Temperature dependency of virus and nanoparticle transport and retention in saturated porous media
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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

The influence of temperature on virus (PRD1 and \textit{ΦX174}) and carboxyl-modified latex nanoparticle (50 and 100 nm) attachment was examined in sand-packed columns under various physicochemical conditions. When the solution ionic strength (IS) equaled 10 and 30 mM, the attachment rate coefficient (\(k_{\text{att}}\)) increased up to 105\% (\(p < 0.0002\)) and the percentage of the sand surface area that contributed to attachment (S\text{a}) increased up to 160\% (\(p < 0.002\)) when the temperature was increased from 4 to 20 °C. Temperature effects at IS = 10 and 30 mM were also dependent on the system hydrodynamics; i.e., enhanced retention at a lower pore water velocity (0.1 m/day). Conversely, this same temperature increase had a negligible influence on \(k_{\text{att}}\) and S\text{a} values when IS was 1 mM or >50 mM. An explanation for these observations was obtained from extended interaction energy calculations that considered nanoscale roughness and chemical heterogeneity on the sand surface. Interaction energy calculations demonstrated that the energy barrier to attachment in the primary minimum (\(\Delta\Phi_p\)) decreased with increasing IS, chemical heterogeneity, and temperature, especially in the presence of small amounts of nanoscale roughness (e.g., roughness fraction of 0.05 and height of 20 nm in the zone of influence). Temperature had a negligible effect on \(k_{\text{att}}\) and S\text{a} when the IS = 1 mM because of the large energy barrier, and at IS = 50 mM because of the absence of an energy barrier. Conversely, temperature had a large influence on \(k_{\text{att}}\) and S\text{a} when the IS was 10 and 30 mM because of the presence of a small \(\Delta\Phi_p\) on sand with nanoscale roughness and a chemical (positive zeta potential) heterogeneity. This has large implications for setting parameters for the accurate modeling and transport prediction of virus and nanoparticle contaminants in ground water systems.

\textsuperscript{*} Corresponding author at: CSIRO Land and Water, Glen Osmond, SA 5064, Australia.
E-mail address: salini.sasidharan@flinders.edu.au (S. Sasidharan).

1. Introduction

Groundwater may become contaminated with enteric pathogenic viruses from contaminated recharge water sources, such as infiltration beneath septic tanks, leaking sewer pipes, and managed aquifer recharge with treated wastewater and urban stormwater (Da Silva et al., 2011; Torkzaban et al., 2006; You et al., 2005). Additionally, the increasing use of nanotechnology in a wide range of applications and products will inevitably result in the release of engineered nanoparticles into the subsurface environment (Torkzaban et al., 2013; Wiesner et al., 2006). An understanding and ability to predict the fate and transport of viruses and nanoparticles (NPs) in soils and aquifers are therefore very important for protection of human and environmental health. During passage through porous media, various physicochemical and biological factors influence the attachment of viruses and NPs to solid surfaces, which in turn affects their transport in the subsurface environment. Some of these factors include flow velocity (Hijnen et al., 2005), type of virus or NP (Chu et al., 2001; Fang et al., 2013), temperature (Bradford et al., 2006; Castro and Tufenkji, 2007; Chrysikopoulos and Aravantinou, 2014; Gallardo-Moreno et al., 2003; García-García et al., 2006; Kim and Walker, 2009; McCaulou et al., 1995), solution chemistry (e.g., ionic strength, pH, ion type) (Gutierrez et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2009), solid surface roughness (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2013; Torkzaban and Bradford, 2016) and chemical heterogeneities (Johnson et al., 1996). A few studies observed an increased adsorption for microlatex colloids, bacteria, and viruses to several adsorbents with temperature and attributed to factors such as an increase in viscosity of the medium, enhanced bacterial polymer formation, viral protein folding, protein attachment, and virus hydrophobicity, and higher inactivation of bacteria/virus at a higher temperature (Bales et al., 1991; Bellamy et al., 1985; Fletcher, 1977; Hendricks et al., 1979; McCaulou et al., 1995;
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The objective of this study was to experimentally and theoretically
investigate the influence of water temperature, coupled with solution
chemistry and flow velocity, on the extent and kinetics of virus and
NP attachment in a porous medium. For this purpose, two different
biotic (PRD1 and phiX174 viruses) and abiotic (50 and 100 nm carbox-
yl-modified latex NPs) nanoparticles were employed in this study. The
transport experiments were performed at 4 and 20 °C at various solution
ionic strength (IS) and pore water velocities. Values of 
and 
were determined by parameter fitting to the observed breakthrough
concentrations of the NPs. XDLVO calculations between a chemically
and physically heterogeneous collector and homogeneous particle
were conducted to explain the observed enhanced attachment of the
virus and latex NPs at the higher temperature. Specific solution chemistry
conditions were identified when temperature-dependent particle
transport is expected. Results from this work provide insight into the
underlying mechanisms that control the influence of temperature on
particle attachment in porous media and have important implications
for determining the potential importance of transients in water temperature on virus and nanoparticle fate and transport in the subsurface environment.

2. Materials and method

2.1. Electrolyte solutions and porous medium

Electrolyte solutions of 1, 10, 30, and 50 mM NaCl were prepared using analytical grade NaCl and Milli-Q water at pH = 5.5–5.8. Ultra-pure quartz sand (Charles B. Chystal CO., Inc., NY, USA) with size ranging from 125 to 300 μm was employed in transport experiments. This sand was cleaned using an acid wash and boiling procedure described by (Sadidharan et al., 2014). This idealized quartz sand was selected in order to minimize many of the complexities associated with natural soil and aquifer materials such as organic matter, clay, and metal oxides (Castro and Tufenkji, 2007; Chrysikopoulos and Aravantinou, 2012; Kim and Walker, 2009).

2.2. Viruses

Bacteriophage PRD1 and φX174 were used in this study. The characteristics of these phages and their production and quantification using the double layer agar (DLA) method are described in our previous study (Sadidharan et al., 2016). The DLA method has a detection limit of around 30 plaque forming units (PFU) mL⁻¹ (ISO 10705-2, 2000). Stock solutions of phages were diluted in electrolyte solution and equilibrated at the experimental temperature (4 and 20 °C) to obtain an input concentration (C₀) of about 5 × 10⁶ PFU mL⁻¹. The inactivation rate of viruses over a period of 140 h was determined in representative electrolyte solutions at both temperatures and a representative result is given in Fig. S1.

2.3. Latex nanoparticles

Carboxyl-modified latex NPs (Polysciences, Inc.) of two different sizes (50 and 100 nm) were used in this study. The manufacturer reported that the 50 and 100 nm NPs had a concentration of 3.64 × 10¹⁴ and 4.55 × 10¹⁸ particles mL⁻¹, respectively. Stock solutions of 50 and 100 nm NPs were diluted to obtain a C₀ of 1.1 × 10¹⁳ and 2.4 × 10¹⁰ particles mL⁻¹, respectively. The aqueous phase concentrations of NPs were determined using a fluorescence spectrophotometer (Synergy HT, BioTek Instruments, Inc., Winooski, VT, USA) and a calibration curve at an excitation and emission wavelength of 441 nm and 520 nm was measured in the electrolyte solutions (1 to 50 mM) to obtain an input concentration (C₀) of about 5 × 10⁶ PFU mL⁻¹. The inactivation rate of viruses over a period of 140 h was determined in representative electrolyte solutions at both temperatures and a representative result is given in Fig. S1.

2.4. Zeta potential and size measurements

The electrophoretic mobility (EM) of latex NPs, viruses, and crushed quartz (<2 μm) was measured in the electrolyte solutions (1 to 50 mM) using a Zetasizer (Malvern, Zetasizer Nano Series, Nano-ZS). The temperature setup option on the instrument was used to measure the EM at different temperatures. The samples were first equilibrated to the selected temperature (4 and 20 °C) for 10 min and then EM measurements were repeated five times with more than twenty runs per measurement. The Smoluchowski equation (Elimelech et al., 1994) was used to convert the measured EM values to zeta potentials. The changes in fluid properties (viscosity and dielectric constant) at different temperatures were taken into account in these calculations.

The size distribution of viruses and latex NPs in different electrolyte solutions (1 to 50 mM) and temperatures was measured using a dynamic light scattering (DLS) process (Malvern, Zetasizer Nano Series, Nano-ZS). DLS also known as photon correlation spectroscopy measures the translational diffusion coefficient of particles that are subject to Brownian motions and relates this to the size of the particles. The size expressed as the hydrodynamic diameter, is determined by illuminating the particles using a laser and analyzing the intensity fluctuations in the scattered light (Malvern Instruments Ltd, 2004; Sikora et al., 2016).

2.5. Column transport experiments

The column experiments were conducted in temperature-controlled laboratories (4 ± 1 and 20 ± 1 °C). Sterilized polycarbonate columns (1.9 cm inside diameter and 5 cm height) were wet-packed using clean quartz sand while the column was being vibrated. The packed column has a porosity of 0.4. After packing, the column was preconditioned with >10 pore volumes (PV) of a selected electrolyte solution using a syringe pump (Model 22, Harvard Apparatus) at a pore water velocity of 5 m day⁻¹. The columns were equilibrated to the selected temperature (4 and 20°C) for 12 h before starting the experiment.

A virus (PRD1 and φX174) or latex NP (50 and 100 nm) suspension at selected IS (1, 10, 30, and 50 mM Na⁺) and temperature (4 or 20 °C) was introduced into the column using a syringe pump at an average pore water velocity of 0.1 or 1 m day⁻¹ for 20 PV (Phase 1). This phase was followed by injection of ~10 PV of the particle-free solution at the same IS, temperature, and pore water velocity (Phase 2). The column effluent samples were collected using a Spectra/Chrom® CF-1 Fraction Collector and the concentration of viruses or latex NPs was quantified using methods explained above. The total mass of retained particles during Phases 1 and 2 (~101 PV) was determined by calculating the difference between the mass of injected particles into the column in Phase 1 (~101 PV) and the mass of particles that was recovered in the effluent during Phases 1 and 2 (~101 PV). This information was used to calculate the mass percentage of retained particles (PR) in the column in each experiment.

All experiments were duplicated and the statistical differences of mean removal efficiencies were identified by one-way ANOVA. The mean removal efficiencies were separated by Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test (p < 0.05). All statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows Version 22.0 (IBM SPSS, 2013).

It should mention that retention profiles for viruses and latex NPs were not determined in this study because of significant amounts of irreversible primary minimum attachment, as well as solid phase inactivation for viruses (Bradford et al., 2006; Bradford et al., 2012). The relative importance of surface straining processes on retention and release decreases for smaller particle size and higher solution ionic strengths (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2015).

3. Theoretical calculations

3.1. Breakthrough curve (BTC) simulations

The experimental BTCs for viruses and latex NPs were simulated using the Hydrus-1D model (Simunek et al., 2005). This model allows for advective and dispersive transport, irreversible attachment on site 1, and reversible attachment on site 2. The following aqueous and solid phase mass balance equations were considered in this model:

\[
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = \lambda v \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} - \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} - r_{att}
\]

\[
r_{att} = \rho_b \frac{\partial (S_1 + S_2)}{\partial t} = k_{att} \psi_1 C + k_{att2} \psi_2 C - \frac{\rho_b}{\theta} k_{diss} S_2
\]

where t (T; T denotes units of time) is time, z (L; L denotes units of length) is the direction of mean water flow, C (NL⁻³) is the number of viruses or latex NPs per unit volume of the aqueous phase, \( \lambda (L) \) is the dispersivity, \( \nu (LT^{-1}) \) is the average pore water velocity, \( r_{att} \) (NL⁻³ T⁻¹) is the particle attachment rate to the solid surfaces,
$\rho_b$ (ML$^{-2}$; M denotes units of mass) is the bulk density, $\theta$ is the water content, $S_1$ and $S_2$ (NM$^{-1}$) are the solid phase concentrations of particles (viruses or latex NPs) on site 1 and site 2, respectively, $k_{att}$ and $k_{det}$ (T$^{-1}$) are the attachment rate coefficients for site 1 and site 2, respectively, and $k_{det}$ (T$^{-1}$) is the detachment rate coefficient for site 2. The parameters $\psi_1$ and $\psi_2$ are dimensionless Langmuirian blocking functions that are given as (Adamczyk et al., 2013):

$$\psi_1 = \left(1 - \frac{S_1}{S_{max1}}\right)$$
$$\psi_2 = \left(1 - \frac{S_2}{S_{max2}}\right)$$

where $S_{max1}$ and $S_{max2}$ (NM$^{-1}$) are the maximum solid phase concentrations of attached latex NPs on site 1 and site 2, respectively. As it will be shown, negligible detachment was observed for the latex NPs, and therefore the value of $k_{det}$ was set to zero for the latex NP simulations. Blocking was not observed in the BTCs of viruses. The $C_0$ of viruses is $10^6$ times smaller than that for the latex NPs. Considering the smaller size and attachment rate for viruses, the time that it takes for viruses to fill $S_f$ will be $10^6$ times longer. Therefore, blocking was neglected for viruses by setting $\psi_1$ and $\psi_2$ to 1. Solid and liquid inactivation of viruses was found to be negligible over the relatively short duration of these transport experiments (Fig. S1) and therefore, all the removal was attributed to attachment.

The total value of $k_{att}$ and $S_{max}$ for the viruses and latex NPs were defined as $k_{att} = k_{att1} + k_{att2}$ and $S_{max} = S_{max1} + S_{max2}$, respectively. The value of $\alpha$ was calculated from $k_{att}$ using filtration theory as (Schijven and Hassanzadeh, 2000; Yao et al., 1971):

$$\alpha = \frac{2d_k k_{att}}{3(1-n)/V^i}$$

where $n$ is the porosity (0.4) and $d_k$ (L) is the collector diameter. Many correlations have been developed to predict $\eta$ (Logan et al., 1995; Ma et al., 2013; Rajagopalan and Tien, 1976; Tufekji and Elimelech, 2004; Yao et al., 1971). However, some of these correlations predict a $\eta$ value that is greater than one, which is physically questionable (Ma et al., 2013), when typical groundwater flow conditions are considered (e.g., $v \approx 0.1$ m day$^{-1}$). Messina et al. (2015) have recently developed a correlation for $\eta$ to overcome this shortcoming. Indeed, calculated values of $\eta$ were greater than one for both latex NPs and viruses at $v = 0.1$ m day$^{-1}$ when using correlations of (Tufekji and Elimelech, 2004; Yao et al., 1971). The correlation equation of (Messina et al., 2015) was therefore employed to determine the value of $\eta$ in this study and values were significantly ($p < 0.008$) different to those calculated using previous correlations (Tufekji and Elimelech, 2004; Yao et al., 1971).

The value of $S_f$ was calculated from $S_{max}$ as (Kim et al., 2009):

$$S_f = \frac{A_f \rho_b S_{max} 100}{1 - \gamma A_s}$$

where $A_f$ (L$^2$ N$^{-1}$) is the cross sectional area of a particle, $A_s$ (L$^{-1}$) is the solid surface area per unit volume, and $\gamma$ is the porosity of a monolayer packing of particles on the solid surface that was set to 0.5 based on information in (Johnson and Elimelech, 1995).

3.2. XDLVO interaction energy calculations

The total interaction energy between homogeneous particle and collector surfaces was determined as:

$$\Phi_{Total} = \Phi_{vdw} + \Phi_{EDL} + \Phi_{HR}$$

where $\Phi_{Total}$ (ML$^2$T$^{-2}$) is the total interaction energy, $\Phi_{vdw}$ (ML$^2$T$^{-2}$) is the van der Waals interaction, $\Phi_{EDL}$ (ML$^2$T$^{-2}$) is the electrostatic double layer interaction, and $\Phi_{HR}$ (ML$^2$T$^{-2}$) is the interaction due to Born repulsion. The value of $\Phi_{vdw}$ was determined from the expression of (Gregory, 1981). The Hamaker constant for each particle-water-quartz system was determined by including the temperature dependency of the refractive index and the dielectric constant as explained in detail by (Yan et al., 2015). The combined Hamaker constant for latex NP-water-quartz was equal to 6.5 $\times$ 10$^{-21}$ at 4 °C and 6.8 $\times$ 10$^{-21}$ J at 20 °C; whereas for virus-water-quartz it was 4.04 $\times$ 10$^{-21}$ J at 4 °C and 4.24 $\times$ 10$^{-21}$ J at 20 °C. The value of $\Phi_{EDL}$ was calculated using the Hogg-Healy-Fuerstenau expression (Hogg et al., 1966) with zeta potentials in place of surface potentials. The value of $\Phi_{HR}$ was calculated using the approach of (Ruckenstein and Prieve, 1976) by setting the collision diameter at 0.21 nm to achieve a primary minimum depth at 0.157 nm (Van Oss et al., 1988).

Natural solid surfaces like sand grains always contain a wide distribution of physical (roughness) or chemical (e.g., metal oxides) heterogeneities. The interaction energy between a homogeneous particle and a heterogeneous collector was calculated by assuming that the zone of influence ($A_z$) on the solid-water-interface contained nanoscale chemical and roughness heterogeneities. Each $A_z$ was assumed to contain a nanoscale roughness function ($f_r$) of 0.01–0.1 with a height ($h_z$) of 1–20 nm and a positive zeta potential function ($f_z$) of 0.01–0.1 with a positive zeta potential ($\zeta_0$) of 1–10 mV. Note that the values of heterogeneity parameters used in this study are hypothetical since accurate measurements or characteristics of these parameters are not yet available. However, similar values for the heterogeneity parameters were used in many previous studies (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2015; Torkzaban and Bradford, 2016). The value of interaction energy ($\Phi$) within $A_z$ was subsequently quantified using a linear combination of interaction energies associated with nanoscale heterogeneities and the homogeneous surface as explained by (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2015). Theoretical values of $\alpha$ and $S_f$ ($\Phi_S$ and $\Phi_f$) were calculated as the average of 10,000 $A_z$ realizations using the approach described by (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2015). The contact angles for quartz, $\Phi_X$174, latex NPs have been reported to be equal to 0°, 26°, and 36°, respectively (Attini et al., 2010; Sirivithayapakorn and Keller, 2003; Subrahmanyan et al., 1999). The contribution of hydrophobic interaction is considered to be negligible when the contact angle is ~90° (Vogler, 1998), and it was therefore not considered. In addition, many previous studies neglected the hydrophobic interactions for PRD1 in DLVO interactions energy calculation (Ryan et al., 1999; Sadeghi et al., 2011, 2013).

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Interaction energy for homogeneous surfaces

Table 1 presents the measured zeta potential values of the viruses, latex NPs, and sand for the various IS and temperature conditions. Zeta potentials of all surfaces were negatively charged at the pH of the experiments (5.5–5.8) and become less negative with increasing IS. Note that the zeta potential values for a given surface and IS were nearly identical ($\pm$ 4 mV) at the two temperature of 4 and 20 °C (Table S1). Hence, an increase in the temperature from 4 to 20 °C did not significantly influence the electrokinetic properties of the viruses, latex NPs, and sand. It is worth mentioning that temperature has been reported to have variable effects on the electrokinetic properties of solid surfaces (Castro and Tufekji, 2007; García-García et al., 2009; Ishido et al., 1983; Reppert and Morgan, 2003; Rodríguez and Araujo, 2006). A few studies reported that zeta potentials of various materials become more negatively charged with increasing temperature from 4 to 50 °C (0.012–0.5 per °C) (Kim and Walker, 2009; Rodríguez and Araujo, 2006). However, other researchers found that increasing temperature from 4 to 40 °C resulted in a decrease in the magnitude of the zeta potentials (0.16–0.25 per °C) (Dhont and Briels, 2008; Freitas and Müller, 1998; Galisteo et al., 1990). Castro and Tufekji (2007) reported that the dissociation constant of certain acidic and basic groups can be sensitive to temperature, whereas other functional groups such as -COOH are insensitive to temperature. Variations in the surface functional groups present on the
various colloid surfaces may explain the observed discrepancies in zeta potential value with temperature. The average size of the viruses and the latex NPs for the various IS and temperature conditions was very stable; tFX174 = 27 ± 3.5 nm, PRD1 = 63 ± 3.9 nm, 50 nm latex = 50 ± 3.6, and 100 nm latex = 100 ± 4.9 nm. This data indicates that the colloidal suspensions were not aggregating under the considered experimental conditions. Measured average zeta potentials at both temperatures (Table 1) and average particle sizes were therefore used for subsequent XDLVO calculations.

The interaction energy profile of latex NPs and viruses on approach to a physically and chemically homogeneous quartz surface was calculated using XDLVO theory. The height of the energy barrier to attachment in primary minimum (∆φ2 = φmax − φ2 min) is given in Table 1 for all the IS and temperature conditions. As expected, the height of ∆φ2 decreased with increasing IS and decreasing particle size. At IS = 50 mM, the energy barrier is completely eliminated because of the relatively low zeta potentials of the sand and particles. The magnitude of ∆φ2 slightly decreased with increasing temperature when the IS < 50 mM due to the increase in the attractive van der Waal interaction; i.e., the Hamaker constant was greater at a higher temperature (Yan et al., 2015) and the electrostatic repulsion was reduced due to the decrease in Debye-length (κ−1) with temperature (κ−1 = 3.06 nm at 4 °C and κ−1 = 3.04 nm at 20 °C). However, a sizable ∆φ2 (~7 kT) was predicted for all particles at both temperatures when IS < 50 mM, which, in principle, should inhibit primary minimum attachment of the particles to sand surfaces (Torkzaban and Bradford, 2016; Tufenkji and Elimelech, 2005). It should be mentioned that the depth of the φ2 min was smaller than ~0.5 kT under all conditions (Table S2), indicating that attachment in the φ2 min was highly unlikely (Tufenkji and Elimelech, 2005).

### 4.2. Retention of viruses and latex NPs in column experiments

Fig. 1 shows representative observed and fitted BTCs for PRD1 and tFX174 when ν = 0.1 m day−1, IS = 10 and 50 mM, and temperature = 4 and 20 °C. Here, the relative influent concentrations (C/Ci; where C is the influent and Ci is the influent concentration) were plotted on a log-arithmetic scale as a function of PV. Tables 2 and S3 presents values of mass retained for the viruses (log scale) and replicate experimental results, respectively. The BTCs showed negligible virus retention when the viruses were suspended in 1 mM solution at both temperatures (Table 2). Hence, the relative effluent concentrations (C/Ci) were plotted on a log-arithmetic scale as a function of PV. Tables 2 and S3 presents values of mass retained for the viruses (log scale) and replicate experimental results, respectively. The BTCs showed negligible virus retention when the viruses were suspended in 1 mM solution at both temperatures (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>IS [mM]</th>
<th>Zeta potential [mV ± STDV]</th>
<th>Temperature [°C]</th>
<th>∆φ2 = φmax − φ2 min heterogeneous</th>
<th>∆φ2 = φmax − φ2 min physically and chemically heterogeneous [kT ± STDV]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 nm (NP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−48 ± 1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33 ± 0.7</td>
<td>13 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>−40 ± 1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29 ± 0.5</td>
<td>11 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>−35 ± 1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 ± 0.6</td>
<td>10 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>−25 ± 0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 ± 0.1</td>
<td>9 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 nm (NP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−51 ± 1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>−47 ± 1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59 ± 0.1</td>
<td>26 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>−40 ± 2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 ± 0.7</td>
<td>22 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>−31 ± 2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31 ± 0.8</td>
<td>12 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRD1 (63 nm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−37 ± 1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>−33 ± 2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28 ± 0.6</td>
<td>13 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>−20 ± 3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24 ± 0.6</td>
<td>11 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tFX174 (27 nm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−36 ± 1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>−30 ± 1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>−17 ± 1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−38 ± 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>−27 ± 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>−23 ± 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>−15 ± 0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** Measured values of zeta potential and calculated values of the energy barrier to attachment in primary minimum (Δφ2 = φmax − φ2 min) for 50 and 100 nm latex NPs and viruses (tFX174 and PRD1).

**References:**


parameters. Values of $k_{att1}$ were found to be more than one order of magnitude greater than those of $k_{att2}$ ($p < 0.0007$) and, therefore, interaction with site 1 accounted for almost 100% of the virus retention (see Table 2). Hence, the values of $k_{att2}$ were used to compare the kinetics of virus attachment at various conditions. Table 2 shows that the average value of $k_{att1}$ for both viruses increased with IS, suggesting that electrostatics dominated virus attachment. The average value of $k_{att}$ for ΦX174 was regularly greater than those of PRD1 over the range of IS, consistent with the isoelectric point value of 6.6 for ΦX174 compared with that of 3.4 for PRD1 (Sasidharan et al., 2016). Similar to the observed BTCs, values of $k_{att}$, only showed a significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) to temperature when the IS was 10 mM. Specifically, the average values of $k_{att}$ at 20°C were 80 and 109% significantly ($p < 0.0002$) higher than those at 4°C for ΦX174 and PRD1, respectively. Our experimental observations were consistent with previous studies (Chrysikopoulos and Aravantinou, 2014; Gharabaghi et al., 2015; Kim and Walker, 2009; McCaulou et al., 1995). For example, (Kim and Walker, 2009) reported that the $k_{att}$ value for latex microspheres increased by 173% when the temperature increased from 10 to 25°C. Values of $η$ are presented in Table 2 to show the contribution of temperature on mass transfer. It is observed that the increase in temperature from 4 to 20°C resulted in an increase in $η$ by only ~8–12% (Table 2). This increase in $η$ with temperature, therefore, cannot fully explain the observed increase in the value of $k_{att}$ (80–109%) when the IS = 10 mM. As a result, it is concluded that the value of $α$ should have also increased with temperature. Indeed, Eq. (4) predicts that $α$ increased by ~47 and 117% for ΦX174 and PRD1, respectively, when the temperature increased from 4 to 20°C. This substantial increase in $α$ at higher temperature suggests that the probability of overcoming the energy barrier was higher for viruses when the temperature increased from 4 to 20°C. It should be mentioned that the survival test of viruses at the experimental conditions and duration confirmed a stable virus concentration (i.e., negligible inactivation, Fig. S1). There was a slight difference between the measured virus concentration between the 4 and 20°C but the difference was ~0.02 log. Therefore, it is confirmed that the observed enhanced retention was due to the influence of temperature on $k_{att}$ rather than on inactivation rate coefficient.

In order to understand the effect of temperature on the retention of abiotic colloids, additional transport experiments were conducted using the latex NPs (50 and 100 nm) at 4 and 20°C for various IS and pore water velocity values. Figs. 2 and 3 present the observed and simulated BTCs for these experiments. Tables 3 and 5 provide values of mass percentage of retained particles and replicate information for the latex NPs experiments, respectively. Similar trends to those of viruses were observed in these experiments, that is, an enhanced latex NP retention was only observed at the higher temperature at intermediate IS conditions (i.e., when the IS was 10 and 30 mM). Comparison of Figs. 2 and 3 at the IS of 10 and 30 mM and the corresponding values of PR (Table 3) indicates that the relative importance of temperature on particle retention was also a function of the pore water velocity. Results show that the increase in the PR with temperature for the IS of 10 and 30 mM was greater when the pore water velocity was lower. These observations collectively demonstrate a coupled effect of IS, pore water velocity, and temperature on latex NP retention in porous media.

Fitted values of $k_{att1}$, $k_{att2}$, $S_{max1}$ and $S_{max2}$ for the latex NPs under various experimental conditions are presented in Table 3. Note that the values of fitted parameters are not presented when latex NP retention was negligible (IS = 1 mM) or when breakthrough concentrations were below the detection limit (IS = 50 mM). The goodness of fit for the IS of 10 and 30 mM simulations confirmed the assumption of Langmuir blocking on both sites 1 and 2, and negligible detachment. Fitted values of $k_{det}$ and $k_{att}$ were not always unique because latex NP concentrations in the initial stage of breakthrough were below the detection limit of our measurement equipment. However, the fitted values of $S_{max1}$ and $S_{max2}$ were unique, as the final values of the fitting process were not affected by the initial values of the parameters. In addition, the Akaike Information Criterion (Akaike, 1974) and $R^2$ values included in Hydrus-1D indicated that the two-site kinetic model with $S_{max1}$ and $S_{max2}$ provides the best model fit for the observed BTCs. Table 3 presents calculated values of $S_{max} = S_{max1} + S_{max2}$ that were used to calculate $S_1$ (Eq. (5)). It was noted that only a small fraction of the sand surface

### Table 2

Experimental conditions and the values of fitted parameters for viruses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus</th>
<th>Temperature [°C]</th>
<th>IS [mM]</th>
<th>Pore water velocity [m day⁻¹]</th>
<th>Mass retained [%]</th>
<th>$k_{att1}$ [day⁻¹]</th>
<th>$k_{att2}$ [day⁻¹]</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$η$</th>
<th>Percentage increase of $η$ [%]</th>
<th>$α$</th>
<th>Percentage increase of $α$ [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΦX174</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16 ± 0.7</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.03</td>
<td>78.3 ± 0.71</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18 ± 0.7</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.03</td>
<td>78.3 ± 0.71</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>25 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.02</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.04</td>
<td>87.1 ± 0.71</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>25 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.04</td>
<td>80.4 ± 0.65</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17 ± 0.3</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.09</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.08</td>
<td>80.2 ± 0.60</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>24 ± 0.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.9 ± 0.09</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.01</td>
<td>84.4 ± 0.54</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>23 ± 0.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.9 ± 0.09</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.01</td>
<td>84.4 ± 0.54</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Observed effluent concentrations (marker) and corresponding model fits (solid line) for representative effluent concentrations of viruses (A) ΦX174 and (B) PRD1 for experiments conducted at temperature = 4 and 20°C, IS = 10 and 50 mM Na⁺ and pore water velocity = 0.1 m day⁻¹. Table 2 provides the values of fitted parameters ($k_{att1}$, $k_{att2}$ and $k_{att2}$). The BTCs showed negligible virus retention when the viruses were suspended in a solution with IS = 1 mM (mass balance data is presented in Table S3).
contributed to latex NP attachment when the IS was 10 and 30 mM (<
33.4%). Note that increasing IS and temperature and decreasing NP
size and pore water velocity increased the value of $S_f$. Interestingly,
values of $S_f$ were observed to increase significantly ($p < 0.002$) by ~
44–160% at the IS of 10 and 30 mM when the temperature increased
from 4 to 20 °C.

The fitted BTCs of NPs showed a bimodal shape. In particular, the
BTCs were initially delayed, next they rapidly increased, and then slowly
approached the influent particle concentration. The initial delay was
increased with increasing IS and temperature. An explanation for the
dependence of latex NP retention on IS and flow velocity and the need
to use the two-site kinetic model with a Langmuirian blocking function
for each site was previously provided by (Sasidharan et al., 2014).

4.3. XDLVO interaction energy for a chemically and physically heteroge-
neous surface

Recall that XDLVO calculations for viruses and latex NPs interacting
with a homogeneous sand surface predicted a large $\Delta \Phi_a$ (>7 kT) and
negligible attachment when the IS was 1, 10, and 30 mM (Table 1). Nat-
ural sand surfaces always exhibit some degree of heterogeneity at the
nanoscale. For example, Fig. S2 shows the presence of micro-nanoscale
surface roughness on a river sand grain observed under scanning elec-
tron microscopy (Quanta 450, Adelaide microscopy, The University of
Adelaide, Australia). Similarly, Han et al. (2016) measured the surface
roughness of bare quartz sand using atomic force microscopy and re-
ported that the average surface roughness was ~33.4 nm. Nanoscale
surface physical heterogeneities (roughness) and chemical heterogene-
ity (mineral defects, isomorphic substitutions, adsorption of different
ions, organic, and/or metal oxides) have been considered in XDLVO cal-
culations to account for observed attachment under unfavorable condi-
tions (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2012; Bradford and Torkzaban, 2013;
Hoek et al., 2003; Huang et al., 2009; Shen et al., 2012). Additional
XDLVO calculations on physically and chemically heterogeneous sand
were, therefore, conducted in an attempt to explain the observed tem-
perature dependency of virus and latex NP retention. We acknowledge
that the virus exhibits chemical (protein coat and lipid membrane)
(Meder et al., 2013) and physical heterogeneity (spikes) (Huiskonen
et al., 2007; Kazumori, 1981) on their surface but this has not char-
acterized very well. Similar to many previous studies, we therefore only
consider XDLVO calculations on a hypothetical solid-water-interface
(Castro and Tufenkji, 2007; Loveland et al., 1996; Wong et al., 2014).
Previous studies have demonstrated that roughness height ($h_r$), roughness fraction ($f_r$), positive zeta potential ($\zeta_+$), and positive zeta potential fraction ($f_z$) at a particular location on the collector surface can have a significant influence on the magnitude of $\Delta \Phi_0$ (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2013; Torkzaban and Bradford, 2016). The values of $\Delta \Phi_0$ calculated for viruses and latex NPs interacting with a chemically and physically heterogeneous sand surface for all the IS and the two temperatures are given in Table 1. Specific heterogeneity parameter values used in these calculations included $f_r = 0.05$, $h_r = 20$ nm, $f_z = 0.1$ and $\zeta_+ = 1$ mV. The magnitude of $\Delta \Phi_0$ was significantly reduced ($p < 0.0002$) for the heterogeneous surface compared to the homogeneous surface (Table 1). For example, Table 1 shows that the value of $\Delta \Phi_0$ for the PRD1 virus at IS = 10 mM decreased from 28 and 24 kT on the homogeneous surface to 1.3 and 1.1 kT on the heterogeneous surface when the IS = 1 mM because the value of $\alpha$ rapidly increased from a minimum value at IS = 1 mM to a maximum at IS = 10 mM, and then slowly decreased with IS and became negligible at IS ≥ 40 mM. Similar behavior was observed for the percentage increase of $S_f$ values. These results were consistent with our experimental observations; e.g., an increase in temperature from 4 to 20 °C produced an increase in attachment ($\alpha$ and $S_f$) when the IS = 10 and 30 mM, but had a negligible influence at IS = 1 and 50 mM. In addition, Fig. 4 and experimental observations (Tables 2 and 3) also indicate that the effect of temperature on attachment was more evident for bigger particles (PRD1 virus or 100 nm latex NP). The larger particles had $\Delta \Phi_0$ values (<7 kT) that were in the range of impossible. Theoretical values of $\alpha$ and $S_f$ were denoted below as $\alpha_T$ and $S_fT$, respectively.

4.4. Coupled effect of IS, water velocity, and temperature on $\alpha$ and $S_f$ values

Numerical simulations were conducted to better understand the coupled influence of IS and temperature on $\alpha$ and $S_f$ values. The model of (Bradford and Torkzaban, 2015) was employed for this purpose. These simulations considered a homogeneous particle interacting with a physically and chemically heterogeneous collector surface at 10,000 random $A_r$ locations. The mean values of physical and chemical heterogeneity parameters in these simulations included $f_r = 0.1$, $h_r = 20$ nm, and zeta potential values from Table 1. It should be noted that the simulations shown below are a representative example to show the effect of collector surface heterogeneity on $\alpha$ and $S_f$ values. Natural surfaces are more complex and determining the accurate heterogeneity parameter distributions is likely to be

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>IS [mM]</th>
<th>Pore water velocity [m d⁻¹]</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>$k_{att}$ [day⁻¹]</th>
<th>$k_{act}$ [day⁻¹]</th>
<th>$S_{max}$ [%]</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$S_f$ [%]</th>
<th>Percentage increase of $S_f$ [%]</th>
<th>Percentage increase of $\alpha$ [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 ± 3.2</td>
<td>123 ± 0.4</td>
<td>6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.7 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>79 ± 0.3</td>
<td>15 ± 0.4</td>
<td>2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.8 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>159.6</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>7.0 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84 ± 3.9</td>
<td>4.4 ± 0.5</td>
<td>2 ± 0.7</td>
<td>1.5 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75 ± 3.1</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>1.7 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 ± 1.8</td>
<td>11 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>6.7 × 10¹³</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>16 ± 1.4</td>
<td>66 ± 0.3</td>
<td>3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>3.1 × 10¹³</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58 ± 4.1</td>
<td>11 ± 0.4</td>
<td>1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>1.6 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>43 ± 3.2</td>
<td>14 ± 0.9</td>
<td>1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>8.0 × 10¹³</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53 ± 1.8</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>2 ± 0.8</td>
<td>8.8 × 10¹³</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67 ± 0.9</td>
<td>25 ± 2.5</td>
<td>67 ± 0.9</td>
<td>8 ± 0.9</td>
<td>5.7 × 10¹³</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>79 ± 3.9</td>
<td>14 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2 ± 0.7</td>
<td>2.5 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66 ± 2.8</td>
<td>12 ± 0.2</td>
<td>1 ± 0.9</td>
<td>1.7 × 10¹⁴</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the greatest sensitivity to particle diffusion. A small reduction of $\Delta \phi_2$ at 20 °C allowed more particles to overcome the shallow energy barrier to attachment in a primary minimum, and substantially enhanced $\alpha$ and $S_f$.

Figs. 2 and 3 indicate that a decrease in pore water velocity enhanced the retention of latex NPs at a given ionic strength. Experimental and theoretical results have shown that colloidal particles weakly associated with solid surfaces via a shallow secondary minimum may translate over the surface by hydrodynamic forces to reach some locations where the attachment is favorable (Kuznar and Elimelech, 2007; Sasidharan et al., 2014; Torkzaban et al., 2010). Bendersky et al. (2015) reported that Brownian motion is more significant than or comparable to DLVO interactions and hydrodynamic forces for small particles (~200 nm) at low flow velocities. Consequently, it is expected that particles with more residence time on the solid surface due to a lower fluid velocity would have an increased probability to diffuse over a shallow $\Delta \phi_2$ and become attached in the primary energy minimum (Bendersky et al., 2015).

The data from groundwater sources across the world show that the temperature may range from 4 to 32 °C (Kar et al., 2010; Vanderzalm et al., 2010; Yates et al., 1985). We acknowledge that, only two temperatures that correspond to average groundwater extremes were considered in the laboratory experiments in this study. However, the simulated value of $\alpha_f$ and $S_f$ at various temperatures were consistent with our experimental observation. Fig. S3 shows the percentage increase of $\alpha_f$ for viruses (PRD1 and tX174) and $S_f$ for latex NPs (50 and 100 nm) interacting with a heterogeneous sand surface when the temperature increases from 0 to 25 °C as an increment of 5 °C at IS = 10 mM. Results show a systematic nonlinear increase in $\alpha_f$ and $S_f$ with increasing temperature, with greater increases occurring for the larger virus (PRD1) and latex NP (100 nm).

5. Conclusion

This study showed that an increase in temperature from 4 °C to 20 °C increased the retention of viruses and latex NPs in porous media under intermediate IS (10 and 30 mM) conditions. In particular, the value of $k_{na}$, $\alpha_f$ (for the virus), and $S_f$ (for the latex NPs) calculated from fitted model parameters showed an increase up to 109, 117, and 160%, respectively, at intermediate IS conditions. Conversely, temperature had negligible influence on $k_{na}$, $\alpha_f$, and $S_f$ values when IS was 1 mM or 50 mM. These results could not be explained by differences in $\gamma$ with temperature. An explanation was obtained from XDLVO calculations on sand surfaces that included nanoscale roughness and chemical heterogeneity. The temperature had a relatively minor (~3 kT) influence on the magnitude $\Delta \phi_2$, in comparison to physical and chemical heterogeneity. However, a small reduction in $\Delta \phi_2$ at a higher temperature significantly increased the probability for particles to attach in the primary minimum under intermediate IS conditions. Numerical model predictions conducted to understand the coupled effect of IS, temperature, and colloidal size were consistent with the experimental observation.

The experiments presented here were conducted in a simple electrolyte solution at pH 5.5–5.8 and using a clean quartz sand. Whereas, natural groundwater can have different chemical compositions (presence of mono or divalent ions, high pH, and/or organic matter) and aquifer sediment can have various mineral properties, clay fractions, and/or grain size distributions. Ongoing research in our laboratory aims at extending this work to examine the transport of viruses and NPs in aquifer sediments and ground water over a wide range of environmentally relevant conditions. A better understanding of the effect of temperature on pathways and engineered NP transport has significant implications for management of potential health and environmental risks associated with groundwater and water reuse. Surface water-groundwater mixing via recharge and seasonal changes in water temperature may significantly affect virus and NP attachment to porous media. Drinking water produced by domestic wells in cold climate regions might be at a higher risk of virus and NP contaminant exposure. Therefore, the influence of temperature should be considered in predictive models in order to accurately assess risks of groundwater contamination.
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