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Abstracts

Rare earth elements (REEs) have become increasingly important to our modern society due to their strategical significance and numerous high-technological applications. Regolith-hosted HREE deposits in South China are currently the main source of the heavy REEs (HREEs) but the ore-forming processes are poorly understood. In these deposits, the REEs are postulated to accumulate in regolith through adsorption on clay minerals. In the Zudong deposit, the world’s largest regolith-hosted HREE deposit, clay minerals are dominated by short, stubby, nm-scale halloysite tubes (either of 10Å or 7Å) and microcrystalline kaolinite in the saprolite and lower pedolith and μm-sized vermicular kaolinite in the humic layer and upper pedolith. A critical transformation of the clay minerals in the upper pedolith is coalescence and unrolling of halloysite to form vermicular kaolinite. Microcrystalline kaolinite also transformed to large, well-crystalline vermicular kaolinite. This transformation could result in significant changes in different physicochemical properties of the clay assemblages. Halloysite-abundant clay assemblages in the deep regolith have specific surface area and porosity significantly higher than the kaolinite-dominant clay assemblages in the shallow soils. Crystallinity of clay minerals also increased, exemplified by decrease in Fe contents of the kaolinite group minerals (from ~1.2 wt. % in the lower saprolite to ~0.35 wt. % in the upper pedolith), thereby indicative of less availability of various types of adsorption sites. Hence, halloysite-abundant clay minerals of high adsorption capacity in deep regolith could efficiently retain the REEs released from weathering of the parent granite. Reduction in adsorption capacity during the clay
transformation in shallow depth partially leads to REE desorption, and the released REEs would be subsequently transported to and adsorbed at deeper part of the soil profile. Hence, the clay-adsorbed REE concentration in the lower pedolith and saprolite (~2,500 ppm on average) is much higher than the uppermost soils (~400 ppm on average). Therefore, weathering environments that favor the release of the REEs in the shallow soils but preservation of halloysite in the deep regolith can continuously adsorb REEs in the clay minerals to form economically valuable deposits.
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Introduction

In facing a continuously growing demand of the rare earth elements (REEs) for various high-technological applications in our modern society, REE resources have become a popular exploration target in the world, especially for the more scarce but important heavy REEs (HREEs). Currently, regolith-hosted HREE deposits are the dominant source of the global HREE production (Simandl, 2014). These deposits are characterized by low grades (0.05 - 0.2 wt.% rare earth oxide; REO) and individually small tonnages (<10 kt REO resources), except the super-large Zudong deposit (Li et al., 2017; Xie et al., 2016). They formed through mobilization, circulation and accumulation of the REEs in regolith, mostly developed from granites and associated volcanic rocks (Li et al., 2017; Sanematsu and Watanabe, 2016). Such deposits occur mostly in South China and other sub-tropical and tropical localities, including the Southeast Asia, Madagascar, Malawi, and Brazil (Berger et al., 2014; Li et al., 2017; Sanematsu and Watanabe, 2016). Accumulation of the REEs in these deposits is postulated to the REE adsorption on various clay minerals as weakly bound outer sphere complexes (Yamaguchi et al., 2018). This explains the feasibility of low-cost extraction through chemical leaching by dilute electrolyte solutions (Moldoveanu and Papangelakis, 2016).

Albeit the importance of clay minerals in accumulating the REEs, most previous studies dealt with bulk mineralogy and geochemistry of these deposits (e.g. Bao and Zhao, 2008; Berger et al., 2014; Padrones et al., 2017; Sanematsu et al., 2015; Sanematsu et al., 2013; Wu et al., 1990). Some recent studies have considered and examined size fractionation of the REEs
(Cheshire, 2011; Cheshire et al., 2018; Elliott et al., 2018), nonetheless, detailed investigations on the clay-sized particles are still lacking. It has been demonstrated that the REEs concentrate in the lower pedolith (B horizon) and upper saprolite (C horizon). The interface between the pedolith and saprolite could be considered as a significant weathering front. Here, consumption of the saprolitic materials to form the pedolith usually leaves behind only residual phases, including refractory REE-bearing minerals, causing an apparent REE accumulation. More importantly, a large amount of the REEs accumulates very likely due to adsorption on the clay minerals. In these deposits, kaolinite and halloysite are frequently observed, whereas occurrence of smectite and illite are usually rare and confined only to the lower part of soil profiles (Li et al., 2019; Wu et al., 1990). However, the role of clay minerals is still poorly understood and little is known about the relationship between species, modes of occurrence, and abundance of clay minerals and REE adsorption. Here, we choose the world’s largest Zudong regolith-hosted HREE deposit, and focus on the variation and transformation of clay minerals in progressive weathering and the associated changes in various physicochemical properties. Thereby, we explore the role of clay minerals in mobilizing and accumulating REEs in regolith to constrain the origin of regolith-hosted HREE deposits.

Site description

The Zudong deposit in southern Jiangxi province (Fig. 1) is HREE-dominant with a current total resource of 17,622 t (pre-mining estimate of 131,000 t at 0.048 wt. % REO) of
REO with an average grade of ~0.1 wt. % REO (Li et al., 2019; Xie et al., 2016). Regionally, the Zudong deposit is located on a moderately undulating landform, with elevation varying from ~250 to 500 m above sea level and slope gradients from 10° to 15° (Liu et al., 2016), and subjected to a subtropical monsoon climate with annual rainfall of 1,200 - 1,900 mm (Huang et al., 2013).

Thicknesses of soil profiles in the deposit range generally from a few meters to 30 m from field observation. A clear soil zonation can be observed, and includes from top to bottom a surficial humic layer (A horizon, 0 - 1 m thick), a pedolith (B horizon, 1 - 10 m thick), and a saprolite zone (C horizon, 3 - 20 m thick) (Fig. 2a). The humic layer is generally dark brownish in appearance with a high total organic carbon (TOC) content. Whereas the pedolith is orangish brown in appearance, attributed to the accumulation of Fe oxyhydroxides (Fig. 2b - c). The soil order could be classified as Ultisol. This zone also contains abundant rounded residual grains of quartz but primary feldspar and muscovite are rare. In the saprolite, relict granitic texture is still largely preserved and exhibits a whitish to pinkish white appearance due to the growth of various clay minerals (Fig. 2d - f). The HREE orebodies, varying from a few meters to up to 10 m thick, exclusively occur in the lower pedolith to upper saprolite (Fig. 2a) (Li et al., 2019).

Previous studies have recognized the dominant clay species of kaolinite and halloysite in the soil profiles, with a sub-ordinate amount of illite and smectite in the lower saprolite (Li et al., 2019; Wu et al., 1990). Quantitatively, there are about 10 - 15% kaolinite group minerals in the saprolite and pedolith, but their contents abruptly reach more than 25% in the humic layer (Fig.
Fe-Mn oxyhydroxides and gibbsite are comparatively scarce, even in the uppermost part of the soil profiles (Li et al., 2019; Wu et al., 1990). Supergene REE minerals, including chernovite-(Y) and cerianite-(Ce), and residual REE minerals, such as zircon, xenotime-(Y), and euxenite-(Y), also commonly appear in the soils. It is estimated that these supergene and residual minerals host up to 30% of the total REE contents of the ores, while the remaining ~70% is largely adsorbed on the clay minerals (Li et al., 2019). This deposit formed from weathering of the late Jurassic A-type Zudong granite (zircon U-Pb age of 168 Ma; Zhao et al. (2014)). The major rock-forming minerals include quartz, albite, orthoclase, and muscovite (Fig. 2g). REE concentrations of the parent granite vary from ~200 to 400 ppm with various REE-bearing accessory phases, including synchysite-(Y), gadolinite-(Y), hingganite-(Y), yttrialite-(Y), Y-rich fluorite, xenotime-(Y), euxenite-(Y), fergusonite-(Y), zircon, and thorite. Preferential weathering of some of these minerals, notably synchysite-(Y), gadolinite-(Y), hingganite-(Y), and yttrialite-(Y), supplies most of the REEs to be accumulated in the regolith through continuous circulation. In term of geochemistry, Li et al. (2019) has demonstrated that the soil pH gradually increases from 4.74 in the uppermost humic layer and upper pedolith to ~5.5 in the lower pedolith and upper saprolite, and further to ~6 in the lower saprolite (Table 1). Whereas the REE concentration increases from ~400 ppm in the uppermost humic layer and upper pedolith to more than 1,000 ppm in the ore bodies. Similar trend could be observed for the extractable REE concentrations. The extractable REE concentration increases from ~200 ppm on average in the humic layer and upper pedolith, being ~45% of the
bulk content, to 600 - 700 ppm in the orebody at the lower pedolith and upper saprolite, sharing
60 - 65% of the bulk content (Table 1; Fig. 3). The proportions of the REEs sorbed to Fe-Mn
oxyhydroxides are minimal at the Zudong deposit, sharing only ~2% of the total REE contents
(Table 1; Fig. 3). The proportions bound to organic substances are negligible (Table 1; Fig. 3).

Sampling and analytical methods

Sampling and sample preparation

Representative samples from different soil horizons of the Zudong deposit were
collected at a depth of at least 50 cm deep below the exposed surfaces to avoid anthropogenic
effects. Detailed description of the ore deposit and investigation of bulk geochemistry are
available in Li et al. (2019). As clay minerals in the studied site could be much larger than 2
µm in size (see results below), particles with size <20 µm were targeted and extracted and
further divided into <2 and 2 - 20 µm fractions. To extract the different clay fractions, samples
were first suspended in DI water by vigorous shaking and ultrasonic bathed for ~15 mins. Both
<2 and <20 µm fraction was collected through sedimentation after required times according to
the Stoke’s law have lapsed.

Particle size distribution
Particle size distribution was analyzed with a LS I3 320 Laser Diffraction Particle Size Analyzer (PSA) at the Department of Earth Sciences, the University of Hong Kong (HKU). The detection range is 0.2 - 2,000 µm and the error for repeated measurement is <1%.

**Scanning electron microscopy (SEM)**

Micro- to nano-scale observations were carried out with a Hitachi S-4800 FEG scanning electron microscope (SEM) at the Electron Microscope Unit (EMU), HKU. Operating voltage is 15 kV and samples were coated with carbon before observation. The SEM used is equipped with an Oxford energy-dispersive spectrometer (EDS) for quick semi-quantitative elemental analysis of the clay minerals.

**High-resolution transmission electron microscopy (HRTEM)**

High-resolution transmission electron microscopic (HRTEM) images were obtained with the Tecnai G2 20 S-TWIN scanning transmission electron microscope at the EMU, HKU operating at an accelerating voltage of 200 kV. Specimens were first dispersed in ethanol and a drop of the suspension was transferred onto a porous carbon film supported by a copper grid. Observations were undertaken after the ethanol had evaporated. Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) processing is applied to obtain the d-spacings of lattice.

**X-ray diffraction (XRD)**
XRD patterns were collected from 3° to 30° (2θ) for oriented and ethylene glycol-solvated samples, and 3° to 15° (2θ) for 550°C heated, and K-acetate-and ethylene glycol-solvated samples at a scanning rate of 1° (2θ) min⁻¹ on a Rigaku D/max diffractometer with Ni-filtered CuKα radiation (λ = 0.154 nm, 40 kV and 100 mA). Oriented samples were prepared by carefully pipetting the clay suspension onto a glass slide and allowing it to dry at ambient temperature. Ethylene glycol-solvated samples were then prepared by treating the oriented samples in a glass desiccator and solvated with ethylene glycol vapor at 30°C for 24 h, and subsequently heated at 550°C for more than 2.5 h to prepare the heated samples. To further decipher kaolinite and halloysite, K-acetate treatment (Wada, 1961) with additional solvation of ethylene glycol (Miller and Keller, 1963) was adopted. Samples were first soaked in K-acetate and then washed with ethylene glycol. Halloysite has basal spacing in the range of 10 - 11Å, whereas kaolinite retains its original basal spacing of ~7Å after the treatment. The corresponding relative proportions could be determined by computing the \( I_{10}/(I_7 + I_{10}) \) ratio from the XRD spectra, in which \( I_7 \) and \( I_{10} \) denote the intensity peaks near 7 and 10Å, respectively. The crystallinity of the kaolinite group minerals is evaluated by the Hinckley Index after Hinckley (1962). The indices are calculated by dividing the sum of the heights of the 1\( \overline{1}0 \) and the 11\( \overline{1} \) peaks above a line drawn from the trough between the 020-1\( \overline{1}0 \) peaks to the background immediately beyond the 11\( \overline{1} \) peak, by the height of 1\( \overline{1}0 \) peak from the general background. XRD patterns were analyzed using the JADE 6.5 software.
Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR)

The FT-IR spectra were obtained on a Nicolet iS10 FT-IR spectrometer by using the KBr pressed disk technique. The pressed disks were prepared by mixing samples and KBr at a ratio of approximate 1:100, and ground in an agate mortar for homogenization. The mixture was then heated under a lamp for 3 min to minimize water adsorption. The spectra were collected over the range of 4000 - 400 cm\(^{-1}\) with 64 scans and a resolution of 4 cm\(^{-1}\).

Specific surface area (SSA), porosity and pore size distribution analysis

Specific surface area (SSA) of representative samples were obtained via the nitrogen adsorption (the BET method) using a Beckman Coulter SA3100 analyzer. All samples were outgassed for 6 - 12 h and heated to a maximum temperature of 50\(^{\circ}\)C to remove surface moisture before the analysis. Porosity and pore size distribution of these samples was further evaluated through the Barrett–Joyner–Halenda (BJH) method (Barrett et al., 1951).

Cation Exchange Capability (CEC) characterization

Cation Exchange Capability (CEC) characterization for the <2 µm and 2 - 20 fractions was carried out following Deng et al. (2014). Samples were first treated with dilute acetic acid to remove any possible carbonates and then washed by 0.5 M and 0.005 M CaCl\(_2\) for 3 times each to completely saturate the cation exchangeable sites and determine the volume of interstitial solution. Ca-saturated samples were then washed with 0.5 M MgCl\(_2\) for 4 times.
Supernatant solutions were collected after centrifugation and the Ca contents were analyzed with a PE Optima 8300 inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectrometer (ICP-OES) at HKU.

Electron-probe micro-analysis (EPMA)

The major element contents of the kaolinite group minerals in soils and primary muscovite and feldspars were analyzed using a JEOL JXA-8230 electron microprobe at the Department of Earth Sciences, HKU. The analyses were performed using a 15 kV accelerating voltage and a 20 nA beam current. The beam spot diameter was varied from 1 to 5 µm to eliminate sample damage. The Kα line was chosen for all analyzed elements. Analytical conditions and applied standards are listed in Supplementary Table 1. All data were corrected using the standard ZAF correction procedures.

Clay-adsorbed REE concentration

Extraction experiment was conducted to quantify for the variations in adsorbed REE concentrations of the clay fractions from different soil horizons. The adsorbed REE portion here is operationally defined as easily extractable fraction by dilute electrolyte solutions. All centrifuge tubes and containers used were soaked in 1 M HNO₃ for over 24 h and rinsed repeatedly with Milli-Q double de-ionized water (Ω = 18.2M) before use. Ten ml of 0.5 M ammonium sulfate was added to 50 mg of clay separates and mechanically shaken for 16 hours.
at room temperature to extract the REEs. The extracted solutions were collected by centrifuging at 10,000 rpm for 30 min and filtration using a cellulose acetate-type membrane filter (φ = 0.22µm). Residues after extraction were dried overnight at 40°C and completely digested in a concentrated mixture of HF-HCl-HNO₃ at a temperature of ~180°C. Acidified and diluted solutions were analyzed with an Agilent 7900 inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometer (ICP-MS) at HKU. Both the accuracy and precision are at <10% for all analyzed elements.

Results

Particle size distribution

Results of particle size distribution for 26 samples are divided into ranges of <2, 2 - 20, 20 - 50, and >50 µm fractions. Average results of each range are summarized in Table 1 and Figure 3. Generally, proportion of fine particles becomes progressively more abundant from the lower part to upper part of the soil profile. In the lower saprolite, about half of the soil particles (~40%) are larger than 50 µm. Whereas there are about 8 and 30% for the <2 and 2 - 20 µm fractions respectively, slightly lower than those in the upper saprolite (9 and 38% respectively). These two fractions comprise 12 and 48%, respectively, of the lower pedolith and the highest as 23 and 58%, respectively, of the humic layer and upper pedolith. In contrast, the proportion of particles with sizes of >50 µm dramatically drops to 28% in the upper saprolite, then further to 15 and 5% in the lower and upper pedolith, respectively.
SEM and HRTEM observation

From SEM and HRTEM observation, morphology and association of clay minerals are directly observed. Halloysite is the major clay species in the saprolite, and is grouped into two types on the basis of appearance. The first type is very short, stubby, narrow, and tubular halloysite. The length varies from <100 to 500 nm. The short halloysite tubes occur as aggregates on surface and in etch pits of weathered feldspar grains (Fig. 4a). These halloysite tubes are also commonly found along edges and cleavages of muscovite flakes (Fig. 4b & c), either as aggregates or as individual tubes. The second type of halloysite is long tubular. These halloysite tubes range from 1 to 5 µm in length and occur as aggregates on the surface of weathered feldspar grains (Fig. 4d) through coalescence of short halloysite tubes (Fig. 4e). Occasionally, the long halloysite tubes occur on the surface of weathered muscovite grains (Fig. 4f). Under HRTEM, d spacing of both 10Å (Fig. 4g) and 7Å (Fig. 4h) could be observed for the halloysite tubes with open-ended cylindrical lumen pores of 10 - 20 nm across (Fig. 5). However, the possibility of rapid dehydration of halloysite-10Å to the 7Å-species during analysis cannot be ruled out. It is notable that the short halloysite tubes are closely associated with muscovite (Fig. 5). Both close tubes with clear lumen pores (Fig. 5a, b & e) and semi-open tubes (Fig. 5c - e) are abundant on the edges of the muscovite sheets. The semi-open tubes may represent an interim stage of formation through rolling-up of the muscovite sheet. In addition, the edges of the muscovite sheets are apparently thicker than the interior under TEM imaging (Fig.5f), probably indicating thickening of sheets at margins due to rolling-up along
edges. Apart from halloysite, sub-ordinate amounts of kaolinite and illite also occur in the saprolite. Kaolinite appears as irregular microcrystalline flakes, a few µm across, growing topotaxially on the surface, and occasionally along the edges of weathered muscovite grains (Fig. 6a & b). Illite grains are mostly of 1 - 5 µm across with irregular shapes and undulating surfaces. Illite mainly occurs as aggregates on the surface of the weathered feldspar grains (Fig. 6c). Residual muscovite grains are common and occur as stacks with sheets of different sizes and shapes (Fig. 6d).

In the humic layer and upper pedolith, platy kaolinite crystals become progressively more abundant and larger in size, of up to 10 µm across. Apparently, these kaolinite “booklets” were formed through the coalescence of halloysite, either on the basal surfaces of the kaolinite booklet (Fig. 7a - e) or along the edge (Fig. 7f). Continuous growth of kaolinite ultimately forms large, euhedral, vermicular kaolinite booklets (Fig. 7g) with a d spacing of ~7.2Å and unit cells of ~5.0Å along the a axis (Fig. 8a). These kaolinite booklets are commonly observed in the shallow soils, whereas euhedral long halloysite tubes of >1 µm long are occasionally associated with kaolinite (Fig. 7h, 8b - d). In addition, halloysite, with a d-spacing of ~8.0Å, has been observed under HR-TEM (Fig. 8c), suggesting a progressive dehydration of halloysite-10Å to the 7Å type (Fig. 8d).

**Modal proportion of clay minerals from XRD spectra**
From the XRD spectra, different clay minerals have been identified and their relative proportions were calculated based on the corresponding peak intensities and heights (Table 2). The entire results are provided in Supplementary Table 2.

In the saprolite and lower pedolith, the <2 μm clay fraction has a higher abundance of kaolinite of 55 - 70% and of ~25 - 35% halloysite. Muscovite/illite contents are comparatively low, ranging from 2 to 9% in the lower pedolith and upper saprolite (Table 2; Fig. 3 & 9). There are trace amounts of other clay minerals, including smectite, interstratified muscovite-illite/smectite, vermiculite, and interstratified muscovite-illite/vermiculite. The 2 - 20 μm fraction generally has higher abundance in muscovite/illite (up to 19%), but similar abundances in kaolinite (47 - 73%) and halloysite (21 - 44%) to the <2 μm fraction. In the uppermost humic layer and upper pedolith, the proportion of kaolinite further increases to 60 - 70% but that of halloysite significantly drops to <10% (Table 2; Fig. 3 & 9). Interstratified muscovite-illite/vermiculite becomes much more abundant, sharing ~15 - 20% (Table 2). Contents of muscovite/illite and vermiculite are also slightly higher and range from ~6 to 10% (Table 2). It is noticed that the 2 - 20 μm fraction has a slightly higher abundance in muscovite/illite and interstratified muscovite-illite/vermiculite, but slightly lower abundance in vermiculite than the <2 μm fraction. To summarize, contents of halloysite gradually decrease with progressive weathering with a dramatic drop from the lower to upper pedolith, whereas contents of kaolinite increase significantly from the lower to upper saprolite and remain consistent in the pedolith (Fig. 3). Crystallinity of kaolinite in the <2 μm fraction gradually rises with progressive...
weathering, as indicated by increases in the Hinckley Index from 0.14 in the lower saprolite to 0.50 in the upper saprolite and further to 0.76 and 0.98 in the lower and upper pedolith respectively (Table 2). Generally, kaolinite from the 2 - 20 µm fraction has a higher crystallinity than the <2 µm fraction from the same soil horizon with a maximum of 1.83 in the shallowest humic layer and upper pedolith (Table 2).

FT-IR spectra

Twelve samples were analyzed by FT-IR and representative spectra are shown in Figure 10. Generally, spectra obtained from the <2 and 2 - 20 µm fractions are extraordinarily similar suggesting similar clay assemblages in both fractions. Halloysite could be differentiated from kaolinite in FT-IR spectra by exhibiting only two Al₂OH-stretching bands at approximately 3695 and 3620 cm⁻¹ and a sharp single Al₂OH-bending band at ~920 cm⁻¹ without shoulders. Whereas well-developed Al₂OH-stretching bands at ~3695, 3670, 3650, and 3620 cm⁻¹ and a broad shoulder at ~940 cm⁻¹ associated with the Al₂OH-bending band could be observed for well-crystallized kaolinite. Hence, clay minerals are dominated by halloysite in the lower saprolite. A broad stretching band for the Si-O bond developed at ~1040 cm⁻¹ with a poorly developed shoulder at ~1100 cm⁻¹ further implies low crystallinity. The proportion of kaolinite progressively increases in the upper saprolite and lower pedolith, as evident by the appearance of weak Al₂OH-stretching bands at ~3670 and 3650 cm⁻¹ and a narrow shoulder at ~940 cm⁻¹. Moreover, the kaolinite-group minerals become more crystalline as indicated by sharper SiO-
stretching bands at ~1010 and 1035 cm⁻¹ and more developed SiO-stretching band at 1100 cm⁻¹. In the humic layer and upper pedolith, appearance of four sharp Al₂OH-stretching bands and a broad shoulder of the Al₂OH-bending band shows the dominance of crystalline kaolinite. High crystallinity of the clay minerals can also be interpreted by the well-developed SiO-stretching bands at ~1010 and 1035 cm⁻¹ in the spectra.

**Specific surface area, pore volume and pore size distribution**

The specific surface area of 11 samples from different soil horizons were measured using the BET method (SBET), and the BJH method for their pore volume and pore size distribution. The averaged results for each fraction are listed in Table 3. The entire results could be obtained in Supplementary Table 3. In the saprolite and lower pedolith, SBET of the <2 and 2-20 µm fractions vary from ~15 to 20 m²/g and ~12 to 17 m²/g, respectively. In the humic layer to upper pedolith, SBET of both the <2 and 2-20 µm fractions are comparatively much lower at ~8 and ~10 m²/g, respectively (Fig. 3). From the adsorption and desorption isotherms shown in Figure 11a, only very little hysteresis is shown for all samples, and moreover, generally low values for the differences between the cumulative SSA from either the adsorption (S_ads) or desorption (S_des) isotherms and the SBET (Table 3). This suggests that the dominant pore shape in all samples is cylindrical (Churchman et al., 1995; Pasbakhsh et al., 2013).

For the pore size, both the average BJH adsorption and desorption cumulative pore volumes of the <2 and 2-20 µm fractions are consistently of 0.10 - 0.12 and 0.06 - 0.07 cm³/g,
respectively, in the saprolite and lower pedolith, but decrease by half to 0.06 cm$^3$/g for the <2 µm fraction in the humic layer and upper pedolith (Table 3; Fig. 3). A bimodal distribution of the pore size is observed for the clay minerals in all soil horizons (Fig. 11b). The clay minerals from the saprolite and lower pedolith are dominated by fine micropores with a narrow distribution of sizes of ~2 - 3 nm, which may be attributed to the internal and/or surface pores (Pasbakhsh et al., 2013). Mesopores with sizes of ~10 nm are sub-ordinately abundant (Fig. 10b) and contributed primarily from the central lumen pores of the halloysite tubes (Pasbakhsh et al., 2013). In the humic layer and upper pedolith, the abundance of the micropore dramatically decreases, whereas the ~10 nm mesopores rarely exist (Fig. 11b). Alternatively, mesopores with a broad distribution of around 12 nm occur likely due to the abundance of kaolinite (Pasbakhsh et al., 2013).

**Cation exchange capacity**

Eleven samples from different soil horizons have been measured for the CEC and the averaged results are tabulated in Table 3. In general, CEC in different soil horizons vary slightly (Fig. 3). The CEC from both the <2 and 2 - 20 µm clay fractions increases slightly from the lower saprolite to the upper saprolite and lower pedolith, from 13 to ~15 and from 11 to ~14 c mol/kg$^{-1}$ on average, respectively. The CEC of the <2 µm fraction at the humic layer and upper pedolith fundamentally remains the same, yet, that of the 2 - 20 µm fraction decreases to ~11 c mol/kg$^{-1}$ on average (Fig. 3).
Chemical composition of minerals

Unweathered grains of muscovite and feldspars from the parent rock and the kaolinite group minerals from different soil horizons have been analyzed. Results are summarized in Tables 4 and 5 and the full dataset is available in Supplementary Table 4 - 6. Fresh muscovite has SiO2, Al2O3, and K2O contents of 45.3, 32.3, and 10.7 wt. % on average, respectively. Notably, muscovite is Fe-rich and contains up to ~8.5 wt. % of FeO. Feldspar of the primary granite is mainly of orthoclase and albite. Orthoclase has 63.1 wt. % SiO2, 17.5 wt. % Al2O3, and 16.7 wt. % K2O on average, whereas albite has 67.0 wt. % SiO2, 18.9 wt. % Al2O3, and 11.7 wt. % Na2O on average.

In the lower saprolite, the kaolinite group minerals have 44.9 wt. % SiO2, 37.5 wt. % Al2O3, and 2.12 wt. % FeO on average, respectively. With progressive weathering, the SiO2 and Al2O3 contents of the kaolinite group minerals subsequently increase to ~45 and 38 wt. % respectively in the upper saprolite and pedolith. Average FeO contents gradually decrease to 0.55 - 1.57 wt. % in the lower pedolith and upper saprolite, and to 0.46 wt. % in the humic layer and upper pedolith (Table 5). EPMA showed that Fe + Si is inversely proportional to Al in the kaolinite group minerals (Fig. 12a). Further supported by the scarce observation of Fe-rich particles associated with the kaolinite group minerals, coupled substitution between Fe + Si and Al should have accounted for the Fe content (Jige et al., 2018). Moreover, Fe in the kaolinite group minerals mainly occurs as the Fe3+ for Al3+ substitution, although minor Fe2+...
for Al\(^{3+}\) substitution takes place in some samples from the lower pedolith and saprolite (Fig. 12b).

Clay-adsorbed REE concentration

As the separation of the clay fractions were performed mechanically, it is inevitable that sub-µm sized supergene REE minerals, such as chernovite-(Y) (Li et al., 2019), and residual REE minerals were also extracted as well. In this regard, the extracted clay fractions were treated with ammonium sulfate extraction instead of bulk analysis to estimate the REE concentrations that are weakly bound to the clay minerals, likely through adsorption. Nonetheless, the residues after extraction were analyzed for comparison. The results are summarized in Table 6 and fully tabulated in Supplementary Table 7. The variation of clay-adsorbed REE concentrations generally follows that of the bulk soils (Fig. 13). Clay fractions from the lower pedolith and upper saprolite have the highest adsorbed REE concentrations, of ~3,500 and 2,500 ppm respectively (Table 6). The concentrations are comparatively lower in the lower saprolite (~1,000 ppm in average for both fractions). Notably, the clay-adsorbed concentrations of the <2 and 2 - 20 µm fractions are largely comparable in the lower pedolith and saprolite (Fig. 3). Whereas, the adsorbed REE concentrations of the 2 - 20 µm fractions are significantly lower than the corresponding <2 µm fractions in the humic layer and upper pedolith and only of ~70 ppm, comparing to >200 to ~1,200 ppm in the <2 µm fractions (Table 6; Fig. 3). In general, the (La/Yb)\(_N\) values of the clay fractions from all soil horizons are similar
(Table 6), with those from the humic layer and pedolith are slightly higher, indicating a slight enrichment of the LREEs. In contrast, Ce anomaly varies significantly. Clay fractions from the lower pedolith and saprolite exhibit significantly negative Ce anomalies of 0.02 to 0.08, yet, Ce anomalies in the humic layer and upper pedolith have become less negative of 0.8 on average for the <2 µm fractions, and even become positive of 1.7 on average for the 2 - 20 µm fractions (Table 6; Fig. 13). In the lower pedolith and saprolite, REE concentrations of the residues (including Fe-Mn oxyhydroxide-sorbed, organic substance-bound, and crystalline phase-hosted REEs) after extraction are generally of one-third of the clay-adsorbed concentrations (Table 6; Fig. 3). This proves that most of the REEs in the clay fractions occur in weakly adsorbed state. However, in humic layer and upper pedolith, the REE concentrations in the clay fractions could be of higher for the residual portion than the clay-adsorbed portion, especially in the 2 – 20 µm fraction (Table 6; Fig. 3). This illustrates a less important role in adsorption on clay minerals in the shallow soils. The comparatively high As concentrations in the residues of the clay fractions from the lower pedolith and saprolite implies that significant amount of the residual REEs are likely hosted in supergene chernovite-(Y), in consistent with previous observation (Li et al., 2019).

Discussions

Transformation of clay minerals in progressive weathering
From the previous results, the following major mineralogical transformation pathways are proposed to have occurred at the Zudong deposit with progressive weathering, causing the variations in their abundance (Fig. 1a):

1. Muscovite $\rightarrow$ Short, tubular halloysite-10Å $\rightarrow$ Halloysite-7Å (either short or long and tubular) $\rightarrow$ Vermicular kaolinite

2. Muscovite $\rightarrow$ Microcrystalline kaolinite $\rightarrow$ Vermicular kaolinite

3. Muscovite $\rightarrow$ Illite, Illite/Smectite & Illite/Vermiculite $\rightarrow$ Vermiculite
   (Subordinate importance and more restricted to the shallow soils)

4. Feldspar $\rightarrow$ Halloysite (either short or long and tubular) $\rightarrow$ Vermicular kaolinite

5. Feldspar $\rightarrow$ Illite $\rightarrow$ Kaolinite

In the lower saprolite, representing an incipient stage of weathering, weathering of muscovite formed short halloysite tubes and subordinately, microcrystalline kaolinite in the saprolite. From SEM and HRTEM observation, it is evident that muscovite gradually transformed to halloysite through rolling-up of the edges (Fig. 5). As primary muscovite was formed through metasomatism of biotite (Huang et al., 1989), the comparatively high concentration of Fe inherited in the muscovite (Table 5) would probably induce higher lattice strain and motivate the decomposition of muscovite. During weathering, it is postulated that the interlayer K cation and a tetrahedral sheet of muscovite would be preferentially removed while a T-O sheet remained. Under a water saturated environment, misfit between the octahedral and tetrahedral sheets were compensated for by rolling and incorporation of...
interlayer water molecules to form halloysite-10Å (Bailey, 1990; Singh, 1996). On the other hand, aggregates of short halloysite tubes along edges of muscovite sheets (Fig. 4b) suggest an alternative dissolution-precipitation mechanism for the growth of halloysite, during which dissolution of muscovite led to local supersaturation of Si and Al in the soil solutions that motivated the rapid precipitation of halloysite nano-tubes (Lu et al., 2016). Whereas microcrystalline kaolinite mostly appears to form topotaxially on muscovite, especially along cleavages (Aoudjit et al., 1996; Robertson and Eggleton, 1991; Singh and Gilkes, 1991).

Feldspar can be decomposed to form halloysite and illite during the incipient weathering (Eswaran and Bin, 1978; Inoue et al., 2012; Jeong, 1998a; Papoulis et al., 2004). Albite can decompose more rapidly than orthoclase during weathering (Banfield and Eggleton, 1990; Blum and Stillings, 1995; White et al., 2001). During dissolution of albite, Na and Ca were lost to the soil solutions, whereas local oversaturation of Si and Al provoked the simultaneous crystallization of halloysite-10Å under a water saturated condition (Banfield and Eggleton, 1990; Velde, 1985). Such a rapid precipitation is demonstrated by meshes of short halloysite tubes and in etch pits on the surface of the albite grains (Fig. 4a). Subsequently, these halloysite nanotubes would coalescence and transform into more stable long halloysite tubes (Fig. 4c). Weathering of orthoclase formed illite during incipient weathering (Fig. 6c) due to local equilibria at grain contacts between orthoclase and muscovite, providing sufficient K during mineral decomposition to precipitate illite (Meunier and Velde, 1976). Rapid formation of halloysite and microcrystalline kaolinite of low crystallinity prevailed during incipient
weathering. With progressive weathering, the short, stubby halloysite coalesced to form long, tubular halloysite and kaolinite in the lower pedolith and upper saprolite.

In the upper pedolith, which represents a more advanced stage of weathering, soils would be subjected to repeated wetting and drying episodes, causing irreversible dehydration of metastable halloysite-10Å to halloysite-7Å and further transformation to kaolinite (Churchman and Carr, 1975; Inoue et al., 2012; Jeong, 1998a; Jeong, 1998b; Papoulis et al., 2004; Singer et al., 2004; Wouatong et al., 1996). The dehydration process is exemplified by the occurrence of halloysite with a d spacing of ~8.0Å (Fig. 8c), which indicates dehydration and shrinking of halloysite-10Å (Churchman et al., 1972; Giese, 1988). Also, crystalline, vermicular kaolinite became progressively dominant towards shallow soils (Table 3; Fig. 7). Evidently, these kaolinite “booklets” have grown through continuous coalescence of halloysite along edges (Fig. 7a - e) and at basal sites (Fig. 7f) of kaolinite grains. During this transformation, kaolinite grains of sizes up to 10 µm could have high crystallinity, as shown in the FT-IR spectra (Fig. 10), and comparatively low Fe contents (<0.5 wt. % in average) (Table 5). Here, we postulate the halloysite-kaolinite transformation can be achieved through a solid-state alteration after prolonged dehydration (Churchman and Gilkes, 1989). Unrolling of the halloysite tubes can be possible after prolonged dehydration (Wouatong et al., 1996), as removal of the interlayer water molecules could make tetrahedral rotation feasible to accommodate the misfit between the octahedral and tetrahedral sheets in platy kaolinite (Bailey, 1990; Radoslovich, 1963; Singh, 1996). Alternatively, long-tubed halloysite (Fig. 7h & 8b) and
crystalline kaolinite could have also grown epitaxially to form aggregates, precipitated from
the soil solutions (Banfield and Eggleton, 1990; Singh and Gilkes, 1991). Restricted occurrence
of interstratified muscovite-illite/vermiculite and vermiculite in this part (Table 2; Fig. 9)
suggests an alternative transformation pathway in more oxidizing shallow soils.

Physicochemical variation of clay minerals in progressive weathering

Transformation of clay minerals in progressive weathering could cause significant
changes in physicochemical properties of the clay assemblages, such as the SSA and the CEC
(e.g. Bobos et al., 2001; Papoulis et al., 2004). In the saprolite and lower pedolith, the kaolinite
group minerals have comparatively high CEC and SSA (Table 3; Fig. 3). High abundance of
short, stubby halloysite and microcrystalline kaolinite with high CEC could have strong edge
and surface effects for adsorption (Hart et al., 2002; Ma and Eggleton, 1999; Singh and Gilkes, 1992). Likewise, low crystallinity, as indicated by the Hinckley Index (Table 2) and high Fe
contents (Table 5), also contributes to the high CEC (Hart et al., 2003; Wilson et al., 2013).
Substitution of Fe for Al in clay minerals can cause permanent negative charge either through
substitution of Fe$^{2+}$ for Al$^{3+}$ in the octahedral sheet (Singh and Gilkes, 1992; Tazaki, 1981) or
non-stoichiometric Fe$^{3+}$ for Al$^{3+}$ substitution (Soma et al., 1992). In the soil profile, Fe$^{3+}$ for
Al$^{3+}$ substitution dominates, yet Fe$^{2+}$ for Al$^{3+}$ substitution also occurs especially in the lower
saprolite (Fig. 12). Moreover, a large contribution to the CEC also comes from pH-dependent
defect sites, such as broken bonds at edge and on basal surfaces, due to lattice deformation and
dislocation, mainly attributed to the Fe for Al substitution and the poor crystalline nature. Clay minerals in these layers are also of high SSA and large pore volume compared to the shallow soils (Table 3; Fig. 11). Specifically, the high SSA could be due to the abundant nano-sized tubular halloysite and fine-grained poorly crystallized kaolinite (Wilson et al., 2013). Both the central lumen and the fine internal and/ or surface pores of the tubular halloysite contribute to the large pore volumes, especially the fine pores as revealed by the non-hysteretic feature in the nitrogen adsorption and desorption isotherms (Fig. 11a) (Churchman et al., 1995). Small aggregates of kaolinite, which frequently occur in these soil layers (Fig. 6a and b), also have significantly higher porosity than large aggregates (Jozefaciuk, 2009).

In the shallow upper pedolith, transformation of tubular halloysite and microcrystalline kaolinite to large, euhedral, vermicular kaolinite is associated with dramatic drops in the SSA and porosity of the clay minerals (Table 3; Fig. 3). During the transformation, the growth in crystalline kaolinite, as indicated by the increase of the Hinckley Index (Table 2) and associated with a decrease in the Fe content (Table 5), significantly eliminated the amount of both permanently and variably charged sites. Moreover, growth in size also causes a drop in the CEC (Joussein et al., 2005). Although the CEC of the clay assemblages only varies slightly from the lower to the upper pedolith (Table 3), this is attributed to the abundance of interstratified muscovite-illite/vermiculite and vermiculite in the humic layer and upper pedolith (Table 2). 2:1 layer clay minerals, such as illite and vermiculite, would generally have a large CEC due to the permanent negative charge in their structures (Joussein et al., 2005;
Wilson et al., 2013). Compared to the CEC, the SSA and porosity of the clay minerals dramatically drops (Table 3; Fig. 3 & 11). This is mainly because of the conversion of halloysite to kaolinite. During this transformation, it is postulated that tubular halloysite unrolled to form platy kaolinite (Wouatong et al., 1996), resulting in a significant reduction in surface area and subsequent reduction in the amount of lumen pores. Coalescence of microcrystalline kaolinite to form large aggregates of vermicular kaolinite have also caused a decrease in the SSA and in the porosity (Jozefaciuk, 2009).

Relation between clay minerals and HREE accumulation

The physicochemical variations of the clay minerals, due to progressive weathering, highlight the contrasting adsorption capacities of the clay minerals from different soil horizons and explain the trends in mineralogy and geochemistry of the deposit. In a previous study (Li et al., 2019), bulk REE contents in the soils are documented to increase with depth from the humic layer and upper pedolith and to reach their maximum in the lower pedolith and upper saprolite (Table 1; Fig. 13b). The proportion of extractable REEs also follows a similar trend, increasing from ~45% in the shallow soils to 60 - 65% in the ore-bearing lower pedolith and upper saprolite (Table 1; Fig. 13b) (Li et al., 2019). The same trend has been observed for the clay fractions (Fig. 3 & 13a). The extraction experiment of the clay fractions performed in this study have further proved that the fine-grained portions control the REE enrichment in these deposits (Wu et al., 1990). Variations for both bulk and clay-adsorbed REE concentrations are
due to the much higher adsorption capacity of the clay minerals in the lower part than the upper part of the soil profile. High CEC, large SSA, and high porosity of the small, poorly crystalline halloysite and kaolinite in the lower part of soil profile are critical to facilitate REE adsorption. In addition, it is likely that halloysite contributes more greatly to the REE adsorption and enrichment (Fig. 14). The proportion of halloysite in the clay fractions are positively correlated with both the adsorbed HREEs (Fig. 14a) and LREEs (Fig. 14b) concentrations, especially for the saprolite, although it is probable that kaolinite also plays an important role in adsorbing the REEs in the lower pedolith. Whereas, no obvious correlation between the proportion of kaolinite and either HREEs (Fig. 14c) or LREEs (Fig. 14d) is exhibited. Although the mode of REE adsorption is still not well understood, it is possible that the HREEs could be adsorbed in the interlayer position of halloysite. Abundant halloysite in the lower part of the soil profile would greatly facilitate adsorption under this mechanism. Another recent study proposed that the REEs are adsorbed as 9 - 10 coordinated hydrated outer sphere complexes on the basal sites of kaolinite (Borst et al., 2018). Therefore, it is likely that the REEs, especially the LREEs, could be partially adsorbed as hydrated complexes in the central lumen pores of the tubular halloysite and basal surfaces of the microcrystalline kaolinite in this scenario.

In the upper part of the soil profile, the adsorption capacity of the clay minerals dramatically decreases along with drops in the CEC, SSA, and porosity during the transformation of halloysite and microcrystalline kaolinite to crystalline kaolinite. This induces REE desorption, which results in a lower proportion of adsorbed REEs (Table 6; Fig. 13a),
although the contents of fine particles and the kaolinite group minerals (Table 1) are higher in the shallow soils (Li et al., 2019). In addition to the decreases in the SSA and porosity (Table 3; Fig. 11), unrolling of the tubular halloysite would expose the adsorbed REEs located in the internal and lumen pores directly to the soil solutions, making desorption much more feasible. Consequently, the clay-adsorbed and bulk REE concentrations dramatically decrease in the humic layer and upper pedolith (Table 1 & 6; Fig. 13 & 15). Considering that the potential of zero charge of kaolinite is generally below the pH of 4.5 (Kosmulski, 2018), kaolinite in the shallow soils remain negatively charged (averaged soil pH of the humic layer and upper pedolith = 4.74; Table 1). This suggests that part of the desorbed REEs would be re-adsorbed, particularly for the <2 μm fraction (Table 6; Fig. 15). Alternatively, the relatively high clay-adsorbed REE concentrations for the <2 μm fraction from the upper pedolith (Fig. 3 & 15a) may suggest preferential REE desorption first on the larger-sized fractions, in consistent with the sub-μm sized halloysite and kaolinite to larger-sized kaolinite transformation. This also explains the much lower clay-adsorbed REE concentrations in the 2 – 20 μm fraction from the humic layer and upper pedolith, compared to the residual REE concentrations (Table 6). The desorbed REEs would be released into the soil solutions and transported downwards to deeper parts of the soil profile, at where the clay minerals, comprising tubular halloysite and microcrystalline kaolinite, have higher CEC, larger SSA, and higher porosity favoring the REE adsorption. With time, continuous input of the REEs from shallow soils, and efficient
adsorption in the lower part of the soil profiles, would result in REE enrichment and ore formation (Li et al., 2019).

Implications

Here, we present a comprehensive study on the variation and transformation of clay minerals during progressive weathering of granite and the corresponding changes in different physicochemical properties that could significantly affect the REE adsorption and accumulation necessary to form world class regolith-hosted HREE deposits. Clay mineralogy is demonstrated to be a key factor in REE accumulation during weathering. Transformation of metastable halloysite and microcrystalline kaolinite to euhedral, crystalline kaolinite in the shallow soils, during which the CEC, SSA and porosity could dramatically decrease, is critical for REE desorption in the shallow soils. Whereas preservation of poorly crystallized halloysite and kaolinite in the deep regolith significantly facilitated the REE adsorption there. Through time, continuous operation of such an eluviation - illuviation process could result in sufficient REE accumulation to form economically valuable deposits.

Hence, several implications could be drawn for resources exploration and metallurgical practice. Contrasting variations in physicochemical properties of kaolinite group minerals along soil profiles could be a promising exploration tool for regolith-hosted HREE resources. Preservation of halloysite in the lower part of the soil profile, coupled with its destruction in the upper part of the same soil profile could be a good indicator for REE enrichment in the
lower soil horizons. As the REEs are largely adsorbed on halloysite, most likely preferentially in the internal and lumen pores, the properties of halloysite should be taken into consideration for exploration and metallurgical processing. Halloysite could form intercalated complexes with certain salts, such as K-acetate, KCl, NH$_4$Cl, (NH$_4$)$_2$SO$_4$, RbCl, and CsCl (Carr et al., 1978; Wada, 1959a; Wada, 1959b). This is partially why ammonium sulfate is a very efficient leaching agent for industrial extraction of the REEs from these deposits. Compounds that could form stable intercalated complexes with halloysite would be of interest in the future design of more environmental friendly metallurgical processes.
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**Figure Captions**

**Figure 1.** Simplified geological map of the Zudong deposit (after Li et al., 2019).

**Figure 2.** (a) A schematic soil profile and profile of REE content of the Zudong deposit (after Li et al., 2019). (b - g) Field photos of the Zudong deposit. (b) Pedolith of orangish brown appearance with abundant residual grains of quartz. (c) Interface between the pedolith and saprolite at where the relict granitic texture progressively demolished. (d) Upper saprolite of mottled pinkish white appearance due to the abundant kaolinized feldspar and relict granitic texture is still preserved. (e) Lower saprolite of mottled purplish white appearance. (f) Saprock in which outline of feldspar grains could still be preserved. (g) Fresh bedrock with major minerals of quartz, orthoclase, and albite.

**Figure 3.** Variations of averaged particle size proportion, bulk mineral proportion and REE distribution, and proportion of clay minerals, SSA, pore volume, CEC and clay-adsorbed REE concentration of the clay fractions in different soil horizons. Abbreviations: Ab, albite; Gbs, goethite; Hal, halloysite; Ill, illite; Kfs, K-feldspar; Kln, kaolinite; Ms, muscovite; Qtz, quartz; Sme, smectite; Vrm, vermiculite. Ms-Ill/Sme and Ms-Ill/Vrm refer to interstratified muscovite-illite with smectite and vermiculite respectively. Note that the proportion of kaolinite in the bulk mineral proportion refers to the family of kaolinite group minerals. “1” indicates data sourced from Li et al. (2019).
Figure 4. Occurrence of halloysite in the saprolite and lower pedolith. (a) - (f) are SEM images while (g) and (h) are TEM images. Short, stubby halloysite tubes occur as (a) aggregates on weathered albite and (b) muscovite or (c) as individual tubes on weathered muscovite. (d) Long halloysite tubes occur as aggregates on weathered albite, (e) through coalescence of short halloysite tubes and (f) on surface of weathered muscovite. Short, stubby halloysite tubes with d spacing of (g) 10.1Å or (h) 7.5Å. Noted that the locations of d spacing measurement were indicated by the red squares. Abbreviations: Ab, albite; Ms, muscovite.

Figure 5. Association of short halloysite tubes and muscovite at the saprolite and lower pedolith. (a) - (d) are SEM images while (e) and (f) are TEM images. Nano-sized halloysite with well grown tubular shapes and clear lumen pores (an example indicated by the black arrow in e) are observed with c axes generally parallel to the muscovite sheet (examples indicated by the blue arrows) and rolled up along edges of muscovite sheets form semi-open tubes (examples indicated by the red arrows). Abbreviations: Ms, muscovite.

Figure 6. Occurrence of other clay minerals in the saprolite and lower pedolith. All images are SEM images. (a) Microcrystalline kaolinite on weathered muscovite. (b) Aggregates of microcrystalline kaolinite occasionally with long halloysite tubes. (c) Aggregates of illite on
surface of weathered orthoclase. (d) Weathered grain of muscovite occasionally with halloysite tubes. Abbreviations: Hal, halloysite; Ill, illite; Kln, kaolinite; Ms, muscovite.

**Figure 7.** SEM images of the occurrence of clay minerals in the upper pedolith. (a) - (f) Progressive transformation of halloysite to kaolinite. (a & b) The initial stage showing coalescence of halloysite tubes along the edges to form sub µm-sized and loosely stacked kaolinite. (c - f) The interim stage as vermicular kaolinite continues growing through coalescence of the halloysite tubes along (d & e) edges and (f) basal surface. (g) Crystalline vermicular kaolinite. (h) Aggregates of kaolinite and halloysite.

**Figure 8.** TEM images of the occurrence of clay minerals in the upper pedolith. (a) Crystalline kaolinite with unit cells of 5.0Å along the a axis. (b) Long, tubular halloysite associated with kaolinite with d spacing of (c) 8.0Å and (d) 7.4Å.

**Figure 9.** Representative XRD spectra of the clay fractions from different soil horizons. Notations: N, Oriented samples; E, ethylene glycol-solvated samples; T, 550ºC heated samples; K, K-acetate & ethylene glycol-solvated samples. Abbreviations: Ill, illite; Ms, muscovite; Vrm: vermiculite.

**Figure 10.** Representative FT-IR spectra of the clay fractions from different soil horizons.
Figure 11. (a) Adsorption (represented by the solid line) and desorption (represented by the dashed line) isotherms and (b) pore size distribution of the clay fractions in different soil horizons.

Figure 12. Correlation plot between (a) (Si – 4) + Fe and Al, and (b) Fe and Al (VI) in kaolinite group minerals from different soil horizons.

Figure 13. Upper continental crust (UCC)-normalized REE patterns of (a) the clay fractions and (b) the bulk compositions from different soil horizons. Solid and dash lines in (a) represent <2 and 2 - 20 µm fractions respectively. Solid and dot lines in (b) represent bulk extractable and whole-rock compositions respectively. Data from (b) is extracted from Li et al. (2019). REE concentration of the upper continental crust is extracted from Rudnick and Gao (2003).

Figure 14. Relations between proportion of halloysite and kaolinite and clay-adsorbed HREE and LREE concentrations.

Figure 15. Variations of bulk extractable and clay-adsorbed REE concentrations for (a) <2 µm and (b) 2 - 20 µm fractions in different soil horizons. Data for the bulk extractable REE concentrations is extracted from Li et al. (2019).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil horizon</th>
<th>Proportion of kaolinite group mineral (%)</th>
<th>Soil pH</th>
<th>Proportion of particle size (%)</th>
<th>Bulk REE concentration (ppm)</th>
<th>Proportion of the total REEs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;2 µm</td>
<td>2 - 20 µm</td>
<td>20 - 50 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humic layer -</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper pedolith</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper saprolite</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower saprolite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark:
**1**: Data from Li et al. (2019); analytical methods provided in Appendix.
Table 2. Summary of average relative proportions of clay minerals in <2 µm and 2 - 20 µm fractions from different soil horizons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil horizon</th>
<th>Size (µm)</th>
<th>Hinckley index*</th>
<th>Kaolinite</th>
<th>Halloysite</th>
<th>Smectite</th>
<th>Interstratified Ms-Ill/Smectite</th>
<th>Muscovite/Illite</th>
<th>Vermiculite</th>
<th>Interstratified Ms-Ill/Vermiculite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humic layer</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper pedolith</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower pedolith</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper saprolite</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
* Hinckley indices are calculated for the kaolinite-group minerals
-- Not detected
Abbreviation: Ill, illite; Ms, muscovite
Table 3. Summary of average mineralogical, physical and chemical properties of <2 µm and 2 - 20 µm fractions from different soil horizons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil horizon</th>
<th>Size (µm)</th>
<th>BET surface area, $S_{BET}$ (m²/g)</th>
<th>BJH cumulative adsorption surface area, $S_{ads}$ (m²/g)</th>
<th>BJH cumulative desorption surface area, $S_{des}$ (m²/g)</th>
<th>$S_{ads} - S_{BET}$</th>
<th>$S_{des} - S_{BET}$</th>
<th>Adsorption pore volume (cm³/g)</th>
<th>Desorption pore volume (cm³/g)</th>
<th>Cation exchange capacity (c mol/kg⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humic layer - Upper pedolith (n = 4)</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower pedolith (n = 3)</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper saprolite (n = 2)</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower saprolite (n = 2)</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Major elemental compositions of the feldspars in the parent rock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Orthoclase (n = 8)</th>
<th>Albite (n = 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (wt. %)</td>
<td>Range (wt. %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>63.06</td>
<td>62.49 - 64.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>17.06 - 18.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeO</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na₂O</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.26 - 0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>16.13 - 17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.81</td>
<td>97.10 - 99.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average (wt. %)</th>
<th>Range (wt. %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.97 - 6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al (IV)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑TET</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>6.00 - 6.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average (wt. %)</th>
<th>Range (wt. %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al (VI)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.92 - 2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05 - 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.90 - 2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑OCT</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.98 - 4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remark:** Structural formula of feldspars is calculated on the basis of 16 positive charges
Table 5. Major elemental compositions of the kaolinite group minerals in different soil horizons and muscovite in the parent rock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Humic - Lower pedolith (n = 31)</th>
<th>Humic - Upper pedolith (n = 26)</th>
<th>Upper saprolite (n = 17)</th>
<th>Lower Saprolite (n = 18)</th>
<th>Parent rock (n = 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (wt. %)</td>
<td>Range (wt. %)</td>
<td>Average (wt. %)</td>
<td>Range (wt. %)</td>
<td>Average (wt. %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>44.31 - 46.21</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>43.78 - 46.41</td>
<td>45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.11</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>38.52</td>
<td>37.17 - 39.76</td>
<td>37.60</td>
<td>28.22 - 39.68</td>
<td>38.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeO</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.10 - 1.37</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.04 - 11.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.57</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.54</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.84</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02 - 0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na₂O</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.82</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 1.83</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>b.d.l. - 0.55</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O= F, Cl</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.11</td>
<td>96.40 - 100.45</td>
<td>98.74</td>
<td>95.46 - 100.54</td>
<td>98.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>Al (IV)</th>
<th>∑TET</th>
<th>Al (VI)</th>
<th>Ti</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>∑OCT</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>∑EXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.11</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: Structural formula of kaolinite group mineral is calculated on the basis of 14 positive charges and muscovite of 22 positive charges.
Table 6. Extraction results of the clay fractions from different soil horizons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil horizon</th>
<th>Size fraction (µm)</th>
<th>Extractable pool</th>
<th>REE</th>
<th>LREE</th>
<th>HREE</th>
<th>(La/Yb)N</th>
<th>Ce/Ce*</th>
<th>Eu/Eu*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humic layer</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper pedolith</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower pedolith</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>3698</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>3049</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>3272</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>2656</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper saprolite</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>2613</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower saprolite</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 20</td>
<td>Clay-adsorbed</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: all elemental compositions in ppm
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