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Abstract

Base metal sulphide (BMS) inclusions in diamonds provide a unique insight into the chalcophile and highly siderophile element composition of the mantle. Entombed within their diamond hosts, these provide a more robust (closed system) sample, from which to determine the trace element, Re-Os and S-isotopic compositions of the mantle than mantle xenoliths or orogenic peridotites, as they are shielded from alteration during ascent to the Earth’s crust, or and subsequent surface weathering. However, at temperatures below 1100°C some BMS inclusions undergo subsolidus re-equilibration from an original monosulphide solid solution (Mss) and this causes fractionation of the major and trace elements within the inclusions. Thus to study the subjects noted above, current techniques require the entire BMS inclusion to be extracted for analyses. Unfortunately, ‘flaking’ of inclusions during break-out is a frequent occurrence and hence the risk of accidentally under-sampling a portion of the BMS inclusion is inherent in current practices. This loss, for example, may have significant implications for Re-Os isotopic analyses where incomplete sampling of a Re-rich phase, such as chalcopyrite, that typically occurs at the outer margins of BMS inclusions, may induce significant bias in the Re-Os and $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os results, and therefore model and isochron ages.

We have developed a method for the homogenisation of BMS inclusions in diamond prior to their break-out from the host stone. Diamonds are heated to 1100°C and then quenched to chemically homogenise any sulphide inclusions for both major and trace elements. Using X-ray Computed Microtomography (µCT) we determine the shape and spatial setting of multiple inclusions within a host stone and crucially show that the volume of a BMS inclusion is the same both before and after homogenisation. We show that the homogenisation process significantly reduces the inherent variability of in situ analysis when compared with unhomogenised BMS, considerably widening the scope for multiple methods of analysis, even on ‘flakes’ of single BMS inclusions. Finally we show that the trace elements present in peridotite (P-type) and eclogitic (E-type) BMS are distinct, with P-type diamonds having systematically higher total platinum-group element (particularly Os, Ir, Ru)
and Te and As concentrations. These distinctions suggest that the PGE and semi-metal budgets of mantle-derived partial melts may be significantly dependent upon the type(s) and proportions of sulphides present in the mantle source.

Keywords: Diamond, sulphide inclusion, homogenisation, PGE, Re-Os isotopes, semi-metals.
1. Introduction

Inclusions encapsulated within diamonds provide a rare opportunity to sample deep-seated mantle silicates, sulphides, fluids, metals or metal alloys. Diamonds are generally considered to be robust containers for these inclusions, effectively shielding them chemically during their ascent to the Earth’s surface and preserving their composition. Inclusions are generally thought to have been formed syngenetically with the host diamond (as indicated by the imposed diamond morphology of the inclusions e.g., Sobolev 1977, Meyer, 1987; Bulanova, 1995; Richardson et al., 2001; Richardson et al., 2004) and their study thus allows us an insight into mantle geochemistry, geodynamics, and diamond mineralisation processes that cannot be achieved by other means.

Base metal sulphides (BMS) are among the most common types of inclusion found in diamonds (e.g., Harris and Gurney, 1979; Stachel and Harris, 2008) and occur in both major diamond parageneses, being relatively Ni-rich in peridotitic (P-type) diamond and relatively Ni-poor when associated with eclogitic (E-Type) diamonds. Their relative abundance may itself be informative about diamond mineralisation – transient volatile-rich (C, H, O, N, S) metasomatic agents have been suggested as key to diamond formation (e.g., Deines and Harris, 1995; Westerlund et al., 2004; Thomasot et al., 2007 and 2009; Stachel & Luth, 2015). Thus studies of BMS inclusions within diamonds have become a major line of enquiry, both for the timing and genesis of diamond growth and for models of crustal and mantle development during the Archaean (e.g., Hart et al., 1997; Pearson et al., 1998; Richardson et al., 2001; Shirey et al., 2004; Stachel and Harris, 2008; Richardson et al., 2009; Harvey et al. 2016).

The first attempts to measure the trace element chemistry of whole diamonds containing BMS inclusions were made by Fesq et al., (1973; 1975) using instrumental neutron activation analysis (INAA). They detected 40 trace elements, including Au and Ir, see below. With these early studies, however, instrumental limitations and lack of suitable standard materials meant that it was only in the 1990’s that quantified concentrations of trace elements in inclusion-bearing whole diamonds
were first published (Schrauder et al., 1996; Damarupurshad et al., 1997; Hart et al., 1997). In particular, Hart et al. (1997) noted a distinction between the Au/Ir ratios of P-type diamonds (Au/Ir <0.3) and E-type diamonds (Au/Ir ranging 0.3-100) and they linked this difference to protoliths involving melt-depleted cratonic mantle and subducted former oceanic lithosphere, respectively.

The INAA studies cited above involved analysis of whole diamonds, generally containing BMS and other inclusions, rather than BMS inclusions alone. The first attempt to analyse trace element concentrations in extracted BMS inclusions was made by McDonald et al. (1996) who dissolved extracted BMS and using inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS). These authors determined the platinum-group elements (PGE), alongside Re and Au and the major elements (Fe, Ni, Cu), in two single inclusions and one composite sample (comprising multiple inclusions from the same stone), extracted from three Orapa E-type diamonds. Ruthenium, Rh, Pd and Au were measurable at ppm to 10's of ppm concentrations in both single inclusions and the composite sample but Ir, Pt and Re were below detection. Os was not analysed due to the volatilisation and loss of OsO₄ during the dissolution stage. In the same year Bulanova et al. (1996) analysed PGE and semi-metals at 10’s-100’s of ppm concentrations in BMS inclusions in Yakutian P-type and E-type diamonds by micro-PIXE (particle-induced X-ray emission) and found a strong enrichment in the Ir-group PGE (IPGE – Os, Ir and Ru) over the palladium-group PGE (PPGE – Rh, Pt and Pd).

Advances in laser ablation ICP-MS (LA-ICP-MS) and in the development of sulphide standards for in situ analysis of PGE and Au in BMS have led to rapid advances in the study of mantle sulphides (see recent reviews by Luguet and Reisberg, 2016; and Harvey et al., 2016). But aside from work primarily devoted towards Re-Os isotopes there have been comparatively few studies devoted to analysing trace elements in diamond-hosted BMS since the 1990’s. The work by Aulbach et al. (2012) on BMS in E-type diamonds from the Slave craton is the only recent study to provide comprehensive PGE, Au, Re and semi-metal data for diamond-hosted BMS inclusions.
This paucity of results may arise from the fact that the sulphides themselves present a number of problems for geochemical and isotopic investigations, stemming from the re-equilibration of high temperature monosulphide solid solution (Mss) to Fe-, Ni- and Cu-rich endmembers during cooling (Naldrett 1989; 2004; Taylor and Liu 2009). During this process (summarised in Figure 1) the PGE, Au, Re and semi-metals partition and fractionate between the different Fe-, Ni- and Cu-rich sulphide minerals and may also form discrete platinum-group minerals (PGM) or gold-rich minerals such as tellurides (e.g., Fleet et al., 1993; Barnes et al., 1997; Mungall et al., 2005; Helmy et al., 2007; Taylor and Liu 2009; Holwell and McDonald 2010). Because of this fractionation, it is incumbent that all of the mass of the inclusion be extracted intact to ensure a completely unbiased composition of the original bulk sulphide (Richardson et al., 2001; Taylor and Liu 2009; Harvey et al., 2016). However, the ‘flaking’ or disintegration of the sulphide during inclusion extraction by breaking open the diamond, is a common and frequently documented inherent problem (e.g., Deines & Harris, 1995; Pearson et al., 1998; Richardson et al., 2001; Thomassot et al., 2009; Richardson et al., 2009). Thus, partial sampling of BMS inclusions is common and may introduce a serious bias to geochemical and/or isotopic results and classifications. The partitioning studies cited above demonstrate that a fragment of the Cu-rich endmember of the fractionated inclusion will have significantly higher Re, Au, Pt and Pd and lower Ni, Ir, Os and Ru abundances than the Ni-rich counterpart from the same inclusion (and vice versa). Cu-rich sulphides are commonly observed to have exsolved to the edges of BMS inclusions and are therefore most susceptible to flaking and incomplete sampling when the diamond is broken.

The genesis ages of BMS inclusions in diamond have been determined as either model ages, or more commonly, as isochrons using Re-Os isotopic systematics (e.g. Pearson and Shirey, 1998; Stachel and Harris, 2008; and Harvey et al., 2016). These results are also reliant upon measuring the total sulphide composition. Due to the intrinsically different compatibility of Re (into the Cu-rich endmember) from Os (into the Ni-Fe endmember) in the re-equilibrating sulphide (Figure 2), these elements may become significantly fractionated from one another. Further complications arise if Re
partitions into any PGM (e.g. Wainwright et al., 2016). Fractionation may start at any time after the sulphide has been encapsulated in the diamond and the isotopic implications are dependent upon the timing and length of the fractionation. For example, the similar Os-isotopic composition ($^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os or expressed as $\gamma_{Os}$) of the core (Ni-(Os)-rich) vs. rim (Cu-(Re)-rich) of a differentiated sulphide inclusion from a single Kimberley diamond was used by Richardson et al., (2001) to suggest that fractionation of the sulphide took place during, or just prior to, transport of the diamond to the surface in the Cretaceous (Richardson et al., 2001). Whilst in this case, fractionation apparently had little effect on the Re-Os isotopic systematics of the inclusion, this may not be the case for inclusions that have been held at temperatures beneath the $M_S$ liquidus for long periods of time, or especially for diamonds from geologically old kimberlites where BMS have fully fractionated and potential for in-growth of $^{187}$Os into chalcopyrite is maximised. This potential sampling problem is inherent in all approaches that rely on unhomogenised sulphide inclusions regardless of whether fragments are analysed by wet chemistry or in situ by LA-ICP-MS.

Sulphur isotopic compositions (particularly $\delta^{34}$S) may also be affected by partial sampling of inclusions, as instrumental mass-fractionation is sensitive to the endmember sulphide analysed (e.g., Chaussidon et al., 1987; Thomassot et al., 2009). Sulphide inclusions in Orapa diamonds show a range in $\delta^{34}$S from +2.1 to +9.5‰ (pyrrhotite, Chaussidon et al., 1987) to -11 to +2 ‰ (MSS and pyrrhotite, Eldridge et al., 1991). More recently, a smaller range of pyrrhotite inclusion $\delta^{34}$S compositions, from -1.4 to +2.6‰, has been reported by Farquhar et al. (2002). We note that the study by Farquhar et al. (2002) used inclusions with a smaller range in Ni-content, either suggesting that a subset of the Orapa sulphide population was represented in their 2002 study and/or that preceding studies could exemplify a degree of bias in sampling fragmented inclusions. Mass-independent fraction $\Delta^{33}$S in the Farquhar et al. (2002) study reported a range from -0.1 to +0.6‰. In all cases, the range of $\delta^{34}$S and $\Delta^{33}$S has been used to infer an isotopic signature for both younger (< 2.45 Ga) and older (> 2.45 Ga) subduction of S-bearing sediments, as recorded in the mantle (e.g., Farquhar et al., 2002; Thomassot et al., 2009).
In principle if the diamond remains a closed system then BMS inclusions could be homogenised (through a process of re-melting and rapid quenching) as part of the sample preparation prior to sulphide inclusion break-out from the diamond host. This would eliminate any partial sampling bias and effectively mean that any fragment of a homogenised inclusion is representative (geochemically and isotopically) to the total sulphide composition encased within the diamond originally. This process potentially provides a new and rigorous test of sulphide inclusion geochemical variability across diamond suites or in cases where there are multiple inclusions within a single diamond host crystal. In particular, it would provide a more robust sampling system for Re-Os isotopic analyses where accidental sampling bias (leading to the exclusion of Re and potentially $^{187}$Os-rich chalcopyrite) may have detrimental effects on calculations of model ages and initial ratios (e.g. Richardson et al. 2001; Shirey et al., 2013; Harvey et al., 2016). The homogenisation method we describe below permits analysis of sulphide inclusions for both major elements by fully quantitative scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive spectrometry (EDS) and trace elements (by LA-ICP-MS) which allows use of the same inclusions for a full geochemical suite of elements, avoids any volatilisation problem of Os, and allows for direct calculation of S/metal and S/Se ratios pertinent to identifying if metal alloy phases are present within the sulphide (e.g., Fleet et al., 1991).

2. Diamond samples

The diamonds and BMS inclusions used in this study are from the Orapa kimberlite in NE Botswana, the mine being situated on the western edge of the Kaapvaal-Zimbabwe Craton (Kalahari Craton) within the 2.1-1.9 Ga Magondi orogenic belt (Fig. 3; Silver et al., 2006 and references therein). The pipe has a Cretaceous eruption age of c. 93 Ma (Davis, 1977; Haggerty et al., 1983). The genesis age of Orapa diamonds was first estimated to be 990 ± 50 Ma (based on a Nd/Sm isochron; Richardson, 1989) but more recently Ar-Ar dating of clinopyroxene inclusions have given genesis ages of 906-1032 Ma with a minor older group of diamonds at > 2500 Ma (Burgess et al., 2004). Sulphide
Inclusions from Orapa E-type diamonds have been dated (Re-Os model age) to include multiple ages of between 2.5-3.0 Ga and 1.0 Ga (see Shirey et al., 2001; Shirey et al., 2002 and references therein).

The sub-solidus sulphide mineralogy from Orapa inclusions in diamond has been previously reported by Deines & Harris (1995). From random polished sections, almost half of the 21 inclusions studied by these authors comprised only pyrrhotite (10). The remaining inclusions being monosulphide solid solution (4), a mixture of pyrrhotite and pentlandite (4), pyrrhotite-pentlandite-chalcopyrite (2) and pentlandite-chalcopyrite (1). Based on the Ni-content of the sulphides, approximately 85% of diamonds these inclusions from Orapa are thought to be from the eclogite paragenesis (on the basis of <8% Ni; Yefimova et al., 1983).

Five colourless diamonds (see Table 1), each approximately 4mm in diameter and of 1 carat weight were used for experiments in this study. In all cases there were no fractures to the surface of the stones from the inclusions. Diamond H1 was a dodecahedral macle and its rounded surface prevented clear internal viewing, but a prominent black metallic rosette fracture within the central portion of the diamond was still visible. Diamond H2 was an elongate octahedron with negative trigons on many of the octahedral surfaces. At least four metallic rosette fractures were visible within this specimen, and the sulphide ‘eyes’ within these systems could be seen. Diamond H3 was a colourless well-shaped octahedron with slightly rounded edges and exhibiting negative trigons on most faces. Apart from a relatively large single sulphide rosette in the centre of the stone some smaller sulphides were noted in later analysis (see Fig. 7). Inclusion sizes ranged from about 50 to 200 microns. Diamond IM2 was a colourless broken dodecahedron and IM6 was a colourless elongate rounded octahedron. Based on external morphology, the diamonds showed no evidence of plastic deformation.

3. Experimental methods
The main aim of our experimental process is to heat all sulphide inclusion(s) within the diamond host to a temperature above the Mss liquidus (1100°C – see for example Kullerud & Yoder, 1959; Arnold, 1971; Bowles et al., 2011) allowing all sulphide phases to fully homogenise, and thereafter to quench the inclusion so rapidly that sulphide fractionation is minimised to the extent that the grain size is at or below the scale of sampling used by SEM or LA-ICP-MS. Thus the major and trace element composition of the sulphide inclusions are made uniform and any partial sample extracted from the diamond will be representative of the average composition of the inclusion (Fig. 2). This process is similar to that used for preparation of homogenised sulphide inclusions in chromitites by Holwell et al. (2011).

The homogenisation experiments were performed at the University of Edinburgh’s (UK) Experimental Geoscience Facility. A vertical tube 1 atmosphere furnace was connected to H₂ and CO₂ gas supplies via Bronkhorst™ gas mass flow controllers to establish a defined fO₂ at the furnace hotspot. The hotspot temperature used was 1100°C, and a gas mix of 14% H₂ and 86% CO₂ was used to ensure a calculated fO₂ environment between 10⁻¹¹.³ to 10⁻¹¹.⁴ (i.e., QFM-1 buffer; Deines et al., 1974) to prevent the diamond from combusting and the sulphide inclusion from oxidising. Due to space restrictions within the tube furnace and the strict location of the ‘hot spot’ at the target temperature within it, each of the three diamonds to be homogenised were run separately through the experimental set-up. The diamond was suspended in a cradle of machinable alumina and Pt wire and positioned within the cold portion at the top of the tube furnace while the furnace was flushed with CO₂ gas. After flushing with CO₂, the CO₂/H₂ mix was allowed to stabilise for 5 minutes before the sample was lowered to the hot spot of the furnace. Based on the relative size of the diamonds compared with the 1 cm³ chromitite blocks successfully homogenised by Holwell et al. (2011) each specimen was allowed to homogenise for 15 minutes. For rapid quenching, the Pt-wire hanger of the crucible was electrically fused, releasing the diamond (and cradle) to drop out of the furnace and into a cold water trap attached to the base of the tube furnace. Before recovery, the furnace was
flushed with pure CO\textsubscript{2} for 10 minutes to remove H\textsubscript{2} from the furnace before the quench trap was removed. The very different relative thermal expansion of diamond and the sulphide inclusion typically results in a rosette fracture system being observed around BMS inclusions in diamond (Taylor and Liu 2009). Whilst these fracture systems may further develop during heating, in the present cases, none were sufficient to break the diamonds used in the experiments, thus the geochemical systems of the sulphide inclusions were not compromised.

After homogenisation and quenching the faces of the diamonds showed nothing more than a mild ‘frosting’ effect. On diamond H1, these etch marks were distributed unevenly across the crystallographic faces, principally because the diamond was a rounded dodecahedron, but for diamond H2, an octahedron, the etching patterned showed positive trigons on octahedral faces. In both cases, no surface graphite was noted. The surface etching is likely the result of the CO\textsubscript{2}/H\textsubscript{2} gas mix flowing through the furnace.

4. Analytical techniques

4.1 X-ray Computed Microtomography (\(\mu\)CT)

Tomographic data from diamond H3 (Table 1) was acquired before and after homogenisation using the \(\mu\)CT instrument designed and built at the University of Edinburgh. The instrument comprised a 10-160kV Feinfocus transmission x-ray source, a MICOS UPR-160-Air rotary table and a Perkin Elmer XRD0822 1 megapixel flat panel amorphous silicon detector with a Gd2O2S:Tb scintillator, operated by control software developed in-house. For the whole diamond scan we used 600 projections and the voxel size of the reconstructed data was 6.2 microns. For the inclusion scan we used 2000 projections and the voxel size was 2.0 microns. All scans were carried out at 100kV peak energy using a 2 second exposure for each projection collected through a 360° sample rotation. The target
power was 2.7W. Tomographic slices were reconstructed by filtered back projection using Octopus
8.7 (Vlassenbroek et al., 2007) and visualised in 2D and 3D using Fiji and Avizo 9 software.

4.2 Sulphide inclusion recovery and preparation

Following homogenisation the sulphides were recovered from the diamond by standard break-out
methods (Harris and Gurney 1979; Stachel and Harris 2008). The inclusions that had undergone
experimental homogenisation were not recovered completely whole and broke during recovery. As
such, a sub-selection of inclusions (listed in Table 1) were mounted in epoxy resin-filled stubs and
polished to 0.25µm grade, using aluminium oxide polishing powder. The largest inclusions (whole or
broken fragments) were preferentially chosen in order to test if the homogenisation was successful.
Unhomogenised sulphide inclusions IM2a, IM2b and IM6a that did not undergo this experimental
procedure were used for comparison. The details of these inclusions can also be found in Table 1.

4.3 SEM imaging, element mapping and quantitative analysis

Backscattered electron (BSE) images were obtained for each inclusion studied using a Zeiss Sigma HD
Scanning Electron Microscope at Cardiff University at operating conditions of 20 kV with ~ 1 nA
beam current. Element mapping was performed using dual 150 mm² active area EDS detectors fitted
to the SEM and Oxford Instruments Aztec software at operating conditions of 20 kV and ~ 2 nA.
Maps were acquired with a step-size between 0.5 and 1 µm and a pixel dwell time of 15 to 20 ms at
a working distance of 8.9 mm. Quantitative spot and area microanalyses were obtained using the
same equipment with Co as a reference standard to measure beam drift every 15 minutes. Elements
were calibrated prior to analysis with MicroAnalysis Consultants Ltd and Astimex Standards Ltd
metal and mineral standards. Accuracy and precision of SEM chemical data was measured using
Astimex chalcopyrite and pentlandite standards (Supplementary Table A). Repeated spot analyses at the beginning and end of the analytical session demonstrate relative accuracies of 0.4-2.6% for S, 0.1-0.8% for Cu, 0.8-2.7% for Ni, 0.3-3.2% for Fe and 23-41% for Co (at a concentration of 0.43 wt%). 1σ precision on these repeated measurements was ≤0.23 wt% for S, ≤0.30 wt% for Fe, ≤0.11 wt% for Cu, 0.05 wt% for Co and 0.58 wt% for Ni respectively.

### 4.4 Laser ablation ICP-MS

Polished blocks were selected for laser ablation inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (LA-ICP-MS) for sulphide trace element analysis. Time resolved analysis (TRA) by LA-ICP-MS was performed on each BMS inclusion at Cardiff University on a New Wave Research UP213 UV laser system attached to a Thermo X Series 2 ICP-MS. Each inclusion underwent multiple analyses (by spots, lines, or both) to allow for data repeatability and homogeneity to be assessed. Both line and spot analysis were used and independently calibrated. For lines, a minimum length of ~80µm and a beam diameter of 40 µm were used, with laser operating conditions of 10 Hz frequency, 0.063 mJ at 4.98 Jcm⁻² and sample translation at 6 µm sec⁻¹. For spot analysis, beam size was 40 µm and the same laser operating conditions as for the line analyses were employed. Acquisition times ranged 40 to 80 seconds with a gas blank measured for 20 seconds prior to laser ablation. Major element abundances (Fe, Ni, Cu, S) of the sulphide were measured by SEM-EDS (as outlined in section 6.3) prior to LA-ICP-MS, and ³⁵S was used as an internal standard for trace element calibration. Gas blank subtraction and internal standard corrections were carried out on Thermo Plasmalab software.

Five synthetic Ni-Fe-S quenched sulphide standards were used for LA-ICP-MS calibration, including S, Ni, Fe and Cu as major elements, and Co, As, Se, Ru, Rh, Pd, Ag, Cd, Sb, Te, Re, Os, Ir, Pt, Au and Bi as trace elements. The compositions and details of analytical methods for these standards are presented in Prichard et al. (2013) and further procedural details are available in Smith et al. (2014).
Standards 1-3 were used for calibration of Fe, Ni, Cu, Co, Zn and Cd as well as matrix-matched corrections for argide species, which interfere with light PGE isotopes ($^{59}$Co$^{40}$Ar, $^{61}$Ni$^{40}$Ar, $^{63}$Cu$^{40}$Ar, $^{65}$Cu$^{40}$Ar and $^{66}$Zn$^{40}$Ar). Standard 1, containing 143 ppm Cd, was also used in corrections for $^{106}$Cd on $^{106}$Pd and $^{108}$Cd on $^{108}$Pd. Independent corrections for isotopes of the same element (e.g., $^{66}$Zn$^{40}$Ar and $^{106}$Cd on $^{106}$Pd, and $^{108}$Cd on $^{108}$Pd) showed < 20% variance for Ru isotopes at concentrations from 0.1-0.2 ppm Ru and 3-10% for Pd isotopes at concentrations around 1 ppm Pd, indicating that the correction criteria are appropriate.

The accuracy for PGE and Au was checked by analysis of the Laflamme-Po724 standard as an unknown against the Cardiff quenched sulphide standards (results in Supplementary Material Table B). Based on the repeated spot and line analyses of each diamond sulphide inclusion (both from the homogenised and unahomogenised sample sets) 1σ precision can be calculated (Table 3). This shows 1σ precision to be typically 3-10% (concentrations 10-100 ppm), 4-41% (1-10 ppm) and 2-46% (<1 ppm) for homogenised samples. All LA-ICP-MS generated data are presented in Table 3, including argide and isobaric-corrected data with values displayed by isotope (for Ru, Rh and Pd).

5. Results

5.1 Sulphide inclusion recovery

Table 1 shows the recovery details of the larger sulphide inclusions recovered in this study. No whole inclusions were recovered from H1, but in total 5 large (> 100µm) and 10 small (< 100µm) pieces were obtained. These were grouped as one population initially. However, single inclusions typically produce 1-5 individual pieces on breakout and as the surface of H1 prevented clear viewing it is highly likely that this collection of fragments represents a mixture derived from a presently unknown number of multiple inclusions. On breakout, all four inclusions originally observed in H2 were recovered virtually whole and the two largest (H2a and H2b) were used for analysis. Diamond H3
shattered on breakout, flaking the one relatively large single inclusion in this stone and the largest fragment (H3a) from this was taken for analysis. Sulphide inclusion H2a (Table 1), had a visibly octahedral shape, imposed by the crystal structure of the diamond. Unhomogenised control diamond inclusions (IM2a, IM2b and IM6a) were recovered as fragments for comparison (Table 1). IM2a and IM2b were two pieces of an originally single inclusion from diamond IM2. IM6a was the largest fragment recovered from a single inclusion contained in stone IM6.

5.2 Petrography and major element mapping

Reflected light microscopy and back-scattered electron (BSE) images by SEM, per polished BMS inclusion, reveals a successful systematic homogenising effect for those diamonds that underwent the experimental heating and quenching process. As can be seen from the example shown in Figure 4a and 4b no zonation in endmember mineralogy can be identified under BSE above a grain size of <1 micron. On the other hand BSE images of unhomogenised samples display multiple sulphide mineral phases with distinct chalcopyrite-rich rims surrounding a pyrrhotite core, (Fig. 5a) or sub-solidus re-equilibration textures between pyrrhotite and pentlandite flames with isolated zones of chalcopyrite (Fig. 5b).

Element mapping (by SEM EDS) was also used to visualise the spatial distribution of Fe, Ni and Cu within each inclusion. Figures 6a and 6b show distinct zonation for Fe, Ni and Cu at scales of 25-300 microns in the unhomogenised samples. With exception of occasional single and multiple pixels that highlight very small (<1 up 3 microns wide) areas of Cu enrichment, but with insufficient Cu to be exsolved chalcopyrite, major elements are uniformly distributed throughout the homogenised inclusions (Figures 6c and 6d). No pixels indicating high concentrations of PGE, Re or Au that might represent sulphide containing PGM nanoparticles were observed.
5.3 Micro-CT visualisation

Figure 7 shows a 3D surface and volume rendering of the µCT data for diamond H3 which contained multiple sulphide inclusions (Fig. 7a), and volume renderings from discrete scans of the largest of these inclusions, before (Fig. 7b) and after (Fig. 7c) homogenisation. Whilst the diamond has a slightly rounded shape with negative trigons on the residual octahedral faces, the largest inclusion has a distinctive stepped shaped with faces in three inferred directions (x, y, z). This demonstrates that the sulphide inclusion has adopted a negative crystal shape from the diamond host. The definition of this stepped shape is very slightly more rounded for the inclusion before homogenisation (Fig. 7b), than after homogenisation (Fig. 7c), but this is likely to be an artefact of the resolution limit of the µCT data. For example, the apparent striations in Figure 7c can result from the slice structure of the tomographic data. Overall, the inclusion shape has been preserved in the homogenised sample indicating that none of the sulphide material was lost to fractures or mobilised elsewhere within the diamond.

To determine the volume of the inclusion before and after homogenisation, the non-local mean-filtered greyscale data were binarised using a global threshold in Avizo 9.2. The total volume of the inclusion was determined from the total voxels in the 3D volume of the binary image and the scan resolution. Before homogenisation the inclusion volume was estimated at 3.31x10^6 cubic microns. After homogenisation the inclusion volume was 3.28x10^6 cubic microns. Therefore the change in volumes before and after homogenisation are <1% which was within analytical error propagations.

Three-dimensional rotating movies of the diamond H3 and its inclusions within (both before and after homogenisation) are available in the online supplementary data files.

5.4 Major element geochemistry
Quantitative major element (S, Fe, Ni, Cu and Co) analyses (by quantitative EDS area analysis) were gathered for each inclusion (or inclusion fragment) for all homogenised and unhomogenised samples in this study (Table 2, n = 142 – see Supplementary Figure A). These have been used to establish chemical variability either across single or fragmented sulphides, or between different sulphide fragments from within the same diamond, thereby allowing a quantitative comparison to be made between unhomogenised and homogenised samples. These data are shown in Figure 8 and a bar chart comparing S, Fe, Ni and Cu abundances by inclusion is given in Supplementary Table C.

The point analyses for the unhomogenised samples (n = 100) show a significant degree of variation between endmember compositions (Table 2, Fig. 8a-b). On a ternary Fe-Ni-S compositional diagram projected for a temperature of 1100⁰C, these straddle the Mss, Mss + liquid, and liquid (L1) compositional fields (Fig. 8a), and equate to a continuum between pentlandite and pyrrhotite on the 100-135⁰C diagram (Fig. 8b). Whilst the data closer to endmember pyrrhotite (Fig. 8b) have some Ni (up to a few wt%), for pentlandite many analyses plot as endmember compositions. A few analyses (2-5 point data) plot as mixtures between pentlandite and pyrrhotite (due to the spot size on the SEM overlapping fine pentlandite flames within Ni-bearing pyrrhotite). A single ‘total’ composition (by summing each pixel of the element mapping) based on the whole surface area of each unhomogenised inclusion exposed by polishing, was calculated using the INCA software and shows a representative total assumed composition for IM2 and IM6 (Fig. 8a-b). The calculated ‘total’ composition for IM2a and IM2b were indistinguishable and were therefore plotted as a single point on these diagrams. These equate to Ni-bearing pyrrhotite compositions akin to those plotted for the homogenised diamonds, but given the nature of the calculation, this alone cannot test the reproducibility of this method in estimating the total composition of an inclusion (as it is dependent upon a single exposed surface).

All analyses for the homogenised samples (n = 42) have a comparatively uniform major element composition (Table 2, Fig. 8c-d), with slight but systematic differences between inclusions from
different diamonds. Despite appearing homogenous under reflected light and BSE imaging, sulphides from diamond H1 divide into higher and lower Cu populations (H1a and H1c with 3.80 wt.% and H1b and H1d with 3.10 wt% Cu respectively) that likely reflect at least two different inclusions in the original stone (see Section 5.1). All the H1 sulphides have higher Cu contents and Ni contents than inclusions H2 and H3 (Table 2). In all inclusions analysed, however, the total Ni content was low enough to prescribe them as being E-type diamonds (< 8 wt.% Ni; Yefimova et al., 1983, or < 15 wt.% Ni; Deines & Harris, 1995). All of the homogenised sulphide inclusions plot as Ni-bearing pyrrhotite on the ternary Fe-Ni-S compositional diagrams (Fig. 8c-d) and the compositional variation define a very tight data cluster of 42 points plotted on both Figures 8c and 8d. Any variation is unresolvable from the natural slight instrument divergence.

5.5 Trace element geochemistry

Representative time resolved analysis (TRA) plots from the LA-ICP-MS data for S, Fe, Ni, Cu and Co indicate that for all the unhomogenised samples, a distinct zonation is noted for major elements, particularly discernible for Cu, an example being shown in Figure 9a. In all the homogenised samples a zonation cannot be detected (e.g., Fig. 9b). This lack of zonation in the homogenised sulphides extends to the trace elements where important elements like Re and, where measurable, Os can also be shown to exhibit near uniformity across a sulphide. For example, compare Figure 9c (unhomogenised) with Figure 9d (homogenised). These observations are true for both spot and line analyses by LA-ICP-MS. For the homogenised samples, both spot and line analyses give consistent calibrated element abundances (Table 3 and Supplementary Tables B, C and D). In Table 3 a comparison is given between unhomogenised and homogenised trace elements to 1σ values (per isotope analysed for each trace element).

6. Discussion
Before proceeding further it is important to demonstrate that homogenisation has been effective.

The BSE-SEM images revealed no phase separation that could be identified above a grain size of <1 micron (Figure 4) and the element maps only highlighted anomalous Cu-rich pixels on a micron-scale. This is comparable or better than the sulphide homogenisation achieved by Holwell et al., (2011). To further test the homogeneity of major and trace elements we have subdivided the TRA spectra obtained by LA-ICP-MS systematically into 5 second time blocks and determined the counts per second for Fe, Ni, Cu, Se, Ag, Te, Pd, Re, Pt and Au along with ratios (counts/counts) for Fe/Ni, Fe/Cu, Se/Ag, Se/Te, Pt/Pd, Re/Pt and Re/Au in each time block. From multiple time blocks we calculate a mean and standard deviation (1σ) and a relative standard deviation ((σ/mean) x 100%) to represent the variability across the data acquisition. This is shown graphically in Figure X and demonstrates an obvious reduction in variability on these ratios in the homogenised versus the unhomogenised inclusions regardless of whether spots or lines are used for analysis.

In Figures 10-16 we compare our Orapa sulphide inclusion trace element data with similar comprehensive trace element data for unhomogenised P-type sulphide inclusions from Yakutia (Siberian Craton) (Bulanova et al., 1996) and E-type sulphide inclusions from the Diavik Mine (Slave Craton; Aulbach et al., 2012). In addition, the present data are compared against documented Re and Os abundances, from E-type sulphides in diamonds from Jwaneng (Richardson et al., 2004), and Kimberley (Richardson et al., 2001), and from P- and E-type sulphide-bearing diamonds at Palmietgat (Simelane, 2004), and sulphides of unspecified paragenesis at Swartruggens (McKenna, 2001).

As with the major elements, TRA plots show significant variation in trace elements across single unhomogenised samples. For example, Figure 9c shows that Re and Au are notably enriched in the Cu-rich portions of the unhomogenised inclusions. By comparison, the homogenised inclusions (see Fig. 9d) shows no such peaked TRA signal for Re, Au or other trace elements. The metal/S ratios (metal = Fe+Ni+Cu) vs. PGE abundances, (see Fig. 10a), for all E-type diamonds (this study unhomogenised and homogenised, and similar data from Aulbach et al., 2012), range from 1.50 to
1.82, with total PGE abundances < 12ppm (Fig. 10a). The unhomogenised Orapa sulphide inclusions in that figure show a wide variation in metal/S ratio and total PGE, values reaching up to 1.75 and 8 ppm, with a broadly positive correlation that falls within the range previously documented for Diavik E-type diamonds by Aulbach et al. (2012). The homogenised Orapa inclusions by comparison have a very limited variability (on a diamond-by-diamond basis) giving distinct, but tightly clustering data, as seen in Figure 10a. Inclusions from homogenised diamond H1, for example, have 2-4ppm total PGE, an order of magnitude higher than the total PGE concentration of inclusions from diamonds H2 and H3 (0.2-0.4 ppm; see also Table 3). A similar situation exists between unhomogenised and homogenised sulphides if metal-to-metal ratios are compared to the PGEs, as shown in Figure 10b and 10c. In these two figures P-type sulphide data are added to allow a comparison with the earlier and present E-type data.

Chondrite normalised Ni-PGE-Au-Re-Cu diagrams (normalised after Fisher-Godde, 2010 for PGE and McDonough & Sun, 1995 for Ni, Re and Cu) are displayed in Figure 11. The grey background area delineates E-type inclusion compositions from Slave Craton diamonds; Aulbach et al., 2012). Overall, all analysed Orapa sulphide inclusions analysed have Ni-PGE-Au-Re-Cu patterns similar to those of Aulbach et al. (2012) with IPGE < PPGE. The unhomogenised Orapa inclusion patterns (Fig. 11a) show similar features to the homogenised ones (Fig. 11b), except that variation is minimised in the former.

Per diamond, the systematic patterns of homogenised samples are distinct for diamond H1 relative to H2 and H3 (Fig. 11b). For example, Pt, Pd and Re are notably higher in inclusions from diamond H1, and these samples also have a distinctive negative Au anomaly. In comparison, inclusions from diamonds H2 and H3 have much lower Pt and Pd, slightly lower Os and Ir, a slight positive anomaly for Au and a slightly negative anomaly for Re (Fig. 11b). These apparent diamond-specific variations are not always reconcilable with the unhomogenised samples (Fig. 11a) because the variation from multiple analyses tends to make the pattern more scattered. However, we observed that unhomogenised samples from diamond IM6 have negative Au anomalies and generally the lowest Re concentrations (Fig. 11b). LA-ICP-MS analyses of unhomogenised samples with the highest Cu
component appear to have significantly higher Re contents, as well as higher Au, and PPGE (cf. Table 3; Fig. 11b). Also in Figure 11a, as a series of black crosses associated with some of the Ni-PGE-Au-Re-Cu elements, are patterns for P-type diamonds from the Bulanova et al. (1996) study. These data are clearly distinct, with enriched IPGE (such that IPGE > PPGE), higher Pd and generally lower Cu contents than all the E-type diamonds.

The very low Os abundances in most of the unhomogenised Orapa sulphide inclusions (often < LOD), contrasts with the extreme variation in Re (0.02 to 9.46 ppm Re; Table 3) in the same sulphide. This relationship causes a spread of (Re/Os)\textsubscript{N} values for these samples and is shown in Figure 12a. By contrast, the (Re/Os)\textsubscript{N} variability of homogenised samples, per diamond, is significantly reduced. This variation in unhomogenised samples is proportional to the dominant end-member sulphide mineral selectively sampled by the LA-ICP-MS, and in particular, the (Re/Os)\textsubscript{N} ratio is positively correlated with the Cu content (Fig. 12b). Also, very low Ir abundances are observed for most of the analysed Orapa sulphide inclusions (often < LOD), but again the extensive variation in Pd (0.07 to 2.39 ppm; Table 3) in the unhomogenised samples causes a spread of (Pd/Ir)\textsubscript{N} for these samples (see Fig. 12c). This variability is significantly reduced for the homogenised samples.

Figure 12d shows that the limited number of P-type sulphide-bearing diamonds analysed to date by Bulanova et al., (1996) have very low (Pd/Ir)\textsubscript{N} relative to the E-type diamond dataset. This separation is largely controlled by the high Ir contents of the P-type diamonds, and the low to very low (< LOD) Pd contents. Consequently, the E- and P-type sulphide inclusions fall in distinct areas on (Pd/Ir)\textsubscript{N} vs. (Os/Ir)\textsubscript{N} diagrams, (see Fig. 12d). More analyses of P-type sulphides from a greater number of localities will be needed to establish the true extent of this separation.

Chondrite normalised (after McDonough & Sun, 1995) multi-element diagrams for semi-metals and heavy metals are shown in Figure 13 (with the light grey area delineating the compositional range of the E-type sulphide inclusions from Aulbach et al., 2012). Again, a greater variation in compositions is seen for the unhomogenised samples in Figure 13a than for the homogenised Orapa inclusion.
samples of Figure 13b. All E-type BMS inclusions observed have slight negative and slight positive anomalies for Te and Co, respectively, with unhomogenised samples having a particularly wide spread in Te abundance (Fig. 13a). All E-type BMS inclusions also have a notable negative As anomaly. Antimony, Ag, Cd and Bi are very variable between unhomogenised samples from different diamonds. For the homogenised diamond suite, H1 has the highest Bi content and generally (although not uniformly) the lowest Cd. Conversely, the P-type diamonds from the Bulanova study, shown as black crosses in Figure 13a are distinctive from the E-type compositions, with notably higher Te and As, and a great spread in Se abundances.

6. Wider implications

6.1 Comparisons with whole E-type diamonds and whole rock eclogites

Hart et al. (1997) determined Au and Ir concentrations in whole diamonds, with and without visible sulphide inclusions. Figure 14 shows that their E-type diamond data formed a steep and positively sloped array on a Au vs Ir plot with Au/Ir ratios > 0.3, whereas their P-type diamonds formed a flat or negatively sloped array with Au/Ir < 0.3. In both cases, absolute metal concentrations were very low (< 0.01 ppm) as the Au and Ir-bearing phases were diluted by the larger mass of the host diamond. The data generated in this present sulphide inclusion study and that of Aulbach et al. (2012) plot as an extension of the earlier E-type diamond Au vs Ir array in Figure 14 and may confirm that the Au and PGE concentrations in a whole diamond are probably controlled by small BMS inclusions. Such inclusions would be sub-microscopic in the case of diamonds that appear to be visually clear.

McDonald and Viljoen (2006) measured PGE and Au concentrations in whole rock samples of eclogites from Orapa and these are compared with alpine eclogites (Dale et al. 2009) and the homogenised BMS inclusions from this study on a chondrite normalised element plot in Figure 15. The whole rock Orapa eclogites show moderate fractionation of PPGE over IPGE and strong Cu
enrichment. Rhenium was not measured in the Orapa eclogite rocks but was in the alpine eclogites. The alpine eclogites generally have lower PGE concentrations but similar pattern shapes to the Orapa eclogites and also show a strong enrichment in Re. The metal concentrations of the E-type sulphide inclusions are 2-3 orders of magnitude greater than the eclogite whole rock samples, but they show similar PPGE:IPGE fractionation and the enrichment in Re and Cu observed in the whole rocks. Comparison of the sulphide inclusion BMS to the bulk rock eclogite data suggests that the PGE and Cu budget is largely controlled by the BMS compositions within the eclogites, however the Re concentration in some of the diamond BMS inclusions is slightly lower than is predicted by the eclogite bulk rock geochemistry. This may be specific to the diamond BMS inclusions analysed during this study, or it may indicate a non-BMS Re-bearing phase present within the eclogite xenoliths but absent in some of the diamond BMS inclusions (c.f. the Re present in the silicate fraction of peridotite xenoliths; Handler and Bennett, 1999).

6.2 Precious and semi-metal content of E-type vs P-type diamond sulphide inclusions

The precious and semi-metal contents of E- and P-type diamond BMS inclusions appear to define entirely distinct compositions. E-type BMS generally have low PGE abundances, with PPGE enriched above IPGE, generally lower Se contents, and systematically lower Te and As concentrations than P-type diamond BMS inclusions. E-type BMS also have higher metal/S ratios, lower Ni contents and higher and/or more variable Cu contents. Re concentrations between E- and P-type BMS largely overlap (e.g. Westerlund et al. 2006), however the notably higher Os abundance in P-type BMS inclusions produces a significant difference in \((\text{Re/Os})_n\) ratios.

Figure 16a shows that Te is higher in all P-type sulphide inclusions (Bulanova et al., 1996) than E-type inclusions (this study and Aulbach et al., 2012) and there is a distinctive positive correlation between Te and Se for P-type inclusions that is absent for E-type. P-type inclusions also have distinctly higher
Pd contents than E-type, such that the two populations of diamond inclusion types follow different
trends in Figure 16b (increasing Pd content with increasing Se for P-type inclusions only). Platinum
was generally < LOD in the Bulanova study and therefore we cannot compare Pt/Pd ratios for P- and
E-type inclusions, however we note that all E-type inclusions fall along a Pt:Pd line close to unity (Fig.
1c), and this trend is observed for inclusions from different host diamonds. Gold and Te do not
correlate with one another in the unhomogenised inclusions, nor in the dataset of Aulbach et al.
(2012), see (Fig. 16d). But when homogenised, 5 out of the 6 Orapa inclusions define positive a trend
between Au and Te. This suggests that Au and Te may be irregularly distributed within or between
sulphide minerals (possibly as alloys or micro-nuggets) that can be recombined by homogenisation.

In all diagrams in Figure 16, the homogenised inclusions form a tight cluster of compositions and
therefore are much less compositionally variable than analyses of the unhomogenised samples.
Whilst the homogenised inclusions tend to cluster per diamond host, we note that the two
inclusions from diamond H2 (which existed as two distinct inclusions within the diamond before
homogenisation, and remained as such after homogenisation) have different element
concentrations – inclusion H2a has higher Cu, Se, Re, Te and Pt contents than H2b (Fig. 16c) and this
is likely to be a primary feature inherited when each BMS inclusion was encapsulated. The same is
probably true for the fragments from diamond H1. H1a and H1c have higher Cu than H1b and H1d
(Table 2). The different S/Se ratios, Te, Au and Bi concentrations further suggest that each of the
large fragments represented by H1b, H1c and H1d originally came from separate inclusions rather
than one inclusion as originally suspected.

This intrinsic difference in E- and P-type diamond BMS inclusion metallogenic budgets may have
significant implications for the metallogenesis of the lithospheric mantle and/or the sources of
metals in mantle-derived melts (e.g., Hughes et al., 2015). Figures 11-13 reveal surprisingly close
similarities between the semi-metals present in E-type sulphides from Orapa and Diavik despite the
diamonds and sulphides forming on different cratons. This may reflect common protoliths or
processes operating during the formation of eclogites on the Slave and Kalahari cratons. Comparison of homogenised E- and P-type diamond BMS inclusions presents an opportunity to assess the wider metallogeny of the two main endmember lithologies of the mantle whilst removing uncertainties over secondary modification. Such studies may have major implications for the metal budget of mantle-derived melts in various tectonic environments through space and time.

7. Conclusions

- Heating diamonds (intact) with their inclusions in a furnace at 1100°C, for 15 mins under controlled fO₂ conditions followed by quenching, successfully homogenises BMS inclusion(s), eradicating distinct endmember sulphide minerals (formed during natural cooling via subsolidus exsolution processes).
- µCT scanning of the diamond confirms that inclusions are the same volume (within error) both before and after homogenisation, demonstrating the success of this method. The diamond host retains each BMS inclusion with no loss or gain of inclusion material.
- µCT methods also gives an effective insight into the shape of BMS inclusions— including fracture propagation within diamond hosts. In this study, we observe a distinctive 3D stepped shape of a BMS inclusion and suggest this is in the form of a negative crystal shape, invoked by the diamond host.
- This homogenisation method produces BMS inclusions of a uniform geochemical composition for both major and trace elements (per inclusion). This has three implications:
  - Multiple geochemical analyses may now be carried out on homogeneous fragments of a single BMS inclusion, allowing for multiple interpretations to be made from a single diamond – for example, geochronology, isotopes and trace element analyses.
Concerns regarding missing Re-rich mineral phases from unhomogenised BMS inclusions (e.g., by ‘flaking’ of chalcopyrite and accidental incomplete sampling of whole inclusions) can be eradicated by utilising this homogenisation method.

If multiple inclusions occur within a single diamond, each may be analysed individually to assess spatial variation of BMS composition in a single diamond.

* Comparison of E-type diamond BMS inclusions in diamond to whole rock eclogite compositions for PGE, Re, Au and Cu indicate that all metals (with the possible exception of Re) are accounted for by the BMS.

* E-type and P-type diamond BMS inclusions in diamond have distinct trace element signatures, especially for precious, heavy and semi-metals. P-type BMS inclusions have higher total PGE and Te concentrations, higher IPGE (Os, Ir and Ru) and As abundances than E-type BMS inclusions. This has important implications for the metallogeny of the mantle, the partitioning behaviour of trace metals during partial melting, and the metal budgets that may be imparted into mantle-derived magmas.
Acknowledgements

HSRH gratefully acknowledges her current Postdoctoral Fellowship with the Claude Leon Foundation and the support of the CIMERA centre of excellence at the Universities of the Witwatersrand and Johannesburg. The Diamond Trading Company (a member of the DeBeers Group of Companies) is thanked for the donation to JWH of the diamonds used in this study. The analytical work in this study was supported by NERC SoS Consortium grant NE/M011615/1 “Te and Se Cycling and Supply” awarded to Cardiff University.
Figure Captions

Figure 1 – Schematic timeline for the cooling and crystallisation of a sulphide liquid to monosulphide solid solution (MSS), intermediate solid solution (ISS), a semimetal immiscible phase and low-temperature mineral phases. Adapted from Holwell & McDonald (2010).

Figure 2 – Schematic diagram demonstrating the problems regarding partial sampling of a fractionated (unhomogenised) sulphide inclusion and its apparent geochemistry vs. partial sampling of a homogenised and quenched sulphide inclusion.

Figure 3 – Location map of Orapa, Magondi Belt and the Kaapvaal-Zimbabwe Craton. Adapted from Shirey et al. (2001), McCourt et al. (2004) and Shirey et al. (2004).

Figure 4 – (a) Reflected light photomicrograph of homogenised inclusion H1d. (b) Back-scattered electron (BSE) scanning electron microscope (SEM) image of homogenised inclusion H1d. Abbreviations are pyrrhotite (Po), pentlandite (Pn), chalcopyrite (Cp) and monosulphide solid solution (Mss).

Figure 5 – (a) Reflected light photomicrograph of unhomogenised inclusion IM2b. (b) BSE SEM image of unhomogenised inclusion IM6a. Abbreviations are the same as in Figure 4.

Figure 6 – Combined element maps for Fe, Ni and Cu for (a) unhomogenised inclusion IM2b, (b) unhomogenised inclusion IM6a, (c) homogenised inclusion H2a and (d) homogenised inclusion H3a.

Figure 7 – Micro-CT scan 3D rendered images for diamond H3 and its inclusions. (a) Diamond H3 itself shown as a semi-transparent blue shell with multiple sulphide inclusions as solid red shells. (b) The largest of these sulphide inclusions in H3 before homogenisation and (c) the same inclusion (from the same perspective) after homogenisation. See text for details.
Figure 8 – Ternary Fe-Ni-S diagrams for T = 1000°C and T = 100-135°C. Major element compositions (summarised in Table 2) for unhomogenised samples in (a) and (b). Major element compositions (summarised in Table 2) for homogenised samples in (c) and (d).

Figure 9 – Time resolved analyses (TRA) for two examples: Major element profiles for (a) an unhomogenised inclusion and (b) a homogenised inclusion. Example trace element profiles for (a) an unhomogenised inclusion and (b) a homogenised inclusion. See supplementary Tables D and E for all TRA plots for all diamond inclusion analyses.

Figure 10 – LA-ICP-MS data for homogenised and unhomogenised inclusions for (a) Metal/S ratio vs total PGE concentration, (b) Ni/(Ni+Fe+Cu) and (c) Cu/(Cu+Fe+Ni). Datasets from Bulanova et al. (1996) and Aulbach et al. (2012) for comparison.

Figure 11 – Multi-element diagrams for Ni, Cu, Re and the PGE: (a) shows unhomogenised samples and (b) shows homogenised samples. The light grey background delineates compositions from Aulbach et al. (2012) E-type Diavik diamond sulphide inclusions while the dashed lines indicate P-type diamond compositions from Yakutia by Bulanova et al. (1996). Downward arrows denote measurements where concentration was < LOD, and which have then been plotted at ½ LOD.

Figure 12 – LA-ICP-MS data for homogenised and unhomogenised inclusions for (a) (Re/Os)$_N$ vs Os, (b) (Re/Os)$_N$ vs Cu, (c) (Pd/Ir)$_N$ vs Ir and (d) (Pd/Ir)$_N$ vs (Os/Ir)$_N$. Downward arrows denote measurements where concentration was < LOD, and which have then been used at ½ LOD for calculated ratios for plotting.

Figure 13 – Multi-element diagrams for semi-metals and heavy metals: (a) shows unhomogenised samples and (b) shows homogenised samples. The light grey background delineates compositions from Aulbach et al. (2012) E-type Diavik diamond sulphide inclusions while the dashed lines indicate P-type diamond compositions from Yakutia by Bulanova et al. (1996). The order of elements in these
diagrams is based on those displayed by Aulbach et al., 2012. Downward arrows denote measurements where concentration was < LOD, and which have then been plotted at ½ LOD.

**Figure 14** – Au vs Ir, after Hart *et al.* (1997).

**Figure 15** – Multi-element diagrams for Ni, Cu, Re and the PGE comparing homogenised diamond inclusion samples with bulk rock data for eclogite xenoliths, abbreviated ‘xnl’, from Orapa McDonald et al. (2006) and for Alpine eclogites from the study by Dale *et al.* (2009).

**Figure 16** – LA-ICP-MS data for homogenised and unhomogenised inclusions for (a) Te vs Se, (b) Pd vs Se, (c) Pt vs Pd and (d) Au vs Te.

**Table Captions**

**Table 1** – List of homogenised and unhomogenised diamond samples and their sulphide inclusions, including dimensions of inclusions and fragments.

**Table 2** – Summary table of the major element compositions of homogenised and unhomogenised diamond inclusion samples. Data are from SEM EDS. Refer to supplementary Table C for all point analyses and supplementary Figure A for a bar chart displaying data from Table 2.

**Table 3** – Summary table of all trace element data (from LA-ICP-MS) of homogenised and unhomogenised diamond inclusion samples. See main text for details regarding calibration and argide corrections. Refer to supplementary Table B for all data (including all analysed isotopes) and supplementary Tables D and E for all TRA diagrams per analysis.
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- F Pt/Pd
- G Re/Pt

Legend:
- Homogenised inclusions
- Unhomogenised inclusions

1. H1c Line
2. H1c spot1
3. H1c spot2
4. H1d spot1
5. H1d spot2
6. H2a spot1
7. H2a spot2
8. H3a spot1
9. IM2a spot1
10. IM2a spot2
11. IM2a spot3
12. IM2a spot4
13. IM2a line1
14. IM2b spot1
15. IM2b spot2
16. IM2b spot3
17. IM2b spot4
18. IM2b line 1
19. IM2b line 2
20. IM6a spot1
21. IM6 spot1
Figure 9

Homogenised diamond: 1
- H1b
- H2a
- H3a
- IM2a

Unhomogenised diamonds:
- H1c
- H2b
- IM2b
- H1d
- IM6a

△ Bulanova et al 1996 - Yakutian P-type diamonds
× Aulbach et al 2012 - Diavik Mine (Slave Craton) E-type diamonds
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Homogenised diamond: 1 2 3
- H1b - H2a - H3a
- IM2a
- H1c - H2b
- IM2b
- IM6a

Unhomogenised diamonds:
- Bulanova et al 1996 - Yakutian P-type diamonds
- Aulbach et al 2012 - Diavik Mine (Slave Craton) E-type diamonds
- Richardson et al 2001 - E-type sulphides in Kimberley diamonds
- Richardson et al 2004 - E-type sulphides in Jwaneng diamonds
- McKenna 2001 - Swartruggens diamonds
- Simelane 2004 - Palmietgat E-type diamonds
- Simelane 2004 - Palmietgat P-type diamonds
- Wiggers de Vries et al 2013 - E-type sulphides in Yakutian diamonds
- Wiggers de Vries et al 2013 - P-type sulphides in Yakutian diamonds
- Westerlund et al 2006 - P-type sulphides in Panda diamonds
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Figure 14

Homogenised diamond: 1 2 3
- H1b
- H2a
- H3a
- H1c
- H2b
- H1d

Unhomogenised diamonds:
- IM2a
- IM2b
- IM6a

△ Bulanova et al 1996 - Yakutian P-type diamonds
× Aulbach et al 2012 - Diavik Mine (Slave Craton) E-type diamonds
Table 1: Details of sulphide inclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diamond</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Dimensions (µm)</th>
<th>Details of fragment/inclusion</th>
<th>Homogenised/Unhomogenised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>150 x 100 x 100</td>
<td>Fragment from mixed multiple inclusions</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>100 x 100 x 80</td>
<td>Fragment from mixed multiple inclusions</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1c</td>
<td>100 x 100 x 80</td>
<td>Fragment from mixed multiple inclusions</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1d</td>
<td>150 x 100 x 30</td>
<td>Fragment from mixed multiple inclusions</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1e</td>
<td>200 x 100 x 30</td>
<td>Fragment from mixed multiple inclusions</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>200 x 150 x 150</td>
<td>Whole inclusion – #1 of 4</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>150 x 100 x 100</td>
<td>Whole inclusion – #2 of 4</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>100 x 50 x 50</td>
<td>Fragment of inclusion – #1 of 5</td>
<td>Homogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM2</td>
<td>IM2a</td>
<td>300 x 150 x 100</td>
<td>Fragment of single inclusion</td>
<td>Unhomogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM2b</td>
<td>350 x 300 x 250</td>
<td>Fragment of single inclusion</td>
<td>Unhomogenised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM6</td>
<td>IM6a</td>
<td>300 x 200 x 150*</td>
<td>Fragment of single inclusion</td>
<td>Unhomogenised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Original size of whole inclusion which subsequently broke (sample IM6a is a fragment of this original)
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample #</th>
<th>Diamond #</th>
<th>Fragment #</th>
<th>Homogenised?</th>
<th>End member mineral</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>S (wt%)</th>
<th>Fe (wt%)</th>
<th>Co (wt%)</th>
<th>Ni (wt%)</th>
<th>Cu (wt%)</th>
<th>Total (wt%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>homogenised</td>
<td>n/a (mean)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>53.16</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>99.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.15</td>
<td>±0.03</td>
<td>±0.04</td>
<td>±0.18</td>
<td>±0.34</td>
<td>±0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>homogenised</td>
<td>n/a (mean)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>99.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.34</td>
<td>±0.18</td>
<td>±0.10</td>
<td>±0.09</td>
<td>±0.33</td>
<td>±0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>homogenised</td>
<td>n/a (mean)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>99.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.09</td>
<td>±0.37</td>
<td>±0.04</td>
<td>±0.10</td>
<td>±0.32</td>
<td>±0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>homogenised</td>
<td>n/a (mean)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>53.38</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>99.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.08</td>
<td>±0.19</td>
<td>±0.04</td>
<td>±0.09</td>
<td>±0.20</td>
<td>±0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>homogenised</td>
<td>n/a (mean)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.46</td>
<td>54.41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>99.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.29</td>
<td>±0.33</td>
<td>±0.03</td>
<td>±0.05</td>
<td>±0.06</td>
<td>±0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>homogenised</td>
<td>n/a (mean)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>54.32</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>99.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.75</td>
<td>±0.21</td>
<td>±0.04</td>
<td>±0.08</td>
<td>±0.20</td>
<td>±0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>homogenised</td>
<td>n/a (mean)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>55.93</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>99.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.15</td>
<td>±0.30</td>
<td>±0.08</td>
<td>±0.04</td>
<td>±0.10</td>
<td>±0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM2a</td>
<td>IM2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>unhomogenised</td>
<td>Po (mean)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>56.48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>99.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.52</td>
<td>±3.15</td>
<td>±0.33</td>
<td>±3.06</td>
<td>±0.06</td>
<td>±0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pn (mean)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>99.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.50</td>
<td>±1.43</td>
<td>±0.14</td>
<td>±2.40</td>
<td>±1.08</td>
<td>±0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cp (mean)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>32.62</td>
<td>100.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.27</td>
<td>±0.74</td>
<td>±0.17</td>
<td>±2.21</td>
<td>±2.07</td>
<td>±2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM2b</td>
<td>IM2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>unhomogenised</td>
<td>Po (mean)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>55.86</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>100.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.46</td>
<td>±3.37</td>
<td>±0.41</td>
<td>±3.62</td>
<td>±0.19</td>
<td>±0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cp (mean)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>100.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.39</td>
<td>±1.26</td>
<td>±0.09</td>
<td>±1.19</td>
<td>±1.14</td>
<td>±1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM6a</td>
<td>IM6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>unhomogenised</td>
<td>Po (mean)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>57.09</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>99.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.38</td>
<td>±1.44</td>
<td>±0.17</td>
<td>±1.36</td>
<td>±1.62</td>
<td>±1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pn (mean)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.83</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>100.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±1.29</td>
<td>±5.80</td>
<td>±0.11</td>
<td>±6.45</td>
<td>±0.52</td>
<td>±0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cp (mean)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>99.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.59</td>
<td>±3.80</td>
<td>±0.10</td>
<td>±0.60</td>
<td>±4.29</td>
<td>±4.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>