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Background
In forward osmosis, water is transported from a feed solution with low osmotic potential to a draw solution with high osmotic potential. Seawater is an inexpensive draw solution if the forward osmosis plant is in the vicinity of the sea, and the seawater can be discharged without treatment, provided there is no contamination from the feed solution. Forward osmosis can be used to concentrate phosphorus from wastewater, but problems have arisen with ammonia contamination of the draw solution. It is important to understand the potential to which ammonia can contaminate the draw solution, and how to reduce it. In this study we evaluate the effect pH has on thin-film composite (TFC) (Porinera, USA) and biomimetic membranes (Aquaporin A/S, Denmark) with regards to ammonia transfer and water flux. Real digester centrate was used as feed solution, while draw solution was seawater or NaCl solution (25-45gL⁻¹).

TFC membranes

- Feed solution was digester centrate
- Draw solution was seawater or NaCl solution (25-45gL⁻¹)
- 140cm² membrane area
- Cross flow configuration

Biomimetic membranes

- Aquaporin proteins can be found in cells
- They are highly selective towards water
- Only the protein channels are permeable

Method

- Highest permeability for TFC membranes
- Low reduction in water and digester centrate permeability for biomimetic membrane
- Large difference between the two feed solutions for TFC membranes

Water Flux and Permeability

- Highest permeability for TFC membranes
- Biometric membranes have 97.7% N rejection
- TFC membranes have 88.2% N rejection
- N rejection independent of draw solutions for biomimetic membranes
- N rejection is reduced at higher draw solution osmotic pressure for TFC membranes
- Difference between two types of membrane is particularly exaggerated at pH 8, where a 25gL⁻¹ draw solution achieved 93.4% rejection whereas 45gL⁻¹ achieved 79.6%

Ammonia Rejection

Ammonia transfer mechanism in biomimetic membranes

There are four key routes for ammonia to move through the membrane:
(a) - through the aquaporin protein channels
(b) - through the TFC portion of the membrane
(c) - through the vesicle walls
(d) - through a combination of (a) and (c)

For lower pH ammonia moved via convection, however, with increasing pH convection plays less of a role.
Therefore, at lower pH the transfer of ammonia is via (a), but with increasing pH (b), (c), and (d) play a greater role.

Ammonia Loss

- Volume concentration ratio (VCR) is the final volume divided by the initial volume
- Based off of average rejections of 88.2% (TFC) and 97.7% (biomimetic)

Conclusions

- Ammonia transfer is higher for TFC membranes than biomimetic membranes
- Water permeability is lower for biomimetic membranes
- Membrane choice will therefore depend on a need for high water flux, or cleaner draw solution
- Ammonia transfer occurs by both convective and diffusive mechanisms
- Convection plays a greater role at lower pH, and diffusion at high pH
- <10% ammonia loss at VCR 6
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