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Abstract

Fluid-rock interaction is an important process in nature, and in many industrial fields. Fluid-rock interaction can be utilized to sequester industrial gases like CO$_2$ and H$_2$S in porous rocks of geothermal systems. The gases are re-injected, together with condensed steam or wastewater, or both into a geothermal reservoir where they dissolve the host rocks, releasing cations, and forming permanent mineralization of carbonates and sulfides. The rate of the reactions and reaction progress depends on many parameters including temperature, pH and the concentrations of injected solutes and gases. In addition, intensive mineralization may lead to changes in porosity of the porous rocks and influence the available surfaces for primary rock leaching.

In order to study these factors of fluid-rock interaction and mineralization of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S under geothermal conditions, a number of laboratory experiments and reaction calculations were conducted. Three scenarios were studied: (1) dissolution of primary minerals and glasses under flow-through conditions using solution chemistry and solid imaging; (2) incongruent alteration of mafic minerals in CO$_2$-rich solutions using solution chemistry, mineralogy and isotopes; (3) mineralization of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S under flow-through conditions using solution chemistry and mineralogy. In all cases, the work involved an experimental and a modeling part.

The first part of this thesis centers on the dissolution of crystalline and amorphous rocks at acidic pH and 25°C. Solution composition, particle surface area, and porosity were determined as a function of travel distance within the reactor and time, using in-situ X-ray computed tomography (XMT) and chemical analysis. In all cases the porosity and the specific surface area of grains were observed to increase. However, these changes were not uniformly distributed along the fluid flow path nor over time. These observations matched the predictions from reactive transport modeling. Some of the materials were observed to dissolve non-stoichiometrically; which is not commonly taken into account in reactive transport modeling. Based on the experimental and modeling results it is concluded that accurate prediction capabilities of modeling at continuum scale may be limited when calculating pore volume and material surface area changes with time and along flow.

The second part of this study was on the alteration of olivine in CO$_2$-rich solutions using solution chemistry, mineralogy and isotope systematics. Upon progressive olivine dissolution and carbonate mineral formation, the dissolved inorganic carbon concentrations were observed to decrease, followed by a pH increase and formation of secondary minerals like chrysotile and brucite. The reactions were further constrained by $\delta^{26}$Mg systematics. The secondary minerals formed preferentially incorporated isotopically light Mg from the dissolving primary phase. The application of a geochemical model was able to reproduce the principal experimental trends in solution chemistry, mineralogy and isotope ratios, suggesting that kinetic modeling of water-rock interaction from mineral dissolution and precipitation rates can work for relatively simple systems.
The third part of the study was on the sequestration and mineralization of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S in geothermal systems. A series of flow-through experiments were conducted where CO$_2$ and H$_2$S-rich solutions were reacted with various types of rocks (basalt, dacite and rhyolite) and at various temperatures (100-250°C). Intensive H$_2$S and CO$_2$ mineralization into sulfides and carbonates was observed. The limiting factor of sulfide mineralization was observed to be the Fe leaching rates from the rocks. Uptake of other Fe-containing minerals like epidote also decreased the H$_2$S sequestration efficiency. Currently, the only geothermal reservoirs being considered for the re-injection and mineralization of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S are located in basalts in Iceland. Other rock types like dacitic and rhyolitic rocks were also found to be effective media for H$_2$S and CO$_2$ sequestration. Based on the measured sequestration rates, ~0.2-0.5 t of CO$_2$ and ~0.03-0.05 t of H$_2$S are sequestered annually per cubic meter, depending on reservoir lithology and surface area. This suggests that the re-injection of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S into geothermal reservoirs is a potential solution for making geothermal energy production close to zero greenhouse gas emission.
Útdráttur


Til þess að rannsaka áhrif og eðli þessara þátta við aðstæður eins og þær sem ríkja í jarðhitakerfum voru tilraunir gerðar á rannsóknarstofu og framgangur efnahvarfa reiknður. Rannsóknin var á þremur lösum: (1) leysing frumsteinda og glers við gegnumfæði vökv, og voru þá lausnir efnagreindar og föst efni myndgreind; (2) ohlutfallsbundin ummyndun frumstæðra steinda í CO₂-ríkum lausnum, og voru þá lausnir efnagreindar, steindir greindar til tegundar og magns, og samsætuhlutföll mæld; (3) steinrenning CO₂ og H₂S við gegnumfæði vökv, og voru þá lausnir efnagreindar og steindir greindar til tegundar og magns. Einn þáttur sérhvers liðar rannsóknarinnar var unninn með tilraunum á rannsóknarstofu en annar með hermireikningum.

Fyrsti hluti ritgerðar þessarar fjallar um leysingu kristallaðs og myndlauss bergs í súrí lausn við 25°C. Upplausnin var efnagreind, yfirborð agna mælt, og poruhluti ákvörðaður, allt sem fall af tíma og lengd rennslisleiðar í hvarfakut. Til þessa var beitt þæði hefðbundnum efnagreiningum og reikningum á röngtensneiðmyndum. Í ljós kom, að þær poruhluti bergs og eðlisýfisfibró korna jukust í öllum tilvikum, en aukningin dreifaður út frumsteinda og glers viður. Rannsóknin var í þremur lösum: (1) leysing frumsteinda og glers viður, en sjaldan er tekið tillit til þessa atriðis í hermireikningum efnahvarfa við gegnumfæði. Níðurstöður tilrauna og reikninga gefa til kynna, að gildi samfelldra hermilíkana til nákvæmrar forsagnar á breytingum á poruhluta og efnisýfisfibróði, sem falli af tíma og lengd rennslisleiðar, sé takmarkað.

Þriðji hluti rannsóknarinnar sneri að bindingu og steinrenningu CO₂ og H₂S í jarðhitakerfum. Gerðar voru allmargar gegnumstreymistilraunir með lausnir af CO₂ og H₂S í miklum styrk, en lausnir voru látnar hverfast við ýmsar bergtegundir, basalt, dasit og riólít, við misháan hita (100-250°C). Reyndist CO₂ steinrenna í karbónót en H₂S í súlfíð, og hvort tveggja í miklum mæli. Í ljós kom, að steinrenning brennisteins í súlfíð takmarkaðist af hraða leysingar járnów úr ber gi. Upptaka járnów í aðrar steindir, svo sem epidót, dró einnig úr steinrenningu súlfíðs. Sem stendur er einu jarðhitageymana, sem til skoðunar eru fyrir niðurdælingu og steinrenningu CO₂ og H₂S, að finna á islenskum basaltsvæðum. Aðrar bergtegundir, svo sem dasit og riólít, reyndust einnig duga vel til að binda H₂S og CO₂. Miðað við mældu bindingarhraðana, bindast ~0.2-0.5 t af CO₂ og ~0.03-0.05 t af H₂S árlega á rúmmeter, háð ber ggerð og yfirborðflatarmálí jarðhitageymis. Þetta bendir til þess, að dæling CO₂ og H₂S niður í jarðhitakerfi kunni að vera fær leið til að gera orkuvinnslu með jarðvarma kolefnishlutlausa.
Scientia Potestas Est.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Fluid-rock interaction

Fluid interaction with the surrounding rocks is one of the fundamental processes occurring in the geosphere and hydrosphere. Fluid-rock interaction is, amongst other things, responsible for shaping various landscapes, is a part of chemical weathering and the formation of soils and plays a key role in the formation of ore deposits and geothermal alteration.

The alteration of rocks by fluid-rock interaction involves the dissolution of primary minerals or glasses and the formation of secondary minerals. In a closed system of fixed composition, the overall reaction is incongruent and affected by factors like temperature, rock and fluid composition, and the extent of the reaction or its reaction time. Moreover, for systems containing more than one phase, the extent of the reaction will further result in changes in mass between the various phases and changes in fluid composition (e.g., Gysi and Stefánsson, 2012a; 2012b; Johnson et al., 2014).

The rate and mechanism of rock alteration depends on the kinetics of the mineral dissolution and formation (precipitation and crystal growth), which in turn is influenced by factors like mineral surface areas (e.g., Gouze et al., 2003; Noiriel et al., 2009; 2012; Pokrovsky and Schott, 2000; Oelkers and Gislason, 2001), properties of the mineral-solution interface (e.g., Hövelmann et al., 2011; Brown and Calas, 2012; Putnis, 2014), solution composition (e.g., Saldi et al., 2009; 2013) and temperature (e.g., Pearce et al. 2012; Gislason and Oelkers 2003). The rate and mechanism of reactions can further be altered by various catalysts/inhibitors (e.g., Pokrovsky and Schott, 1999; Techer et al., 2001; Nielsen et al., 2016). Fluid-rock interaction results in changes in rock porosity and permeability with time, which in turn influences fluid flow and elemental transport (e.g., Steefel and Maher, 2009; Luquout and Gouze, 2009; Gouze and Luquot, 2011; Noiriel et al., 2015). All systems have a tendency to approach the most stable thermodynamic state, and the rate of these changes is controlled by kinetics (e.g., Aagaard and Helgeson, 1982; Helgeson et al., 1984; Marini, 2006; Schott et al., 2009). The above described relations may change considerably with the extent of the reaction.

Fluid-rock interaction is associated with geothermal systems, where the thermal fluid and steam react with the surrounding host rocks and secondary mineral forms (Figures 1.1 and 1.2). The type of geothermal secondary minerals formed depend mainly on temperature but fluid and rock composition also matter. The alteration minerals typically follow a temperature-related distribution with calcite, sulfides and sulfates, zeolites, various clays and oxides and hydroxides present at low temperature (<150°C) whereas oxides, feldspars, epidote, chlorite, amphiboles and garnets are common at higher temperatures (>200°C) (e.g., Tómasson and Kristmannsdóttir, 1972; Kristmannsdóttir, 1976; Browne, 1978; Gunnlaugsson and Arnórsson, 1982). The fluids interacting with the primary rocks and forming the secondary minerals are typically of meteoric or seawater origin. Reservoir fluids have typically mildly acid to neutral pH and Na, Cl, SO\textsubscript{4} and Si as the dominant dissolved solids with CO\textsubscript{2}, H\textsubscript{2}S and H\textsubscript{2} being the most important gases (e.g., Arnórsson et
The major element composition is characteristically controlled by close approach to equilibria with secondary minerals, except for elements like Cl and B that are essentially incompatible (e.g., Giggenbach 1980, 1981; Arnórsson et al., 1983).

**Figure 1.1.** Product of fluid-rock interaction, silica scaling, is taking place in a geothermal hot pool when silica concentration exceeds the solubility value and is supersaturated, Geysir geothermal area, Iceland.

**Figure 1.2.** Hikers observing a spectacular natural playground; interaction of water, rhyolitic rock, geothermal fluid and steam at Kerlingarfjöll mountain range, Iceland.

Hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) are among the major components in geothermal fluids, with concentrations ranging from a few ppb to hundreds of ppm (e.g.,
Stefánsson, 2017). Hydrogen sulfide and CO$_2$ are volatile elements that are often emitted into the atmosphere from geothermal power plants, causing potential environmental problems (e.g., Arnórsson, 2004). Several methods have been used to reduce H$_2$S emissions including oxidation to form elemental sulfur or sulfuric acid (Sanopoulos and Karabelas, 1997); however CO$_2$ emissions from geothermal power plants are less commonly controlled. Reykjavík Energy is currently running a pilot project where CO$_2$ and H$_2$S is re-injected into the geothermal system where it is predicted that the gases mineralize into carbonates and sulfides. Previous work on volatile gas disposal has mainly focused on reaction modeling and experiments regarding CO$_2$ (e.g. Xu et al., 2003; Zerai et al., 2006; McPherson and Lichtner, 2001; Knauss et al., 2005; Palandri and Kharaka, 2005; Gaus et al., 2008; Gysi and Stefánsson, 2012b). However, less is known about H$_2$S disposal, and mixed CO$_2$ and H$_2$S sequestration under geothermal conditions. There are considerable geochemical uncertainties related to the injection and sequestration of H$_2$S and mixtures of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S, including the effects of injection on the fluid-rock interaction, rate and mechanism of H$_2$S and CO$_2$ mineralization, long term sustainability of such injection within the geothermal system, the effects of porosity and permeability associated with the sulfide and carbonate mineralization, and methods to assess the quantity of gas sequestration.
1.2 Aim and philosophy of the present work

The goal of this work was to study various aspects of fluid-rock interaction including: (1) dissolution of primary rock and changes in rock porosity and mineral surface areas; (2) tracing progressive fluid-rock interaction using solution chemistry, mineralogy and isotope systematics; (3) assessing the mechanism, rate and the effects of rock porosity related to \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) mineralization under geothermal conditions, and long term sustainability of \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) sequestration in geothermal systems. These processes and thematic questions were addressed using two methods, laboratory fluid-rock interaction experiments and reactive transport modeling. In addition, by combining the two, the aim was to evaluate the reliability of reaction and reactive transport.

The first question of interest that was addressed was: can bulk mineral dissolution and precipitation kinetic rates be applied to accurately predict mineral and solution chemistry, mass changes and variations in rock porosity as a function of time in a flow-through or an open system? The simplest case was tested, when various primary phases were dissolved in a flow-through reactor as a function of time, and the solution chemistry and in-situ rock properties measured as a function of time. Reaction front consisting of dissolution pattern, distribution of surface area, porosity and reactivity of various material were explored as a function of time and distance into the reaction column. The reactive transport modeling was designed as full-kinetic simulation and the results compared with experimental observations.

The second question was aimed at examining if kinetic reaction path modeling of a closed system is capable of accurately predicting incongruent fluid-rock interaction. Here, the interaction that involves fluid, \( \text{CO}_2 \) and forsterite was studied, a relatively simple chemical system to minimize problems associated with multicomponent systems. Batch type experiments were conducted, the solution chemistry, isotope systematics and mineralogy studied as a function of extent of reaction or reaction time and the trends simulated using kinetic reaction path modeling. The modeling included solution chemistry, mineralogy and magnesium isotope systematics.

The final question addressed the mechanisms, rate and long-term sustainability of \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) sequestration into geothermal systems. Similar methods were applied as before, flow-through experiments and reactive transport modeling. Several rock types were tested ranging in mafic to silicic composition. Selected geochemical scenarios were further tested at field scales, and for long time injection and sequestration in geothermal systems, to assess the feasibility and sustainability of \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) sequestration into geothermal systems in various geological environments.
1.3 Methods

Material preparation, experimental design, analyses of experimental solutions and solids, reaction path, transport and isotope geochemical modeling methodology are described in detail in the following Appendices (I-IV). This chapter is a brief summary of the experimental setups and the geochemical modeling, in order to provide an overview.

Photographs of the experimental apparatuses are shown in Figure 1.3. In total, three different experimental setups were used. The first setup used flow-through column reactors for dissolution experiments of rocks at low temperatures and pressures. The reactors were made of Teflon, 112 mm long and 5 mm in diameter with an internal volume of ~8800 mm³. The height/diameter ratio of 22.4 maintains laminar and steady one dimensional (1D) flow in the system. The second setup involved Inconel flow-through reactors for experiments at elevated pressures and temperatures. The reactors were 300 mm long and had an internal diameter of 5.5 mm. This results in a similar height/diameter ratio (27.3) to the Teflon reactors. Temperature is maintained using an aluminum heating mantle and a temperature controlling unit. Both flow-through reactor designs were custom built. The third setup involved a modified Parr stirred reactor with volumes of 600 cm³. All wetted parts of the reactor were made of inert titanium.

Aqueous speciation, mineral saturation indices and reaction path and reactive transport simulations were carried out using the PhreeqC geochemical program (Parkhurst and Appelo, 2013). The PhreeqcRM reaction module for transport models was used for field-scale reactive transport simulations, with parallel processing implemented in C++ using the MPI multiprocessing library (Parkhurst and Wissmeier, 2015). Larger scale simulations were calculated by computer cluster Garpur, a joint project of the University of Iceland and the University of Reykjavík. All modeling presented here was designed at continuum scale, meaning not every single grain, its morphology, surface nor space relation is considered, but instead is accounted as a summary and approximation of all associated parameters. Those simplifications are essential when reflecting composite systems of for example...
millions of grains, forming a porous medium in the presented experiments. The kinetic rate \( r \) of mineral dissolution (+) and precipitation (-) was considered with generally employed transition state theory (Lasaga, 1998). One dimensional transport calculations for open systems can be imagined by dividing the reactor into several reactive cells to track reaction progress as a function of column distance (Fig. 1.4.), with total transport calculation steps per cell depending on the initial pore volume and corresponding solutions refilling rate. This also defined as the time step of transport in each cell. One dimensional advective-dispersive and reactive transport of solution was computed with forward flow direction to the cell with higher number to mimic experimental behavior (Appelo and Postma, 2005). Dispersivity (with 10% of travelled distance) in each cell was fixed for the total length of cell and no diffusion was defined.

![Figure 1.4. Conceptual drawing of reactive transport simulation compared to experimental reactor and field situation. The reactor is divided into independent calculation cells with incremental reactions where potential geochemical processes take place in each cell.](image)
2 Summary

The research conducted in this dissertation thesis consists of four original research articles, prepared for publication or already published in peer-reviewed international journals. Paper I, II were published in *Applied Geochemistry* and *Geothermics*, respectively. Both papers are reprinted with permission from Elsevier. Manuscript III and IV are submitted to *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control* and to *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, respectively.

**Paper I (Appendix I)**


The paper describes the mineral and rock dissolution behavior of various rock types (basaltic glass, crystalline basalt and forsterite) in acidic solution (pH ~2.1-2.9, 8.1-8.7 mmol/kg HCl) at 25°C. Concentrations of the dissolved elements for crystalline basalt and forsterite reached a steady-state after ~10-15 days whereas basaltic glass retained almost the same concentrations after a month from the start. The reaction stoichiometry was studied by comparing elemental ratios in outlet solutions with ratios in the fresh minerals and rocks. In the case of basaltic glass and crystalline, the elemental mole ratios suggest non-stoichiometric dissolution under acidic conditions whereas forsterite dissolved stoichiometrically.

Two distinctive dissolution features were observed in the surface of the materials. Firstly, as time elapsed the dissolution became more apparent. This was the case for all the experiments. Secondly, the dissolution was observed to be unevenly distributed within the column. More intense dissolution features on the grains were observed in the inlet part of the reaction column than at the outlet part, including deep etch pits and troughs. These trends are considered to have been caused by mineral dissolution at the inlet side of reactors where fresh solution encounters the solid surfaces, followed by a slight increase in pH and corresponding slower dissolution with increasing reactor’s distance. This is consistent with grain-size distribution showing solids to decrease with increasing experimental duration and the size of grains increasing from the inlet towards the outlet of the flow-through reactors.

Mineral and glass surface areas and porosities were observed to increase with experimental duration. These changes were minor for crystalline basalts and forsterite but significant for basaltic glass. Moreover, the variations in porosity were not uniformly distributed, they were greater on the inlet side than the outlet side. These observations demonstrate that dissolution of minerals and glasses resulted in progressive changes in solid grain size, that lead to changes in surface area and pore volume. Comparison of the experimental results with reactive transport modeling show that dissolution rates far from equilibrium obtained in this study using a complex flow-through system are comparable to those obtained from
mixed flow reactor experiments, where transport along the dissolving material does not occur. Some of the minerals and rocks were not observed to dissolve stoichiometrically, such non-stoichiometric dissolution is not commonly taken into account in reactive transport modeling. Similar results were obtained independently of the method applied for the calculations of mineral surface areas, i.e. whether geometric or tomographic normalized surface area was used or whether the simple spherical model or more complicated sugar lump model was implemented. Experimental mineral and rock dissolution of porous media resulted in increased porosity and specific surface area of the solids. Similar trends were predicted by reactive transport modeling. However, accurate values were difficult to predict. It follows that accurate prediction of the capabilities of simple reactive transport modeling may be limited for calculating pore volume and mineral and rock surface area changes with time and along flow paths that in turn are key parameters in determining dissolution rates, overall chemical mass movement in the system, and solution flow paths and velocities.

**Paper II (Appendix II)**


This manuscript is dedicated to the basalt alteration in hydrogen sulfide (H2S) of rich solutions at 100-250°C, using an experimental and modeling approach. The conditions were selected to imitate the H2S-injection conditions associated with the Sulfix project taking place at Hellisheiði power plant (SW Iceland).

The experimental outlet solution pH had in all cases neutral to mildly alkaline pH values: 6.6-7.3 at 100 °C, 7.7-8.2 at 200 °C, 6.0-9.4 at 240 °C and 8.9-9.7 at 250 °C. The solution concentration of elements showed narrow variation with time at given temperature. The outlet solution showed non-stoichiometric concentration with respect to basaltic glass in all samples. The H2S concentrations rapidly attained an approximately constant value at each temperature, independently from the initial H2S concentration in solution. The inlet side of the system had the biggest mass of precipitated secondary phases, decreasing with distance from the reactor inlet. Among the sulfur containing secondary minerals, pyrrhotite formed exclusively at 200 °C, whereas pyrite at 100, 240 and 250 °C. Saturation of sulfides in the solution at 200, 240 and 250 °C caused precipitation of many euhedral crystals of pyrite and pyrrhotite. However, minor pyrite with prevailing secondary iron oxides was observed at 100°C. Other phases observed were clay minerals at 100 °C, prehnite at 200 °C, and the solid solution of clinohumite-epidote at 250 °C. Crystals, up to 5 µm, of subhedral clinohumite formed predominantly in the upper parts of the reactor compared to sulfides.

The decrease in H2S between the inlet and outlet solution, together with the observed formation of sulfide minerals like pyrite and pyrrhotite, indicate that H2S mineralization occurred with a fluid-rock reaction of H2S-rich solutions and basaltic rocks under geothermal conditions. The process of mineralization of H2S from solution was summarized from the percentage difference between the H2S concentration in the inlet and outlet solution. The difference at 100 °C corresponds to up to ~22% of the injected H2S converted into sulfur containing minerals, like pyrite and possibly also into elemental
sulfur (e.g. Meyer, 1976; Stefánsson et al., 2011) whereas at 200, 240 and 250 °C the difference indicates ~62% of H₂S mineralized into pyrite and pyrrhotite at acidic pH and up to ~30% at neutral pH.

At each temperature, relatively steady state rates were observed within 1-2 days of the experiments, with rates increasing with decreasing pH of solution. The precipitation rates of H₂S are affected by the fluid’s pH rather than by temperature and concentration. However, at 100 °C the precipitation rates of Fe did not correspond to the H₂S mineralization rate into sulfides completely, as elemental sulfur was also formed. In contrast, the H₂S mineralization rates at 250 °C closely correspond to the modeled Fe dissolution rates of basalt, based on mass balance. This suggests the limiting factor in H₂S mineralization on re-injection of H₂S-rich fluids into geothermal systems was the leaching rate and availability of Fe. The results of reactive transport calculations demonstrate that the H₂S mineralization depends on the secondary mineral paragenesis. Assuming that pyrite-clinozoisite-clinochlore (model I) dominate the alteration mineralogy, the greater part of the Fe released from basaltic glass was consumed by pyrite. In contrast, assuming that pyrite, pyrrhotite, prehnite and epidote dominate the alteration mineralogy (model II), less H₂S mineralization into pyrite was observed due to significant uptake of Fe by epidote. However, independent of modeled alteration mineralogy, pyrite was observed to preferentially form at the inlet side of the reactor, where Fe leaching rates are rapid.

Reactive transport simulations were extended to cover a duration of H₂S-rich fluid re-injection over 100 years at 250 °C with conditions similar to those observed at Hellisheiði and associated with the Sulfix project (Gunnarsson et al., 2013). The reactor dimensions were scaled up. The porosity close to the re-injection well was observed to increase with time due to vigorous dissolution of the basaltic glass and formation of secondary minerals dominated by pyrite and some chlorite and chlorine-site-epidote. A few meters into the geothermal reservoir, away from the outlet of the re-injection well, the fluid-rock interaction had reached fluid chemistry and alteration mineralogy patterns observed within natural geothermal systems. The system maintained a similar rate over whole duration, dissolving 26% of 2600 tonnes of initial basalt, and precipitating 114 tonnes of pyrite in 120 years, sequestered 32 tonnes of H₂S (16% of injected H₂S within the modeled volume) without clogging the system. This means 32 000 tonne/year emissions at Hellisheiði would be safely captured within volume of 0.001 k m³ of rock.

The findings are in favour of H₂S fluid injection into rocks as a sustainable method for reduction H₂S emissions from geothermal power plants. The method is also considerably cheaper than currently used procedures which also make it an economically feasible option.

**Manuscript III (Appendix III)**


The third manuscript aims at assessing the process of CO₂ and H₂S mineralization in geothermal systems in relation to the gas sequestrations. Interactions with basaltic, dacitic and rhyolitic glass was studied at 250°C.
The successful sequestration of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S through re-injection was demonstrated by the difference between inlet and outlet solutions in all cases, for mafic, intermediate, and felsic rock types. The CO$_2$ mineralization rates normalized to geometric surface for experimental series of basalt, dacite and rhyolite were on average -7.2 ± 0.1, -7.4 ± 0.3, and -7.5 ± 0.2 (log mol/m$^2$/s), respectively. The corresponding H$_2$S rates were -8.2 ± 0.4, -8.2 ± 0.2, and -8.0 ± 0.2 (log mol/m$^2$/s). The secondary minerals found within all the post-experiment solids were mainly carbonates, sulfides, plagioclase, and epidote, in agreement with the natural mineral assemblages described for high-temperature geothermal fields (Browne, 1978; Gunnlaugsson and Arnórsson, 1982; Stefánsson and Arnórsson, 2002; Wiese et al., 2008). The inlet reactor side was characterized by the most abundant proportion of secondary minerals, whose mass decreases with distance. Also this side was enriched in carbonate and sulfate, indicating a rapid disequilibrium and saturation of carbon- and sulfur-rich minerals respectively, in the initial stage of fluid-rock interactions.

To date, only geothermal reservoir characterized by basalt as a host rock have been considered suitable for the co-injection and mineralization of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S (Matter et al., 2016; Gunnarsson et al., 2015). However most of the geothermal fields spread across the world are characterized by andesitic to acidic magmatic rocks. The current experimental findings extend and broaden the application of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S sequestration into geothermal system. To scale up the laboratory mineralization rates obtained to field conditions, the equivalent steady-state sequestration rates of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S for natural systems were calculated. Laboratory mineralization rates were multiplied with surface area of the rocks in the natural geothermal system and respective rock density. The current world total emissions from geothermal activity, before any abatement system, have been calculated to be ~10 Mt (megaton) of CO$_2$ per year, and ~0.2 Mt/yr of H$_2$S. The CO$_2$ emissions are on average 134 g/KWh, which is in agreement with the previously proposed 122 g/KWh (Fridriksson et al., 2016) based on a survey involving emissions from only the ~50% installed capacity. The H$_2$S emissions proposed here for the first time are on average 1.83 g/KWh. Both the averages were calculated for 97% of the geothermal capacity installed worldwide (Bertani, 2016). Using the field sequestration CO$_2$ and H$_2$S precipitation rates, and the gas emissions the sequestration capacity was calculated. The measured mineralization rates indicate that ~0.2-0.5 t of CO$_2$, and ~0.03-0.05 t of H$_2$S can be sequestrated annually per cubic meter, depending on reservoir lithology and surface area. No particular increment in gaseous emissions has been observed to be associated with a specific lithology. However, the nature of host rocks is a key parameter in the estimation of required volume to sequester CO$_2$ and H$_2$S.

From an economic perspective, the low-cost H$_2$S removal involved with the proposed method of gas re-injection could play a key role in the case of geothermal activities characterized by H$_2$S-rich fluids. The in-situ simultaneous re-injection of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S for geological storage could then act as an incentive to drastically decrease the greenhouse gas emissions while adopting an economically convenient H$_2$S abatement system, which would otherwise be very expensive. Also, the coupling of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S would optimize the space used by geothermal fields, the number of required facilities, and the capital invested for waste water disposal. The production of energy from renewable sources, such as geothermal fluids can be freed from polluting atmospheric emissions by their permanent mineralization underground, addressing one of the major environmental concerns on a global scale.
Manuscript IV (Appendix IV)

Přikryl, J., Stefánsson, A., Pearce, C.R., 2018. Tracing olivine carbonation and serpentinization in CO$_2$-rich fluids via magnesium exchange and isotopic fractionation (submitted to Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta)

This manuscript is focused on fluid-rock interaction of simple geochemical closed system where forsterite was reacted with CO$_2$-rich aqueous solutions at 150°C and the solution chemistry, mineral alteration and magnesium isotope systematic were studied. The experimental work was accompanied by reaction modeling.

Two types of experiments were carried out with: (1) low initial CO$_2$ concentrations and (2) elevated initial CO$_2$ concentrations. The initial pH of the solutions in both cases was ~6.5 and was observed to increase to ~6.7 - ~7.5 with reaction time accompanied with a decrease in the CO$_2$ concentration. The concentrations of dissolved Si and Mg rose rapidly during the first hour followed by steady concentrations with time. Identified secondary phases were magnesite, chrysotile/lizardite, amorphous silica and halite. The altered olivine surfaces showed conical or funnel-shaped etch pits that formed along the mineral edges and within the previously smoothed surfaces. The effect of reaction time at constant initial CO$_2$ concentration can be summarized as following. Initially, small crystals of magnesite formed, up to 1 μm, on the olivine grains. Following this randomly distributed needle shaped formations of chrysotile/lizardite up to 0.5 μm in length formed. With time, the magnesite crystals were observed to grow in size. No major differences in mineralogy were observed depending on initial CO$_2$ concentration. At low CO$_2$ concentration, magnesite crystals formed along the olivine edges and within surface cleavages, small chrysotile/lizardite needles formed randomly over the whole olivine surface. At elevated CO$_2$ concentration, magnesite resulted in crystals larger, up to 10 μm. Some of the olivine grains were completely coated with such conglomerates of magnesite. Honeycomb structures and mesh texture of chrysotile/lizardite typically coated the olivine surface and occasionally shaped conglomerates around the magnesite crystals.

The reaction modeling was observed to imitate the experimental observations, both with respect to the solution chemistry and secondary mineralogy. The exact solution composition and mass of secondary minerals, as well as the effects of element transfer with time, was found to largely depend on the fraction of the total olivine surface area reacting. The effects of the choice of the nucleation surface area values ($A_n$) for the secondary mineral phases was found to have a limited effect on the mass of secondary minerals formed in the model runs. Comparison of the experimental and modeling results demonstrated that although kinetic reaction path modeling is unable to reproduce all of the observed chemical changes, it does provide an accurate representation of the relative trends in secondary mineralogy, solution composition and element transfer as a function of time, at least for the relatively simple systems such as that investigated here.

The reaction progress was further studied using $\delta^{26}$Mg ratios of water samples and fresh and reacted forsterite. Upon olivine-water reaction the $\delta^{26}$Mg solution ratio decreased initially from -0.14 to -0.27 ‰ followed by an increase to 0.35 ‰. This is considered to be related to Mg-containing secondary minerals formation enriched by $^{24}$Mg relative to olivine and the aqueous solution upon fluid-rock interaction. Similar results were obtained using reaction and isotope modeling, further indicating that magnesite is significantly $^{24}$Mg enriched compared to chrysotile and brucite. The results of our study are consistent with
the relatively positive $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratios (0.23 ‰ to 0.85 ‰) of ground- and geothermal waters in basaltic terrains (Pogge von Strandmann et al., 2008) and altered oceanic basalts with the most negative values being associated with the carbonation of the basalts, and less negative values associated with serpentinization. Revealing mechanism of Mg isotope distribution within reaction progress in nature indicates also application as a tracer during CO$_2$ sequestration.

**Contribution of JP to the presented research**

*Paper I*

JP carried out all experimental work, including designing the experimental apparatus, JP conducted analytical measurements according the instruction of the managing technical staff and written and ran geochemical numerical simulations. Writing was done by JP, AS, SS, DJ.

*Paper II*

JP carried out preparation of the material together with SG, helped partly with the experimental work and with analytical measurements. JP conducted reactive transport simulations. Paper was written by JP, CM, AS.

*Manuscript III*

JP and CM contributed equally to the experimental work and analytical measurements. CM analyzed the economic implications and world emissions. Manuscript was prepared by CM, JP, AS.

*Manuscript IV*

All experimental work was managed by JP. Analytical measurements were done by JP according the guidance of the managing technical staff, except isotope samples analyzed by CP. JP ran all geochemical modeling. Manuscript was written by JP, AS, CP.
3 Concluding remarks

The aim of this work was to study fluid-rock interaction under hydrothermal conditions including: (1) dissolution of primary rock and changes in rock porosity and mineral surface areas upon reaction time; (2) tracing progressive fluid-rock interaction using solution chemistry, mineralogy and isotope systematics and (3) assessing the mechanism, rate and the effects of rock porosity upon H$_2$S and CO$_2$ mineralization under geothermal conditions, and long term sustainability of H$_2$S and CO$_2$ sequestration in geothermal systems. Two methods were applied, laboratory fluid-rock interaction experiments and reactive transport modeling. Comparison of the two also made it possible to assess the reliability of reaction and reactive transport modeling for a real system.

The study demonstrated that mineral and rock dissolution in the absence of secondary phases results in increased porosity and specific surface area of the solids. Such changes may not be evenly distributed along the fluid transport path and over time. Reactive transport modeling of the same systems indicated that bulk changes in solution chemistry and dissolution rates could be accurately simulated. In contrast, changes in pore volume distribution and mineral surface areas are more difficult to accurately model. In the case of closed system fluid-rock interaction whereas primary minerals are dissolved and secondary minerals are formed, experimental mineralogy with solution chemistry and isotope ratio may be mimicked by geochemical modeling, at least for simple systems.

Applying similar experimental and modeling approach to CO$_2$ and H$_2$S sequestration by mineralization in geothermal systems results in the rate of mineralization and long-term sustainability of such sequestration. The re-injection of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S into geothermal systems were found to result in primary rock dissolution and calcite solid solution and pyrite formation. The overall process resulted in limited effects of long-term porosity changes. For various rock types the co-sequestered H$_2$S and CO$_2$ reached 52% and 36% for basalt, 17% and 12% for intermediate rocks, and 15% and 40% for felsic rocks respectively, for the injected gases during limited transport length of tested systems at 250°C. Single injection of H$_2$S mineralized up to 62%, faster in acidic pH and higher H$_2$S concentration >10 mmol/kg. Stable H$_2$S mineralization is also achieved at 200-250°C. The measured mineralization rates indicate that ~0.2-0.5 t of CO$_2$, and ~0.03-0.05 t of H$_2$S can be sequestered annually per cubic meter. Field calculations show that a total rock sequestration capacity of 0.03 km$^3$ would be sufficient to store the annual world CO$_2$ and H$_2$S geothermal emissions. Annual sequestration volumes indicate efficient abatement of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S emissions at field conditions, suggesting the strategy sustainability for lifetime of geothermal power plants, also in different lithologies.
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Highlights:

- Bulk dissolution rates from flow-through and mixed-flow reactors are similar.
- Increased porosity and surface area affected dissolution rates and fluid composition.
- Modeling does not accurately predict porosity and surface area in time and distance.
- Non-stoichiometric dissolution is observed, commonly missing in reactive modeling.
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A B S T R A C T
Mineral and rock dissolution was studied experimentally using flow-through reactors and reactive transport modeling. The porous media were forsterite, crystalline basalt, and amorphous basalt, dissolved in HCl solutions at pH ~2.5 and 25 °C. Solution composition, particle surface area, and porosity were determined as a function of travel distance within the reactor and time, using in situ X-ray computed tomography (XMT) and solution chemical composition. The obtained bulk dissolution rates, normalized to the initial geometric surface area, were: log r, forsterite ~7.59 ± 0.05 for forsterite, ~7.64 ± 0.12 for basaltic glass and ~8.12 ± 0.24 (mol/m²/s) for crystalline basalt, at 25 °C and pH ~2.5, similar to those previously obtained using mixed flow reactors and for conditions far from equilibrium. Mineral and rock dissolution resulted in increased porosity and specific surface area of the solids; these changes were not uniformly distributed along the fluid flow path or with time. Similar trends were predicted by reactive transport modeling, however, the exact values of pore volume and surface area were difficult to predict. The results were found to be independent of the method applied in the surface area calculations: either the simple spherical model or the sugar lump model. Also, in the models, stoichiometric mineral dissolution is commonly assumed, but was not observed to occur for either glassy or crystalline basalt. It shows that accurate prediction capabilities of simple reactive transport modeling may be limited for calculating pore volume, mineral and rock surface area changes, and pore fluid chemistry with time and along flow paths. These, in turn, are key parameters in determining dissolution rates, overall chemical mass movement in the system, and fluid flow paths and velocities.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Weathering and alteration of rocks by water-rock interaction play a key role in many geochemical cycles, for example in forming landscapes and soils (Brantley et al., 2008), in the effectiveness of carbon capture and storage (e.g., McGrail et al., 2006; Gislason and Oelkers, 2014), in acid mine drainage, and in the transport of toxic elements (e.g., Akcil and Koldas, 2006; Gandy et al., 2007).

The initial step of water-rock interaction in porous media is dissolution of primary minerals by fluid, usually water, resulting in dissolved solutes and formation of secondary minerals. Commonly, the rate of the overall water-rock interaction is quantified by change in solution composition as a function of time. Most common are dissolution experiments (e.g., Pokrovsky and Schott, 2000; Oelkers and Gislason, 2001) but rates of secondary mineral formation have also been determined (e.g., Nagy et al., 1991; Saldi et al., 2009). In porous rocks, mineral dissolution and formation of secondary minerals may also cause changes in pore volume, permeability and mineral surface area, however, these effects have received less attention (e.g., Kieffer et al., 1999; Colón et al., 2004). Dissolution rates determined from experiments are commonly higher than those determined from field studies (e.g. White and Brantley, 2003). The causes can be many. Dissolution rates are influenced by available mineral surface area and the availability and transport of water to and from those surfaces. The surfaces of natural minerals may be previously weathered compared with those used in experiments, this affecting the measured dissolution rates. Moreover, mineral surface area may vary and change during progressive water-rock interaction and weathering and water transport are influenced by the porosity and permeability of the rocks. In recent years, advances in computed tomography (CT) have provided new insight into water-rock interaction in porous media.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: jap5@hi.is (J. Příkryl).
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particularly the changes in porosity and particle surface area (e.g., Noiri et al., 2004, 2009; 2012; Noiri, 2015; Luquot and Gouze, 2009; Gouze and Luquot, 2011; Cnudde and Boone, 2013; Molins et al., 2014). These studies have demonstrated that dissolution and precipitation kinetics can be influenced by fluid transport and availability of surface area and that surface area and porosity usually change as a function of flow path and progressive water-rock interaction.

This study focused on water-rock interaction and mineral dissolution in porous media. Flow-through experiments were conducted where the dissolution of single and multiphase, unconsolidated porous media, with crystalline or amorphous material, was investigated. The progress of the reaction was followed by in situ imaging and by chemical analysis, which allowed changes in local porosity and surface area to be determined along the flow path, as a function of time. The chemical composition data were used to determine dissolution rates. The experimental data were compared with results from reactive transport modeling, to validate prediction capabilities of such model calculations for solution composition and changes in porosity and mineral surface area.

2. Methods

2.1. Experimental details

Three materials were used for the experiments: basaltic glass (BG) as an amorphous single phase, crystalline basalt (XB) as a crystalline multiphase and forsterite (FO) representing a crystalline single phase system. The composition of the basaltic glass was close to that of mid-ocean ridge basalt (MORB) and was collected from Stapafell, SW Iceland. The material has been described previously (e.g., Oelkers and Gislason, 2001; Gislason and Oelkers, 2003; Gysi et al., 2014). The bulk composition of the crystalline basalt was collected at the same locality. The mineralogy and petrology of the material have previously been reported by Gudbrandsson et al. (2011). The forsterite (Mg$_{2.86}$Fe$_{0.14}$SiO$_4$) used in this study was collected in Gusdal quarry, in the Almåklovdalen peridotite massif, situated in the Western Gneiss Region, Norway (Brueckner et al., 2010).

The solid materials were broken in a jaw crusher, then ground in an automatic agate mortar and dry sieved to obtain the 125–250 μm size fraction. We used gravitational settling in deionized ultrapure water and the water further served to remove the ultrafine particles. The material was rinsed with deionized water and acetone in an ultrasonic bath and dried in an oven at 40 °C. A summary of the chemical and physical properties of the starting material is given in Table 1 and SEM images of the fresh material are shown in Fig. 1. The specific geometric surface area of the starting materials was determined as (Tester et al., 1994),

$$A_{geo} = \frac{6}{\pi d_e \rho}$$

the constant, 6, is a shape factor, used for grains that are spherical and smooth. The effective particle diameter is denoted $d_e$, and $\rho$ stands for the density of the material. The BET specific surface area of cleaned and dried starting materials was determined by six point nitrogen adsorption, using a Quantachrome Gas Sorption system.

The dissolution experiments were conducted at 25 °C using a flow-through reactor system, consisting of an inlet solution, a peristaltic pump, a vertically placed reaction vessel and an outlet tube. The cylindrical Teflon reactor had a volume of 8.80 cm$^3$, length (l) of 11.2 cm and internal diameter (D) of 0.5 cm. The reactors had thin walls (3 mm) for in situ X-ray microtomography (XMT) measurements as a function of reaction time and distance along the flow path within the reactor. Prior to the experiments, the reactor was loaded with one of the solid materials, in suspension, to optimize homogeneous particle distribution and to avoid preferential channeling.

The inlet solutions were made from HCl (37% Sigma-Aldrich) and deionized water to form 8.44–8.68 mmol/kg HCl with pH of 2.10–2.11. The solutions were pumped at a constant flow rate (0.5 ml/min) through the columns. The solid material and the inlet and outlet solution compositions were determined during the experimental runs. A schematic figure of the experimental setup is presented in Fig. 2, together with an example of 3D XMT images of the material before and after dissolution, taken in situ. The experimental conditions are summarized in Table 2.

2.2. Solid material analysis

The solid materials were analyzed at the beginning and at the end of the experiments. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM, HITACHI TM-3000) showed the morphology of the grains. Images of gold coated samples were taken at an accelerating voltage of 15 kV, at a range of magnifications. The chemical composition of the fresh material was determined using an electron microprobe (JEOL JXA-8200 Superprobe), at an accelerating voltage of 15 kV, a beam current of 15 nA, and a beam size of 1–5 μm.

2.3. Solution composition and dissolution rates

Solution samples for chemical analysis were collected at the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and chemical properties of the starting solid material used in the experiments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Basaltic glass (BG)</th>
<th>Crystalline basalt (XB)</th>
<th>Forsterite (FO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical composition</td>
<td>Na$<em>{0.08}$K$</em>{0.08}$Mg$<em>{0.25}$Ca$</em>{0.32}$Fe$<em>{0.177}$Al$</em>{0.356}$SiO$_{3.297}$</td>
<td>Na$<em>{0.08}$K$</em>{0.08}$Mg$<em>{0.25}$Ca$</em>{0.32}$Fe$<em>{0.177}$Al$</em>{0.356}$SiO$_{3.297}$</td>
<td>Mg$<em>{2.86}$Fe$</em>{0.14}$SiO$_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain size</td>
<td>125–250 μm</td>
<td>125–250 μm</td>
<td>125–250 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material (g)</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET surface area (A$_{BET}$) (m$^2$/g)</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.812$^{c}$</td>
<td>0.088$^{d}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray microtomography surface area (A$_{XMT}$) (m$^2$/g)</td>
<td>5.274</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray microtomography porosity (h$_{XMT}$) (%)</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Gudbrandsson et al. (2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Aradóttir et al. (2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Giammar et al. (2005).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
standard buffers as well as with a more rigorous standard addition calibration with acid-base titration and determination of standard potential, Nernstian slope, and acid and alkaline liquid junction potentials.

Based on the difference in chemical composition of the inlet and outlet solutions, the forward dissolution rate \( r_{\text{fi}} \) was calculated from the expression,

\[
r_{\text{fi}} = \frac{\Delta m_i q}{A}
\]

(2)

where \( \Delta m_i \) represents the concentration difference between the inlet and outlet solutions for the \( i \)-th element, \( \Delta m_i \) was divided by stoichiometric coefficient of the \( i \)-th element in the case of Mg, and \( q \) denotes flow rate. The surface area, \( A \), was assumed to be the initial geometric surface area of the material inside the reactor or the surface area determined from the 3D XMT images as a function of time. The dissolution rates were derived using the Si and Mg concentrations.

Exact mass of residual material in the reactor for XMT normalized dissolution rate was obtained from the mass of dissolved material \( \Delta M(t) \) calculated from the following equation:

\[
\Delta M(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(t) \text{ where } m_i(t) = \int_0^t (c_{i,\text{in}} - c_{i,\text{out}}(t)) q(t) \, dt
\]

(3)

with \( c_{i,\text{in}} \) and \( c_{i,\text{out}} \) as the concentrations of the \( i \)-th cation (mmol/kg) in the inlet and outlet fluids respectively, \( q \) the flow-rate (L/s) and \( m_i \) the total moles of cation released from the sample at time \( t \). The total mass of cations was converted to mass of respective oxides (SiO\(_2\), Al\(_2\)O\(_3\), CaO, MgO, FeO).

2.4. X-ray microtomography, calculation of porosity and specific surface area

Tomography measurements were made using a Phoenix Nanotom S X-ray microCT system (General Electric Measurement and Control) situated at Innovation Center Iceland, Reykjavík, at a source current of 140 \( \mu \text{A} \), a source voltage of 120 kV and a sampling distance of 7.83–8.83 \( \mu \text{m} \). Measurements were made on the original material, prior to the experiments, and after 2 and 4 weeks of dissolution, for the inlet \( (2 = 20–27 \pm 2 \text{ mm}) \) and outlet portions of the reactor \( (2 = 100–107 \pm 2 \text{ mm}) \). Two phase (solid and fluid) reconstructed 3D tomography data was processed as follows: 1) Each voxel, \( I_{(x,y,z)} \) with intensity value greater than \((\mu_{ij} + 3\sigma_{ij})\) was replaced by \((\mu_{ij} + 3\sigma_{ij})\). Here, \( \mu_{ij} \) is the mean intensity value and \( \sigma_{ij} \), the standard deviation of the tomogram’s voxel values. This removed any outlier patch of pixels. 2) Noise level was estimated following Liu et al. (2013). 3) Bilateral filtering was performed using the noise level parameter obtained in Step 2 (Tomasi and Manduchi, 1998). 4) At this point, voxels representing solid and fluid were segmented by setting a threshold level obtained by Otsu method (Otsu, 1979). These steps improved the segmentation by minimizing false pore matrix indicators (Jha et al., 2014). The intensity histograms show a clear bimodal distribution after the processing steps, which allows a reliable and automatic selection of threshold levels (Fig. 3). We calculated the digital surface area \( (\text{pixel}^2) \) of the segmented binary data by counting marching cube surface values in it. Total digital surface area was converted to physical surface area \( (\text{m}^2) \) by multiplying it with the area of a voxel’s face. The porosity, \( \alpha \), was given by \( \frac{V_c}{V_s} \), where \( V_c \) is the total volume of voxels in the tomogram and \( V_s \) is the total solid phase volume.
voxel count. The mass (g) of the solid material was obtained from $V_s$ and the material density, $\rho$. This consequently allowed us to calculate specific surface area in commonly used units ($m^2/g$). In order to calculate the tomographic surface normalized dissolution rates, the average surface area, $\overline{X}$, over all of the solid was calculated as the arithmetic mean,

$$\overline{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

where $n$ represents the set of sample and $X_i$, the specific surface area of samples. Consequently average surface area, $\overline{X}$, was multiplied with the residual mass of material to obtain total surface area.

2.5. Reactive transport modeling

Reactive transport modeling was conducted using the PHREEQC program (Parkhurst and Appelo, 2013). The reactor was divided into 10 reactive cells to track reaction progress as a function of column distance, with a total 52 to 62 transport calculation steps per cell to calculate 1 month of experimental duration. This number of transport shifts depended on the initial pore volume and corresponding solution refill rate; the time step associated with each shift was close to 1 minute. 1D advective-dispersive-reactive transport of the solution was determined using the forward flow direction from cell 1 up to cell 10 to mimic experimental behavior (Appelo and Postma, 2005). Dispersivity in each cell (10% of traveled distance) was corrected for the total length of the cell and we assumed no diffusion.

The rate of dissolution was calculated using the transition state theory for the $i$-th solid phase,

$$r_{\text{dis},i} = A_i \sum_{j} k_{i,j} \prod_{j} a_{j}^{n} \left(1 - S_{i,j}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

where $A$ represents the surface area, $k_{i,j}$ represents the kinetic rate constant at a given pH and temperature, and $\prod a_{j}^{n}$ represents the activity expression for the $j$-th dissolved aqueous species in the solution, to the power of the reaction order of species $j$, $n$.

The saturation index, $S_{i}$, was calculated from,
\[ SI = \frac{Q}{K} \]

where \( Q \) denotes the reaction quotient of the dissolution reaction and \( K \), the respective equilibrium solubility constant.

Dissolution rates and solubility data used in this study are listed in Table 3. These were taken from dissolution rate studies reported by Gíslason and Oelkers (2003), Palandri and Kharaka (2004), Olsen and Rimstidt (2008), and Gudbrandsdóttir et al. (2014). The thermodynamic data for aqueous species and the minerals used to calculate the mineral solubilities were taken from by Phillips et al. (1988), Shock and Helgeson (1988), Cox et al. (1989), Shock et al. (1997), Arnórsson and Andrésdóttir (1999), Arnórsson and Stefánsson (1999), Gunnarsson and Arnórsson (2000), Stefánsson (2001), and Aradóttir et al. (2012).

The pore volume or porosity, \( \phi \), was calculated from the volume difference between the empty experimental reactor and the volume of the solid material in the reactor. The volume of solid was determined from the mass of material divided by its density.

The total surface area of the grains, \( A \), was determined in two ways, first, by assuming spherical grains and homogeneous dissolution of the solid particles with time, and second, using the sugar lump model (Noiriel et al., 2009), where material is dissociated into smaller grains, which increases the surface area. In the spherical dissolution model, the surface area of the dissolving phases was calculated from the initial surface area, \( A_0 \), and the ratio of the initial number of moles of the solid, \( n_0 \), and the number of moles remaining, as a function of time, \( m_t \), assuming the grains to be spherical, hence a factor of 2/3,

\[ A = \frac{\zeta A_0}{m_t/m_0} 2^{3/2} \]

where \( A_0 \) represents the maximum surface area, which is given by the sum of the surface area for all of the individual particles. \( n_{1,2,3} \) are empirical coefficients that depend on the geometry of the aggregate. Coefficient \( n_2 \) is equal to 2/3, assuming spherical grains. In addition to the sugar lump model, the coefficient \( \zeta \) represents the fraction of reactive surface area of the solids. Its value can range from 0 to 1, where 0 represents the case where none of the surface is reactive and 1, where all of the surface reacts. Here, we have assumed \( \zeta = 1 \) but the reactive surface area could be only a part of the total surface area (e.g., Brantley and Mellott, 2000; Colon et al., 2004; Aagaard and Helgeson, 1982; Helgeson et al., 1984), and it could vary greatly over long periods of water-rock interaction. This would cause dissolution rates to change significantly (e.g., Lichtner, 1996; White and Brantley, 2003; Luquot and Gouze, 2009; Noiriel et al., 2004).

3. Results

3.1. Solution composition

The chemical composition of the inlet and outlet solutions is presented in Table 4. The concentration of the inlet solution for all experiments was similar, between 8.44 and 8.68 mmol/kg HCl, pH of 2.10–2.11, and the concentration of other elements was below detection. The outflow solution pH was similar from all solid
solutions were Si/Mg sterite. For crystalline basalt, the elemental ratios in the outlet solution were Ca and Mg relative to Si. The element ratio in the outlet solution for stoichiometric dissolution under acid conditions with respect to basaltic glass were 3.55, 3.80 and 0.93, suggesting non-stoichiometric dissolution.

For the output solutions from the crystalline basalt and forsterite experiments, the concentrations of the dissolved elements reached steady state within 10–15 days. For the basaltic glass, outflow solution concentration was relatively constant during the entire experiment.

The reaction stoichiometry can be studied by comparing element ratios in the solutions with those in the bulk solid. For basaltic glass dissolution, the element mole ratios in the outlet solutions after 10 days were Si/Mg = 2.15 ± 0.19, Si/Ca = 2.19 ± 0.25 and Mg/Ca = 0.99 ± 0.03. The corresponding ratios for the initial basaltic glass were 3.55, 3.80 and 0.93, suggesting non-stoichiometric dissolution under acid conditions with respect to Ca and Mg relative to Si. The element ratio in the outlet solution for forsterite was Si/Mg = 0.57 ± 0.01, close to the corresponding mineral ratio, 0.54, indicating stoichiometric dissolution of forsterite. For crystalline basalt, the elemental ratios in the outlet solutions were Si/Mg = 1.35 ± 0.24, Si/Ca = 2.70 ± 0.64 and Mg/Ca = 2.13 ± 0.91, compared with the corresponding bulk crystalline basalt ratios, 3.62, 3.47 and 1.01, respectively, indicating non-stoichiometric dissolution.

### Chemical composition of the solutions sampled at the column outlet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. #</th>
<th>Time (Days)</th>
<th>Flow rate (ml/min)</th>
<th>pH/25 °C</th>
<th>Si (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>Na (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>K (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>Ca (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>Mg (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>Fe (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>Al (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>Cl (mmol/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basaltic glass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG inlet</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 1 inlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 2 inlet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 3 inlet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 4 inlet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 5 inlet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 6 inlet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 7 inlet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 8 inlet</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 9 inlet</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 10 inlet</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 11 inlet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crystalline basalt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO inlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 1 outlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 2 outlet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 3 outlet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 4 outlet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 5 outlet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 6 outlet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 7 outlet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 8 outlet</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 9 outlet</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 10 outlet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analytical uncertainty based on repeated analysis of the reference sample (GYG13).*

3.2. Solid product

The changes in solid surface properties, as a function of distance within the column and time, are shown in Fig. 5. Two features were observed. First, with increasing reaction time, dissolution features became progressively more obvious. This applied for all of the solids. Particle edges were covered by etch pits up to ~20 μm in diameter, which intercepted in some cases and formed corrosion troughs up to ~100 μm in length. Some amorphous basaltic glass grains developed networks of interconnected fractures all over their surfaces, forming flakes (~10–30 μm wide). Such features are caused by preferential dissolution along weaker planes or areas of the glass particles: effects of grain drying and spalling of an altered layer that precipitated on the surface (Gislason and Oelkers, 2003). Second, dissolution features were unevenly distributed in the column. Deeper etch pits and more extensive dissolution channeling were observed near the inlet of the column than near the outlet. For glass, the powder on inlet side, within the first 1 cm, even lost its black color and appeared mostly white. This indicated extensive dissolution at the inlet, where fresh solution came into contact with the solid. This was accompanied by a slight increase in pH through the rest of the column and slower dissolution toward the outlet.
3.3. X-ray microtomography

The results derived from X-ray microtomography, i.e. grain size, porosity, \( \phi \), and surface area, \( A \), for the initial and the reacted material as a function of experiment duration are listed in Table 5.

The grain size distributions for the fresh and reacted material are shown in Fig. 6. There are two characteristic features. First, there was a considerable range in grain size for all of the solids. Although we used the sieved portion that was between 125 and 250 \( \mu m \), the actual particles ranged from \(-50 \) to \(-200 \) \( \mu m \), with initial distribution skewed towards the smaller grain size. Second, the median grain size decreased with increasing experiment duration for amorphous and crystalline basalt at the inlet side of the flow-through reactors but increased for forsterite. For basaltic glass, the median value for grain size decreased in the inlet of the reactor, from 103 (±39) \( \mu m \) to 79 (±40) \( \mu m \) after 4 weeks, while the outlet grain size remained relatively constant at 103 – 97 (±39–37) \( \mu m \) for the first two weeks, followed by a decrease to 77 (±32) \( \mu m \) at the end of the experiment. The trend for crystalline basalt was similar, with a decrease in the inlet grain size from 96 to 90 (±31–33) \( \mu m \) in 4 weeks, whereas the outlet grain size decreased from 96 to 88 (±31) \( \mu m \) throughout the experiment. For forsterite, the grain size did not change significantly at 2 weeks from 71 (±31) to 77 (±32–34) \( \mu m \), either at the inlet and or the outlet, but at 4 weeks was 80 (±33) \( \mu m \) at the inlet and 64 (±27) \( \mu m \) at the outlet.

The specific surface area of all solids increased during the experiments. These changes were minor for forsterite and crystalline basalts (~7–13% ±5–6 increase in 4 weeks), whereas the specific surface area of basaltic glass changed considerably (up to 43% ± 5 in 4 weeks).

A similar trend was observed for porosity. It increased with experiment duration for all solids. For crystalline basalt and forsterite, these changes were minor, up to 6% ±5–6 increase, whereas the porosity for basaltic glass changed considerably, up to an
increase of \( \pm 5 \). The change in porosity was not evenly distributed within the reaction column. For all solid types, the difference was greater near the inlet. Porosity increased as grain size decreased and specific surface area increased, in all cases.

These observations demonstrate that dissolution along a flow path resulted in progressive changes in grain size, which led to changes in surface area and pore volume. These changes were dependent on the type of solid.

4. Discussion

4.1. Dissolution rates

The forward dissolution rates were calculated from the difference in solution composition at the inlet and the outlet side of the flow-through reactor, the flow rate and surface area of the solids (Eqn. (2)). The resulting rates with respect to Si and Mg are listed in Table 6 and shown in Fig. 7. For forsterite, the calculated dissolution rates derived from geometric surface area are systematically lower than those calculated from the surface area derived from X-ray microtomography images. The difference was \( -0.3 \log \text{mol/m}^2/\text{s} \) units. Dissolution rates determined from Si and Mg were equivalent to those previously reported by Olsen and Rimstidt (2008) at the same pH and temperature. The Si rates obtained in this study are comparable to those reported by Rimstidt et al. (2012) from a compilation of available literature data but somewhat lower than the rates reported by Oelkers (2001), Golubev et al. (2005) and Pokrovsky and Schott (2000) (Table 7). Rimstidt et al. (2012) concluded that there was a negligible difference, within uncertainty, whether the forsterite dissolution rate was normalized to BET or the geometric surface area. As observed here, the calculated geometric surface area of forsterite was systematically greater (0.46 \( \text{m}^2/\text{g} \)) than that obtained from X-ray microtomography images and integrated over the entire flow-through reaction vessel (0.24–0.19 \( \text{m}^2/\text{g} \)). Using a fixed geometric surface for the calculations...
resulted in lower reaction rates ($\log r_{\text{Si}} = -7.52$ to $-7.66$ mol/m$^2$/s) whereas using the surface area obtained from the X-ray microtomography 3D images, which took into account the progressive decrease in forsterite surface, resulted in similar rates throughout the experiment ($\log r_{\text{Si}} = -7.28$ to $-7.24$ mol/m$^2$/s).

For basaltic glass and crystalline basalt, the results were similar to forsterite. The rates determined from the geometric surface area were systematically lower than those determined from the X-ray microtomography measurements. Both the geometric and tomographic normalized rates obtained in this study compare well with those previously reported for crystalline basalt (Gudbrandsson et al., 2011) but the rate for basaltic glass was an order of magnitude lower than those reported by Gíslason and Oelkers (2003) (Table 7). The most probable reason was the different experimental setup, which resulted in a wide solute gradient with steeply increasing pH along our reaction pathway, which slowed the dissolution rate. The difference in surface area derived from the X-ray microtomography data was higher for basaltic glass and forsterite than for crystalline basalt, however the dissolution rate of crystalline basalt changed more during the experiment despite the changes in surface area.

From our results, we interpret that bulk dissolution rates for mafic minerals and rocks are relatively insensitive to change in the total surface area during progressive water-rock interaction. Dissolution of forsterite, basaltic glass and crystalline basalt all resulted in consumption of $\text{H}^+$ (acid) (reactions listed in Table 3), causing increased pH and decreased dissolution rates along the flow path. According to the geochemical model calculations, this was indeed to be expected, i.e. with increasing distance into the reactor, pH increases and dissolution rate decreases (Fig. 8). The
The calculated rates of experimental dissolution using Si and Mg concentrations. The dissolution rates are normalized to geometric initial surface and tomographic surface. $A_{\text{geo}}$ tot averaged surface area of tomographic measurements as a function of column distance, x, residual grams in the column (obtained from mass balance of outlet concentration).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. #</th>
<th>Time days</th>
<th>$A_{\text{geo}}$ tot $\text{m}^2$</th>
<th>$A_{\text{XMT}}$ tot $\text{m}^2$</th>
<th>Dissolution rate, log $r_{\text{geo}}$ $\text{mol/(m}^2\text{s})$</th>
<th>$r_{\text{XMT}}$</th>
<th>$M_{\text{geo}}$</th>
<th>$M_{\text{XMT}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basaltic glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 1 outlet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>−7.57</td>
<td>−7.14</td>
<td>−7.27</td>
<td>−6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 2 outlet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>−7.57</td>
<td>−7.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 3 outlet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>−7.56</td>
<td>−7.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 4 outlet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>−7.53</td>
<td>−7.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 5 outlet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>−7.89</td>
<td>−7.44</td>
<td>−7.74</td>
<td>−7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 6 outlet</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>−7.77</td>
<td>−7.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 7 outlet</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>−7.08</td>
<td>−7.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 8 outlet</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>−7.59</td>
<td>−7.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 9 outlet</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>−7.58</td>
<td>−7.17</td>
<td>−7.37</td>
<td>−6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−7.64 ± 0.12</td>
<td>−7.25 ± 0.22</td>
<td>−7.40 ± 0.15</td>
<td>−7.01 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystalline basalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 1 outlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>−8.07</td>
<td>−7.72</td>
<td>−7.36</td>
<td>−7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 2 outlet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−7.82</td>
<td>−7.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 3 outlet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−7.83</td>
<td>−7.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 4 outlet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−7.89</td>
<td>−7.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 5 outlet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−7.96</td>
<td>−7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 6 outlet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>−8.04</td>
<td>−7.68</td>
<td>−7.28</td>
<td>−6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 7 outlet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−8.19</td>
<td>−7.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 8 outlet</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−8.26</td>
<td>−7.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 9 outlet</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−8.40</td>
<td>−7.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 10 outlet</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>−8.45</td>
<td>−7.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XB 11 outlet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>−8.45</td>
<td>−8.1</td>
<td>−7.91</td>
<td>−7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.12 ± 0.24</td>
<td>−7.83 ± 0.23</td>
<td>−7.42 ± 0.33</td>
<td>−7.16 ± 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsterite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 1 outlet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>−7.52</td>
<td>−7.24</td>
<td>−7.54</td>
<td>−7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 2 outlet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−7.54</td>
<td>−7.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 3 outlet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−7.58</td>
<td>−7.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 4 outlet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−7.61</td>
<td>−7.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 5 outlet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−7.55</td>
<td>−7.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 6 outlet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−7.58</td>
<td>−7.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 7 outlet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>−7.63</td>
<td>−7.28</td>
<td>−7.66</td>
<td>−7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 8 outlet</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−7.57</td>
<td>−7.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 9 outlet</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−7.66</td>
<td>−7.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 10 outlet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>−7.66</td>
<td>−7.27</td>
<td>−7.69</td>
<td>−7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−7.59 ± 0.05</td>
<td>−7.26 ± 0.02</td>
<td>−7.62 ± 0.05</td>
<td>−7.29 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Porosity and surface area change during progressive dissolution

During progressive mineral and rock dissolution, the porosity and surface area can change. In its simplest form, when only mineral dissolution occurs, mass decreases and pore volume increases. The specific surface area for individual grains increases due to reduction in grain size; the overall specific surface area of the material may change differently as small particles may also dissolve to completion, leaving a residue with, on average, larger particles. In more complex cases, progressive water-rock interaction dissolves primary solid phases and forms secondary phases. This can result in solid volume increase if the mole volume of the secondary phases is greater than the mole volume of the primary phases initially. An example is calcium carbonate precipitation experiments in cylindrical plug flow column reactors filled with calcite seed and glass beads (Noiriel et al., 2012, 2015). As a result, porosity can decrease in the rock matrix because of progressive water-rock interaction. In this work, we focused on the simpler case, dissolution only.

The changes in porosity were determined for the inlet and outlet sides of the flow-through reactor column using in situ XMT images. Progressive mineral and rock dissolution caused porosity in the columns to increase. Changes were greatest for basaltic glass, followed by crystalline basalt and forsterite (Fig. 9). Preferential dissolution was observed on the inlet side of the flow-through reactor. This trend was consistent with predictions from the reactive transport modeling, with dissolution of basaltic glass leading to pore volume increase from 50 to 90% on the inlet side but only 60% at the outlet side after 4 weeks of dissolution. These differences within the flow-through reactor system resulted from the pH dependence of the mineral and rock dissolution rates on progressive consumption of $\text{H}^+$ from the solution, increasing the pH and slowing the dissolution rate (Fig. 8). The average final porosity derived from the modeling matched well with the averaged XMT porosity for the glass (4% difference) and crystalline basalt (3% difference) but for olivine, the difference derived from solution composition was 27% higher. The reason for these differences was a different solid mass used for different experiments and the olivine geometric dissolution rate from the inlet side of the reactor matched well with the results of Gislason and Oelkers (2003). Increase of pH and decreasing rates in flow-through systems have been presented previously (Molins et al., 2014). The pH change from the inlet to the outlet of the column resulted in a corresponding dissolution decrease of 0.4–0.6 log units for the three solids studied. This was at a similar order and greater than the changes in the dissolution rate that resulted from changes in surface area at the inlet and outlet of the reactor and with time. It is therefore clear that small changes and heterogeneity in solution composition, including pH, can cause considerable effects on dissolution and the rate of elemental leaching.
Comparision of dissolution rates obtained in this study and reported in the literature.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid</th>
<th>pH/25 °C</th>
<th>Surface area</th>
<th>log ( r_{\text{Si}} ) ( \text{mol/m}^2/\text{s} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basaltic glass</td>
<td>2.25–2.92</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–7.64 ± 0.12</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25–2.92</td>
<td>XMT</td>
<td>–7.25 ± 0.22</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–6.34(^a)</td>
<td>Gislason and Oelkers (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystalline basalt</td>
<td>2.19–2.34</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–8.12 ± 0.24</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.19–2.34</td>
<td>XMT</td>
<td>–7.83 ± 0.23</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–7.64(^b)</td>
<td>Gudbrandsson et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsterite</td>
<td>2.48–2.86</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–7.59 ± 0.05</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsterite</td>
<td>2.48–2.86</td>
<td>XMT</td>
<td>–7.26 ± 0.02</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsterite</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–6.97(^c)</td>
<td>Oelkers (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsterite</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–7.58(^d)</td>
<td>Golubev et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsterite</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–7.46</td>
<td>Rimstidt et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsterite</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>geo</td>
<td>–7.23(^e)</td>
<td>Pokrovsky and Schott (2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Converted to geo from BET surface area.
\(^b\) Extrapolated.

Progressive mineral and rock dissolution decreases grain size and this was observed by XMT and geochemical modeling. Surface area increased as water-rock interaction progressed. The changes were reasonably modeled by the reactive transport simulations, particularly in the case of basaltic glass, but less successfully for forsterite and crystalline basalt (Fig. 10). Very little difference resulted from the method used for calculating surface area, i.e. the sugar lump or the spherical loss approach.

4.3. Do geochemical model calculations predict reactive transport behavior in porous media?

Reactive transport models are used to understand: the composition of natural waters; acidic water generation and leaching of metals from mine wastes; the origin of mineral deposits; the formation and dissolution of rocks and minerals in geologic formations in response to re-injection of industrial wastes, steam, CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\)S; and to predict contaminant plume migration such as radionuclides in waste repositories, biodegradation of chemicals in landfills, and other contaminants (e.g., Steefel et al., 2005).

Comparison of the results from the reactive transport modeling and the experimental observations for solution composition, porosity, and surface area evolution for mineral and rock dissolution in a flowing system revealed some important aspects in the capabilities and limitations of commonly applied reactive transport modeling. First, some of the studied minerals and rocks were not observed to dissolve stoichiometrically. Non-stoichiometric dissolution of minerals and solids is usually not taken into account in geochemical modeling. However, such a modeling approach is possible by redefining individual elemental leaching rates along the flow-path and time rather than bulk mineral or solid dissolution rate. Second, fluid dynamics and preferential flow are commonly ignored in simple reactive transport modeling. This however affects the pore fluid composition and in turn the dissolution rates and changes in pore volume and surface area with time. Faster refill rate of the solution and/or a higher water/rock ratio would enhance the dissolution and porosity generation.

However, the capacity of the model to infer the dissolution dynamics at larger field scales is not affected when the same macroscopic approach is applied to define input parameters as presented here in the models. Moreover, the systems under study were the simplest cases: dissolution far from equilibrium. For systems at close-to-equilibrium, other complications can be introduced like nucleation and growth of secondary phases; flow path heterogeneity favouring non-uniform precipitation patterns; and geometry of porous network and in turn...
closure of flow paths with time (Noiriel et al., 2015; Peuble et al., 2015). Third, similar results were obtained for mineral surface area and surface area normalized dissolution rates independent of the method applied in the calculations, i.e. whether geometric or tomographic normalized surface area was used for calculating solid dissolution rates or whether the simple spherical model or the more complicated sugar lump model was used. Fourth, the dissolution rates obtained from a complex flow-through system were observed to be comparable to those obtained from mixed flow reactor experiments at far from equilibrium. However, observed differences in our results arose from changes in the properties of the solid and solution along the flow path and as a function of time, such as surface area heterogeneity and pH variations. Such variations must be included in computations to be able to compare the two systems. Fifth, the calculated porosity and surface area changes along flow-path and time were observed to represent similar trends as those measured, however, accurate values are difficult to predict. This points towards the problem of the predicting capabilities of reactive transport modeling, i.e. calculations of pore
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Fig. 8. Dissolution rates derived from the reactive transport modeling as a function of distance through the reactor. Model I used the sugar lump approach to estimate change in surface area (gray) and Model II assumed spherical particles with homogeneous loss (black).

Fig. 9. Experiment (symbols) and model derived (lines) porosity as a function of distance at initial conditions (gray square and gray line marked), 2 and 4 weeks of interaction. The model that used simple spherical dissolution is the solid line, the model that used sugar lump dissolution is shown as a dashed black line.
volumes and mineral and rock surface area changes with time and along flow paths that in turn are key parameters in determining dissolution rates, overall chemical mass movement in the system, and fluid flow paths and velocities.

5. Conclusions

Mineral and rock dissolution was studied experimentally using flow-through reactors and reactive transport modeling. The studied rocks and minerals were forsterite and crystalline and amorphous basalt, dissolved in HCl solutions at pH ~2.5. Solution composition, particle surface area, and porosity were determined as a function of reaction time and travel distance within the reactor, using in situ X-ray computed tomography (XMT) and chemical composition of the inlet and outlet solutions. Comparison of the results from the modeling and experiments demonstrate some important points.

(1) The dissolution rates far from equilibrium obtained here using a complex flow-through system were observed to be comparable to those obtained from mixed flow reactor experiments. The rates, normalized to the initial geometric surface area, were: log $r_{\text{Si}}$ $= -7.59 \pm 0.05$ for forsterite, $-7.64 \pm 0.12$ for basaltic glass and $-8.12 \pm 0.24$ (mol/m²/s) for crystalline basalt, at 25°C and pH ~2.5.

(2) Some of the minerals and rocks were not observed to dissolve stoichiometrically; such non-stoichiometric dissolution of minerals and solids is commonly not taken into account in reactive transport modeling.

(3) Similar results were obtained independent of the method applied in the calculations for mineral surface area and surface area normalized dissolution rates, i.e. whether geometric or tomographic normalized surface area was used or whether the simple spherical model or more complicated sugar lump model implemented.

(4) Mineral and rock dissolution resulted in increased porosity and specific surface area of the solids; these changes were not uniformly distributed along the fluid flow path or with time. Similar trends were predicted by reactive transport modeling, however, true values were difficult to predict. It follows that accurate prediction capabilities of simple reactive transport modeling may be limited for calculating pore volume and mineral and rock surface area changes with time and along flow paths that in turn are key parameters in determining dissolution rates, overall chemical mass movement in the system, and fluid flow paths and velocities.
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Highlights:

- H$_2$S injection into rocks is cheap and a sustainable abatement method.
- Optimal sequestration condition is 200-250 °C with fluid’s acidic pH and H$_2$S 10-30 mmol/kg.
- Formation of Fe silicates is limiting factor in H$_2$S sequestration efficiency.
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ABSTRACT

Reduction of H₂S emissions from geothermal power plants is an important environmental, economic, and social challenge that needs to be addressed. The geochemistry associated with H₂S injection into a geothermal reservoir with a basaltic host rock followed by sulfide mineralization was investigated experimentally, and reactive transport modeling used to determine the geochemical feasibility of such H₂S sequestration. Re-injection of H₂S-rich fluids into geothermal systems resulted in the dissolution of basalt followed by the mineralization of the H₂S into pyrite and pyrrhotite. At a neutral pH of the injected solution the H₂S mineralization was observed to be slow and result in limited H₂S mineralization, whereas at acid pH the reaction rates are much faster, and up to ~62% of the injected H₂S mineralized. The rate of H₂S mineralization was observed to be limited by Fe leaching rates from basaltic glass, suggesting that the rock dissolution rate is the limiting factor of H₂S sequestration in geothermal systems. The long-term effects of H₂S-rich fluid re-injection into geothermal systems (> 100 years) apparently results in increased porosity close to the outlet of the injection well due to rock dissolution, whereas pyrite formation has only limited effects on the porosity of the entire system. The optimized conditions of H₂S sequestration are moderate H₂S concentrations of re-injection fluids (10–30 mmol/kg) with acid pH/25 °C ~ 2–3, and reaction temperatures of 200–250 °C. Higher H₂S concentrations result in a lower sequestration proportion due to the limited supply of Fe from the host rocks for sulfide precipitation. Higher temperatures result in the uptake of Fe by minerals other than pyrite, such as epidote, and also lower the proportion of sequestration. H₂S re-injection and sequestration in geothermal systems is thought to be a geochemically and economically feasible option, as the method is cheaper than commonly used procedures today.

1. Introduction

Hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) is among the major elements in geothermal fluids, with concentrations ranging from a few ppb to hundreds of ppm (e.g., Kaasalainen and Stefánsson, 2011; Stefánsson et al., 2015; Gunnarsson-Robin et al., 2017). Although geothermal energy generation is more environmentally friendly than many other energy sources like coal, oil and gas, geothermal power plants also contribute to atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) and H₂S pollution (e.g., DiPippo, 2012). Odor can be detected even at very low concentrations or ~1 μg/m³, and when exceeding 1500 μg/m³ H₂S is considered toxic to humans, animals and vegetation (e.g., Koch and Erskine, 2001; Selene and Chou, 2003). Moreover, contact with atmospheric oxygen may cause the oxidation of H₂S to elemental sulfur (S), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄) and result in the formation of acid rain, which damages structures, buildings, agricultural crops, and other vegetation (e.g., Greaver et al., 2012; Likens et al., 1979). Over the last two decades, local (e.g., in Iceland, 5/14/2010) and international (World Health Organization, 2000) air quality regulations have been enacted to control the anthropogenic harmfulness, with the maximum atmospheric H₂S concentrations not allowed to exceed 50–150 μg/m³ in 24 h, depending on location.

A method proposed to abate the H₂S emissions from geothermal power plants is re-injection into the geothermal reservoir followed by mineralization into sulfides (e.g., Stefánsson et al., 2011). Such re-injection is currently being tested at the Hellisheiði geothermal plant, SW Iceland, in a project named SulFix. A mixture of H₂S and CO₂ is injected together with condensed steam and waste water into the geothermal reservoir (Gunnarsson et al., 2013). The interaction between host basaltic rocks and gas-loaded water at temperatures above 230 °C is thought to result in the precipitation of H₂S as secondary minerals (Stefánsson et al., 2011). The minerals involved in the reactions may
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include various sulfides such as pyrite and pyrrhotite as well as prehnite, epidote and magnetite (Stefánsson and Arnórsson, 2002; Stefánsson et al., 2015; Gunnarsson-Robin et al., 2017). However, the rates and mechanisms, possible changes in rock porosity upon sulfide mineralization and prolonged sustainability of H$_2$S re-injection into geothermal system are not well understood.

The aim of the present study is to assess the geochemical reactions associated with H$_2$S re-injection and mineralization in geothermal systems, in particular the reaction mechanisms, secondary minerals involved, the effects of pH, temperature, H$_2$S concentration on the rate of mineralization, and the long-term changes within the geothermal reservoir. In order to answer these questions, flow-through experiments were conducted on basalt in the form of glass reacted with an H$_2$S-rich solution under geothermal conditions (100–250 °C). Both solution chemistry and alteration mineralogy were analyzed. Furthermore, reactive transport modeling was carried out to further support the mechanisms for the reactions and forecast long-term geochemical effects on H$_2$S re-injection into geothermal systems.

2. Application of experiments and modeling to large-scale H$_2$S sequestration problems

Large-scale geothermal processes can be studied quickly and reliably using experiments and geochemical modeling. A combination of small-scale flow-through experiments and reactive transport numerical simulations in an open system, where fluid-rock interaction causes H$_2$S abatement, occurs as an analogue to a field scenario (Fig. 1). With such a method, we can sample and study changes in rock, physical properties, secondary minerals, solution composition and the sulfide precipitation process as a function of reaction distance, time or system conditions. This profoundly reduces any environmental hazard and investment risk and the findings can easily be enlarged for field scale applications.

3. Experimental details

3.1. Experimental solutions

The initial aqueous solutions were created following two different experimental series, A and B. In series A, two solutions were mixed inline prior to entering the flow-through reactor; one solution consisted of an H$_2$S-rich solution made from Na$_2$S (Sigma-Aldrich®, > 99.99%) and deionized water with a pH of ~12, whereas the other solution was a ~0.01 M HCl solution (Sigma-Aldrich®) of a pH of ~2. The desired pH of the mixed inlet fluid was reached by adjusting the flow rates of the two solutions. In series B, a single inlet solution was prepared by dissolving Na$_2$S in degassed deionized water followed by adjustment of the pH using 0.01 M HCl (Sigma) to a value of ~7. For series B, the ionic strength of the solutions was adjusted using NaCl (Sigma-Aldrich®, > 99%). For both experimental series A and B, the concentrations of all the inlet solutions were undersaturated with respect to sulfide minerals, including pyrite and pyrrhotite. The composition of the initial aqueous solutions is given in Tables 1 and 3.

3.2. Solid material

The solid material used in the experiments consisted of basaltic glass collected from Mt. Stapafell, SW Iceland. The solid material was ground and then sieved to obtain a 45–125 μm size fraction which was then used in the experiments. The material was ultrasonically cleaned in deionized water and acetone. An ultrafine suspension was removed at the end of each cleaning cycle. The cleaned material was dried overnight at 50 °C. The chemical composition of the basaltic glass is given in Table 2 (Oelkers and Gislason, 2001) and the geometric surface area ($A_{geo}$) was calculated to be 261 cm$^2$/g using the method of Tester et al. (1994).

3.3. Experimental setup

The experiments were carried out at 100, 200, 240 and 250 °C using a 29-cm long flow-through column reactor. A schematic illustration of the reactor system is shown in Fig. 2. It consisted of inlet solutions, HPLC pump(s) (Chromotech®), an inline sample valve (Vici), a reaction column made of Inconel and filled with basaltic glass, a cooling jacket, and a back pressure regulator (Coretest). All wetted parts of the experimental apparatus were made of inert material, including PEEK, titanium and Inconel. The reactor was heated to within ± 2 °C of the desired temperature using a heating mantle and a temperature controlling system. The experimental pressures were kept at ~55 bar. The flow-rate of the inlet solutions was ~0.5 ml/min. The experimental conditions are summarized in Table 1. For the series A experiments, two inlet solutions were pumped into a mixing chamber and connected with a tube to the reactor, whereas in the series B experiments, only one inlet solution was used. The series A experiments were carried out at 100, 200 and 240 °C, whereas the series B experiments were carried out at 250 °C.
3.4. Solution analysis

Samples of the outlet solutions were collected at the low-pressure end of the back pressure regulator for major elemental analysis. Samples of the inlet solutions were collected using an in-line sampling loop (series A) or directly from the inlet solution bottle (series B). About 5 ml of solution were collected for immediate pH analysis using a combination pH electrode (713 Metrohm pH electrode coupled to a Mettler Toledo Inlab® 422 potentiometer). A further sample was collected for the determination of total dissolved sulfide (H₂S) analyzed by precipitation titration using mercuric acetate as a titrant and dithiozone as an indicator (Arnórsson et al., 2006). Samples for major elemental determination (Si, Na, K, Mg, Ca, Fe, Al and Cl) were filtered through a 0.2 μm filter (cellulose acetate), acidified to 1% using HNO₃ (Merck, Suprapur®), and degassed using N₂ followed by analysis using ICP-OES (Spectro Vision). The analytical precision based on repeated analysis of the internal standard (GYG13) at the 95% confidence level was > 3% for most elements, but as high as ∼14% for Fe. The error of the pH measurements was estimated to be ± 0.05 pH units.

3.5. Solid analysis

The surface morphology, before and after the experiments, and the secondary mineralogical composition of the solid products were analyzed using scanning electron microscopy (LEO Supra™ 25 FE-SEM) and standard energy-dispersive spectrometry (EDS), both at the Innovation Center Iceland, Reykjavík. All chemical analysis was performed using an acceleration voltage of 20 kV, a beam current of 200 pA and a beam diameter of 1–2 μm. Natural and synthetic minerals and glasses were used as standards to check for potential drift.

In addition, the chemical composition of the alteration products was determined using electron microprobe analysis (EMPA) with JOEL Superprobe JSL 8200 at the University of Copenhagen. The analysis was performed using an acceleration voltage of 15 kV, a beam current of 15 nA and a beam diameter of 2 μm. Natural and synthetic minerals and glasses were used as standards to check for potential drift.

3.6. Dissolution rates

The steady-state sequestration rates \( r_{geo} \) (log mol/m²/s) have been
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Table 1
Summary of the initial experimental conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>T °C</th>
<th>Mass of basaltic glass</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Inlet solution</th>
<th>pH/22 °C</th>
<th>∑S mmol/kg</th>
<th>Initial porosity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1-1504</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>5.94–7.70</td>
<td>10.4–13.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1-glass</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.39–2.59</td>
<td>1.64–2.55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1-BG-240</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.75–2.04</td>
<td>7.28–15.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG-1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>7.26–7.50</td>
<td>2.50–3.76</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The composition of the basaltic glass from Stapafell used in the experiments and NORM basalt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stapafell\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>N-MORB\textsuperscript{b}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>49.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe₂O₃</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeO</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe₉O₉</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na₂O</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₂O₅</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Oelkers and Gislason (2001).
\textsuperscript{b} GERG (2000).
calculated for different elements applying the following equation,

$$ r_{geo} = \frac{Q \times (m_{inlet} - m_{outlet})}{A_{geo} \times M} $$

where $Q$ refers to the flow rate, and $m_{inlet}$ and $m_{outlet}$ are the concentrations of the $i$-th element in the inlet and outlet solutions, respectively. To obtain the precipitation rate of minerals and the leaching concentrations of the $i$-th element in the inlet and outlet solutions, respectively. To obtain the precipitation rate of minerals and the leaching concentrations of the $i$-th element in the inlet and outlet solutions, respectively.

4. Numerical modeling

Reactive transport modeling was performed using the PHREEQC program (Parkhurst and Appelo, 2013) and PHREEQM module (Parkhurst and Wissmeier, 2015) for parallel computing in order to simulate the reactions occurring and influencing H$_2$S mineralization under geothermal conditions. A one dimension advective-dispersive-reactive transport (Appelo and Postma, 2005) was computed to mimic the flow-through column reactor experiments and enlarged field scale simulations at 250 °C as the most relevant to the Hellsheim geothermal plant conditions. Dispersivity in each cell (10% of travelled distance) was corrected for the total length of the cell and we assumed no diffusion. The system was divided into reactive cells to track reaction progress as a function of column distance, with variable transport calculation steps to calculate experimental or prolonged duration. This number of transport shifts depended on the initial pore volume and corresponding solution refill rate; the time step associated with each shift was 3 min for experiments and 28 h for field scale simulation.

The rate of basaltic glass dissolution was calculated using the transition state theory for the $i$-th solid phase,

$$ r_{i} = A_{geo} v_{i} \sum_{j} k_{ij} \prod_{i} a_{ij}^{q_{ij}} (1 - S_{i}) $$

where $A_{geo}$ is the geometric normalized reactive surface area, $k_{ij}$ is the kinetic rate constant, $\prod_{i} a_{ij}^{q_{ij}}$ is an activity expression for the $j$-th solid phase.
dissolved aqueous species in solution to the power of the reaction order of species $j$, $n$, and $S_i$ is the saturation index.

The geometric normalized reactive surface area of basaltic glass $A_{geo}^{n}$, was obtained from the sugar-lump model (Noiriel et al., 2009),

$$A_{geo}^{n} = \frac{Q_i}{K_i} = \prod \frac{a_i^j}{a_{i,j}^{n,j}}$$

where $Q_i$ and $K_i$ are the reaction quotient and equilibrium constant of the $i$-th mineral, and $a_i$ and $v_i$ are the respective activities to the stoichiometric power that are negative for reactants and positive for products. The thermodynamic properties of aqueous species and minerals used to calculate the mineral solubility at water saturation pressure were taken from Phillips et al. (1988), Delaney and Wolery (1989), Johnson et al. (1992), Arnórsson and Stefánsson (1999), Gysi and Stefánsson (2011), Holland and Powell (2011), and Aradóttir et al. (2012). The aqueous speciation and reaction quotients were calculated with the aid of the PHREEQc program.

Two sets of reactive transport models were conducted (model I and II), the difference between the models reflecting variable mineral paragenesis. Model I incorporated the formation of secondary mineral phases observed experimentally in this study, whereas model II included mineralization of secondary phases commonly observed in geothermal systems at temperatures between 200 and 300 °C (e.g., Kristmannsdóttir, 1979; Stefánsson et al., 2011).

Finally, the total porosity $\phi$ within the reactor was calculated based on the volume difference of an empty reactor ($V_{reactor}$) and the volume of the solid material in the reactor, $V_{material}$.

$$\phi = \frac{V_{reactor} - V_{material}}{V_{reactor}} \times 100 = \frac{V_{reactor} - \sum m_i/\rho_i}{V_{reactor}} \times 100$$

where $m_i$ is the mass of basaltic glass and secondary phases, and $\rho_i$ are the respective densities.

5. Assessing the process of $H_2S$ sequestration into rocks

5.1. Solution trends

The chemical composition of the inlet and outlet experimental solutions is reported in Table 3. The inlet solution composition was very variable, whereas at each temperature the outlet solution composition was relatively constant. This was best reflected by the pH variations. The inlet pH varied from acid to neutral pH. However, pH of all the outlet solutions was neutral to mildly alkaline within a relatively narrow pH range with few exceptions: 6.55–7.26 at 100 °C, 7.68–8.20 at 200 °C, 6.03–9.39 at 240 °C and 8.90–9.68 at 250 °C (Fig. 3A). The same was observed for the major elemental chemical composition (Table 3). After the initial period of 2–4 days, most elemental concentrations including Si, Ca and Fe reached a stable concentration, with the absolute concentrations varying depending on temperature.

The concentrations of $H_2S$ in the outlet solution are shown in Fig. 3B. In all cases, they attained close to a constant value at a given temperature, independently of the inlet $H_2S$ concentration in solution: 8.50–9.69 mmol/kg at 100 °C, 0.40–1.19 mmol/kg at 200 °C, and 1.77–2.78 mmol/kg at 250 °C (Fig. 3B). This is thought to indicate that fluid-rock interaction influenced the $H_2S$ concentration at each temperature and pH, rather than the input $H_2S$ concentration.

5.2. Secondary mineralogy

The typical surface morphology and secondary phases, with relative EDS spectra, obtained with the experiments are presented in Fig. 4 and the chemical composition determined by EMPA analysis is listed in Table 4. The most abundant ratio of precipitated secondary phases was observed on the inlet side, decreasing into the reactor along the flow-
The secondary minerals containing sulfur included pyrrhotite that was only observed at 200 °C, whereas pyrite was the major sulfide mineral at 100, 240 and 250 °C. The pyrite displayed euhedral crystals of ∼1–3 μm, pyrrhotite up to ∼20 μm. On the other hand, only a small amount of pyrite was observed at 100 °C, together with prevailing secondary iron oxides. Other common phases identified in the experiments are clay minerals at 100 °C, prehnite at 200 °C, and the solid solution of clinozoisite-epidote at 250 °C, with a prevailing clinozoisite end-member. Clinozoisite forms mostly subhedral crystals up to 5 μm, and its precipitation seems to be more abundant in the upper part of the reactor than sulfides.

Further inspection of the alteration products of basalt at 200 °C (Table 4) reveals three trends in cross sections: composition close to altered basalt, composition close to pyrrhotite and an alteration rim with composition close to that encountered in smectite, and chlorite members rich in Mg and Fe as, for instance, saponite. Calcium-containing phases such as feldspars, zeolites, epidote end-member and wollastonite were not observed within the alteration product according to the EMPA analysis, whereas a clinozoisite in solid path. The secondary minerals containing sulfur included pyrrhotite that was only observed at 200 °C, whereas pyrite was the major sulfide mineral at 100, 240 and 250 °C. The pyrite displayed euhedral crystals of ∼1–3 μm pyrite, and pyrrhotite up to ∼20 μm. On the other hand, only a small amount of pyrite was observed at 100 °C, together with prevailing secondary iron oxides. Other common phases identified in the experiments are clay minerals at 100 °C, prehnite at 200 °C, and the solid solution of clinozoisite-epidote at 250 °C, with a prevailing clinozoisite end-member. Clinozoisite forms mostly subhedral crystals up to 5 μm, and its precipitation seems to be more abundant in the upper part of the reactor than sulfides.

**Table 4**

The composition of altered material, selected EMPA analyses on reaction rim after experiments at 200 °C (R1-glass). Altered basaltic glass = BG, Pyrrhotite = Prh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>wt%</th>
<th>AB-1</th>
<th>AB-2</th>
<th>s5-33</th>
<th>s5-34</th>
<th>s6-2</th>
<th>s6-16</th>
<th>s6-26</th>
<th>s6-27</th>
<th>s6-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr₂O₃</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₃</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeO</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na₂O</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>99.95</td>
<td>100.11</td>
<td>89.64</td>
<td>86.46</td>
<td>90.85</td>
<td>88.62</td>
<td>86.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
solution and prehnite were clearly identified by SEM and EDS analysis. Moreover, anhydrite and other sulfate minerals were absent from the alteration product, suggesting a limited oxidation of $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ to $\text{SO}_4$ in the experiments.

6. Discussion

6.1. $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ mineralization under geothermal conditions

The decrease in $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ concentrations between the inlet and outlet solutions, together with the observed formation of sulfide minerals like pyrite and pyrrhotite, indicate that $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ mineralization took place with a fluid-rock reaction of $\text{H}_2\text{S}$-rich solutions and basaltic rocks under geothermal conditions.

The process of mineralization of $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ from solution may be summarized from the percentage difference between the $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ concentration in the inlet and outlet solutions. The difference at 100 °C corresponds to up ∼ 22% of the injected $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ converted into sulfur-containing minerals, like pyrite and possibly also into elemental sulfur (e.g. Meyer, 1976; Stefánsson et al., 2011), whereas at 200, 240 and 250 °C the difference indicates that ∼ 62% of $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ are mineralized into pyrite and pyrrhotite at an acidic pH and up to ∼ 30% at a neutral pH.

In Fig. 5, the activities of $\text{H}_2\text{S}(aq)$ in the outlet experimental solutions are compared with those calculated, assuming equilibrium with mineral buffers in reactions thought to control $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ concentrations under geothermal conditions (e.g., Stefánsson and Arnórsson, 2002; Stefánsson et al., 2015; Gunnarsson-Robin et al., 2017). The $\text{H}_2\text{S}(aq)$ activities in the reservoir fluids in the Hellisheiði geothermal system are also shown for comparison (Scott et al., 2014). As observed, the results of the experiments at 200–250 °C were close to those predicted, assuming equilibrium between fluids and selected minerals. The same was true with respect to geothermal fluids at Hellisheiði. In contrast, the experimental outlet solutions at 100 °C were considerably higher concentrated than those predicted by fluid-mineral equilibria. This suggests that at low temperature (100 °C) a significant amount of time is needed to attain equilibrium with respect to $\text{H}_2\text{S}$, whereas at higher temperatures (> 200 °C) the attainment of $\text{H}_2\text{S}$-fluid-mineral equilibria is relatively rapid.
Many of the reactions suggested to possibly control H$_2$S concentration in geothermal fluids involve Ca-containing aluminum silicate minerals, such as epidote, grossular and wollastonite, which were not observed to form during the experiments. Investigation of the equilibrium with respect to some of these minerals reveals that the outlet experimental solutions were supersaturated with, for example, epidote (Fig. 6), resulting in higher Ca concentrations in the outlet experimental solutions than observed for natural geothermal fluids. This suggests that either more time is needed to attain equilibrium with common Ca-containing aluminum silicates than for pyrite, or that the system is mass limited, i.e. that there is a limited supply of some elements such as Al needed to form the Ca-containing aluminum silicates.

6.2. Rates and mechanisms of H$_2$S mineralization under geothermal conditions

The H$_2$S mineralization rates were calculated using the difference between inlet and outlet H$_2$S concentrations, the flow rate, and the basaltic glass surface area in the flow-through reactor (Eq. (1)). With the stoichiometric coefficient for Fe in pyrite and pyrrhotite the rate was normalized to Fe precipitation rates of the respective sulfides. The results are shown in Fig. 7 as a function of pH. At each temperature, relatively steady state rates were observed within 1–2 days after the start of the experiments, with rates increasing with a decreasing pH of the solution. The precipitation rates of H$_2$S are affected by the fluid’s pH rather than by temperature and concentration (Fig. 7). However, at 100 °C the precipitation rates of Fe compounds did not correspond to the H$_2$S mineralization rate into sulfides completely, as elemental sulfur was formed too. This reaction explains the tiny amount of pyrite observed by SEM-EDS. In contrast, the H$_2$S mineralization rates at 250 °C correspond closely to the Fe dissolution rates modeled for basalt, based on mass balance. This suggests that the limiting factor in H$_2$S mineralization on re-injection of H$_2$S-rich fluids into geothermal systems is the leaching rate and availability of Fe. As the primary rock was dissolved during the transport, the pH of the fluid causes different release rates of Fe, which has a substantial effect on H$_2$S abatement, calculated from the dissolution and precipitation rates.

To get further insight into the mineralization of H$_2$S into pyrite, reactive transport calculations were conducted, simulating the conditions of the experimental flow-through the reactor. The results of the calculations reveal that the fluid-rock interaction process and H$_2$S mineralization along the flow-path of the flow-through reactor is somewhat more complicated than implied by the bulk basaltic glass dissolution and H$_2$S mineralization rates. Upon injection of H$_2$S-rich solutions into the flow-through reactor, an analogue to H$_2$S re-injection into geothermal reservoirs, rapid basaltic dissolution occurred, followed by H$_2$S mineralization into pyrite. Moreover, the basaltic glass dissolution results in the uptake of H$^+$, increased pH of the pore solution along the flow path, and decreased basaltic glass dissolution rates and, hence, the quantity of alteration products. The results of the reactive transport calculations also demonstrate that the H$_2$S mineralization depends on secondary mineral paragenesis. Assuming that the pyrite-clinozoisite-clinochlore (model I) dominates the alteration mineralogy, the greater part of the Fe released from basaltic glass was consumed by pyrite. In contrast, assuming that pyrite, pyrrhotite, prehnite and epidote dominates the alteration mineralogy (model II), less H$_2$S mineralization into pyrite is observed due to significant uptake of Fe by epidote (Fig. 8). However, independent of modeled alteration mineralogy, pyrite is observed to preferentially form on the inlet side of the reactor, where the Fe leaching rate is rapid.

6.3. Sustainability of H$_2$S sequestration into geothermal systems

Based on the results of short term experimental and reactive transport modeling it is clear that H$_2$S-rich solutions re-injected into geothermal reservoirs with basaltic host rocks at temperatures higher than 200 °C are likely to cause vigorous dissolution of the primary rocks, followed by pyrite formation. However, the sustainability of such long-term injections and sequestration are unknown. Among the main questions needed to be answered for optimal H$_2$S sequestration in geothermal systems are: (1) the prolonged availability of Fe for pyrite formation, (2) the movement of the pyrite mineralization zone eventually reaching production wells, and (3) clogging of the reservoir due to intensive mineralization of pyrite close to the H$_2$S-rich fluid re-injection well.

In order to answer these questions, the reactive transport simulations were extended to cover a duration of H$_2$S-rich fluid re-injection for 120 years at 250 °C with conditions similar to those observed at Hellisheiði and associated with the Sulfix project (e.g., Gunnarsson et al., 2013). The system was characterized by an initial 10% porosity flow of 8.9 m/day and H$_2$S concentration of the injection fluid entering the reservoir of ~30 mmol/kg (Gunnarsson et al., 2011; Gunnarsson et al., 2013). The reactor dimensions were scaled up to 96 m in length and 3.6 m in width. In accordance with the reactive modeling (Fig. 9) the porosity close to the re-injection well was observed to increase with time due to the vigorous dissolution of the basaltic glass and formation of secondary minerals dominated by pyrite and some chlorite and epidote. A few meters into the geothermal reservoir, away from the outlet of the re-injection well (∼40 m within 120 years), the fluid-rock interaction had reached fluid chemistry and alteration mineralogy patterns observed within natural geothermal systems. Furthermore, the system maintained a similar rate over 120 years (a convenient time frame with other short-term simulations), dissolving 26% of the 2600 t of initial basalt, and precipitating 114 t of pyrite in 120 years. The modeled porous medium, of 10$^3$ m$^3$ (area of 0.001 km$^2$), could sequestrate 32 t of H$_2$S (16% of injected H$_2$S within the modeled volume) without clogging the system. This means 32 000 t/year emissions at Hellisheiði would be safely captured within a volume of 10$^3$ m$^3$ of rock, which will still have ~75% of its mass available for fluid-rock reaction. However, coating of the surface by secondary phases has not been considered and could mean an additional limitation of Fe supply. Fig. 9 shows a partly mobile reaction front for secondary minerals forming, where the mass of precipitated silicates is being shifted and re-mineralized farther along the flow path with elapsed time. On the other hand, sulfides were stable after precipitation and subsequent re-disolution was not observed within the duration studied.

6.4. Comparison of Sulfix with common sequestration methods: economic implications

The reduction of the anthropogenic sulfur discharges into the atmosphere was influenced by the cost of the H$_2$S abatement systems and the urgency to decrease the emissions to meet air quality regulations. Many geothermal power plants have already been equipped with H$_2$S abatement apparatus (∼90% removal factor), employing burning and scrubbing with alkali, liquid-redox processes (e.g., Stretford, Unisulf, LO-CAT, SuFerox, and Hiperon), and oxidizing biocide “BIOX”, from which the H$_2$S is converted to sulfates, elemental sulfur, and water-soluble sulfates, respectively (e.g., Dalrymple et al., 1989; Farison et al., 2010; Gallup, 1994; Nagl, 2009; Owen and Michels, 1984; Rodríguez et al., 2014; Sanopoulos and Karabelas, 1997; Stephens et al., 1980; Takahashi and Kuragaki, 2000; World Environment Center, 1994). A plant-specific method called AMIS has been implemented in the Italian field of Larderello, to deal with the particularly mercury-rich geothermal resources (Baldacci, 2004). Thanks to the AMIS process, the average specific emissions of mercury and H$_2$S decrease by 23 and 30%, respectively, producing sulfur dioxide (Periot et al., 2015). An example of methods used in the gas industry, which are potentially applicable to geothermal power plants, is the THIOPAQ, which involves the use of microorganisms for oxidizing the H$_2$S to elemental sulfur (Benschop et al., 2002; Padilla, 2007). However, despite the different technicalities and final by-products, the standard abatement methods have
relatively high operating costs in common (Table 5).

A more attractive option for the geothermal industry is on-site H$_2$S injection (SulFix), together with condensed steam and waste water, into the geothermal reservoir, where the cost per tonne of sequestered H$_2$S is one or even two orders of magnitude lower than that of the other methods. For example, if all the H$_2$S produced by the world’s largest geothermal power plants, The Geysers (USA), were to be injected into the host reservoir, the final estimated cost would be $< 300,000 per year, which is twenty times lower than the current abatement expenses. Still, this assessment depends on the success of H$_2$S mineralization through underground re-injection into different reservoir lithologies. To date, this strategy has been tested on basalt only, whereas most of the world reservoirs are characterized by intermediate to acidic rocks. Most importantly, the Fe concentration of the geothermal magmatic suite of host rocks, which has been suggested as a limiting factor in H$_2$S mineralization, should be evaluated.

7. Conclusions

Reduction of H$_2$S emissions from geothermal power plants is an important environmental, economic, and social challenge that needs to be addressed. The geochemistry associated with H$_2$S-injection into a geothermal reservoir with basaltic host rock followed by sulfide mineralization was investigated experimentally and reactive transport modeling used to determine the geochemical feasibility of such H$_2$S sequestration.

Re-injection of H$_2$S-rich fluids into geothermal systems resulted in dissolution of basalt, followed by mineralization of the H$_2$S into pyrite. At low temperatures (∼100 °C) the reactions were observed to be limited to stable H$_2$S mineralization. At higher temperatures...
Moreover, concentrations of the re-injected H$_2$S observed not to decrease porosity fundamentally and possibly clog the well due to rock dissolution, and the fact that pyrite formation was thermal systems are the porosity increase close to the outlet of injection geochemically feasible method for the reduction of H$_2$S concentrations were found to result in quantitatively greater H$_2$S sequestration e.

Table 5: H$_2$S abatement costs and methods for a suite of geothermal power plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Power Plant</th>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>H$_2$S emission before abatement (t/y)</th>
<th>Abatement method</th>
<th>Abatement cost ($/t$ of H$_2$S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador$^a$</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>THIOPAQ</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland$^b$</td>
<td>Heliliehei</td>
<td>basalt</td>
<td>16900</td>
<td>SulFix</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy$^c$</td>
<td>Larderello</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>19635</td>
<td>AMIS</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Coso$^d$</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>LO-CAT II</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Geyser$^e$</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>6170</td>
<td>Burn/scrub</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Geyser$^e$</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>3880</td>
<td>Streftord</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Highlights:

- CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S mineralization within geothermal reservoir is geochemically feasible.
- Carbonates and sulfides form within basaltic to silicic reservoirs in few days.
- This abatement method can be scaled up worldwide and over at least 50 years.
- The re-injection of CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S is five time cheaper the H\textsubscript{2}S-only abatement systems.
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Abstract

Geothermal fluid utilization is considered one of the green energy sources. Yet, mitigation strategies must be applied to reduce the associated pollutants like carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) and toxic hydrogen sulfide (H$_2$S) emissions. One suggested method is the re-injection of the two gases back into the geothermal reservoir wherein carbon and sulfur are expected to mineralize naturally for a long-term underground storage. However, CO$_2$ and H$_2$S mineralization rates for natural systems are not well defined. To address the feasibility of such sequestration, experiments were conducted at 250°C for several reservoir rock types, ranging from basaltic to silicic. Analysis of solution composition and secondary mineralogy confirmed the precipitation of Fe-Ca carbonates and Fe sulfide for all the rocks within days. The measured mineralization rates indicate that ~0.2-0.5 t of CO$_2$, and ~0.03-0.05 t of H$_2$S can be sequestrated annually per cubic meter of rock, depending on reservoir lithology and surface area. Calculations show that a total rock sequestration capacity of ~0.03 km$^3$ would be sufficient to store the annual world CO$_2$ and H$_2$S geothermal emissions. These findings indicate efficient abatement of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S at field conditions, confirming the strategy applicability for at least the typical 50 years-lifetime of geothermal power plants.

1 Introduction

The increasing level of carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) in the atmosphere is considered to cause climate change (IPCC, 2014). The fraction of anthropogenic CO$_2$ in the atmosphere amounts to ~30% (~900 Gt) (Hofmann et al., 2009), with geothermal exploitations contributing only ~9 Mt/yr through more enhanced natural discharges (Bertani, 2016; Fridriksson et al., 2016). However, besides CO$_2$, geothermal activity emits hydrogen sulfide (H$_2$S), which is toxic and life-threatening when above 100 ppm (ATSDR, 2016), and commonly contains pollutant elements such as arsenic, boron, and mercury (Barbier, 2002). If present at high concentrations in the geothermal fluids, these chemicals represent a major environmental concern once released to the environment at surface (e.g., Hansell and Oppenheimer, 2010; Kristmannsdóttir and Ármannsson, 2003). One developing method to reduce the geothermal CO$_2$ and H$_2$S emissions is the re-injection of the gases together with condensed steam and/or waste water back into the reservoir where natural fluid-rock interactions are considered to lead to mineralization of secondary carbonates and sulfides, respectively (Aradóttir et al., 2015). This option offers the
advantages of avoiding major modifications on the power plants, costly CO₂ and H₂S separation steps, and generation of waste by-products while harvesting the heat energy.

A number of laboratory and field investigations have focused on the CO₂ sequestration potential of mafic rocks, demonstrating its potential and the associated environmental and societal benefits (e.g., Galeczka et al., 2014; Gysi and Stefánsson, 2012; Matter et al., 2016; Matter et al., 2007; McGrail et al., 2016; Rosenbauer et al., 2012; Schaef et al., 2009; Shibuya et al., 2013). The results highlight the feasibility of long-term underground storage of greenhouse gas in a solid state. On the other hand, very few studies have considered the H₂S abatement through geological storage (e.g., Bachu and Gunter, 2005), and even less through mineralization at geothermal conditions (Přikryl et al., 2018; Stefánsson et al., 2011). Technical difficulties encountered during re-injection tests in the field, such as gas breakthrough and well casing corrosion, have led to the development of other abatement technologies (Sanopoulos and Karabelas, 1997). For instance, a more conventional and usually expensive approach commonly in use to reduce H₂S emissions from geothermal power plants is oxidation to form elemental sulfur or sulfuric acid (Rappold and Lackner, 2010; Rodríguez et al., 2014). However, the recent successful H₂S re-injection into the basaltic reservoir at the Hellisheiði power plant, SW Iceland, has put this option under the spotlight (Gunnarsson et al., 2015). Nonetheless, considerable uncertainties remain relating to the co-mineralization potential, especially the effects of H₂S mineralization on the CO₂ sequestration, chemical variability of host-rocks, and reservoir capacity. To address these issues, we investigate the geochemical applicability of re-injection of CO₂ and H₂S into geothermal reservoirs by conducting experiments on a suite of typical host-rocks and the potentials of such sequestration method for geothermal systems worldwide.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Solid material

Three volcanic glasses were used to account for the compositional variability of the main common rock types associated with geothermal systems worldwide: basaltic glass (BG) (Stapafell Mountain, SW Iceland); dacitic glass (DG) (Hekla volcano, S Iceland); and rhyolitic glass (RG) (Askja caldera, NE Iceland) (Oelkers and Gislason, 2001; Wolff-Boenisch et al., 2004). The solid material was ground, and then sieved to obtain a 45–125 µm size fraction, which was then used in the experiments. The material was cleaned ultrasonically in deionized water and acetone to obtain grains with smooth surfaces and no fine particles (<10 µm) (Fig. 1).

The surface morphology, before and after the experiments, and the secondary mineralogical composition of the solid products were analysed using scanning electron microscopy (LEO Supra™ 25 FE-SEM) and standard energy-dispersive spectrometry (EDS). All chemical analysis was performed using an acceleration voltage of 20 kV, a beam current of 200 pA, and a beam diameter of 1-2 µm. Natural and synthetic minerals and glasses were used as standards to check for potential drift.

The bulk chemical composition and the physical characterisation of all the glasses pre-experiment are summarised in Table 1.
Figure 1. Scanning electron microscope (SEM) images of pre-experiment solid grains of basaltic (BG), dacitic (DG) and rhyolitic (RG) glass.
Table 1. Glass densities, together with BET specific surface areas (A_{BET}), geometric surface areas (A_{geo}), roughness factor (A_{BET}/A_{geo}) and chemical compositions.

2.2 Solution preparation and analysis

The initial experimental solution contained \(~15.5\) and \(~2\) mmol/l of dissolved inorganic \(\text{CO}_2\) (\(\text{CO}_2 = [\text{CO}_3^2-]+[\text{HCO}_3^-]+[\text{CO}_2\text{H}^-]\)) and \(\text{H}_2\text{S}\), respectively, and had pH \(~7\) (Table 2). They were made from HCl (Sigma–Aldrich\(^\text{®}\) 37%), \(\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3\) (Sigma–Aldrich\(^\text{®}\)), and \(\text{Na}_2\text{S}\) (Sigma–Aldrich\(^\text{®}\)) in \(\text{N}_2\)-deoxygenated deionized water (Millipore\(^\text{TM}\)). A fresh solution was made every two to three days to avoid oxidation of \(\text{H}_2\text{S}\). For all experiments, the inlet solution was undersaturated with respect to sulfide and carbonate minerals.

Samples of inlet and outlet solutions were collected to determine their chemical composition. Samples for major dissolved elements (Si, Ti, Na, K, Mg, Ca, Fe, Al, Cl) determination were first filtered through 0.2 \(\mu\text{m}\), then acidified to 1% HNO\(_3\) (Suprapur\(^\text{®}\)), and analyzed using ICP-OES. Samples for SO\(_4\) analysis were treated with 2% Zn-acetate (1 ml to 100 ml sample) in order to precipitate all the residual \(\text{H}_2\text{S}\) as ZnS(s), which was filtered off prior to measuring SO\(_4\) using IC. Determination of pH, \(\text{CO}_2\), and \(\text{H}_2\text{S}\) was carried out on un-treated samples using a combination of a pH electrode and a pH meter, modified alkalinity titration, and precipitation titration using Hg-acetate, respectively (Arnórsson et al., 2006; Stefánsson et al., 2007). The analytical precision at the 95% confidence level based on repeated analysis of an internal standard was \(~1-10\)% for different elements. Based on duplicated determination, the analytical precision of \(\text{CO}_2\) and \(\text{H}_2\text{S}\) concentrations was <3%, and pH was ±0.05 pH units.
Table 2. Summary of the initial experimental conditions.

### 2.3 Experimental setup

The re-injection of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S into geothermal reservoirs and subsequent mineralization was studied using flow-through column experiments at 250 °C and 55 bar to reproduce typical geothermal conditions. A schematic illustration of the pressurized reactor system is shown in Fig. 2. All wetted parts of the experimental apparatus were made of inert material, including PEEK, titanium and Inconel. The CO$_2$-H$_2$S-rich solutions were pumped into the 29 cm-long reactor at flow rates of 0.5 ml/min using a HPLC pump (Chromotech®), and the pressure was controlled at the end of the line using a back pressure regulator (Coretest). The reactor was heated to the target temperature (±5°C) using a heating mantle and a temperature controlling system. The outlet fluid was cooled to room temperature with the help of a cooling jacket placed between the reactor and the back pressure regulator. Samples of the outlet solutions were collected at the low-pressure end of the back-pressure regulator. Samples of the inlet solutions were collected directly from the inlet solution bottle. The initial experimental conditions are summarized in Table 2.

The solid sample post experiments were carefully collected pushing the rock slurry out of the reactor from top to bottom, with the help of a cylindrical bar and spatula. On the base of the total reactor length, four sections of ~7 cm of length were separately stored to study the dissolution-precipitation products as a function of time and space. The material was then dried at 50 °C, and part of it mounted on a sample holder and gold-coated for SEM-EDS analysis.
Figure 2. Schematic representation of the experimental setup used for the flow-through column experiments.

2.4 Sequestration rates

The steady-state experimental mineralization rates $r_i$ (log mol/m$^2$/s) were calculated for H$_2$S and CO$_2$ following:

$$r_i = \frac{Q \times \Delta_i}{A \times M} \quad (1)$$

where $Q$ stands for flow rate, $\Delta_i$ represents the concentration difference of CO$_2$ or H$_2$S between inlet and outlet solutions, $A$ is the initial specific surface area, and $M$ is the initial mass of ground particles inside the reactor. In this study, both BET specific surface areas ($A_{BET}$), and computed geometric surface areas ($A_{geo}$) were considered.

To scale up the obtained laboratory mineralization rates to field conditions, the equivalent steady-state sequestration rates ($sr_i$) of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S for natural systems were calculated from the relationship:

$$sr_i = r_i \times A_{field} \times \rho \quad (2)$$

where $r_i$ is the experiment mineralization rate of CO$_2$ or H$_2$S either normalized to geometric surface area, $A_{field}$ is the rock surface area of natural geothermal systems (m$^2$/g), and $\rho$ is the respective rock density (g/m$^3$). Field sequestration rates were normalized only to geometric surface area because were found to be more consistent than normalized rates to BET, which are usually considered to overestimate the true reactive surface area between fluids and rocks (e.g., Anbeek 1992; Brantley and Chen, 1995; Brantley and Mellott, 2000; Gislason and Oelkers, 2003; Lüttinge and Arvidson, 2008; Přikryl et al., 2017; Wolff-Boenisch et al., 2004).
3 Results

3.1 Solution chemistry

The results of the chemical composition of the experimental solutions are given in Table 3. For all rock types, the pH increased from neutral in the inlet solutions to more alkaline in the outlet solutions. In the case of BG, the first measured outlet pH was 4.5 due to the presence of non-deoxygenated distilled water within the reactor, initially used to compact the powder. This water triggered an initial acidification of the inlet solution, but in less than 4 hours the outlet pH was re-established at 7. On this base, no distilled water was used for the other experimental runs. For basaltic (BG) and intermediate (DG) rocks the outlet pH increased with experimental duration to >8, whereas for silicic rocks (RG) the pH was relatively stable between 7.3 and 7.9 throughout the experiments (Fig. 3). The accompanied decrease of CO₂ and H₂S was estimated from the difference between the inlet and outlet solution concentrations (Fig. 3). The CO₂ and H₂S concentration difference between the inlet and outlet reached 52 and 36% for basalt (BG), 17% and 12% for intermediate rock (DG), and 15% and 40% for acidic rock (RG), respectively.

Figure 3. CO₂ (A) and H₂S (B) sequestration capabilities into geothermal reservoirs based on the inlet and outlet experimental solution composition (Δ% = c_{inlet} - c_{outlet}/c_{inlet} * 100), and pH (C) values of the outlet solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Runtime (hours)</th>
<th>Flow rate (mL/min)</th>
<th>pH/25°C</th>
<th>H₂S</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>SO₄</th>
<th>Inlet solution</th>
<th>pH/25°C</th>
<th>H₂S</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SiO₂</th>
<th>Al</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>SO₄</th>
<th>Outlet solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.1118</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>23.87</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>32.48</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-6</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-7</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-8</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-9</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>32.53</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.** Chemical composition of the experimental outlet solutions.
3.2 Secondary mineralogy

The secondary minerals identified within the alteration assemblages included carbonates, sulfides, feldspars and epidote (Fig. 4). In all the host rocks, the only secondary mineral containing sulfur was pyrite, which exhibits euhedral crystals of ~1-3 μm. No anhydrite (CaSO₄) or other sulfate minerals were observed. Iron-enriched solid solution of siderite (Fe₀.₀₅) and calcite (Ca₀.₉₅) formed preferentially in the basaltic rocks (BG), whereas calcite end-member solid solution prevailed within silicic rocks (RG) and intermediate rocks (DG). Iron-enriched solid solution of carbonates was present as tabular crystals up to ~10 μm, and sometimes in the shape of massive conglomerates. Calcite grains ranged in size from ~1 to 20 μm, with sub to euhedral crystal habit. The presence of albite and epidote confirmed the achievement of silicate saturation state during the experimental runs. Albite was visible in all the post-experiment materials, with up to ~20 μm large crystals. Epidote was detected associated with intermediate (DG) and silicic rocks (RG), shaped into ~5-15 μm big, elongated crystals.

The distribution of secondary minerals during the fluid-rock interaction, obtained by point counting through secondary electron microscopy, is shown schematically in Fig. 5 as a function of four spatial stages. Carbonates and sulfide were most abundant at the inlet side of the reaction column, and decreased with distance along the fluid flow. This demonstrate a rapid solution saturation with respect to carbon- and sulfur-bearing minerals during the initial stage of fluid-rock interactions. On the other hand, albite and epidote were mostly located in the outlet side of the reaction column, suggesting a lower initial saturation state. Overall, considering the whole reactor, the suggested order of abundance of the main secondary minerals is carbonates > pyrite > albite > epidote.
Figure 4. SEM images of typical secondary phases observed within the post-experiment solid material. A) pyrite (py) precipitation on basaltic glass with minor carbonates; B) secondary calcite (cal) with blocky albite (ab) on the grain of dacitic glass; C) epidote (ep) with plagioclase (pl) on rhyolitic glass; D) example of ~20 µm big crystal of calcite; E) example of ~3 µm big crystals of pyrite; and F) EDS spectra of pyrite, albitic plagioclase, calcite, and epidote.
Figure 5. A) Schematic summary of the mineral formation sequence along the reactor column, for all the experimental runs. Mineral box size is proportional to volumetric abundance amongst secondary phases. B) SEM images showing example of typical secondary minerals formed during the experiments as a function of reaction distance.

4 Discussion

4.1 CO₂-H₂S mineralization rates

The steady-state CO₂ and H₂S mineralization rates \( r_i \) were obtained from the experimental results, normalized both to BET and geometric surface area (Eqn. 1). The CO₂ rates were calculated based on the observed carbonate mineral composition \( \text{Ca}_0.95\text{Fe}_{0.05}\text{CO}_3 \). The results are listed in Table 4. For the CO₂ mineralization, the rock types with fastest rate were basaltic and intermediate rocks, both showing similar potential. For the H₂S mineralization rates, the opposite was observed with the fastest rate for silicic rocks (RG), despite its low content in Fe. The CO₂ and H₂S mineralization rates for volcanic rocks obtained here were observed to be faster than for sedimentary rocks (Benson and Cole, 2008; Gunter et al., 1997). Moreover, the H₂S mineralization rates obtained here are comparable with previous results at similar pH, and temperature, for basaltic conditions (Přikryl et al., 2018). This suggests that carbonate formation does not significantly affect the mineralization rate of sulfide.

Considerable differences were observed between the mineralization rates normalized to BET and geometric surface area. However, given the BET overestimation of true reactive surface area, the rate estimations normalized to geometric surface areas are considered to be more consistent with the dissolution behavior of natural glass, and were used for further calculations at field conditions. It should also be pointed out that the rates obtained here are related to optimal mineralization conditions with freshly ground material, high porosity (~70%), and very extensive particle surface area available for fluid-rock interactions. Geothermal reservoir may instead be characterized by already altered rocks and lower porosity (Aradóttir et al., 2012; Gunnarsson et al., 2011), and reactive surface areas associated to fracture networks (Watanabe and Takahashi, 1995).
The sulfides and carbonates mineralization was observed to occur preferentially on the inlet side of the flow-through column with more complex aluminum silicates forming at the outlet side. This is in agreement with the evolution of the solution composition. The divalent cations are leached from the rocks upon reactions with the CO$_2$ and H$_2$S-rich fluids, resulting in the initial carbonate and sulfide mineral saturation and their formation. At this initial stage many common Ca, Mg and Fe containing aluminum silicates are undersaturated and do not form. However, with progressive reactions along the flow-path, the solution pH increases as well as the elemental concentrations in solutions, eventually resulting in aluminum silicate mineral saturation and formation of, for example, albite and epidote. Previous studies have demonstrated how the uptake of divalent cations like Ca$^{2+}$, Mg$^{2+}$ and Fe$^{2+}$ by such aluminum silicates may reduce the rock capacity of mineralizing CO$_2$ and H$_2$S into carbonates and sulfides (e.g., Gysi and Stefánsson, 2012; Hellevang et al. 2017; Přikryl et al., 2018; Stefánsson et al., 2011; Wolff-Boenisch and Galeczka, 2018).
Based on the experimental mineralization rates, the rock injection of the gases into the geothermal reservoir where they are potentially mineralized is assumed to be Ca$_{0.95}$Fe$_{0.05}$CO$_3$.

Table 4. CO$_2$ and H$_2$S experiment mineralization rates normalized to flow rate, and both BET specific surface area and geometric surface area. Based on SEM-EDS analysis, the carbonate composition is assumed to be Ca$_{0.95}$Fe$_{0.05}$CO$_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Runtime</th>
<th>Experiment mineralization rate - geo</th>
<th>Experiment mineralization rate - BET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO$<em>2$$</em>{geo}$ log $r_{geo}$ (mol/m$^2$/s)</td>
<td>H$<em>2$S$</em>{geo}$ log $r_{geo}$ (mol/m$^2$/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet6</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet7</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet8</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-BG1-outlet9</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-s (from outlet 5)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>-8.2 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhyolite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-RG1-outlet1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-RG1-outlet2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-RG1-outlet3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-RG1-outlet4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-RG1-outlet5</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-RG1-outlet6</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-RG1-outlet7</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-s (without outlet 7)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td>-8.0 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet6</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-DG1-outlet8</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-s(from outlet 6)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>-8.2 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average steady-state calculated from Si concentrations

4.2 CO$_2$–H$_2$S sequestration rates for natural geothermal systems

One developing method to reduce the geothermal CO$_2$ and H$_2$S emissions is the re-injection of the gases into the geothermal reservoir where they are potentially mineralized (Áradóttir et al., 2015). Based on the experimental mineralization rates, the rock geometric surface area of natural geothermal systems and rock density, the field scale
CO₂ and H₂S sequestration rates were estimated (Eqn. 2). The field geometric surface areas ($A_{\text{field.geo}}$) have been set to 0.002 m²/g (Aradóttir et al., 2012) for all the rock types. The scaled up field mineralization rates resulted in the range of ~200 to ~500 kg/m³/yr for CO₂, and of 30 to ~50 kg/m³/yr for H₂S (Table 5). Based on the SEM-EDS analysis on the composition of the secondary phases, these rates on CO₂ and H₂S led to an estimated mineralization of ~120-300 kg/m³/yr of carbonates, and ~50-85 kg/m³/yr of pyrite, respectively. Further calculations based on the initial rock stoichiometry shows that the annual estimated carbonates approached the maximum stoichiometric mass of secondary minerals that can precipitate per m³ of rock (Table 5). The fact that each m³ of rock is depleted in metallic cations around one year suggests that the total sequestration volumes must be bigger than this. However, the annual field scale sequestration rates, extrapolated from laboratory data, propose valuable estimations, which can be used to calculate the sequestration capacity, and to assess the feasibility of CO₂ and H₂S sequestration into natural geothermal systems.

**Table 5.** Sequestration rates calculated for field scenarios, together with field secondary mineral formation rates. Based on SEM-EDS analysis, the carbonate composition is assumed to be $Ca_{0.95}Fe_{0.05}CO₃$. For comparison, maximum amount of secondary minerals formed through rock stoichiometry are listed as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>CO₂ type</th>
<th>Field sequestration rate</th>
<th>Field secondary mineral rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>log $sr_{\text{geo}}$</td>
<td>$sr_{\text{geo}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mol/m³/s</td>
<td>kg/m³/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhyolite</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacite</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 CO₂ and H₂S emissions and sequestration capacities worldwide**

In this study the CO₂ and H₂S emissions from geothermal power plants worldwide were estimated. The CO₂ and H₂S emission rates were obtained in terms of emissions per energy produced (g/kWh) per country, and then multiplied by the averaged production of geothermal energy per year (GWh/yr) (Bertani, 2016). The CO₂ emissions are on average 134 g/KWh, which is in agreement with the previously proposed 122 g/KWh (Fridriksson et al., 2016) based on a survey involving emissions from only the ~50% installed capacity. The H₂S emissions, proposed here for the first time, are on average 1.83 g/kWh. Both average values were calculated for 97% of the geothermal capacity installed
worldwide (Bertani, 2016). The current world total emissions from geothermal activity, before any abatement system, were estimated to be ~10 Mt of CO$_2$ per year, and ~0.2 Mt/yr of H$_2$S, with peaks in Italy, Turkey, U.S., Iceland, Mexico, and New Zealand (Table 6).

Using the field sequestration CO$_2$ and H$_2$S mineralization rates ($s_{r_{i,geo}}$) and the gas emissions ($Q_{gas}$), the sequestration capacity ($S_{Q_{i}}$) were calculated according to

$$S_{Q_{i}} = \frac{Q_{gas_{i}}}{s_{r_{i,geo}}} \tag{3}$$

The results are listed for each country in Table 6. Based on these estimations, a geothermal field with sequestration capacity of $3 \times 10^{-2}$ km$^3$ would be sufficient to store the annual world CO$_2$ and H$_2$S geothermal emissions, and 1.6 km$^3$ to store the global CO$_2$ and H$_2$S geothermal production over an average power plant lifetime of 50 years. Furthermore, Table 6 summarizes the sequestration capacities for specific geothermal power plants in Mexico, New Zealand, Iceland, and El Salvador. In the case of Wairakei power plant (New Zealand), only $4 \times 10^{-4}$ km$^3$ of host rock would be needed to sequester through re-injections into andesite all the CO$_2$ (~78 kt) and H$_2$S (~0.5 kt) produced in one year, and $2 \times 10^{-2}$ km$^3$ through all the lifetime of the plant.

The obtained sequestration capacities are based on experimental conditions and do not take into account the variability of natural systems, for example in porosity, permeability, and reactive surface area. Moreover, natural rocks may already be altered to variable degrees. However, the CO$_2$ and H$_2$S sequestration into geothermal systems is considered a feasible abatement method in terms of geochemistry and gas emissions as it may rapidly convert the global geothermal emissions into solid minerals, throughout the lifetimes of a geothermal power plants, and within reasonable reservoir volumes (Fig. 6) even when stoichiometric limitation would be accounted for.
Figure 6. Worldwide geothermal emission rates of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S and sequestration capacities for annual emissions (normalized to geometric surface areas), divided by country, and by generalized rock type associated with geothermal systems – note logarithmic scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank (by capacity)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>H₂S</th>
<th>Geothermal field</th>
<th>Field sequestration capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MWe</td>
<td>GWh/yr</td>
<td>t/yr</td>
<td>t/yr</td>
<td>Main lithology</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>16600</td>
<td>1510600</td>
<td>15989</td>
<td>sandstone and granite</td>
<td>Adams et al. 2000, Thompson 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>9646</td>
<td>617334</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td>Williams et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>9600</td>
<td>47273</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td>Williams et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>740662</td>
<td>19828</td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td>Williams et al. 2011, Arellano et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico - Los Azufres</td>
<td></td>
<td>340782</td>
<td>4503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>728000</td>
<td>18512</td>
<td>rhyolite</td>
<td>Krupp and Seward 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand - Wairakei</td>
<td></td>
<td>77760</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rhyolite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>5660</td>
<td>1867800</td>
<td>23772</td>
<td>granite</td>
<td>Pertot et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>179633</td>
<td>29746</td>
<td>basalt</td>
<td>Alfredsson et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland - Nesjavellir</td>
<td></td>
<td>18600</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>basalt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>337290</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>basalt and trachyte</td>
<td>Omenda and Simiyu 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>2687</td>
<td>40305</td>
<td>8417</td>
<td>dacite</td>
<td><a href="http://en.openei.org">http://en.openei.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3409350</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>limestone</td>
<td>Haizlip et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>77281</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td>Chavarría Rojas 2003,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://en.openei.org">http://en.openei.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>El salvador</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>48119</td>
<td>2699</td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td>Gonzalez Partida et al. 1995, Torio-Henriquez 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El salvador - Ahuachapan</td>
<td>21620</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td>Porras et al. 2007,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>24600</td>
<td>2846</td>
<td>andesite</td>
<td><a href="http://en.openei.org">http://en.openei.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>12397</td>
<td>72069</td>
<td>9628247</td>
<td>131590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>12729</td>
<td>73689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Bertani 2016

Table 6. Geothermal emission rates of CO₂ and H₂S by country, together with the field sequestration capacity for 1 year, calculated with Ageo. As examples, detailed data of four geothermal power plants across the world are shown (details in Appendix). To calculate these values, the lithologies listed for the country have been associated with the chemically most similar experimental composition: andesite with dacite, and granite with rhyolite. The top 13 countries are listed in decreasing order following their installed geothermal capacity described by Bertani (2016).
4.4 Economic implications

In the last decades, the CO$_2$ and H$_2$S geological sequestration have received increasing attention due to the pressing need to control the environmental aspects and to limit GHG emissions globally. Advantages and disadvantages have been evaluated, and, as all the proposed geoengineering solutions, even this strategy has been found to be lacking in information on two key issues: feasibility and economic impact. Following this, the current experimental findings extended and broadened the strategy applicability into natural geothermal system. From an economical perspective, the low-cost H$_2$S removal involved with the proposed method of gas re-injection, estimated to be <30 $/t (LDEO Columbia University), could play a key role in the case of geothermal activities characterized by H$_2$S-rich fluids. New Zealand, Japan, Italy, and Mexico are all examples of countries with H$_2$S emission rates above the average value of 1.83 g/kWh, generating more than 10 kt of H$_2$S per year, and spending at least 115 $/t for H$_2$S reduction (Mamrosh et al., 2012). The in-situ simultaneous re-injection of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S for geological storage could then act as incentive to drastically decrease the GHG emissions while adopting an economically convenient H$_2$S abatement system, otherwise very expensive. Also, the coupling of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S would optimize the space used by geothermal fields, the number of required facilities, and the capital invested for waste water disposal. Further investigations would however be required to determine CO$_2$ and H$_2$S mineralization rates at lower temperatures, permeability and reactive surface area in the reservoirs, and effect of higher gaseous concentrations in the inlet fluids on the reservoir porosity.

4.5 Further implications

From a wider perspective, a number of additional steps are required to assess the sustainability of long-term re-injections, bridging laboratory experiments and field scale projects. Further study on the optimal sequestration in geothermal systems will also have to consider: (1) the clogging of the reservoir due to intensive mineralization close to the fluid re-injection well, (2) the movement of the secondary mineralization front within the reservoir, eventually reaching production wells, and (3) the use of large volumes of valuable groundwater and its implication on the market. However, results suggest that: the porosity close to the re-injection well increases with time due to the vigorous dissolution of the primary rock, and the system does not clog over continuous re-injections modelled for >100 years (Přikryl et al., 2018); the rapid mineralization during field re-injections of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S for over 2 years confirms such predictions (Matter et al., 2016); and the use of unlimited supplies of seawater rather than groundwater could be a more feasible and economically convenient option (Gislason and Oelkers, 2014; Snaebjörndottir and Gislason, 2016; Wolff-Boenisch et al., 2011; Wolff-Boenisch and Galeczka, 2018).

More importantly, the current political and economic efforts put into geological storage of gaseous emissions from geothermal activities is not at the level of impacting climate change. However, the implementation of this sequestration strategy to the geothermal energy production provides a greener alternative to energy produced by coal and oil.
5 Conclusions

The present work explored the potential of re-injections of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S under geothermal conditions, as a strategy to reduce the anthropogenic emissions into the atmosphere. Flow-through column experiments at 250 °C demonstrate the geochemically possible and rapid sequestration of both gases, even with initial neutral pH, and within rocks of various compositions. The successful mineralization in silicic rocks, such as dacitic and rhyolitic glasses, extends the applicability beyond the Icelandic basalt. However, the faster reactivity of amorphous rocks compared to crystalline material, and the high experimental porosity must be taken into account during the determination of reservoir storage potential. CO$_2$ and H$_2$S are mineralized as carbonates and pyrite, respectively, already in the initial stage of fluid-rock interactions. On the other hand, the observation of additional silicate mineralization could be a limiting factor on the long-term, and further detailed investigations are required.

The analysis on CO$_2$ and H$_2$S emission rates by country, based on the information available for the main geothermal power plants, estimates fluxes of ~10 Mt of CO$_2$ per year, and ~0.2 Mt/yr of H$_2$S, with peaks in Italy, Turkey, U.S., Iceland, Mexico, and New Zealand. The CO$_2$ rate is consistent with previous studies, whereas the H$_2$S emission rate is here proposed for the first time. These findings indicate encouraging, yet polluting emissions from power plants that produce energy through renewable sources. The re-injection of gas mixture may help to boost the carbon capture and storage market, exploiting the relatively low cost associated with the capture of CO$_2$ to also abate the H$_2$S – the removal of which is otherwise very expensive. The proposed method is five-times cheaper than common H$_2$S abatement systems. Moreover, this geological sequestration requires relatively small volumes to accommodate the annual CO$_2$ and H$_2$S geothermal worldwide emissions, which is very promising for long-term operations.

The worldwide application of this re-injection strategy would lead to the production of enhanced energy from geothermal fluids free from atmosphere-polluting emissions by their permanent mineralization underground, contributing to address one of the major environmental concerns on a global scale.

Supporting Information

Appendix A

Further details about the calculations of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S emission rates by country are available in A1 and A2, respectively.
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### Table A1: CO₂ emissions by country, before any abatement system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Power plants</th>
<th>CO₂ emission energy rate</th>
<th>Average energy</th>
<th>CO₂ emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g/kWh</td>
<td>GWh/yr</td>
<td>t/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costa Rica</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>77281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica Miravalles</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>76574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica Las Pailas</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>48119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador Ahuachapan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>179633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9600</td>
<td>47273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>5660</td>
<td>1867800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2687</td>
<td>40305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>337290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Olkaria I + wellheads</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>19840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Olkaria II</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>15280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Olkaria III</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>234090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Olkaria IV</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>68080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Eburru and Oserian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>740662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>728000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>24600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua Momotombo</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>13550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua San Jacinto-Tizate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>11050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9046</td>
<td>617344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3409350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16600</td>
<td>1510600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Power plants</td>
<td>H₂S emission energy rate</td>
<td>Average energy</td>
<td>Dry steam and flash plants¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g/kWh</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>GWh/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa rica</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa rica Las Pailas</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Moya and Rodriguez (2009)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>9600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>5660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy Larderello-Travale-Radicondoli</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Pertot et al. (2013)</td>
<td>4675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Olkaria</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Wetan' ulu (2011)</td>
<td>2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>6071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Rotokawa</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Wairakei plant</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Barbier (1991)</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua San Jacinto-Tizate</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>9646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines Tongonan</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>4030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Denizli-Kizildere</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Aydin-Germencik</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>AVERAGE LOCAL DATA</td>
<td>16600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Coso</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>CALCULATED for 2002</td>
<td>2333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Geysers</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>CALCULATED</td>
<td>6512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Average for local data before any abatement system. Dry steam and flash energy rate.
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Highlights:

- The rate of olivine carbonation/serpentinization is predominately controlled by pH
- Magnesium isotopic fractionation can be used to track reaction progress
- Fluid $\delta^{26}$Mg compositions are primarily influenced by secondary mineral formation
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Abstract

Chemical exchange between seawater and the oceanic crust is thought to play a significant role in the regulation of the global magnesium (Mg) cycle, yet relatively little is known about the rates and mechanisms of Mg exchange in mafic crustal environments. In this study we experimentally characterize the extent, and nature, of Mg isotope fractionation during the carbonation and serpentinization of olivine (one of the principal minerals found in ultramafic rocks) under hydrothermal conditions. Olivine alteration was found to be incongruent, with fluid composition and the secondary mineralogy varying according to the extent of reaction. In mildly acid water (pH ~6.5), olivine dissolved to form Mg-Fe carbonate solid solutions and minor chrysotile. Upon carbonation and a decrease of CO$_2$ in the water, the pH increased to >8, with chrysotile and brucite becoming the dominant alteration minerals. The Mg-rich carbonates and chrysotile preferentially incorporated lighter Mg isotopes, whereas brucite preferentially incorporated heavier Mg isotopes. This resulted in a ~0.5‰ increase of the $\delta^{26}$Mg composition of the fluid relative to olivine during the initial carbonation and serpentinization reactions, followed by a decrease in $\delta^{26}$Mg upon the formation of brucite. Our experimental and modeling results therefore demonstrate that the $\delta^{26}$Mg composition of fluids involved in olivine alteration reflect the type and quantity of secondary Mg minerals formed, which in turn depend on the pH and CO$_2$ concentration of the water. Comparison of these results with natural ground- and thermal waters from basaltic terrains indicate that the $\delta^{26}$Mg composition of natural waters are likely to also be controlled by mafic rock leaching and incorporation of isotopically light Mg into carbonates and Mg-Si minerals such as chrysotile. Together, these findings improve our understanding of Mg isotope systematics during water-rock interaction, and suggest that $\delta^{26}$Mg may be a useful tool for tracing reactions that are critical to geological CO$_2$ sequestration.

1 Introduction

The oceanic crust of the Earth (together with hydrosphere and continental crust) contain <0.1% of the total Mg in the bulk Earth, however, show the largest Mg isotopic variation (e.g. Galy et al., 2003; Foster et al., 2010; Huang, 2013; Teng, 2017). This highlights their significance for understanding Mg isotopic balance of the bulk Earth and global Mg cycling. The oceanic crust mainly consists of ultramafic and mafic rocks, with olivine among the major primary minerals (e.g. McDonough and Sun, 1995). Alteration of olivine near and at the Earth’s surface is fast compared to many other igneous minerals (e.g., Palandri and Kharaka, 2004). The process involves the dissolution of olivine followed by precipitation of secondary minerals like carbonates, chrysotile, talc, brucite and serpentine (e.g., Janecky and Seyfried, 1986; Berndt et al., 1996). The serpentinization of mafic rocks results in the generation of H$_2$ by water reduction through oxidation of ferrous iron (Fe$^{II}$) dissolved from the primary rocks like olivine. The H$_2$ formed may further lead to formation of inorganic hydrocarbons from reduction of inorganic carbon like CO$_2$ (e.g., McCollom and Seewald, 2001; Etiope and Sherwood Lollar, 2013). Moreover, the sequestration process into mafic and ultramafic rocks has received growing interest as a potential method for CO$_2$ storage and reducing atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration, as such rock types are a primary source of Mg, Fe and Ca needed for carbonate formation (e.g., McGrail et al., 2006; Gislason et al., 2010; Matter et al., 2016).
Previous studies on the carbonation and serpentinization of mafic and ultramafic rocks have focused on characterizing water-rock interaction with seawater and meteoric water at various pressures and temperatures (e.g., James et al., 2003; Giammar et al., 2005; Béarat et al., 2006; Seyfried et al., 2007; Andreani et al., 2009; McCollom and Bach, 2009; King et al., 2010; Jones et al., 2010; Stefánsson, 2010; Daval et al., 2011; Hövelmann et al., 2011; Gysi and Stefánsson, 2011, 2012a; Klein and Garrido, 2011; Marcaillou et al., 2011; Marieni et al. 2013; Lafay et al., 2012; Neubeck et al., 2014). Such alteration has been observed to result in the formation of various carbonate minerals at elevated CO$_2$ concentrations and pH <7, whereas at low CO$_2$ concentrations the water pH become more alkaline, resulting in the formation of clays, serpentine and chrysotile. Many of the alteration minerals contain the same major elements (e.g. Mg and Si), meaning that quantifying the rate of carbonization and serpentinization reactions and the processes influencing such reactions may be difficult. Such an understanding is important to quantify carbonization associated with CO$_2$ mineral sequestration and quantifying variations in the Mg isotope ($\delta^{26}$Mg) composition of the fluids may be useful in this regard.

Ultramafic and mafic oceanic rocks and mantle xenoliths show a relatively small $\delta^{26}$Mg range of -0.35 to -0.18‰ (e.g., Wiechert and Halliday, 2007; Teng et al., 2007, 2010, 2015; Liu et al., 2017). In contrast, continental basalts display more negative $\delta^{26}$Mg values of -0.60 to -0.35‰ as a result of incongruent partial melting of an isotopically light carbonated mantle (e.g., Huang et al., 2015), while altered oceanic basalts show significant $\delta^{26}$Mg variations ranging from -2.76 to +0.21‰, suggesting significant Mg isotope fractionation upon water-rock interaction (Huang, 2013). The lowest $\delta^{26}$Mg ratios in these altered basalts are typically associated with carbonation reactions, while the higher values are generally associated with serpentinization reactions. The fluids associated with these alteration reactions also have varying $\delta^{26}$Mg compositions, with seawater having a uniform composition of -0.83±0.09‰ (e.g. Ling et al. 2011), while thermal and non-thermal groundwaters range between -0.96 and +0.64‰ (Pogge von Strandmann et al. 2008). Carbonate minerals formed in the altered rocks are typically enriched in $^{24}$Mg relative to original silicate phases (Beinlich et al., 2014; Wimpenny et al. 2014). The variations observed in fluid $\delta^{26}$Mg may result from Mg isotope fractionation upon water-rock interaction with different fractionation factors for different secondary minerals (Wimpenny et al., 2014; Voigt et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017). Once they have been properly quantified, such differences may be used to trace the degree of water-rock interaction, including the carbonation and serpentinization of mafic and ultramafic rocks.

In this study, we conducted reaction path experiments and geochemical and isotope modeling of olivine alteration in CO$_2$-rich hydrothermal fluids as a function of reaction time and CO$_2$ concentration. The reaction process was traced through time by solution chemistry, alteration mineralogy and Mg isotope systematics in order to define the major factors controlling water-olivine (mafic rock) alteration. Particular focus was made on understanding the extent of $\delta^{26}$Mg fractionation during mineralization, and its potential for use as a mechanism of tracing CO$_2$ sequestration in mafic and ultramafic rocks.
2 Experimental methods

2.1 Material and Experimental design

The olivine used in the experiments was collected from Almklovodalen peridotite massif, Western Gneiss Region, Norway (Brueckner et al., 2010). The source dunite samples contained over 90% olivine, which was handpicked, crushed in a jaw crusher and agate mortar and pestle then dry sieved. The 45-125 µm size fraction was used in all of the experiments. The grains were unzoned, and have a composition determined by EMPA ($n = 23$) of $\text{Mg}_{1.81-1.88}\text{Fe}_{0.13-0.15}\text{Si}_{0.97-1.01}\text{O}_4$. The sum of other elements was ≤0.36 wt%. Hereafter, the olivine composition is referred to as 93% forsterite (Fo$_{93}$). Prior to the experiments it was cleaned using deionized water, acetone and magnet, followed by drying at 40°C. The specific geometric surface area ($A_{\text{geo}}$) was determined according to the method of Tester et al. (1994) to be 226.3 cm$^2$/g.

The batch (closed-system) experiments of olivine alteration in CO$_2$-rich aqueous solutions were carried out at 5-21 mmol/kg initial total dissolved inorganic carbon (ΣCO$_2$) in a Parr stirring reactor made of titanium (Fig. 1). Prior to each experiment the 600 ml reactor was filled with ~53 g Fo$_{93}$ and ~400 g of degassed CO$_2$-rich fluid under N$_2$ atmosphere, giving an initial fluid/rock ratio of ~8. The reactor was heated to 150°C with the pressure controlled by the solution vapor saturation pressure. The solutions were prepared from deionized water, NaCl (ACS, Sigma-Aldrich), NaHCO$_3$ (ACS, Sigma-Aldrich) and 37% HCl (pro. anal. Merck). The starting conditions of the experiments are summarized in Table 1.
**Figure 1. A schematic picture of the experimental setup.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. #</th>
<th>Sample #</th>
<th>t (°C)</th>
<th>Duration (days)</th>
<th>pH$_1$</th>
<th>$\sum$CO$_2$ (mmol/kg)</th>
<th>r/w ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>1e-9e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>1f-8f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1g-8g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>1h-8h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>1k-5k</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* The initial $\sum$CO$_2$ and pH corresponds to the values measured in the first sample of each experimental run.  
*b* The initial experimental rock to water ratio.

**Table 1. Summary of the experimental conditions.**

### 2.2 Sampling and analysis

Solution samples were collected regularly throughout the experiments. Samples for pH determination were analyzed immediately using a combination pH electrode (Cole-Parmer) calibrated with commercial buffer solutions. Samples for CO$_2$ analyses were collected into 0.01-0.1 M NaOH solutions to prevent degassing and analyzed immediately using a modified alkalinity titration (Stefánsson et al., 2007). Samples for Cl concentration determination were filtered through a 0.2 µm filter (cellulose acetate) followed by analysis using ion chromatography (Dionex-2000). Samples for Na, Mg, Si, Fe and isotopic
analyses were also filtered through a 0.2 µm filter, acidified to 1% HNO₃ (Merck Suprapur®) followed by analysis by ion chromatography for Na and Mg (Dionex-1000) and spectrophotometrically for Si and Fe (Dougan and Wilson, 1973; Fishman and Friedman, 1989). The analytical precision based on repeated analysis of an internal standard (GYG13) at the 95% confidence level was 4.4% for Na, 3.0% for Mg, 2.8% for Cl, 6.5% for Fe and 8.7% for Si.

Samples of the reacted solid were collected at the end of each experiment. These were dried at room temperature prior to analysis. The chemical composition of the material was determined using an electron microprobe (JEOL JXA-8200 Superprobe) with an accelerating voltage of 15 kV, a beam current of 15 nA, and a beam size of 5-1 µm. Unfortunately, most of the secondary phases (with the exception of magnesite) were too fine for point analysis even with a beam size of 1 µm, and were too small to be visible on polished samples. The surface morphology of the olivine grains and secondary phases were also studied by scanning electron microscope (SEM) equipped with EDS (HITACHI TM-3000) at an accelerating voltage of 15 kV with a working distance of 6.8 mm. Finally, the samples were analyzed using powder x-ray diffraction (XRD) with scans collected for 9 hours with a Bruker D8 Advanced (CuKα1, 1.5406 Å; 2θ range 3-90; 0.01°/step and 768 s/step). Patterns were compared to standard mineral files compiled in the PDF2 database (ICDD PDF-2 Powder Diffraction File Database) using the software code EVA.

2.3 Magnesium isotope analyses

Solution samples were prepared for Mg isotopic (δ²⁵Mg and δ²⁶Mg) analysis by evaporating between 0.4 ml and 1.9 ml of solution in order to process ~2µg Mg per sample. Once dry each sample was dissolved in concentrated HNO₃, followed by drying and dissolution in 0.2 ml 0.8M HNO₃. For olivine, 5 mg of fresh sample was digested in HF-HNO₃ at 130 °C. Once dissolved the samples were dried down, dissolved in concentrated HCl, dried again, dissolved in concentrated HNO₃, dried down and then finally dissolved in 0.8M HNO₃. The solution and olivine samples were loaded onto acid-cleaned Teflon columns filled with a AG50W-X12 cation exchange resin to a height of 8.5 cm in 0.8M HNO₃. Magnesium separation followed the technique described by Pogge von Strandmann et al. (2011), with the sample being loaded and washed in 0.8M HNO₃ before the Mg fraction was eluted in 2M HNO₃. All samples were passed through the ion exchange columns twice to ensure complete separation from the other matrix elements, which was verified by ICP-MS analysis prior to isotopic analysis.

Isotopic analyses were performed on a ThermoFisher Scientific ‘Neptune’ Multi Collector Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometer (MC-ICP-MS). Samples were introduced to the Ar Plasma in 2% aqueous HNO₃ using a standard sample induction system (SIS) attached to a PFA Teflon nebuliser. ²⁴Mg, ²⁵Mg, and ²⁶Mg were measured in low-resolution mode, with each analysis consisting of 1 block of 30 measurements per analysis. Solution concentrations of 600 ppb typically gave beam intensities of ~12 V for ²⁴Mg, with total procedural blanks having a negligible contribution of <12 mV. Isotopic compositions were determined via sample-standard bracketing, and are reported as δ²⁶Mg with respect to the DSM-3 standard (Galy et al., 2003). All sample analyses were run in duplicate, with the mean value and associated 2 standard error (se) reported (Table 4). Total procedural reproducibility was assessed by the analysis of the DSM, BCR, IAPSO and JDol standards during the same measurement session, with the corresponding δ²⁶Mg values of +0.01±0.02‰, -0.26±0.10‰, -0.83±0.02‰ and -2.32±0.01‰ being identical, or within
error, of those previously reported by Pearce et al. (2012). The long-term reproducibility (2σ) of the δ²⁶Mg analytical protocol at the University of Southampton, determined by repeat analyses of the DSM-3 Mg standard, is 0.07‰.

The δ²⁵Mg and δ²⁶Mg systematics of the dataset show mass dependent behavior. It follows that δ²⁵Mg ratios do not provide additional information of magnesium isotope systematics beyond that of δ²⁶Mg, thus although the δ²⁵Mg data are reported in this study (Table 4) only the δ²⁶Mg results are used in the models and discussion.

3 Numerical simulations

3.1 Geochemical reaction path modeling

Aqueous speciation, mineral saturation state and reaction path simulations were carried out using the PHREEQC geochemical program (Parkhurst and Appelo, 2013). The wateq.dat database used in these simulations was updated for the aqueous species, mineral solubilities and reaction kinetics of interest; the key thermodynamic and kinetic parameters used in the models are listed in Table 2. The general rate expression used to simulate the progress of olivine dissolution, formation of secondary minerals and the associated solution chemistry was

\[ r_{±, i} = ± ζ_i A_i \sum_i \left( k_{T, i} \prod_j a_j^X \right) (1 - SI_i^n) \]

(1)

where \( ζ \) is the fraction of the surface area that is reactive having a value between 0 and 1 as in Přikryl et al. (2017), \( A \) is the surface area, \( k_T \) is the rate constant at given temperature and \( \prod_j a_j^X \) as an activity expression for the \( j \)-th dissolved aqueous or surface species in solution. The saturation index to the power of \( n \) standing for order of reaction, SI, is defined as

\[ SI = Q/K \]

(2)

where \( Q \) is the activity product of the mineral reaction and \( K \) is the respective equilibrium solubility constant.

The surface area of the dissolved phases (olivine) was expressed as decreasing upon dissolution or loss of moles, assuming the grains to be spherical, i.e.
$A = A_0 \left( \frac{m_t}{m_0} \right)^{2/3}$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $m$ is number of moles. The rate expressions for secondary mineral formation represent crystal growth rates of a given mineral surface. However, the initial formation of minerals and mineral surfaces involves nucleation with $A = A_n$ whereas $A_n$ is the total surface area of the nucleuses formed for a given mineral. In this study nucleation was not included into the rate expression as it requires knowledge of many parameters (De Yoreo and Vekilov, 2003; Karthika et al. 2016) undetermined in literature. Instead, the initial surface area of the secondary minerals was assigned with $A_n$ representing 0.1-10% of the initial olivine surface area. The purpose of varying the $A_n$ value was to study the effect of this initial surface area of secondary minerals on the model results. For the mineral formation, the value of $\varsigma$ was taken to be 1.

### 3.2 Isotope modeling

The variations in $\delta^{26}$Mg were simulated as a part of the reaction path model in a similar manner as described previously (e.g., Stefánsson and Barnes, 2016; Stefánsson et al., 2016; 2017; Gunnarsson-Robin et al., 2017). The isotopic composition of the system (water-rock reaction in the reactor) is defined as;

$$\delta^{26}Mg_{system} = \sum_s x_s \delta^{26}Mg_s = \sum_i x_i \delta^{26}Mg_i$$ \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $s$ denotes the various sources and their isotope values. As olivine is the only source of Mg in the system, $\delta^{26}$Mg of the system becomes equal to that of olivine ($\delta^{26}Mg_{system} = \delta^{26}Mg_{olivine}$). $i$ denotes the $i$-th aqueous species and mineral being formed, and $x_i$ is the mole fraction defined by;

$$x_i = \frac{n_i}{\sum_i n_i}$$ \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $n$ is the number of moles of Mg in the $i$-th aqueous species and/or minerals. Isotopic fractionation due to chemical reactions including formation of secondary minerals can be calculated as a function of reaction progress ($\Xi$), where

$$n_i = n^0_i + \nu_i \Delta \Xi$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)
where \( n_i^0 \) and \( v_i \) are the initial mole number and stoichiometry coefficient of the \( i \)-th aqueous species and minerals.

The isotope values of aqueous species and minerals is subsequently calculated from,

\[
\delta^{26}Mg^{\text{system}} = x_k \delta^{26}Mg_k + \sum_i x_i (\alpha_{i-k}(1000 + \delta^{26}Mg_k) - 1000) \quad (7)
\]

\[
\delta^{26}Mg_i = \alpha_{i-k}(1000 + \delta^{26}Mg_k) - 1000 \quad (8)
\]

where \( k \) is the key aqueous species or mineral, here taken to be \( \text{Mg}^{2+} \). \( \alpha_{i-j} \) is the equilibrium isotope fractionation factor between the \( i \)-th and \( k \)-th phases defined by;

\[
\alpha_{i-k} = \frac{1000 + \alpha^{26}Mg_i}{1000 + \alpha^{26}Mg_k} \quad (9)
\]

The values for the fractionation factors between \( \text{Mg}^{2+} \) and various secondary minerals are listed in Table 2. The minerals included Mg-carbonates (magnesite and Mg-Fe carbonate solid solutions), talc, brucite and chrysotile (which was taken to be equivalent to that of chlorite). The values of the fractionation factors are based on those reported by Pearce et al. (2012), Beinlich et al. (2014), Wimpenny et al. (2014) (Fig. 2). In order to obtain the fractionation factors under the experimental conditions of 150°C, the reported fractionation factors were fitted assuming a linear relationship between \( 10^3 \ln \alpha \) and \( 1/T^2 \) with a zero intercept at infinite temperature \( (\alpha \to 1 \text{ at } 1/T^2 \to 0) \) (Fig. 2), similar to Huang et al. (2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>( 10^3 \ln \alpha ) (150°C)</th>
<th>fit ( (T \text{ in Kelvin}) )</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>talc-Mg(^{2+})(aq)</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>( 10^3 \ln \alpha = 0.0771 ) ( (10^6/T^2) )</td>
<td>Beinlich et al. (2014), extrapolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chrysotile-Mg(^{2+})(aq)</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>( 10^3 \ln \alpha = -0.046 ) ( (10^6/T^2) )</td>
<td>Beinlich et al. (2014), extrapolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brucite-Mg(^{2+})(aq)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>( 10^3 \ln \alpha = 0.064 ) ( (10^6/T^2) )</td>
<td>Wimpenny et al. (2014), extrapolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnesite-Mg(^{2+})(aq)</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>( 10^3 \ln \alpha = -0.207 ) ( (10^6/T^2) )</td>
<td>Pearce et al. (2012), Beinlich et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. \( \delta^{26}\)Mg fractionation factors between minerals and Mg\(^{2+}\) in aqueous solutions.*
Figure 2. δ\textsuperscript{26}Mg fractionation factors between minerals and dissolved Mg\textsuperscript{2+}. The lines represent regressions through the data points assuming α→1 when 1/T\textsuperscript{2}→0. The data are based on results reported by Wimpenny et al. (2014), Li et al. (2014), Pearce et al. (2012) and Beinlich et al. (2014) and consistent with values of Rustad et al. (2010) and Schauble (2011).

4 Results

4.1 Solution composition

Two types of experiments were conducted at 150°C: (1) low CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations of 5.17 - 6.36 mmol/kg (Experiments F, G and H), and (2) elevated CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations of 13.7 - 20.9 mmol/kg (Experiments K and E). The changes in solution chemistry as a function of reaction time are given in Table 3. Initially the pH of the solutions was ~6.5 and increased to between ~6.7 and ~7.5 with reaction time. The aqueous CO\textsubscript{2} concentration decreased as pH increased. The dissolved concentrations of Si and Mg increased rapidly during the first hours, reaching values of Si ~0.4-1.2 and Mg ~0.7-1.1 mmol/kg after ~30 minutes followed by a decrease with experimental duration after ~1-10 days. An increase in Si concentration observed in experiment E from day 2 was significant compared to runs with lower CO\textsubscript{2} concentration. The high CO\textsubscript{2} experiments resulted in greater olivine mass dissolved, and a faster intake of Mg ions by secondary phases from solution relative to the low CO\textsubscript{2} experiments. Very low concentrations (generally less than ~1 µmol/kg) were also initially observed for Fe.

Variations in the δ\textsuperscript{26}Mg composition of the reacting fluid were determined together with the composition of the reacting olivine in experiment E that showed the greatest change in Mg concentration. The results are given in Table 4. The δ\textsuperscript{26}Mg ratio measured for olivine was -0.22±0.07‰, no variation between initial and reacted material was observed. This is
similar to the previously observed $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratio of unaltered oceanic crust and mantle xenolites of -0.35 to -0.18‰ (e.g., Wiechert and Halliday, 2007; Teng et al., 2007, 2010, 2015; Liu et al., 2017). The $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratios of the experimental solutions ranged from -0.27 to +0.35‰, was low initially, increased during the first five days followed by a relatively steady value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. #</th>
<th>Temp.</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>pH / 22°C</th>
<th>ΣCO₂</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Fe&lt;sub&gt;tot&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Cl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>days</td>
<td>mmol/kg</td>
<td>mmol/kg</td>
<td>mmol/kg</td>
<td>mmol/kg</td>
<td>mmol/kg</td>
<td>mmol/kg</td>
<td>mmol/kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9e</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25.31</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8f</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8g</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8h</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1k</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3k</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4k</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5k</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Experimental solutions composition.*
### Table 4. Isotopic composition of forsterite and experimental fluid in the run E. Long-term analytical reproducibility (2σ) is 0.07 ‰.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>δ(^{25})Mg ‰</th>
<th>δ(^{26})Mg ‰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/Exp.</td>
<td>Mean 2 s.e.</td>
<td>Mean 2 s.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo(_{93}) -</td>
<td>Mean 2 s.e.</td>
<td>Mean 2 s.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreacted</td>
<td>-0.121 0.006</td>
<td>-0.224 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo(_{93}) - Altered</td>
<td>-0.108 0.007</td>
<td>-0.221 0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1</td>
<td>-0.070 0.010</td>
<td>-0.136 0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-0.154 0.009</td>
<td>-0.266 0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3</td>
<td>0.058 0.008</td>
<td>0.105 0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4</td>
<td>0.150 0.008</td>
<td>0.317 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>0.168 0.009</td>
<td>0.354 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6</td>
<td>0.155 0.007</td>
<td>0.317 0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e7</td>
<td>0.149 0.011</td>
<td>0.292 0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e8</td>
<td>0.112 0.006</td>
<td>0.255 0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e9</td>
<td>0.158 0.007</td>
<td>0.319 0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 Secondary mineralogy

The identified secondary minerals were magnesite, chrysotile/lizardite, amorphous silica and halite. Halite was considered to form upon quenching of the experimental systems. SEM images of the alteration products, altered olivine surfaces are shown in Figure 3. The unaltered olivine surfaces showed pristine and smooth surfaces with sharp mineral edges. Upon dissolution, conical or funnel-shaped etch pits were observed to form along the mineral edges and within the previously smoothed surfaces. The composition of the chrysotile/lizardite was determined to be Mg\(_{2.87}\)Fe\(_{0.19}\)Si\(_{1.96}\)O\(_5\)(OH)\(_4\) and the composition of magnesite was Mg\(_{0.92-0.95}\)Fe\(_{0.08-0.05}\)CO\(_3\). No precipitating iron oxides were observed, suggesting that Fe released from the dissolving olivine was mostly incorporated as impurities into the magnesite and/or chrysotile/lizardite solid solutions.

The changes in mineralogy as a function of reaction time at constant initial CO\(_2\) (~6 mmol/kg; Experiments G and H) are shown in Figure 3 (d and e). Small single euhedral crystals of magnesite formed up to 1 μm. Randomly distributed needle shaped formations, up to 0.5 μm in length, are chrysotile/lizardite. No major dissolution features on the olivine surfaces are observed after 7 days (Fig. 3d). After two weeks, no large changes were observed except magnesite crystals grew and became larger, up to 3 μm in size. After 4 weeks of interaction (Fig. 3e), the precipitation pattern of magnesite was characteristic with euhedral crystals up to 5 μm in diameter. A thin layer of coarse alteration coating developed partly over the olivine surfaces, typically as scales sticking out from the surface and no bigger than 0.5 μm; this is an early stage of chrysotile/lizardite nucleation and serpentinization. Dissolution etch pits were also clearly observed on the olivine grain edges after four weeks of interaction.
The effect of changing initial CO$_2$ concentration (Experiments H and E) on the olivine alteration mineralogy is shown in Figure 3 (e and f). At low CO$_2$ (~6 mmol/kg; Exp. G, F, H; Fig. 3d, e), magnesite crystals were observed to form along the olivine edges and within surface cleavages whereas small chrysotile/lizardite needles formed randomly over the whole olivine surface. However, for experiments with initially elevated CO$_2$ (~21 mmol/kg, Exp. E; Fig. 3f), the magnesite crystals grew up to 10 μm in size with some of the olivine grains completely coated with conglomerates of euhedral magnesite crystals after 25 days. Honeycomb structures or mesh texture of chrysotile/lizardite coated some of the olivine surface and formed conglomerates around the magnesite crystals.
Figure 3. SEM photomicrographs with typical surface of (A) reacted olivine surface showing the conical or funnel-shaped etch pits, B) euhedral crystals of magnesite and conglomerates of chrysotile microtubes covering Fo$_{93}$ grains, and (C) secondary magnesite and chrysotile together with spherical amorphous silica and halite flakes. Experimental conditions presented are the end of the runs (A, B, C). Magnesite formation as a function of reaction time for solutions with initially similar CO$_2$ concentrations (D and E), and as a function of initial low and elevated CO$_2$ concentrations (E and F). At low initial CO$_2$ concentrations of ~6 mmol/kg euhedral crystals of magnesite were observed to grow with reaction time from 1 to 5 µm in about a 3 weeks (D and E). However, the quantity and size of magnesite crystals was predominantly found to depend on initial CO$_2$ concentration (E and F); with elevated CO$_2$ concentration the magnesite grew to ~10 µm. Starting experimental pH and CO$_2$ conditions are presented (D, E, F). Scale bar is 15 µm on all presented SEM images, mineral abbreviations are: Ctl-chrysotile, Fo-forsterite, Hl-halite, Mgs-magnesite, Si am-amorphous silica.

5 Discussion

5.1 Olivine alteration

The experimental results are compared with the calculated solution composition and mineralogy in Figures 4 and 5. The experimental solution composition was reasonable well reproduced by the geochemical models (Fig. 4). A declining trend for CO$_2$ concentration was observed in all experiments and models with time. Similarly pH values increased in both the experiments and models, reflecting the decreasing acid supply in the system. Some discrepancies were observed for Si (Fig. 4c), and are considered to be related to an initial non-stoichiometric leaching of Si from the olivine. For Mg, the modeled concentrations were lower than the experimental data until ~3 days of interaction. Afterwards a close match was observed between experiments and models. It is likely that the difference between model and experimental data reflects an initial overestimation of the extent of secondary mineral precipitation, as the changes in CO$_2$ concentration showed good agreement between modeled and experimental system (Fig 4).

The secondary mineralogy predicted by the geochemical models showed a clear trend with reaction time and solution pH (Fig. 5). Initially at pH<6.5, chrysotile and Mg-Fe carbonate solid solutions dominated the alteration mineralogy whereas with reaction time and pH increase brucite also became important. In the experiments, brucite was not observed as a part of the alteration product, as the pH of the solutions was not high enough for brucite formation at the end of the experiments. The amount of initial CO$_2$ (Fig. 5a, b) reflected the total mass of dissolved olivine and of formed secondary minerals. High CO$_2$ run dissolved ~6 times more olivine than low CO$_2$ run. This resulted in one order of magnitude difference in precipitating magnesite and talc. However, relative proportions between forming minerals were similar in both scenarios.

The results of the experiments and geochemical modeling demonstrate that the main factors controlling olivine-fluid interaction in CO$_2$-rich solutions are the extent of the reaction (Ξ) (or reaction time) and pH. Solution pH is in turn controlled by acid supply and the extent of reaction. For olivine alteration where CO$_2$ is the major acid, two alteration stages were distinguished based on the solution pH (Figs. 4 and 5): (1) stage I was characterized by mildly acid to neutral pH values, buffered by dissolved CO$_2$ and H$^+$
consumption upon olivine dissolution, and by the formation of Mg-Fe carbonate solid solutions and chrysotile; stage II was characterized by progressive olivine alteration, decrease of CO$_2$ concentration due to carbonate mineral formation and pH increase to >8. Under the alkaline conditions chrysotile, brucite and Mg and Fe containing carbonates were formed. Similar pH effects on the alteration product have been observed during fluid-rock reactions with basaltic glasses (Gysi and Stefánsson, 2012a, 2012b).

The mass of secondary minerals formed was found to largely depend on the reactive surface area of the olivine (Fig. 5c). The best fit corresponded to 30% ($\zeta = 0.3$) and 80% ($\zeta = 0.8$) (Eqn. 1) of the total olivine geometric surface at low- and high CO$_2$ concentration, respectively. In contrast, the effects of the nucleation surface area ($A_n$) of secondary minerals were found to have a limited effect on the mass of secondary minerals formed. This observation is related to the fact that the secondary minerals were close to equilibrium and that their formation rates were primarily driven by the affinity term ($1 - SI^m$), rather than the surface area of the nuclei and crystals.

The rate limiting reaction controlling elemental transfer is generally thought to be the dissolution rate of the primary mineral. However, as pointed out by Saldi et al. (2012), this may not always be the case, as the precipitation rate of magnesite is 3-5 orders of magnitude lower than the corresponding dissolution rate for olivine. Here, we observed that olivine alteration rate primarily depends on pH. At pH ~6.5, the dissolution rate of olivine was slightly greater than the formation rate of carbonates, demonstrating that the rate limiting factor of carbonation in the system was not the dissolution rate of olivine, but the precipitation rate of the carbonates. With increasing reaction progression, the pH increased to >8. Under these conditions the dissolution rate of olivine became slower than the formation rates of all secondary minerals, demonstrating that the rate limiting factors during water-rock interaction of olivine was its dissolution rate.
Figure 4. Measured changes in pH, CO$_2$, Mg and Si concentrations in the experimental solutions as a function of time and aqueous CO$_2$ concentration at 150°C. The symbols denote the different CO$_2$ concentrations used in each experimental run, and the curved lines the results of the geochemical model. Two different models are shown, at low and elevated CO$_2$ concentrations of 6 and 21 mmol/kg, respectively, with low and high fraction of olivine reactive surface areas 0.3 and 0.8 ($\varsigma$). The vertical dashed line separates the two stages of olivine alteration inferred by these experiments (see text for details).
Figure 5. Mass of secondary minerals precipitated according to the geochemical modeling for low (A) and high (B) initial CO$_2$ concentration. Experimental magnesite mass precipitated was in agreement with results from the geochemical model (C). Quantification of magnesite is based on XRD analysis, SEM observations versus the geochemical model. $\varsigma$ is the fraction of total reactive surface area applied in the model. Ctl: chrysotile; ss carb: Mg-Fe carbonate solid solutions; mgs: magnesite; sid: siderite; tlc: talc; bru: brucite.
5.2 Magnesium isotope systematics during olivine carbonation and serpentinization

The only source of Mg in experimental system was the olivine powder, which had a starting $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratio of -0.22±0.07‰. The initial alteration of the olivine in CO$_2$-rich water (stage I) was characterized by Mg leaching from the olivine, buffering of the pH at ~6.5 and formation of Mg-Fe carbonates and chrysotile. Assuming equilibrium fractionation between the solution and the Mg-Fe carbonates ($\alpha = 0.99975$) and chrysotile ($\alpha = 0.9988$) at 150°C, modeled olivine alteration resulted in the solution becoming enriched in $^{26}\text{Mg}$ and the alteration product enriched in $^{24}\text{Mg}$. Consequently, the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratio of the solution becomes higher than the system or olivine and the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratio of the alteration product becomes lower. This is indeed what was observed experimentally (Fig. 6), as upon initial leaching the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratio of the solution was similar to that of olivine (between -0.27 and -0.14‰), whereas the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ composition of the solution increased to between +0.26 and +0.35‰ following the formation of Mg-Fe carbonates and chrysotile.

Upon further alteration of olivine (stage II) the CO$_2$ concentration decreased due to carbonate mineralization and the solution pH increased to >8 with chrysotile and eventually brucite becomes the dominant alteration product. The equilibrium fractionation factor between the solution and brucite ($\alpha = 1.0004$) and talc ($\alpha = 1.0004$) resulted in the solution becoming enriched in $^{24}\text{Mg}$ and the alteration product enriched in $^{26}\text{Mg}$, or the reverse $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ systematics compared to initial olivine alteration.

These results suggest that changes in the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ composition of the solution may be used to trace the extent of olivine alteration via carbonation and serpentinization reactions: Figure 6 demonstrates that the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ composition shifts rapidly under close to equilibrium conditions, before stage II is reached. This is most likely caused by rapid element transfer during stage I, where olivine dissolution and carbonation reactions occur under far-from equilibrium conditions. This indicates that the dominant reaction pathway can be identified with $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$, for instance in an ultramafic CO$_2$ sequestration system and therefore verify ongoing carbonate formation. The extensive precipitation of Mg-carbonate minerals (presented in studied system as stage I) with light $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ composition will be reflected with the solution enriched in $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$.

![Figure 6](image.png)

**Figure 6.** (A) The result of the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ isotopic systematics of the secondary minerals obtained from the isotope modeling. (B) Comparison of the measured and calculated $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ isotopic systematics of the water. Also shown are the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ for the bulk alteration product calculated using the isotope modeling results.
5.3 Comparison with natural analogues

The results of these experiments and isotopic modeling are compared with naturally altered basalts and ground- and geothermal water in Figure 7. The higher $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ values of the solutions measured in this study (relative to the starting olivine composition) are similar to the elevated values of +0.23 ‰ to +0.85 ‰ observed in the ground- and geothermal waters of the basaltic terrain in Iceland (Pogge von Strandmann et al., 2008). This positive shift in the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ composition of the fluid is likely to be due to the formation of clay minerals (similar to serpentine minerals) and carbonate minerals that are enriched in $^{24}\text{Mg}$ relative to the olivine and bulk Mg of the basalts. The $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ compositions of altered oceanic basalts in the western Pacific reveal large isotopic fractionation during oceanic crust alteration (Huang, 2013), with the most negative values being associated with the carbonation of the basalts, and less negative values associated with serpentinization. These observations are in good agreement with our isotopic modeling, where the carbonates (and to lesser extend chrysotile) are found to be enriched in the $^{26}\text{Mg}$ isotope relative to olivine and the solution, whereas extensive serpentinization of oceanic crust and formation of brucite and talc may result in the reversed $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$, with these minerals becoming enriched in $^{24}\text{Mg}$ and the resulting solutions enriched in $^{26}\text{Mg}$.

The hydrothermal carbonation of ultramafic rocks (and by analogy mafic rocks) is thought to be accompanied by significant inter-mineral fraction resulting in the formation of $^{24}\text{Mg}$ enriched magnesite and $^{26}\text{Mg}$ enriched talc (Beinlich et al. 2014). The field results of Beinlich et al. (2014) suggest that Mg isotopes may not be fractionated during serpentinization reactions, as their olivine exhibits and invariant Mg isotope ratio. This study is in agreement that formation of Mg-bearing carbonates during ocean water circulation through mid-ocean ridge flanks at hydrothermal conditions forms a sink for isotopically light Mg. We show, the late stage serpentinization with limited Mg supply from slowly dissolving olivine and slowly forming chrysotile-brucite caused hydrothermal water to be progressively enriched in $^{24}\text{Mg}$ eventually. The isotopic composition of water therefore points out sensitivity to formation and dissolution rates of different minerals at different settings during reaction progress. This is possible to track by application of kinetic Mg isotope fractionation for Mg-rich rock-forming minerals, which were calibrated by laboratory experiments, theoretical calculation and analysis of natural samples.
Figure 7. Comparison of $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratios of natural fresh and altered mafic and ultramafic rocks, natural ground- and hydrothermal water and the results obtained here experimentally and using isotope modeling (min-max values): $^a$ this study, $^b$ this study, $^c$ Pogge von Strandmann et al. (2008), $^d$ Huang (2013). The vertical line represents the average Mg isotopic composition of the mantle, i.e., bulk Earth (Teng, 2017).

6 Conclusions

Olivine carbonation and serpentinization in CO$_2$-rich fluids at 150˚C was studied experimentally and using geochemical modeling. The alteration of olivine was found to be incongruent and dependant on reaction time, with two main stages being identified: Stage I was characterized by a low pH (buffered at $\sim$6.5), during which olivine dissolved to form Mg-Fe carbonate solid solutions and minor chrysotile. Assuming equilibrium fractionation, the Mg-rich carbonates and chrysotile forming during this interval preferentially incorporated $^{24}\text{Mg}$, such that the alteration product had lower $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ values and the solution higher $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ relative to the olivine that provided the only source of Mg in the experiments. Stage II continued the extensive alteration of olivine, with the carbonation reactions ultimately driving a decrease of CO$_2$ concentration and associated increase in pH (to $>8$), under which chrysotile and brucite became the dominant alteration minerals. As a result, the alteration product becomes progressively enriched in $^{26}\text{Mg}$ relative to the solution that eventually may display lower $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ ratios than for the olivine source.

It follows that changes in the $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ composition of the fluid phase and alteration products formed during olivine alteration primarily reflects the type and quantity of secondary Mg minerals formed, and thus in turn depend on pH and extent of reaction. Comparison of the experimental and isotope modeling results with ground- and geothermal water of basaltic terrains indicate that $\delta^{26}\text{Mg}$ systematics of the natural waters are controlled by mafic rock leaching and incorporation of $^{24}\text{Mg}$ into carbonates and Mg-Si minerals like chrysotile and
possibly clays. The results also demonstrate that isotope fractionation upon geochemical processes like water-rock interaction may exceed differences observed among various sources, highlighting the effects and importance of chemical reactions on the isotope characteristics of reactive elements like magnesium.

Tracking Mg isotope exchange mechanism and rates relevant to hydrothermal olivine alteration in oceanic crust showed formation of Mg-bearing carbonates at mid-ocean ridge flanks indeed forms a sink for isotopically light Mg. Dissolution and precipitation of different minerals varied with reaction extent and so the isotopic composition of water. This is possible to follow with Mg isotope fractionation for Mg-rich rock-forming minerals. Moreover, Mg isotopic signatures indicate application as a tracer during CO$_2$ sequestration.

**Associated content**

Appendix 1 is thermodynamic and kinetic dataset used for the kinetic reaction path simulations.
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Associated content (Appendix 1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>log $K_{150^\circ C}$</th>
<th>log $k_{150^\circ C}$ (mol/m$^2$/sec)</th>
<th>$r_{eq} = A_{geo} k$ (1-SI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aqueous Species and surface reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td></td>
<td>CO$_2$ + H$_2$O = H$^+$ + HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>-6.74$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_3^{2-}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>HCO$_3^-$ = H$^+$ + CO$_3^{2-}$</td>
<td>-10.30$^4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaHCO$_3$(aq)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Na$^+$ + HCO$_3^-$ = NaHCO$_3$(aq)</td>
<td>0.42$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCO$_3^-$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Na$^+$ + CO$_3^{2-}$ = NaCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>1.94$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgHCO$_3^+$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mg$^{2+}$ + HCO$_3^-$ = MgHCO$_3$+</td>
<td>1.76$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgCO$_3$(aq)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mg$^{2+}$ + CO$_3^{2-}$ = MgCO$_3$(aq)</td>
<td>3.70$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgOH$^+$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mg$^{2+}$ + H$<em>2$O = MgOH$^-$</em> + H$^+$</td>
<td>-8.06$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mineral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivine</td>
<td>fo$_{93}$</td>
<td>Mg$<em>{2.38}$Fe$</em>{0.14}$SiO$_4$(s) + 4H$^+$ = 1.86Mg$^{2+}$ + 0.14Fe$^{2+}$ + H$_2$SiO$_4$(aq)</td>
<td>16.89$^d$</td>
<td>-4.12-0.256pH$^e$</td>
<td>$A_{geo} k$ (1-SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesite</td>
<td>mgs</td>
<td>MgCO$_3$(s) + H$^+$ = Mg$^{2+}$ + HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>-0.33$^f$</td>
<td>-10$^g$</td>
<td>$k$ (1-SI$^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siderite</td>
<td>sid</td>
<td>FeCO$_3$(s) + H$^+$ = Fe$^{2+}$ + HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>-2.53$^f$</td>
<td>-10$^g$</td>
<td>$k$ (1-SI$^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg$<em>{0.23}$Fe$</em>{0.77}$CO$_3$</td>
<td>carb-ss</td>
<td>Mg$<em>{0.23}$Fe$</em>{0.77}$CO$_3$(s) + H$^+$ = 0.75Fe$^{2+}$ + 0.25Mg$^{2+}$ + HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>-2.22$^f$</td>
<td>-10$^g$</td>
<td>$k$ (1-SI$^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg$<em>{0.23}$Fe$</em>{0.77}$CO$_3$</td>
<td>carb-ss</td>
<td>Mg$<em>{0.23}$Fe$</em>{0.77}$CO$_3$(s) + H$^+$ = 0.5Fe$^{2+}$ + 0.5Mg$^{2+}$ + HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>-1.73$^f$</td>
<td>-10$^g$</td>
<td>$k$ (1-SI$^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg$<em>{0.23}$Fe$</em>{0.77}$CO$_3$</td>
<td>carb-ss</td>
<td>Mg$<em>{0.23}$Fe$</em>{0.77}$CO$_3$(s) + H$^+$ = 0.25Fe$^{2+}$ + 0.75Mg$^{2+}$ + HCO$_3^-$</td>
<td>-1.12$^f$</td>
<td>-10$^g$</td>
<td>$k$ (1-SI$^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysothile</td>
<td>ctl</td>
<td>Mg$_2$Si$_2$O$_7$(OH)$_2$(s) + 6H$^+$ = 3Mg$^{2+}$ + 2H$_2$SiO$_4$(aq) + H$_2$O</td>
<td>20.11$^h$</td>
<td>-8.20($k_a$), -9.78($k_a$)$^i$</td>
<td>($k_a+k_b a_{H^+}^{0.22}$) (1-SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talc</td>
<td>tlc</td>
<td>Mg$_2$Si$_2$O$_7$(OH)$_2$(s) + 4H$_2$O + 6H$^+$ = 3Mg$^{2+}$ + 4H$_2$SiO$_4$(aq)</td>
<td>13.42$^h$</td>
<td>-9.83$^i$</td>
<td>$k$(1-SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brucite</td>
<td>bru</td>
<td>Mg(OH)$_2$(s) = Mg$^{2+}$ + 2OH$^-$</td>
<td>-12.35$^j$</td>
<td>-1.68($k_a$), -6.07($k_a$)$^i$</td>
<td>($k_a a_{H^+}^{0.5} + k_a$)(1-SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorphous silica</td>
<td>am-Si</td>
<td>SiO$_2$(s) + 2H$_2$O = H$_4$SiO$_4$(aq)</td>
<td>-1.98$^f$</td>
<td>-9.43$^k$</td>
<td>$k$(1-SI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Stefánsson et al. (2013)  
$^b$ Stefánsson et al. (2014)  
$^c$ Saldi et al. (2012)  
$^d$ Stefánsson and Wesolowski (1997)  
$^f$ Stefánsson (2001)  
$^g$ Gunnarsson et al. (2005)  
$^h$ Palandri and Kharaka (2004)  
$^i$ Holland and Powell (2011)  
$^j$ Carroll et al. (1998)  
$^k$ Caroll et al. (1998)  

**Appendix 1.** Thermodynamic and kinetic database used for the kinetic reaction path simulations.
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ABSTRACT
The interaction of CO₂-rich water with olivine was studied using geochemical reaction modelling in order to gain insight into the effects of temperature, acid supply (CO₂) and extent of reaction on the secondary mineralogy, water chemistry and mass transfer. Olivine (Fo93) was dissolved at 150 and 250°C and pCO₂ of 2 and 20 bar in a closed system and an open system with secondary minerals allowed to precipitate. The progressive water–rock interaction resulted in increased solution pH, with gradual carbonate formation starting at pH 5 and various Mg–OH and Mg–Si minerals becoming dominant at pH>8. The major factor determining olivine alteration is the pH of the water. In turn, the pH value is determined by acid supply, reaction progress and temperature.

KEYWORDS: CO₂, olivine, reaction modelling, water–rock interaction.

Introduction
Carbonate mineral scaling is commonly associated with geothermal fluid utilization, both in the reservoir as well as in production and re-injection wells and surface pipelines (Gunnlaugsson 2012; Gunnlaugsson et al., 2014). Understanding the CO₂–water–rock interaction at geothermal conditions is therefore important in terms of geothermal utilization. Olivine is a major constituent of mafic rocks and commonly associated with geothermal systems. Moreover, it contains a limited number of main elements (Mg, Fe²⁺, Si and O) and may serve as a suitable system to demonstrate and test geochemical reaction modelling with observations from experiments.

A number of studies have focused on CO₂–water–rock interaction by geochemical modelling and laboratory experiments. Under geothermal conditions these include, for example, forsterite dissolution and magnesite formation (Giammar et al., 2005) and CO₂–water–basalt interaction (Gysi and Stefánsson, 2011, 2012a,b,c; Galeczka et al., 2014). Most of these studies have implemented relatively simple models though some recent work has tried to include a fully kinetic approach (Hellevang et al., 2013).

The aim of the present study was to examine the interaction of CO₂-rich water with olivine under hydrothermal conditions using geochemical reaction modelling, in particular, to investigate the effects of acid supply, reaction progress (ξ) on the overall reaction path and the rate of mass transfer.

Model calculations
Reaction-path simulations were carried out at 150–250°C in order to study the effects of temperature, CO₂ supply, extent of reaction, and time on the CO₂–water–olivine alteration process (geochemical system with CO₂-H₂O-MgO-FeO-SiO₂ chemical components). The calculations were carried out using the PHREEQC geochemical program, version 2.18.
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(Parkhurst and Appelo, 1999) and the Wateq database with updates listed below. The reaction-path calculations were carried out on the interaction between forsterite (Fo93) and solutions of variable CO$_2$ concentration. The initial solution contained 10 to 200 mmol kg$^{-1}$ of dissolved CO$_2$ ($p$CO$_2$ = ~2 and ~20 bar), the solutions were titrated stepwise with 1.378 mol of olivine (200 mg olivine) and the reaction progress was followed. Two types of calculations were used: closed (limited CO$_2$) and open (unlimited CO$_2$) systems. In the present study, the moles of progressively dissolved olivine per kilogram of solution were taken to represent the reaction progress ($\xi$) of the system. In the calculation, secondary mineral precipitation reactions were assumed to be controlled by instantaneous equilibration upon saturation in solution. The secondary minerals considered include goethite (FeOOH), talc (Mg$_3$Si$_2$O$_5$(OH)$_2$), chrysotile (Mg$_3$Si$_2$O$_5$(OH)$_4$), antigorite (Mg$_4$Si$_3$O$_8$5(OH)$_6$2), chlorite-Al free (Mg$_6$Si$_4$O$_10$(OH)$_8$), anthophyllite (Mg$_3$Si$_2$O$_5$(OH)$_4$), brucite (Mg(OH)$_2$), magnesite (MgCO$_3$), siderite (FeCO$_3$) and Fe-Mg carbonates (Mg$_{0.25}$Fe$_{0.75}$CO$_3$, Mg$_{0.5}$Fe$_{0.5}$CO$_3$, Mg$_{0.75}$Fe$_{0.25}$CO$_3$). These mineral solubilities and the appropriate CO$_2$-aqueous speciation dataset were updated in the present work using recent literature data (Palmer and Wesolowski, 1997; Holland and Powell, 2011; Gysi and Stefánsson, 2011; Stefánsson et al., 2013; 2014). The mass exchanges in the system were assumed to be controlled by the rate of olivine dissolution, the rate expression taken from Rimstidt et al. (2012).

**CO$_2$—olivine interaction**

Initially the solution pH was between 3.8 and 4.2 at 150ºC, depending on $p$CO$_2$. Upon progressive CO$_2$—water—rock interaction, the pH increased due to consumption of H$^+$ upon olivine dissolution. At first, the pH was buffered at ~6 by the ionization of carbonic acid and formation of talc, carbonates and either chlorite or chrysotile. Such mildly acid to neutral conditions are characterized either by high initial acid supply and low to moderate extent of the reaction or a low acid supply and low extent of reaction. When most of the CO$_2$ has been mineralized, the pH rises rapidly to >8 and is buffered by the coexistence of brucite, carbonates and either chlorite or

---

**Fig. 1.** Changes in pH upon reaction progress ($\xi$) at $p$CO$_2$ = 2—20 bar for open (os) and closed systems (cs) at 150ºC. Indication of the minerals when pH is buffered is included on the diagram also. Mineral abbreviations: bru — brucite, carb — carbonates, chlo — chlorite, chr — chrysotile, mag — magnesite, sid — siderite.
chrysotile (Figs 1, 2 and 3). This results in decreased mobility and concentrations of Mg and Si in solution. Consequently, the carbonates were found to become increasingly more Fe rich upon reaction progress and increased pH (Fig. 3). Insignificant amounts of olivine are needed at low initial CO$_2$ concentration to increase the pH to alkaline conditions. With increasing initial CO$_2$ concentration, more olivine dissolution is needed to increase the pH of the water.

For open systems with unlimited CO$_2$ supply the pH is buffered at 5–5.7, depending on $p$CO$_2$ (Fig. 1), upon dissolution of a limited amount of olivine and consequent precipitation of talc and a solid solution of Mg-Fe carbonates (Figs 1, 3). With increasing reaction progress, pH remains fixed at such comparatively low values by mineral-solution equilibria due to the continuous supply of CO$_2$ which triggers further dissolution of olivine accompanied by precipitation of talc.

Fig. 2. The concentration of ΣCO$_2$ (sum of CO$_2$ aqueous speciation) in solution as a function of reaction progress ($\xi$) at 150°C for open (os) and closed (cs) systems.

Fig. 3. The moles of secondary minerals formed as a function of reaction progress at $p$CO$_2$ = 2 bar and for open (os) and closed (cs) systems at 150°C. Mineral abbreviations: bru – brucite, carb – carbonates, carb ss – carbonate solid solutions, mag – magnesite, sid – siderite.
and carbonates as indicated schematically by the reaction:

$$\text{Mg}_{1.86}\text{Fe}_{0.14}\text{SiO}_4 + 1.26\text{CO}_2 + 0.25\text{H}_2\text{O} = 0.25\text{Mg}_3\text{Si}_4\text{O}_{10}(\text{OH})_2 + 1.26\text{Mg}_{0.88}\text{Fe}_{0.11}\text{CO}_3$$

In other words, a steady state is attained, with constant composition of both the aqueous solution and the carbonate solid solution as well as a constant ratio between the masses of precipitating secondary minerals.

Based on this, one can conclude that the very fine variations in pH at a particular temperature constitute the dominant parameter in determining secondary-mineral composition. In turn, pH is controlled by acid supply, partial pressure and extent of reaction.

The rate of olivine dissolution and overall mass transfer is also related to the pH of the solution as well as the temperature (Figs 1, 4). The dissolution rate of olivine decreases with increasing pH. It follows that progressive CO$_2$–water–olivine interaction result in decreased olivine dissolution rate and the overall mass transfer within the system. On the other hand, increased temperature increases the dissolution rate and the overall mass movement of the system. However, temperature does not have a significant influence on the overall reaction path with carbonates predominant at pH<7 and Mg-Si and Mg-OH minerals at pH>8.

The variety of conditions presented and their effect on olivine alteration represent theoretical scenarios, reaction paths, for natural fluid–rock interactions at geothermal conditions.

**Conclusions**

The interaction of CO$_2$-rich water with olivine under hydrothermal conditions (150 and 250°C) was studied using geochemical modelling. In particular, the effects of acid supply and reaction progress on the overall reaction path as well as rate of mass exchanges within the system under consideration were investigated. The progressive water–rock interaction resulted in increased solution pH, with carbonate formation starting at pH 5 and various Mg-OH and Mg-Si minerals becoming predominant under alkaline conditions. As a result, the carbonates were Mg-rich at mildly acid conditions but became increasingly Fe-rich with increasing pH. The major factor determining olivine alteration is the pH of the water. In turn, the pH value is determined by acid supply, reaction progress and temperature.

![Graph showing the dissolution rate of olivine as a function of reaction progress in time at 150°C and 250°C and pCO$_2$ = 2 and 20 bar for open (os) and closed systems (cs).](image)

Fig. 4. The dissolution rate of olivine (Rimstidt et al., 2012) as a function of reaction progress in time at 150°C and 250°C and pCO$_2$ = 2 and 20 bar for open (os) and closed systems (cs). As observed, mass movement is influenced by pH as well as temperature. In turn, the pH is affected by the reaction progress and initial CO$_2$ concentration.
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