

Non-Hydroxyl Radical Species Production during Dark Air Oxidation of Alluvial Soils

Elora Bourbon, Frédéric Averseng, Pierre Le Pape, Thierry Allard, Fulvia Baratelli, Fabrice Alliot, Alexandre Gélabert, Valentine Rollot, Elodie Guigon, Jessica Brest, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Elora Bourbon, Frédéric Averseng, Pierre Le Pape, Thierry Allard, Fulvia Baratelli, et al.. Non-Hydroxyl Radical Species Production during Dark Air Oxidation of Alluvial Soils. ACS Earth and Space Chemistry, 2024, 8 (9), pp.1757-1770. 10.1021/acsearthspacechem.4c00113 . hal-04744483

HAL Id: hal-04744483 https://hal.science/hal-04744483v1

Submitted on 18 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

2	Non-hydroxyl radical species production during dark air-
3	oxidation of alluvial soils
4	
5	
6	Elora Bourbon ^{1,5} , Frédéric Averseng ² , Pierre Le Pape ¹ , Thierry Allard ¹ , Fulvia Baratelli ³ , Fabrice
7	Alliot ³ , Alexandre Gélabert ⁴ , Valentine Rollot ⁴ , Elodie Guigon ³ , Jessica Brest ¹ , Sylvie Nélieu ⁵ ,
8	Guillaume Morin ¹ *
9	
10	¹ Institut de Minéralogie, de Physique des Matériaux et de Cosmochimie (IMPMC), UMR 7590, CNRS-
11	Sorbonne Université, MNHN, IRD, 4 place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France
12	² Laboratoire de Réactivité de Surface (LRS) UMR 7197, Sorbonne Université – CNRS, 4 place Jussieu,
13	75252 Paris Cedex 05, France
14	³ Milieux Environnementaux, Transferts et Interactions dans les hydrosystèmes et les Sols (METIS), UMR
15	7619 Sorbonne Université, CNRS, EPHE, 4 place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France.
16	⁴ Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Université Paris Diderot, UMR 7154 CNRS,
17	75005 Paris, France
18	⁵ Ecologie fonctionnelle et écotoxicologie des agroécosystèmes (ECOSYS), UMR 1402, Université
19	Paris-Saclay, INRAE, AgroParisTech, 91120 Palaiseau, France
20	2 nd revised version (R2) to be submitted to ACS Earth and Space Chemistry
21	
22	*Corresponding Author: guillaume.morin@sorbonne-universite.fr
23	

24 ABSTRACT

Natural environments subjected to hydrologically-driven redox fluctuations are regarded as 25 26 propitious to contaminant degradation since they favor cyclic oxygenation of Fe(II)-minerals that produces oxidizing reactive species, such as the hydroxyl radical, OH[•]. However, the identity of 27 these reactive species may vary as a function of physicochemical conditions and is still a matter of 28 research. Here, using spin-trapping electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) with 5,5-dimethyl-1-29 30 pyrroline *N*-oxide (DMPO) as spin trap, we show that a non-hydroxyl reactive species is produced in 31 significant amount upon air-oxidation of alluvial soil suspensions (Seine River basin, France). Indeed, among the DMPO-OH[•], DMPO-CO₂^{•-} and DMPO-alkyl[•] adducts observed, the latter one 32 33 dramatically raised when adding ethanol or, to a lesser extent, *tert*-butanol, especially with phosphate 34 buffer. This result revealed a dominant non-hydroxyl species we interpret as Fe(IV) since it is known 35 to oxidize alcohols into alkyl[•] radicals and to be favored by phosphate ligands. With phosphate buffer 36 and ethanol, the DMPO-alkyl[•] production correlated with the initial reduced-state iron pool in the samples determined using Fe K-edge X-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS). Fe(II)-phyllosilicates, 37 38 and Fe(0) in one soil, and to a lesser extent vivianite, were the most significantly oxidized upon soil oxygenation, pyrite appearing less reactive. Hence, we show that a significant reactive species, 39 40 differing from OH[•], forms upon oxygenation of soil Fe(II)-minerals, especially in the presence of soil-sourced phosphate. Our results may thus call for further direct identification of this putative 41 42 Fe(IV) species and for investigating its ability to degrade organic contaminants in natural 43 environments.

- 46
- 47

50 GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT (TOC)



56 **INTRODUCTION**

57 A wide diversity of advanced oxidation processes has been the subject of intense research for the 58 last decades in order to help designing efficient remediation processes for organic pollutants in water and soils¹⁻³. Among recent developments, particular interest has been devoted to investigate Fenton-59 based processes using iron-bearing compounds as catalysts and airborne O₂ as oxidant, especially in 60 61 order to promote eco-compatible routes favoring circumneutral pH and avoiding strong oxidants^{4,5}. For instance, various organic compounds have been reported to be degraded upon oxygenation of 62 iron-rich solid phases such as zero-valent iron⁶, magnetite^{7,8}, FeS^{9,10}, pyrite¹¹ and clay minerals¹²⁻¹⁴. 63 64 Moreover, some studies have provided promising results regarding the degradation of organic 65 contaminants upon oxygenation of natural soils and sediments, in relation with the redox reactivity of Fe(II)-bearing soil components^{15–17}. In these studies, organic contaminant degradation has been 66 attributed to the oxidizing role of reactive oxygen species (ROS), particularly OH[•], that have been 67 68 reported to be produced upon oxygenation of reduced soils and sediments^{17–23}. Some of these studies proposed that OH[•] production could be related to oxidation of iron minerals¹⁵⁻¹⁸ and organic 69 matter^{18,24–26}. Nevertheless, in aqueous media that are relevant to this literature, the actual formation 70 71 of OH[•] could be probed only using indirect approaches, due to the high reactivity and extremely short lifetime of this species (typically estimated to ~ 10^{-9} s at 37°C in 1M linoleate ²⁷). Thus, OH• 72 scavengers have been used to investigate the role of this radical species in pollutant degradation¹⁶. 73 74 More generally, the hydroxylation of specific aromatic molecules by OH[•] has been rather used to obtain quantitative estimates of this short-lived species. In particular, the production rate of p-75 hydroxybenzoic acid (p-HBA) from benzoic acid (BA) has been often used to assess OH• production. 76 This method was first established by Zhou & Mopper²⁸ and has been now commonly used in various 77 78 contexts including in soils and sediments oxygenation experiments^{15,20,26,29,30}. Similarly, the 79 conversion of terephthalic acid (TPA) into hydroxyterephthalic acid (hTPA) is another method that has been used to quantify OH^{•18,19} upon oxygenation of soils. However, the specificity of aromatic 80 81 hydroxylation methods, especially the ability of the BA/p-HBA method to selectively quantify aqueous OH• upon Fe(II)-mineral air-oxidation have been recently questioned³¹. In addition, the
 molecular-scale mechanisms of heterogeneous Fenton-like reaction using O₂ as the primary oxidant,
 remains an ongoing debate.

85 Besides, while it is commonly assumed that OH[•] is produced under such oxygenation conditions, spin-trapping electronic paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectroscopy studies have revealed a wider 86 87 variety of radicals species that can be produced upon oxygenation of soils or sediments, including alkyl radicals that can be formed upon oxidation of natural organic matter by reactive oxygen 88 species^{32,33}. Moreover, pioneering and recent spin-trapping EPR studies have suggested that another 89 reactive species, the ferryl ion Fe(IV)=O²⁺, is formed upon oxygenation of Fe(II) at neutral and 90 alkaline pH³⁴⁻³⁶. This was not confirmed by another indirect method involving the conversion of 91 92 phenyl methyl/dimethyl sulfoxide (PMSO/DMSO) to phenyl methyl/dimeththyl sulfone (PMSO), which was not observed upon oxygenation of aqueous iron complexes³⁷ or magnetite at neutral pH³⁸, 93 94 although this conversion is expected to occur in the presence of Fe(IV). In contrast in another study, 95 the PMSO to PMSO₂ conversion was observed upon oxygenation of reduced smectites and rectorite³⁹. Nevertheless, the selectivity of this latter method has been recently disputed⁴⁰. Hence, although 96 providing direct evidence for Fe(IV) in aqueous systems remains challenging^{41–43}, EPR studies have 97 98 given clues for the formation of abundant non-hydroxyl species upon homogeneous and 99 heterogeneous oxygenation of Fe(II), especially in the presence of ligands such as phosphate^{34,36}, 100 which has been interpreted as possible ligand-promoted Fe(IV) formation³⁵.

101 Nevertheless, natural environments subjected to hydrological fluctuations are particularly regarded 102 as propitious to such contaminant degradation processes since they may favor cyclic oxygenation of 103 Fe(II)-minerals. Indeed, due to fluctuations of the redox boundary in riverbanks, alluvial soils or 104 coastal areas sediments^{23–25}, ROS are expected to be produced during low-water periods from the 105 oxidation of reduced-state iron substrates that may be regenerated via microbial reduction during 106 high-water periods, thus contributing to ROS production at the next low-water period^{23,33,44}. According to these previous findings, the mechanisms of ROS production in soils subjected to redox fluctuation thus deserve further research. The two main objective of this work were to better characterize the reactive species involved in the air-oxidation of natural soils in darkness at neutral pH, using spin-trapping EPR spectroscopy, and to evaluate the role of Fe-bearing phases in the reactive species production, using X-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS) as a probe for Fe-speciation.

112

113 MATERIALS AND METHODS

All samples were handled in a JACOMEX® glovebox under N₂ atmosphere (O₂ < 2 ppm, as measured using a JACOMEX® electro-galvanic oxygen sensor) to avoid oxidation of the alluvial soil samples before oxygenation experiments. When required, O₂-free deionized water (18.2 m Ω .cm, Millipore® Milli-Q system) was prepared by bubbling N₂ gas at 75°C for 50 minutes, ensuring dissolved O₂ concentration in the 10⁻⁵ mg.L⁻¹ range⁴⁵. All experiments presented were conducted at room temperature except XAS analyses that were conducted at cryogenic temperature to limit beamdamage.

121 Alluvial soils sampling and characterization procedures. Alluvial soils were collected from 122 two different locations (Figure S1, top). Two soil cores were collected in the Orgeval watershed, on the banks of the Avenelles river, on the edge of a cropped field (CRD3) and of a meadow (CRG1). A 123 124 third alluvial soil core was collected in the Seine riverbank upstream from the Bassée alluvial plain 125 (T1S1). At the Avenelles site, we used a PVC tube and a rubber hammer for coring. A manual steel corer with an inner PVC tube and a rubber hammer were used to core the muddy soil at the T1S1 site. 126 The soils cores of about 30 cm length were immediately sealed in their PVC tube with taped plastic 127 128 stoppers in order to limit contact with atmosphere and were transported in a passive cool box ($\leq 5^{\circ}$ C) to the IMPMC laboratory within 24 hours. The cores within their PVC tubes were cut transversally 129 130 in the glovebox and half-cores were subdivided into subsamples as a function of depth, according to the difference of colors and textures of the horizons. Subsamples were then dried under vacuum in adesiccator within the glovebox.

133 Major elements concentrations in the dry soils samples were determined by Inductively Coupled 134 Plasma - Optical Emission Spectrometry (ICP-OES), at SARM-CRPG (Nancy, France) after alkaline 135 fusion and acid digestion (Table 1). Full chemical compositions are reported in Table S1. Total carbon, total organic carbon (TOC), and total inorganic carbon (TIC) calculated by subtraction (Table 136 137 1), were determined in dried samples in three replicates by pyrolysis and element analysis using a Vario Isotope Select element analyzer (Elementar, Lvon, France) at ECOSYS, INRAE. Prior to the 138 139 organic carbon measurements, inorganic carbon was eliminated from soils by acidic fumigation using HCl⁴⁶. 140

141 For two selected samples, CRD3 20-30 cm and T1S1 0-10 cm, dissolved organic carbon (DOC) 142 was measured in the filtered suspension after air-oxidation (please see next section for oxidation 143 protocol) using a total organic carbon analyzer TOC-5050A (Shimadzu, Marne-La-Vallée, France). 144 Uncertainties were estimated from two independent experiments. Phosphate concentration was 145 measured by the molybdenum blue reaction with orthophosphate, by colorimetry at 710 nm,⁴⁷ in the 146 filtered suspension before air-oxidation and uncertainties were estimated from triplicate experiments. 147 The mineralogy of the dried soil subsamples was determined using powder X-ray diffraction (XRD) and Scanning Electron Microscopy coupled to Energy Dispersive X-ray analysis (SEM-148 149 EDX). XRD data were collected using a PANalytical® Xpert Pro diffractometer in Bragg-Brentano geometry with Co-K α radiation, for 2h between 2 and 80° 2 θ -range in a continuous mode. For this 150 151 purpose, soil samples were ground in the anoxic glove-box in an agate mortar in mixture with ethanol 152 and were deposited on a zero-background silicon wafer before being placed into an anoxic chamber 153 with Kapton® window during the XRD measurements. Mineral phases were identified using the HighScore Plus® software and the PDF-2 database (Table 1). 154

For scanning electron microscopy coupled to energy dispersive X-ray (SEM-EDX) spectroscopy
 analyses, ~50 μm thick soil thin-sections were prepared on glass slides from soil powder embedded

in Epoxy resin. SEM observations were performed on a Zeiss Ultra55 SEM equipped with a FEG-Schottky electronic source operating at 15 kV and with a BrukerTM Si-drift detector for EDX. Semiquantitative elemental analysis was performed on EDX spectra using the Esprit1.9[®] using a spectra database for standard materials (**Figure 1**).

161 Air-oxidation procedure. To avoid any photo-activation from natural light, the air-oxidation 162 experiments were conducted within amber glass flasks. For all samples of the CRD3, CRG1 and T1S1 soil cores, suspensions were prepared in an anoxic glove box. For this purpose, 100 mg of dried 163 164 sample were mixed with 350 µL phosphate buffer 1 M pH 7 (prepared from anhydrous NaH₂PO₄ and 165 Na₂HPO₄ salts), 16 µL of 99.98% absolute ethanol, 160 µL of O₂-free deionized water, and then 300 μ L of DMPO 0.1 M (n° CAS: 3317-61-1; \geq 98.0 % for EPR-spectroscopy, Sigma-Aldrich®). Final 166 concentrations in the mixture are 0.036 M, 0.42 M, 0.33 M for DMPO, phosphate and ethanol 167 168 respectively. The suspensions were left equilibrating overnight before adding DMPO and sealing the 169 flasks with butyl rubber stoppers. Air-oxidation was performed outside from the glove box, by 170 injecting 200 mL of air over a two minutes period of time using a 50 mL syringe and needle through 171 the butyl rubber stopper. The suspension is $60\pm5\%$ saturated with O₂ after this 2 min air bubbling as determined with a WTW® 3630 IDS FDO Check probe for dissolved oxygen. The flask was then 172 173 shaken for ten seconds and the liquid phase was extracted with a 5 mL syringe and needle and was 174 then filtered through 0.2 µm nylon filters before being transferred in an EPR liquid flat-cell for 175 analysis. Besides, a control experiment without solid was also carried out in the same conditions and 176 is referred to as blank.

In order to better decipher among various possible reactive species, specific experiments were conducted on the CRD3 20-30 cm and T1S1 0-10 cm samples, with or without adding 16 μ L of the OH• scavenger, i.e. either ethanol (99.98%) or *tert*-butanol (99%). In addition, to assess the possible effects of ligands, the air-oxidation experiments were conducted with or without phosphate buffer, then replacing it by O₂-free deionized water. Removing the buffer did not significantly affect the pH of the suspensions upon oxygenation since they were already buffered at pH 7.0-7.3 by the soilalkalinity and dropped to 6.7-6.8 after oxidation.

Spin-trapping Electron Paramagnetic Resonance (EPR). Immediately after the air-oxidation, shaking and filtration steps, an EPR spectrum was acquired every 5 min over a one-hour period, with the beginning of air-bubbling as the initial time reference (t = 0 min). For these measurements, Xband EPR spectra were acquired at room temperature at the IMPMC laboratory over the 0.3460 – 0.3560 Tesla magnetic field-range on a Bruker EMXplusTM EPR spectrometer, or at the LRS laboratory, over the 0.33204–0.34204 Tesla magnetic field-range on a JEOL® FA-300 spectrometer (**Figure S2**). Acquisition parameters are detailed in Supporting Information Section S1.

As in Morin et al. (2023)³⁶, EPR spectra were least-squares fit using the EPRPLP code⁴⁸ in order to extract EPR parameters of the DMPO-radical adducts (**Table 2; Figure 2**) and scale factors proportional to the abundance of every adduct as a function of time. Typical time course series of EPR spectra collected for this spin-trapping kinetic EPR analysis are displayed in **Figure S3**. For all experiments, the time-course evolution of the scale factor for each adduct was fit by a combination of two first order kinetic laws, representing the adduct production and decay, which can be expressed as follows for a given DMPO-radical[•] adduct (**Figures S4 and S5**; **Table S2** and **Table 3**):

198

199
$$[DMPO-radical^{\bullet}](t) = [DMPO-radical^{\bullet}]_{max} \cdot \frac{k_{prod}}{(k_{decay} - k_{prod})} \cdot (e^{-k_{prod} \cdot t} - e^{-k_{decay} \cdot t})$$
(1)

200

where k_{prod} and k_{decay} are rate constants and [DMPO-radical[•]]_{max} is the calculated maximum EPR intensity. This latter parameter was then used as an estimate of the amount of radical species produced in our air-oxidation experiments (**Table S2**; **Figures S6 and S7**). Triplicate experiments were especially conducted with phosphate buffer and EtOH for all samples (**Figure S8**; **Table 3**). As previously observed in a previous study³⁶ upon air-oxidation of pure iron substrates, a short radical production phase is observed (k_{prod}) before decay (k_{decay}) indicating that radicals are still produced in the filtered supernatant after the 2 min bubbling. This effect is related to the contribution of aqueous Fe(II) species oxidation to radical production after filtration, in addition to surface Fe(II) species
oxidized before filtration^{31,36}.

X-ray Absorption Spectroscopy (XAS). Iron K-edge X-ray Absorption Near Edge Structure 210 211 (XANES) and Extended X-ray Absorption Fine Structure (EXAFS) spectroscopy data were collected 212 on the soil core samples before and after the same 2 min air-oxidation protocol as that used for EPR 213 analyses, but without DMPO. Following the bubbling step, samples were centrifuged for 20 seconds 214 before being vacuum-dried into the anoxic glovebox. In the glove box, the samples were ground in 215 agate mortar, weighted to ~ 30 mg to optimize edge-jump vs. total absorbance, pressed as pure pellets, 216 sealed under Kapton® tape and mounted on samples holders. Those were then sealed within glass 217 vials closed with butyl rubber stoppers and brought to the synchrotron beamline glove box. The 218 sample holders were exposed to air for less than 20 seconds before being placed into the liquid nitrogen cryostat sample chamber that was then pumped down to $\sim 10^{-6}$ bar and cooled. The data on 219 220 the CRD3 and T1S1 samples were collected at 80K in transmission detection mode using ionization 221 chambers on the bending-magnet XAFS beamline at the ELETTRA synchrotron (Trieste, Italy). 222 Energy was selected using a Si(111) double-crystal monochromator detuned for 30% in order to avoid the 3rd order harmonic. The data on the CRG1 samples were collected at 30K on the undulator LUCIA 223 224 beamline at the SOLEIL synchrotron (Saint-Aubin, France) using a Si(111) double-crystal monochromator, and harmonic rejection mirrors. On this beamline, transmission and fluorescence 225 226 (Si-drift detector) detection mode data were used for EXAFS and XANES, respectively. Energy was 227 calibrated using a Fe foil analyzed in double-transmission setup, setting the first inflection point of the Fe K-edge at 7112 eV. Either two or three spectra were merged, normalized, background-228 229 subtracted, and deglitched if necessary, using the Athena software⁴⁹.

A Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Target Transform (TT) analysis (**Figure S9-S11**; **Table S3**), followed by Linear combination fit (LCF) (**Figures 3 and 4; Table 4**) was performed to assess iron speciation in the soil samples, before and after air-oxidation. PCA-TT was performed using the SIXPack software⁵⁰, whereas XANES and EXAFS LCF was performed with a home-built Fortran 90 code based on a Levenberg-Marquardt minimization algorithm used in previous studies^{51–} 235 55.

In this latter software, fit quality for XANES LCF is estimated with a R-factor, $R_f = \sum [\mu_{exp} - \mu_{fit}]^2$ 236 $\sum \mu_{exp}^2$, where μ is the normalized absorbance, and with a reduced chi-square, Chi²_R = N/(N-N_p) 237 $[\mu_{exp}-\mu_{fit}]^2 / \Sigma \mu_{exp}^2$, where N_p is the number of fitting components and N is the number of independent 238 parameters corresponding to the energy range divided by the natural width of the Fe levels⁵⁶. The 239 uncertainty on each fitting parameter p was estimated to 99.7% confidence (3 σ) as $3\sqrt{(var(p).Chi^2_R)}$ 240 where var(p) is the variance of parameter p returned by the Levenberg-Marquardt routine for the 241 lowest Chi₂^R value. The fit quality of EXAFS LCF was estimated by a reduced chi-square parameter 242 $\text{Chi}^2_{R_2} = \text{N}/[(\text{N}-\text{N}_p).\text{n}.\epsilon^2] \sum [k^3 \chi(k)_{exp} - k^3 \chi(k)_{fit}]^2$, with $\text{N} = (2\Delta k\Delta R)/\pi$, the number of independent 243 parameters. Np the number of free fitting parameters, n the number of data points, and ε the root mean 244 245 square of the data noise. This latter value was estimated as the Fourier back-transform of the data in the 15–25 Å R-range, following a method modified after Ravel and Newville⁴³. The uncertainty on 246 EXAFS fitting parameters was estimated to 95% confidence (2σ) by $2\sqrt{\operatorname{var}(p)}$. Chi²_R, where $\operatorname{var}(p)$ 247 is the variance of parameter p returned by the Levenberg-Marguardt routine for the lowest Chi_{R}^{2} 248 249 value. Fitting components were selected from our database using the results of TT analysis (Table **S3**) and were further screened by requiring uncertainties returned from the LCF procedure to be lower 250 251 than the refined parameter values (Table 4). Applying this method, a consistent set of six fitting 252 components, i.e. Fe(0), pyrite, vivianite, biotite, illite and goethite, was found to fit both XANES and 253 EXAFS spectra of our whole set of soil cores samples, before and after air-oxidation. Calculated 254 uncertainties revealed that vivianite and pyrite minor components, although observed by SEM, were 255 significant in XANES fitting but not in EXAFS fitting (Figure 4; Table 4). In contrast, Fe(0) was 256 required to fit both the XANES and EXAFS data of CRD3 samples (Figure S12; Table S4). This 257 component may be attributed to steel or other metallic particles, some of which being identified by 258 SEM-EDX observations (Figure 1). We infer that they could originate from incident anthropogenic inputs in the studied cropped fields, due for instance to soil tilling. 259

260 Thanks to lower uncertainties and reliable sum-of-component criteria, XANES spectroscopy was

261 more accurate at determining Fe redox state than EXAFS and was then used to evaluate the "reduced-

state iron" pool, calculated as the sum of Fe(0) and Fe(II) (Table 4). This observation obviously

results from the well-known sensitivity of the energy position of the Fe K-edge to oxidation state and

264 first-ligands, which allows accurate determination of Fe oxidation state in complex natural samples

using XANES LCF, provided that appropriate model compounds are available^{53,55,57–59}.

266

267 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

268 Chemical and mineralogical characterization of the alluvial soils

269 Major minerals determined by XRD analysis, i.e. quartz, feldspars, calcite and clay minerals

270 (Table 1; Figure S1) were in qualitative agreement with ICP-OES data (Table 1 and S1). Hence,

the samples from the Seine site (T1S1) were found to be more calcic than the siliceous soils from the

272 Avenelles site (CRD3 and CRG1).

Table 1. Selected chemical and mineralogical data on the studied soil core samples, as determined by ICP-OES (Fe and S concentrations refer to total concentrations of these elements), carbon analyser (TOC, TIC), powder XRD (Qz: Quartz; Cal: Calcite; Feld: Feldspar; Clay: phyllosilicates; **Figure S1**) and SEM-EDX (Viv: vivianite, Py: pyrite; Fe-Ox: iron oxyhydroxides; OM: organic matter; Fe(0): metallic iron (**Figure 1**). Relative analytical uncertainties are $\pm 10\%$, $\pm 20\%$ and $\pm 15\%$ for Fe, S and P, respectively. Uncertainties (3 σ) on last digit are given under bracket for triplicate measurements of TOC and TIC.

Sample	Fe (wt%)	S (wt%)	P (wt%)	TOC (wt%)	TIC (wt%)	Major minerals	Fe-bearing phases
CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 20-30 cm	0.67 0.97 0.92 1.02	0.03 0.04 0.05 0.04	< 0.044 < 0.044 < 0.044 < 0.044	$1.4(2) \\ 2.06(6) \\ 1.6(1) \\ 4.2(1)$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.2(1) \\ 0.12(1) \\ 0.3(2) \\ 0.2(1) \end{array}$	Qz, Cal, Feld, Clays	Clays, Fe- Ox, Fe(0)
CRG1 8-14 cm CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 28-35 cm	1.02 1.09 0.79 1.23 1.18	0.04 0.04 0.07 0.07	0.048 < 0.044 0.057 0.052	$\begin{array}{c} 3.8(2) \\ 2.2(4) \\ 3.9(1) \\ 5.4(3) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.2(1) \\ 0.3(2) \\ 0.4(3) \\ 0.2(2) \\ 0.3(3) \end{array}$	Qz, Cal, Feld, Clays	Clays, Fe- Ox
T1S1 0-10 cm T1S1 10-15 cm T1S1 15-24 cm T1S1 24-30 cm	1.58 1.59 1.54 0.92	0.10 0.07 0.08 0.07	0.096 0.096 0.100 0.061	4.2(7) 4.1(7) 4(1) 2.2(2)	5.7(7) 5.7(8) 6(1) 7.9(3)	Cal, Qz, Clays	Clays, Fe- Ox, Viv, Py, OM

281 Complementary information on minor Fe-bearing phases below XRD detection limit was provided 282 by SEM-EDX analysis (**Figure 1**). Fe-bearing phyllosilicates and iron-oxyhydroxides were identified 283 as Fe-bearing phases in the CRD3 and CRG1 soil cores (**Figure 1**; **Table 1**) and metallic iron particles 284 were observed in the former core (**Figure 1e**). In the T1S1 soils, Fe-bearing phyllosilicates and iron-285 oxyhydroxides were also observed, as well as iron associated to organic matter (**Figure 1d**), 286 framboidal pyrite (FeS₂) (**Figure 1b**) and vivianite (Fe₃(PO₄)₂•8H₂O) (**Figure 1c**).



Figure 1. SEM images in backscattering mode (left) and corresponding EDX spectra (right) (a) phyllosilicate aggregate in CRD3 0-3 cm sample with spectra corresponding to the red tags, (b) framboidal pyrites in T1S1 24-30 cm sample (Fe/S = 0.50 ± 0.05 mol/mol) (c) vivianite grain in T1S1 24-30 cm sample (Fe/P = 1.40 ± 0.05 mol/mol) (d) organic matter aggregate in T1S1 24-30 cm sample (Fe/C = 0.08 ± 0.01 mol/mol) (e) metalli iron grain in CRD3 20-30 cm sample (f) iron oxyhydroxide in CRD3 0-3 cm sample.

296

297 Radical species produced upon air-oxidation of the alluvial soils. Three DMPO adducts were
298 produced upon air-oxidation of the soil suspensions particularly in the absence of alcohol and
299 phosphate buffer, and were observed by EPR in the filtered soil suspensions, as shown in Figure 2a.

The first signal is the DMPO-OH[•] adduct, characterized by its quadruplet spectrum^{60,61} (**Table 2**). 300 Accordingly, DMPO is known as an efficient spin trap for the hydroxyl radical OH[•] and the DMPO-301 OH[•] adduct has been previously detected using EPR upon oxygenation of soils^{15,20} and of Fe(II)-302 bearing substrates such as FeS⁹. However, DMPO-OH[•] can be also formed by decomposition of 303 DMPO-O₂^{•-} with typically a few percent of this adduct being transformed into DMPO-OH[•] after a 304 few minutes⁶². Such origin for DMPO-OH[•] cannot be excluded in our experiments since the half-life 305 of the DMPO-O₂^{•-} adduct is as short as 1 or 2 min, and even shorter in the presence of Fe^{2+62,63}. This 306 307 adduct might then be overlooked by our first EPR spectrum that is taken at 5 min after the beginning 308 of the oxygenation.



309

Figure 2. EPR spectra taken at time 26 ± 2 min after the start of 2 min air-oxidation of the CRD3 20-30 cm or T1S1 0-10 cm samples suspensions. (a) without phosphate buffer and without EtOH added. Experimental (black) and fitting curves (blue or orange) are displayed together with weighted theoretical fitting components: DMPO-alkyl[•], DMPO-OH[•] and DMPO-CO₂^{•-} adducts. (b) Without phosphate buffer and without or with EtOH added. (c) With phosphate buffer and with or without EtOH added. EPR parameters of the adducts are reported in Table 2.

316

Nevertheless, even though the hydroxyl radical could be directly produced by oxygenation of Fe(II)-minerals at neutral pH, the intensity of DMPO-OH• EPR signal in our study, as well as in previous reports, was found to be close to the background signal^{9,15,20}. In contrast, based on aromatic 320 hydroxylation methods such as BA/p-HBA conversion, OH• has been assumed to be generated upon 321 oxygenation of soils and sediments^{17–23}.

The second signal is a sextet with hyperfine parameters (Table 2) matching those of DMPO 322 323 adducts of alkyl radicals (RCH[•]R') or hydroxyalkyl radicals (RCH[•]OH) with R being an alkane or a H atom⁶¹, which we will both refer to as DMPO-alkyl[•] adduct thereafter. Such adduct is typically 324 observed when a ROS scavenger, especially an alcohol, is present and reacts with the ROS before 325 being trapped by DMPO⁶². Hence, OH[•] scavengers such as methanol, ethanol or DMSO are used to 326 distinguish genuine DMPO-OH[•] from the same adduct resulting from the decomposition of DMPO-327 O_2^{\bullet} , since the superoxide radical O_2^{\bullet} is not scavenged by alcohols nor DMSO^{60,62}. In our 328 329 experiments, one may infer that the DMPO-alkyl[•] formation results from the scavenging of reactive 330 species by alkyl groups associated to dissolved organic matter in our soil suspensions (Table 1), and 331 their subsequent trapping by DMPO. Similar signal was indeed reported in the past upon oxygenation of sediments¹⁵. 332

333

Table 2. EPR parameters of DMPO adducts of the hydroxyl radical (DMPO-OH[•]), carbon dioxide anion radical (DMPO-CO₂^{•-}), hydroxyethyl radical (DMPO-EtOH[•]) and hydroxy*tert*-butyl radical (DMPO-t-BuOH[•]), determined from the fitting of soil samples suspension data. Parameters include the g factor of the (S=1/2) center and its hyperfine coupling constants to hydrogen (A_H) and nitrogen (A_N) neighbors.

		This	study	<i>Buettner</i> (1987) ⁶¹ *		
Adduct	g	$A_H (ext{cm}^{-1})$ $A_H (ext{Gauss})$	$A_N (ext{cm}^{-1})$ $A_N (ext{Gauss})$	$A_H (\mathrm{cm}^{-1})$ $A_H (\mathrm{Gauss})$	A_N (cm ⁻¹) A_N (Gauss)	
DMPO-OH•	2.0055(2)	0.00138(6)	0.00141(6)	0.00140(3)	0.00140(3)	
		14.7(7)	15.1(7)	15.0(3)	15.0(3)	
DMPO-CO ₂ •-	2.0054(2)	0.00177(4)	0.00149(2)	0.00175(5)	0.00146(4)	
		18.9(4)	15.9(2)	18.7(5)	15.6(4)	
DMPO-alkyl•	2.0054(1)	0.00217(4)	0.00150(1)	0.0022(2)	0.00149(8)	
		23.2(4)	16.0(1)	23.5(20)	15.9(8)	

339 * Mean values of hyperfine constants reported in Buettner (1987)⁶¹ converted in cm⁻¹ unit using either g = 2.0054340 er a value reported therein. Only the values measured in water as solvent were kent for this calculation.

340 or *g*-value reported therein. Only the values measured in water as solvent were kept for this calculation.

342 A third radical was observed, whose hyperfine constants matched those of DMPO-CO2⁻⁻ 343 adducts^{60,61} (**Table 2**). The carbon anion radical CO₂^{•-} has been reported to be produced in the presence of formate HCOO⁻ upon oxygenation of iron-bearing asbestos⁶⁴. This radical was also 344 345 detected in a Fe(II)-EDTA/H₂O₂ system at pH 7.4 in the presence of formate⁶⁵. More recently, it has been reported CO₂^{•-} formation upon photo-oxidation of formate⁶⁶. Besides, CO₂^{•-} was recently 346 detected upon Cr(VI) reduction in wastewaters⁶⁷. According to these previous reports, the CO₂--347 348 radical that formed upon oxygenation of our soils suspension could likely result from the oxidation 349 of carboxylate compounds that necessarily originated from soil-sourced organic matter.

As shown in **Figure 2a**, the three DMPO adducts of OH[•], alkyl[•] and CO₂^{•-} were observed upon air-oxidation of alluvial soils samples from both sites, but with a higher intensity of alkyl[•] and CO₂^{•-} radicals for the T1S1 sample than for the CRD3 sample. Since we infer that these two radicals may be generated through ROS scavenging by alkyl and carboxylate groups from dissolved organic matter, the more than two-fold higher amount of DOC in the filtered suspension after oxygenation of the T1S1 0-10 cm sample (150±40 mg.L⁻¹) compared to the CRD3 20-30 cm sample (65±20 mg.L⁻¹) could be invoked to explain this difference in radical production.

357 Effect of radical scavengers and phosphate. EtOH used as scavenger is expected to convert OH• into the α -hydroxyethyl radical, EtOH• and forms a DMPO-hydroxyethyl• adduct with a sextet EPR 358 spectrum, typical of the DMPO-alkyl[•] adducts⁶². It can be then distinguished from the quadruplet 359 360 spectrum of a DMPO-OH• adduct that could have potentially resulted from the decomposition of DMPO- $O_2^{\bullet-62}$. In our experiments conducted in the absence of phosphate buffer, the addition of EtOH 361 362 lead to a significant decrease of the DMPO-OH[•] signal (Figure 2b and S6), suggesting that the major 363 fraction of the DMPO-OH[•] observed in the absence of both EtOH and phosphate buffer was related 364 to the production of OH[•] upon air-oxidation of the soil samples. Since OH[•] is converted into alkyl[•] in the presence of EtOH, the amount of DMPO-alkyl[•] adduct would be expected to be in the same 365 366 range as that of the DMPO-OH[•] adduct observed in the absence of EtOH, as observed in Fenton-like

oxidation experiments performed with $H_2O_2^{36}$. On the contrary, addition of EtOH led to a significant 367 368 increase of the DMPO-alkyl[•] sextet signal that was found about 50-fold higher than the DMPO-OH[•] observed without EtOH (Figure 2b and S6, Table S2). Importantly, this strong DMPO-alkyl[•] signal 369 370 observed in the presence of added EtOH (Figure 2b) indicates that another non-hydroxyl species is produced by air-oxidation of our soil samples and that it is able to oxidize EtOH into EtOH[•]. More 371 372 precisely, the relative proportions of this non-hydroxyl species and of the hydroxyl radical can be estimated, as shown in Figure S6, from the amounts of DMPO-OH[•] and DMPO-alkyl[•] adducts 373 374 determined from our spin-trapping EPR kinetic analysis (Table S2), the trapping rate constants of OH• by DMPO⁶⁰ and EtOH⁶⁸ and the known concentrations of DMPO, EtOH and DOC in our soil 375 376 suspensions. This estimation indicated that ~87 and ~99% of the DMPO-alkyl[•] adduct signal is due 377 to EtOH oxidation by a non-hydroxyl species upon air-oxidation of the CRD3 20-30 cm and T1S1 0-10cm soil suspensions, respectively, in the presence of EtOH. In other words, the relative proportion 378 379 of non-hydroxyl species over hydroxyl species is estimated to 86 and 91% for the CRD3 20-30 cm 380 and T1S1 0-10cm soil suspensions, respectively, in these conditions (Figure S6). Previous evidences for the formation of a non-hydroxyl species air-oxidation of aqueous Fe(II) species^{34,35} and Fe(II)-381 mineral phases³⁶ at near neutral pH have been reported from EPR spin-trapping analyses. In these 382 former studies, the authors proposed that the main reactive species produced in such conditions may 383 be a high-valent state of iron, the ferryl ion Fe^{IV}O²⁺, since this species is known to oxidize EtOH into 384 EtOH' through hydrogen abstraction^{4,65,69,70}. Indeed, the ferryl ion has been proposed as a possible 385 product of Fe(II) oxidation by H₂O₂ in Fenton-like systems especially at neutral pH^{65,71-76} and has 386 been also proposed to form upon oxygenation of Fe(II)^{34,35,77} and zero-valent iron^{4,78}. Based on these 387 388 findings, we hypothesize that, in our air-oxidation experiments in the presence of EtOH, the 389 hydroxyethyl radical EtOH[•] could have mainly formed from the following reactions^{36,70} (**Figure 2b**):

$$390 Fe^{2+} + \frac{1}{2}O_2 \iff Fe^{IV}O^{2+} (2)$$

391
$$\operatorname{Fe^{IV}O^{2+} + EtOH} \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{Fe^{III}(OH)^{2+} + EtOH^{\bullet}}$$
 (3)

while in the absence of EtOH, the low amount of observed alkyl radicals could have resulted from
the oxidation of soils-sourced natural organic matter by both OH[•] and Fe(IV) (Figure 2a):

$$394 \qquad OH^{\bullet} + alkyl_{soil-organic-matter} \Leftrightarrow H_2O + alkyl^{\bullet}$$
(4)

395
$$Fe^{IV}O^{2+} + alkyl_{soil-organic-matter} \Leftrightarrow Fe^{III}(OH)^{2+} + alkyl^{\bullet}$$
 (5)

396 More detailed hypotheses on the mechanisms possibly underlying reaction (2) are especially 397 reported in previous studies^{4,32} and references therein. In the present study, support for this non-398 hydroxyl species is further provided by the results of air-oxidation experiments conducted in the 399 presence of our concentrated phosphate buffer at pH 7 (Figure 2c and S5). Without ethanol, the overall EPR signal remained low but a slight increase could be observed compared to the experiments 400 401 without phosphate buffer (Figure 2b), especially for the CRD3 20-30 cm (Figure S6). In the presence 402 of ethanol, addition of the phosphate buffer lead to a greater increase of the DMPO-alkyl[•] adduct 403 signal (Figure 2c, S4a and S6) than in the non-added phosphate experiments (Figure 2b, S5a and 404 S6), especially for the CRD3 20-30 cm sample, indicating that phosphate favored the formation of 405 the putative Fe(IV) species. More precisely, the amount of non-hydroxyl species, interpreted as 406 Fe(IV), increased by factors of ~4 and ~2 for the CRD3 20-30 cm and T1S1 0-10 cm samples, 407 respectively, when adding the phosphate buffer in the presence of EtOH (Figure S6). Furthermore, 408 the relative proportion of putative Fe(IV) over hydroxyl radical species is estimated to 79 and 92% 409 for the CRD3 20-30 cm and T1S1 0-10 cm soil suspensions, respectively, in the presence of added 410 EtOH and phosphate buffer (Figure S6). Such effect of phosphate has been documented in previous studies^{34–36} and is thought to be another hint pointing toward Fe(IV). Moreover, other specific iron 411 412 complexing agents, such as EDTA, have been reported to favor the Fe(IV) pathway over the OH. pathway at neutral pH, both in Fenton systems^{65,72,73,79} and in oxygenation experiments^{34–36}. Hence, 413 414 the increase in alkyl[•] radicals production observed in the presence of phosphate buffer (Figure 2c 415 and S6) is consistent with the reported ability of phosphate to favor the formation of Fe(IV) over OH• upon oxygenation at neutral pH^{34–36}. Addition of ethanol in our EPR-spin trapping experiments is 416 then thought to reveal Fe(IV) through the formation of the DMPO-alkyl[•] adduct, due to the known 417

ability of this species to abstract an hydrogen atom to ethanol^{4,65,69,70}, leading to an EtOH• 418 radical^{34,36,62}. Moreover, according to the excess of DMPO over DOC in our experiments, the higher 419 420 amount of DMPO-alkyl[•] adduct than DMPO-OH[•] in the absence of ethanol (Figure 2a, S4a, and 421 **S5a**) suggests that a significant fraction of the soil-derived dissolved organic molecules may be oxidized rather by Fe(IV)⁶⁹ than by OH[•] to form alkyl[•] radicals. Accordingly, owing to DOC 422 concentrations measured in our soil suspensions, i.e., 65 ± 20 and 150 ± 40 mg.L⁻¹ for the T1S1 0-10 423 cm and CRD3 20-30 cm samples, respectively, the relative proportion of non-hydroxyl species 424 425 largely exceeds that of hydroxyl radical in the absence of EtOH as estimated in Figure S6.

Interestingly, the effect of added ethanol and phosphate buffer on the production of DMPO-alkvl* 426 427 varied among the two selected soil samples studied (Figure 2b, 2c, S4, S5 and S6), which suggests 428 that soil-derived aqueous species present in the soil suspensions, specifically DOC and phosphate, 429 may have interfered in the putative production of Fe(IV) during air-oxidation. Indeed, the stronger 430 DMPO-alkyl[•] signal observed in T1S1 0-10 cm than in CRD3 20-30 cm, in the absence of phosphate 431 buffer (Figure 2a, 2b and S4a; Table S2), could be explained by both the higher dissolved phosphate and higher dissolved organic carbon concentrations in the former sample suspension (2.1±0.1 mg.L⁻ 432 433 ¹P as phosphate and 150±40 mg.L⁻¹ DOC) than in the latter (1.2±0.4 mg.L⁻¹P as phosphate and 65±20) mg.L⁻¹ DOC). Furthermore, assuming that CRD3 20-30 cm sample is more sensitive to air-oxidation 434 435 than the T1S1 0-10 cm one, as it will be shown in the next section, the lower concentration of soil-436 sourced phosphate in CRD3 20-30 cm could help explaining why the addition of phosphate buffer has a larger effect on Fe(IV) production for this sample than for the T1S1 0-10 cm one, with and 437 438 without EtOH (Figure 2c, S5a and S6; Table S2).

A supplementary result supporting the formation of Fe(IV), especially in the presence of phosphate buffer, is given by using *tert*-butanol (t-BuOH) instead of ethanol as radical scavenger (**Figure S7**). Indeed, whereas OH• is expected to oxidize t-BuOH as well as ethanol with fast kinetics⁸⁰, we observe a significantly weaker DMPO-alkyl• adduct signal with t-BuOH than with ethanol, which is consistent with the lower reactivity of high-valent iron species toward the former alcohol^{74,81}. Our results thus suggest that a non-hydroxyl species, interpreted as a putative Fe(IV)
species, could be produced upon oxygenation of natural alluvial soil samples, which calls for further
examination of the role of Fe(II)-bearing phases in this process, as discussed in the next section.

447 Role of the reduced-state iron pool in reactive species production. Addition of ethanol and of phosphate in excess in our experiments conducted with EtOH and phosphate buffer allowed us to 448 449 compare the soils samples reactivity to air-oxidation on a same basis and to evaluate the role of iron-450 bearing phases in radical production. Indeed, under this excess phosphate and with the chosen ethanol over DMPO ratio in our experiments, alkyl radicals are mostly produced via the oxidation of ethanol 451 452 into the α -hydroxyethyl radical by a non-hydroxyl species as indicated by Figure 2 and illustrated in 453 Figure S6, and we interpret these species as Fe(IV) as detailed in the previous section. In Figure S8, 454 intensities varied significantly from one replica to another likely because of soils samples heterogeneity, as attested by the error bars representing the standard deviation within triplicate results. 455 456 However, particular samples with lower radical production could be easily distinguished, i.e. those 457 with the lowest iron content: CRD3 0-3 cm, CRG1 14-21 cm and T1S1 24-30 cm (Table 1).

458

Table 3. Kinetics parameters, namely [DMPO-alkyl[•]]_{max}, k_{prod} and k_{decay} derived from the fitting to Eq.1 (see text) of the time-course evolution of the DMPO-alkyl[•] scale factor in the air-oxidation experiments conducted in the presence of ethanol and 0.435 M phosphate buffer. Reported kinetic parameters were obtained from the fitting of the average of triplicate experiments to Eq.1, as shown in **Figure S8**. Uncertainties on [DMPO-alkyl[•]]_{max} values are reported under bracket for the last digit and include mean quadratic error on triplicates together with fitting uncertainties to Eq.1. Uncertainties on kinetic constants refer to fitting to Eq.1.

DMPO-alkvl•	[DMPO-alkyl•]max	[DMPO-alkyl•]max	<i>k</i> _{prod}	kdecay	Chi ²	R
DMF O-alkyl	μΜ	$(a.u.) \times 10^5$	(\min^{-1})	(min^{-1})	x10 ⁶	
CRD3 0-3 cm	14.5(17)	0.57(7)	0.22(6)	0.023(3)	109.0	0.956
CRD3 3-10 cm	42.5(23)	1.67(9)	0.35(2)	0.0125(3)	16.54	0.998
CRD3 10-20 cm	49.8(20)	1.96(8)	0.277(9)	0.0071(2)	21.37	0.996
CRD3 20-30 cm	64.0(30)	2.52(12)	0.274(2)	0.00985(4)	0.94	0.999
CRG1 8-14 cm	57.6(8)	2.27(3)	0.253(5)	0.0178(2)	8.25	0.999
CRG1 14-21 cm	31.9(8)	1.26(3)	0.24(2)	0.0113(7)	44.93	0.989
CRG1 21-28 cm	68.1(15)	2.68(6)	0.36(2)	0.144(3)	57.78	0.998
CRG1 28-21 cm	66.0(23)	2.60(9)	0.254(3)	0.0170(1)	5.47	0.999
T1S1 0-10 cm	45.7(20)	1.80(8)	0.283(4)	0.00792(9)	2.64	0.999
T1S1 10-15 cm	47.5(26)	1.87(10)	0.16(1)	0.0077(8)	116.0	0.977
T1S1 15-24 cm	42.2(23)	1.66(9)	0.221(5)	0.0051(2)	10.58	0.995
T1S1 24-30 cm	26.8(25)	1.06(10)	0.18(1)	1.06(3)	47.93	0.968





471

472 **Figure 3.** Role of the reduced-state iron pool in reactive species production upon air-oxidation. (a) 473 The quantity of DMPO-alkyl[•] adduct produced after 2 min air-oxidation is displayed as a function of 474 total iron concentration (open circles) and of the initial reduced-state iron pool (plain circle). 475 Uncertainties fall within the symbol size (**Table 3**). The reduced-state iron pool is calculated as 476 Fe(0)+Fe(II) species in the pristine soil samples, as determined from LCF of XANES data at the Fe K-edge (Figure 4; Table 4) (b) Detail of the LCF in the edge region is displayed before and after air-477 oxidation with fit curves displayed as as green and red curves, respectively, and overlap experimental 478 479 data displayed as light blue, blue and orange colors for CRD3, CRG1 and T1S1, respectively. Strong 480 overlap between fit and experiment relies to fit quality. (c) Iron speciation derived from XANES LCF analysis of the soils core samples before and after 2 min air-oxidation is displayed as bar diagrams 481 482 scaled to total iron concentration. Additional details on XANES and EXAFS LCF procedures are 483 reported in Supporting Information.

485 Such positive but complex correlation between radical production and total iron content¹⁵ or with 486 $Fe(II)^{18,20}$ were previously observed in the past, which emphasizes the need for better identifying the 487 driving factor for radical production, especially using spectroscopic methods¹⁷.

488 In our study, the differences in trend observed between the soils cores when considering total iron 489 may be explained by differences in iron redox state as shown in Figure 3b and 3c. Indeed, the energy-490 shift of the Fe K-edge position before and after air-oxidation, is larger for most of the CRD3 and 491 CRG1 samples than for the T1S1 ones (Figure 3b). This difference suggests that a larger proportion 492 of total iron has been oxidized upon oxygenation in CRD3 and CRG1 than in T1S1. Accordingly, in 493 the pristine samples, the proportion of initially reduced-state iron species over total iron is higher in CRD3 and CRG1 than in T1S1, as determined from LCF of Fe K-edge XANES data (Table 4). 494 495 Hence, when scaling XANES LCF results (Table 4) to total iron (Table 1), the absolute "reduced-496 state iron" pool concentration in the pristine soil samples, i.e. Fe(0) + Fe(II) in CRD3 or Fe(II) in 497 T1S1 and CRG1, ranges within similar values for the three soils cores (0.044 - 0.198 wt) (Figure 498 **3c**). It is then possible to compare this reduced-state iron pool in the pristine soil samples with the 499 quantity of radical species produced upon their oxygenation and detected by EPR in the form of DMPO-alkyl[•] adducts (Figure 3a). The differences in radical production trends between the CRD3, 500 501 CRG1 and T1S1 soils cores tend to vanish when considering the initial reduced-state iron pool instead 502 of total iron. The fast and close-to-linear increase of radical species as a function of reduced-state 503 iron pool (R = 0.85 in Figure 3a) could then be interpreted as the initial rate of Fe(IV) production from highly reactive reduced-state Fe species. 504

The identity of the initial reduced-state iron pool species was further investigated by EXAFS LCF (**Figure 4**; **Table 4**). According to both EXAFS and XANES LCF results, structural Fe(II) in phyllosilicates largely contributed to the oxidizable fraction of iron since it systematically decreased after oxidation (**Figure 3c**; **Table 4**). Our proxy for the structural-Fe(II) clay component in the XANES and EXAFS LCF analysis is a Fe(II,III) biotite model compound (**Table 4**). Other phyllosilicates may actually host structural-Fe(II) and could match this proxy, especially smectites.



515 Figure 4. Results of Fe K-edge XANES and EXAFS LCF for all samples studied. Experimental data 516 are plotted in light-blue, blue and orange colours for CRD3, CRG1 and T1S1 core samples, 517 respectively. Fitting curves are plotted in green and red curves for pristine and oxidized samples, 518 respectively

Table 4. Results of LCF analysis for Fe K-edge XANES and EXAFS data of alluvial soil samples from the Avenelles (CRD3 and CRG1 cores) and upstream-Bassée (T1S1 core) sites, before and after 2 min airoxidation. Uncertainties on the last digit of reported component proportions are indicated under bracket to 99.7% and 95% confidence (3σ and 2σ) for XANES and EXAFS, respectively (see text). Fit quality was estimated by a R factor (Rf) and a reduced χ^2 (chi²_R)(see text). The proportion of "reduced-state Fe" over total iron is calculated as Fe(0)-metal + Fe(II)-pyrite + Fe(II)-vivianite + 0.7 x Fe(II,III)-biotite, based on the Feredox composition of our Fe(II,III)-biotite model compound (**Figure S9**).

XANES LCF Samples	Fe(0)- metal (%)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%)	Fe(II)- vivianite (%)	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%)	Fe(III)- illite (%)	Fe(III)- goethite (%)	Sum (%)	"reduced- state Fe" (%)	Rf x104	chi ² _R x10 ³
CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox	6(2) -	3(2) 6(2)	7(2)	12(3) 4(3)	21(5) 31(10)	50(5) 59(10)	100 100	24(2) 9(2)	0.25 1.06	0.254
CRD3 3-10 cm	9(1)	-	9(2)	17(3)	22(5)	44(5)	101	30(2)	0.27	0.270
CRD3 3-10 cm ox	-	3(1)	4(3)	5(5)	30(8)	60(8)	100	11(4)	0.63	0.641
CRD3 10-20 cm ox	5(2)	$\frac{2(2)}{4(2)}$	$\frac{10(2)}{4(1)}$	18(3)	$\frac{22(3)}{34(9)}$	43(3) 58(9)	100	$\frac{30(2)}{8(2)}$	0.27	0.271
CRD3 20-30 cm	5(1)	-	7(2)	15(3)	29(5)	44(5)	100	23(3)	0.27	0.271
CRD3 20-30 cm ox	-	2(2)	5(3)	6(5)	34(9)	54(9)	101	11(5)	0.75	0.774
CRG1 10-14 cm	-	-	13(3)	20(6)	30(10)	36(10)	99	27(5)	1 10	1 091
CRG1 10-14 cm ox	-	-	9(4)	9(7)	33(11)	48(10)	99	15(6)	1.16	1.147
CRG1 14-21 cm	-	1(1)	8(3)	11(5)	27(8)	52(7)	99	17(4)	0.57	0.563
CRG1 14-21 cm ox	-	2(2)	5(3)	6(5)	31(9)	56(9)	100	11(4)	0.76	0.767
CRG1 21-28 cm	-	2(2)	12(3)	23(6)	30(10)	32(10)	99	30(5)	0.95	0.942
CRG1 21-28 cm ox	-	-	16(2)	-	31(20)	53(19)	101	16(2)	4.13	4.128
CRG1 28-35 cm	-	-	18(5)	28(9)	30(15)	22(15)	99	38(8)	2.36	2.313
CRG1 28-35 cm ox	-	8(3)	11(2)	-	32(16)	50(16)	101	19(3)	2.64	2.660
T1S1 0-10 cm	-	1(1)	7(2)	16(3)	30(5)	47(5)	100	19(3)	0.23	0.229
T1S1 0-10 cm ox	-	2(1)	3(2)	5(4)	33(7)	57(7)	100	9(3)	0.46	0.461
T1S1 10-15 cm	-	I(1)	5(2)	14(4)	29(6)	51(6)	100	16(3)	0.33	0.337
$T_{1}S_{1} = 10 - 15 \text{ cm ox}$	-	4(1)	S(1)	-	31(7) 25(5)	60(7) 40(5)	100	9(1)	0.51	0.506
T1S1 15-24 cm ox	-	$\frac{-}{2(1)}$	9(2) 8(3)	18(3)	23(3) 31(8)	49(3) 60(8)	100	$\frac{22(0)}{10(2)}$	0.28	0.281
T1S1 75-24 cm 0x T1S1 24-30 cm	-	$\frac{2(1)}{5(1)}$	5(2)	10(4)	23(7)	58(7)	99	10(2) 17(4)	0.04	0.443
T1S1 24-30 cm ox	-	7(2)	6(3)	6(5)	29(9)	52(8)	99	17(4)	0.73	0.727
EXAFS data	Fe(0)-	Fe(II)-	Fe(II)-	Fe(II,III)-	Fe(III)-	Fe(III)-	Sum	"reduced-	Rf	chi ² _R
EXAFS data	Fe(0)- metal	Fe(II)- pyrite	Fe(II)- vivianite	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%)	Fe(III)- illite (%)	Fe(III)- goethite	Sum	"reduced- state Fe"	Rf $r 10^2$	chi ² _R
EXAFS data Samples	Fe(0)- metal (%)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%)	Fe(II)- vivianite (%)	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%)	Fe(III)- illite (%)	Fe(III)- goethite (%)	Sum (%)	"reduced- state Fe" (%)	Rf $x10^2$	chi ² _R
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%)	Fe(II)- vivianite (%)	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10)	Sum (%) 91	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%)	Fe(II)- vivianite (%)	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8)	Sum (%) 91 94	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14)	Sum (%) 91 94 94	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10²</i> 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 22(21)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 25(25)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 27(9)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(4)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 92 92 93	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10²</i> 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8 339
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3)	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) 33(16)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 92 93	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 56(16) 72(12)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 29(12)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 92 93 100	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) -	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 56(16) 73(13) 44(11)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 20(0)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 12(8)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.62	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.320
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 56(16) 56(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 13(8) 0	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 55(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 13(8) 0 15(14)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 56(16) 56(16) 56(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 100 93 102 92 90 94	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 13(8) 0 15(14) 9(6)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 13(8) 0 15(14) 9(6) 19(9)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 55(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10) 23(8)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 13(8) 0 15(14) 9(6) 19(9) 9(6)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07 4.76	chi^{2}_{R} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm ox T1S1 0-10 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9) 31(20)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10) 38(20)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10) 23(8) 31(17)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94 100	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 13(8) 0 15(14) 9(6) 19(9) 9(6) 22(16)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10²</i> 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07 4.76 2.15	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703 7.645
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm ox T1S1 0-10 cm T1S1 0-10 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9) 31(20)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10) 38(20) 54(20)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10) 23(8) 31(17) 36(21)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94 100 90	$\begin{array}{c} ``reduced-state Fe'' (\%) \\ 20(7) \\ 2(1) \\ 30(12) \\ 0 \\ 27(15) \\ 8(6) \\ 24(20) \\ 3(3) \\ 18(12) \\ 0 \\ 13(8) \\ 0 \\ 15(14) \\ 9(6) \\ 19(9) \\ 9(6) \\ 22(16) \\ 0 \end{array}$	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10²</i> 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07 4.76 2.15 2.64	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703 7.645 13.62
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm CRG1 28-35 cm ox T1S1 0-10 cm T1S1 0-10 cm ox T1S1 10-15 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9) 31(20) - 27(13)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10) 38(20) 54(20) 40(13)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10) 23(8) 31(17) 36(21) 29(11)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94 100 90 95	"reduced- state Fe" (%) 20(7) 2(1) 30(12) 0 27(15) 8(6) 24(20) 3(3) 18(12) 0 13(8) 0 15(14) 9(6) 19(9) 9(6) 22(16) 0 19(9)	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10²</i> 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07 4.76 2.15 2.64 1.85	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703 7.645 13.62 3.138
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm CRG1 28-35 cm ox T1S1 0-10 cm T1S1 0-10 cm ox T1S1 10-15 cm T1S1 10-15 cm ox	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9) 31(20) - 27(13)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10) 38(20) 54(20) 40(13) 52(16)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10) 23(8) 31(17) 36(21) 29(11) 34(16)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94 100 90 95 85	$\begin{array}{c} ``reduced-state Fe'' (%) \\ 20(7) \\ 2(1) \\ 30(12) \\ 0 \\ 27(15) \\ 8(6) \\ 24(20) \\ 3(3) \\ 18(12) \\ 0 \\ 13(8) \\ 0 \\ 15(14) \\ 9(6) \\ 19(9) \\ 9(6) \\ 22(16) \\ 0 \\ 19(9) \\ 0 \\ \end{array}$	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10²</i> 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07 4.76 2.15 2.64 1.85 2.44	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703 7.645 13.62 3.138 8.409
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 28-35 cm CRG1 28-35 cm CRG1 28-35 cm ox T1S1 0-10 cm T1S1 0-10 cm ox T1S1 10-15 cm T1S1 10-15 cm ox T1S1 15-24 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) - 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9) 31(20) - 27(13) - 33(12)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10) 38(20) 54(20) 40(13) 52(16) 36(12)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10) 23(8) 31(17) 36(21) 29(11) 34(16) 27(10)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94 100 90 95 85 97	$\begin{array}{c} ``reduced-state Fe'' (%) \\ 20(7) \\ 2(1) \\ 30(12) \\ 0 \\ 27(15) \\ 8(6) \\ 24(20) \\ 3(3) \\ 18(12) \\ 0 \\ 13(8) \\ 0 \\ 15(14) \\ 9(6) \\ 19(9) \\ 9(6) \\ 22(16) \\ 0 \\ 19(9) \\ 0 \\ 23(8) \end{array}$	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10²</i> 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07 4.76 2.15 2.64 1.85 2.44 2.41	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703 7.645 13.62 3.138 8.409 11.37
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm CRG1 28-35 cm ox T1S1 0-10 cm T1S1 0-10 cm ox T1S1 10-15 cm T1S1 10-15 cm ox T1S1 15-24 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) 33(16) 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9) 31(20) - 27(13) - 33(12)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10) 38(20) 54(20) 40(13) 52(16) 36(12) 58(18)	Fe(III)- goethite (%) 36(10) 23(8) 31(14) 26(20) 27(18) 27(9) 24(22) 24(17) 19(13) 20(13) 39(9) 33(12) 17(16) 23(8) 17(10) 23(8) 31(17) 36(21) 29(11) 34(16) 27(10) 28(18)	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94 100 90 95 85 97 86	$\begin{array}{c} ``reduced-state Fe'' (%) \\ 20(7) \\ 2(1) \\ 30(12) \\ 0 \\ 27(15) \\ 8(6) \\ 24(20) \\ 3(3) \\ 18(12) \\ 0 \\ 13(8) \\ 0 \\ 15(14) \\ 9(6) \\ 19(9) \\ 9(6) \\ 22(16) \\ 0 \\ 19(9) \\ 0 \\ 23(8) \\ 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} Rf \\ x10^2 \\ 2.02 \\ 2.66 \\ 2.55 \\ 3.17 \\ 3.39 \\ 2.79 \\ 3.00 \\ 3.41 \\ 7.93 \\ 6.61 \\ 5.63 \\ 9.93 \\ 7.60 \\ 4.76 \\ 6.07 \\ 4.76 \\ 2.15 \\ 2.64 \\ 1.85 \\ 2.44 \\ 2.41 \\ 2.67 \end{array}$	<i>chi</i> ² _{<i>R</i>} 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703 7.645 13.62 3.138 8.409 11.37 10.51
EXAFS data Samples CRD3 0-3 cm CRD3 0-3 cm ox CRD3 3-10 cm CRD3 3-10 cm ox CRD3 10-20 cm CRD3 10-20 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRD3 20-30 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 10-14 cm ox CRG1 14-21 cm CRG1 14-21 cm ox CRG1 21-28 cm CRG1 21-28 cm ox CRG1 28-35 cm CRG1 28-35 cm ox T1S1 0-10 cm T1S1 0-10 cm ox T1S1 10-15 cm T1S1 10-15 cm ox T1S1 15-24 cm T1S1 15-24 cm ox T1S1 24-30 cm	Fe(0)- metal (%) 5(2) 2(1) 7(3) - 5(3) - 3(4) 3(3) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- pyrite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II)- vivianite (%) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Fe(II,III)- biotite (%) 21(11) 33(16) - 32(20) 12(10) 30(24) - 25(15) - 19(11) - 21(19) 13(9) 27(12) 13(9) 31(20) - 27(13) - 33(12) - 27(18)	Fe(III)- illite (%) 30(12) 69(8) 23(17) 56(19) 27(21) 52(11) 35(25) 66(16) 73(13) 44(11) 59(12) 52(19) 60(10) 51(12) 60(10) 38(20) 54(20) 40(13) 52(16) 36(12) 58(18) 22(19)	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Fe(III)-}\\ \text{goethite}\\ (\%)\\ \hline\\ 36(10)\\ 23(8)\\ 31(14)\\ 26(20)\\ 27(18)\\ 27(9)\\ 24(22)\\ 24(17)\\ 19(13)\\ 20(13)\\ 39(9)\\ 33(12)\\ 17(16)\\ 23(8)\\ 17(10)\\ 23(8)\\ 31(17)\\ 36(21)\\ 29(11)\\ 34(16)\\ 27(10)\\ 28(18)\\ 49(16)\\ \end{array}$	Sum (%) 91 94 94 82 90 92 92 93 100 93 102 92 90 94 95 94 100 90 95 85 97 86 98	$\begin{array}{c} ``reduced-state Fe'' (%) \\ 20(7) \\ 2(1) \\ 30(12) \\ 0 \\ 27(15) \\ 8(6) \\ 24(20) \\ 3(3) \\ 18(12) \\ 0 \\ 13(8) \\ 0 \\ 15(14) \\ 9(6) \\ 19(9) \\ 9(6) \\ 22(16) \\ 0 \\ 19(9) \\ 0 \\ 23(8) \\ 0 \\ 19(13) \end{array}$	<i>Rf</i> <i>x10</i> ² 2.02 2.66 2.55 3.17 3.39 2.79 3.00 3.41 7.93 6.61 5.63 9.93 7.60 4.76 6.07 4.76 2.15 2.64 1.85 2.44 2.41 2.67 4.36	chi^2_R 2.529 1.893 5.119 11.80 7.607 2.177 11.59 8.339 4.682 5.427 2.330 4.415 7.033 1.703 2.721 1.703 7.645 13.62 3.138 8.409 11.37 10.51 6.779

This result is in line with other studies^{15,17} proposing the Fe(II)-clay component as a major contributor to radical species production upon oxygenation of soils or sediments. In addition, our results suggest that Fe(0), likely from anthropogenic origin (**Figure 1e**), could also contribute to the oxidizable Fe fraction in the CRD3 samples since its proportion systematically decreases after oxidation (**Figure 3c; Table 5.**). Vivianite (**Figure 1c**) could also contribute to oxidizable iron as indicated by a decrease of this component after air-oxidation (**Table 4**).

533 Alternative XANES and/or EXAFS LCF fit solutions could also be obtained, from sample to 534 sample, by adding Fe(II)-polyphosphate or carboxylates fitting components, but with larger 535 uncertainties (data not shown) than in **Table 4**, and resulted however in similar overall Fe(II)-pool 536 quantities. Nevertheless, sorbed- or organic-Fe(II) species could also contribute to the Fe(II) pool and to radical production, as proposed in previous studies^{15,23,82,83}. Because of such uncertainties on the 537 538 identity of minor Fe(II) components, we have chosen in the present study to merge the Fe(II) 539 components in the whole reduced-state iron pool, this latter estimate being accurately estimated by 540 XANES LCF (Table 3; Figure 3b and Figure 4), and appearing relevant to be compared with the radical species production rate (Figure 3a). Finally, XANES LCF results do not reveal significant 541 pyrite oxidation considering our experimental conditions, which is consistent with the results of 542 543 previous laboratory experiments conducted under similar oxygenation conditions³⁶.

544 Our results thus confirm that iron minerals are susceptible to play a major role in producing reactive species upon soil or sediment oxygenation^{15,17}. For instance, a non-linear but positive 545 correlation has been reported¹⁵ between total iron content in river sediments and the amount of OH• 546 547 produced upon oxygenation, as measured by BA/p-HBA method. In the same study, radical species production was found to increase with sediment sampling depth and after their reduction, thus 548 549 suggesting that Fe(II) may be a major substrate for radical production. Structural and sorbed Fe(II) 550 associated to clay minerals has been proposed as main contributors to radical production upon 551 oxygenation, based on comparative air-oxidation experiments after selective chemical treatments¹⁵, and more recently using spectroscopic analyses^{17,39}. Natural organic matter has been also proposed 552

to contribute in other studies^{18,24,25,33,84}. The generation of re-oxidizable Fe(II) species in soils is typically attributed to microbial reduction of Fe(III)-minerals under anaerobic flooding conditions^{23–} studies the studies studied here.

Beyond these previous findings, the present study show that Fe(II)-minerals, especially Fe(II)bearing phyllosilicates play a key role in the production of non-hydroxyl reactive species in airoxidation of riverbank soils. We also show that soil sourced and added phosphate favor these nonhydroxyl reactive species over OH• and that natural organic matter may be oxidized by these nonhydroxyl reactive species to form alkyl• and $CO_2^{\bullet-}$ radical species.

561

562 CONCLUSION

563 Our results confirm that ferrous iron oxidation can be a major driver for the production of reactive species in soils and sediments upon air-oxidation^{15,17,23,82}, which is actually recognized as a 564 widespread process that may occur for instance in alluvial plains and coastal areas^{18,24,82,85}. However, 565 the identity of the various reactive species produced during iron-bearing minerals oxygenation may 566 vary as a function of physicochemical conditions and are still a matter of research^{4,5,34,35,51,77,78}. While 567 it is widely assumed in the literature that OH• is produced, here we show by EPR spin-trapping 568 analysis that another non-hydroxyl species is significantly produced upon air-oxidation of natural 569 soils and sediments. Based on its differential reactivity toward tert-butanol and ethanol, and its 570 571 enhancement by phosphate ligands, we hypothesize that this non-hydroxyl species could be interpreted as $Fe(IV)^{4,34-36,65,69,70}$. Interestingly, the results of our air-oxidation experiments 572 conducted without phosphate buffer show that this putative Fe(IV) species can be formed in natural 573 574 soils suspensions, which could be explained by the presence of natural ligands favoring Fe(IV) 575 formation in the soils, especially phosphate.

576

578 ASSOCIATED CONTENT

579 The supporting information file contains 4 tables (**Tables S1-S4**) and 12 figures (**Figure S1-S12**) 580 including in particular XRD data, kinetics results on reactive species as derived from EPR data fitting, 581 as well as PCA-TT analysis of Fe *K*-edge XANES and EXAFS data.

582

583 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Ludovic Delbes and Benoît Baptiste for their help on the XRD platform of 584 585 IMPMC and Fériel Skouri and Cynthia Travers for their help in the IMPMC chemistry laboratories. 586 Cédric Plessis, Sébastien Breuil and Adrien Lescoat are thanked for their determination of total and 587 organic carbon in soil and aqueous solutions; as well as Eric Vachet and Amélie Trouvé for 588 complementary phosphorus analysis in solutions (Ecosys, INRAE). The ELETTRA synchrotron 589 (Trieste) and SOLEIL synchrotron (Orsay) are acknowledged for having provided beamtime and the 590 authors are especially indebted to Camille Rivard, Delphine Vantelon (LUCIA Beamline at SOLEIL) 591 and Luca Olivi (XAFS Beamline at ELETTRA) for beamline tuning and help during data collection. 592 We thank the SEM-FIB platform staff members of IMPMC, Imène Estève, Béatrice Boisneau, and Stéphanie Delbrel for their help and for providing time on their equipment. The authors are indebted 593 594 to Xavier Carrier for his help within the framework of the DEPOLECO program. TOC 595 crystallographic structure has been drawn using CrystalMaker[®]. This study has been granted by ANR 596 DEPOLECO and PIREN Seine research programs.

597

598 **REFERENCES**

⁽¹⁾ Dong, H.; Zeng, G.; Tang, L.; Fan, C.; Zhang, C.; He, X.; He, Y. An Overview on Limitations of TiO2-Based Particles for Photocatalytic Degradation of Organic Pollutants and the Corresponding Countermeasures. *Water Res.* 2015, 79, 128–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.04.038.

- 603 (2) Guan, X.; Sun, Y.; Qin, H.; Li, J.; Lo, I. M. C.; He, D.; Dong, H. The Limitations of Applying
 604 Zero-Valent Iron Technology in Contaminants Sequestration and the Corresponding
 605 Countermeasures: The Development in Zero-Valent Iron Technology in the Last Two Decades
 606 (1994–2014). *Water Res.* 2015, 75, 224–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.02.034.
- (3) Nidheesh, P. V. Heterogeneous Fenton Catalysts for the Abatement of Organic Pollutants from
 Aqueous Solution: A Review. *RSC Adv.* 2015, 5 (51), 40552–40577.
 https://doi.org/10.1039/C5RA02023A.
- (4) Keenan, C. R.; Sedlak, D. L. Factors Affecting the Yield of Oxidants from the Reaction of
 Nanoparticulate Zero-Valent Iron and Oxygen. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2008, *42* (4), 1262–1267.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/es7025664.
- 613 (5) Lee, C. Oxidation of Organic Contaminants in Water by Iron-Induced Oxygen Activation: A
 614 Short Review. *Environ. Eng. Res.* 2015, 20 (3), 205–211. https://doi.org/10.4491/eer.2015.051.
- (6) Feitz, A. J.; Joo, S. H.; Guan, J.; Sun, Q.; Sedlak, D. L.; David Waite, T. Oxidative
 Transformation of Contaminants Using Colloidal Zero-Valent Iron. *Colloids Surf. A: Physicochem. Eng. Asp.* 2005, 265 (1–3), 88–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2005.01.038.
- 618 (7) Fang, G.-D.; Zhou, D.-M.; Dionysiou, D. D. Superoxide Mediated Production of Hydroxyl
 619 Radicals by Magnetite Nanoparticles: Demonstration in the Degradation of 2-Chlorobiphenyl. *J.*620 *Hazard. Mater.* 2013, 250–251, 68–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.01.054.
- (8) Ardo, S. G.; Nélieu, S.; Ona-Nguema, G.; Delarue, G.; Brest, J.; Pironin, E.; Morin, G. Oxidative
 Degradation of Nalidixic Acid by Nano-Magnetite via Fe²⁺/O₂ -Mediated Reactions. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2015, *49* (7), 4506–4514. https://doi.org/10.1021/es505649d.
- (9) Cheng, D.; Neumann, A.; Yuan, S.; Liao, W.; Qian, A. Oxidative Degradation of Organic
 Contaminants by FeS in the Presence of O2. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2020, *54* (7), 4091–4101.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b07012.
- (10) You, X.; Liu, S.; Berns-Herrboldt, E. C.; Dai, C.; Werth, C. J. Kinetics of Hydroxyl Radical
 Production from Oxygenation of Reduced Iron Minerals and Their Reactivity with
 Trichloroethene: Effects of Iron Amounts, Iron Species, and Sulfate Reducing Bacteria. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2023, *57* (12), 4892–4904. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c00122.
- (11) Zhang, P.; Yuan, S. Production of Hydroxyl Radicals from Abiotic Oxidation of Pyrite by
 Oxygen under Circumneutral Conditions in the Presence of Low-Molecular-Weight Organic
 Acids. *Geochim. Acta* 2017, 218, 153–166.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2017.08.032.
- (12) Zeng, Q.; Dong, H.; Wang, X.; Yu, T.; Cui, W. Degradation of 1, 4-Dioxane by Hydroxyl
 Radicals Produced from Clay Minerals. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 2017, *331*, 88–98.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2017.01.040.
- (13) Chen, N.; Fang, G.; Liu, G.; Zhou, D.; Gao, J.; Gu, C. The Degradation of Diethyl Phthalate
 by Reduced Smectite Clays and Dissolved Oxygen. *Chem. Eng. J.* 2019, 355, 247–254.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2018.08.160.
- Huang, L.; Liu, Z.; Dong, H.; Yu, T.; Jiang, H.; Peng, Y.; Shi, L. Coupling Quinoline 641 (14)642 Degradation with Fe Redox in Clay Minerals: A Strategy Integrating Biological and 643 Physicochemical 188, Processes. Appl. Clay Sci. 2020, 105504. 644 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2020.105504.
- (15) Tong, M.; Yuan, S.; Ma, S.; Jin, M.; Liu, D.; Cheng, D.; Liu, X.; Gan, Y.; Wang, Y.
 Production of Abundant Hydroxyl Radicals from Oxygenation of Subsurface Sediments. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2016, *50* (1), 214–221. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b04323.
- (16) Schaefer, C. E.; Ho, P.; Berns, E.; Werth, C. Mechanisms for Abiotic Dechlorination of
 Trichloroethene by Ferrous Minerals under Oxic and Anoxic Conditions in Natural Sediments.
 Environ. Sci. Technol. 2018, *52* (23), 13747–13755. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b04108.
- (17) Xie, W.; Yuan, S.; Tong, M.; Ma, S.; Liao, W.; Zhang, N.; Chen, C. Contaminant Degradation
 by •OH during Sediment Oxygenation: Dependence on Fe(II) Species. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*2020, 54 (5), 2975–2984. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b04870.

- (18) Page, S. E.; Kling, G. W.; Sander, M.; Harrold, K. H.; Logan, J. R.; McNeill, K.; Cory, R. M.
 Dark Formation of Hydroxyl Radical in Arctic Soil and Surface Waters. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*2013, 47 (22), 12860–12867. https://doi.org/10.1021/es4033265.
- (19) Trusiak, A.; Treibergs, L. A.; Kling, G. W.; Cory, R. M. The Role of Iron and Reactive
 Oxygen Species in the Production of CO2 in Arctic Soil Waters. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **2018**, 224, 80–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2017.12.022.
- (20) Liao, P.; Yu, K.; Lu, Y.; Wang, P.; Liang, Y.; Shi, Z. Extensive Dark Production of Hydroxyl
 Radicals from Oxygenation of Polluted River Sediments. *Chem. Eng. J.* 2019, *368*, 700–709.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2019.03.018.
- (21) Chen, Y.; Miller, C. J.; Waite, T. D. Heterogeneous Fenton Chemistry Revisited: Mechanistic
 Insights from Ferrihydrite-Mediated Oxidation of Formate and Oxalate. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*2021, 55 (21), 14414–14425. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c00284.
- (22) Yu, C.; Lu, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Qian, A.; Zhang, P.; Tong, M.; Yuan, S. Significant Contribution
 of Solid Organic Matter for Hydroxyl Radical Production during Oxygenation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2022, *56* (16), 11878–11887. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c02766.
- Zhao, G.; Tan, M.; Wu, B.; Zheng, X.; Xiong, R.; Chen, B.; Kappler, A.; Chu, C. Redox 669 (23)670 Oscillations Activate Thermodynamically Stable Iron Minerals for Enhanced Reactive Oxygen Production. Environ. 671 Species Sci. Technol. 2023, 57 (23),8628-8637. 672 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c02302.
- (24) Du, H.; Cao, Y.; Li, Z.; Li, L.; Xu, H. Formation and Mechanisms of Hydroxyl Radicals
 during the Oxygenation of Sediments in Lake Poyang, China. *Water Res.* 2021, 202, 117442.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117442.
- (25) Du, H.; Wang, H.; Chi, Z.; Song, N.; Wang, C.; Xu, H. Burst of Hydroxyl Radicals in
 Sediments Derived by Flooding/Drought Transformation Process in Lake Poyang, China. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2021, 772, 145059. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145059.
- 679 Wang, Y.; Huang, D.; Ge, C.; Wang, X.; Zhu, C.; Chen, N.; Fang, G.; Zhou, D. Amendment (26)of Organic Acids Significantly Enhanced Hydroxyl Radical Production during Oxygenation of 680 131799. 681 Paddy Soils. Hazard. Mater. 2023. 457. J. 682 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2023.131799.
- 683 (27) Pryor, W. A. Oxy-Radicals and Related Species: Their Formation, Lifetimes, and Reactions.
 684 Annu. Rev. Physiol. 1986, 48 (1), 657–667.
 685 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ph.48.030186.003301.
- (28) Zhou, X.; Mopper, K. Determination of Photochemically Produced Hydroxyl Radicals in
 Seawater and Freshwater. *Mar. Chem.* 1990, *30*, 71–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/03044203(90)90062-H.
- (29) Xie, W.; Zhang, P.; Liao, W.; Tong, M.; Yuan, S. Ligand-Enhanced Electron Utilization for
 Trichloroethylene Degradation by OH during Sediment Oxygenation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2021, 55 (10), 7044–7051. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c00136.
- (30) Zhang, P.; Liu, J.; Yu, H.; Cheng, D.; Liu, H.; Yuan, S. Kinetic Models for Hydroxyl Radical
 Production and Contaminant Removal during Soil/Sediment Oxygenation. *Water Res.* 2023, 240,
 120071. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2023.120071.
- (31) He, J.; Miller, C. J.; Collins, R.; Wang, D.; Waite, T. D. Production of a Surface-Localized
 Oxidant during Oxygenation of Mackinawite (FeS). *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2020, *54* (2), 1167–
 1176. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b03975.
- (32) Li, K.; Ma, S.; Zou, C.; Latif, J.; Jiang, Y.; Ni, Z.; Shen, S.; Feng, J.; Jia, H. Unrecognized
 Role of Organic Acid in Natural Attenuation of Pollutants by Mackinawite (FeS): The
 Significance of Carbon-Center Free Radicals. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2023, 57 (49), 20871–
 20880. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c07473.
- (33) Liu, F.; Wang, Z.; Liu, J.; Latif, J.; Qin, J.; Yang, H.; Jiang, W.; Deng, Y.; Yang, K.; Ni, Z.;
 Ding, Y.; Xie, J.; Wang, Y.; Jia, H. Seasonal and Spatial Fluctuations of Reactive Oxygen Species
 in Riparian Soils and Their Contributions on Organic Carbon Mineralization. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2024, *58* (16), 7066–7077. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c10756.

- 706 Reinke, L. A.; Rau, J. M.; McCay, P. B. Characteristics of an Oxidant Formed during Iron (34)707 (II)Autoxidation. Free Radic. Biol. and Med. 1994, 16 (4),485-492. 708 https://doi.org/10.1016/0891-5849(94)90126-0.
- (35) Welch, K. D.; Davis, T. Z.; Aust, S. D. Iron Autoxidation and Free Radical Generation:
 Effects of Buffers, Ligands, and Chelators. *Arch. of Biochem. Biophys.* 2002, *397* (2), 360–369.
 https://doi.org/10.1006/abbi.2001.2694.
- 712 Morin, G.; Averseng, F.; Carrier, X.; Le Pape, P.; Du, Y.; HongE, Y.; Bourbon, E.; Sportelli, (36)713 G.; Da Silva, T. A.; Mezzetti, A.; Baya, C.; Allard, T.; Brest, J.; Rouelle, M. Phosphate Boosts 714 Nonhydroxyl Radical Species Production upon Air Oxidation of Magnetite and Iron Sulfides at 715 Neutral pH. Chem. 2023, 9650-9662. J. Phys. С 127 (20),716 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcc.3c02236.
- Zong, Y.; Mao, Y.; Xu, L.; Wu, D. Non-Selective Degradation of Organic Pollutants via 717 (37)Dioxygen Activation Induced by Fe(II)-Tetrapolyphosphate Complexes: Identification of 718 719 Reactive Oxidant and Kinetic Modeling. Chem. Eng. J. 2020, 125603. *398*. 720 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2020.125603.
- (38) Zhang, C.; Kong, C.; Tratnyek, P. G.; Qin, C.; Zhao, Y.; Piao, Y. Effect of Interfacial Action
 on the Generation and Transformation of Reactive Oxygen Species in TripolyphosphateEnhanced Heterogeneous Fe3O4/O2 Systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2024, *58* (2), 1378–1389.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c07372.
- (39) Guo, D.; Xia, Q.; Zeng, Q.; Wang, X.; Dong, H. Antibacterial Mechanisms of Reduced Iron-Containing Smectite–Illite Clay Minerals. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2021, *55* (22), 15256–15265.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c04367.
- (40) Chen, Y.; Miller, C. J.; Xie, J.; Waite, T. D. Challenges Relating to the Quantification of
 Ferryl(IV) Ion and Hydroxyl Radical Generation Rates Using Methyl Phenyl Sulfoxide (PMSO),
 Phthalhydrazide, and Benzoic Acid as Probe Compounds in the Homogeneous Fenton Reaction. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2023, acs.est.2c06753. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c06753.
- Gu, A. Y.; Musgrave, C.; Goddard, W. A.; Hoffmann, M. R.; Colussi, A. J. Role of Ferryl Ion
 Intermediates in Fast Fenton Chemistry on Aqueous Microdroplets. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2021,
 55 (21), 14370–14377. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c01962.
- Liang, J.; Duan, X.; Xu, X.; Chen, K.; Zhang, Y.; Zhao, L.; Qiu, H.; Wang, S.; Cao, X.
 Persulfate Oxidation of Sulfamethoxazole by Magnetic Iron-Char Composites via Nonradical
 Pathways: Fe(IV) Versus Surface-Mediated Electron Transfer. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2021, 55
 (14), 10077–10086. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c01618.
- 739 England, J.; Martinho, M.; Farquhar, E. R.; Frisch, J. R.; Bominaar, E. L.; Münck, E.; Que, (43) 740 L. A Synthetic High-Spin Oxoiron(IV) Complex: Generation, Spectroscopic Characterization, 741 and Reactivity. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2009. 48 (20),3622-3626. 742 https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.200900863.
- (44) Wan, D.; Liu, F.-F.; Chen, J.-B.; Kappler, A.; Kuzyakov, Y.; Liu, C.-Q.; Yu, G.-H. Microbial
 Community Mediates Hydroxyl Radical Production in Soil Slurries by Iron Redox
 Transformation. *Water Res.* 2022, *220*, 118689. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118689.
- (45) Seder-Colomina, M.; Mangeret, A.; Bauda, P.; Brest, J.; Stetten, L.; Merrot, P.; Julien, A.;
 Diez, O.; Barker, E.; Billoir, E.; Poupin, P.; Thouvenot, A.; Cazala, C.; Morin, G. Influence of Microorganisms on Uranium Release from Mining-Impacted Lake Sediments under Various Oxygenation Conditions. *Environ. Sci.: Processes Impacts* 2022, *24* (10), 1830–1843. https://doi.org/10.1039/D2EM00104G.
- (46) Harris, D.; Horwáth, W. R.; van Kessel, C. Acid Fumigation of Soils to Remove Carbonates
 Prior to Total Organic Carbon or CARBON-13 Isotopic Analysis. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 2001, 65
 (6), 1853–1856. https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2001.1853.
- 754 (47) Rodier, J.; Legube, B.; Merlet, N. L'analyse de l'eau Ed. 10; Dunod, 2016.
- 755 Morin, G.; Bonnin, D. Modeling EPR Powder Spectra Using Numerical Diagonalization of (48)Hamiltonian. 756 Spin J. Magn. Reson. 1999, 136 176-199. the (2),757 https://doi.org/10.1006/jmre.1998.1615.

- (49) Ravel, B.; Newville, M. ATHENA, ARTEMIS, HEPHAESTUS: Data Analysis for X-Ray
 Absorption Spectroscopy Using IFEFFIT. J Synchrotron Rad 2005, 12 (4), 537–541.
 https://doi.org/10.1107/S0909049505012719.
- (50) Webb, S. M. SIXpack: A Graphical User Interface for XAS Analysis Using IFEFFIT. *Phys. Scr.* 2005, 2005 (T115), 1011. https://doi.org/10.1238/Physica.Topical.115a01011.
- Morin, G.; Juillot, F.; Casiot, C.; Bruneel, O.; Personné, J.-C.; Elbaz-Poulichet, F.; Leblanc,
 M.; Ildefonse, P.; Calas, G. Bacterial Formation of Tooeleite and Mixed Arsenic(III) or
 Arsenic(V)–Iron(III) Gels in the Carnoulès Acid Mine Drainage, France. A XANES, XRD, and
 SEM Study. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2003, *37* (9), 1705–1712. https://doi.org/10.1021/es025688p.
- 767 (52) Morin, G.; Noël, V.; Menguy, N.; Brest, J.; Baptiste, B.; Tharaud, M.; Ona-Nguema, G.;
 768 Ikogou, M.; Viollier, E.; Juillot, F. Nickel Accelerates Pyrite Nucleation at Ambient Temperature.
 769 *Geochem. Persp. Let.* 2017, 6–11. https://doi.org/10.7185/geochemlet.1738.
- (53) Noël, V.; Marchand, C.; Juillot, F.; Ona-Nguema, G.; Viollier, E.; Marakovic, G.; Olivi, L.;
 Delbes, L.; Gelebart, F.; Morin, G. EXAFS Analysis of Iron Cycling in Mangrove Sediments
 Downstream a Lateritized Ultramafic Watershed (Vavouto Bay, New Caledonia). *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 2014, *136*, 211–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2014.03.019.
- (54) Baya, C.; Le Pape, P.; Baptiste, B.; Brest, J.; Landrot, G.; Elkaim, E.; Noël, V.; Blanchard,
 M.; Ona-Nguema, G.; Juillot, F.; Morin, G. Influence of Trace Level As or Ni on Pyrite Formation
 Kinetics at Low Temperature. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 2021, 300, 333–353.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2021.01.042.
- 778 Lefebvre, P.; Le Pape, P.; Mangeret, A.; Gourgiotis, A.; Sabatier, P.; Louvat, P.; Diez, O.; (55)Mathon, O.; Hunault, M. O. J. Y.; Baya, C.; Darricau, L.; Cazala, C.; Bargar, J. R.; Gaillardet, J.; 779 780 Morin, G. Uranium Sorption to Organic Matter and Long-Term Accumulation in a Pristine 781 Alpine Wetland. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 2022. 338. 322-346. 782 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2022.10.018.
- (56) Krause, M. O.; Oliver, J. H. Natural Widths of Atomic K and L Levels, Kα X-ray Lines and
 Several KLL Auger Lines. J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 1979, 8 (2), 329–338.
 https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555595.
- Merrot, P.; Juillot, F.; Noël, V.; Lefebvre, P.; Brest, J.; Menguy, N.; Guigner, J.-M.; Blondeau, 786 (57)787 M.; Viollier, E.; Fernandez, J.-M.; Moreton, B.; Bargar, J. R.; Morin, G. Nickel and Iron 788 Partitioning between Clay Minerals, Fe-Oxides and Fe-Sulfides in Lagoon Sediments from New 789 Caledonia. Science The Total Environment 2019. 689. of 1212-1227. 790 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.06.274.
- (58) Stetten, L.; Mangeret, A.; Brest, J.; Seder-Colomina, M.; Le Pape, P.; Ikogou, M.; Zeyen, N.;
 Thouvenot, A.; Julien, A.; Alcalde, G.; Reyss, J. L.; Bombled, B.; Rabouille, C.; Olivi, L.; Proux,
 O.; Cazala, C.; Morin, G. Geochemical Control on the Reduction of U(VI) to Mononuclear U(IV)
 Species in Lacustrine Sediments. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 2018, 222, 171–186.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2017.10.026.
- (59) Ingall, E. D.; Diaz, J. M.; Longo, A. F.; Oakes, M.; Finney, L.; Vogt, S.; Lai, B.; Yager, P.
 L.; Twining, B. S.; Brandes, J. A. Role of Biogenic Silica in the Removal of Iron from the Antarctic Seas. *Nat Commun* 2013, *4* (1), 1981. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2981.
- (60) Finkelstein, E.; Rosen, G. M.; Rauckman, E. J. Spin Trapping of Superoxide and Hydroxyl
 Radical: Practical Aspects. *Arch. of Biochem. Biophys.* 1980, 200 (1), 1–16.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9861(80)90323-9.
- 802 (61) Buettner, G. R. Spin Trapping: ESR Parameters If Spin Adducts. *Free Radic. Biol. Med.* 1987,
 803 3 (4), 259–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0891-5849(87)80033-3.
- (62) Finkelstein, E.; Rosen, G. M.; Rauckman, E. J. Production of Hydroxyl Radical by
 Decomposition of Superoxide Spin-Trapped Adducts. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1982, 21 (2), 262.
- 806 (63) Buettner, G. R.; Oberley, L. W. Considerations in the Spin Trapping of Superoxide and
 807 Hydroxyl Radical in Aqueous Systems Using 5,5-Dimethyl-1-Pyrroline-1-Oxide. *Biochem.*808 *Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1978, 83 (1), 69–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-291X(78)90398-4.

- (64) Zalma, R.; Bonneau, L.; Guignard, J.; Pezerat, H.; Jaurand, M.-C. Formation of Oxy Radicals
 by Oxygen Reduction Arising from the Surface Activity of Asbestos. *Can. J. Chem.* 1987, 65
 (10), 2338–2341. https://doi.org/10.1139/v87-390.
- (65) Yamazaki, I.; Piette, L. H. EPR Spin-Trapping Study on the Oxidizing Species Formed in the
 Reaction of the Ferrous Ion with Hydrogen Peroxide. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1991, 113 (20), 7588–
 7593. https://doi.org/10.1021/ja00020a021.
- (66) Rosso, J. A.; Bertolotti, S. G.; Braun, A. M.; Mártire, D. O.; Gonzalez, M. C. Reactions of
 Carbon Dioxide Radical Anion with Substituted Benzenes: REACTION OF CO 2 RADICAL
 CATION WITH BENZENES. J. Phys. Org. Chem. 2001, 14 (5), 300–309.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/poc.365.
- (67) Zhou, Q.; Niu, W.; Li, Y.; Li, X. Photoinduced Fenton-Simulated Reduction System Based
 on Iron Cycle and Carbon Dioxide Radicals Production for Rapid Removal of Cr(VI) from
 Wastewater. J. Clean. Prod. 2020, 258, 120790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120790.
- 822 (68) Buxton, G. V.; Greenstock, C. L.; Helman, W. P.; Ross, A. B. Critical Review of Rate
 823 Constants for Reactions of Hydrated Electrons, Hydrogen Atoms and Hydroxyl Radicals (·OH/·O
 824 ⁻ in Aqueous Solution. *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data* 1988, *17* (2), 513–886.
 825 https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555805.
- 826 Jacobsen, F.; Holcman, J.; Sehested, K. Reactions of the Ferryl Ion with Some Compounds (69) 827 Cloud Water. J. Chem. Kinet. 1998. Found in Int. 30 (3),215-221. 828 https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4601(1998)30:3<215::AID-KIN7>3.0.CO;2-V.
- 829 Pestovsky, O.; Bakac, A. Reactivity of Aqueous Fe(IV) in Hydride and Hydrogen Atom (70)Reactions. 830 Transfer J_{\cdot} Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126 (42),13757-13764. 831 https://doi.org/10.1021/ja0457112.
- 832 (71) Bray, W. C.; Gorin, M. H. FERRYL ION, A COMPOUND OF TETRAVALENT IRON. J.
 833 Am. Chem. Soc. 1932, 54 (5), 2124–2125. https://doi.org/10.1021/ja01344a505.
- (72) Yamazaki, I.; Piette, L. H. ESR Spin-Trapping Studies on the Reaction of Fe2+ Ions with
 H2O2-Reactive Species in Oxygen Toxicity in Biology. J. Biol. Chem. 1990, 265 (23), 13589–
 13594. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9258(18)77389-4.
- 837 (73) Sawyer, D. T.; Kang, C.; Llobet, A.; Redman, C. Fenton Reagents (1:1 FeIILx/HOOH) React
 838 via [LxFeIIOOH(BH+)] (1) as Hydroxylases (RH .Fwdarw. ROH), Not as Generators of Free
 839 Hydroxyl Radicals (HO.Bul.). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 115 (13), 5817–5818.
 840 https://doi.org/10.1021/ja00066a057.
- Reaction, J. J.; Liu, D.; Huston, P. Evidence for an Additional Oxidant in the Photoassisted
 Fenton Reaction. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1999**, *33* (11), 1832–1839.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/es980969b.
- 844 (75) Bataineh, H.; Pestovsky, O.; Bakac, A. pH-Induced Mechanistic Changeover from Hydroxyl
 845 Radicals to Iron(Iv) in the Fenton Reaction. *Chem. Sci.* 2012, *3* (5), 1594.
 846 https://doi.org/10.1039/c2sc20099f.
- (76) Lee, H.; Lee, H.-J.; Sedlak, D. L.; Lee, C. pH-Dependent Reactivity of Oxidants Formed by
 Iron and Copper-Catalyzed Decomposition of Hydrogen Peroxide. *Chemosphere* 2013, *92* (6),
 652–658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.01.073.
- (77) Hug, S. J.; Leupin, O. Iron-Catalyzed Oxidation of Arsenic(III) by Oxygen and by Hydrogen
 Peroxide: pH-Dependent Formation of Oxidants in the Fenton Reaction. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*2003, 37 (12), 2734–2742. https://doi.org/10.1021/es026208x.
- Kim, H.-H.; Lee, H.; Kim, H.-E.; Seo, J.; Hong, S. W.; Lee, J.-Y.; Lee, C. PolyphosphateEnhanced Production of Reactive Oxidants by Nanoparticulate Zero-Valent Iron and Ferrous Ion
 in the Presence of Oxygen: Yield and Nature of Oxidants. *Water Res.* 2015, *86*, 66–73.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.06.016.
- Farinelli, G.; Minella, M.; Pazzi, M.; Giannakis, S.; Pulgarin, C.; Vione, D.; Tiraferri, A. 857 (79) 858 Natural Iron Ligands Promote a Metal-Based Oxidation Mechanism for the Fenton Reaction in 859 Water Environments. Hazard. Mater. 2020, 393. 122413. J. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.122413. 860

- (80) Alam, M. S.; Rao, B. S. M.; Janata, E. OH Reactions with Aliphatic Alcohols: Evaluation of
 Kinetics by Direct Optical Absorption Measurement. A Pulse Radiolysis Study. *Radiat. Phys. Chem.* 2003, 67 (6), 723–728. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-806X(03)00310-4.
- (81) Rahhal, S.; Richter, H. W. Reaction of Hydroxyl Radicals with the Ferrous and Ferric Iron
 Chelates of Diethylenetriamine-N,N,N',N",N"-Pentaacetate. *Free Radic. Res. Commun.* 1989, 6
 (6), 369–377. https://doi.org/10.3109/10715768909087920.
- 867 (82) Jia, M.; Bian, X.; Yuan, S. Production of Hydroxyl Radicals from Fe(II) Oxygenation Induced
 868 by Groundwater Table Fluctuations in a Sand Column. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2017, *584–585*, 41–
 869 47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.01.142.
- (83) Yu, C.; Lu, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Qian, A.; Zhang, P.; Tong, M.; Yuan, S. Significant Contribution
 of Solid Organic Matter for Hydroxyl Radical Production during Oxygenation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2022, *56* (16), 11878–11887. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c02766.
- (84) Zeng, Q.; Wang, X.; Liu, X.; Huang, L.; Hu, J.; Chu, R.; Tolic, N.; Dong, H. Mutual
 Interactions between Reduced Fe-Bearing Clay Minerals and Humic Acids under Dark,
 Oxygenated Conditions: Hydroxyl Radical Generation and Humic Acid Transformation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2020, *54* (23), 15013–15023. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c04463.
- 877 (85) Du, H.; Wang, H.; Chi, Z.; Song, N.; Wang, C.; Xu, H. Burst of Hydroxyl Radicals in 878 Sediments Derived by Flooding/Drought Transformation Process in Lake Poyang, China. *Sci.* 879 *Total Environ.* 2021, 772, 145059. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145059.

881