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Abstract:
The effect of sulfur dissolved in anorthite-diopside eutectic (AD) glasses on the glass transition temperature (Tg) has been investigated via Differential Scanning Calorimetric measurements (DSC) and Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA) under moderately reducing to oxidizing conditions.

In a series of AD glasses, we have measured the change in Tg as a function of S content present as SO$_4^{2-}$ (HS$^-$ is also identified to a lesser extent) and H$_2$O content. The AD glasses investigated have S contents ranging from 0 to 7519 ppm and H$_2$O contents ranging from 0 to 5.3 wt.%. In agreement with previous studies, increasing H$_2$O content induces a strong exponential decrease in Tg: volatile free AD glass has a Tg at 758±13°C and AD glass with 5.18±0.48 wt.% H$_2$O has a Tg at 450±11°C. The change in Tg as a function of H$_2$O is well-reproduced with a third-order polynomial function and has been used to constrain Tg at any H$_2$O content. The effect of S on Tg is almost inexisten or towards a decrease in Tg with increasing S content. For instance, at ~2.4 wt.% H$_2$O, the addition of S induces a change in Tg from 585±10°C with 0 ppm S to 523±3°C with 2365±138 ppm S; a further increase in S up to 7239±90 ppm S does not induce a dramatic change in Tg measured at 529±2°C.

The limited effect of S on the glass transition temperature contrasts with recent spectroscopic measurements suggesting that S dissolution as SO$_4^{2-}$ groups provokes an increase in the polymerization degree. We propose an alternative view which reconciles the spectroscopic evidence with the Tg measurements. The dissolution of S as SO$_4^{2-}$ does not induce the formation of Si-O-Si molecular bonding through consumption of available non-bridging oxygens (NBO) but instead we suggest that Si-O-Si molecular bonds are formed which are not detectable by DSC measurements but mimic the increase in glass polymerization. Therefore,
spectroscopic measurements must be used with caution in order to extract melt physical properties.
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1. **Introduction:**

Sulfur (S) is an important volatile element implied in volcanic system (Carroll and Webster, 1994; Paris et al., 2001; Scaillet et al., 2003; Clemente et al., 2004; Scaillet and Pichavant, 2005; Moune et al., 2009), playing a major role in degassing processes and related atmospheric changes (Carroll and Webster, 1994; Edmonds et al., 2003; Webster and Mandeville, 2007; Oppenheimer et al., 2011). The behaviour of S in magmas is complex owing to its variable oxidation state in silicate melts: under oxidising conditions S is present as sulfate groups ($\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ where sulfur is $S^{6+}$), whilst under reducing conditions S is present as sulphide groups (where sulfur is $S^{2-}$) (e.g. Fincham and Richardson, 1954; Carroll and Rutherford, 1988; O’Neill and Mavrogenes, 2002; Jugo et al., 2005a,b; Moretti and Ottonello, 2005; Klimm and Botcharnikov, 2010; Baker and Moretti, 2011; Klimm et al., 2012).

The structure of a silicate glass can be described via a model involving Q-species (e.g. Grimmer et al., 1984; Brandiss and Stebbins, 1988; Merzbacher et al., 1990; Stebbins, 1995; Mysen and Richet, 2005). A $Q^n$ unit represents a tetrahedral structural unit with $n$ bridging oxygens (BO, $n = 0$ to $4$). The abundance of each $Q^n$ species is dependent on bulk composition (e.g. Maekawa et al., 1991; Mysen and Frantz, 1993; Frantz and Mysen, 1995; Malfait et al., 2007). The distribution of those individual Q-species can be related to the structure of melts, hence to their physical properties such as viscosity (e.g. Mysen et al., 1980; Mysen, 1998; Toplis and Dingwell, 2004; Neuville, 2006; Malfait et al., 2007).

The presence of volatile species influences the distribution of Q-species in silicate glasses. For instance, H$_2$O induces a strong melt depolymerisation when dissolving as OH groups (e.g. Farnan et al., 1987; Kummerlen et al., 1992; Zotov and Keppler, 1998; Zeng et al., 1999; Xue and Kanzaki, 2004, 2008; Mysen and Cody, 2005; Xue, 2009) according to the following general reaction:
In this dissolution mechanism, a water molecule breaks the bridge between two \( Q^n \) structural units changing, therefore, \( Q^n \) species into \( Q^{n-1} \), less polymerised, species. Because molecular bonding is broken during this process, it impacts the melt physical properties such as viscosity. This common water dissolution mechanism is not the only one occurring in silicate melt and other dissolution mechanisms have been proposed. For instance, in highly depolymerized melt, water has been suggested to have an opposite effect, it induces an increase in the degree of polymerization (Romano et al., 2001; Xue and Kanzaki, 2004; Moretti and Ottonello, 2005; Giordano et al., 2009; Malfait and Xue, 2014).

Viscometric measurements on hydrous silicate melt (e.g. Scaillet et al., 1996; Richet et al., 1996; Whittington et al., 2000; Giordano and Dingwell, 2003; Robert et al., 2013) as well as glass transition temperature (\( T_g \) used as a proxy for viscosity) determination in hydrous silicate glasses (e.g. Deubener et al., 2003; Giordano et al., 2005; Morizet et al., 2007) confirm this fact. It is also consistent with the possible structural definition of glass transition temperature. The glass transition temperature is a temperature corresponding to a fixed relaxation time of the silicate melt structure which is thought to correspond to the exchange rate of the oxygens between tetrahedral units (Moynihan et al., 1976; Liu et al., 1988; Moynihan, 1995). As a result, there is a direct correlation between the change in the degree of polymerisation induced by \( H_2O \) dissolution and the diminution in \( T_g \) value observed with increasing \( H_2O \) content (Dingwell et al., 1996; 1998; Giordano et al., 2008a,b).

In contrast to water, the effect of sulfur on viscosity or \( T_g \) is currently unknown. Recent spectroscopic investigations by Morizet et al. (2013) lead to the proposition that the presence of \( SO_4^{2-} \) induces an apparent polymerisation of the melt which could therefore translate into an increase in melt viscosity or an increase in \( T_g \). Whether this increase in polymerisation
corresponds to an increase in glass transition temperature involving the formation of Si-O-Si molecular bonding is yet not clear. Morizet et al. (2013) suggested that the dissolution of S as SO₄²⁻ is accompanied by the formation of Si-O-S (their equation 9) and hence might not be viewed as a true polymerization process.

In the present study, we investigated the change in Tg in anorthite-diopside eutectic glasses (AD) with known S and H₂O contents, similar to those investigated in Morizet et al. (2013). In the studied AD glasses S is dissolved mainly as SO₄²⁻ but also as HS⁻, though in minor amounts. The choice for this composition is motivated by the fact that the obtained calorimetric results can be compared to both the spectroscopic of Morizet et al. (2013) and to viscosity and Tg data obtained by Giordano et al. (2008a) on the same anorthite-diopside eutectic composition with various H₂O content. The results are discussed in terms of the effect of S and H₂O on Tg and the way sulfur dissolves into the silicate melt structure is also discussed.

2. **Experimental and analytical methods:**

2.1. **Experimental method:**

In the present study, we used the quenched glass samples investigated in Morizet et al. (2013) and additional glass samples were also synthesised. The dataset produced by Morizet et al. (2013) consists in glasses of anorthite-diopside eutectic composition (50.2 SiO₂, 15.7 Al₂O₃, 23.4 CaO and 10.6 MgO in wt.%). From a theoretical standpoint, the investigated glass composition is slightly depolymerised with an NBO/T close to 0.9 (i.e. NBO/T can have values from 0 to 4) using the method of Mysen (1988, 1990). The detailed glass compositions are provided in the Supplementary material and in Table 1. The starting composition preparation method is fully described in Morizet et al. (2013) and in most of the case it
consists in mixing a starting volatile-free AD glass powder (ADVF in Table 1) with a known amount of elemental S (0 to ~5 wt.%, see Table 1). Prior to loading the obtained mixture into the Pt capsule a known amount of H₂O (up to 8.2 wt.% H₂O) is loaded at the bottom of the capsule using a micro syringe. For three samples (AD5M-2, AD2M-5 and AD10M-5) we adopted the method described in Zajacz (2015) who used a sulphuric acid solution with a known S concentration instead of elemental S as a source of S. For those samples, solutions with 2, 5 and 10 mol.L⁻¹ of H₂SO₄, corresponding to 0.25, 0.7 and 1.6 wt.% S, were loaded into the charge (~3.5 wt.% H₂O).

As shown in Table 1, the AD glasses were synthesised at 300 MPa using an Internally Heated Pressure Vessel (IHPV) at 1250°C with a quench rate above 150°C/s. (Di Carlo et al., 2006). Most of the glasses were synthesised under oxidizing conditions (using only Ar as pressurizing gas, which yields an intrinsic fH₂ of the IHPV of 1.0-1.4 bars); however, some AD glass samples were also synthesised under moderately reducing conditions: AD20 to AD24. Those experiments were conducted with an IHPV at 300 MPa and 1250°C with a fH₂ of either 3 bars (AD20 to AD22) or of 10 bars (AD23 and AD24), which were produced using an Ar-H₂ mixture. Five additional samples were synthesised using piston cylinder apparatus at 500 MPa and 1450°C. For these experiments we used a ¾ inch pressure plate with a special design (Morizet et al., 2015) which allows quench rate higher than usually observed with that kind of apparatus (on the order of 200°C/s.). Therefore, it can be considered that glasses synthesised using either IHPV or piston-cylinder apparatus have a comparable thermal history (i.e. quench rate) and that the small difference in quench rate is unlikely to produce any noticeable changes on Tg (Webb and Dingwell, 1990; Dingwell, 1995). The piston cylinder experiments run duration was kept short (2h) in order to avoid substantial H diffusion through the capsule walls which could lead to a possible reduction of the charge (Matjuschkin et al., 2015).
The $f_{O_2}$ conditions during the IHPV experiments are calculated using the $H_2O$ content measured in the glass and the prevailing $f_{H_2}$ ($f_{H_2}$ conditions in piston cylinder experiment is unknown). The calculated $f_{O_2}$ for each sample is reported in Table 1 and is expressed relative to FMQ. ADVF sample was synthesised in air which corresponds to $\Delta$FMQ+5. The moderate $f_{O_2}$ conditions applied ($\Delta$FMQ+2.8 to +0.8) did not induce a significant change in $S$ speciation, as shown in Table 1. Only a few samples show the existence of reduced $S$ species ($HS^-$) as identified with a peak located at $\sim$2575 cm$^{-1}$ (Klimm and Botcharnikov, 2010; Klimm et al., 2012) from Micro-Raman spectroscopy. In sample AD-5-5, 3% of $HS^-$ is identified and considered as negligible. Typical example of Raman spectra are provided in the Supplementary material. The small fraction of $HS^-$ in spite of moderate reducing condition is consistent with Fe-free experimental work pioneered by Nagashima and Katsura (1973) showing that in Fe-free glass compositions, the $HS^-$ species appears below $\Delta$FMQ+2.

2.2. Volatile content measurements:

The reader is referred to Morizet et al. (2013; their section 3.1 and 3.3) for a full description of the methods used to measure volatile content in the recovered glasses. The major element chemical composition and the $S$ content have been determined by Electron Probe Micro Analysis (EPMA). More than 20 point analyses were acquired to obtain a representative standard deviation in the $S$ content (see Table 1). One interesting point to notice is that the measured $S$ content appears to be maximised when the experimental protocol uses $H_2SO_4$ aqueous solution as the initial source for $S$. For instance, AD2M-5 and AD5M-2 were synthesised with an initial $S$ content of 0.25 and 0.7 wt.% $S$, respectively; the measured $S$ content for those samples is $2365 \pm 138$ and $7239 \pm 90$ ppm, respectively. On the contrary, charges prepared with elemental $S$ have a measured $S$ content which is well-below the initial loaded $S$ content (see Table 1). For example, AD12 has $\sim$5 wt.% as an initial $S$ content and...
the measured S content in the glass is less than 1000 ppm. In the current, it is not clear if this behaviour is dependent on the initial H$_2$O content. The enhanced capability of S dissolution when S is loaded in the experimental charge as an aqueous sulphuric solution has been pointed out by Zajacz (2015).

We used FTIR spectroscopy and followed the method described in Morizet et al. (2013) to determine the total water content (H$_2$O$^{\text{tot}}$). For the newly synthesised glass samples, a 256 scans collection was done to obtain a good signal-to-noise ratio. We used an IR light source, a MCT-B detector and a CaF$_2$ beamsplitter as a spectrometer configuration. The water content was determined by summing up the contribution of OH$^-$ and H$_2$O$^{\text{mol}}$ vibrations peaks located at 4500 and 5200 cm$^{-1}$, respectively. The concentration of each water species was calculated with the Beer-Lambert approximation using the peak areas and the integrated molar absorption coefficients ($\epsilon$). As explained in Morizet et al. (2013), the integrated extinction coefficients from Stolper (1982) (200 and 300 L.mol$^{-1}$.cm$^{-2}$ for OH$^-$ and H$_2$O$^{\text{mol}}$) for a An-Di like composition need a correction factor (x1.6) in order to retrieve correct H$_2$O concentrations. Therefore, we used $\epsilon$OH$^-$ = 125 L.mol$^{-1}$.cm$^{-2}$ and $\epsilon$H$_2$O$^{\text{mol}}$ = 187.5 L.mol$^{-1}$.cm$^{-2}$. The H$_2$O$^{\text{tot}}$ in the studied glasses ranges from 1.03 to 5.33 wt.% for AD1H-6 and AD23, respectively. The typical error on water measurement is better than 0.5 wt.% (see Table 1).

2.3. DSC-ATG measurements:

We used differential scanning calorimeter (DSC SETSYS EVO 2400) equipped with a thermogravimetric analyser (TGA). The glass transition temperature (Tg) for each recovered glass sample was determined using the variation of heat flow (in mW) with increasing temperature (Py et al., 2011). Prior to the sample analysis, the heat flow from two identical
empty Pt-Rh crucibles (6 mm in diameter) was measured to determine the baseline of the DSC apparatus, which was subtracted from the standard and sample measurements. The DSC was then calibrated by measuring the enthalpy of fusion of metal standards (gold, silver, aluminium and nickel) and the sensitivity is better than 0.5% in relative with respect to the temperature measurement. Additional TGA measurements were also conducted conjointly to DSC measurements in order to determine the possible volatile loss during the heating cycle for determining the glass transition temperature.

Prior to calorimetric measurements, the glass samples were crushed to avoid sample fragmentation during the DSC experiment. The crushed glass was placed in one of the crucibles and its heat flow was measured. All measurements were performed with the same two crucibles under a constant flow of Ar gas of 20 ml.min\(^{-1}\). Each sample was heated from 40°C across the glass transition at a rate of 10 or 20 K/min (see Table 2). The glass transition temperature is characterised by a decrease in the heat flow (as shown in Figure 1). In the liquid state (above Tg) there is a constant decrease in the heat flow followed by a strong increase around 700°C. This change in the heat flow curve shape with increasing temperature may be attributed to crystallization of the sample. For these samples further repeated measurements (after controlled cooling) is not possible as the sample’s aspect had clearly changed due to crystallization.

1. **Results:**

1.1. *Tg determination from DSC curves:*

The Tg value was determined by the in-built DSC software (Setsoft 2000) using the tangent definition as shown in Figure 1A for AD-5-3 sample DSC measurement. Tg is defined by the three points definition. Two tangents with the same slope coefficient are fitted before and after the glass transition region. A third tangent is fitted on the glass transition region curve.
The Tg value is represented by the mid-point of this last segment defined by the intersection obtained with the two tangents before and after the glass transition region. The used Tg value corresponds to the typical inflection point definition and is different to the Tg defined by the onset temperature (Mazurin, 2007). The Tg temperature defined by the onset point is lower in value as compared to the inflection point. We have estimated this difference using the heat flow curves obtained on our investigated samples. On average the Tg defined by the tangent method is higher by 20°C as compared to the Tg defined by the inflection point (see Supplementary material for both Tg values).

Based on the reproducibility of the Tg measurements, we suggest a large uncertainty (±5 K) associated with the Tg determination. This error is larger than it is usually assumed for that kind of apparatus (±2.5 K, Giordano et al., 2005; Morizet et al., 2007). The replicate measurements conducted on several samples (see Table 2, ADVF and AD-5-0) yield an uncertainty larger than the suggested ±5 K and on the order of ±10 K which is still a low error considering the observed large change in Tg values (more than 250 K). Replicated measurements were also conducted with different heating rates (10 or 20 K/min, see Table 2). For AD-5-3, changing the heating rate does not result in a change in the determined Tg as shown in Fig. 1B: changing the heating rate between 10 and 20 K/min results in a Tg variation of less than 5 K. This result is consistent with previous works suggesting that Tg is a function of thermal history (Giordano et al., 2005; Morizet et al., 2007). However, the change in Tg appears to be close to the asserted uncertainty in Tg measurements. We, therefore conclude that Tg determination can be readily compared regardless of the used heating rate.

The rapid rise in the heat flow, indicating possible crystallization or foaming, occurs at higher temperatures than Tg. Considering that Tg marks the beginning of the relaxation process, the
timescales of structural relaxation are too long for volatile escape at this point. This is supported by diffusion calculations using the equations of Freda et al. (2005). At such a low temperature (<600°C) the S diffusive loss is insignificant and does not exceed the μm scale. Moreover, we have conducted combined TGA and DSC measurements to investigate the possibility for diffusive loss below the Tg. We represent the combined DSC and TGA for four samples in Figure 2. We observe clearly that any loss in mass occurs well-above the Tg value (>600°C) supporting the view that the dissolved volatiles (S and H₂O) do not escape the glass sample below Tg.

An additional feature can be observed from typical DSC curves shown in Figure 3. The position of the Tg is indicated by the dot on the curve. There is an unambiguous change in the Tg value in between the samples (see also Table 2 for the whole set of determined Tg values). However, we observe an additional peak located well-below the determined Tg. This peak is also observed in Figure 1B in replicated measurements for AD-5-3 and also visible in Figure 2A for AD-5-0 DSC curve. For instance, this peak is located at ~425°C and 360°C for AD-5-3 and AD-4.5-1 (less visible), respectively. This peak is currently unexplained, however, it is observed in both S-free and S-rich samples. The characterization of the glass samples by Morizet et al. (2013) revealed that the glass samples contained H₂O+SO₂±H₂S fluid inclusions. Thus, the 300-400°C peak could arise from the burst of residual fluid inclusions in the glass powder whenever the glass samples were not finely crushed. Alternatively, it could correspond to an instrumental artefact. In any case, we believe that it does not influence the Tg position and determination owing to 1) the large interval between the Tg value and this feature (more than 100°C) and 2) the way Tg is defined by the two tangents method (the slope of the tangents is not affected by this feature).
1.2. Effect of volatiles content on glass transition temperature:

The determined Tg values as a function of volatile contents are shown in Figure 4: Figure 4A as a function H2O content and Figure 4B as a function of S content. In both plots we added either the ppm S or wt.% H2O next to each data point. As a function of H2O, most of the determined Tg values define an exponential decay trend. The S- and H2O-free sample (ADVF) exhibits the highest Tg value at 767°C whereas the sample with the highest H2O content and S-free (AD-5-0) has the second lowest Tg value at 450°C. Such a negative trend for Tg with increasing H2O is consistent with previous studies obtained on various types of glass compositions, based on either viscosimetric or Tg calorimetric measurements (e.g. Dingwell et al., 1996, 1998; Whittington et al., 2000, 2001; Deubener et al., 2003; Giordano et al., 2004, 2005; Di Genova et al., 2013; Robert et al., 2013, 2014). It also supports the model for water dissolution mechanism in silicate inducing a strong depolymerisation of the melt through Si-O-Si bond breaking (e.g. Farnan et al., 1987; Kummerlen et al., 1992; Zotov and Keppler, 1998; Zeng et al., 1999; Mysen and Cody, 2005) and therefore the decrease in Tg value.

We have tried to apply existing models which take into account the effect of H2O and chemical composition. The change in Tg as a function of H2O content for a theoretical anorthite-diopside eutectic composition has been calculated using the general model of Giordano et al. (2008b; dashed line in Figure 4A) and the model of Giordano et al. (2008a; dotted line in Figure 4B) applied to anorthite-diopside join. It should be mentioned that in both models, Tg is calculated at the onset which represents a lower value as compared to the Tg we derive from the tangent method. However, as explained earlier, the difference in between the value is not significant (~20°C). Both models seem to bracket the measured Tg values. However, considering the data point distribution as well as the repartition of the S-free H2O-bearing points, Giordano et al. (2008a) is more adequate to reproduce our Tg data.
than the Giordano et al. (2008b), in agreement with the fact that Giordano et al. (2008a) has been calibrated on identical glass compositions to the one studied here. Furthermore, considering a 20°C decrease in the measured Tg so as to correspond to the onset Tg will provide an even better agreement with the model of Giordano et al. (2008a).

In contrast, the change in Tg as a function of S content is more difficult to constrain. In Figure 4A, it appears that the measured Tg for almost all S-bearing glasses is very close to the Tg value predicted by the model of Giordano et al. (2008a) which only considers the effect H2O which suggests that S does not affect significantly glass transition temperature. It should be emphasized that this is in sharp contrast with the spectroscopic interpretation from Morizet et al. (2013). This aspect will be further discussed in section 4.2. The absence of S effect on Tg can only be approached at a constant water content. For instance, S-free AD-3-0 exhibits a Tg value at 545°C with 3.01 wt.% H2O while AD-4.5-1 exhibits a Tg value at 504°C with 3.1 wt.% H2O and 4150 ppm S. This difference in Tg value (ΔTg = 41°C) is largely beyond error in Tg determination. We note that at such a high H2O content, a variation of 0.1 wt.% H2O produces a change in Tg of about 10°C (see Giordano et al., 2005; Whittington et al., 2009). This observation points towards a negative effect of S dissolved as SO42- on Tg which conflicts again with previous spectroscopic-based inferences by Morizet et al. (2013).

We also added in Figure 4B horizontal lines corresponding to the calculated Tg values at a fixed H2O contents (2.0, 3.0 and 4.0 wt.%) using Giordano et al. (2008a) model. This approach suggests an absence of any strong S effect on Tg. At 2.0 wt.% H2O, the model gives Tg = 551°C; AD10M-5 with 2.0 wt.% H2O and 5481±324 ppm S has a measured Tg = 544±5°C. At 3.0 wt.% H2O, the model gives Tg = 503°C; AD4 and AD-4.5-1 at 3.1 wt.% H2O have a measured Tg = 507 and 504±5°C for 2718±598 and 4150±974 ppm S,
respectively. Within error the measured Tg values are almost identical to the predicted Tg value by the model therefore suggesting that S does not influence Tg.

2. Discussion:

2.1. Model for the effect of S on Tg:

We tested several mathematical functions in order to quantify the effect of both H₂O and S on Tg. The Tg data are reproduced as a function of both H₂O and S on a molar fraction basis with the following function:

\[
T_g(H_2O,S) = 426 + 325 \times e^{(-142 \times H_2O)} - 2594 \times S + 286869 \times S^2
\]

Eq. 2

The measured Tg versus the calculated Tg values are reported in Figure 5: in Figure 5A Tg is calculated with the model of Giordano et al. (2008a) and in Figure 5B Tg is calculated with Eq. 2. The correlation factor (r²) is 0.914 and 0.921 with the linear regression in Figure 5A and 5B, respectively. The error on the calculated Tg value using Eq. 2 is derived from linear regression and does not exceed ±19°C. In Eq. 2, the negative value of the parameter associated with the XS witnesses a negative effect of S on Tg. This negative effect remains trivial considering 1) the exponential form of the Tg dependency as a function of H₂O content and 2) the range of volatile contents usually observed in natural volcanic glasses (i.e. wt.% H₂O versus x100 ppm S). For example, Métrich and Clocchiatti (1996) reported up to 0.34 wt.% S dissolved in melt inclusions from Etna (Italy); De Hoog et al. (2001) reported up to 0.29 wt.% S dissolved in melt inclusions from Galunggung (Indonesia). In general, it appears unlikely that the S content could overwhelm that H₂O content in natural basaltic magmas (e.g. Spillaert et al., 2006). In any case, the presence of S does not induce a dramatic change in the glass transition temperature; hence, melt viscosity might not be strongly affected by the presence of S on the contrary to H₂O.
2.2. Implications for S dissolution mechanisms:

The observations reported here are a follow-up of the spectroscopic investigation of Morizet et al. (2013). In their work, Morizet et al. (2013) suggested that S dissolution as SO$_4^{2-}$ groups in silicate melt induces a polymerization of the silicate melt network. The present results based on DSC calorimetric measurement do not support such an effect. The apparent contradiction between NMR and DSC results can be solved by considering the molecular configuration of the SO$_4^{2-}$ groups when dissolving in silicate melt structure. As already stated in the introduction, Morizet et al. (2013) proposed that SO$_2$ dissolution mechanisms in silicate melts lead to the formation of Si-O-S molecular bonds. On the basis of the above results, we suggest that this cannot be considered as a polymerization process but instead the apparent polymerization observed by $^{29}$Si NMR is an analytical artefact. In fact the formation of the Si-O-S is strong enough to change the $^{29}$Si NMR spectral signature so as to mimic a polymerization effect of SO$_2$ dissolution onto the melt structure. In other words, the shift of -3 ppm in the $^{29}$Si peak maximum witnessing the apparent increase in melt polymerization only reflects the consumption of non-bridging oxygen by SO$_2$ molecules to form SO$_4^{2-}$ molecular groups (Manara et al., 2007; Machacek et al., 2010). Consequently, the dissolution of SO$_2$ molecules in silicate melts does not induce the formation of Si-O-Si bonds, which should be accompanied by an increase in glass transition temperature which is related to the kinetic rate of forming/breaking of Si-O-Si bonds (Liu et al., 1988; Moynihan, 1995).

The potential slight decrease in Tg with increasing S evidenced by fit parameters of Eq. 2 is more difficult to explain as it implies that Si-O-Si molecular bonding are broken upon S dissolution which is unlikely (Machacek et al., 2010). If S dissolution does induce major changes on the silicate network structure, an alternative explanation is that the dissolution of S as SO$_4^{2-}$ induces slight geometrical changes (Si-O bond length and/or angle). Those
changes would be important enough to change the configurational entropy ($S_{\text{conf}}$) of the melt according to the Adam-Gibbs theory (Adam and Gibbs, 1965):

$$\ln \eta = A_e + \frac{B_e}{TS_{\text{conf}}} \quad \text{Eq. 3}$$

In Eq. 3, $A_e$ and $B_e$ are constants. At a constant viscosity value $\eta = 10^{12}$ Pa.s corresponding to the viscosity at $T_g$, a decrease in $T_g$ value will be accompanied by an increase in $S_{\text{conf}}$. This point has to be investigated in more details with additional spectroscopic investigation or viscosimetric measurements on $S$-bearing aluminosilicate glasses.

3. **Summary:**

In the present study, we have determined the glass transition temperature of anorthite–diopside eutectic glasses synthesised at high pressure and high temperature conditions and equilibrated with $H_2O$ and $S$ present as $SO_4^{2-}$ groups. We have shown that 1) water induces an exponential decrease in $T_g$ in agreement with previous studies and 2) $S$ dissolved as $SO_4^{2-}$ has a limited effect on $T_g$ or slightly decrease $T_g$. The slight decrease in $T_g$ with increasing $S$ content is in contradiction with spectroscopic based interpretations which suggest that $S$ would induce an increase in glass transition temperature. We explain this discrepancy through the Si-O-S molecular groups which are formed. Those molecular groups induce spectroscopic changes which mimic melt polymerization. The slight decrease in $T_g$ is on the contrary thought to reflect structural geometrical changes inducing changes in thermodynamic configuration properties.

The present work is only preliminary and further work is required in order to obtain a broader picture on the effect of $S$ on melt viscosity. In particular, the role of volatiles species relationship might also be important to look at. Recent work by Baasner et al. (2013) showed
that Cl induce an increase in peralkaline melt viscosity. Botcharnikov et al. (2004) showed
that there is a strong relationship in between S and Cl in magmatic systems. It would
therefore be interesting to address in greater details the possible interactions between
different volatile species onto melt viscosity. Considering that it is currently assumed that
H$_2$O produces two different effects on the silicate melt structure: 1) depolymerizing effect in
relatively polymerized melt composition or 2) polymerizing effect highly depolymerized melt
composition; it might be interesting to determine the change in Tg for various S-bearing melt
compositions.
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**Figure caption:**

Figure 1: A) Tg determination from the three point tangent definition on AD-5-3. B) Replicated DSC measurements for AD-5-3 using different heating rate: 10 or 20 K/min. The determination of Tg appears easier for measurements with 20 K/min due to the more important decrease in the heat flow value across the glass transition region. Above Tg, heat flow curve is strongly affected by crystallization processes around 700°C.

Figure 2: Combined DSC and TGA measurements for AD-5-0 (A) and AD-5-1 (B). A significant weight loss (in %) occurs well above Tg suggesting that the Tg determination is not affected by potential diffusive loss of S or H$_2$O escaping the sample powder.

Figure 3: Typical DSC curves obtained for several samples. The curve are not placed as a function of volatile content but one can appreciate the change in Tg value with varying volatile content indicated in between brackets (ppm S, wt.% H$_2$O).

Figure 4: A) Change in Tg as a function of wt.% H$_2$O. The Tg value decreases with increasing water content following an exponential decay function (solid curve calculated with Eq. 3). We show the change in Tg as a function of wt.% H$_2$O for a theoretical anorthite-diopside eutectic glass composition calculated with the models of Giordano et al. (2008a,b) (dashed and dotted curves). B) Change in Tg value as a function of ppm S. The reported volatile content was determined with micro-FTIR for wt.% H$_2$O and EPMA for ppm S. There is no identifiable trend between Tg value and the ppm S suggesting that the effect of S on Tg is limited. We added the expected Tg value at a given H$_2$O content (2.0 to 4.0 wt.%). At a
given wt.% H$_2$O, a S-bearing sample will exhibit a lower Tg value than expected by the calculation with Eq. 3.

Figure 5: Calculated Tg versus Measured Tg. Tg is calculated with the model of Giordano et al. (2008a) (A) and with the empirical Eq. 2. The Tg values are reproduced within ±19°C with Eq. 2. The error on Tg with the model of Giordano et al. (2008a) is assumed to be ±2.5°C.

**Table caption:**

Table 1: Sample dataset, experimental conditions, volatile content and speciation.

Table 2: Differential Scanning Calorimetry results.
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Tg = 456°C
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![Graph showing heat flow vs temperature for different samples. The graph includes lines for AD10M-5, AD-5-3, AD-4.5-1, AD-4.7-0.5, AD-4-0, and AD-2.6-0. Each line has a corresponding temperature peak at 542°C, 533°C, 505°C, 486°C, 521°C, and 548°C respectively.](image-url)
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Figure 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Pressure (MPa)</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Log $f_{O_2}$ (ΔFMQ) $^d$</th>
<th>Loaded S (wt.%)</th>
<th>Loaded H$_2$O (wt.%)</th>
<th>ppm S$^a$</th>
<th>S speciation$^c$</th>
<th>wt.% H$_2$O$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVF</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD1H-6$^e$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>&gt;+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2H-6$^e$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>&gt;+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.55 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-5-0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.18 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-3-0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.01 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-4-0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.67 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-4.7-0.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2434 (567)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.39 (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-5-1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3430 (136)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.81 (0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-4.5-1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4150 (974)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.14 (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-5-3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6621 (355)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-5-5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7519 (3397)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.68 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2718 (598)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.08 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD10</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6973 (73)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70 (0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>671 (441)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.77 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1240 (25)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.79 (0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD21</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>902 (26)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.17 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD22</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1025 (20)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.34 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD23</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1263 (91)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5.33 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD24</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1075 (59)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.17 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD5M-2$^e$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>&gt;+1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7239 (90)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.26 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2M-5$^e$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>&gt;+1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2365 (138)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD10M-5$^e$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>&gt;+1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5481 (324)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.01 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ The S content is reported in Morizet et al. (2013) and has been determined via EPMA measurements. More than 20 spots were taken on each glass sample to obtain the standard deviation (numbers between brackets).

$^b$ The wt.% H$_2$O was determined with micro-FTIR measurements on doubly polished plate. Three to five spectra were taken for standard error determination.

$^c$ The S speciation was determined with Raman spectroscopy (see Supplementary material for typical Raman spectra). The HS$^-$ contribution (peak located at 2575 cm$^{-1}$) is small and does not exceed 3% of the total S.

$^d$ The log $f_{O_2}$ has been calculated using the total H$_2$O content and is reported relative Fayalite – Magnetite – Quartz (FMQ) buffer.
Those samples were synthesised using piston-cylinder apparatus at 500 MPa. In the S-bearing experiments, the S was loaded prior the experiment in the Pt capsule as H₂SO₄ aqueous solution of 2, 5 and 10 mol.L⁻¹ in concentration.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>m (mg)</th>
<th>heating rate (K/min)</th>
<th>Tg (°C)</th>
<th>Average Tg (°C)</th>
<th>Tg from Giordano et al. (2008a): H2O effect</th>
<th>Tg from Eq. 2: H2O and S effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVF</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>758 ±13</td>
<td>757 ±2.5</td>
<td>751 ±19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD1H-6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>609 ±5</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2H-6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>450 ±11</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-3-0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>545 ±5</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-4-0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>521 ±5</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-4.7-0.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>491 ±4.6</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-5-1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>521 ±5</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-5-3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>535 ±5</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD-5-5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>513 ±5</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD4</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>507 ±5</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD10</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>489 ±5</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD12</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>582 ±5</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD20</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471 ±5</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD21</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>481 ±5</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD22</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>458 ±5</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD23</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>457 ±5</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD24</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>469 ±5</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD5M-2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>530 ±5</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2M-5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>522 ±5</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD10M-5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>544 ±5</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tg was determined from the two tangents, three points methods (see text for details). The error corresponds to the standard deviation of the obtained from the replicated Tg measurements. In the case the standard deviation is low; we still apply a ±5°C as a standard error.
The model of Giordano et al. (2008a) is used to calculate a Tg value which is a function of the water content and takes into account the chemical composition determined by EPMA analyses (see Supplementary material). The error on Tg is the one reported for the model ($\pm 2.5$).
Highlight
- Sulfate groups (SO$_4^{2-}$) do not affect glass transition temperature.
- Discrepant with spectroscopic observation.
- Limited effect of S on melt viscosity.