Effects of Reductants on the Fluorescence Spectra of Natural Organic Matter Marta Viscut, Dr. Julie Korak, Prof. Fernando Rosario-Ortiz

Introduction

- Fluorescence Spectroscopy bulk characterization technique for Natural Organic Matter (NOM)
- Used for qualitative and quantitative characterization
- Highly sensitive to the sample conditions
- Thiosulfate (TS) and ascorbic acid (AA) are reductants commonly used to quench oxidation experiments with NOM

Objective

- Analyze fluorescence spectra of NOM with reductants added at a range of concentrations
- Determine absorbance threshold where interference occurs, as well as concentration of preservative for which problems arise
- Make recommendations for preservative use during fluorescence

Experimental Methods

- Samples preparation:
 - 3 mg/L TOC Suwannee River NOM (SRNOM) 2R101N
 - ~7.5 pH, 10 mM phosphate buffer
 - Reductant concentrations range between 5 and 160 mgAA/L and 5 to 160 mgTS/L in NOM solution (< 2%) dilution)
 - Overnight storage at 5°C
- **Fluorescence Spectroscopy runs:**
 - Jobin Yvon HORIBA FluoroMax 4
 - $\lambda_{FX} 240 450 \text{ nm}; \lambda_{FM} 300 550 \text{ nm}$
 - 20°C, duplicates
- **Ultraviolet/visible spectra (UV/Vis)**
 - CARY 100 Bio, VARIAN 200-800 nm
 - HACH DR 500 200- 600 nm

NOM + AA Results



Ascorbic Acid 1.38

spectra analysis

Investigate effect of reductants on NOM redox properties with respect to observed fluorescence

NOM Background

- Heterogeneous mixture of organic matter from natural waters, sediments, and soils
- Refractory
- NOM: made of soluble and particulate components (Figure2), affecting:
- **Biogeochemical processes**
- Water quality, contaminant binding, fertility of soil, and carbon cycle
- Composition and function dependent on origin, temperature, ionic strength and composition of cations, pH, microbial activity, and photochemistry



Figure 1: Proposed structure for humic acid fraction of NOM¹



TS&NOM, AA&NOM; TS& Distilled Water (DI); AA&DI

- EEM corrections and analysis in MATLAB[®]:
 - Blank subtraction, Raman normalized, instrument correction, light screening correction; Matlab code
 - Differential EEMs AA&NOM versus AA& DI plots; peaks A, C analysis; FI analysis

General NOM Results

- Control EEM spectra 0 mg preservative per litter NOM solution (Figure 5)
- Used in order to determine differential fluorescence interference after preservative addition



Figure 5. Control EEM, performed under similar experimental conditions as the rest of the samples

Figure 8. Differential EEM after

subtraction of the control EEM

from the 160mgTS/L EEM



enhances fluorescence intensity in the Peak C region, and quenches fluorescence intensity of Peak A region (Figure 12)

AA does not fluoresce

AA presence systematically

- FI statistically similar for up to 40 mgAA/L (p=0.15) (Figure 13)
- **Deduced that AA affects the** redox properties of NOM which affect fluorescence



Figure 13. Fluorescence index changes with increase in concentration of AA

Conclusions

1.36

- TS and AA are important for oxidant quenching
- During analysis of samples prepared with these preservatives, there is need to consider constraints for fluorescence characterization
- For TS concentrations above 78 mg/L, it is expected to notice 10% screening of light, and along with it strong effects in the EEM plot below 250 nm λ_{FX}
- It is hypothesized that AA can lead to changes in the redox properties of NOM, changing the photo-physics of the sample

Concentration expressed as Total Organic Carbon (TOC)

NOM/Total Organic Matter (TOM); Dissolved Organic Nitrogen (DON); Dissolved Organic Phosphorous (DOP); Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC); Particulate Organic Carbon (POC)²

- Figure 7. NOM solution with 160 Figure 6. NOM solution with 10 mgTS/L concentration mgTS/L concentration
- The interference observed only affects low λ_{FX} (Figure 8)
- The interference seems to be uniform and independent of
- Λ_{FM} FI determined to be statistically similar (p value=0.74) Peak A dependent on TS concentration

High absorbance

below 270 nm,

affecting correction

(Figure 9)

Ο



Figure 9. Changes in Peak A intensity with changes in TS concentration UV/Vis Data for TS&DI Samples • 160 mg/L TS&DI 10 mg/L TS&DI $\widehat{5}$ 1.4 • 40 mg/L TS&DI • 80 mg/L TS&DI 120 mg/L TS&DI observed (Figure 10) in the UV/Vis Spectra

Future Work

- Analyze NOM from other sources (different composition)
- Verify all results through the reproduction of the full experiment
- Perform size exclusion chromatography (SEC) for the AA+NOM samples to determine potential size effects due to redox reactions
- Perform Nuclear Magnetic Resonance experiments, to asses transformations in NOM structure after AA addition
- Publish findings, providing concise description of the constraints in oxidant quenching chemicals
- Analyze the fluorescence spectra for additional preservatives

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful for the support provided by the following institutions and people:

- University of Colorado Boulder
- Discovery Learning Apprenticeship Program
- All the members of Fernando Rosario-Ortiz Research Group
- **Gregory Rulifson**
- Sharon E Anderson
- Daniel Watson

Fluorescence Background

- Absorption of photon -> excitation of electron to higher energy level (Figure 3)
- Relaxation of electron -> emission of fluorescence (fluorophores)
- Composition specific
- Information on redox state, source, and reactivity information for NOM
- EEMs plots: Intensity of energy emitted at particular emission (λ_{FM}) and excitation (λ_{FX}) wavelengths (Figure 4)
- FI assess composition differences
- $FI=I_{470}/I_{520} @ \lambda_{Fx}=370 \text{ nm}$
- Microbial FI~1.8
- Terrestrial FI~1.2
- Excitation femto nano (10-9 s) (10-15s) ≥micro (10⁻⁶s) Figure 3: Fluorescence photo-physical phenomena 380 FI 360 340 320 வீ 300 B



260 270 280 Wavelength (nm) 290 300 250 factor: Figure 10. UV/Vis absorbance of TS+DI samples $A_{EX} + A_{EM}$ $\frac{F_{corr}}{1} = 10^{-1}$ Fmeas 0 to 11 mg/L TS in DI • 10% screening at =78 **Correction factor** : statistically similar accounts for light mgTS/L ○ 1.27 * 1.1 = Peak A values screening 0.002[TS] + 1.2404(Average=1.3, p_value=0.20)



1) H.R. Schulten, M. Schnitzer, Naturwissenschaften, 1993, 80, 27; 2) <u>www.mdpi.com;</u>

3) J.W. Lichtman, and J.A. Conchello, Nature Methods, 2005 2, 910-919; 4) J.A. Korak et. al., Water Research, 2014, 49, 328

Fernando Rosario-Ortiz Research Group

University of Colorado at Boulder

