

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Nguyen, Thanh-Tin, Kook, Seungho, Lee, Chulmin, Field, Robert and Kim, In S. (2019) Critical flux-based membrane fouling control of forward osmosis: Behavior, sustainability, and reversibility. Journal of Membrane Science, 570571. pp. 380-393. ISSN 0376-7388

Published by: Elsevier

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2018.10.062>
<<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2018.10.062>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/42213/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

1 **Critical flux-based membrane fouling control of forward osmosis:**
2 **Behavior, sustainability, and reversibility**

3
4 Thanh-Tin Nguyen, Seungho Kook, Chulmin Lee, Robert W. Field*, In S. Kim**
5
6 Global Desalination Research Center (GDRC), School of Earth Sciences and Environmental
7 Engineering, Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology, 123 Cheomdangwagi-ro, Buk-gu,
8 Gwangju 61005, Korea

9
10 *Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

11
12 ** Corresponding author.

13 In S. Kim

14 Email: iskim@gist.ac.kr

15 Telephone: +82-62-715-2477

16 Fax: +82-62-715-2434

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Membrane fouling is closely related to the concept of critical flux. Therefore, a fouling control
26 strategy for forward osmosis (FO) membranes that is based on the critical flux is necessary. This
27 study systematically investigated the critical flux behavior of FO membranes (CTA and PA-TFC)
28 in the short-term using a stepping method (draw solution (DS) concentration stepping). In addition,
29 to test the reliability of this method, long-term experiments were conducted to evaluate the
30 influences of operational critical flux on the fouling behavior (sustainable operation and fouling
31 reversibility/irreversibility), thereby determining the critical flux for reversibility. Our results
32 showed that the DS concentration stepping could be applied for critical flux determination in FO.
33 Both membranes exhibited higher critical flux values for alginate fouling compared to other single
34 foulants such as colloidal silica or gypsum. The values were 15.9 LMH for a cellulose triacetate
35 membrane (CTA) and 20.5 LMH for the polyamide thin-film composite (PA-TFC). Whilst these
36 values should be adequate in FO applications they were determined for single foulants. The
37 presence of multispecies of foulants caused a significant decline in the critical flux values. This
38 study found 5.4 LMH for the CTA membrane and 8.3 LMH for the PA-TFC membrane for the
39 combined foulants of alginate + gypsum. This indicates that the critical flux behavior in FO was
40 dependent on the foulant type and membrane type. Importantly, 98-100% restoration of water flux
41 was achieved with the PA-TFC membrane at an operation either close to or below critical flux (i.e.,
42 in case of negligible fouling), except for the combination of alginate-combined colloidal silica. The
43 critical fluxes for reversibility obtained in this study will aid the efficient operation of practical FO
44 processes.

45
46 **Keywords:** Critical flux; Single foulant; Combined foulant; Forward osmosis membrane; Critical
47 flux for reversibility.

48 1. Introduction

49 Forward Osmosis (FO) is an osmotically driven membrane process in which water is transported
50 from low osmotic pressure (feed solution) to high osmotic pressure (draw solution) across the
51 semipermeable membrane through the action of a chemical potential gradient [1]. Hybrid FO
52 processes have recently emerged as possible systems for the simultaneous treatment of
53 impaired/reclaimed water and seawater for reuse [2] [3] [4] [5] since standalone FO process cannot
54 economically achieve either water treatment or desalination of seawater. These hybrid processes
55 can bring many advantages regarding the energy consumption and the water quality: i) decrease of
56 desalinated energy cost because seawater is diluted before entering RO desalination, ii) reduction
57 of the fouling propensity of the RO stage through pretreatment of impaired water; (iii) a multi-
58 barrier protection is established to improve contaminant removal; thereby giving opportunity for
59 safe and high-quality reuse of impaired water [5] [6] [7]. In detail, complex wastewater (i.e., raw
60 sewage, primary effluent, secondary effluent, biologically treated wastewater effluent) can be
61 directly pre-treated by FO process (i.e., pre-treated wastewater or pre-concentrated wastewater)
62 and subsequently potable water can be produced by combining with a draw solute recovery process
63 (i.e., reverse osmosis or membrane distillation) [8] [9]. Despite less impact of fouling compared to
64 RO (i.e. due to the absence of hydraulic pressure) the performance and large-scale implementation
65 of FO process can be significantly affected by fouling [10]. The fouling, or to be more precise, the
66 flux decline occurring with an FO membrane is generally considered to be less severe than that
67 with a RO membrane. This has been attributed by some to the absence of applied hydraulic
68 pressure; the foulant layer on a FO membrane is said to be looser whereas that on an RO membrane
69 is said to be more densely compacted [11]. On the other hand others have found no difference in
70 flux decline between FO and RO fouling, and attributed this to the low starting flux which was said
71 to be below the critical flux [12]. Others have specifically suggested that foulant layer compaction

72 is physically related to water flux not hydraulic pressure [13] **ADD [new ref]**. Three major types
73 of fouling occur in the FO membrane: (1) organic fouling caused by macromolecular organic
74 compounds as polysaccharides, protein, and humic acid; (2) inorganic fouling involving the scaling
75 with the crystallization of sparingly soluble mineral salts and colloidal fouling with the deposition
76 of particles; (3) biofouling from bacteria attachment [14].

77

78 **Membrane fouling is closely related to the concept of the critical flux, which was originally**
79 **introduced by several authors [15] [16] [17], who reported: “below the critical flux, fouling occurs**
80 **insignificant, whereas, above the critical flux, fouling becomes more severed”**. Therefore, the
81 critical flux concept has been widely introduced to the full range of pressure-driven membrane
82 processes, including microfiltration (MF) [18], ultrafiltration (UF) [19] [20], nanofiltration (NF)
83 [21] [22] and even in RO [23] [24], to control fouling in desalination and water treatment processes.

84 **An operation below a critical value, called critical flux (where the distinction is between no fouling**
85 **and fouling) or threshold flux (where the distinction is between low fouling and more extensive**
86 **fouling) is favorable to the control of membrane fouling and thus the maintenance of sustainable**
87 **operation [25]. Membrane fouling comprises reversible and irreversible fouling, the difference**
88 **being based on the degree of attachment of foulants to the membrane surface. This is a vital**
89 **assessment to quantify the fouling propensity as well as the potential recovery of water flux. A**
90 **sufficient shear force (i.e., physical flushing) can be used for the removal of reversible fouling but**
91 **this is not the case with irreversible fouling. Numerous authors have investigated the fouling**
92 **reversibility of FO under various scenarios: single fouling (i.e., alginate [26] [27], colloidal silica**
93 **[26] [27], gypsum scaling [14] [28] [29], combined fouling (i.e., alginate + colloidal silica [27],**
94 **alginate + gypsum scaling [14]), different membrane types [28] [30], and operating condition (i.e.,**
95 **effect of applied hydraulic pressure [27] [31]). Their results indicated that a higher restoration of**

96 water flux is obtained with single foulants. Nevertheless, the effect of various initial fluxes
97 (achieved by varying DS concentration) on the fouling reversibility has not been fully explored
98 yet. The critical flux for reversibility has previously been introduced for pressure-driven process;
99 efficiency and economical operation are favoured by operation below this value [32]. Thus, this
100 concept is also expected to be applicable in FO membrane processes. To determine the critical flux,
101 several methods can be used: flux–pressure profile, flux stepping, flux cycling, mass balance, and
102 fouling rate analysis [32]. In particular, the stepping method is commonly used in pressure-driven
103 membrane processes for critical flux determination, in which either the transmembrane pressure
104 (TMP) or the flux is increased stepwise, and the response (either flux or TMP) is observed [32]
105 [33].

106
107 Nevertheless, hitherto, little attention has been directed to the role of the critical flux of osmotically
108 driven processes (FO) in controlling membrane fouling compared to that of pressure-driven
109 processes (RO, NF, and UF). For instance, several authors have investigated the critical flux
110 governing the fouling in the FO membrane through observations and experiments (Table 1) [34]
111 [35] [36]. These studies have not systematically investigated the various fouling scenarios essential
112 for applications such as the simultaneous treatment of impaired water for reuse and seawater
113 desalination. In addition, past studies have focused on studying the commercial membranes
114 principally those with low to moderate permeability from HTI (i.e. their, cellulose triacetate (CTA)
115 and thin film composite (TFC)). However, a newly developed polyamide thin-film composite (PA-
116 TFC) from the Toray company was recently introduced as a potential candidate for the practical
117 application due to its high permeability [37] [38] [39]. Therefore, a comparison of critical flux
118 behavior between the former and latter membrane is essential to aid membrane selection.
119 Moreover, as aforementioned, critical flux for reversibility is definitely beneficial but previous

120 studies (Table 1) have not performed the essential long-term evaluation. Therefore our work
121 included a systematic study on the critical flux behavior in longer term operation whilst also
122 comparing: CTA from HTI Company with PA-TFC membrane from Toray Company.

123
124 As mentioned above the stepping method is well known for the characterization of critical flux in
125 pressure-driven processes. This was adapted for the current study. Instead of using pressure
126 stepping (or flux stepping), the draw solution (DS) concentration stepping method (0.25–3 M) was
127 used for the critical flux determination in various FO fouling scenarios under the short-term test.
128 Moreover, to test the reliability of the DS concentration stepping method in this study, an essential
129 investigation of the sustainability of the water fluxes was also performed in a series of long-term
130 tests. These were run to determine membrane fouling behavior above the determined value of
131 critical flux, at critical flux, and below critical flux. Additionally, in the current study, to solve the
132 gap of the previous studies as mentioned beforehand, an assessment of the fouling reversibility
133 around critical flux conditions was also made in order to determine the critical flux for reversibility.

134

135

136

137 **Table 1.** Summary of previous studies related to critical flux in FO membranes

Test method	Application	Foulant	Membrane	Results	Reference
Fouling surface coverage using direct microscopic observation through the me	Membrane-based seawater desalination	Latex microparticles (3 μm)	Cellulose Triacetate (CTA) flat sheet membrane (HTI)	FO critical flux for latex filtration was approximately 28 LMH. AL-FS orientation more fouling resistant than AL-DS. Feed spacer was able to considerably enhance initial flux and critical flux in FO (> 52 LMH)	[34]
Stepping method: Flux stepping (concentration stepping)	Membrane-based microalgae filtration	Microalgae 100 mg/L	Cellulose Triacetate (CTA) flat sheet membrane (HTI)	FO critical flux was between 9.3 and 15.5 LMH. Stable flux can be obtained by operating below the critical flux. Fouling was more severe and less reversible due to the presence of divalent ions (Mg^{2+}). A higher critical flux of 21 LMH was obtained with spacers in the feed channel	[35]
Long-term test: Flux decline observation	Membrane-based seawater desalination	Humic acid: 200 mg/L Alginate: 200 mg/L	Cellulose triacetate (CTA), thin-film composite (TFC) FO membrane (HTI) and TFC FO (Porifera Inc.)	Low-fouling behavior observed in FO (AL-FS), while operating at lower permeation of 10 LMH.	[36]

139

140

141

142 **2. Materials and methods**

143 **2.1. FO membranes and characterization**

144 FO membranes used in the current study include the CTA membrane from Hydration Technologies
145 Inc., USA and a PA-TFC membrane from Toray Chemical Korea Inc., Korea. The CTA membrane
146 was fabricated from cellulose acetate embedded in a polyester woven mesh [14]. Meanwhile, the
147 PA-TFC membrane consisted of a selective polyamide active layer formed by interfacial
148 polymerization on top of a polysulfone porous substrate [39]. Prior to experimental use, the FO
149 membranes were soaked in deionized (DI) water and stored at 4 °C. For the membrane
150 characterization, a cross-section of the pristine membrane was used to determine its thickness and
151 the membrane morphology was analyzed using a high-resolution field-emission gun scanning
152 electron microscope (FE-SEM), LEO Ge- mini 1525 (Carl Zeiss). The contact angle, determined
153 using the sessile drop approach (Kruss G10 goniometer, Kruss, Germany), was used to characterize
154 the hydrophobicity/hydrophilicity. The roughness of the membranes was determined using atomic
155 force microscopy (AFM). To measure the A, B and S parameters, this study followed the
156 procedures of the previous works [38] [40]. In detail, water permeability (A) and solute
157 permeability (B) were determined using a pressure-driven filtration unit whilst structural parameter
158 (S) was defined using an osmosis-driven filtration unit. For the permeability test, a stable water
159 flux was obtained after membrane compaction test (10 bar) using DI within 2 hours. Afterwards,
160 under an applied hydraulic pressure of 10 bar with 2000 ppm NaCl solution, water and solute
161 permeability were determined by measuring the mass of permeate and NaCl rejection. For osmosis-
162 driven filtration unit, water flux was measured in FO mode with DI (feed solution) and NaCl
163 solution as draw solution (with concentrations of 0.1, 0.2, 0.5 and 1.0 M). The S parameter was
164 calculated from the data, the pre-determined A and B values, following the equations given in a
165 previous study [40].

166 The specific properties of the membranes including water permeability (A), solute permeability
 167 (B), thickness, hydrophobicity/hydrophilicity, surface roughness, are detailed in Table 2. The
 168 average roughness of PA-TFC and CTA are 50.5 nm and 23.9 nm, respectively, suggesting that
 169 the PA-TFC membrane has a rougher active layer surface. The lower contact angle of the PA-TFC
 170 indicates a more hydrophilic surface.

171 **Table 2.** Specific membrane properties

Properties		CTA	PA-TFC
Membrane thickness (μm)		59.3 ± 24.0	91.4 ± 1.3
Average surface roughness (nm)	Active layer	23.9 ± 8.9	50.5 ± 2.2
	Support layer	11.1 ± 1.6	20.4 ± 3.4
Hydrophobicity ($^\circ$)	Active layer	50.0 ± 2.4	40.3 ± 2.4
	Support layer	58.1 ± 0.3	48.4 ± 0.7
Water permeability (A) (LMH Bar^{-1})		0.821	8.818
Solute permeability (B) (m s^{-1})		1.672×10^{-7}	2.457×10^{-7}
Structure parameter (S) (μm)		477 ± 30	276 ± 13

172

173 **2.2. Model foulants**

174 The model foulants used for the fouling experiments consist of sodium alginate, colloidal silica,
 175 and gypsum scaling, which represent the primary constituents of the major inorganic and organic
 176 components in wastewater effluent or surface water. Sodium alginate was used as the organic
 177 foulant; it consists of polysaccharides, in the molecular weight range of 12–80 kDa and is
 178 negatively charged [41]. It was obtained in powder form from Sigma–Aldrich, USA. Prior to
 179 introducing it into the feed solution (FS), 2 g/L of the sodium alginate stock solution was prepared
 180 by completely dissolving the powder in DI water for 24 h before keeping it at 4 $^\circ\text{C}$. Colloidal silica
 181 (Snowtex ST-ZL) supplied by Nissan Chemical Industries, Tokyo, Japan, was used to represent
 182 the suspended colloidal matter. An average particle size of 139 nm was detailed by Bo et al. [42],
 183 for a colloidal suspension containing 40% w/w amorphous silica and 60% w/w water. The colloidal
 184 silica was stirred for 1 h to achieve complete dispersion before its use in the feed solution. With

185 regard to gypsum scaling experiments, stock solutions of 1 M CaCl₂ and 1 M Na₂SO₄, were
186 vigorously mixed for 24 h and then kept at 4 °C.

187

188 2.3. Feed and draw solutions

189 The FS used contained 10-mM NaCl for the baseline experiment and the fouling experiments. The
190 concentration of foulants in the feed solution was fixed at 200 mg/L and 1,000 mg/L for alginate
191 and silica, respectively whilst gypsum scaling was formed from 20-mM Na₂SO₄ and 20-mM CaCl₂.
192 The foulant concentrations were introduced either for single fouling or mixed fouling. To avoid the
193 effect a changes in the total ionic strength (IS) on flux behavior, the total IS was maintained at 0.13
194 M. To achieve this in the short-term operation (section 2.5) a fresh feed solution was prepared for
195 each step of DS concentration.. In brief, the detailed compositions of the FS for the baseline
196 experiment and fouling experiments are listed in Table 3. The FS pH was retained at 7.05 ± 0.03
197 using either 0.1-M NaOH solution or 0.5-M HCl solution. The concentration range of the NaCl DS
198 (0.25–3 M) was adjusted based on the experimental protocol of the short-term critical flux
199 determination experiment (described in detail in section 2.5).


200 **Table 3.** Components of feed solution for baseline and fouling experiments

Foulants	NaCl (mM)	Silica colloid (mg/L)	Alginate (mg/L)	Na ₂ SO ₄ (mM)	CaCl ₂ (mM)	IS Total (M)
Baseline experiment	10	0	0	40	0	0.13
Alginate	10	0	200	40	0	0.13
Colloidal silica	10	1000	0	40	0	0.13
Gypsum	10	0	0	20	20	0.13
Alginate + Colloidal silica	10	1000	200	40	0	0.13
Alginate + Gypsum	10	0	200	20	20	0.13

201 IS: Ionic Strength

202 2.4. Lab-scale FO system setup

203 Fig. 1 shows a schematic diagram of the lab-scale FO system. The system was operated in the
 204 cross-flow mode for all experiments. An acrylic FO cell consisting of two rectangular channels
 205 with dimensions of 75 mm (length) \times 25 mm (width) \times 3 mm (height) and an effective filtration
 206 area of 1875 mm², was used to evaluate water permeation. No spacer was used for both the feed
 207 and draw channels of the FO cell. A similar cross-flow velocity (CFV) of 6.66 cm/s using flow
 208 meters was maintained in both the feed and draw channels. Circulation in counter-current mode
 209 was maintained using a magnetic drive gear pump (GAF-T23-DEMSE MICROPUMP Inc., USA).
 210 For the physical cleaning experiment, a high CFV of 13.32 cm/s was imposed on the feed side for
 211 30 min with DI water. Additionally, to check the maintenance of the FO mode, pressure gauges
 212 were installed in the DS and FS channels. The temperature was maintained at 23 \pm 1 °C for the FS
 213 and DS using a water bath. An electronic mass balance (GF-6100, A&D Company, Japan) was
 214 used to record the variation in the DS mass to enable the calculation of the water flux.



215
 216 **Figure 1.** Schematic diagram of lab-scale FO system

217 **2.5. Short-term critical flux determination experiment**

218 For a typical critical-flux determination experiment, a membrane was placed in the test cell and
219 CFV adjustments of the DS and FS were made to reach the desired value of 6.66 cm/s. The DS and
220 FS were prepared with the same volume of 2 L. A stabilization testing for 30 min was performed
221 using DI water for both the FS and DS sides prior to the stepping experiments. Then DS
222 concentrations of 0.25-, 0.5-, 1.0-, 1.5-, 2.0-, and 3.0-M NaCl were employed consecutively to
223 conduct the DS concentration stepping method. Each test included the baseline stage (without
224 foulant) followed by the fouling stage. A difference between the two stages was the presence of
225 foulants in the FS in the latter stage. To avoid the influence of excessive DS dilution and FS
226 concentration, which may change the osmotic pressure, a stepping duration of 30 min was selected
227 from the study of Zou et al. [43]. Consequently, in every minute only 0.17–0.68 mL (CTA
228 membrane) and 0.29–1.26 mL (PA-TFC membrane) with respect to the DS concentration of 0.25–
229 3 M was permeated into 2 L of the DS; therefore such weak dilutions have a negligible effect. A
230 membrane orientation with the active layer facing the FS (AL-FS) was applied throughout all tests.

231

232 **2.6. Long-term FO fouling experiment**

233 To check the reliability of the DS concentration stepping method for the critical-flux determination
234 in the FO membrane, a long-term experiment was conducted to evaluate the influences of
235 operational critical flux on the fouling behavior including fouling reversibility/irreversibility. From
236 the critical flux value determined from the short-term experiments, operations above value, at this
237 value, and below this value were investigated for various fouling scenarios for both the CTA and
238 PA-TFC membranes (Table S-1). Similar to the short-term test, a FO test using DI water on both
239 the DS and FS sides was conducted to stabilize the system for the 30 min prior to the baseline
240 experiments. As FO flux reduction may also be influenced by factors other than fouling, such as
241 the dilution of the DS, which occurs in the AL-FS of an FO membrane [44], the baseline tests

242 (where foulant was absent) were also performed as a control test. The fouling experiments were
243 conducted by maintaining identical conditions of CFV, pH, and temperature corresponding to the
244 baseline tests. In the presence of a foulant, a water flux decline was observed. This is primarily due
245 to two factors: lower osmotic pressure due to dilution of DS and concentration of FS, and fouling
246 [44]. The extent of fouling could be evaluated by comparing the water flux curve of a fouled
247 membrane to the baseline which had similarly been influenced by dilution of DS and concentration
248 of FS. For every foulant, the length of the tests was 10 h. A physical cleaning test (water flushing)
249 was immediately performed for 30 min with an increased CFV value (as mentioned in section 2.3)
250 prior to repeating a baseline experiment with a reduction to the initial CFV. Subsequently, flux
251 recovery of the membrane was systematically evaluated to check for fouling reversibility, thereby
252 enabling a determination of the critical flux for irreversibility. During the physical cleaning
253 process, the feed was DI water, and the DS channel drained to ensure the absence of permeate flux
254 through the membrane.

255

256 **2.7. Parameter determination**

257 **2.7.1. Water flux**

258 In brief, the water flux was calculated based on the volume changes in the permeate as a function
259 of time (minute by minute), which was adopted from the prior studies. The equation for water flux
260 is as follows:

261

$$262 \quad J_t = \frac{1}{A_m} \frac{\Delta V}{\Delta t} \quad (1)$$

263

264 where J_t is the water flux (LMH) at time t , A_m is the effective membrane area (m^2 , $0.001875 m^2$ in
265 the current study), V is the volume of collected permeate (L), and t is the time for collecting the
266 permeate (h).

267

268 **2.7.2. Quantification of water flux decline for long-term experiments**

269 To evaluate the water flux decline caused by the effect of dilution or fouling, the percentage of flux
270 decline was considered to access the long-term operation. In the baseline experiment, a water flux
271 decline due to the effect of concentrating the FS and DS dilutions [44], which led to the loss of
272 osmotic driving force across the membrane is presented as follows:

$$273 \text{ \% flux decline in baseline test} = (1 - J_{wb}/J_{wbo}) \times 100\% \quad (2)$$

274

275 where J_{wb}/J_{wbo} is a normalized flux of the baseline experiment; J_{wb} is the final flux of the baseline
276 experiment (LMH); J_{wbo} is the initial flux of baseline experiment (LMH).

277 Meanwhile, a flux decline was induced simultaneously by the effect of dilution and the occurrence
278 of fouling in the fouling experiment:

279

$$280 \text{ \% flux decline in fouling test} = (1 - J_{wf}/J_{wfo}) \times 100\% \quad (3)$$

281 where J_{wf}/J_{wfo} is a normalized flux of the fouling experiment; J_{wf} is the final flux of the fouling
282 experiment (LMH); J_{wfo} is the initial flux of the fouling experiment (LMH)

283

284

285

286 **2.7.3. Fouling reversibility**

287 The reversibility of the fouling layer deposited on an active layer was determined using physical
288 cleaning for 30 min with elevated CFV (twice the value used in the fouling experiment). The
289 cleaning effectiveness is shown in the equation below:

$$290 \quad R (\%) = \frac{J_c - J_a}{J_b - J_a} \times 100 \quad (4)$$


291 where J_a is the water flux after the fouling experiment (LMH); J_b is the water flux before fouling
292 (pristine membrane) (LMH); J_c is the water flux after physical cleaning (LMH).

293

294 **3. Results and discussion**

295 **3.1. Critical flux determination using single foulant**

296 A comparison of the results from the baseline tests with those from single fouling tests is shown in
297 Fig. 2. The DS concentration was gradually increased via stepping from 0.25 M to 3 M with a step
298 interval of 30 min. The results allowed the determination of the critical flux behavior for an FO
299 single foulant. Regarding the baseline experiments, the water flux increased as the DS
300 concentration (and hence the osmotic driving force) was increased. A stable flux was obtained in
301 the baseline tests at various DS concentrations (0.25–2 M) for both the CTA and PA-TFC
302 membranes. However for the 3-M DS, a slight water flux decline was observed under the baseline
303 condition due to the combination of FS concentration and DS dilution; both lead to a loss of osmotic
304 driving force across the membrane [44]. The water flux of PA-TFC is approximately two times
305 higher than that of the CTA membrane, as shown in Fig. 2, despite having the same DS
306 concentration. This is due to the PA-TFC membrane having a lower structural parameter and
307 contact angle, and a much higher 'A' parameter (see Table 2). Subsequently, foulants such as
308 alginate (200 mg/L), colloidal silica (1000 mg/L), and gypsum scaling (20 mM Na₂SO₄ and 20
309 mM CaCl₂) were added singularly into the FS. The variation of water flux upon fouling with single
310 foulants is presented in Fig. 2.



312

313 **Figure 2.** Flux behavior of various single foulants: alginate (a, b), colloidal silica (c, d), gypsum
 314 scaling (e, f), for a range of DS-concentrations (0.25–3 M) for the CTA membrane (left) and PA-
 315 TFC membrane (right)


316

317 The degree of fouling can be evaluated by comparing the water flux curve of a fouled membrane
 318 to the baseline. It is noteworthy that the fouling rate at various single fouling scenarios was

319 gradually promoted as the DS concentration is increased, corresponding to elevated water flux. The
320 increase in membrane fouling with a higher initial flux can be primarily attributed to the larger
321 hydrodynamic drag force that enhances the foulant deposition onto the membrane [46] [44] [47].
322 With respect to alginate fouling (Fig. 2-a, b), the flux curves overlap with the baseline flux curves
323 for DS concentrations of 0.25–1.5 M (flux: 2.7–12.5 LMH), and 0.25–0.5 M (flux: 8.3–12.8 LMH)
324 for the CTA and PA-TFC membranes, respectively. Otherwise, the water flux started deviating
325 from the baseline at higher DS concentrations of 2 M (CTA) and 1 M (PA-TFC), directly indicating
326 a reduction in water flux at these conditions due to the addition of alginate. In some cases the water
327 flux fouling flux did not decline although the initial flux in fouling was lower than that of the
328 baseline. This same trend was observed in a study by Zou et al., [43], who observed foulant
329 deposition onto a membrane using direct microscopic observation.

330
331 Fig. 2-c, d, e, f present the fouling trends of colloidal silica and of gypsum scaling with respect to
332 each DS concentration (0.25–3 M). Similarly, an overlap between the fouling flux and baseline
333 flux was observed for DS of 0.25–1.5 M for the CTA membrane, which shows the same trend as
334 alginate fouling. We can assume that the CTA membrane is less sensitive to various single foulants
335 when operating at a low or moderate initial flux. Meanwhile, for the PA-TFC membrane, this
336 overlap only appeared at a low DS of 0.25 M. A deviation from the baseline flux was immediately
337 recorded when operation at 1-M DS was started for both colloidal silica and gypsum scaling.
338 Specifically, a steady upward trend in fouling of the colloidal silica and gypsum was observed with
339 further increases in DS concentration. In particular the PA-TFC membrane was found to be more
340 prone to fouling by a single foulant at an operation of moderate or high initial flux (28.0–39.0
341 LMH). This agreed with the study of Yu et al. [49], who reported that severe fouling can occur
342 even at moderate flux levels (25 LMH), especially for PA-TFC. Additionally, they reported that

343 for TFC membranes the surface roughness plays a more dominant role over surface hydrophilicity
 344 in membrane fouling [49]. Moreover, membrane surface morphology has been demonstrated as a
 345 factor that largely affects the foulant–membrane interaction [48]. Therefore, with a much rougher
 346 surface (data in Table 2) and a higher initial flux (Fig. 1), the fouling by a single foulant in the PA-
 347 TFC membrane can be more significant, for a given DS concentration, compared to that with the
 348 CTA membrane. This result is also consistent with that of Mazlan et al. [30], who indicated a
 349 greater adhesion of foulant on the TFC active surface, which could be attributed to factors such as
 350 surface roughness, surface charge, surface chemical heterogeneity, and hydrodynamic effects.
 351 Finally we note that for the same flux of say 15.0 LMH the rate of fouling was similar for both
 352 membranes.




353 **Figure 3.** Critical flux behaviors when various single foulants (◇) alginate, (□) colloidal silica, and
 354 (○) gypsum scaling) were tested in AL-FS orientation for (a) CTA membrane and (b) PA-TFC
 355 membrane. The fouling flux was plotted against the baseline flux, and data points below the line
 356 with 1:1 slope indicate the occurrence of flux decline due to fouling.
 357

358

359 Based on the flux measurements, a precise determination of the critical flux values was made by
360 plotting the fouling flux (at the end of each DS concentration step) against the corresponding
361 baseline flux (Fig. 3). The line with a 1:1 slope denotes no fouling (i.e., fouling flux equals the
362 corresponding baseline flux). Each foulant type has specific properties (i.e., alginate: transparent
363 gel layer [31], colloidal silica: particulate [26] [50], gypsum: crystallization [51]), thus resulting in
364 various forms of membrane interactions, leading to different fouling potentials on the FO
365 membrane. When the FS contains only a single foulant, a mild fouling condition is induced but
366 with a strong membrane dependence [49]. Membrane surface properties (surface roughness, caused
367 by functional groups bonding) and hydrodynamic conditions (initial flux, cross-flow velocity) have
368 been known to be vital factors for controlling membrane fouling [30]. Therefore, a distinct critical
369 flux behavior between CTA and PA-TFC can be anticipated. As illustrated in Fig. 3-a, the critical
370 flux behavior of the CTA membrane for alginate fouling was found to be within the range of 12.5–
371 15.9 LMH (critical DS 1.5–2 M). A critical flux value of 12.5 LMH (critical DS 1.5 M) was found
372 for both the colloidal silica and gypsum scaling. Regarding PA-TFC, a higher critical flux was
373 found for alginate compared to the other foulants, the value being 20.5 LMH (critical DS 1 M)
374 compared to 12.8 LMH (critical DS 0.5 M). Interestingly, the critical flux values by the single
375 foulants were higher for the PA-TFC membrane compared to those of the CTA membrane although
376 previous studies have reported that PA-TFC has a more pronounced fouling propensity [49] [48]
377 [30]. As noted in [32], the length of experiments can influence the determination of the critical
378 flux values. Thus to refine the determination of critical values, an essential investigation into
379 operational critical fluxes with long-term experiments was performed (in section 3.3.1).

380

381 **3.2. Critical flux determination using combined foulant**




382
 383 **Figure 4.** Flux behavior of various combined foulants (a, b) alginate + colloidal silica, (c, d)
 384 alginate + gypsum scaling with the DS-concentration step function (0.25–3 M) for CTA membrane
 385 (left) and PA-TFC membrane (right)

386
 387 In general, various foulant types are present in wastewater and surface water. Therefore an
 388 investigation of the critical flux behavior by combined fouling is necessary. Fig. 4 presents the flux
 389 behavior of various combined foulants (i.e., alginate + colloidal silica, and alginate + gypsum
 390 scaling) as the DS-concentration is increased step wise from 0.25 to 3 M both for CTA membrane
 391 (a, c) and PA-TFC membrane (b, d). Regarding the CTA membrane, at low DS concentrations of
 392 0.25–0.5 M (corresponding to low flux of 2.7–5.4 LMH), an entire overlap between the fouling
 393 flux and baseline flux was observed for the combined foulants (Fig. 4-a, c), indicating negligible
 394 fouling. In contrast, at DS concentrations of 1–3 M (flux range 9.0–17.8 LMH), fouling started to

395 appear as indicated by the fouling flux deviating from the baseline flux. This indicates that for the
396 CTA membrane an effective control of combined fouling can only be achieved at an extremely low
397 initial flux, which might be insufficient for economical application of FO membrane process.

398
399 For the PA-TFC membrane, only DS of 0.25 M (corresponding to flux of 9.4 LMH) showed an
400 overlap between the fouling flux and baseline flux (i.e., negligible fouling). When the DS was
401 increased from 0.5 M to 3 M, fluxes in the range 12.8–39.0 LMH were found but there was
402 deviation between the fouling flux and the baseline flux for DS concentration of 0.5 M upwards.
403 The extent of fouling increased steadily with increased DS concentration. From Fig. 4, for each DS
404 concentration it can be observed that clear deviation follows the following order: alginate + gypsum
405 > alginate + colloidal silica. Also PA-TFC > CTA and the reasons for this are primarily due to the
406 higher initial flux [26] [50] [51] and rougher surface of the PA-TFC membrane (Table 2). The
407 finding of a more complex fouling by alginate combined with gypsum accords with those of others
408 [14] [49] [52]. Gu et al. [49] reported that severe fouling for PA-TFC at either moderate flux levels
409 of around 25.0 LMH or with combined foulants. They mentioned that in addition to membrane–
410 foulant interaction, foulant–foulant interaction was important [49]. Moreover and more generally,
411 previous studies have reported that a susceptibility to fouling occurs when the membrane surface
412 becomes covered by fouling [44] [49] [52]. Consequently, further deposition is governed by
413 interaction between the foulant cake layer and foulants in the FS [49].



415

416 **Figure 5.** Critical flux behaviors when various combinations of foulants: (\diamond) alginate + colloidal
 417 silica, (Δ) alginate + gypsum scaling were tested in the AL-FS orientation for (a) CTA membrane
 418 and (b) PA-TFC membrane. The fouling flux was plotted against the baseline flux, and data points
 419 below the line with 1:1 slope indicate the occurrence of flux decline due to fouling.

420


421 As illustrated in Fig. 5, the fouling flux is plotted against the corresponding baseline flux to
 422 determine the critical flux values for combined foulants. As mentioned above (section 3.1), the
 423 potential fouling on an FO membrane was different for each foulant type. However, when more
 424 than one type of foulant is present, the interaction among foulants can result in various changes
 425 such as physical changes in size and molecular weight and chemical changes e.g. charge and
 426 hydrophobicity [53] [41] [51] [52] [54]. Such changes explain the finding that the critical flux for
 427 the CTA membrane was just 5.2 LMH (corresponding to DS 0.5 M) for both combined fouling
 428 conditions. This value is to be compared to the finding that for single foulants the critical flux was
 429 between 12.5 and 15.9 LMH. The determination of the critical flux behavior of PA-TFC
 430 membranes under combined fouling conditions found that for alginate combined with colloidal

431 silica the critical flux was 12.8 LMH (corresponding to DS 0.5 M). Meanwhile, for alginate +
432 gypsum the value is lower than 9.4 LMH (corresponding to DS < 0.25 M). Whilst a short-term test
433 at a lower DS concentration was not performed, a DS concentration of 0.15 M was investigated in
434 long-term test of alginate + gypsum fouling (in section 3.3.2)

435

436 **3.3. Membrane fouling behavior in long-term tests**

437 **3.3.1 Single foulant**



438

439 **Figure 6.** Water flux behavior as a function of time for various single foulants under three
 440 operational conditions: above critical flux, at critical flux, and below critical flux. Single fouling
 441 experiments:(a, b) alginate, (c, d) colloidal silica, (e, f) gypsum scaling for CTA membrane (left)
 442 and PA-TFC membrane (right). $J_o \times J_f / J_b$ is a normalized representation of the extent of membrane
 443 fouling. J_o represents the initial flux, J_f is the flux in the fouling test, J_b is the baseline flux.

444 According to the critical flux value obtained in the short-term test (in section 3.1), a long-term
445 experiment of 10 h was performed to not only investigate the reliability of the DS concentration
446 stepping method but also to determine the influence of the fluxes around these critical values on
447 the fouling behavior. Fig. 6 shows the water flux decline as a function of time at various single
448 foulants under operational critical fluxes (above critical flux, at critical flux, below critical flux).
449 The desired DS concentration was changed based on the design shown in Table S-1. In the baseline
450 experiments for both membranes (Fig. S-2), water flux flows from the feed to the draw side,
451 inherently induces a simultaneous concentration of feed and dilution of the draw. A higher water
452 flux reduction was caused by the larger dilution [44], which became severe in the PA-TFC
453 membrane because of higher flux. For the CTA membrane, by comparing the water flux curve of
454 a fouled membrane to the baseline ($J_o \times J_f/J_b$ is a normalized representation of the extent of
455 membrane fouling), the extent of fouling could be evaluated for the various single foulants such as
456 alginate, colloidal, and gypsum (Fig. 6- a, c, e and Fig S-2-a, c, e). An unstable flux (Fig. 6) and a
457 flux reduction caused by fouling (Fig S-4) was observed above the critical flux, i.e., 3-M DS
458 (alginate), 2-M DS (colloidal silica), 2-M DS (gypsum), whereas negligible or even no fouling
459 occurred at the critical flux and below it. When operating below the critical flux, the flux decline
460 appears to result only from the effect of draw dilution (Fig. S-4), which indicates less sensitivity to
461 single fouling of the CTA membrane (as stated in section 3.1). These findings suggest the existence
462 of critical fluxes (J_{crit}) for single foulants and the CTA membrane as follows: $J_{crit} \approx 15.9$ LMH
463 (alginate), $J_{crit} \approx 12.5$ LMH (colloidal silica), $J_{crit} \approx 12.5$ LMH (gypsum). Obviously, a sustainable
464 operation without fouling could be achieved by setting an appropriate flux (i.e., close to or below
465 critical flux); this promotes the minimization of fouling of the CTA membrane by single foulants.
466

467 Regarding the PA-TFC membrane (Fig. 6-b, d, f and Fig S-2, b, d, f), fouling occurred above the
468 critical flux being considerable for colloidal silica, moderate for gypsum and slight for alginate,
469 with all being much greater compared to that with the CTA membrane. As mentioned in sections
470 3.1 and 3.2, either a high initial flux or the properties of the membrane surface (i.e., much rougher,
471 bonding of functional groups) was the primary reason of vulnerable fouling in the PA-TFC
472 membrane. This finding accords with others for instance, Mi et al. [55] demonstrated that surface
473 roughness caused an increase in the adhesion force between the PA-TFC membrane and a colloidal
474 silica gel layer. Kim et al. [56] also concluded that the structure of colloidal fouling was
475 significantly dependent on the initial permeate flux, with the fouling transitioning from fluid-like
476 to solid-like [57], thereby promoting excessive fouling [51]. According to previous studies, severe
477 fouling with colloidal silica is to be expected and for the resultant flux decline to be magnified by
478 the effect of cake enhanced-concentration polarization (CE-CP), thereby significantly increasing
479 the overall FO flux decline [42] [26] [50] [28]. Meanwhile, gypsum scaling was accelerated
480 because of a greater membrane surface roughness [58] [59] and the rich presence of the carboxylic
481 group (-COO-), which could interact with the Ca^{2+} ions to form a complex foulant [51] [59].
482 Additionally, the role of the initial flux was also pronounced in the gypsum scaling behavior, i.e.,
483 more than 50% water flux decline was recorded when the initial flux was increased from 10 LMH
484 to 25 LMH with PA-TFC [51]. Other previous studies have indicated that a dominant
485 heterogeneous crystallization occurs in gypsum scaling on PA-TFC, thus causing a much larger
486 degree of fouling than that with a CTA membrane [51] [29]. Fig. 6 and Fig. S-4 show that the
487 considerable flux decrease via fouling began to appear with colloidal silica foulant, when operating
488 above the critical flux condition. Contrastingly just a minor degree of fouling and a sustainable flux
489 were observed close to or below the critical values. When there is an acceptable minor degree of
490 fouling it has been suggested that the term threshold flux be used and it can be defined as the flux


491 at or below which low fouling occurs but above which the fouling rate increases significantly [25].
492 However this distinction is not made here. With single foulants and the PA-TFC membrane,
493 operation is super-critical at a higher flux of 20.0 LMH, but fouling control could be successfully
494 achieved by operation at the following values: $J_{\text{crit}} \approx 20.5$ LMH (alginate), $J_{\text{crit}} \approx 12.8$ LMH
495 (colloidal silica), $J_{\text{crit}} \approx 12.8$ LMH (gypsum).

496

497 3.3.2 Combined foulant

498 Fig. 7 depicts the water flux behavior as a function of time for various combined foulants under at
499 fluxes above critical flux, at critical flux, and below critical flux. The corresponding DS
500 concentrations are given in Table S-1. As discussed in section 3.2, the presence of colloidal silica
501 or gypsum partially contributed to the formation of a complex foulant layer, causing a more severe
502 fouling. For example, the study of Motsa et al. [41] demonstrated that the significant flux loss of
503 the CTA membrane in combined fouling (i.e., alginate + colloidal silica) was due to the hydraulic
504 resistance of a gel layer that hindered back diffusion of the colloid and gave rise to CE-CP. Their
505 experiments were operated with an initial flux of 15.8 LMH (i.e., DS 3.5 M). In addition, the
506 synergistic effect of combined fouling (i.e., alginate + gypsum) was investigated at an initial flux
507 of 17.6 LMH (DS 4 M), in which accelerated gypsum scaling due to CE-CP has been reported for
508 a CTA membrane [14]. Liu et al. [52] found that alginate molecules could act as nuclei for gypsum
509 crystal growth, thus considerably increasing the gypsum crystal size and aggravating their
510 deposition onto a CTA membrane; their experiments were operated with an initial flux of 16.2
511 LMH. However, in the current study with the CTA membrane, combined fouling (i.e., alginate +
512 gypsum) only a slight flux decline above the critical flux was observed. This is due to a lower initial
513 flux (operation was at 9.0 LMH corresponding to DS 1 M) and a lower Ca^{2+} concentration (i.e.,
514 20-mM Na_2SO_4 and 20-mM CaCl_2 was used in this study). In previous studies the initial fluxes

515 were 16.2–17.6 LMH and Ca^{2+} concentration was higher owing to the use of 20-mM Na_2SO_4 and
 516 35-mM CaCl_2 [14] [52]. Meanwhile in the present study sustainable fluxes were found at the
 517 critical flux and below the critical flux (i.e., DS 0.5 M and DS 0.25 M) (Fig. 7-a, c). Clearly with
 518 respect to the CTA membrane, control of combined fouling can be achieved by selection of an
 519 appropriate DS concentration; a lower DS concentration gives a lower initial flux.
 520



521
 522 **Figure 7.** Water flux behavior as a function of time for combined foulants under three operational
 523 conditions: above critical flux, at critical flux, and below critical flux. (a, b) alginate + colloidal
 524 silica, (c, d) alginate + gypsum scaling for CTA membrane (left) and PA-TFC membrane (right).
 525 $J_o \times J_f/J_b$ is a normalized representation of the extent of membrane fouling. J_o represents the initial
 526 flux, J_f is the flux in the fouling test and J_b is the flux in the baseline test.

527

528 Above the critical flux the water flux declined dramatically after 10 h of operation, indicating

529 significant fouling (Fig. 7-b, d and Fig S-3-b, d). However, a negligible fouling of PA-TFC was

530 observed below the critical flux for both combinations of mixed foulants, resulting in a sustainable

531 flux. The critical flux values for the combined foulants were different being $J_{crit} \approx 12.8$ LMH for

532 alginate + colloidal silica and $J_{crit} \approx 8.3$ LMH for alginate + gypsum. Clearly, for the PA-TFC

533 membrane fouling control with alginate + gypsum is more difficult than that of alginate with

534 colloidal silica. As discussed in section 3.1, for single gypsum fouling, the presence of a rich

535 carboxylic group (-COO-) in PA-TFC [37] could interact with the Ca^{2+} ions to generate a

536 homogeneous crystallization [52]; this being an example of adverse membrane–foulant interaction.

537 Moreover, this fouling becomes more severe in the presence of alginate (i.e., a large number of

538 negatively charged carboxylate (-COO-)). A more complex matrix with the calcium ion of gypsum

539 is created which increases the crystal size[14]; this being an example of adverse foulant–foulant

540 interaction. A summary of critical flux values is given in Table 4.

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548 **Table 4. Critical flux values for fouling (LMH)**

Foulants	Critical Flux for fouling (J_{crit})	
	CTA	PA-TFC

Single foulant		
Alginate	15.9	20.5
Colloidal silica	12.5	12.8
Gypsum	12.5	12.8
Combined foulants		
Alginate + gypsum	5.4	8.3
Alginate + colloidal silica	5.4	12.8

549 Note: The critical values above are specific for the FO membrane process with the conditions: i)
550 FO mode (AL-FS), ii) Feed and draw flow rate of 300 mL/min (equivalent CFV of 6.66 cm/s), iii)
551 Foulant concentration: 200 mg/L alginate, 1000 mg/L colloidal silica, gypsum scaling (20 mM
552 Na₂SO₄ and 20 mM CaCl₂) and iv) determination after flux stepping with a step interval of 30mins.

553

554 **3.3.3 Fouling reversibility and critical flux for reversibility**


555 Distinguishing between reversible and irreversible fouling is a vital to a proper assessment of the
556 fouling propensity of a FO membrane as well as to the potential recovery of water flux. Therefore,
557 in the current study when fouling had occurred, membrane flushing was performed for 30 min after
558 the fouling test to assess the degree of fouling reversibility . The results enabled us to establish the
559 critical flux for reversibility (J_{ci}). Fig. 8 shows the water flux recovered after the physical cleaning
560 of membranes fouled in the single foulant studies; there aresome blanks were the test was not
561 performed because there had been no fouling. In detail, the normalized flux after fouling showed
562 an increasing trend as the DS concentration decreased (i.e., lower initial flux), for both membranes
563 and three single foulants. As discussed in section 3.1, factors such as the initial flux, foulant type,
564 and membrane type led to a different impact on the membrane fouling propensity.

565

566 Regarding alginate fouling (Fig. 8-a), PA-TFC showed a higher fouling rate than the CTA
567 membrane above critical flux conditions because of a higher initial flux. Nevertheless, we noticed
568 that the flux recovered by physical cleaning appear to be the same for both membranes, with
569 recoveries of 95%. It is likely that the fouling by alginate could be readily reversible, which was
570 successfully demonstrated in previous studies with the CTA membrane [14] [31] [26] [27] and PA-
571 TFC membrane [11]. Interestingly, 98-100% recovery of water flux was recorded at close to and
572 below the critical flux i.e. 12.8 LMH (DS 0.5 M) for the PA-TFC membrane and at above critical
573 flux i.e. 15.9 LMH (DS 3 M) for CTA membrane; thus, they do accord with the critical flux for
574 reversibility [32]. As stated in section 3.1, although PA-TFC still exhibited a slight fouling with
575 alginate below the critical flux (Fig. S-4, b), this fouling could be completely restored (Fig. 7-a).
576 Obviously, an appropriate operation (i.e., close to or below critical flux) could help minimize the
577 alginate fouling of PA-TFC membranes and promote fouling reversibility. A lower DS
578 concentration was set to meet the operational critical flux conditions in colloidal silica fouling (Fig.
579 8-b). As mentioned in section 3.3.1, in operation above the critical flux, colloidal silica showed a
580 more noticeable fouling tendency than alginate despite operation being at a lower initial flux (lower
581 DS concentration) (Fig. 6). This was particularly noticeable with the PA-TFC membrane, which
582 reached a low normalized flux of 0.55 after the formation of the fouling layer (Fig. 7-b). In addition,
583 a low cleaning effectiveness was found for PA-TFC (i.e., 50%) indicating that with colloidal silica
584 fouling this membrane gave poor recovery when starting above the critical flux (i.e., 20.5 LMH).
585 This trend is consistent with the study of Xie et al. [53], who showed the effect of initial flux on
586 the recovery of a TFC membrane subject to colloidal fouling (e.g., a flux of 20 LMH corresponded
587 to a low recovery of 30%). However, for both membranes, a better recovery after colloidal silica
588 fouling was obtained after operation at critical flux i.e. at 12.5 LMH (CTA) and 12.8 LMH (PA-
589 TFC), and below critical flux condition i.e. at 8.3 LMH (PA-TFC). For the former and latter, high


590 values of 94% and 100% recovery respectively were found (Fig. 7-b). The study of Mi et al. [55]
 591 indicated that the surface roughness of PA-TFC played an important role in increasing the
 592 membrane-silica interaction, thus significantly decreasing the water flux recovery. However, in
 593 this study, it is noteworthy that PA-TFC exhibited a completely reversible fouling (roughly 100%
 594 recovery) when operating below the critical flux i.e., at 8.3 LMH (DS 0.25 M). Regarding gypsum
 595 scaling, it can be remarked that the physical cleaning appears to be more efficient after gypsum
 596 fouling of the CTA membrane with a high value of 97% recovery for operation above critical flux
 597 i.e. 15.9 LMH (DS 2.0 M). For the PA-TFC membrane similar recovery (98%) was found at the
 598 critical flux condition i.e. 12.8 LMH (DS 0.5 M). In summary, after fouling with single foulants
 599 membrane permeability could be well recovered by simple physical cleaning. Consequently this
 600 mode may offer the extraordinary advantage of significantly reducing or even eliminating chemical
 601 cleaning. The concept of critical flux for reversibility (J_{ci}) was defined by Bachin et al. [34] as “the
 602 permeate flux above which a multi-layer of irreversible fouling occurs”. This accords with the
 603 results above and thus shows the existence of a critical flux for reversibility for both FO membranes
 604 tested. The J_{ci} results for the CTA and PA-TFC membranes are summarised in Table 5.

605



606

(c) Gypsum




607
608 **Figure 8.** Water flux recovery after physical cleaning of membranes fouled by various single
609 foulants: (a) alginate, (b) colloidal silica, (c) gypsum scaling at various operational fluxes (above
610 critical flux, critical flux, below critical flux). Flux recovery was calculated from water
611 permeability measurements taken between 15 min and 30 min after the physical cleaning step.
612 Blanks exist where no fouling was observed during the fouling tests. (Alginate: CTA- DS 2M (at
613 critical flux), 1.5 M (below critical flux); Colloidal silica: CTA-DS 1M (below critical flux);
614 Gypsum: CTA- DS 1.5M (at critical flux), 1M (below critical flux) and PA-TFC- DS 0.25 M
615 (below critical flux)).

616
617 An investigation of fouling reversibility by combined foulants is presented in Fig. 9. With the PA-
618 TFC membrane both combined foulants caused significant decline in water flux over 10 h of
619 operation for all conditions used (Fig. 8-a, b). In contrast the CTA membrane showed no flux
620 decline over 10 h of operation in half of the cases. For the others a moderate reduction in water
621 flux occurred with the normalized flux being 0.71 (above critical flux) and 0.8 (at critical flux) for
622 alginate + colloidal silica, and 0.73 (above critical flux) for alginate + gypsum. The lower
623 susceptibility of the CTA membrane to fouling is attributed, in part, to the relatively lower initial
624 flux. Additionally the cleaning process depends on various factors such as the foulant-foulant

625 interaction and foulant-membrane interaction which is influenced by surface roughness,
 626 hydrophilicity and bonding to functional groups [60]. Regarding the CTA membrane, Liu et al. [8]
 627 reported that after combined fouling by alginate + gypsum the water flux only recovered to
 628 approximately 80%; their experiments were operated at a flux of 17.6 LMH (DS 4 M) with 20
 629 Na₂SO₄ mM and 35 CaCl₂ mM. However, in the current study, with 20 Na₂SO₄ mM and 20 CaCl₂
 630 mM (e.g., gypsum scaling) and at a lower flux of 9.0 LMH (DS 1 M) the CTA membrane exhibited
 631 a high water flux recovery of 93%. This shows that the initial flux and concentration of Ca²⁺ ions
 632 are critical in determining flux recovery for this combined foulant.

633
 634 Another one, Kim et al. [27] observed that fouling reversibility with alginate + colloidal silica was
 635 only 93% compared to complete flux recovery (i.e., 100%) for single foulants. Their operations
 636 were at identical initial fluxes of 25.3 LMH (DS 5 M) with IS =50 mM and pH=7. Meanwhile, the
 637 current study indicated that full restoration of water flux was obtained when operating close to
 638 critical flux i.e. at 5.4 LMH (DS 0.5 M). From the results (Fig 9), the critical flux for reversibility
 639 for the CTA membrane could also be identified. A summary is given in Table 5.



640
 641 **Figure 9.** Water flux recovery after physical cleaning of membranes fouled by various combined
 642 foulants: (a) alginate + colloidal silica, (b) alginate + gypsum scaling under operational critical flux
 643 (above critical flux, critical flux, below critical flux). Water permeating between 15 min and 30

644 min after the physical cleaning step is used for the calculation of flux recovery. Blanks exist where
 645 no fouling was observed during the fouling tests.

646
 647 As shown in Fig. 9-a, b the results for the PA-TFC membrane are significantly different with the
 648 water flux declining after 10 h to normalized fluxes of *circa* 0.6. After combined fouling by alginate
 649 + colloidal silica full reversibility was not exhibited with the water flux recovery being around 96%
 650 at operation below the supposed critical flux i.e. at 8.3 LMH (DS 0.25 M) and approximately 92%
 651 for operation at the supposed critical flux i.e. at 12.8 LMH (DS 0.5 M). For the other combined
 652 foulants, 100% recovery was found at operation below critical flux values of 2.3 LMH (DS 0.15
 653 M). For the PA-TFC membrane, the complete set of critical flux for reversibility is summarized in
 654 Table 5.

655
 656
 657 **Table 5. Critical flux values for fouling reversibility (LMH)**

Foulants	Critical Flux for fouling reversibility (J_{ci})	
	CTA	PA-TFC
Single foulant		
Alginate	< 15.9	12.8
Colloidal silica	< 12.5	8.3
Gypsum	< 15.9	< 12.8
Combined foulants		
Alginate + gypsum	< 9.0	2.3
Alginate + colloidal silica	5.4	< 8.3

658 Note: The values above are specific for the FO membrane process with the conditions: i) FO mode
659 (AL-FS), ii) Feed and draw flow rate of 300 mL/min (equivalent CFV of 6.66 cm/s), iii) Foulant
660 concentration: 200 mg/L alginate, 1000 mg/L colloidal silica, gypsum scaling (20 mM Na₂SO₄ and
661 20 mM CaCl₂), and iv) determination after fouling for 10 h followed by evaluation of fouling
662 reversibility after a 30 min physical clean.

663

664 **4. Conclusions**

665 First, the existence of critical fluxes in an FO process (CTA and PA-TFC membranes with three
666 single separate foulants) was demonstrated through a reliable stepping method (DS concentration
667 stepping) in conjunction with water flux measurements in short-term experiments. The critical flux
668 behavior in the FO processes was evidently affected by the foulant type and the membrane type.
669 PA-TFC membrane outperformed the CTA membrane in terms of critical flux, which suggests that
670 the former might be favored for practical applications. The critical flux values determined by flux
671 stepping ranged from 5.4 to 20.5 LMH (dependent upon membrane-foulant combination) and these
672 would be adequate for applications in certain FO processes. Finally, 98-100% restoration of water
673 flux was achieved with the PA-TFC membrane at an operation either close to critical flux or below
674 critical flux (i.e., with negligible irreversible fouling), except for the combination of alginate and
675 colloidal silica. This study has confirmed that plant operation below the critical flux (which has
676 also been referred to as sustainable flux or sub-critical operation) is vital for the minimization of
677 chemical cleaning.

678

679 **Acknowledgment**

680 This research was supported by a grant (code 18IFIP-B087389-05) from the Plant Research
681 Program funded by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, and Transport. RWF has been partially

682 supported by an APEX award (AX170010) granted by a partnership between the Royal Society,
683 the British Academy and the Royal Academy of Engineering. This APEX award is for work on
684 Exploring Water Re-use – the Nexus of Politics, Technology and Economics.

685

686 **Appendix A: Supplementary data**

687

688 **References**

689

- 690 [1] T.Y. Cath, A.E. Childress, M. Elimelech, Forward osmosis: Principles, applications, and
691 recent developments, *J. Memb. Sci.* 281 (2006) 70–87. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2006.05.048.
- 692 [2] C. Boo, M. Elimelech, S. Hong, Fouling control in a forward osmosis process integrating
693 seawater desalination and wastewater reclamation, *J. Memb. Sci.* (2013).
694 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2013.05.004.
- 695 [3] T.Y. Cath, N.T. Hancock, C.D. Lundin, C. Hoppe-Jones, J.E. Drewes, A multi-barrier
696 osmotic dilution process for simultaneous desalination and purification of impaired water,
697 *J. Memb. Sci.* (2010). doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2010.06.056.
- 698 [4] M.M. Motsa, B.B. Mamba, A.R.D. Verliefe, Forward osmosis membrane performance
699 during simulated wastewater reclamation: Fouling mechanisms and fouling layer
700 properties, *J. Water Process Eng.* 23 (2018) 109–118. doi:10.1016/j.jwpe.2018.03.007.
- 701 [5] F. Volpin, E. Fons, L. Chekli, J.E. Kim, A. Jang, H.K. Shon, Hybrid forward osmosis-
702 reverse osmosis for wastewater reuse and seawater desalination: Understanding the
703 optimal feed solution to minimise fouling, *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.* 117 (2018) 523–
704 532. doi:10.1016/j.psep.2018.05.006.
- 705 [6] L. Chekli, S. Phuntsho, J.E. Kim, J. Kim, J.Y. Choi, J.S. Choi, S. Kim, J.H. Kim, S. Hong,

- 706 J. Sohn, H.K. Shon, A comprehensive review of hybrid forward osmosis systems:
707 Performance, applications and future prospects, *J. Memb. Sci.* (2016).
708 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2015.09.041.
- 709 [7] G. Blandin, A.R.D. Verliefde, J. Comas, I. Rodriguez-Roda, P. Le-Clech, Efficiently
710 combining water reuse and desalination through forward osmosis-reverse osmosis (FO-
711 RO) hybrids: A critical review, *Membranes (Basel)*. (2016).
712 doi:10.3390/membranes6030037.
- 713 [8] A.J. Ansari, F.I. Hai, W.E. Price, J.E. Drewes, L.D. Nghiem, Forward osmosis as a
714 platform for resource recovery from municipal wastewater - A critical assessment of the
715 literature, *J. Memb. Sci.* 529 (2017) 195–206. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2017.01.054.
- 716 [9] A.J. Ansari, F.I. Hai, W. Guo, H.H. Ngo, W.E. Price, L.D. Nghiem, Factors governing the
717 pre-concentration of wastewater using forward osmosis for subsequent resource recovery,
718 *Sci. Total Environ.* 566–567 (2016) 559–566. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.05.139.
- 719 [10] Q. She, R. Wang, A.G. Fane, C.Y. Tang, Membrane fouling in osmotically driven
720 membrane processes: A review, *J. Memb. Sci.* 499 (2016) 201–233.
721 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2015.10.040.
- 722 [11] M. Xie, J. Lee, L.D. Nghiem, M. Elimelech, Role of pressure in organic fouling in forward
723 osmosis and reverse osmosis, *J. Memb. Sci.* 493 (2015) 748–754.
724 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2015.07.033.
- 725 [12] W.C.L. Lay, T.H. Chong, C.Y. Tang, A.G. Fane, J. Zhang, Y. Liu, Fouling propensity of
726 forward osmosis: Investigation of the slower flux decline phenomenon, *Water Sci.*
727 *Technol.* 61 (2010) 927–936. doi:10.2166/wst.2010.835.
- 728 [13] A.G. Fane, T.H. Chong, J. Zhang, W.C.L. Lay, The Effect of Flux and Pressure on Fouling
729 in Reverse Osmosis Desalination, *Proceedings IDA World Congress*, (2009) Paper DB09-

- 730 128.
- 731 [14] Y. Liu, B. Mi, Combined fouling of forward osmosis membranes: Synergistic foulant
732 interaction and direct observation of fouling layer formation, *J. Memb. Sci.* 407–408
733 (2012) 136–144. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2012.03.028.
- 734 [15] R.W. Field, D. Wu, J.A. Howell, B.B. Gupta, Critical flux concept for microfiltration
735 fouling, *J. Memb. Sci.* 100 (1995) 259–272. doi:10.1016/0376-7388(94)00265-Z.
- 736 [16] J.A. Howell, Sub-critical flux operation of microfiltration, *J. Memb. Sci.* 107 (1995) 165–
737 171. doi:10.1016/0376-7388(95)00114-R.
- 738 [17] P. Bacchin, P. Aimar, V. Sanchez, Model for colloidal fouling of membranes, *AIChE J.* 41
739 (1995) 368–376. doi:10.1002/aic.690410218.
- 740 [18] F. Wicaksana, A.G. Fane, P. Pongpairoj, R. Field, Microfiltration of algae (*Chlorella*
741 *sorokiniana*): Critical flux, fouling and transmission, *J. Memb. Sci.* 387–388 (2012) 83–92.
742 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2011.10.013.
- 743 [19] J. Xu, L.G. Ruan, X. Wang, Y.Y. Jiang, L.X. Gao, J.C. Gao, Ultrafiltration as pretreatment
744 of seawater desalination: Critical flux, rejection and resistance analysis, *Sep. Purif.*
745 *Technol.* 85 (2012) 45–53. doi:10.1016/j.seppur.2011.09.038.
- 746 [20] L. Qi, X. Zheng, G. Li, Factors influencing critical flux of UF membrane in drinking water
747 treatment, *Desalin. Water Treat.* 56 (2015) 3305–3312.
748 doi:10.1080/19443994.2014.968879.
- 749 [21] M. Stoller, Effective fouling inhibition by critical flux based optimization methods on a
750 NF membrane module for olive mill wastewater treatment, *Chem. Eng. J.* 168 (2011)
751 1140–1148. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2011.01.098.
- 752 [22] Y. Lan, K. Groenen-Serrano, C. Coetsier, C. Causserand, Fouling control using critical,
753 threshold and limiting fluxes concepts for cross-flow NF of a complex matrix: Membrane

- 754 BioReactor effluent, *J. Memb. Sci.* 524 (2017) 288–298.
755 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2016.11.001.
- 756 [23] T.H. Chong, F.S. Wong, A.G. Fane, Implications of critical flux and cake enhanced
757 osmotic pressure (CEOP) on colloidal fouling in reverse osmosis: Experimental
758 observations, *J. Memb. Sci.* 314 (2008) 101–111. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2008.01.030.
- 759 [24] C.Y. Tang, Y.N. Kwon, J.O. Leckie, Fouling of reverse osmosis and nanofiltration
760 membranes by humic acid-Effects of solution composition and hydrodynamic conditions,
761 *J. Memb. Sci.* 290 (2007) 86–94. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2006.12.017.
- 762 [25] R.W. Field, G.K. Pearce, Critical, sustainable and threshold fluxes for membrane filtration
763 with water industry applications, *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* 164 (2011) 38–44.
764 doi:10.1016/j.cis.2010.12.008.
- 765 [26] Y. Jang, H. Cho, Y. Shin, Y. Choi, S. Lee, J. Koo, Comparison of fouling propensity and
766 physical cleaning effect in forward osmosis, reverse osmosis, and membrane distillation,
767 *Desalin. Water Treat.* 3994 (2016) 1–10. doi:10.1080/19443994.2016.1152650.
- 768 [27] Y. Kim, M. Elimelech, H.K. Shon, S. Hong, Combined organic and colloidal fouling in
769 forward osmosis: Fouling reversibility and the role of applied pressure, *J. Memb. Sci.* 460
770 (2014) 206–212. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2014.02.038.
- 771 [28] Y.N. Wang, E. Järvelä, J. Wei, M. Zhang, H. Kyllönen, R. Wang, C.Y. Tang, Gypsum
772 scaling and membrane integrity of osmotically driven membranes: The effect of membrane
773 materials and operating conditions, *Desalination.* 377 (2016) 1–10.
774 doi:10.1016/j.desal.2015.08.024.
- 775 [29] M. Elimelech, Gypsum Scaling and Cleaning in Forward Osmosis : Measurements and
776 Mechanisms, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44 (2010) 2022–2028.
- 777 [30] N.M. Mazlan, P. Marchetti, H.A. Maples, B. Gu, S. Karan, A. Bismarck, A.G. Livingston,

778 Organic fouling behaviour of structurally and chemically different forward osmosis
779 membranes: A study of cellulose triacetate and thin film composite membranes, *J. Memb.*
780 *Sci.* 520 (2016) 247–261. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2016.07.065.

781 [31] B. Mi, M. Elimelech, Organic fouling of forward osmosis membranes: Fouling
782 reversibility and cleaning without chemical reagents, *J. Memb. Sci.* 348 (2010) 337–345.
783 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2009.11.021.

784 [32] P. Bacchin, P. Aimar, R.W. Field, Critical and sustainable fluxes: Theory, experiments and
785 applications, *J. Memb. Sci.* 281 (2006) 42–69. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2006.04.014.

786 [33] S.P. Beier, G. Jonsson, Critical flux determination by flux-stepping, *AIChE J.* 56 (2010)
787 1739–1747. doi:10.1002/aic.

788 [34] Y. Wang, F. Wicaksana, C.Y. Tang, A.G. Fane, Direct Microscopic Observation of
789 Forward Osmosis Membrane Fouling, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44 (2010) 7102–7109.
790 doi:10.1021/es101966m.

791 [35] S. Zou, Y. Gu, D. Xiao, C.Y. Tang, The role of physical and chemical parameters on
792 forward osmosis membrane fouling during algae separation, *J. Memb. Sci.* 366 (2011)
793 356–362. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2010.10.030.

794 [36] G. Blandin, H. Vervoort, P. Le-Clech, A.R.D. Verliefde, Fouling and cleaning of high
795 permeability forward osmosis membranes, *J. Water Process Eng.* 9 (2016) 161–169.
796 doi:10.1016/j.jwpe.2015.12.007.

797 [37] T.P.N. Nguyen, B.M. Jun, J.H. Lee, Y.N. Kwon, Comparison of integrally asymmetric and
798 thin film composite structures for a desirable fashion of forward osmosis membranes, *J.*
799 *Memb. Sci.* 495 (2015) 457–470. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2015.05.039.

800 [38] S.J. Kim, S. Kook, B.E. O’Rourke, J. Lee, M. Hwang, Y. Kobayashi, R. Suzuki, I.S. Kim,
801 Characterization of pore size distribution (PSD) in cellulose triacetate (CTA) and

- 802 polyamide (PA) thin active layers by positron annihilation lifetime spectroscopy (PALS)
803 and fractional rejection (FR) method, *J. Memb. Sci.* 527 (2017) 143–151.
804 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2016.12.064.
- 805 [39] J. Lee, S. Kook, C. Lee, I.S. Kim, Effect of intermittent pressure-assisted forward osmosis
806 (I-PAFO) on organic fouling, *Desalination*. 419 (2017) 60–69.
807 doi:10.1016/j.desal.2017.06.003.
- 808 [40] N.Y. Yip, A. Tiraferri, W.A. Phillip, J.D. Schiffman, M. Elimelech, High Performance
809 Thin-Film Composite Forward Osmosis Membrane, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* (2010).
810 doi:10.1021/es1002555.
- 811 [41] M.M. Motsa, B.B. Mamba, A.R.D. Verliefde, Combined colloidal and organic fouling of
812 FO membranes: The influence of foulant-foulant interactions and ionic strength, *J. Memb.*
813 *Sci.* 493 (2015) 539–548. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2015.06.035.
- 814 [42] C. Boo, S. Lee, M. Elimelech, Z. Meng, S. Hong, Colloidal fouling in forward osmosis:
815 Role of reverse salt diffusion, *J. Memb. Sci.* 390–391 (2012) 277–284.
816 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2011.12.001.
- 817 [43] S. Zou, Y.N. Wang, F. Wicaksana, T. Aung, P.C.Y. Wong, A.G. Fane, C.Y. Tang, Direct
818 microscopic observation of forward osmosis membrane fouling by microalgae: Critical
819 flux and the role of operational conditions, *J. Memb. Sci.* 436 (2013) 174–185.
820 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2013.02.030.
- 821 [44] C.Y. Tang, Q. She, W.C.L. Lay, R. Wang, A.G. Fane, Coupled effects of internal
822 concentration polarization and fouling on flux behavior of forward osmosis membranes
823 during humic acid filtration, *J. Memb. Sci.* 354 (2010) 123–133.
824 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2010.02.059.
- 825 [45] M.M. Motsa, B.B. Mamba, A. D’Haese, E.M.V. Hoek, A.R.D. Verliefde, Organic fouling

- 826 in forward osmosis membranes: The role of feed solution chemistry and membrane
827 structural properties, *J. Memb. Sci.* 460 (2014) 99–109.
828 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2014.02.035.
- 829 [46] Q. She, X. Jin, Q. Li, C.Y. Tang, Relating reverse and forward solute diffusion to
830 membrane fouling in osmotically driven membrane processes, *Water Res.* 46 (2012)
831 2478–2486. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2012.02.024.
- 832 [47] W.S. Ang, M. Elimelech, Protein (BSA) fouling of reverse osmosis membranes:
833 Implications for wastewater reclamation, *J. Memb. Sci.* 296 (2007) 83–92.
834 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2007.03.018.
- 835 [48] B. Mi, M. Elimelech, Chemical and physical aspects of organic fouling of forward osmosis
836 membranes, *J. Memb. Sci.* 320 (2008) 292–302. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2008.04.036.
- 837 [49] Y. Gu, Y.N. Wang, J. Wei, C.Y. Tang, Organic fouling of thin-film composite polyamide
838 and cellulose triacetate forward osmosis membranes by oppositely charged
839 macromolecules, *Water Res.* 47 (2013) 1867–1874. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2013.01.008.
- 840 [50] C. Kim, S. Lee, S. Hong, Application of osmotic backwashing in forward osmosis:
841 Mechanisms and factors involved, *Desalin. Water Treat.* 43 (2012) 314–322.
842 doi:10.1080/19443994.2012.672215.
- 843 [51] M. Xie, S.R. Gray, Gypsum scaling in forward osmosis: Role of membrane surface
844 chemistry, *J. Memb. Sci.* 513 (2016) 250–259. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2016.04.022.
- 845 [52] Y. Liu, B. Mi, Effects of organic macromolecular conditioning on gypsum scaling of
846 forward osmosis membranes, *J. Memb. Sci.* 450 (2014) 153–161.
847 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2013.09.001.
- 848 [53] M. Xie, L.D. Nghiem, W.E. Price, M. Elimelech, Impact of organic and colloidal fouling
849 on trace organic contaminant rejection by forward osmosis: Role of initial permeate flux,

850 Desalination. 336 (2014) 146–152. doi:10.1016/j.desal.2013.12.037.

851 [54] E. Arkhangelsky, F. Wicaksana, A.A. Al-Rabiah, S.M. Al-Zahrani, R. Wang,
852 Understanding the interaction between biomacromolecules and their influence on forward
853 osmosis process, Desalination. 385 (2016) 12–23. doi:10.1016/j.desal.2016.02.006.

854 [55] B. Mi, M. Elimelech, Silica scaling and scaling reversibility in forward osmosis, DES. 312
855 (2013) 75–81. doi:10.1016/j.desal.2012.08.034.

856 [56] A.S. Kim, E.M. V Hoek, Cake Structure in Dead-End Membrane Filtration: Monte Carlo
857 Simulations, Environ. Eng. Sci. 19 (2002) 373–386. doi:10.1089/109287502320963373.

858 [57] J.C. Chen, M. Elimelech, A.S. Kim, Monte Carlo simulation of colloidal membrane
859 filtration: Model development with application to characterization of colloid phase
860 transition, J. Memb. Sci. 255 (2005) 291–305. doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2005.02.004.

861 [58] S. Lee, C. Boo, M. Elimelech, S. Hong, Comparison of fouling behavior in forward
862 osmosis (FO) and reverse osmosis (RO), J. Memb. Sci. 365 (2010) 34–39.
863 doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2010.08.036.

864 [59] M. Zhang, Q. She, X. Yan, C.Y. Tang, Effect of reverse solute diffusion on scaling in
865 forward osmosis: A new control strategy by tailoring draw solution chemistry,
866 Desalination. 401 (2017) 230–237. doi:10.1016/j.desal.2016.08.014.

867 [60] E. Arkhangelsky, F. Wicaksana, C. Tang, A.A. Al-Rabiah, S.M. Al-Zahrani, R. Wang,
868 Combined organic-inorganic fouling of forward osmosis hollow fiber membranes, Water
869 Res. 46 (2012) 6329–6338. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2012.09.003.

870