

Kimberlite Weathering: Mineralogy and Mechanism

By

JACQUELINE MORTEL

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree

**PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR
(METALLURGICAL ENGINEERING)**

in the

Faculty of Engineering, Built Environment and Information
Technology

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

2006

Kimberlite Weathering: Mineralogy and Mechanism

STUDENT: JACQUELINE MORKEL

SUPERVISORS: M.K.G. VERMAAK AND P.C. PISTORIUS

**DEPARTMENT: MATERIALS SCIENCE AND METALLURGICAL
ENGINEERING**

**DEGREE: PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR
(METALLURGICAL ENGINEERING)**

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to arrive at a fundamental understanding of kimberlite weathering and of factors which affect the rate and extent of weathering. Weathering was evaluated by measuring the change in size distribution after immersing crushed kimberlite in solutions of various compositions. Reproducibility of the measurements was found to be good, with the cumulative mass passing a given size differing by 7% or less, as tested for various weathering conditions.

Kimberlite mineralogy, specifically the swelling clay content, was found to play a central role: kimberlite ores containing no swelling clay were not prone to weathering under any of the conditions tested.

The cation exchange capacity (CEC) correlates well with the swelling clay content and with the weathering behaviour. The cation exchange capacity may be used in conjunction with the swelling clay content, as a predictor of possible kimberlite behaviour; however, given the relative complexity and cost of measuring swelling clay content (by X-ray diffraction), the CEC is the preferred parameter for practical use.

Cations in the weathering solution have a strong effect on kimberlite weathering; the strength of the effect followed the series $\text{Cu}^{2+} > \text{Li}^+ > \text{Fe}^{2+} > \text{Ca}^{2+} > \text{Fe}^{3+} > \text{Mg}^{2+}$, whereas K^+ and NH_4^+ stabilised the kimberlite somewhat against weathering. This sequence was in reasonable

correlation with the ionic potential (ratio of valency to ionic radius), but with exceptionally strong weathering effects of Cu^{2+} , and (to a lesser extent) of Li^+ and Fe^{2+} . The strong effect of the latter group of cations may be related to their tendency to adsorb onto other crystal sites in addition to the interlayer – the associated change in surface energy can change the fracture behaviour of the kimberlite.

Measurement of the layer spacing of the swelling clay (by X-ray diffraction) showed no correlation between the weathering effect of a cation and the associated thickness of the interlayer. For solutions of cupric ions, the identity of the anion (chloride or sulphate) has little effect on weathering. The size of the crushed kimberlite ore similarly has little effect on the relative extent of size degradation by weathering.

The concentration of cupric ions affects weathering, as does the weathering time – although 85% of the weathering caused by 30 days' exposure was found to occur within the first 24 hours. Increasing the temperature to 40°C (in a magnesium chloride solution) also increased weathering strongly. The kinetics of exchange of cuprous and potassium ions was measured (for two different kimberlites); the apparent reaction order (with respect to the concentration of exchanging cations in solution) varied between 1 and 3.5, and exchange of potassium was more rapid.

This work has practical implications for in-plant processing of kimberlite, possible alternative kimberlite processing routes which eliminate one or more crushing steps, and for the stability of mine tunnels which pass through kimberlite.

KEYWORDS: Kimberlite, weathering, swelling, mineralogy, clay minerals, accelerated weathering, cation exchange

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly I thank the Lord Jesus Christ for the abilities and talents He blessed me with. Also for His divine inspiration and for giving me hope in the times it felt that there was none. I thank my husband for his continued support and understanding and for always being there. I thank Dr. Thys Vermaak for his technical support and also friendship during this time. I would also like to thank the University of Pretoria colleagues, especially Sarah Havenga for her administrative functions and her friendship. I am grateful to my parents for the opportunities they provided, for always being there and supporting me. I am grateful to De Beers, especially Mr. Pete Sergeant for his contributions and Richard Kekana for the supply of ore resources. Other De Beers colleagues that contributed are Leon Kruger and Serkan Saydam. Thanks to Fanie Kruger at Mintek for the hours spent on XRD work to characterise the mineralogy and also Sabine Verryn at the University of Pretoria. Prof Pistorius deserves a special acknowledgement for his time, technical guidance, editing and contributing to my personal growth.

My wish is that this study will really improve the understanding of weathering and the impact thereof on kimberlite material. I hope wholeheartedly that this goal was achieved.

Heb 13:21 May God make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* glory forever and ever.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.1 PROJECT DEFINITION.....	1
1.2 DIAMOND PROCESSING	1
2 LITERATURE STUDY	4
2.1 KIMBERLITE MINERALOGY	4
2.1.1 Olivine	7
2.1.2 Phlogopite / Micas.....	7
2.1.3 Serpentine.....	8
2.1.4 Monticellite.....	8
2.1.5 Perovskite	8
2.1.6 Carbonates (calcite and dolomite)	9
2.1.7 Chlorite.....	9
2.1.8 Clay minerals.....	9
2.1.9 Spinel.....	9
2.1.10 Magnesian Ilmenite	10
2.1.11 Pyroxene.....	10
2.1.12 Apatite.....	10
2.1.13 Garnet.....	10
2.1.14 Conclusion.....	11
2.2 WEATHERING PRINCIPLES	12
2.2.1 Mechanical Weathering.....	12
2.2.1.1 Low temperature, water based weathering	12
2.2.1.2 Hydration shattering	13
2.2.1.3 Salt weathering	13
2.2.1.4 Wetting and drying	15
2.2.1.5 Insolation weathering.....	15
2.2.1.6 Pressure release weathering.....	16
2.2.2 Chemical weathering.....	16
2.2.2.1 Hydration.....	16
2.2.2.2 Water exchange rates on hydrated ions	19
2.2.2.3 Solution.....	20
2.2.2.4 Acids and Bases.....	20
2.2.2.5 Hydrolysis.....	20
2.2.2.6 Carbonation	21
2.2.2.7 Redox reactions	22
2.2.2.8 Cation Exchange.....	22
2.2.3 Biological weathering.....	23

2.2.3.1	Production of organic and inorganic acids.....	23
2.2.4	<i>Silicate weathering</i>	26
2.2.4.1	Nesosilicates	26
2.2.4.2	Sorosilicates.....	27
2.2.4.3	Cyclosilicates.....	27
2.2.4.4	Inosilicates	27
2.2.4.5	Phyllosilicates	27
2.2.4.6	Tectosilicates	28
2.2.5	<i>Products of weathering</i>	29
2.2.5.1	Crystalline phyllosilicate clays	29
2.2.5.1.1	Structure of the sheets	29
2.2.5.1.2	Linkage between sheets	30
2.2.6	<i>Intensity of weathering</i>	35
2.2.6.1	Controls of intensity	35
2.2.6.2	Verbally descriptive approach to the intensity of weathering.....	38
2.2.7	<i>Rate of weathering</i>	39
2.2.7.1	Units for measuring weathering rates	39
2.2.7.2	Experimental determination of weathering rates	40
2.3	QUANTIFICATION / MEASUREMENT OF KIMBERLITE WEATHERING	42
2.3.1	<i>Expressing kimberlite weathering</i>	42
2.3.1.1	Changes in chemical or mineralogical properties of the ore.....	42
2.3.1.1.1	X-Ray Fluorescence analysis	42
2.3.1.1.2	X-Ray Diffraction analysis	43
2.3.1.1.3	Chemical indices as an indication of the intensity	44
2.3.1.1.4	Changes in chemical properties of the weathering solution.....	47
2.3.1.1.5	Adsorption of water to form swelling clays	47
2.3.1.2	Assessment based on the mechanical properties of the ore	48
2.3.1.2.1	Single particle breakage tests	48
2.3.1.2.2	Batch tests	50
2.3.1.3	Fines generation or mass loss of the sample	52
2.3.1.4	The slake durability test.....	52
2.3.1.5	Conclusion.....	54
2.4	PARAMETERS THAT INFLUENCE KIMBERLITE WEATHERING.....	55
2.4.1	<i>Accelerated weathering</i>	55
2.4.2	<i>Ion concentration</i>	55
2.4.3	<i>Acid concentration</i>	55
2.4.4	<i>Temperature</i>	56
2.4.5	<i>Wetting and drying cycles</i>	56
2.4.6	<i>Other parameters</i>	56

3. MECHANISMS CONTROLLING KIMBERLITE WEATHERING.....	57
3.1 SWELLING AS THE WEATHERING MECHANISM	57
3.2 THE EFFECT OF CATIONS ON SWELLING BEHAVIOUR.....	58
4. PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	61
5. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE	62
5.1 MINERALOGY	63
5.1.1 XRF ANALYSIS.....	63
5.1.2 XRD ANALYSIS.....	63
5.2 WEATHERING TESTS AND CONDITIONS	71
5.2.1 Standard test.....	71
5.2.2 Koffiefontein	72
5.2.3 Wesselton.....	72
5.2.4 Cullinan TKB.....	73
5.2.5 Geluk Wes.....	73
5.2.6 Dutoitspan	73
5.2.6.1 Influence of Mono-, Di- and Trivalent cations on weathering.....	73
5.2.6.2 Time dependence of weathering	73
5.2.6.3 Influence of cation concentration on weathering.....	74
5.2.6.4 Influence of temperature on weathering	74
5.2.6.5 Influence of anions on weathering.....	74
5.2.6.6 Influence of particle size on weathering	74
5.2.6.7 Influence of milling on weathering results	74
5.2.6.8 The effect of a stabilising cation vs. swelling cation	75
5.2.7 Venetia.....	75
5.3 REPEATABILITY OF RESULTS	75
5.4 KINETIC EVALUATION OF CATION EXCHANGE	76
5.5 CATION EXCHANGE BEHAVIOUR.....	76
5.6 CORRELATION BETWEEN CATION WEATHERING AND INTERLAYER SPACING (FROM XRD)	76
5.7 MECHANICAL TEST.....	77
5.8 AGGLOMERATION TEST	78
6. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	80
6.1 GEOCHEMISTRY AND MINERALOGY	80
6.1.1 XRF Analysis	80
6.1.2 XRD Analysis.....	81
6.1.3 Visual observation of the kimberlite ores	86
6.1.4 Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC).....	88
6.1.5 Conclusion.....	88

6.2	WEATHERING RESULTS	89
6.2.1	<i>Koffiefontein</i>	90
6.2.2	<i>Wesselton</i>	91
6.2.3	<i>Cullinan</i>	95
6.2.4	<i>Geluk Wes</i>	97
6.2.5	<i>Dutoitspan</i>	100
6.2.5.1	Standard weathering test.....	100
6.2.5.2	Influence of cation species on weathering.....	101
6.2.5.3	Time dependence of weathering	110
6.2.5.4	Influence of cation concentration on weathering.....	116
6.2.5.5	Influence of temperature on weathering	118
6.2.5.6	Influence of anions	119
6.2.5.7	Influence of particle size.....	120
6.2.5.8	Influence of milling on weathering results	122
6.2.5.9	The effect of a stabilising cation vs. swelling cation	123
6.2.6	<i>Venetia</i>	125
6.3	REPEATABILITY OF RESULTS	131
6.4	KINETIC EVALUATION OF CATION EXCHANGE	134
6.5	CATION EXCHANGE BEHAVIOUR.....	152
6.6	CORRELATION BETWEEN CATION WEATHERING AND INTERLAYER SPACING (FROM XRD)	154
6.7	AGGLOMERATION TEST RESULTS.....	158
7	INDUSTRIAL APPLICATION	162
7.1	% SMECTITE VS. CEC FOR SOME DE BEERS MINES	162
7.2	POTASSIUM AS STABILISER OF KIMBERLITE	168
7.2.1	<i>Background</i>	168
7.2.2	<i>Slake durability test results</i>	169
8	POSSIBLE FUTURE WORK	171
9	CONCLUSION.....	172
10	REFERENCES	176
APPENDIX A: SPECIFICATION ON XRD WORK DONE AT UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA AND MINTEK.....		182
APPENDIX B: ORIGINAL XRD DATA.....		183
B1:	XRD OF DUTOITSPAN	184
B2:	XRD OF GELUK WES	185
B3:	XRD OF KOFFIEFONTEIN	187

B4:	XRD OF CULLINAN TKB	189
B5:	XRD OF WESSELTON	191
B6	VENETIA KIMBERLITES	193
B6.1	K1 HYPABYSSAL NORTH EAST	193
B6.2	K1 HYPABYSSAL SOUTH.....	194
B6.3	K1 TKB EAST.....	195
B6.4	K2 NORTH EAST	196
B6.5	K2 SOUTH.....	197
B6.6	K2 WEST.....	198
B6.7	K8.....	199
B6.8	RED KIMBERLITE	200
APPENDIX C: SIZE DISTRIBUTION DATA.....		201
C1:	DATA OF DUTOITSPAN	202
C1.1	<i>Standard Weathering test</i>	202
C1.2	<i>Influence of cations on weathering: Monovalent cations</i>	203
C1.2	<i>Influence of cations on weathering: Divalent cations</i>	204
C1.2	<i>Influence of cations on weathering: Trivalent cations</i>	205
C1.3	<i>Time dependence tests: Mg time tests (0.2 M)</i>	206
C1.3	<i>Time dependence tests: Cu time tests (0.2 M)</i>	207
C1.3	<i>Time dependence tests: Cu time tests (0.5 M)</i>	208
C1.4	<i>Cation concentration</i>	209
C1.5	<i>Temperature tests</i>	210
C1.6	<i>Influence of anions</i>	211
C1.7	<i>Particle size tests</i>	212
C1.8	<i>Influence of milling on weathering results</i>	214
C1.9	<i>The effect of a stabilising cation vs. a swelling cation</i>	215
C1.10	<i>Repeatability of results</i>	216
C2:	DATA ON GELUK WES.....	217
C2.1	<i>Standard Weathering test</i>	217
C2.2	<i>Sodium-, lithium-, aluminium- chloride media (0.2 M)</i>	218
C3:	DATA ON KOFFIEFONTEIN	219
C4:	DATA ON CULLINAN TKB	220
C4.1	<i>Standard Weathering test</i>	220
C4.2	<i>Sodium chloride media</i>	221
C5:	DATA ON WESSELTON.....	222
C5.1	<i>Standard Weathering test</i>	222
C5.2	<i>Acid water media</i>	223
C5.3	<i>Sodium chloride media</i>	224
C5.4	<i>Cyclic water wetting</i>	225

C5.5	<i>Copper sulphate media</i>	226
C6:	DATA ON VENETIA ORES	227
APPENDIX D: SLAKE DURABILITY DATA		230

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1. Generalised flowsheet for diamond extraction (Hodgson, 1981).
- Figure 2. De Beers Operations in Southern Africa (From the De Beers website: www.debeersgroup.com)
- Figure 3. Schematic diagram showing the alteration of olivine, pyroxene and mica (Dawson, 1980).
- Figure 4. Hydration structures of lithium, sodium and potassium (Richens, 1997).
- Figure 5. Hydration energy as a function of size and charge of the cation (Greenwood and Earnshaw, 1997).
- Figure 6. Water exchange rate constants and mean residence times for aqua metal ions at 25 °C (Richens, 1997).
- Figure 7. Ternary phase diagram showing the make up of feldspars (Bland and Rolls, 1998).
- Figure 8. Illustration of a single SiO₄ tetrahedron and the sheet structure of SiO₄ tetrahedra (Bland and Rolls, 1998).
- Figure 9. Illustrating a single octahedron and the sheet structure of linked octahedral (Bland and Rolls, 1998).
- Figure 10. Structures of the clay minerals (Bland and Rolls, 1998).
- Figure 11. Sequence of mineral stability (Goldich, 1938).
- Figure 12. Normal size distribution curve illustrating the t_{10} from Napier-Munn et al (1996).
- Figure 13. Slake durability test equipment.
- Figure 14. Innercrystalline swelling of montmorillonite (Madsen and Müller-Vonmoos, 1989).
- Figure 15. XRD scans of untreated (U) and ethylene glycol treated Cullinan TKB (EG), displaying the peak shift that characterizes smectite (swelling clay).
- Figure 16. XRD-scans of Cullinan TKB for untreated (U), two-hour (HT2), and four-hour heat-treated (HT4) samples, displaying the effect on chlorite peaks (550 °C heat treatment temperature).
- Figure 17. Autogeneous batch mill used.
- Figure 18. Swing mill used for agglomeration tests.
- Figure 19. Ore added to the swing mill container for the agglomeration test showing the grinding metal pieces inside the container.
- Figure 20. Visual appearance of the untreated kimberlite lumps.
- Figure 21. Comparison of the cation exchange capacity (CEC) and % smectite. Additionally a datapoint for a sodium bentonite from Herbert and Moog (1999) are presented.
- Figure 22. Results of a 1.5 kg (- 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Koffiefontein sample weathered for 1 and 3 hours respectively in distilled water.
- Figure 23. Visual appearance of Koffiefontein ore (- 26.5 + 22.4 mm initial size fraction) weathered for 3 hours in distilled water.
- Figure 24. Weathering results from the standard test procedure; 1.5 kg (- 19 + 16 mm) Wesselton ore weathered in distilled water for 0, 6 and 15 days.

Figure 25. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 19 + 16 mm) Wesselton ore sample weathered in sodium chloride solution (0.2 M) for 0, 6 and 15 days.

Figure 26. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 19 + 16 mm) Wesselton ore sample weathered in dilute sulphuric acid (pH ~ 3) for 0, 6 and 15 days.

Figure 27. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 19 + 16 mm) Wesselton ore sample weathered by cyclic wetting with 500 ml of distilled water once a day for 0, 6 and 15 days.

Figure 28. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Wesselton ore sample weathered in a 0.2 M copper sulphate solution for 0 and 6 days. The 6 days standard weathering test is shown for comparative purposes.

Figure 29. Visual appearance of Wesselton ore after the standard weathering test (- 19 + 16 mm).

Figure 30. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 19 + 16 mm) Cullinan TKB ore sample weathered by the standard test method for 0, 6 and 15 days.

Figure 31. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 19 + 16 mm) Cullinan TKB ore sample weathered in a 0.2 M sodium chloride solution for 0, 6 and 15 days.

Figure 32. Visual appearance of Cullinan TKB ore after the standard weathering test (-19 + 16 mm).

Figure 33. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 19 + 16 mm) Geluk Wes ore sample weathered by the standard test method for 0 and 15 days.

Figure 34. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 22.4 + 19 mm) Geluk Wes ore sample weathered in 0.2 M sodium chloride, acidified sodium chloride at low pH (~ 2.5), aluminium chloride and lithium chloride solutions, all for 6 days.

Figure 35. Visual appearance of Geluk Wes ore (initial size -22.4 + 19 mm) weathered in sodium chloride solution (0.2 M) for 6 days.

Figure 36. Visual appearance of Geluk Wes ore (initial size - 22.4 + 19 mm) weathered in aluminium chloride solution (0.2 M) for 6 days.

Figure 37. Visual appearance of Geluk Wes ore (initial size -22.4 + 19 mm) weathered in lithium chloride solution (0.2 M) for 6 days.

Figure 38. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (- 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Dutoitspan ore sample weathered for 6 days in a distilled water medium.

Figure 39. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in potassium chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 40. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in lithium chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 41. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in ammonia chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 42. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in sodium chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 43. Results of the investigation on the influence of monovalent cations on the weathering behaviour of Dutoitspan ore. Tests were done utilising 1.5 kg (initial size – 26.5 + 22.4 mm) ore weathered in a 0.4 M cation solution for 6 days.

Figure 44. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in calcium chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 45. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in cupric chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 46. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in ferrous chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 47. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in magnesium chloride solution (0.4 M) for 6 days.

Figure 48. Results of the investigation on the influence of divalent cations on the weathering behaviour. Tests were done utilising 1.5 kg (initial size – 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Dutoitspan ore weathered in 0.4 M cation solution for 6 days.

Figure 49. Results of the investigation on the influence of trivalent cations on the weathering behaviour. Tests were done utilising 1.5 kg (initial size – 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Dutoitspan ore weathered in a 0.4 M cation solution for 6 days.

Figure 50. Comparing the influence of different charged cations on weathering behaviour. The tests were done on a 1.5 kg (- 26.5 + 22.4 mm) sample weathered for 6 days in a 0.4 M solution.

Figure 51. Weathering results of differently charged cations as a function of ionic potential.

Weathering tests were performed with 300 g of – 16 + 13.2 mm Dutoitspan kimberlite, weathered in a 0.5 M cation solution for 6 days.

Figure 52. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (initial size – 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Dutoitspan ore sample weathered in a 0.2 M magnesium chloride solution for 0, 2, 6 and 15 days.

Figure 53. Summarised weathering results from a 1.5 kg (initial size – 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Dutoitspan ore sample weathered in a 0.2 M magnesium chloride solution for 0, 2, 6 and 15 days (from figure 52).

Figure 54. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in cupric sulphate solution (0.2 M) for 12 hours.

Figure 55. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in cupric sulphate solution (0.2 M) for 24 hours.

Figure 56. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in cupric sulphate solution (0.2 M) for 6 days (144 hours).

Figure 57. Weathering results from a 1.5 kg (initial size – 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Dutoitspan ore sample weathered in a 0.2 M cupric sulphate solution for 6, 12, 24 and 144 hours (6 days).

Figure 58. Results from the investigation of the time dependence of kimberlite weathering. Drawn from figure 57 as cumulative % passing 17.5 mm.

Figure 59. Weathering results from a 300 g (initial size – 16 + 13.2 mm) Dutoitspan ore sample weathered in a 0.5 M cupric sulphate solution for up to 30 days.

Figure 60. Results from the investigation of the time dependence of kimberlite weathering. Drawn from figure 59 as cumulative % passing 10.3 mm.

Figure 61. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size -26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in a 0.005 M cupric sulphate medium for 6 days.

Figure 62. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size -26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in a 0.1 M cupric sulphate medium for 6 days.

Figure 63. Visual appearance of Dutoitspan ore (initial size -26.5 + 22.4 mm) weathered in a 0.4 M cupric sulphate media for 6 days.

Figure 64. Results of the investigation to determine the influence of cation concentration. The tests were conducted on 1.5 kg of -26.5 +22.4 mm Dutoitspan ore. Copper sulphate concentrations were 0.005, 0.025, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2 and 0.4 M. The weathering time was constant at 6 days.

Figure 65. Weathering as a function of cation (cupric) concentration. The weathering is reported as the cumulative percent passing 14.2 mm from figure 64.

Figure 66. Results of the investigation of the influence of temperature on the weathering behaviour. The results include the standard test at room temperature and the standard test at 40 °C. The weathering tests in a 0.2 M MgCl₂ solution for 6 days at room temperature and 40 °C are also shown. All the tests were done on a 1.5 kg (initial size - 19 + 16 mm) Dutoitspan kimberlite sample.

Figure 67. Results of tests to determine the influence of the type of anion on weathering. Tests conducted on a 1.5 kg -26.5 + 22.4 mm Dutoitspan ore sample at 0.3 M cupric chloride and cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 68. Results of the investigation to determine the influence of particle size. The tests were conducted in 0.2 M magnesium chloride solution for 6 days. The particle sizes used were -26.5 + 22.4, -22.4 + 19, -19 + 16 and -16 + 13.2 mm, using Dutoitspan ore.

Figure 69. Results from the investigation of particle size. Comparison of the size distribution curves for the unweathered and weathered states at 70 % of the starting material size.

Figure 70. Investigation of the influence of milling on weathering tests. Weathering tests were performed in a 0.2 M cupric sulphate solution (initial size - 26.5 + 22.4 mm) Dutoitspan ore for 12 hours and the unmilled and milled sample product size distributions compared.

Figure 71. Investigation of the influence of potassium on weathering tests. Weathering tests were performed on a 250 - 300 g -16 + 13.2 mm Dutoitspan kimberlite in a 0.5 M potassium solution for 8, 48 and 144 hours.

Figure 72. Investigation of the influence of copper on weathering tests. Weathering tests were performed on a 250 - 300 g -16 + 13.2 mm Dutoitspan kimberlite in a 0.5 M copper solution for up to 15 days.

Figure 73. Comparison of the effect of copper (swelling cation) on the left and potassium (stabilising cation) on the right and their effect on the weathering of kimberlite (photos taken after 6 days for potassium and 15 days for copper medium).

Figure 74. Venetia K1 Hypabyssal North East kimberlite unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 75. Venetia K1 Hypabyssal South kimberlite unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 76. Venetia K1 TKB East kimberlite unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 77. Venetia K2 South kimberlite unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 78. Venetia K2 North East kimberlite unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 79. Venetia K2 West kimberlite unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 80. Venetia K8 unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 81. Venetia Red kimberlite unweathered (left) compared to the weathered product (right). Weathering was done in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 82. Results of weathering tests performed on Venetia kimberlites (- 26.5 + 22.4 mm) in a 0.05 M cupric sulphate solution for 6 days.

Figure 83a. Comparing weathering results with the smectite content of Venetia ores. Weathering is shown as log cumulative % passing at 10.3 mm from figure 82 (6 days' weathering in 0.05 M copper sulphate).

Figure 83b. Comparing weathering results with cation exchange capacity of Venetia ores. Weathering is shown as log cumulative % passing at 10.3 mm from figure 82 (6 days' weathering in 0.05 M copper sulphate).

Figure 84. Repeatability of the weathering tests were evaluated by triplicate tests at 0.025, 0.1 and 0.5 M copper concentration. Tests were done on 300 g, -16 + 13.2 mm Dutoitspan kimberlite.

Figure 85. ICP analysis results displaying the steady decrease of the concentration of copper in the weathering solution as a function of time. The lines are fitted curves for simple n^{th} - order kinetics (parameters of curve fits in table 25).

Figure 86. ICP analysis results displaying the release of sodium, potassium, calcium and the sum of minor cations (K^+ , Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} and Al^{3+}) from the kimberlite into the 0.025 M copper solution.

Figure 87. ICP analysis results displaying the release of sodium, potassium, calcium and the sum of minor cations (K^+ , Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} and Al^{3+}) from the kimberlite into the 0.1 M copper solution.

Figure 88. ICP analysis results displaying the release of sodium, potassium, calcium and the sum of minor cations (K^+ , Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} and Al^{3+}) from the kimberlite into the 0.5 M copper solution.

Figure 89. ICP analysis results displaying the release of sodium from the kimberlite into the solution at 0.025, 0.1 and 0.5 M copper concentration.

Figure 90. ICP analysis results displaying the release of the sum of other cations (K^+ , Ca^{2+} , Mg^{2+} and Al^{3+}) from the kimberlite into the solution at 0.025, 0.1 and 0.5 M copper concentration.

Figure 91. A plot of $\log dC/dt$ vs. $\log (C-C_{\infty})$ for the 0.025 M copper weathering test. Time in hours, $(C-C_{\infty})$ in mmol/l and dC/dt in mmol/(lxh).

Figure 92. A plot of $\log dC/dt$ vs. $\log (C-C_\infty)$ for the 0.1 M copper weathering test. Time in hours, $(C-C_\infty)$ in mmol/l and dC/dt in mmol/(lxh).

Figure 93. A plot of $\log dC/dt$ vs. $\log (C-C_\infty)$ for the 0.5 M copper weathering test. Time in hours, $(C-C_\infty)$ in mmol/l and dC/dt in mmol/(lxh).

Figure 94. ICP analysis results displaying the steady decrease of the concentration of potassium in the weathering solution as functions of time. The lines are fitted curves for simple n^{th} - order kinetics (parameters in table 30).

Figure 95. ICP analysis results displaying the increase in the concentration of sodium in the potassium weathering solution as functions of time.

Figure 96. ICP analysis results displaying the increase in the concentration of the sum of calcium and magnesium in the potassium weathering solution as functions of time.

Figure 97. A plot of $\log dC/dt$ vs. $\log (C-C_\infty)$ for the 0.1 M potassium weathering test. Time in hours, $(C-C_\infty)$ in mmol/l and dC/dt in mmol/(lxh).

Figure 98. A plot of $\log dC/dt$ vs. $\log (C-C_\infty)$ for the 0.5 M potassium weathering test. Time in hours, $(C-C_\infty)$ in mmol/l and dC/dt in mmol/(lxh).

Figure 99. A plot of $\log dC/dt$ vs. $\log (C-C_\infty)$ for the 1 M potassium weathering test. Time in hours, $(C-C_\infty)$ in mmol/l and dC/dt in mmol/(lxh).

Figure 100. A plot of $t_{0.5}$ (time to reduce the difference between the exchanging cation concentration and the equilibrium concentration to half of the original difference) vs. $\log C_o-C_\infty$ for the copper and potassium data.

Figure 101. Langmuir adsorption isotherm for kimberlite treated with copper at 0.025, 0.1 and 0.5 M and treated with potassium at 0.1, 0.5 and 1 M.

Figure 102. Cation exchange constants as published by Bruggenwert and Kamphorst (1982) as a function of ionic potential.

Figure 103. Experimentally determined cation exchange constants as a function of ionic potential.

Figure 104. XRD scans ($5.5 - 8^\circ 2\theta$) of Dutoitspan kimberlite after exposure to copper solutions for 4 hours, 8 hours, 2 days, 7 days and 30 days.

Figure 105. XRD scans ($5.5 - 8^\circ 2\theta$) of Venetia Red kimberlite after exposure to a 1.5 M potassium chloride solution for 4 hours.

Figure 106. Visual results of the agglomeration test showing the degree of agglomerated ore on the metal piece.

Figure 107. Comparing weathering results with the agglomeration test of Venetia ores. Weathering is shown as log cumulative % passing at 10.3 mm from figure 82 (6 days' weathering in 0.05 M copper sulphate).

Figure 108. Agglomeration test results for kimberlites dried at 100 °C and then wetted in distilled water for 2 hours.

Figure 109. Smectite vs. CEC for Venetia ores / kimberlites from the De Beers geological database. Symbols of kimberlites shown in table 36.

Figure 110. Smectite vs. CEC for Koffiefontein ores / kimberlites from the De Beers geological database. Symbols of ores / kimberlites shown in table 37.

Figure 111. Smectite vs. CEC for Cullinan ores / kimberlites from the De Beers geological database. Symbols of ores / kimberlites given in table 38.

Figure 112. Smectite vs. CEC for Oaks ores / kimberlites from the De Beers geological database. Symbols used for the ores/ kimberlites are given in table 39.

Figure 113. Smectite vs. CEC for the Oaks, Koffiefontein, Cullinan and Venetia mines from the De Beers geological database.

Figure 114. Slake durability test results for three different Cullinan kimberlites (L732T109DP9, L717T66N, L732T109DP13) and Venetia Red and Venetia Hypabyssal kimberlites in distilled water.

Figure 115. Slake durability test results for Venetia Red and Cullinan L732T109DP9 in a distilled water and a potassium chloride solution.

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1. Kimberlite mineral phases (Composed from Klein and Hurlbut, 1993).*
- Table 2. The mica types present in South Africa according to Dawson and Smith (1977), (compositions are in mass percentage).*
- Table 3. Metal and ionic radii from Greenwood and Earnshaw (1997) and hydration bond size from Richens (1997).*
- Table 4. Hydrolysis of salts as in Bland and Rolls (1998).*
- Table 5. Types of silicates from Bland and Rolls (1998).*
- Table 6. The layered silicates (Bland and Rolls, 1998).*
- Table 7. Unit layer formula, octahedral and tetrahedral cations, charge per unit formula and fixed and exchangeable interlayer components (Brady and Weil, 1999).*
- Table 8. Sequence of mineral persistence or Bowen's reaction series (Pettijohn, 1941).*
- Table 9. Scheme of weathering grades for engineering purposes (Bland and Rolls, 1998).*
- Table 10. A five-point scale of friability (Ollier, 1965).*
- Table 11. Weathering indices as published by Bland and Rolls (1998).*
- Table 12. Weathering Description of the Slake durability index.*
- Table 13. Minerals identified by X-ray diffraction in the Cullinan TKB sample.*
- Table 14. Literature information on minerals in the Cullinan TKB sample in the 3 - 30 ° 2θ range.*
- Table 15. Changes recorded in diffraction characteristics of untreated and treated clay minerals. Numbers in the table refer to d-spacings in Å.*
- Table 16. Basal spacings (Å) for smectite minerals.*
- Table 17. d- spacings (Å) for chlorite minerals.*
- Table 18. d-value ranges for saponite after treatment (Thorez, 1975)*
- Table 19. Comparison of XRD results from three different institutions, Mintek, Agricultural Research Council and University of Pretoria.*
- Table 20. Results of XRF analysis done at Mintek Analytical Services on the ore samples tested (proportions by mass).*
- Table 21. XRD Analysis results on Dutoitspan, Geluk Wes, Koffiefontein, Cullinan TKB and Wesselton kimberlites as done by Mintek.*
- Table 22. XRD Analysis on Venetia Kimberlites as done by Mintek.*
- Table 23. Cation Exchange Capacities for the kimberlites tested.*
- Table 24. Statistical evaluation of repeatability results.*
- Table 25. ICP analysis results of copper weathering solution as a function of time.*
- Table 26. Results of fitting kinetic equation 33 to weathering data.*
- Table 27. Results of graphical fitting kinetic equation 32 to weathering data.*
- Table 28. Results of fitting n^{th} – order kinetic equation to copper weathering data.*
- Table 29. Mass balance of copper weathering tests.*

Table 30. ICP analysis results of potassium weathering solution as a function of time.

Table 31. Results of fitting kinetic equation 33 to weathering data.

Table 32. Results of graphical fitting of kinetic equation 32 to potassium weathering data.

Table 33. Results of fitting n^{th} – order kinetic equation to potassium weathering data.

Table 34. Interlayer spacing for Dutoitspan kimberlite weathered in solutions containing different cations.

Table 35. Results of the agglomeration test.

Table 36. Venetia ores / kimberlites from the De Beers Geological database.

Table 37. Koffiefontein ores / kimberlites from the De Beers Geological database.

Table 38. Cullinan ores / kimberlites from the De Beers Geological database.

Table 39. Oaks Kimberlite types from the De Beers Geological database.

ABBREVIATIONS

XRD: X-Ray Diffraction

XRF: X-Ray Fluorescence

Cpht: Carats per hundred tons of ore

ESP: Exchangable Sodium Percentage

CEC: Cation Exchange Capacity

REE: Rare Earth Elements

TKB: Tuffisitic Kimberlite Breccia

HYP: Hypabyssal Kimberlite

ppm: Parts per million

s: Seconds

μm : micrometer

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Specifications on XRD work done at University of Pretoria and Mintek

Appendix B: Original XRD Data

Appendix C: Size distribution data

Appendix D: Slake Durability data