UO₃ produces Raman bands at 236, 342, 408, 480, 638, 798, and 888 cm⁻¹.¹⁵ None of these bands were observed in our Raman spectra, even though many of these bands are of greater relative intensity than the 752 cm⁻¹ band. On the other hand, Palacios et al. found that γ-UO₃ produces Raman bands at 768 and 846 cm⁻¹.¹⁶ The band at 768 cm⁻¹ has a much higher relative intensity than the band at 846 cm⁻¹ which is consistent with our observation of a broad band centered at 750 cm⁻¹ and a shoulder embedded in the broad band near 840 cm⁻¹. Thus, we have tentatively assigned the feature near 750 cm⁻¹ to UO₃. In total, the observation of Schoepite-like complexes, and possibly UO₃ in our Raman spectra, clearly indicates that humidity-based degradation occurs to UF₄ at room-temperature and 85% RH.

Conversely, pXRD measurements obtained on UF₄ exposed to 85% RH showed no change had occurred in the material (Figure S4). This observation is in stark contrast to our Raman results, yet quantitative Rietveld analysis on the obtained pXRD data confirmed the purity of the UF₄ phase. Our Rietveld analysis agrees with the recent report by Pastoor et al., in which, quantitative phase analysis of pXRD data found UF₄ to be stable over the course of months when stored at room-temperature and <90% RH.²⁴
Raman spectra obtained from exposing UF₄ to 50% RH were different from those obtained at 85% RH. As shown in Figure 1 (Bottom), Raman measurements obtained after 1 day of exposure to 50% RH showed minor in-growth of bands at 861 and between 170 - 180 cm⁻¹. As stated above, these bands likely correspond to UO₂F₂ hydrate. Error! Bookmark not defined. This Raman spectrum also contains the broad band at 840 cm⁻¹ corresponding to Schoepite-like complexes of uranium; however, in this case, the band does not obscure the energy region around the UO₂F₂ band. Another interesting Raman spectral feature from the 50% RH experiments is the emergence of a broad band at 440 cm⁻¹ which has been tentatively assigned to higher order UₓOᵧ compounds based on comparison with previously published spectra.15-17

Despite the rich chemical speciation observed by Raman spectroscopy, pXRD measurements exhibited no changes when UF₄ was exposed to 50% RH (Figure S5). The diffraction data for UF₄ exposed to 50% RH was similar to diffraction data for anhydrous UF₄ as confirmed by Rietveld analysis. This is similar to our 85% RH pXRD measurements and is consistent with the recent report by Pastoor et al.7a

Attempts at using ¹⁹F nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) to observe chemical changes in UF₄ were not fruitful. Although the presence of paramagnetic UF₄⁺ causes the ¹⁹F spin-lattice relaxation time to be very short, allowing for rapid spectral acquisition with good signal-to-noise, the ¹⁹F resonances are fairly broad and no changes were observed in them after 14 days of humidity exposure (Figure S6). Observation of these broad spectroscopic features is consistent with literature precedent for UF₄ ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy.18

Considering that chemical changes to UF₄ were observed at 85% and 50% RH using Raman spectroscopy, but no changes were observed by us and Pastoor et al. using pXRD, we hypothesized that humidity-induced degradation likely occurs on the surface of UF₄ particles. Because of this, we suspect that both ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy and X-ray diffraction, which are well-suited for bulk analysis, are less optimal than Raman spectroscopy for studying the hydrolysis of UF₄.

To better understand the morphological changes that occur during UF₄ hydrolysis, SEM micrographs were acquired for UF₄ both before (Figure 3A) and after humidity exposure. After exposure to 85% RH (Figure 3B) and 50% RH (Figure 3C), the smooth, spherical feature of anhydrous UF₄ particles became irregular, rough, and etched.19 Degradation largely began on the surface of the material and then penetrated somewhat into the spheroid.

Focused ion beam (FIB) microscopy with energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) was used to further evaluate the morphology and composition of a single particle of UF₄ exposed to 85% RH for thirteen days. These data show that oxygen may be present at the particle surface, although the amount relative to fluorine is extremely small, such that the EDS signal from oxygen is of a low signal-to-noise ratio (Figure 4 and Figure S8). Assignment of oxygen on the surface of the UF₄ particle from EDS alone would be dubious; however, in conjunction with our Raman results we believe these oxygen EDS signals to be genuine, albeit of low intensity. This further highlights the utility of Raman spectroscopy for identifying minor constituents in chemical mixtures, such as these oxygen-bearing moieties.
Conclusions

Commercially purchased uranium tetrafluoride was exposed to room-temperature air at 85% and 50% relative humidity. Raman spectroscopy revealed that UF₄ clearly degrades upon exposure to ambient moisture. Specific degradation products are tentatively assigned to multiple U-bearing oxides.

After exposure to 85% RH, the formation of Schoepite-like complexes and possibly UO₃ was observed. After exposure to 50% RH, UF₄ appears to form UO₂F₂ and Schoepite-like complexes in addition to a higher order uranium oxide (UₓOᵧ). Observation of the broad Schoepite-like band in Raman measurements of both 50% and 85% RH samples is uninformative in terms of identifying the specific chemical form of the degradation products; however, this would seem to indicate that UF₄ hydrolytically degrades to complex oxide/hydroxide complexes within two weeks of exposure to humid air.

The chemical changes observed in UF₄ throughout this manuscript are tentatively assigned by Raman spectroscopy. Measuring quality Raman spectra of UF₄ without degrading the sample requires low laser power and long integration times. Integration time is lengthened as the spectral window broadens. As hydrolytic degradation of UF₄ is a dynamic process, it is critical that the required integration time is relatively short such that the presented spectra show a snapshot of the status of the UF₄ material and not a blend of changes over many hours. To achieve this, the spectral window of the Raman spectra presented herein have been truncated. Using the Raman signatures in the 100-1000 cm⁻¹ range, we have attempted to assign the degradation products to materials which logically follow the breakdown of UF₄ in humid air. However, assignment of some bands becomes complicated as multiple uranium-bearing complexes exhibit Raman bands at similar energies.

Both powder X-ray diffraction and nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy were not useful for observing subtle hydrolytic changes incurred by UF₄ at both 50% and 85% RH. This is in excellent agreement with previously published results which found that UF₄ appears highly stable to ambient humidity when it is analyzed by pXRD.⁷DETAIL

Formation of oxide species at the surface of UF₄ following humidity exposure was confirmed using FIB microscopy and degradation/etching of the UF₄ surface was observed by SEM imaging.

The sum of all measurements presented herein leads to following conclusions:

1) Hydrolysis of UF₄ particles starts with surface degradation that is not easily measured by X-ray diffraction or ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy.
2) Raman spectroscopy is an excellent tool for measuring humidity-induced degradation of UF₄.
3) Degradation seems to produce several U-bearing oxides; however, definitive assignment is difficult due to overlapping or very similar Raman bands.

There is still room for exploration in the subject of UF₄ hydrolytic degradation in both experimental and computational space. Experimentally, options include infrared spectroscopy measurements, analysis of higher energy vibrational modes in the Raman spectra, and luminescence spectroscopy. Computationally, DFT investigation into the hydrolytic degradation of UF₄ without further experimental results may prove difficult. For example, when considering DFT calculations of one compound observed in this report, UO₃, one would need to calculate the vibrational modes of many polymorphs of this material and each of the corresponding hydrated structures. To this end, with additional efforts, there may be a potential synergy between future experimental results and DFT calculation efforts.

While the near indefinite stability of UF₄ as a solid has been previously reported,²⁰ herein we provide yet another disclosure of the water sensitivity of UF₄ in a controlled environment. As evidence of UF₄ hydrolytic sensitivity mounts, one must consider that UF₄ (of varying surface area) produced and stored in different locations around the world with different climates, ventilation systems, and humidities will behave differently. As such, exposure of UF₄ to ambient moisture in a chamber where humidity is continually applied may be considered a “stress-test” of sorts that has real-world applications.
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**Experimental Methods**

**General Considerations**

**Caution:** The UF4 in these experiments contains natural uranium. Standard precautions for handling radioactive materials are recommended.

Anhydrous UF4 was purchased from International Bio-Analytical Industries, Inc. and was stored in a temperature and humidity-controlled chamber (<5% RH). This UF4 was produced through an anhydrous hydrofluorination reaction with HF. Microscopy of this product showed the morphology of the UF4 particles to be microspheres (Figure S3).

**Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR)**

19F NMR spectra and relaxation rates were obtained for UF4 under static (i.e., non-spinning) conditions at room temperature and low field (2.35 T) using specially designed sample holders and probes which allowed in situ exposure to fixed humidity conditions (Figure S7). All experiments were performed using an Oxford superconducting magnet with a maximum field of 2.35 T and a 110 mm diameter room temperature bore. The specially designed NMR probe was attached to a Thorlabs linear translation stage (LNRS/M) which was mounted vertically underneath the magnet. LabVIEW software (National Instruments) in combination with a Thorlabs stepper motor controller (BSC201) was used to control the vertical motion of the NMR probe. The NMR spectrometer was based on a Tecmag in situ NMR spectrometer equipped with a UV-enhanced deep depletion CCD detector. The excitation laser wavelength was \(\lambda = 785\) nm (Note: When performing Raman spectroscopy measurements of UF4, it is important that the laser excitation wavelength is away from the fluorescence absorption bands of UF4. To date, 514 nm and 785 nm are among the more ideal laser excitation wavelengths to use when studying UF4)). The laser power ranged from 100 µW to 3 mW. The integration time varied from a few seconds to several hours for a high signal to noise ratio. For each integration time, at least two spectra were co-added to remove the contribution of cosmic rays to the spectra. In *in situ* Raman measurements, the RH values for each sample were maintained using an Okolab electric stage incubation system capable of maintaining a desired humidity level within ±1%.

**Powder X-ray Diffraction (pXRD).**

Powder X-ray diffraction (pXRD) measurements were acquired using a Rigaku Ultima IV powder X-ray diffractometer with a multi-sample changer attachment. X-rays were produced from a copper target at 40 kV and 44 mA. Scattered X-rays were detected using a D/teX Ultra semi-conductor detector with a Cu KB filter, with the tube/detector operated in the focusing beam (Bragg Brentano) method. On the incident side of the beam, the divergence slit was set at 2/3° and the divergence height limit slit at 10 mm while the scattering slit was set at 8.0 mm and the receiving slit was open on the diffracted side of the beam. The sample substrate was a 1-inch silicon disk cut along the (510) crystal plane to minimize background reflections. Paraffin wax is used to secure the powders to the substrate. The 2θ scan range was from 5 - 80° at a scan rate of 0.1° per minute. Measurements were performed with a stationary sample holder. XRD scans were analyzed with PDFL (Rigaku). A qualitative analysis of diffraction patterns was performed using search-match identification of the experimental XRD pattern to the ICDD database of crystal and powder X-ray diffraction pattern using the peak intensity and peak position.22

**Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)**

A Zeiss Supra 40 VP FEG-SEM utilizing SmartSEM software acquired the included micrographs under high-vacuum conditions. High resolution microscopy analyses consisted of secondary electron detection with the standard 30 µm aperture. Images were obtained at magnifications ranging from 600 – 21,000x with accelerating voltages ranging from 1.0 – 20.0 kV.

**Focused Ion Beam Microscopy (FIB) and Energy-Dispersive X-ray Spectroscopy (EDS).**

Micrographs of single milled UF4 particles were obtained using an NB5000 Nanodue’t double beam microscope with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy. Milling was conducted with 40 kV gallium ions with a 5 nm resolution at 40 kV.
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Figure S8. Left: Representative UF₄ sample after exposure to air at 85% RH for 13 days and corresponding EDS spectrum. Right: Representative UF₄ sample after exposure to air at 50% RH for 11 days.
Table S1. Previously published Raman resonance bands for UF₄ and several uranium-bearing compounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Laser (nm)</th>
<th>Raman shift bands (cm⁻¹)</th>
<th>SI Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anhydrous UF₄</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>59.4, 66.8, 78.9, 91.0, 101.3, 107.2, 115.9, 131.4, 148.5, 170.4, 197.3, 255.8, 296.1, 322.4, 360.8, 603.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF₄(H₂O)₂.₅</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>82, 95, 106, 118, 156, 185, 235, 257, 282, 320, 333, 340, 364, 427, 3283, 3390, 3481, 3535</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrated UO₂F₂</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>867, 174</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhydrous UO₂F₂</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>915, 442, 180</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>448, 630, 1104, 1152</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>232, 445, 1151</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>450, 585, 1595</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>448, 585, 920, 1150</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>445, 583, 640, 1160, 1360</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U₃O₅</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>210, 465</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U₃O₇</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>210, 465</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U₃O₇</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>410, 445, 500</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U₃O₆</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>343, 351, 412, 483, 738, 811</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U₃O₆</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>236, 342, 408, 480, 752, 798</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U₃O₅</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>235, 340, 405, 480, 640, 745, 800, 885</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U₃O₄</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>236, 342, 408, 480, 638, 752, 798, 888</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-UO₃</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>768, 846</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO₂(OH)₂</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>838, 855</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoepite</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>843, 845</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SI References
1. PDF 4 Database, International Centre for Diffraction Data, Newtown Square, PA, 2015, Card No #01-082-2317.