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ABSTRACT: The diffusion of water and ions in the interlayer region of smectite clay minerals represents a direct probe of the type and strength of clay–fluid interactions. Interlayer diffusion also represents an important link between molecular simulation and macroscopic experiments. Here we use molecular dynamics simulation to investigate trends in cation and water diffusion in montmorillonite interlayers, looking specifically at the effects of layer charge, interlayer cation and cation charge (sodium or calcium), water content, and temperature. For Na-montmorillonite, the largest increase in ion and water diffusion coefficients occurs between the one-layer and two-layer hydrates, corresponding to the transition from inner-sphere to outer-sphere surface complexes. Calculated activation energies for ion and water diffusion in Na-montmorillonite are similar to each other and to the water hydrogen bond energy, suggesting the breaking of water–water and water–clay hydrogen bonds as a likely mechanism for interlayer diffusion. A comparison of interlayer diffusion with that of bulk electrolyte solutions reveals a clear trend of decreasing diffusion coefficient with increasing electrolyte concentration, and in most cases the interlayer diffusion results are nearly coincident with the corresponding bulk solutions. Trends in electrical conductivities computed from the ion diffusion coefficients are also compared.

INTRODUCTION

Diffusion of water molecules and cations in the interlayer of swelling clay minerals, known as the smectite group (and which includes montmorillonite), is a critical process that controls ion exchange and adsorptive properties important to many environmental, industrial, petroleum, and related engineering systems. The nanoconfinement of water and cations in the interlayer region of smectite minerals offers a unique opportunity to examine the influence of water content, cation charge, and the influence of clay surfaces on the transport properties of interlayer species. These molecular properties, combined with the low permeability of clay-rich rocks such as bentonite, underscore the use of clays and clay minerals as adsorptive backfill materials for the safe isolation of high-level radioactive waste in geological waste repositories. Similarly, such natural and modified materials are often used for the remediation of chemical waste spills to prevent the spread of contaminants into the greater environment. Clays are an important mineral in many subsurface environments, and understanding their properties is important for many energy applications.

Recent advances in computational chemistry and molecular dynamics (MD) methods have led to new understanding of clay interlayer structures and the diffusion rates of various interlayer cations and water. For example, it is now widely accepted that water properties, including diffusion rates, are affected by nanoconfinement. The swelling of a clay interlayer from a collapsed structure with no water to one, two, and three water-layer hydrates with layer thicknesses of about 3 to 6 to 9 Å is primarily dependent on relative humidity and clay surface charge. MD studies have successfully investigated the molecular mechanism of smectite swelling and determined the distribution of cations and water molecules within the interlayer. Furthermore, the use of molecular simulation to derive diffusion rates of interlayer species in clay minerals provides an important link to macroscopic experiments and field measurements. Simulation-derived diffusion rates can be used to evaluate time and distance constraints for geochemical processes involving chemical species within clay particles and nanopore environments. Additionally, diffusion of charged species (cations) in the clay interlayer or in clay-dominated nanopores is fundamentally equivalent to electrical conductivity, which is itself a common probe of fluid composition and behavior used in petroleum drilling operations, oil exploration, reservoir characterization, pipeline flow, and disposition of hazardous materials.

In this work we use MD simulations to compute diffusion coefficients of ions and water molecules confined to the interlayer regions of bulk clay minerals. We compare the effects of cation hydration enthalpy (Na⁺ vs Ca²⁺), layer charge, water content, and temperature for conditions expected in various technical applications. Rather than comparing interlayer
diffusion coefficients with bulk water or ions at infinite dilution, results are compared to bulk solutions at equivalent concentrations as the clay interlayers. Finally, electrical conductivity values are computed from the interlayer ion diffusion coefficients, and a comparison of these conductivities relative to bulk solutions provides useful insight for the interpretation of conductivity measurements in rocks containing clays. The length scale of porosity in clay-bearing reservoir sands ranges over several orders of magnitude, from mesoscale pores hundreds of microns in dimension down to nanoscale porosity separating individual clay layers. There is an exceptionally large range of observed clay fabric and habitat due to the large range not just in clay type but, more significantly, in complex and varied diagenesis. Clay mineral interlayers and bulk solutions therefore represent the minimum and maximum porosity expected in such natural rock phases.

### METHODS

Initial atomic coordinates for the smectite model were taken from a similar layer structure (muscovite) which contains interlayer potassium ions but no interlayer water molecules. Removing the interlayer potassium ions and replacing all aluminum atoms in the tetrahedral sheets with silicon atoms resulted in a generic neutral structure with unit cell formula $\text{[Si}_8\text{](Al}_4\text{O}_2\text{)}\_\text{OH}_4$ with silicon and aluminum atoms in tetrahedral and octahedral coordination, respectively. After orthogonalization, a supercell containing $8 \times 4 \times 2$ repeats in the $x$, $y$, and $z$ directions was created, with approximate dimensions in the $xy$ plane of 41 Å × 36 Å. The neutral supercell was transformed into a montmorillonite model by randomly replacing aluminum atoms in the octahedral sheet with magnesium atoms. While creating the negative charge sites, care was taken to avoid nearest neighbor Mg–O–Mg interactions. Two montmorillonite models were created, corresponding to unit cell (u.c.) layer charges of $-0.375$ e/u.c and $-0.750$ e/u.c, denoted as “low-charge” and “high-charge”, respectively. After balancing the layer charge with interlayer sodium ions, unit cell formulas for the montmorillonite models were $\text{Na}_\text{8.375}[\text{Si}_8\text{](Al}_\text{4.25}\text{Mg}_\text{0.75})\text{O}_\text{20}\text{OH}_4$ and $\text{Na}_\text{8.75}[\text{Si}_8\text{](Al}_\text{4.25}\text{Mg}_\text{0.75})\text{O}_\text{20}\text{OH}_4$. Analogous Ca-montmorillonite models were created, with only half the number of calcium ions as sodium ions needed for charge balance.

Models of hydrated montmorillonites were created by expanding the interlayer regions of the anhydrous models and adding an appropriate number of water molecules to create one-layer (1W), two-layer (2W), and three-layer (3W) hydrates. The stoichiometric ratios of water molecules per unit cell (3.9, 7.9, and 11.8) are consistent with previous simulation studies of montmorillonite hydrates. Counterions were initially placed in the midplane between clay layers, above (or below) negative charge sites. The remaining accessible region of the interlayer was filled with the appropriate number of water molecules in a grid pattern that avoided close contacts with counterions or siloxane surfaces. During an initial energy minimization, water molecules formed hydration shells about the counterions. Ion concentrations in the montmorillonite systems (Table 1) were calculated from the accessible volume of the interlayers. Each clay layer was assumed to have a thickness of 2 Å, which is equivalent to the $(001)$ spacing of 36 Å. The neutral dehydrated Na-montmorillonite. Therefore, for each hydrated clay model, a layer thickness of $2 \times 9.6$ Å was subtracted from each equilibrated cell $z$ parameter in determining the interlayer accessible volume. Likewise, porosity values for each equilibrated system were calculated as the ratio of accessible volume to total volume. In estimating this accessible volume, the contribution from hexagonal cavities at the siloxane surfaces is indirectly included, since interlayer cations can occupy these cavities. However, this volume contribution is negligible compared to the total accessible volume.

In order to compare ion and water diffusion coefficients with values from bulk solution, separate bulk solution models were created containing either 4096 or 5832 water molecules in a

### Table 1. Composition of Clay Simulation Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>layer charge (e/ unit cell$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>counterion</th>
<th>$T$ (K)</th>
<th>water layers</th>
<th>d(001) (Å)$^{11}$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>10$^3$ ppm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-0.375$</td>
<td>Na$^+$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-0.750$</td>
<td>Na$^+$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ca$^{2+}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ca$^{2+}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{11}$Uncertainties in all d(001) spacings were less than 0.07 Å.
cubic simulation cell for dilute and more concentrated solutions, respectively. Neutral NaCl and CaCl₂ solutions were created by adding the appropriate ions in stoichiometric ratios (Table 2) to achieve maximum total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations similar to the 2W clay systems. A TDS concentration is independent of estimated volume and importantly highlights the lack of anions in the interlayer fluids. Additionally, the TDS concentration unit is common to fluids. Additionally, the TDS concentration unit is common to solutions and will be used for interlayer (two-dimensional) diffusion parallel to the basal surface (i.e., xy plane)

\[
\langle \Delta x(t)^2 + \Delta y(t)^2 \rangle = 4Dt
\]

or three-dimensional diffusion in bulk solutions

\[
\langle \Delta x(t)^2 + \Delta y(t)^2 + \Delta z(t)^2 \rangle = 6Dt
\]

where the brackets denote an ensemble average of particle displacement (e.g., \( \Delta x \)) at time \( t \). Equation 1 was applied for each ion type and all water molecules in the simulation cell, and was calculated between 150 and 250 ps, \( \Delta \) based on observations that interlayer diffusion can be overestimated if calculated over shorter times. \( \Delta \) Plots of mean-square displacement versus time from similar simulations show that the linear behavior can change over time, \( \Delta \) but we have minimized this problem by restarting our calculation at each data frame (2.0 fs). Errors in the slopes determined from linear least-squares analysis were approximately 0.01% and correspond to errors in \( D \) of 0.05%–0.65% for ions and 0.01%–0.10% for water.

Ion conductivities \( \sigma_i \) (i = Na⁺ or Ca²⁺) were then calculated using the Nernst–Einstein relationship

\[
\sigma_i = z_i^2 e F^2 D_i \frac{1}{RT}
\]

where \( z_i \) is the ion valency, \( e \) is the ion concentration, \( F \) is the Faraday constant, and \( R \) is the gas constant. In the above equations, units of the simulated properties (e.g., \( A \), fs) were converted to SI units for calculation of \( D \) (m²·s⁻¹) and \( \sigma \) (S·m⁻¹).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Calculated diffusion coefficients and electrical conductivities from MD simulations of montmorillonite interlayers are shown in Table 3. Specific trends of these transport properties are presented graphically below, so only a brief summary is

---

Table 2. Composition of Bulk Simulation Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>solution</th>
<th>T (K)</th>
<th>N_{ions}</th>
<th>N_{water}</th>
<th>L (Å)</th>
<th>M (g/mol)</th>
<th>10⁶ ppm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaCl₂</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Uncertainties in cell parameters (L) were less than 0.07 Å.*
Table 3. Ion and Water Diffusion Coefficients ($10^{-10}$ m$^2$·s$^{-1}$) and Electrical Conductivities (S·m$^{-1}$) from MD Simulations of Montmorillonite Interlayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer charge (e-unit cell$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Counterion$^a$</th>
<th>$T$ (K)</th>
<th>Water layers</th>
<th>$D_{\text{ion}}$</th>
<th>$D_{w}$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>−0.375</td>
<td>Na$^+$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ca$^{2+}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−0.750</td>
<td>Na$^+$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ca$^{2+}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

provided here. The results confirm two expected trends: diffusion coefficients for ions ($D_{\text{ion}}$) and water ($D_{w}$) increase as temperature increases, and they decrease as the clay layer charge increases. Interlayer regions for low-charge models contain half the number of cations as their high-charge counterparts. The reduced ion concentration, combined with the more hydrophobic clay layers confining the interlayer fluid, result in substantially larger diffusion coefficients for the low-charge systems.

For Na-montmorillonite, $D_{\text{Na}}$ values increase sharply by a factor of 2–4 between the 1W and 2W hydration states, while $D_{w}$ values approximately double between 1W and 2W. For Ca-montmorillonite, the corresponding increase in $D_{\text{Ca}}$ and $D_{w}$ values are much smaller. In the 1W state, many sodium ions are adsorbed directly on the siloxane surface (inner-sphere surface complexes), while most calcium ions have already formed full hydration shells characteristic of bulk solution. As the 2W state forms in Na-montmorillonite, sodium ions occur as fully hydrated outer-sphere complexes, which are much more mobile than inner-sphere complexes. The increase in diffusion coefficients is much smaller between the 2W and 3W states, reflecting only an increase in accessible volume rather than different ion coordination environments. In fact, $D_{w}$ values in low-charge Na- and Ca-montmorillonite actually decrease slightly between the 2W and 3W states at 300 K, indicating a similarity to bulklike behavior in both states.

Comparing diffusion coefficients in montmorillonite interlayers to published values, we first note the similarity in $D_{\text{ion}}$ and $D_{w}$ values to those from MD simulations of montmorillonites,$^{52}$ hectorites,$^{53,54}$ and saponites$^{16}$ with similar layer charge to our high-charge model. The relative increase in $D$ values between 1W and 2W states in Na-saponite is similar to our results, but there is a much larger increase in $D_{\text{Ca}}$ (7×) and $D_{w}$ (4×) between 1W and 2W.$^{16}$ The negative layer charge in saponite exists exclusively in the tetrahedral (siloxane) sheet compared to the octahedral (alumina) substitution in our montmorillonite model. As a result, interlayer calcium ions are more strongly bound to the clay surface in the 1W state of Ca-saponite compared to Ca-montmorillonite. Additionally, MD simulations of interlayer calcium structure in Ca- Hectorite also showed inner-sphere calcium surface complexes in both the 1W and 2W hydration states.$^{37}$ Diffusion results for our montmorillonite model should be generally applicable to models with tetrahedral charge, at least at higher water contents where interlayer cations are likely to be fully hydrated as in our 2W and 3W states.

Diffusion coefficients in clay interlayers are often compared to the corresponding values in bulk solution to determine the effects of interlayer confinement and layer charge on mobility. Simulation results for bulk NaCl(aq) and CaCl$_2$(aq) solutions (Table 4) correspond to infinite dilution (0.05 M) and higher parts per million (ppm) concentrations seen in the 2W states of our montmorillonite models. Specific comparisons of ion and water diffusion coefficients for the Na$^+$ and Ca$^{2+}$ ions, and electrical conductivities for the Na$^+$ and Ca$^{2+}$ solutions, are provided here. The results confirm the expected trends for ions and water diffusion coefficients, and the electrical conductivities are in agreement with the expected trends for the Na$^+$ and Ca$^{2+}$ solutions.

Table 4. Ion and Water Diffusion Coefficients ($10^{-10}$ m$^2$·s$^{-1}$) and Electrical Conductivities (S·m$^{-1}$) from MD Simulations of Bulk NaCl and CaCl$_2$ Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Temperature (K)</th>
<th>Concentration (M)</th>
<th>$D_{\text{ion}}$</th>
<th>$D_{w}$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>366</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaCl$_2$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Diffusion coefficients for the Na$^+$ and Ca$^{2+}$ solutions are provided here. The results confirm the expected trends for ions and water diffusion coefficients, and the electrical conductivities are in agreement with the expected trends for the Na$^+$ and Ca$^{2+}$ solutions.
water diffusion between interlayer regions and bulk solutions are discussed in more detail below, but we note here that interlayer \( D_w \) and \( D_{\text{ion}} \) values are significantly lower than in bulk solution or even more concentrated solutions. Diffusion coefficients at 0.05 M are in good agreement with published simulation results for bulk water\(^{55} \) and NaCl(aq) at infinite dilution\(^{56} \). It is well-known that \( D_w \) predicted by the flexible SPC water model is larger than the experimental value of 23.5 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\).\(^{57} \) Finally, we note that our simulation results for ion diffusion coefficients in bulk solution are in good agreement with the experimental values of 13.3 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) (Na\(^+\)), 7.9 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) (Ca\(^{2+}\)), and 20.3 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) (Cl\(^-\))\(^{58} \).

Experimental values of water diffusion in Na-smectites are available from quasi-elastic neutron scattering (QENS) for comparison (Table 5). Both simulation and experiment reveal the dramatic increase in water diffusion between the 1W and 2W states, and both methods show that water diffusion in the 2W states is significantly reduced compared to bulk water (discussed below). Simulated \( D_w \) values for Na-montmorillonite are consistently larger than experiment, but for the 2W state of Ca-montmorillonite we note that the simulated value of \( D_w \) (8.6 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\)) is slightly lower than the experimental value (12.0 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\))\(^{59} \). For synthetic Na-saponite (\(-0.8 \) e-unit cell\(^{-1}\)) at 300 K, two \( D_w \) values for each hydration state were reported, depending on the QENS energy resolution.\(^{16} \) Our simulated \( D_w \) value for the 1W state lies between the experimental values, while for the 2W state, the simulation value is slightly larger than the upper value of the reported range.

For synthetic Na-fluorohectorite (\(-0.8 \) e-unit cell\(^{-1}\))\(^{53,54} \), \( D_w \) values from QENS experiments are approximately half as large as our simulated montmorillonite results for both the 1W and 2W states. MD simulations of the fluorohectorite models also showed an overestimation of \( D_w \) values compared with experiment, although a definite explanation for this trend remains unclear.\(^{54} \) Given the differences in clay structure and layer charge between the simulation model and the experimental samples, our simulated water diffusion coefficients compare favorably with the available experimental data.

Although experimental values for ion diffusion in clays are available from tracer diffusion or impedance spectroscopy, the use of compacted clay samples of varying water contents and porosities makes a quantitative comparison difficult. A range of experimental \( D_{\text{ion}} \) values at 298 K have been reported for Kunipia-F montmorillonite with similar layer charge characteristics as our simulation model: 0.1 \( \times 10^{-10} \) – 0.8 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) (Na\(^+\))\(^{61} \) and 0.06 \( \times 10^{-10} \) – 0.2 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) (Ca\(^{2+}\))\(^{62} \) over a range of dry densities of 1.0–1.8 Mg m\(^{-3}\). These values are slightly lower than our simulation results for high-charge montmorillonite, but the trend of \( D_{\text{Na}} > D_{\text{Ca}} \) is consistent. For Na\(^+\) diffusion in compacted MX-80 montmorillonite (layer charge \(-1.2 \) e-unit cell\(^{-1}\)) at 293 K, \( D_{\text{ion}} \) values of 0.54 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) and 9.6 \( \times 10^{-10} \) m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) have been reported at relative humidities of 30% (1W) and 90% (2W), respectively.\(^{70} \) In comparison, our simulation results slightly overpredict the 1W value and underpredict the 2W value, but given the difference in clay sample (including layer charge), the comparison is reasonable.

Additional simulations were performed on high-charge Na-montmorillonite at higher temperatures to obtain activation energies of sodium and water diffusion. Arrhenius plots of sodium and water diffusion over the temperature range 300–366 K (Figure 2) show a consistent behavior. Reduced mobility as a result of extreme confinement results in small \( D_w \) values in the 1W state (interlayer width = 2.6 Å) relative to 2W (5.2 Å) and 3W (7.4 Å). The similarity of activation energy (\( E_{\text{act}} \)) values (Table 6) follow from the nearly identical Arrhenius plots. Such a narrow range of \( E_{\text{act}} \) values for sodium ions and water molecules across a range of hydration states is best explained by considering that any translational motion of interlayer species involves breaking of hydrogen bonds (H-bonds) as the initiation step. It is not surprising, therefore, that the \( E_{\text{act}} \) values in Table 6 are consistent with that of pure water at 298 K (16.9 kJ mol\(^{-1}\)) from QENS experiments\(^{59} \) and the H-bond strength between two water molecules (20.5 kJ mol\(^{-1}\)).\(^{54} \) Our water \( E_{\text{act}} \) values also compare well with those reported from QENS experiments of Na-montmorillonite.\(^{59,65} \) The slight increase in sodium ion \( E_{\text{act}} \) at higher water content is not consistent with the expected trend of decreasing \( E_{\text{act}} \) with increasing water content\(^{64} \), but all three values are similar to the value in dilute aqueous solution (18.4 kJ mol\(^{-1}\)).\(^{59} \) In MD simulations of Na-hectorite, Marry et al.\(^{53} \) noted that diffusion coefficients and activation energies were sensitive to stacking of adjacent clay layers. Although we have made no attempt to simulate montmorillonites in different stacking arrangements, we have taken care to use random configurations of layer charge sites to avoid the influence of adjacent clay layers on our results.

A graphical comparison of \( D_{\text{ion}} \) and \( D_w \) values (Figures 3 and 4) reveals the consistency in diffusion behavior between bulk solution and clay interlayers. Error bars are not shown in the diffusion plots since the errors are sufficiently small (<0.65%). Molar ion concentrations in the bulk models are lower than the interlayer fluids, but the parts per million concentrations are similar (Tables 1–2). The presence of confining clay surfaces
reduces the accessible volume available to the interlayer fluid, resulting in much higher molar concentrations compared to the bulk solutions. A clear trend of decreasing diffusion coefficients with increasing electrolyte concentration is observed for the bulk solutions. The same trend holds for the interlayer fluids, and surprisingly the interlayer \(D\) values appear to extend the curves established by the bulk solution values. This feature is particularly apparent for Na-montmorillonite (both ion and water) but less obvious for Ca-montmorillonite due to the sharp decrease in diffusion with increasing concentration. In the case of low-charge Na- and Ca-montmorillonite, the interlayer ion concentrations in the 2W and 3W states lie within the range of the bulk solutions, and the \(D_w\) values nearly overlap. Interlayer ions are more strongly influenced by the charged clay surfaces, so the interlayer \(D_{\text{ion}}\) values are lower than their bulk solution counterparts.

Table 6. Activation Energies (kJ·mol\(^{-1}\)) for Sodium Ion and Water Diffusion in Montmorillonite Interlayers (−0.750 e/u.c.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>water layers</th>
<th>(E_{\text{act}}) (Na(^+))</th>
<th>(E_{\text{act}}) (H(_2)O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1W</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2W</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3W</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concentration-dependent diffusion behavior in clay interlayers suggests that these fluids behave as concentrated (neutral) aqueous solutions. Rather than adopt the common practice of comparing structural and dynamic properties of interlayer fluids with bulk water or dilute electrolyte solutions, Figures 3 and 4 suggest that a reference solution of equivalent concentration seems much more appropriate. Simulations of bulk solutions at higher molar concentrations were not attempted due to the significant ion pairing expected. These ion–water potentials\(^{67,68}\) have not been validated for such concentrated solutions. The only evidence of ion pairing in the bulk solutions was seen in the 2.78 M NaCl solution. An examination of average radial distribution function data from this simulation at 300 K (data not shown) revealed a contact ion pair with a Na–Cl separation of 2.8 Å and a coordination number of 0.3. Approximately 30% of sodium ions were paired with chloride ions in this concentrated solution, which might reduce the mobility of each ion. However, as with the less concentrated solutions, \(D_{\text{Cl}}\) is greater than \(D_{\text{Na}}\) (Table 4), but...
with ion pairing effects this difference is smaller at higher concentration. Ion pairing did not occur in the CaCl$_2$ solutions to an appreciable extent. Even for the most concentrated solution (0.89 M) at 300 K, the average Ca$^-$Cl coordination number was only 0.03.

One helpful application of the diffusion data derived through MD simulations is the determination of mass diffusion penetration depth $\delta$ ($=\sqrt{2Dt}$) which provides an approximate distance of mass diffusion transport for a given time. Conversely, it can be used to estimate the time required for a diffusing species to transport a prescribed distance; for example, from a clay particle through its interlayer and into a coexisting aqueous phase. Assuming a clay grain is 2 $\mu$m in diameter (at the large end of the size distribution), it would take about 0.7 ms for Na$^+$ and just 0.2 ms for H$_2$O to diffuse outward from the middle of the clay grain, based on the diffusion data derived by MD simulations for the low-charge 1W montmorillonite at 300 K. It would require roughly one-third the corresponding time for both Na$^+$ (0.2 ms) and H$_2$O (0.07 ms) for a montmorillonite expanded to a 3W hydrate.

Electrical conductivities were calculated from $D_{\text{ion}}$ values and are plotted as a function of TDS concentration in Figure 5. In the case of bulk solutions, TDS values include cations and chloride ions. The ppm scale is used to reflect ion concentration units more commonly seen in conductivity measurements. Solution concentrations and therefore volumes are required in the calculation of electrical conductivity (eq 3),

Figure 4. Water diffusion coefficients vs ion concentration in Na- and Ca-montmorillonite interlayers and bulk NaCl(aq) and CaCl$_2$(aq) solutions at 300 K (Na and Ca) and 366 K (Na). Model systems consist of low-charge montmorillonite ($-0.375$ e.u.c.$^{-1}$, blue squares), high-charge montmorillonite ($-0.75$ e.u.c.$^{-1}$, green triangles), and bulk solutions (red circles).

Figure 5. Electrical conductivity vs TDS concentration in Na- and Ca-montmorillonite interlayers and bulk NaCl(aq) and CaCl$_2$(aq) solutions at 300 K (Na and Ca) and 366 K (Na). Model systems consist of low-charge montmorillonite ($-0.375$ e.u.c.$^{-1}$, blue squares), high-charge montmorillonite ($-0.75$ e.u.c.$^{-1}$, green triangles), and bulk solutions (red circles).
so uncertainties in our calculation of fluid volumes could affect the resulting conductivity values. However, given the small uncertainties in average cell parameters (0.07 Å) combined with the small possible error in volume due to surface hexagonal cavities, we feel that uncertainties in our calculated conductivity values would have a minimal effect in the conductivity trends shown in Figure 5.

While the conductivity of NaCl and CaCl₂ solutions increases linearly with concentration over the ppm range relevant to clay interlayers, the conductivity of Na- and Ca-montmorillonite interlayers does not follow the same linear trend. Since the clay interlayers only contain cations and no chloride anions, interlayer conductivity generally decreases with increasing (cation) concentration, as seen in the ion diffusion trends (Figure 3). For bulk solutions, the contribution of diffusing cations and anions results in the opposite trend in observed conductivity values compared to diffusion values.

For Na-montmorillonite, conductivity increases between the 3W (less concentrated) and 2W (more concentrated) states, followed by a decrease in conductivity at the most concentrated 1W state. In Ca-montmorillonite, ionic strength effects result in decreasing conductivity as concentration increases. Additionally, the linear trend for bulk solutions allows for approximate bulk conductivity values to be determined for each ppm value in the interlayer fluids. Because electrical conductivity varies linearly with ion diffusion (eq 2), trends in the two properties are similar. One significant difference is seen in the conductivity trends at lower water content (higher ppm concentration). Rather than a linear trend of increasing σ with increasing ppm concentration, interlayer conductivities at the highest ion concentrations (1W) are similar to or lower than the 2W values. We also note that layer charge exerts less influence on conductivity than diffusion. Additionally, our simulated conductivity values for the 2W and 3W hydration states of high-charge Na-montmorillonite at 300 K (Figure 5a) compare favorably to the values obtained by Salles et al. using impedance spectroscopy on MX-80 Na-montmorillonite at 293 K

Plots of relative electrical conductivity (Figure 6) allow for a more direct comparison of interlayer conductivity between clays with different layer charge and exchangeable cation. Regardless of layer charge, relative conductivities for Na-montmorillonite at 300 K are nearly identical to the values at 366 K. This is an important finding for conductivity experiments in the field, where temperatures can vary widely. Plotting relative conductivity on a porosity scale, results for the commonly occurring 2W states can easily be compared. In this case, clays with reduced layer charge show a higher relative conductivity than clays with higher layer charge. This result follows directly from trends in ion diffusion (Figure 3) showing that ions diffuse faster in low-layer-charge interlayers.

**CONCLUSIONS**

MD simulations have been used to investigate transport properties of ions and water in montmorillonite interlayers and corresponding bulk electrolyte solutions. By varying the layer charge (low and high charge), interlayer cation (Na⁺ and Ca²⁺), water content (1W – 3W states), and temperature (300 K – 366 K), we have developed a better understanding of some of the key factors governing interlayer transport in clays. Not surprisingly, reduced layer charge leads to a more hydrophobic interlayer environment with significantly faster diffusion motion compared to the high-charge models. Interlayer water content only plays a significant role in the 1W state of Na-montmorillonite, where some sodium ions are directly adsorbed to the siloxane surface and are less mobile. At higher water contents of Na-montmorillonite and for Ca-montmorillonite at all hydration states, additional water has very little effect on ion or water diffusion. In those cases, the interlayer cations are fully hydrated, and an Arrhenius analysis indicates that water and ion activation energies are similar to each other and to the hydrogen bond energy in water. Thus, we can conclude that hydrogen bond breaking is a key step in the diffusion of interlayer water or ions.

Although diffusion coefficients for interlayer water never approach that of pure water, our comparisons with bulk NaCl and CaCl₂ solutions show that the diffusion properties of interlayer fluids are analogous to bulk solutions of similar ion concentration. In fact, ion and water diffusion coefficients from both interlayer fluids and bulk solutions follow the same trend of decreasing diffusion coefficient with increasing ion concentration. In the cases where the interlayer ion
concentration is similar to that of a bulk solution, the diffusion coefficients are nearly identical. Diffusion coefficients were converted to electrical conductivity values to provide insight into conductivity measurements at the laboratory or field scale. Comparing conductivities of interlayer fluids with bulk solutions based on a ppm scale of TDS, the confined interlayer fluids have much lower values than bulk solutions with similar ppm concentration. Finally, a comparison of relative electrical conductivity values for interlayer fluids reveals consistent behavior as a function of ion concentration or interlayer porosity, regardless of temperature, layer charge, or interlayer cation.

While diffusion coefficients from MD simulations of clay interlayers have often been carefully compared to high-quality experimental measurements using synchrotron techniques, our results suggest that a comparison of simulated and experimental conductivity measurements would yield additional insight into the dynamic behavior in clays.
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