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**Abstract**

The production of liquid transportation fuels such as bioethanol and more recently also biobutanol from renewable resources has received considerable attention. In the production of bio-based alcohols, the separation steps are expensive as the mixtures to be separated are dilute. As an energy-efficient separation technology, pervaporation is considered to be a potential process in biofuel purification.

One of the main constraints in the commercialization of pervaporation has been low membrane fluxes, and the consequent high costs due to the high membrane area needed. In order to obtain high fluxes, the membranes should be as thin as possible. In this thesis, the performance of ultra-thin zeolite membranes in pervaporation was investigated. Binary ethanol/water and n-butanol/water mixtures were studied using both hydrophobic and hydrophilic zeolite membranes for alcohol concentration, as well as dehydration.

The development of pervaporation membranes and processes has been mainly empirical. Process modeling, however, is an indispensable tool in process design. In this work, the pervaporation performance of the studied membranes was evaluated on the basis of experimental results in combination with mathematical modeling. Due to the low film thickness of the studied membranes, the fluxes were generally higher than reported earlier. Nevertheless, the evaluation in this work showed that the pervaporation performance of the ultra-thin membranes decreased due to flux limitation by membrane support.

In this work, pervaporation was modeled by applying both a semi-empirical and a detailed Maxwell-Stefan based mass transfer model. The latter model considers explicitly both adsorption and diffusion, i.e. the phenomena involved in separation by pervaporation. The description of the support behavior was included in the models. Maxwell-Stefan formalism was applied in unary pervaporation for the determination of diffusivities in zeolite membranes. The models performed well within the range of experimental data.

Additionally, a practical modeling approach was developed in this work to predict the temperature dependency of adsorption on zeolites. The developed approach can be utilized, e.g., in pervaporation modeling. Thus, this thesis provides knowledge of using ultra-thin zeolite membranes in the pervaporation of alcohol/water mixtures, and offers tools for pervaporation modeling.
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List of symbols and abbreviations

$A$ Specific area of adsorbent ($m^2$/effective membrane area ($m^2$)
$b$ Adsorption equilibrium parameter ($Pa^{-1}$)
$B$ Permeability ($m^2$)
$c$ BET adsorption parameter
$C$ Number of data points
$d$ Diameter ($m$)
$D$ Diffusivity ($m^2 s^{-1}$)
$E$ Energy ($J mol^{-1}$)
$f$ Fugacity ($Pa$/function
$H$ Enthalpy ($J mol^{-1}$)
$J$ Flux ($kg m^{-2} h^{-1}$ or mol $m^{-2}s^{-1}$)
$K$ Knudsen structural parameter ($m$)
$l$ Thickness ($m$)
$n$ Dimensionless adsorption parameter
$m$ Sample amount ($kg$)
$M$ Molar mass ($g mol^{-1}$)
$P$ Pressure ($Pa$)
$R$ Gas constant ($8.314 J mol^{-1} K^{-1}$)
$t$ Sampling time ($h$)
$T$ Temperature ($K$)
$w$ Weight fraction
$x$ Mole fraction in adsorbed or liquid phase
$y$ Mole fraction in gas phase
$q$ Adsorption loading ($mol kg^{-1}$)

Greek symbols

$\gamma$ Activity coefficient
$\Gamma$ Thermodynamic factor
$\varepsilon$ Adsorption potential
$\theta$ Fractional surface coverage
$\lambda$ Mean free path ($m$)
$\mu$ Chemical potential
$\pi$ Spreading pressure ($Pa$)
$\rho$ Density ($kg m^{-3}$)
Subscripts

ads  Adsorption
dif'  Diffusion
f  Feed
F  Freundlich
H  Henry's law
i,j  Components
Kn  Knudsen
perm  Permeate
pore  Pore
s  Support layer
vis  Viscous
tot  Total
SL1  Support layer 1
SL2  Support layer 2
Z  Zeolite film

Superscripts

0  Reference state
eff  Effective
exp  Experimental
f  Feed side
mod  Model
p  Permeate side
pred  Predicted
sat  Saturated
Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>Acetone Butanol Ethanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET</td>
<td>Brunauer-Emmet-Teller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BuOH</td>
<td>Butanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EtOH</td>
<td>Ethanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAU</td>
<td>Faujasite (zeolite framework type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Gas Chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAST</td>
<td>Ideal Adsorbed Solution Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPAC</td>
<td>International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLE</td>
<td>Liquid-Liquid Equilibrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Linde Type A (zeolite framework type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Molecular Dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFI</td>
<td>Mordenite Framework Inverted (zeolite framework type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maxwell-Stefan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRTL</td>
<td>Non-Random Two Liquid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMR</td>
<td>Nuclear Magnetic Resonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMS</td>
<td>Poly(dimethyl siloxane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFG</td>
<td>Pulsed Field Gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Pervaporation Separation Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVA</td>
<td>Poly(vinyl alcohol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QENS</td>
<td>Quasi-Elastic Neutron Scattering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAST</td>
<td>Real Adsorbed Solution Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Scanning Electron Microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>Sum of Squared Residuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRD</td>
<td>X-ray Diffraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSM-5</td>
<td>Zeolite Socony Mobil-5 (zeolite framework type)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

During the past decades, the production of chemicals and fuels from renewable resources has received growing attention due to limited oil resources, the increasing oil price, and environmental concerns. The primary focus on liquid transportation biofuels has centered on bioethanol and biodiesel. Commercial bioethanol is mainly produced from starch/sugar-based crops, and also the production of bioethanol from lignocellulosic materials has started (Guo et al. 2015). More recently, the production of n-butanol from biomass feedstocks (namely biobutanol) has also received considerable attention (Abdehagh et al. 2014, Bankar et al. 2013). Biobutanol is mostly produced by ABE (acetone butanol ethanol) fermentation, an old industrial process. Butanol is an attractive biofuel as it has several advantages over ethanol: higher energy content, lower vapor pressure and higher flash point (safety), less hygroscopic (less corrosion) and better miscibility with gasoline. However, the production of biobutanol is still in the development stage.

Fermentation is a process typically inhibited by the products. In the production of fermented bio-based alcohols, the separation steps are expensive due to the low concentration of the desired products. Micro-organisms start to experience ethanol inhibition above 5–8 wt.% ethanol (Vane 2005), and the fermentation process stops at ethanol concentrations near 15 wt.% (Caro & Noack 2008). Similarly butanol inhibition is a severe problem in ABE fermentation, as normally the final product concentration is below 3 wt.% making the separation costs high (Huang et al. 2014).

Distillation is the leading separation process in the chemical industry, and also in ethanol enriching. Ethanol forms a homogeneous azeotrope with water with approximately 95 wt.% ethanol, at atmospheric pressure, and a temperature of 78 °C. The separation of mixtures forming azeotropes by distillation traditionally occurs through pressure-swing distillation, or by using a third component as an entrainer in extractive or azeotropic distillation; both alternatives being very energy intensive. Generally, concentrating ethanol by distillation for more than 85 wt.% concentration becomes very expensive (Huang et al. 2008).

The recovery of butanol from dilute ABE fermentation broth involves the removal of acetone and ethanol, and the separation of butanol from water. This can be carried out in a series of distillation columns (Mariano & Filho 2012). Separation of acetone due to its high volatility is easy, but separating the butanol-water system is more complicated since n-butanol forms a heterogeneous azeotrope with water with approximately 56 wt.% n-butanol, at atmospheric pressure, and at a temperature of 93 °C. As a whole, biobutanol recovery by distillation is too energy-
intensive for a large-scale industrial process (Schiell-Bengelsdorf et al. 2013). Thus, there is great interest in investigating other separation methods to concentrate ethanol or butanol from fermentation broths.

Pervaporation is recognized as an energy-efficient separation process with great potential in biofuel production (Huang et al. 2014, Oudshoorn et al. 2009, Vane 2005, Weyd et al. 2008). Pervaporation is a separation process in which a liquid mixture is fed to a membrane, and one or several of the mixture components are selectively transported through the membrane and evaporated on the other side of the membrane. The permeate is typically subsequently condensed back into liquid. Generally, a low partial or total pressure is maintained on the permeate side of the membrane. Preferably, the membrane should have both high permeation selectivity and high permeability. Thus, even a component with a low concentration in the feed can be enriched in the process.

Processes involving phase changes are generally energy-intensive. However, pervaporation is referred to as an energy-efficient and cost-effective process. In pervaporation, separation is based on membrane selectivity, not e.g. on vapor-liquid equilibrium. Pervaporation typically deals with components of less than 10 wt.% of the liquid mixtures, and only the permeating species is evaporated. Pervaporation is considered as a unit process alternative especially in cases where separation is difficult to achieve by conventional separation processes, such as in the separation of azeotropic or close-boiling mixtures, thermally sensitive compounds or isomers.

The core of the pervaporation process is the membrane. The first pervaporation plants were installed in the 1980s by GFT (now owned by Sulzer) for ethanol dehydration (Kujawski 2000). Most of the available commercial membranes are polymer based. A few hundred small pervaporation plants have been installed around the world mostly for the removal of water from ethanol and isopropyl alcohol streams produced in the pharmaceutical and fine chemicals industries (Baker 2012). Generally, the zeolite membranes exhibit a higher pervaporation performance in ethanol and isopropyl alcohol dehydration in terms of separation factor and flux when compared to polymeric membranes (see e.g. Chapman et al. 2008). However, the zeolite membranes are more expensive when compared to polymeric membranes (Wee et al. 2008), which has slowed down the commercialization of zeolite membranes in pervaporation applications.

At present, the majority of the existing ethanol plants use a combination of distillation and molecular sieve drying to separate the ethanol/water mixture. Nevertheless, the use of pervaporation in bioethanol production has a great
potential due to the fact that the worldwide production of fuel bioethanol in 2013 was 87.2 billion liters (REN21 2014) and is likely to increase in the future when cost-effective lignocellulose-to-ethanol technologies fully enter the market.

During the past decades, the development of inorganic membranes, especially zeolite membranes, has gained increasing interest due to their thermal and chemical stability (Bowen et al. 2004, Caro & Noack 2008, Wee et al. 2008). The increasing industrial use of zeolite membranes might broaden the application range of pervaporation. Zeolites are hydrophilic or hydrophobic by nature, enabling separation of water over organics as well as organics over water. So far, pervaporation using zeolite membranes has been more successful in dehydrating organic components than in separating organic components from aqueous mixtures (Wee et al. 2008).

In general, the development of pervaporation membranes and process concepts applying them has focused on empirical work. Process simulation software provides tools for process design and evaluation, but commercial simulation programs do not provide phenomenon-based models for membrane technology. Thus, users are forced to build the models themselves and integrate them into existing simulation programs to enable feasible process design and evaluation. In order to be able to do so, it is crucial to understand and model the behavior of permeating components in zeolite membranes in pervaporation. However, modeling of pervaporation through zeolite membranes has been somewhat neglected, especially in the case of membranes of hydrophobic character.

The steps in bioethanol or biobutanol production are shown in Fig. 1. Biomass has to be broken down into fermentable sugars by pre-treatment and hydrolysis. Then, in fermentation, yeast or bacteria is used to convert the sugars into valuable products, such as alcohols. Finally, the fermented alcohol is recovered and purified.

**Fig. 1. Potential applications of pervaporation using zeolite membranes in biofuel (ethanol/butanol) production (colored gray).**

Pervaporation is seen as a viable method to separate the fermentation products and thus surpass the product inhibitory effect (Liu et al. 2014). The alcohol-enriched
solution could be further dehydrated to produce anhydrous alcohols, as shown in Fig. 1. In this study, the focus is on pervaporation using both hydrophobic and hydrophilic zeolite membranes. The hydrophobic high-silica Mordenite Framework Inverted (MFI)-type zeolite membranes can be used, e.g., for the concentration of alcohols from fermentation broths, whereas the hydrophilic Faujasite (FAU)-type zeolite membranes can be used, e.g., for the dehydration of alcohol-rich solutions (see the colored gray zones in Fig. 1). The dashed line in Fig. 1 emphasizes the possibility of coupling fermentation with pervaporation (see e.g. Bankar et al. 2013 and Huang et al. 2014).

1.1 Objectives and scope

This study is focused on zeolite membranes due to their unique, defined microporous inorganic structure, making the application of zeolite membranes in pervaporation of great interest. Low membrane thickness is a desired membrane property in order to obtain high fluxes, which is essential for industrial applications. Thus, in this study, ultra-thin zeolite membranes are investigated in the selected applications. The importance of both the experimental and modeling work is realized in evaluating the pervaporation performance of zeolite membranes. The objectives of the thesis can be summarized as

- Increase the understanding of the pervaporation process using zeolite membranes;
- Evaluate the pervaporation performance of ultra-thin supported zeolite membranes (MFI/FAU) in the separation of aqueous ethanol and \( n \)-butanol solutions;
- Apply and modify available semi-empirical and detailed models to describe the pervaporation process behavior;
- Investigate the contribution of the support to mass transfer in the case of supported ultra-thin zeolite membranes, and apply the description of the support behavior in membrane mass transfer models;
- Formulate phenomenon-based tools to enable detailed modeling of the ultra-thin supported zeolite membranes.

In this work, pervaporation using zeolite membranes is studied in the separation of binary ethanol/water and \( n \)-butanol/water mixtures. Pervaporation through zeolite membranes is generally described phenomenologically by adsorption into the membrane pores and diffusion along the surface of the zeolite pores as a
consequence of the chemical potential gradient within the pores. Hence, the separation of the components is a result of the combined effect of adsorption and diffusion selectivity, and the driving force prevailing across the membrane. The different phenomena shown in Fig. 2 having an effect on the separation performance of the membranes are considered in this thesis.

![Pervaporation using zeolite membranes](image)

**Fig. 2. Outline of the thesis.**

The scope of each paper and its contribution to the thesis are shown in Fig 2. In Papers I and VI, the pervaporation performance of ultra-thin MFI and FAU membranes are evaluated for the first time for the separation of aqueous mixtures of ethanol and n-butanol. The zeolite film properties and defects are characterized and the effect of the mass transfer resistance is investigated.

In Paper II, pervaporation using hydrophobic high-silica MFI membranes in ethanol separation from aqueous mixtures is further studied and analyzed. The pervaporation process is modeled using a semi-empirical mass transfer model, also including a model for the membrane support. In the models of Paper II the driving force is well established whereas the permeation-related effects of adsorption and diffusion phenomena are combined into a single permeance term.

Papers III and IV deal with adsorption on zeolites. In Paper III, a new, easy, and relatively reliable approach is introduced to describe the temperature
dependency of pure component adsorption on zeolites with the temperature dependency of pure component saturated vapor pressure. In Paper IV, the approach introduced in Paper III is studied in the prediction of mixture adsorption on zeolites with a small amount of experimental adsorption data. The proposed approach can be used as a short-cut tool in the modeling and design of industrial processes exploiting adsorption, such as pervaporation using zeolite membranes where separation is based on both adsorption and diffusion phenomena.

In Paper V, unary ethanol and water pervaporation through a high-silica MFI zeolite membrane is modeled in more detail, considering various phenomena separately. Hence, Maxwell-Stefan modeling is applied to describe the membrane behavior in Paper V. The tool introduced in Paper III to describe adsorption is also exploited in Paper V.

1.2 Dissertation structure

Chapter 2 presents the theory closely related to this work. In order to be able to evaluate the pervaporation performance of supported zeolite membranes, it is important to know, for example, the zeolite membrane structure, synthesis and characterization methods, and to understand the effects of the membrane support. Process models are typically based on the mathematical description of phenomena occurring in the process. The separation in pervaporation is based on adsorption of the components in the zeolite pores and diffusion along the surface of the zeolite pores. Thus, the theory of adsorption and diffusion is also included in Chapter 2. The methods that have been used to achieve the objectives of this thesis are summarized in Chapter 3. The main results are shown in Chapter 4 (see Fig. 2). Conclusions are summarized in Chapter 5 and proposals for future research arising from this thesis are discussed in Chapter 6.
2 Theory

2.1 Zeolite membranes

Zeolites are naturally occurring inorganic crystalline aluminum-silicates, which can also be synthetically produced. Zeolites have a three-dimensional framework structure with uniform, molecular-sized pores. Their structure is composed of a framework of \([\text{SiO}_4]^4-\) and \([\text{AlO}_4]^5-\) tetrahedra linked to each other at the corners, sharing the oxygen atoms. The framework exhibits a negative charge when aluminum is incorporated in the structure, which is balanced by cations such as Na\(^+\), K\(^+\), Ca\(^{2+}\) and H\(^+\). The mobile cations are not part of the zeolite framework; instead, they are located in the channels. Nevertheless, cations affect the zeolite pore size and play an important role in determining the adsorption properties of zeolites (Ruthven 1984).

According to the International Zeolite Association, more than 200 different zeolite types have been recognized and assigned with a three letter code. Zeolite pores are made up of rings in the zeolite framework. The pores are categorized as micropores as their pore size range from about 0.3 to 1.3 nm, depending on the zeolite structure and cations present in the zeolite channels.

Silicalite-1, a pure siliceous zeolite, is hydrophobic. The inclusion of aluminum in the zeolite structure increases the net negative charge, and the material becomes hydrophilic. This is due to the fact that the localized electrostatic poles between the positively charged cations and the negatively charged zeolite framework preferentially attract polar molecules (Huang et al. 2006). Hence, the lower the Si/Al ratio of a zeolite, the more hydrophilic the zeolite, adsorbing polar molecules more strongly. The Si/Al ratio of a zeolite can be controlled in zeolite synthesis.

Due to the unique properties of zeolites, they have been used, for example, as catalysts and adsorbents. The unique properties of regular, molecular-sized pores, high thermal stability, acidic or basic properties, hydrophilic or organophilic properties, ion-exchange possibilities, dealumination and realumination possibilities, isomorphous substitution and insertion of catalytically active parts (Cot et al. 2000) also make zeolites very promising candidates for membrane material.

Zeolite membranes have the unique properties of zeolites in a film-like configuration. They are polycrystalline structures composed of well intergrown zeolite crystals. Zeolite membranes are typically supported, in order to provide
mechanical stability. The most common zeolite structures that have been prepared as membranes are MFI, Linde Type A (LTA), and FAU.

MFI zeolite membranes have a suitable pore size (~0.55 nm pore diameter) for the separation of many industrially important molecules (Vroon et al. 1998). The MFI structure includes silicalite-1, which is made up of pure silica, and ZSM-5, which has Al substituted for some of the Si atoms. In the literature, silicalite-1 and high-silica Zeolite Socony Mobil-5 (ZSM-5) are often referred to as hydrophobic. One potential application of high-silica MFI membranes is the concentration of alcohols from fermentation broths in the production of fuel grade alcohols (Vane 2005).

LTA-type zeolite membranes are very well suited for organic dehydration because they are highly hydrophilic and their pore diameter (~0.4 nm) is smaller than most organic molecules but larger than water. In fact, organic dehydration by pervaporation using hydrophilic zeolite membranes was demonstrated on a large scale more than 10 years ago (Morigami et al. 2001). Nowadays there are about 200 such units in operation around the world, as the only commercial application of zeolite membranes so far (Lin & Duke 2013).

FAU zeolite has relatively large pores of 0.74 nm. The Si/Al ratio, and thus the polarity of FAU zeolite can vary a lot. Low-silica FAU is denoted as zeolite X while high-silica FAU as zeolite Y. FAU zeolite membranes are considered to have potential in organic dehydration (Sato et al. 2008a, Zhu et al. 2009).

2.1.1 Synthesis

The aim in membrane preparation is to produce membranes that are as thin as possible in order to obtain high fluxes and to have a low defect concentration in order to obtain high selectivities, be reliably reproducible and be durable. Zeolite membrane thicknesses ranging from 0.5 μm (Hedlund et al. 2002, Kosinov et al. 2014) to several hundred micrometers (Nomura et al. 1998, Sano et al. 1995a) have been reported. Since zeolite membranes have to be very thin to reach high permeation fluxes, zeolite films are mostly prepared on porous inorganic supports to supply mechanical strength and durability to the membrane.

Zeolite membranes are usually prepared by hydrothermal synthesis. The synthesis mixture usually contains water, a silica source, an alumina source, a mineralizing agent, and an organic structure-directing template (Andersson 2007). The synthesis mixture is heated typically to 150–180°C, reaction time often being in the range of 16–24 hours (Gavalas 2006).
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Supported zeolite membranes can be prepared either by \textit{in situ} crystallization where zeolite crystals nucleate and grow directly on the support, or by secondary (seeded) growth where seed crystals are first well deposited onto the support followed by the hydrothermal growth of the seeds into a continuous layer (McLeary \textit{et al.} 2006). Zeolite seeds are typically prepared as a colloidal solution by hydrothermal synthesis. By first seeding the support, a more uniform film can be obtained in addition to the better reproducibility of the membranes than in one step \textit{in situ} hydrothermal synthesis (Hang Chau \textit{et al.} 2000). After synthesis the membranes are dried to remove the solvent, and calcined i.e., heated in air (at \textasciitilde 500°C) in order to remove the organic template that blocks the pores.

\subsection*{2.1.2 Membrane support}

The interaction between the synthesis solution and the support depends on the physical and chemical nature of the support. The quality of the underlying support determines largely the quality of the selective membrane layer on top of it (McLeary \textit{et al.} 2006). Adhesion of the zeolite film to the support surface, for example, is very important. The support surface should be smooth, because if the surface is rough or has large pores, adhesion of a thin and continuous zeolite film is less likely. The most frequently used supports in the zeolite membrane literature are alumina and stainless steel. The typical pore diameter of alumina supports varies between 5 nm (\textgreek{g}alumina) and 200 nm (\textalpha-alumina), and that of stainless steel in the range of 0.5–4 µm (Bowen \textit{et al.} 2004).

Alumina supports have been used in the majority of the reported work due to the availability of high-quality ultrafiltration and microfiltration membranes with a smooth surface, also being suitable to be used as zeolite membrane supports. Instead, the stainless steel supports typically have a rougher surface and larger pores with respect to alumina supports (Algieri \textit{et al.} 2011). The support surface roughness and pore size are important factors when synthesizing high-quality zeolite membranes. Basically, the optimum zeolite crystal size and film thickness for each support-zeolite combination can be defined on the basis of support roughness and film thickness (Hang Chau \textit{et al.} 2000). It might be difficult to deposit a uniform seed layer on a rough stainless steel surface (Stoeger \textit{et al.} 2011). Although, zeolite film formation can be also altered with, e.g., chemical modification of the support surface (Hang Chau \textit{et al.} 2000, Ji \textit{et al.} 2012). In addition, stainless steel supported zeolite membranes have a higher risk of cracking during calcination due to the thermal expansion mismatch between the steel support
and the zeolite layer (Caro et al. 2000). However, it is known that in the hydrothermal synthesis of zeolite membranes on alumina supports, aluminum can be leached into the zeolite film (Geus et al. 1992, Shu et al. 2012). As a result, the leached aluminum changes the zeolite framework so that it contains more aluminum and thus the framework becomes more hydrophilic.

Besides the fact that the support should allow the application of a thin and defect-free separation layer on top of it, the flow resistance of the support is also a concern when choosing the support material. As the composite membrane consists of both a selective layer and a porous support layer(s), all the layers contribute to the transport of a component through the membrane. Typically the main transport resistance is in the zeolite film (de Bruijn et al. 2003, Thomas et al. 2001). Thus, in order to increase the flux, the zeolite film should be very thin. However, as a consequence, the resistance over the thicker support becomes more significant.

In macroporous and mesoporous media, i.e., in the zeolite membrane support media, the nature of the transport is determined by the magnitude of the mean free path $\lambda$ of the molecules and the pore diameter $d_{pore}$. When the ratio of the mean free path over the pore size is large ($\lambda \gg d_{pore}$), collisions of molecules with the pore walls dominate. This transport regime is referred to as the Knudsen regime (Kärger & Ruthven 1992). Knudsen molar flux in low pressures can be defined as (de Bruijn et al. 2003)

$$J_{Kn,i,s} = -\frac{1}{RT} D_{Kn,i,s}^{eff} \nabla p_{i,s},$$

(1)

where $R$ is the gas constant, $T$ is the temperature, $D_{Kn,i,s}^{eff}$ is the effective Knudsen diffusivity, and $\nabla p_{i,s}$ is the partial pressure gradient of component $i$ through support layer $s$. In the Knudsen regime the diffusivity is controlled by the molecular weight rather than the molecule size. Knudsen diffusivity is given by

$$D_{Kn,i,s}^{eff} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} \frac{d_{pore}}{3} \sqrt{\frac{8000RT}{\pi M_i}} = 97K_s \sqrt{\frac{T}{M_i}},$$

(2)

where $\varepsilon$ is the porosity and $\tau$ is the tortuosity of the support (which considers deviations from a straight path), $M_i$ is the molar mass of component $i$ and $K_s$ is the Knudsen structural parameter for support layer $s$.

As can be seen in Eq. (2), Knudsen diffusivity varies only weakly with temperature and is basically independent of pressure, since the mechanism does not depend on intermolecular collisions. The selectivity effect of Knudsen diffusion
originates from the ratio of molecular masses and the partial pressure gradient of the investigated components.

When the support pores are large, i.e. in the macropore scale, or the pressure is high, the relative number of molecule-molecule collisions increases compared to the number of collisions with the pore wall. In these conditions, viscous (Poiseuille) flow emerges as an important mechanism of mass transfer. Basically, viscous flow is a non-selective mass transfer mechanism. The viscous molar flux is induced by a pressure gradient of the fluid mixture as (de Bruijn et al. 2003)

\[ J_{i, s, a} = -\left( \frac{p_{i, a}}{RT} \right) \frac{B_{i, s}^{\text{eff}}}{\eta} \nabla P_i, \]  

where \( p_{i, s} \) is the average arithmetic pressure of component \( i \) in the support layer \( s \), \( \eta \) the viscosity, \( \nabla P_s \) is the pressure gradient through layer \( s \), and \( B_{i, s}^{\text{eff}} \) is the effective permeability for support layer \( s \) defined as

\[ B_{i, s}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\varepsilon d_{\text{pore}}^2}{\tau 32}. \]  

For materials with a broad pore size distribution, Eqs. (2) and (4) can only be used to approximate the average structural parameters. As the diffusion through the zeolite layer is typically assumed to be much lower compared to that of the support, the transport resistance through the porous support material is often neglected. However, the support can introduce a significant relative resistance to transport, especially in the case of thin membranes. Subsequently, in order to decrease the mass transfer resistance of the support, and hence increase the diffusivity of the support, the support layer characteristics should be affected. As it is seen in Eqs. (1)–(4), the important parameters are the support porosity and pore size, tortuosity and thickness. Thus, to minimize the transport resistance caused by the membrane support, the support should ideally be thin, have high porosity, large pores and straight diffusion paths to ensure high flux. Besides minimizing the resistance of the support, the support surface should be smooth to enable complete coating by a thin zeolite film.

### 2.1.3 Defects

Zeolite pores are defined by a crystal lattice. Due to the polycrystalline nature of zeolite membranes, membranes have transmembrane pathways larger than the
intracrystalline zeolite pores, called defects. Both the zeolite pores and defects, also referred to as non-zeolite pores, offer pathways for mass transfer. The adsorption and diffusion properties of molecules are different in zeolite pores and defects. According to IUPAC definitions, the defects in zeolite membranes can be classified into macrodefects (size > 50 nm), mesodefects (size 2–50 nm) and microdefects (size < 2 nm) (Tavolaro & Drioli 1999).

Pinholes, cracks, and open grain boundaries are typical examples of defects. Different types of mesodefects and microdefects are typically formed by non-perfect intergrowth between zeolite crystals in hydrothermal synthesis (Tavolaro & Drioli 1999).

Pinholes are holes that may propagate through the zeolite film, and may be formed due to non-uniform seeding in membrane synthesis, for example. Generally, the number of pinholes is dependent on the synthesis procedure (Hedlund et al. 2003). Cracks, on the other hand, may be formed during calcination, for example, if there is a mismatch between the thermal expansion between the zeolite and the support (Geus & van Bekkum 1995). Similarly, cracks typically extend from one side of the zeolite film to the other. A crack is typically characterized as a macrodefect.

Zeolite membranes consist of several crystals or grains, and the grain boundaries can be either intergrown or open (Andersson 2007). The grain boundaries can be regarded as the borderlines between adjacent zeolite crystals. The defects in the form of open grain boundaries are thus intercrystalline pores between the grains. The intracrystalline and intercrystalline pathways i.e. different kinds of defects are illustrated in Fig. 3.
Another type of defect in zeolite membranes is broken Si-O-Si bonds in the zeolite crystals (Hunger et al. 1987), referred to as an intracrystalline defect. In general, the hydrophobicity of zeolite membranes is caused by the Si-O-bonds, resulting in the lack of ionic sites for water adsorption. Hence, hydrophobic zeolite membranes preferentially adsorb organic molecules that are small enough to enter the pore openings. Conventional zeolite synthesis is performed in alkaline conditions. The presence of hydroxide ions causes structural defects which originate from the formation of Si-OH and Si-O’ groups at internal defect sites (Zhou et al. 2014), i.e., at sites where Si-O bonds are broken. These intracrystalline defects decrease the hydrophobicity of even a fully siliceous silicalite-1 (Zhang et al. 2012a). In addition to intracrystalline defects caused by the broken Si-O bonds in the zeolite lattice, silanol (-OH) groups are present on the external surface of a zeolite where Si-O-Si network is terminated and oxygen atoms cannot be bonded to another Si atom (Özgür Yazaydin & Thompson 2009). These terminal silanol groups are able to interact with guest molecules (Saengsawang et al. 2005).

The influence of defects on zeolite membrane performance depends on the selected application e.g. whether the operating conditions are at high or low temperatures or whether the application is gas/vapor/liquid separation (Julbe 2007). Typically defects lower the selectivity of zeolite membranes. As silanol groups are
hydrophilic, the defects increase the local hydrophilicity of zeolite membranes, i.e., water adsorbs in zeolite defects over organics. Due to the hydrophilicity of zeolite defects, the effect of defects in the case of hydrophilic membranes is not necessarily that detrimental to membrane performance as concluded e.g. in the study of Okamoto et al. (2001). On the other hand, in the case of hydrophobic membranes, as the zeolite pores favor ethanol transport and defects water transport (Algieri et al. 2003, Sebastian et al. 2010), the net effect of defects on the organic/water selectivity is larger than in the case of hydrophilic zeolite membranes. Even high-quality zeolite membranes contain intercrystalline defects with sizes smaller than 2 nm, but larger than the zeolite pores (Lin & Duke 2013). A schematic representation of the contribution of zeolite pores and microporous defects for hydrophilic LTA/FAU and hydrophobic high silica MFI zeolite membranes in the pervaporation of water/ethanol is shown in Fig. 4.
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**Fig. 4. Contribution of zeolite pores and defects in pervaporation using hydrophilic (LTA, FAU) and hydrophobic (high-silica MFI) zeolite membranes in the pervaporation of water/ethanol mixtures.**

Separation in zeolite membranes occurs mostly through adsorption and surface diffusion, as discussed in more detail in Section 2.2. In Fig. 4, it is shown in principle that due to the local polarity and thus hydrophilicity, defects in zeolite membranes favor the transport of water molecules. Small-pore hydrophilic LTA membranes adsorb water rather than ethanol in addition to that transport of ethanol molecules is also inhibited due to size exclusion (molecular sieving effect). Large-pore hydrophilic FAU membranes adsorb water over ethanol, whereas hydrophobic high-silica MFI membranes adsorb ethanol over water.

### 2.1.4 Characterization

Membrane characterization is essential in order to evaluate the quality of the membranes synthesized. Zeolite membranes can be characterized using several
Zeolite film properties (thickness, uniformity, continuity) can be investigated by imaging zeolite film with scanning electron microscopy (SEM). For example, pinholes and cracks can in principle be observed by characterizing the surface using SEM whereas open grain boundaries in the micropore range are difficult to observe due to the limited resolution (Hedlund et al. 2009). Zeolite phase identification, framework structure and degree of crystallinity are usually determined by using X-ray diffraction (XRD).

Minimizing the proportion of defects in the membrane is important in membrane synthesis since defects typically lower the membrane selectivity. As the direct observation of microdefects in zeolite membranes is difficult, indirect methods have been used to characterize membranes. Single gas permeation is a common method used in membrane characterization, and the ratio of single gas permeances (ideal selectivity) is often used as an indication of membrane quality (Funke et al. 1996, Kalipčilar & Çulfaz 2002, Sebastian et al. 2010). Single-gas permeation is typically measured with small molecules (e.g. H₂, N₂, He) and molecules of the same size range as the membrane pores (e.g. SF₆ for MFI membranes). The assumption behind single gas permeance ratio measurements is that the permeation rate through the zeolite pores for components of the same size as the intracrystalline pores should be very low so that substantial flux of these probe components is an indication of flow-through defects. For example, N₂/SF₆ permeance ratios varying from as low as 4 (Macdougall et al. 1999) to as high as 80 (Funke et al. 1996) have been claimed to be a criterion of good quality MFI membranes.

However, despite the wide use of single gas permeance ratios as an indication of membrane quality, it does not necessarily correlate with the achieved separation levels or even with whether a membrane can separate certain mixtures or not (Bernal et al. 2002, Coronas et al. 1998). Single-component permeance ratios also depend on several other parameters besides the defects in the zeolite film (Hedlund et al. 2003, Jareman & Hedlund 2005). Nevertheless, notable permeation of molecules much larger than the zeolite pores, can be used as an indicator of the presence of flow-through defects (Bowen et al. 2004).

Permporometry is generally used for the characterization of the size and proportion of pores in porous membranes. As permporometry is a simple and non-destructive method, zeolite membrane microstructure has been characterized frequently by permporometry, in the determination of flow-through defects (Hedlund et al. 2002, Noack et al. 2006, Wang et al. 2009a). The basic concept of permporometry is that the permeance of an inert, non-condensable (and non-
adsorbing) gas like helium is measured while the activity (calculated as the ratio of the partial pressure of the component to its saturated vapor pressure) of a highly adsorbing vapor is increased gradually from 0 to 1. Typically, \( n \)-hexane is used as the condensable component in the case of hydrophobic membranes, and water in the case of hydrophilic membranes (Caro & Noack 2008). As the activity of the highly adsorbing component increases, its occupancy in the pores increases, blocking the flow of the non-condensable component through the pores so that the remaining flux is assumed to occur through the defects above a certain size. The defect size blocked by the condensable vapor can be estimated with appropriate physical equations such as the Horvath-Kawazoe and Kelvin equations (see e.g. Hedlund et al. 2009). As a result, the defect distribution of the flow-through defects in a zeolite membrane can be obtained.

2.2 Adsorption and diffusion in zeolite materials

Permeation of components through zeolite membranes is generally explained by adsorption of the components in the zeolite pores and diffusion along the surface of the zeolite pores as a consequence of the chemical potential gradient \( \nabla \mu \) within the pores. Due to the differences between the adsorption and diffusion properties of the components in the zeolite pores, zeolite membranes can be applied in the separation of certain mixtures. In order to design zeolite membrane based processes, knowledge of adsorption and diffusion behavior is essential.

2.2.1 Pure component adsorption

In the adsorption phenomenon, an adsorbate (sorbate) is accumulated on the surface of a solid adsorbent (sorbent). The adsorbate attaches on the surface by physical adsorption (physisorption) or chemical adsorption (chemisorption). Adsorption on zeolites under pervaporation conditions is mainly physical in nature (Bowen et al. 2004). The characteristics of physisorption depend on several factors, e.g. adsorbent porosity, the size and geometry of pores, defects in the adsorbent structure, and interactions between adsorbent-adsorbate and adsorbate-adsorbate pairs.

Although applications of adsorption usually involve mixtures, adsorption equilibrium data is typically measured for single components as pure component adsorption measurements are the most reliable and also the easiest to perform. Mixture adsorption is then predicted by adsorption models, which are discussed in
more detail in Section 2.2.2. In general, pure component adsorption behavior is investigated based on isothermal equilibrium measurements. The adsorption equilibrium data is then used to form an adsorption isotherm. Isotherms typically describe the amount of adsorbate adsorbed for a given mass of adsorbent as a function of adsorbate pressure, relative pressure, fugacity or concentration in the fluid phase at a constant temperature. Adsorption in zeolite crystals have been measured, for example, by gravimetric (Nayak & Moffat 1988, Ryu et al. 2001) and volumetric uptake (Wang & LeVan 2009, Yun et al. 1998) as well as chromatographic (Sakuth et al. 1995) methods.

Adsorption measurements on zeolites are typically performed with zeolite powders, and not with membranes, because the measurement techniques are usually not suitable for measuring adsorption directly from membranes. The main practical reason for this is that the zeolite material constitutes only a minor weight fraction of the whole composite membrane. Hence, the adsorption measurements would include the adsorption behavior of the support material, which is not part of the film transport pathway (Gardner et al. 2002b). For example, it has been concluded that alumina supports significantly affect the total amount adsorbed due to its relative thickness (Hammond et al. 2007). An alternative method to evaluate the adsorption behavior of a zeolite film is to use computational methods. Hence, molecular simulation techniques have been used to study adsorption in zeolites (Smit & Krishna 2001).

Adsorption equilibrium data can be described with different mathematical models, i.e. adsorption isotherm equations. The adsorption behavior of different adsorbent-adsorbate pairs varies considerably. Therefore, a number of isotherm formulations have been proposed in the literature to describe adsorption on porous adsorbents. Some of the frequently applied isotherms connected to adsorption on zeolites are shown in Table 1. It is characteristic to the isotherm equations presented in Table 1 that they have mostly two or three adjustable parameters, which are determined on the basis of the adsorption equilibrium data.
### Table 1. Isotherms for component adsorption on porous adsorbents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isotherm</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Adjustable parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Henry’s law</td>
<td>( q_i = K_p, p )</td>
<td>( K_{p, i}(T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Freundlich</td>
<td>( q_i = K_p, p^n )</td>
<td>( K_p, n(T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Langmuir</td>
<td>( q_i = \frac{q_{\text{sat}} b, p}{1 + b, p} )</td>
<td>( q_{\text{sat}}, b, p(T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sips</td>
<td>( q_i = \frac{q_{\text{sat}} (b, P)^{1/n}}{1 + (b, P)^{1/n}} )</td>
<td>( q_{\text{sat}}, b, (T), n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tóth</td>
<td>( q_i = \frac{q_{\text{sat}} b, p}{1 + (b, P)^{1/n}} )</td>
<td>( q_{\text{sat}}, b, (T), n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BET</td>
<td>( q_i = \frac{q_{\text{sat}} c, (P/P_{\text{sat}})}{(1 - P/P_{\text{sat}})(1 - P/P_{\text{sat}} + c, P/P_{\text{sat}})} )</td>
<td>( q_{\text{sat}}, c, (T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dubinin- Raduschkevich</td>
<td>( q_i = q_{\text{sat}}^{\text{exp}} \left{ \frac{RT}{E \ln \left( \frac{P_{\text{sat}}}{P} \right)^2} \right} )</td>
<td>( q_{\text{sat}}^{\text{exp}}, E )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At low pressures (or fugacities), the adsorption loading is directly proportional to pressure, referred to as Henry’s law (isotherm 1 in Table 1). The low loading region where the adsorption isotherm is linear is called Henry’s law region. At higher pressures, the linear relationship between loading and pressure is no longer valid. Thus, the application of Henry’s law should be restricted to the linear region of the isotherm from adsorption equilibrium measurements.

The Langmuir isotherm (isotherm 3 in Table 1) is widely applied in the adsorption of a pure component on zeolite. The Langmuir isotherm is nonlinear at high pressures and shows linearity at low pressures, i.e., it reduces according to Henry’s law in low-pressure conditions. On the other hand, at high pressures the Langmuir isotherm approaches asymptotically the maximum adsorption loading (saturation loading) \( q_{\text{sat}} \), i.e., the amount where the zeolite pores are completely filled. The Langmuir isotherm is a frequently used theoretical model for monolayer adsorption (Ruthven 1984). In general, saturation loading can be taken as constant or it can take an empirical functional form of temperature dependency. However, the temperature dependency of saturation loading is not well validated (Malek & Farooq 1996) and the temperature dependency of \( q_{\text{sat}} \) has only a small effect in model predictions (Do & Do 1997). The usage of a constant saturation loading is
widely accepted when describing adsorption on zeolites (Pera-Titus et al. 2008, Zhu et al. 2006).

The earliest empirical isotherm is the Freundlich isotherm (isotherm 2 in Table 1). The Freundlich isotherm does not approach asymptotically the saturation loading as the pressure increases. Furthermore, as the empirical Freundlich isotherm does not exhibit proper Henry’s law behavior at low pressure, i.e., lacking linear proportionality between the adsorbed amount and pressure, it is generally valid in a limited range of adsorption equilibrium data (Do 1998). The same kind of form as in the Freundlich isotherm is found in the Sips isotherm (isotherm 4 in Table 1), but in a finite adsorption loading at high pressure. In addition, an empirical three-parameter Tóth isotherm (isotherm 5 in Table 1) is commonly used to correlate the adsorption equilibrium data of zeolites. The heterogeneity parameter $n$ in isotherms 4 and 5 in Table 1 can be regarded as the parameter characterizing the system heterogeneity, which could stem from the adsorbent or the adsorbate, or both (Do 1998). If the parameter $n$ has the value of one, the Sips and Tóth isotherms reduce to the Langmuir isotherm. Deviations from unity, on the other hand, indicate that the system is heterogeneous.

The temperature dependency of adsorption isotherms (see Table 1) is frequently represented by the adsorption equilibrium parameter $b_i$. The temperature dependency of $b_i$ is often described using the van’t Hoff type equation (Zhu et al. 2006)

$$b_i = b_{i0} e^{-\frac{\Delta H_{ads}^{\text{ref}}}{RT}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $b_{i0}$ is the adsorption equilibrium constant and $\Delta H_{ads}^{\text{ref}}$ is the heat of adsorption reflecting the degree of adsorption strength in the adsorbent. As adsorption is an exothermic process, adsorption loading $q_i$ decreases as the temperature increases.

As can be seen in Table 1, isotherms 6 and 7 include the ratio of pressure to the saturated vapor pressure of a component, $P/P_{\text{sat}}$. The theory of Brunauer-Emmet-Teller (BET, isotherm 6 in Table 1) was developed to describe multilayer adsorption. BET is used mainly in the determination of the surface area of finely-divided and porous materials (Sing et al. 1985). The validity range of the BET isotherm is approximately between the relative pressure values of 0.05 and 0.30. In addition to the temperature dependency of the vapor pressure, the affinity coefficient $c_i$ in the BET isotherm (isotherm 6 in Table 1) is dependent on the temperature.

The basis for having the $P/P_{\text{sat}}$ relation in the Dubinin-Radushkevich (D-R) isotherm (isotherm 7 in Table 1) is the adsorption potential theory originally
presented by Polanyi, and further developed by Dubinin. The theory states that the 
adsorbed amount of a component is a function of the adsorption potential \( \varepsilon \)  
(Ruthven 1984, Wood 2001)

\[
q_i = f(\varepsilon) = f \left( RT \ln \left( \frac{P^m(T)}{P} \right) \right).
\]  

(6)

The utility of the D-R isotherm is that the temperature dependency is reflected in 
the adsorption potential, i.e., if the adsorption data at different temperatures are 
plotted as the logarithm of the amount adsorbed vs. the square of the adsorption 
potential, all the data points should fall into one curve called the characteristic curve 
(Nguyen & Do 2001). The D-R isotherm is generally applicable for systems 
involving only van der Waals forces (non-polar systems), being particularly useful 
for adsorption on activated carbon (Chen & Yang 1994). However, it does not 
perform well in solids having fine micropores, such as molecular sieving carbon 
and zeolites (Do 1998).

2.2.2 Mixture adsorption

Mixture adsorption measurements are much more complicated, tedious and error-
prone than single component measurements (Talu 2011). Yet, multi-component 
adsorption knowledge is crucial as typical industrial applications of adsorption 
involve mixtures. Thus, typically only single-component isotherms are determined 
experimentally, and mixture adsorption is then predicted by multicomponent 
adsorption isotherms or adsorption models based on adsorbed solution theory 
(AST), for example.

The simplest mathematical function to account for multicomponent adsorption 
is the extended Langmuir isotherm, which gives the adsorbed amount of species \( i \) in 
the multicomponent system as

\[
q_i = \frac{q_i^m b_i P_i}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j P_j}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, N.
\]  

(7)

The extended Langmuir isotherm, however, is applicable only when the saturation 
loadings of the mixture components are identical, as otherwise Eq. (7) is not 
thermodynamically consistent (Krishna 2001). Thus, for the general case of
unequal saturation loadings, it is better to use models based on the adsorbed solution theory.

Myers and Prausnitz (1965) were the first to propose the usage of AST in the description of multicomponent adsorption. The basis of AST is that the bulk fluid phase and the adsorbed phase are in thermodynamic equilibrium. On the basis of AST, two different approaches have been formulated: the real adsorbed solution theory (RAST) and the ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST). The main difference between RAST and IAST is that in IAST the adsorbed phase is assumed to be ideal whereas in RAST the deviations of the adsorbed phase from ideal behavior are taken into account. The relationship between the phases can be formulated based on AST as

$$y_i P = \gamma_{i,ads} x_i^{ads} P^0(\pi),$$

where $y_i$ is the gas phase mole fraction, $\gamma_{i,ads}$ is the adsorbed phase activity coefficient (in IAST the adsorbed phase is considered ideal, i.e. $\gamma_{i,ads} = 1$), and $x_i^{ads}$ is the adsorbed phase mole fraction of component $i$. $\pi$ is the mixture spreading pressure, and $P^0$ is the hypothetical pressure of the pure component that gives the same spreading pressure on the surface as that of the mixture. The spreading pressure is a thermodynamic variable, which cannot be measured directly. According to AST, the relationship between the spreading pressure and pure component adsorption isotherms can be represented as

$$\frac{\pi A}{RT} = \int_0^{\pi_0} \frac{q_i}{P_1} dP_1 = \int_0^{\pi_0} \frac{q_i}{P_2} dP_2 = ... = \int_0^{\pi_0} \frac{q_i}{P_i} dP_i,$$

where $A$ is the specific surface area of the adsorbent. The sum of the mole fractions in the adsorbed phase must naturally equal one:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^{ads} = 1.$$  

When the adsorbed phase is considered to behave non-ideally and RAST is applied, the activity coefficients can be estimated, in principle, using correlations with similar mathematical formulation as is used for vapor-liquid equilibrium, e.g., the Wilson activity coefficient model. However, in the estimation of the activity coefficients of the adsorbed phase using correlations for vapor-liquid equilibrium, the spreading pressure is not taken into account (Sochard et al. 2010). The application of RAST is limited because of the uncertainty in the activity coefficient calculation of the adsorbed phase (Do 1998).
Based on the knowledge of the pure component adsorption isotherms together with the bulk gas composition and system pressure, the values for \( P_i^0 \) and \( x_i^{\text{ads}} \) for each component in the mixture can be determined using Eqs (8)–(10). When IAST is applied in the description of mixture adsorption, or when RAST is applied assuming that adsorbate-adsorbate interactions prevail with respect to adsorbate-adsorbent interactions, the adsorption loadings can be calculated using

\[
\frac{1}{q_{\text{tot}}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^{\text{ads}} \frac{q_i^0}{q_{\text{tot}}},
\]

where \( q_{\text{tot}} \) is the total adsorbed amount and \( q_i^0 \) is the amount of component \( i \) adsorbed at the reference state, and is thus obtained with the pure component adsorption isotherm equation applied to \( P_i^0 \).

IAST and RAST are not limited to any particular pure component adsorption isotherm, being suitable also for the description of various adsorbent-adsorbate systems, e.g., an adsorbate mixture having unequal saturation loadings on the adsorbent. The ideal solution concept has been used a lot in predicting mixture adsorption.

### 2.2.3 Diffusion

Diffusion in micropores is dominated by interactions between the diffusing molecules and the pore wall (Kärger & Ruthven 1992). Diffusion in zeolites takes place mostly in the configurational regime (Xiao & Wei 1992) by configurational diffusion, also often referred to as activated surface diffusion. Physically adsorbed molecules are relatively mobile, and adsorbates can be considered as jumping from site to site in the zeolite pores. Thus, the different diffusion rates of molecules in zeolite pores is based partly on adsorption. The driving force for diffusion through the zeolite membrane is the chemical potential gradient of the component. Jumping from one site to another requires a molecule to surmount an energy barrier, i.e., surface diffusion is an activated process. The temperature dependency of surface diffusion can be represented according to the Arrhenius equation as (Kärger & Ruthven 1992)

\[
D_i = D_i^0 \exp \left( -\frac{E_i^{\text{diff}}}{RT} \right),
\]
where $D_i$ is the diffusivity of component $i$, $D_0$ a pre-exponential factor and $E_{\text{dif}}$ the activation energy of diffusion. Larger molecules generally have larger activation energies of diffusion than smaller molecules (Xiao & Wei 1992).

In addition to adsorption and surface diffusion, separation may, in the case of zeolite membranes, also occur through molecular sieving, where smaller molecules can fit into zeolite pores while larger molecules have difficulties (see Fig. 4).

Diffusivity is a measure of the mobility of individual molecules. Due to the small pore sizes of zeolites, the diffusivities of molecules with different sizes may differ by orders of magnitude (Xiao & Wei 1992). Knowledge of diffusivities is essential in evaluating the mass transfer of components through a zeolite film. However, most diffusion studies have been performed with permanent gases (Bowen et al. 2004). Thus, diffusivities have not been measured comprehensively for molecules used in pervaporation.

Different techniques have been employed in determining component diffusivities in zeolites. Mass transfer can result from a concentration gradient and Brownian molecular motion, i.e. transport diffusion and self-diffusion, respectively (Kärger & Ruthven 1992). Therefore, the mobility of molecules can be measured on microscopic scale at equilibrium conditions, that is, without the application of a concentration gradient by either pulsed field gradient nuclear magnetic resonance (PFG NMR) (Bussai et al. 2002, Caro et al. 1986) or quasi-elastic neutron scattering (QENS) (Demontis et al. 2009), yielding self-diffusivities. Microscopic techniques measure the diffusivities on a length scale smaller than the individual crystals. Self-diffusivities can also be obtained from theoretical grounds by molecular dynamics (MD) simulations (Ari et al. 2009, Bussai et al. 2002).

In contrast to steady-state measurements, transient measurements contain information of both adsorption and diffusion (Gavalas 2008). In powder uptake measurements, for example, where the adsorption equilibrium quantity of the adsorbate on the adsorbent is measured, the uptake rates can be used to estimate the intracrystalline diffusion coefficient (Kärger & Ruthven 1992). Besides uptake-measurements (Nayak & Moffat 1988, Zhang et al. 2013), non-equilibrium macroscopic techniques also include e.g. chromatographic techniques (Lin & Ma 1988). Since in macroscopic methods, the whole transport process from the surrounding phase into the porous solid is considered, macroscopic techniques generally measure transport diffusivities. Typically, packed beds are investigated rather than individual particles, or much less membranes. Gardner and coworkers (Gardner et al. 2002a, Gardner et al. 2004) developed a transient method to estimate simultaneously membrane thickness as well as adsorption and diffusion.
parameters in a gas/membrane system with a two-step procedure for thick membranes. Another macroscopic method in determining diffusion coefficients has been the application of Maxwell-Stefan (MS) modeling to steady-state gas permeation through zeolite membranes (Kangas et al. 2013, Kapteijn et al. 1995).

At zero loading, self-diffusivity, transport-diffusivity and MS diffusivity should equal one another (Paschek & Krishna 2001). Unfortunately, the diffusivities determined by different techniques vary quite considerably. Kapteijn et al. (1995), for example, tabulated the reported diffusivities for alkanes and alkenes for silicalite-1, having orders of magnitude differences in the diffusivity values obtained using various techniques. Generally, the component diffusivities determined by the microscopic techniques or MD simulations can be several magnitudes higher than those measured by macroscopic methods.

2.3 Modeling of mass transfer in pervaporation using zeolite membranes

Mathematical modeling is an indispensable tool in process design and optimization, as well as for the purpose of the performance evaluation of process alternatives. Modeling the mass transfer could lead to a better understanding of the phenomena occurring in the pervaporation process, allowing predictions of fluxes and selectivities.

The separation in pervaporation using inorganic membranes is generally based on adsorption and diffusion. Adsorption-diffusion theory basically divides pervaporation into a few consecutive steps: adsorption on the membrane surface, diffusion through the zeolite film, desorption as a vapor on the other side of the membrane, and combined diffusion and bulk flow through the support layer (see also Fig. 2). Modeling of the mass transfer through pervaporation membranes requires the consideration of these steps. Desorption on the permeate side of the membrane is typically fast, and thus generally not considered in modeling (Bettens et al. 2005). Moreover, the flow through the support layer is also mostly omitted, and the focus of modeling is on the phenomena occurring in the separation layer.

Both empirical and more theoretical approaches to model pervaporation have been developed, with the empirical models being less complex than the theoretical models (Lipnizki & Trägårdh 2001). The models for mass transfer in pervaporation are mostly semi-empirical, combining features of both the theoretical and empirical approaches. In semi-empirical models, typically the permeation-related effects such as adsorption and diffusion effects are summarized in empirical parameters.
Thus, these types of models rely heavily on experiments as experimental data is required to determine certain parameters for the models. However, often the semi-empirical models may still provide the desired depth especially for process and module design (Lipnizki & Trägårdh 2001).

Wijmans & Baker (1993) showed that, based on a solution-diffusion model for polymeric membranes, a component flux can be described by multiplying the normalized permeation flux or permeance by the driving force, i.e., the fugacity difference across the membrane

$$J_i = Q_i \left( x_i \gamma_i P_{perm}^{\text{sat}} - y_i P_{perm} \right) = Q_i \left( f_{i,\text{feed}} - f_{i,\text{perm}} \right),$$

(13)

where $Q_i$ is the permeance of component $i$, $x_i$ is the mole fraction, $\gamma_i$ the activity coefficient of component $i$ in the liquid feed, $P_{perm}$ is the permeate pressure and $f_{i,\text{feed}}$ and $f_{i,\text{perm}}$ are the feed and permeate fugacities. As adsorption-diffusion model for inorganic membranes is analogous to solution-diffusion model for polymeric membranes, similar models can be applied to describe transport through inorganic membranes. The model shown in Eq. (13) has been applied to the description of pure component transport through microporous silica membranes (de Bruijn et al. 2007), dehydration of alcohols with LTA-type zeolite membranes (Sommer & Melin 2005) and also for the removal of ethanol from aqueous streams by multi-channel MFI zeolite membranes (Kuhn et al. 2009b).

Eq. (13) does not require any additional information about the affinity (adsorption) and diffusivity of permeating species in the membrane film as those effects are combined into a single permeance term. In order to be able to describe the adsorption and diffusion more precisely, information regarding the material properties and adsorption behavior of the components in the material, for instance, should be known. Detailed modeling could offer a good insight into the transport mechanisms, which in turn is crucial in the design and development of membranes, as well as pervaporation-based processes. In detailed models the parameters are generally more fundamental than in semi-empirical models, i.e., the parameters have a physical meaning.

Krishna (1990) proposed the application of a generalized Maxwell-Stefan (GMS) formulation to surface diffusion. Since then, GMS has been successfully applied in modeling gas permeation of both a single component and mixtures through zeolite membranes (Kangas et al. 2013, Kapteijn et al. 1995, Zhu et al. 2006). However, application of Maxwell-Stefan (MS) modeling in pervaporation using zeolite membranes, is not very common; it is generally limited to the
dehydration of alcohols using LTA or DDR zeolite membranes where simplifications to the MS equations are possible on the basis of the assumption that the interactions between the adsorbed molecules are of negligible importance (Kuhn et al. 2009a, Pera-Titus et al. 2008). It is a little controversial that, despite the active research work in developing alcohol-selective zeolite membranes for alcohol concentration from fermentation broths (Chen et al. 2007, Kosinov et al. 2014, Negishi et al. 2002, Sebastian et al. 2010), the pervaporation process using hydrophobic zeolite membranes has not been modeled using the Maxwell-Stefan formulation.

The general form of GMS equations applied to surface diffusion for an n-component system is given as (Kapteijn et al. 2000)

\[-\rho \frac{\theta_i}{RT} \nabla \mu_i = \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{q_{ij} J_j}{q_{ij} q_{jj}^m D_{ij}} + \frac{J_j}{q_{jj}^m D_{jj}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \quad (14)\]

where \(J_i\) is the molar flux of component \(i\) and \(\rho\) is the zeolite density, which is 1760 kg m\(^{-3}\) for high-silica MFI zeolite (Farhadpour & Bono 1996). Eq. (14) defines two types of MS diffusivities: \(\bar{D}_{ij}\) and \(\bar{D}_{ij}\). \(\bar{D}_{ij}\) represents single-component surface diffusivity, i.e. adsorbate-adsorbent interactions, whereas \(\bar{D}_{jj}\) represents interexchange diffusivity between species \(i\) and \(j\), i.e., adsorbate-adsorbate interactions. Thus, the first term on the right side of Eq. (14) describes the friction from the interaction between the adsorbed molecules and the last term the friction between the molecule and the zeolite.

The chemical potential gradient can be related to the surface coverage by the thermodynamic matrix \([\Gamma]\) as

\[-\frac{\theta_i}{RT} \nabla \mu_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Gamma_{ij} \nabla \theta_j , \quad (15)\]

where \(\Gamma_{ij} = \theta_i \frac{\partial \ln f_i}{\partial \theta_j} \), \(i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n\). \(\quad (16)\)

The thermodynamic factor Eq. (16) includes the partial derivative of fugacity \(f_i\) with respective to coverage \(\theta_i\), i.e., thermodynamic factor is closely related to adsorption. Thus, the thermodynamic factor can be determined on the basis of the adsorption isotherm, which relates the surface coverage to fugacity. The elements of \(\Gamma_{ij}\) can be determined from the models describing mixture adsorption, e.g. IAST. The analytical solution of the thermodynamic factor for some pure component
adsorption isotherms is possible (Lito et al. 2011). When the Langmuir isotherm is applied, the thermodynamic factor is reduced to

\[ \Gamma_i = \frac{1}{1 - \theta_i}. \]  

(17)

As can be seen in Eq. (17), the thermodynamic factor increases as the coverage increases.

The MS diffusivity \( D_{i,z} \) has frequently been assumed to be independent of coverage when modeling gas permeation through zeolite membranes (Gardner et al. 2002a, Li et al. 2005, Nagumo et al. 2001, Zhu et al. 2006). The assumption of coverage independence has also been used in modeling pervaporation of water and ethanol using hydrophilic LTA membranes (Guo et al. 2011). When \( D_{i,z} \) is assumed to be independent of coverage, it is equal to the limiting value of zero loading as

\[ D_{i,z} = D_{i,z}(0), \]  

(18)

where \( D_{i,z}(0) \) is the zero-loading MS diffusivity of component \( i \).

\( D_{i,z} \) can also be considered dependent on the fractional surface coverage within the zeolite so that a molecule can only migrate from one site when the receiving site is vacant. Several molecular simulation studies (Chempath et al. 2004, Krishna & Van Baten 2005, Paschek & Krishna 2000, Skoulidas & Sholl 2002) have been carried out to evaluate the coverage-dependency for a variety of components in various zeolites. It has been shown that the \( D_{i,z} \) changes as a function of fractional surface coverage. In many studies \( D_{i,z} \) has been shown to vary linearly with loading, but not necessarily throughout the whole fractional surface coverage area (Chempath et al. 2004). Without experimental evidence, however, \( D_{i,z} \) can be assumed to depend linearly on the vacant sites as

\[ D_{i,z} = D_{i,z}(0)(1 - \theta_{st}), \]  

(19)

where the total coverage is

\[ \theta_{st} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i. \]  

(20)

Linearly coverage-dependent MS diffusivity has been applied, e.g., in the modeling of dehydration of water/ethanol mixtures by pervaporation (Pera-Titus et al. 2006, Pera-Titus et al. 2008).
The MS interexchange coefficient $D_{ij}$ represents the capability of the adsorbed component $i$ to replace the adsorbed component $j$. There are no fundamental models to predict $D_{ij}$ (Krishna & Paschek 2000). Krishna (1990) proposed a procedure to estimate binary correlations based on the generalization of the empirical Vignes (1966) relation developed originally for bulk liquid mixture diffusion. For the determination of $D_{ij}$ in the diffusion of adsorbed species the mole fractions are replaced with fractional surface coverages as
\[
D_{ij} = [D_{i,z}]^\theta_i(\theta_i+\theta_j) [D_{j,z}]^{-\theta_j(\theta_i+\theta_j)}.
\]
Thus, the value of $D_{ij}$ falls in between the values of $D_{i,z}$ and $D_{j,z}$.

The strength of Maxwell-Stefan modeling in comparison to semi-empirical modeling (see e.g. Eq. (13)) is that it comprises both intracrystalline diffusion as well as adsorption, and all the parameters applied have a physical meaning. In addition, mixture permeation through zeolite membranes can be predicted by incorporating the following properties in the Maxwell-Stefan formulation:

- single component adsorption isotherms with IAST
- single component surface diffusivities with Eq. (21).

This approach has been applied to gas separation modeling using zeolite membranes (Kapteijn et al. 1995, Van De Graaf et al. 1999, Zhu et al. 2006), and can also be applied to pervaporation modeling using zeolite membranes.
3 Materials and methods

3.1 Synthesis and properties of composite membranes

The zeolite membranes employed in the study were prepared and characterized by Prof. Jonas Hedlund’s group at Luleå University of Technology. The high-silica MFI zeolite membranes (film thickness is approximately 0.5 µm as detected by SEM) were prepared using the seeding method and support masking procedure described in detail in Hedlund et al. (2002), Hedlund et al. (2003), and briefly in Paper I.

The MFI zeolite membranes synthesized similarly to the membranes applied in this study, have a Si/Al ratio of 139 (Sandström et al. 2010). Thus, the high-silica MFI membranes considered in this work can be classified as hydrophobic (Zhang et al. 2012a). Similar membranes as used in this study have been shown to be reproducible and isomer selective (Hedlund et al. 2002), and very efficient in various gas separation applications (Hedlund et al. 2009, Lindmark & Hedlund 2010, Sandström et al. 2010).

The zeolite membranes prepared by Prof. Jonas Hedlund’s group are characterized typically by n-hexane/helium permporometry (Hedlund et al. 2009). The membranes have low amount of detectable flow-through defects (Hedlund et al. 2003, Korelskiy et al. 2012). The total amount of defects for membrane M2 used in this study accounted for 0.5% of the total membrane area, and more than 97% of the total relative area of defects consisted of defects smaller than 1 nm. Essentially no defects larger than 4.25 nm were detected by permporometry.

Zeolite X (FAU) membranes (film thickness approximately 1 µm as detected by SEM, crystal phase confirmed with XRD) for ethanol dehydration were prepared using the synthesis method described in Paper VI.

The membranes in this work are referred to as ultra-thin, as in the literature zeolite membranes below 2.5–3 µm are considered ultra-thin membranes (Liu et al. 2011b, White et al. 2010). Zeolite films were grown on graded α-alumina support discs (Fraunhofer IKTS, Germany) with a diameter of 25 mm. The disc consists of two layers: a thin 30 µm top layer with 100 nm pores and a thicker 3 mm layer with larger 3 µm pores.

As the membrane consists of a microporous selective layer on top of a porous support, the mass transfer through the composite membrane is the overall contribution of both the zeolite film and the support. As discussed in Section 2.2.3,
surface diffusion governed by adsorption controls the transport through the zeolite film. To estimate the mass transfer resistance in the support, the approach presented by de Bruijn et al. (2003) was applied, where the Knudsen diffusion and/or viscous flow controls the transport through the zeolite support (see Section 2.1.2). A schematic representation of the composite membrane and the transport mechanisms considered in this work is given in Fig. 5.

![Fig. 5. Zeolite membrane on a graded support. SL1 denotes support layer 1 and SL2 support layer 2.](image)

The Knudsen structural parameters (see Eq. (2)) and the effective permeability for the supporting layers (see Eq. (3) and Paper VI) are shown together with the zeolite film characteristics in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>zeolite film</th>
<th>α-alumina support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$l$ (m)</td>
<td>500 x 10^{-9} (MFI) / 1000 x 10^{-9} (FAU)</td>
<td>30 x 10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_{pore}$ (m)</td>
<td>0.55 x 10^{-9} (MFI) / 0.74 x 10^{-9} (FAU)</td>
<td>100 x 10^{-9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_s$ (m)</td>
<td>2.94 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td>2.04 x 10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_s$ (m²)</td>
<td>1.45 x 10^{-16}</td>
<td>6.46 x 10^{-13}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SL1 denotes support layer 1 and SL2 support layer 2

### 3.2 Pervaporation experiments

Pervaporation experiments of aqueous solutions of ethanol and n-butanol were carried out using the pervaporation experimental set-up presented in Fig. 6.
Fig. 6. Pervaporation equipment.

The membrane was sealed in a stainless steel cell with the zeolite film facing the feed side. Liquid feed was pumped to the membrane cell at a flow rate of approximately 0.7 kg min\(^{-1}\) from a feed tank containing approximately 3 liters of feed mixture, and the retentate, i.e., the flow retained by the membrane, was recirculated back to the feed tank.

The experiments were carried out at feed temperatures in a range of 30–70 °C. The temperature of the feed tank was kept at the desired value with a heating jacket connected to a temperature control system. The piping as well as the membrane cell was insulated in order to minimize heat losses. The temperature of the cell was monitored by a thermocouple.

Pervaporation deals typically with components of less than 10 wt.% of the liquid mixtures. The feed compositions were selected on the basis of typical alcohol concentrations in fermentation broths in the case of hydrophobic membranes. For hydrophilic membranes the feed composition, on the other hand, was selected on the basis of the typical composition for ethanol dehydration. In the case of MFI membranes, the binary ethanol/water solutions had 5/7.5/10 wt.% of ethanol and the binary n-butanol/water solution had 3 wt.% of n-butanol (Papers I and II). In the case of hydrophilic zeolite X (FAU) membranes (Paper VI) the feed was 90/10 wt.% ethanol/water mixture. The composition change in the feed was not considered as the permeate flux was insignificant both in comparison to the total feed volume and feed flow rates of individual components.

After start-up, the system was allowed to equilibrate in order to attain steady-state conditions. The permeate side pressure was kept low with a vacuum pump,
the pressure staying below 24 mbar in all the experiments. The permeate samples, i.e., the flow that traverses the membrane, were collected in liquid nitrogen cold traps. There were two condensation loops in order to enable continuous operation. Several samples were taken at each experimental temperature. The samples were defrosted and weighed, and the steady-state pervaporation flux was determined as

$$J = \frac{m}{At}, \quad (22)$$

where \(m\) is the mass of the permeate sample, \(t\) is the sampling time, and \(A\) is the effective membrane area for permeation, which for the membranes studied was \(3.14 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2\).

The composition of samples was analyzed off-line by gas chromatography (Agilent Technologies 6890N Network GC System) equipped with a flame ionization detector. In the case of the \(n\)-butanol experiments, the two-phase permeate sample was diluted with Milli-Q water prior to the analysis in order to obtain a homogeneous sample. The separation factor was determined as the ratio of component weight fractions in the permeate to those in the feed as

$$\alpha_{i,j} = \frac{w_{i,\text{perm}} / w_{j,\text{perm}}}{w_{i,\text{feed}} / w_{j,\text{feed}}}, \quad (23)$$

where \(w_{i,\text{perm}}\) and \(w_{j,\text{perm}}\) are the weight fractions of components \(i\) and \(j\) in the permeate, and \(w_{i,\text{feed}}\) and \(w_{j,\text{feed}}\) are the weight fractions of components \(i\) and \(j\) in the feed, respectively.

Both the separation factor and the pervaporation flux are generally applied to evaluate the membrane performance. However, both factors yield only a partial view of the membrane overall performance. Therefore, Huang & Yeom (1990) introduced pervaporation separation index PSI (kg m\(^{-2}\) h\(^{-1}\)) to facilitate simultaneous evaluation of the effects of both the flux and separation factor. PSI was originally defined as the total flux multiplied by separation factor. Later, to exclude the effects of a membrane with no separation (\(\alpha = 1\)), PSI has been modified to

$$\text{PSI} = J (\alpha - 1). \quad (24)$$

However, PSI is can be considered only as a pragmatic attempt to evaluate flux and separation factor simultaneously. Nevertheless, PSI is usable, e.g., when similar membranes are compared. For adequate process evaluation, however, modeling of the pervaporation process is needed.
3.3 Modeling

The present work includes both experimental work and modeling. The Antoine equation, with parameters from Poling et al. (2001), was used to determine the saturated vapor pressures of ethanol, n-butanol and water. Other equations and corresponding parameters for calculating the saturated vapor pressures were also used in Papers III and IV. The choice of $P_{i}^{\text{sat}}$ representation was done on the basis of the validity-range of $P_{i}^{\text{sat}}$ formulation and its parameters with respect to temperature.

The viscosity for the permeate vapor and the activity coefficients of the components in the feed mixture were obtained with Aspen Plus, a commercial simulation software. The Wilson property package was used for ethanol/water mixtures as the Wilson activity coefficient model is suitable for liquid-phase non-idealities. For the n-butanol/water mixtures, the NRTL model (LLE-Aspen) was used, as it is also suitable for immiscible systems.

The parameters for the semi-empirical mass transfer models (Paper II, Section 4.3), pure component adsorption isotherms (Papers III and IV, Section 4.4) and diffusion parameters (Paper V, Section 4.5) were determined by non-linear regression minimizing the sum of squares of the difference between the model and experimental data, using the optimization routine *lsqcurvefit* of Matlab. The non-linear equation set formed for IAST calculations by Eqs. (8)–(10) was solved using the Matlab *fsolve* routine (Paper IV, Section 4.4.2).
4 Results

4.1 Performance of ultra-thin zeolite membranes in alcohol/water separations

In Papers I and VI the pervaporation performance of ultra-thin MFI and FAU membranes are evaluated for the first time for the separation of aqueous mixtures of ethanol and n-butanol. Ethanol/water pervaporation using hydrophobic high-silica MFI membranes is discussed in Section 4.1.1 and dehydration by pervaporation using hydrophobic zeolite X (FAU) membranes in Section 4.1.2. n-Butanol recovery using hydrophobic MFI membranes is discussed in Section 4.1.3.

4.1.1 Ethanol/water pervaporation using high-silica MFI membranes (Papers I and II)

During the past decades, efforts have been made to develop various membrane materials for separating ethanol from fermentation broths. The reported fluxes for ethanol/water separation by pervaporation using the most common polymeric membranes, poly(dimethyl siloxane) (PDMS) membranes, are mostly below 1 kg m\(^{-2}\) h\(^{-1}\) (Beaumelle et al. 1993, Chovau et al. 2011, Gaykawad et al. 2013, Li et al. 2004, Rozicka et al. 2014); the ethanol/water separation factor (\(\alpha_{\text{EtOH/water}}\)) often being a little above or below 10 (Lee et al. 2012, Vane 2005). The modification of PDMS membranes with fillers (e.g. hydrophobic zeolites), referred to as mixed matrix membranes, has also been studied. Typically the ethanol/water separation factors of hydrophobic polymer/zeolite mixed matrix membranes are somewhat higher than those of polymer membranes, with the fluxes remaining mostly below 1 kg m\(^{-2}\) h\(^{-1}\) (Peng et al. 2011, Shirazi et al. 2012, Vane et al. 2008).

For organic removal from aqueous streams by pervaporation using zeolite membranes, high silica MFI membranes have been studied the most due to their hydrophobic properties and well-defined pore size. The performance of the MFI membranes used in this study in ethanol/water separation are reported in Table 3 together with other reported ethanol/water pervaporation performances using high-silica MFI membranes for comparison. M1 and M2 in Table 3 refer to the membranes used in Paper I and M3 to the membrane used in Paper II.
Table 3. Pervaporation performance of high-silica MFI zeolite membranes in the separation of ethanol/water mixtures (results from this study bolded).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>Feed</th>
<th>Flux</th>
<th>Separation factor</th>
<th>PSI</th>
<th>Membrane thickness</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EtOH (wt.%)</td>
<td>(kg m⁻²h⁻¹)</td>
<td>(EtOH/H₂O)</td>
<td>(kg m⁻²h⁻¹)</td>
<td>(µm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>80–90</td>
<td>SS-tube</td>
<td>Tuan et al. 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:M1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:M2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:M3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:M3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.24 (ave)</td>
<td>39 (ave)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS-support</td>
<td>Matsuda et al. 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.55 (ave)</td>
<td>28 (ave)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS-support</td>
<td>Ikegami et al. 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>SS-disc</td>
<td>Sano et al. 1999b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>ca. 0.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>SS-support</td>
<td>Nomura et al. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS-disc</td>
<td>Sano et al. 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>Sano et al. 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>γ-tube</td>
<td>Liu et al. 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>titania-tube</td>
<td>Weyd et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>~5*(2-sided)</td>
<td>α-capillary</td>
<td>Sebastian et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60:M1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60:M2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60:M3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60:M3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>10–30</td>
<td>SS-tube</td>
<td>Lin et al. 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>159.3</td>
<td>10–30</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Lin et al. 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>10–30</td>
<td>muillite</td>
<td>Lin et al. 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Shen et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9 (ave)</td>
<td>12.3 (ave)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>0.5–5</td>
<td>α-HF</td>
<td>Kosinov et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>muillite</td>
<td>Zhang et al. 2012b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>α-HF</td>
<td>Shan et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>340.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YSZ-HF</td>
<td>Shu et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>α-HF</td>
<td>Shu et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Peng et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>~1.3</td>
<td>~85</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>~5</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Peng et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Algieri et al. 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70:M3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>286.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>Shan et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS-tube</td>
<td>Stoeger et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.35 (ave)</td>
<td>69 (ave)</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>silica tube</td>
<td>Chen et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where ave is average; SS is stainless steel; α is α-alumina; γ is γ-alumina; YSZ is yttria stabilized zirconia; HF is hollow fiber; * denotes the total thickness of membrane on both support sides
M1 and M2 denotes membranes used in Paper I and M3 the membrane used in Paper II
As shown in Table 3, the reported ethanol/water separation factors range from 1.3 to 106. High separation factors are often accompanied by rather low flux, as the membranes having a separation factor above 40 display mostly fluxes of below 0.5 kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$ at 30 °C, and typically below 2 kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$ at higher temperatures as shown in Table 3.

The high-silica MFI membranes studied in this work display a higher pervaporation flux than that previously reported. The high flux of the studied membranes is attributed to the lower zeolite film thickness of the synthesized membranes compared to the other reported fluxes for thicker high-silica MFI membranes. However, the ethanol/water separation factors of this work are mostly poorer than those reported for other high-silica MFI membranes. Fig. 7 shows the flux and separation factor for ethanol/water mixtures using the studied membranes as a function of temperature at different feed compositions (5/7.5/10 wt.% ethanol). The data points in Fig. 7 are the mean values of the samples with the same experimental conditions; the error bars represent the standard deviations between the replicates.

![Figure 7](image_url)

**Fig. 7.** Total flux (open symbols) and ethanol/water separation factor (filled symbols) as a function of temperature for ethanol/water pervaporation experiments at different feed compositions: (○) 5 wt.% ethanol, (■) 7.5 wt.% ethanol, and (◊) 10 wt.% ethanol. The lines are guidance for the eye. (Paper II)
Typically, the permeation flux through the membrane increases exponentially with increasing temperature (Sommer & Melin 2005), as can also be seen in Fig. 7. This is due to the strong influence of temperature on the saturated vapor pressure $P_{\text{sat}}$, and thus on the feed side fugacity (see Eq. (13)).

As shown in Fig. 7, there is a slight temperature-dependency of the separation factor for each feed composition: the selectivity first slightly increases as the temperature increases and then rather stabilizes as the temperature is further increased. However, the temperature-effect is so minor that the ethanol/water separation factor can be considered basically independent of temperature in the investigated conditions. In pervaporation, the adsorption and diffusion of the components in the zeolite film as well as the driving force for mass transfer are influenced by temperature. Thus, the overall effect of temperature on membrane separation is a result of the combination of all these factors.

As ethanol is a larger molecule than water, it should have a lower diffusivity in zeolites than water. Thus, in pervaporation using zeolite membranes, diffusion favors water permeation. Larger molecules typically have a larger activation energy of diffusion than small molecules (Bowen et al. 2003). This implies that the ethanol diffusivity should increase more with temperature than water diffusivity (see Eq. (12)). Hence, the diffusion rate of ethanol should increase more with increasing temperature than the diffusion rate of water.

Components in feed mixtures compete for occupation of vacant adsorption sites. Hydrophobic zeolites preferentially adsorb organics over water. The analysis of adsorption selectivity as a function of temperature is difficult without valid experimental data. This is apparent, as for example the data for heat of adsorption $-\Delta H_{\text{ads}}$ on high-silica MFI zeolite varies for ethanol from 18 kJ mol$^{-1}$ (Chandak & Lin 1998) to 70 kJ mol$^{-1}$ (Lee et al. 1997) and for water from 25.1 kJ mol$^{-1}$ to 50.6 kJ mol$^{-1}$ (Bordat et al. 2010).

In contrast to the present study, the ethanol/water separation factor using similar MFI membranes to this study often decreases, even substantially, with increasing temperature, such as in the studies of Lin et al. (2001), Matsuda et al. (2002), Sano et al. (1994), and Kuhn et al. (2009b). This type of behavior could be attributed to the defects in the membrane structure (Pera-Titus et al. 2006, Tuan et al. 2002).

The membranes used have a low proportion of defects of the overall membrane surface, characterized by permoporometry (see Section 3.1), the defect distribution being similar to previously reported as-synthesized high-quality MFI membranes (Korelskiy et al. 2012). Due to the high quality of the studied membranes, the
ethanol/water separation factors were originally anticipated to be higher. In the absence of larger defects, the explanation for the modest separation factors achieved may basically be caused by the combination of three factors, all of which become significant when the zeolite film is ultra-thin:

– aluminum incorporated from the α-alumina support into the zeolite framework makes the zeolite film less hydrophobic (Geus et al. 1992, Shu et al. 2012),
– directly undetectable open grain boundaries in the zeolite film (see Fig. 3) serve as water selective pathways (Algieri et al. 2003, Sebastian et al. 2010),
– the support of the membrane considerably reduces the chemical potential gradient across the zeolite layer (analyzed in Section 4.2).

Despite the masking of the support in zeolite synthesis of the studied membranes, some aluminum is incorporated in the ultra-thin zeolite film (see Section 3.1). Water adsorption in particular has been observed to depend strongly on the Si/Al ratio of the zeolite, although the Si/Al ratio of 140 (approximately the same as the ratio in the membranes studied) is considered to be fairly hydrophobic (Zhang et al. 2012a). As it is seen in Table 3, many of the separation factors above 40 have been prepared on aluminum-free substrates. For example, by using an inert YSZ (yttria stabilized zirconia) support, and thus eliminating Al contamination, a relatively high separation factor of 47 for a thin 3 µm zeolite film was obtained (Shu et al. 2012). Thicker alumina-supported membranes also have high separation factors (see Table 3). The increased thickness of the membrane reduces the effect of Al incorporation in the membrane (Shu et al. 2012).

Achieving high flux, as with the studied membranes, is an advantageous property of a membrane. The potential of the high-flux membranes originates from the fact that the increase of flux, assuming that the separation factor stays on the same level, reduces the capital investment and processing costs. PSI (see Eq. (24)) can be used to roughly compare similar membranes for a certain separation target in comparable conditions. As it can be observed from Table 3, the membranes of this study fall in the middle range in terms of PSI in separating ethanol from aqueous mixtures by pervaporation using high-silica MFI membranes. Although PSI is a decent attempt to compare the membrane performance including the effects of permeation flux and selectivity simultaneously, just selecting a membrane with the highest PSI may not be the optimal choice for the pervaporation process (Chapman et al. 2008). In fact, recently Van der Bruggen & Luis (2014) stated that a high-performance membrane in the case of bioethanol purification is a high-flux membrane rather than a highly selective membrane, and that PSI might
underestimate the significance of flux. With the combination of high flux and a decent separation factor, the membranes studied in this work have potential in bioethanol purification. Nevertheless, for adequate process evaluation, proper modeling of the pervaporation process is inevitably needed.

4.1.2 Ethanol dehydration by pervaporation using zeolite X (FAU) membranes (Paper VI)

Anhydrous ethanol is used as a gasoline extender. Pervaporation is considered as a viable, energy-efficient separation method for ethanol dehydration (Cardona Alzate & Sánchez Toro 2006). Although the small-pore LTA zeolite membranes are very well suited for organics dehydration, and have already found industrial application (Morigami et al. 2001), they are unstable in high water concentrations (>20 wt.%) due to the dealumination of the zeolite framework (Li et al. 2007, Zhang et al. 2014). FAU membranes are more hydrothermally stable than LTA membranes (Zhang et al. 2014). The separation factors achieved with FAU membranes are not as high as with LTA membranes, but the permeation fluxes are higher with FAU membranes due to the larger pore size of a FAU zeolite (Zhu et al. 2009), which makes them attractive for the dehydration of relatively water-rich solutions. However, the pervaporation dehydration using FAU membranes has not been studied extensively. The performance of the ultra-thin zeolite X (FAU) membranes considered in this study in ethanol dehydration by pervaporation are reported in Table 4 together with other reported ethanol-water pervaporation performances with similar membranes for comparison.

As the pervaporation temperature was increased, the pervaporation flux was increased as expected due to the increase in driving force. As shown in Table 4, the performance of the membranes in this study in terms of flux, separation factor, and PSI is rather similar to that of the thicker membranes reported in the literature.
Table 4. Pervaporation performance of zeolite X membranes in the dehydration of aqueous ethanol (results from this study bolded).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>Feed EtOH (wt.%)</th>
<th>Flux (kg m⁻² h⁻¹)</th>
<th>Separation factor (H₂O/EtOH)</th>
<th>PSI (kg m⁻² h⁻¹)</th>
<th>Membrane thickness (µm)</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 – M4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – M5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – M6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Zhu et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>10 000*</td>
<td>16998</td>
<td>4–5</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Zhu et al. 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Sato et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>20–30</td>
<td>cer-tube</td>
<td>Kita et al. 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where α is α-alumina; cer is ceramic; M4–M6 are membranes used in Paper VI

* denotes being beyond the detection limit of GC

In the case of hydrophilic membranes, the effect of aluminum incorporated in the zeolite structure and the intercrystalline grain boundaries should not have as detrimental effect on pervaporation performance as in the case of hydrophobic membranes (see Section 4.1.1). On the other hand, the contribution of the support may decrease the membrane performance significantly. The effect of the support on membrane performance is analyzed in Section 4.2.

4.1.3 Butanol/water pervaporation using high-silica MFI membranes (Paper I)

Several research groups have focused on butanol recovery from aqueous solutions using polymeric or mixed matrix membranes in pervaporation (Liu et al. 2011a, Pääkkilä et al. 2012, Qureshi et al. 2001). The fluxes using polymeric membranes are typically below 0.5 kg m⁻² h⁻¹ with separation factors below 40 (Dong et al. 2014). For mixed matrix membranes, the fluxes remain mostly below 1 kg m⁻² h⁻¹ and the separation factor below 50 (Huang et al. 2014), although a high butanol/water separation factor of 465 was reported by Negishi et al. (2010) for a silicone rubber-coated silicalite membrane, with a low flux of 0.04 kg m⁻² h⁻¹.

Butanol recovery by pervaporation from dilute solutions using zeolite membranes, on the other hand, had not been studied much before Paper I. The performance of the ultra-thin MFI membranes used in this study in butanol/water separation are reported in Table 5, together with other reported butanol/water pervaporation performances using similar membranes for comparison.
As shown in Table 5, the $n$-butanol/water separation factors in this work are similar to the work of Stoeger et al. (2011), although the fluxes of the studied membranes are considerably higher. In general, the earlier reported fluxes of butanol separation in pervaporation using zeolite membranes are considerably lower compared to the studied membranes, which in turn leads to the PSI being higher with the membranes used in this work (see Table 5). Low flux is a limiting factor considering industrial application due to the need for a high membrane area, and because the costs of pervaporation are dominated by membrane units and membrane replacements (Srinivasan et al. 2007).

Table 5. Pervaporation performance of MFI zeolite membranes in the separation of $n$-butanol/water mixtures (results from this study bolded).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>Feed BuOH (wt.%)</th>
<th>Flux (kg m$^{-2}$h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Separation factor (BuOH/H$_2$O)</th>
<th>PSI (kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Membrane thickness (µm)</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS-tube</td>
<td>Stoeger et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:M1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:M2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Li et al. 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60:M1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60:M2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>α-disc</td>
<td>this study, Paper I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS-tube</td>
<td>Stoeger et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>Shen et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SS-tube</td>
<td>Stoeger et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where SS is stainless steel; α is α-alumina; γ is γ-alumina; M1 and M2 are membranes used in Paper I

In the present work, the $n$-butanol/water separation factor increases noticeably as the temperature increases. This is partly due to the fugacity difference of the feed and permeate of $n$-butanol increasing more relative to that of water and partly due to the increase in the relative permeance of $n$-butanol to water in MFI zeolite with increasing temperature (see e.g. Tables 4 and 5 in Paper I).

As dilute alcohol mixtures cannot be concentrated in a one-step pervaporation unit to anhydrous alcohol, further treatment is required. Yet, even small changes in concentration may lead to high changes in process costs, e.g., when butanol concentration is increased from approximately 1 wt.% to 4 wt.%, considerable energy savings can be achieved in butanol recovery by distillation (Ezeji et al. 2004).
Cost-effective butanol recovery is critical for the successful commercialization of biobutanol production. In fact, in the case of butanol separation, phase separation by decantation can be utilized as the binary n-butanol/water system exhibits partial miscibility. For example, at 30 °C (in atmospheric pressure), n-butanol/water mixture with n-butanol concentration of more than 7 wt.% separates into two phases: an organic concentrated phase with a composition of 80/20 wt.% n-butanol/water, and a low organic concentration in the aqueous phase with a concentration of 7/93 wt.% n-butanol/water.

Thus, if the permeate falls into the immiscible region, the organic phase in the permeate will have a high n-butanol concentration and the aqueous phase a low n-butanol concentration. As an example, in order to produce 80 wt.% n-butanol at 30 °C from 3 wt.% n-butanol solution (corresponding to a separation factor of 130), it would be sufficient to shift the concentration to the immiscible region by pervaporation with membranes displaying a separation factor of above 3. In this case the pervaporation unit should be followed by a settler to carry out the phase separation. After the phase separation, the aqueous phase could be recycled to the feed stream to increase the butanol recovery. The n-butanol-rich phase can be further dehydrated, for instance, by pervaporation using hydrophilic membranes (e.g. FAU or LTA). In this type of process the relative amount of the two phases depends on the membrane separation factor. Thus, separation factors of higher than 3 would definitely be desired. The utilization of phase separation in combination with pervaporation has not been studied extensively. Only recently Zhou et al. (2014b) analyzed the phase separation of the permeate during the pervaporation of ABE-water solution, and concluded that it is possible to obtain a high permeate organic concentration under proper conditions.

The fluxes in n-butanol/water separation by pervaporation in this work are very high, while the separation factors are reasonable. Thus, the membranes in this study may have a potential for n-butanol recovery from dilute aqueous solutions, especially if phase separation is utilized in the process. The effect of support resistance is discussed in Section 4.2.

4.2 Mass transfer resistance caused by the support when using ultra-thin membranes in pervaporation of binary alcohol/water mixtures (Papers I, II and VI)

In essence, a decrease in zeolite film thickness, while assuming that the permeation properties of the film stay the same, should increase the permeation flux in
proportion to the change in the film thickness. Indeed, the membranes of this study with ultra-thin selective layer, have a higher flux than similar, thicker membranes studied in the literature. However, when comparing the fluxes achieved in this study to the ones obtained with thicker membranes (see Tables 3–5), the fluxes of the ultra-thin zeolite membranes in the present work do not increase in proportion to the membrane thickness. The most probable explanation for the smaller fluxes is the flux limitation caused by the membrane support, as the support has been concluded to also decrease the fluxes when using membranes with thicker selective zeolite layers (de Bruijn et al. 2003, Sato et al. 2008b, Weyd et al. 2008, Zah et al. 2006).

The effect of the support on the mass transfer of the composite membrane used in this study is depicted in Fig. 8. As Fig. 8 illustrates, the effective driving force over the membrane is reduced due to the fugacity drop in the supporting layers. The feed-side fugacities can be determined based on the feed-side bulk liquid properties (see Eq. (13)) whereas the component fugacities from the zeolite film-support layer interface downstream can be determined from the gas phase properties. Due to the low pressure, the ideal gas assumption is reasonable. Thus, the component fugacities can be expressed as partial pressures in the support layers.

Fig. 8. Composite zeolite membrane and fugacity profile over the zeolite film (Z) and support layers 1 and 2 (SL1 and SL2).
As the total pressure and composition at the interfaces between the zeolite film and SL1 as well as between SL1 and SL2 cannot be measured directly, some means to calculate the fugacity drop across the support layers is needed, i.e., to describe the mass transfer in the support. As outlined in Section 3.1, in this work it was assumed that both Knudsen diffusion and viscous flow have significance in the transport through the composite support. Thus, the transport in the support layer can be written out as a combination of Knudsen diffusion Eq. (1) and viscous flow Eq. (3) as

\[
J_{i,SL1} = 97K_{SL1} \frac{\bar{T}}{M_i} \frac{\Delta p_{i,SL1}}{I_{SL1}RT} + \left( \frac{B_{eff,i,SL1} \left( p_i,z,SL1 + p_{i,SL1-SL2} \right)}{RT2\eta} \right) \Delta p_{i,SL1}, \tag{25}
\]

\[
J_{i,SL2} = 97K_{SL2} \frac{\bar{T}}{M_i} \frac{\Delta p_{i,SL2}}{I_{SL2}RT} + \left( \frac{B_{eff,i,SL2} \left( p_{i,SL1-SL2} + p_{i,perm} \right)}{RT2\eta} \right) \Delta p_{i,SL2}. \tag{26}
\]

As can be seen in Eqs. (25) and (26), the Knudsen diffusion and viscous flow parameters of the individual support layers are needed. These can be determined on the basis of suitable permeation experiments. With the parameters (see Table 2) and having knowledge of the fluxes from the pervaporation experiments, pressures and compositions at the interfaces can be determined on the basis of Eqs. (25) and (26). The contribution of the support to the mass transfer resistance can be expressed as the relative fugacity drop across the entire support as

\[
\text{the relative fugacity (pressure) drop (\%) } = \frac{f_{i,z,SL1} - f_{i,perm}}{f_{i,feed} - f_{i,perm}} \times 100\%. \tag{27}
\]

The relative contributions of Knudsen diffusion and viscous flow can be calculated; e.g., the Knudsen share can be determined as

\[
\text{Knudsen share (\%) } = \frac{J_{Kn,i,s}}{J_{Kn,i,s} + J_{Vis,c,s}} \times 100\%. \tag{28}
\]

### 4.2.1 High-silica MFI zeolite membranes (Papers I and II)

The relative fugacity drop for each component is determined by Knudsen diffusion and viscous flow on the basis of Eqs. (25)–(28) for different conditions. The effect of the support on the mass transfer for ethanol/water mixture using MFI membranes is introduced in Table 6 and for n-butanol/water in Table 7.
Table 6. Effect of support on the mass transfer in ethanol/water pervaporation experiments (modified from Paper I, published by permission of Elsevier).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membrane</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Ethanol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fugacity drop (%)</td>
<td>Knudsen share (%)</td>
<td>Fugacity drop (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>SL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 30</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 30</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where SL1 is support layer 1; SL2 is support layer 2; M1 and M2 are membranes used in Paper I

Table 7. Effect of support on the mass transfer in n-butanol/water pervaporation experiments (modified from Paper I, published by permission of Elsevier).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membrane</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>n-Butanol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fugacity drop (%)</td>
<td>Knudsen share (%)</td>
<td>Fugacity drop (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>SL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 30</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 30</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where SL1 is support layer 1; SL2 is support layer 2; M1 and M2 are membranes used in Paper I

As can be observed from Table 6 and Table 7 (see also Table 3 in Paper II), the relative fugacity drop over the support for alcohol and water fluxes is substantial, thus limiting the component fluxes considerably. The effect of the support can be reduced by increasing the operating temperature as the relative fugacity drop decreases with increasing temperature. Mass transfer, especially in the narrow-pore support layer SL1, is governed by Knudsen diffusion. Knudsen diffusion favors the permeation of water over ethanol or n-butanol, resulting in lower alcohol/water selectivity. Thus, besides affecting the pervaporation flux, the support affects the separation factor of the pervaporation process. As the composition of the mixture in zeolite film–support layer 1 can be determined on the basis of Eqs. (25) and (26), the separation factor for the zeolite film can be determined from

$$\alpha_{ij} = \frac{w_{i,Z-SL1}}{w_{j,Z-SL1}} / \frac{w_{i,feed}}{w_{j,feed}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(29)}

The separation factor for the zeolite film alone (Eq. (29)) is shown for ethanol/water (10/90 wt.% feed) and n-butanol/water (3/97 wt.% feed) mixtures in
Fig. 9 together with the actual measured separation factors, i.e. including the effect of the support from the experiments at 30 °C and 60 °C (see Tables 3 and 5).

As it is seen in Fig. 9, the support lowers the separation factors of both ethanol/water and \( n \)-butanol/water pervaporation. The decreased effective driving force caused by support resistance is taken into account later in Sections 4.3 and 4.5 where the pervaporation of ethanol/water mixtures and pure component pervaporation through MFI membranes is modeled.
Thus, in addition to membrane thickness affecting the membrane performance, the mass transfer resistance of the support has a significant effect on the flux and selectivity of the supported zeolite membranes. The options for reducing the resistance caused by the support are to reduce the thickness of the support layers, and to increase the size of the support pores and porosity.

An example of supports having a very thin wall thickness is porous ceramic hollow fibers, which have recently been successfully adopted to support zeolite membranes (Pera-Titus et al. 2009, Wang et al. 2009b). Due to the thin wall thickness, hollow fiber supports are claimed to be superior in low transport resistance, and also have other advantages such as high packing density and cost-effectiveness (Dong et al. 2014, Liu et al. 2014, Wang et al. 2009b).

In fact, besides the effect of membrane thickness, the effect of the support can also be roughly evaluated on the basis of the reported support properties in combination with the reported pervaporation performance of MFI membranes in ethanol/water separation. The support properties of the thinnest (film thickness < 5 µm) MFI membranes from Table 3 are collected in Table 8 together with the pervaporation performance of ethanol separation from aqueous streams.

Table 8. Pervaporation performance of very thin MFI zeolite membranes on different supports in ethanol/water separation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Membrane thickness</th>
<th>Pervaporation conditions</th>
<th>Membrane performance</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material - material-geometry</td>
<td>l (mm)</td>
<td>d_pore (µm)</td>
<td>ε (%)</td>
<td>Feed (wt.%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α⁺: SL1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>34ᵇ</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α⁺: SL2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34ᵇ</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-HF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-HF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSZ-HF</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-HF</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>~5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-capillary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-capillary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-tube</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where HF is hollow fiber; YSZ is yttria stabilized zirconia

ᵇ Membrane used in this study has two α-alumina support layers SL1 and SL2

ᵇ see structural parameters in Table 2
The highest flux after the ultra-thin membranes used in this study have been achieved with membranes synthesized on hollow fiber supports (see Table 8, Kosinov et al. 2014 and Shu et al. 2012). Even though the pervaporation conditions, zeolite film thickness and support geometry are similar, the flux in the study of Shu et al. (2012) is approximately twice as high as that in the study of Kosinov et al. (2014). This is most probably due to the reduced support resistance of the thinner hollow fiber support wall with larger pore sizes and porosity in the study of Shu et al. (2012) in comparison to Kosinov et al. (2014) (see Table 8).

The MFI membranes with a membrane thickness of below 5 µm synthesized on α-alumina tubes (tube wall thickness of 3–4 mm, Table 8), on the other hand, exhibit a noticeably lower pervaporation flux in similar pervaporation conditions when compared to membranes synthesized on hollow fiber supports. This is an indirect indication of the lower support resistance of hollow fiber supports. On the other hand, in the study of Sebastian et al. (2010) (see Table 8) the fluxes increased considerably with basically no contribution to the separation factor when only the support pore size of otherwise similar membranes was increased. This is due to the decreased flux limitation caused by the support resistance. Although a quantitative analysis is difficult to make from different sources due to insufficient information especially of support properties, based on the above analysis the support plays an important role in determining the membrane performance. Thus, as well as optimizing the membrane film properties of very thin membranes in particular, optimization of the support properties is crucial.

### 4.2.2 Zeolite X membranes (Paper VI)

In the case of zeolite X membranes, the water/ethanol separation factor is very high (Table 4). Thus, it would be justified to assume water as the only permeating species when calculating the contribution of the support using Eqs. (25) and (26), as it is done in Paper VI and, for instance, in the studies of de Bruijn et al. (2003) and Sato et al. (2008). When including both the components in the calculations, it is shown in Table 9 that for water the fugacity drop (Eq. (27)) is almost 90%, and still more than 50% at higher temperatures, limiting the water flux. On the other hand, the generally low ethanol flux is not limited by the support (Table 9) as it was assumed in Paper VI.
Table 9. Effect of support on the mass transfer in ethanol dehydration by pervaporation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Ethanol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q (x 10^4 mol m^{-2} s^{-1} Pa^{-1})</td>
<td>Fugacity drop (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>SL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where M4–M6 are membranes used in Paper VI

Besides optimizing the membrane synthesis to obtain ultra-thin membranes with high selectivity, optimizing the support mass transfer properties is also very important, so that the fluxes would not become significantly limited by the support. Thinner support layers (see Eqs. (25) and (26)), for example, decrease the resistance caused by the support. In addition, the support resistance can be decreased by using supports with less tortuosity and larger porosity and pores (see Eqs. (2) and (4)).

In this study, the majority of the fugacity drop using zeolite X membranes occurs in the thin supporting layer SL1 (see Table 9), which is why reducing the resistance in SL1 affects the flux relatively more than the thicker layer SL2. The effect of the support on the flux can be demonstrated by changing the support properties while retaining the membrane properties. In addition to the experimental flux using zeolite X membranes M4–M6 with the support used, the predicted flux and separation factor using changed support properties can be viewed in Fig. 10 for the following cases:

- Case 1: Decreasing the SL1 thickness from 30 µm to 10 µm since the ceramic microfiltration membrane used as zeolite membrane supports are typically prepared with layers of between 10–50 µm thick (Purchas & Sutherland 2002).
- Case 2: Decreasing both the SL1 and SL2 thicknesses to one third (SL1 from 30 µm to 10 µm and SL2 from 3 mm to 1 mm). The wall thickness of typical hollow fiber supports is below 1 mm (see Table 8).
- Case 3: Decreasing both the supporting layer thicknesses to one third, and additionally increasing the Knudsen structural parameter $K_{SL1}$ approximately 3-fold from $2.94 \times 10^{-9}$ to $10 \times 10^{-9}$ (almost all the transport in SL1 occurs by Knudsen diffusion, Table 9). The structural parameter $K$ can be affected by pore size, porosity and tortuosity (see Eq. (2)). A threefold increase of, for example, the pore size is very realistic (see e.g. Sebastian et al. 2010).
Fig. 10. Estimated a) fluxes and b) water/ethanol separation factors for membranes M4–M6 prepared on graded support with tailored support properties.

As can be seen from Fig. 10a, the flux could be increased substantially by tailoring the support properties. Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 10b, also the water/ethanol separation factor would increase as a result of tailored support properties. The increase of the separation factor (Eq. (23)) from for example 256 (M4 experiment at 30 °C) to 779 (Case 3 for M4) means an increase of permeate water content from 96.6 wt.% to 98.9 wt.%. Optimizing the support properties is essential in order to
make pervaporation through zeolite membranes an attractive alternative for industrial application.

4.3 Modeling of ethanol/water mixture pervaporation using MFI membranes (Paper II)

As discussed in Section 1, the mass-transfer modeling of pervaporation using hydrophobic zeolite membranes in particular, has been somewhat neglected, even though a lot of laboratory work has been conducted on using hydrophobic zeolite membranes in pervaporation (see Tables 3 and 5). Nevertheless, a semi-empirical model (see Eq. (13)) based on solution-diffusion has been applied, e.g., in the study of Kuhn et al. (2009b) in the removal of ethanol from an aqueous mixture using MFI zeolite membranes.

Although the influence of the support has been analyzed to reduce the driving force through the zeolite layer (Weyd et al. 2008, Zah et al. 2006), the contribution of the support layer is generally omitted when modeling pervaporation in various conditions. As concluded in Section 4.2, the contribution of the support to the mass transfer resistance is substantial in pervaporation using the ultra-thin zeolite membranes. The influence of the support should thus be included in model describing membrane mass transfer, as it reduces the driving force. The reduced fugacity difference can be used as a driving force in modeling the mass transfer of pervaporation of ethanol/water mixtures using high-silica MFI membranes by replacing the permeate side fugacity determined from bulk conditions in Eq. (13) with the fugacity between the zeolite layer and support layer 1 (see Table 5 and Fig. 8) as

$$J_i = Q \left( x_i y_i P_i^\text{ref} - y_{i,Z-SL1} P_{Z-SL1} \right),$$

(30)

The temperature-dependency of permeance $Q_i$ can be described as

$$Q_i = Q_i^\text{ref} \exp \left[ \frac{-E_i^p}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_{\text{ref}}} \right) \right],$$

(31)

where $Q_i^\text{ref}$ is the permeance of component $i$ at a reference temperature $T_{\text{ref}}$, which in this study is the mean temperature of the experiments, and $E_i^p$ is the activation energy of permeance for component $i$, characterizing the temperature effect of adsorption and diffusion in the zeolite layer.
The model based on reduced fugacity in Eq. (30) has not been used earlier in modeling the mass transfer in pervaporation using hydrophobic zeolite membranes. As shown in Section 4.2, the total pressure and the composition and thus the fugacity between the zeolite film and support layer 1 is determined on the basis of the mass transfer model for the support. The model parameters were fitted based on all the available experimental data points, and are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Parameters for transport model (Eqs. (30) and (31), $T_{r,ref} = 50.5 \, ^\circ C$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>component</th>
<th>$Q_m$ (kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$ Pa$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$E_p$ (kJ mol$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ethanol</td>
<td>$6.28 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>-5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>$7.74 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>-14.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fit of the model to the experimental partial fluxes can be seen in Fig. 11. The experimental data points are the mean values of the samples from the same experimental conditions; the error bars represent the standard deviation.

As can be observed in Table 10, the activation energy of both water and ethanol is negative. This implies that the membrane permeance decreases with increasing temperature. Nevertheless, overall, the flux still increases with increasing temperature (see Fig. 11), because the temperature effect on saturated vapor pressure and thus feed side fugacity is so significant. Although the water activation energy of permeance is more negative than that of ethanol leading to water permeance decreasing more with increasing temperature in comparison to ethanol, the effect of the driving force is the opposite (see e.g. Tables 7 and 8 in Paper I). Therefore, the separation factor is relatively independent of temperature.
Fig. 11. Experimental and modelled fluxes for ethanol and water for a) 5 wt.% EtOH, b) 7.5 wt.% EtOH and c) 10 wt.% EtOH mixture as feed. The lines are guidance for the eye. (Paper II)
As shown in Section 4.2, the reduction of the driving force is substantial with the ultra-thin membranes studied in this work. For comparison, Weyd et al. (2008) reported a support pressure drop of approximately 450 Pa for 5 wt.% aqueous ethanol feed at 40 °C (see also Table 3), corresponding to approximately 5% of the total mass transfer resistance with a thicker 50 µm high-silica MFI membrane. If the membranes studied in this work had a similar relative pressure drop (retaining the membrane properties), the predicted total flux for 5 wt.% ethanol feed at 40 °C, using the parameters in Table 10 would be doubled to about 7 kg m⁻² h⁻¹ (the corresponding experimental value with a supported membrane is 3.5 kg m⁻² h⁻¹, see Table 3 and Fig. 7).

Although the model applied performs satisfactorily, it does not take into account, for example, the variation of feed concentration in the permeance, which causes some error in the model predictions. Furthermore, any error in the Knudsen diffusion and viscous flow parameters used to model the support mass transfer behavior (Table 2) propagates additional error in the model predictions.

The semi-empirical model applied in Paper II relies heavily on experiments. Therefore, extrapolation into regions beyond the measurement range can lead to clear errors in the model predictions. It is notable, however, that semi-empirical models have been used in the simulation of hybrid distillation-pervaporation systems in the dehydration of alcohols using polymeric membranes (see e.g. Koczka et al. 2007 and Valentinyi & Mizsey 2014). The main shortcoming of the model applied in Koczka et al. (2007) and Valentinyi & Mizsey (2014) is that a higher number of parameters needs to be estimated than in the model of this work. The higher number of parameters enables model flexibility and better prediction of membrane behavior in varying feed conditions, but the model application requires more extensive experimental work to obtain credible values for the parameters. Thus, due to the satisfactory performance of the model applied in the present work, the model of this work is applicable in the initial stages of conceptual design of an ethanol recovery process that applies pervaporation.

### 4.4 Predicting adsorption on zeolites (Papers III and IV)

In Section 4.3, the applied pervaporation model did not require specification of the adsorption behavior of components in the zeolite or their diffusion behavior in the membrane. However, both of these phenomena have significance in pervaporation. In addition, the usability of the model in varying process conditions increases considerably by the proper description of the prevailing phenomena. Thus, a
description of the adsorption and diffusion behavior should be included in a
detailed membrane model. As discussed in Section 2.2.1, the adsorption data is
typically obtained for zeolite powders, and zeolite membranes are assumed to have
similar properties to the powders. The tools for modeling the adsorption of pure
components and mixtures are studied in Paper III and Paper IV.

4.4.1 Modeling pure component adsorption (Paper III)

Usually the adsorption isotherms of gases and vapors on zeolites are expressed as
a function of pressure. An example of this is illustrated in Fig. 12a for methanol
adsorption at three temperatures on a hydrophobic high-silica MFI zeolite. When
the same adsorption data is presented as a function of $P/P_{\text{sat}}$ as in Fig. 12b, it can
be seen that the data points at different temperatures form a uniform temperature
dependency.
Fig. 12. Methanol adsorption a) as a function of pressure and b) as a function of $P/P_i^{sat}$ on high-silica MFI (Si/Al=990). Data taken from Nayak and Moffat (1988).

The unique relationship between the methanol loadings and $P/P_i^{sat}$ (Fig. 12b) means that the temperature dependency of methanol adsorption on a hydrophobic high-silica zeolite can be represented by pure component saturated vapor pressure $P_i^{sat}$. The overlapping behavior of the adsorption of various components on various types of zeolites is studied in Paper III with the conclusion that the temperature dependency especially of water and short straight-chain alcohol adsorption on zeolites can be covered with the temperature dependency of saturated vapor pressure. Additionally, as concluded in Paper IV, the temperature dependency of
short-chain condensable aliphatic hydrocarbons adsorption on zeolites can be described with the temperature-dependency of pure component saturated vapor pressure. On the other hand, the temperature dependency of the adsorption of aromatics on zeolites could not be represented by saturated vapor pressure alone. An example of water adsorption as a function of $P/P_{i}^{\text{sat}}$ on hydrophilic NaA zeolite (LTA) is illustrated in Fig. 13.

Fig. 13. Water adsorption on a NaA zeolite at different temperatures. Symbols refer to experimental data from Pera-Titus et al. (2008) and solid lines to modified Langmuir model predictions (see Table 11).

The $P/P_{i}^{\text{sat}}$ approach can be used in the context with existing adsorption models by adopting the mathematical form of the existing isotherms and replacing the pressure $P$ term with $P/P_{i}^{\text{sat}}$, which makes the approach flexible and not bound to a certain adsorption isotherm. Instead, the adsorption behavior of pure components on zeolites can be modeled as a function of $P/P_{i}^{\text{sat}}$ with an adsorption model that is able to describe the adsorption data well. In the case of the Langmuir isotherm (isotherm 3 in Table 1), the modified Langmuir model is presented as

$$q_{i} = \frac{q_{i}^{\text{sat}} b_{i}^{*} P}{1 + b_{i}^{*} P/P_{i}^{\text{sat}}},$$

(32)
where $b_i^*$ is a dimensionless and temperature-independent adsorption equilibrium parameter. The application of the proposed $P_i^{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach is straightforward as parameters for $P_i^{\text{sat}}$ are available in numerous textbooks and databanks. The solid line in Fig. 13 refers to the modified Langmuir model prediction, based only on the adsorption data derived at 305 K (see Table 11).

Traditionally the temperature dependency of adsorption is represented e.g., with Eq. (5). Thus, to include the temperature dependency of adsorption, at least data on the heat of adsorption is required. The determination of the heat of adsorption requires experimental data at several temperatures. In the literature, on the other hand, it is common to report the measured adsorption data at only one temperature. The usage of this data (or isotherm) to predict adsorption behavior at another temperature is difficult without heat of adsorption values. Performing adsorption equilibrium measurements at different temperatures may not be a feasible alternative due to limitations of the time and experimental facilities. Hence, due to the lack of applicable adsorption data, the temperature dependency has to be estimated based on the literature values, which can differ substantially even though the adsorption isotherm shape and also the measured adsorption amount on the same type of zeolite at different pressures would otherwise be quite similar. Therefore, sometimes the temperature dependency of adsorption may even have to be neglected in order to estimate the adsorption behavior (see e.g. Bettens et al. 2010). At least the approaches presented in Fig. 14 can be applied to predict adsorption at different temperatures.
When the approach presented in Paper III is used, instead of Eq. (5), the temperature-dependency of the equilibrium parameter can be represented as

$$ b_i = \frac{b_i^*}{P_{sat}}. \quad (33) $$

The dimensionless parameter $b_i^*$ in Eq. (33) can be determined on the basis of extensive pure component adsorption data at only one temperature, and then the adsorption behavior can be predicted at other temperatures.

The fruitful area of predicting the temperature dependency of adsorption on microporous materials on the basis of a minimum amount of adsorption data has also been realized recently in other studies (Krishna 2015, Whittaker et al. 2013). Whittaker et al. (2013) introduced a method to predict the temperature dependency of gas adsorption on solid materials on the basis of one adsorption equilibrium data set at one temperature. Krishna (2015) evaluated the procedure of Whittaker et al. (2013) in the estimation of the heat of adsorption, and also analyzed the applicability of the $P/P_{sat}$ approach developed in this work (Paper III) in the adsorption of components on microporous materials, also other than zeolites. Using the $P_{sat}$ temperature-dependency approach or the method of Whittaker et al. (2013) both have applicability, but they cannot predict the temperature-dependency of adsorption of all adsorbate-adsorbent combinations (Krishna 2015).
Predicting temperature dependency of adsorption using different approaches

Case examples to elucidate the differences between different approaches (see Fig. 14) to predict adsorption behavior are presented below for the adsorption of water on NaA zeolite (see Fig. 13). In modeling adsorption, the Langmuir isotherm (isotherm 3 in Table 1) for Cases 1–4 and the modified Langmuir isotherm Eq. (32) for Case 5 were applied as a Langmuir-type isotherm can describe the applied adsorption data well. In all the cases, the adsorption is predicted at 423 K. The following cases are included:

- Case 1: The adsorption parameters are determined traditionally for the Langmuir isotherm based on all the adsorption experiments at various temperatures, parameters obtained from Pera-Titus et al. (2008).

In all the other cases it is assumed that adsorption data is available at only 305 K, and thus the adsorption parameters are fitted based on data at that temperature. The temperature dependency is predicted in some other way, or totally omitted as it is sometimes done when there is a lack of adsorption data (Bettens et al. 2010).

- Case 2: The temperature dependency is estimated by the value of lower limit of heat of adsorption from the literature, which ranges for water adsorption in NaA zeolite from approximately 20 to 120 kJ mol⁻¹ as reviewed by Loughlin (2009) and Murdmaa & Serpinskii (1972).

- Case 3: The temperature dependency is estimated similarly to Case 2, except that the higher limit of heat of adsorption value is used.

- Case 4: The temperature-dependency is totally omitted.

- Case 5: The $P/P_{sat}$ approach (Paper III) is used where the temperature dependency of pure component saturated vapor pressure alone is used to describe the temperature dependency of adsorption.

Table 11 shows the adsorption parameters for the different cases and Fig. 15 the adsorption prediction of different cases as a function of pressure at 423 K, together with the experimental data points at that temperature, from Pera-Titus et al. (2008).
Table 11. Langmuir isotherm (Cases 1–4) and modified Langmuir isotherm parameters (Case 5) for water adsorption on a NaA zeolite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>T (K)</th>
<th>$b_1$ (Pa$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$b_1^*$ (-)</th>
<th>$q_1^{sat}$ (mol kg$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\Delta H^{ads}$ (kJ mol$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1$^a$</td>
<td>363.4</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>20$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>120$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76.46</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ From Pera-Titus et al. (2008)

$^b$ The lower and $^c$ the higher limit of heat of adsorption values.

Fig. 15. Water adsorption loadings on NaA zeolite at 423 K predicted using different temperature-dependency approaches (Table 11). Experimental data from Pera-Titus et al. (2008).

The average percentage deviation for adsorption $\Delta q_i$ (%) was determined as

$$\Delta q_i = \frac{100}{C} \sum_{j=1}^{C} \left| \frac{q_{i,exp} - q_{i,\text{pred}}}{q_{i,exp}} \right|,$$

where $C$ is the number of data points. The average percentage deviation for water adsorption on NaA zeolite in different cases is presented in Table 12.
Table 12. Average percentage deviation $\Delta q_i$ for different cases of adsorption prediction of water on the NaA zeolite at 423 K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
<th>Case 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>349.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>692.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 12 and the observed overlapping behavior in Fig. 15, the accuracy provided by the $P/P_{\text{sat}}$ approach (Case 5) is very similar to that obtained using the traditional approach (Case 1) of having extensive adsorption equilibrium data at various temperatures to determine the adsorption parameters. When the traditional case of fitting the adsorption parameters at one temperature (305 K), and using the lower limit literature heat of adsorption value (Case 2), the adsorption at 423 K is clearly overestimated. On the other hand, if the higher limit literature heat of adsorption value (Case 3) is used, the adsorption is severely underestimated. When temperature dependency is omitted (Case 4), the adsorption is severely overestimated at a substantially higher temperature than where the adsorption parameters were obtained.

If adsorption equilibrium data are abundantly available at several temperatures, it is natural to use the traditional approach (Case 1) to model adsorption. However, based on Fig. 15 and Table 12 it can be concluded that with adsorption data at one temperature, the largely varying literature $-\Delta H_{\text{ads}}^*$ values cause uncertainty in predicting adsorption. Selecting an inappropriate literature value for the heat of adsorption may cause the traditional approach to fail. Thus, with a lack of adsorption data as a function of temperature, by applying the pure component saturated vapor pressure temperature dependency, adsorption can be predicted in a straightforward manner having a theoretical base, which is particularly valuable for engineers for process design purposes. The main limit of the approach with respect to temperature is the validity range of the vapor pressure, i.e., the proposed approach is only suitable for components in subcritical conditions. For instance, the approach can be used as a modeling tool in mass-transfer modeling of pervaporation using zeolite membranes, where knowledge of adsorption is essential.

Moreover, the studies of $P/P_{\text{sat}}$ behavior of multiple cases in Paper III support the conception that saturation loading is essentially independent of temperature. However, occasionally in the literature, saturation loading is also estimated for each temperature separately as in the studies of Kim et al. (2003), Loughlin (2009), and Ryu et al. (2002). This leads typically to a decline in the saturation loading with increasing temperature, which in general may be merely a result of the lack of adsorption data over a sufficiently wide pressure range. The approach may even
lead to changes of an order of magnitude in the $q_i^{\text{sat}}$ value (Kim et al. 2005), which is highly unlikely in the given context. The need for estimating saturation loading separately can be avoided when using the $P_i^{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach (Paper III).

A summary of the systematic and engineering-friendly procedure to model pure component adsorption on zeolites developed in this work is introduced in Fig. 16.

**Fig. 16.** $P_i^{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach to model pure component adsorption on zeolites. (Paper III, published by permission of Elsevier)
4.4.2 Predicting mixture adsorption (Paper IV)

Mixture adsorption data is scarce in the literature, which is natural due to the considerable number of different types of adsorbents and adsorbate combinations. In addition, mixture adsorption measurements are more prone to error than pure component adsorption. Hence, there is a clear need to predict mixture adsorption based on pure component adsorption.

In Paper IV the $P/P_{\text{sat}}$ approach investigated in Paper III and Section 4.4.1 is applied to predict mixture adsorption on zeolites. The basic idea is to fit pure component adsorption parameters at one temperature for each component (the temperatures do not have to be the same), using the $P_{\text{sat}}$ temperature dependency (Fig. 16). Then the mixture adsorption is predicted at a different temperature than where the pure component data was obtained, with a suitable mixture adsorption model discussed in Section 2.2.2.

The application of the $P/P_{\text{sat}}$ approach together with IAST to predict mixture adsorption is demonstrated for water/ethanol mixture adsorption on a NaA zeolite, which was investigated in Paper IV. The fitted water adsorption parameters of water adsorption on the NaA zeolite at 305 K, using the modified Langmuir model Eq. (32), is shown in Section 4.4.1 (see Case 5 in Table 11 and Fig. 13). For ethanol, the parameters and fit of the model are presented in Table 4 and Fig. 3b in Paper IV.

Fig. 17 shows the water/ethanol mixture adsorption loading predictions at a higher temperature (333 K) than where the pure component adsorption parameters had been fitted (305 K). For comparison, as well as using the $P_{\text{sat}}$ temperature dependency, a case of IAST prediction with no temperature dependency of adsorption is shown in Fig. 17. In order to be able to evaluate the predictions, mixture experimental data points (taken from Pera-Titus et al. (2008)) are also included in Fig. 17. The error bars indicate the uncertainty of the measured mixture data points given in Pera-Titus et al. (2008).
As shown in Fig. 17, using the \( P_{sat} \)^{\text{P/P}} temperature-dependency approach with IAST is a feasible method in predicting water/ethanol mixture adsorption on NaA zeolite. When the temperature dependency is omitted, IAST clearly overestimates water adsorption loading and underestimates that of ethanol, as illustrated in Fig. 17.

As shown in Fig. 17 and concluded in Paper IV, reasonably good mixture adsorption predictions can be achieved using the \( P_{sat} \)^{\text{P/P}} temperature-dependency approach (presented in Paper III and Section 4.4.1) in conjunction with a suitable mixture adsorption model. The approach is not restricted to the vapor phase as it is also applicable in the modeling of liquid phase adsorption (Paper IV). Adsorption isotherms in the literature are typically presented as a function of pressure \( P \) as shown in Table 1, but they can also be expressed as a function of fugacity \( f \) to emphasize the non-idealities of the bulk phase, by replacing pressure with fugacity. Thus, e.g. the modified Langmuir model (see Eq. (32)) can be expressed as

\[
q_i = \frac{q_i^{\text{sat}} h_i f_i}{1 + h_i^* f_i^{\text{P/P}}}. \tag{35}
\]
The gas phase can be considered ideal at low or moderate pressures. Thus, the fugacity of a component can be expressed as partial pressure in the conditions. Instead, for the liquid phase fugacities, activity coefficients are applied if the liquid mixture contains polar components like water, see Eq. (13).

Hence, it can be concluded that the $P_i^{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach with IAST is a versatile method of predicting both liquid mixture and vapor mixture adsorption on zeolites. The approach could be used in e.g., in modeling the mass transfer in pervaporation or vapor permeation, where both adsorption and diffusion phenomena are important.

4.5 Modeling ethanol and water unary pervaporation using MFI membranes (Paper V)

Mass transfer models for pervaporation are based on the phenomena occurring in the process. In Paper V, the Maxwell-Stefan formalism (see Section 2.3) was used to model the mass transfer of pure ethanol and water through an ultra-thin supported high-silica MFI membrane. Together with pure component adsorption isotherms and pervaporation flux measurements, Maxwell-Stefan modeling allows the estimation of component diffusivities in zeolites.

For single-component diffusion, inserting Eq. (15) into Eq. (14), and considering mass transfer only in the $z$ direction perpendicular to the membrane surface, the molar flux of component $i$ across the membrane can be expressed as

$$J_i = -\rho q_i^m \Gamma D_{zi} \frac{d\theta}{dz}. \quad (36)$$

The steady-state single-component molar flux can be obtained by integrating Eq. (36) in combination with the modified Langmuir model Eq. (32), assuming adsorption equilibrium on both sides of the membrane as

$$J_i = \frac{\rho q_i^m}{l} \int_0^\theta \frac{D_{zi}(\theta) d\theta}{1-\theta_i}. \quad (37)$$

The coverage dependency of MS surface diffusivity $D_{zi}$ of ethanol and water in MFI zeolites has not been studied experimentally in the literature. The simplest scenario is to consider $D_{zi}$ to be independent of the occupancy fraction of component $i$ according to Eq. (18). Guo et al. (2011) assumed a coverage-independent MS diffusivity in modeling the pervaporation of water and ethanol through hydrophilic NaA zeolite membranes. The study of Krishna & van Baten
(2010), using configurational-bias Monte Carlo (CBMC) and MD simulations, shows that the MS diffusivities of water and alcohols may have several types of coverage dependencies, depending on the investigated adsorbate-adsorbent combination. Without experimental evidence, the use of coverage-independent MS surface diffusivity is a good first step approximation. With this approximation, the MS surface diffusivity can be assumed to present the average diffusivity value across the membrane, including all the pathways to mass transfer. With coverage-independent $D_{i,z}$, i.e. $D_{i,A}(\theta) = D_{i,A}(0)$, the permeation flux Eq. (37) is reduced to

$$J_i = \frac{\rho q_{i,sat} D_{i,z}(0)}{l} \ln \left( \frac{1 + b_i^f f_i^{f,sat}}{1 + b_i^f f_i^{f,sat}} \right).$$

(38)

The MS diffusivity follows the Arrhenius-type temperature dependency (see Eq. (12)). To enable efficient parameter estimation, typically the MS diffusivity value is estimated at the reference temperature $T_{ref}$. Hence, the MS surface diffusivities at zero loading are expressed as

$$D_{i,z}(0) = D_{i,z}^{0}(T_{ref}) \exp \left[ \frac{-E_{i,z}^{\text{diff}}}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_{ref}} \right) \right].$$

(39)

The Maxwell-Stefan model, Eq. (11), does not in principle take into account the effect of support. However, when the permeate-side fugacity is considered from the zeolite-support interface in Eq. (38) (estimated similarly to Section 4.2, details in Paper V), the driving force is corrected by the resistance in the support.

As it can be seen in Eq. (38), the evaluation of the flux requires knowledge of the physical properties of the film and adsorption behavior of the components under investigation. As the measurement of adsorption straight from ultra-thin zeolite membranes is not possible, the adsorption data were taken from the literature. The selected data sets were obtained from adsorption measurements on similar high-silica MFI zeolites to those used in the pervaporation studies of this work. However, it is worth noting that there are discrepancies between the available adsorption data sets. Ethanol adsorption has been shown to present relatively comparable results with zeolites of different Si/Al ratios, whereas water uptake can differ considerably (Zhang et al. 2012a).

The adsorption data for ethanol was acquired from the study of Nayak & Moffat (1988) and for water from Li et al. (2001). The data from Li et al. (2001) is
very similar to the water adsorption data on silicalite-1 from Flanigen et al. (1978), and also qualitatively similar (same shape of the isotherm) as, e.g., the water adsorption reported by Ohlin et al. (2013) in a Na-ZSM-5 zeolite film with a similar Si/Al ratio compared to the zeolite membranes used in this study. The saturation loadings of both pure ethanol and water in high-silica MFI are approximately 2.8 mol kg\(^{-1}\) (Farhadpour & Bono 1996). This value was given for \(q_i^{\text{sat}}\) of both the components. The modified Langmuir isotherm Eq. (32) is used as the adsorption model. The dimensionless parameter \(b_i^*\) was determined for ethanol on the basis of data at 293 K and for water at 298 K, being 75.872 for ethanol and 5.891 for water. The fit of the models to experimental data is shown in Fig. 18.

![Ethanol and water adsorption on high-silica MFI zeolite. Open symbols refer to experimental adsorption data (ethanol from Nayak and Moffat (1988) and water from Li et al. (2001)). Lines refer to modified Langmuir model predictions. (Paper V, reprinted with permission from ACS)](image)

The fitted adsorption models were used to predict adsorption of ethanol and water in a high-silica MFI zeolite membrane at 30–70 °C. The temperature dependency of adsorption was accounted for through \(P_i^{\text{sat}}\) as described in Paper III and Section 4.4.1.

The relative fugacity drop (see Eq. (27)) across the support for water was calculated to be 70 % at 31°C, decreasing at higher temperatures, thus affecting the driving force considerably. In fact, although the fugacity drop for ethanol was below 10 % at each experimental temperature, it also has a considerable effect on the ethanol coverage at the permeate side of the membrane due to the Langmuirian-
type adsorption behavior characterized by the steep increase in loading with increasing fugacity (see Fig. 18). Thus, even a minor increase in the fugacity at low pressures typical of the permeate side of the membrane leads to appreciable changes in the surface coverage. Thus, it is important to include the effect of the support, as otherwise the derived diffusivities would be reduced in value.

The parameters for Eq. (38) along with Eq. (39) for the temperature-dependency were fitted on the basis of all the experimental data points. The parameters are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Parameters for ethanol and water mass-transfer models (Eqs. (38) and (39), \(T_{ref} = 322\ K\), 95 % Confidence interval, t distribution assumed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>component</th>
<th>(D_{ij}(T_{ref}) \times 10^{-11} m^2 s^{-1})</th>
<th>(E_i^d) (kJ mol(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ethanol</td>
<td>0.046±0.0043</td>
<td>40.7±6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>1.68±0.083</td>
<td>30.3±2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fit of the formed Maxwell-Stefan based model to the experimental fluxes is illustrated in Fig. 19. The experimental data points in Fig. 19 are the mean values of the samples at the same experimental conditions; error bars represent the standard deviation. For water, the predicted flux fits within the standard deviation of the experiments, and for the flux of ethanol the average percentage of deviation (Eq. (34)) for the flux is approximately 15%.

![Fig. 19. Experimental and predicted ethanol and water fluxes in the unary permeation experiments as a function of temperature.](image)
The water MS diffusivity (see Table 13, and Tables 4 and 5 in Paper V) is larger than that of ethanol. That is at least partly due to the larger kinetic diameter of ethanol (0.43 nm) compared to that of water (0.30 nm), which causes ethanol to have more trouble jumping from one adsorption site to another site in the zeolite pores than water. The activation energy of diffusion for a larger ethanol molecule is as expected larger than that of water. Maxwell-Stefan modeling comprises both intracrystalline diffusion as well as adsorption, but real zeolite membranes consist of complexly intergrown zeolite crystals with defects. The application of MS modeling to steady-state permeation through zeolite membranes includes all the pathways involved in mass transfer. Thus, the diffusivities determined in this work are generally a little higher than those transport diffusivities determined by other macroscopic measurement methods using zeolite powder (see Tables 4 and 5 in Paper V).

Ethanol and water self-diffusivities in MFI type zeolites determined either by microscopic methods or by MD simulations are several orders of magnitude higher than those obtained in this study or by other macroscopic measurement techniques (see Tables 4 and 5 in Paper V). Although consistent with the results typically obtained with macroscopic vs. microscopic methods, the extent of deviation is considerable. Yang et al. (2007), for example, computed self-diffusivity coefficients by molecular dynamics simulation for water as $26 \times 10^{-10}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ and for ethanol $1.2 \times 10^{-10}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ at 303 K. If these diffusivity values were used in predicting ethanol and water transport at 30 °C under the same reduced fugacity and zeolite film properties as in this study (Eq. 38), the predicted ethanol flux would be approximately 500 kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$ (experimental value 0.5 kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$), and water flux approximately 400 kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$ (experimental value 1.5 kg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$). Thus, the predicted fluxes would be severely overestimated, in proportion to the difference in the diffusion coefficients. Considerable overestimation of unary pervaporation fluxes can be found e.g. in the study of Guo et al. (2011). According to Guo et al. (2011), the overestimation of pervaporation flux is caused probably by the combination of the resistance of the support layer, defects and the multi-crystalline zeolite film structure. However, it is also highly likely that the simulated high diffusivity values have an effect on the overestimation of the unary fluxes.

Molecular simulations in general do not take into account the polycrystalline nature of the membrane. Thus, the quantitative prediction of membrane permeation by molecular simulations is still facing challenges. On the basis of this work, it is recommended that the diffusivities should be determined from pervaporation flux
measurements rather than the other methods due to the real zeolite membrane properties differ from those of individual crystals.

The quantitative prediction of mixture pervaporation using MS modeling would ideally be possible on the basis of pure component adsorption isotherms and pervaporation data (see Section 2.3). As analyzed in Sections 4.2 and 4.5, including the description of the support is important in membrane models, but also the incorporation of defects, for example, into the detailed mass transfer model would be important. Thus, further work is required on the development of reliable prediction procedures for mixture pervaporation using zeolite membranes.
5 Conclusions

Pervaporation is seen as a viable separation alternative in the purification of bio-based alcohols. Especially bioethanol upgrading is actively studied on laboratory scale. The main constraint of hydrophobic membranes in e.g., ethanol/water pervaporation has been the low flux, although the achieved separation factors especially in the case of zeolite membranes are reasonably high. The increase of pervaporation flux, while the separation factor stays the same, reduces the required membrane area, and size of the membrane unit. This in turn means that a high pervaporation flux is highly beneficial in industrial applications as the costs of pervaporation are determined by the size and number of membrane units.

The flux through a membrane can be increased by decreasing the membrane thickness. In this work, ultra-thin (0.5–1 µm) alumina-supported MFI and FAU zeolite membranes were studied in the pervaporation of aqueous ethanol/n-butanol solutions. Due to the low zeolite film thickness, the fluxes achieved in this work are generally higher than those reported earlier. Use of thin zeolite membranes in pervaporation, however, constitutes another challenge as the relative resistance caused by the support becomes significant, affecting membrane performance negatively. As analyzed in Section 4.2, the support used reduces both the separation factor and the flux in this work considerably. Thus, besides optimizing the operating conditions, the support resistance should be minimized by optimizing the support properties. This is important as otherwise the benefit of the thinner selective zeolite layer is partly lost.

Based on the experimental results, it can be concluded that the membranes studied in this work have potential in the recovery of products in bioethanol and biobutanol production. The design of pervaporation-based processes for the applications requires tools to evaluate the process feasibility. Mass-transfer models for the applied membranes can be used as a tool in the feasibility studies. An example of mass-transfer models is semi-empirical models, which can be used when there is empirical permeation data available for the investigated mixtures. In this work, this type of a model, based originally on the solution-diffusion theory of polymeric membranes, was applied in describing the mass transfer of ethanol/water mixtures in pervaporation using MFI zeolite membranes, based on experiments of several feed compositions at various temperatures. In the semi-empirical model used, the phenomena occurring in the zeolite film were combined into one permeance term, which can be considered as a significant simplification in
comparison to the phenomena occurring in reality. The effect of support resistance was also taken into account in modeling the mass transfer in pervaporation.

The correlation between the experiments and the semi-empirical model used was acceptable. Although performing relatively well in the experimental range, the model relies heavily on the experiments due to the semi-empirical nature of the model. Thus, it should be used with caution if extrapolating outside the experimental area. This type of model is still sufficient for the early stages of process design, i.e. when the operating conditions of the pervaporation unit have not yet been fixed or alternatively when the purpose is to compare different type of membranes in a given separation task.

The semi-empirical pervaporation model in this work did not require any additional information about the adsorption of components on the zeolite or the diffusion in the membrane. However, as both of these phenomena are considered important in pervaporation, including them in the membrane model is desirable.

Single-component adsorption isotherms on zeolites can be found in the literature, although typically they are reported at only one temperature. The large variation in heat of adsorption values causes uncertainty in predicting the temperature-dependency of adsorption, as it was demonstrated in Section 4.4.1. In this work, a simple tool was developed to utilize pure component saturated vapor pressure in representing the temperature-dependency of adsorption on zeolites. The application of the $P_{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach is straightforward, as temperature-dependency parameters for $P_{\text{sat}}$ are abundantly available. The proposed approach, however, can be used only in subcritical conditions. As shown in Section 4.4.2, reasonably good mixture adsorption predictions can be achieved using the developed approach in conjunction with a suitable mixture adsorption model. As a result of this work, vapor and also liquid adsorption can be predicted in various conditions on the basis of extensive pure component adsorption equilibrium data at one temperature. The approach can be applied in modeling zeolite-membrane based processes, for instance, pervaporation.

Besides adsorption, knowledge of diffusion behavior, and diffusivities, is essential in evaluating transport through zeolite films. Both phenomena are taken into account in Maxwell-Stefan modeling of pervaporative transport using zeolite membranes. In the present work, Maxwell-Stefan modeling was applied for unary permeation, together with pure component adsorption isotherms and pervaporation flux measurements, in the estimation of component diffusivities in zeolites. The diffusivities determined by different techniques differ considerably, which unfortunately can result in large deviations in predicted fluxes using zeolite
membranes, as demonstrated in Section 4.5. Thus, when the defects and zeolite pores are not considered separately in the model describing membrane mass-transfer, it is recommended to estimate the diffusivities from real membranes as it is done in the present work. As the direct measurement of the adsorption properties of the ultra-thin zeolite membranes studied is not possible, the adsorption data for unary permeation modeling were taken from the literature. The $P_{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach developed in this work was used to describe the temperature dependency of adsorption in unary pervaporation modeling.
6 Future perspectives

The ultra-thin membranes studied in this work exhibit a high membrane flux with a modest separation factor. The influence of the support is concluded in the present work to significantly reduce the membrane performance. However, in case of hydrophobic MFI membranes, even after eliminating the contribution of the support, the alcohol/water separation factors of the zeolite film in this study remain lower than reported in most literature studies. Further studies are needed to better understand the microstructure of the membranes. With this knowledge, the main factors affecting membrane separation can be identified, and the means of increasing the separation factor of ultra-thin membranes can be developed.

The membranes used in this work were characterized as having a small amount of flow-through defects, which are detectable by permoporometry and SEM. However, some of the defects, in the form of open grain boundaries cannot be detected with those methods. These defects may have significance in relation to the membrane separation performance. In the case of ethanol or n-butanol separation from aqueous solutions with zeolite membranes, the open grain boundaries are assumed to be water-selective pathways. Hence, the grain boundaries have a negative effect on membrane performance. The low film thickness may result in a greater negative effect of directly undetectable open grain boundaries than in the case of thicker membranes. This is because, with increasing film thickness, the crystal grains most probably have the chance to inter-grow better i.e. the proportion of flow-through defects decreases.

For future research, due to the lack of direct analysis methods, the effect of grain boundaries should be studied indirectly e.g. by testing similarly synthesized thicker pervaporation membranes. However, as concluded in Section 4.1.1, aluminum incorporated from the α-alumina support into the zeolite framework reduces the membrane hydrophobicity. Hence, the increase of film thickness could reduce the possible negative effects of aluminum. Thus, it would be difficult to separate the effects of grain boundaries and aluminum incorporation from each other, when alumina supports are used. Therefore, whether or not aluminum has a negative effect on the performance of thin zeolite membranes in pervaporation, should be studied using aluminum-free supports, e.g., other metal oxides like titania or zirconia.

Similarly to the membranes in this work, MFI zeolites are commonly synthesized in basic media with OH⁻ ions as the mineralizing agent. However, as discussed in Section 2.1.3, OH⁻ ions result in zeolite intracrystalline defects, which
decrease the hydrophobicity. Using fluoride ions as the mineralizing agent at near neutral conditions instead of OH\textsuperscript{-} in zeolite synthesis, results in silicalite-1 with the lowest water adsorption reported in the literature (Zhang et al. 2012a). Therefore, synthesis via a fluoride-mediated route has also attracted recently zeolite membrane fabrication research. In fact, the fluoride-mediated zeolite membrane synthesis route has been noticed to decrease the amount of intercrystalline defects considerably in addition to intracrystalline defects (Zhou et al. 2014). This could have a profound effect on pervaporation performance, and thus using ultra-thin MFI membranes prepared via the fluoride-route (Zhou et al. 2014) should be studied in pervaporation.

As concluded, the membranes studied in this work have potential in the product recovery of bioethanol and biobutanol production. The potential should be investigated in more detail in the future. Typically the most attention in zeolite membrane research is paid to preparing more selective membranes. As discussed in Section 4.1.1, it is not that straightforward, however, to conclude which kind of membrane is the best for each separation case. The optimal membrane might not be the highly selective membrane if it is accompanied with low flux, but rather a membrane with a high flux with acceptable selectivity. In the future, more effort should be targeted to evaluating the performance and feasibility of processes based on the use of pervaporation. Complete replacement of distillation as the most typical separation process with pervaporation units might be difficult, but more research, development and collaborative efforts should be targeted to consideration of distillation-pervaporation hybrid processes.

The adsorption parameters used in zeolite membrane modeling, including this work, are typically obtained from zeolite powder measurements, although zeolite membrane adsorption properties are not necessarily similar to those of powders. The distinctive features between adsorption on zeolite powders and membranes has not been sufficiently investigated. Further development of adsorption measurement methods is needed to enable investigation of the adsorption on thin zeolite membranes. In addition, the $P_{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach applied in this study was concluded to cover at least the temperature dependency of water, short straight-chain alcohols and short-chain condensable aliphatic hydrocarbons adsorption on zeolites, but not of aromatics adsorption on zeolites. In the future the temperature dependency of adsorption of also other adsorbates on zeolites as well as on other adsorbents using the $P_{\text{sat}}$ temperature-dependency approach could be studied.
Maxwell-Stefan modeling, as performed in this work, as such does not take the defects in the membrane structure into account. Thus, the diffusivities determined in this work include the effects of non-idealities in the structure of the membrane. The incorporation of defects into a detailed mass-transfer model would be important as zeolite membranes even with reasonable separation performance have nanometer-sized grain boundary defects. The adsorption-diffusion mechanism is also considered to be the prevailing transport mechanism in these grain boundary defects (Yu et al. 2011). The adsorption and diffusion parameters of defects, however, are difficult to quantify due to the different sizes of non-zeolite pores. Hence, there is still work to be done in the detailed modeling of the pervaporation process in the future. The inclusion of defects in the membrane model could be started by relating the permoporometry data to pervaporation similarly to what has been done previously for gas permeation applications (Jareman et al. 2004, Kangas et al. 2013).

Zeolite membranes are stated to be stable, but most often the pervaporation experiments on laboratory scale are performed within short periods of time. Thus, more long-term stability tests are required. Moreover, similar to this work, typically most studies in pervaporation using hydrophobic zeolite membranes are conducted on binary water/alcohol solutions, although the actual process stream, e.g., the fermentation broth in bioethanol or biobutanol production is generally a multi-component mixture containing a variety of by-products. Naturally, the by-products have an influence on the separation process, e.g., succinic acid has been found to decrease the pervaporation performance of high-silica MFI membranes in ethanol fermentation (Ikegami et al. 2002). As the understanding and modeling of the pervaporation process of aqueous alcohol solutions were the objectives in this thesis, only binary mixtures were studied. However, the effects of fermentation by-products and thus multi-component mixtures certainly have to be addressed in the future.

Active laboratory-scale pervaporation research should be complemented with more efforts in scaling up the process from laboratory to industry. There are still many challenges to enable the usage of especially hydrophobic zeolite membranes in pervaporation separations in the industry. Nevertheless, despite the challenges, in terms of the unique microporous structure and properties of zeolites, zeolite membranes are currently suitable for multiple applications, and are likely to remain potential alternatives for pervaporation separation in the future.
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