

## List of Figures

---

### Chapter 3

- Figure 3.1** Continuous membrane casting machine.
- Figure 3.2** Dead end cell assembly
- Figure 3.3a** Schematic of cross flow setup; R: reservoir,  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ : control valves, G: pressure gauge, FP: feed pump, FM: flow meter, MC: measuring cylinder.
- Figure 3.3b** Cross flow cell assembly.
- Figure 3.4** Spiral winder assembly.
- Figure 3.5** Spiral wound module.
- Figure 3.6** Effect of PAN concentration on water flux (●) and dope solution viscosity (○).
- Figure 3.7** SEM images of cross section of (a) PAN<sub>15</sub>, (b) PAN<sub>17</sub> and (c) PAN<sub>20</sub> membranes prepared using ZnCl<sub>2</sub> as an additive.
- Figure 3.8** FT-IR analysis of organic acid additives (MA, CA, TA) and ZnCl<sub>2</sub> solution in DMF.
- Figure 3.9** Water flux analysis of PAN membrane prepared using different solvents in dope solution.
- Figure 3.10** Rejection analysis of PAN membrane prepared by varying solvent and polymer concentration in dope solution; PAN<sub>15</sub> (■), PAN<sub>18.5</sub> (●), PAN<sub>20.5</sub> (□), PAN<sub>23</sub> (○).
- Figure 3.11** Scanning electron micrographs of cross sections of membranes casted on different supports; (a) M-3160, (b) M-1006, (c) M-3329, (d) M-3324, (e) M-3265, (f) M-PES -111.
- Figure 3.12a** Pore size distribution of membranes; -x-: M-3160, -o-: M-1006, -■-: M-3329, -□-: M-3324.
- Figure 3.12b** Pore size distribution of membranes; -Δ-: M-3265, -▲-: M-111.
- Figure 3.13** Rejection analysis of membranes using proteins of different molecular weight; -x-: M-3160, -o-: M-1006, -■-: M-3329, -□-: M-3324, -Δ-: M-3265, -▲-: M-111.

- Figure 3.14** Relationship of water flux and ovalbumin rejection for various membranes.
- Figure 3.15** Variation in water flux ( $J_w$ ) and ovalbumin rejection ( $R_{\text{ovalbumin}}$ ) with support porosity.
- Figure 3.16** Variation of membrane surface porosity with bulk porosity of the support material.
- Figure 3.17** Variation of average water flux ( $J_w$ ) with transmembrane pressure ( $\Delta P$ ) for membranes prepared with different backing;  $-x-$ : M-3160,  $-o-$ : M-1006,  $-■-$ : M-3329,  $-□-$ : M-3324,  $-\Delta-$ : M-3265,  $-\blacktriangle-$ : M-111.

## Chapter 4

- Figure 4.1** Schematics of cross flow set up.
- Figure 4.2a** Variation in water flux ( $\Delta f$ ) caused by treatment with dead end mode in comparison to the untreated membrane; ( $\circ$ ) 1N NaOH treatment, ( $\bullet$ ) 1N NaOH followed by 0.1N HCl treatment.
- Figure 4.2b** Variation in water flux ( $\Delta f$ ) caused by treatment with dead end mode in comparison to the untreated membrane; ( $\circ$ ) 1N KOH treatment, ( $\bullet$ ) 1N KOH followed by 0.1N HCl treatment.
- Figure 4.3** Schematic representation of pore swelling by NaOH treatment and regain of porosity by HCl treatment.
- Figure 4.4a** Variation in  $J_w$  ( $\Delta f$ ) caused by treatment at 30 °C by cross flow mode in comparison to that of untreated membrane; ( $\circ$ ) 1N NaOH treatment, ( $\bullet$ ) 1N NaOH followed by 0.1N HCl treatment.
- Figure 4.4b** Variation in  $J_w$  ( $\Delta f$ ) caused by treatment at 45 °C by cross flow mode in comparison to that of untreated membrane; ( $\circ$ ) 1N NaOH treatment, ( $\bullet$ ) 1N NaOH followed by 0.1N HCl treatment.
- Figure 4.5** SEM of cross section of PAN membranes; (a) unmodified, (b) 1N NaOH treatment at 30 °C for 5 hour, (c) 1N NaOH treatment at 30 °C for 5 hour, followed by 0.1 N HCl, (d) 1N NaOH treatment at 45 °C for 5 hour, followed by 0.1 N HCl.

- Figure 4.6** FT-IR spectra of PAN powder treated at 45 °C with; (a) 2.5N NaOH solution (b) 2.5N NaOH, followed by 0.1N HCl; I: unmodified, II: 0.5 hour, III: 1 hour, IV: 2.5 hour, V: 5 hour.
- Figure 4.7** Occurrence of Na by ESCA for membranes treated at 30 °C with 1N NaOH at; (a) 0.5 hour, (b) 2.5 hour, (c) 5 hour and (d) 45 °C for 5 hour.
- Figure 4.8** Effect of annealing time on flux performance.
- Figure 4.9** Rejection analysis of unmodified (○) and surface modified (●) membrane.
- Figure 4.10** Change in water flux (○) and PEG (6 kDa) rejection (●) for membranes with different surface characteristics.
- Figure 4.11** PEG rejection versus PEG diameter for surface modified PAN membrane.
- Figure 4.12** FTIR-ATR spectra of (a) unmodified and (b) surface modified PAN membrane.
- Figure 4.13** SEM of cross section of (a) unmodified and (b) surface modified PAN membrane.
- Figure 4.14** AFM analysis of (a) unmodified and (b) surface modified PAN membrane.
- Figure 4.15** Arsenic rejection (R) at different feed concentration (pH: 7, cross flow velocity: 0.29 m.s<sup>-1</sup>, pressure: 1 bar, temperature: ambient).
- Figure 4.16** Variation in arsenic rejection (R) at 250 ppb (unfilled symbols) and 1000 ppb (filled symbols) as the function of cross flow velocity and pressure (0.24 bar: 0.24 m.s<sup>-1</sup> (-◆-), 0.39 m.s<sup>-1</sup> (-◇-); 1 bar: 0.23 m.s<sup>-1</sup> (-■-), 0.35 m.s<sup>-1</sup> (-□-); 2 bar: 0.09 m.s<sup>-1</sup> (-▲-), 0.13 m.s<sup>-1</sup> (-△-).
- Figure 4.17** Variation in arsenic rejection (R) at 50 ppm (unfilled symbols) and 1000 ppm (filled symbols) as the function of cross flow velocity and pressure (0.29 m.s<sup>-1</sup>, 0.24 bar: -◇-, -◆-; 0.28 m.s<sup>-1</sup>, 1 bar: -□-, -■-; 0.027 m.s<sup>-1</sup>, 2 bar: -△-, -▲-).
- Figure 4.18** Variation in arsenic rejection (R, unfilled symbols) and permeate flux (filled symbols) with time and feed solution pH for 50 ppm As-V concentration in feed, (pH = 4: -□-, -■-; pH = 5: -◇-, -◆-; pH = 6: -○-, -●-; pH = 7: -△-, -▲-).

- Figure 4.19** Variation in arsenic rejection (R) with feed temperature (feed concentration: 50 ppm of As-V, pH: 7).
- Figure 4.20** Flux analysis of grafted membrane; (●) before NaOH treatment and (○) after NaOH treatment.
- Figure 4.21** PEG<sub>8k</sub> rejection analysis of grafted membrane; (●) before NaOH treatment and (○) after NaOH treatment.

## **Chapter 5**

- Figure 5.1** Sheen automatic film applicator.
- Figure 5.2** WAXD spectrum of ABPBI.
- Figure 5.3** TGA spectrum of ABPBI.
- Figure 5.4** Pore size distribution of membranes prepared using different supports and 6% ABPBI in dope solution.
- Figure 5.5** SEM cross section images of (a), (b) supported and (c) unsupported ABPBI membrane.
- Figure 5.6** Rejection (R) of membranes prepared using different supports and 6% ABPBI in dope solution.
- Figure 5.7** PEG rejection versus PEG diameter for membranes prepared using 6% dope solution concentration on different supports.
- Figure 5.8** Rejection (R) of ABPBI membranes prepared by varying polymer concentration in dope solution and nonsolvent.
- Figure 5.9** Pore size distribution of ABPBI based membranes.
- Figure 5.10** PEG rejection versus PEG diameter for M-1 and M-6.
- Figure 5.11** Change in  $J_w$  after repeated glycerol treatment for membrane M-6.