

A new method for determining ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ isotope ratios in environmental samples by means of ICP-MS/MS

Silvia Diez-Fernández, Hugo Jaegler, Carole Bresson, Frédéric Chartier, O. Evrard, Amélie Hubert, Anthony Nonell, Fabien Pointurier, Hélène Isnard

▶ To cite this version:

Silvia Diez-Fernández, Hugo Jaegler, Carole Bresson, Frédéric Chartier, O. Evrard, et al.. A new method for determining $^{236}\mathrm{U}/^{238}\mathrm{U}$ isotope ratios in environmental samples by means of ICP-MS/MS. Talanta, 2020, 206, pp.120221. 10.1016/j.talanta.2019.120221. cea-02610582

HAL Id: cea-02610582 https://cea.hal.science/cea-02610582

Submitted on 18 May 2020 $\,$

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

	1	A NEW METHOD FOR DETERMINING ²³⁶ U/ ²³⁸ U ISOTOPE RATIOS IN
1 2 3	2	ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES BY MEANS OF ICP-MS/MS
4 5 6	3	Silvia Diez-Fernández ¹ , Hugo Jaegler ² , Carole Bresson ¹ , Frédéric Chartier ³ , Olivier Evrard ² ,
7 8 9	4	Amélie Hubert ⁴ , Anthony Nonell ¹ , Fabien Pointurier ⁴ , Hélène Isnard ^{1*} .
10 11	5	1. Den – Service d'Etudes Analytiques et de Réactivité des Surfaces (SEARS), CEA,
12 13 14	6	Université Paris-Saclay, F-91191, Gif sur Yvette, France
15 16 17	7	2. Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement (LSCE-IPSL), UMR 8212
18 19 20	8	(CEA/CNRS/UVSQ), Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France
21 22 23	9	3. Den – Département de Physico-Chimie (DPC), CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, F-
24 25 25	10	91191, Gif sur Yvette, France
26 27 28	11	4. CEA, DAM, DIF, 91297 Arpajon, France
29 30 31	12	
32 33 34	13	* Corresponding author: <u>helene.isnard@cea.fr</u>
35 36 37	14	
38 39	15	*Journal : Talanta
40 41 42	16 17	Keywords : Uranium-236, ICP-MS/MS, spectral interferences, MC-ICP-MS, Fukusnima, environmental samples.
43 44 45	18	Highlights :
46 47 48	19	
49 50	20	
51 52 53	21	
54 55 56		
57 58 59		
60 61		
63 64		1
65		

22 Abstract:

The ²³⁶U/²³⁸U isotope ratio is a widely used tracer, which provides information on source identification for safeguard purposes, nuclear forensic studies and environmental monitoring. This paper describes an original approach to determine ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios, below 10⁻⁸, in environmental samples by combination of ICP-MS/MS for ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ration and multiple collector ICPMS measurements for ²³⁵U/²³⁸U and ²³⁴U/²³⁵U isotope ratios.

Since the hydride form of UO⁺ (UOH⁺) is less prone to occur than UH⁺, we were focused on the oxidised forms of uranium in order to reduce hydride based-interferences in ICPMS/MS. Then, in-cell ion-molecule reactions with O₂ and CO₂ were assessed to detect the uranium isotopes in mass-shift mode (Q1: U⁺ \rightarrow Q2: UO⁺). The performances in terms of UO+ sensitivity and minimisation of hydride form of UO⁺ were evaluated using five different desolvating systems. The best conditions, using an Apex Ω or an Aridus system, produced uranium oxide hydride rate (²³⁵U¹⁶O¹H⁺/²³⁵U¹⁶O⁺) of about 10⁻⁷ with O₂ in the collision eell.

The method was validated through measurements of two certified IRMM standards with 236 U/ 238 U isotope ratio of 1.245 x 10⁻⁷ and 1.052 x 10⁻⁸, giving results in agreement with certified reference values. The relative standard deviations on seven independent measurements for each standard were respectively of 1.5% and 6.2%. Finally, environmental samples corresponding to sediments from the radioactive contamination plume emitted by the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant accident were analysed after a well-established uranium chemical separation procedure. $^{236}U/^{238}U$ atomic ratios between 1.5 x 10⁻⁸ and 7 x 10⁻ ⁹ were obtained with a level accuracy lower than 20%.

1. Introduction

Uranium-236 with a half-life of 23.4 million years was produced by the $^{235}U(n,\gamma)$ and $^{238}U(n,3n)$ nuclear reactions in nuclear atmospheric weapons testings carried out between 1945 and 1980 [1, 2]. The atmospheric nuclear tests released ²³⁶U which deposited on ground as aerosol particles; this is referred to as global fallout, with the ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ isotope ratio falling in the range of $10^{-7}-10^{-9}$ [1]. Uranium-236 is also produced via thermal neutron captures on ²³⁵U in nuclear power plants or in nature. In the terrestrial environment, the ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ ratio signatures fall in the range of 10^{-11} to 10^{-14} [3, 4]. In nuclear reactors, the isotopic composition of ${}^{236}\text{U}/{}^{238}\text{U}$ varies and atomic ratios as high as 10^{-3} can be reached. In the case of nuclear power plant accidents, like Chernobyl or Fukushima Daiichi, hot particles with such high ratios can be found in the environment [5, 6]. Given its potential variation depending on the emission source, the ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ isotopic ratio has been used in nuclear forensics, nuclear safeguard and environmental monitoring studies [7-12] and it is now considered to be a new tracer for oceanographic studies [13-15].

Since uranium-236 is present at ultra-trace level in environmental samples, inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) is a sensitive and versatile analytical technique to determine 236 U/ 238 U isotope ratios [9, 10]. The major concern for determining 236 U/ 238 U isotope ratios in such samples by ICP-MS is to implement a careful sample preparation and uranium purification procedure to prevent matrix effects [17, 18] and to perform several corrections in relation to the very low abundance of ²³⁶U relative to ²³⁸U and ²³⁵U. The two major corrections concern 1) the formation of polyatomic interferences such as ${}^{235}U^{1}H^{+}$ whose formation rate in the plasma, expressed as UH⁺/U⁺ ratio, is about 10⁻⁵ [19], and 2) the overlap of the tailings of ²³⁸U and ²³⁵U. However, the determination of ${}^{236}\text{U}/{}^{238}\text{U}$ isotope ratios as low as 10^{-8} - 10^{-9} is not possible with single quadrupole ICP-MS or double focusing ICP-MS mainly because the peak tailing of ²³⁸U on the adjacent masses is not completely removed [20]. ICPMS/MS instruments, commercialized since 2012, provide peak tailing effect far lower than other type of instrument [21]. With this new technology, an additional quadrupole is introduced in front of the collision-reaction cell as a first mass filter stage. The presence of two quadrupoles allows to eliminate peak tailing effects from ²³⁸U and ²³⁵U. Furthermore, the mass-shift

mode, which consists in U reaction with O_2 in the cell to form UO^+ , allows to reduce by one order of magnitude the polyatomic interferences due to hydride forms UOH^+ , because they are less prone to occur than UH^+ [19]. The potential of the ICP MS/MS technology to determine ²³⁶U/²³⁸U isotope ratios has been addressed by Tanimizu *et al.* in synthetic samples, with ratios between 1 x 10⁻⁷ and 2 x 10⁻⁹ [19]. This technology has been further used to determine ²³⁶U/²³⁸U isotope ratios in soil samples contaminated by the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant (FDNPP) accident, showing isotope ratios between 3 x 10⁻⁷ and 4 x 10⁻⁸ with uncertainties between 20 and 50% [11, 22].

In this work, we present a new method to determine very low $^{236}U/^{238}U$ isotope ratios by ICP-MS/MS. All analytical steps were validated and a comprehensive evaluation of the uncertainty budget was performed. All uranium isotope ratios were determined with the best precision in environmental samples, especially by MC-ICP-MS for $^{234}U/^{235}U$ and $^{235}U/^{238}U$ and by ICP-MS/MS for $^{236}U/^{238}U$ that is below 10⁻⁸. Before measurements, the sample preparation and purification of uranium were carried out using a well-established procedure [23]. The ²³⁴U/²³⁵U determined by MC-ICP-MS was used to correct the mass bias and the bias between analog and pulse counting modes of the secondary electron multiplier in the ICP-MS/MS instrument. The operating conditions to obtain the best performance in term of sensitivity and minimisation of polyatomic interferences are detailed and discussed. Firstly, the reaction profiles of O2 and CO2 with U in the Collision Reaction Cell (CRC) were evaluated independently [24-26] and in combination with He in the cell. Secondly, five desolvating systems, with and without gas in the cell, were compared on the basis of two criteria, i.e. uranium sensitivity and uranium hydride formation rate. Thirdly, after determining the optimal parameters, the methodology was validated by assessing the reproducibility and accuracy of the ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios (about 10⁻⁷ and 10⁻⁸) in two certified IRMM (Joint Research Center, Geel) reference materials. The methodology was finally applied to analyse real samples, made of sediments collected in the Mano Dam Reservoir, which drains a part of the main radioactive plume released by the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant (FDNPP) accident.

98 2. Materials and methods

2.1. Reagents, isotopic reference materials and samples

We used ultrapure water (18.2 M Ω cm) from Millipore (Molsheim, France), and analytical grade HNO₃ (67-69% purity) and HCl (32-35% purity) acids ("PlasmaPure Plus degree") from SCP Science (Courtaboeuf, France). Ultrapure Ar, O₂, CO₂, N₂ and He were purchased from Air Liquide. Two certified isotopic reference materials of uranium, IRMM 184 and IRMM 075/5, were used to determine precision and accuracy of the ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratio, determined by ICP-MS/MS. These two standards show ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios of 1.245±0.002 x10⁻⁷ (IRMM 184) and 1.0652±0.0008 x10⁻⁸ (IRMM 075/5). ²³⁵U/²³⁸U ratio of 0.0072623 ±0.0000022 from IRMM 184 was used to measure the mass bias factor on MC-ICP-MS measurements. The standard solutions were prepared by evaporating aliquots of stock solution and dissolving the dry extract in 2% HNO₃. An in-house natural uranium powder (U_3O_8) was dissolved in 0.5 mol L⁻¹ HNO₃ to prepare a stock solution used for optimization of the measurement methods by ICP-MS/MS. The environmental samples were selected from a sediment core (~35 cm depth) collected in Hayama Lake, located 39 km from the northwest of FDNPP (Mano Dam reservoir), as described in Jaegler et al. [23].

Sample preparation and chemical treatment: Around 5 g of each sample collected in selected layers along the length of the sediment core were calcined and dissolved by several leaching-evaporation cycles with 14 mol.L⁻¹ HNO₃, and a final step with a mixture of HNO₃ (67%) and 10 mol.L⁻¹ HCl (37%) in a molar ratio of 1/3. Samples were further filtrated and evaporated again to be recovered in a solution of 8 M HNO₃, before uranium separation by ion exchange chromatography. The uranium fraction was collected and purified by successively using a 20-ml-column filled with AG1X8 anion-exchange resin, and a 2 mL-column filled with UTEVA extraction resin (100 - 150 mesh). The eluate was evaporated to dryness and recovered in a final solution of 2% HNO₃ to be analysed with both ICP-MS instruments. A schematic diagram of the sample treatment protocol is given in Figure S1 and detailed in a previous study [23].

123 Two solutions from the IRMM 075/5 standard (called SDC1 and SDC2) underwent the whole 124 procedure including dissolution and purification through the two steps of ion exchange chromatography, while a third solution (called SC1) was only subjected to the two steps of liquidchromatography. Seven procedural blanks were included in the analytical sessions.

2.2. Instrumentation

ICP-MS/MS: The ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratio was determined with an ICP-MS/MS (Agilent 8800 ICP-QQQ, Tokyo, Japan). The ICP-MS/MS was optimized daily using a solution containing 10 ng mL⁻¹ of Li, Co, Y, Ce, Tl and U in 2% HNO₃. The operating conditions for the instrument are summarized in Table S1. The dead time of the secondary electron multiplier detector for this instrument was precisely evaluated at 32 ns with a method previously described [27].

Sample introduction system: Five desolvating systems associated to the ICP-MS/MS were compared : i) an Aridus II[™] from Cetac Technologies (Nebraska, USA) and various Apex systems from Elemental Scientific (Nebraska, USA): ii) an Apex IRTM, iii) an Apex ΩTM, iv) an Apex HFTM without desolvating membrane, and v) an Apex HFTM with a desolvation membrane, the Spiro TDM. All the devices were used with a 120 µL mL⁻¹ microconcentric PFA nebulizer (Elemental Scientific, ESI, USA). When no desolvating system was implemented, a MicroMist concentric quartz nebulizer (Agilent, California, USA) was used at a flow rate around 300 µL mL⁻¹. The different desolvating systems were compared with respect to several parameters: uranium sensitivity and uranium oxide hydride rate. Before comparison, the nebulizer gas, N2 flows and, in the case of membrane systems (Apex Ω^{TM} , Spiro TDM and Aridus IITM), sweep gas flows, were optimized daily with respect to the Ce oxide formation (CeO/Ce ratio <0.05 %).

Uranium reactivity evaluation: The reactivity of U in the cell with two different oxidizing agents 145 (O_2 and CO_2) was evaluated with respect to sensitivity of UO^+ . Both pure gases were introduced using 146 the third cell gas entrance. A step of 2% for the cell gases was applied, ranging from 0 to 40%. The 147 role of He was evaluated by increasing the gas flow from 0 to 6 mL min⁻¹, with a 0.2 mL min⁻¹ step, 148 using the corresponding entrance of the cell.

MC-ICP-MS: An MC-ICP-MS Neptune Plus[™] (Thermo Scientific, Bremen, Germany) was also employed to determine the $^{234}U/^{235}U$ and $^{235}/^{238}U$ ratios with a high level of precision. The relevant operating conditions are given in Table S1. The samples were introduced into the plasma by means of a "stable introduction system" (SIS) composed of a 100 µL mL⁻¹ microconcentric PFA nebulizer (Elemental Scientific, Nebraska, USA) mounted on a tandem quartz spray chamber made of a doublepass chamber composed of cyclonic and Scott chambers, and equipped with a PC^3 Peltier chiller (Elemental Scientific, Nebraska, USA). The sensitivity was daily optimized to obtain a signal with maximal intensity and stability.

2.3. Analytical approach

Analytical method for MC-ICP-MS: ²³⁵U/²³⁸U and ²³⁴U/²³⁵U isotope ratios were determined by MC-ICP-MS. The sensitivity was around 125 V per ppm for U during the analytical sessions; the acquisition method consisted of 30 cycles (3 blocks of 10 cycles) with an integration time of 4.2 s and removal of outliers using a 2σ test. The instrumental mass bias was corrected by means of a classical Sample Standard Bracketing (SSB) approach using the certified IRMM 184 standard and applying an exponential law [28]. Concentrations of samples and standards were in the same range (less than 20% relative difference between them). The analyses were conducted at low mass resolution and in static mode. Signals for 235 U and 238 U isotopes were acquired using a Faraday cup equipped with 10^{11} Ohm resistor amplifiers. The ²³⁴U signal was acquired using a SEM detector combined with a Retarding Potential Quadrupole (RPQ) to reduce abundance sensitivity. The SEM/Faraday yield was determined by standard bracketing with the same IRMM 184 standard used for mass bias correction. By applying this approach, the standard deviation obtained for the ${}^{234}U/{}^{238}U$ ratio was around 0.4% at k=1. Uncertainties on ²³⁵U/²³⁸U and ²³⁴U/²³⁵U isotope ratios were calculated according to the Kragten method, described elsewhere [29, 30].

Analytical method for ICP-MS/MS: All isotopes of uranium were measured in their corresponding oxide forms ($U^{16}O^+$), taking advantage of the *mass-shift* mode [19]. Transitions are given in Table S2. The ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratio was determined indirectly by determining the ²³⁶U/²³⁵U ratio by ICP-MS/MS and The intensity of ${}^{234}U^{16}O^{+}$ and ${}^{236}U^{16}O^{+}$ signals was measured in pulse counting mode, while ${}^{235}U^{16}O^{+}$ and ${}^{238}U^{16}O^{+}$ were measured in analog mode. A total of 20 replicates were acquired for ${}^{234}U^{16}O^{+}$, ${}^{235}U^{16}O^{+}$ and ${}^{236}U^{16}O^{+}$. ${}^{236}U^{16}O^{+}$ counting was also corrected from the formation of ${}^{235}U^{16}O^{1}H^{+}$. The uranium oxide hydride formation rate was calculated in a separate acquisition method by determining the ${}^{238}U^{16}O^{1}H^{+}/{}^{238}U^{16}O^{+}$ ratio. The method consisted of 5 replicates with 3 points per peak and 100 sweeps. Instrumental blanks were corrected for all U isotopes.

Experimental ${}^{236}\text{U}/{}^{235}\text{U}$ ratios were internally corrected in terms of the mass bias and the bias corresponding to the combined pulse counting and analog detection modes. This "B" value was calculated for the experimental ${}^{234}\text{U}/{}^{235}\text{U}$ ratio in each sample, following Eq (1):

$$B = \frac{Ln\left(\frac{\left(\frac{234}{235}\right)}{\left(\frac{234}{235}\right)}_{exp}\right)}{Ln\left(\frac{m_{234}}{m_{235}}\right)}, \text{ (Eq. 1)}$$

where $(^{234}\text{U}/^{235}\text{U})_{tr}$ represents the true value of the ratio, $(^{234}\text{U}/^{235}\text{U})_{exp}$ represents the ratio obtained by ICP-MS/MS, and m_{234} and m_{235} correspond to the exact mass of isotopes ^{234}U and ^{235}U respectively.

190 The true value of the ${}^{234}\text{U}/{}^{235}\text{U}$ ratio in the IRMM 184 is the certified one, while this ratio was 191 measured by MC-ICP-MS for IRMM 075/5 and for the samples. Once the experimental ratio ${}^{236}\text{U}/{}^{235}\text{U}$ 192 had been corrected with the *B* value, the final ${}^{236}\text{U}/{}^{238}\text{U}$ ratios in the samples were calculated by 193 multiplying the corrected ${}^{236}\text{U}/{}^{235}\text{U}$ ratios by the ${}^{235}\text{U}/{}^{238}\text{U}$ values, previously determined by MC-ICP-194 MS. Uncertainties were calculated according to the Kragten method [29, 30].

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Study of gas reactivity and collisional focusing

197 One of the main concerns with respect to determining the ${}^{236}\text{U}/{}^{238}\text{U}$ ratio in environmental samples is 198 the formation of ${}^{235}\text{U}^{1}\text{H}$ (*m*/*z*=236) in the plasma. To correct this interference, the ${}^{238}\text{U}\text{H}^{+}/{}^{238}\text{U}^{+}$ ratio in our instrument in a single quadrupole mode and in a standard configuration without desolvating system, was measured around $7x10^{-5}$, which is in agreement with values quoted in the literature [11, 23]. This hydride formation is not negligible considering that the ²³⁶U/²³⁵U ratios in our IRMM standards are below 10⁻⁵, and also expected in the samples. As described by Tanimizu et al. [19], the collision/reaction technology made possible by ICP-MS/MS, allows to reduce such rate thanks to the *mass-shift* mode, through the reaction of U with O_2 in the cell to form $UO^+ (U^+ + O_2 \rightarrow UO^+ + O, \Delta H_r =$ -2.89 eV). This reduces hydride based-interferences compared with the SQ mode, since the hydride form of UO^+ (UOH^+) is less prone to occur than UH^+ .

Using this method, two different oxidizing agents were compared as cell gases (O2 and CO2) in order to provide the best performance in term of sensitivity for signal of oxide form of uranium. Reaction curves, corresponding to the variations of the signal intensity of the oxide form of uranium as a function of the gas flow introduced in the cell, were plotted for a 0.050 μ g mL⁻¹ U solution (Figure 1). As can be observed, both reaction profiles are similar in shape and sensitivity (~ $9x10^5$ counts.s⁻¹ for 238 UO⁺), although the optimal gas flow for CO₂ is slightly shifted with respect to O₂ (10% and 7% respectively). The total oxide rate conversion could not be computed since UO⁺ oxide reacts with O₂ to form UO₂⁺ (Δ H_r= -2.63 eV) at *m*/*z* 270, being outside the recording range of the instrument (maximum m/z at 260). Potential collisional focusing effects already described in the literature [31] were also evaluated by adding He in the cell along with the corresponding reaction gas (O_2, CO_2) . Since no sensitivity enhancement was observed (Figure S2), He was no longer used. This may be related to the fact that O2 and CO2 already produce some collisional focusing; not only inelastic collisions occur, leading to the formation of the expected ion, but also elastic collisions for which there is no energy exchange and thus no reaction. According to these results, the reaction gas of choice was O_2 , since CO_2 does not improve either or UO^+ sensitivity or the formation of UOH^+ .

3.2. Uranium oxide hydride formation rate using different desolvating systems

Although the *mass-shift* strategy can reduce the uranium oxide hydride formation rate to around one order of magnitude, it remains necessary to reduce its incidence over ²³⁶U to reach the desired ratios. Consequently, the following step was to access the different desolvating devices described in section

2.2. Such sample introduction systems are able to remove the solvent from the matrix and decrease the hydride formation [32]. Comparisons were performed on the basis of the sensitivity at $m/z = {}^{238}U^{16}O^{+}$ and the uranium oxide hydride formation rate ($^{238}UOH^+/^{238}UO^+$), using a 1 µg mL⁻¹U solution. In each analytical session, the carrier gas and the N₂ flows were optimised for all the systems in order to provide the best conditions, as was the Ar sweeping gas flow for the Apex HF+Spiro, Apex Ω and Aridus systems. Considering the instrumental variation from day to day, the sensitivity values in Table 1 are mostly given as a range. In the configuration, without a desolvating system and in MS/MS mode, the sensitivity was around 100,000 counts.s⁻¹ per ng mL⁻¹ for $^{238}UO^+$, and the $^{238}UOH^+/^{238}UO^+$ ratio was 3×10^{-6} . The Apex IR system provided a slight improvement in sensitivity, though the uranium oxide hydride formation rate remained unchanged. This may be due to the system design, focused on providing high reproducibility for isotope ratio determination. Although the sensitivity increased by a factor two with the Apex HF, the uranium oxide hydride formation rate remained also unchanged. The addition of the Spiro TDM membrane to the Apex HF did not allow the reduction of the ²³⁸UOH⁺ formation rate. Best results were obtained with the Aridus and the Apex Ω systems. Representative operating conditions for these two systems are given in Table S³. Sensitivity increased around 4 fold, while the uranium oxide formation hydride rate decreased by one order of magnitude, down to 3×10^{-7} $(^{238}U^{16}O^{1}H^{+}/^{238}U^{16}O^{+})$. However, the stabilization time required to attain the adequate hydride rate using the APEX Ω system was significantly shorter than this needed for the ARIDUS system. Both desolvating systems were used in the rest of the study.

3.3. Abundance sensitivity

The effect of ²³⁸U tailing over the minor ²³⁶U isotope has been described for numerous sample introduction systems with respect to determining ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios [33]. Reported values of abundance sensitivity for a standard ICP-QMS instrument tend to be about 10⁻⁶, however two quadrupoles positioned in a tandem configuration provided abundance sensitivity values between 10⁻¹⁰ and 10⁻¹⁴ [21], which would virtually allow to determine very low ratios. In our case, the abundance sensitivity was estimated below 10⁻⁹ in MS/MS mode, considering the contribution of ²³⁸U¹⁶O⁺ at *m*/*z* = 253. An accurate measurement of the contribution of the ²³⁸U tailing at the ²³⁶U *m*/*z* is limited by the dynamic

range of the detector (10^{10}) . In order to evaluate this contribution, a 500 ng mL⁻¹ solution of natural U in 2% HNO3 with ²³⁶U abundance lower than 10⁻¹⁰ was analysed in SQ and MS/MS modes. Mass spectra were recorded from m/z = 234 to m/z = 239 in SQ mode, while they were recorded between m/z = 250 and m/z = 255 in MS/MS mode. Masses at m/z = 239 in SQ mode and m/z = 255 in MS/MS mode were included in order to observe the uranium hydride and uranium oxide hydride $(^{238}U^{1}H^{+})$ and $^{238}U^{16}O^{1}H^{+}$, respectively). Both spectra are shown in Figure 2. As can be seen, peaks in the spectrum registered in SQ mode overlap completely. Peaks observed at m/z = 237 are due to a significant ²³⁸U peak tailing effect and peaks at m/z=236 corresponds to ²³⁸U tailing and ²³⁵UH⁺. It is also worth noting the decrease in the uranium hydride formation rate when switching from SQ mode to MS/MS mode, as already explained. Analysis in MS/MS mode completely removes the tailing effects, according to the peaks shapes shown in Figure 2.

3.4. Isotope ratio measurements in standards

3.4.1. Non-treated standards

Accuracy and reproducibility of the ²³⁶U/²³⁵U ratio measurements with ICP-MS/MS was checked by the analysis of two certified standards: IRMM 184 and IRMM 075/5. These two standards were specifically chosen because of their ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios, close to those expected in the samples: 1.245±0.002 x10⁻⁷ (IRMM 184) and 1.0652±0.0008 x10⁻⁸ (IRMM 075/5). Whereas all uranium isotope ratios are certified for the IRMM 184 standard $(^{234}U/^{235}U=0.007317 \pm 0.000005;$ 235 U/ 238 U=0.0072623 ± 0.000002), only the 236 U/ 238 U ratio is certified for IRMM 075/5. Therefore, the "reference" ²³⁵U/²³⁸U and ²³⁴U/²³⁵U ratios were determined by MC-ICP-MS. For this, three solutions of IRMM 075/5 containing 200 ng mL⁻¹ of U were analysed as explained in previous sections. Average values obtained for the ${}^{234}U/{}^{235}U$ and ${}^{235}U/{}^{238}U$ ratios were 0.007332 ± 0.000005 (n=3) and 0.0072575 \pm 0.0000009 (n=3) respectively. For our purposes, these values were used as references to correct the experimental ²³⁶U/²³⁵U ratios obtained by ICP-MS/MS.

The ${}^{236}U/{}^{235}U$ ratio was determined for both standards in seven solutions, each containing around 1 µg mL⁻¹ of U, with the ICP-MS/MS equipped with an Aridus desolvating system. Experimental ratios were individually calculated using the corresponding B value for mass and detector bias corrections. The contribution of ${}^{235}U^{16}O^{1}H^{+}$ and of the instrumental blanks over ${}^{236}U^{16}O^{+}$ were subtracted at $m/z = 252 \ ({}^{236}UO^{+})$. Final ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ ratios for the IRMM 184 and IRMM 075/5 standards are shown in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Regarding IRMM 184, uncertainties for the ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ ratios were between 2-3% in most cases. The 284 ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ ratios obtained for seven standard solutions analysed during different analytical sessions, 285 showed a relative standard deviation of 1.5%, lower than the calculated uncertainties. The accuracy of 286 the average value with respect to the certified ratio was -0.6%. A similar situation was found for the 287 IRMM 075/5. However, uncertainties were much more variable, ranging between 8-23%, because of 288 the very low counting for the ${}^{236}UO^+$ signal. In any case, the relative standard deviation between the 289 seven different measurements was 6.2%, lower than the uncertainty. Accuracy for the average value 290 was 2.6%.

3.4.2. Treated standards

To make sure that ²³⁶U cannot be polluted during the chemical pre-treatment of the samples, three solutions of the IRMM 075/5 standard – called SC1, SDC1 and SDC2 were also subjected to the chemical separation and purification procedure. Along with the standards, three procedural blanks were included in the analytical session. For the analysis of these samples, the desolvating Apex Ω system was used.

The signal at ${}^{236}\text{U}{}^{16}\text{O}{}^+$ *m/z* in the three procedural blank solutions showed counting lower than 0.2 cps. By contrast, the absolute count rates of the standard solutions for the same ${}^{236}\text{U}{}^{16}\text{O}{}^+$ signal was around 10 cps, meaning that the contribution of the blank was less than 2% of the final ${}^{236}\text{U}{}^{16}\text{O}{}^+$ signal and can therefore be neglected.

As for the non-treated standards, the ${}^{234}U/{}^{235}U$ and ${}^{235}U/{}^{238}U$ ratios were determined by MC-ICP-MS. Average values were 0.007336 ± 0.000012 and 0.0072566 ± 0.0000011 for ${}^{234}U/{}^{235}U$ and ${}^{235}U/{}^{238}U$ ratios respectively. These values are statistically indistinguishable from those obtained for the nontreated standards (${}^{234}U/{}^{235}U=0.007332 \pm 0.000005$; ${}^{235}U/{}^{238}U=0.0072575 \pm 0.000009$).

With respect to the ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratio, and considering the lower precision of the measurements performed by ICP-MS/MS, three non-treated IRMM 075/5 standards (I, II, III) were also measured before and after the treated standards. The results are given in Figure 3. The average ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ ratio for non-treated standards was $1.10 \pm 0.03 \times 10^8$, statistically similar to this measured for the treated standards $(1.13 \pm 0.10 \text{ x}10^{-8} \text{ for SC1} \text{ and } 1.11 \pm 0.03 \text{ x}10^{-8} \text{ for SCD1} \text{ and SCD2})$. Consequently, no detectable differences in isotope ratios due to the sample treatment procedure could be found.

3.4.3. Assessing sources of uncertainty

The Kragten method provides information on the relative contribution of each error source on the final uncertainty. Error sources taken into account are: count rates at the different m/z in samples and blank solutions, uncertainties on the certified ratios of the isotope standards. As an example, the relative contribution of each source on the final uncertainty is shown in Table 4. As can be observed, more than 90% of the uncertainty budget is due to ²³⁶U¹⁶O⁺ count rate, which, as mentioned before, is around 10 cps for the IRMM 075/5 standard at 1 µg mL⁻¹ U. Other significant contributions were the count rates for ²³⁸U¹⁶OH⁺ and ²³⁵U¹⁶O⁺ with 6.6% and 1.1% respectively. The influence of the other terms tended to be minor, mostly below 0.5%.

3.5. Isotope ratio measurements in the Fukushima environmental samples.

The ²³⁵U/²³⁸U and ²³⁴U/²³⁵U ratios were measured by MC-ICP-MS, and the ²³⁶U/²³⁵U ratio was measured by ICP-MS/MS using an Aridus system. Solutions were diluted to obtain a final U concentration of around 1 μ g mL⁻¹ to ensure that the ²³⁶U¹⁶O⁺ counting rate would be detectable.

A 2% HNO₃ solution corresponding to the instrumental blank was analysed before each procedural blank or sample. Corresponding counting rates at m/z of ${}^{236}U^{16}O^+$ for both types of blanks are shown in Figure 4. There is no evidence of carry-over for the instrumental blank, as the counting remained constant during the session. Besides, no significant differences were observed between the instrumental (<0.4 cps) and the procedural blank (<0.7 cps), meaning that the sample treatment did not contribute significantly to the ²³⁶U¹⁶O⁺ background.

Seven sections from a sediment core of the Mano Dam reservoir were analysed according to the methodology described above. MDh corresponds to the sample closest to the surface, and MDb to the deepest one. Set-up stability was checked before analysis through the analysis of standards. The ²³⁴U/²³⁵U and ²³⁵U/²³⁸U ratios obtained by MC-ICP-MS, and ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios obtained by ICP-MS/MS are given in Table 5. ²³⁴U/²³⁵U ratios were used for correction of ²³⁶U/²³⁵U ratios determined with ICP-MS/MS. $^{235}U/^{238}U$ ratios were used for the final computation of the $^{236}U/^{238}U$ ratios. The average value obtained for the ${}^{235}U/{}^{238}U$ ratio, i.e. 0.007257 \pm 0.000003, is in perfect agreement with the natural ratio reported in the literature, i.e. 0.007257 ± 0.00004 [4]. Nonetheless, $^{234}U/^{235}U$ ratios vary slightly between samples with a relative standard deviation of 2%. Uncertainties calculated for the samples measured by ICP-MS/MS were consistent with the uncertainties obtained for the standards.

Measured ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios ranged between 7.0x10⁻⁹ and 4.2x10⁻⁸. Associated uncertainties obtained using the Kragten method varied between 6.7% and 16.8% at k=2. These values are significantly lower than the uncertainties reported in previous publications using ICP-MS/MS technology for the analysis of seawater and soil samples [11, 19, 21]. In the present work, the ²³⁶U/²³⁸U ratios measured in sediments can be attributed to the global fallout values <10⁻⁷ [23].

4. Conclusion

In this work, we present a new methodology to determine all uranium isotope ratios in environmental samples after a chemical separation procedure involving a combination of anion exchange and extraction resins. $^{234}U/^{238}U$ and $^{235}U/^{238}U$ ratios were determined by MC-ICP-MS while $^{236}U/^{238}U$ isotope ratios, which are below 10⁻⁸, were measured using ICP-MS/MS. In this later case, the strategy was based on the use of MS/MS mass-shift mode, since abundance sensitivity values are generally below 10⁻¹⁰ and the hydride form of UO⁺ (UOH⁺) is less prone to occur than UH⁺. The selected gas introduced in the cell was O₂ and in order to obtain the lower UOH⁺/UO⁺ ratio, five different desolvating systems are tested. The Apex Ω and Aridus systems provided the best results in term of sensitivity and UOH⁺/UO⁺ ratios down to 4 x 10⁻⁷ were reached.

The method was developed and validated for two certified IRMM isotopic standards with $^{236}U/^{238}U$ certified ratio of 1.245 x 10⁻⁷ (IRMM 184) and 1.052 x 10⁻⁸ (IRMM 075/5). The IRMM 075/5 standard

was subjected to the preparation and chemical purification procedure, and no detectable difference in isotope ratios due to sample treatment was found. The isotopic ratios obtained for seven independent measurements of the two standards gave results in agreement with certified reference values, with relative standard deviation of respectively 1.5% (IRMM 184) and 6.2% (IRMM 075/5). Finally, the $^{236}U/^{238}U$ isotope ratios were determined in sediments collected along a core in a lake draining a part of the main radioactive pollution plume released by the FDNPP accident. The measured $^{236}U/^{238}U$ ranged between 7.0x10⁻⁹ and 4.2x10⁻⁸, with accuracy levels below 20%, corresponding to the global fallout signature. These ratios were the lowest ever measured by ICP-MS/MS in sediment samples, with uncertainty below 20% for ratios below 10⁻⁸.

367 5. Acknowledgements

The collection and analysis of the sediment samples were funded under the TOFU (ANR-11-JAPN001) and the AMORAD (ANR-11-RSNR-0002) projects, via by the French National Research Agency
(ANR).

[1] A. Sakaguchi, K. Kawai, P. Steier, F. Quinto, K. Mino, J. Tomita, M. Hoshi, N. Whitehead, M. Yamamoto, First results on ²³⁶U levels in global fallout. Sci. Total Environ. 407 (2009) 4238–4242. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.01.058.

[2] S.R. Winkler, P. Steier, J. Carilli, Bomb fall-out ²³⁶U as global oceanic tracer using an annually
resolved coral core. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 359-360 (2012) 124-130. DOI: 10.1016/j.epsl.2012.10.004

[3] P. Steier, M. Bichler, L.K. Fifield, R. Golser, W. Kutschera, A. Priller, F. Quinto, S Richter, M.
Srncik, P. Terrasi, L. Walker, A. Wallner, G. Wallner, K.M. Wilcken, E.M. Wild, Natural and
anthropogenic ²³⁶U in environmental samples. Nucl. Instr. Meth. B 266 (2008) 2246-2250. DOI:
10.1016/j.nimb.2008.03.002

[4] S. Richter, A. Alonso, W. De Bolle, R. Wellum, P.D.P. Taylor, Isotopic "fingerprint" for natural
uranium samples. Int. J. Mass Spectrom. 193 (1999) 9-14. DOI: 10.1016/S1387-3806(99)00102-5

[5] S.F. Boulyga, J.S. Becker, Determination of uranium isotopic composition and ²³⁶U content of soil
samples and hot particles using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry. Fresenius J. Anal.
Chem. 30 (2001) 612-617. DOI 10.1007/s002160100838

[6] B. Salbu, L. Skipperud, O.C. Lind, Sources contributing to radionuclides in the environment: With
focus on radioactive particles. In: Walther C., Gupta DK, editors. Radionuclides in the environment:
influence of chemical speciation and plant uptake on radionuclides migration. Springer International
Publishing. p 1-36.

[7] R. Eigl, M. Srncik, P. Steier, G. Wallner, ²³⁶U/²³⁸U and ²⁴⁰Pu/²³⁹Pu isotopic in small (2L) sea and
 river water samples. J. Environ. Radioact. 116 (2013) 54-58. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvrad.2012.09.013

[8] F. Quinto, P. Steier, G. Wallner, A. Wallner, M. Srncik, M. Bichler, W. Kutschera, F. Terrasi, A.
Petraglia, C. Sabbarese, The first use of ²³⁶U in the general environment and near a shutdown nuclear
power plant. Appl. Radiat. Isotopes 67 (2009) 11775-1780. DOI: 10.1016/j.apradiso.2009.05.007.

[9] S.F. Boulyga, J.S. Becker, J.L. Matusevitch, H-J. Dietze, Isotope ratio measurements of spent
reactor uranium in environmental samples by using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry.
Int. J. Mass Spectrom. 203 (2000) 143–154. DOI: 10.1016/S1387-3806(00)00296-7.

[10] J.S. Santos, L.S.G. Teixeira, W.N.L. dos Santos, V.A. Lemos, J.M. Godoy, S.L.C. Ferreira,
Uranium determination using atomic spectrometric techniques: An overview. Anal. Chim. Acta 674
(2010) 143-156. DOI: 10.1016/j.aca.2010.06.010.

400 [11] G. Yang, H. Tazoe, M. Yamada, Determination of ²³⁶U in environmental samples by single
401 extraction chromatography coupled to triple-quadrupole inductively coupled plasma-mass
402 spectrometry. Anal. Chim. Acta 944 (2016) 44-50. DOI: 10.1016/j.aca.2016.09.033.

[12] W. Bu, J. Zheng, M.E. Ketterer, S. Hu, S. Uchida, X. Wang, Development and application of
mass spectrometric techniques for ultra-trace determination of ²³⁶U in environmental samples-A
review. Analyt. Chim. Acta 995 (2017) DOI: 1-20. 10.1016/j.aca.2017.09.029

406 [13] M. Christl, C. Lachner, C. Vockenhuber, O. Lechtenfeld, I. Stimac, M.R. Van der Loeff, H.A.
407 Synal, A depth profile of uranium-236 in the Atlantic ocean. Geoch. Cosmochim. Acta 777 (2012) 98408 107. DOI: 10.1016/j.gca.2011.11.009

[14] R. Tortorello, E. Widom, W.H. Renwick, Use of uranium isotopes as a temporal and spatial tracer
of nuclear contamination in the environment. J. Environ. Radioact. 124 (2013) 287-300. DOI:
10.1016/j.jenvrad.2013.06.007

[15] A. Sakaguchi, T. Nomura, P. Steier, R. Golser, K. Sasaki, T. Watanabe, T. Nakakuki, Y.
Takahashi, H. Yamamo, Temporal and vertical distributions of anthropogenic ²³⁶U in the Japan Sea
using a coral core and seawater samples. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 121 (2016) 4-13. DOI:
10.1002/2015JC011109

[16] N. Casacuberta, M. Christl, J. Lachner, M.R. van der Loeff, P. Masque, H.A. Synal, A first
transect of ²³⁶U in the North Atlantic ocean. Geoch. Cosmochim. Acta 133 (2014) 34-46. DOI:
10.1016/j.gca.2014.02.012

419 [17] E.P. Horwitz, M.L. Dietz, R. Chiarizia, H. Diamond, Separation and preconcentration of uranium 420 from acidic media by extraction chromatography. Anal. Chim. Acta 266 (1992) 25-37. DOI: 421 10.1016/0003-2670(92)85276-C

[18] J. Qiao, X. Hou, P. Steier, S. Nielsen, R. Golser, Sequential injection method for rapid and
simultaneous determination of ²³⁶U, ²³⁷Np, and Pu isotopes in seawater. Anal. Chem. 85 (2013) 1102611033. DOI: 10.1021/ac402673p

[19] M. Tanimizu, N. Sugiyama, E. Ponzevera, G. Bayon, Determination of ultra-low ²³⁶U/²³⁸U
isotope ratios by tandem quadrupole ICP-MS/MS. J. Anal. Atom. Spectrom. 28 (2013) 1372-1376.
DOI: 10.1039/C3JA50145K.

[20] M. Thirlwall, Inappropriate tail corrections can cause large inaccuracy in isotope ratio
determination by MC-ICP-MS. J. Anal. Atom. Spectrom. 16 (2001) 1121-1125. DOI:
10.1039/b103828c

[21] L. Balcaen, E. Bolea-Fernández, M. Resano, F. Vanhaecke, Inductively coupled plasma-tandem
mass spectrometry (ICP-MS/MS): A powerful and universal tool for the interference-free
determination of (ultra) trace elements-A tutorial review. Anal. Chim. Acta 894 (2015) 7-19. DOI:
10.1016/j.aca.2015.08.053.

435 [22] G. Yang, H. Tazoe, K. Hayano, K. Okayama, M. Yamada, Isotopic compositions of ²³⁶U, ²³⁹Pu,
436 and ²⁴⁰Pu in soil contaminated by the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant accident. Sci. Rep. 7
437 (2017) 13619. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-017-13998-6.

[23] H. Jaegler, F. Pointurier, S. Diez-Fernández, A. Gourgiotis, H. Isnard, S. Hayashi, H. Tsuji, Y.
Onda, A. Hubert, J.P. Laceby, O. Evrard, Reconstruction of uranium and plutonium dynamics at ultratrace concentrations in sediment accumulated in the Mano Dam reservoir, Japan, before and after the
Fukushima accident. Chemosphere 225 (2019) 849-858. doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.03.064

442 [24] A. Gourgiotis, M. Granet, H. Isnard, A. Nonell, C. Gautier, G. Stadelmann, M. Aubert, D.
443 Durand, S. Legand, F. Chartier, Simultaneous uranium/plutonium separation and direct isotope ratio

measurements by using CO₂ as the gas in a collision/reaction cell-based MC-ICPMS. J. Anal. Atom.
Spectrom. 25 (2010) 1939–1945. DOI: 10.1039/c0ja00092b.

446 [25] S.D. Tanner, C. Li, V. Vais, I. Barano, D.R. Bandura, Chemical resolution of Pu(+) from U(+)
447 and Am(+) using a band-pass reaction cell inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometer. Anal.
448 Chem. 76 (2004) DOI : 3042-3048. 10.1021/ac049899j.

[26] V. Vais, C. Li, R.J. Cornett, Separation of plutonium from uranium using reactive chemistry in a
bandpass reaction cell of an inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometer. Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 380
(2004) 235-239. DOI: 10.1007/s00216-004-2673-3

[27] A. Gourgiotis, H. Isnard, M. Aubert, E. Dupont, I. AlMahamid, G. Tiang, L. Rao, W. Lukens, P.
Cassette, S. Panebianco, A. Letourneau, F. Chartier, Accurate determination of Curium and
Californium isotopic ratio by inductively coupled plasma quadrupole mass spectrometry (ICP-QMS)
in 248Cm samples for transmutation studies. Int. J. Mass Spectrom. 291 (2010) 101-107.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijms.2010.02.002.

457 [28] W. A. Russell, D. A. Papanastassiou, T. A. Tombrello, Ca isotope fractionation on the Earth and
458 other solar system materials. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 42 (1978) 1075–1090. DOI: 10.1016/0016459 7037(78)90105-9.

[29] J. Kragten, Calculating standard deviations and confidence intervals with a universally applicable
 spreadsheet technique. Analyst 119 (1994) 2161-2165. DOI: 10.1016/0169-7439(95)80042-8.

462 [30] J. Kragten, A standard scheme for calculating numerically standard deviations and confidence
463 intervals. Chemom. Intell. Lab. Syst. 28 (1995) 89-97. DOI: 10.1016/0169-7439(95)80042-8.

[31] S.D. Tanner, V.I. Baranov, D.R. Bandura, Reaction cells and collision cells for ICP-MS: a tutorial
review. Spectrochim. Acta, Part B 57 (2002) 1361-1452. DOI: 10.1016/S0584-8547(02)00069-1.

466 [32] S.F. Boulyga, K.G. Heumann, Determination of extremely low $^{236}U/^{238}U$ isotope ratios in 467 environmental samples by sector-field inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry using high-

468 efficiency sample introduction. J. Environ. Radioact. 88 (2006) 1-10. DOI: 469 10.1016/j.jenvrad.2005.12.007. 470 [33] I.W. Croudace, P.W. Warwick, D.G. Reading, B.C. Russell, Recent contributions to the rapid 471 screening of radionuclides in emergency responses and nuclear forensics. Tr. Anal. Chem. 85 (2016)

120–129. DOI: 10.1016/j.trac.2016.05.007.

490 Figures and captions

Figure 1: Reaction profile of ${}^{236}\text{U}{}^{16}\text{O}{}^+$ in counts.s⁻¹ in MS/MS and mass-shift mode versus O₂ and CO₂ gas flow rates expressed in % of gas in the cell. The concentration of U in solution was 0.050 µg mL⁻¹

Figure 2: Spectra of a natural U solution at 500 ng mL⁻¹ in SQ mode (a) and in MS/MS mode (b)

Figure 3: ²³⁶U/²³⁸U isotope ratios obtained by ICP-MS/MS for the non-treated standards (black squares) and the treated standards (white squares). Black and dotted lines indicate the average value and the uncertainty range respectively for the non-treated standards. The uncertainties were calculated according to the Kragten method [27, 28] considering all the sources

Figure 4: Blank average count rate (counts.s⁻¹) for ${}^{236}U^{16}O^+$ during the analytical sessions. The black squares represent measurement of instrumental blanks, while the measurement of procedural blanks are represented by white squares

Table 1: Sensitivity (counts.s⁻¹ for ${}^{238}U^{16}O^+$) and U oxide hydride rates obtained using different desolvating systems

Table 2: 236 U/ 238 U isotope ratios measured for the standard IRMM 184. Uncertainties are combined expanded (k=2) uncertainties calculated according to the Kragten method

Table 3: 236 U/ 238 U isotope ratios measured for the standard IRMM 075/5. Uncertainties are combined expanded (k=2) uncertainties calculated according to the Kragten method

Table 4: Evaluation of the relative contribution (%) of the different sources of errors on the final uncertainty of the ${}^{236}U/{}^{238}U$ ratio in IRMM 075/5 (I). Annotation (B) indicates that the counting corresponds to a blank solution

Table 5: U isotope ratios obtained for the FDNPP samples including the associated combined
 expanded uncertainty (k=2). [†]Measurements by MC-ICP-MS. [‡]Measurements by ICP-MS/MS

Figure S1: Schematic diagram of the chemical treatment and chemical purification protocol of environmental Fukushima samples

- $\frac{2}{3}$ 516 **Table S2**: *m/z* transitions considered for ICP-MS/MS measurements
 - **Table S3**: Experimental conditions applied for the desolvating systems
 - **Figure S2:** Variation in the 238 UO⁺ intensity (count.s⁻¹) when adding He. Reaction gases O₂ and CO₂
 - 19 were at 5% and 10% respectively. Helium flux was increased from 0 to 6 mL min⁻¹, by steps of 0.2 mL

20 min⁻¹







Table 2.

Standard IRMM 184	²³⁶ U/ ²³⁸ U	Combined expanded uncertainty	Relative combined expanded uncertainty (%)	Relative difference/certifie ratio %
Certified ratio	1.2446x10 ⁻⁷	0.0017x10 ⁻⁷	0.13	
Ι	1.239x10 ⁻⁷	0.039x10 ⁻⁷	3.2	-0.4
II	1.216x10 ⁻⁷	0.040×10^{-7}	3.3	-2.3
III	1.241x10 ⁻⁷	0.025×10^{-7}	2.0	-0.3
IV	1.251x10 ⁻⁷	0.025×10^{-7}	2.0	0.5
V	1.207×10^{-7}	0.022×10^{-7}	1.8	-3.0
VI	1.252×10^{-7}	0.028×10^{-7}	2.2	0.6
VII	1.250x10 ⁻⁷	0.028×10^{-7}	2.2	0.5
Average ratio	1.237x10 ⁻⁷			
StdDev (n=7)	0.018x10 ⁻⁷			
Relative StdDev (%)	1.5			
Relative difference/ certified ratio (%)	-0.6			
			26	

Table 3.

]	Standard IRMM 075/5	²³⁶ U/ ²³⁸ U	Combined expanded uncertainty	Relative combined expanded uncertainty (%)	Relat differo / certi ratio
0	Certified ratio	1.06519x10 ⁻⁸	0.00075x10 ⁻⁸	0.07	6.3
	Ι	1.13x10 ⁻⁸	0.15x10 ⁻⁸	13.5	6.3
	II	1.10x10 ⁻⁸	0.09x10 ⁻⁸	8.3	3.4
	III	1.04x10 ⁻⁸	0.09x10 ⁻⁸	8.7	-2.0
	IV	1.14x10 ⁻⁸	0.11x10 ⁻⁸	9.5	7.3
	V	1.19x10 ⁻⁸	0.10×10^{-8}	8.3	8.3
	VI	1.04x10 ⁻⁸	0.24x10 ⁻⁸	22.8	-2.8
	VII	1.00x10 ⁻⁸	0.20x10 ⁻⁸	19.4	-5.
A	verage ratio	1.09x10 ⁻⁸			
S	tdDev (n=7)	0.068x10 ⁻⁸			
R S	elative tdDev (%)	6.2			
R d c (9	elative iference / ertified ratio %)	2.3			
				27	

Table 4.

	Source of uncertainty	²³⁴ UO ⁺ cps	(B) 234 UO ⁺ cps	²³⁵ UO ⁺ cps	$(B)^{235}UO^+ cps$	²³⁶ UO ⁺ cps	$(\mathbf{B})^{236}\mathbf{UO}^{+}\mathbf{cps}$	²³⁸ UO ⁺ ²³⁸	U ¹ H ⁺ cps	²³⁴ U/ ²³⁵ U ref	²³⁵ U/ ²³⁸ U
2	Contribution (%)	0.65	<0.0001	1.10	<0.0001	90.7	0.44	0.12	6.61	0.35	0.001
3											
+											
5	Table 5.										
	Sample	²³⁵ U/ ²³⁸ U [†]	Combined expanded uncertainty	$^{234}U/^{235}U^{\dagger}$	Combined expanded uncertainty	²³⁶ U/ ²³⁸ U [‡]	Combined expanded uncertainty	Relative combined expanded uncertainty (%)			
	MDh	0.007257	0.000002	0.008296	0.000008	1.64x10 ⁻⁸	0.11x10 ⁻⁸	6.7%	_		
	MD1	0.007253	0.000002	0.008379	0.000009	2.42x10 ⁻⁸	0.36x10 ⁻⁸	14.9%			
	MD2	0.007256	0.000002	0.008141	0.000008	1.20x10 ⁻⁸	0.20×10^{-8}	16.6%			
	MD3	0.007258	0.000002	0.008077	0.000008	8.93x10 ⁻⁹	1.5x10 ⁻⁹	16.8%			
	MDp	0.007261	0.000002	0.007955	0.000009	6.94x10 ⁻⁹	1.1x10 ⁻⁹	15.9%			
	MD4	0.007258	0.000002	0.008277	0.000009	1.49x10 ⁻⁸	0.15x10 ⁻⁸	10.1%			
i	MDb	0.007255	0.000002	0.008078	0.000008	7.19x10 ⁻⁹	0.84 x10 ⁻⁹	11.7%			
							28				

Supplementary Material Click here to download Supplementary Material: Supplementary Information.docx

