

ATTI DELLA SOCIETÀ TOSCANA DI SCIENZE NATURALI MEMORIE • SERIE A • VOLUME CXXVI • ANNO 2019



INDICE - CONTENTS

pag.	5	M. BACCI, S. CORSI, L. LOMBARDI, M. GIUNTI – Gli interventi di ripristino morfologico ed ecologico del sistema dunale del Golfo di Follonica (Toscana, Ita- lia): tecniche utilizzate e risultati del monitoraggio. <i>Morphological and ecological activities to restore the</i> <i>dune system at the Follonica Gulf (Tuscany, Italy): tech-</i> niques used and monitoring populte.		57
		niques usea ana monitoring resuits.	>>)/
		D. MAGALDI – Interglacial Pleistocene paleosols sup- porting old roads in central Tuscany. <i>Paleosuoli del Pleistocene interglaciale a supporto di</i> <i>artiche strade nalla Toscana centrale</i>		67
		unicije strade retta 10scana centrale.	"	07
»	13	V. SPADINI – Pliocene scleractinians from Estepona (Malaga, Spain).		75
		Scierairiniari phocenici ai Estepona (Maiaga, Spagna).	"	D
	22	R. GIANNECCHINI, M. AMBROSIO, A. DEL SORDO, M-T. FAGIOLI, A. SARTELLI, Y. GALANTI – Hydroge- ological numerical modeling of the southeastern por- tion of the Lucca Plain (Tuscany, Italy), stressed by groundwater exploitation.		
»	<i>))</i>	Modello larogeologico numerico del settore sud-orien- tale della Piana di Lucca (Toscana Italia) caratterizzato		
		da sfruttamento intensivo delle risorse idriche.	*	95
		W. LANDINI – In memoria di Marco Tongiorgi (1934-2019).		
*	45	In memory of Marco Tongiorgi (1934-2019).	*	111
		Processi Verbali della Società Toscana di Scienza Na- turali residente in Pisa. Anno 2019 - http://www.stsn.it.	»	121
	pag. »	pag. 5 » 13 » 33 » 45	 M. BACCI, S. CORSI, L. LOMBARDI, M. GIUNTI – Gli interventi di ripristino morfologico ed ecologico del sistema dunale del Golfo di Follonica (Toscana, Ita- lia): tecniche utilizzate e risultati del monitoraggio. pag. 5 Morphological and ecological activities to restore the dune system at the Follonica Gulf (Tuscany, Italy): tech- niques used and monitoring results. D. MAGALDI – Interglacial Pleistocene paleosols sup- porting old roads in central Tuscany. Paleosuoli del Pleistocene interglaciale a supporto di antiche strade nella Toscana centrale. » 13 V. SPADINI – Pliocene scleractinians from Estepona (Malaga, Spain). Sclerattiniari pliocenici di Estepona (Malaga, Spagna). R. GIANNECCHINI, M. AMBROSIO, A. DEL SORDO, M-T. FAGIOLI, A. SARTELLI, Y. GALANTI – Hydroge- ological numerical modeling of the southeastern por- tion of the Lucca Plain (Tuscany, Italy), stressed by groundwater exploitation. » 33 Modello idrogeologico numerico del settore sud-orien- tale della Piana di Lucca (Toscana, Italia) caratterizzato da sfruttamento intensivo delle risorse idriche. W. LANDINI – In memoria di Marco Tongiorgi (1934-2019). » 45 In memory of Marco Tongiorgi (1934-2019). Processi Verbali della Società Toscana di Scienza Na- turali residente in Pisa. Anno 2019 - http://www.stsn.it. 	 M. BACCI, S. CORSI, L. LOMBARDI, M. GIUNTI – Gli interventi di ripristino morfologico ed ecologico del sistema dunale del Golfo di Follonica (Toscana, Ita- lia): tecniche utilizzate e risultati del monitoraggio. pag. 5 Morphological and ecological activities to restore the dune system at the Follonica Gulf (Tuscany, Italy): tech- niques used and monitoring results. » D. MAGALDI – Interglacial Pleistocene paleosols sup- porting old roads in central Tuscany. Paleosuoli del Pleistocene interglaciale a supporto di antiche strade nella Toscana centrale. » V. SPADINI – Pliocene scleractinians from Estepona (Malaga, Spain). Sclerattiniari pliocenici di Estepona (Malaga, Spagna). » R. GIANNECCHINI, M. AMBROSIO, A. DEL SORDO, M-T. FAGIOLI, A. SARTELLI, Y. GALANTI – Hydroge- ological numerical modeling of the southeastern por- tion of the Lucca Plain (Tuscany, Italy), stressed by groundwater exploitation. 33 Modello idrogeologico numerico del settore sud-orien- tale della Piana di Lucca (Toscana, Italia) caratterizzato da sfruttamento intensivo delle risorse idriche. » W. LANDINI – In memoria di Marco Tongiorgi (1934-2019). * 45 In memory of Marco Tongiorgi (1934-2019). » Processi Verbali della Società Toscana di Scienza Na- turali residente in Pisa. Anno 2019 - http://www.stsn.it. »

PAOLO FULIGNATI ⁽¹⁾, PAOLA MARIANELLI ⁽¹⁾, ALESSANDRO SBRANA ⁽¹⁾

QUANTITATIVE SEM-EDS ANALYSIS OF REFERENCE SILICATE MINERAL AND GLASS SAMPLES

Abstract - P. FULIGNATI, P. MARIANELLI, A. SBRANA, *Quantitative* SEM-EDS analysis of reference silicate mineral and glass samples.

SEM-EDS microanalysis is an accurate technique for quantitative microchemical X-ray analyses of geological samples. The aim of this study was to set up the procedure for the determination of major, minor and volatile elements (Si, Al, Ti, Mg, Fe, Ni, Mn, Na, Ca, K, Ba, P, B, Cl, S, F) in reference silicate mineral and glass samples, by using the new SEM-EDS ThermoFisher® Quanta 400 Forensic with Pathfinder microanalysis installed at the Earth Sciences Department, University of Pisa. The obtained precision and accuracy are acceptable for many mineralogical, petrographic and geological purposes.

Key words - microanalysis, scanning electron microscope (SEM), energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS)

Riassunto - P. FULIGNATI, P. MARIANELLI, A. SBRANA, Analisi quantitative SEM-EDS di campioni di riferimento di vetri e minerali silicatici.

La microanalisi SEM-EDS è una tecnica accurata per le analisi microchimiche quantitative a Raggi X di campioni di materiali geologici. Lo scopo di questo studio era di mettere a punto una procedura per la determinazione degli elementi maggiori, minori e volatili (Si, Al, Ti, Mg, Fe, Ni, Mn, Na, Ca, K, Ba, P, B, Cl, S, F) in campioni di vetri e minerali silicatici di riferimento, usando il nuovo strumento SEM-EDS ThermoFisher® Quanta 400 Forensic con microanalisi Pathfinder installato al Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra dell'Università di Pisa. La precisione e l'accuratezza ottenute sono risultate soddisfacenti per finalità mineralogiche, petrografiche e geologiche.

Parole chiave - microanalisi, microscopio elettronico a scansione (SEM), spettroscopia a dispersione di energia (EDS)

INTRODUCTION

The composition of silicate minerals and glasses is particularly relevant in the study of geosciences. As a consequence, the possibility to carry out high quality, in situ and relatively fast analyses on these materials is pivoting for a lot of Earth Science scientists. This kind of analysis can be obtained by electron microprobe and scanning electron microscope using Wavelenght Dispersive Spectrometer (WDS), Energy Dispersive Specrometer (EDS) or an integration of both (WD/ ED combined). Although detection limits (typically around 0.1%) of EDS apparatus are higher (about ten times higher, Goldstein *et al.*, 1981) and the resolution is lower (i.e. due to the interference between F/ Fe L α fluorine cannot be quantified in Fe-rich materials) than WDS apparatus, for many applications (e.g. major elements in rock-forming silicate and glasses) quantitative EDS analysis is perfectly satisfactory, and even has some advantages, including simpler setting up and compatibility with lower current density that minimize damage to feldspars, glasses, carbonates, etc. (Reed, 2005).

The main purpose of this paper is to evaluate the accuracy of calibration of the new SEM-EDS ThermoFisher® Quanta 400 Forensic with Pathfinder v. 1.3 microanalysis system recently installed at Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, University of Pisa (Italy) as concern the quantitative determination of major and minor elements (Si, Al, Ti, Mg, Fe, Ni, Mn, Na, Ca, K, Ba, P, B, Cl, S, F) in silicate minerals and glasses.

The Pathfinder microanalysis is based on quantification in a 2-step process: 1) from spectrum to net peak intensities using the filter-fit method (McCarthy & Schamber, 1979); 2) from intensities to element concentration using the PROZA model for matrix correction (Bastin *et al.*, 1998 and references therein; Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc, 2016).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The calibration of the method was carried out on five minerals, three natural glasses and one synthetic glass (Tab. 1). Samples were polished (down to $0.3 \mu m$ alumina powder) and carbon coated (25 nm thickness) before each analytical session.

The SEM-EDS Quanta 400 is equipped with a Thermo Scientific Pathfinder EDS UltraDry 10 (129 eV) detector working under high-vacuum mode (<10⁻⁴ Pa). The active area is 10 mm² and 129 eV energy resolution at Mn k-alpha. Norvar window with proprietary evacuated tube design for detection sensitivity to Be. The instrumental conditions were set in order to obtain the optimization of analytical results considering the materials commonly investigated by the users of

⁽¹⁾ Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università di Pisa, via S. Maria 53, 56126 Pisa, Italy *Corresponding author:* Paola Marianelli (paola.marianelli@unipi.it)

the Laboratory. Spectra collection has been performed at 20 kV accelerating voltage, 10⁻¹⁰ A beam current. This is not the optimal condition for the determination of elements lighter than fluorine, however 20 kV accelerating voltage minimizes the migration of alkalies (Goodhew & Gulley, 1975) and improves the statistics of heavy elements. Spot diameter was tuned before each analytical session in order to obtain 32000 cps on pure Au sample with 500X magnification. In order to minimize thermal decomposition effects each analysis was performed with a scanning window of about 900 μ m² and an acquisition time of 50 seconds live time (preliminary analyses on reference minerals and glasses with different acquisition live times were performed and 50 seconds live time resulted the best choice).

Repeated analyses were performed on each sample of reference material in different analytical sessions in order to check the reproducibility of analyses. For the calibration we adopted a selection of international reference samples (CFA47, ALV981R23, KE12, Scapolite Zabargad, Metrich, 1985; Metrich & Clocchiatti, 1989; Metrich & Rutherford, 1992; Vaggelli *et al.*, 1999), minerals supplied by C.M. Taylor Corporation (Multi-Element Standard No. 214-30, Albite, Ortose, Olivine, Diopside), and one B-bearing synthetic glass appositely prepared (Flint glass, Kimble Italia).

The PROZA correction factors (PCF) for matrix correction (Bastin *et al.*, 1998) were tuned in order to minimize the discrepancies between the measured and the expected values of B_2O_3 , Na_2O , MgO, Al_2O_3 , SiO_2 , P_2O_5 , S, Cl, K_2O , CaO, TiO₂, MnO, FeO, NiO (expressed as wt.%) in reference material. The analyses were normalized to 100 wt. % due to the Thermo Scientific Pathfinder software used; obviously this must be taken into account during quantification processes of analysis performed on hydrous phases (i.e., water-rich natural and experimental glasses, hydrous minerals, etc), as normalization to 100% may disguise the effect of water content (Reed, 2005).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the afore-mentioned accurate calibration, the huge number of analysis collected on reference minerals and glasses testifies the good precision obtained with the new SEM-EDS apparatus at Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra di Pisa (Tab. 1). Collected data on reference minerals and glasses indicate that the analytical precision reached with the new SEM EDS instrument is good. For concentrations higher than 10 wt.% the percent deviation is within 2%, and the percent deviation is generally within 5% also for concentration down to around 0.5 wt.% (Tab. 1). Box plots of reference mineral and glass analyses (Fig. 1) provide a medium to show both the homogeneity of reference samples and the reproducibility of analyses performed with Quanta 400 apparatus. The narrow spread of the box plots (Fig. 1) indicates a good reproducibility of the data and a general compositional homogeneity of the reference samples. Only Olivine and ALV981R23 show wider spread of the FeO boxplot that can be ascribed to a slightly higher compositional heterogeneity of the sample, and not to the analytical procedure.

We also determined the equations representing the absolute deviation as function of concentration of elements. The equations have been calculated through a linear regression from data reported in Tab. 1 for MgO, Al₂O₃, SiO₂, K₂O, CaO, FeO, TiO₂ and Cl (Fig. 2).

Tab. 2 provides a comparison of the chemical concentrations determined with SEM EDS Ouanta 400 with values recommended from either WDS data of literature or provided by supplying companies. Because of normalization to 100%, due to the Pathfinder software used, the composition of reference material determined by WDS are normalized to 100 for comparison. The average percentage error for EDS systems is considered around 5% for all elements (Krusemann, 1995); as a consequence, the results obtained in this study are particularly encouraging as the average percentage error is generally below 3% with the exception of low concentration elements (such as CaO in Albite, Na₂O in Diopside, MgO in CFA47 glass, Tab. 2). However, these errors may still be considered acceptable for many mineralogical and petrographic purposes. The obtained results are well in agreement with those obtained by WDS apparatus. Indeed, several papers, based on EDS data performed with SEM-EDS instrument of Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, University of Pisa, demonstrated the reliability of EDS data on reference standards in comparison with WDS analyses performed on the same standards (Cioni et al., 1998; Marianelli & Sbrana, 1998; Fourmentraux et al., 2012; Gatti et al., 2018).

We would like to remark that the new SEM-EDS system has been tested and set up in the present work for quantitative routine microchemical analyses of B (very light element) in silicate glass. We obtained very good results showing a percentage deviation of 1.60 and a percentage error of 0.75 (Tabs 1 and 2).



Figure 1. Box plots summarizing the whole set of EDS reference mineral and glass analyses. Each box encloses 50% of the data (the median value of the variable is displayed as a line). The lines extending from each box mark the minimum and maximum values of the data set, outliers are not displayed.



Figure 2. Diagrams showing the chemical concentration in wt.% analyzed on reference minerals and glasses in respect to the standard deviation (1σ). Regression lines and R² are calculated on the basis of the concentrations analyzed in following minerals and glasses. MgO: Olivine, Diopside, CFA47, Flint glass; Al₂O₃: Ortose, Diopside, Scapolite Zabargad, CFA47, KE12, Flint glass; SiO₂: Albite, Olivine, Diopside, Scapolite Zabargad, ALV 981 R23, Flint glass; K₂O: Ortose, Scapolite Zabargad, CFA47, KE12, ALV 981 R23, Flint glass; CaO: Albite, Diopside, Scapolite Zabargad, CFA47, KE12, Flint glass; FeO: Ortose, Olivine, Diopside, Scapolite Zabargad, CFA47, ALV 981 R23; FiO₂: Scapolite Zabargad, CFA47, ALV 981 R23, KE12; Cl: Scapolite Zabargad, CFA47, KE12, Flint glass.

			Albite		Dana da	Ortose			Olivine			Diopside		Scap	olite Zabar	gad
Kub6416612613610613610613611613611613611613611613611613611613Lub24.41.641.650.001.650.001.650.001.650.002.690.032.690.032.60Lub24.00.111.650.0024.051.650.002.600.072.600.072.600.072.60Lub0.200.120.012.4031.690.033.490.140.150.160.102.60Lub1.151.150.150.160.200.210.160.200.210.210.24 <th></th> <th>(49 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th>(20 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th>(80 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th>(35 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th>(30 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th>		(49 an.)	SD	%SD	(20 an.)	SD	%SD	(80 an.)	SD	%SD	(35 an.)	SD	%SD	(30 an.)	SD	%SD
	SiO ₂	68.18	0.27	0.39	65.17	0.10	0.15	41.10	0.17	0.41	54.91	0.16	0.29	33.98	0.11	0.33
Holic1.330.051.437.110.030.390.047.560.070.057.10MinoMino771.43771.43771.44771.4471.441.44Mino1.120.131.161.161.161.161.160.171.160.171.160.171.160.131.160.141.160.141.160.141.161.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.140.160.160.140.16	M_2O_3	20.49	0.34	1.65	16.85	0.10	0.57				09.0	0.05	8.30	28.74	0.09	0.31
	FeO				1.83	0.08	4.39	7.71	0.30	3.95	0.94	0.07	7.66	0.07	0.05	71.00
Meto7.300.021.271.260.032.402.310.231.271.260.040.10Ka0.110.171.561.000.333.492.310.310.313.490.310.313.490.310.313.490.31 <th>MnO</th> <th></th> <th>0.02</th> <th>0.01</th> <th>52.63</th>	MnO													0.02	0.01	52.63
	MgO							50.86	0.27	0.53	17.80	0.23	1.27			
No. 111 0.17 1.56 1.00 0.31 3.49	CaO	0.20	0.05	24.05							25.18	0.19	0.77	13.65	0.14	1.01
K0 bit 1315 0.09 0.73 0.94 0.74 0.84 0	Na_2O	11.12	0.17	1.56	1.00	0.03	3.49				0.57	0.04	6.73	14.25	0.06	0.43
Ni0330341.583.430351.12S \mathbf{F} \mathbf{I} I	K_2O	lbdl			15.15	0.09	0.57							0.49	0.02	4.83
Normality <	NiO							0.33	0.04	11.58						
d state st	S													3.43	0.03	1.02
($60m$) SD MJ MJ MJ MJ MJ MI <	C													5.33	0.05	0.86
(60 ar) SD $%SD$ SAD MOO 010 1670 021 021 210 2100 2100 2100			CFA47		A	ALV 981 R23	~		KE12			Flint glass				
St0 (10) 0.1 0.21 49.3 0.22 0.44 70.0 0.13 1107 0.25 0.35 TO ₂ 0.42 0.04 10.32 1.25 0.05 3.71 0.30 0.16 0.25 0.35 AjO 18.70 0.08 0.40 16.60 0.23 13.3 791 0.36 0.56 0.25 0.35 0.66 753 0.66 MoO 0.21 0.03 16.70 0.21 0.34 0.35 0.36 0.66 753 0.66 753 0.66 MoO 0.21 0.01 2.12 0.14 7.23 0.16 0.25 0.66 7.23 0.66 7.69 7.69 MoO 5.47 0.03 2.04 2.12 0.14 7.23 0.04 0.25 0.66 7.69 MoO 1.80 1.80 0.23 0.24 0.25 </th <th></th> <th>(60 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th>(30 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th>(25 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th>(20 an.)</th> <th>SD</th> <th>%SD</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>		(60 an.)	SD	%SD	(30 an.)	SD	%SD	(25 an.)	SD	%SD	(20 an.)	SD	%SD			
TiO2 0.42 0.04 10.32 1.25 0.05 3.71 0.30 0.04 12.76 AjO 18.70 0.08 0.40 16.69 0.22 1.33 7.91 0.05 0.60 7.53 0.05 0.66 Fo 2.77 8.17 0.29 3.37 8.12 0.09 0.37 0.05 0.66 MiO 0.21 0.03 16.70 0.21 0.04 21.12 0.34 0.03 7.50 MiO 18.30 10.08 8.81 0.21 0.04 21.12 0.34 0.03 7.50 MiO 18.30 10.08 8.81 0.21 2.43 2.43 2.33 0.40 0.35 7.69 MiO 18.30 10.08 8.81 0.21 0.14 17.40 0.25 0.44 0.25 0.49 0.56 0.59 MiO 18.30 10.30 10.30 0.26 1.43 0.25 0.41 0.26 0.26 0.26 MiO 18.30 0.07 0.03 0.01 1.40 0.25 0.04 0.56 2.96 MiO 1.31 1.32 0.10 0.32 0.04 0.105 0.26 0.26 0.26 MiO 1.31 0.10 1.35 0.21 0.22 0.11 0.25 0.12 0.16 MiO 1.31 1.32 0.31 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.31 0.32 MiO 1.31 1.31	SiO ₂	61.91	0.13	0.21	49.38	0.22	0.44	70.97	0.10	0.13	71.07	0.25	0.35			
$\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ 18.70 0.08 0.40 16.60 0.22 1.33 7.91 0.05 0.60 7.53 0.05 0.66 \mathbf{FO} 0.01 2.75 8.47 0.29 3.37 8.12 0.08 0.98 \mathbf{A} $\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ 0.02 16.70 0.21 0.21 2.112 0.34 0.03 9.77 \mathbf{A} $\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ 0.03 10.08 8.81 0.21 2.43 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} $\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ 0.03 10.08 8.81 0.21 2.43 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} $\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ 1.93 0.03 12.15 0.14 1.40 7.23 0.04 0.78 0.05 7.69 $\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ 7.99 0.07 0.93 0.03 0.02 6.027 4.37 0.07 0.03 4.00 $\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} $\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{O}$ \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} <th>TiO_2</th> <th>0.42</th> <th>0.04</th> <th>10.32</th> <th>1.25</th> <th>0.05</th> <th>3.71</th> <th>0.30</th> <th>0.04</th> <th>12.76</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	TiO_2	0.42	0.04	10.32	1.25	0.05	3.71	0.30	0.04	12.76						
FO 2.70 0.07 2.75 8.47 0.29 3.37 8.12 0.08 0.98 MiO 0.21 0.03 16.70 0.21 0.04 2.12 0.34 0.03 5.7 MiO 0.21 0.03 16.70 0.21 0.04 2.13 0.03 0.78 0.03 7.90 Mio 1.83 0.03 10.06 12.15 0.14 1.40 7.23 0.04 0.78 0.06 7.69 Na,O 7.99 0.07 1.83 0.03 1.60 1.40 7.23 0.04 0.76 0.03 2.96 Na,O 7.99 0.07 0.03 0.02 60.27 4.37 0.06 7.69 Na,O 7.99 0.07 0.03 0.03 60.21 4.37 2.86 Na,O 1.40 1.40 7.29 0.11 0.26 0.13 0.13 <th>Al_2O_3</th> <th>18.70</th> <th>0.08</th> <th>0.40</th> <th>16.69</th> <th>0.22</th> <th>1.33</th> <th>7.91</th> <th>0.05</th> <th>09.0</th> <th>7.53</th> <th>0.05</th> <th>0.66</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Al_2O_3	18.70	0.08	0.40	16.69	0.22	1.33	7.91	0.05	09.0	7.53	0.05	0.66			
Mi0 0.21 0.03 16.70 0.21 0.04 21.12 0.34 0.03 57 Mg0 0.28 0.03 16.70 0.21 2.43 2.43 0.03 7.50 CaO 1.83 0.05 2.90 12.15 0.19 1.75 0.40 0.03 7.50 Na ₂ O 5.47 0.10 1.85 0.19 1.75 0.04 0.75 0.06 7.69 Na ₂ O 5.47 0.10 1.85 0.04 1.40 7.23 0.04 0.56 7.69 Na ₂ O 7.99 0.07 0.95 0.26 0.29 0.18 2.86 Na ₂ O 7.99 0.07 0.95 0.75 0.03 4.00 Na 1.41 7.29 0.05 0.75 0.03 4.00 Na 1.41 1.40 0.26 0.29 0.19 0.56 0.20 Na	FeO	2.70	0.07	2.75	8.47	0.29	3.37	8.12	0.08	0.98						
Mg0 0.28 0.03 10.08 8.81 0.21 2.43 0.40 0.05 7.50 CaO 1.83 0.05 2.90 12.15 0.19 1.55 0.43 0.03 7.93 0.76 7.50 Na ₂ O 7.41 0.10 1.85 2.95 0.04 1.40 7.23 0.04 0.56 6.29 0.18 2.86 Na ₂ O 7.99 0.07 0.93 0.03 6.02 4.37 0.05 6.29 0.18 2.86 Na ₂ O 7.99 0.07 0.93 0.03 0.02 6.027 4.37 0.05 0.29 0.18 2.86 BaO 7 1 2	MnO	0.21	0.03	16.70	0.21	0.04	21.12	0.34	0.03	9.57						
	MgO	0.28	0.03	10.08	8.81	0.21	2.43				0.40	0.03	7.50			
	CaO	1.83	0.05	2.90	12.15	0.19	1.55	0.43	0.03	7.93	0.78	0.06	7.69			
k_2 O 7.99 0.07 0.93 0.03 60.27 4.37 0.05 1.05 0.03 4.00 BaO P_O P	Na_2O	5.47	0.10	1.85	2.95	0.04	1.40	7.23	0.04	0.56	6.29	0.18	2.86			
BaO 2.20 0.10 4.55 P2O5 0.04 0.03 68.43 2.20 0.10 4.55 B2O3 0.04 0.03 68.43 10.62 0.17 1.60 B2O3 0.03 0.01 43.48 0.33 0.03 8.05 bdl C 0.50 0.03 5.91 0.33 0.03 8.05 bdl F 0.10 0.33 0.03 8.05 bdl 26.47	K_2O	7.99	0.07	0.93	0.03	0.02	60.27	4.37	0.05	1.05	0.75	0.03	4.00			
	BaO										2.20	0.10	4.55			
	$\mathrm{P}_{2}\mathrm{O}_{5}$				0.04	0.03	68.43									
	B_2O_3										10.62	0.17	1.60			
CI 0.50 0.03 5.91 0.33 0.03 8.05 bdl F 0.19 0.09 26.47	S				0.02	0.01	43.48									
F 0.19 0.09 26.47	CI	0.50	0.03	5.91				0.33	0.03	8.05	lbdl					
	F										0.19	0.09	26.47			
Iso I - success of successory and successed and detection [[A]: V. N] - percent detaction; but - balonin detaction limit	(an.) = nu	mber of avera	ged analyse:	s; DU = stan	dard deviaud	Jn (10); 703.	D = percen	t deviation: L	dI = below	detection 1	imit.					

9

P. FULIGNATI, P. MARIANELLI, A. SBRANA

Table 2.	Calculated	percentage errors of	EDS analy	ses of reference	minerals and glasses.
		1 0			0

	Alb	oite	Ortose		Oliv	vine	Diopside		Scapolite	Zabargad
	(49 an.)	%error	(20 an.)	%error	(80 an.)	%error	(35 an.)	%error	(30 an.)	%error
SiO2	68.18	0.04	65.17	0.52	41.10	0.28	54.91	0.40	33.98	2.06
Al2O3	20.49	3.64	16.85	1.40			0.60	28.61	28.74	0.80
FeO			1.83	7.52	7.71	1.03	0.94	54.00	0.07	3.45
MnO									0.02	5.26
MgO					50.86	0.01	17.80	0.66		
CaO	0.20	48.23					25.18	0.33	13.65	0.25
Na2O	11.12	2.93	1.00	6.14			0.57	33.50	14.25	3.62
K2O			15.15	1.88					0.49	13.59
NiO					0.33	12.58				
S									3.43	0.42
Cl									5.33	2.40
	CFA	447	ALV 98	81 R23	KE	12	Flint	glass		
	(60 an.)	%error	(30 an.)	%error	(25 an.)	%error	(20 an.)	%error		
SiO2	61.91	0.05	49.38	0.75	70.97	0.20	71.07	0.03		
TiO2	0.42	1.04	1.25	2.60	0.30	6.91				
Al2O3	18.70	0.44	16.69	0.18	7.91	1.12	7.53	2.26		
FeO	2.70	1.40	8.47	0.27	8.12	6.82				
MnO	0.21	12.83	0.21	31.82	0.34	16.41				
MgO	0.28	51.72	8.81	0.97			0.40	15.00		
CaO	1.83	0.89	12.15	2.42	0.43	19.35	0.78	5.13		
Na2O	5.47	1.36	2.95	1.83	7.23	0.05	6.29	3.82		
K2O	7.99	0.43	0.03	48.00	4.37	4.03	0.75	13.33		
BaO							2.20	2.27		
P2O5			0.04	37.62						
B2O3							10.62	0.75		
S			0.02	80.83						
Cl	0.50	1.61			0.33	0.36				
F							0.19	21.05		

(an.) = number of averaged analyses, present study; %error = percentage error, estimated from EDS analyses (this paper) and reference values from literature. Albite, Ortose, Olivine and Diopside: Marianelli & Sbrana (1998); Scapolite: Metrich 1985; CFA47: Metrich & Clocchiatti (1989), Metrich (1985), Vaggelli *et al.* (1999); ALV 981 R23: Fine & Stolper (1986), Metrich & Clocchiatti (1989), Vaggelli *et al.* (1999); KE12: Metrich & Rutherford (1992); Flint glass: Kimble Italia.

CONCLUSIONS

The new SEM-EDS ThermoFisher® Quanta 400 Forensic with Pathfinder v. 1.3 X-ray microanalysis system allows quantitative microchemical analyses of silicate minerals and glasses. This apparatus, equipped with the Norvar window and an analyzer electronics with up to 1,000,000 X-ray input counts per second and 300,000 X-ray output counts per second, dramatically improves the counting statistics allowing reducing the collecting time (50 sec live time) with respect to older liquid N₂-cooled SEM- EDS apparatus. This also minimizes thermal decomposition, which affects the quantification of light elements.

Precision and accuracy of quantitative EDS analysis can be considered comparable to that of WDS analysis for concentrations above 1%, provided that proper standards are used (Reed, 2005). In the present work, the microanalytical routine developed for this SEM-EDS apparatus testifies that the estimated analytical precision and accuracy (Tabs 1 and 2, Figs 1 and 2) result to be appropriate for analyzing the major and some minor elements of silicate minerals and glasses and the volatile elements (Si, Al, Ti, Mg, Fe, Ni, Mn, Na, Ca, K, Ba, P, B, Cl, S, F).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was financially supported by University of Pisa grants PRA_2018_19 and PRA_2018_41. We are grateful to F. Tatti and H. Dijkstra, application specialists of ThermoScientific, for their support. Two anonymous reviewers and the Editor are acknowledged for their comments and suggestions on an early version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- BASTIN G.F., DIJKSTRA J.M., HEIJLIGERS H.J.M., 1998. PROZA96: an improved matrix correction program for electron probe microanalysis, based on a double Gaussian $\varphi(rz)$ approach. *X-Ray Spectrometry* 27: 3-10.
- CIONI R., MARIANELLI P., SANTACROCE R., 1998. Thermal and compositional evolution of the shallow magma chambers of Vesuvius: evidence from pyroxene phenocrysts and melt inclusions. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 103: 18277-18294.
- FINE G. & STOLPER E., 1986. Dissolved carbon dioxide in basaltic glasses: concentrations and speciation. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 76: 263-278.
- FOURMENTRAUX C., MÉTRICH N., BERTAGNINI A., ROSI M., 2012. Crystal fractionation, magma step ascent, and syn-eruptive mingling: the Averno 2 eruption (Phlegraean Fields, Italy). *Contribution to Mineralogy and Petrology* 163: 1121-1137.
- GATTI A., MARIANELLI P., ANDRONICO D., SBRANA A., 2018. The December 2015 paroxysms at Mt. Etna: Insights from mineral chemistry and glasses. *Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali Serie A* 125: 81-92. DOI:10.2424/ASTSN.M.2018.25.

- GOLDSTEIN J.I., NEWBURY D.E., ECHLIN P., JOY D.C., FIORI C., LIFSHIN, E., 1981. Scanning electron microscopy and X ray microanalysis. Springer, New York, pp. 673.
- GOODHEW P.J. & GULLEY J.E.C., 1975. The determination of alkali metals in glasses by electron microprobe analysis. *Glass Technol.* 15: 123-126.
- KRUSEMANN J.P., 1995. SEM-EDX microanalysis. Manual for the course. Philips Electron Optics, Eindhoven, Netherlands.
- MARIANELLI P. & SBRANA A., 1998. Risultati di misure di standard di minerali e di vetri naturali in microanalisi a dispersione di energia. *Atti della Società Toscana di Scienze Naturali*. *Memorie. Serie A* 105: 57-63.
- MCCARTHY J.J. & SCHAMBER F.H., 1979. Least-squares fit with digital filter: a status report. National Bureau of Standard Special Publication 604: 273-296.
- METRICH N., 1985. Méchanismes d'évolution a l'origine des roches potassiques d'Italie centrale et méridionale. Examples du Mt Somma Vesuve, des Champs Phlegréens et de l'Ile de Ventotène. *These Doctorat, Université d'Orsay. Bull PIRSPEV*, 110: 1-130.
- METRICH N. & CLOCCHIATTI R., 1989. Melt inclusion investigation of the volatile behavior in historic alkali basaltic magmas of Etna. *Bulletin of Volcanology* 51: 185-198.
- METRICH N. & RUTHERFORD M., 1992. Experimental study of chlorine behavior in hydrous silicic melts. *Geochimica et Cos*mochimica Acta 56: 607-616.
- REED S.J.B., 2005. Electron Microprobe Analysis and Scanning Electron Microscopy in Geology. Cambridge University Press, pp. 189.
- THERMO FISHER SCIENTIFIC INC, 2016. X-Ray Acquisition and Analysis Software Pathfinder User Guide, pp. 322.
- VAGGELLI O., OLMI F., CONTICELLI S., 1999. Quantitative electron microprobe analysis of reference silicate mineral and glass samples. Acta Vulcanologica 11(2): 297-303.

(ms. pres. 15 febbraio 2019; ult. bozze 10 maggio 2019)

Edizioni ETS

Palazzo Roncioni - Lungarno Mediceo, 16, I-56127 Pisa info@edizioniets.com - www.edizioniets.com Finito di stampare nel mese di dicembre 2019