RECLANATION Managing Water in the West

Desalination and Water Purification Research and Development Program Report No. 170

Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control



U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation

December 2013

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highw ay, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.				
	. REPORT TYPE		3.	DATES COVERED (From - To)
25 Nov 2013	Final			Oct 2011 to Nov 2013
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE			5a. CONTR	ACT NUMBER
Development and Testing of a Copper	-Charged Cellulose Aceta	e Membrane	Agreement No. R11AC81536	
for Biofilm Control			5b. GRANT	NUMBER
			5c. PROGR	AM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S) Isabel C. Escobar			5d. PROJE	CT NUMBER
Cyndee L. Gruden Sunitha Asapu			5e. TASK N Task I	NUMBER V
			5f. WORK	UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S)	AND ADDRESS(ES)			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT
The University of Toledo				NUMBER
2801 W. Bancroft Street				
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Department of the Interior. Bureau of Reclamation				BOR
Technical Service Center, Environmental Services Division				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT
Water Treatment Engineering and Research Group, 86-68230				NUMBER(S)
PO Box 25007, Denver, CO 80225-0007				DWPR Report No. 170
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Available from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS)				
Operations Division, 5285 Port Royal	Road. Springfield. VA 22	161		
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE	, ~F&			
Report can be downloaded from Reclamation Web site:				
www.usbr.gov/pmts/water/publications/reports.html				
14. ABSTRACT				
The goal of this project was to develop low-biofouling membranes through the functionalization of cellulose acetate (CA)				
epoxy was used to attach a chelating	agent iminodiacetic acid	(IDA) to facilit	ate the char	rging of copper to the membrane surface
CA and copper-charged membranes were characterized chemically and structurally. Permeation experiments were conducted with				
distilled (DI) water and then subjected	d to protein rejection meas	urements. The p	permeation	of the copper-charged membrane was
initially lower than the CA membrane during the filtration of DI water. The membranes were then subjected to bovine serum albumin				
(BSA) and lipase filtration. The copper-charged membrane showed higher permeation values for of both proteins as compared to CA				
from reduced fouling from both proteins. The rejection of BSA and linese was the same for both the copper charged and CA				
membranes. Therefore, the modified membranes have a potential to be used as low-biofouling membranes in the future.				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
biofouling, cellulose acetate, reverse osmosis, nanofiltration, surface functionalization, copper				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: 17. LIMITATION 18. NUMBER 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON OF ABSTRACT OF PAGES John Waln			OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT b. ABSTRACT a. THIS PA				.

Desalination and Water Purification Research and Development Program Report No. 170

Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control

Prepared for Reclamation Under Agreement No. R110AC81536

by

Isabel C. Escobar Cyndee L. Gruden



U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation

MISSION STATEMENTS

The U.S. Department of the Interior protects America's natural resources and heritage, honors our cultures and tribal communities, and supplies the energy to power our future.

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public.

Disclaimer

The views, analyses, recommendations, and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not represent official or unofficial policies or opinions of the U.S. Government, and the United States takes no position with regard to any findings, conclusions, or recommendations made. As such, mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Acknowledgements

The research reported herein was made possible by a grant from the Bureau of Reclamation's Desalination and Water Purification Research and Development Program (Cooperative Agreement No. R11AC81537). The contents do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the sponsors nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use. The authors wish to express their appreciation for the advice and assistance of Frank Leitz and Andrew Tiffenbach, the Bureau of Reclamation project officers. The authors are especially grateful to Mr. Jonathan Daly and his staff at the City of Corona, specifically Mr. Justin Amon, Mr. Tom Moody, and the operators at the Temescal Desalter, for providing facilities for the pilot testing and assisting with set up and decommissioning of the equipment. Further thanks go to GE Infrastructure Water and Process Technologies, who provided some pilot equipment at a reduced cost, and to Mr. Jeff Mosher and the Southern California Salinity Coalition who also provided some financial assistance for the project.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ATCC	American Type Culture Collection		
BSA	bovine serum albumin		
CA	cellulose acetate		
CCMP	Center for Cultivation of Marine Phytoplankton		
DI	distilled		
DMSO	dimethyl sulfoxide		
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid		
DOM	dissolved organic matter		
EDS	energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy		
EDTA	ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid		
EPS	extracellular polymeric substance		
FTIR	Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy		
g/L	grams per liter		
ĞMA	glycidyl methacrylate		
IDA	iminodiacetic acid		
IMA	immobilized metal affinity		
Μ	moles per liter		
MF	microfiltration		
mg/L	milligrams per liter		
mĽ	milliliter		
mM	millimole		
Mw	molecular weight		
NaCl	sodium chloride		
NF	nanofiltration		
nm	nanometer		
NMP	N-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone		
NOM	natural organic matter		
PA	polyamide		
PEG	polyethylene glycol		
pI	isoelectric points		
PP	polypropylene		
ppm	parts per million		
PS	polysulfone		
RO	reverse osmosis		
SEM	scanning electron microscopy		
TEP	transparent exopolymeric particles		
TFC	thin film composite		
TOC	total organic carbon		
UF	ultrafiltration		
wt%	weight percent		
Symbols			
°C	dagraas Calsius		
	areater than		
/ 	micron		
μ #	number		
π 0⁄2	nercent		
/U +	plue or minue		
<u>-</u>	plus of filling		

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	. ES-1
Background and Introduction	1
Membrane Materials	2
Membrane Fouling	3
Colloidal Fouling	3
Inorganic Fouling	3
Organic Fouling	4
Biofouling	5
Charging Membranes with Copper	8
Conclusions and Recommendations	9
Equipment and Methods	9
Materials	9
Methods	10
Polymerization of Glycidal Methacrylate	10
Phase Inversion	11
Iminodiacetic Acid and Copper Application	11
Pseudomonas fluorescens Migula (ATCC #12842)	11
The Marine Algae, Chaetoceros affinis (CCMP 158)	11
Characterization	14
Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy Analysis	14
Scanning Electron Microscopy Analyses	14
Contact Angle Measurements	14
Pore Size Distribution	14
Copper Leaching Cross-Flow Studies	15
Filtration Experiments	16
Surface Area Coverage Analysis	17
Results	18
Chemical Characterization of CA, CA-GMA, and CA-GMA-IDA	
Membranes	18
Morphological Characterization of Cellulose Acetate and	
Copper-charged Membranes	19
Hydrophilicity of Cellulose Acetate and Copper-charged Membranes	21
Pore Size Distribution Analysis	21
Copper Leaching – Cross-Flow Study	22
Filtration Experiments	23
Discussion of Results	26
References	29

Tables

Table

1	Neutral solutes used for pore size distribution analysis	15
2	Compositions of synthetic brackish water	17
3	FTIR peak descriptions	19
4	FTIR peak descriptions	19
5	Protein rejections of CA and copper-charged membranes	
6	Biofilm surface area coverage using Image J	
7	FTIR peak descriptions	

Figures

Figure

Page

Page

1	Reaction scheme of the modification [92]	10
2	Biofoulant (P. fluorescens) growth curve.	12
3	C. affinis observed with light microscopy at 5 days of incubation	12
4	Algae growth curve and the corresponding TEP concentration	13
5	TEP stained with alcian blue $(20\times)$.	13
6	Contact angle measurement.	14
7	Cross-flow experiment apparatus used for copper leaching studies.	16
8	Schematic of dead-end filtration cell [93].	17
9	Bioflim surface area coverage assessment using Image J.	
	(a) Biofouled membrane; (b) clean membrane; and	
	(c) biofouled membrane	18
10	FTIR spectra comparing pure CA membranes with CA-GMA	
	membranes.	18
11	FTIR spectra comparing pure CA membranes with	
	CA-GMA-IDA membranes.	19
12	SEM images of the treated membrane (left) and nontreated	
	membranes (right).	20
13	EDS images of the copper-charged membrane	20
14	Contact angle of membranes.	21
15	Contact angle of membranes.	22
16	Cross-flow copper leaching results.	22
17	Permeation measurements with DI water (0–8 hours), BSA	
	(8–16 hours), and lipase (16–24 hours)	23
18	Flux decline in 24-hour cross-flow filtration studies with	
	biofoulant	24
19	Flux decline data with TEP (1 mg/L) in saline water	
	(35 g/L NaCl).	25
20	FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes.	26

Appendices

Appendix

- A Bacterial Growth Data
- B Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) Peak Data
- C Flux Data

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Implementation of nanofiltration and reverse osmosis (RO) processes in treating traditional water sources can provide a steady-state level of removal that eliminates the need for regeneration of ion exchange resins or granular activated carbon. Moreover, RO can help meet future potable water demands through desalination of seawater and brackish waters. Many of these applications use membranes in a spiral-wound configuration that contains a feed spacer between the envelopes. The productivity of membrane filtration is severely lowered by fouling, which is caused by the accumulation of foreign substances on the surface and/or within pores of membranes. Microbial fouling, or biofouling, is the growth of micro-organisms on the membrane surface and on the feed spacer. The fouling of membranes has demanded and continues to demand considerable attention from industry and research communities.

The goal of this project was to develop low-biofouling membranes through the functionalization of cellulose acetate (CA) membranes with metal chelating ligands charged with biocidal metal ions, i.e., copper ions. The use of lowbiofouling membranes would reduce the cost associated with chemical pretreatment and cleaning as well as chemical storage. To this end, glycidyl methacrylate (GMA), an epoxy, was used to attach a chelating agent, iminodiacetic acid (IDA) to facilitate the charging of copper to the membrane surface. Both CA and CA-GMA membranes were cast using the phase-inversion method. The CA-GMA membranes were then charged with copper ions to make them resistant to microbial growth. The pore size distribution analysis of CA and copper-charged membranes were conducted using various molecular weights of polyethylene glycol. CA and copper-charged membranes were characterized using Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy for chemistry, scanning electron microscopy for copper dispersion on the membrane surface, and contact angle for hydrophilicity changes. The permeation experiments were conducted with distilled (DI) water and protein solutions followed by protein rejection measurements. The permeation of the copper-charged membrane was initially lower than the CA membrane during the filtration of DI water. The membranes were then subjected to bovine serum albumin (BSA) and lipase filtration. The copper-charged membrane showed higher permeation values for both proteins as compared to CA membranes. The lower permeation with DI resulted from increased resistance from the IDA and copper on the surface during DI water filtration, and later, higher permeation resulted from reduced fouling from both proteins. The rejection of BSA and lipase was the same for both the coppercharged and CA membranes. Therefore, the modified membranes have a potential to be used as low-biofouling membranes in the future.

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Currently, about one-half of the world's population suffers from water shortages, and over the next 25 years, the number of people affected by severe water shortages is expected to increase fourfold [1]. In the developing countries that are most affected, 80 - 90 percent (%) of all diseases and 30% of all deaths result from poor water quality [2]. In addition, modern economies cannot develop and thrive without sufficient access to water. There is growing recognition by governments and corporations that future peace and prosperity is intimately tied to the availability of clean, fresh water [3, 4].

Membranes possess the ability to treat a wide variety of source waters, such as brackish and seawater for desalination, as well as low quality surface water and even wastewater. They can produce water that is of higher quality than traditional water treatment processes such as coagulation, flocculation, sedimentation, sand filtration, etc. For this reason, membranes and membrane processes have gained much popularity in recent years. Furthermore, like any high-tech product, membrane performance has been consistently increasing while membrane cost has been consistently decreasing [5]. Ultimately, dwindling freshwater resources, more stringent water treatment standards, and the need to augment existing water supplies in growing urban areas are all driving factors for the expansion of membrane processes [6].

Membranes for water treatment are usually characterized into four main classifications that can be based solely on pore size. These classifications are, from the largest pore size (approximately 1 micron [µm]) to the smallest (approximately 0.001 µm): microfiltration (MF) and ultrafiltration (UF), which are considered low-pressure membranes, and nanofiltration (NF) and reverse osmosis (RO), which are considered high-pressure membranes. RO membranes have also been considered to be nonporous membranes resulting in a solutiondiffusion based separation. Much advancement has been made in membrane performance, permeability, and durability, but there are still many problems with membrane performance and lifetime, which restrict them from more widespread uses. One such challenge, which is common to both low- and high-pressure systems, is membrane fouling [7]. Fouling can be described as the undesirable accumulation and/or formation of deposits at the membrane surfaces, on the membrane pores, or within the pores. Just as it is with membrane classifications, there are four main categories of membrane fouling: colloidal fouling, inorganic fouling, organic fouling, and biological fouling, which is often referred to as biofouling. The accumulation of foulants hinder the membrane filtration process by decreasing the flux of permeate and increasing the hydraulic resistance of mass transport. This accumulation can come in the form of cake/gel layer formation, concentration polarization, or physical pore blocking.

Biofouling is the accumulation and growth of micro-organisms on the membrane surface and on the feed spacer present between the envelopes in spiral-wound RO

Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control – Report No. 170

membrane modules. This accumulation of micro-organisms, along with the presence of nutrients that are common in many membrane applications, forms biofilms. For spiral-wound RO and NF membranes, biofouling is the major type of fouling leading to pressure drop [8–10]. It has been shown that biofouling causes a flux decline by increasing hydraulic resistance and by hindering back diffusion of salts, which further increases the concentration polarizations phenomenon [11, 12]. Furthermore, biofouling is particularly significant because membrane replacement due to fouling is the single largest operating cost in water separation [7]. For this reason, research on altering the chemical, and possibly antimicrobial, properties of the feed spacer is the focus of much attention.

In biofilms, organisms are embedded in a matrix of microbial origin consisting of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS). These matrices are often very complex and difficult to remove. For this reason, much effort goes into the prevention of biofilm growth rather than its removal. This prevention is usually attempted through the use of pretreatments, nutrient removal, maximizing shear forces at the membrane surface, and back-flushing. The problem with pretreatment methods is that even if 99.9% of micro-organisms are removed, those left remaining can proliferate and cause irreversible fouling. Furthermore, biocides, such as free or combined chlorine, can only be used with certain chlorine-resistant membranes. Since biofouling is such a common problem, this has its downfalls. Biofouling often starts at the membrane/feed spacer interface, suggesting that biofouling might be a feed spacer problem [13].

The goal of this project was to develop low-biofouling membranes through the functionalization of the membrane surface. The functionalized membrane contained a metal chelating ligand, iminodiacetic acid (IDA). Many studies have been conducted on the use of copper ions to disinfect water against microbial biofilms [14, 15]. These ions are believed to interfere with enzymes involved in cellular respiration and bind deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) at specific sites [16]. For this reason, the metal chelating ligands were charged with copper ions to increase biofouling resistance.

Membrane Materials

The majority of RO and NF membranes are found in a spiral-wound configuration and are polyamide (PA) thin-film composite (TFC) membranes, although cellulose acetate (CA) and cellulose triacetate are also used [17]. Other commercial materials of NF/RO membranes include sulfonated polysulfone, sulfonated polyether sulfone, piperazine polyamide, and polyvinyl alcohol [18]. The TFC RO membrane usually consists of three structural components: polyester fabric, polysulfone (PS) support, and PA dense film layer [19]. This type of membrane provides high flux and strength, coming from a loose and porous, yet mechanically strong, support layer and high rejection due to the thin selective polyamide layer.

Membrane Fouling

Colloidal Fouling

Feed water to membranes is generally pretreated for larger particles. Hence, colloids are generally the reason for particulate fouling in membrane systems. As its definition implies, when the term colloid is used in fouling, it covers a myriad of different materials or aggregates of materials, including organic, inorganic, and biological materials. Low-pressure membranes such as MF and UF are usually discussed when colloid fouling is of concern. This is because these sorts of filtration are designed to reject such particles. The rejections of these particles result in cake/gel layers on or in the membrane pores. The layer has characteristics that may depend on the system operation parameters (flux and velocity levels), membrane characteristics (surface roughness and charge), solution chemistry (pH, ionic strength, ionic composition), and the characteristics of the colloids (size, shape, charge, and hydrophobicity). Particulate fouling has obvious impacts on the performance of a membrane system. The increase in deposition of materials on the surface can form a compact layer that decreases flux and increases the pressure required for operation [20]. Colloidal fouling is typically assessed or evaluated in terms of transport, which is determined by convective forces, such as permeate flux and cross-flow velocity, and attachment, which is determined by electrostatic, van der Waals, and hydrophobic interactions [21]. Colloidal fouling is most commonly dealt with via pretreatment of the feed stream and back-flushing of the membranes, but sometimes pH adjustment is used as well. Overall, little can be done to prevent colloidal fouling on a long-term basis because, as previously mentioned, it is what some membranes are intended to reject [22, 23].

Inorganic Fouling

Inorganic fouling is caused by any material of inorganic origin. It may be the sole source of fouling, but more commonly, it is in concert with other types of fouling [24]. This type of fouling is usually thought of as the precipitation of dissolved, sparingly soluble metals as metal hydroxides, salts, and minerals onto membrane surfaces, which results in scaling. Inorganic fouling is usually encountered in desalination systems where salt concentrations and their rejections are high. The phenomenon known as concentration polarization plays a large part in inorganic fouling and, more specifically, mineral scaling [25, 26]. In a concentration polarization layer, the concentration of chemical species (the inorganic compounds in this case) is higher at the membrane surface than in the bulk solution. Concentration polarization occurs because the rate of arrival of an inorganic species at the surface is larger than that of the diffusion of it back into

Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control – Report No. 170

the bulk solution. As Elimelech and Bhattacharjee [26] have shown, concentration polarization can affect membrane performance adversely outright, but what is more important is its role in the formation of mineral scaling. Mineral scale formation is almost always initiated within the concentration polarization boundary layer. This is due to the elevated salt concentrations in the concentration polarization layer relative to those in the bulk solution, which can result in precipitation [26]. This precipitation and the subsequent mineral scaling occur when rejected salts or minerals become so concentrated at the membrane surface that they exceed their solubility limit. As is common with most types of fouling, the properties of this scale are dependent on the chemistry of the bulk solution.

More often than not though, the scaling is considered to be a hard or rock-like structure that grows from an initial nucleation site. This scale can contain its own microenvironment that can result in difficult removal and flow obstructions. There are many different forms of mineral scale that can occur simultaneously in a system and this can result in the formation of a very complex scale. Because of this, the chemistry of mineral scale removal is poorly understood and currently the topic of much research. pH adjustment through acid addition and the use of antiscalants are the two most widely used pretreatment methods to avoid scaling in NF and RO processes [27]. Due to the weak pH dependence of the solubility of barium and calcium sulfate, it is difficult to control scaling due to it in membrane systems through pH adjustment alone. In these cases, antiscalants are required to prevent mineral scale formation. The mechanisms through which an antiscalant works relies on its ability to interfere with the two principle mechanisms of scale formation: nucleation and crystal growth [27]. The four mechanisms through which this may occur are interference with the clustering process, dispersion, crystal distortion, and chelation, which results in a soluble salt [28].

Polycarboxylates and phosphonates, two types of polymeric organic compounds, are the most common antiscalants used in membrane treatment [27]. Metallic ions have also been proposed to be an efficient antiscalant for feed streams prone to calcium carbonate precipitation [29]. As far as pH adjustment goes, the most common form is acid addition to control inorganic scaling. However, alkalization has been utilized as another form of pretreatment [30].

Organic Fouling

Organic fouling generally results from the adsorption of dissolved organic matter (DOM) on the membrane surface but can also result from deposition of colloidal organic matter. It is usually the first form and primary cause of chronic membrane fouling in most membrane systems. Organic foulants can include natural organic matter (NOM), algogenic organic matter, organic macromolecules, organic colloids, biopolymers, and microbially derived cellular debris. Organic fouling is a ubiquitous problem throughout all membrane processes. Studies have shown that organic matter is the most prevalent membrane foulant, having accounted for nearly one-half of the foulants that were identified in membrane autopsies [28].

Organic fouling occurs through a variety of mechanisms, including adsorption, attachment, pore blockage, and cake/gel layer formation. The occurrence and progression of these different mechanisms are influenced by a host of parameters, including the properties of the organic matter, such as size, hydrophobicity, and charge; membrane characteristics such as hydrophobicity, charge, surface roughness, and pore size; water chemistry; and operation parameters [31, 32]. Since adsorption is the mechanism most commonly associated with organic fouling, interaction between the membrane surface and organic foulant is of supreme significance. It is this interaction that has become the focus of much organic fouling control. As previously mentioned, surface characteristics play a large role in the adsorption of organic materials. If these can be altered, then the fouling can be controlled. Two membrane surface characteristics that have shown promising results are decreases in surface roughness and increases in membrane hydrophilicity. Both have shown the ability to decrease organic fouling, probably by lessening the effect of adsorption of organic matter [33, 34].

Biofouling

Biofouling, which is the accumulation and growth of micro-organisms and biofilms on the membrane surface and on the feed spacer, causes a significant increase in differential pressure, is difficult to eliminate by routine cleaning procedures, and is ultimately endemic [35]. Biofouling can cause a flux decline by two methods: (i) an increase of the hydraulic resistance over the membrane and (ii) hindering the back diffusion of salts [36]. Micro-organisms are present in nearly all water systems [37], and because of this, biofouling and its control remains a major operating problem for many RO plants, as it occurs despite the use of pretreatment systems and the addition of disinfectants. Biofouling is especially problematic because biofilms occurring in membrane systems may cause severe loss of performance and the use of costly cleaning procedures to maintain output and quality. Frequently, the fouling can be so severe that operation cannot be maintained, and membrane replacement is needed [35]. In spirally wound elements, biofouling is especially problematic due to the possibility for some sections of the flow channel to become blocked. Furthermore, biofouling can lead to other types of fouling, such as inorganic fouling, as these channeling issues cause rapid salt concentration in the affected areas. This leads to the precipitation of sparingly soluble salts and, ultimately, scaling [38].

Biofouling Mechanism

Biofouling of membrane surfaces occurs in a few general phases. Initially, the surface to which the biofilm attaches becomes conditioned with a range of organic molecules that rapidly adsorb to the surface upon exposure to an aqueous environment. These molecules can include proteins, polysaccharides, nucleic acids, humic acids, lipids, fatty acids, pollutants, etc. [39] Then, primary colonization occurs where adhesion is essentially proportional to the cell density in the water phase and occurs owing to weak physicochemical interactions. It

Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control – Report No. 170

is thought that the cells that initially attach during this phase are often in starvation/survival phase and tend to be smaller in size and secreting a higher ratio of extracellular polysaccharides [39]. It has been shown that higher amounts of EPS are directly related to cellular adhesion [40]. This primary colonization is then followed by the logarithmical growth phase, when cell growth on the surface contributes more to biofilm accumulation than does the adhesion of planktonic cells. Essentially, the cells which have attached to the conditioned surface can now feed off the nutrients which are concentrated at the membrane surface, due to rejection by the membrane's selective layer, and multiply [37]. Finally, a plateau phase, when biofilm growth (adhesion and cell multiplication) and cell detachment are in balance, occurs. This phase is controlled by the nutrient concentration and the resultant growth rate, the mechanical stability of the biofilm, and the effective shear forces. Also, it is independent of the concentration of cells in the raw water. It is also thought that during this stage subsequent production of extracellular polymers occurs [41].

Role of Transparent Exopolymeric Particles in Biofouling

The most abundant and widely available water sources today are saline waters, including estuarine, brackish, and seawater. However, fouling of membranes can be very problematic during seasonal algal blooms [42–44]. Potential membrane foulants present in saline feed water include, but are not limited to, microorganisms (e.g., bacteria and algae) and their fragments, EPS, soluble microbial products, and NOM. Recent data suggest that transparent exopolymeric particles (TEP), which exist as individual amorphous particles with a varied size range $(0.4 \text{ to } 100 \,\mu\text{m})$ and in concentrations up to 5,000 mL⁻¹ during algal blooms may facilitate membrane fouling [45, 46, 47–49]. Similar to EPS, TEP can form from soluble microbial products (e.g., sugars) excreted by plankton or bacteria and have varied composition [50, 51]. TEP have been largely overlooked in membrane research due to the fact that these particles are invisible. They are operationally defined as particles that are visible when stained with the cationic dye, alcian blue, which detects sulfated and carboxylated polysaccharides. Their presence and abundance have been established in saline environments [52–55], and their characteristics may alter our previously held views on the process of membrane fouling and biofouling during desalination [56–58].

Many case studies [59–62] have previously established the major stages of biofilm formation, including transport to the solid-liquid interface, initial deposition, adhesion facilitated by EPS excreted from the biofoulants, biofoulant proliferation, and biofilm formation. Recent studies indicate that this model may not be complete since TEP present in the feed water can play a significant role in fouling and biofilm formation [55, 56, 63]. TEP are considered very surface active or sticky. Berman and Holenberg [64] suggested that TEP adhered to membrane surfaces could provide a nutritious substrate for microbial growth and establishment of biofilm. Using cross-flow filtration with lake water on a UF membrane, Berman found that active, live bacteria excreting EPS were not

required, but rather TEP in the feed water were adhered to the membrane surface at biofilm initiation [65]. Previous studies have demonstrated TEP deposition as well as reversible and irreversible fouling by TEP in UF, MF, and RO membrane processes [55, 57, 58].

RO membrane desalination facilities have been adversely impacted by the onset of massive algal blooms [42–44]. These seasonal events generate high concentrations of cells (up to millions of cells per milliliter [mL]) and organic substances, which wreak havoc on desalination processes by causing membrane fouling. Although some desalination biofoulants have been previously considered extensively, including cellular organisms (e.g., bacteria or algae) and cellular debris, including algae skeletons [44, 66, 67], the impact of abundant TEP on fouling in desalination facilities has only recently been documented [56–58, 63, 68, 69]. TEP, present in extremely high concentrations (up to 10³ particles per milliliter) during an algal bloom, can occur from DOM (e.g., sugars) excreted by plankton or bacteria and from abiotic colloidal polysaccharides and are considered surface active or "sticky" [47, 50, 53, 54]. Due perhaps to the fact that they are invisible, these particles have only recently been implicated in organic fouling [63, 69] as well as the initiation of biofilms on UF water membranes [70].

Traditional Biofouling Control

Biofilm formation and biofouling are essentially unavoidable, as some small percentage of micro-organisms present can survive physical pretreatment processes like coagulation, flocculation, sand filtration, UF and cartridge filtration [71]. More recent developments have led to technologies such as UF membrane and ultraviolet pretreatment, but the former has a high capital and operational cost, and the latter can lead to scale formation and has no residual effects. Both of these technologies are also ultimately incapable of completely removing microorganisms. As a result, chemical pretreatment of RO membrane units is required but is also shown to be ineffective in removing and/or completely destroying the complex multicellular structures [72]. Some common chemicals such as chlorine and ozone by alkaline treatment, tensides, enzyme, or complex-forming substances [73] have been used, as have been biodispersants [74]. Chlorine containing substances are notorious for chemical corrosion of RO membranes and can also form toxic disinfectant byproducts [41]. Recently, modifications to the membrane to prevent biofouling have been explored. These modifications usually look to reduce the formation of the conditioning layer, via an increase in hydrophilicity [33, 75, 76] and a decrease in surface roughness [34], or by coating/impregnating the membrane is antimicrobial metals [77, 78]. Conventional cleaning with toxic chemicals has an effect on the occurrence of biofouling in RO systems, but is not effective in really cleaning the RO system [71], as the biomass must be physically removed [79]. Because of this, methods of physically removing the biofilm layer have been investigated. Such methods

include back-flushing the membrane, air sparging [13, 80], and, more recently, modifications to the membrane feed spacer's size and geometry to increase shear forces[81].

Charging Membranes with Copper

Grafting of unsaturated vinyl monomers onto polypropylene (PP) is a convenient route to develop new polymeric materials with synergistic properties [82]. Polymer-metal complexes have been extensively studied and successfully employed in several fields [83]. As in low-molecular-weight compounds, a polymer ligand must donate unshared electrons to the metal ion to form metalligand bonds. Among the multidentate ligands, IDA possesses one aminopolycarboxylate and provides a reactive secondary amine hydrogen to react with alternate functional groups [83]. Hence, IDA can be more easily introduced to the side chain of a polymer or vinyl monomer via what is proposed to be an SN2 epoxy group reaction of glycidyl methacrylate (GMA) and IDA [84]. This reaction has two advantages: (1) GMA is a commercial industrial material that is cheaper than any other vinyl monomers that possess an epoxy ring in the side chain and (2) it produces a vinyl monomer that can be polymerized in the presence of an initiator and can be grafted to activated polymer surfaces. The chemical modification of PP feed spacers to allow metal chelation, increase antimicrobial properties, and ultimately control membrane biofouling has been studied [84, 85]. In these studies, PP was functionalized with copper to demonstrate that copper-charged PP could be used to make low-biofouling feed spacers for spiral-wound elements. The functionalized PP contained grafted GMA with the metal chelating ligand (IDA) to which copper was chelated [84].

Many studies have been conducted on the use of copper ions to disinfect water against microbial biofilms with effective dosages of a few tenths of 1 milligram per liter (mg/L) [14]. Copper is thought to be cytotoxic by causing changes in the plasma membrane permeability or efflux of intracellular K⁺ during the entry of Cu^{2+} ions [86]. Copper is known to coordinate with cysteine residues, which in turn may lead to changes in enzyme activity and intracellular trafficking [87]. It can also participate in Fenton-like reactions, generating reactive hydroxyl radicals, which can cause cellular damage imparted via oxidative stress [86]. Copper may damage many proteins, both on the micro-organism envelope or within the cell. Conformational changes in the protein structure or in the protein active site may occur, resulting in the inhibition or neutralization of the proteins' biological activities [88]. Silver ions also possess antimicrobial properties, as they are known to have strong interactions with thiol (sulfydryl, -SH) groups [89]. Cytoplasmic proteins and DNA are targets of silver through interaction with these thiol groups in proteins, causing enzymatic inactivation [90]. Additionally, cytosines in DNA form stable C-Ag-C structures [91].

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The initial goal of this project was to develop a copper-charged CA membrane that could potentially be used in desalination applications. To this end, CA was functionalized with metal affinity ligands. Infrared spectroscopy verified that CA was successfully modified to become CA-GMA-IDA. A scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and elemental analyses were used to show that the CA-GMA-IDA was uniformly charged with copper (II). The modification method utilized simple a reaction apparatus, inexpensive straightforward techniques, and commonly used, readily available chemicals.

A second goal of this project was to show that this method was able to control membrane biofouling. As mentioned, CA membranes were functionalized with metal affinity ligands that could be charged with biocidal metals such as copper. This modification gave antimicrobial properties to the CA membrane without affecting its hydrophilicity. The chelation of copper to the CA membrane was determined to be preferential to Fe(II), ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA), and DOM in cross-flow leaching studies. Thus, environmental impacts from copper leaching when using copper-charged membranes would be minimal. More significantly, use of the copper-charged membrane led to a consistently lower rate of flux decline during filtration of BSA and lipase proteins.

During cross-flow filtration experiments, the copper-charged membrane resulted in a decrease in flux decline over a 24-hour period when compared to unmodified membranes in the presence of a biofoulant. In addition, the amount of biofilm on the copper-charged membrane was significantly less than on the unmodified membranes. Dead-end filtration experiments were carried out with algae organic matter, specifically TEP. Using Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR), we were able to detect protein and polysaccharides on the fouled membranes following TEP filtration. We discovered that the copper-charged membrane experienced less flux decline in the presence of TEP. Therefore, the use of copper-charged membrane has the potential to increase membrane life and decrease chemical cleanings associated with detrimental biofouling of membranes.

EQUIPMENT AND METHODS

Materials

The polymer dope used to cast flat sheet membranes was made of CA (average M_N 30,000) with an acetyl content of 39.8 weight% (wt%) purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and GMA (average M_N 142.16) purchased from Alfa Aesar, in N-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone(>99%, Alfa Aesar) solvent. GMA was polymerized with toluene (99.9%, 92.14) purchased from Fisher Scientific and benzoyl peroxide (97%) purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. Iminodiacetate dibasic hydrate

98% was purchased from Aldrich Chemistry (St. Louis, Missouri). Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) 99%, copper sulfate, acetone, and hydrochloric acid were purchased from Fisher Scientific (Hampton, New Hampshire). Bovine serum albumin (BSA), lipase, glycerol, glucose, sucrose, fructose, and polyethylene glycol (PEG) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich.

Methods

The preparation of the copper-charged membrane involved three steps. Figure 1 shows the reaction scheme. In the first step, GMA was homopolymerized separately and added as a blend to the polymer dope. The flat sheet membranes were then cast using the phase inversion method. In the second step, the metal chelating ligand IDA was attached to the membrane surface via the spacer arm of GMA. Lastly, the membrane was charged with copper ions by covalently binding the copper ions to the chelation group of IDA and attached to the surface of the membrane.



Figure 1.—Reaction scheme of the modification [92].

Polymerization of Glycidal Methacrylate

The polymerization of GMA was done with a mixture of 15 mL of GMA monomer, 35 mL of toluene, and 0.100 gram benzoyl peroxide with a stir bar in a round bottom flask. The polymerization reaction was completed in a nitrogen-rich environment and maintained at 70 degrees Celsius (°C) with continuous stirring for 3 hours. The GMA polymer was removed from the round bottom flask, placed in a glass petri dish, dried, and crushed. The drying process in this experiment

took 4 days to air dry and then an additional 4 days of drying in a fume hood before it was suitable to be blended into the polymer dope solutions.

Phase Inversion

The phase inversion process induced by immersion precipitation is a well-known technique for preparing asymmetric polymer membranes. Flat sheet membranes were cast with the polymer dope solution of 21/77/2 wt% ratio of CA/NMP/GMA using the phase inversion method. The polymeric dope solution was poured on a glass mirror, and the flat sheets were cast using the doctor's blade at a thickness of 130 μ m. These were then immersed in a water bath to allow interaction of the solvent in the casting solution film with the nonsolvent in the precipitation media. This process resulted in an asymmetric membrane with a dense top layer and a porous sublayer.

Iminodiacetic Acid and Copper Application

The metal chelating ligand IDA was attached to the epoxy group of GMA by treating the flat sheet membranes with 0.5M IDA dissolved in a 50/50% water/DMSO mixture for approximately 2-4 hours at a constant temperature between 50–55 °C. Then the membranes were washed with distilled (DI) water and placed in 0.6M copper sulfate solution for 24 hours.

Pseudomonas fluorescens Migula (ATCC #12842)

For the analysis of the biofilm formation on membranes, *Pseudomonas fluorescens Migula (ATCC #12842)* was purchased from ATCC and grown in Luria-Bertani broth. PicoGreen was used to nonspecifically stain all organisms green, and the stained sample was mounted on a slide using immersion oil. Slides of samples were counted using fluorescent microscopy for (1000× magnification) the analysis of bacteria growth in the medium at different intervals of time (figure 2). A 27-hour incubation time was determined for bacteria growth at the exponential phase. Bacteria from the exponential phase were included at a final concentration of 10^4 cells/mL.

The Marine Algae, Chaetoceros affinis (CCMP 158)

The presence of marine algae in feed water can drastically change the behavior in the formation of bioflim on the membrane. For this analysis, *Chaetoceros affinis* (CCMP 158) was purchased from the National Center for Marine Algae and Microbiota. *C. affinis* is being grown on f/2-si medium in green house chamber at the University of Toledo. The algae cultures are incubated at 20 ± 2 °C room temperature under an artificial light source (fluorescent lamp) at a 12/12-hour light/dark regime and a continuous slow mixing condition over a shaker. Light intensity was set at 40–50 µmol/m²s. The cell concentrations of algae are measured every 2–4 days with the help of a counting chamber and



Figure 2.—Biofoulant (*P. fluorescens*) growth curve.

light microscopy (figure 3). The growth curve for algae has been developed (figure 4). Peak concentration occurs after approximately 15 days of incubation. The corresponding TEP concentration was measured during *C. affinis* growth. Notably, the TEP concentration continues to increase while the *C. affinis* are in the death/dying phase.



Figure 3.—*C. affinis* observed with light microscopy at 5 days of incubation.



Figure 4.—Algae growth curve and the corresponding TEP concentration.

To detect the TEP present in the samples, filtered *C. affinis* were stained with 0.02% alcian blue for 7 minutes and gently rinsed twice by dipping in distilled water. The stained samples were then mounted on slides using immersion oil and viewed under bright field illumination to reveal adhesion of TEP to the surface (figure 5).



Figure 5.—TEP stained with alcian blue (20×).

Characterization

Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy Analysis

FTIR data were acquired using an attenuated total reflection Fourier transform infrared spectrometer (ATR-FTIR, Digilab UMA 600 FT-IT microscope with a Pike HATR adapter and an Excalibur FTS 400 spectrometer). Four random areas of the membrane were analyzed, and the data received were averaged.

Scanning Electron Microscopy Analyses

The surface of the membrane was dusted with a thin layer of palladium-gold using a Cressington 108 auto sputtering device. To view the surface structure, and distribution of copper on the surface, these samples were studied using a Hitachi S-4800 SEM.

Contact Angle Measurements

The hydrophobicity of the copper-charged membrane was compared with that of CA membranes by measuring the contact angle using a Cam-Plus micro contact angle meter. The flat sheet membranes were placed on the device, and a water droplet was dropped on the membrane. The contact angle of the droplet was measured through the micro contact angle meter as shown (figure 6).



Figure 6.—Contact angle measurement.

Pore Size Distribution

The pore size distribution analyses of CA and copper-charged membranes were conducted using 200 parts per million (ppm) of glycerol, glucose, sucrose, various molecular weights of PEG, and dextrans. The solutions were filtered through CA membranes. The total organic carbon (TOC) of both feed and permeate solutions were measured using a Tekmar Phoenix 8000 TOC analyzer. The rejection of solutes R(%) was calculated using the equation below:

$$R = \left(1 - \frac{c_p}{c_f}\right) \times 100\%$$

where C_p is the concentration of the solute in the permeate and C_f is the concentration of solute in the feed solution. The various solute samples that were used in this study, along with their Stokes-Einstein radii, are shown in table 1. The rejection values of all solutes were used to determine the mean effective pore size.

Solute	Molecular weight (gram/mol)	Stokes- Einstein radius (nm)
Glycerol	92.09	0.26
Glucose	180.16	0.37
Sucrose	342.30	0.47
Raffinose	504.42	0.58
PEG 600	600.00	0.61
PEG 1000	1,000.00	0.80
PEG 2000	2,000.00	1.14
PEG 4600	4,600.00	1.75
PEG 8000	8,000.00	2.31
Dextran 10	10,000.00	2.30
Dextran 40	40,000.00	4.50
Dextran 70	70,000.00	6.00

Table 1.—Neutral solutes used for pore size distribution analysis

Copper Leaching Cross-Flow Studies

The copper leaching studies were conducted using cross-flow experiments as shown on figure 7. The apparatus consists of a feed bottle, which is filled with the solution of interest; a pump to flow the solution through a flow cell that contains the copper-charged membrane; and a collection bottle to collect nearly all of the solution that has passed over the copper-charged membrane (containing an average amount of copper leached).

Five separate solutions were prepared in DI water: one containing 5 mM EDTA at a pH of 11, one containing 35 g/L of sodium chloride (NaCl), one containing 10 mg/L ferrous sulfate, and one containing 8 ppm of DOM solutions comprised of 4 ppm of humic acid and 4 ppm of tannic acid. These solutions



Figure 7.—Cross-flow experiment apparatus used for copper leaching studies.

were then pumped for 24 hours, at a flow rate of 0.6 milliliter/minute, through a flow cell (24 mm \times 40 mm \times 8 mm deep; Stovall Life Sciences Incorporated, Greensboro, North Carolina), which contained samples of copper-charged membranes. As mentioned, the solution that had flowed through the cell was sent to a collection bottle, and the membrane samples were collected at different intervals of times. Analyses of the samples were performed using energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) to measure the wt% of copper on the membrane surface.

These solutions were chosen because the first solution is the most common cleaning solution; the second is the typical salt concentration found in brackish water; the third contains a divalent metal ion that could compete with copper for IDA chelation sites, causing the potential copper to be displaced; and the last solution is the possible competition between copper complexation with DOM and copper chelation to IDA.

Filtration Experiments

Cross-flow filtration was used to test the performance of RO membranes, both commercial and those developed here (i.e., copper-charged membrane) in the

presence of a biofoulant (*p. fluorescens*). Feed water (table 2) was pumped from the reservoir to the cell membrane (GE Water Sepa CF, Minnetonka, Minnesota). Both the concentrate and permeate were recycled to the reservoir.

Component	Concentration (mg/L)
Na⁺	849.00
Ca ²⁺	1,330.00
Mg ²⁺	514.00
Ba ²⁺	2.00
Fe ³⁺	2.30
CI-	3,933.00
SO4 ² -	991.00
NO ₃ -	89.00
Alkalinity (as CaCO ₃)	780.00
Total dissolved solids	8,790.00

Table 2.—Compositions of synthetic
brackish water

The remaining filtration experiments were conducted using an Amicon dead-end filtration cell (figure 8) with an effective cross sectional area of 4.1 square centimeters at an operating pressure of 70 pounds per square inch. The membranes were tested by precompacting with DI water for the first 8 hours followed by protein permeations using BSA for 8–16 hours and lipase for 16–24 hours. Filtration experiments were also performed with saltwater (35 g/L NaCl) and TEP (1 mg/L) in saltwater (35 g/L NaCl).



Figure 8.—Schematic of dead-end filtration cell [93].

Surface Area Coverage Analysis

Surface area coverage of the formed biofilm on the modified and unmodified membranes was calculated using software Image J 1.41 (figure 9). The commercially available software was downloaded (http://rsbweb.nih.gov/ij/) to

use as a direct observation method to detect biofilm coverage (area) on membranes.



Figure 9.—Bioflim surface area coverage assessment using Image J. (a) Biofouled membrane; (b) clean membrane; and (c) biofouled membrane.

RESULTS

Chemical Characterization of CA, CA-GMA, and CA-GMA-IDA Membranes

Data were acquired using an attenuated total reflection Fourier transform infrared spectrometer. Four random areas of the membrane were analyzed, and the data received were averaged as shown on figure 10 (CA versus CA-GMA) and figure 11 (CA versus CA-GMA-IDA) and tables 3 and 4, respectively. Characteristic FTIR absorption bands were observed at 860cm⁻¹, 955cm⁻¹, and 2,990cm⁻¹ for the modified dope (i.e., CA/GMA/NMP dope) and IDA treated membranes.



Figure 10.—FTIR spectra comparing pure CA membranes with CA-GMA membranes.

Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control – Report No. 170

Wavenumber (cm ⁻¹)	Band assignment	Associated biomolecule	References
860	=C-H Bending	Methylene bending vibrations	[94], [95]





Figure 11.—FTIR spectra comparing pure CA membranes with CA-GMA-IDA membranes.

Wavenumber (cm ⁻¹)	Band assignment	Associated biomolecule	References
955, 2990	-C-H bend, O-H stretch	Alkenes, carboxylic acids	[94], [95]

Morphological Characterization of Cellulose Acetate and Copper-charged Membranes

Membranes were cast and treated with IDA and copper in order to determine optimal IDA dosage to maximize copper chelation. The SEM (figure 12) and EDS (figure 13) images show a uniform distribution of copper on the surface of the treated membrane. Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control – Report No. 170



Figure 12.—SEM images of the treated membrane (left) and nontreated membranes (right).



Figure 13.—EDS images of the copper-charged membrane.

Hydrophilicity of Cellulose Acetate and Coppercharged Membranes

The contact angle was measured on three different areas of each membrane, and averages and standard deviations were compared for CA and copper-charged membranes (figure 14).



Figure 14.—Contact angle of membranes.

Pore Size Distribution Analysis

Solutions of different sizes (listed in table 1) were filtered through both the CA and copper-charged membranes. The effective mean pore size for each membrane sample was calculated for each membrane, and the pore size distributions are shown on figure 15.



Figure 15.—Contact angle of membranes.

Copper Leaching – Cross-Flow Study

The results obtained from the cross-flow leaching experiments are shown on figure 16. The points on the graph represent wt% of the copper on the membrane surface at different intervals of time.



Figure 16.—Cross-flow copper leaching results.

Filtration Experiments

Flux measurements for CA membranes and copper-charged membranes are shown on figure 17. The membranes were tested for the first 24 hours by precompaction for 0–8 hours with DI water, followed by the filtration of a BSA solution for 8–16 hours and a lipase solution for 16–24 hours (figure 17).



Figure 17.—Permeation measurements with DI water (0–8 hours), BSA (8–16 hours), and lipase (16–24 hours).

The protein rejections of the BSA and lipase were determined using ultravioletvisible spectroscopy of both the CA and copper-charged membranes. The results are shown in table 5.

Membrane	BSA rejection (%)	Lipase rejection (%)
СА	95.7	88.9
Copper-charged	95.1	88.0

Table 5.—Protein rejections of CA and copper-charged membranes

Flux decline using cross-flow filtration was measured in the presence of the biofoulant *P. fluorescens*. Modified membranes resulted in less flux decline when compared to unmodified membranes (figure 18).



Figure 18.—Flux decline in 24-hour cross-flow filtration studies with biofoulant.

Copper-charged surface membranes showed that the biofilm surface area was significantly less than the biofilm surface area formed on unmodified membranes, suggesting that the modified membranes can reduce biofilm formation (table 6).

	Unmodified membrane	Copper-charged surface		
Samples	Biofilm surface area coverage (%)	Biofilm surface area coverage (%)		
1	91.7	63.8		
2	94.5	67.8		
3	93.4	72.3		
Average	93.2	68.0		

Table 6.—	-Biofilm	surface	area	coverage	using	Image J	

We carried out similar experiments in the presence of algae organic matter, specifically TEP, since TEP are shown to cause significant fouling of desalination membranes. Sample flux measurements for modified (copper-charged) and unmodified membranes are shown on figure 19. The membranes tested were first precompacted with DI water, followed by filtering with saltwater only or TEP in


Figure 19.—Flux decline data with TEP (1 mg/L) in saline water (35 g/L NaCl).

saltwater. As shown on figure 19, all filtrations led to decreases in flux during operation. Salt-only runs resulted in approximately a 5–7% decline in flux. The samples, including TEP, resulted in a statistically significant increase in flux decline to almost 10–13%, while the maximum decline for the modified membranes was just over 8%.

FTIR was used to characterize the type of functional groups present on the surface of clean membranes and fouled membranes (Figure 20) [96]. There were distinct peaks present between 950 and 1,450 cm⁻¹ on the membranes fouled with TEP when compared to membranes fouled with only saltwater. The distinct infrared peaks on the TEP fouled membranes include polysaccharides and proteins (table 7).

Wavenumber (cm ⁻¹)	Band assignment	Associated molecule	Reference
970	C-O stretch	Polysaccharides	[97]
1052	C-O or C-O-C stretch	Polysaccharides	[98]
1,350–1,450	Amide III	Protein	[99]

Table 7.—FTIR peak descriptions



Figure 20.—FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The FTIR analyses of the CA, CA-GMA, and CA-GMA-IDA membranes (see figures 10 and 11) showed characteristic FTIR absorption bands at 860cm⁻¹, 955cm⁻¹, and 2,990cm⁻¹. These bands were absent from the CA sample, which confirms the GMA presence in the modified doped polymer solution, and IDA addition was verified by peaks for -C-H bend and –O-H stretch, associated with the presence of alkenes and carboxylic acid (tables 3 and 4).

IDA-treated membranes were tested with 0.5M, 0.4M and 0.3M IDA in 50/50, 60/40, 70/30, and 80/20 water/DMSO mixtures. All samples were then treated with copper sulfate solution and analyzed for copper loading using EDS (see figure 13). The maximum copper loading was found on the membrane treated with 0.5M in 50/50 water/DMSO solution with a copper loading of $2.27 \pm 0.74\%$ by weight on the surface in a uniform fashion (figure 13). The EDS analysis of the copper-charged membrane validates the experimental procedure of the surface modification.

The contact angle analyses showed that copper-charging did not affect the hydrophobicity of the membranes (figure 14). This is important since changing the hydrophobicity of the membranes could have a negative effect on permeation flux and fouling if the membranes had become more hydrophobic.

The mean pore size was the pore size in which 50% solute rejection was achieved. The typical rejection curves for neutral solutes (see table 1) were analyzed with trend lines (figure 15). The effective mean pore radius for the CA membrane was determined to be 0.43 nm, whereas the copper-charged membrane had a mean pore radius of 0.525 nm.

The copper leaching studies showed that very little copper leached from the surface of the membranes (see figure 16). The membranes were collected after 24 hours of filtration. The average copper that leached into the NaCl solution was 0.10 wt%, into the EDTA solution was 0.11 wt%, into the Fe(II) solution was 0.22 wt%, and into the DOM solution was 0.26 wt%. Therefore, little copper leached from the copper-charged membrane. The copper that leached from the surface was slightly higher in the Fe(II) and DOM solutions compared to NaCl and EDTA, which is hypothesized due to the higher affinity of the iron and DOM for the IDA chelation causing displacement of copper from the membrane surface.

During filtration, membrane precompaction using DI water showed lower flux values for the copper-charged membrane as compared to the CA membranes (see figure 17). This is believed to be due to the additional resistance to filtration offered by GMA and IDA. On the other hand, the filtration of proteins showed slightly higher fluxes for copper-charged membrane compared to CA membranes. Other researchers have shown that protein permeation is strongly affected by pH and solution conductivity ([100-102]). They have shown that proteins were electrostatically excluded by both negatively and positively charged membranes at a solution pH away from their isoelectric points (pI). Filtration was performed at neutral pH values, which is away from the isoelectric points of BSA (pI = 4.7) and lipase (pI = 4.5). CA membranes are uncharged; therefore, an accumulation of protein was hypothesized to form a fouling layer on the membrane, which led to a flux decline. The positive copper-charged membrane would lead to electrostatic exclusion of proteins, so no proteins accumulated on the surface, which led to a minimal flux decline. Similar protein rejections of both the BSA and lipase were noticed for the copper-charged membrane compared to CA membranes (see table 5), indicating that modification of the membranes did not affect rejection ability.

Cross-flow filtration experiments using the bacterial biofoulant *P. fluorscens* indicated that the copper-charged membrane was effective at mitigating biofilm formation. This was concluded due to a lower observed flux decline to approximately 25% as compared to 15% during 24 hours of filtration. The lower flux decline is likely attributed to the biofilm coverage, which was significantly lower (66%) on the copper-charged membrane as compared to the unmodified

Development and Testing of a Copper-Charged Cellulose Acetate Membrane for Biofilm Control – Report No. 170

membranes (93%). The positive charge of the copper-charged membrane is believed to cause an oxidizing atmosphere, which can lead to cell lysis and cell death [103]. Other studies have shown that a positive charge can also increase bacterial surface mobility, which prevents bacteria from attaching [104].

This project also commenced studying the impact of TEP commonly found in sea water desalination systems and attributed to algae. In dead-end filtration studies, TEP in the salt feed water did result in an increase in flux decline (10–13%) for unmodified membranes during approximately 6 hours of filtration as compared to modified membrane (2–8.5%) filtration experiments. FTIR analyses of the membranes showed distinct IR peaks present in the TEP filtration studies. These peaks may be attributed to polysaccharides and proteins, which are commonly present in TEP [56, 58, 96]. Polysaccharides are common in biofilms, and their contribution to biofilm formation on membranes has been well studied and presented in EPS literature [105, 106]. The objective with TEP studies going forward will be to characterize the proteins and polysaccharides present. These have been shown to vary with the life cycle stage of an organism [96]. The components of the TEP may be used to predict incidents of increased flux decline and to develop strategies for membrane cleaning during algal blooms.

REFERENCES

- Engelman R; Cincotta RP; Dye B; Gardner-Outlaw T; Wisnewski J, *People in the Balance Population and Natural Resources at the Turn of the Millennium.* 2000, 1300 19th Street, NW Second Floor. Washington, DC 20036 USA: Population Action. 32.
- [2] Leitner, G.F., *Is there a water crisis?* Int. Desalination and Water Reuse Quart., 1998. **7**(4): p. 10–21.
- [3] Maude Barlow, T.C., *Blue Gold.* 2002, New York, NY: News Press.
- [4] Rothfeder, J., *Every Drop for Sale: Our Desperate Battle Over Water*. 2001, New York, NY: Tarcher.
- [5] J. Birkett, R.T., *A Figure of Merit for Appreciating Improvements in RO Membrane Performance.* International Desalination Association News, 2007. **16**.
- [6] Safrik, J., D.P., *Final Report for Department of Water Resources Project: Role of Microfiltration (MF) Cake Layer Composition and Stability in Desalination Efficiency*, C.D.o.W. Resources, Editor 2005: Sacramento.
- [7] Escobar I.C., E.H., C. Gabelich, F. DiGiano, Y. Le Gouellec, P. Berube, K. Howe, J. Allen, K. Atasi, M. Benjamin, P. Brandhuber, J. Brant, Y. Chang, M. Chapman, A. Childress, W. Conlon, T. Cooke, I. Crossley, G. Crozes, P. Huck, S. Kommineni, J. Jacangelo, A. Karimi, J. Kim, D. Lawler, Q. Li, L. Schideman, S. Sethi, J. Tobiason, T. Tseng, S. Veerapaneni, and A. Zander, *American Water Works Association Membrane Technology Research Committee Report: Membrane Fouling – Recent Advances and Research Needs*. American Water Works Association, 2005. 97(8): p. 78–89.
- [8] Characklis, W.G., Marshall, K.C., *Biofilms*. 1990, New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- [9] Ridgeway, H.F., H.C.F., Membrane Biofouling, in Water Treatment: Membrane Processes, P.E.O. J. Mallevialle, M. R. Weisner, Editor 1996, McGraw-Hill: New York, NY. p. 6.1–6.62.
- [10] Patching, J.W., G.T.A.F., Industrial biofilm: formation, problems and control, in Biofilms in medicine, industry and environmental biotechnology: characteristics, analysis and control, P. Lens, Editor 2003, IWA Publishing: London. p. 568–590.

- [11] Herzberg, M. and M. Elimelech, *Biofouling of reverse osmosis membranes: Role of biofilm-enhanced osmotic pressure*. Journal of Membrane Science, 2007. 295(1-2): p. 11–20.
- [12] Chong, T.H., F.S. Wong, and A.G. Fane, *The effect of imposed flux on biofouling in reverse osmosis: Role of concentration polarisation and biofilm enhanced osmotic pressure phenomena.* Journal of Membrane Science, 2008. **325**(2): p. 840–850.
- [13] Cornelissen, E.R., et al., *Periodic air/water cleaning for control of biofouling in spiral wound membrane elements*. Journal of Membrane Science, 2007. 287(1): p. 94–101.
- [14] Kim, B.R., et al., *Literature review efficacy of various disinfectants against Legionella in water systems*. Water Research, 2002. 36(18): p. 4433–4444.
- [15] Roe, D., et al., Antimicrobial surface functionalization of plastic catheters by silver nanoparticles. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy, 2008.
 61(4): p. 869–876.
- [16] Landeen, L.K., M.T. Yahya, and C.P. Gerba, *Efficacy of Copper and Silver Ions and Reduced Levels of Free Chlorine in Inactivation of Legionella-Pneumophila*. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 1989. 55(12): p. 3045–3050.
- [17] Kwak, S.Y., Relationship of relaxation property to reverse osmosis permeability in aromatic polyamide thin-film-composite membranes.
 Polymer, 1999. 40(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 6361–6368.
- [18] Driol, E.M., Francesca, Membrane Research, Membrane Production and Membrane Application in China, 2008, ITM-CNR - Italy: Institute on Membrane Technology.
- [19] Jin, Y. and Z. Su, *Effects of polymerization conditions on hydrophilic groups in aromatic polyamide thin films*. J. Membr. Sci., 2009. **330**(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 175–179.
- [20] Gabelich, C.J., et al., *Effects of aluminum sulfate and ferric chloride coagulant residuals on polyamide membrane performance*. Desalination, 2002. **150**(1): p. 15–30.

- [21] Park, C., et al., *Effect of cake layer structure on colloidal fouling in reverse osmosis membranes.* Desalination, 2008. **220**(1-3): p. 335–344.
- [22] Moftah, K., *For water treatment consider high-pH reverse osmosis*. Chemical Engineering, 2003. **110**(9): p. 62–69.
- [23] Niriella, D. and R.P. Carnahan, *Influence of operating parameters on clay fouling of a RO membrane*. Separation Science and Technology, 2006.
 41(1): p. 25–41.
- [24] Hoek, E.M.V. and M. Elimelech, *Cake-Enhanced Concentration Polarization: A New Fouling Mechanism for Salt-Rejecting Membranes*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2003. **37**(24): p. 5581–5588.
- [25] Kim, S. and E.M.V. Hoek, *Modeling concentration polarization in reverse* osmosis processes. Desalination, 2005. **186**(1-3): p. 111–128.
- [26] Elimelech, M. and S. Bhattacharjee, A novel approach for modeling concentration polarization in crossflow membrane filtration based on the equivalence of osmotic pressure model and filtration theory. Journal of Membrane Science, 1998. 145(2): p. 223–241.
- [27] Tzotzi, C., et al., A study of CaCO3 scale formation and inhibition in RO and NF membrane processes. Journal of Membrane Science, 2007.
 296(1-2): p. 171–184.
- [28] Darton, E.G. and E. Buckley, *Thirteen years' experiences treating a seawater RO plant*. Desalination, 2001. **134**(1-3): p. 55–62.
- [29] Lisitsin, D., et al., *Inhibition of CaCO3 scaling on RO membranes by trace amounts of zinc ions*. Desalination, 2005. **183**(1-3): p. 289–300.
- [30] Hafez, A.I., M.S. El-Manharawy, and M.A. Khedr, *RO membrane* removal of unreacted chromium from spent tanning effluent. A pilot-scale study, part 2. Desalination, 2002. **144**(1-3): p. 237–242.
- [31] Taniguchi, M., J.E. Kilduff, and G. Belfort, *Modes of natural organic matter fouling during ultrafiltration*. Environmental Science & Technology, 2003. 37(8): p. 1676–1683.
- [32] Zularisam, A.W., A.F. Ismail, and R. Salim, *Behaviours of natural* organic matter in membrane filtration for surface water treatment a review. Desalination, 2006. **194**(1-3): p. 211–231.

- [33] Gullinkala, T. and I. Escobar, *Study of the hydrophilic-enhanced ultrafiltration membrane*. Environmental Progress, 2008. **27**(2): p. 210–217.
- [34] Chennamsetty, R. and I. Escobar, *Effect of Ion Beam Irradiation on Two Nanofiltration Water Treatment Membranes*. Separation Science and Technology, 2008. 43(16): p. 4009–4029.
- Baker, J.S. and L.Y. Dudley, *Biofouling in membrane systems a review*.
 Water Supply, 1999. 17(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 173–181.
- [36] Vrouwenvelder, J.S., et al., *Biofouling of spiral-wound nanofiltration and reverse osmosis membranes: A feed spacer problem.* Water Res., 2009.
 43(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 583–594.
- [37] Flemming, H.-C., *Reverse osmosis membrane biofouling*. Exp. Therm. Fluid Sci., 1997. 14(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 382–391.
- [38] Amjad, Z. *Scale inhibition in desalination applications: an overview*. 1996. NACE International.
- [39] Geesey, G.G., et al., *Biofouling and Biocorrosion in Industrial Water Systems*. 1994: Lewis. 297 pp.
- [40] Tsuneda, S., et al., *Extracellular polymeric substances responsible for bacterial adhesion onto solid surface*. FEMS Microbiol. Lett., 2003.
 223(Copyright (C) 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 287–292.
- [41] Kim, D., et al., *Biocide application for controlling biofouling of SWRO membranes an overview*. Desalination, 2009. 238(Copyright (C) 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 43–52.
- [42] Caron, D.A., et al., *Harmful algae and their potential impacts on desalination operations off southern California*. Water Research, 2010.
 44(2): p. 385–416.
- [43] Kwon, B., N. Park, and J. Cho, *Effect of algae on fouling and efficiency of UF membranes*. Desalination, 2005. **179**(1-3): p. 203–214.
- [44] Ladner, D.A., D.R. Vardon, and M.M. Clark, *Effects of shear on microfiltration and ultrafiltration fouling by marine bloom-forming algae*. Journal of Membrane Science, 2010. **356**(1-2): p. 33–43.

- [45] Villacorte, L.O., et al., The fate of Transparent Exopolymer Particles (TEP) in integrated membrane systems: Removal through pre-treatment processes and deposition on reverse osmosis membranes. Water Research, 2009. 43(20): p. 5039–5052.
- [46] Bar-Zeev, E., et al., *Transparent exopolymer particles:Potential agents for fouling and bioflim formation in desalination and water treatment plants.* Desalination and Water Treatment, 2009. **3**: p. 136–142.
- [47] Alldredge, A.L., U. Passow, and S.H.D. Haddock, *The characteristics and transparent exopolymer particle (TEP) content of marine snow formed from thecate dinoflagellates*. Journal of Plankton Research, 1998. 20(3): p. 393–406.
- [48] Passow, U. and A.L. Alldredge, Distribution, Size and Bacterial-Colonization of Transparent Exopolymer Particles (Tep) in the Ocean. Marine Ecology-Progress Series, 1994. 113(1-2): p. 185–198.
- [49] Passow, U. and A.L. Alldredge, Abiotic Formation of Transparent Exopolymer Particles (TEP) from Polysaccharides Excreted by Phytoplankton. Abstracts of Papers of the American Chemical Society, 1994. 207: p. 178-GEOC.
- [50] Mari, X. and T. Kiorboe, *Abundance, size distribution and bacterial colonization of transparent exopolymeric particles (TEP) during spring in the Kattegat.* Journal of Plankton Research, 1996. **18**(6): p. 969–986.
- [51] Passow, U., et al., *The origin of transparent exopolymer particles (TEP) and their role in the sedimentation of particulate matter.* Continental Shelf Research, 2001. **21**(4): p. 327–346.
- [52] Berman, T., *Biofouling: TEP a major challenge for water filtration*. Filtration & Separation, 2010. **47**(2): p. 20–22.
- [53] Passow, U., *Transparent exopolymer particles (TEP) in aquatic environments.* Progress in Oceanography, 2002. **55**(3-4): p. 287–333.
- [54] Passow, U., Production of transparent exopolymer particles (TEP) by phyto- and bacterioplankton. Marine Ecology-Progress Series, 2002. 236: p. 1–12.
- [55] Van Nevel, S., et al., *Transparent exopolymer particle removal in different drinking water production centers.* Water Res, 2012. **46**(11): p. 3603–3611.

- [56] Bar-Zeev, E., et al., *Transparent exopolymer particles (TEP) link phytoplankton and bacterial production in the Gulf of Aqaba.* Aquatic Microbial Ecology, 2009. **56**(2-3): p. 217–225.
- [57] Villacorte, L.O., et al., *The fate of Transparent Exopolymer Particles* (*TEP*) *in integrated membrane systems: Removal through pre-treatment processes and deposition on reverse osmosis membranes.* Water Res, 2009. **43**(20): p. 5039–5052.
- [58] Villacorte, L.O., et al., *Measuring transparent exopolymer particles (TEP) as indicator of the (bio)fouling potential of RO feed water.* Desalination and Water Treatment, 2009. **5**(1-3): p. 207–212.
- [59] Al-Ahmad, M., et al., *Biofuoling in RO membrane systems Part 1: Fundamentals and control.* Desalination, 2000. **132**(1-3): p. 173–179.
- [60] Bos, R., H.C. van der Mei, and H.J. Busscher, *Physico-chemistry of initial microbial adhesive interactions its mechanisms and methods for study.* Fems Microbiology Reviews, 1999. 23(2): p. 179–230.
- [61] Escobar, I.C., et al., *Committee Report: Recent advances and research needs in membrane fouling*. Journal of the American Water Works Association, 2005. **97**(8): p. 79–89.
- [62] Ivnitsky, H., et al., *Characterization of membrane biofouling in nanofiltration processes of wastewater treatment*. Desalination, 2005.
 185(1-3): p. 255–268.
- [63] Villacorte, L.O., et al., *The fate of Transparent Exopolymer Particles* (*TEP*) *in integrated membrane systems: Removal through pre-treatment processes and deposition on reverse osmosis membranes (vol. 43, pg. 5039, 2009).* Water Res, 2011. **45**(2): p. 960–960.
- [64] Berman, T. and M. Holenberg, *Don't fall foul of biofilm through high TEP levels*. Filtration + Separation, 2005. **42**(4): p. 30–32.
- [65] Berman, T., *Biofouling: TEP a major challenge for water filtration*. Filtration + Separation, 2010. **47**(2): p. 20–22.
- [66] Brant, J.a.P.K., State-of-the-Science Review of Membrane Fouling: Organic, Inorganic, and Biological, in Water Reuse Foundation Report No. WRF-06-010A2010, WateReuse Foundation: Alexandria, VA.

- [67] Farooque, A.M., Al-Amoudi, A.S., Saeed, M.O., Al-Muaili, F. A., *Impact of Fouling on Performance of Different Hff Membranes Operated at Different Coasts*, International Desalination and Water Reuse Quarterly, 2004(14): p. 19–24.
- [68] Berman, T., *Don't fall foul of biofilm through high TEP levels*. Filtration & Separation, 2005. **42**(4): p. 30–32.
- [69] Villacorte, L.O., et al., *The fate of transparent exopolymer particles (TEP)* in seawater UF-RO system: A pilot plant study in Zeeland, *The Netherlands*. Desalination and Water Treatment, 2010. 13(1-3): p. 109– 119.
- [70] Berman, T., R. Mizrahi, and C.G. Dosoretz, *Transparent exopolymer* particles (*TEP*): A critical factor in aquatic biofilm initiation and fouling on filtration membranes. Desalination, 2011. **276**(1–3): p. 184–190.
- [71] Bereschenko, L.A., et al., *Effect of conventional chemical treatment on the microbial population in a biofouling layer of reverse osmosis systems*.
 Water Res., 2011. 45(Copyright (C) 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 405–416.
- [72] Flemming, H.C., *Biofouling in water systems cases, causes and countermeasures.* Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol., 2002. 59(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 629–640.
- [73] Turakhia, M.H., K.E. Cooksey, and W.G. Characklis, *Influence of a calcium-specific chelant on biofilm removal*. Appl. Environ. Microbiol., 1983. 46(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 1236–1238.
- [74] Whitekettle, W.K., J. Jiang, and X. Huang, Method for reduction of microbial biofilms on surfaces in aquatic systems by adding polyalkyleneoxide polysiloxane surfactants, 2010, General Electric Company, USA . p. 20pp.; Chemical Indexing Equivalent to 153:78822 (US).
- [75] Gullinkala, T., Evaluation of Poly (Ethylene Glycol) Grafting as a Tool for Improving Membrane Performance, in Chemical and Environmental Engineering, 2010, University of Toledo: Toledo, OH.
- [76] Liu, C.X., et al., Modification of membrane surface for anti-biofouling performance: Effect of anti-adhesion and anti-bacteria approaches. J. Membr. Sci., 2010. 346(Copyright (C) 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 121–130.

- [77] Zodrow, K., et al., Polysulfone ultrafiltration membranes impregnated with silver nanoparticles show improved biofouling resistance and virus removal. Water Res., 2009. 43(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 715–723.
- [78] Yang, H.L., J.C.T. Lin, and C. Huang, Application of nanosilver surface modification to RO membrane and spacer for mitigating biofouling in seawater desalination. Water Res., 2009. 43(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 3777–3786.
- [79] Vrouwenvelder, J.S. and van der Kooij, D.. *Diagnosis, prediction and prevention of biofouling of NF and RO membranes*. 2001. American Water Works Association.
- [80] Willems, P., et al., Bubbles in spacers: Direct observation of bubble behavior in spacer filled membrane channels. J. Membr. Sci., 2009.
 333(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 38–44.
- [81] Koutsou, C.P., S.G. Yiantsios, and A.J. Karabelas, *Direct numerical simulation of flow in spacer-filled channels: Effect of spacer geometrical characteristics*. J. Membr. Sci., 2007. 291(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 53–69.
- [82] Picchioni, F., J.G.P. Goossens, and M. van Duin, *Solid-state modification of polypropylene (PP): grafting of styrene on atactic PP*. Macromolecular Symposia, 2001. **176**(1): p. 245–264.
- [83] Chen, C.Y. and C.Y. Chen, Stability constants of polymer-bound iminodiacetate-type chelating agents with some transition-metal ions. J. Appl. Polym. Sci., 2002. 86(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 1986–1994.
- [84] Hausman, R., T. Gullinkala, and I.C. Escobar, *Development of low-biofouling polypropylene feedspacers for reverse osmosis.* J. Appl. Polym. Sci., 2009. 114(Copyright © 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 3068–3073.
- [85] Hausman, R., T. Gullinkala, and I.C. Escobar, *Development of copper-charged polypropylene feedspacers for biofouling control*. J. Membr. Sci., 2010. 358(Copyright (C) 2011 American Chemical Society (ACS). All Rights Reserved.): p. 114–121.

- [86] Selvaraj, S., et al., *Toxicity of free and various aminocarboxylic ligands* sequestered copper(II) ions to Escherichia coli. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 2009. **166**(2-3): p. 1403–1409.
- [87] Massaro, E.J., *Handbook of Copper Pharmacology and Toxicology*. 2002, Totowa, New Jersey: Humana Press Inc.
- [88] Borkow, G. and J. Gabbay, Copper, An Ancient Remedy Returning to Fight Microbial, Fungal and Viral Infections. Current Chemical Biology, 2009. 3(3): p. 272–278.
- [89] Belly, R.T. and G.C. Kydd, *Silver resistance in microorganisms*. Dev. Ind. Microbiol., 1982. **23**: p. 567–577.
- [90] Pradeep, T. and Anshup, *Noble metal nanoparticles for water purification: A critical review.* Thin Solid Films, 2009. **517**(24): p. 6441–6478.
- [91] Dattagupta, N.C., Donald M., *Solution structural studies of the Ag(I)-DNA complex*. Nucleic Acids Research, 1981. **9**(12): p. 2971–2985.
- [92] Appaw, C., *Rheology and Microstructure of Cellulose Acetate in Mixed* Solvent Systems. 2005.
- [93] Zhao, Q., et al., *Polyelectrolyte complex membranes for pervaporation, nanofiltration and fuel cell applications.* Journal of Membrane Science, 2011. **379**(1-2): p. 19-45.
- [94] Silverstein, R.M., G.C. Bassler, and T.C. Morrill, *Spectrometric identification of organic compounds*. 5th ed. 1991, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 419 p.
- [95] Meyers, R.A., *Encyclopedia of analytical chemistry : applications, theory and instrumentation.* 2011, Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- [96] Villacorte, L.O., et al., Characterisation of transparent exopolymer particles (TEP) produced during algal bloom: a membrane treatment perspective. Desalination and Water Treatment, 2013. 51(4-6): p. 1021– 1033.
- [97] Osiro, D., et al., A kinetic model for Xylella fastidiosa adhesion, biofilm formation, and virulence. Fems Microbiology Letters, 2004. 236(2): p. 313–318.
- [98] Schmitt, J., et al., *Changes of biofilm properties in response to sorbed substances An FTIR-ATR study*. Water Science and Technology, 1995.
 32(8): p. 149–155.

- [99] Mayo D.W., M.F.A.a.H.R.W., *Course Notes On The Interpretation of Infrared and Raman Spectra*, 2004, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- [100] Lucas, D., et al., *Role of the physico-chemical environment on ultrafiltration of lysozyme with modified inorganic membrane*. Colloids and Surfaces a-Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects, 1998. 136(1-2): p. 109–122.
- [101] Nakao, S., et al., Separation of Proteins by Charged Ultrafiltration Membranes. Desalination, 1988. 70(1-3): p. 191–205.
- [102] Saksena, S. and A.L. Zydney, EFFECT OF SOLUTION PH AND IONIC-STRENGTH ON THE SEPARATION OF ALBUMIN FROM IMMUNOGLOBULINS (IGG) BY SELECTIVE FILTRATION. Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 1994. 43(10): p. 960–968.
- [103] Shim, S., et al., *Prevention of Pseudomonas aeruginosa adhesion by electric currents.* Biofouling, 2011. **27**(2): p. 217–24.
- [104] de Lannoy, C.F., et al., *Aquatic biofouling prevention by electrically charged nanocomposite polymer thin film membranes*. Environ Sci Technol, 2013. **47**(6): p. 2760–8.
- [105] Kim, D., et al., *Biocide application for controlling biofouling of SWRO membranes - an overview*. Desalination, 2009. **238**(1-3): p. 43–52.
- [106] Tsuneda, S., et al., *Extracellular polymeric substances responsible for bacterial adhesion onto solid surface*. Fems Microbiology Letters, 2003. 223(2): p. 287–292.

APPENDICES

- A Bacterial Growth Data
- B Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) Peak Data
- C Flux Data

APPENDIX A

Bacterial Growth Data

The acronyms, abbreviations, and units of measure as they appear in this appendix are defined as follows:

h	hour
#	number
mL	milliliter
mm²	square millimeter

Time (h)	2 (dilution 1:10)		7 (dilution 1:10)		20 (dilution 1:100)		26 (dilution 1:400)		32 (dilutio	on 1:400)	48 (dilution 1:400)	
	S-01	S-02	S-01	S-02	S-01	S-02	S-01	S-02	S-01	S-02	S-01	S-02
	21	18	24	24	85	79	51	54	42	35	26	41
	22	22	21	25	90	74	49	49	40	31	34	31
	18	21	20	32	79	83	60	52	36	42	36	38
	21	24	30	26	75	93	55	55	43	35	34	36
	16	18	22	24	81	80	58	59	37	29	35	27
	20	19	27	20	76	75	61	52	44	36	39	35
	17	23	26	29	73	81	48	54	41	43	38	41
Average	19.29	20.71	24.29	25.71	79.86	80.71	54.57	53.57	40.43	35.86	34.57	35.57
Cells#/mL	9,004,693	9,671,707	11,339,243	12,006,257	372,860,986	376,863,071	1,019,197,829	1,000,521,429	755,060,171	669,682,343	645,669,829	664,346,229
Standard Deviation	1,068,612	1,134,578	1,677,290	1,802,585	28,070,129	29,371,359	99,329,155	57,924,088	55,880,778	96,702,503	79,132,374	96,358,365

Table A-1.—Biofoulant (Pseudomonas fluorescens) growth curve data for figure 2

		Algae co	unt day 2		Algae count day 6							
Samples	Α	В	С	D	Α	В	С	D				
	1	1	2	2	7	3	10	7				
	3	0	3	2	7	1	11	8				
	3	1	4	1	4	3	9	12				
	3	2	0	3	11	1	10	9				
	1	0	1	4	10	5	13	10				
	3	1	2	3	8	4	8	10				
	2	1	1	2	13	3	10	8				
	2	1	2	2	9	4	12	12				
	2	2	3	1	10	2	7	8				
	1	2	1	1	11	5	10	10				
Total	21	11	19	21	90	31	100	94				
Average	2.1	1.1	1.9	2.1	9	3.1	10	9.4				
Average of counts		1.8				7.875						
Standard deviation	0.8756	0.7379	1.1972	0.9944	2.5820	1.4491	1.7638	1.7127				
Average of standard deviation		0.9513				1.8769						
Algal cell number in batch culture	308,824	161,765	279,412	308,824	1,323,529	455,882	1,470,588	1,382,353				
Algal cell number in average		264,706			Average count	1,158,088						
Algal cell number in standard deviation		70,014			Standard deviation	472,022						
Area of field (mm ²)	0.0068											
Area of chamber (mm ²)	1,000		Standard deviation	70,014	472,022	363,605	226,673	283732.1				
# of fields	147,059		Counts	265,000	1,160,000	2,120,000	1,730,000	4.96E+05				

Table A-2.—Algae growth curve and corresponding transparent exopolymeric particles concentration data for figure 4

		Algae co	unt day 9		Algae count day 12								
Samples	Α	В	С	D	Α	В	С	D					
	8	19	23	11	5	16	21	10					
	8	13	19	12	6	10	15	11					
	11	22	17	20	9	19	14	14					
	12	9	18	14	13	6	15	12					
	8	19	14	12	12	18	11	8					
	14	13	14	20	16	13	12	12					
	14	15	17	12	15	13	13	8					
	14	13	14	13	11	9	11	9					
	11	18	18	20	11	13	13	12					
	9	14	12	12	8	8	11	8					
Total	109	155	166	146	106	125	136	104					
Average	10.9	15.5	16.6	14.6	10.6	12.5	13.6	10.4					
Average of counts		14.4				11.775							
Standard deviation	2.5582	3.8944	3.2042	3.8064	3.6271	4.3012	3.0258	2.1187					
Average of standard deviation		3.3658				3.2682							
Algal cell number in batch culture	1,602,941	2,279,412	2,441,176	2,147,059	1,558,824	1,838,235	2,000,000	1,529,412					
Algal cell number in average	Average count	2,117,647	Standard deviation	363,605			1,731,618	226,673					

Table A-2.—Algae growth curve and corresponding transparent exopolymeric particles concentration data for figure 4

		Algae cou	unt day 14					
А	В	С	D					
6	1	4	9					
2	0	8	1					
3	2	5	2					
3	0	4	2					
3	1	3	4					
4	2	3	4					
3	0	3	5					
3	0	4	3					
3	0	5	4					
4	1	13	8		TE	P ABSORBAN	ICE	
34	7	52	42					
3.4	0.7	5.2	4.2	Day 2	Day 6	Day 9	Day 12	Day 14
	3.375			0.087	0.302	0.389	0.869	1.238
1.0750	0.8233	3.1198	2.5734	0.102	0.187	0.434	1.207	0.905
	1.8979			0.106	0.205	0.451	1.424	1.992
500,000	102,941	764,706	617,647	0.113	0.192	0.511	0.676	1.23
Average count	496,324			0.102	0.2215	0.44625	1.044	1.34125
Standard deviation	283,732			0.0110	0.0542	0.0505	0.3352	0.4607

Table A-2.—Algae growth curve and corresponding transparent exopolymeric particles concentration data for figure 4

APPENDIX B

Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) Peak Data

The acronyms, abbreviations, and units of measure as they appear in this appendix are defined as follows:

CA	cellulose acetate
GMA	glycidyl methacrylate
IDA	iminodiacetic acid

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA		
XLabel	Wavenumber	XLabel	Wavenumber	XLabel	Wavenumber	
YLabel	%Transmittance	YLabel	%Transmittance	YLabel	%Transmittance	
FileType	%Transmittance	FileType	%Transmittance	FileType	%Transmittance	
DisplayDirection	20300	DisplayDirection	20300	DisplayDirection	20300	
PeakDirection	20311	PeakDirection	20311	PeakDirection	20311	
698.229749	77.213422	698.229749	71.908354	698.229749	89.149662	
702.087372	76.716946	702.087372	71.301447	702.087372	88.963939	
705.944995	76.357376	705.944995	70.840765	705.944995	88.864142	
709.802618	76.081096	709.802618	70.466265	709.802618	88.843364	
713.660241	76.099947	713.660241	70.455209	713.660241	89.013894	
717.517864	76.144453	717.517864	70.51183	717.517864	89.164904	
721.375487	76.247974	721.375487	70.64156	721.375487	89.392905	
725.23311	76.446583	725.23311	70.835512	725.23311	89.736288	
729.090733	76.679637	729.090733	71.041124	729.090733	90.079603	
732.948356	76.887763	732.948356	71.236973	732.948356	90.358116	
736.805979	77.072039	736.805979	71.434373	736.805979	90.535445	
740.663602	77.241105	740.663602	71.628588	740.663602	90.539587	
744.521224	77.490136	744.521224	71.914813	744.521224	90.483505	
748.378847	77.769819	748.378847	72.239153	748.378847	90.496407	
752.23647	78.068034	752.23647	72.606491	752.23647	90.595896	
756.094093	78.400185	756.094093	73.019807	756.094093	90.765109	
759.951716	78.75	759.951716	73.466629	759.951716	91.082043	
763.809339	79.074123	763.809339	73.900711	763.809339	91.565114	
767.666962	79.38794	767.666962	74.314602	767.666962	92.091533	
771.524585	79.740635	771.524585	74.746828	771.524585	92.531619	
775.382208	80.116261	775.382208	75.180775	775.382208	92.833189	
779.239831	80.465645	779.239831	75.57081	779.239831	93.020697	
783.097454	80.818481	783.097454	75.977886	783.097454	93.190111	
786.955077	81.193314	786.955077	76.45951	786.955077	93.401013	
790.8127	81.593104	790.8127	77.004282	790.8127	93.651289	
794.670323	82.029402	794.670323	77.572884	794.670323	93.914243	
798.527945	82.481735	798.527945	78.136501	798.527945	94.158479	
802.385568	82.945167	802.385568	78.719089	802.385568	94.390548	
806.243191	83.422842	806.243191	79.340638	806.243191	94.641164	
810.100814	83.900752	810.100814	79.969119	810.100814	94.905755	
813.958437	84.368045	813.958437	80.582752	813.958437	95.150075	
817.81606	84.831023	817.81606	81.195112	817.81606	95.36558	
821.673683	85.295778	821.673683	81.809085	821.673683	95.530895	
825.531306	85.753575	825.531306	82.427629	825.531306	95.596827	
829.388929	86.185297	829.388929	83.041792	829.388929	95.543255	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

CA		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA			
833.246552	86.610498	833.246552	83.654408	833.246552	95.433564		
837.104175	87.078257	837.104175	84.294391	837.104175	95.429708		
840.961798	87.619971	840.961798	84.988168	840.961798	95.673617		
844.819421	88.224941	844.819421	85.732164	844.819421	96.175175		
848.677043	88.857619	848.677043	86.514036	848.677043	96.846426		
852.534666	89.449197	852.534666	87.288902	852.534666	97.514194		
856.392289	89.924483	856.392289	87.984532	856.392289	98.006433		
860.249912	90.259594	860.249912	88.572001	860.249912	98.258882		
864.107535	90.509628	864.107535	89.112163	864.107535	98.285646		
867.965158	90.700078	867.965158	89.648085	867.965158	98.102087		
871.822781	90.812511	871.822781	90.158109	871.822781	97.75516		
875.680404	90.918634	875.680404	90.632453	875.680404	97.425877		
879.538027	91.143277	879.538027	91.115559	879.538027	97.291292		
883.39565	91.459343	883.39565	91.621522	883.39565	97.23215		
887.253273	91.699081	887.253273	92.096342	887.253273	96.921821		
891.110896	91.725506	891.110896	92.478371	891.110896	96.08641		
894.968519	91.497816	894.968519	92.735433	894.968519	94.685405		
898.826141	91.175798	898.826141	92.910178	898.826141	93.24269		
902.683764	91.090636	902.683764	93.126947	902.683764	92.591349		
906.541387	91.411323	906.541387	93.48736	906.541387	93.074492		
910.39901	92.037481	910.39901	93.994583	910.39901	94.407641		
914.256633	92.763069	914.256633	94.556746	914.256633	96.010815		
918.114256	93.423172	918.114256	95.073054	918.114256	97.339931		
921.971879	93.985196	921.971879	95.505873	921.971879	98.252198		
925.829502	94.487237	925.829502	95.872277	925.829502	98.891151		
929.687125	94.930851	929.687125	96.188095	929.687125	99.321635		
933.544748	95.278468	933.544748	96.431269	933.544748	99.504079		
937.402371	95.502091	937.402371	96.59415	937.402371	99.415909		
941.259994	95.593091	941.259994	96.693701	941.259994	99.073723		
945.117617	95.543731	945.117617	96.729774	945.117617	98.498659		
948.97524	95.387035	948.97524	96.704209	948.97524	97.792151		
952.832862	95.232275	952.832862	96.647435	952.832862	97.222309		
956.690485	95.204956	956.690485	96.611761	956.690485	96.985519		
960.548108	95.292104	960.548108	96.60743	960.548108	96.892137		
964.405731	95.285834	964.405731	96.563723	964.405731	96.522594		
968.263354	95.00867	968.263354	96.423659	968.263354	95.664191		
972.120977	94.48937	972.120977	96.207281	972.120977	94.417675		
975.9786	93.866275	975.9786	95.953191	975.9786	92.98986		
979.836223	93.24027	979.836223	95.682603	979.836223	91.528991		
983.693846	92.637388	983.693846	95.41943	983.693846	90.118755		

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA			
987.551469	92.094813	987.551469	95.195248	987.551469	88.865642		
991.409092	91.702261	991.409092	95.04895	991.409092	87.898681		
995.266715	91.42932	995.266715	94.994361	995.266715	87.144169		
999.124338	91.024705	999.124338	94.946828	999.124338	86.194771		
1002.98196	90.274693	1002.98196	94.795292	1002.98196	84.634666		
1006.839583	89.140029	1006.839583	94.496688	1006.839583	82.306342		
1010.697206	87.554422	1010.697206	94.004646	1010.697206	79.17367		
1014.554829	85.406856	1014.554829	93.273077	1014.554829	75.276205		
1018.412452	82.623516	1018.412452	92.274345	1018.412452	70.792993		
1022.270075	79.211873	1022.270075	90.955311	1022.270075	66.02138		
1026.127698	75.337014	1026.127698	89.299695	1026.127698	61.349765		
1029.985321	71.448292	1029.985321	87.444124	1029.985321	57.446549		
1033.842944	68.466069	1033.842944	85.817198	1033.842944	55.172103		
1037.700567	67.057215	1037.700567	84.860534	1037.700567	54.70867		
1041.55819	66.775418	1041.55819	84.468419	1041.55819	55.326026		
1045.415813	66.874464	1045.415813	84.199284	1045.415813	56.455685		
1049.273436	67.337073	1049.273436	83.944822	1049.273436	58.175174		
1053.131058	68.604625	1053.131058	84.015841	1053.131058	60.658958		
1056.988681	70.798341	1056.988681	84.682913	1056.988681	63.75659		
1060.846304	73.308506	1060.846304	85.770709	1060.846304	66.822109		
1064.703927	75.435105	1064.703927	86.85297	1064.703927	69.282935		
1068.56155	77.203421	1068.56155	87.807924	1068.56155	71.254194		
1072.419173	78.999895	1072.419173	88.794742	1072.419173	73.211067		
1076.276796	80.899606	1076.276796	89.85152	1076.276796	75.321718		
1080.134419	82.762943	1080.134419	90.885693	1080.134419	77.49377		
1083.992042	84.548171	1083.992042	91.85944	1083.992042	79.699014		
1087.849665	86.330015	1087.849665	92.804619	1087.849665	81.984169		
1091.707288	88.090781	1091.707288	93.722531	1091.707288	84.264055		
1095.564911	89.682293	1095.564911	94.558657	1095.564911	86.313871		
1099.422534	90.900301	1099.422534	95.210111	1099.422534	87.870009		
1103.280156	91.6404	1103.280156	95.613089	1103.280156	88.791519		
1107.137779	91.990356	1107.137779	95.819918	1107.137779	89.159333		
1110.995402	92.123478	1110.995402	95.932639	1110.995402	89.188378		
1114.853025	92.147272	1114.853025	96.000709	1114.853025	89.049917		
1118.710648	92.10078	1118.710648	96.015563	1118.710648	88.855689		
1122.568271	92.055665	1122.568271	95.969415	1122.568271	88.743917		
1126.425894	92.180873	1126.425894	95.927842	1126.425894	88.885945		
1130.283517	92.606314	1130.283517	95.992788	1130.283517	89.365688		
1134.14114	93.223708	1134.14114	96.165015	1134.14114	90.022247		
1137.998763	93.785381	1137.998763	96.346221	1137.998763	90.52607		

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA			
1141.856386	94.076551	1141.856386	96.409275	1141.856386	90.561522		
1145.714009	93.903319	1145.714009	96.218525	1145.714009	89.944033		
1149.571632	93.239879	1149.571632	95.777728	1149.571632	88.905223		
1153.429255	92.386329	1153.429255	95.305259	1153.429255	88.00742		
1157.286877	91.792639	1157.286877	95.044603	1157.286877	87.565027		
1161.1445	91.741263	1161.1445	95.075839	1161.1445	87.545664		
1165.002123	92.1751	1165.002123	95.303061	1165.002123	87.859078		
1168.859746	92.842162	1168.859746	95.599691	1168.859746	88.442435		
1172.717369	93.574991	1172.717369	95.92971	1172.717369	89.286032		
1176.574992	94.340899	1176.574992	96.299399	1176.574992	90.356954		
1180.432615	95.063065	1180.432615	96.6699	1180.432615	91.421766		
1184.290238	95.552058	1184.290238	96.953013	1184.290238	92.124498		
1188.147861	95.615604	1188.147861	97.068574	1188.147861	92.120109		
1192.005484	95.142687	1192.005484	96.978779	1192.005484	91.119654		
1195.863107	94.033379	1195.863107	96.652637	1195.863107	88.877008		
1199.72073	92.110661	1199.72073	96.032763	1199.72073	85.116762		
1203.578353	89.145082	1203.578353	95.01481	1203.578353	79.65801		
1207.435975	85.085935	1207.435975	93.507365	1207.435975	72.989466		
1211.293598	80.334924	1211.293598	91.568331	1211.293598	66.452793		
1215.151221	75.707271	1215.151221	89.45344	1215.151221	61.389306		
1219.008844	71.961261	1219.008844	87.490354	1219.008844	58.236172		
1222.866467	69.341842	1222.866467	85.88058	1222.866467	56.597248		
1226.72409	67.608983	1226.72409	84.587498	1226.72409	55.92478		
1230.581713	66.511397	1230.581713	83.477583	1230.581713	56.06947		
1234.439336	66.094941	1234.439336	82.553329	1234.439336	57.221252		
1238.296959	66.519521	1238.296959	81.960593	1238.296959	59.423364		
1242.154582	67.789458	1242.154582	81.824665	1242.154582	62.422341		
1246.012205	69.71479	1246.012205	82.160964	1246.012205	65.836724		
1249.869828	72.085654	1249.869828	82.906029	1249.869828	69.429972		
1253.727451	74.785664	1253.727451	84.006743	1253.727451	73.107838		
1257.585073	77.685876	1257.585073	85.421033	1257.585073	76.73203		
1261.442696	80.652677	1261.442696	87.076722	1261.442696	80.1957		
1265.300319	83.555623	1265.300319	88.833872	1265.300319	83.46603		
1269.157942	86.287476	1269.157942	90.562054	1269.157942	86.516716		
1273.015565	88.885504	1273.015565	92.250696	1273.015565	89.354678		
1276.873188	91.258088	 1276.873188	93.789019	1276.873188	91.853084		
1280.730811	93.222979	1280.730811	95.033865	1280.730811	93.888156		
1284.588434	94.785668	1284.588434	96.025891	1284.588434	95.530412		
1288.446057	96.006172	1288.446057	96.812115	1288.446057	96.847608		
1292.30368	96.929896	 1292.30368	97.401468	1292.30368	97.887607		

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA			CA-GMA-IDA			
1296.161303	97.645222	1296.161303	97.850878		1296.161303	98.730604		
1300.018926	98.191517	1300.018926	98.191985		1300.018926	99.380473		
1303.876549	98.535358	1303.876549	98.418626		1303.876549	99.790995		
1307.734172	98.660631	1307.734172	98.528233		1307.734172	99.949826		
1311.591794	98.627922	1311.591794	98.545605		1311.591794	99.917977		
1315.449417	98.531929	1315.449417	98.514986		1315.449417	99.822851		
1319.30704	98.460117	1319.30704	98.48067		1319.30704	99.787912		
1323.164663	98.478357	1323.164663	98.479977		1323.164663	99.862945		
1327.022286	98.604623	1327.022286	98.529494		1327.022286	100.019862		
1330.879909	98.807576	1330.879909	98.620867		1330.879909	100.208518		
1334.737532	99.033307	1334.737532	98.733998		1334.737532	100.391358		
1338.595155	99.207911	1338.595155	98.837483		1338.595155	100.508654		
1342.452778	99.256049	1342.452778	98.896522		1342.452778	100.491354		
1346.310401	99.122891	1346.310401	98.887729		1346.310401	100.249769		
1350.168024	98.6806	1350.168024	98.747725		1350.168024	99.513757		
1354.025647	97.637499	1354.025647	98.332322		1354.025647	97.744226		
1357.88327	95.659071	1357.88327	97.47805		1357.88327	94.498083		
1361.740892	92.863972	1361.740892	96.189789		1361.740892	90.329203		
1365.598515	90.24742	1365.598515	94.865658		1365.598515	86.984171		
1369.456138	88.922611	1369.456138	94.06649		1369.456138	85.801933		
1373.313761	88.998763	1373.313761	93.956611		1373.313761	86.504785		
1377.171384	89.851013	1377.171384	94.278846		1377.171384	88.110902		
1381.029007	91.105232	1381.029007	94.830669		1381.029007	90.138948		
1384.88663	92.841412	1384.88663	95.661989		1384.88663	92.619186		
1388.744253	94.920869	1388.744253	96.72402		1388.744253	95.341601		
1392.601876	96.838956	1392.601876	97.743385		1392.601876	97.752591		
1396.459499	98.240427	1396.459499	98.50804		1396.459499	99.454711		
1400.317122	99.04053	1400.317122	98.964054		1400.317122	100.365497		
1404.174745	99.36071	1404.174745	99.183335		1404.174745	100.695079		
1408.032368	99.418926	1408.032368	99.283277		1408.032368	100.738146		
1411.88999	99.350395	1411.88999	99.32764		1411.88999	100.639417		
1415.747613	99.195861	1415.747613	99.331343		1415.747613	100.427908		
1419.605236	98.951642	1419.605236	99.266893		1419.605236	100.087952		
1423.462859	98.635901	1423.462859	99.121542		1423.462859	99.628214		
1427.320482	98.32489	1427.320482	98.946019		1427.320482	99.14921		
1431.178105	98.128133	1431.178105	98.809765		1431.178105	98.812459		
1435.035728	98.140793	1435.035728	98.772499		1435.035728	98.762384		
1438.893351	98.368515	1438.893351	98.845004		1438.893351	99.020546		
1442.750974	98.719377	1442.750974	98.988428		1442.750974	99.467364		
1446.608597	99.082102	1446.608597	99.156703		1446.608597	99.967209		

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA	
1450.46622	99.370032	1450.46622	99.297645	1450.46622	100.425197
1454.323843	99.574968	1454.323843	99.39612	1454.323843	100.840189
1458.181466	99.772355	1458.181466	99.478457	1458.181466	101.27541
1462.039089	100.02409	1462.039089	99.561255	1462.039089	101.72335
1465.896711	100.33541	1465.896711	99.664386	1465.896711	102.183804
1469.754334	100.663903	1469.754334	99.790748	1469.754334	102.682436
1473.611957	100.935166	1473.611957	99.884614	1473.611957	103.153579
1477.46958	101.086794	1477.46958	99.87784	1477.46958	103.449097
1481.327203	101.123545	1481.327203	99.780804	1481.327203	103.521023
1485.184826	101.092994	1485.184826	99.653459	1485.184826	103.480817
1489.042449	101.025655	1489.042449	99.540795	1489.042449	103.440786
1492.900072	100.953365	1492.900072	99.472784	1492.900072	103.434689
1496.757695	100.892886	1496.757695	99.428167	1496.757695	103.404144
1500.615318	100.847711	1500.615318	99.380131	1500.615318	103.293241
1504.472941	100.822928	1504.472941	99.346877	1504.472941	103.110426
1508.330564	100.797249	1508.330564	99.31156	1508.330564	102.838853
1512.188187	100.764172	1512.188187	99.256615	1512.188187	102.49715
1516.045809	100.746743	1516.045809	99.218521	1516.045809	102.20511
1519.903432	100.73952	1519.903432	99.194874	1519.903432	102.038711
1523.761055	100.72215	1523.761055	99.156893	1523.761055	101.926257
1527.618678	100.696579	1527.618678	99.11409	1527.618678	101.779311
1531.476301	100.677238	1531.476301	99.081846	1531.476301	101.618575
1535.333924	100.671429	1535.333924	99.068586	1535.333924	101.489442
1539.191547	100.674578	1539.191547	99.068242	1539.191547	101.401163
1543.04917	100.679484	1543.04917	99.04999	1543.04917	101.347968
1546.906793	100.698215	1546.906793	99.023634	1546.906793	101.379331
1550.764416	100.747199	1550.764416	99.027854	1550.764416	101.586785
1554.622039	100.8261	1554.622039	99.072235	1554.622039	102.001866
1558.479662	100.927368	1558.479662	99.140694	1558.479662	102.580583
1562.337285	101.031051	1562.337285	99.19655	1562.337285	103.184986
1566.194907	101.143748	1566.194907	99.248236	1566.194907	103.735295
1570.05253	101.261712	1570.05253	99.306513	1570.05253	104.237484
1573.910153	101.337964	1573.910153	99.325767	1573.910153	104.63795
1577.767776	101.342081	1577.767776	99.263535	1577.767776	104.92052
1581.625399	101.250828	1581.625399	99.100061	1581.625399	105.078868
1585.483022	101.060814	 1585.483022	98.841378	1585.483022	105.10067
1589.340645	100.753787	1589.340645	98.461287	1589.340645	104.955524
1593.198268	100.320427	1593.198268	97.950346	1593.198268	104.631575
1597.055891	99.767913	 1597.055891	97.321579	1597.055891	104.153407
1600.913514	99.094882	 1600.913514	96.578781	1600.913514	103.520198

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA	
1604.771137	98.303897	1604.771137	95.728621	1604.771137	102.732665
1608.62876	97.394625	1608.62876	94.766913	1608.62876	101.77259
1612.486383	96.415428	1612.486383	93.74623	1612.486383	100.687492
1616.344005	95.384574	1616.344005	92.684034	1616.344005	99.528357
1620.201628	94.358285	1620.201628	91.621291	1620.201628	98.380893
1624.059251	93.405538	1624.059251	90.628511	1624.059251	97.323603
1627.916874	92.55619	1627.916874	89.743049	1627.916874	96.377056
1631.774497	91.878848	1631.774497	89.032594	1631.774497	95.598978
1635.63212	91.38347	1635.63212	88.511191	1635.63212	94.962774
1639.489743	91.071387	1639.489743	88.184332	1639.489743	94.44493
1643.347366	90.954304	1643.347366	88.071976	1643.347366	94.05715
1647.204989	91.029484	1647.204989	88.175313	1647.204989	93.847424
1651.062612	91.278969	1651.062612	88.470242	1651.062612	93.943849
1654.920235	91.659249	1654.920235	88.904888	1654.920235	94.403404
1658.777858	92.117041	1658.777858	89.42204	1658.777858	95.104215
1662.635481	92.645345	1662.635481	90.030215	1662.635481	95.890153
1666.493104	93.212078	1666.493104	90.701837	1666.493104	96.628151
1670.350726	93.74795	1670.350726	91.361517	1670.350726	97.223528
1674.208349	94.235178	1674.208349	91.990763	1674.208349	97.676502
1678.065972	94.641193	1678.065972	92.56195	1678.065972	97.979285
1681.923595	94.972155	1681.923595	93.100122	1681.923595	98.170556
1685.781218	95.222871	1685.781218	93.598123	1685.781218	98.236516
1689.638841	95.345681	1689.638841	94.001284	1689.638841	98.107309
1693.496464	95.355844	1693.496464	94.346549	1693.496464	97.792585
1697.354087	95.192284	1697.354087	94.610766	1697.354087	97.176771
1701.21171	94.732362	1701.21171	94.702271	1701.21171	96.065802
1705.069333	93.869268	1705.069333	94.573264	1705.069333	94.271278
1708.926956	92.472406	1708.926956	94.183049	1708.926956	91.590997
1712.784579	90.452234	1712.784579	93.493933	1712.784579	87.968475
1716.642202	87.771401	1716.642202	92.45864	1716.642202	83.478344
1720.499824	84.689205	1720.499824	91.133172	1720.499824	78.68329
1724.357447	81.747515	1724.357447	89.742897	1724.357447	74.506629
1728.21507	79.411496	1728.21507	88.54901	1728.21507	71.568745
1732.072693	77.970007	1732.072693	87.749425	1732.072693	70.087702
1735.930316	77.466445	1735.930316	87.404308	1735.930316	69.907573
1739.787939	77.773169	1739.787939	87.469807	1739.787939	70.710167
1743.645562	78.669251	1743.645562	87.840192	1743.645562	72.17078
1747.503185	79.965778	1747.503185	88.391771	1747.503185	74.074257
1751.360808	81.799899	1751.360808	89.192082	1751.360808	76.595063
1755.218431	84.56715	1755.218431	90.577632	1755.218431	80.168506

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA	
1759.076054	88.401249	1759.076054	92.778783	1759.076054	84.974798
1762.933677	92.692585	1762.933677	95.420231	1762.933677	90.466618
1766.7913	96.264742	1766.7913	97.657431	1766.7913	95.348245
1770.648922	98.582402	1770.648922	99.100452	1770.648922	98.820265
1774.506545	99.903229	1774.506545	99.912912	1774.506545	100.964382
1778.364168	100.63916	1778.364168	100.362703	1778.364168	102.211355
1782.221791	101.09099	1782.221791	100.645412	1782.221791	102.985266
1786.079414	101.383922	1786.079414	100.836311	1786.079414	103.48611
1789.937037	101.59664	1789.937037	100.982264	1789.937037	103.835132
1793.79466	101.765094	1793.79466	101.100247	1793.79466	104.090793
1797.652283	101.899943	1797.652283	101.191983	1797.652283	104.283953
1801.509906	102.019916	1801.509906	101.272975	1801.509906	104.451355
1805.367529	102.132822	1805.367529	101.35104	1805.367529	104.604341
1809.225152	102.24503	1809.225152	101.430321	1809.225152	104.751539
1813.082775	102.354224	1813.082775	101.50565	1813.082775	104.889853
1816.940398	102.455318	1816.940398	101.577217	1816.940398	105.01719
1820.798021	102.546647	1820.798021	101.644946	1820.798021	105.130883
1824.655643	102.631595	1824.655643	101.705068	1824.655643	105.231503
1828.513266	102.708727	1828.513266	101.761007	1828.513266	105.321702
1832.370889	102.772597	1832.370889	101.808007	1832.370889	105.393628
1836.228512	102.820345	1836.228512	101.842634	1836.228512	105.442976
1840.086135	102.856951	1840.086135	101.874811	1840.086135	105.482446
1843.943758	102.89039	1843.943758	101.905191	1843.943758	105.517443
1847.801381	102.915309	1847.801381	101.927015	1847.801381	105.537695
1851.659004	102.933568	1851.659004	101.945607	1851.659004	105.555117
1855.516627	102.951553	1855.516627	101.964162	 1855.516627	105.576578
1859.37425	102.97092	1859.37425	101.980567	 1859.37425	105.594542
1863.231873	102.991144	1863.231873	101.996157	 1863.231873	105.61135
1867.089496	103.008002	1867.089496	102.012484	 1867.089496	105.629134
1870.947119	103.021892	1870.947119	102.026783	1870.947119	105.644222
1874.804741	103.035691	1874.804741	102.03834	1874.804741	105.656677
1878.662364	103.051657	1878.662364	102.051122	1878.662364	105.673116
1882.519987	103.06717	1882.519987	102.063288	1882.519987	105.689807
1886.37761	103.076953	1886.37761	102.070702	1886.37761	105.699858
1890.235233	103.081007	 1890.235233	102.072964	1890.235233	105.703315
1894.092856	103.083999	 1894.092856	102.076487	1894.092856	105.7047
1897.950479	103.083482	1897.950479	102.081196	1897.950479	105.702426
1901.808102	103.076163	1901.808102	102.079927	1901.808102	105.693811
1905.665725	103.068587	1905.665725	102.076331	1905.665725	105.6869
1909.523348	103.060857	 1909.523348	102.071969	1909.523348	105.679455

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA	
1913.380971	103.05135	1913.380971	102.065977	1913.380971	105.670685
1917.238594	103.043933	1917.238594	102.06163	1917.238594	105.664135
1921.096217	103.038431	1921.096217	102.058226	1921.096217	105.657628
1924.953839	103.0313	1924.953839	102.052423	1924.953839	105.653564
1928.811462	103.024302	1928.811462	102.04459	1928.811462	105.651841
1932.669085	103.0213	1932.669085	102.038117	1932.669085	105.650642
1936.526708	103.019213	1936.526708	102.031474	1936.526708	105.648881
1940.384331	103.015619	1940.384331	102.023666	1940.384331	105.647998
1944.241954	103.008598	1944.241954	102.015561	1944.241954	105.648303
1948.099577	102.998336	1948.099577	102.004212	1948.099577	105.647109
1951.9572	102.989986	1951.9572	101.990733	1951.9572	105.645931
1955.814823	102.986639	1955.814823	101.980745	1955.814823	105.647162
1959.672446	102.986046	1959.672446	101.972504	1959.672446	105.652807
1963.530069	102.984937	1963.530069	101.962983	1963.530069	105.663461
1967.387692	102.983704	1967.387692	101.952908	1967.387692	105.67471
1971.245315	102.983193	1971.245315	101.94128	1971.245315	105.684249
1975.102938	102.986908	1975.102938	101.931662	1975.102938	105.698349
1978.96056	102.991633	1978.96056	101.922615	1978.96056	105.716203
1982.818183	102.989524	1982.818183	101.909156	1982.818183	105.730032
1986.675806	102.983831	1986.675806	101.894818	1986.675806	105.7411
1990.533429	102.977361	1990.533429	101.879324	1990.533429	105.749108
1994.391052	102.970034	1994.391052	101.861693	1994.391052	105.749963
1998.248675	102.960282	1998.248675	101.843896	1998.248675	105.746866
2002.106298	102.945779	2002.106298	101.824929	2002.106298	105.743412
2005.963921	102.928581	2005.963921	101.803124	2005.963921	105.735639
2009.821544	102.909035	2009.821544	101.779093	2009.821544	105.722583
2013.679167	102.888778	2013.679167	101.755348	2013.679167	105.708233
2017.53679	102.870243	2017.53679	101.731914	2017.53679	105.694901
2021.394413	102.851208	2021.394413	101.707775	2021.394413	105.683212
2025.252036	102.833135	2025.252036	101.6846	2025.252036	105.673275
2029.109658	102.818638	2029.109658	101.663752	2029.109658	105.666796
2032.967281	102.804345	2032.967281	101.642668	2032.967281	105.660481
2036.824904	102.789217	2036.824904	101.619986	2036.824904	105.651427
2040.682527	102.776608	2040.682527	101.598134	2040.682527	105.6446
2044.54015	102.766071	2044.54015	101.577313	2044.54015	105.641293
2048.397773	102.753946	2048.397773	101.556085	2048.397773	105.638427
2052.255396	102.740651	2052.255396	101.534769	2052.255396	105.634018
2056.113019	102.729765	2056.113019	101.516169	2056.113019	105.629368
2059.970642	102.720858	2059.970642	101.500731	2059.970642	105.625716
2063.828265	102.710345	2063.828265	101.484651	2063.828265	105.622345

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA	
2067.685888	102.696633	2067.685888	101.466729	2067.685888	105.620123
2071.543511	102.681639	2071.543511	101.44828	2071.543511	105.614954
2075.401134	102.666476	2075.401134	101.42947	2075.401134	105.603435
2079.258756	102.650208	2079.258756	101.411489	2079.258756	105.5914
2083.116379	102.631263	2083.116379	101.393607	2083.116379	105.576958
2086.974002	102.61344	2086.974002	101.375516	2086.974002	105.560438
2090.831625	102.601997	2090.831625	101.36204	2090.831625	105.549458
2094.689248	102.589122	2094.689248	101.350563	2094.689248	105.535002
2098.546871	102.571966	2098.546871	101.335373	2098.546871	105.515723
2102.404494	102.558685	2102.404494	101.321627	2102.404494	105.502106
2106.262117	102.546771	2106.262117	101.311367	2106.262117	105.490789
2110.11974	102.532319	2110.11974	101.300981	2110.11974	105.478894
2113.977363	102.519927	2113.977363	101.292923	2113.977363	105.468287
2117.834986	102.512129	2117.834986	101.287977	2117.834986	105.462789
2121.692609	102.507157	2121.692609	101.283833	2121.692609	105.464255
2125.550232	102.506227	2125.550232	101.283	2125.550232	105.468749
2129.407854	102.509841	2129.407854	101.285372	2129.407854	105.47598
2133.265477	102.516789	2133.265477	101.289226	2133.265477	105.488563
2137.1231	102.527918	2137.1231	101.296823	2137.1231	105.50779
2140.980723	102.541443	2140.980723	101.30852	2140.980723	105.530249
2144.838346	102.559648	2144.838346	101.322826	2144.838346	105.552082
2148.695969	102.583639	2148.695969	101.338676	2148.695969	105.575997
2152.553592	102.605387	2152.553592	101.355966	2152.553592	105.602254
2156.411215	102.625898	2156.411215	101.37503	2156.411215	105.626193
2160.268838	102.651677	2160.268838	101.39645	2160.268838	105.651483
2164.126461	102.681793	2164.126461	101.421707	2164.126461	105.684296
2167.984084	102.714079	2167.984084	101.449613	2167.984084	105.72007
2171.841707	102.742718	2171.841707	101.474997	2171.841707	105.751468
2175.69933	102.766757	2175.69933	101.497208	2175.69933	105.775207
2179.556953	102.795508	2179.556953	101.523109	2179.556953	105.796242
2183.414575	102.825875	2183.414575	101.552646	2183.414575	105.820379
2187.272198	102.851266	2187.272198	101.579527	2187.272198	105.843114
2191.129821	102.877602	2191.129821	101.602822	2191.129821	105.860342
2194.987444	102.905547	2194.987444	101.628601	2194.987444	105.874764
2198.845067	102.930638	2198.845067	101.659899	2198.845067	105.891391
2202.70269	102.954902	2202.70269	101.688059	2202.70269	105.909878
2206.560313	102.978092	2206.560313	101.711465	2206.560313	105.924593
2210.417936	102.998696	2210.417936	101.735511	2210.417936	105.938563
2214.275559	103.023385	2214.275559	101.764228	2214.275559	105.95865
2218.133182	103.050684	2218.133182	101.80062	2218.133182	105.979681

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11
СА		CA-G	AMA	CA-GMA-IDA		
2221.990805	103.072443	2221.990805	101.833728	2221.990805	105.996682	
2225.848428	103.092432	2225.848428	101.860686	2225.848428	106.013889	
2229.706051	103.112994	2229.706051	101.887713	2229.706051	106.029722	
2233.563673	103.13201	2233.563673	101.911343	2233.563673	106.040862	
2237.421296	103.153081	2237.421296	101.937366	2237.421296	106.05175	
2241.278919	103.177197	2241.278919	101.966996	2241.278919	106.065026	
2245.136542	103.198962	2245.136542	101.993054	2245.136542	106.076584	
2248.994165	103.218358	2248.994165	102.021206	2248.994165	106.084469	
2252.851788	103.238573	2252.851788	102.049726	2252.851788	106.091569	
2256.709411	103.257249	2256.709411	102.071717	2256.709411	106.097505	
2260.567034	103.274632	2260.567034	102.095563	2260.567034	106.103176	
2264.424657	103.290772	2264.424657	102.12345	2264.424657	106.110012	
2268.28228	103.304989	2268.28228	102.14846	2268.28228	106.115593	
2272.139903	103.320649	2272.139903	102.173183	2272.139903	106.123757	
2275.997526	103.338471	2275.997526	102.197878	2275.997526	106.136744	
2279.855149	103.356356	2279.855149	102.221788	2279.855149	106.148175	
2283.712771	103.372492	2283.712771	102.246652	2283.712771	106.157416	
2287.570394	103.390122	2287.570394	102.267625	2287.570394	106.170978	
2291.428017	103.409066	2291.428017	102.287803	2291.428017	106.187054	
2295.28564	103.424884	2295.28564	102.310418	2295.28564	106.196746	
2299.143263	103.444874	2299.143263	102.335294	2299.143263	106.209051	
2303.000886	103.471842	2303.000886	102.367059	2303.000886	106.234409	
2306.858509	103.496378	2306.858509	102.396889	2306.858509	106.258041	
2310.716132	103.516199	2310.716132	102.419173	2310.716132	106.274016	
2314.573755	103.533028	2314.573755	102.437479	2314.573755	106.289005	
2318.431378	103.549357	2318.431378	102.453087	2318.431378	106.306204	
2322.289001	103.570603	2322.289001	102.476219	2322.289001	106.332098	
2326.146624	103.591102	2326.146624	102.503141	2326.146624	106.357211	
2330.004247	103.60534	2330.004247	102.522205	2330.004247	106.374055	
2333.86187	103.619954	2333.86187	102.538862	2333.86187	106.386793	
2337.719492	103.633409	2337.719492	102.556247	2337.719492	106.38919	
2341.577115	103.641826	2341.577115	102.57442	2341.577115	106.381854	
2345.434738	103.648149	2345.434738	102.593527	2345.434738	106.366205	
2349.292361	103.654363	2349.292361	102.611371	2349.292361	106.354626	
2353.149984	103.66658	2353.149984	102.63082	2353.149984	106.378034	
2357.007607	103.68651	2357.007607	102.648869	2357.007607	106.424948	
2360.86523	103.707632	2360.86523	102.663067	2360.86523	106.453372	
2364.722853	103.722882	2364.722853	102.681258	2364.722853	106.456401	
2368.580476	103.729622	2368.580476	102.700028	2368.580476	106.445024	
2372.438099	103.736766	2372.438099	102.714958	2372.438099	106.422566	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

CA		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA	
2376.295722	103.748331	2376.295722	102.734291	2376.295722	106.398463
2380.153345	103.75788	2380.153345	102.756399	2380.153345	106.380435
2384.010968	103.763938	2384.010968	102.774332	2384.010968	106.370659
2387.86859	103.767137	2387.86859	102.786377	2387.86859	106.367499
2391.726213	103.771568	2391.726213	102.795378	2391.726213	106.360219
2395.583836	103.779832	2395.583836	102.806908	2395.583836	106.351006
2399.441459	103.785962	2399.441459	102.817734	2399.441459	106.347253
2403.299082	103.788362	2403.299082	102.825789	2403.299082	106.341024
2407.156705	103.790088	2407.156705	102.836171	2407.156705	106.332773
2411.014328	103.79243	2411.014328	102.848452	2411.014328	106.327346
2414.871951	103.798287	2414.871951	102.85947	2414.871951	106.324528
2418.729574	103.808274	2418.729574	102.869939	2418.729574	106.32668
2422.587197	103.819071	2422.587197	102.883265	2422.587197	106.331655
2426.44482	103.829542	2426.44482	102.898978	2426.44482	106.336526
2430.302443	103.839801	2430.302443	102.913189	2430.302443	106.339398
2434.160066	103.849677	2434.160066	102.926352	2434.160066	106.34187
2438.017688	103.860802	2438.017688	102.938744	2438.017688	106.347018
2441.875311	103.871852	2441.875311	102.945978	2441.875311	106.348396
2445.732934	103.882383	2445.732934	102.954655	2445.732934	106.347996
2449.590557	103.889782	2449.590557	102.969236	2449.590557	106.348855
2453.44818	103.890876	2453.44818	102.978655	2453.44818	106.344716
2457.305803	103.894342	2457.305803	102.987752	2457.305803	106.339282
2461.163426	103.901568	2461.163426	103.001578	2461.163426	106.335912
2465.021049	103.905903	2465.021049	103.009514	2465.021049	106.335348
2468.878672	103.911785	2468.878672	103.015885	2468.878672	106.337612
2472.736295	103.920901	2472.736295	103.025748	2472.736295	106.335862
2476.593918	103.931087	2476.593918	103.038364	2476.593918	106.336374
2480.451541	103.939464	2480.451541	103.052059	 2480.451541	106.341474
2484.309164	103.944063	2484.309164	103.059229	2484.309164	106.340459
2488.166786	103.951159	2488.166786	103.064731	 2488.166786	106.338946
2492.024409	103.959503	2492.024409	103.074875	2492.024409	106.341547
2495.882032	103.966173	2495.882032	103.087494	2495.882032	106.344559
2499.739655	103.976568	2499.739655	103.101694	2499.739655	106.35025
2503.597278	103.984257	2503.597278	103.111835	2503.597278	106.354228
2507.454901	103.989612	2507.454901	103.119404	2507.454901	106.355756
2511.312524	104.003175	2511.312524	103.131473	2511.312524	106.358246
2515.170147	104.013661	2515.170147	103.144004	2515.170147	106.358202
2519.02777	104.015615	2519.02777	103.1507	2519.02777	106.355655
2522.885393	104.018837	2522.885393	103.154138	2522.885393	106.35479
2526.743016	104.020428	2526.743016	103.160766	2526.743016	106.357336

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-C	GMA	CA-GMA-IDA		
2530.600639	104.024206	2530.600639	103.16858	2530.600639	106.357545	
2534.458262	104.032347	2534.458262	103.17238	2534.458262	106.354943	
2538.315885	104.034767	2538.315885	103.17723	2538.315885	106.353619	
2542.173507	104.03779	2542.173507	103.188123	2542.173507	106.352146	
2546.03113	104.046337	2546.03113	103.199759	2546.03113	106.356738	
2549.888753	104.053099	2549.888753	103.207739	2549.888753	106.360918	
2553.746376	104.055674	2553.746376	103.211873	2553.746376	106.35374	
2557.603999	104.053517	2557.603999	103.211444	2557.603999	106.345893	
2561.461622	104.053191	2561.461622	103.214203	2561.461622	106.342116	
2565.319245	104.056232	2565.319245	103.22142	2565.319245	106.337631	
2569.176868	104.056291	2569.176868	103.224047	2569.176868	106.330205	
2573.034491	104.059425	2573.034491	103.227848	2573.034491	106.324758	
2576.892114	104.064871	2576.892114	103.235751	2576.892114	106.324011	
2580.749737	104.061131	2580.749737	103.238443	2580.749737	106.317125	
2584.60736	104.05372	2584.60736	103.236259	2584.60736	106.308782	
2588.464983	104.050007	2588.464983	103.23665	2588.464983	106.30538	
2592.322605	104.044124	2592.322605	103.240743	2592.322605	106.296364	
2596.180228	104.041102	2596.180228	103.245336	2596.180228	106.287644	
2600.037851	104.046656	2600.037851	103.253409	2600.037851	106.284072	
2603.895474	104.048663	2603.895474	103.26033	2603.895474	106.277297	
2607.753097	104.046716	2607.753097	103.25895	2607.753097	106.271908	
2611.61072	104.046241	2611.61072	103.256873	2611.61072	106.265784	
2615.468343	104.040565	2615.468343	103.258369	2615.468343	106.255845	
2619.325966	104.031158	2619.325966	103.260143	2619.325966	106.250431	
2623.183589	104.02364	2623.183589	103.257264	2623.183589	106.243039	
2627.041212	104.020935	2627.041212	103.249775	2627.041212	106.230057	
2630.898835	104.021469	2630.898835	103.247042	2630.898835	106.219093	
2634.756458	104.016196	2634.756458	103.254432	2634.756458	106.214248	
2638.614081	104.010253	2638.614081	103.265615	2638.614081	106.216706	
2642.471703	104.010829	2642.471703	103.267856	2642.471703	106.216549	
2646.329326	104.008805	2646.329326	103.264323	2646.329326	106.212479	
2650.186949	104.005271	2650.186949	103.263434	2650.186949	106.213917	
2654.044572	104.009356	2654.044572	103.262798	2654.044572	106.220045	
2657.902195	104.0153	2657.902195	103.265408	2657.902195	106.22802	
2661.759818	104.016482	2661.759818	103.268803	2661.759818	106.234681	
2665.617441	104.016562	2665.617441	103.27193	2665.617441	106.239288	
2669.475064	104.017642	2669.475064	103.280483	2669.475064	106.24534	
2673.332687	104.015243	2673.332687	103.284553	2673.332687	106.248705	
2677.19031	104.009583	2677.19031	103.280502	2677.19031	106.246308	
2681.047933	104.007586	2681.047933	103.27751	2681.047933	106.244669	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

C	Α	CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA		
2684.905556	104.007004	2684.905556	103.27659	2684.905556	106.242973	
2688.763179	104.002392	2688.763179	103.275451	2688.763179	106.237293	
2692.620802	103.997281	2692.620802	103.275141	2692.620802	106.235515	
2696.478424	103.99051	2696.478424	103.275072	2696.478424	106.236296	
2700.336047	103.979194	2700.336047	103.27151	2700.336047	106.229867	
2704.19367	103.96825	2704.19367	103.267437	2704.19367	106.216697	
2708.051293	103.95984	2708.051293	103.264925	2708.051293	106.201305	
2711.908916	103.948405	2711.908916	103.256894	2711.908916	106.185288	
2715.766539	103.931161	2715.766539	103.243368	2715.766539	106.167543	
2719.624162	103.915487	2719.624162	103.229915	2719.624162	106.15315	
2723.481785	103.903646	2723.481785	103.220216	2723.481785	106.146934	
2727.339408	103.891006	2727.339408	103.214629	2727.339408	106.141294	
2731.197031	103.887102	2731.197031	103.212578	2731.197031	106.137759	
2735.054654	103.894026	2735.054654	103.213851	2735.054654	106.146721	
2738.912277	103.896088	2738.912277	103.210706	2738.912277	106.159024	
2742.7699	103.898595	2742.7699	103.206868	2742.7699	106.165089	
2746.627522	103.908621	2746.627522	103.211138	2746.627522	106.173018	
2750.485145	103.910875	2750.485145	103.209749	2750.485145	106.180411	
2754.342768	103.903523	2754.342768	103.19561	2754.342768	106.180107	
2758.200391	103.893271	2758.200391	103.179979	2758.200391	106.177543	
2762.058014	103.884069	2762.058014	103.169215	2762.058014	106.175921	
2765.915637	103.880529	2765.915637	103.160592	2765.915637	106.172564	
2769.77326	103.876669	2769.77326	103.152456	2769.77326	106.168798	
2773.630883	103.871899	2773.630883	103.147907	2773.630883	106.169515	
2777.488506	103.863389	2777.488506	103.142857	2777.488506	106.167291	
2781.346129	103.845708	2781.346129	103.133624	2781.346129	106.156712	
2785.203752	103.82892	2785.203752	103.120752	2785.203752	106.14638	
2789.061375	103.813517	2789.061375	103.102647	2789.061375	106.132911	
2792.918998	103.799243	2792.918998	103.086631	2792.918998	106.116215	
2796.77662	103.789402	2796.77662	103.073785	2796.77662	106.10192	
2800.634243	103.770974	2800.634243	103.052012	2800.634243	106.082047	
2804.491866	103.746389	2804.491866	103.025243	2804.491866	106.062027	
2808.349489	103.730712	2808.349489	103.007949	2808.349489	106.049774	
2812.207112	103.716791	2812.207112	102.992911	2812.207112	106.03611	
2816.064735	103.695789	2816.064735	102.967719	2816.064735	106.019237	
2819.922358	103.672595	2819.922358	102.943029	2819.922358	106.000201	
2823.779981	103.649222	2823.779981	102.922653	2823.779981	105.972641	
2827.637604	103.6251	2827.637604	102.893327	2827.637604	105.938251	
2831.495227	103.595907	2831.495227	102.851932	2831.495227	105.895936	
2835.35285	103.553895	 2835.35285	102.798658	2835.35285	105.819615	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA			CA-GMA-IDA			
2839.210473	103.498352	2839.210473	102.728788		2839.210473	105.694809		
2843.068096	103.41461	2843.068096	102.615918		2843.068096	105.470912		
2846.925719	103.290868	2846.925719	102.439001		2846.925719	105.077371		
2850.783341	103.171105	2850.783341	102.274763		2850.783341	104.695507		
2854.640964	103.106486	2854.640964	102.219862		2854.640964	104.582989		
2858.498587	103.080498	2858.498587	102.246099		2858.498587	104.655617		
2862.35621	103.048812	2862.35621	102.277847		2862.35621	104.730416		
2866.213833	102.994025	2866.213833	102.276508		2866.213833	104.744506		
2870.071456	102.920937	2870.071456	102.234515		2870.071456	104.687829		
2873.929079	102.848566	2873.929079	102.182847		2873.929079	104.625535		
2877.786702	102.786964	2877.786702	102.142914		2877.786702	104.592681		
2881.644325	102.724753	2881.644325	102.097045		2881.644325	104.558958		
2885.501948	102.66105	2885.501948	102.029444		2885.501948	104.504982		
2889.359571	102.599278	2889.359571	101.945835		2889.359571	104.432676		
2893.217194	102.539987	2893.217194	101.862739		2893.217194	104.360617		
2897.074817	102.495464	2897.074817	101.783402		2897.074817	104.289031		
2900.932439	102.459559	2900.932439	101.698917		2900.932439	104.209214		
2904.790062	102.417995	2904.790062	101.609507		2904.790062	104.112712		
2908.647685	102.366844	2908.647685	101.498491		2908.647685	103.953067		
2912.505308	102.285438	2912.505308	101.329641		2912.505308	103.651935		
2916.362931	102.176546	2916.362931	101.124495		2916.362931	103.238669		
2920.220554	102.08362	2920.220554	100.956509		2920.220554	102.922942		
2924.078177	102.031594	2924.078177	100.863504		2924.078177	102.831421		
2927.9358	102.00495	2927.9358	100.838241		2927.9358	102.869607		
2931.793423	101.970482	2931.793423	100.848069		2931.793423	102.934629		
2935.651046	101.909228	2935.651046	100.853621		2935.651046	103.001275		
2939.508669	101.82589	2939.508669	100.838913		2939.508669	103.07332		
2943.366292	101.745827	2943.366292	100.799611		2943.366292	103.159704		
2947.223915	101.68594	2947.223915	100.732873		2947.223915	103.243208		
2951.081537	101.62529	2951.081537	100.639929		2951.081537	103.28266		
2954.93916	101.554444	2954.93916	100.537051		2954.93916	103.272279		
2958.796783	101.505285	2958.796783	100.465648		2958.796783	103.291067		
2962.654406	101.512272	2962.654406	100.453682		2962.654406	103.423054		
2966.512029	101.582516	2966.512029	100.490127		2966.512029	103.666431		
2970.369652	101.685713	2970.369652	100.541987		2970.369652	103.965526		
2974.227275	101.777171	2974.227275	100.57604		2974.227275	104.24904		
2978.084898	101.838113	2978.084898	100.58338		2978.084898	104.472156		
2981.942521	101.864277	2981.942521	100.553356		2981.942521	104.619586		
2985.800144	101.846994	2985.800144	100.472021		2985.800144	104.687101		
2989.657767	101.79981	2989.657767	100.362991		2989.657767	104.7084		

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-G	AMA	CA-GMA-IDA		
2993.51539	101.74004	2993.51539	100.239863	2993.51539	104.714404	
2997.373013	101.664626	2997.373013	100.099563	2997.373013	104.711029	
3001.230635	101.585383	3001.230635	99.966747	3001.230635	104.709853	
3005.088258	101.510698	3005.088258	99.848	3005.088258	104.717576	
3008.945881	101.426093	3008.945881	99.723034	3008.945881	104.732327	
3012.803504	101.328966	3012.803504	99.580936	3012.803504	104.736988	
3016.661127	101.228609	3016.661127	99.434645	3016.661127	104.735024	
3020.51875	101.129481	3020.51875	99.306471	3020.51875	104.755883	
3024.376373	101.033059	3024.376373	99.182012	3024.376373	104.787004	
3028.233996	100.940183	3028.233996	99.038989	3028.233996	104.806216	
3032.091619	100.845146	3032.091619	98.882563	3032.091619	104.814667	
3035.949242	100.750406	3035.949242	98.727	3035.949242	104.826376	
3039.806865	100.661026	3039.806865	98.573495	3039.806865	104.84588	
3043.664488	100.561044	3043.664488	98.402366	3043.664488	104.842442	
3047.522111	100.444753	3047.522111	98.215103	3047.522111	104.815235	
3051.379734	100.320642	3051.379734	98.025918	3051.379734	104.779221	
3055.237356	100.192095	3055.237356	97.826734	3055.237356	104.72691	
3059.094979	100.064771	3059.094979	97.617227	3059.094979	104.679396	
3062.952602	99.93494	3062.952602	97.403767	3062.952602	104.643136	
3066.810225	99.789148	3066.810225	97.180164	3066.810225	104.599928	
3070.667848	99.626096	3070.667848	96.945986	3070.667848	104.556666	
3074.525471	99.462097	3074.525471	96.710346	3074.525471	104.521944	
3078.383094	99.300037	3078.383094	96.467783	3078.383094	104.486249	
3082.240717	99.125669	3082.240717	96.209285	3082.240717	104.43495	
3086.09834	98.94286	3086.09834	95.94272	3086.09834	104.378859	
3089.955963	98.762721	3089.955963	95.672454	3089.955963	104.332501	
3093.813586	98.581199	3093.813586	95.395723	3093.813586	104.287202	
3097.671209	98.387653	3097.671209	95.105619	3097.671209	104.234375	
3101.528832	98.185126	3101.528832	94.803398	3101.528832	104.168415	
3105.386454	97.979092	3105.386454	94.503102	3105.386454	104.0963	
3109.244077	97.759422	3109.244077	94.193005	3109.244077	104.021177	
3113.1017	97.534448	3113.1017	93.86972	3113.1017	103.938456	
3116.959323	97.312375	3116.959323	93.547173	3116.959323	103.854563	
3120.816946	97.075693	3120.816946	93.205978	3120.816946	103.759385	
3124.674569	96.829789	3124.674569	92.852246	3124.674569	103.649929	
3128.532192	96.589034	3128.532192	92.50917	3128.532192	103.543593	
3132.389815	96.346379	3132.389815	92.160478	3132.389815	103.437662	
3136.247438	96.094478	3136.247438	91.802207	3136.247438	103.322379	
3140.105061	95.83118	3140.105061	91.44113	3140.105061	103.205156	
3143.962684	95.563659	3143.962684	91.077856	3143.962684	103.093262	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA		
3147.820307	95.299888	3147.820307	90.712738	3147.820307	102.973535	
3151.67793	95.030575	3151.67793	90.338535	3151.67793	102.838803	
3155.535552	94.749654	3155.535552	89.954384	3155.535552	102.700627	
3159.393175	94.467198	3159.393175	89.564267	3159.393175	102.564043	
3163.250798	94.184432	3163.250798	89.1852	3163.250798	102.431093	
3167.108421	93.899848	3167.108421	88.814159	3167.108421	102.299926	
3170.966044	93.617431	3170.966044	88.426995	3170.966044	102.160356	
3174.823667	93.326244	3174.823667	88.038881	3174.823667	102.008759	
3178.68129	93.027002	3178.68129	87.659112	3178.68129	101.851056	
3182.538913	92.732295	3182.538913	87.277127	3182.538913	101.69022	
3186.396536	92.440252	3186.396536	86.900244	3186.396536	101.526894	
3190.254159	92.149064	3190.254159	86.530818	3190.254159	101.369468	
3194.111782	91.849654	3194.111782	86.165341	3194.111782	101.212799	
3197.969405	91.544269	3197.969405	85.802945	3197.969405	101.048094	
3201.827028	91.254299	3201.827028	85.449911	3201.827028	100.888584	
3205.684651	90.979094	3205.684651	85.107353	3205.684651	100.735181	
3209.542273	90.709319	3209.542273	84.765347	3209.542273	100.582328	
3213.399896	90.440566	3213.399896	84.4356	3213.399896	100.431977	
3217.257519	90.171717	3217.257519	84.128043	3217.257519	100.272191	
3221.115142	89.910004	3221.115142	83.828355	3221.115142	100.108054	
3224.972765	89.654094	3224.972765	83.533922	3224.972765	99.955311	
3228.830388	89.405837	3228.830388	83.250605	3228.830388	99.79995	
3232.688011	89.177697	3232.688011	82.983033	3232.688011	99.632319	
3236.545634	88.962766	3236.545634	82.736208	3236.545634	99.46635	
3240.403257	88.751415	3240.403257	82.503161	3240.403257	99.307708	
3244.26088	88.552711	3244.26088	82.284779	3244.26088	99.147225	
3248.118503	88.367838	3248.118503	82.087345	3248.118503	98.981338	
3251.976126	88.189821	3251.976126	81.894596	3251.976126	98.814702	
3255.833749	88.018732	3255.833749	81.702517	3255.833749	98.649681	
3259.691371	87.858842	3259.691371	81.532929	3259.691371	98.49216	
3263.548994	87.711175	3263.548994	81.386367	3263.548994	98.347968	
3267.406617	87.57114	3267.406617	81.243396	3267.406617	98.209939	
3271.26424	87.441435	3271.26424	81.103053	3271.26424	98.075926	
3275.121863	87.318919	3275.121863	80.969082	3275.121863	97.954281	
3278.979486	87.191482	3278.979486	80.831708	3278.979486	97.846927	
3282.837109	87.060463	3282.837109	80.693303	3282.837109	97.752407	
3286.694732	86.932622	3286.694732	80.563529	3286.694732	97.668118	
3290.552355	86.814228	3290.552355	80.443323	3290.552355	97.605683	
3294.409978	86.703375	3294.409978	80.335387	3294.409978	97.571492	
3298.267601	86.583878	3298.267601	80.22729	3298.267601	97.53057	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

CA		CA-G	MA	CA-GMA-IDA		
3302.125224	86.458151	3302.125224	80.108023	3302.125224	97.483055	
3305.982847	86.338923	3305.982847	79.987811	3305.982847	97.449103	
3309.840469	86.214375	3309.840469	79.863977	3309.840469	97.397986	
3313.698092	86.083296	3313.698092	79.734187	3313.698092	97.341105	
3317.555715	85.963954	3317.555715	79.609747	3317.555715	97.305173	
3321.413338	85.844824	3321.413338	79.48854	3321.413338	97.263755	
3325.270961	85.708525	3325.270961	79.359253	3325.270961	97.212527	
3329.128584	85.568914	3329.128584	79.225649	3329.128584	97.156647	
3332.986207	85.440356	3332.986207	79.106057	3332.986207	97.10104	
3336.84383	85.313836	3336.84383	78.995067	3336.84383	97.053707	
3340.701453	85.177396	3340.701453	78.877222	3340.701453	96.988882	
3344.559076	85.038613	3344.559076	78.759476	3344.559076	96.909286	
3348.416699	84.901621	3348.416699	78.645773	3348.416699	96.838012	
3352.274322	84.760048	3352.274322	78.534092	3352.274322	96.758704	
3356.131945	84.627852	3356.131945	78.432031	3356.131945	96.671027	
3359.989568	84.506613	3359.989568	78.339575	3359.989568	96.586511	
3363.84719	84.380551	3363.84719	78.243775	3363.84719	96.496692	
3367.704813	84.257365	3367.704813	78.149382	3367.704813	96.400852	
3371.562436	84.139479	3371.562436	78.071421	3371.562436	96.302582	
3375.420059	84.028262	3375.420059	78.011621	3375.420059	96.213136	
3379.277682	83.929446	3379.277682	77.966374	3379.277682	96.125718	
3383.135305	83.840732	3383.135305	77.928019	3383.135305	96.019309	
3386.992928	83.776627	3386.992928	77.905879	3386.992928	95.9219	
3390.850551	83.722731	3390.850551	77.901477	3390.850551	95.843052	
3394.708174	83.66878	3394.708174	77.905207	3394.708174	95.762449	
3398.565797	83.641222	3398.565797	77.933126	3398.565797	95.690172	
3402.42342	83.627764	3402.42342	77.979503	3402.42342	95.617056	
3406.281043	83.620883	3406.281043	78.032673	3406.281043	95.536734	
3410.138666	83.626674	3410.138666	78.10513	3410.138666	95.462929	
3413.996288	83.638824	3413.996288	78.196271	3413.996288	95.395324	
3417.853911	83.673213	3417.853911	78.301875	3417.853911	95.344773	
3421.711534	83.727298	3421.711534	78.417636	3421.711534	95.306753	
3425.569157	83.786234	3425.569157	78.54091	3425.569157	95.265424	
3429.42678	83.853997	3429.42678	78.67831	3429.42678	95.227824	
3433.284403	83.933288	3433.284403	78.834934	3433.284403	95.196505	
3437.142026	84.020356	3437.142026	79.003794	3437.142026	95.17098	
3440.999649	84.115216	3440.999649	79.179983	3440.999649	95.15346	
3444.857272	84.227972	3444.857272	79.372619	3444.857272	95.143418	
3448.714895	84.353299	3448.714895	79.570886	3448.714895	95.142918	
3452.572518	84.482829	3452.572518	79.763036	3452.572518	95.151124	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-GMA		CA-GMA-IDA		
3456.430141	84.622206	3456.430141	79.962538	3456.430141	95.168663	
3460.287764	84.768915	3460.287764	80.174281	3460.287764	95.194558	
3464.145386	84.927284	3464.145386	80.399098	3464.145386	95.226813	
3468.003009	85.092906	3468.003009	80.629574	3468.003009	95.263432	
3471.860632	85.249389	3471.860632	80.848539	3471.860632	95.297693	
3475.718255	85.410423	3475.718255	81.069011	3475.718255	95.335236	
3479.575878	85.582925	3479.575878	81.303999	3479.575878	95.37852	
3483.433501	85.751627	3483.433501	81.538174	3483.433501	95.417215	
3487.291124	85.927914	3487.291124	81.767547	3487.291124	95.46188	
3491.148747	86.122197	3491.148747	82.002551	3491.148747	95.526442	
3495.00637	86.304437	3495.00637	82.248501	3495.00637	95.599729	
3498.863993	86.4715	3498.863993	82.500712	3498.863993	95.668411	
3502.721616	86.659625	3502.721616	82.750238	3502.721616	95.734393	
3506.579239	86.861555	3506.579239	83.001892	3506.579239	95.807843	
3510.436862	87.058844	3510.436862	83.259737	3510.436862	95.891597	
3514.294484	87.255212	3514.294484	83.51427	3514.294484	95.972692	
3518.152107	87.453042	3518.152107	83.771077	3518.152107	96.057503	
3522.00973	87.668983	3522.00973	84.047061	3522.00973	96.163394	
3525.867353	87.894186	3525.867353	84.332426	3525.867353	96.269845	
3529.724976	88.116346	3529.724976	84.614913	3529.724976	96.374946	
3533.582599	88.34644	3533.582599	84.900964	3533.582599	96.494955	
3537.440222	88.56478	3537.440222	85.183249	3537.440222	96.603202	
3541.297845	88.77515	3541.297845	85.459566	3541.297845	96.700556	
3545.155468	89.006892	3545.155468	85.748075	3545.155468	96.817924	
3549.013091	89.241261	3549.013091	86.045072	3549.013091	96.945419	
3552.870714	89.4624	3552.870714	86.333459	3552.870714	97.065456	
3556.728337	89.68681	3556.728337	86.608685	3556.728337	97.181825	
3560.58596	89.920381	3560.58596	86.884744	3560.58596	97.304346	
3564.443583	90.156729	3564.443583	87.182524	3564.443583	97.437957	
3568.301205	90.393838	3568.301205	87.487386	3568.301205	97.57812	
3572.158828	90.634945	3572.158828	87.77655	3572.158828	97.718526	
3576.016451	90.870593	3576.016451	88.060339	3576.016451	97.851094	
3579.874074	91.095721	3579.874074	88.346369	3579.874074	97.976044	
3583.731697	91.341267	3583.731697	88.641532	3583.731697	98.11431	
3587.58932	91.607044	3587.58932	88.943962	3587.58932	98.262392	
3591.446943	91.860273	3591.446943	89.234669	3591.446943	98.397868	
3595.304566	92.110345	3595.304566	89.527022	3595.304566	98.538144	
3599.162189	92.370193	3599.162189	89.832639	3599.162189	98.695775	
3603.019812	92.634653	3603.019812	90.132068	3603.019812	98.853861	
3606.877435	92.908165	3606.877435	90.436785	3606.877435	99.014744	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-0	SMA	CA-GMA-IDA		
3610.735058	93.18884	3610.735058	90.750051	3610.735058	99.184481	
3614.592681	93.481593	3614.592681	91.058424	3614.592681	99.36469	
3618.450303	93.792778	3618.450303	91.381347	3618.450303	99.562044	
3622.307926	94.101492	3622.307926	91.712336	3622.307926	99.764601	
3626.165549	94.415203	3626.165549	92.052406	3626.165549	99.976128	
3630.023172	94.758	3630.023172	92.413783	3630.023172	100.216743	
3633.880795	95.110287	3633.880795	92.765462	3633.880795	100.462023	
3637.738418	95.469632	3637.738418	93.127664	3637.738418	100.705722	
3641.596041	95.841821	3641.596041	93.517896	3641.596041	100.976855	
3645.453664	96.233558	3645.453664	93.926193	3645.453664	101.27283	
3649.311287	96.65547	3649.311287	94.36862	3649.311287	101.581049	
3653.16891	97.069308	3653.16891	94.811743	3653.16891	101.886002	
3657.026533	97.473439	3657.026533	95.247216	3657.026533	102.18248	
3660.884156	97.883653	3660.884156	95.695245	3660.884156	102.477231	
3664.741779	98.281044	3664.741779	96.134942	3664.741779	102.763385	
3668.599401	98.674288	3668.599401	96.575482	3668.599401	103.046497	
3672.457024	99.057958	3672.457024	97.014945	3672.457024	103.319484	
3676.314647	99.41871	3676.314647	97.429208	3676.314647	103.562756	
3680.17227	99.736194	3680.17227	97.79899	3680.17227	103.774474	
3684.029893	100.000981	3684.029893	98.123231	3684.029893	103.963216	
3687.887516	100.252582	3687.887516	98.433476	3687.887516	104.13912	
3691.745139	100.489499	3691.745139	98.714493	3691.745139	104.289875	
3695.602762	100.689138	3695.602762	98.943848	3695.602762	104.416253	
3699.460385	100.863342	3699.460385	99.148631	3699.460385	104.533969	
3703.318008	101.013864	3703.318008	99.329997	3703.318008	104.627775	
3707.175631	101.144038	3707.175631	99.488188	3707.175631	104.711409	
3711.033254	101.263488	3711.033254	99.641588	3711.033254	104.807496	
3714.890877	101.365571	3714.890877	99.77264	3714.890877	104.886032	
3718.7485	101.446035	3718.7485	99.87136	3718.7485	104.942381	
3722.606122	101.518004	3722.606122	99.96193	3722.606122	104.998153	
3726.463745	101.589071	3726.463745	100.05205	3726.463745	105.04715	
3730.321368	101.65936	3730.321368	100.140714	3730.321368	105.094922	
3734.178991	101.727225	3734.178991	100.221944	3734.178991	105.146555	
3738.036614	101.782178	3738.036614	100.283873	3738.036614	105.187207	
3741.894237	101.826325	3741.894237	100.33662	3741.894237	105.220212	
3745.75186	101.875474	3745.75186	100.39231	3745.75186	105.260765	
3749.609483	101.924545	3749.609483	100.445288	3749.609483	105.30824	
3753.467106	101.961272	3753.467106	100.489922	3753.467106	105.346551	
3757.324729	101.999234	3757.324729	100.529961	3757.324729	105.372206	
3761.182352	102.038053	3761.182352	100.566394	3761.182352	105.39626	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

СА		CA-	CA-GMA		CA-GN	IA-IDA
3765.039975	102.061496	3765.039975	100.600052		3765.039975	105.419408
3768.897598	102.088995	3768.897598	100.640752		3768.897598	105.441637
3772.75522	102.12686	3772.75522	100.683238		3772.75522	105.466929
3776.612843	102.155496	3776.612843	100.719665		3776.612843	105.495329
3780.470466	102.179062	3780.470466	100.753241		3780.470466	105.518467
3784.328089	102.2001	3784.328089	100.779935		3784.328089	105.532088
3788.185712	102.216893	3788.185712	100.799526		3788.185712	105.543509
3792.043335	102.235535	3792.043335	100.815271		3792.043335	105.553704
3795.900958	102.259901	3795.900958	100.837726		3795.900958	105.570844
3799.758581	102.289034	3799.758581	100.874915		3799.758581	105.60048
3803.616204	102.315314	3803.616204	100.913013		3803.616204	105.630664
3807.473827	102.337507	3807.473827	100.942772		3807.473827	105.6523
3811.33145	102.356924	3811.33145	100.967221		3811.33145	105.668536
3815.189073	102.376097	3815.189073	100.995158		3815.189073	105.693984
3819.046696	102.395399	3819.046696	101.020296		3819.046696	105.717255
3822.904318	102.409188	3822.904318	101.029878		3822.904318	105.724993
3826.761941	102.423355	3826.761941	101.040569		3826.761941	105.735423
3830.619564	102.444087	3830.619564	101.057946		3830.619564	105.749765
3834.477187	102.468919	3834.477187	101.078292		3834.477187	105.769026
3838.33481	102.493475	3838.33481	101.108524		3838.33481	105.794901
3842.192433	102.5124	3842.192433	101.126563		3842.192433	105.808535
3846.050056	102.523591	3846.050056	101.12866		3846.050056	105.815088
3849.907679	102.534512	3849.907679	101.152348		3849.907679	105.833701
3853.765302	102.548303	3853.765302	101.188354		3853.765302	105.856872
3857.622925	102.549676	3857.622925	101.200052		3857.622925	105.863929
3861.480548	102.549084	3861.480548	101.198832		3861.480548	105.862597
3865.338171	102.568775	3865.338171	101.20516		3865.338171	105.874145
3869.195794	102.593641	3869.195794	101.225948		3869.195794	105.892368
3873.053417	102.605276	3873.053417	101.248561		3873.053417	105.905821
3876.911039	102.604181	3876.911039	101.250447		3876.911039	105.916761
3880.768662	102.606424	3880.768662	101.250634		3880.768662	105.923742
3884.626285	102.626281	3884.626285	101.270059		3884.626285	105.934147
3888.483908	102.646892	3888.483908	101.285501		3888.483908	105.946224
3892.341531	102.657028	3892.341531	101.285998		3892.341531	105.946085
3896.199154	102.665915	3896.199154	101.295965		3896.199154	105.95655
3900.056777	102.676321	3900.056777	101.320518		3900.056777	105.984039
3903.9144	102.68805	3903.9144	101.337344		3903.9144	105.997144
3907.772023	102.692427	3907.772023	101.33645		3907.772023	105.99822
3911.629646	102.690358	3911.629646	101.329654		3911.629646	106.000794
3915.487269	102.703166	3915.487269	101.337979		3915.487269	106.007909

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

C	A	CA-0	SMA	CA-GMA-IDA		
3919.344892	102.720092	3919.344892	101.358659	3919.344892	106.024185	
3923.202515	102.718402	3923.202515	101.368418	3923.202515	106.0382	
3927.060137	102.715995	3927.060137	101.371457	3927.060137	106.041908	
3930.91776	102.723511	3930.91776	101.378797	3930.91776	106.04042	
3934.775383	102.729943	3934.775383	101.382621	3934.775383	106.040631	
3938.633006	102.739189	3938.633006	101.388196	3938.633006	106.053234	
3942.490629	102.751092	3942.490629	101.4035	3942.490629	106.072899	
3946.348252	102.755337	3946.348252	101.409491	3946.348252	106.080979	
3950.205875	102.755327	3950.205875	101.401044	3950.205875	106.083372	
3954.063498	102.760342	3954.063498	101.402969	3954.063498	106.090291	
3957.921121	102.77251	3957.921121	101.419032	3957.921121	106.096549	
3961.778744	102.787478	3961.778744	101.431385	3961.778744	106.107054	
3965.636367	102.796453	3965.636367	101.43531	3965.636367	106.117578	
3969.49399	102.802054	3969.49399	101.443848	3969.49399	106.123284	
3973.351613	102.812346	3973.351613	101.457847	3973.351613	106.135417	
3977.209235	102.8188	3977.209235	101.461341	3977.209235	106.145246	
3981.066858	102.818672	3981.066858	101.462407	3981.066858	106.148929	
3984.924481	102.824626	3984.924481	101.474284	3984.924481	106.160698	
3988.782104	102.839096	3988.782104	101.487171	3988.782104	106.17962	
3992.639727	102.850161	3992.639727	101.493524	3992.639727	106.192065	
3996.49735	102.855414	3996.49735	101.499321	3996.49735	106.195233	
4000.354973	102.868196	4000.354973	101.515097	4000.354973	106.209826	

Table B-1.—FTIR data of the CA versus CA-GMA membranes presented on figure 10 and CA versus CA-GMA-IDA presented on figure 11

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
XLabel	Wavenumber	XLabel	Wavenumber	
YLabel	%Transmittance	YLabel	%Transmittance	
FileType	%Transmittance	FileType	%Transmittance	
DisplayDirection	20300	DisplayDirection	20300	
PeakDirection	20311	PeakDirection	20311	
698.229749	98.764786	698.229749	96.102003	
702.087372	98.753744	702.087372	96.095694	
705.944995	98.781873	705.944995	96.062559	
709.802618	98.765525	709.802618	96.049093	
713.660241	98.742882	713.660241	96.027987	
717.517864	98.7604	717.517864	95.978629	
721.375487	98.788761	721.375487	95.94108	
725.23311	98.802746	725.23311	95.946683	
729.090733	98.813375	729.090733	95.99157	
732.948356	98.836373	732.948356	96.050815	
736.805979	98.881672	736.805979	96.121781	
740.663602	98.905397	740.663602	96.225195	
744.521224	98.907958	744.521224	96.334039	
748.378847	98.9406	748.378847	96.411654	
752.23647	98.950268	752.23647	96.472146	
756.094093	98.938593	756.094093	96.522933	
759.951716	98.955082	759.951716	96.566265	
763.809339	98.959846	763.809339	96.645492	
767.666962	98.960005	767.666962	96.767706	
771.524585	98.982195	771.524585	96.857893	
775.382208	99.006888	775.382208	96.909358	
779.239831	99.021048	779.239831	96.987905	
783.097454	99.032713	783.097454	97.087064	
786.955077	99.055577	786.955077	97.19424	
790.8127	99.082457	790.8127	97.302944	
794.670323	99.117813	794.670323	97.391837	
798.527945	99.158311	798.527945	97.498598	
802.385568	99.182598	802.385568	97.613923	
806.243191	99.197549	806.243191	97.694347	
810.100814	99.212209	810.100814	97.770809	
813.958437	99.219585	813.958437	97.858426	
817.81606	99.228471	817.81606	97.939511	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
821.673683	99.25944	821.673683	98.012577	
825.531306	99.29228	825.531306	98.087615	
829.388929	99.314846	829.388929	98.175795	
833.246552	99.349261	833.246552	98.281666	
837.104175	99.379829	837.104175	98.391106	
840.961798	99.392885	840.961798	98.49972	
844.819421	99.401904	844.819421	98.631432	
848.677043	99.416628	848.677043	98.783249	
852.534666	99.436323	852.534666	98.933957	
856.392289	99.459722	856.392289	99.038311	
860.249912	99.495269	860.249912	99.049822	
864.107535	99.51896	864.107535	99.018511	
867.965158	99.526561	867.965158	98.997597	
871.822781	99.541473	871.822781	99.004788	
875.680404	99.542357	875.680404	99.042341	
879.538027	99.537437	879.538027	99.089816	
883.39565	99.557411	883.39565	99.145586	
887.253273	99.578226	887.253273	99.208596	
891.110896	99.59719	891.110896	99.261037	
894.968519	99.623661	894.968519	99.302346	
898.826141	99.635185	898.826141	99.353321	
902.683764	99.639866	902.683764	99.417207	
906.541387	99.656711	906.541387	99.472005	
910.39901	99.679192	910.39901	99.518246	
914.256633	99.696714	914.256633	99.564939	
918.114256	99.703953	918.114256	99.618849	
921.971879	99.708374	921.971879	99.685242	
925.829502	99.714469	925.829502	99.744874	
929.687125	99.716502	929.687125	99.798668	
933.544748	99.711269	933.544748	99.874183	
937.402371	99.702381	937.402371	99.959199	
941.259994	99.704129	941.259994	100.024055	
945.117617	99.720105	945.117617	100.087712	
948.97524	99.735139	948.97524	100.167616	
952.832862	99.743247	952.832862	100.237692	
956.690485	99.752808	956.690485	100.274977	
960.548108	99.763399	960.548108	100.289221	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
964.405731	99.76571	964.405731	100.321678	
968.263354	99.761766	968.263354	100.361721	
972.120977	99.758319	972.120977	100.364842	
975.9786	99.762236	975.9786	100.367398	
979.836223	99.775752	979.836223	100.392463	
983.693846	99.789353	983.693846	100.42222	
987.551469	99.801647	987.551469	100.473044	
991.409092	99.805464	991.409092	100.533739	
995.266715	99.792156	995.266715	100.591595	
999.124338	99.790263	999.124338	100.671888	
1002.98196	99.808632	1002.98196	100.75521	
1006.839583	99.814883	1006.839583	100.811283	
1010.697206	99.816651	1010.697206	100.841083	
1014.554829	99.831052	1014.554829	100.821632	
1018.412452	99.834168	1018.412452	100.761249	
1022.270075	99.825839	1022.270075	100.699087	
1026.127698	99.827358	1026.127698	100.625406	
1029.985321	99.837711	1029.985321	100.551903	
1033.842944	99.845524	1033.842944	100.499066	
1037.700567	99.849662	1037.700567	100.454267	
1041.55819	99.85679	1041.55819	100.436762	
1045.415813	99.855265	1045.415813	100.466676	
1049.273436	99.839022	1049.273436	100.521858	
1053.131058	99.82336	1053.131058	100.562319	
1056.988681	99.815485	1056.988681	100.577243	
1060.846304	99.823574	1060.846304	100.609877	
1064.703927	99.835917	1064.703927	100.660662	
1068.56155	99.825152	1068.56155	100.687446	
1072.419173	99.808194	1072.419173	100.691812	
1076.276796	99.808884	1076.276796	100.67827	
1080.134419	99.815708	1080.134419	100.660815	
1083.992042	99.82583	1083.992042	100.670095	
1087.849665	99.840086	1087.849665	100.681334	
1091.707288	99.83356	1091.707288	100.667723	
1095.564911	99.810934	1095.564911	100.647558	
1099.422534	99.801794	1099.422534	100.623718	
1103.280156	99.796269	1103.280156	100.590896	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
1107.137779	99.790457	1107.137779	100.567748	
1110.995402	99.800296	1110.995402	100.549393	
1114.853025	99.813646	1114.853025	100.513328	
1118.710648	99.821203	1118.710648	100.47998	
1122.568271	99.826824	1122.568271	100.472136	
1126.425894	99.81686	1126.425894	100.491232	
1130.283517	99.797727	1130.283517	100.545775	
1134.14114	99.795132	1134.14114	100.618644	
1137.998763	99.790892	1137.998763	100.68001	
1141.856386	99.774095	1141.856386	100.73091	
1145.714009	99.769633	1145.714009	100.774208	
1149.571632	99.771651	1149.571632	100.795037	
1153.429255	99.774194	1153.429255	100.798534	
1157.286877	99.785588	1157.286877	100.803333	
1161.1445	99.787912	1161.1445	100.803894	
1165.002123	99.775772	1165.002123	100.794712	
1168.859746	99.772294	1168.859746	100.775281	
1172.717369	99.776221	1172.717369	100.742899	
1176.574992	99.76939	1176.574992	100.707777	
1180.432615	99.764726	1180.432615	100.670305	
1184.290238	99.767562	1184.290238	100.623363	
1188.147861	99.768047	1188.147861	100.575726	
1192.005484	99.775755	1192.005484	100.547011	
1195.863107	99.783619	1195.863107	100.541806	
1199.72073	99.781037	1199.72073	100.548576	
1203.578353	99.782699	1203.578353	100.563942	
1207.435975	99.787867	1207.435975	100.585799	
1211.293598	99.781852	1211.293598	100.618332	
1215.151221	99.777278	1215.151221	100.656364	
1219.008844	99.787417	1219.008844	100.680435	
1222.866467	99.79811	1222.866467	100.709308	
1226.72409	99.803314	1226.72409	100.75485	
1230.581713	99.801303	1230.581713	100.793181	
1234.439336	99.794709	1234.439336	100.823386	
1238.296959	99.794634	1238.296959	100.850396	
1242.154582	99.796337	1242.154582	100.870531	
1246.012205	99.807723	1246.012205	100.894052	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
1249.869828	99.823093	1249.869828	100.908508	
1253.727451	99.823073	1253.727451	100.873253	
1257.585073	99.824595	1257.585073	100.782844	
1261.442696	99.825046	1261.442696	100.660964	
1265.300319	99.810787	1265.300319	100.532534	
1269.157942	99.80122	1269.157942	100.428826	
1273.015565	99.810006	1273.015565	100.359058	
1276.873188	99.819816	1276.873188	100.310863	
1280.730811	99.811363	1280.730811	100.261081	
1284.588434	99.794258	1284.588434	100.204095	
1288.446057	99.783405	1288.446057	100.167006	
1292.30368	99.780706	1292.30368	100.141263	
1296.161303	99.783185	1296.161303	100.108407	
1300.018926	99.790323	1300.018926	100.080386	
1303.876549	99.800602	1303.876549	100.052564	
1307.734172	99.808681	1307.734172	100.027204	
1311.591794	99.81077	1311.591794	100.014075	
1315.449417	99.809765	1315.449417	100.003594	
1319.30704	99.818573	1319.30704	100.000175	
1323.164663	99.826655	1323.164663	100.012891	
1327.022286	99.822821	1327.022286	100.032233	
1330.879909	99.827222	1330.879909	100.04654	
1334.737532	99.830279	1334.737532	100.049399	
1338.595155	99.817509	1338.595155	100.040823	
1342.452778	99.806979	1342.452778	100.032834	
1346.310401	99.807467	1346.310401	100.032695	
1350.168024	99.812278	1350.168024	100.030796	
1354.025647	99.807491	1354.025647	100.028594	
1357.88327	99.800614	1357.88327	100.039734	
1361.740892	99.815522	1361.740892	100.061534	
1365.598515	99.841284	1365.598515	100.084778	
1369.456138	99.84596	1369.456138	100.107229	
1373.313761	99.832944	1373.313761	100.12302	
1377.171384	99.833127	1377.171384	100.125873	
1381.029007	99.839542	1381.029007	100.114102	
1384.88663	99.832138	1384.88663	100.096665	
1388.744253	99.824749	1388.744253	100.084548	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
1392.601876	99.825628	1392.601876	100.062168	
1396.459499	99.826737	1396.459499	100.018444	
1400.317122	99.831479	1400.317122	99.970844	
1404.174745	99.847129	1404.174745	99.924666	
1408.032368	99.86491	1408.032368	99.882819	
1411.88999	99.869383	1411.88999	99.848645	
1415.747613	99.859303	1415.747613	99.811808	
1419.605236	99.847699	1419.605236	99.798296	
1423.462859	99.843875	1423.462859	99.827014	
1427.320482	99.842625	1427.320482	99.853497	
1431.178105	99.841855	1431.178105	99.873957	
1435.035728	99.846339	1435.035728	99.912575	
1438.893351	99.851895	1438.893351	99.93698	
1442.750974	99.840837	1442.750974	99.927796	
1446.608597	99.818934	1446.608597	99.894602	
1450.46622	99.812672	1450.46622	99.844613	
1454.323843	99.805498	1454.323843	99.807071	
1458.181466	99.797615	1458.181466	99.806801	
1462.039089	99.814673	1462.039089	99.821357	
1465.896711	99.826305	1465.896711	99.818658	
1469.754334	99.810203	1469.754334	99.814315	
1473.611957	99.791889	1473.611957	99.812807	
1477.46958	99.793138	1477.46958	99.795711	
1481.327203	99.803311	1481.327203	99.779262	
1485.184826	99.796932	1485.184826	99.768775	
1489.042449	99.779217	1489.042449	99.758175	
1492.900072	99.769153	1492.900072	99.743092	
1496.757695	99.76598	1496.757695	99.714467	
1500.615318	99.755792	1500.615318	99.68216	
1504.472941	99.734654	1504.472941	99.654446	
1508.330564	99.726692	1508.330564	99.633893	
1512.188187	99.740227	1512.188187	99.613691	
1516.045809	99.742709	1516.045809	99.577981	
1519.903432	99.726527	1519.903432	99.53856	
1523.761055	99.722905	1523.761055	99.499633	
1527.618678	99.734584	1527.618678	99.445569	
1531.476301	99.734371	1531.476301	99.383501	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
1535.333924	99.711207	1535.333924	99.318738	
1539.191547	99.684628	1539.191547	99.247799	
1543.04917	99.684575	1543.04917	99.17671	
1546.906793	99.700949	1546.906793	99.102836	
1550.764416	99.699307	1550.764416	99.022193	
1554.622039	99.673434	1554.622039	98.940291	
1558.479662	99.652696	1558.479662	98.8608	
1562.337285	99.659536	1562.337285	98.786583	
1566.194907	99.672512	1566.194907	98.712785	
1570.05253	99.666157	1570.05253	98.632607	
1573.910153	99.642612	1573.910153	98.553319	
1577.767776	99.627859	1577.767776	98.491299	
1581.625399	99.629107	1581.625399	98.439044	
1585.483022	99.621615	1585.483022	98.376412	
1589.340645	99.609042	1589.340645	98.303122	
1593.198268	99.607815	1593.198268	98.211465	
1597.055891	99.600646	1597.055891	98.092625	
1600.913514	99.562578	1600.913514	97.952511	
1604.771137	99.507371	1604.771137	97.790835	
1608.62876	99.454123	1608.62876	97.609335	
1612.486383	99.387614	1612.486383	97.393192	
1616.344005	99.322864	1616.344005	97.148466	
1620.201628	99.273216	1620.201628	96.928514	
1624.059251	99.207267	1624.059251	96.735961	
1627.916874	99.135102	1627.916874	96.561206	
1631.774497	99.076902	1631.774497	96.428611	
1635.63212	99.030486	1635.63212	96.341599	
1639.489743	99.006575	1639.489743	96.314502	
1643.347366	99.002546	1643.347366	96.359831	
1647.204989	99.003202	1647.204989	96.453306	
1651.062612	99.007962	1651.062612	96.581258	
1654.920235	99.043784	1654.920235	96.756198	
1658.777858	99.105154	1658.777858	96.960933	
1662.635481	99.146435	1662.635481	97.169093	
1666.493104	99.177926	1666.493104	97.375073	
1670.350726	99.234224	1670.350726	97.583069	
1674.208349	99.305479	1674.208349	97.8046	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
1678.065972	99.366391	1678.065972	98.032333	
1681.923595	99.417121	1681.923595	98.250221	
1685.781218	99.477276	1685.781218	98.456976	
1689.638841	99.536021	1689.638841	98.652231	
1693.496464	99.573802	1693.496464	98.825287	
1697.354087	99.61132	1697.354087	98.976087	
1701.21171	99.662108	1701.21171	99.113979	
1705.069333	99.709979	1705.069333	99.240923	
1708.926956	99.745531	1708.926956	99.354192	
1712.784579	99.768501	1712.784579	99.454601	
1716.642202	99.793779	1716.642202	99.547674	
1720.499824	99.825993	1720.499824	99.630031	
1724.357447	99.846822	1724.357447	99.711166	
1728.21507	99.856481	1728.21507	99.794832	
1732.072693	99.851754	1732.072693	99.864679	
1735.930316	99.841464	1735.930316	99.940072	
1739.787939	99.856382	1739.787939	100.026966	
1743.645562	99.874253	1743.645562	100.093767	
1747.503185	99.88155	1747.503185	100.13335	
1751.360808	99.896719	1751.360808	100.145681	
1755.218431	99.912552	1755.218431	100.138208	
1759.076054	99.935124	1759.076054	100.127034	
1762.933677	99.957738	1762.933677	100.105291	
1766.7913	99.954852	1766.7913	100.080534	
1770.648922	99.9373	1770.648922	100.074874	
1774.506545	99.929428	1774.506545	100.080818	
1778.364168	99.932118	1778.364168	100.08428	
1782.221791	99.936227	1782.221791	100.091002	
1786.079414	99.933969	1786.079414	100.096051	
1789.937037	99.925893	1789.937037	100.092184	
1793.79466	99.927921	1793.79466	100.08665	
1797.652283	99.935557	1797.652283	100.091154	
1801.509906	99.937651	1801.509906	100.102101	
1805.367529	99.939779	1805.367529	100.106383	
1809.225152	99.937728	1809.225152	100.111019	
1813.082775	99.939474	1813.082775	100.120594	
1816.940398	99.946268	1816.940398	100.124378	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
1820.798021	99.946819	1820.798021	100.125419	
1824.655643	99.947864	1824.655643	100.134408	
1828.513266	99.94167	1828.513266	100.147092	
1832.370889	99.937893	1832.370889	100.15009	
1836.228512	99.94829	1836.228512	100.154054	
1840.086135	99.944435	1840.086135	100.16864	
1843.943758	99.935662	1843.943758	100.171371	
1847.801381	99.943869	1847.801381	100.163643	
1851.659004	99.954237	1851.659004	100.1664	
1855.516627	99.960356	1855.516627	100.16916	
1859.37425	99.958955	1859.37425	100.164405	
1863.231873	99.949908	1863.231873	100.166452	
1867.089496	99.944713	1867.089496	100.1748	
1870.947119	99.945695	1870.947119	100.177508	
1874.804741	99.947113	1874.804741	100.178106	
1878.662364	99.949598	1878.662364	100.180891	
1882.519987	99.956181	1882.519987	100.183808	
1886.37761	99.957672	1886.37761	100.18945	
1890.235233	99.95203	1890.235233	100.1899	
1894.092856	99.950235	1894.092856	100.178128	
1897.950479	99.952409	1897.950479	100.169709	
1901.808102	99.952291	1901.808102	100.173694	
1905.665725	99.947953	1905.665725	100.178257	
1909.523348	99.945106	1909.523348	100.175128	
1913.380971	99.946165	1913.380971	100.167199	
1917.238594	99.948449	1917.238594	100.160444	
1921.096217	99.955936	1921.096217	100.152376	
1924.953839	99.96491	1924.953839	100.143517	
1928.811462	99.966199	1928.811462	100.145832	
1932.669085	99.957451	1932.669085	100.147328	
1936.526708	99.942734	1936.526708	100.135166	
1940.384331	99.932241	1940.384331	100.125267	
1944.241954	99.928639	1944.241954	100.121076	
1948.099577	99.932758	1948.099577	100.117079	
1951.9572	99.945744	1951.9572	100.11218	
1955.814823	99.951239	1955.814823	100.108038	
1959.672446	99.943395	1959.672446	100.109664	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
1963.530069	99.937521	1963.530069	100.105689	
1967.387692	99.934907	1967.387692	100.0937	
1971.245315	99.936186	1971.245315	100.08747	
1975.102938	99.940885	1975.102938	100.080972	
1978.96056	99.934355	1978.96056	100.065975	
1982.818183	99.927787	1982.818183	100.052628	
1986.675806	99.929107	1986.675806	100.050623	
1990.533429	99.919867	1990.533429	100.05173	
1994.391052	99.911604	1994.391052	100.0446	
1998.248675	99.91585	1998.248675	100.035046	
2002.106298	99.917208	2002.106298	100.026072	
2005.963921	99.916339	2005.963921	100.016541	
2009.821544	99.917276	2009.821544	100.010605	
2013.679167	99.915044	2013.679167	99.99704	
2017.53679	99.914002	2017.53679	99.975413	
2021.394413	99.919133	2021.394413	99.965007	
2025.252036	99.922803	2025.252036	99.96161	
2029.109658	99.917573	2029.109658	99.94958	
2032.967281	99.912593	2032.967281	99.933695	
2036.824904	99.914431	2036.824904	99.923918	
2040.682527	99.914436	2040.682527	99.912197	
2044.54015	99.908329	2044.54015	99.898211	
2048.397773	99.902186	2048.397773	99.89273	
2052.255396	99.899512	2052.255396	99.887603	
2056.113019	99.895256	2056.113019	99.880938	
2059.970642	99.894239	2059.970642	99.875816	
2063.828265	99.899062	2063.828265	99.869681	
2067.685888	99.894724	2067.685888	99.866279	
2071.543511	99.889745	2071.543511	99.857262	
2075.401134	99.893947	2075.401134	99.840723	
2079.258756	99.894645	2079.258756	99.832782	
2083.116379	99.899573	2083.116379	99.831756	
2086.974002	99.908902	2086.974002	99.821866	
2090.831625	99.908281	2090.831625	99.808021	
2094.689248	99.903537	2094.689248	99.797919	
2098.546871	99.898582	2098.546871	99.784848	
2102.404494	99.896155	2102.404494	99.781224	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
2106.262117	99.895517	2106.262117	99.782959	
2110.11974	99.885878	2110.11974	99.770328	
2113.977363	99.87832	2113.977363	99.765493	
2117.834986	99.887224	2117.834986	99.770125	
2121.692609	99.899064	2121.692609	99.764597	
2125.550232	99.899942	2125.550232	99.760923	
2129.407854	99.898233	2129.407854	99.756705	
2133.265477	99.903168	2133.265477	99.748429	
2137.1231	99.905544	2137.1231	99.747936	
2140.980723	99.900035	2140.980723	99.751434	
2144.838346	99.897118	2144.838346	99.755967	
2148.695969	99.899824	2148.695969	99.756538	
2152.553592	99.899508	2152.553592	99.753097	
2156.411215	99.898615	2156.411215	99.755277	
2160.268838	99.907301	2160.268838	99.75904	
2164.126461	99.912294	2164.126461	99.765707	
2167.984084	99.905457	2167.984084	99.770022	
2171.841707	99.904905	2171.841707	99.762769	
2175.69933	99.907087	2175.69933	99.764511	
2179.556953	99.910419	2179.556953	99.781184	
2183.414575	99.921588	2183.414575	99.789871	
2187.272198	99.923325	2187.272198	99.783493	
2191.129821	99.923229	2191.129821	99.776354	
2194.987444	99.925536	2194.987444	99.779251	
2198.845067	99.918843	2198.845067	99.786289	
2202.70269	99.922433	2202.70269	99.789552	
2206.560313	99.928933	2206.560313	99.790375	
2210.417936	99.928227	2210.417936	99.792264	
2214.275559	99.936574	2214.275559	99.799812	
2218.133182	99.941409	2218.133182	99.814997	
2221.990805	99.937126	2221.990805	99.823323	
2225.848428	99.935658	2225.848428	99.817402	
2229.706051	99.944058	2229.706051	99.815562	
2233.563673	99.961079	2233.563673	99.82413	
2237.421296	99.966707	2237.421296	99.832449	
2241.278919	99.961006	2241.278919	99.836424	
2245.136542	99.958896	2245.136542	99.842891	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
2248.994165	99.959544	2248.994165	99.85798	
2252.851788	99.965269	2252.851788	99.872075	
2256.709411	99.969967	2256.709411	99.88194	
2260.567034	99.966159	2260.567034	99.889709	
2264.424657	99.969215	2264.424657	99.882255	
2268.28228	99.972519	2268.28228	99.865447	
2272.139903	99.960871	2272.139903	99.863502	
2275.997526	99.955762	2275.997526	99.873841	
2279.855149	99.958345	2279.855149	99.880756	
2283.712771	99.959631	2283.712771	99.881259	
2287.570394	99.970538	2287.570394	99.881308	
2291.428017	99.976935	2291.428017	99.891627	
2295.28564	99.969608	2295.28564	99.904863	
2299.143263	99.96481	2299.143263	99.902322	
2303.000886	99.976567	2303.000886	99.891938	
2306.858509	99.988881	2306.858509	99.893858	
2310.716132	99.978647	2310.716132	99.907143	
2314.573755	99.974018	2314.573755	99.912252	
2318.431378	99.97945	2318.431378	99.898756	
2322.289001	99.963088	2322.289001	99.880547	
2326.146624	99.944563	2326.146624	99.873269	
2330.004247	99.946795	2330.004247	99.874568	
2333.86187	99.956525	2333.86187	99.875405	
2337.719492	99.964197	2337.719492	99.869693	
2341.577115	99.970577	2341.577115	99.866556	
2345.434738	99.973606	2345.434738	99.886032	
2349.292361	99.974224	2349.292361	99.904975	
2353.149984	99.966042	2353.149984	99.890022	
2357.007607	99.948375	2357.007607	99.867765	
2360.86523	99.949656	2360.86523	99.861758	
2364.722853	99.962118	2364.722853	99.862872	
2368.580476	99.964563	2368.580476	99.875433	
2372.438099	99.97305	2372.438099	99.896299	
2376.295722	99.979717	2376.295722	99.909431	
2380.153345	99.981743	2380.153345	99.915042	
2384.010968	99.994204	2384.010968	99.916198	
2387.86859	100.007908	2387.86859	99.913546	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
2391.726213	100.015462	2391.726213	99.92075	
2395.583836	100.011558	2395.583836	99.934439	
2399.441459	100.001822	2399.441459	99.935716	
2403.299082	100.003804	2403.299082	99.929875	
2407.156705	100.008241	2407.156705	99.924611	
2411.014328	100.001203	2411.014328	99.926054	
2414.871951	99.996338	2414.871951	99.935933	
2418.729574	100.00896	2418.729574	99.936794	
2422.587197	100.02489	2422.587197	99.928349	
2426.44482	100.029563	2426.44482	99.914925	
2430.302443	100.027703	2430.302443	99.903113	
2434.160066	100.021307	2434.160066	99.908602	
2438.017688	100.023763	2438.017688	99.913989	
2441.875311	100.034275	2441.875311	99.903093	
2445.732934	100.03116	2445.732934	99.888505	
2449.590557	100.028092	2449.590557	99.886754	
2453.44818	100.033178	2453.44818	99.8949	
2457.305803	100.032923	2457.305803	99.89249	
2461.163426	100.029564	2461.163426	99.890588	
2465.021049	100.026645	2465.021049	99.898517	
2468.878672	100.035579	2468.878672	99.903192	
2472.736295	100.049704	2472.736295	99.906474	
2476.593918	100.04855	2476.593918	99.903001	
2480.451541	100.049067	2480.451541	99.892786	
2484.309164	100.051737	2484.309164	99.886113	
2488.166786	100.03592	2488.166786	99.877144	
2492.024409	100.021978	2492.024409	99.863465	
2495.882032	100.027419	2495.882032	99.857282	
2499.739655	100.038892	2499.739655	99.861547	
2503.597278	100.045696	2503.597278	99.865488	
2507.454901	100.048696	2507.454901	99.870676	
2511.312524	100.053247	2511.312524	99.871628	
2515.170147	100.049441	2515.170147	99.866102	
2519.02777	100.043965	2519.02777	99.869452	
2522.885393	100.055529	2522.885393	99.868975	
2526.743016	100.055605	2526.743016	99.857505	
2530.600639	100.045487	2530.600639	99.854918	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
2534.458262	100.056515	2534.458262	99.862824	
2538.315885	100.065918	2538.315885	99.862386	
2542.173507	100.064841	2542.173507	99.852742	
2546.03113	100.065155	2546.03113	99.85685	
2549.888753	100.063871	2549.888753	99.864668	
2553.746376	100.066658	2553.746376	99.856162	
2557.603999	100.066376	2557.603999	99.846834	
2561.461622	100.060142	2561.461622	99.846328	
2565.319245	100.056837	2565.319245	99.843576	
2569.176868	100.048103	2569.176868	99.836769	
2573.034491	100.042662	2573.034491	99.840115	
2576.892114	100.054227	2576.892114	99.849037	
2580.749737	100.062274	2580.749737	99.851495	
2584.60736	100.059673	2584.60736	99.853425	
2588.464983	100.060219	2588.464983	99.852322	
2592.322605	100.063122	2592.322605	99.846084	
2596.180228	100.065999	2596.180228	99.832437	
2600.037851	100.063999	2600.037851	99.8168	
2603.895474	100.052627	2603.895474	99.825555	
2607.753097	100.042022	2607.753097	99.845202	
2611.61072	100.044176	2611.61072	99.84182	
2615.468343	100.055404	2615.468343	99.82567	
2619.325966	100.06108	2619.325966	99.810662	
2623.183589	100.07036	2623.183589	99.803941	
2627.041212	100.087081	2627.041212	99.812939	
2630.898835	100.079621	2630.898835	99.81819	
2634.756458	100.055492	2634.756458	99.815178	
2638.614081	100.054135	2638.614081	99.818785	
2642.471703	100.073942	2642.471703	99.821462	
2646.329326	100.089171	2646.329326	99.817971	
2650.186949	100.082231	2650.186949	99.813704	
2654.044572	100.066537	2654.044572	99.813992	
2657.902195	100.064993	2657.902195	99.811925	
2661.759818	100.064659	2661.759818	99.802284	
2665.617441	100.054111	2665.617441	99.802112	
2669.475064	100.048935	2669.475064	99.80437	
2673.332687	100.056639	2673.332687	99.798497	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
2677.19031	100.059476	2677.19031	99.800401	
2681.047933	100.057881	2681.047933	99.797724	
2684.905556	100.069247	2684.905556	99.779243	
2688.763179	100.067425	2688.763179	99.773918	
2692.620802	100.052869	2692.620802	99.78484	
2696.478424	100.062343	2696.478424	99.77642	
2700.336047	100.071443	2700.336047	99.755394	
2704.19367	100.059303	2704.19367	99.752045	
2708.051293	100.055162	2708.051293	99.753547	
2711.908916	100.061551	2711.908916	99.746185	
2715.766539	100.049134	2715.766539	99.735832	
2719.624162	100.036252	2719.624162	99.727389	
2723.481785	100.055368	2723.481785	99.71894	
2727.339408	100.070568	2727.339408	99.703311	
2731.197031	100.062191	2731.197031	99.69244	
2735.054654	100.058488	2735.054654	99.688386	
2738.912277	100.061758	2738.912277	99.686911	
2742.7699	100.061415	2742.7699	99.694068	
2746.627522	100.055684	2746.627522	99.689504	
2750.485145	100.039309	2750.485145	99.67614	
2754.342768	100.024468	2754.342768	99.671445	
2758.200391	100.035807	2758.200391	99.65805	
2762.058014	100.048788	2762.058014	99.642839	
2765.915637	100.04525	2765.915637	99.634228	
2769.77326	100.05062	2769.77326	99.617636	
2773.630883	100.05646	2773.630883	99.607163	
2777.488506	100.052592	2777.488506	99.60928	
2781.346129	100.039497	2781.346129	99.601272	
2785.203752	100.026769	2785.203752	99.591909	
2789.061375	100.037084	2789.061375	99.596985	
2792.918998	100.04578	2792.918998	99.592054	
2796.77662	100.046179	2796.77662	99.57258	
2800.634243	100.0489	2800.634243	99.552987	
2804.491866	100.03271	2804.491866	99.530526	
2808.349489	100.018362	2808.349489	99.523464	
2812.207112	100.021253	2812.207112	99.521654	
2816.064735	100.018262	2816.064735	99.494145	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
2819.922358	100.010916	2819.922358	99.470053	
2823.779981	100.009429	2823.779981	99.458707	
2827.637604	100.017611	2827.637604	99.440529	
2831.495227	100.028217	2831.495227	99.423145	
2835.35285	100.030708	2835.35285	99.409449	
2839.210473	100.023966	2839.210473	99.414113	
2843.068096	100.008927	2843.068096	99.4221	
2846.925719	100.004924	2846.925719	99.409079	
2850.783341	100.01232	2850.783341	99.407188	
2854.640964	100.017716	2854.640964	99.408439	
2858.498587	100.032304	2858.498587	99.399763	
2862.35621	100.035146	2862.35621	99.396562	
2866.213833	100.019519	2866.213833	99.377652	
2870.071456	100.010008	2870.071456	99.349457	
2873.929079	100.001035	2873.929079	99.322759	
2877.786702	99.994973	2877.786702	99.299695	
2881.644325	99.983557	2881.644325	99.297585	
2885.501948	99.968283	2885.501948	99.291297	
2889.359571	99.972268	2889.359571	99.262869	
2893.217194	99.97246	2893.217194	99.225739	
2897.074817	99.967512	2897.074817	99.176572	
2900.932439	99.974935	2900.932439	99.132477	
2904.790062	99.977269	2904.790062	99.111399	
2908.647685	99.973895	2908.647685	99.084987	
2912.505308	99.971179	2912.505308	99.05478	
2916.362931	99.968728	2916.362931	99.043404	
2920.220554	99.978125	2920.220554	99.026032	
2924.078177	99.996249	2924.078177	98.993906	
2927.9358	99.995386	2927.9358	98.956942	
2931.793423	99.982331	2931.793423	98.912876	
2935.651046	99.980657	2935.651046	98.864373	
2939.508669	99.961944	2939.508669	98.820892	
2943.366292	99.925016	2943.366292	98.788664	
2947.223915	99.904834	2947.223915	98.757645	
2951.081537	99.898846	2951.081537	98.731914	
2954.93916	99.893813	2954.93916	98.713381	
2958.796783	99.887534	2958.796783	98.690428	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
2962.654406	99.89074	2962.654406	98.66522	
2966.512029	99.892539	2966.512029	98.640211	
2970.369652	99.86636	2970.369652	98.610421	
2974.227275	99.835426	2974.227275	98.562304	
2978.084898	99.82463	2978.084898	98.513806	
2981.942521	99.813356	2981.942521	98.450583	
2985.800144	99.7867	2985.800144	98.330956	
2989.657767	99.763873	2989.657767	98.214782	
2993.51539	99.750455	2993.51539	98.137428	
2997.373013	99.732598	2997.373013	98.076815	
3001.230635	99.717212	3001.230635	98.022578	
3005.088258	99.706259	3005.088258	97.940818	
3008.945881	99.692046	3008.945881	97.849628	
3012.803504	99.672653	3012.803504	97.790756	
3016.661127	99.645992	3016.661127	97.751269	
3020.51875	99.628898	3020.51875	97.687584	
3024.376373	99.620787	3024.376373	97.602026	
3028.233996	99.596844	3028.233996	97.537389	
3032.091619	99.573864	3032.091619	97.465399	
3035.949242	99.564521	3035.949242	97.369066	
3039.806865	99.543052	3039.806865	97.284235	
3043.664488	99.513204	3043.664488	97.207723	
3047.522111	99.49254	3047.522111	97.133675	
3051.379734	99.479881	3051.379734	97.047418	
3055.237356	99.459869	3055.237356	96.943023	
3059.094979	99.422735	3059.094979	96.855361	
3062.952602	99.401494	3062.952602	96.78114	
3066.810225	99.400374	3066.810225	96.685473	
3070.667848	99.374148	3070.667848	96.568658	
3074.525471	99.331999	3074.525471	96.464936	
3078.383094	99.309633	3078.383094	96.367578	
3082.240717	99.293422	3082.240717	96.24769	
3086.09834	99.264401	3086.09834	96.134687	
3089.955963	99.235972	3089.955963	96.028059	
3093.813586	99.218482	3093.813586	95.901313	
3097.671209	99.201309	3097.671209	95.777294	
3101.528832	99.169347	3101.528832	95.658184	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
3105.386454	99.137352	3105.386454	95.53089	
3109.244077	99.116954	3109.244077	95.397148	
3113.1017	99.074309	3113.1017	95.262772	
3116.959323	99.024556	3116.959323	95.136677	
3120.816946	99.003199	3120.816946	95.005351	
3124.674569	98.982659	3124.674569	94.864605	
3128.532192	98.958532	3128.532192	94.732407	
3132.389815	98.935895	3132.389815	94.609282	
3136.247438	98.897032	3136.247438	94.47031	
3140.105061	98.85184	3140.105061	94.310262	
3143.962684	98.815863	3143.962684	94.15955	
3147.820307	98.78687	3147.820307	94.02067	
3151.67793	98.752914	3151.67793	93.878701	
3155.535552	98.712724	3155.535552	93.73475	
3159.393175	98.677505	3159.393175	93.585875	
3163.250798	98.648338	3163.250798	93.43342	
3167.108421	98.616261	3167.108421	93.280489	
3170.966044	98.581497	3170.966044	93.129826	
3174.823667	98.5501	3174.823667	92.986098	
3178.68129	98.50961	3178.68129	92.842392	
3182.538913	98.465981	3182.538913	92.68561	
3186.396536	98.435999	3186.396536	92.524572	
3190.254159	98.401804	3190.254159	92.376333	
3194.111782	98.366616	3194.111782	92.239098	
3197.969405	98.336683	3197.969405	92.118348	
3201.827028	98.294003	3201.827028	91.998896	
3205.684651	98.257159	3205.684651	91.859777	
3209.542273	98.235719	3209.542273	91.729677	
3213.399896	98.208752	3213.399896	91.616209	
3217.257519	98.175859	3217.257519	91.503952	
3221.115142	98.143437	3221.115142	91.392217	
3224.972765	98.116678	3224.972765	91.278776	
3228.830388	98.09319	3228.830388	91.173311	
3232.688011	98.0626	3232.688011	91.075252	
3236.545634	98.022246	3236.545634	90.991607	
3240.403257	97.984001	3240.403257	90.919974	
3244.26088	97.968802	3244.26088	90.823531	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
3248.118503	97.962931	3248.118503	90.737416	
3251.976126	97.945796	3251.976126	90.693202	
3255.833749	97.925126	3255.833749	90.634203	
3259.691371	97.895255	3259.691371	90.559384	
3263.548994	97.866364	3263.548994	90.499379	
3267.406617	97.858455	3267.406617	90.440649	
3271.26424	97.85064	3271.26424	90.393389	
3275.121863	97.831329	3275.121863	90.368179	
3278.979486	97.816107	3278.979486	90.332476	
3282.837109	97.814378	3282.837109	90.274142	
3286.694732	97.818106	3286.694732	90.223328	
3290.552355	97.803709	3290.552355	90.188401	
3294.409978	97.774961	3294.409978	90.155408	
3298.267601	97.75952	3298.267601	90.117384	
3302.125224	97.749902	3302.125224	90.061917	
3305.982847	97.725858	3305.982847	89.997087	
3309.840469	97.70302	3309.840469	89.946559	
3313.698092	97.691287	3313.698092	89.907521	
3317.555715	97.674138	3317.555715	89.862657	
3321.413338	97.656631	3321.413338	89.803656	
3325.270961	97.640491	3325.270961	89.747548	
3329.128584	97.613544	3329.128584	89.712059	
3332.986207	97.59071	3332.986207	89.676175	
3336.84383	97.580075	3336.84383	89.633744	
3340.701453	97.573515	3340.701453	89.601948	
3344.559076	97.560834	3344.559076	89.56369	
3348.416699	97.538391	3348.416699	89.519319	
3352.274322	97.522041	3352.274322	89.488014	
3356.131945	97.509124	3356.131945	89.457701	
3359.989568	97.492714	3359.989568	89.42343	
3363.84719	97.480891	3363.84719	89.390805	
3367.704813	97.470268	3367.704813	89.36972	
3371.562436	97.456928	3371.562436	89.354617	
3375.420059	97.4371	3375.420059	89.343046	
3379.277682	97.411635	3379.277682	89.365288	
3383.135305	97.398513	3383.135305	89.385839	
3386.992928	97.409399	3386.992928	89.374708	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
3390.850551	97.422853	3390.850551	89.390804	
3394.708174	97.416416	3394.708174	89.436518	
3398.565797	97.408191	3398.565797	89.475616	
3402.42342	97.413143	3402.42342	89.511498	
3406.281043	97.418336	3406.281043	89.551745	
3410.138666	97.422732	3410.138666	89.606332	
3413.996288	97.439003	3413.996288	89.671717	
3417.853911	97.461751	3417.853911	89.746665	
3421.711534	97.47481	3421.711534	89.836099	
3425.569157	97.492805	3425.569157	89.918238	
3429.42678	97.524203	3429.42678	90.000469	
3433.284403	97.536992	3433.284403	90.09964	
3437.142026	97.5387	3437.142026	90.198025	
3440.999649	97.554703	3440.999649	90.297237	
3444.857272	97.569897	3444.857272	90.399286	
3448.714895	97.599445	3448.714895	90.501049	
3452.572518	97.646712	3452.572518	90.602038	
3456.430141	97.673963	3456.430141	90.709924	
3460.287764	97.698108	3460.287764	90.846566	
3464.145386	97.73676	3464.145386	90.972883	
3468.003009	97.76295	3468.003009	91.078802	
3471.860632	97.77653	3471.860632	91.212854	
3475.718255	97.80993	3475.718255	91.354612	
3479.575878	97.865417	3479.575878	91.489512	
3483.433501	97.90659	3483.433501	91.630076	
3487.291124	97.936485	3487.291124	91.770626	
3491.148747	97.967222	3491.148747	91.902934	
3495.00637	97.980663	3495.00637	92.028094	
3498.863993	97.990456	3498.863993	92.168604	
3502.721616	98.00587	3502.721616	92.300962	
3506.579239	98.027149	3506.579239	92.413515	
3510.436862	98.060751	3510.436862	92.550926	
3514.294484	98.09068	3514.294484	92.704166	
3518.152107	98.116824	3518.152107	92.850801	
3522.00973	98.129642	3522.00973	93.000303	
3525.867353	98.140238	3525.867353	93.152476	
3529.724976	98.196259	3529.724976	93.293977	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
3533.582599	98.267283	3533.582599	93.427931	
3537.440222	98.318041	3537.440222	93.582155	
3541.297845	98.358423	3541.297845	93.752118	
3545.155468	98.392493	3545.155468	93.907288	
3549.013091	98.435031	3549.013091	94.049377	
3552.870714	98.473261	3552.870714	94.192934	
3556.728337	98.49905	3556.728337	94.345827	
3560.58596	98.531154	3560.58596	94.508262	
3564.443583	98.565747	3564.443583	94.658147	
3568.301205	98.60518	3568.301205	94.796118	
3572.158828	98.659836	3572.158828	94.941183	
3576.016451	98.714997	3576.016451	95.082709	
3579.874074	98.748923	3579.874074	95.231349	
3583.731697	98.781806	3583.731697	95.382884	
3587.58932	98.820691	3587.58932	95.508787	
3591.446943	98.843261	3591.446943	95.624749	
3595.304566	98.876721	3595.304566	95.747515	
3599.162189	98.934199	3599.162189	95.881318	
3603.019812	98.990254	3603.019812	96.006581	
3606.877435	99.034076	3606.877435	96.125527	
3610.735058	99.065679	3610.735058	96.27062	
3614.592681	99.105135	3614.592681	96.406742	
3618.450303	99.154781	3618.450303	96.541323	
3622.307926	99.188962	3622.307926	96.705641	
3626.165549	99.213741	3626.165549	96.858796	
3630.023172	99.260805	3630.023172	97.006772	
3633.880795	99.323771	3633.880795	97.160665	
3637.738418	99.371326	3637.738418	97.309202	
3641.596041	99.405053	3641.596041	97.476031	
3645.453664	99.441316	3645.453664	97.643605	
3649.311287	99.482136	3649.311287	97.789605	
3653.16891	99.527237	3653.16891	97.942773	
3657.026533	99.587182	3657.026533	98.100282	
3660.884156	99.664102	3660.884156	98.235066	
3664.741779	99.728152	3664.741779	98.356987	
3668.599401	99.766521	3668.599401	98.479965	
3672.457024	99.803063	3672.457024	98.594805	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
3676.314647	99.843073	3676.314647	98.691074	
3680.17227	99.881952	3680.17227	98.77343	
3684.029893	99.918924	3684.029893	98.846116	
3687.887516	99.937995	3687.887516	98.902774	
3691.745139	99.964844	3691.745139	98.94982	
3695.602762	100.020272	3695.602762	99.007312	
3699.460385	100.059045	3699.460385	99.075306	
3703.318008	100.068903	3703.318008	99.133663	
3707.175631	100.070952	3707.175631	99.171943	
3711.033254	100.077265	3711.033254	99.189637	
3714.890877	100.10221	3714.890877	99.204374	
3718.7485	100.132791	3718.7485	99.229132	
3722.606122	100.149526	3722.606122	99.245205	
3726.463745	100.152273	3726.463745	99.261023	
3730.321368	100.13969	3730.321368	99.275445	
3734.178991	100.124158	3734.178991	99.271365	
3738.036614	100.134556	3738.036614	99.265376	
3741.894237	100.159157	3741.894237	99.251217	
3745.75186	100.173101	3745.75186	99.249063	
3749.609483	100.178321	3749.609483	99.285565	
3753.467106	100.174107	3753.467106	99.302766	
3757.324729	100.172821	3757.324729	99.284419	
3761.182352	100.176497	3761.182352	99.284911	
3765.039975	100.17612	3765.039975	99.307311	
3768.897598	100.182331	3768.897598	99.319043	
3772.75522	100.193733	3772.75522	99.33072	
3776.612843	100.194749	3776.612843	99.354239	
3780.470466	100.171348	3780.470466	99.365263	
3784.328089	100.163199	3784.328089	99.365725	
3788.185712	100.190849	3788.185712	99.361403	
3792.043335	100.191801	3792.043335	99.335741	
3795.900958	100.181842	3795.900958	99.313655	
3799.758581	100.197984	3799.758581	99.318237	
3803.616204	100.198772	3803.616204	99.33114	
3807.473827	100.177176	3807.473827	99.350799	
3811.33145	100.152055	3811.33145	99.364647	
3815.189073	100.144852	3815.189073	99.350346	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane		
3819.046696	100.170364	3819.046696	99.330719	
3822.904318	100.185257	3822.904318	99.333874	
3826.761941	100.17167	3826.761941	99.346256	
3830.619564	100.175512	3830.619564	99.338351	
3834.477187	100.193776	3834.477187	99.322238	
3838.33481	100.193997	3838.33481	99.325526	
3842.192433	100.197619	3842.192433	99.346404	
3846.050056	100.197204	3846.050056	99.364635	
3849.907679	100.162592	3849.907679	99.355718	
3853.765302	100.145736	3853.765302	99.346936	
3857.622925	100.180669	3857.622925	99.355864	
3861.480548	100.201869	3861.480548	99.339542	
3865.338171	100.190278	3865.338171	99.313284	
3869.195794	100.187453	3869.195794	99.317623	
3873.053417	100.184454	3873.053417	99.339235	
3876.911039	100.176718	3876.911039	99.352135	
3880.768662	100.183706	3880.768662	99.350839	
3884.626285	100.190327	3884.626285	99.335921	
3888.483908	100.193043	3888.483908	99.320386	
3892.341531	100.201854	3892.341531	99.333556	
3896.199154	100.209688	3896.199154	99.348616	
3900.056777	100.209326	3900.056777	99.340461	
3903.9144	100.202855	3903.9144	99.341021	
3907.772023	100.188826	3907.772023	99.344085	
3911.629646	100.177108	3911.629646	99.349128	
3915.487269	100.195212	3915.487269	99.375386	
3919.344892	100.205093	3919.344892	99.395825	
3923.202515	100.191939	3923.202515	99.391474	
3927.060137	100.219259	3927.060137	99.368604	
3930.91776	100.236448	3930.91776	99.339067	
3934.775383	100.206089	3934.775383	99.315896	
3938.633006	100.207851	3938.633006	99.309534	
3942.490629	100.217533	3942.490629	99.326253	
3946.348252	100.195419	3946.348252	99.341326	
3950.205875	100.182345	3950.205875	99.337083	
3954.063498	100.17935	3954.063498	99.328452	
3957.921121	100.187279	3957.921121	99.320825	

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes

Clean membrane		Biofouled membrane	
3961.778744	100.199561	3961.778744	99.311638
3965.636367	100.194422	3965.636367	99.299664
3969.49399	100.201445	3969.49399	99.302171
3973.351613	100.21541	3973.351613	99.328636
3977.209235	100.20726	3977.209235	99.332012
3981.066858	100.201704	3981.066858	99.305618
3984.924481	100.198872	3984.924481	99.312814
3988.782104	100.178891	3988.782104	99.339194
3992.639727	100.167036	3992.639727	99.330064
3996.49735	100.17918	3996.49735	99.315702
4000.354973	100.199213	4000.354973	99.323662

Table B-2.—FTIR peaks data for figure 20: FTIR spectra comparing clean membranes and fouled membranes
APPENDIX C

Flux Data

The acronyms, abbreviations, and units of measure as they appear in this appendix are defined as follows:

cm ²	square centimeter
g/L	grams per liter
h	hour
L	liter
L/h	liters per hour
L/m²-h	Liters per square meter per hour
m ²	square meter
mg/L	milligram per liter
mL	milliliter
min	minute
NaCl	sodium chloride
psi	pounds per square inch
psia	Pounds per square inch absolute
S	second
Symbols	
μm	micron
#	number
%	percent

Actual flux data of filtration experiments with distilled (DI) water (0–8 hours), bovine serum albumin (BSA) (8–16 hours), and lipase (16–24 hours) presented on figure 17.

		cm ²	m²					
Effective membrane area		21% CA	4.1	0.00041				
Date: 8/21/12		Thickness:	120.904	microns (µm)		P (psia)	70	
Precompaction						•		
Starting time		#	Volume (mL)	t (min)	t (s)	Time (h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Flux total time (h)
8/21, 11:21 AM		1	2	24	21	0.405833333	12.01983272	0.00
12:05		2	2	25	32	0.425555556	11.46277781	0.733
13:22		3	2	24	43	0.411944444	11.84152098	2.02
14:02		4	2	25	26	0.423888889	11.50784771	2.68
15:17		5	2	26	26	0.440555556	11.07249408	3.93
15:59		6	2	26	31	0.441944444	11.0376968	4.63
16:40		7	2	26	57	0.449166667	10.86021992	5.32
13:05		8	2	27	55	0.465277778	10.48416454	6.18
13:51		9	2	27	58	0.466111111	10.46542051	6.95
Filtration with BSA – 5 mg/L								
Starting time		#	Volume (mL)	t (min)	t (s)	Time (h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Flux total time (h)
8/23, 10:38 AM		10	2	48	19	0.805277778	6.057597658	7.88
11:24		11	2	48	35	0.809722222	6.024348408	8.650
12:12		12	2	48	36	0.81	6.022282445	9.450
13:23		13	2	52	9	0.869166667	5.612328415	10.633
14:16		14	2	53	3	0.884166667	5.517114549	11.517
15:06		15	2	53	31	0.891944444	5.469005173	12.350
15:55		16	2	53	36	0.893333333	5.460502366	13.17
11:36		17	2	54	15	0.904166667	5.395076992	14.15
13:07		18	2	54	16	0.904444444	5.393420028	15.67
Filtration with lipase - 5 mg/L								
Starting time		#	Volume (mL)	t (min)	t (s)	Time (h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Total time (h)
8/27, 1:27 PM		22	2	46	17	0.771388889	6.323721862	16.87
14:24		23	2	47	30	0.791666667	6.161745828	17.817
15:17		24	2	47	2	0.783888889	6.222882923	18.700
16:10		25	2	46	38	0.777222222	6.276260046	19.583
11:36		26	2	45	57	0.765833333	6.369595796	20.433
13:53		27	2	45	21	0.755833333	6.453868287	21.717
14:48		28	2	45	28	0.75777778	6.437307775	22.633
15:43		29	2	45	43	0.761944444	6.402105581	23.550
16:35		30	2	45	58	0.766111111	6.367286298	24.42

Table C-1.—Flux data of cellulose acetate (CA) membranes with DI water, BSA, and lipase

Table C-2.—Flux data of copper-charg	ed membrane with DI w	ater, BSA, and lipase
--------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

	-								
			cm ²	m²					
Effective membrane area			4.1	0.00041					
Date: 12/6/12	21% CA	Thickness:	122.683	microns (µm)	microns (µm)		P (psia) 70		
Precompaction									
Starting time		#	Volume (mL)	t (min)	t (s)	Time (h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Flux total time (h)	
12/6, 11:51 AM		1	2	36	31	0.608611111	8.015050484	0.00	
12:47		2	2	36	25	0.606944444	8.037059776	1.050	
13:41		3	2	36	9	0.6025	8.096346524	2.20	
13:35		4	2	36	53	0.614722222	7.935370813	3.27	
15:31		5	2	36	40	0.611111111	7.982261641	4.40	
16:25		6	2	36	23	0.606388889	8.044423092	5.57	
17:21		7	2	36	18	0.605	8.062890546	6.75	
16:30		8	2	38	58	0.64944444	7.511110184	7.73	
Filtration with BSA – 5 mg/L									
Starting time		#	Volume (mL)	t (min)	t (s)	Time (h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Flux total time (h)	
10:46		9	2	46	1	0.766944444	6.360367841	8.68	
13:05		10	2	47	18	0.788333333	6.187799722	11.000	
14:20		11	2	48	58	0.816111111	5.977187069	12.250	
15:22		12	2	47	58	0.799444444	6.101798336	13.283	
16:26		13	2	49	37	0.826944444	5.898883309	14.350	
17:30		14	2	47	37	0.793611111	6.146648796	15.417	
18:29		15	2	48	5	0.801388889	6.086993279	16.400	
Date: 12/ 10/12									
Filtration with lipase – 5 mg/L									
Starting time		#	Volume (mL)	t (min)	t (s)	Time (h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Flux total time (h)	
12/11, 10:26 AM		16	2	37	1	0.616944444	7.906787758	17.65	
11:12		17	2	37	47	0.629722222	7.74635007	18.42	
12:00		18	2	37	34	0.626111111	7.791027334	19.22	
12:47		19	2	38	13	0.636944444	7.658515312	20.00	
13:41		20	2	37	32	0.625555556	7.797946541	20.90	
14:28		21	2	38	25	0.640277778	7.618644516	21.67	
15:16		22	2	37	50	0.630555556	7.736112603	22.48	

CA membrane								
Time (h)	1st run	2nd run	3rd run	Average	Standard deviation			
0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000			
1	0.7165	0.4847	0.7165	0.6392	0.1639			
2	0.5651	0.4270	0.5651	0.5191	0.0977			
4	0.5679	0.3600	0.4299	0.4526	0.1470			
8.5	0.4299	0.2800	0.4000	0.3700	0.1060			
18	0.3704	0.2484	0.1200	0.2462	0.0863			
20	0.1013	0.2300	0.0800	0.1371	0.0910			
22	0.0895	0.1800	0.0800	0.1165	0.0640			
24	0.1048	0.1617	0.1000	0.1222	0.0402			

Table C-3.—Flux data for flux decline in 24-hour cross-flow filtration studies with biofoulant of cellulose acetate (CA) membranes for figure 18

Table C-4.— Flux decline data of 24-hour cross-flow filtration studies with biofoulant of copper-charged membranes for figure 18

Copper-charged membrane									
Time (h)	1st run	2nd run	3rd run	Average	Standard deviation				
0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000				
1	0.9900	0.7300	0.9680	0.8600	0.1838				
2	0.9000	0.5900	0.8900	0.7450	0.2192				
4	0.7800	0.5000	0.7700	0.6400	0.1980				
8.5	0.6400	0.4400	0.5710	0.5400	0.1414				
18	0.4100	0.3000	0.3100	0.3550	0.0778				
20	0.3600	0.2500	0.2800	0.3050	0.0778				
22	0.3500	0.2200	0.2507	0.2850	0.0919				
24	0.3400	0.2000	0.2346	0.2700	0.0990				

Thickness: 129.5 µm	Effective area: 0.00041 m ²	Pressure: 78 psi				
Cumulative filtration time (h)	Infiltration time (s)	Time (h)	Volume (L)	Flow rate (L/h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Normalized flux (%)
0.0000	2,298	0.6383	0.0020	0.0031	7.6419	100
1.2892	2,343	0.6508	0.0020	0.0031	7.4951	98
1.9772	2,477	0.6881	0.0020	0.0029	7.0896	93
2.6842	2,545	0.7069	0.0020	0.0028	6.9002	90
3.4106	2,615	0.7264	0.0020	0.0028	6.7155	88
Thickness: 128.5 µm	Effective area: 0.00041 m ²	Pr	Pressure: 75 psi			
Cumulative filtration time (h)	Infiltration time (s)	Time (h)	Volume (L)	Flow rate (L/h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Normalized flux (%)
0.0000	4,257	1.1825	0.0020	0.0017	4.1252	1.0000
2.4158	4,440	1.2333	0.0020	0.0016	3.9552	0.9588
2.4806	4,490	1.2472	0.0020	0.0016	3.9111	0.9481
Thickness: 93.5 µm	Effective area: 0.00041 m ²	Pr	Pressure: 70 psi			
Cumulative filtration time (h)	Infiltration time (s)	Time (h)	Volume (L)	Flow rate (L/h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Normalized flux (%)
0.0000	4,871	1.3531	0.0020	0.0015	3.6052	1.0000
2.7800	E 107	4 4000	0.0000	0.0014	2 /105	0.0492
	5,137	1.4269	0.0020	0.0014	3.4100	0.9462

Table C-5.—Flux decline data with transparent exopolymeric particles (1 mg/L) in saline water (35 g/L NaCl) of cellulose acetate membranes for figure 19

Table C-6.—Flux decline data with transparent exopolymeric particles (1 mg/L) in saline water (35 g/L NaCl) of copper-charged membrane for figure 19

Thickness: 113 µm	Effective area: 0.00041 m ²	Pressure: 70 psi				
Cumulative filtration time (h)	Infiltration time (s)	Infiltration time (h)	Volume (L)	Flow rate (L/h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Normalized flux (%)
0.0000	3,665	1.0181	0.0020	0.0020	4.7915	100%
2.0689	3,783	1.0508	0.0020	0.0019	4.6421	97%
3.1578	3,920	1.0889	0.0020	0.0018	4.4798	93%
Thickness: 178.4 µm	Effective area: 0.00041 m ²	Pressure: 70 psi				
Cumulative filtration time (r)	Infiltration time (s)	Infiltration time (h)	Volume (L)	Flow rate (L/h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Normalized flux (%)
0.0000	4,765	1.3236	0.0020	0.0015	3.6854	100%
2.6906	4,921	1.3669	0.0020	0.0015	3.5686	97%
4.0586	4,925	1.3681	0.0020	0.0015	3.5657	97%
Thickness: 188.5 µm	Effective area: 0.00041 m ²	Pressure: 70 psi				
Cumulative filtration time (h)	Infiltration time (s)	Infiltration time (h)	Volume (L)	Flow rate (L/h)	Flux (L/m²-h)	Normalized flux (%)
0.0000	4,401	1.2225	0.0020	0.0016	3.9902	100%
2.5003	4,600	1.2778	0.0020	0.0016	3.8176	96%
3.8336	4,800	1.3333	0.0020	0.0015	3.6585	92%