

RESEARCH ARTICLE | JANUARY 03 2017

# The effect of polymer concentration on flux stability of polysulfone membrane **FREE**

D. Ariono; P. T. P. Aryanti; S. Subagjo; I. G. Wenten



AIP Conf. Proc. 1788, 030048 (2017)

<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4968301>



CrossMark

Boost Your Optics and Photonics Measurements

Lock-in Amplifier

Find out more

Boxcar Averager

# The Effect of Polymer Concentration on Flux Stability of Polysulfone Membrane

D. Ariono<sup>1, a)</sup>, P.T.P. Aryanti<sup>2, b)</sup>, S. Subagjo<sup>1, c)</sup> and I.G. Wenten<sup>1, d)</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Chemical Engineering Dept., Institut Teknologi Bandung, Bandung 40132, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Chemical Engineering Dept., Jenderal Achmad Yani University, Cimahi, West Java, Indonesia

<sup>a)</sup>Corresponding author: danu@che.itb.ac.id

<sup>b)</sup>p.teta@lecture.unjani.ac.id

<sup>c)</sup>subagjo@che.itb.ac.id

<sup>d)</sup>igw@che.itb.ac.id

**Abstract.** The influence of various polymer concentrations on flux stability of polysulfone membranes was investigated. The polysulfone membrane was prepared by blending polysulfone in DMAc with 25%wt concentration of PEG400 and 4% wt concentration of acetone. It was found that the pure water flux was sharply decreased from 1230 to 7 Lm<sup>2</sup>h<sup>-1</sup>, when the polysulfone concentration was increased from 14% to 24%wt. Furthermore, the increase of polysulfone concentration also affects the fouling behavior of the membranes, in which almost of 90% of FRR was achieved by the addition of 18 %wt of polysulfone concentration. It was suggested that fouling formed on the membrane surface was dominated by reversible fouling, thus it could be easily cleaned by flushing method. In addition, the applied transmembrane pressure (TMP) also plays an important role in fouling behavior of polysulfone membrane. It was observed that irreversible fouling of organic matter was deteriorated by the increase of TMP, which contributed to the reduction of water flux. More stable membrane flux performance was achieved although it was operated at high TMP, when 20% wt concentration of polysulfone was added into membrane solution.

## INTRODUCTION

Ultrafiltration membranes have been challenged to maintain their flux stability and selectivity. In water treatment field, the ultrafiltration membrane is severe to flux decline due to accumulation of natural organic matter (NOM) on the membrane surface or in the membrane structure, which known as fouling phenomenon [1]. This organic matter fouling creates additional resistance on the membrane, may be greater than the intrinsic membrane resistance, which contributes to the deterioration of membrane performances and flux loss [2-4]. In addition, the operation pressure increases due to the fouling impact, which further increases the energy consumption as well as the operating costs [5]. Therefore, development of low fouling ultrafiltration membrane has significantly growth as a promising approach to maintain its stability for long term of membrane operation.

Yuan and Zydny [6, 7] studied humic substances fouling mechanism on porous membranes. They found that the humic substances fouling are initiated by convective deposition of large aggregates on the membrane surface, then followed by further deposition of non-aggregated humic substances. This convective deposition of foulants depends on applied transmembrane pressure during filtration process. On the other research, Mousa et al. [8] investigated fouling mechanism of humic acid in different pore size of UF membrane, i.e. 10, 50 and 100 kDa. They found that flux decline at the smaller pore size (i.e. 10 and 50 kDa) is affected by the accumulation of organic particles that led to the formation of cake layer on the membrane surface. Meanwhile at the larger pore size (100 kDa), a number of organic particles are absorbed into membrane structure, which leads to pore blocking. However, membrane selectivity towards the humic substances can actually be improved by the addition of volatile solvent into membrane solution during membrane preparation [9]. Aryanti et al. [10] added low concentration of acetone and high

concentration of PEG400 into casting membrane solution. Their experimental results showed that more than 80% humic substances is achieved when 4%wt of acetone is added into membrane solution. Rapid loss of the acetone during the membrane preparation leads to further polymer concentration in top layer of the membrane and form a tight skin membrane layer. As the acetone concentration is increased, thicker membrane skin layer was obtained, which resulting in a lower membrane flux.

UF membrane properties can also be affected by polymer concentration in the casting membrane solution that controls the formation of membrane structure [11, 12]. Higher concentration of polymer contributes to kinetic hindrance against phase separation due to the rise of membrane solution viscosity [13]. As a result, macrovoid formations in the membrane structure can be eluded. Most of commercial UF membrane is prepared from hydrophobic polymer, such as polysulfone, which is susceptible to organic matter fouling due to its natural hydrophobic property [14, 15]. Therefore, most of membrane modification methods are focused in improving membrane hydrophilicity [16-19]. Blending with hydrophilic polymers has been widely used to accomplish this task as it is also the simplest method [20, 21]. The presence of additives in membrane solution could bring the composition of membrane close to the equilibrium boundary of solution, thus the formation of membrane structure can occur instantaneously [9]. Ma et al. [22] observed that the presence of PEG in membrane solution led to the enhancement of membrane porosity and water permeability. The membrane performances depended on the PEG molecular weight and concentration in casting membrane solution. The water permeability is improved as the concentration of PEG is increased. Charabarty et al. [23] found that the increase of molecular weight of PEG reduced the average pore size and enhanced pure water flux of the membrane. Aryanti et al [24] blended 35%wt of PEG400 into polysulfone membrane solution and found that the pure water flux was improved to 20 times compared with the unmodified membrane. However, the presence of high concentration of PEG400 induced the formation of open pore in membrane structure that reduced the membrane selectivity.

In the present work, the effect of polysulfone concentration on fouling and rejection of the resulted UF membranes towards humic substances were investigated. The polysulfone membrane was prepared by blending polysulfone in DMAc with 25%wt concentration of PEG400 and 4% wt concentration of acetone. The addition of PEG400 and acetone are intended to improve membrane hydrophilicity and selectivity, which has been investigated in our previous works [24, 25]. The polysulfone concentration was varied in order to investigate the influence of its concentration on the membrane performances. Further evaluation was performed using different transmembrane pressure for better understanding of the fouling and rejection of humic substances during peat water filtration. The main objective of this experiment was prepared low pressure ultrafiltration membrane by simple blending method but does not sacrifice its humic substances rejection performance.

## EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

### Materials

The polysulfone (UDEL-P3500 MB7) used in this paper was provided by Solvay Advanced polymer. DMAc with 99.9% purity was used as a solvent and supplied by Shanghai Jingsan Jingwei Chemical Co. Ltd, without further purification. PEG400 and acetone were used as additives to improve the polysulfone membrane performances. Demineralized water was used as a coagulant to induce the formation of membrane structure. The peat water, with a pH less than 4, was taken from Pekanbaru river-Riau, Indonesia.

### Preparation of Polysulfone Membrane

The immersion precipitation method was used to prepare the flat sheet membrane. Polysulfone was dissolved into DMAc at room temperature and then mixed with 25% wt of PEG400 and 4%wt of acetone concentration as additives. The membrane solution was stirred for around 12 hours in closed stirred tank up to homogenous, and then left without stirring until no bubbles appeared. Afterward, the membrane solution was casted on a flat glass plate with 200  $\mu\text{m}$  thickness and immediately immersed into coagulation bath filled with demineralized water. The compositions of casting membrane solution used in this experiment are shown in Table 1. The peat water filtration was operated in different transmembrane pressures, i.e. 10, 15 and 30 Psig.

TABLE 1. Casting membrane composition

| Membrane code | Casting membrane composition (%-wt) |        |         |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------|---------|
|               | PSF                                 | PEG400 | Acetone |
| PSf-1         | 14                                  | 25     | 4       |
| PSf-2         | 16                                  | 25     | 4       |
| PSf-3         | 18                                  | 25     | 4       |
| PSf-4         | 20                                  | 25     | 4       |
| PSf-5         | 22                                  | 25     | 4       |
| PSf-6         | 24                                  | 25     | 4       |

## Flux and Selectivity Measurement

The experimental setup is shown in Fig. 1, the same configuration as our previous work [25], which performed in crossflow mode. Prior to the experiment circular flat sheet membrane was placed inside membrane module and rinsed by demineralized water for 30 minutes at 1 atm. The active surface area of each membrane is 45 cm<sup>2</sup>.




FIGURE 1. Experimental setup

The pure water flux (PWF) was determined using demineralized water at a fixed pressure, followed by the peat water flux measurement. The peat filtration was operated for two (2) hours, where the flux measurement and sampling were conducted periodically every 20 minutes. Humic acid content in raw water and permeate solution were analyzed using UV/vis spectrophotometer with 254 wavelength ( $\lambda=254$  m) [26, 27]. The PWF and peat water flux were calculated with the following equation:

$$J_{w1} = \frac{V}{A \times \Delta t} \quad (1)$$

Where  $J_{w1}$  is pure water flux (PWF) ( $\text{Lm}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}$ ),  $V$  is the volume of permeate ( $\text{m}^3$ ),  $t$  is permeation time (s), and  $A$  is membrane surface area ( $\text{m}^2$ ). Peat water flux is mentioned as  $J_t$  that is measured at the first time of filtration and calculated by the same equation as eq.(1). Meanwhile, the humic substances rejection ( $R, \%$ ) is calculated by following equation [28]:

$$R(\%) = \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{C_p}{C_f} \right) \right] \times 100 \quad (2)$$

where  $C_p$  and  $C_f$  are a concentration of humic substances in permeate and feed solution.

After two (2) hours of peat water filtration, the flat sheet membrane was flushed by demineralized water for around

45 minutes. The pure water flux (PWF) of the cleaned membrane was measured and denoted as  $J_{W2}$ . Flux recovery ratio (FRR) was calculated by equation (3) to investigate the effect of organic matter on membrane fouling during peat water filtration.

$$FRR(\%) = \left( \frac{J_{W2}}{J_{W1}} \right) \times 100 \quad (3)$$

Flux loss due to reversible ( $r_r$ ) and irreversible ( $r_{ir}$ ) fouling in polysulfone membrane was also calculated. Reversible fouling (rr) is formed by gel formation on the membrane surface, which can be easily removed by flushing or backwash method. Meanwhile, irreversible fouling ( $r_{ir}$ ) is pore blocking fouling that shall be removed by chemical cleaning. In this research, both reversible and irreversible flux loss were evaluated by flushing method. The flux loss was calculated by the following equation:

$$r_r = \frac{J_{W2} - J_t}{J_{W1}} \quad (4)$$

$$r_{ir} = \frac{J_{W1} - J_{W2}}{J_{W1}} \quad (5)$$

Total flux loss ( $r_t$ ) is the sum of  $r_r$  and  $r_{ir}$ , which indicates the total flux loss during peat water filtration.

### Resistance Series in Model

The total resistance in fouled polysulfone membrane was calculated by the resistance-in-series model, as shown in Eq. (6).

$$J = \frac{\Delta P}{\mu R_t} = \frac{\Delta P}{\mu (R_m + R_f)} \quad (6)$$

$\Delta P$  is transmembrane pressure (bar),  $\mu$  is viscosity of solution (bar.h),  $R_t$  is total resistance ( $m^{-1}$ ),  $R_m$  is membrane resistance ( $m^{-1}$ ), and  $R_f$  is fouling resistance ( $m^{-1}$ ). The membrane resistance ( $R_m$ ) was determined by filtering demineralized water through the membrane, then calculated by the following equation:

$$R_m = \frac{\Delta P}{\mu J_{W1}} \quad (7)$$

After two (2) hours of peat water filtration, the peat water flux was measured in order to calculate the total fouled membrane ( $R_{ft}$ ). Then,  $R_f$  was determined by subtracting the membrane resistance ( $R_m$ ) from the total fouling resistance ( $R_{ft}$ ), as shown in Eq. (8).


$$R_f = R_{ft} - R_m \quad (8)$$

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### The effect of polysulfone concentration on membrane permeability and selectivity

Figure 2 presents the pure water flux (PWF) and humic substance rejection in various polysulfone concentration in membrane solution. This figure shows a trade-off between membrane selectivity and permeability that has been

widely known as one of the drawbacks in polymeric membranes [29, 30]. The PWF is decreased with the increase of polysulfone concentration. It may be attributed to the formation of smaller membrane pore size in high polysulfone concentration. As the increase of polysulfone concentration, the membrane solution viscosity is enhanced, which inhibits the growth of membrane pore [31]. Consequently, it contributes to the reduction of PWF. In contrast, humic substances rejection of the membrane is raised with the addition of higher concentration of polysulfone. In low polysulfone concentration, which has a larger pore size, the retention of low molecular weight solutes accumulated on the membrane surface is lower than the intrinsic membrane resistance [32]. Therefore, it easily passes through the membrane and leads to low rejection of humic substances.




**FIGURE 2.** The effect of polysulfone on Rejection of humic substances and pure water flux at a constant transmembrane pressure (15 Psig)

During the peat water filtration, rejection of humic substances is not only affected by the membrane pore size. The accumulation of humic substances on the polysulfone membrane is also attributed to hydrophobic interaction between the membrane surface and humic substances molecules [33, 34]. The increase of polysulfone concentration improves the membrane hydrophobicity, which then escalates the humic substances accumulation on the membrane surface. In addition, low pH of peat solution also exacerbates membrane fouling since it enhances the interaction between membrane and molecules due to increase in solutes hydrophobicity. The negative charge of phenolic and carboxylic functional groups is neutralized with the decrease of pH, which leads to lower water solubility and greater hydrophobicity [35-37]. The accumulation of humic substances on the membrane surface can serve as a second layer, which influences the membrane selectivity.


### Fouling of humic substances analysis in different polysulfone concentration

The effect of polysulfone concentration on relative water flux at constant transmembrane pressure is shown in Fig. 3. This relative flux measurement is performed to investigate the fouling behavior on the membrane surface that responsible to flux decline during the peat water filtration. It shows that the most severe flux decline phenomenon occurs when 14%wt of polysulfone concentration is blended into membrane solution. In low concentration of polysulfone, the rapid adsorption of humic substances on the membrane surface may be attributed by the larger pore formed in membrane skin layer. Furthermore, drag permeation during cross-flow filtration deteriorates the fouling formation in membrane structure, which contributes to the extreme flux decline at 20 minutes of filtration time. This rapid flux decline could be minimized by adding the polysulfone concentration above 16%wt. Further increase of polysulfone concentration, a slight decline of flux is observed. Although the number of humic substance that accumulates on the membrane surface enhances at higher polysulfone concentration, weak interaction between the humic substances and the membrane is resulted that can easily be cleaned by the cross-flow filtration. The optimum stable flux is achieved by blended 20%wt of polysulfone concentration.



**FIGURE 3.** The effect of polysulfone on Rejection of humic substances and pure water flux at a constant transmembrane pressure (15 Psig)

Figure 4 exhibits the effect of polysulfone concentration on total resistance of the fouled membrane during two (2) hours of peat water filtration. It has been explained that high concentration of polysulfone resulted in smaller pore size of the membrane. The smaller membrane pore size contributes to the increase of intrinsic membrane resistance, which reduces the membrane water flux. Such a behavior of membrane fouling is also affected by polysulfone concentration in membrane solution due to hydrophobic interaction with the humic substances. The rise of membrane hydrophobicity due to a higher concentration of polysulfone enhances the adsorption of humic substances on the membrane surface. Therefore, the fouling resistance of the membrane is increased and causes greater loss towards membrane flux.



**FIGURE 4.** The effect of polysulfone concentration on total resistance of fouled polysulfone membranes

The influence of polysulfone concentration on both flux recovery ratio (FRR) and flux loss after two (2) hours of peat water filtration is presented in Table 2. FRR of the membrane is increased up to 89% when 20 % wt of polysulfone concentration is added into membrane solution. However, this tendency is limited since the further addition of polysulfone in membrane solution leads to a slight decrease of FRR before it reaches its stationary point. Overall performance evaluation shows that higher concentration of polysulfone gives the antifouling property to the membrane as clearly shown by lower flux loss. Regarding membrane flux loss, both reversible and irreversible fouling of humic substances plays an important role. As shown in Table 2 that higher concentration of polysulfone,

which resulted in smaller membrane pore size, minimizes the irreversible fouling in the membrane structure. It is found that the irreversible fouling can be reduced from 0,867 to 0,097 when the polysulfone concentration is increased from 14 to 24%wt. However, the decrease of irreversible fouling is not quite apparent towards reversible fouling. It shows that the addition of polysulfone concentration at above 20%wt results in the decrease of reversible fouling. Even though the accumulation of foulant on membrane surface is increased, the interaction between the membrane and the foulant is weak and reversible. It then means that initial membrane performance can be well recovered by simple cleaning methods, such as through flushing or backwashing method.

**TABEL 2.** The effect of polysulfone concentration on flux recovery ratio and flux loss

| Membrane Code | FRR (%) | Total Flux loss | Reversible flux loss (rir) | Irreversible flux loss (rr) |
|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| PSf-1         | 13,325  | 0,951           | 0,084                      | 0,867                       |
| PSf-2         | 16,129  | 0,947           | 0,108                      | 0,839                       |
| PSf-3         | 25,000  | 0,881           | 0,131                      | 0,750                       |
| PSf-4*        | 89,189  | 0,781           | 0,673                      | 0,108                       |
| PSf-5         | 88,338  | 0,543           | 0,426                      | 0,117                       |
| PSf-6         | 88,824  | 0,465           | 0,368                      | 0,097                       |

all experiments is conducted at a constant pressure (15 psig); \*refer to our previous work [10]

### Fouling and rejection of humic substances in different transmembrane pressure

It has been known that fouling on a membrane surface alters the separation characteristic of the membrane [38, 39]. Low cross flow velocity and transmembrane pressure lead to higher concentration of the rejected solute on the membrane surface, due to the longer time of membrane exposure to the raw water. Therefore, higher flux decline of membrane water flux during the peat filtration process can occur. In this sub-chapter, the effect of transmembrane pressure on polysulfone membrane performance is discussed.

Figure 5 shows the relative flux of polysulfone membranes and rejection of humic substances at a various concentration of polysulfone and TMP. It is found that very low relative flux is found at a low concentration of polysulfone. Beside of the larger pore in the membrane skin layer, fouling of organic matter in membrane structure deteriorates by the increase of TMP. As the increase of TMP, cross-flow velocity on the membrane surface has enhanced that impact to the increase of drag permeation rate of solute through the membrane. Therefore, lower rejection of humic substances is obtained at higher TMP. Beside of the drag permeation effect, low rejection of humic substances could also be attributed to the presence of PEG400 in the membrane solution, which leads to the formation of an open pore in the membrane skin layer. The optimum level of humic substances rejection is obtained at 18%wt concentration of polysulfone. It may be attributed to the uniform pore size distribution of the resulted membrane compared with other compositions. In the other hand, low concentration of polysulfone results in a weak mechanical resistance of the membrane, which indicated by the damage of resulted membrane at 30 psig. More stable membrane performance is found at 20% wt concentration of polysulfone, although it is operated at high TMP. Very tight pore structure is formed by further increasing of the polysulfone concentration, which could not be operated in lower operating pressure than 15 psig.






FIGURE 5. Humic substance rejection in different transmembrane pressure and polysulfone concentration

The influence of transmembrane pressure on total resistance of the fouled polysulfone membrane is displayed in Fig. 6. It has been explained that the increase of polysulfone concentration improves the resulted membrane hydrophobicity, which leads to the enhancement of humic substance interaction with the membrane surface and results in higher fouling resistance. By increasing the transmembrane pressure, the total resistance of the fouled membrane is increased. In this case, higher drag permeation effect plays an important role in increasing the fouling resistance of the membrane. at 24%wt of polysulfone concentration, the total resistance seems slight decrease as the increase in transmembrane pressure. Improvement in fouling resistance may be attributed to the tight skin layer formation due to the high concentration of polysulfone, which is mainly dominated by reversible fouling.




FIGURE 6. Total resistance of polysulfone membranes during two (2) hours of peat water filtration at different transmembrane pressures

Flux loss of the polysulfone membranes at various transmembrane pressures is shown in Table 3. As the transmembrane pressure is raised, flux loss of the membranes during two (2) hours of peat water filtration becomes higher. It suggests that higher transmembrane pressure enhances the accumulated humic substances, which increase the fouling resistance of the polysulfone membrane. However, the insignificant increase of flux loss during peat water filtration is found with the increase of transmembrane pressure.

**TABLE 3.** Flux loss during two (2) hours of peat water filtration in different transmembrane pressure

| Transmembrane pressure (psig) | Flux loss (%) |       |       |       |       |       |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                               | PSf-1         | PSf-2 | PSf-3 | PSf-4 | PSf-5 | PSf-6 |
| 10                            | 94            | 94    | 70    | 71    | -     | -     |
| 15                            | 95            | 95    | 88    | 78    | 54    | 45    |
| 30                            | -             | 97    | 94    | 81    | 66    | 55    |

## CONCLUSIONS

Fouling and rejection of humic substances in various compositions of polysulfone membrane and transmembrane pressure have been investigated. It is found that the increase of polysulfone concentration in membrane solution reduces the pure water flux of the membrane due to smaller pore size formation that attributed by the enhancement of kinetic hindrance of the membrane solution. The pure water flux (PWF) significantly decreases from 1230 to 7 Lm<sup>-2</sup>h<sup>-1</sup>, when the polysulfone concentration is increased from 14% to 24%wt. However, the tight membrane pore size contributes to higher humic substances rejection. More than 80% rejection of humic substances is achieved when 18%wt of polysulfone concentration is added into membrane solution.

The increase of polysulfone concentration also affects the fouling behavior of the membranes. High concentration of polysulfone leads to the improvement of membrane hydrophobicity, which more susceptible to humic substances fouling and results in higher fouling resistance. However, this fouling is dominated by reversible fouling that could be easily cleaned by flushing method. It results in higher flux recovery ratio (FRR) of the membrane after two (2) hours of peat water filtration. Almost of 90% of FRR is achieved by the addition of 18%wt of polysulfone concentration. Further addition of polysulfone in membrane solution leads to lower FRR before it reaches its stationary point.

The applied transmembrane pressure (TMP) during peat water filtration also plays an important role in the fouling behavior of polysulfone membrane. It is observed that irreversible fouling of organic matter is deteriorated by the increase of TMP due to drag permeation effect. Therefore, higher humic substance concentration is found in permeate when high TMP is applied during peat water filtration. More stable membrane flux performance is found at 20% wt concentration of polysulfone, although it is operated at high TMP.

Higher peat water flux decline occurs when the system is operated at low transmembrane pressure. It may be attributed to the longer period of membrane exposure to the raw water. On the other hand, higher transmembrane pressure increases the drag permeation rate, which allows the humic substances molecules to penetrate through the ultrafiltration membrane. Therefore, it contributes to lower humic substances rejection.

## REFERENCES

1. G. Jonsson and I. Wenten, presented at the Proceedings of the ASEAN-EC Workshop on Membrane Technology in Agro-Based Industry (Kuala-Lumpur, Malaysia, 1994, unpublished).
2. L. D. Nghiem and S. Hawkes, *Desalination*, **236** (1), 273-281 (2009).
3. I. Wenten, D. Koenhen, H. Roesink, A. Rasmussen and G. Jonsson, Proceedings of Engineering of Membrane Processes, II Environmental Applications (Ciocco, Italy, 1994).
4. M. Goosen, S. Sablani, H. Al- Hinai, S. Al- Obeidani, R. Al- Belushi and D. Jackson, *Sep. Sci. Tech.* **39** (10), 2261-2297 (2005).
5. A. Al-Amoudi and R. W. Lovitt, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **303** (1), 4-28 (2007).
6. W. Yuan and A. L. Zydney, *Env. Sci. Tech.*, **34** (23), 5043-5050 (2000).
7. W. Yuan and A. L. Zydney, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **157** (1), 1-12 (1999).
8. H. A. Mousa, *Desalination* **217** (1), 38-51 (2007).
9. M. Aroon, A. Ismail, M. Montazer-Rahmati and T. Matsuura, *Sep. Purif. Tech.*, **72** (2), 194-202 (2010).
10. P. T. P. Aryanti, Khoiruddin and I. G. Wenten, *J. Water Sustainability* **3** (2), 85-96 (2013).
11. G. Bakeri, A. Ismail, M. Shariaty-Niassar and T. Matsuura, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **363** (1), 103-111 (2010).

12. M. Sivakumar, D. R. Mohan and R. Rangarajan, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **268** (2), 208-219 (2006).
13. M.-J. Han and S.-T. Nam, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **202** (1), 55-61 (2002).
14. A. W. Zularisam, A. F. Ismail and R. Salim, *Desalination* **194** (1-3), 211-231 (2006).
15. A. Zularisam, A. F. Ismail, M. Salim, M. Sakinah and O. Hiroaki, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **299** (1), 97-113 (2007).
16. H. Yu, Y. Cao, G. Kang, J. Liu, M. Li and Q. Yuan, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **342** (1), 6-13 (2009).
17. D. Rana and T. Matsuura, *Chem. Rev.*, **110** (4), 2448-2471 (2010).
18. L. Li, G. Yan and J. Wu, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.* **111** (4), 1942-1946 (2009).
19. Z. Yi, L.-P. Zhu, Y.-Y. Xu, Y.-F. Zhao, X.-T. Ma and B.-K. Zhu, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **365** (1), 25-33 (2010).
20. S. Mousavi, E. Saljoughi, Z. Ghasemipour and S. Hosseini, *Polym. Eng. Sci.* **52** (10), 2196-2205 (2012).
21. H. Wang, T. Yu, C. Zhao and Q. Du, *Fibers and Polymer*. **10** (1), 1-5 (2009).
22. Y. Ma, F. Shi, J. Ma, M. Wu, J. Zhang and C. Gao, *Desalination* **272** (1), 51-58 (2011).
23. B. Chakrabarty, A. Ghoshal and M. Purkait, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **309** (1), 209-221 (2008).
24. P. T. P. Aryanti, S. Subagio, D. Ariono and I. G. Wenten, *J Mem. Sci. Res.* **1** (Issue 1), 41-45 (2015).
25. P. Aryanti, R. Yustiana, R. Purnama and I. Wenten, *Mem. Water Treatment* **6** (5), 379-392 (2015).
26. R. Beckett, Z. Jue and J. C. Giddings, *Env. Sci. Tech.*, **21** (3), 289-295 (1987).
27. S. J. Traina, J. Novak and N. E. Smeck, *J. Env. Quality* **19** (1), 151-153 (1990).
28. R. W. Baker, *Membrane Technology and Applications*, 2nd Edition ed. (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. , 2004).
29. A. Mehta and A. L. Zydney, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **249** (1), 245-249 (2005).
30. A. F. Ismail, N. Ridzuan and S. Abdul Rahman, Songklanakarin, *J. Sci. Tech.* **24** (Suppl), 1025-1043 (2002).
31. P. Machado, A. Habert and C. Borges, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **155** (2), 171-183 (1999).
32. M. Mulder, (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996).
33. M. Mänttari, L. Puro, J. Nuortila-Jokinen and M. Nyström, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **165** (1), 1-17 (2000).
34. S. Madaeni, S. N. Sedeh and M. De Nobili, *Transport in Porous Media*, **65** (3), 469-484 (2006).
35. A. R. Costa and M. N. de Pinho, *Desalination* **145** (1), 299-304 (2002).
36. P. Aryanti and I. G. Wenten, in *The 5th AUN/SEED-Net Regional Conference on Global Environment* (Bandung - Indonesia, 2012).
37. C. Jucker and M. M. Clark, *J. Mem. Sci.*, **97** (0), 37-52 (1994).
38. I. Chang, C. Lee and K. Ahn, *Sep. Sci. Tech.*, **34** (9), 1743-1758 (1999).
39. J. Hanemaaijer, T. Robbertsen, T. Van den Boomgaard, C. Olieman, P. Both and D. Schmidt, *Desalination*, **68** (2), 93-108 (1988).