

## What is the actual structure of samarskite-(Y)? A TEM investigation of metamict samarskite from the Garnet Codera dike pegmatite (Central Italian Alps)

GIAN CARLO CAPITANI<sup>1,\*</sup>, ENRICO MUGNAIOLI<sup>2</sup>, AND ALESSANDRO GUASTONI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Milano-Bicocca, Piazza della Scienza, 4, 20156 Milano, Italy

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physical Sciences, Earth and Environment, University of Siena, Via Laterina, 8, 53100 Siena, Italy

<sup>3</sup>Department of Geoscience, University of Padova, Via Gradenigo, 6, 35131 Padova, Italy

### ABSTRACT

We investigated, by scanning and transmission electron microscopy (SEM, TEM), wavelength- and energy-dispersive spectroscopy (WDS, EDS), and electron diffraction tomography (EDT), several (Y-REE-U-Th)-(Nb-Ta-Ti) oxides from the Garnet Codera dike pegmatite (Central Italian Alps). These oxides have compositions in the samarskite-(Y) field and yield an amorphous response from the single-crystal X-ray diffractometer. Backscattered electron images reveal that the samples are zoned with major substitutions involving (U+Th) with respect to (Y+REE). At the TEM scale, the samples show a continuous range of variability both in terms of composition and in radiation damage, and the amount of radiation damage is directly correlated with the U-content. Areas with high U-content and highly damaged show crystalline, randomly oriented nanoparticles that are interpreted as decomposition products of the metamictization process. On the other hand, areas with lower U-content and radiation dose contained within  $0.7 \times 10^{16}$   $\alpha$ -event/mg, although severely damaged, still preserve single-crystal appearance. Such areas, noticeably consisting of relicts of the original samarskite structure, were deeply investigated by electron diffraction techniques. Surprisingly, the retrieved crystal structure of untreated samarskite is consistent with aeschynite and not with ixiolite (or columbite), as believed so far after X-ray diffraction experiments on annealed samples. In particular, the resolved structure is a niobio-aeschynite-(Y), with *Pnma* space group, cell parameters  $a = 10.804(1)$ ,  $b = 7.680(1)$ ,  $c = 5.103(1)$  Å, and composition  $(Y_{0.53}Fe_{0.22}Ca_{0.10}U_{0.09}Mn_{0.07})_{\Sigma=1}(Nb_{1.07}Ti_{0.47}Fe_{0.34}Ta_{0.07}W_{0.06})_{\Sigma=2}O_6$ . If this finding can be confirmed and extended to the other members of the group [namely samarskite-(Yb), calciosamarskite, and ishikawaite], then the samarskite mineral group should be considered no longer as an independent mineral group but as part of the aeschynite group of minerals.

It is finally suggested that the rare crystalline sub-micrometric ixiolite domains, occasionally spotted in the sample by TEM, or the nanoparticles detected in highly metamict areas interpreted as decomposition product of the metamictization process, which may have in fact the ixiolite structure, act as seeds during annealing, leading to the detection of ixiolite peaks in the X-ray powder diffractograms.

**Keywords:** Samarskite-(Y), niobioaeschynite-(Y), TEM, electron diffraction tomography

### INTRODUCTION

Most niobium-tantalum-titanium oxide minerals, common accessory minerals of granitic pegmatites, contain yttrium, rare earths, iron, and manganese, together with relatively high amounts of radioactive elements such as uranium and thorium, whose decay causes their structure to become metamict over geological times. As a consequence, the identification of these minerals is not trivial, since many of them are so structurally compromised by radiation damage that their crystallographic determination is impossible. Other diagnostic features may be either not present (e.g., crystal forms, cleavage), common to several minerals (e.g., surface luster, color), or heavily altered by the metamictization process (e.g., birefringence). As such, phase identification is commonly done on the basis of mineral-chemistry alone.

However, especially for some oxide minerals where yttrium is the dominant metal, mineral identification via compositional data alone is often ambiguous, and over time has given origin to confusion in their naming, systematics, and crystal chemistry (e.g., Ewing 1976; Ercit 2005; Škoda and Novák 2007). In fact, many diverse mineral groups show compositional overlapping, e.g., fergusonite vs. samarskite and euxenite vs. aeschynite. There are doubts about the proper cation site assignment, which is distinctive for some minerals, as well as about the knowledge of the valence state of iron and uranium, which is impossible to determine by electron microprobe, i.e., the most common analytical technique in mineral sciences. Moreover, the presence of additional, partially occupied sites that originate from the metamictization process, further complicate the task (Bonazzi and Menchetti 1999).

For these reasons, the identification of metamict minerals is usually done through X-ray diffraction of recovered material after heating and recrystallization at high temperature. Also in

\* E-mail: giancarlo.capitani@unimib.it

this case, however, several problems arise. First, the chemical composition of the metamict mineral may have experienced compositional changes, during geological times, due to infiltration of metasomatic fluids, which may find a preferential pathway and a more reactive exchange medium in the amorphous regions (e.g., Bonazzi et al. 2006). Second, the annealed material is usually polyphasic, due to the presence of crystalline inclusions in the metamict sample that act as seeds, and the related additional peaks complicate the interpretation of the powder diffraction pattern (e.g., Sugitani et al. 1984; Tomašić et al. 2010). Moreover, these additional phases withdraw from the system elements that become no longer available for the main phase, which may develop as a phase inconsistent with the original mineral.

In this paper, we employed transmission electron microscopy (TEM), energy-dispersive spectroscopy (EDS), and electron diffraction tomography (EDT) for characterizing a metamict mineral from the Garnet Codera dike pegmatite (Central Italian Alps), whose identification was doubtful after wavelength-dispersive (WDS) electron microprobe (EMP) analyses and that was amorphous at the single-crystal diffractometer. Nonetheless, as often observed for metamict minerals (e.g., Capitani et al. 2000; Bonazzi et al. 2006, 2009), the investigated sample shows nanosized domains, coherently oriented, that represent remnants of the original structure. Thanks to the strong interaction between accelerated electrons and matter,  $10^3$ – $10^4$  times greater than for X-rays, small volumes of diffracting material are sufficient to collect instantaneously an electron diffraction pattern. It was therefore possible to collect from single nanosized domains punctual chemical analyses and 3D electron diffraction data sets that allowed ab-initio crystal structure determination and thus an unambiguous identification of the metamict sample as aeschynite-(Y).

### THE CODERA VALLEY PEGMATITE

The studied (Y-REE-U-Th)-(Nb-Ta-Ti) oxides occur in a pegmatite named Garnet Codera pegmatite. This pegmatite belongs to swarms of pegmatite dikes cropping out along the ancient glacial circle located in the upper Codera Valley (Central Italian Alps) that intrude both the main granodiorite body and the outer thin tonalite rim of the Masino-Bregaglia pluton (Guastoni et al. 2014). Dikes were emplaced during the syn-magmatic stage above 500 °C, which was characterized by a pervasive solid-state foliation and circulation of late-stage hydrothermal fluids. Crosscutting relationships indicate the presence of more than a single generation of pegmatite dikes. U-Th-Pb dating on monazite and xenotime indicate an average emplacement age of 25–26 Ma (Guastoni, in preparation).

The Garnet Codera dike crops out for 30 m, reaches up to 3 m in width, and shows boudins and lobate structures along the contacts with the enclosing rocks. It shows symmetric core-

border zoning in terms of mineral assemblage, with the core composed by coarse-grained (pluridecimeteric) vitreous smoky quartz and decimeteric white K-feldspar perthite crystals. Both these minerals are elongated along the strike of the dike due to the effect of the intense ductile deformation that occurred during emplacement. In the core zone, accessory minerals like red garnet and beryl “aquamarine” crystals are common. The wall-intermediate zone is mainly composed of K-feldspar and graphic quartz+K-feldspar textures are locally predominant. In this portion, granular black magnetite and layers of millimetric trapezohedral red spessartine are also present.

The border zone is composed by medium-grained (pluricentimeteric) white K-feldspar, quartz and biotite flakes that developed comb textures. In this area, several REE-U bearing minerals were described, including (Y-REE-U-Th)-(Nb-Ta-Ti) oxides, uraninite, monazite-(Ce), and zircon (Guastoni et al. 2014). The (Y-REE-U-Th)-(Nb-Ta-Ti) oxides include columbite-(Fe), euxenite-(Y), and other compositionally related oxides, possibly belonging to the samarskite group minerals, whose definitive identification could not be ascertained due to their metamict state. These oxides occur as black to reddish-brown, platy or prismatic crystals, with conchoidal fracture and vitreous luster and up to 1 cm in length.

### SAMARSKITE AND RELATED (Y-REE-U-Th)-(Nb-Ta-Ti) OXIDES

The outstanding features of the (Y-REE-U-Th)-(Nb-Ta-Ti) oxides relevant for the present study are briefly reported below and summarized in Table 1. Aeschynite and euxenite groups have the general formula  $AB_2O_6$ , where A is eightfold coordinated in a typical square antiprism and mostly occupied by Y, REE, Ca, and U; and B is sixfold coordinated and mostly occupied by Ti, Nb, and Ta. Both structures are orthorhombic, but stacking of the  $BO_6$  octahedra is different leading to the *Pbnm* space group in aeschynite and to the *Pbcn* space group in euxenite. In particular, in the aeschynite structure, pairs of edge-sharing  $BO_6$  octahedra are connected by corners to form double chains running in a zig-zag pattern along the *b* axis (Aleksandrov 1962). In the euxenite structure, the  $BO_6$  octahedra form double layers stacked parallel to the *c* axis, joined both by edge and corner-sharing (Weitzel and Schröcke 1980). Annealing experiments on aeschynite-(Y) evidence the beginning of a phase transition toward euxenite at 800 °C (Bonazzi et al. 2002; Tomašić et al. 2004). The aeschynite structure shows a preference for larger A cations than the euxenite structure. Different aeschynite and euxenite mineral members are distinguished by the dominant A and B cations.

The currently accepted structural formula of samarskite is  $ABO_4$ , with A mostly occupied by Y, REE, Ca, U,  $Fe^{2+}$ , and  $Fe^{3+}$ ; and B mostly occupied by Ta, Nb, and Ti. Iron is usually reported as a subordinate A cation, although some studies place  $Fe^{3+}$  in the

**TABLE 1.** (Y,REE,U,Th)-(Nb,Ta,Ti) metamict oxides relevant for the mineral association occurring in the Garnet Codera dike samples

| Mineral name        | Ideal chemical formula               | Space group     | <i>a</i> (Å) | <i>b</i> (Å) | <i>c</i> (Å) | References                  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Aeschynite-(Y)      | Y(Ti,Nb) <sub>2</sub> O <sub>6</sub> | <i>Pbnm</i>     | 5.194(2)     | 10.930(3)    | 7.386(2)     | Tomašić et al. (2004)       |
| Nioboaeschynite-(Y) | Y(Nb,Ti) <sub>2</sub> O <sub>6</sub> | <i>Pbnm</i>     | 5.279(3)     | 10.966(5)    | 7.443(3)     | Bermanec et al. (2008)      |
| Euxenite-(Y)        | Y(Nb,Ti) <sub>2</sub> O <sub>6</sub> | <i>Pbcn</i>     | 14.643(2)    | 5.553(1)     | 5.195(1)     | Weitzel and Schröcke (1980) |
| Polycrase-(Y)       | Y(Ti,Nb) <sub>2</sub> O <sub>6</sub> | <i>Pbcn</i>     | 14.667(1)    | 5.593(1)     | 5.189(1)     | Johnsen et al. (1999)       |
| Samaraskite-(Y)     | (Y,Ca,Fe)NbO <sub>4</sub>            | <i>Pbcn</i> (?) | 5.687(4)     | 4.925(2)     | 5.210(4)     | Sugitani et al. (1985)      |
| Ishikawaite         | (U,Fe,Y,Ca)NbO <sub>4</sub>          | <i>Pbcn</i> (?) | 5.664(6)     | 4.940(3)     | 5.173(7)     | Sugitani et al. (1985)      |

B-site (Warner and Ewing 1993). All minerals of the samarskite group have Nb as dominant cation on the B-site, thus the different member of the group can be mutually distinguished by the dominant A-site cation (Hanson et al. 1999). The REE-dominant member is usually samarskite-(Y), even if an ytterbium-dominant samarskite-(Yb) has also been reported (Simmons et al. 2006). The member with uranium dominant at the A-site is ishkawaite, and the calcium-dominant one is calciosamarskite.

For none of these minerals the crystal structure has been thoughtfully described. According to the available data, a low-temperature samarskite modification and a high-temperature samarskite modification may be possible. On the basis of chemical composition, orthorhombic morphology preserved in rare euhedral samples (Palache et al. 1944), and X-ray diffraction (XRD) data on natural and synthetic samples annealed at 550 °C (Sugitani et al. 1984, 1985), the low-temperature modification is commonly assumed to have the columbite- or ixiolite-type structure and most likely crystallizes in *Pbcn* space group. The high-temperature samarskite is assumed to have the wolframite-type structure and space group *P2/c*, as revealed by XRD patterns of samples annealed at temperatures around 1000 °C (Komkov 1965; Sugitani et al. 1985). Remarkably, only octahedral cation sites are present in ixiolite, columbite, and wolframite, an arguably close packing for large radius elements like Y, REE, Th, and U.

## EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Two mounts from the same U-bearing sample from the Garnet Codera dike were prepared for TEM-EDS investigations. The crystal aggregates were embedded in epoxy, polished on one side, and carbon coated. At this stage, samples were observed at the SEM with the aim to carry out a map to guide the further preparation of the TEM foils. A Tescan Vega TS 5136XM SEM, equipped with an EDAX Genesis 4000XMS EDS system, made available at the Earth and Environmental Sciences Department of the University of Milano-Bicocca, was used for this step. Spot analyses and compositional profiles were acquired at 20 keV on specific microstructures evidenced by BSE images. The standardless method (i.e., theoretical K-factors) and the ZAF correction method were employed for semi-quantitative analysis.

Quantitative chemical composition of (Y-REE-U-Th)-(Nb-Ta-Ti) oxides were determined using a Cameca-Camebax SX50 wavelength-dispersive electron microprobe at the University of Padova, operating at 20 keV with probe current of 20 nA and probe diameter of ~1 µm. Counting times were 10 and 5 s at peak position and background for major elements, and 20 and 10 s at peak position and background for minor elements. X-ray counts were converted to oxide wt% using the PAP correction program supplied by Cameca (Pouchou and Pichoir 1991). Peak overlaps within the REE were minimized by using the *Lβ* peak position for Nd and *Lα* peak positions for all the other elements. The following natural and synthetic standards, spectral lines, and analyzing crystals were used: wollastonite (CaK $\alpha$ , TAP), MgO (MgK $\alpha$ , TAP), MnTiO<sub>3</sub> (MnK $\alpha$ , LiF), ScPO<sub>4</sub> (ScK $\alpha$ , LiF), TiO<sub>2</sub> (TiK $\alpha$ , TAP), Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (FeK $\alpha$ , LiF), Zr-Y-REE-silicates (YLa, REEL $\alpha$ , and NdL $\beta$ , LiF), synthetic UO<sub>2</sub> and ThO<sub>2</sub> (UM $\alpha$  and ThM $\alpha$ , PET), metallic Nb (NbL $\alpha$ , PET), and metallic Ta, Sn, and W (TaL $\alpha$ , SnL $\alpha$ , and WL $\alpha$ , LiF). In all examined Nb-Ta oxides, the concentrations of Al, Zr, Ba, Pb, La, and Ce were found to be below the limits of detection (0.05 wt%), while Tb and Ho were not analyzed. Analytical precision is estimated to within 1% for major elements and 5% for minor elements.

After this step, the two mounts were sectioned parallel to the polished surface with a diamond wheel, mechanically milled down to 30 µm, polished on the rough side and then ion milled down to electron transparency with a Gatan PIPS instrument made available at the Earth Science Department of the University of Milan.

TEM investigations were performed at the Department of Physical Sciences, Earth and Environment of the University of Siena with a Jeol JEM 2010 instrument operating at 200 keV and equipped with an Oxford ISIS EDS system. Samples were first carbon coated to avoid charging during observation, and later mounted on a JEOL double tilt holder. The standardless EDS method and the Cliff Lorimer approximation (Cliff and Lorimer 1975) were employed for semi-quantitative

analysis. The relative error was calculated above 50% for concentrations below 0.5 wt%. The latter should thus be considered the TEM-EDS detection limit and, in general, oxides concentrations below 1 wt% should be considered with caution. Either photographic films (Kodak SO-163) or a slow-scan CDD camera (Olympus Tengra 2k × 2k × 14 bit) were used for image acquisition.

Electron diffraction tomography (for details on the EDT method, see Kolb et al. 2007; Mugnaioli 2015 and references therein) was performed with the same instrument in selected-area electron diffraction (SAED) mode. Two acquisitions from the same area were performed, tilting the specimen holder in steps of 1°, respectively around the  $\alpha$ - and  $\beta$ -tilt axes through the JEOL computer interface. Tilt ranges for the two acquisitions were  $-30/+25^\circ$  and  $-25/+17^\circ$ . Precession was performed using a SpinningStar precession device from NanoMEGAS and keeping the precession angle at 1°. Precession allows reducing dynamical effects of electron diffraction and integrates over the whole volume of reflection intensity (Vincent and Midgley 1994; Mugnaioli et al. 2009a). Diffraction patterns were acquired digitally and 3D reconstructed using the ADT3D software (Kolb et al. 2011) and in-house developed routines. Reflection intensities from the two data sets collected on the same sample area were integrated separately and merged into a single *hkl* file with no scale factor.

Cell determination was performed using the sole  $\alpha$ -tilt data set, because the  $\beta$ -tilt reconstruction was found to be distorted, probably because the nominal tilt value does not rightly correspond to the actual sample tilt. Intensity integration, however, is not affected by  $\beta$ -tilt error. Cell parameters were subsequently refined on the basis of in-zone oriented SAED patterns acquired on the same sample after it was coated with a thin nanocrystalline Au film. The diffraction rings produced by the Au film were then used as an internal standard to rescale the data and to correct them for elliptical distortion (Capitani et al. 2006; Mugnaioli et al. 2009b; Mitchell 2015).


Structure solution was obtained ab initio by direct methods as implemented in the SIR2014 program (Burla et al. 2015) employing reflections up to 0.8 Å resolution and adopting a fully kinematical approximation ( $I_{\text{hkl}} \sim F_{\text{hkl}}^2$ ). Structure refinement was performed with the least-squares method as implemented in the SHELX-97 program (Sheldrick 1997). Since electron scattering factors for Y, Nb, and W are not available, Zr scattering factors were used for Y, Mo scattering factors for Nb, and Ta scattering factors for W.

## RESULTS

### Mineral association and microstructure (SEM-EDS results)

The Garnet Codera dike samples were first investigated by SEM-EDS techniques. SEM images with BSE detector of the polished samples reveal that they are made of aggregates of at least three different phases. EDS semi-quantitative analyses are consistent with a mineral association made of ilmenite-pyrophanite solid solution [with approximate composition  $(\text{Ti}_{1.95}\text{Fe}_{1.17}\text{Mn}_{0.88})_{\Sigma=4}\text{O}_6$ ], Hf-bearing zircon [ $(\text{Zr}_{0.90}\text{Hf}_{0.07}\text{Si}_{1.04})_{\Sigma=2}\text{O}_4$ ], and an U-bearing phase (Fig. 1a). Higher magnification images of the U-bearing phase reveal that it is pervasively zoned with two domains clearly distinct on the basis of the BSE contrast (Fig. 1b).

Several spot analyses acquired in the two domains of the U-bearing phase (data not shown) revealed that the different contrast is related to substitution of (U+Th) with respect to (Y+REE), the latter more abundant in the darkest regions, in agreement with their lower mean atom weights. The compositional changes between the two domains were further investigated by EDS line scans across their interface. A representative result is reported in Figure 2. From this plot emerges clearly that moving across the interface from the brighter region to the darker gray region there is a net decrease of U and Mn and a net increase of (Y+Ta). Less palpable are a slight decrease of Th and a slight increase of Dy and Ti, whereas Nb and Fe seem roughly constant across the interface. The exchange vector that can be confidently derived at this stage is






**FIGURE 1.** SEM-BSE images of a polished section of sample 2 (sample 1 shows analogous microstructure with similar compositions). (a) Low-magnification image showing the sample embedded in epoxy (peripheral black contrast). At least three different phases can be recognized on the basis of BSE contrast: ilmenite-pyrophanite, occupying the widest, dark gray area; Hf-bearing zircon, with intermediate gray contrast; and an U-bearing phase, with the brightest contrast. (b) High-magnification image of the area enclosed within the black rectangle in a where the zoning affecting the U-bearing phase can be appreciated. A-A' trace of the line scan (see Fig. 2).




**FIGURE 2.** Representative compositional line scan across the two domains of the U-bearing phase (see Fig. 1b for locating the line scan). The line scan is composed of 103 points equally spaced within  $\sim 54 \mu\text{m}$ , each point counted for 10 s. The gray band represents the interface between the brighter (left) and the darker domain (right). (Color online.)

However, this exchange vector is problematic, since it involves the exchange of two A-cations for one A-cation and one B-cation.

#### Mineral-chemistry of the U-bearing phase and radiation dose (EMP-WDS results)

Representative chemical analyses of the U-bearing phases of the Garnet Codera dike samples are reported in Table 2. Although the presence of minor hydroxyls in these minerals cannot be excluded, we assumed that low-analytical totals are attributed to adsorbed molecular water, a common feature of metamict minerals (Ewing 1975; Simmons et al. 2006). Since

this adsorbed water is not crystallographically bounded, atoms are recalculated on an anhydrous basis of 6 O atoms. The excess cation sums were considered for the calculation of  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  (Droop 1987), leading to 3.0 cations pfu. Cation assignment to the A- and B-sites was done following Warner and Ewing (1993). Data show a quite large chemical variability, especially as regard the content of U, which appears inversely correlated with Y plus Ta. The Fe content is exceptionally high for this type of minerals, but relatively constant, as well as is Nb. Cation distribution, assuming  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  occupying the A-site and  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  the B-site, shows a slight excess of A-site cations (Mg, Ca, Sc, Mn,  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ , Y, Sn, REE, Th, U) and a slight deficiency of B-site cations (Ti,  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$ ,

**TABLE 2.** Representative WDS microprobe analyses (oxide %) of the U-bearing phases found in the Garnet Codera dike

|                                     | Darker BSE contrast |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | Brighter BSE contrast |       |       |       |       |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                     | G4f                 | G4a   | G4g   | G4b   | G4c   | G4e   | G4h   | G4d   | G1d                   | G1e   | G1b   | G1c   | G1a   |
| MgO                                 | 0.14                | 0.09  | 0.08  | 0.13  | 0.07  | 0.07  | 0.16  | 0.13  | 0.10                  | 0.12  | 0.10  | 0.12  | 0.11  |
| CaO                                 | 0.31                | 0.37  | 0.42  | 0.41  | 0.33  | 0.38  | 0.26  | 0.24  | 0.26                  | 0.18  | 0.28  | 0.21  | 0.21  |
| Sc <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>      | 0.52                | 0.50  | 0.45  | 0.40  | 0.42  | 0.54  | 0.50  | 0.46  | 0.56                  | 0.56  | 0.66  | 0.46  | 0.36  |
| TiO <sub>2</sub>                    | 3.88                | 3.74  | 3.66  | 3.83  | 4.48  | 4.21  | 4.16  | 3.75  | 3.07                  | 4.35  | 4.05  | 3.82  | 3.92  |
| MnO                                 | 1.51                | 1.53  | 1.20  | 1.49  | 1.44  | 1.52  | 1.19  | 1.12  | 1.16                  | 1.00  | 1.15  | 1.21  | 1.40  |
| FeO                                 | 4.24                | 4.66  | 6.97  | 4.77  | 5.00  | 4.41  | 4.15  | 4.38  | 4.50                  | 4.37  | 3.86  | 4.18  | 5.01  |
| Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>      | 3.55                | 3.10  | 0.37  | 3.03  | 3.10  | 3.72  | 4.58  | 4.74  | 5.03                  | 5.32  | 6.06  | 5.48  | 4.16  |
| Y <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>       | 10.70               | 10.50 | 9.90  | 10.16 | 9.89  | 9.98  | 9.97  | 9.77  | 8.33                  | 8.91  | 8.95  | 6.93  | 6.60  |
| Nb <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>      | 34.79               | 34.56 | 37.92 | 35.51 | 34.89 | 35.40 | 36.16 | 37.29 | 36.01                 | 34.48 | 36.03 | 36.77 | 37.28 |
| SnO <sub>2</sub>                    | 1.98                | 2.05  | 1.92  | 1.97  | 1.88  | 1.96  | 1.24  | 1.03  | 1.01                  | 0.97  | 1.05  | 1.29  | 1.36  |
| Ta <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>      | 16.93               | 17.23 | 16.71 | 16.53 | 16.90 | 16.78 | 14.03 | 12.59 | 13.74                 | 14.57 | 13.13 | 10.35 | 10.59 |
| WO <sub>3</sub>                     | 1.43                | 1.85  | 1.13  | 1.55  | 1.45  | 1.00  | 1.37  | 1.11  | 1.40                  | 1.76  | 1.81  | 0.63  | 0.70  |
| Nd <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>      | 0.98                | 1.15  | 0.99  | 1.01  | 1.10  | 1.06  | 1.17  | 0.99  | 1.09                  | 1.10  | 1.12  | 1.15  | 1.18  |
| Sm <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>      | 0.53                | 0.55  | 0.60  | 0.52  | 0.51  | 0.61  | 0.71  | 0.54  | 0.57                  | 0.51  | 0.67  | 0.84  | 0.84  |
| Gd <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>      | 1.60                | 1.35  | 1.44  | 1.60  | 1.12  | 1.13  | 1.15  | 1.12  | 1.10                  | 0.88  | 0.98  | 1.18  | 0.98  |
| Dy <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>      | 1.00                | 0.89  | 0.93  | 0.87  | 0.94  | 1.46  | 1.14  | 1.09  | 1.42                  | 1.12  | 0.96  | 1.42  | 1.28  |
| Yb <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>      | 0.43                | 0.46  | 0.53  | 0.68  | 0.61  | 0.33  | 0.92  | 0.98  | 0.93                  | 0.93  | 1.07  | 0.59  | 0.55  |
| ThO <sub>2</sub>                    | 1.29                | 1.63  | 1.32  | 1.59  | 1.45  | 1.41  | 1.28  | 1.36  | 1.43                  | 1.54  | 1.59  | 1.66  | 1.75  |
| UO <sub>2</sub>                     | 10.17               | 10.26 | 10.63 | 10.81 | 11.08 | 11.15 | 11.74 | 12.11 | 15.54                 | 15.56 | 15.81 | 20.36 | 21.14 |
| Total                               | 95.98               | 96.46 | 97.17 | 96.86 | 96.66 | 97.11 | 95.88 | 94.80 | 97.24                 | 98.24 | 99.33 | 98.62 | 99.41 |
| Mg                                  | 0.015               | 0.010 | 0.008 | 0.013 | 0.007 | 0.007 | 0.017 | 0.014 | 0.011                 | 0.012 | 0.010 | 0.012 | 0.011 |
| Ca                                  | 0.024               | 0.028 | 0.031 | 0.031 | 0.025 | 0.028 | 0.019 | 0.018 | 0.020                 | 0.014 | 0.021 | 0.016 | 0.016 |
| Sc                                  | 0.032               | 0.031 | 0.028 | 0.024 | 0.025 | 0.032 | 0.030 | 0.028 | 0.035                 | 0.034 | 0.039 | 0.028 | 0.022 |
| Mn                                  | 0.090               | 0.091 | 0.071 | 0.088 | 0.085 | 0.089 | 0.071 | 0.067 | 0.069                 | 0.059 | 0.067 | 0.072 | 0.083 |
| Fe <sup>2+</sup>                    | 0.250               | 0.274 | 0.407 | 0.279 | 0.293 | 0.256 | 0.242 | 0.258 | 0.266                 | 0.254 | 0.221 | 0.245 | 0.293 |
| Y                                   | 0.400               | 0.393 | 0.367 | 0.379 | 0.368 | 0.369 | 0.371 | 0.366 | 0.313                 | 0.330 | 0.326 | 0.259 | 0.246 |
| Sn                                  | 0.055               | 0.058 | 0.053 | 0.055 | 0.053 | 0.054 | 0.035 | 0.029 | 0.028                 | 0.027 | 0.029 | 0.036 | 0.038 |
| Nd                                  | 0.025               | 0.029 | 0.025 | 0.025 | 0.027 | 0.026 | 0.029 | 0.025 | 0.027                 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.029 | 0.030 |
| Sm                                  | 0.013               | 0.013 | 0.014 | 0.013 | 0.012 | 0.015 | 0.017 | 0.013 | 0.014                 | 0.012 | 0.016 | 0.020 | 0.020 |
| Gd                                  | 0.037               | 0.032 | 0.033 | 0.037 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.027 | 0.026 | 0.026                 | 0.020 | 0.022 | 0.028 | 0.023 |
| Dy                                  | 0.023               | 0.020 | 0.021 | 0.020 | 0.021 | 0.033 | 0.026 | 0.025 | 0.032                 | 0.025 | 0.021 | 0.032 | 0.029 |
| Yb                                  | 0.009               | 0.010 | 0.011 | 0.014 | 0.013 | 0.007 | 0.020 | 0.021 | 0.020                 | 0.020 | 0.022 | 0.013 | 0.012 |
| Th                                  | 0.021               | 0.026 | 0.021 | 0.025 | 0.023 | 0.022 | 0.020 | 0.022 | 0.023                 | 0.024 | 0.025 | 0.026 | 0.028 |
| U                                   | 0.159               | 0.161 | 0.165 | 0.168 | 0.172 | 0.172 | 0.183 | 0.190 | 0.244                 | 0.241 | 0.241 | 0.318 | 0.329 |
| Σ <sub>A</sub>                      | 1.151               | 1.175 | 1.256 | 1.172 | 1.151 | 1.138 | 1.106 | 1.101 | 1.129                 | 1.100 | 1.087 | 1.133 | 1.180 |
| Ti                                  | 0.205               | 0.198 | 0.192 | 0.202 | 0.236 | 0.220 | 0.219 | 0.199 | 0.163                 | 0.228 | 0.209 | 0.202 | 0.207 |
| Fe <sup>3+</sup>                    | 0.188               | 0.164 | 0.019 | 0.160 | 0.163 | 0.195 | 0.241 | 0.251 | 0.267                 | 0.279 | 0.312 | 0.289 | 0.219 |
| Nb                                  | 1.106               | 1.100 | 1.195 | 1.124 | 1.103 | 1.112 | 1.142 | 1.187 | 1.151                 | 1.085 | 1.115 | 1.167 | 1.180 |
| Ta                                  | 0.324               | 0.330 | 0.317 | 0.315 | 0.321 | 0.317 | 0.267 | 0.241 | 0.264                 | 0.276 | 0.244 | 0.198 | 0.202 |
| W                                   | 0.026               | 0.034 | 0.020 | 0.028 | 0.026 | 0.018 | 0.025 | 0.020 | 0.026                 | 0.032 | 0.032 | 0.011 | 0.013 |
| Σ <sub>B</sub>                      | 1.849               | 1.825 | 1.744 | 1.828 | 1.849 | 1.862 | 1.894 | 1.899 | 1.871                 | 1.900 | 1.913 | 1.867 | 1.820 |
| D (×10 <sup>16</sup> ) <sup>a</sup> | 1.12                | 1.13  | 1.15  | 1.18  | 1.21  | 1.21  | 1.28  | 1.34  | 1.67                  | 1.66  | 1.67  | 2.15  | 2.22  |
| dpa <sup>b</sup>                    | 1.25                | 1.27  | 1.30  | 1.33  | 1.36  | 1.36  | 1.43  | 1.49  | 1.91                  | 1.88  | 1.88  | 2.47  | 2.56  |

Notes: Atom per formula unit recalculated on the basis of 6 O atoms. Cations sum to 3 apfu after Fe<sup>3+</sup> recalculation (Droop 1987). The dose (*D*, α-decay event per mg) and the related displacements per atom (dpa) calculated at each spot analysis are also reported. Analyses are ordered for increasing UO<sub>2</sub> content and distinguished on the basis of the BSE contrast.

<sup>a</sup> Dose calculated assuming the total uranium detected with the microprobe as <sup>238</sup>U and the total Th as <sup>232</sup>Th:  $D = 8N_{238} \left( e^{t/\tau_{238}} - 1 \right) + 6N_{232} \left( e^{t/\tau_{232}} - 1 \right)$ , where  $N_{238}$  and  $N_{232}$  are the number of atoms/mg of <sup>238</sup>U and <sup>232</sup>Th,  $\tau_{238}$  and  $\tau_{232}$  the half-lives of <sup>238</sup>U and <sup>232</sup>Th, and *t* the geologic age (Lumpkin and Ewing 1986).

<sup>b</sup> dpa were calculated assuming 1500 displacements per α-decay event:  $dpa = 1500DM/N_{\beta}N_A$ , where *M* is the molecular weight in mg, *N<sub>t</sub>* the number of atoms per formula unit, and *N<sub>A</sub>* the Avogadro's number (Lumpkin and Ewing 1986).

Nb, Ta, W), suggesting that additional A-cations, other than Fe<sup>3+</sup>, may in part occupy the B-site.

All the (Y,REE,U,Th)-(Nb,Ta,Ti) oxides reported in Table 1 fit the M:O = 1:2 stoichiometry. With the aim to classify the mineral on the basis of the chemical composition, the canonical discriminant analysis proposed by Ercit (2005) was applied. According to this classification method, the compositions of the analyzed oxides, either from the darker or the brighter regions, fall in the samarskite field (Fig. 3a). Further distinction within this group can be done on the basis of a ternary diagram concerning the A-site occupancy (Hanson et al. 1999). According to this diagram, the analyzed samples fall in the field of samarskite-(Y) (Fig. 3b). It is worth noting, however, that the (Y+REE) ↔ (U+Th) substitution is such to move the compositions of the brighter regions at the limit of the ishikawaite field.

According to Lumpkin and Ewing (1988), in the absence of isotope measurements, the α-decay dose (*D*) of the sample can be calculated from the EMP analyses assuming the total U measured as <sup>238</sup>U and the total Th as <sup>232</sup>Th:

$$D = 8N_{238} \left( e^{t/\tau_{238}} - 1 \right) + 6N_{232} \left( e^{t/\tau_{232}} - 1 \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $N_{238}$  and  $N_{232}$  are the number of atoms/mg of <sup>238</sup>U and <sup>232</sup>Th,  $\tau_{238}$  and  $\tau_{232}$  the half-lives of <sup>238</sup>U and <sup>232</sup>Th, and *t* the geologic age (25.5×10<sup>6</sup> yrs, Guastoni et al., in preparation). The corresponding number of displacements per atoms (dpa), assuming 1500 displacements per α-decay event, can be calculated as:

$$dpa = 1500DM/N_{\beta}N_A \quad (3)$$




**FIGURE 3.** (a) Plot of the WDS microprobe compositions on the canonical variable diagram of Ercit (2005).  $CV1 = 0.106 \text{ Ca} - 0.077 (\text{Fe}^{2+} + \text{Fe}^{3+} + \text{Mn}) + 0.220 \text{ Y} + 0.280 (\text{Nd} + \text{Sm}) + 0.137 (\text{Gd} + \text{Dy} + \text{Yb}) + 0.100 \text{ U} + 0.304 \text{ Ti} + 0.097 \text{ Nb} + 0.109 (\text{Ta} + \text{W}) - 12.81 (\text{oxide wt\%})$ ;  $CV2 = -0.113 \text{ Ca} - 0.371 (\text{Fe}^{2+} + \text{Fe}^{3+} + \text{Mn}) - 0.395 \text{ Y} - 0.280 (\text{Nd} + \text{Sm}) - 0.265 (\text{Gd} + \text{Dy} + \text{Yb}) - 0.182 \text{ U} - 0.085 \text{ Ti} - 0.166 \text{ Nb} - 0.146 (\text{Ta} + \text{W}) + 17.29 (\text{oxide wt\%})$ . Dark diamonds = point analyses on BSE darker regions; white diamonds = point analyses on BSE brighter regions. (b) Ternary diagrams for the samarskite group minerals. From a compositional point of view, the U-bearing phases detected in the Codera dike samples can be classified as samarskite-(Y).

where  $M$  is the molecular weight in mg,  $N_f$  the number of atoms per formula unit, and  $N_a$  the Avogadro's number. From Table 2 it turns out that  $D$  ranges from  $1.1 \times 10^{16}$  to  $1.3 \times 10^{16}$   $\alpha$ -decay events/mg for areas with lower U content and darker BSE contrast, and from  $1.7 \times 10^{16}$  to  $2.2 \times 10^{16}$   $\alpha$ -decay events/mg for U richer areas with brighter BSE contrast. Corresponding dpa ranges are 1.3–1.5 and 1.9–2.6, respectively.

### Crystallinity and crystal-chemistry (TEM-EDS results)

The structural state of the U-bearing phase as function of the U-content across the interface detected in SEM-BSE images was deeply investigated by TEM. At the TEM scale, a distinct separation between what was a clearly distinct bright-gray or dark-gray region in SEM-BSE images could not be recognized, either in terms of composition or crystallinity. Rather a continuous variation in chemical content and degree of crystallinity was found, with a great prevalence of material lacking long-range order. Indeed, bright-field images repeatedly show the spotty contrast typical of metamict materials.

Depending on the degree of radiation damage, the corresponding diffraction patterns are either typical of single-crystal long-range ordered material, where the structural damage is low (Fig. 4, lower line), or contain diffuse diffraction rings typical of amorphous material, where the structural damage is high (top line). Interestingly, higher resolution images acquired in these latter regions show nanoparticles with random orientation embedded within an amorphous matrix (third column). The nanoparticles probably represent a decomposition product of the radiation-induced amorphization (metamictization) process. Unfortunately, it was not possible to identify the mineral phase the nanoparticles belong to, since the error involved in the measurement of the lattice fringe distances was such that the latter could not be used as discriminant among potential candidates.

In other words, ixiolite and aeschynite with composition close to the studied system have their most “dense” lattice planes at  $2.98\text{--}3.03 \text{ \AA} (111)_{\text{Ixi}}$ ,  $\sim 2.94 (121)_{\text{Aes}}$ , and  $\sim 3.00 \text{ \AA} (301)_{\text{Aes}}$ , which are too close and even partially overlapped and thus impossible to be safely distinguished in high-resolution images.

High-resolution images of areas with low-radiation damage show that here the original crystal structure is preserved. Such crystalline areas generally have a consistent orientation over a range of several tens of nanometers, even if small lattice rotations and bending are locally observed and nanosized domains lacking of long-range order are also present. Of course, a continuous range of intermediate states between these two extremes occurs (Fig. 4, second line). As expected, the degree of crystallinity is inversely correlated with the U-content (last column).

TEM-EDS results of the U-bearing phase are reported in Table 3. Each column represents the mean of several, closely spaced spot analyses representative of zones with similar degree of crystallinity, as inferred from the related SAED patterns. All the elements detected at significant level with the WDS microprobe were considered in the first round of quantification. However, only elements found always or mostly above the  $2\sigma$  detection limit were considered in the quantification results.

Even if TEM-EDS analysis is not as accurate as WDS spectrometry—in the present case, for instance, Ti is overestimated and Ta underestimated—TEM-EDS analyses are internally consistent and some interesting hints can be inferred from Table 3. To facilitate comparison with WDS analyses, cations were normalized to 3; Fe was calculated as  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  and entirely assigned to the A-site, along with Ca, Mn, Y, and U; Ti, Nb, Ta, and W were assigned to the B-site. In this way, an excess of A-cations and a deficit of B-cations is detected. This unbalance almost completely cancels out if part of the iron is considered oxidized, as suggested by the WDS results, and attributed to the B-sites.





**FIGURE 4.** TEM images and EDS spectra at different regions of the metamict U-bearing phase detected in the Codera dike sample. Columns are organized as to show from left to right selected area diffraction patterns, bright-field images, high-resolutions images, and compositional spectra. The degree of radiation damage decreases from the top to the bottom row, corresponding to a decrease in radiogenic uranium content. Scale bar 100 nm in BF images and 10 nm in HR images.

This hypothesis is supported by the observation that Fe does not show any clear correlation with the other cations (Fig. 5), consistent with the fact that it can be present either as  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  in the A-site or as  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  in the B site, thus less constrained to the other cations abundances.

As regard the other cations, from the TEM-EDS analyses it is confirmed that U is inversely correlated with Y and emerge clearly that Ti is inversely correlated with Nb (Fig. 5). The exchange vector derived above can thus be tentatively refined as it follows:



This exchange vector does not consider other minor cations, namely Mg, Ca, Sc, Mn, and W, whose concentration is very close or below the detection limit for the current technique. TEM-EDS, in addition, cannot determine the oxidation state of some major elements, such as Fe, U, and Mn. For this reasons, the above exchange vector should be considered just as a gross

approximation of the real one.

From the comparison of the structural state as function of the U-content revealed by TEM with EMP data, it can be argued that radiation doses of the order of  $2.1\text{--}2.2 \times 10^{16}$   $\alpha$ -event/mg can make the structure completely amorphous, and that crystalline domains can be hardly preserved even in areas with radiation dose of the order of  $1.1 \times 10^{16}$   $\alpha$ -event/mg, the lowest limit calculated from EMP analyses. In fact, the radiation dose estimated from TEM-EDS analyses for domains that preserved the original structure (s. ahead) is  $0.7 \times 10^{16}$   $\alpha$ -event/mg at the maximum (Table 3).

#### Crystallography (EDT and in-zone SAED results)

It is well known (e.g., McLaren et al. 1994; Nasdala et al. 2006), and has been demonstrated for the present case, that metamict minerals often show a striking zoning involving radiogenic elements and that the original crystalline structure can be preserved in zones with lower radionuclide content. Even when the bulk sample results amorphous for single-crystal and powder X-ray diffraction, these submicrometric less-damaged

domains show coherent single-crystal diffraction patterns when illuminated by electrons.

Actually, conventional in-zone SAED patterns taken from coherent domains found inside the U-bearing phase of the Garnet Codera dike pegmatite have single-crystal appearance, despite some evidence of radiation-induced disorder, as ovoidal shape and splitting of the diffraction spots, caused by slight misorientation of adjoining, nanosized diffracting domains (Fig. 6). Distances and angles derived from these SAED patterns were consistent with the aeschynite-(Y) (Bonazzi and Menchetti 1999), and considering the composition, with niobioaeschnite-

(Y) (Bermanec et al. 2008).

To get more detailed crystallographic information about the precursor of the metamict phase, we investigated these relict crystalline areas by selected area electron diffraction tomography (SA-EDT) (relevant data collection and refinement parameters in Table 4). The 3D diffraction reconstruction clearly shows an orthorhombic unit cell with parameter ratio  $a:b:c \approx 2.1:1.5:1.0$ , and extinction symbol  $Pn-a$ , consistent with space groups  $Pn2_1a$  and  $Pnma$ .

To get accurate and precise unit-cell parameters, we sputtered a thin nanocrystalline Au film on the sample and we collected several in-zone SAED patterns from the less damaged zones of

**TABLE 3.** Average TEM-EDS analyses (oxide%) of U-bearing phase from the Garnet Codera dike sample

|                                | 66–68 | 84–88 | 11–12 | 69–71 | 78–80 | 49–50 | 75–77 | 72–74 |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| CaO                            | 2.00  | 1.76  | 1.61  | 1.04  | 2.24  | 0.36  | 3.22  | 2.62  |
| TiO <sub>2</sub>               | 9.45  | 10.04 | 11.00 | 10.53 | 9.70  | 10.91 | 16.89 | 16.01 |
| MnO                            | 0.51  | 0.64  | 1.45  | 1.47  | 1.79  | 2.48  | 2.75  | 2.83  |
| FeO                            | 12.71 | 12.41 | 11.76 | 6.45  | 6.77  | 11.79 | 5.62  | 10.11 |
| Y <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>  | 20.35 | 20.69 | 17.60 | 14.32 | 11.16 | 7.03  | 5.56  | 6.35  |
| Nb <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | 43.72 | 42.45 | 41.57 | 45.52 | 39.56 | 39.00 | 33.76 | 27.70 |
| Ta <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | 4.00  | 5.35  | 4.34  | 3.13  | 9.23  | 8.64  | 9.77  | 9.83  |
| WO <sub>3</sub>                | 5.49  | 3.82  | 3.88  | 3.46  | 5.59  | 2.37  | 2.63  | 3.56  |
| UO <sub>2</sub>                | 1.77  | 2.84  | 6.82  | 14.08 | 13.96 | 17.42 | 19.80 | 21.00 |
| Ca                             | 0.12  | 0.11  | 0.10  | 0.07  | 0.15  | 0.02  | 0.21  | 0.17  |
| Mn                             | 0.02  | 0.03  | 0.07  | 0.08  | 0.10  | 0.13  | 0.14  | 0.14  |
| Fe                             | 0.59  | 0.58  | 0.56  | 0.33  | 0.36  | 0.61  | 0.29  | 0.51  |
| Y                              | 0.60  | 0.62  | 0.53  | 0.47  | 0.37  | 0.23  | 0.18  | 0.20  |
| U                              | 0.02  | 0.04  | 0.09  | 0.19  | 0.20  | 0.24  | 0.27  | 0.28  |
| $\Sigma_A$                     | 1.36  | 1.37  | 1.34  | 1.14  | 1.17  | 1.23  | 1.09  | 1.31  |
| Ti                             | 0.40  | 0.42  | 0.47  | 0.49  | 0.46  | 0.50  | 0.77  | 0.72  |
| Nb                             | 1.10  | 1.07  | 1.07  | 1.27  | 1.13  | 1.08  | 0.94  | 0.75  |
| Ta                             | 0.06  | 0.08  | 0.07  | 0.05  | 0.16  | 0.14  | 0.16  | 0.16  |
| W                              | 0.08  | 0.06  | 0.06  | 0.05  | 0.09  | 0.04  | 0.04  | 0.06  |
| $\Sigma_B$                     | 1.64  | 1.63  | 1.66  | 1.86  | 1.83  | 1.77  | 1.91  | 1.69  |
| $D (\times 10^{19})$           | 0.18  | 0.29  | 0.68  | 1.44  | 1.43  | 1.76  | 2.01  | 2.11  |
| dpa                            | 0.17  | 0.27  | 0.66  | 1.47  | 1.50  | 1.82  | 2.06  | 2.14  |

Notes: Atoms per formula unit are recalculated on the basis of three cations. Each column refers to the average of 2–5 spot analyses carried out on closely spaced areas related to similar degree of crystallinity (the actual number of spots can be inferred from the labels). The dose ( $D$ ,  $\alpha$ -decay event per mg) and the related displacements per atom (dpa) are calculated for each average analysis. Analyses are ordered for increasing U-content. Relative error (Er%) < 4 for oxide concentrations > 20 wt%; Er% < 7 for wt% > 10; Er% < 11 for wt% > 5; Er% < 20 for wt% > 2; Er% < 30 for wt% > 1; Er% < 50 for wt% > 0.5. Dose and dpa calculated as in Table 2, but ignoring Th.




**FIGURE 5.** Plot of the TEM-EDS chemical analyses in several areas of the U-bearing phase ordered for increasing U-content. A clear correlation among Ti, U, Ca, Ta, and Mn is observable, as well as an anti-correlation of these elements with Nb and Y. Conversely, iron does not show any clear correlation. (Color online.)




**FIGURE 6.** Electron diffraction experiments on crystalline areas of the U-bearing phase. (a) SAED patterns collected with  $[1\bar{1}3]^*$  and (b)  $[101]^*$  incidence. Note the single-crystal appearance but also the splitting and rotational disorder observable in high-order reflections. (Indexing according to the cell determined with EDT). Reconstructed 3D diffraction space by EDT acquisition around  $\alpha$ -tilt, viewed along  $[010]^*$  (c) and  $[01\bar{1}]^*$  (d). Extinctions relative to the  $a$ -glide plane orthogonal to  $c^*$  and the  $n$ -glide plane orthogonal to  $a^*$  are marked by small arrows. (Note that these are projection of a 3D diffraction volume and not conventional in-zone 2D electron diffraction patterns.)

**TABLE 4.** Experimental EDT data collection details and crystallographic information for the coherent crystallographic domains found inside the U-bearing phase

|                                                        |                                                       |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| System                                                 | (Y,REE,U,Th)(Nb,Fe,Ti,Ta) <sub>2</sub> O <sub>6</sub> |
| Tilt range $\alpha(^{\circ})$ ; $\beta(^{\circ})$      | $-30/+25$ ; $-25/+17$                                 |
| Tilt step $(^{\circ})$ ; precession angle $(^{\circ})$ | 1; 1                                                  |
| $a, b, c$ (Å)                                          | 10.804(1), 7.680(1), 5.103(1)                         |
| Space group                                            | $Pnma$                                                |
| Total; independent reflections                         | 1570; 369                                             |
| Resolution (Å); coverage                               | 0.80; 0.85                                            |
| $R_{int}$                                              | 0.304                                                 |
| $R_i$ ; all                                            | 0.2795; 369                                           |
| $R_{\alpha\beta}$ refl. with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$      | 0.2533; 310                                           |

Notes: Two acquisitions series were performed from the same domain rotating the sample respectively around  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  tilt-axis. For cell parameters determination, only the  $\alpha$  tilt acquisition was used. For ab initio structure determination and refinement, intensities from both acquisitions were merged with no scale factor.

the metamict area. Au rings were then used as an internal standard for determining the effective camera length and the elliptical distortion (Capitani et al. 2006; Mugnaioli et al. 2009b; Mitchell 2015). Elliptical distortion was found to have an eccentricity of 0.22; 157 independently measured reflections were employed to refine the unit-cell parameters, that eventually lead to  $a = 10.804(1)$ ,  $b = 7.680(1)$ ,  $c = 5.103(1)$ .

Reflection intensities from the EDT acquisitions were integrated and used for ab initio structure determination by direct methods. Structure solution was achieved in space group  $Pnma$  and resulted in a model fully consistent with the structure topology of niobiaeschnynite-(Y) (Fig. 7).

The structure was then refined by least-squares constraining the site occupancy to the local chemical composition obtained by TEM-EDS measurements (Table 3, column 3). Fe was distributed between the A- and B-sites to get rightly 1 and 2 apfu, respectively. The structural residual is quite high because the dynamic effects could not be eliminated completely. In this respect, dynamical refinement seems a promising method (Palatinus et al. 2013, 2015), but the presence of additional problems, such as the diffuse scattering of metamict domains, that worsen the peak to background ratio, and the rotational disorder induced by mosaicity (see Figs. 6a and 6b), both affecting the correct intensity integration, discouraged us to attempt this method. The kinematical refinement, however, turned out very stable without restraints on the bond distances. The structure clearly shows the two cation sites, the eightfold-coordinated A-site, with average bond distances of 2.419 Å, and the sixfold-coordinated B-site, with average bond distances of 1.989 Å, confidently comparable with the literature data on aeschnynite (Table 5). The CIF file embodying the structure factor list of the refined structure is provided as supplementary material<sup>1</sup>.




**FIGURE 7.** Structural sketch down the **b** direction of the niobiaeschnynite-(Y) as solved and refined from EDT data (**a** horizontal; **c** vertical). The structure topology, beside an origin shift, is identical to the aeschnynite-(Y) refined by Bonazzi and Menchetti (1999). (Blue polyhedra = B-site; red circles = A-site). (Color online.)

## DISCUSSION

The zoning detected in the U-bearing phase of the Garnet Codera dike is unrelated with fractures in the sample (Fig. 1) and the compositional difference involved is peculiar and unrelated to what would be expected for altered samples. For instance, Tomašić et al. (2010), in a study of samarskite from Beinmyr pegmatite (Norway), found that alteration moves the composition of samarskite into the pyrochlore compositional field. Pieczka et al. (2014), in a study of samarskite group minerals and their alteration products from the Julianna Pegmatite (Poland), found that the initial stages of alteration of samarskite are characterized by a Ca-metasomatism that leads to the formation of calciosamarskite and calciopyrochlore patchy domains and eventually to the formation of secondary pyrochlore rims around samarskite. Ercit (2005) analyzed fresh and altered samarkites from REE-enriched pegmatites conserved at the Canadian Museum of Nature and concluded that the predominant effect of alteration is hydration and addition of Si and Al, moving the composition toward lower CV1 and higher CV2 values on his discriminant canonical variable diagram, i.e., toward the pyrochlore compositional field. None of these compositional trends are involved in the zoning patterns detected in the Codera dike samples investigated in this study.

It is thus very probable that the zoning detected in the U-bearing phase is a primary growth feature, due to fast kinetic and lack of equilibrium between the growing solid and the crystallizing solution. It is suggested that the original crystal structure is preserved within zones with the lowest U-content, below  $\sim 0.7 \times 10^{16}$   $\alpha$ -event/mg, whereas it is largely damaged up to resemble an amorphous material in the U-richest regions.

Differently from what previously presumed (i.e., Sugitani et al. 1985; Tomašić et al. 2010), our results suggest that the low-temperature modification of samarskite is isostructural with aeschnynite and not with ixiolite or columbite, and the structural formula is  $AB_2O_6$  and not  $ABO_4$  as currently accepted.

The columbite structure can be considered a superstructure of the ixiolite structure, with tripled  $a$  parameter, and both differ significantly from that of aeschnynite, even in the powder diffraction pattern (actually there is no doubt that the calculated powder diffractogram of ixiolite matches better the experimental powder pattern obtained for the sample annealed at 550 °C in  $H_2$  by Sugitani et al. 1984) (Fig. 8). This makes difficult to reconcile our results with those of previous studies. However, it should be noted that the structure identification in previous studies was done on almost completely amorphous samples after

<sup>1</sup>Deposit item AM-16-75605, CIF. Deposit items are free to all readers and found on the MSA web site, via the specific issue's Table of Contents (go to <http://www.minsocam.org/MSA/AmMin/TOC/>).

**TABLE 5.** Comparison of the average bond distances of samarskite [actually niobiaeschnynite-(Y)] from the Codera dike with those of other minerals with similar crystal chemistry and columbites

| Phase           | Sample provenance and reference                    | <A-O> | <B-O> | Crystal chemistry                                                                                                           |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Samarskite-(Y)  | Codera Valley, Italy (this study)                  | 2.419 | 1.989 | $(Y_{0.53}Fe_{0.22}Ca_{0.10}U_{0.09}Mn_{0.07})(Nb_{1.07}Ti_{0.47}Fe_{0.34}Ta_{0.07}W_{0.06})O_6$                            |
| Aeschnynite-(Y) | Triplet Valley, Italy (Bonazzi and Menchetti 1999) | 2.388 | 1.973 | $(Y_{0.64}REE_{0.22}Th_{0.06}U_{0.04}Ca_{0.01})(Ti_{1.95}Nb_{0.03})(W_{0.03}O_{5.23}(OH)_{0.77})$                           |
| Aeschnynite-(Y) | Val Vigizzo, Italy (Bonazzi and Menchetti 1999)    | 2.388 | 1.989 | $(Y_{0.65}REE_{0.16}Th_{0.07}U_{0.04}Ca_{0.01}Fe_{0.03})(Ti_{1.41}Nb_{0.36}Ta_{0.22}W_{0.01})(W_{0.04}O_{5.79}(OH)_{0.21})$ |
| Columbite-(Fe)  | Minas Gerais, Brazil (Tarantino and Zema 2005)     | 2.110 | 2.024 | $[(Mn,Fe)_{0.75}Nb_{0.25}][[(Mn,Fe)_{0.25}Nb_{1.65}Ta_{0.10}]O_6]$                                                          |
| Columbite-(Mn)  | Kragero, Norway (Tarantino and Zema 2005)          | 2.134 | 2.027 | $[(Mn,Fe)_{0.70}Nb_{0.25}Ta_{0.05}][[(Mn,Fe)_{0.25}Nb_{1.58}Ta_{0.14}]O_6]$                                                 |
| Polycrase-(Y)   | Zomba-Malosa, Malawi (Johnsen et al. 1999)         | 2.373 | 2.014 | $(Y_{0.87}Dy_{0.05}Er_{0.04}Yb_{0.02}Pb_{0.01}Th_{0.01})(Ti_{1.20}Nb_{0.79}Ta_{0.02}O_{5.82}(OH)_{0.18})$                   |
| Uranopolycrase  | Elba Island, Italy (Aurischio et al. 1993)         | 2.36  | 2.00  | $(U_{0.62}Y_{0.29}Th_{0.07}Nd_{0.01}Ca_{0.02}Mn_{0.03})(Ti_{1.46}Nb_{0.36}Ta_{0.12})O_6$                                    |

annealing (i.e., Sugitani et al. 1984, 1985), or on the basis of few reflections on SAED patterns (i.e., Tomašić et al. 2010), which are affected by distortion and camera length (scale) fluctuation (see for instance Capitani et al. 2006; Mugnaioli et al. 2009b; Mitchell 2015), so there is a possibility that the actual crystal structure of samarskite may have been missed.

For instance, ixiolite inclusions were found within the samarskite studied here, but these cannot be considered the samarskite original structure since they are perfectly crystalline and free of radiogenic elements (Fig. 9). Thus, it is possible that ixiolite inclusions were present also the samples from Kawabe studied by Sugitani et al. (1984), and that these inclusions could have acted as seeds during annealing leading to the ixiolite structure.

Moreover, the current TEM study has shown that the most metamict parts of the sample contain abundant nanoparticles with chaotic orientation. Even if the nature of these nanoparticles could not be determined—HR images are affected by calibration errors and astigmatism that make impossible to distinguish ixiolite than aeschynite from their lattice fringe distances and diffraction rings are too diffuse to be measured—we can reasonably assume that these nanoparticles do not represent remnants of the original samarskite single crystal, since they are randomly oriented, but rather a decomposition product of the metamictization process. Assuming that these nanoparticles have the ixiolite structure, annealing would make these particles to grow

into larger domains whose presence would be finally detected in the powder diffractogram. This is similar to what observed for heavily metamict zircon, where the first steps of annealing lead to the formation of the zirconia and not of zircon, whose structure is recovered only above 1100 °C (Capitani et al. 2000).

Similarly, one could speculate that the diffraction rings used by Tomašić et al. (2010) to determine the ixiolite interplanar distances (their Table 2) could probably come from the decomposition product of the metamict processes rather than from the samarskite original structure, and the single-crystal SAED pattern from ixiolite inclusions.

Finally, the comparison of the average interatomic distances of samarskite-(Y) found in the Codera dike samples with those of other minerals with Y and U as the dominant cations at the A-site and columbites, clearly shows that the crystal chemistry of samarskite fits better the aeschynite structure than the columbite (or ixiolite) structure (Table 5). Indeed, large ionic radius cations like Y and U can be better accommodated in the large A-site found in aeschynite (coordination number 8) than in the small, octahedral A-site of columbite.

## IMPLICATIONS

This study plainly demonstrates that the structure of the metamict relicts with samarskite-(Y) composition found in the Garnet Codera dike have an aeschynite-like structure. This




**FIGURE 8.** Structure of ixiolite (a) and columbite (b) showing the stacking of the octahedral cations (shadowed) as seen along [001] (different colors means different cation occupancies). Note how the ordering of octahedral cations in columbite leads to the tripling of the *a* parameter, making the latter a superstructure with ixiolite subcell. Powder X-ray diffractograms of samarskite-(Y) (Sugitani et al. 1984): (c) sample annealed at 580 °C in air for 12 h (upon these conditions a different phase forms); (d) annealed at 550 °C for 16 h in H<sub>2</sub> (these conditions lead to the low-temperature ixiolite-like structure); (e) annealed at 950 °C for 15 h in H<sub>2</sub> (these conditions lead to the high-temperature wolframite-like structure). Calculated powder diffractograms: (f) ixiolite with cell parameters and composition of Sugitani et al. (1984); (g) aeschynite-(Y) with structure and composition obtained in this study. (Color online.)




**FIGURE 9.** (a) BF image showing and ixiolite crystal (ixi) making a bridge between two amorphous region of samarskite-(Y) (sam). (b and c) SAED patterns recorded in ixiolite along two different directions obtained rotating the crystal around  $c^*$ . (d and e) EDS spectra taken in the amorphous region and in the crystalline ixiolite, respectively. Note the absence of U in the latter (N.B.: the Cu peaks come from the TEM supporting grid).

evidence raises doubts about the real structure of the samarskite mineral group, so far believed to have an ixiolite- or columbite-like structure. This inconsistency may derive from the fact that the ixiolite or columbite structure, actually detected in amorphous samples after annealing at high temperature, is the results of the recrystallization and growing of nanoparticles with ixiolite structure that form as decomposition product of the metamictization process. If this finding can be confirmed, then samarskite-(Y) and ishikawaite should be considered no longer as members of the samarskite group of minerals but rather U-rich members of the aeschynite mineral group.

These results imply that other metamict minerals such as uranopolycrase (Aurischio et al. 1993), samarskite-(Yb) (Simmons et al. 2006), niobiaeschynite-(Y) (Bermanec et al. 2008), calciosamarskite (Hanson et al. 1999), and possibly many other, whose identification and classification has been done on the basis of the X-ray powder diffraction on annealed samples, may hide similar pitfalls. Indeed, crystalline decomposition products of the metamict process different than the original mineral and that can grow a different phase upon annealing can be present in other mineral systems and can develop as a different phase upon annealing. Moreover it has been largely documented that the recovered phase is sensitive to the annealing conditions (e.g., Sugitani et al. 1984).

In this respect, transmission electron microscopy combined with electron diffraction tomography may result a sound method of investigation to validate the proper mineral species assignment. As a final corollary, this study is also the first report of the crystal structure of niobiaeschynite-(Y).

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

E.M. and E.D.T. were supported by the Italian national project FIR2013 "Exploring the Nanoworld." The authors are very grateful to the A.E. Fernando

Colombo, to Greg Lumpkin and two other anonymous referees for their careful and qualified revision of the manuscript.

#### REFERENCES CITED

- Aleksandrov, V.B. (1962) The crystal structure of aeschynite. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 142, 181–184. English translation in *Doklady of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Earth Sciences Sections*, 142, 107–109.
- Aurischio, C., Orlandi, P., Pasero, M., and Perchiazzi, N. (1993) Uranopolycrase, the uranium-dominant analogue of polycrase-(Y), a new mineral from Elba Island, Italy, and its crystal structure. *European Journal of Mineralogy*, 5, 1161–1165.
- Bermanec, V., Tomašić, N., Kniewald, G., Back, M.E., and Zagler, G. (2008) Niobiaeschynite-(Y), a new member of the aeschynite group from the Bear Lake Diggings, Haliburton County, Ontario, Canada. *Canadian Mineralogist*, 46, 395–402.
- Bonazzi, P., and Menchetti, S. (1999) Crystal chemistry of aeschynite-(Y) from the Western Alps: Residual electron density on difference-Fourier map. *European Journal of Mineralogy*, 11, 1043–1049.
- Bonazzi, P., Zoppi, M., and Dei, L. (2002) Metamict aeschynite-(Y) from the Eyje-Iveland district (Norway): Heat-induced recrystallization and dehydrogenation. *European Journal of Mineralogy*, 14, 141–150.
- Bonazzi, P., Bindi, L., Zoppi, M., Capitani, G.C., and Olmi, F. (2006) Single-crystal diffraction and transmission electron microscopy studies of silicified pyrochlore from Narssárssuk, Julianehaab district, Greenland. *American Mineralogist*, 91, 794–801.
- Bonazzi, P., Holtstam, D., Bindi, L., Nysten, P., and Capitani, G.C. (2009) Multi-analytical approach to solve the puzzle of a mineral from Kesebol, Västra Götaland, Sweden, belonging to the allanite-subgroup. *American Mineralogist*, 94, 121–134.
- Burla, M.C., Caliendo, R., Carrozzini, B., Cascarano, G.L., Cuocci, C., Giacovazzo, C., Mallamo, M., Mazzzone, A., and Polidori, G. (2015) Crystal structure determination and refinement via SIR2014. *Journal of Applied Crystallography*, 48, 306–309.
- Capitani, G.C., Leroux, H., Doukhan, J.C., Rios, S., Zhang, M., and Salje, E.K.H. (2000) A TEM investigation of natural metamict zircons: structure and recovery of amorphous domains. *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals*, 27, 545–556.
- Capitani, G.C., Olevnikov, P., Hovmoeller, S., and Mellini, M. (2006) A practical method to detect and correct for lens distortion in the TEM. *Ultramicroscopy*, 106, 66–74.
- Cliff, G., and Lorimer, G.W. (1975) The quantitative analysis of thin specimens. *Journal of Microscopy*, 103, 203–207.
- Droop, G.T.R. (1987) A general equation for estimating  $Fe^{3+}$  concentration in ferromagnesian silicates and oxides from microprobe analyses, using stoichiometric criteria. *Mineralogical Magazine*, 51, 431–435.

- Ercit, T.S. (2005) Identification and alteration trends of granitic pegmatite-hosted (Y,REE,U,Th)-(Nb,Ta,Ti) oxide minerals: A statistical approach. *Canadian Mineralogist*, 43, 1291–1303.
- Ewing, R.C. (1975) The crystal chemistry of complex niobium and tantalum oxides. IV. The metamict state: Discussion. *American Mineralogist*, 60, 728–733.
- (1976) A numerical approach toward the classification of complex, orthorhombic, rare-earth,  $AB_2O_6$ -type Nb-Ta-Ti oxides. *Canadian Mineralogist*, 14, 111–119.
- Guastoni, A., Pennacchioni, G., Pozzi, G., Fioretti, A.M., and Walter, J.M. (2014) Tertiary pegmatite dikes of the Central Alps. *Canadian Mineralogist*, 52, 641–669.
- Hanson, S.L., Simmons, W.B., Falster, A.U., Foord, E.E., and Lichte, F.E. (1999) Proposed nomenclature for samarskite-group minerals: new data on ishikawaite and calciosamarskite. *Mineralogical Magazine*, 63, 27–36.
- Johnsen, O., Stahl, K., Petersen, O.V., and Micheelsen, H.I. (1999) Structure refinement of natural non-metamict polycrase-(Y) from Zomba-Malosa complex, Malawi. *Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Monatshefte*, 1999, 1–10.
- Kolb, U., Gorelik, T.E., Kübel, C., Otten, M.T., and Hubert, D. (2007) Towards automated diffraction tomography: Part I—Data acquisition. *Ultramicroscopy*, 107, 507–513.
- Kolb, U., Mugnaioli, E., and Gorelik, T.E. (2011) Automated electron diffraction tomography—A new tool for nano crystal structure analysis. *Crystal Research and Technology*, 46, 542–554.
- Komkov, A.I. (1965) O kristalličeskoj strukture i himičeskoj konstitucii samarskitov. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 160, 693–696 (in Russian). English translation in *Doklady of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Earth Science Section*, 160, 127–129.
- Lumpkin, G.R., and Ewing, R.C. (1988) Alpha-decay damage in minerals of the pyrochlore group. *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals*, 16, 2–20.
- McLaren, A.C., Fitz Gerald, J.D., and Williams, I.S. (1994) The microstructure of zircon and its influence on the age determination from Pb/U isotopic ratios measured by ion microprobe. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 58, 993–1005.
- Mitchell, D.R.G. (2015) Development of an ellipse fitting method with which to analyse selected area electron diffraction patterns. *Ultramicroscopy*, 160, 140–145.
- Mugnaioli, E. (2015) Single nano crystal analysis using automated electron diffraction tomography. *Rendiconti Fisici dell'Accademia dei Lincei*, 26, 211–223.
- Mugnaioli, E., Gorelik, T., and Kolb, U. (2009a) “Ab initio” structure solution from electron diffraction data obtained by a combination of automated diffraction tomography and precession technique. *Ultramicroscopy*, 109, 758–765.
- Mugnaioli, E., Capitani, G.C., Nieto, F., and Mellini, M. (2009b) Accurate and precise lattice parameters by selected area electron diffraction in the transmission electron microscope. *American Mineralogist*, 94, 793–800.
- Nasdala, L., Kronz, A., Hanchar, J.M., Tichomirowa, M., Davis, D.W., and Hofmeister, W. (2006) Effects of natural radiation damage on back-scattered electron images of single crystals of minerals. *American Mineralogist*, 91, 1739–1746.
- Palache, C., Berman, H., and Frondel, C. (1944) *Dana's System of Mineralogy*, 7th ed., 1, 797 p. Wiley, New York.
- Palatinus, L., Jacob, D., Cuvillier, P., Klementová, M., Sinkler, W., and Marks, L.D. (2013) Structure refinement from precession electron diffraction data. *Acta Crystallographica*, A69, 171–188.
- Palatinus, L., Petříček, V., and Antunes Corrêa, C. (2015) Structure refinement using precession electron diffraction tomography and dynamical diffraction: Theory and implementation. *Acta Crystallographica*, A71, 1–10.
- Pieczka, A., Szuszkiewicz, A., Szeleg, E., Ilnicki, S., Nejbert, K., and Turniaik, K. (2014) Samarskite-group minerals and alteration products: An example from the Julianna pegmatitic system, Piława Górna, SW Poland. *Canadian Mineralogist*, 52, 303–319.
- Pouchou, J.L., and Pichoir, F. (1991) Quantitative analysis of homogenous or stratified microvolumes applying the model “PAP”. In K.F.J. Heinrich and D.E. Newbury, Eds., *Electron Probe Quantitation*, p. 31–75. Plenum, New York.
- Sheldrick, G.M. (1997) SHELXL97: Program for the refinement of crystal structures. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Simmons, W.B., Hanson, S.L., and Falster, A.U. (2006) Samarskite-(Yb): A new species of the samarskite group from the Little Patsy pegmatite, Jefferson County, Colorado. *Canadian Mineralogist*, 44, 1119–1125.
- Škoda, R., and Novák, M. (2007) Y,REE,Nb,Ta,Ti-oxide ( $AB_2O_6$ ) minerals from REL-REE euxenite-subtype pegmatites of the Třebíč Pluton, Czech Republic; substitutions and fractionation trends. *Lithos*, 95, 43–57.
- Sugitani, Y., Suzuki, Y., and Nagashima, K. (1984) Recovery of the original samarskite structure by heating in a reducing atmosphere. *American Mineralogist*, 69, 377–379.
- (1985) Polymorphism of samarskite and its relationship to other structurally related Nb-Ta oxides with the  $\alpha$ - $PbO_2$  structure. *American Mineralogist*, 70, 856–866.
- Tarantino, S.C., and Zema, M. (2005) Mixing and ordering behavior in manganocolumbite-ferrocolumbite solid solution: A single-crystal X-ray diffraction study. *American Mineralogist*, 90, 1291–1300.
- Tomašić, N., Gajović, A., Bermanec, V., and Rajić, M. (2004) Recrystallization of metamict Nb-Ta-Ti-REE complex oxides: A coupled X-ray-diffraction and Raman spectroscopy study of aeschynite-(Y) and polycrase-(Y). *Canadian Mineralogist*, 42, 1847–1857.
- Tomašić, N., Gajović, A., Bermanec, V., Linarić, M.R., Su, D., and Škoda, R. (2010) Preservation of the samarskite structure in a metamict  $ABO_4$  mineral: A key to crystal structure identification. *European Journal of Mineralogy*, 22, 435–442.
- Vincent, R., and Midgley, P. (1994) Double conical beam-rocking system for measurement of integrated electron diffraction intensities. *Ultramicroscopy*, 53, 271–282.
- Warner, J.K., and Ewing, R.K. (1993) Crystal chemistry of samarskite. *American Mineralogist*, 78, 419–424.
- Weitzel, H., and Schröcke, H. (1980) Kristallstrukturverfeinerungen von euxenit,  $Y(Nb_{0.5}Ti_{0.5})_2O_6$ , und M-fergusonit,  $YNbO_4$ . *Zeitschrift für Kristallographie*, 152, 69–82.

MANUSCRIPT RECEIVED OCTOBER 22, 2015

MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTED MARCH 9, 2016

MANUSCRIPT HANDLED BY FERNANDO COLOMBO