



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe



Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

This is an author produced version of a paper published in :

Desalination

Cronfa URL for this paper:

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa29389>

Paper:

Alkhubiri, A. & Hilal, N. (2016). Air Gap Membrane Distillation: A detailed study of high saline solution. *Desalination*

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2016.07.046>

This article is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Authors are personally responsible for adhering to publisher restrictions or conditions. When uploading content they are required to comply with their publisher agreement and the SHERPA RoMEO database to judge whether or not it is copyright safe to add this version of the paper to this repository.

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/iss/researchsupport/cronfa-support/>

Air Gap Membrane Distillation: A detailed study of high saline solution

Abdullah Alkudhiri^a, Nidal Hilal^b

^a King Abdulaziz City for Science and Technology (KACST), Nanotechnology Centre, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

^b Centre for Water Advanced Technologies and Environmental Research (CWATER), College of Engineering, Swansea University, United Kingdom

Abstract

An experimental study is used to examine the effect of high concentration of several salts, i.e., NaCl, MgCl₂, Na₂CO₃ and Na₂SO₄ on permeate flux and rejection factor by air gap membrane distillation (AGMD). A comparative study involving three different membrane pore sizes (0.2, 0.45 and 1.0 μm) were performed to investigate the influence of pore size on energy consumption, permeate flux and rejection factor. The permeate flux decline is higher than that predicted from the vapour pressure reduction. Furthermore, the energy consumption was monitored at different membrane pore size and was found to be increased when the concentration increased.

Key words: Air gap membrane distillation (AGMD); High saline solution; Desalination ; Water treatment

1. Introduction

Salinity is one of the most pressing environmental economic problems in arid countries. Desalting systems have long proven effective in the arid countries, such as in the Arabian Gulf. Water desalination can be performed using different techniques, such as thermal and membrane processes. Membrane distillation (MD) have the benefits of thermal and membrane technologies, as it is considered a thermally-driven separation process. Vapour molecules are only able to pass through a porous hydrophobic membrane. As a result, high purity water will be obtained from aqueous solution [1-4]. This separation process is driven by the vapour

28 pressure difference existing between the porous hydrophobic membrane surfaces.
29 Consequently, MD processes have vapour pressure difference as the driving force. Permeate
30 flux, in general increases linearly with trans-membrane vapour pressure [2-7].

31 There have been many studies to explore the impact of high salt concentration on the
32 membrane permeability. The influence of high salt concentration and complex solution such
33 as produced water on the permeate flux and rejection factor was reported [8-11]. Yun et al
34 [10] found that, there was a noticeable variation on membrane permeability with time. As a
35 result, it is hard to determine the permeate flux by using the existing models. They assumed
36 that, the properties of the boundary layer solution (at the membrane surface) reaches the
37 saturation and varies from the bulk solution. Indeed, the solution features are changed; for
38 example, the density and viscosity increase, while the vapour pressure decreases [8, 10-12].
39 Moreover, the boiling point and surface tension rise when the concentration increases [12-
40 15].

41 In addition, Li et al. [16], indicated that the permeate flux reduction becomes significant as
42 salt concentration exceeds 2.0 M. The permeate flux of KCl, NaCl and MgCl₂ solutions
43 reduced by 44.4% , 59.6% and 86.8% as the salt concentration increased from 2.0 to 4.0 M.
44 In addition, they pointed out that the impact of viscosity on the permeate flux could not be
45 neglected at high salt concentration.

46 Moreover, Safavi and Mohammadi [9], employed VMD to treat highly saline solution. They
47 concluded that, the permeate flux is better with decreasing the feed concentration. However,
48 the rejection factor is not affected by the feed concentration.

49 Fouling is a deposition of unwanted materials such as scale, suspended solids and insoluble
50 salts on the external surfaces of the membrane (Fig 1). Kullab and Martin [17] pointed out that
51 fouling and scaling lead to blocking the membrane pores, which reduces the effective
52 membrane, and therefore the permeate flux obviously decreases. These may also cause a

53 pressure drop, and higher temperature polarization effect. Gryta [18] indicated that the deposits
 54 formed on the membrane surface leads to the adjacent pores being filled with feed solution
 55 (partial membrane wetting). Moreover, additional mass and heat resistance will be created by
 56 the fouling layer (Eq.1 and 2), which is deposited on the membrane surface. As a result, the
 57 overall heat and mass transfer coefficient of the membrane decreased. For DCMD, Gryta and
 58 Goh et al. [19, 20] specified:

$$59 \quad J = \frac{P_f - P_{f,fouling}}{R_f} = \frac{P_{f,fouling} - P_{f,m}}{R_{fouling}} = \frac{P_{f,m} - P_{p,m}}{R_m} = \frac{P_{p,m} - P_p}{R_p} \quad (1)$$

60 where $\frac{P_f - P_{f,fouling}}{R_f}$ represents the mass transfer through the feed boundary layer; $\frac{P_{f,fouling} - P_{f,m}}{R_{fouling}}$
 61 represents the mass transfer through the fouling layer ; $\frac{P_{f,m} - P_{p,m}}{R_m}$ represents mass transfer
 62 through the membrane ; $\frac{P_{p,m} - P_p}{R_p}$ represents mass transfer through the permeate.

63 $R_f, R_{fouling}, R_m, R_p$ are the resistance in the feed boundary, fouling layer, membrane and
 64 permeate boundary respectively.

$$65 \quad h_f(T_f - T_{f,fouling}) = \frac{k_{fouling}}{\delta_{fouling}}(T_{f,fouling} - T_{f,m}) = \frac{k_m}{\delta}(T_{f,m} - T_{p,m}) + J\Delta H_v$$

$$66 \quad = h_p(T_{p,m} - T_p) \quad (2)$$

67 where $k_{fouling}, \delta_{fouling}$ and $T_{f,fouling}$ are the fouling layer thermal conductivity, thickness,
 68 and fouling layer temperature, respectively.

69

70

71

72


73

74

75

76

77



78

Fig.1. Temperature profile across fouled membrane

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89 **2. Experimental procedure and material**

90

91

92

93

El-bourawi [21] proposed that scale formation and deposition at membrane surfaces may diminish the membrane hydrophobicity and cause water logging of some membrane pores. Tun et al. [22] examined the effect of high concentration of NaCl and Na₂SO₄ on the permeate flux. The flux gradually decreases during the MD process, until the feed concentration reaches the supersaturation point, and then the flux decreases sharply to zero. The membrane was completely covered by crystal deposits.

The influence of high concentrations on permeate flux, salt rejection factor, and energy consumption was examined in this work. In addition, the effect of pore size on the permeate flux and rejection factor was analysed too.

The influence of a wide range of concentrations of NaCl, MgCl₂, Na₂CO₃ and Na₂SO₄ on permeate flux, salt rejection factor, and energy consumption was examined as shown in table 1. In addition, the effect of pore size was investigated by three commercial membrane pore sizes (0.2, 0.45 and 1.0 μ m). The experimental tests were achieved by AGMD module, as

94 shown in Fig.2. Three types of flat sheet polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) microporous
95 hydrophobic membranes were used in this work. PTFE has excellent chemical resistance
96 (nonreactive) being unaffected by almost all chemicals. Moreover, it is insoluble and thermally
97 stable to high temperatures (up to 260 °C) [23] . These membranes, manufactured by Sterlitech
98 corporation, were used to filter high saline solutions. The membrane cell was maintained in a
99 horizontal position. The feed solution was maintained in direct contact with the membrane
100 surface. Furthermore, the heat was supplied to the feed by a heating coil. The feed reservoir
101 was insulated to minimize the heat losses. The feed temperature can be manipulated and
102 controlled by an Autotune temperature controller. The feed flow rate was heated and
103 maintained constant at 50°C and 1.5 l/min during the experimental run. Also, the cooling
104 temperature can be selected and controlled at the desired level by a refrigerated thermostatic
105 bath (LTD 6G) supplied by Grant Instruments, and then pumped at a constant flow rate (8.5
106 l/min) and constant temperature (10°C) to the bottom of the cell . In addition, the hot feed and
107 cooling water are pumped in opposite flow directions in a closed system within the
108 membrane cell. The inlet and outlet temperatures of the feed solution and the cooling water
109 were continually measured using four (T-type) thermocouples placed at the inlets and outlets
110 of the membrane cell. In order to measure accurate temperature for each thermocouple, these
111 were calibrated.

112 The permeate flux (J) was measured by weighing the obtained permeate during a predetermined
113 time using an electronic balance which connected to a computer:

$$114 \quad J = \frac{W}{A \Delta t} \quad (3)$$

115 Where W is the obtained permeate weight and A is the membrane area.

116 Furthermore, the concentration of single salt solution can be determined by measuring the
117 conductivity. The electrical conductivity of the feed was monitored and recorded hourly by

118 conductivity meter. However, the electrical conductivity of the permeate concentration was
119 measured and recorded at the end of the experiment; the rejection factor can be calculated:

120
$$Rejection\ Factor = 1 - \frac{C_p}{C_{f,avg}} \times 100 \quad (4)$$

121 It is worthwhile stating that the energy consumption in each AGMD experiment was
122 measured using the energy meter that registers the amount of electric energy consumed (in
123 kWh), including all AGMD equipment, such as heating and cooling systems as well as the
124 feed circulation pump.


125

126 **Table 1: Range of concentration of single salts used in the filtration experiments.**

Single Salt	NaCl	MgCl ₂	Na ₂ SO ₄	Na ₂ CO ₃
Lowest concentration (ppm)	5844	4760	4260	5300
Highest Concentration (ppm)	180000	95210	142000	106000

127

128



129

130 **Fig. 2. Schematic diagram of the AGMD used in this work.**

131

132 **3. Result and discussion**

133 **3.1 Water activity and vapour pressure**

134 Water activity of aqueous solution is the ratio between the vapor pressure of water in the
 135 solution to the vapor pressure of pure water at the same temperature. Water activity indicates
 136 to the total amount of pure water existing in the material. According to this definition, the value
 137 of unity for Water activity reveals to pure water, whereas zero reveals the total absence of water
 138 molecules.

139 For the ideal solution, the water activity is equal to the mole fraction of water in the solution
 140 [24]:

141
$$a_w = x_w = 1 - x_s \tag{5}$$

142 where x_s is mole fraction of solute.

143 However, the water activity for non-ideal solution can be evaluated by [24]:

144
$$a_w = (1 - x_s) \exp(\alpha x_s^2 + \beta x_s^3) \tag{6}$$

145 Where α and β are parameters equal to 1.825 and -20.78 respectively for NaCl, and equal to
 146 11.859 and -404.5 respectively for MgCl₂.

147

148 **Table 2: The influence of concentration on the water activity**

NaCl molar fraction	Water Activity (a_w) [25]
0	1
0.00179	0.9966
0.0035	0.9934
0.0053	0.99
0.016	0.97
0.0261	0.95
0.0356	0.93
0.044	0.91
0.0527	0.89

149

150

Na ₂ SO ₄ molar fraction	Water Activity (a_w) [25]
0	1
0.0018	0.993
0.0089	0.98
0.0177	0.965
0.0263	0.948
0.0347	0.935
0.043	0.918

MgCl ₂ molar fraction	Water Activity (a_w) [24]
0	1
0.0008	0.999207377
0.0009	0.999109303
0.0036	0.996534344
0.0072	0.993260559
0.01	0.990773888
0.014	0.987198142

151

152

153 In terms of the concentration impact on water activity, Martínez [8] and Sparrow [26] indicated
 154 that there was a considerable decrease in water activity as concentration increases. However,
 155 the influence of temperature on water activity is almost negligible [25].


156 The effect of both concentration and temperature on the vapour pressures for aqueous salt
 157 solution can be evaluated by considering the water activity at the feed and permeate sides, such
 158 that:

159 $P(T, x) = P^*(T) a_w(x)$ (7)

160 Where, $a_w(x)$ is water activity as a function of concentration, and $P^*(T)$ is vapour pressure of
161 pure water at a given temperature, which can be calculated by Antoine equation:

162 $P^* = \text{Exp}(23.238 - \frac{3841}{T-45})$ (8)

163 Figures 3-6 show the effect of concentration on vapour pressure.




164

165

Fig. 3. Effect of concentration on the vapour pressure for NaCl


166



168

169

170

Fig. 4. Effect of concentration on vapour pressure for $MgCl_2$ 

171

172

173

Fig. 5. Effect of concentration on vapour pressure for Na_2SO_4




Fig. 6. Effect of concentration on vapour pressure for Na_2CO_3 [27]

3.2 The effect of Concentration and the pore size effect


It is obvious from the results that the permeate flux decreases when the concentration increases.

It can be summarised that the vapour pressure plays an important role in permeate flux. This decrease can be referred to the water activity and vapour pressure reduction, and thereby reduced driving force (Fig 7 - 10). In addition, vapour pressure reduction means that less vaporization of water occurs at the membrane surface causing a decrease in amount of vapour flows through the membrane. Moreover, the solute is kept in by the membrane, then accumulates on the membrane surface. As a consequence, the feed concentration at the feed membrane surface will gradually increase, and then the temperature at the membrane surface is different (lower) than the bulk temperature measured in the feed. Furthermore, Qtaishat et al. [28] and Safavi and Mohammadi [9] stated that, in the case of aqueous solution, the salt will build an additional boundary layer adjacent to the membrane surface (concentration polarization). This boundary layer together with temperature boundary layer (temperature polarization) reduce the driving force. Moreover, Lawson and Alkudhiri [29, 30] specified that, as a consequence of the raised of concentration polarization and temperature polarization

192 effects, the mass and heat transfer coefficients at the boundary layer decreased. Moreover,
 193 Concentration polarization can cause a membrane wetting by scaling and building up of salt
 194 crystals on the membrane surface. Shirazi et al. [31] reported that, the particulate matters that
 195 are smaller than the membrane pore size will plug the membrane pores, in addition to the
 196 formation of cake on the membrane surface caused by accumulation of particles on the
 197 membrane surface.

198 It is worth stating that the permeate flux decay is higher than that predicted from the vapour
 199 pressure reduction. The explanation of this decrease is attributed to the fouling phenomenon,
 200 change in the solution layer feature facing the membrane surface, such as viscosity and to the
 201 temperature polarization phenomena. Similar results have also been reported by Drioli et al [7].


202



203

204

Fig. 7. The permeate flux and pore size effect for NaCl at different concentration




205

206

Fig. 8. The permeate flux and pore size effect for MgCl₂ at different concentrations

207



208

209

Fig. 9. The permeate flux and pore size effect for Na₂SO₄ at different concentrations

210




Fig. 10. The permeate flux and pore size effect for Na₂CO₃ at different concentrations

211

212

213

214 The effects of membrane pore size on permeate flux are shown in Figure 7-10 too. The
 215 permeation flux for NaCl at concentration 180,000 ppm increases from 1.289, 1.800 to 2.023
 216 g/m².s in going from TF200, TF450 to TF1000 respectively. As shown in table 3, this
 217 corresponds to an enhancement of 39.6 % in the pure water flux corresponding to an increase
 218 in the mean pore size of 125% (from TF200 to TF450). The same enhancement of permeation
 219 flux is also noticed for the other saline solutions. This is a direct evidence of the enhanced mass
 220 transfer in the pores, which are subjected to Knudsen /ordinary diffusion mechanism [21].

221

222

Table 3: The influence of pore size on the permeate flux

Salt type and concentration	The percent increase from TF200 to TF450	The percent increase from TF200 to TF1000
NaCl (180,000 ppm)	39.6 %	56.9 %
MgCl ₂ (95,210 ppm)	15.0 %	26.36 %

Na ₂ SO ₄ (142,040 ppm)	10.9 %	23.22 %
Na ₂ CO ₃ (21,197 ppm)	21.7 %	25.0 %


223

224 With regard to the rejection factor, Figures 7-10 reveal the relation between the concentration,
 225 pore size and rejection. The rejection factor decreases with increasing concentration for
 226 TF1000. However, it rose slightly for TF450 and remains constant for TF200. Similar results
 227 have also been reported by Drioli et al. [7]. He et al. [32] and Calabro et al. [33] confirm that
 228 the decrease in rejection factor was due to the decrease in LEP (Liquid Entry Pressure) because
 229 liquid entry pressure (LEP) reduces when the pore size increases under higher concentration
 230 conditions. In addition, Khayet and Matsuura [34] proposed that, the surface membrane pore
 231 size is different from bulk pore size, and pore size is not cylindrical as assumed. Furthermore,
 232 liquid entry pressure (LEP) reduces when the pore size increases. Besides that, the possibility
 233 of membrane fouling increases with increasing salt concentration. Scale formation and
 234 deposition at membrane surfaces may reduce the membrane hydrophobicity; so the saline
 235 solution will go through some membrane pores [21]. Moreover, fouling and scaling lead to
 236 block the membrane pores, which reduce the permeate flux and may cause a pressure drop too
 237 [17]. Gryta et al. [35] reported that the scale formation and deposition on the membrane surface
 238 starts in the largest pores . For these reasons, TF450 and TF1000 membranes were wetted at
 239 42,000 ppm Na₂CO₃, as is shown in figure 9. Consequently, using TF450 and TF1000
 240 membranes is not recommended to treat 42,000 ppm Na₂CO₃ and higher.

241 **4.4 Energy Consumption**


242 The energy consumption considered in this work referred only to the amount of electric energy
 243 consumed (in kWh) for external heat supply, the cooling systems and for the pump used for re-
 244 circulating feed. The effect of salt concentration on the energy consumption was explored using
 245 TF200, TF450 and TF1000 membranes. Figures 11-14 illustrate that as the salt concentration

246 of NaCl, MgCl₂, Na₂SO₄ and Na₂CO₃ increases, the energy consumption ratio increases. For
 247 TF200, for example, the energy consumption /permeate flux production ratio was 0.016, 0.023,
 248 0.028 and 0.034 kWh/g for NaCl concentrations of 5,844; 35,064; 116,880 and 180,000 ppm
 249 respectively. The rise in energy consumption as the concentration increases can be explained
 250 by the fact that the higher the concentration, the higher the boiling point. It is worth noting that
 251 the viscosity and water activity are function of feed concentration. Because of the high
 252 concentration, the flow and water vapour pressure will be affected negatively. Therefore, it was
 253 predicted that feed concentration had a negative impact on the energy consumption for the
 254 process [36, 37]. Similar results have also been reported elsewhere; Sharqawy et al. [12]
 255 specified that increasing the salinity led to higher boiling temperature.
 256 It was noted from the experiments that the energy consumption as kWh was almost equal even
 257 though pore size increased. However, energy consumption as kWh / permeate flux production
 258 ratio was found to be slightly lower as pore size increased, because of the positive effect of
 259 pore size on flux when it increases.



260
 261 **Fig. 11. Energy consumption for NaCl at different concentrations**


262



263

264

Fig. 12. Energy consumption for MgCl₂ at different concentrations



265

266

Fig. 13. Energy consumption for Na₂SO₄ at different concentrations




Fig. 14. Energy consumption for Na₂CO₃ at different concentrations

4.5 Conclusion

An experimental study using four different salts (NaCl, MgCl₂, Na₂CO₃, and Na₂SO₄) and three microporous membranes (TF200, TF450 and TF1000) was performed using AGMD. A wide range of concentrations for the previous salts was studied. The effect of high salt concentration was tested. In particular, the influence of salt concentration on permeate flux, rejection factor and energy consumption for different membrane pore sizes was examined. The major findings can be summarised as follows:

- The vapour pressure plays a noticeable role in permeate flux. For instance, the permeate flux declines when salt solution increases.
- The permeate flux decline is higher than that predicted from the vapour pressure reduction. The explanation of this decrease is attributed to the fouling phenomenon,

283 change in the solution layer features on the membrane surface, such as viscosity, and
284 the temperature polarization.

285 • The permeate flux raises, as expected, When the pore size increases due to the enhanced
286 mass transfer in the pores.

287 • The rejection factor decreases with the increasing salt concentration for TF1000.
288 However, it declined slightly for TF450 and remained constant for TF200. This can be
289 attributed to the decrease in LEP (Liquid Entry Pressure) under higher concentration
290 conditions.

291 • TF200 membrane revealed a great hydrophobicity compared to TF450 and TF1000 for
292 Na_2CO_3 .

293 • The energy consumption increased when the concentration increased. This can be
294 explained by the fact that the higher the concentration, the higher the boiling point.

295 • Energy consumption as kW.h per g production was found to slightly decline with pore
296 size increase, because of the positive effect of pore size on flux, which increases.

297 **References**

- 298 1. Alkhudhiri, A., N. Darwish, and N. Hilal, *Treatment of high salinity solutions: Application of air*
299 *gap membrane distillation*. Desalination, 2012. **287**(0): p. 55-60.
- 300 2. Alkhudhiri, A., N. Darwish, and N. Hilal, *Membrane distillation: A comprehensive review*.
301 Desalination, 2012. **287**(0): p. 2-18.
- 302 3. Banat, F.A. and J. Simandl, *Theoretical and experimental study in membrane distillation*.
303 Desalination, 1994. **95**(1): p. 39-52.
- 304 4. Bandini, S. and G.C. Sarti, *Heat and mass transport resistances in vacuum membrane*
305 *distillation per drop*. 1999. **45**: p. 1422-1433.
- 306 5. Bandini, S., C. Gostoli, and G.C. Sarti, *Separation efficiency in vacuum membrane distillation*.
307 Journal of Membrane Science, 1992. **73**(2-3): p. 217-229.
- 308 6. Kurokawa, H., O. Kuroda, S. Takahashi, and K. Ebara, *Vapor Permeate Characteristics of*
309 *Membrane Distillation*. Separation Science and Technology, 1990. **25**(13): p. 1349 - 1359.
- 310 7. drioli, E., V. Calabro, and Y. Wu, *Microporous membranes in membrane distillation*. Pure &
311 Appl. Chem, 1986. **58**(12): p. 1657-1662.
- 312 8. Martínez, L., *Comparison of membrane distillation performance using different feeds*.
313 Desalination, 2004. **168**: p. 359-365.
- 314 9. Safavi, M. and T. Mohammadi, *High-salinity water desalination using VMD*. Chemical
315 Engineering Journal, 2009. **149**(1-3): p. 191-195.
- 316 10. Yun, Y., R. Ma, and A.G. Fane, *Direct contact membrane distillation mechanism for high*
317 *concentration NaCl solutions*. Desalination, 2006. **188**(1-3): p. 251-262.

- 318 11. Alkhudhiri, A., N. Darwish, and N. Hilal, *Produced water treatment: Application of Air Gap*
319 *Membrane Distillation*. Desalination, 2013. **309**(0): p. 46-51.
- 320 12. Sharqawy, M.H., J.H. Lienhard, and S.M. Zubair, *Thermophysical properties of seawater: a*
321 *review of existing correlations and data*. Desalination and Water Treatment, 2010. **16**(1-3): p.
322 354-380.
- 323 13. Ge, X. and X. Wang, *Estimation of Freezing Point Depression, Boiling Point Elevation, and*
324 *Vaporization Enthalpies of Electrolyte Solutions*. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research,
325 2009. **48**(4): p. 2229-2235.
- 326 14. Hunter, J.B. and H. Bliss, *Thermodynamic Properties of Aqueous Salt Solutions*. Industrial &
327 Engineering Chemistry, 1944. **36**(10): p. 945-953.
- 328 15. Weissenborn, P.K. and R.J. Pugh, *Surface Tension of Aqueous Solutions of Electrolytes:*
329 *Relationship with Ion Hydration, Oxygen Solubility, and Bubble Coalescence*. Journal of Colloid
330 and Interface Science, 1996. **184**(2): p. 550-563.
- 331 16. Li, J., Y. Guan, F. Cheng, and Y. Liu, *Treatment of high salinity brines by direct contact*
332 *membrane distillation: Effect of membrane characteristics and salinity*. Chemosphere, 2015.
333 **140**: p. 143-149.
- 334 17. Kullab, A. and A. Martin, *Membrane distillation and applications for water purification in*
335 *thermal cogeneration plants*. Separation and Purification Technology, 2011. **76**(3): p. 231-237.
- 336 18. Gryta, M., *Long-term performance of membrane distillation process*. Journal of Membrane
337 Science, 2005. **265**(1-2): p. 153-159.
- 338 19. Gryta, M., *Fouling in direct contact membrane distillation process*. Journal of Membrane
339 Science, 2008. **325**(1): p. 383-394.
- 340 20. Goh, S., J. Zhang, Y. Liu, and A.G. Fane, *Fouling and wetting in membrane distillation (MD) and*
341 *MD-bioreactor (MDBR) for wastewater reclamation*. Desalination, 2013. **323**: p. 39-47.
- 342 21. El-Bourawi, M.S., Z. Ding, R. Ma, and M. Khayet, *A framework for better understanding*
343 *membrane distillation separation process*. Journal of Membrane Science, 2006. **285**(1-2): p. 4-
344 29.
- 345 22. Tun, C.M., A.G. Fane, J.T. Matheickal, and R. Sheikholeslami, *Membrane distillation*
346 *crystallization of concentrated salts--flux and crystal formation*. Journal of Membrane Science,
347 2005. **257**(1-2): p. 144-155.
- 348 23. Meltzer, T.H. and M.W. Jornitz, *Filtration and Purification in the Biopharmaceutical Industry,*
349 *Second Edition*. 2008: Taylor & Francis Group.
- 350 24. Miyawaki, O., A. Saito, T. Matsuo, and K. Nakamura, *Activity and Activity Coefficient of Water*
351 *in Aqueous Solutions and Their Relationships with Solution Structure Parameters*. Bioscience,
352 Biotechnology, and Biochemistry, 1997. **61**(3): p. 466-469.
- 353 25. Guendouzi, M.E. and A. Dinane, *Determination of water activities, osmotic and activity*
354 *coefficients in aqueous solutions using the hygrometric method*. The Journal of Chemical
355 Thermodynamics, 2000. **32**(3): p. 297-310.
- 356 26. Sparrow, B.S., *Empirical equations for the thermodynamic properties of aqueous sodium*
357 *chloride*. Desalination, 2003. **159**(2): p. 161-170.
- 358 27. Poling, B.E., G.H. Thomson, D.G. Friend, R.L. Rowley, and W.V. Wildind, eds. *Physical and*
359 *Chemical Data*. Perry's Chemical Engineering Handbook, ed. R.H. Perry and D.W. Green.
360 1997, McGraw-Hill.
- 361 28. Qtaishat, M., T. Matsuura, B. Kruczek, and M. Khayet, *Heat and mass transfer analysis in direct*
362 *contact membrane distillation*. Desalination, 2008. **219**(1-3): p. 272-292.
- 363 29. Lawson, K.W. and D.R. Lloyd, *Membrane distillation*. Journal of Membrane Science, 1997.
364 **124**(1): p. 1-25.
- 365 30. Alkhudhiri, A., N. Darwish, and N. Hilal, *Treatment of saline solutions using Air Gap Membrane*
366 *Distillation: Experimental study*. Desalination, 2013. **323**(0): p. 2-7.
- 367 31. Shirazi, S., C.-J. Lin, and D. Chen, *Inorganic fouling of pressure-driven membrane processes --*
368 *A critical review*. Desalination, 2010. **250**(1): p. 236-248.

- 369 32. He, K., H. Hwang, and I. Moon, *Air gap membrane distillation on the different types of*
370 *membrane*. Korean Journal of Chemical Engineering, 2011. **28**(3): p. 770-777.
- 371 33. Calabro, V., G. Pantano, M. Kang, R. Molinari, and E. Drioli, *Experimental study on integrated*
372 *membrane processes in the treatment of solutions simulating textile effluents*. Energy and
373 *exergy analysis*. Desalination, 1990. **78**(2): p. 257-277.
- 374 34. Khayet, M. and T. Matsuura, *Determination of surface and bulk pore sizes of flat-sheet and*
375 *hollow-fiber membranes by atomic force microscopy, gas permeation and solute transport*
376 *methods*. Desalination, 2003. **158**(1-3): p. 57-64.
- 377 35. Gryta, M., M. Tomaszewska, and K. Karakulski, *Wastewater treatment by membrane*
378 *distillation*. Desalination, 2006. **198**(1-3): p. 67-73.
- 379 36. Bui, V.A., M.H. Nguyen, and J. Muller, *The energy challenge of direct contact membrane*
380 *distillation in low temperature concentration*. Asia-Pacific Journal of Chemical Engineering,
381 2007. **2**(5): p. 400-406.
- 382 37. Al-Obaidani, S., E. Curcio, F. Macedonio, G. Di Profio, H. Al-Hinai, and E. Drioli, *Potential of*
383 *membrane distillation in seawater desalination: Thermal efficiency, sensitivity study and cost*
384 *estimation*. Journal of Membrane Science, 2008. **323**(1): p. 85-98.

385