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QCM-D characterization of particle deposition kinetics


Figure S1. Representative QCM-D measurement data. The figure shows the frequency and dissipation measured at the $3^{\text {rd }}$ overtone as a function of time during the deposition experiment of pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ onto bare silica surface in 20 mM NaCl solution.

Table S1. The initial slop of the measured $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ overtone frequency shift $\Delta f_{3}$ and the mass deposition rate calculated by the viscoelastic Voigt model for pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ deposition on silica surface at various NaCl concentrations.

| $\mathrm{NaCl}(\mathrm{mM})$ | $\Delta f_{3}(\mathrm{~Hz} / \mathrm{min})$ | Mass Deposition Rate $\left(\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{cm}^{2} \mathrm{~min}\right)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 | 0.0615 | 1.5 |
| 10 | 0.5955 | 16.7 |
| 20 | 0.6525 | 19.8 |
| 40 | 0.2385 | 12 |
| 80 | 0.147 | 7.2 |
| 100 | 0.099 | 4.9 |



Figure S2a. The initial slop of the measured $3^{\text {rd }}$ overtone frequency shift $f_{3, \text { slope }}$ of pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ deposition on silica surface as a function of NaCl concentration.


Figure S2b. The mass deposition rate calculated by the viscoelastic Voigt model for pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ deposition on silica surface as a function of NaCl concentration.

## Determination of $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ particle size in deposition experiments

In the QCM-D experiments, it took 5 min for the $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ nanoparticles to reach the measurement chamber after being mixed with the NaCl solution. At high ionic strength $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ aggregation occurred. The $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ particle size during deposition in the measurement chamber was therefore determined based on the aggregation kinetics curve (average particle size vs. aggregation time) by setting the aggregation time to

| Sample | NaCl concentration (mM) | Particle/aggregate size at $5 \mathrm{~min}(\mathrm{~nm})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prstine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ | 1 | 162 |
|  | 5 | 162 |
|  | 10 | 162 |
|  | 20 | 163.8 |
|  | 40 | 241.8 |
|  | 60 | 334.5 |
|  | 80 | 449.4 |
|  | 100 | 492 |
| 7DUV nC 60 | 40 | 162 |
|  | 100 | 162 |
|  | 150 | 162 |
|  | 200 | 168.9 |
|  | 250 | 191.1 |
|  | 300 | 244.5 |
|  | 350 | 280.8 |

be 5 min .
Table S2. Pristine and 7-day UVA-irradiated (7DUV) $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ particle size during the QCM-D experiments.

## Packed column experiments

Quartz sand sizing from $250 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ to $300 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in diameter was obtained by sieving a $50-70$ mesh quartz sand (sigma-aldrich) with 50 and 60 mesh sieves. Before use, the sand was cleaned by soaking in a 1.5 $\mathrm{M} \mathrm{HNO}_{3}$ solution for 24 h and rinsing with deionized water until the pH reaches neutral. The sand was then oven dried at $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . Columns (Omnifit, 1.5 cm in diameter) were wet packed with clean quartz sand to a height of $\sim 5 \mathrm{~cm}$ with a porosity of 0.39 as determined gravimetrically. Figure S3 presents the packed column experimental setup. Ten pore volume of deionized water, followed by 10 pore volume of background solution, was passed through the column at a flow rate of $2 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ to rinse and condition the sand. The $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ stock suspension and the electrolyte stock solution were mixed to yield the test $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ suspension at $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$, which was then introduced into the column at a flow rate of 0.84 $\mathrm{mL} / \mathrm{min}$ until the effluent $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ concentration reached steady state. The effluent was continuously collected by a fraction collector (Pharmacia Fine Chemicals) and the $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ concentration was analyzed using a UV-vis spectrophotometer (UV 2550, Shimadazu) at a wavelength of 350 nm . Representative breakthrough curves of $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ are shown in Figure S 4 .

To create favorable deposition conditions, clean quartz sand was precoated with poly-L-lysine (PLL) by
soaking in a solution containing $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ PLL, 100 mM NaCl and 10 mM HEPES, followed by thoroughly rinsing with deionized water and drying at room temperature.

The deposition rate coefficient $K_{d}$ of $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ in different solution chemistry was determined using following equation: ${ }^{2}$
$k_{d}=-\frac{U}{\varepsilon L} \operatorname{In}\left(\frac{C}{C_{0}}\right)$
where $U$ is the superficial velocity, $\varepsilon$ is the porosity, $L$ is the column length, $C$ is the steady state effluent concentration of $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ (i.e., the plateau of the breakthrough curve), and $C_{0}$ is the influent $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ concentration.

The particle attachment efficiency $\alpha$ was calculated by normalizing the deposition rate coefficient of interest, $K_{d}$, by the deposition rate coefficient under favorable conditions, $K_{d, f a v}$.


Figure S3. Diagram of the packed column setup


Figure S4. Representative breakthrough curves for $\mathrm{nC}_{60}(5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ transport experiments in silica sand packed columns in NaCl solutions.

The seepage velocity used in the packed column experiments was controlled to match the flow velocity used in the QCM-D experiment. This resulted in similar Peclet number in the two systems.

For the QCM-D system, a parallel-plate channel configuration was assumed: ${ }^{3}$

$$
P_{e Q C M}=\frac{3 v_{m} a^{3}}{2 b^{2} D}
$$

Here, $v_{m}$ is the flow velocity in the measurement chamber, $a$ is the particle radius, $b$ is the half depth of the channel $(0.00032 \mathrm{~m})$, and $D$ is the diffusion coefficient. The flow velocity $v_{m}$ in the QCM-D chamber is $0.0002 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ at the volumetric flow rate of $100 \mu \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{min}$. The particle diameter $2 a$ at different ionic strength was determined in Table S1. The diffusion coefficient $D$ is estimated using the StokesEinstein equation:
$D=\frac{k T}{3 \pi \mu d}$
where $k$ is the Boltzman constant $\left(1.38 \times 10^{-23} \mathrm{~J} \cdot \mathrm{~K}^{-1}\right), T$ is the absolute temperature $(298 \mathrm{~K}), \mu$ is the viscosity of water $\left(10^{-3} \mathrm{~Pa} \cdot \mathrm{~s}\right)$, and the $d$ is the particle diameter.

For packed column system, a sphere in uniform flow configuration was assumed: ${ }^{3}$
$P_{e \text { column }}=\frac{3 A_{f} v a^{3}}{R^{2} D}$
Here, $v$ is the seepage velocity in the column $(0.0002 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}), a$ is the radius of $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ nanoparticles, $R$ is the radius of silica sands $(137.5 \mu \mathrm{~m})$, and the dimensionless flow parameter $A_{f}$ is given by: ${ }^{4}$
$A_{f}=\frac{3}{2}\left[1+\frac{0.19 R_{e}}{1+0.25 R_{e}{ }^{0.56}}\right]$
Where $R_{e}$ is the Reynolds number, $R_{e}=2 v R \rho / \mu . \rho$ and $\mu$ is the density and viscosity of water respectively.

XPS spectra of pristine and 7DUV $\mathbf{n C}_{60}$


Figure S5. C(1s) XPS spectra of pristine and 7-day UVA-irradiated (7DUV) $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$.

Calculation of DLVO interaction energy between $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ and bare/EHA coated silica surface
The DLVO interaction energy was calculated by assuming sphere-plate interactions. The van der Waals

| NaCl <br> $(\mathrm{mM})$ | Pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$-silica <br> energy barrier $(\mathrm{kT})$ | 7DUV $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$-silica <br> energy barrier $(\mathrm{kT})$ | Pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$-EHA coated <br> silica energy barrier $(\mathrm{kT})$ | $7 \mathrm{DUV} \mathrm{nC}_{60}$-EHA coated <br> silica energy barrier $(\mathrm{kT})$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | 159.8 | - | 30.5 | - |
| 10 | 124.4 | - | 18.5 | - |
| 20 | 93.4 | - | 13.4 | - |
| 40 | 80.7 | 139.3 | 0 | 0.4 |
| 100 | 42.3 | 41.4 | 0 | 0 |
| 150 | - | 12 | - | 0 |
| 250 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| 300 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| 350 | - | 0 | - | 0 |

113
interaction energy was calculated from ${ }^{24}$ :
$\Phi_{\mathrm{v}}=-\frac{A a}{6 h}\left[1+\frac{14 h}{\lambda}\right]^{-1}$
where $A$ is the Hamaker constant of $\mathrm{C}_{60}$-water-silica system $\left(4.71 \times 10^{-21} \mathrm{~J}^{7}\right), a$ is the nanoparticle radius, $h$ is the separation distance, and $\lambda$ is the characteristic wavelength of the dielectric (normally assumed to be 100 nm ).

The electrostatic interaction energy was calculated from ${ }^{25}$ :
$\Phi_{\mathrm{E}}=\pi \varepsilon_{0} \varepsilon_{r} a\left\{2 \psi_{p} \psi_{c} \ln \left[\frac{1+\exp (-\kappa h)}{1-\exp (-\kappa h)}\right]+\left(\psi_{p}{ }^{2}+\psi_{c}{ }^{2}\right) \ln [1-\exp (-2 \kappa h)]\right\}$
where $\varepsilon_{0}$ is the dielectric permittivity in a vacuum, $\varepsilon_{r}$ is the relative dielectric permittivity of water, $a$ is the nanoparticle radius, $\kappa$ is the inverse Debye length, $h$ is the separation distance, and $\psi_{p}$ and $\psi_{c}$ are the $\zeta$ potential of the particle and the silica surface respectively.

Table S3. Calculated energy barrier between $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ and bare/EHA coated silica surface at various NaCl concentrations. The $\zeta$ potentials used in the calculation are presented in Figure 3 b and 6 a .


Figure S6a. Calculated DLVO interaction energy profiles for pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ approaching a flat silica or EHA coated silica surface at various NaCl concentrations.


Figure S6b. Calculated DLVO interaction energy profiles for 7-day UVA-irrdiated $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ approaching a flat silica or EHA coated silica surface at various NaCl concentrations.

## Humic acid adsorption experiments

Humic acid (HA) adsorption by the pristine and 7DUV $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ in deionized water was measured by batch sorption experiments. The EHA stock solution was filtered through centrifugal filters equipped with 30 kDa MWCO ultrafiltration membranes (Millipor, Carrigtwohill, Co. Cork, Ireland). The resulting EHA solution was used in the adsorption experiment. Both pristine and $7 \mathrm{DUV} \mathrm{nC}_{60}$ solutions were concentrated using centrifugal filters to $250 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L} .1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ EHA was mixed with $200 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L} \mathrm{nC} 60$ in 10 mL PTFE-lined screw cap glass vials and agitated on a shaker bed at room temperature for 24 h . Then the samples were filtered with the 30 kDa MWCO centrifugal filters to separate $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ and the residual dissolved EHA. The dissolved humic acid concentration was determined by measuring UV absorbance at 254 nm .

Table S4. Humic acid adsorption on pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ and 7-day UV-irradiated $\mathrm{nC}_{60}\left(7 \mathrm{DUV} \mathrm{nC}_{60}\right.$ ) in $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ humic acid solutions. *SRHA adsorption data was reported by our previous paper. ${ }^{1}$

|  | SRHA* | EHA |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $K_{d}(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) /(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ | $K_{d}(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{Kg}) /(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ |
| Pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ | 1722 | 1648 |
| $7 \mathrm{DUV} \mathrm{nC}_{60}$ |  |  |

Adsorption of SRHA onto pristine $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ nanoparticles in 10 mM and 40 mM NaCl solutions was studied by QCM-D. After coating the silica crystal surface with PLL, $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{LnC}_{60}$ in 1 mM NaCl was flowed across the crystal for 1 h to allow $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ deposition. The $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ deposit layer was then rinsed with the background NaCl solutions. After a stable baseline was achieved, a $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ SRHA solution in 10 mM or 40 mM NaCl was introduced into the measurement chamber, allowing SRHA to adsorb on $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ until reaching adsorption equilibrium. The amount of SRHA adsorbed was calculated using the Sauerbrey Equation. The SRHA adsorption density on $\mathrm{nC}_{60}$ was quantified by normalizing the total amount of SRHA adsorbed with the surface area of the crystal.
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