Interaction between L-aspartate and the brucite [Mg(OH)₂]–water interface
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Abstract

The interaction of biomolecules at the mineral–water interface could have played a prominent role in the emergence of more complex organic species in life’s origins. Serpentinite-hosted hydrothermal vents may have acted as a suitable environment for this process to occur, although little is known about biomolecule–mineral interactions in this system. We used batch adsorption experiments and surface complexation modeling to study the interaction of L-aspartate onto a thermodynamically stable product of serpentinization, brucite [Mg(OH)₂], over a wide range of initial aspartate concentrations at four ionic strengths governed by [Mg²⁺] and [Ca²⁺]. We observed that up to 1.0 l mol of aspartate adsorbed per m² of brucite at pH ≥ 10.2 and low Mg²⁺ concentrations (0.7 × 10⁻³ M), but surface adsorption decreased at high Mg²⁺ concentrations (5.8 × 10⁻³ M). At high Ca²⁺ concentrations (4.0 × 10⁻³ M), aspartate surface adsorption doubled (to 2.0 l mol m⁻²), with Ca²⁺ adsorption at 29.6 l mol m⁻².

We used the extended triple-layer model (ETLM) to construct a quantitative thermodynamic model of the adsorption data. We proposed three surface reactions involving the adsorption of aspartate (HAsp⁻) and/or Ca²⁺ onto brucite:

\[
2 \text{SOH} + \text{H}^+ + \text{HAsp}^- \rightarrow \text{SOH}^+ + 2\text{SAsp}^- + \text{H}_2\text{O},
\]

\[
\text{SOH} + \text{HAsp}^- + \text{Ca}^{2+} \rightarrow \text{SO}^- \text{Ca}^{(\text{HAsp})^+} + \text{H}^+,
\]

and

\[
\text{SOH} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{SOH}_2^{+} \text{Ca(OH)}_2 + \text{H}^+.
\]

We used the ETLM to predict that brucite particle surface charge becomes more negative with increasing [Mg²⁺], creating an unfavorable electrostatic environment for a negatively-charged aspartate molecule to adsorb. In contrast, our addition of Ca²⁺ to the system resulted in Ca²⁺ adsorption and development of positive surface charge. Our prediction of surface speciation of aspartate on brucite with Ca²⁺ revealed that the calcium–aspartate complex is the predominant surface aspartate species, which suggests that the increase in aspartate adsorption with Ca²⁺ is primarily driven by calcium adsorption. The cooperative effect of Ca²⁺ and the inhibitive effect of Mg²⁺ on aspartate adsorption onto brucite indicate that serpentinite-hosted hydrothermal fluids provide an ideal environment for these interactions to take place.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The origin of life on early Earth was a geochemical sequence of emergent steps involving increasing complexity (Hazen, 2005). Among the first of these steps was the synthesis of prebiotic organic molecules in the midst of the Archean atmosphere, ocean, and lithologies. The emergence of simple molecules such as amino acids and sugars may have occurred under a variety of plausible Archean environments (Ponnamperuma and Pering, 1966; Deamer and Pashley, 1989; Henretta et al., 1992; Holm and Andersson, 2005; Jablout et al., 2007; Cleaves et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2011). Far less is known about the selection, concentration, and self-organization of these biomolecules into macromolecular systems from dilute solutions.

Mineral surfaces may provide the means by which simple biomolecules self-organize. The mineral–water interface is known to concentrate biomolecules through adsorption (Jonsson et al., 2009, 2010; Cleaves et al., 2012). Mineral surfaces change significantly with shifts in pH owing to surface protonation reactions. Accordingly, mineral surfaces may have potentially played a key role in the origin of life, whereby the mineral–water interface provided sites for the selection, concentration, and self-organization of biomolecules (Goldschmidt, 1952; Hazen, 2006; Cleaves et al., 2012).

Hydrothermal vent systems have been discussed as plausible environments for the origin of life by providing templates for macromolecular assembly (Baross and Hoffman, 1985; Shock and Canovas, 2010; Sleep et al., 2011). The disequilibria established by mixing hot, hydrothermal fluids (<350 °C) with the overlying cold seawater (2 °C) may drive the formation of some prebiotic molecules (Shock and Schulte, 1998; Shock and Canovas, 2010). A different type of hydrothermal system known as the Lost City hydrothermal field was discovered off the Mid-Ocean Ridge Axis (Kelley et al., 2001). The Lost City hydrothermal field belongs to a class of hydrothermal systems that undergo serpentinization, which involves the hydration of magnesium-rich olivine to serpentine and ferro-brucite (Bach et al., 2006), according to the reaction:

\[
\text{Mg}_x\text{Fe}_y\text{SiO}_4 + 3\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Mg}_{x+2}\text{Fe}_{y+4}\text{Si}_2\text{O}_5(\text{OH})_4 + \text{Mg}_{1-x}\text{Fe}_y\text{SiO}_2(\text{OH})_2
\]

Serpentinite-hosted hydrothermal vents such as the Lost City hydrothermal field release fluids that contain up to 19 × 10⁻³ M and 4 × 10⁻³ M of H₂ and CH₄, respectively (Kelley et al., 2005; Proskurowski et al., 2006). The mixing of these hydrothermal fluids with seawater creates a strong redox gradient that may facilitate the formation of prebiotic molecules (Holm et al., 2006; Shock and Canovas, 2010). Furthermore, greenstone sequences discovered at the Isua Formation (3.8 Ga) and the Pilbara Formation (3.5 Ga) suggest that serpentinite-hosted hydrothermal activity may have been present on early Earth (Dymek et al., 1988; Van Kranendonk et al., 2007; Shibuya et al., 2010). These localities and the presence of Archean komatitites provide evidence that the oceanic crust on early Earth was more ultramafic compared to today’s mafic, basalt-hosted seafloor (Herzberg et al., 2010; Van Kranendonk, 2010). Depending on the prevalence of the ultramafic host rock, serpentinite-hosted hydrothermal fields may have been prolific on the Archean seafloor prior to the emergence of the first cellular lifeform at 3.48 Ga (Noffke et al., 2013).

Ferro-brucite \[
\text{[Mg}_{0.75}\text{Fe}_{0.25}(\text{OH})_2] \]

is a thermodynamically stable mineral of the serpentinization reaction in Eq. (1). The ferrous iron in ferro-brucite controls the amount of \[H_2(\text{aq})\] produced in the hydrothermal field as magnetite is subsequently precipitated:

\[
\text{(Mg,Fe)}_y(\text{OH})_2 \rightarrow (\text{Mg,Fe})_{y-z}(\text{OH})_2 + z\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_4 + z\text{H}_2(\text{aq}) + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}
\]
The aim of this study is to evaluate the potential role that minerals within serpentinite-hosted hydrothermal fields play in concentrating and selecting prebiotic molecules from a dilute aqueous environment. In this framework, we characterized the extent and possible importance of this interaction with a combination of batch adsorption experiments at 25 °C and 1 bar and surface complexation modeling. Furthermore, we investigated the effects that common dissolved ions, including Mg$^{2+}$ and Ca$^{2+}$, have on the interaction between aspartate and the brucite–water interface so that we may predict mineral surface reactions in plausible prebiotic aqueous environments.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Brucite synthesis

We synthesized a microcrystalline brucite powder with a precipitation method previously reported by Henrist and coworkers (2003) and Lu and coworkers (2004). With 18.2 MΩ cm Milli-Q water (Millipore), we prepared a 2.0 M MgCl$_2$ solution (99.99% Alfa Aesar dry ampoules under Ar gas) and a solution containing 2.0 M NH$_4$OH (Sigma–Aldrich, 25 wt.% solution). We added the MgCl$_2$ dropwise to the NH$_4$OH solution at a rate of approximately 2.5 mL min$^{-1}$ using a graduated buret while we kept the latter solution vigorously stirred at a constant temperature of 45 ± 3 °C. Lu and colleagues (2004) have proposed that the precipitation reaction:

$$\text{MgCl}_2 + 2\text{NH}_4\text{OH} \rightarrow \text{Mg(OH)}_2 + 2\text{NH}_4\text{Cl}$$

(3)

occurred during the addition of MgCl$_2$ to NH$_4$OH. After brucite precipitated, we set the sealed reaction vessel aside to cool at room temperature for 3 days. We thoroughly washed the soluble NH$_4$Cl byproduct from the precipitate with Milli-Q water. We then dried the precipitate on a Corning PC-420D hot plate at 135 °C for 1 h.

2.1.1. Hydrothermal treatment

Both Henrist and coworkers (2003) and Lu and coworkers (2004) observed that the crystallinity and morphology of synthetic brucite improved when it was sealed with water in a reaction vessel heated above 100 °C over an extended period of time. We carried out a hydrothermal aging treatment on our synthetic brucite by sealing an aqueous suspension of the synthetic brucite in Milli-Q water within a PTFE-lined stainless steel reaction vessel (Col-Int-Tech). We heated the precipitate in a furnace at 150 °C for 3 days, and after cooling the brucite–water solution to room temperature, we dried the powder at 135 °C with a hotplate. We then stored the hydrothermally-treated brucite powder in a glass vial under an Ar gas atmosphere at room temperature.

SEM imaging (JEOL 8500F) revealed that the untreated brucite has a crystal habit characterized by rosettes of rough, circular, and oblong platelets (Fig. 1a), whereas the hydrothermally-treated brucite is distinguished by clusters of lamellar, hexagonal platelets (Fig. 1b). Additionally, the powder XRD (Bruker D2 Phaser) pattern of the hydrothermally-treated brucite demonstrates higher intensity peaks in the case of reflection (001) and reduced intensity for the (100), (101) and (111) reflections (Fig. 2). This pattern is consistent with powder XRD patterns collected

![Fig. 1. SEM image of synthetic brucite (a) before hydrothermal treatment where oblong platelets are clustered in rosettes and (b) after hydrothermal treatment where platelets are hexagonal and in lamellar clusters (scale = 1 μm).](image1)

![Fig. 2. Synthetic brucite powder XRD patterns, both untreated (blue) and hydrothermally treated (black). (hkl) reflections are indexed by the red squares. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)](image2)
under ambient conditions that have been archived at the International Centre for Diffraction Data (http://icdd.com). Our SEM and powder XRD observations may be interpreted as evidence that the hydrothermal treatment process enhanced the crystallinity in the basal direction by reducing terraces and kink sites and improving hexagonal morphology.

2.2. Brucite specific surface area

We characterized the surface area of the synthetic brucite powder with the multi-point BET N₂ adsorption method (Micromeritics, Norcross, GA, USA) to obtain a specific surface area of 17.6 ± 0.1 m² g⁻¹. A high proportion of this measured surface area most likely represents the prominent (001) basal surface, although the distribution between the basal and lateral (edge) surfaces cannot be determined with the classical N₂ gas adsorption method. This distinction is important because previous adsorption studies involving mineral surfaces similar to brucite, such as gibbsite, goethite, illite, and kaolinite, conclude that only the lateral surfaces are active in the protonation and deprotonation reactions that lead to surface adsorption (Prélot et al., 2003; Sayed-Hassan et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2013). If the lateral surfaces primarily adsorb aspartate, it is necessary to determine the surface area specific to these edge surfaces.

We assayed the edge-specific surface area (ESA) with low-pressure Ar gas adsorption at the Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire des Environnements Continentaux (Vandœuvre les Nancy, France). Consistent basal- and edge-specific surface areas were previously obtained with this technique for several lamellar minerals including talc, kaolinite, illite, lamellar silica, saponite, and smectite clays (Eypert-Blaison et al., 2002; Michot and Villiéras, 2002; Villiéras et al., 2002; Tournassat et al., 2003; Sayed-Hassan et al., 2005, 2006; Perronnet et al., 2007). Other types of minerals have also been investigated with this method, including goethite, anatase, and manganese dioxide (Prélot et al., 2003; Stevanovic et al., 2012; Ali et al., 2012).

We determined a total surface area of 19.8 ± 0.2 m² g⁻¹ with low-pressure Ar gas adsorption, which is comparable to the BET determined by N₂ gas (17.6 ± 0.1 m² g⁻¹). Using the methods detailed in previous studies (Villiéras et al., 1992, 1997, 2002; Tournassat et al., 2003; Sayed-Hassan et al., 2006), we have estimated that 89.5% of the surface area can be represented by basal brucite surfaces, whereas 10.5% are represented by lateral brucite surfaces (see Appendix A). We adopted a basal surface area of 15.7 m² g⁻¹ and a lateral surface area of 1.9 m² g⁻¹ by assuming that the total surface area was 17.6 m² g⁻¹. We tested these surface areas by deriving the brucite particle thickness (t) and length (l) with the equations:

\[
l = \frac{4}{\rho S_t}
\]

and

\[
t = \frac{2}{\rho S_b}
\]

where \(\rho\) is the density of brucite (2.39 g cm⁻³) and \(S_t\) and \(S_b\) are the lateral and basal surface areas, respectively. We calculated an average brucite plate length of 0.9 μm and thickness of 53 nm, which were consistent with the dimensions we observed with SEM (l = 0.1–1 μm and t = 30–50 nm, see Fig. 1b). We therefore consider 1.9 m² g⁻¹ to accurately represent the ESA of the lateral surface of our brucite sample.

2.3. Batch adsorption experiments

In a single batch sample, we added between 2 and 300 μM aspartate to 10.0 ± 0.5 g L⁻¹ brucite in a 15 mL sterile Falcon tube. The pH of each sample (10.2–10.3 without added MgCl₂) was strongly buffered by the brucite powder. We studied four ionic strengths that resulted from the dissolution of Mg²⁺ from brucite and our addition of either MgCl₂ or CaCl₂ to the aqueous phase. We conducted low-Mg²⁺, high-Mg²⁺, low-Ca²⁺, and high-Ca²⁺ experiments, which we describe in Table 1.

We conducted preliminary adsorption experiments over multiple periods of time and determined that aspartate adsorption on brucite reaches a steady state within 16 h. In this study, we placed the batch samples on a test tube rotator at 40 rpm (25 ± 1 °C, 1 bar) for 22 h to ensure that the brucite–aspartate suspensions had reached a steady state. We then measured the pH of the brucite–aspartate suspensions with a combination glass electrode (Thermo- Electron Orion 8103BNUWP) that we calibrated prior to the experiment with NIST-standardized buffers that referred to pH values of 4, 7, and 10 (Fischer Scientific). As we obtained pH measurements, we flushed each sample with Ar gas to avoid contamination by CO₂. We centrifuged the samples for 10 min with a relative centrifugal force of 1073g. In each sample, we then separated the liquid supernatant from the solid brucite.

We analyzed the concentration of the aspartate, Mg²⁺ and Ca²⁺ in the supernatant with ion chromatography (IC). We used a Dionex ICS-5000 DP dual pump system equipped with an AminoPac10 column, IonPac CS12A column, and Chromeleon 6.8 software (Dionex Corporation, Sweden).

Table 1. Description of the low-Mg²⁺, high-Mg²⁺, low-Ca²⁺, and high-Ca²⁺ experiments. Dissolved Mg²⁺ concentrations from brucite are present in each experiment in addition to added MgCl₂ and CaCl₂. All concentrations are expressed in mol/L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Dissolved Mg²⁺</th>
<th>Added MgCl₂</th>
<th>Added CaCl₂</th>
<th>Ionic Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Mg²⁺</td>
<td>0.7 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.1 × 10⁻³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Mg²⁺</td>
<td>0.6 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>5.2 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17.4 × 10⁻³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Ca²⁺</td>
<td>0.9 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.0 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>5.8 × 10⁻³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Ca²⁺</td>
<td>1.0 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.0 × 10⁻³</td>
<td>15.2 × 10⁻³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sunnyvale, CA, USA). We analyzed the samples in triplicate and determined the mean concentration of aspartate remaining in the liquid supernatant within ±1 standard error (s.e.m.). It was necessary to analyze the aspartate samples in triplicate because we initially determined that low amounts of aspartate adsorbed onto the brucite surface (<10%), and collecting data in triplicate better constrained accurate aspartate adsorption values. It was not necessary for us to analyze Ca\(^{2+}\) adsorption data in triplicate because we initially observed that Ca\(^{2+}\) adsorbed onto brucite in large amounts (>10%), and we calculated that ±1 standard deviation (s.e.m.) was equal to about 8% of the adsorption values. From the analytical concentrations we determined the surface adsorption, (Γ\(_{\text{ads}}\) \(\text{μmol m}^{-2}\)) of aspartate or Ca\(^{2+}\) on brucite, according to:

\[
\Gamma_{\text{ads}} = \frac{[X]_0 - [X]_{\text{eq}}}{C_sA_s}
\]

in which \([X]_0\) is the initial concentration of aspartate or Ca\(^{2+}\), \([X]_{\text{eq}}\) is the concentration of aspartate or Ca\(^{2+}\) remaining in the liquid supernatant, \(C_s\) is the solid concentration, and \(A_s\) is the edge-specific surface area of brucite. We report \(\Gamma_{\text{ads}}\) as an isotherm as a function of \([X]_{\text{eq}}\).

### 2.4. Surface complexation modeling approach

We modeled the data from our batch adsorption experiments with the extended triple-layer model or ETLM (Sverjensky and Sahai, 1996; Sahai and Sverjensky, 1997; Sverjensky, 2003, 2005; Sverjensky and Fukushima, 2006). Unlike other solid–water interface models, the ETLM includes the electrical work resulting from the release of water dipoles during inner-sphere adsorption. We iteratively fit the adsorption data in a manner described in previous studies (Jonsson et al., 2009; Bahri et al., 2011) and obtained reaction stoichiometries that represent our best fit to the adsorption data. When it has been possible to test such surface complexation modeling with spectroscopy and quantum chemical modeling (Parikh et al., 2011; Lee et al., 2012), there has been excellent agreement as to the nature of the adsorbed species. We carried out calculations for the ETLM with the computer code GEOSURF (Sahai and Sverjensky, 1998). We estimated a pH\(_{\text{PZC}}\) = 10.5 from measurements of the pH after only aspartate or water had been added to brucite during our batch adsorption experiments. We previously calculated speciation reactions involving aqueous aspartate and found them to be consistent with those determined with potentiometric titrations (De Robertis et al., 1991; Jonsson et al., 2010). We obtained both protonation and electrolyte adsorption parameters for the brucite surface from a regression of surface titration data measured by Pokrovsky and Schott (2004). As illustrated by Fig. 3, we fit these data with the ETLM using parameters that were derived from a constant capacitance model (\(C = 500 \text{μF cm}^{-2}\)), where pH\(_{\text{PZC}}\) = 11.0, site density (\(N_s\)) = 10 sites nm\(^{-2}\), and BET surface area (\(A_s\)) = 9.2 m\(^2\) g\(^{-1}\)). We recalculated the protonation and electrolyte adsorption parameters for our estimated pH\(_{\text{PZC}}\), lateral \(A_s\), and \(N_s\) using the methods detailed by Sverjensky (2003, 2005). These parameters are displayed in Table 2.

Site densities can be estimated from the number of bond defects at the surface, and these estimations are usually consistent with measurements by tritium exchange experiments (Koretsky et al., 1998). Accordingly, we calculated site densities for the lateral brucite surfaces (100), (010), (110), and (111) by examining the broken bonds of each idealized surface with the program CrystalMaker (Palmer, 2009). We estimated a minimum possible site density of 9.7 sites nm\(^{-2}\) and a maximum possible site density of 20.9 sites nm\(^{-2}\) (Table 3). However, to fit both the Ca\(^{2+}\) and aspartate adsorption data we observed for the low-Ca\(^{2+}\) and high-Ca\(^{2+}\) experiments, we required a site density of 38 sites nm\(^{-2}\). This value is greater than what we estimated for the idealized surfaces, but it is consistent with site densities estimated (40.8 sites nm\(^{-2}\)) and measured (36 sites nm\(^{-2}\)) on periclase [MgO], a mineral that is structurally similar to brucite and may well be covered by a thin layer of brucite in water (Anderson et al., 1965; Koretsky et al., 1998). We can also use our measurements of aspartate and Ca\(^{2+}\) adsorption to estimate site density (e.g., 1.0 μmol m\(^{-2}\) = 0.6 sites nm\(^{-2}\)). However, due to possible intermolecular forces between surface species, it may be unlikely that every active site within 1 nm\(^2\) would interact with Ca\(^{2+}\) or aspartate. It may also be possible that surface imperfections primarily caused by the dissolution of Mg\(^{2+}\) from brucite in the aqueous phase explain why it is necessary for us to adopt a higher site density. Our estimated site density of 38 sites nm\(^{-2}\) could be tested by future adsorption studies involving a variety of chemically different ions as probes of the surface.
Table 2
Aqueous aspartate properties\(^a\), characteristics of brucite\(^b\), and ETLM parameters for proton, electrolyte, and aspartate surface adsorption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction type</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>log (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqueous aspartate equilibria</td>
<td>Asp(^2+) + H(^+) = HAsp(^-)</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAsp(^-) + H(^+) = H(_2)Asp(^+)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H(_2)Asp(^+) + H(^+) = H(_3)Asp(^2+)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAsp(^-) + Cl(^-) + 2H(^+) = H(_2)AspCl</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAsp(^-) + Na(^+) = NaHAsp</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAsp(^-) + Na(^+) + H(^+) = NaH(_2)Asp(^+)</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAsp(^-) + Ca(^2+) + H(^+) = CaHAsp(^+)</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAsp(^-) + Ca(^2+) = CaAsp + H(^+)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface equilibria</td>
<td>Hypothetical 1.0 m standard state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_s)</td>
<td>&gt;SOH + H(^+) → SOH(^2+)</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_s)</td>
<td>&gt;SOH + H(^+) + H(_2)O → SOH(^2+) + H(_3)O(^+)</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_Na)</td>
<td>&gt;SOH + Na(^+) → SO(^-)Na(^+) + H(^+)</td>
<td>-9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_Cl)</td>
<td>&gt;SOH + Cl(^-) + H(^+) → SO(^-)Cl(^+)</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_SOH&gt;)SAsp(^-)</td>
<td>2&gt;SOH + H(^+) + H(_2)O → SO(^-)Cl(^+) + H(_3)O(^+)</td>
<td>16.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface equilibria</td>
<td>Site-occupancy standard states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_SOH&gt;)SAsp(^-)</td>
<td>2&gt;SOH(^2+) + H(_2)O → SO(^-)Cl(^+) + H(_3)O(^+)</td>
<td>18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_SOH&gt;)CaHAsp(^+)</td>
<td>&gt;SO(^-) + Ca(^2+) + H(_2)O → SO(^-)CaHAsp(^+) + H(^+)</td>
<td>-5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log (K)(_SOH&gt;)Ca(OH)(_2)</td>
<td>&gt;SO(^-) + Ca(^2+) + 2H(_2)O → SO(^-)Ca(OH)(_2) + H(^+)</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Protonation constants and electrolyte ion pair constants from De Robertis et al. (1991), Jonsson et al. (2010).

\(^b\) Brucite properties are \(N_s = 38 \text{ sites nm}^{-2}\), \(A_s = 1.9 \text{ m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}\), \(C_1 = 190 \mu \text{F cm}^{-2}\), \(C_2 = 190 \mu \text{F cm}^{-2}\), \(pH_{PPZC} = 10.5\), \(\Delta pK_w = 2.08\), \(\log K_w^s = 9.46\), \(\log K_{Na}^d = 11.54\), \(\log K_{Cl}^d = -9.14\), \(\log K_{SOH>\)SAsp\(^-\)}^d = -11.66\).

\(^c\) Equilibrium constants relative to site occupancy standard states can be written relative to charged surface sites calculated using the equations: \(\log K_{SOH>\)SAsp\(^-\)}^d = \log K_{SOH>\)SAsp\(^-\)}^d + \log(N_sA_sC_s)/100; \(\log K_{SOH>\)CaHAsp\(^+\)}^d = \log K_{SOH>\)CaHAsp\(^+\)}^d + \log(N_sA_sC_s)/100; \(\log K_{SOH>\)Ca(OH)\(_2\)}^d = \log K_{SOH>\)Ca(OH)\(_2\)}^d + \log(N_sA_sC_s)/100, where \(N_s\) is site density, \(A_s\) is BET edge surface area \(\text{m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}\), and \(C_s\) is solid concentration \(\text{g L}^{-1}\).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Aspartate adsorption onto brucite at low Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations

The adsorption isotherm in Fig. 4 shows the surface adsorption of aspartate on brucite as a function of the remaining aspartate concentration in the aqueous phase ([Asp]\(_{aq}\)) when low concentrations of Mg\(^{2+}\) dissolved from the surface. We report all aspartate adsorption data in Table 4. Aspartate surface adsorption (\(\Gamma_{ads}\)) at a pH of 10.3 ± 0.1 increased steadily as a function of [Asp]\(_{aq}\). The error in Fig. 4 is ±1 cm of each \(\Gamma_{ads}\) and [Asp]\(_{aq}\) value. Aspartate surface adsorption was between 8.4 × 10\(^{-2}\) and 1.0 μmol m\(^{-2}\). This range of \(\Gamma_{ads}\) corresponds to 16.4–3.6% of the initial aspartate added, where the percentage of adsorbed aspartate decreases with increasing \(\Gamma_{ads}\). As a consequence, the reported error substantially increases with \(\Gamma_{ads}\) and [Asp]\(_{aq}\).

As previously discussed, we assumed that only the lateral brucite surfaces were active in adsorption reactions; however, we were unable to distinguish whether there was one lateral surface that more predominantly adsorbed
aspartate. Our crystallographic examination of the idealized lateral surfaces (100), (110), (111), and (010) revealed two distinct terminations on the three-coordinated brucite hydroxyl group: a geminal site (>Mg(OH)2) with two bonds broken and a bridging site (>MgOH) with a single bond broken at the surface. We could not determine whether aspartate attached at a geminal or bridging reaction site with the ETLM because our proposed surface reactions in Table 2 resulted in the same amount of electrical work at both sites. Therefore to avoid ambiguity, we display surface reactions occurring at the (100) brucite plane as an example surface only, and henceforth regard the neutral brucite surface as “>SOH”.

We used the ETLM to carry out a series of iterative calculations to establish possible surface reactions for the aspartate. We proposed a surface reaction represented by the stoichiometry:

\[
2 \text{>SOH} + \text{H}^+ + \text{HAsp}^- \rightarrow \text{SOH}_2^- + \text{SAsp}^- + \text{H}_2\text{O}
\]

This reaction resulted in a close fit to the adsorption data, within analytical uncertainties, as illustrated by Fig. 4. We subsequently interpreted this surface reaction as involving a bidentate mononuclear, or “leaning” configuration with two points of attachment (one that is hydrogen-bonded and one that is inner-sphere) onto the brucite surface. A possible schematic illustration of the “leaning” surface species is shown in Fig. 5. Pokrovsky and colleagues (2005) also concluded that it was likely that biomolecules attached onto brucite through an inner-sphere attachment. Our observed range of aspartate adsorption on the brucite surface is consistent with the citrate adsorption (0.4 \text{\mu mol m}^{-2}) measurements by Pokrovsky and coworkers (2005). Furthermore, we previously measured similar amounts of aspartate adsorption (1 \text{\mu mol m}^{-2}) on rutile [TiO_2], and our calculations with the ETLM also predicted an inner-sphere attachment of the aspartate molecule at the mineral–water interface (Jonsson et al., 2010).

### Table 4a
Aspartate surface adsorption data observed for the low-Mg^{2+} and high-Mg^{2+} batch experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch Experiment</th>
<th>[Asp]_aq (\mu M)</th>
<th>(\Gamma_{ads}) (\text{\mu mol m}^{-2})</th>
<th>% Ads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Mg^{2+}</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.7</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.2</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mg^{2+}</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch Experiment</th>
<th>[Asp]_aq (\mu M)</th>
<th>(\Gamma_{ads}) (\text{\mu mol m}^{-2})</th>
<th>% Ads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Ca^{2+}</td>
<td>217.2</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ca^{2+}</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.0</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.9</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Adsorption of aspartate on brucite as a function of aspartate concentration remaining in solution for the low-Mg^{2+} experiments. Dashed curve represents the modeled fit to the experimental data calculated with the parameters in Table 2. Symbols represent experimental data that are the average of a triplicate run and horizontal and vertical error bars are ±1 standard error from the average.
The reaction in Eq. (7) corresponds to the equilibrium constant:

\[
K_{SOH}^{0} = \frac{a_{SOH} > SAsp \cdot a_{H_{2}O}^{n_{H_{2}O}}}{a_{SOH}^{n_{SOH}} a_{H_{2}O}^{n_{H_{2}O}}} \]  

(8)

where the superscript \( ^{+} \) indicates the reaction is expressed relative to the \( >SOH \) surface, and “0” refers to a hypothetical 1.0 molal standard state (Sverjensky, 2003). The value \( \Delta \psi_{r,7} \) represents the electrical work involved in Eq. (7). The electrical work includes a contribution from the movement of water dipoles off the brucite surface according to \( \Delta \psi_{r} = -n_{H_{2}O}(\psi_{0} - \psi_{p}) \), where \( n_{H_{2}O} \) are the number of water molecules on the right-hand side of the reaction. In Eq. (7), \( n_{H_{2}O} = 1 \), which resulted in \( \Delta \psi_{r,7} = \psi_{0} - \psi_{p} \).

**3.2. Aspartate adsorption onto brucite at high \( Mg^{2+} \) concentrations**

When brucite is immersed in water, the surface dissolves in aqueous solution according to:

\[
Mg(OH)_{2} + 2H^{+} = Mg^{2+} + 2H_{2}O \]  

(9)

where the equilibrium constant of Eq. (9) is:

\[
\log K = \frac{a_{Mg^{2+}}}{a_{H_{2}O}^{2}} \]  

(10)

We calculated equilibrium constants of \( \log K = 17.3 \pm 0.01 \) and \( \log K = 17.3 \pm 0.06 \) for batch experiments in which we added only water or aqueous aspartate, respectively, to our synthetic brucite powder. These equilibrium constants are consistent with Pokrovsky and Schott’s measured value of \( \log K = 17.6 \pm 0.5 \) for a ground, natural sample of brucite. We calculated the steady-state activity ratio from the activity coefficient of \( Mg^{2+} \) with GEOSURF and our measured pH values from the batch adsorption experiments. We observed that the activity ratio in Eq. (10) did not change as a function of pH (Fig. 6).

Therefore, we assumed that brucite was in equilibrium with the aqueous phase during our batch adsorption experiments. If brucite was in equilibrium with the aqueous phase, we estimated that our addition of MgCl\(_2\) to an aspartate batch experiment would decrease solution pH while maintaining the equilibrium constant. We therefore calculated the activity ratio with data from the high-Mg\(^{2+}\) experiment. As we predicted, pH decreased (pH = 9.9 ± 0.1), and the average activity ratio of \( \log K = 17.2 \pm 0.04 \) was consistent within the range of uncertainty of the log\( K \) we calculated for the low-Mg\(^{2+}\) experiment.

The adsorption isotherm in Fig. 7 shows aspartate adsorption on brucite at high Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations along with data from the low-Mg\(^{2+}\) experiment. We had no indication from our IC analysis that the MgCl\(_2\) we added adsorbed onto the brucite surface. Aspartate adsorption at high Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations was between \( 1.7 \times 10^{-2} \) and 0.6 \( \mu \)mol m\(^{-2}\). In comparison with adsorption data we obtained under low Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations, \( \Gamma_{ads} \) decreased by a factor of about 1.5.

Using the ETLM and the surface reaction proposed in Eq. (7), we predicted adsorption of aspartate for the high-Mg\(^{2+}\) data at pH = 9.9. As shown in Fig. 8, there is close agreement between the curve predicted by the “leaning” aspartate species from Eq. (7) and our data at two distinct Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations. This fit lends support to our use of the surface reaction in Eq. (7).

We also tested and dismissed dozens of other surface reactions with the ETLM. For instance, we considered the reaction stoichiometry:

\[
3 > SOH + HAsp^{-} + H^{+} = 2(> S) > SOHAsp + 2H_{2}O \]  

(11)

which resulted in an excellent fit to the adsorption data at low Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations. However, this reaction also predicted substantially higher amounts of aspartate adsorption (up to 3.5 \( \mu \)mol m\(^{-2}\)) at high Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations. This strong disagreement with the experimental data led us to
dismiss this surface reaction. Through this process of
elimination, we determined that only the surface reaction
in Eq. (11) could predict aspartate adsorption at both
Mg\(^{2+}\) concentrations.

According to the reaction in Eq. (7), Asp\(^{2-}\) attaches
onto brucite. However, when the pH decreased from 10.2
in the low-Mg\(^{2+}\) experiment to 9.9 in the high-Mg\(^{2+}\) experi-
ment, the abundance of the doubly-deprotonated aspartate
species (pKa = 10.01) decreased in the aqueous phase.
Therefore, the decrease in pH may have caused a decrease
in aspartate adsorption.

### 3.3. Aspartate adsorption onto brucite in the presence of Ca\(^{2+}\)

The adsorption isotherms in Fig. 8 illustrate aspartate
adsorption onto brucite in the presence of low and high
Ca\(^{2+}\) concentrations. The low-Ca\(^{2+}\) and high-Ca\(^{2+}\) experi-
ments were conducted at a pH of 10.2 ± 0.02 and
10.2 ± 0.05, respectively. We observed that surface adsorp-
tion increased with Ca\(^{2+}\) concentration, where \(\Gamma_{\text{ads}}\) was
between 4.3 \(\times\) 10\(^{-2}\) and 1.8 \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) for the low-Ca\(^{2+}\)
experiment and between 0.1 and 2.1 \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) for the high-
Ca\(^{2+}\) experiment. The range of \(\Gamma_{\text{ads}}\) in the high-Ca\(^{2+}\)
experiment corresponded to between 56.4% and 17.1%
aspartate adsorption, respectively.

Aspartate surface adsorption was significantly greater in
the presence of Ca\(^{2+}\) compared with the low-Mg\(^{2+}\) experi-
ment (see Fig. 4). In particular, when aspartate adsorbed
onto brucite at high Ca\(^{2+}\) concentrations, \(\Gamma_{\text{ads}}\) increased
two-fold. In addition to this increase in aspartate adsorp-
tion, we observed that a significant amount of Ca\(^{2+}\)
adsorbed onto brucite as illustrated in Fig. 9. The amount
of Ca\(^{2+}\) surface adsorption averaged 21.6 ± 1.8 \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\)
(41.8%) for the low-Ca\(^{2+}\) experiment and
29.6 ± 2.3 \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\) (14.4%) for the high-Ca\(^{2+}\) experiment.
We report all calcium adsorption data in Table 5.
We developed a model of the surface adsorption of aspartate and Ca\(^{2+}\) by iteratively fitting the adsorption data. We discovered that in addition to the surface reaction in Eq. (7), two surface reactions involving Ca\(^{2+}\) were needed to fit the experimental data. The first surface reaction involved the formation of a calcium–aspartate complex:

\[
> \text{SOH} + \text{HAsp}^- + \text{Ca}^{2+} \rightarrow \text{SO}^- \cdot \text{CaHAsp}^+ + \text{H}^+ \quad (12)
\]

that may attach as a monodentate outer-sphere species on brucite. Franchi and coworkers (2003) observed enhanced adsorption of nucleic acids on the clay minerals montmorillonite and kaolinite in the presence of Ca\(^{2+}\). The authors suggested a configuration involving calcium–nucleic acid complexes where the Ca\(^{2+}\) ion would act as a “bridge” between the nucleic acid and the clay–water interface (Franchi et al., 2003). We estimated a similar configuration of our predicted calcium–aspartate species at the brucite surface in Fig. 10a. We proposed that the calcium–aspartate species adsorbs in addition to the “leaning” aspartate species (Fig. 5). The equilibrium constant of the surface reaction in Eq. (12) is:

\[
K_{\text{SO}^- \cdot \text{CaHAsp}} = \frac{a_{\text{SO}^-} a_{\text{CaHAsp}}}{a_{\text{SOH}} a_{\text{Ca}^{2+}}} 10^{\Delta \psi_{t,12}}
\]

where the value \(\Delta \psi_{t,12} = -\psi_0 + \psi_p\).

The second reaction we proposed required the adsorption of a hydrated calcium complex:

\[
> \text{SOH} + \text{Ca}^{2+} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{SOH}^- \cdot \text{Ca(OH)}_2 + \text{H}^+ \quad (14)
\]

that can be interpreted as a monodentate outer-sphere surface species as illustrated in Fig. 10b. The equilibrium constant of the surface reaction in Eq. (14) is:

\[
K_{\text{SOH}^- \cdot \text{Ca(OH)}_2} = \frac{a_{\text{SOH}^-} a_{\text{Ca(OH)}_2}}{a_{\text{SOH}} a_{\text{Ca}^{2+}} a_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}} 10^{\Delta \psi_{t,14}}
\]

where \(\Delta \psi_{t,14} = \psi_0\).

Our proposed species differs from the prediction by Pokrovsky and coworkers (2005) that Ca\(^{2+}\) may be attaching onto brucite as a monodentate or bidentate inner-sphere species. We tested surface reactions containing these species with the ETLM. However, they failed to adequately fit the Ca\(^{2+}\) and aspartate adsorption data. For example, the reaction stoichiometry:

\[
> \text{SOH} + \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{SOH} \cdot \text{CaOH}^+ + \text{H}^+ \quad (16a)
\]

which we can alternatively express as

\[
> \text{SOH} + \text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{SCaOH}^+ + \text{H}^+ \quad (16b)
\]

might result in a monodentate inner-sphere calcium species at the brucite surface. This reaction underestimated the amount of Ca\(^{2+}\) adsorption for the high-Ca\(^{2+}\) experiment by approximately 5.7 \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-2}\). Furthermore, the addition of this surface reaction in combination with Eqs. (7) and

![Fig. 10. Possible representation of surface species predicted by surface complexation calculations using the parameters in Table 2. (a) Attachment of a calcium–aspartate complex to the (100) surface forming a monodentate outer-sphere species through an electrostatic interaction between a surface oxygen atom and the calcium atom. (b) Attachment of a hydrated calcium molecule to the brucite surface forming a monodentate outer-sphere species. Large red spheres represent oxygen, yellow spheres are magnesium, small tan spheres are hydrogen, large light blue spheres are calcium, small pale blue spheres are nitrogen and black spheres are carbon atoms. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)](image)
(12) suppressed the amount of aspartate adsorption to less than 0.1 μmol m$^{-2}$ at both Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations. We therefore could not consider Eq. (16) as a surface reaction representing Ca$^{2+}$ adsorption onto brucite.

We combined the surface reactions in Eqs. (7), (12) and (14) to fit the aspartate adsorption data at low and high Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations (Fig. 9). The calculated curve for the low-Ca$^{2+}$ experimental data fit within analytical uncertainty. Although in overall agreement with the isotherm shape, the curve calculated at high Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations is a bit low compared with all of the data points except for the highest surface coverage, but is consistent with the data within ±2.5 σm, or approximately 7% uncertainty.

We predicted curves for Ca$^{2+}$ adsorption as a function of initial aspartate concentration, [Asp]$_0$. As shown in Fig. 9, there are two data points from the high-Ca$^{2+}$ experiment that are elevated above the predicted curve. However, we determined that the average predicted surface adsorption of Ca$^{2+}$ was 28.1 μmol m$^{-2}$, which is well within the analytical uncertainty of the average experimental surface adsorption of Ca$^{2+}$, 29.6 ± 2.3 μmol m$^{-2}$. Therefore, our prediction of Ca$^{2+}$ surface adsorption is in acceptable agreement with the data collected at low and high Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations. We thus regard the surface reactions proposed by Eqs. (7), (12) and (14) as sufficiently characterizing the aspartate–brucite and Ca$^{2+}$–brucite adsorption systems with respect to different ionic strengths, pH conditions, divalent cation concentrations and initial aspartate concentrations.

### 3.4. Prediction of brucite particle surface charge

The significant increase in aspartate adsorption with Ca$^{2+}$ and its decrease with MgCl$_2$ addition suggest that the particle surface charge of brucite shifted relative to the experimental conditions we investigated (Table 1). We therefore calculated the particle surface charge by predicting the ζ-potential of the brucite surface with the ETLM as a function of [Asp]$_0$ for each type of batch experiment. In these calculations, we assumed that the ζ-potential was equal to the potential at the start of the diffuse layer ($\Psi_d$) in the ETLM. As shown in Fig. 11, we predicted that ζ-potential was neutral to slightly negative for the low-Mg$^{2+}$ experiment, and it decreased with increasing [Mg$^{2+}$]. This could be a result of decreased pH with added MgCl$_2$, which may directly affect the brucite surface charge. Moreover, we did not observe Mg$^{2+}$ adsorption on brucite, although we added MgCl$_2$ to the system. In Eq. (7), we also predicted the doubly-deprotonated aspartate molecule, Asp$^{2-}$, adsorbed onto brucite. A decrease in surface particle charge could create an unfavorable electrostatic environment for Asp$^{2-}$ to adsorb onto brucite, which reflects our observation of decreased aspartate adsorption with added MgCl$_2$. In Fig. 11, we modeled a reversal of the ζ-potential with Ca$^{2+}$. This calculation of positive particle surface charge reflects the ETLM reactions in Eqs. (12) and (14) where calcium adsors onto the brucite surface resulting in a net positive surface charge.

The cooperative calcium–aspartate complex, CaHAsp$^+$, may have enabled the aspartate molecule to adsorb in greater amounts. We predicted the distribution of the two adsorbing aspartate species in Eqs. (7) and (12) with the ETLM at both low and high Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations as a function of [Asp]$_0$ in Fig. 12. At both Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations, we observed that the calcium–aspartate outer-sphere species overwhelmingly predominates, whereas very little of the surface adsorption can be represented by the “leaning” aspartate species. This result may provide evidence that the formation of a calcium–aspartate complex enhances the adsorption of aspartate.

We predicted that a calcium–aspartate surface species forms at the brucite–water interface (Eq. 12). We predicted the distribution of aqueous aspartate species that can be represented by calcium–aspartate complexes (Fig. 13), and we determined that up to 25.8% and 6.5% of aqueous aspartate species are represented by CaAsp$^+$ at high Ca$^{2+}$ and low Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations, respectively. This prediction indicates that the calcium–aspartate aqueous complex could easily form during our batch adsorption experiments. Whereas CaAsp$^+$ predominates in aqueous solution, CaHAsp$^+$ does not exceed 0.5% at low Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations and 2% at high Ca$^{2+}$ concentrations. Nevertheless, we predicted that the CaHAsp$^+$ species predominates as a surface species, which illustrates the tendency for the mineral–water interface to adsorb organic species that may not always predominate in bulk water (Geiger, 2009; Malin et al., 2009).

It is possible that because aspartate is a polar, negatively-charged amino acid, it may readily form a cooperative complex with calcium that leads to advantageous surface adsorption on brucite. A similar amino acid, such as glutamate (C$_6$H$_{12}$N$_2$O$_4$), may also form a complex with Ca$^{2+}$ and follow a similar pattern of increased surface adsorption. Likewise, Ca$^{2+}$ may not strongly bond to a positively-charged amino acid, such as lysine (C$_6$H$_{14}$N$_2$O$_2$), and competitively adsorb with the amino acid on the brucite surface.
Whether Ca\(^{2+}\) may either cooperatively or competitively affect the surface adsorption of a particular biomolecule onto brucite is worth future investigation.

### 3.5. Prediction of aspartate adsorption in Lost City fluids

We propose that an ideal natural environment for aspartate to adsorb onto brucite would have elevated concentrations of Ca\(^{2+}\) and little or no Mg\(^{2+}\) present. Serpentinite-hosted hydrothermal systems provide such an environment with brucite and possibly other biomolecules such as aspartate (Kelley et al., 2001; Shock and Canovas, 2010). Kelley and colleagues (2002) report that vent fluids at the Lost City hydrothermal field have high concentrations of Ca\(^{2+}\) \((23.3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ M})\) relative to a 0 M Mg\(^{2+}\) endmember composition over a pH range between 9.0 and 9.8. We invoked the surface reactions in Eqs. (7), (12) and (14) with the major ion (Na\(^{+}\), Cl\(^{-}\), Ca\(^{2+}\) and SO\(_4^{2-}\)) concentrations reported by Kelley and coworkers (2002) to predict the surface adsorption of aspartate on brucite in Lost City vent fluids at 25 °C and 1 bar. We predicted surface adsorption at pH values of 9.8 and 10.2 (see Fig. 14). We found that surface adsorption steadily increases with a decrease in pH. For instance, we predicted that surface adsorption at a pH of 9.8 is approximately double the adsorption at a pH of

---

**Fig. 12.** The predicted surface speciation of aspartate on brucite as a function of initial aspartate concentration for the (a) low-Ca\(^{2+}\) and (b) high-Ca\(^{2+}\) experiments. The “leaning” and outer-sphere species refer to Fig. 5 and Fig. 10a and reaction stoichiometries in Eqs. (7) and (11), respectively. Dashed curves represent the individual species and the solid curve represents the total aspartate adsorption.

**Fig. 13.** The predicted distribution (%) of the aspartate aqueous species that can be represented by calcium–aspartate complexes, including CaH\(_2\)Asp\(^{2+}\), CaHA Asp\(^{+}\), and CaAsp\(^0\) as a function of initial aspartate concentration in the presence for the (a) low-Ca\(^{2+}\) and (b) high-Ca\(^{2+}\) experiments.
2+ and aspartate on brucite. Our combination of batch adsorption data and surface complexation modeling contributes to a fundamental understanding of the role of the brucite–water interface in the emergence of complex biochemistry and the geochemical origin of life.
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