



Cite this: *Chem. Commun.*, 2019, 55, 4035

Received 29th January 2019,  
Accepted 11th March 2019

DOI: 10.1039/c9cc00837c

rsc.li/chemcomm

## Electrochemical oxidation of trivalent americium using a dipyrazinylpyridine modified ITO electrode†

Michael J. Lopez,<sup>‡a</sup> Matthew V. Sheridan,<sup>‡a</sup> Jeffrey R. McLachlan,<sup>‡a</sup>  
Travis S. Grimes,<sup>‡b</sup> and Christopher J. Dares<sup>‡\*a</sup>

**We present here the electrochemical oxidation of Am(III) to Am<sup>VO</sup><sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> and Am<sup>VI</sup>O<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup> in pH 1 nitric acid using a mesoporous tin-doped indium oxide electrode modified with a covalently attached dipyrazinylpyridine ligand. The applied potential affects the distribution of Am oxidation products. At potential 1.8 V, only Am(v) is observed, while increasing the potential to as much as 2.0 V, results in oxidation of Am(III) to Am(v) and subsequent oxidation of Am(v) to Am(vi). At applied potentials >2.0 V, Am(III) is oxidized to Am(v), while Am(vi) is reduced to Am(v). The latter reduction reaction is likely due to the increased rate of hydrogen peroxide formation from the 2-electron oxidation of water at the electrode at these high potentials. The development of future ligand modified electrodes for actinide oxidations must consider how they facilitate Am oxidations while disfavoring unwanted or competing reactions.**

Nuclear energy is a viable option for global future energy needs given its relatively low carbon footprint, and large power production relative to its land usage. A problem with the expansion of nuclear energy however is the reprocessing of used nuclear fuel. There are reprocessing schemes in place to separate uranium and plutonium which can be subsequently reconstituted for re-use in nuclear reactors. Presently, the remaining used fuel components (fission products including tri-valent lanthanides, and neutron capture products including the minor actinides Am and Cm) are not appropriately dealt with. This is not ideal as Am is responsible for the long-term heat load associated with UNF. Many countries, including France and the United Kingdom have adopted processes which partially separate americium, in an effort to more fully recycle their fuel elements, and, to conserve space in their repositories.<sup>1</sup> In the United States however, this is not currently implemented. Americium is a challenge to separate from UNF due to its similar oxidation state (+3) and charge

density compared to the lanthanides.<sup>2</sup> Through judicious ligand design, many have developed organo-soluble ligands that selectively bind to trivalent Am vs. Ln, which can subsequently be used to separate Am by solvent extraction.<sup>3,4</sup> Such separation schemes require multiple steps, and can cause more downstream complications as ligands degrade in the strong radiation field and produce reactive species.<sup>5</sup>

There is therefore, a need to develop a simplified fuel cycle where Am is separated with U and Pu so that it can be more efficiently removed from the fission products, and used in a fast reactor. Our approach to this problem has involved investigating methods to generate Am(vi). In its hexavalent state, Am(vi) exists as Am<sup>VI</sup>O<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup>, and has a structure analogous to that of other hexavalent actinides (UO<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup>, NpO<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup>, and PuO<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup>).<sup>6</sup> It is therefore anticipated that it will have similar binding characteristics to these similar high-valent species, which are substantially different from Am(III) or Ln(III). Nevertheless, this oxidation is not thermodynamically simple, given the high 1-electron Am(IV/III) couple at 2.6 V vs. SCE.<sup>7</sup> This severely limits the chemical oxidants available that are viable options from an industrial standpoint. There has been notable progress in developing new oxidants which are capable of generating Am(vi) which persists long enough to effect a solvent extraction.<sup>8,9</sup>

The subsequent Am(IV) generated *via* 1-electron oxidation of Am(III) is unstable and can either reduce back to Am(III), or be oxidized to Am<sup>VO</sup><sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> ( $E_{1/2}$  for Am(v/iv) is 0.84 V vs. SCE).<sup>10</sup> Am<sup>VO</sup><sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> has a thermodynamic oxidation potential of 1.60 V to Am<sup>VI</sup>O<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup>, which reinforces the point that in most systems, the initial oxidation of Am(III) is the most challenging hurdle. Our efforts to oxidize Am(III) have involved a Ligand Modified Electrode (LME) strategy. We previously demonstrated that an electrode comprised of a terpyridine ligand covalently attached to the surface of a mesoporous film of tin-doped indium oxide (nanoITO|terpy) is capable of electrochemically generating Am(vi) at potentials as low as 1.8 V vs. SCE.<sup>11</sup> Paramount to the operation of these LMEs is the ability to coordinate Am(III) and decrease the potential required to generate Am(IV), and, to decrease the faradaic efficiency for unwanted reactions

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th St., Miami, FL 33199, USA. E-mail: cdares@fiu.edu

<sup>b</sup> Idaho National Laboratory, PO Box 1625, Idaho Falls, ID 83415, USA

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: 10.1039/c9cc00837c

‡ These authors contributed equally to this work.

including the 2-electron oxidation of water to hydrogen peroxide, and nitrate to nitrous acid.<sup>12</sup> Attachment of a relatively non-polar organic ligand modifies the hydrophobicity of the surface, ultimately increasing the overpotential for water oxidation relative to a bare nanoITO electrode. In this work, we extend this LME strategy to a similar nanoITO electrode modified with a phenylphosphonic acid derivatized dipyrazinylpyridine (dpp); capable of oxidizing Am(III) to Am(V) and Am(VI) at similar potentials. The dpp ligands coordinate more strongly to Am(III) than their terpyridine analogues in acidic solutions,<sup>13</sup> suggesting that they may be better candidates for the electrochemical generation of Am(VI).

A detailed preparation of our nanoITO electrodes is described elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> The preparation of our dpp ligand is described using a modified procedure reported elsewhere, where acetylpyrazine was used in place of acetylpyridine.<sup>14,15</sup> Characterization by <sup>1</sup>H-NMR and <sup>31</sup>P-NMR (Fig. S1–S3, ESI†) are consistent with literature, confirming the structure of our ligand. Further experimental details are provided in the ESI.†

LMEs were prepared by soaking a nanoITO electrode in a 1 mM methanol solution of the dpp ligand (Fig. 1). Surface coverage of dpp at nanoITO was determined by soaking the LME in a solution containing Fe(ClO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub> and acquiring the associated cyclic voltammogram (Fig. S6, ESI†). The charge under the resultant Fe(III/II) oxidation wave associated with nanoITO|Fe(dpp)<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup> is related to the surface coverage using the equation  $\Gamma = Q/nFA$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the surface coverage in mol cm<sup>-2</sup>,  $Q$  is the charge under the oxidation wave in Coulombs,  $n$  is the number of electrons involved in the redox process (1),  $F$  is Faraday's constant (96 485 C mol<sup>-1</sup>), and  $A$  is the surface area of the electrode in cm<sup>2</sup> (typically 1.0 cm<sup>2</sup>, though this was determined with a Vernier calliper in each case). The binding isotherm was determined by varying the concentration of the ligand loading solution (Fig. S7, ESI†), and corresponds to a Langmuir isotherm. The surface coverage of the dpp ligand on nanoITO—calculated using a Langmuir binding isotherm is  $29 \times 10^{-9}$  mol cm<sup>-2</sup>, which corresponds to a well packed monolayer.




Fig. 1 Molecular structure of a dpp ligand attached to a nanoITO electrode.







Fig. 2 Cyclic voltammograms of a nanoITO|dpp electrode in 0.1 M HNO<sub>3</sub> in the absence (black) and presence (red) of 0.8 mM Am(III). Scan rate is 50 mV s<sup>-1</sup>.

In the absence of Am(III), no electrochemical redox events are observed with the nanoITO|pdpp electrode. Upon substitution of the solution for one with 0.81 mM Am(III), a minor quasi-reversible redox couple is observed at 1.55 V vs. SCE (Fig. 2) ascribed to an Am(IV/III) couple. At potentials above 1.8 V vs. SCE catalytic oxidative current is observed, with new reduction peaks at 0.58 V and 0.43 V vs. SCE (Fig. S8, ESI†).

Controlled potential electrolysis with concurrent UV-visible measurement was performed with the same nanoITO|dpp electrodes in 0.1 M nitric acid solutions containing 0.81 mM Am(III). At an applied potential of 1.8 V vs. SCE, Am(III) was oxidized to Am(V), while no Am(VI) was observed. After 4 h of electrolysis at 1.8 V, the concentration of Am(V) reached 0.51 mM, while the concentration of Am(III) had dropped to 0.28 mM. The mechanism associated with this oxidation is analogous to what has been proposed for similar LMEs:<sup>11</sup> two sequential 1-electron oxidations of Am(III) to Am(IV) and then Am(IV) to Am(V). This first redox event requires an equilibrium coordination of Am(III) to the nanoITO|dpp electrode followed by the 1-electron oxidation to form Am(IV). Am(IV) is a stronger Lewis acid, and so will bind to the electrode more tightly than Am(III). The subsequent oxidation of Am(IV) to Am(V) is lower than that to oxidize Am(III) to Am(IV) ( $E(\text{Am(V/IV)}) = 0.84$  V vs. SCE). The oxidation of Am(IV) to Am(V) is proton-coupled and requires 2 molecules of water within the inner coordination sphere of Am(IV) to generate AmO<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>.

Am<sup>V</sup>O<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> is a weak Lewis acid (weaker than Am<sup>3+</sup>), and is therefore expected to dissociate from the electrode. Given that the Am(V) is formed, Am(VI) should also be thermodynamically possible, however, Am(V) has less affinity for the surface thereby decreasing the rate of electron-transfer at the electrode surface from dpp sites likely occupied by excess Am<sup>3+</sup>.





While Am(vi) may be electrochemically generated from Am(v) at 1.8 V, it is rapidly reduced by radiolytically produced reducing agents such as hydrogen peroxide or nitrous acid.<sup>16</sup> Increasing the applied potential from 1.8 V to 2.0 V does not appreciably change the rate of disappearance of Am(III), which can be approximated to a first order reaction with a rate constant of  $8.1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . This indicates that Am(III) diffusion to the electrode limits the rate of Am(III) oxidation. At a 2.0 V applied potential, Am(v) now decreases in concentration, while Am(vi) starts to appear. After 2 hours of electrolysis at 2.0 V, the concentration of Am(v) has dropped by 0.12 mM (0.51 mM to 0.39 mM), while the concentration of Am(vi) increased to 0.31 mM. This indicates that at 2.0 V not only is Am(v) oxidized to Am(vi), but, Am(III) is also oxidized to Am(vi) before significantly diffusing from the electrode surface.

At potentials above 2.0 V, the rate of disappearance of Am(III) is unchanged, however, Am(v) increases in concentration, concurrent with a decrease in Am(vi) concentration. This suggests Am(III) is being oxidized to Am(v) and Am(vi). However, unwanted electrochemical reactions are now more significant, and are producing reducing agents which act on Am(vi). One possible unwanted reaction at the electrode surface is the 2-electron oxidation of water to form hydrogen peroxide ( $E_{1/2} = 1.8 \text{ V vs. SCE}$ ).<sup>17</sup> The overpotential associated with this reaction is likely large, and therefore requires  $>2.0 \text{ V}$  to become significant. Additional studies are currently underway to quantify these side reactions. A cyclic voltammogram of the Am solution after bulk electrolysis was acquired with a glassy carbon working electrode. There is a single ill-defined quasi-reversible redox couple centred at 1.61 V vs. SCE ascribed to the one-electron Am(vi/v) couple (Fig. S9, ESI†).

Comparison of the reactivity of the nanoITO|dpp to a nanoITO|terpy electrode (where terpy is 4'-phosphonyl-(4-phenyl)-2,2':6',2''-terpyridine) shows some similarities and differences.<sup>11</sup> Both electrodes are able to effect the electrochemical oxidation of Am(III) to yield a mixture of Am(v) and Am(vi), however, the product ratios as a function of applied potential are different. The nanoITO|dpp electrode presented here also selectively produces Am(v) at 1.8 V vs. SCE. At the same potential, this selectivity is not observed with nanoITO|terpy electrodes. Additionally, there is a narrow potential range where Am(vi) is generated with our nanoITO|dpp electrodes, which is not reported for the nanoITO|terpy electrodes. This is explained by the slightly faster electron transfer kinetics associated with the nanoITO|dpp electrodes compared to those of nanoITO|terpy. This qualitative statement is partially made based on the appearance of a well-defined Am(iv/iii) couple (Fig. 2), not observed with nanoITO|terpy. As the applied potential is increased, the driving-force for a redox event is increased according to the Nernst equation. This is true however not only for desired reactions (Am oxidation), but, also for unwanted reactions, including the 2-electron oxidation of water to hydrogen peroxide (which is energetically favourable at an applied potential greater than 1.8 V vs. SCE).





Fig. 3 Am speciation derived from UV-visible spectroscopy during controlled potential electrolysis with a nanoITO|dpp electrode. Applied potentials are labelled in V vs. SCE.

At applied potentials above 2.0 V, electrochemical hydrogen peroxide generation appears to become significant, and is the likely culprit associated with the reduction of Am(vi) to Am(v) (Fig. 3). With a nanoITO|terpy electrode, Am(vi) is generated at an applied potential upwards of 2.25 V vs. SCE in lower molar ratios, suggesting that even at potentials exceeding 2.2 V, the generation of hydrogen peroxide is not as significant. The oxidation of Am(v) to Am(vi) and oxidation of water to hydrogen peroxide at similar potentials therefore compete with one another. Ultimately, these competing reactions limit the utility of nanoITO|dpp electrodes, and mean the quantitative generation of Am(vi) will require precise control of the applied potential to disfavour hydrogen peroxide formation over Am(vi) generation from Am(III) and Am(v) (Fig. 4).

The low-potential electrochemical generation of  $\text{Am}^{\text{V}}\text{O}_2^+$  and  $\text{Am}^{\text{VI}}\text{O}_2^{2+}$  from Am(III) using a nanoITO|dpp LME is




Fig. 4 UV-vis spectra of initially 0.81 mM Am(III) in 0.1 M nitric acid over 11.5 h during bulk electrolysis using a nanoITO|dpp electrode at potentials between 1.8 and 2.1 V vs. SCE. Changes with time are highlighted by a change in spectra colour from black to red (0 to 5.7 h), and finally red to green (5.7 to 11.5 h).

demonstrated. An Am(IV/III) redox couple at 1.60 V vs. SCE is observed in a 0.1 M nitric acid solution with 0.81 mM Am(III). The 0.81 mM solution of Am(III) in 0.1 M HNO<sub>3</sub> is converted into 0.39 mM Am(V) (48%), and 0.31 mM Am(VI) (38%) after 6 h of electrolysis at 2.0 V. Increasing the applied potential above 2.0 V increases the rate of electrochemical oxidation of Am(III) and Am(V) to Am(VI), but also increases the rate of hydrogen peroxide generation which reacts with Am(VI) decreasing its mole fraction. It is therefore not enough to simply consider how to facilitate Am binding and oxidation when developing a LME for Am oxidation, but also to be cognizant, and design a LME that inhibits unwanted reactions that may poison the solution. The results in this work facilitate the development of a LME platform for this purpose, ultimately to develop an efficient LME to generate only Am(VI). As Am(VI), Am has the potential to be separated in a single step along with other hexavalent actinyl cations. Efforts must continually be made to increase the rate of wanted oxidation reactions (Am oxidation), and increase the overpotential for unwanted reactions such as the oxidation of water to hydrogen peroxide and the electrochemical deactivation of radiolytically produced reducing agents such as nitrous acid, both of which retard the generation of Am(VI).

This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy from the Nuclear Energy University Program through award number DE-NE0008539. CJD thanks Bruce Mincher, and Bruce Moyer for insightful discussions. JRM was supported by a U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission fellowship (NRC-HQ-84-14-G-0038).

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

## Notes and references

- 1 J.-M. Adnet, Separation of oxidised americium. In SACSESS Technical Meeting, CEA, 2013.
- 2 A. Leoncini, J. Huskens and W. Verboom, Ligands for f-element extraction used in the nuclear fuel cycle, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2017, **46**(23), 7229–7273.
- 3 P. J. Panak and A. Geist, Complexation and Extraction of Trivalent Actinides and Lanthanides by Triazinylpyridine N-Donor Ligands, *Chem. Rev.*, 2013, **113**(2), 1199–1236.
- 4 J. C. Braley, T. S. Grimes and K. L. Nash, Alternatives to HDEHP and DTPA for Simplified TALSPEAK Separations, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2012, **51**(2), 629–638.
- 5 B. J. Mincher, L. R. Martin and N. C. Schmitt, Tributylphosphate Extraction Behavior of Bismuthate-Oxidized Americium, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2008, **47**(15), 6984–6989.
- 6 E. Aneheim, C. Ekberg, A. Fermvik and M. R. S. Foreman, Development of a Novel GANEX Process, *Nuclear Energy and the Environment*, American Chemical Society, 2010, vol. 1046, pp. 119–130.
- 7 L. B. Asprey, S. E. Stephanou and R. A. Penneman, A New Valence State Of Americium, Am(VI), *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1950, **72**(3), 1425–1426.
- 8 W. H. Runde and B. J. Mincher, Higher Oxidation States of Americium: Preparation, Characterization and Use for Separations, *Chem. Rev.*, 2011, **111**(9), 5723–5741.
- 9 K. McCann, S. I. Sinkov, G. J. Lumetta and J. C. Shafer, Organic and Aqueous Redox Speciation of Cu(III) Periodate Oxidized Transuranium Actinides, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2018, **57**(4), 1277–1283.
- 10 A. J. Bard, R. Parsons, J. Jordan and International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, *Standard potentials in aqueous solution*, M. Dekker, New York, 1985.
- 11 C. J. Dares, A. M. Lapidés, B. J. Mincher and T. J. Meyer, Electrochemical oxidation of <sup>243</sup>Am(III) in nitric acid by a terpyridyl-derivatized electrode, *Science*, 2015, **350**(6261), 652–655.
- 12 T. S. Grimes, G. P. Horne, C. J. Dares, S. M. Pimblott, S. P. Mezyk and B. J. Mincher, Kinetics of the Autoreduction of Hexavalent Americium in Aqueous Nitric Acid, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2017, **56**(14), 8295–8301.
- 13 M. Miguiritchian, D. Guillauneux, D. Guillaumont, P. Moisy, C. Madic, M. P. Jensen and K. L. Nash, Thermodynamic Study of the Complexation of Trivalent Actinide and Lanthanide Cations by ADPTZ, a Tridentate N-Donor Ligand, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2005, **44**(5), 1404–1412.
- 14 C. J. Dares, T. Manivannan, P. G. Potvin and A. B. P. Lever, Hydroxyphenyl- and Octoxyphenyl-Substituted Dipyrazinylpyridine Complexes of Ruthenium(II), Iron(II) and Nickel(II), *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2011, **374**, 606.
- 15 M. R. Norris, J. J. Concepcion, C. R. Glasson, Z. Fang, A. M. Lapidés, D. L. Ashford, J. L. Templeton and T. J. Meyer, Synthesis of phosphonic acid derivatized bipyridine ligands and their ruthenium complexes, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, **52**(21), 12492–12501.
- 16 G. P. Horne, T. A. Donocliift, H. E. Sims, R. M. Orr and S. M. Pimblott, Multi-Scale Modeling of the Gamma Radiolysis of Nitrate Solutions, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2016, **120**(45), 11781–11789.
- 17 X. Shi, S. Siahrostami, G.-L. Li, Y. Zhang, P. Chakhranont, F. Studt, T. F. Jaramillo, X. Zheng and J. K. Nørskov, Understanding activity trends in electrochemical water oxidation to form hydrogen peroxide, *Nat. Commun.*, 2017, **8**(1), 701.