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ABSTRACT

Gold dissolution was investigated in ferric chloride solution, being one alternative cyanide-free leaching media of increasing interest. The effect of process variables \([\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.02-1.0 \text{ M}, [\text{Cl}^-] = 2-5 \text{ M}, \text{pH} = 0-1.0, T = 25-95 \degree \text{C}\) on reaction mechanism and kinetics were studied electrochemically using rotating disk electrode with \(\omega_{\text{disc}} = 100-2500 \text{ RPM}\) and Tafel method. The highest gold dissolution rate \((7.3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1})\) was achieved at 95 \degree C with \([\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \text{ M}, [\text{Cl}^-] = 4 \text{ M}, \text{pH} = 1.0\) and \(\omega_{\text{disc}} = 2500 \text{ RPM}\). Increase in gold dissolution rate was observed with increase in temperature, ferric ion concentration and chloride concentration, but gold dissolution rate did not have a clear dependency on pH. Redox potential was found to vary between 636 and 741 mV vs. SCE during experiments. According to the calculated equilibrium and measured open circuit potentials, gold was suggested to dissolve as aurous ion \(\text{Au}^+\) and form \(\text{AuCl}_2^-\), rather than auric ion \(\text{Au}^{3+}\) and form \(\text{AuCl}_4^-\). Further, it is suggested that \(\text{AuCl}_2^-\) does not oxidize to \(\text{AuCl}_4^-\) under the investigated conditions. Levich plot and the calculated activation energies suggested that gold dissolution was limited by mass and electron transfer. According to a mechanistic kinetic model developed in the current work, intrinsic surface reaction mainly controls gold dissolution, especially at higher rotational speeds (> 1000 RPM). Uncertainties in the model parameters of the mechanistic kinetic model were studied with Markov chain Monte Carlo methods.

1. Introduction

Cyanide leaching is the predominant method used in gold production from primary raw materials (Marsden and House, 2006) regardless of the toxic nature of the chemical posing a significant health threat if exposed to the ecological entities (Hilson and Monhemius, 2006). Since the Baia Mare disaster in Romania in 2000, the use of cyanide has been the subject of international concern (UNEP/OCHA, 2000). Moreover, several countries have started to ban cyanidation via legislation, e.g., Costa Rica, many states of the USA and provinces within Argentina (Laitos, 2012). Therefore, alternative solutions, such as thiourea, thiocyanate, oil-coal agglomerates as well as halides have been proposed to replace cyanide (Adams, 2016; Aromaa et al., 2014; Aylmore, 2005; Hilson and Monhemius, 2006; Lampinen et al., 2015a).

Halide gases (\(\text{Cl}_2\) and \(\text{Br}_2\)) have been industrially used since the 19th century in gold ore leaching due to their oxidative nature and ability for gold complexation by \(\text{Cl}^-/\text{Br}^-\) ions in solution originating form \(\text{Cl}_2\) and \(\text{Br}_2\) gases (Kirke Rose, 1898). The disadvantage in the use of halide gases is that they are expensive, strongly corrosive, and requires high focus on safety and storing during operation. In addition, the use of halide gases can induce high redox potentials that result in gold passivation (Abe and Hosaka, 2010).

Chloride leaching provides major advantages for hydrometallurgical processing, as it supports high metal solubility, enhanced redox potentials and high leaching rates (Liddicoat and Dreisinger, 2007). According to Abe and Hosaka (2010), ferric ion can be an effective oxidant in chloride media for gold leaching, gold dissolution occurring at lower redox potentials compared to chlorine and aqua regia leaching. A redox potential of \(\geq 480 \text{ mV} (\text{Ag/AgCl})\) is required in ferric chloride leaching compared with typical redox potentials of \(\geq 778 \text{ mV} (\text{Ag/AgCl})\) in chlorine/bromine gas leaching (Abe and Hosaka, 2010). Ferric and cupric chloride leaching can have advantage over cyanidation being capable for refractory gold mineral leaching, without pre-treatment like pressure oxidation or roasting (Angelidis et al., 1993, Marsden and House, 2006; Lundström et al., 2014; van Meersbergen et al., 1993). According to Aylmore (2005), 4% of publications for alternative lixiviants to cyanide in gold leaching were under category oxidative chloride processes including aqua regia and acid ferric chloride. Further, some patents have been subjected for ferric chlorides for gold leaching (Abe and Hosaka, 2010; Lundström et al., 2016).

Gold can be present in aqueous chloride solution as either in monovalent aurous form \(\text{Au}^+\) or trivalent auric form \(\text{Au}^{3+}\) (Marsden and House, 2006). Putnam (1944) suggested that the dissolution of gold proceeds in two steps: formation of intermediate \(\text{AuCl}_2^-\) occurs by...
anodic reaction at the gold surface, Eq. (1), after which AuCl forms a more stable complex AuCl$_2^-$, Eq. (2). AuCl$_2^-$ is the prevailing species at oxidation potentials < 1.2 V vs. Standard Hydrogen Electrode (SHE), whereas oxidation further into AuCl$_4^{2-}$ can occur at oxidation potentials > 1.2 V vs. SHE (0.956 V vs. SCE), Eq. (3) (Nicol, 1980). According to Diaz et al. (1993), gold dissolves as an AuCl$_2^-$ complex with an oxidation state +1, when the potential is 0.8 V vs. Saturated Calomel Electrode (SCE) (1.044 V vs. SHE) and also as AuCl$_4^{2-}$ complex with oxidation state +3 at higher potentials. Frankenthal and Siconolfi (1982) also suggested that gold dissolves as aurous ions Au$^+$, when the potential is below 0.8 V vs. SCE, but as auric Au$^{3+}$ ions, when the potential is above 1.1 V vs. SCE. Furthermore, Diaz et al. (1993) proposed that AuCl$_2^-$ complexes can oxidize into AuCl$_4^{2-}$ complexes by a very slow disproportionation reaction (Eq. (4)).

\[
\begin{align*}
2\text{Au} + 2\text{Cl}^- &\rightarrow 2\text{AuCl} + 2e^- \\
\text{AuCl} + \text{Cl}^- &\rightarrow \text{AuCl}_2^- \\
\text{AuCl}_2^- + 2\text{Cl}^- &\rightarrow \text{AuCl}_4^{2-} + 2e^- \\
3\text{AuCl}_2^- &\rightarrow 2\text{Au} + \text{AuCl}_4^{2-} + 2\text{Cl}^- 
\end{align*}
\]

The net reaction of gold dissolution in ferric chloride solution is described in Eq. (5) according to the gold dissolution steps by Putnam (1944) and Liu and Nicol (2002). Furthermore, the net reaction of AuCl$_4^{2-}$ oxidizing into AuCl$_2^-$ ions is presented in Eq. (6) (Liu and Nicol, 2002). The regeneration of ferrous ions back to ferric ions or ferric chloride complexes can be achieved by oxygen purging, Eq. (7) (Abe and Hosaka, 2010; Liu and Nicol, 2002; Lu and Dreisinger, 2013; Senanayake, 2004). This reuse of oxidant via regeneration is a major advantage in chloride leaching (Abe and Hosaka, 2010).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Au} + 2\text{Cl}^- &\rightarrow \text{AuCl}_2^{2-} + \text{Fe}^{3+} \\
\text{AuCl}_2^{2-} + 2\text{Cl}^- &\rightarrow \text{AuCl}_4^{2-} + 2\text{Fe}^{3+} \\
4\text{Fe}^{3+} + 4\text{H}^+ + \text{O}_2 &\rightarrow 4\text{Fe}^{3+} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}
\end{align*}
\]
and can act as oxidant in ferric chloride leaching of gold (Abe and Hosaka, 2010). Moreover, it has been suggested that pH in ferric chloride leaching should be between 0.5 and 1.9 as the gold dissolution rate decreases at pH values below 0.5 (Abe and Hosaka, 2010). According to Lundström et al. (2016), the preferred pH in ferric chloride leaching is between 1 and 1.5.

It has been suggested previously that the presence of HCl decreases the solubility of sodium chloride (Potter and Clynne, 1980), whereas increase in temperature increases the solubility of sodium chloride. In this work, the concentrations of HCl used for pH adjustment were low (max 0.28 M (10.2 g L⁻¹)) and as a result did not have an effect on the solubility of sodium chloride in the investigated system.

Dissolution of gold can be limited by mass transfer, electron transfer or a combination of these referred to as mixed control. It has been stated that for a diffusion controlled reaction, the values of activation energies are below 21 kJ mol⁻¹ whereas for reactions controlled by electron transfer, the values of activation energies in the range of 40–100 kJ mol⁻¹ (Peters, 1973). Furthermore, when the effect of diffusion is no longer a rate limiting step, other phenomena will replace it.

Recently, Lampinen et al., (2017) investigated the mechanism and kinetics of cupric chloride leaching of gold. In the case of ferric chloride leaching of gold, very limited amount of work has been published at limited conditions and predicts that the diffusion-limited cathodic current (mA cm⁻²), Eq. (8) (Duranteau et al., 2004).

\[
J_{\text{corr}} = \frac{b_h b_i}{2.303(b_h + b_i)} - \frac{1}{R_p} = \frac{B}{R_p}
\]

where \(b_h\) represents the anodic side of Tafel slope (mV decade⁻¹), \(b_i\) the cathodic side of Tafel slope (mV decade⁻¹), \(B\) the systematic coefficient called Stern-Geary constant (mV) and \(R_p\) the LPR (Ω cm²).

The Stern-Geary constant was determined from separate Tafel measurements at \([Cl^-]\) = 0.7, 1.5, 3 and 5 M as well as \(T = 27, 65\) and \(90\) °C. B varied from 17.2 to 30.0 mV in resulting in Eq. (9) for determining the B value. In Eq. (9) temperature is in degrees centigrade and concentration in mol dm⁻³. Results outside of studied range (i.e., temperatures below 27 and above 90 °C) were extrapolated.

\[
B = 8.00 + 0.147T + 1.89[Cl^-]
\]

The Levich equation (Eq. (10)) applies to totally mass-transfer limited conditions and predicts that the diffusion-limited cathodic current is proportional to the oxidant concentration in bulk solution and to the square root of rotational speed (Bard and Faulkner, 1980).

\[
\frac{i_{\text{lim,c}}}{i_{\text{lim,rad}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}
\]

R Levich plot showing reaction rate as the function of the square root of angular speed, \(i_{\text{lim,c}}\) vs. \(\omega_{\text{rad}}^{1/2}\), is a procedure to determine the rate-limiting step (Jeffrey et al., 2001). A linear dependency of these variables suggests that gold dissolution is limited by diffusion of oxidant (Jeffrey et al., 2001). Bard and Faulkner (1980) emphasized that the linearity is not the only requirement, but the \(i_{\text{lim,c}}\) vs. \(\omega_{\text{rad}}^{1/2}\) should also intersect the origin. If the relation is not linear or the plot does not intersect the origin, the limiting step is electron transfer rather than the diffusion of oxidant (Jeffrey et al., 2001). Moreover, Angelidis et al. (1993) suggested that if the relation of the leaching rate and the square root of rotational speed is first linear at lower rotational speeds, but then changes at higher rotational speeds, then mass transfer as a rate-controlling step has changed to chemical or mixed control.

\[
i_{\text{lim,c}} = -0.620eFAD_{O}^{1/2}{\omega_{\text{rad}}^{1/2}}^{-1/4}C_{O}^{2}
\]

where \(i_{\text{lim,c}}\) is the diffusion-limited cathodic current (mA cm⁻²), \(s\) the number of transferred electrons during reaction, F is Faraday’s constant (96,485 C mol⁻¹), \(A\) the area of the electrode (cm²), \(D_{O}\) the diffusion coefficient of oxidant (cm² s⁻¹), \(\omega_{\text{rad}}\) the angular speed (rad s⁻¹), \(v\) the kinematic viscosity (cm² s⁻¹) and \(C_{O}\) the concentration of oxidant in bulk solution (mol cm⁻³).

R Levich plot showing reaction rate as the function of the square root of angular speed, \(i_{\text{lim,c}}\) vs. \(\omega_{\text{rad}}^{1/2}\), is a procedure to determine the rate-limiting step (Jeffrey et al., 2001). A linear dependency of these variables suggests that gold dissolution is limited by diffusion of oxidant (Jeffrey et al., 2001). Bard and Faulkner (1980) emphasized that the linearity is not the only requirement, but the \(i_{\text{lim,c}}\) vs. \(\omega_{\text{rad}}^{1/2}\) should also intersect the origin. If the relation is not linear or the plot does not intersect the origin, the limiting step is electron transfer rather than the diffusion of oxidant (Jeffrey et al., 2001). Moreover, Angelidis et al. (1993) suggested that if the relation of the leaching rate and the square root of rotational speed is first linear at lower rotational speeds, but then changes at higher rotational speeds, then mass transfer as a rate-controlling step has changed to chemical or mixed control.

If both diffusion and the chemical reaction are limiting the reaction rate, the Koutecký-Levich equation (Eq. (11)) then applies (Bard and Faulkner, 1980):

2.3. Electrochemical methods and determination of rate limiting step

RDE measurements were performed with an ACM Instrument Gill AC potentiostat using linear polarization resistance sweep by Gill AC Sequencer software (from ~10 to 10 mV vs. open circuit potential (OCP), sweep rate of 10 mV min⁻¹). Three parallel measurements were performed for each experiment and their average value used to determine the gold dissolution rate. LPR (\(R_p\)) was determined from the slope of the potential-current density diagram, \(R_p\) being inversely proportional to the dissolution current density (\(J_{\text{corr}}\) mA cm⁻²), Eq. (8) (Duranteau et al., 2004).

The effect of temperature on gold dissolution was studied at 25–95 °C. The effect of mass transfer was investigated at all temperatures using RDE with 100–2500 RPM in order to determine the rate limiting step. The oxidant (Fe³⁺) concentrations investigated were 0.02, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75 and 1.0 M as well as chloride concentrations of 2, 3, 4 and 5 M. Based on literature, pH values 0, 0.5 and 1.0 were investigated, with pH adjusted by HCl (4 M) or NaOH (2 M). Additionally, pH of 1.5 was tested at 95 °C, [Fe³⁺] = 0.1 M and [Cl⁻] = 3 M, however, the iron started to precipitate.
\[
\frac{1}{i} = \frac{1}{i_{\text{lim,e}}} = \frac{1}{i_{\text{lim,c}}} + \frac{1}{k_{\text{mean}}} + \frac{1}{0.6207 F A C_{\text{Fe3+}} C_{\text{O2}}^2 D^{1/2} \nu^{-1/6} \alpha_{\text{rad}}^{1/2}}
\]

where \(i\) represents the sum of the currents due to electron transfer and diffusion, \(i_{\text{lim,e}}\) the electron transfer limited current (mA cm\(^{-2}\)) and \(i_{\text{lim,c}}\) the mass transfer limited current of cathodic reaction (mA cm\(^{-2}\)).

Additionally, Arrhenius equation can be used to calculate the activation energy, the value being indicative of the rate limiting step, Eq. (12) (Peters, 1973). Further, error limit of activation energy can be determined as the error of linear regression slope.

\[
k = A e^{\frac{E_{\text{a}}}{RT}} \quad (12)
\]

where \(k\) is the rate constant, \(A\) the frequency factor, \(E_a\) the activation energy (J mol\(^{-1}\)), \(R\) the universal gas constant (8.314 J mol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)) and \(T\) the temperature (K).

### 2.4. Modeling methods

Gold is dissolved from the rotating gold disc electrode due to oxidation reaction of gold in chloride solution by the oxidant (Fe\(^{3+}\)) at the surface of the disc. It is assumed that gold surface reaction rate \((r_s)\) can be described by a simple rate equation (Eq. (13)):

\[
r_s = k \left( c_{\text{Fe3+}} \right)^{n_1} \left( c_{\text{Cl}^-} \right)^{n_2}
\]

where \(c_{\text{Fe3+}}\) is the concentration of the oxidant at the disc surface, \(c_{\text{Cl}^-}\) the chloride ion concentration at liquid bulk phase and \(n_1\) and \(n_2\) the reaction orders. Since \([\text{Cl}^-]\) is always in excess to \([\text{Fe}^{3+}]\), it is assumed that \([\text{Cl}^-]\) bulk phase concentration can be used. This is justified assumption when considering relatively high chloride concentrations (2–4 M) compared to ferric ion concentrations (0.01–0.5 M). Furthermore, Jeffrey et al., (2001) presented that at high chloride concentration the dissolution rate is ultimately limited by the diffusion of oxidant.

The temperature dependence of the rate constant \((k)\) is taken into account by the Arrhenius equation (Eq. (14)) given in a parameterised form as:

\[
k = k_{\text{mean}} \left( \frac{1}{T} \right)^{1/3} \left( \frac{1}{T_{\text{mean}}} \right)^{2/3}
\]

where \(T_{\text{mean}}\) is a reference temperature (K) and \(k_{\text{mean}}\) the rate constant at the reference temperature.

One possibility is that the dissolution rate could be described as a mixed-control mechanism, where both the surface reaction and diffusion affect gold dissolution rate. The oxidant (Fe\(^{3+}\)) diffuses through a boundary layer to the disc surface. Mass transfer of the oxidant through the boundary layer can be described by Eq. (15):

\[
h_{\text{Fe3+}} = k_s \left( c_{\text{Fe3+}} \right)^{2/3} \left( c_{\text{Fe3+}} \right)^{1/3}
\]

where \(k_s\) is the mass transfer coefficient through the boundary layer and \(c_{\text{Fe3+}}\) the concentration of oxidant in the liquid bulk phase. At steady state, \(r_s = n_1 h_{\text{Fe3+}} + c_{\text{Fe3+}} n_2\), can be solved iteratively from Eqs. (13) and (15). \(y\) is the stoichiometric coefficient of Fe\(^{3+}\) to oxidize 1 mol of gold.

Mass transfer to the surface of a rotating disc has been studied by several authors (Sulaymon and Abbar, 2012; Petrescu et al., 2009; Dib and Makhlouf, 2007). The mass transfer correlation has the general form (Eq. (16)):

\[
Sh = a_1 \text{Re}^{a_2} \text{Sc}^{1/3}
\]

where the \(Sh\) is the Sherwood number, \(Re\) the Reynolds number, \(a_1\) the constant in general mass transfer correlation, \(a_2\) the fitted exponent for the Reynolds number and \(Sc\) the Schmidt number. The Sherwood number is defined as (Eq. (17)):

\[
Sh = \frac{k_s d}{D}
\]

where \(d\) is the rotating disc diameter, and \(D\) is the diffusion coefficient.

The Reynolds number is defined as (Eq. (18)):

\[
Re = \frac{\alpha_{\text{eff}} D^2}{v}
\]

where \(v\) is the kinematic viscosity.

The Schmidt number is defined as (Eq. (19)):

\[
Sc = \frac{v}{D}
\]

Both, the diffusion coefficient and the kinematic viscosity depend on temperature, which needs to be taken into account when calculating the mass transfer coefficient.

The diffusion coefficient of Fe\(^{3+}\) in electrolyte solutions has been discussed by Gil et al., (1996) and the value reported is 4.8 \(\times\) 10\(^{-3}\) m\(^2\) s\(^{-1}\) at 26 °C in 1 M H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) solution. Correction to other temperatures can be done by using the Stokes-Einstein relation (Eq. (20)).

\[
\left( \frac{D_{\text{eff}}^2 \rho}{T} \right)_{\eta_1} = \left( \frac{D_{\text{eff}}^2 \rho}{T} \right)_{\eta_2}
\]

where \(D\) is the diffusion coefficient of Fe\(^{3+}\) and \(\mu\) is the dynamic viscosity.

The gold dissolution rate model composed of Eqs. (13)–(17) has 6 parameters, \(k_{\text{lim,e}} E_a\), \(n_1\), \(n_2\), \(a_1\), and \(a_2\). These parameters were estimated by comparing the calculated gold dissolution rates to the measured rates from the RDE experiments. In the solution of the model, the surface concentration of the oxidant \(c_{\text{Fe3+}}\) was solved iteratively from the balance between Eqs. (13) and (15). The model parameters were estimated using the Modest software (Haario, 2002).

The model parameters were first estimated with standard least squares fitting by minimizing the squared difference between the measured and the calculated gold leaching rates. The goodness of the fit was determined by the \(R^2\) value and the standard errors from the estimation. However, to thoroughly evaluate the accuracy and reliability of the estimated parameters in a nonlinear multiparameter model, it is important also to consider possible cross-correlation and identifiability of the parameters. Classical statistical analysis that gives the optimal parameter values, their error estimates, and correlations between them, is based on linearization of the model and is, therefore, approximate. Furthermore, it may sometimes even be quite misleading, especially if the available data are limited and the parameters are poorly identified. The importance of parameter reliability evaluation in development of leaching processes has been stressed (Baldwin and Demopoulos, 1998; Lampinen, 2016). The reliability of the models and their parameters was investigated in this study using the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method. The MCMC method is based on Bayesian inference and gives the probability distribution of solutions. MCMC methods have recently been successfully applied in various modeling cases to study parameter reliability (Kuosa et al., 2009; Lampinen et al., 2015b; Vahteristo et al., 2013; Zhukov et al., 2017).

Moreover, the question of the reliability of the model predictions remains unaddressed, i.e., how the uncertainty in the model parameters is reflected in the model response. According to a Bayesian paradigm all the parametrizations of the model that statistically fit the data equally well are determined. The distribution of the unknown parameters is generated using available prior information (e.g., results obtained from previous studies or bound constraints for the parameters) and statistical knowledge of the observation noise. Computationally, the distribution is generated using the MCMC sampling approach. The length of the calculated chain was 200,000 samples. Simple flat, uninformative priors with minimum and maximum bounds set for each parameter were used in the calculation of the chain. Up-to-date adaptive computational schemes are employed in order to make the simulations as effective as possible (Haario et al., 2001; Laine, 2008). In this study, a FORTRAN 90 software package, MODEST 15 (Haario, 2002), was used for both the least-squares and the MCMC estimation. The two methods
are also implemented in a MATLAB package (Laine, 2008; Laine, 2013).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Effect of process variables

First, the effect of temperature on gold dissolution rate was determined by RDE at \( T = 25–95 ^\circ C \), \( \omega_{\text{cyc}} = 100–2500 \text{ RPM} \). \( [\text{Fe}^{3+}] \) = 0.5 M, \( [\text{Cl}^-] = 3 \text{ M} \) and \( \text{pH} = 1.0 \) (Fig. 1). Changes in \( R_p \) were shown to be most significant between \( \omega_{\text{cyc}} \) values of 100 and 300 RPM, whereas smaller change was observed at rotational speeds > 1000 RPM. As a consequence, gold dissolution rate increased with increasing rotational speed at all temperatures. Additionally, increase in temperature was shown to increase gold dissolution in ferric chloride solution. This is in line with Liu and Nicoll (2002), who also found increasing temperature promotes the anodic dissolution of gold in ferric chloride leaching.

Fig. 2 presents the effect of pH on the gold dissolution rate. pH values 0 and 0.5 both were shown to result in higher gold dissolution rate compared to those observed at pH 1.0. However, the difference in gold dissolution rates was minimal, which suggests that dissolution rate did not have a clear dependency on pH range pH = 0–1.0. pH lower than 1.5 is recommended in gold ferric chloride leaching, as iron started to precipitate at 95 °C \(([\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \text{ M and } [\text{Cl}^-] = 3 \text{ M})\) at pH = 1.5. Values higher than 1.5 in gold dissolution can be justified if very low oxidant (ferric ion) concentrations are used for oxidation, i.e. pH controlling the oxidant (ferric species) concentration level in the solution.

Fig. 3 shows the effect of ferric ion concentration on gold dissolution rate. The dissolution of gold increased with increase in ferric ion concentration up to \([\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.75 \text{ M}\), however, the dissolution rates at 0.5 to 1 M were almost the same. It can be stated that gold dissolution increased with increasing ferric concentration up to 0.5 M, after which it did not increase significantly.

Fig. 4 presents the effect of chloride concentration on the gold dissolution rate. The dissolution rates were calculated from \( R_p \) values by Eq. (8), when systematic coefficient (B) was either 25.2 mV \(([\text{Cl}^-] = 2 \text{ M})\), 27.1 mV \(([\text{Cl}^-] = 3 \text{ M})\), 29.0 mV \(([\text{Cl}^-] = 4 \text{ M})\) or 30.9 mV \(([\text{Cl}^-] = 5 \text{ M})\) with the standard error of \( \pm 3.1 \text{ mV} \) for each value. The dissolution rate of gold was shown to increase at all rotational rates with increasing chloride concentration increased up to \([\text{Cl}^-] = 5 \text{ M}\). However, the dissolution rate of gold decreased, when chloride concentration increased from 4 to 5 M.

3.2. Redox potential of the electrolyte

In order to compare the theoretical redox potential of the solution to the measured potential, Eq. (23) was applied. Equilibrium potentials were calculated with HSC 8.1 (HSC 8.1, 2015) and with Nernst equation: Eq. (21) for the anodic oxidation of \( \text{AuCl}_3^- \) into \( \text{AuCl}_4^- \), Eq. (22) for the anodic oxidation of Au into \( \text{AuCl}_4^- \) or \( \text{AuCl}_5^- \) and Eq. (23) for the cathodic reduction of \( \text{Fe}^{3+} \) into \( \text{Fe}^{2+} \).

\[
E = E^0 - \frac{R_T}{2F} \ln \left( \frac{[\text{AuCl}_3^-][\text{Cl}^-]^x}{[\text{AuCl}_4^-]} \right)
\]

\[
E = E^0 - \frac{R_T}{2F} \ln \left( \frac{[\text{Cl}^-]^x}{[\text{AuCl}_4^-]} \right)
\]

\[
E = E^0 - \frac{R_T}{2F} \ln \left( \frac{[\text{Fe}^{3+}]}{[\text{Fe}^{2+}]} \right)
\]

where \( E^0 \) is the standard equilibrium potential (V) determined by HSC 8.1, \( T \) the temperature (K), \([\text{AuCl}_3^-]\) and \([\text{AuCl}_4^-]\) the concentration of \( \text{AuCl}_2^- \) and \( \text{AuCl}_4^- \), \([\text{AuCl}_5^-]\) the concentration of \( \text{AuCl}_2^- \) or \( \text{AuCl}_4^- \), \( x \) the number of chloride ions involved in reaction, \([\text{Cl}^-]\) the concentration of free chlorides, \([\text{Fe}^{2+}]\) the concentration of ferrous ions as well as \([\text{Fe}^{3+}]\) the concentration of ferric ions. However, it should be noted that Eq. (23) is valid, when ferric ions are present in solution as \( \text{Fe}^{3+} \), not in chloro complexes. This simple form of Nernst equation can be used, since \( \text{Fe}^{3+} \) ions are predominant with chloride concentration from 0 to 2 M (Strahm et al., 1979).

Fig. 5 presents the measured redox potential (0.694–0.740 V vs. SCE) as a function of the logarithm of the ferric iron concentration. Increase in ferric iron concentration was shown to increase solution redox potential.

In order to determine the dependency between gold dissolution behavior and chloride concentration, redox potential was first investigated. Fig. 6 shows that in ferric chloride solution redox potential decreased from 741 to 704 mV vs. SCE as chloride concentration increased from 2 to 5 M, when \([\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \text{ M, } T = 95 ^\circ C \) and \( \text{pH} = 1.0 \). However, Fig. 4 shows that the dissolution rate increased when chloride concentration increased from 2 to 4 M. Therefore, it is clear that redox potential does not alone determine the kinetics of gold dissolution. When chloride concentration increased the OCPs were shown to decrease, while dissolution rates of gold increased. Therefore, according to mixed potential theory, the rate of anodic reaction, in this case gold dissolution, increased (Stern and Geary, 1957).

Increase in temperature increased measured redox potential, Fig. 7. The values of measured redox potentials (0.636–0.726 V vs. SCE) did not correspond to the potentials calculated with the Nernst equation (Eq. (23)): 0.807–0.958 V vs. SCE with the lowest ferrous concentration (i.e. \( 8.4 \times 10^{-8} \text{ M} \)) and 0.670–0.789 V vs. SCE with the highest ferrous concentration (i.e. 1.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M} \). With \([\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M} \), the calculated and measured redox potentials were almost similar (0.631–0.742 V vs. SCE), but ferrous concentration was calculated to vary between \( 8.4 \times 10^{-8} \text{ M} \) and \( 1.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M} \) in experiments with the assumption that ferric ions would react only into ferrous ions. However, it should be noted that ferric ions occurs also as chloro complexes in ferric chloride solution. Comparison of measured and calculated redox potentials is presented in Fig. 8.

The increase in ferric iron concentration as well as redox potential correlated with increase in gold dissolution rate up to ca. \( E_{\text{redox}} = 0.73 \text{ V vs. SCE} \), Fig. 9. It should be noted that though redox potential increased linearly with ferric iron concentration (see Fig. 5), gold dissolution rate did not increase significantly, when exceeding \([\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \text{ M} \) and redox potential of 0.72 V vs. SCE (see Figs. 3 and 9).

Redox potential was found to vary between 636 and 741 mV vs. SCE in all the experiments. An increase in temperature and ferric concentration increased, but increasing chloride concentration decreased redox potential. Corresponding dissolution rates varied from \( 3.9 \times 10^{-6} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) with redox potential of 636 mV vs. SCE \(( T = 25 ^\circ C, [\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \text{ M, } [\text{Cl}^-] = 3.0 \text{ M, pH} = 1.0 \text{ and } \omega_{\text{cyc}} = 100 \text{ RPM}) \) to \( 7.3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) with redox potential of 717 mV vs. **

\( T = 95 ^\circ C; \text{Fe}^{3+} = 0.5 \text{ M, } [\text{Cl}^-] = 3.0 \text{ M, pH} = 1.0 \text{ and } \omega_{\text{cyc}} = 100 \text{ RPM} \).
However, with the highest redox potential (741 mV vs. SCE), gold dissolution rate was $5.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ($T = 95 \degree C, [\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \text{ M}, [\text{Cl}^{-}] = 4 \text{ M}, \text{pH} = 1.0$ and $\omega_{\text{cyc}} = 2500 \text{ RPM}$). Therefore, it can be concluded that redox potential affects linearly gold dissolution rate up to approximately 0.73 V (corresponding to $[\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.75 \text{ M}$), Fig. 9.

The decreasing gold dissolution rate, when chloride concentration increased from 4 to 5 M as well as ferric concentration increased from 0.75 to 1.0 M, is in line with Liu and Nicol (2002). The anodic reaction rates increased with increasing chloride concentration, but the rate of cathodic reaction (reduction of ferric ions) decreased with increase in chloride concentration (Liu and Nicol, 2002). The anodic dissolution is rate-determining step at 2–4 M, but cathodic reaction becomes limiting at higher chloride concentrations.
investigated temperatures (25–95 °C), Fig. 10. The highest gold dissolution rate was achieved with the rotational speed of 2500 RPM, when $[\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \, \text{M}$, $[\text{Cl}^-] = 3 \, \text{M}$ and $T = 95 \, ^\circ\text{C}$ and pH = 1.0, whereas the lowest with the rotational speed of 100 RPM, when $[\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \, \text{M}$, $[\text{Cl}^-] = 3 \, \text{M}$, $T = 25 \, ^\circ\text{C}$ and pH = 1.0. The equilibrium potentials calculated with Eq. (22) for Au/AuCl$_2^-$ varied from 143 to 574 mV, while the equilibrium potential for Au/AuCl$_4^-$ varied from 971 to 1067 mV, Fig. 10. Rotational speed did not affect OCP value, though dissolution rates of gold increased, when rotational speed increased. Therefore, it can be stated that increasing mass transfer rate promotes equally both anodic and cathodic reactions.

Fig. 10 shows that the calculated equilibrium potential of Au/AuCl$_4^-$ did not vary significantly with increasing temperature but remains close to 1.0 V vs. SCE, however, the equilibrium potential of Au/AuCl$_2^-$ was shown to decrease with increasing temperature. Despite the temperature, measured OCPs were always higher than equilibrium potentials of Au/AuCl$_4^-$ but lower than equilibrium potentials of Au/AuCl$_2^-$. However, OCPs more close to equilibrium potentials of Au/AuCl$_2^-$ suggested that the gold oxidation state of +1 was predominant in the investigated ferric chloride environment. These results were in line with determined potentials, in which Au occurs as AuCl$_2^-$ and AuCl$_4^-$: AuCl$_2^-$ < 0.8 V vs. SCE, AuCl$_4^-$ > 0.8 V (Diaz et al., 1993), AuCl$_2^-$ < 0.956 V vs. SCE, AuCl$_4^-$ > 0.956 V (Nicol, 1980) and AuCl$_2^-$ < 0.8 V vs. SCE, while AuCl$_4^-$ > 1.1 V vs. SCE (Frankenthal and Siconolfi, 1982). The determined equilibrium potentials of Au/AuCl$_2^-$ and Au/AuCl$_4^-$ in this study were most similar to Frankenthal and Siconolfi (1982) results.

3.3. Oxidation state of gold

In the current research, the OCP varied from 597 to 684 mV vs. SCE at investigated ferric concentrations (0.02–1 M). During RDE experiments the OCP was shown to vary from 642 to 662 mV vs. SCE, at
For the electrochemical oxidation reaction from \( \text{AuCl}_2^- \) to \( \text{AuCl}_4^- \), Eq. (6), the calculated equilibrium potential \( (E) \) (Eq. (21)) at \( T = 25–95 \, ^\circ C \), varied from 1.25 V \( ([\text{Au}]) = 1.6 \times 10^{-5} \, M, \, [\text{Cl}^-] = 4 \, M, \, T = 25 \, ^\circ C \) to 1.51 V \( ([\text{Au}]) = 8.4 \times 10^{-8} \, M, \, [\text{Cl}^-] = 3 \, M, \, T = 95 \, ^\circ C \) vs. SCE. The oxidation of \( \text{AuCl}_2^- \) to \( \text{AuCl}_4^- \) in the studied ferric chloride solutions is thus unlikely.

Thermodynamic calculations using HSC 8.1 software show that the disproportionation reaction (Eq. (4)) has equilibrium constant from \( 10^{-13} \) to \( 10^{-18} \) at \( T = 0–100 \, ^\circ C \). Therefore, such disproportionation is not thermodynamically likely to happen. It can be concluded that gold dissolution can be described by Eq.(5) in ferric chloride leaching of gold.

### 3.4. Rate-limiting step of gold dissolution

Fig. 11 presents the gold dissolution rates determined by linear polarization resistance using RDE and Levich plot, when \( T = 25–95 \, ^\circ C \), \( \omega_{\text{cyc}} = 100–2500 \, \text{RPM} \) corresponding \( \omega_{\text{rad}} = 10.5–262 \, \text{rad s}^{-1} \), \( [\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \, M, \, [\text{Cl}^-] = 3.0 \, M \) and \( \text{pH} = 1.0 \). The trend lines had high correlation \( (R^2 = 0.985–0.999) \), though some scatter occurred at \( T = 95 \, ^\circ C \). However, none of slopes intersected the origin, which indicated that the gold dissolution rate was not purely limited by mass transfer.

Activation energies were calculated \( (T = 35–95 \, ^\circ C, \, \omega_{\text{cyc}} = 100–2500 \, \text{RPM}, \, [\text{Fe}^{3+}] = 0.5 \, M, \, [\text{Cl}^-] = 3.0 \, M \) and \( \text{pH} = 1.0 ) \), were shown to be almost independent of the rotation speed, varying from 46.4 to 48.6 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) with error limits from \( \pm 1.0 \) to \( \pm 1.7 \) kJ mol\(^{-1}\), Fig. 12. These values suggest that gold dissolution reaction was controlled by electron transfer.

### 4. Kinetic model for gold leaching

The activation energy determined by the electrochemical measurements indicated that the gold dissolution rate is limited by the surface reaction. The effect of mass transfer was seen with increasing rotational speed (Figs. 1–4), which indicates that mass transfer also had effect on gold leaching rate. In order to observe the rate limiting steps, a mechanistic model was developed. With mechanistic model rate limiting steps can be separated and their relative importance studied in selected conditions.

The Modeling was conducted at ferric ion concentrations from 0.02 to 0.5 M, chloride concentrations from 2 to 4 M, temperature range from 55 to 95 °C and at \( \text{pH} = 1.0 \). These conditions can be considered an optimal range for ferric chloride gold leaching, since ferric ion concentration > 0.5 M or chloride concentration > 4 M was shown not to improve gold dissolution and \( T < 55 \, ^\circ C \) showed slow dissolution kinetics in the electrochemical experiments. According to the previous discussion about gold leaching chemistry that gold dissolves as described in Eq. (5), a value of 1 is used for \( \gamma \).

Comparison of the measured and predicted gold dissolution rates is
shown in Fig. 13. The modeled dissolution rate follows the measured points quite closely as the coefficient of regression for the model was 92.19%. The main discrepancy between the measurements and the simulations can be seen at low temperatures (55 and 65 °C) and with low ferric ion concentrations (0.02 and 0.1 M) where the measured dissolution rate is higher than what is obtained by the model.

As presented above, the measured data always showed a dependency from mass transfer even at high rotational speeds. Hence, the relative importance of mass transfer should be studied in detail. The existence and effect of mass transfer limitations can be studied with the established model by the simulated curves presented in Fig. 14, which shows the ratio of the actual leaching rate over the leaching rate without diffusion limitations (leaching agent concentration at the surface equals the bulk leaching agent concentration calculated from the model as presented). If the ratio presented in Fig. 14 is low (< < 1) it means that the overall dissolution rate is limited by mass transfer of oxidant from the bulk phase to the gold surface. If, on the other hand, the ratio is close to unity, the dissolution is mainly controlled by the intrinsic surface reaction. Between these two cases, the dissolution rate is affected by both the reaction and mass transfer steps. The model predicts mainly control by intrinsic surface reaction for gold dissolution. As expected, the obtained results show that at low temperatures (55 and 65 °C) rate is limited by the intrinsic surface reaction, while with low oxidant concentration ([Fe³⁺] = 0.02 M) the dissolution is mainly controlled by mass transfer. With low oxidant concentrations, the concentration difference between the bulk liquid phase and the disc surface is so low that the generated mass transfer rate is not enough to maintain high oxidant surface concentration even at high stirring speeds. Therefore, the dissolution rate remains low. At higher rotational speeds (> 1000 RPM) the ratio approaches 1.0 in most of the experiments, indicating control by intrinsic surface reaction, as shown in Fig. 14.

The estimated parameters are shown below in Table 1. The activation energy (Eₘ) for the intrinsic surface reaction is 74.7 kJ mol⁻¹ and the reaction order for Fe³⁺ is 0.35. It may be noticed from the parameter estimation results that the fitted exponent for the Reynolds number (a₂) is much higher than the theoretical value of 0.5 in the Levich correlation (Dib and Makhloufi, 2007). The exact reason for this is not known, but it can be presented that, since the Levich equation was derived for an ideal case, any nonidealities, such as surface non-uniformities, vibrations, or existence of vapour bubbles probably influence the boundary layer at the disc surface generating higher mass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>std. error, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kₐ,mean, (m² kmol⁻¹ s⁻¹)⁻¹ m s⁻¹</td>
<td>154 · 10⁻⁶</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eₘ, J mol⁻¹</td>
<td>74.7 · 10³</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n₁</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n₂</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a₁</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a₂</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transfer rates than expected compared to the ideal case. Similar behaviour was presented by Lampinen et al. (2017) in gold cupric chloride leaching.

The reliability of the estimated parameters studied by the MCMC method is depicted in Fig. 15 showing the marginal posterior distributions for the estimated parameters. It can be seen that the reliability of the parameters is good. All the distributions are well-centred around the most probable point.

5. Conclusions

In this study, the reaction mechanism and kinetics of gold dissolution in ferric chloride solutions were studied with ferric ion concentrations between 0.02 and 1.0 M, chloride concentration between 2 and 5 M, temperature between 25 and 95 °C and pH between 0 and 1.0. The rotating disc electrode (RDE) method was used to measure linear polarization resistance at rotational speeds from 100 to 2500 RPM. According to the calculated equilibrium potentials and measured OCPs, gold dissolved as aurous ion as AuCl$_2^-$, under all test conditions, which is in line with literature. Furthermore, calculated theoretical equilibrium potentials for the oxidation reaction of AuCl$_2^-$ to AuCl$_4^-$ suggest that this reaction does not occur under the investigated conditions. Additionally, the calculated equilibrium constants suggests that the disproportionation does not occur. The increase in gold dissolution rate was observed to be proportional to increases in temperature, ferric iron concentration as well as the chloride concentration. Further, rotational speed was found not to affect OCP value, though dissolution rates of gold increased, when rotational speed increased in all test conditions. Therefore, it can be concluded that rotational speed promotes equally anodic and cathodic reactions.

OCPs were shown to decrease, while dissolution rates of gold increased, when chloride concentration increased. Therefore, according to mixed potential theory, anodic reaction rate increased. Additionally, it was shown that the dissolution of gold did not significantly increase when the ferric ion concentration was above 0.5 M. However, the reason for decreasing gold dissolution rate, when chloride concentration increased from 4 to 5 M as well as ferric concentration increased from 0.75 to 1.0 M, was not investigated in this study. pH was shown not to affect clearly on the gold dissolution rate, however, values lower than 1.5 support soluble iron. Redox potential was found to vary between 636 and 741 mV vs. SCE, and temperature and ferric concentration increased redox potential, while increasing chloride concentration was shown to decrease redox potential. The redox potential affected linearly on gold dissolution rate up to approximately 0.73 V vs. SCE (corresponding to [Fe$^{3+}$] = 0.75 M) after which the dissolution rate remained approximately the same.

The reaction mechanism was investigated by the use of Levich plot and by determining activation energies. Levich plot indicated that the gold dissolution rate was not purely limited by mass transfer, though activation energies indicated that the gold dissolution in ferric chloride solution was controlled by the electron transfer. However, the dissolution rates did not reach a constant value with increasing rotational speed of gold RDE at any investigated conditions, therefore, it was expected that mass transfer affects the system regardless of the high rotational speeds.

The rate limiting steps were studied more closely by developing a mechanistic model. With mechanistic model the rate limiting steps were separated and their relative importance studied. The kinetics were modeled in the optimum leaching ranges determined in the current work. The reliability of the mechanistic model and model parameters was investigated in this study using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method. The model ($R^2 = 92.19\%$) was shown to describe well the leaching data presented and all the estimated model parameters showed good reliability. The model predicted that gold dissolution was mainly controlled by intrinsic surface reaction at rotational speeds > 1000 RPM. At low temperatures (55 and 65 °C) rate...
was limited by the intrinsic surface reaction, while with low oxidant concentration \((Fe^{2+}) = 0.02\, \text{M}\), the dissolution was mainly controlled by mass transfer.
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