

Table of Contents

List of Publications	ii
Abstract	iv
Abbreviations	xii
Contents	xvi
1 CHAPTER: INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 Background of the project	3
1.2 Motivation for work	8
1.3 Goal and research objectives	9
1.4 Outline (structure) of this study	10
1.5 References	12
2 CHAPTER: LITERATURE REVIEW	20
2.1 Pulp-and-paper mill manufacturing	21
2.1.1 Pulp making	22
2.1.2 Pulp processing	23
2.1.3 Paper-making	23
2.2 Effluent characteristics from Paper industry	24
2.3 Wastewater treatment in paper industry	25
2.3.1 Primary / physical treatment	26
2.3.2 Secondary treatment	26
2.3.2.1 Aerobic Treatment	27
2.3.2.2 Anaerobic Treatment	29
2.3.3 Tertiary treatment	32
2.4 Membrane filtration fundamentals	32
2.4.1 Ultrafiltration membrane process	35
2.4.2 Comparison between Dead - end vs. cross-flow Ultrafiltration	37
2.4.3 Membrane Fouling	40
2.4.4 Internal and external fouling	41
2.4.5 Reversible and irreversible fouling	42
2.4.6 Prevention and reduction of membrane fouling	42
2.5 Mathematical models for membrane fouling analysis	44

2.5.1	Pore blocking mechanisms-----	44
2.5.1.1	Pore blocking models for dead-end filtration -----	46
2.5.1.2	Pore blocking models adapted for cross-flow filtration-----	48
2.5.2	Resistance-in-series model -----	51
2.5.3	Constant-pressure filtration and cake formation-----	52
2.6	Membrane foulants characterization and identification -----	54
2.6.1	Mainly membrane foulants components-----	55
2.6.1.1	Dissolved and colloidal substances-----	55
2.6.1.2	Biofoulants y Organic Foulants-----	56
2.6.1.3	Inorganic Foulants-----	58
2.6.2	Specific ultraviolet absorbance (SUVA)-----	58
2.6.3	Fluorescence spectroscopy -----	59
2.6.4	Attenuated total reflection-Fourier transform infrared (ATR-FTIR) -----	62
2.6.5	Scanning electron microscopy (FESEM) -----	66
2.6.5.1	SEM-energy-dispersive spectrophotometry (EDX) -----	66
2.6.6	Optical coherence tomography (OCT) -----	67
2.7	References -----	69
3	CHAPTER: GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	92
3.1	Source and properties of treated effluent used as feed solution in the UF process -----	93
3.2	Analytical methods and apparatus -----	95
3.2.1	General characteristics-----	95
3.3	Membrane properties and characteristics-----	97
3.4	Pre-treatment before the UF processes -----	98
3.5	Cross-flow filtration experiments-----	99
3.5.1	Cross-flow filtration setup-----	99
3.5.2	Membrane characterisation -----	101
3.5.3	Flux decline in UF-----	102
3.5.4	Cleaning membranes procedure-----	103
3.6	Dead-end filtration experiments-----	104
3.6.1	Dead-end filtration setup-----	104
3.6.2	Filtration experiments-----	106
3.7	References -----	106

4	CHAPTER: PROCESS OPTIMIZATION VIA TAGUCHI METHOD TO REMOVE COLLOIDAL SUBSTANCES FROM RECYCLED PAPER AND CARDBOARD PRODUCTION WASTEWATER	109
4.1	Abstract-----	110
4.2	Introduction-----	111
4.3	Materials and methods-----	113
4.3.1	Paper mill treated effluent feedstock-----	113
4.3.2	Membranes and experimental setup-----	113
4.3.3	Analytical methods-----	114
4.3.4	Field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM)-----	114
4.3.5	Experimental procedure-----	114
4.3.5.1	Ultrafiltration experiments-----	114
4.3.5.2	Average permeate flux, COD rejection and cumulative flux decline analysis	115
4.3.6	Experimental design based on the Taguchi method-----	116
4.3.7	Utility concept-----	119
4.3.8	Optimum performance prediction-----	121
4.3.9	Analysis of variance (ANOVA)-----	122
4.4	Results and discussion-----	123
4.4.1	Design of experiments and experimental results-----	123
4.4.2	Taguchi results-----	127
4.4.3	ANOVA results-----	131
4.4.4	Optimum results obtained from the Taguchi method and utility concept	134
4.4.4.1	Analysis of individual response optimization-----	134
4.4.4.2	Analysis of multi- response optimization-----	134
4.4.5	Confirmation experiment under optimum conditions-----	137
4.5	Conclusion-----	141
4.6	References-----	142

5 CHAPTER: MODELLING APPROACH TO AN ULTRAFILTRATION PROCESS FOR THE REMOVAL OF DISSOLVED AND COLLOIDAL SUBSTANCES FROM TREATED EFFLUENT FOR REUSE IN RECYCLED PAPER MANUFACTURING 147

5.1	Abstract-----	148
5.2	Introduction-----	148
5.3	Materials and methods-----	150
5.3.1	Effluent sample used as feed solution-----	150
5.3.2	Membrane fouling experiments-----	150
5.3.3	Fouling models for cross-flow filtration-----	150
5.3.3.1	Pore blocking description-----	150
5.3.3.2	Determination of the sum of squared deviations and average relative error-----	152
5.4	Results and discussion-----	154
5.4.1	Membrane characterisation-----	154
5.4.2	Physical and chemical aspects of PMTE after the ultrafiltration process-----	154
5.4.3	Pore Blocking Mechanism-----	155
5.4.4	Estimation of the Pore Blocking resistance (R_{pb})-----	160
5.4.5	Predicting performance of constant-pressure filtration (membrane fouling)-----	165
5.4.6	Determination of membrane cleaning efficiency-----	167
5.5	Conclusion-----	171
5.6	References-----	172

6 CHAPTER: IDENTIFICATION OF FOULANTS ON POLYETHERSULFONE (PES) MEMBRANES USED TO REMOVE COLLOIDS AND DISSOLVED MATTER FROM A PAPER MILL TREATED EFFLUENT 177

6.1	Abstract-----	178
6.2	Introduction-----	178
6.3	Materials and methods-----	181
6.3.1	Membrane filtration tests-----	181
6.3.2	Ultrafiltration fouling models-----	182
6.3.3	Mass Balance Analysis-----	184

6.3.4	Identification and characterization of foulants-----	185
6.3.4.1	Field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM) and energy dispersive spectrophotometry (EDS). -----	185
6.3.4.2	Attenuated total reflection-Fourier transform infrared (ATR-FTIR) spectroscopy analysis -----	186
6.3.4.3	Foulant extraction-----	187
6.3.4.4	3DEEM fluorescence spectra analysis-----	188
6.4	Results and discussion-----	191
6.4.1	Analysis of the influence of membrane MWCO on permeate flux and fouling mechanism -----	191
6.4.2	Resistance-in-series and pore blocking model analysis-----	192
6.4.3	Mass balance analysis -----	198
6.4.4	Aromatic carbon (SUVA) removal by UF membrane-----	198
6.4.5	3DEEM fluorescence analysis-----	199
6.4.6	ATR-FTIR analysis -----	208
6.4.7	SEM and EDS analysis-----	212
6.5	conclusions -----	219
6.6	References -----	221
7	CHAPTER : CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK RECOMMENDATIONS	228
7.1	Conclusions -----	228
7.2	Recommendations and future work-----	230
	Appendix A: Factorial Design Calculations-----	232
	Appendix B: The Matlab modelling programmes. -----	235

List of Figures

Figure 2-1 - Schematic illustration of the pulp and paper process.....	22
Figure 2-2 - Typical layout of paper mill effluent treatment plant (Thompson et al., 2001).....	26
Figure 2-3 - Basic principle of the active sludge process.....	27
Figure 2-4 - IC (anaerobic reactor @ Paques) for treatment of papermill effluent. ...	31
Figure 2-5 - Biobed EGSB anaerobic reactor (@Veolia Water Technologies) for treatment of paper mill effluent.	31
Figure 2-6 - membrane separation by size exclusion.	33
Figure 2-7 - Spectrum of membrane filtration. Addapted from Graff, 2012).....	35
Figure 2-8 - PES composite membrane used in UF- (a) Scheme - (b) FESEM pictures (magnification = 200 x, 100µm, 799V) highlighting the 3 layers.	36
Figure 2-9 - Common commercial polymers used for production UF membranes....	36
Figure 2-10 - Principle of dead - end filtration: (a) schematic diagram setup; (b) separation mode.	37
Figure 2-11 - Principle of cross flow filtration: (a) Schematic diagram of CFF system; (b) separation process.....	38
Figure 2-12 - Configuration of a) hollow fiber cartridges and b) plate and flat sheet.	39
Figure 2-13 - A schematic diagram of the various fouling mechanisms on membrane.	41
Figure 2-14 - Different fouling mechanisms happening in porous membranes (Hermia, 1982).....	45
Figure 2-15 - Excitation and emission wavelength boundaries for natural organic matter (Chen et al., 2003b).....	61
Figure 2-16 - Locations of fluorescence Peaks A, B, C, T and M. (adopted from Hudson et al., 2007).....	62
Figure 2-17 - Spectra of PES UF membrane and fouled membrane by paper mill treated effluent.	65

Figure 2-18 - Illustration of the membrane interfacing with the ATR crystal (successively fouling layer/active layer of membrane and support layer of membrane).	65
Figure 3-1 - Aerial view of the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) in a papermaking factory. Google Maps (on-line), 2019.	93
Figure 3-2 - Photograph of the setup for TOC-VCSN Shimadzu Analyzer used in the IEM.	96
Figure 3-3 - Photograph of the setup for Zetasizer Nano ZS instrument (Malvern Instruments) used in the ISIRYM.	97
Figure 3-4 - Schematic image of the setup with a membrane cell used for pre-filtration experiments before dead-end filtration.	98
Figure 3-5 - Schematic image of the setup with a conventional filtration used for pre-treatment before the cross-flow UF.	99
Figure 3-6 - Photographs of the experimental system. UF pilot plant with flat-sheet membrane module (Rhône-Poulenc, France).	100
Figure 3-7 - Schematic diagram for the cross-flow ultrafiltration membrane process.	101
Figure 3-8 - Lab-scale of the dead-end membrane filtration system with stirred cell (a) process setup photograph and (b) pilot schematic diagram.	105
Figure 4-1 Flow diagram of Taguchi method steps to optimize a UF process to remove DCS from paperboard mill treated effluent (Kumar and Singh, 2014; Roy, 1990). ...	119
Figure 4-2 - Volumetric flux as a function of transmembrane pressure for PES membranes of different MWCO (T = 22.5 °C).	124
Figure 4-3 - Profile of the permeate flux through the operating time for each MWCO: (a) 10 kDa, (b) 50 kDa, and (c) 100 kDa.	126
Figure 4-4 - Mean effect curves for S/N ratios for a) the average permeate flux, b) COD rejection rate, and c) the cumulative flux decline (SFD).	129
Figure 4-5 - ANOVA results for the percentage contribution of each factor to the response processes.	133

Figure 4-6 - Effect of process parameters on mean utility value (<i>JP</i> ; COD rejection rate, SFD).....	136
Figure 4-7 - Permeate flux as a function of time under optimized conditions during UF of PMTE: PES 100 kDa membrane at TMP= 2.0 bar, CFV = 0.752 m/s, and T = 15 °C.	138
Figure 4-8 - FESEM image of fresh and fouled membranes (PES 100 kDa) at different operating times, (a) clean membrane surface, (b) membrane surface fouled after 30 min filtration, (c) at the end of the UF (2 hours) with pore blocking and cake layer (d) membrane foulant sediments.	139
Figure 5-1 - Algorithm for the parameter K optimization.	152
Figure 5-2 - Pure water permeate flux vs. applied pressure. TMPs (1.0, 1.5, 2.0 and 3.0 bar) at 22 °C, crossflow rate of 4.5 L/min and operation time 2 h. The value obtained for the <i>R_m</i> for the flat sheet 10 kDa PES membrane was $1.629 \times 10^{12}(\text{m}^{-1})$	154
Figure 5-3 - Hermia's pore blocking models fitting for recycled paper wastewater 10 kDa PES membrane filtration experiments, at 3 bar.....	156
Figure 5-4 - Hermia's pore blocking models fitting for recycled paper wastewater 10 kDa PES membrane filtration experiments, at 2 bar.....	157
Figure 5-5 -Hermia's pore blocking models fitting for recycled paper wastewater 10 kDa PES membrane filtration experiments, at 1 bar.....	157
Figure 5-6 - Comparison of predictive pore blocking resistances as a function of filtration time among different models at different TMPs for UF PMTE with 10 kDa PES membrane: (a) 1.0 bar, (b) 2.0 bar and (c) 3.0 bar.....	162
Figure 5-7 - Experimental and predicted pore blocking resistance distribution for PMTE at 10 kDa PES membrane and different TMPs. Averaged values of resistance was used and the data was modeled using Matlab® modelling programmes (Appendix B).	163
Figure 5-8 - Comparison between experimental flux decline and theoretical model for permeate flux with cross flow for a flat-sheet 10 kDa PES membrane in cross flow filtration mode as calculated from Equation 5-9 (conditions: TMP=3.0 bar, <i>C_g</i> =0.7, $\epsilon=0.3$, <i>C₀</i> =0.2 g/L, <i>a_p</i> =158 nm, <i>R_m</i> = $1.65 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^{-1}$).....	165

Figure 5-9 - Resistance of the cake layer and cake thickness as a function of UF time (8 h) in flat-sheet, crossflow filtration at constant pressure . Conditions TMP= 3.0 bar, C _g = 0.7, ε= 0.3, C ₀ = 0.2 g/L, a _p = 158 nm, R _m = 1.65× 10 ¹² m ⁻¹ , r _c =3.01 × 10 ¹² (m ⁻²).	167
Figure 5-10 - Normalised flux recovery (J _p (t)/J ₀) by chemical and hydraulic methods. Initial permeate flux was 55.12±1.0 L/m ² h and resistance by total fouling 2.26 ×10 ¹³ m ⁻¹	168
Figure 5-11 - Membrane resistance removal at various filtration cycles by chemical and hydraulic methods.	170
Figure 6-1 - Flow chart of the recovery process of water in the cardboard paper making process.....	179
Figure 6-2 - Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscope (FESEM) (ZEISS ULTRA 55 model. Oxford Instruments, UK) used in the ISIRYM.	186
Figure 6-3 - FT-IR spectrometer with universal ATR Sampling Attachment (Thermo Electron Corporation, USA) used in the IEM.	187
Figure 6-4 - Rotavapor extraction system and vacuum unit used to foulants extraction, used in the IEM.	188
Figure 6-5 - Photograph of Perkin-Elmer, LS-55 fluorescence spectrometer (Perkin-Elmer, USA), used in the IEM.....	189
Figure 6-6 - Normalized flux vs. specific filtration volume, during the filtration of PMTE using 10 kDa, 50 kDa and 100 kDa UF-PES membranes. The applied TMP was 2.0 bar, at room temperature and TOC concentration of the feed solution about 78.0 ± 2.5 mg·L ⁻¹	191
Figure 6-7 - Specific resistance (α) and fouling resistance (R _f) calculated using the resistance-in series-model for (a) 10 kDa MWCO, (b) 50 kDa MWCO and (c) 100 kDa MWCO membranes.....	194
Figure 6-8 - Comparison between experimental average permeate flux and predicted average flux fitted by dead-end pore blocking models Equation 6 6 – Equation 6 9:(a) 10 kDa MWCO, (b) 50 kDa MWCO and (c) 100 kDa MWCO membranes.	197
Figure 6-9 - Carbon mass balances during UF for different MWCO, m _{feed} = 19.76 ±0.5 mg.C.....	198

Figure 6-10 - 3DEEM fluorescence spectra for (a) feed solution (prefiltered with 0.45 μm filter); (b) permeate 10 kDa; (c) permeate 50 kDa; and (d) permeate 100 kDa . Region I and II = aromatic protein-like substances I and II respectively; Region III = fulvic acid-like substances; Region IV = soluble microbial by-products; Region V = humic acid-like substances.....201

Figure 6-11 - 3D view of fluorescence spectra of foulants extracted from fouled membranes at the end of filtration (dead-end filtration protocol): (a) 10 kDa; (b) 50 kDa, and (c) 100 kDa.....207

Figure 6-12 - Volumen of fluorescence distribution for the foulants extracted of three different PES membranes.207

Figure 6-13 - ATR-FTIR spectra comparison of fresh PES membrane and fouled membrane: (a) 10 kDa; (b) 50 kDa, and (c) 100 kDa (the IR spectrum comparison between MWCO membranes were almost the same) and DCS- fouled PES membranes (10 kDa, 50kDa and 100 kDa) by PMTE filtration (d).....210

Figure 6-14 - FESEM images of the membrane surfaces (a) fresh 10 kDa MWCO; (b) fouled 10 kDa MWCO; (c) cleaned 10 kDa MWCO, (d) fresh 50 kDa MWCO; (e) fouled 50 kDa MWCO; (f) cleaned 50 kDa MWCO, (g) fresh 100 kDa MWCO; (h) fouled 100 kDa MWCO; (i) cleaned 100 kDa MWCO.....215

Figure 6-15 - EDS spectrum of the membrane surfaces (a) fresh 10 kDa MWCO; (b) fouled 10 kDa MWCO; (c) fresh 50 kDa MWCO; (d) fouled 50 kDa MWCO; (e) fresh 100 kDa MWCO; (f) fouled 100 kDa MWCO.217

List of Tables

Table 1-1 - Physical-chemical characterization of recycled paper wastewater from Zwain et al. (2013).....	5
Table 2-1 - Removal efficiency of different aerobic treatment processes applied in pulp-and-paper wastewaters. Adopted from (Ashrafi et al., 2015).....	28
Table 2-2 - Removal efficiency of different anaerobic treatment processes applied in pulp-and-paper wastewaters. Adopted from (Ashrafi et al., 2015).....	30
Table 2-3 -Classification of membrane Mulder processes with pore size and pressure-drive (adapted from Mulder, 1996).	34
Table 2-4 - Classification of membrane resistances.	52
Table 2-5 - Sources of DCS in various pulp and paper Process Waters adapted from Hubbe et al. (2012).....	56
Table 2-5 - Guidelines on the nature of DOM according to SUVA. Addapted from (Cunha, 2014; Edzwald and Tobiason, 1999)	59
Table 2-6 - Commonly identified PARAFAC components and their corresponding peaks identified in Coble. (1996). Adapted from B. Fellman et al., 2010 and Hudson et al., 2007.....	61
Table 2-7 - The most common peaks from PES and the residual fouling found in the IR spectrum.....	64
Table 2-8 - Summary comparing analytical techniques for foulant identification and characterization of membrane fouling. Addapted from (Chen et al., 2018).	68
Table 3-1 - Average compositions of the paper mill treated effluent (anaerobic and aerobic treatment) used in the experiments.	94
Table 3-2 - Technical data on the membranes used in this study.....	98
Table 4-1 - Average compositions of the paperboard mill treated effluent (biologically treated wastewater) used in the experiments.....	113
Table 4-2 - Process parameters and their levels.....	117
Table 4-3 - Experimental layout using L9 (34) orthogonal array in accordance with the Taguchi method.....	117

Table 4-4 - Taguchi orthogonal array L_9 (3^4) for the operating parameters and experimental response parameters.	125
Table 4-5 - Signal-to-noise results (mean \pm standard deviation (SD), three repetitions for each experimental condition).	128
Table 4-6 - Analysis of variance (ANOVA) results for average permeate flux, COD rejection, and SFD for each factor.	131
Table 4-7 - Individual Taguchi predictions for average permeate flux, COD rejection rate and SFD.	134
Table 4-8 - Pairwise comparison matrix.	135
Table 4-9 - Utility value based on UF responses (JP , COD rejection, SFD).	135
Table 4-10 - ANOVA analysis results for multi-response UF (overall utility function).	136
Table 4-11 - Optimum conditions for multi-response UF predicted using the utility concept.	137
Table 4-12 - Permeate quality (process performance) under optimum conditions, at the end of 2 hours operating.	140
Table 4-13 - Summary and comparison of experimental and predicted optimal conditions for PMTE.	140
Table 5-1 - Fouling mechanism for constant flow rate in cross-flow UF (Field et al., 1995).	151
Table 5-2 - Physical-chemical parameters of the effluent treated by conversional filtration and ultrafiltration separation.	155
Table 5-3 - Pore blocking R^2 , fitting of Hermia's models. Values for recycled paper wastewater 10 kDa MWCO PES membrane, ultrafiltration experiments.	159
Table 5-4 - Pore blocking standard error of the estimate and coefficient of residual variation between experimental data and Hermia's models against TMP.	164
Table 5-5 - Membrane flux recovery after each cleaning step with DI water in backwash and NaOH. Initial permeate flux 55.5 ± 1.0 L/m ² h.	169

Table 6-1 - Summary of the fouling mechanisms by blocking models during dead-end filtration.....	184
Table 6-2 - Characteristics of the associated fluorophores detected by 3DEEM according to W. Chen et al. (2003b).....	189
Table 6-3 - Permeate flux, flux reduction and total flux recovery after cleaning steps (relaxation and backwashing) from different MWCO membranes.	192
Table 6-4 - Values of pore blocking parameters, comparison between the experimental and predicted average permeate flux and the model fitting accuracy (R^2).	194
Table 6-5 - Aromatic carbon (SUVA) in the PMTE and permeates, at 2.0 bar and different MWCO.....	199
Table 6-6 - Volume of fluorescence Φ_i and the reduction in the concentration of fluorescent compounds after UF.	203
Table 6-7 - Peaks and assignments of infrared spectra for clean and fouled membranes.	211
Table 6-8 - Inorganic composition of fresh and fouled membranes.	218