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Abstract

3D printing offers the flexibility to achieve favourable spacer geometrical modification. The role of 3D printed spacers for organic fouling mitigation in direct contact membrane distillation (DCMD) is evaluated. Compared to a commercial spacer, the design of 3D printed triply periodic minimal surfaces spacers (Gyroid and tCLP) - varying filament thickness and smaller hydraulic diameter enhanced DCMD fluxes by 50-65%. The highest DCMD flux was obtained with the 3D tCLP spacer due to its specific geometrical design feature. However, its design characteristics resulted in higher channel pressure drop compared to 3D Gyroid spacer. Moreover, 3D Gyroid spacer exhibited superior fouling mitigation (lower membrane organic mass deposition and reversible membrane hydrophobicity with humic acid solution), attributed to its tortuous design that repelled foulants. 3D Gyroid spacer was effective in achieving high water recovery (85%) while maintaining good quality distillate (10-15 µS/cm, 99% ion rejection) in DCMD with wastewater concentrate that contained high organics, mixed with inorganics. In MD, high organic contents minimally affected MD fluxes but reduced membrane hydrophobicity. Repeated DCMD cycles showed that organic pre-treatment as well as cleaning-in-place of membrane and spacer are essential for achieving high recovery rate while maintaining a stable long-term DCMD operation with wastewater concentrate.
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1. Introduction

Membrane distillation (MD) is a thermal integrated membrane process driven by a vapour pressure gradient across a microporous and hydrophobic membrane [1, 2]. As a phase separation process, MD produces high quality permeate (distillate) with a good recovery due to its insensitivity to osmotic pressure of a highly saline solution [3]. The energy requirement for MD can be met by waste heat from the industry [3]. These factors have led to a focus on the application of MD as an alternative treatment process for wastewater [4], seawater [5] and other saline solutions from the industry [6].

Direct contact MD (DCMD) is the most frequently studied MD configuration due to its simplicity [3, 7]. In the DCMD configuration, the hot feed and cold distillate streams are in direct contact with the membrane, thus, heat conduction and temperature polarization are significant factors governing the energy efficiency. Several operational approaches have been explored to reduce the impact of temperature polarization and increase the overall performance of DCMD, such as improving the hydrodynamic conditions at the membrane surface by increasing the circulation flow rate or generating a suction (vacuum) on the distillation side [8, 9]. Another noteworthy approach is to improve the design of the membrane spacer. Previous studies have shown that spacers act as static turbulence promoter to enhance the efficiency of transmembrane mass transfer, thereby, increasing permeate fluxes by up to 60% compared to an empty channel [10-14].

1.1 3D printed spacers for MD

The effectiveness of spacers is highly dependent on factors such as mesh design, thickness, flow attack angle, and materials. The onset of 3D printing has enabled the fabrication of novel spacers with complex mesh designs, varying thickness and materials without manufacturing restraints. The performance of 3D printed spacers have been previously evaluated in reverse osmosis (RO) and ultrafiltration (UF) processes [15-19]. These studies reported considerable enhancement in mass
transfer with 3D spacers compared to conventional feed spacers. Nevertheless, an invariable trade-off with spacers is pressure drop [18], which increases the energy consumption of the process. Even so, the significant enhancement in water recovery may potentially offset the overall energy consumption.

The application of 3D printed spacers for MD has not been explored in detail thus far. Most studies used computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations to evaluate the effect of spacer geometrical parameters such as orientation, filament diameter, and thickness to identify optimal spacers for MD [10, 13, 14]. For instance, Chang et al. [10] used CFD simulations to study transmembrane DCMD transfer mechanism using empty and spacer-filled channels. The simulations established the benefits of using spacers in DCMD for enhanced mass flux as well as heat transfer and these enhancement factors depended on both the spacer design as well as the operating parameters such as the Reynolds number. Taamneh and Bataineh [20] used CFD simulations to evaluate the performance of DCMD with thick spacers with varied filament orientation (angle) and reported a positive increase of shear stress and the Nusselt number with spacer filaments oriented at 45° angles to the flow channel. Similarly, based on simulation results, Seo et al. [12] recommended zigzag spacers with symmetric circular designs and relatively high filament numbers as ideal to enhance permeate flux. These simulation studies imply the suitability of 3D spacers for MD application. In another study, Hagedorn et al. [21] highlighted that spacer characteristics such as porosity and spacer and filament thickness attributed to higher hydraulic diameter, which contributed towards turbulence (larger Reynolds) in DCMD. This factor is especially relevant for 3D printed spacers, as they can be fabricated at varied filament and spacer thickness. Thomas et al. [7] analyzed the performance of MD with 3D printed spacers and reported on enhanced permeate flux and overall heat transfer coefficient by up to 60% compared to commercial spacers. The performance enhancement was attributed to the significantly higher
turbulence induced by the maze-like interpenetrating design characteristics of triply periodic minimal surfaces (TPMS) used as the spacer topologies.

1.2 Potential of 3D printed spacers for fouling mitigation in MD

Apart from flux enhancement, spacer design can influence fouling and channel pressure drop in membrane processes. The presence of spacers enhances flow turbulence, which improves the mixing of the solution close to the membrane surface with the bulk solution. This, in turn, is expected to prevent foulant layer build-up on the membrane surface [22, 23]. A number of RO studies have established that spacer characteristics such as larger mesh size with varying/irregular filament thickness play a significant role in maintaining reasonable pressure drop, while creating high shear stress at the membrane surface, which is essential to avoid polarization and fouling issues [17, 24, 25]. These studies demonstrated the potential for fouling reduction using spacers with specific characteristics. 3D spacers can potentially meet such characteristics, given that the technology has the flexibility to fabricate spacers with complex features.

Organic fouling development in MD was systematically evaluated by a number of studies [26-28]. The severity of fouling in MD process appears to be significantly lower compared to pressure based membrane processes such as RO [2]. Nevertheless, the long-term operation can still lead to the accumulation of deposits on the membrane surface and pores, causing a decline of membrane permeability and it is a challenge to reverse fouled MD membrane even with chemical cleaning [1]. Further, the gradual membrane surface hydrophobicity reduction due to organic foulants deposition increases its susceptibility to wetting [1, 27]. This is especially relevant when MD is used to treat wastewater that contains a significant amount of organics [4, 29]. For instance, Wu et al. [29] reported significant membrane wetting when DCMD was used for fermented wastewater with high organic concentrations. Naidu et al. [4] demonstrated the potential of DCMD for wastewater RO concentrate treatment. Nevertheless, they also showed that the deposition of low molecular weight organics onto the membrane, due to the breakdown of humics at elevated
temperature, resulted in a considerable reduction in the membrane hydrophobicity [4]. The presence of spacers may potentially reduce fouling deposition onto the MD membrane. While Thomas et al. [7] indicated that 3D spacers show significant promise for treating brine solutions with high scaling tendency, a detailed evaluation of the implication of 3D spacers on fouling development in MD is still lacking. This study intends to bridge this gap.

Hence, this study aims to evaluate the role of 3D printed spacers (for simplicity referred to as 3D spacers hereafter) in improving the overall performance and fouling development in DCMD used for the treatment of wastewater RO concentrate. The influence of 3D spacer-filled channels for enhancing DCMD permeate flux, energy efficiency, as well as the implication on pressure drop, were evaluated. Specifically, in-depth analysis of organic fouling tendency in the presence of 3D spacers in DCMD used to treat wastewater up to high recovery rates (80-85% water recovery) was carried out. Factors such as accumulation of foulants onto the spacers and fouling reversibility with cleaning were also evaluated in detail.

2. Methodology

2.1 Materials

2.1.1 Membrane, chemicals, and feed solutions

A commercial polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) hydrophobic flatsheet membrane (General Electric, US) with nominal pore size, porosity, and membrane thickness of 0.22 μm, 70–80% and 179 μm, respectively [4] and total effective area of 40 cm² was used for all DCMD experiments. DI water was used as a feed solution in the baseline tests. Baseline tests were conducted to evaluate the performance of DCMD with empty and spacer-filled channels at varied feed temperatures and flow velocities. The influence of spacers on organic fouling development in DCMD was tested using model humic solution as well as actual wastewater RO concentrate. The latter was obtained from a water reclamation plant of Sydney Olympic Park Authorities. Key
characteristics of this wastewater RO concentrate are summarized in Table 1. Model humic solution at a concentration of 20.3±0.7 mg/L was used to represent only the organic contents of the actual wastewater RO concentrate (Table 1) without any inorganic salts. Actual wastewater RO concentrate was used in this study to represent wastewater with both organic contents as well as inorganic salts.

Humic acid (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) and citric acid (Sigma-Aldrich, reagent grade) were used to prepare the simulant feed solution and chemical cleaning solution, respectively. The model humic acid solution was prepared by mixing 500 mg/L humic acid powder in deionized (DI) water with continuous stirring for 24 h. The pH of the final solution was not adjusted to ensure that the natural organic characteristics are unaltered. The humic acid stock solution was filtered (0.45 µm Millipore filter) to remove suspended solids and thereafter stored at 4 °C.

Furthermore, to critically determine the impact of organic contents in a mixed constituent, a condition of reduced organics with actual wastewater RO concentrate was used in this study. To achieve this condition, granular activated carbon (GAC) (from James Cumming & Sons Pty Ltd, MDW4050CB, particle size range 430 - 600 µm) was mixed (120 rpm) at 5.0±0.2 g/L with wastewater RO concentrate (24 h) to adsorb the organic contents, following the approach of our previous work [4]. Upon batch adsorption, the wastewater RO concentrate was filtered (0.45 µm millipore filter) to exclude suspended solids. The batch absorption using GAC significantly reduced the organic contents in actual wastewater RO concentrate to less than 2 mg/L while maintaining the inorganic salt contents.

Table 1 Characteristics of wastewater RO concentrate obtained from Sydney Olympic Park water reclamation plant [4].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total dissolved solids (TDS)</td>
<td>1500.3±1.4 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>0.2±0.1 NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.0±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved organic carbon</td>
<td>20.3±0.7 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>97.0±2.3 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>69.0±1.6 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>448.5±3.2 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>66.9±4.1 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄</td>
<td>184.4±5.7 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>611.4±3.3 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness as CaCO₃</td>
<td>429.7±6.1 mg/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2 Spacers

In this study, one commercial spacer and two types of 3D spacers were used. The commercial spacer (FILMTEC™) was diamond shaped (45° filament angle) with a porosity and thickness of 0.85 and 0.79 mm respectively, and made of polypropylene. The 3D spacers were designed based on TPMS resulting in a sheet-based transverse Crossed Layer of Parallel (tCLP) spacer and a skeletal-based Gyroid spacer. More details about TPMS shapes and their governing mathematical equations can be found elsewhere [7, 18]. The designs were modeled using computer-aided design software and then 3D printed by selective laser sintering technique. The unit cell representation of the selected TPMS spacer designs is presented in Fig. 1. The 3D tCLP spacer design consists of protrusions that create microchannels aligned perpendicular to the feed flow direction. This design feature was considered to create maximum flow disruption and resultantly increased turbulence.

The specifications of the 3D spacers and their images are presented in Table 2 and Fig. 2, respectively. The adaptation of TPMS is especially beneficial in minimizing the contact area between the membrane and spacer, which is essential to avoid flow restrictions and flow dead zones formation [16].

Table 2 Characteristics of 3D printed spacers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Surface Area</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Voidage</th>
<th>Hydraulic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>design</th>
<th>(mm$^2$)</th>
<th>(mm$^3$)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tCLP</td>
<td>14786</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyroid</td>
<td>10709</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1 3D printed TPMS spacer design features presented as (a) representative volume element, and (b) photographic images (profile view).

Fig. 2 Commercial spacer and 3D printed spacers (tCLP and Gyroid) (a) photographic images (image scale bar = 0.5 cm) (b) SEM image (top view) (c) SEM image (cross section).
2.2 Direct Contact Membrane Distillation (DCMD)

The spacer performance was evaluated in a closed looped bench scale DCMD system containing an acrylic membrane module (Fig. 3). The module length and width were 8.10 cm × 5.10 cm, respectively, with a channel depth of 0.23 cm.

Gear pumps (Cole-Parmer, model 75211-15, United States) were used to direct both the permeate (deionized (DI) water) and feed solution into the membrane channel in countercurrent flow at velocity ($v_f$ and $v_p$) ranges of 0.1-0.3 m/s. Pressure variation at the feed inlet and outlet were recorded using pressure gauges placed at the feed inlet and outlet channel. A jacketed feed vessel coupled with a heating system was used to vary the feed solution temperature ($T_f$) from 45.0±2.0 °C to 65.0±2.0 °C while the permeate solution temperature ($T_p$) was maintained at 22.0±2.0 °C for all experiments. Temperature at the inlet and outlet of the feed and permeate flow channels close to the membrane module was recorded using temperature sensors. The average feed and permeate membrane surface temperature profiles were obtained through these values. Heat losses on the feed side were determined based on the feed inlet to outlet temperature difference and as a function of the feed flow rate and constants (specific heat capacity = 4.2 kJ/kg.K; water density =1000 kg/m$^3$).

The permeate flux obtained across the active membrane area and latent heat of vaporization (2345.5 KJ/kg) were used to determine the latent heat transferred. The system energy efficiency was calculated based on the latent heat transferred over the heat losses at the feed side (detailed in Section S1).

DCMD experiments were carried out until 85% water recovery, equivalent to a reduction of the initial feed volume from 1.7 L to approximately 0.25 L or up to the point of significant permeate flux decline. An electronic balance was used for recording the weight changes in the permeate tank throughout the operation duration. The permeate flux computed as the ratio of permeate volume (L) increment over operation duration (h) and unit membrane area (m$^2$) was reported as L
The permeate flux was represented as a function of the water recovery rate as well as volume concentration factor (VCF). The VCF (defined as the ratio of initial to final feed solution volume) indicates the extent of feed solution volume reduction achieved by DCMD.

DCMD with empty and spacer-filled channels were carried out with a number of feed solutions from DI water for baseline evaluations followed by model humic solution as well as wastewater RO concentrate for detailed analysis on the influence of spacers on fouling phenomena. The same spacer design was used in both the feed and permeate channels for each DCMD experiment with the spacer-filled channels.

**Fig. 3** DCMD experimental setup.

The overall salt removal efficiency of DCMD was determined by measuring the conductivity and pH value of the feed and permeate solution before and after DCMD operation, using a portable multimeter (HQ40d, HACH, US). Inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS, Agilent 7900, US) was used to measure the concentration of each individual cation in the wastewater RO concentrate. For organic removal efficiency, the initial and final permeate and feed
solutions (humic acid concentrations and wastewater RO concentrate) upon DCMD operation were analyzed by a total organic carbon (TOC) analyzer (Analytik Jena multi N/C® 3100).

### 2.3 Fouling reversibility with membrane cleaning

#### 2.3.1 Batch membrane cleaning

The effectiveness of cleaning the membrane as an approach to reverse membrane fouling was evaluated using DI water as well as a chemical solution (0.1% citric acid). For this reason, small portions of the used membranes were placed in falcon tubes with 20 ml of cleaning solution. The falcon tubes were stirred in a flat shaker at 120 rpm for 24 hours. Upon air drying, the membrane contact angle was analyzed.

#### 2.3.2 Cleaning-in-place

Cleaning-in-place (cleaning the membrane and spacer while in the module) was carried out to emulate membrane maintenance and fouling mitigation in an actual operational scenario, upon wastewater RO concentrate treatment. Cleaning-in-place was carried out with water cleaning (flushing 300 mL of DI water through membrane module using the same operating flow velocity, 0.13 m/s) as well and chemical cleaning (0.1% citric acid with water flushing). Acid cleaning was carried out by recirculating acid (20 mins at a low flow velocity of 0.08 m/s to achieve sufficient contact time with the membrane) followed by water flushing (to neutralize the acid residues) (200 ml at 0.13 m/s). Cleaning-in-place is pertinent to establish the reuse capacity of both the membrane as well as the 3D spacer.

### 2.4 Characterization techniques
2.4.1 Organic Characterization

Organic characterization of the feed and permeate solution, as well as membrane foulant, was established using liquid chromatography with organic carbon detection (LC-OCD) \[4, 30\]. To evaluate the organic characteristics deposited on the used MD membrane, foulant residues were extracted from the membrane into MQ water based on the procedure of our previous studies \[4, 27\].

2.4.2 Membrane characterization

Changes in membrane characteristics before and after the DCMD experiments were evaluated in terms of surface hydrophobicity and morphology. Membrane surface hydrophobicity was measured using contact angle. Contact angle measurement was carried out at the end of each experiment (upon drying the used membrane) together with a virgin membrane as a control measure for the instrument setting. The contact angle measurements were conducted using a water droplet goniometer (Theta Lite). Further, the surface morphology and element contents of the membranes (virgin and used upon DCMD experiments) were examined using scanning electron microscope (SEM) integrated with energy-dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) as described in a previous study \[4\].

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Baseline study

The DCMD performance with and without spacer-filled channels was evaluated. For the baseline study, DI water was used as the feed and permeate solution. The average DCMD permeate fluxes obtained with varying operating conditions are presented in Table S1.

3.1.1 Permeate flux performance
In an empty channel (i.e., no spacer condition), increasing the bulk feed temperature from 45 to 65 °C (at a fixed flow velocity of 0.08 m/s) enhanced the permeate flux by 200% from 7.68±0.92 LMH to 24.26±1.45 LMH (Fig. 4a). In this study, temperature losses at the membrane feed side were evaluated by measuring the temperature difference at the channel inlet and outlet (Section 2). With the increase of bulk feed temperature, a higher feed temperature loss was observed due to the large quantity of heat required for vaporizing liquid at the feed side of the membrane surface [9]. As a result of the temperature loss, only minimal energy efficiency increment was achieved with the increase of permeate flux (Fig. 4a).

Meanwhile, at similar operating condition (feed temperature of 55 °C and flow velocity of 0.08 m/s), the permeate flux increased significantly by 63% (20.78±1.24 LMH) with commercial spacer-filled channel, and by more than 200% (30.62±1.36 LMH to 36.06±1.09 LMH) with 3D printed spacers as compared to that with empty channel (12.67±1.87 LMH) (Fig. 4b). More importantly, the scenario of increasing the feed temperature to achieve higher permeate flux invariably resulted in higher feed temperature losses, which compromised the energy efficiency.

The approach of spacer-filled channels was especially favorable in achieving both higher permeate fluxes and energy efficiency.

Upon comparing the performance of DCMD with different spacers, the 3D spacer-filled channels achieved 30-70% higher permeate fluxes compared to commercial spacer-filled channels under similar operating conditions (Fig. 5a). This could be attributed to the smaller hydraulic diameter of the 3D spacers (Table 2) and the channels/protrusions aligned perpendicular to the feed flow such as in 3D tCLP spacer. A smaller hydraulic diameter increases the flow velocity and Reynolds number. This, in turn, increases turbulence, resulting in higher mass transfer. Amongst the 3D spacers, tCLP achieved 15-24% higher permeate fluxes compared to that with the Gyroid spacer.
Fig. 4 Baseline performance of DCMD with (a) empty channel at $T_f$ of 45.0±2.0 to 65.0±2.0 °C (b) empty and spacer-filled channels at $T_f$ of 55.0±2.0 °C ($v_f$, $v_p = 0.08$ m/s; $T_p = 22.0±1.5$ °C).

Fig. 5 Performance of empty and spacer-filled channel at varying flow velocities based on (a) permeate flux (b) channel pressure drop (figure trend line derived from experimental data from Table S1).
3.1.2 Channel pressure drop

Pressure drop is an inevitable trade-off associated with spacer application. The results of this study showed a trend of channel pressure drop increment in the ranges of 0.02–0.07 bar/m up to 0.13-0.25 bar/m as the flow velocity was increased (represented by Reynolds number) for both empty and spacer filled channels (Fig. 5b). The same trend of increasing pressure drop with flow velocity and Reynolds number was reported in previous MD studies [20, 21]. For instance, a previous MD study [21] showed that pressure drop in spacers could range from as low as 0.008 bar/m to over 1.0 bar/m depending on the flow velocity as well as spacer characteristics. A 48-200% increment in channel pressure drop was observed with spacer-filled channels compared to an empty channel. Higher drag force in the presence of spacers is associated with the higher channel pressure drop [12, 20, 21]. This apart, spacer characteristics such as spacer hydraulic diameter also influences the degree of channel pressure drop. Hagedorn et al. [21] demonstrated the inverse correlation of channel pressure drop and spacer hydraulic diameter, in which, reduced flow velocity associated with higher hydraulic diameter of the spacer resulted in lower channel pressure drop. Likewise, in this study, the channel pressure drop with Gyroid spacer (hydraulic diameter of 1.6 mm) was lower compared to the tCLP spacer (hydraulic diameter of 1.4 mm). In addition to the hydraulic diameter, another spacer characteristic that influences the feed channel pressure drop is the flow attack angle [31]. The flow attack angle of the spacer is the angle formed between the spacer strands and the fluid flow direction. In the tCLP design, the microchannels of the spacer are aligned perpendicular to the flow direction creating maximum disruption to the approaching fluid. However, with increasing flow attack angle, the pressure drop also increases. This explains the higher permeate flux and pressure drop observed with the tCLP spacer. Thus, based on the combined effects of flux enhancement and channel pressure drop, the Gyroid spacer demonstrated an overall improved performance over the commercial spacer.
3.2 Influence of spacer design on organic fouling mitigation

The baseline results established that the incorporation of spacers in DCMD enabled an improvement in permeate flux by maintaining low temperature polarization. The results also highlighted that at increased flow velocity, a higher permeate flux was achieved. However, at increased flow velocity, a trade-off of channel pressure drop is inevitable, especially in the presence of spacers. Based on all these factors, a DCMD operational setting of 55 °C feed temperature and 0.13 m/s flow velocity was decided upon for the subsequent tests to evaluate the influence of spacers on organic fouling development.

3.2.1 Process performance

DCMD tests were conducted for empty and spacer-filled channels using organic (humic acid) feed solution. Permeate flux results were compared in terms of the normalized flux ($J/J_0$). The obtained initial permeate fluxes ($J_0$) of 20.2±2.3 LMH (empty channel), 27.1±1.7 LMH (commercial spacer-filled channel), 37.5±1.3 LMH (3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel) and 44.2±2.4 LMH (3D tCLP spacer-filled channel) were in line with the baseline permeate flux results discussed earlier.

For both empty and spacer-filled channels, the flux performance was relatively consistent over the majority of the experiment duration followed by a marginal decline towards the end of the experiment (Fig. 6). A similar pattern of marginal decline in permeate fluxes was reported in previous studies [26, 28]. In MD, organic foulant tends to predominantly deposit onto the membrane surface and minimally on the membrane pores, due to the vapor pressure driving force rather than applied pressure. As a result, only marginal flux decline was observed. Fig. 6b highlights the improved performance duration achieved with the incorporation of 3D spacers.

Owing to the enhanced flux performance, both the 3D spacers were able to achieve the targeted 85% water recovery within a shorter duration of MD operation i.e. 50 to 80% of the operational duration needed with that of the commercial spacer. Additionally, the final flux
decline with the 3D Gyroid spacer (12%) was slightly lower to that obtained with the commercial spacer (17%) and empty channel (16%). These results suggest that 3D spacer-filled channels were able to improve MD process performance. Further, in order to ascertain the influence of spacers on organic deposition onto the MD membrane, evaluations were carried out to study the organic mass deposition, characteristic of the organic compounds (LC-OCD analysis) and the condition of the used membranes such as the hydrophobicity and foulant deposition pattern.

Fig. 6 Normalized DCMD permeate flux as a function of (a) water recovery and (b) experiment duration for both empty and spacer-filled channels. Conditions: Feed: model humic feed solution, $T_f=55.0\pm2.0$ °C, $T_p=22.0\pm2.0$ °C, $v_f=v_p=0.13$ m/s).

3.2.2 Impact on foulant composition and adhesion

For all experimental conditions, a high-quality permeate was obtained throughout experiment duration. The conductivity (10-15 µS/cm) and organic contents (0.05- 0.10 mg/L) in the final permeate solutions were at trace levels and remained lower than that of the initial permeate
solutions, corresponding to 98-99% rejection of organics. The results indicated that the organics of
the feed solution did not penetrate into the membrane pores, as also supported by the marginal
permeate flux decline pattern (Fig. 6).

Table 3 Feed solution organic mass balance for empty and spacer-filled channel DCMD operated
with model humic acid solution (initial feed solution volume -1.70 L; final feed solution volume -
0.25 L).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCMD operating condition</th>
<th>Spacer type</th>
<th>Feed solution organic concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>Feed solution organic mass (mg)</th>
<th>Organic mass reduction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Final</td>
<td>Initial Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty channel</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>19.50±0.75 87.27±0.62</td>
<td>33.15±0.45 22.08±0.51</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacer-filled channel</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>19.50±0.75 102.96±0.71</td>
<td>33.15±0.45 26.05±0.60</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D Gyroid</td>
<td>19.50±0.75 127.63±0.60</td>
<td>33.15±0.45 32.29±0.33</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D tCLP</td>
<td>19.50±0.75 120.75±0.57</td>
<td>33.15±0.45 30.55±0.41</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dissolved organic content of the initial and final feed solution showed that the total organic
mass contents (Table 3) of the final feed solution with the empty channel and commercial spacer-
filled channels were 33% and 21% lower, respectively, than the expected value corresponding to a
seven-fold volume concentration (85% water recovery, VCF 6.7) of the organic contents in the
initial feed solution. On the contrary, the organic mass content of the final feed solutions with the
3D spacer-filled channels was closely similar to the expected value for seven-fold volume
concentration (85% water recovery, VCF 6.7) of the organic contents in the initial feed solution.
As only trace level of organics was detected in the permeate solutions, the reduced final feed
organic contents could presumably be attributed to organics deposition onto the feed channel and
adhesion onto the membrane as organic foulants. Considering that the same operating conditions
were applied for all the experiments, the organics deposition onto the feed channel would be
closely similar between empty and spacer-filled channels. However, based on the relatively lower
organic mass reduction of the feed solutions with 3D spacer-filled channels (3-8%), it would be
reasonable to infer that organic losses by deposition on the feed channel was minimal. Hence, the significant organic mass losses within the empty channel and commercial spacer-filled channels (21–33%) could most likely be attributed to organic foulant adhesion onto the membrane surface.

Analysis of the organic characteristics of the initial feed solution affirmed that it predominantly consisted of humics (Fig. 7). Meanwhile, the final feed solutions of the empty and spacer-filled channels displayed some variation in organic characteristics. The final feed solution with empty channel showed a pattern of low humic peak with a substantially higher peak of building blocks. On the other hand, the organic characteristics of the final feed solution with spacer-filled channels maintained the same pattern as the initial feed solution, containing major peaks of humics with minor portions of low molecular weight (LMW) organics.

Fig. 7 LC-OCD chromatogram of initial and final humic feed solution for empty and spacer-filled channels (BP- Biopolymers, HS- Humic substances, BB- Building blocks, LMW –Low molecular weight organics).

Overall, the organic analyses of the feed solutions indicated that the presence of spacers in MD plays a significant role in organic fouling deposition pattern. Specifically, 3D spacers showed
significantly lower organic mass losses compared to commercial spacers. Overall, the organic analyses of the feed solutions strongly indicated that the presence of spacers in MD play a significant role in organic fouling deposition pattern. The 3D spacers, in particular, showed significantly lower organic mass losses compared to commercial spacers. This observation was in line with recent studies that analysed membrane fouling development with spacer filled channels [32-34]. For instance, Wu et al. [34] explored the role of 3D spacers in membrane fouling mitigating and highlighted that the design and orientation of 3D spacers resulted in lower fouling by 25% compared to 2D spacers. Likewise, a simulation MD study observed that membrane fouling occur on small isolated regions with spacer-filled channels compared to empty channel attributed to uniform resident time and induction of the feed solution with the incorporation of spacers [32]. Further, the feed solution organic characteristics results with LC-OCD imply that spacers play a role in reducing the breakdown of humics to low molecular weight. To further substantiate this observation and to understand the correlations between different spacer types and organic fouling development in MD, organic characteristics of the foulant deposited onto the membrane were analyzed.

Foulant deposition on the surface of the used membrane was visibly different with empty and spacer-filled channels (Fig. 8a). The used membrane in the empty channel, showed significant brown deposition while less deposition was observed in spacer-filled channels, especially with 3D spacers. The SEM images (Fig. 8b) showed the presence of large colloid-like deposits on the used membrane with the empty channel. Comparatively, only small and scattered deposits were observed on the used membrane with spacer-filled channels.
The hydrophobicity of the virgin and used membrane surfaces were measured using water contact angle. The used membrane with empty channels showed the lowest water contact angle (70.2±1.3°), with a 50% hydrophobicity reduction compared to the virgin membrane (139.5±1.7°). Meanwhile, the used membranes with both commercial and 3D tCLP spacers showed similar hydrophobicity reduction in the range of 33-36%. On the other hand, the used membrane with 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel retained the highest contact angle (only 13% hydrophobicity reduction) compared to the other used membranes, and its hydrophobicity was restored closely to the original condition with membrane cleaning (batch membrane cleaning). These results suggest that the low foulant deposition with 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channels enabled the membrane hydrophobicity to be restored closely to its original condition, even as the organic concentration in the feed solution was increased by more than 100 mg/L.

Fig. 8 Membrane surface morphology showing (a) foulant deposition on the used membranes (b) high magnified SEM images of the used membrane upon DCMD operation with empty and spacer-filled channels using model humic acid solution (SEM image scale bar = 100 µm).
Table 4  Water contact angle of MD membrane (virgin, used and DI water cleaned) for empty and spacer-filled channel DCMD operation with model humic acid solution (Contact angle of new/virgin membrane =139.5±1.7°)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCMD operating condition</th>
<th>Spacer type</th>
<th>Membrane water contact angle (°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Used membrane (upon 85% water recovery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty channel</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>70.2±1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>87.5±1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacer-filled channel</td>
<td>3D Gyroid</td>
<td>119.3±1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D tCLP</td>
<td>91.4±1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Batch membrane cleaning (method as reported in Section 2.3.1)

**Fig. 9** LC-OCD chromatogram representing membrane foulant composition upon operation in empty and spacer-filled channels (BP- Biopolymers, HS- Humic substances, BB- Building blocks, LMW –Low molecular weight organics).

LC-OCD chromatograms of the membrane foulant (extracted from the membrane at the end of the experiment) are presented in **Fig. 9**. The results showed that the foulant deposited on the used membranes predominantly consisted of LMW organics. This was in line with the observation from
our previous studies that established the tendency of humics to break down to LMW organics in MD operation and thereafter, for LWM organics to deposit onto the hydrophobic membrane [4, 27]. This was attributed to the thermal condition in MD as well as the hydrophilic-hydrophobic attraction tendency between the foulant and the hydrophobic membrane. Given that the thermal condition was the same for all these four experiments, it is likely that the presence of the spacers may have acted as a barrier that reduced the hydrophilic-hydrophobic attraction between the MD membrane and the foulant. Therefore, the breakdown of humics was reduced in the scenarios with spacer-filled channels. Due to the barrier created by spacers, the tendency of humics breaking down to LMW organics in the feed solution was reduced, as observed with the feed solution organics characteristics analysis (Fig. 7). Hence, less LMW organics are deposited onto the membrane with spacer-filled channels. This tendency was especially apparent with 3D spacers and this could be due to their higher surface area coverage compared to commercial spacers (Table 2). The deposition of LMW organics onto the membrane is associated with membrane hydrophobicity reduction. In line with this, the substantially high LMW organics deposition on the used membrane with the empty channel resulted in significantly higher contact angle reduction (Table 4). The lower deposition of LMW organics on the membrane with spacer-filled channels could be due to the spacers acting as a barrier between the membrane and the concentrated feed solution.

### 3.2.3 Effect on fouling deposition patterns

Overall, the results indicated that the application of spacers (both commercial as well as 3D spacers) in MD resulted in lower fouling deposition compared to the empty channel. This could be related to the higher turbulence created by spacers. Higher turbulence disrupts the boundary layer close to the membrane (polarization effect) and enhances shear stress as established by a number of CFD modeling studies [12, 20, 32]. Higher shear stress is directly associated with reduced fouling deposition onto the membrane [18, 35].
Meanwhile, compared to the commercial spacer-filled channel, both the 3D spacers showed reduced fouling intensity, based on the lower foulant deposition on the membrane (Table 3 and Fig. 8) as well as the lower reduction in membrane hydrophobicity (Table 4). This could be attributed to two factors, enhanced turbulence, and reduced dead zones. Firstly, compared to the commercial spacer, 3D spacers resulted in higher turbulence at the same feed velocity as reflected by the higher permeate fluxes achieved (Fig. 5a). The higher turbulence in 3D spacers is attributed to the non-uniform/varying filament thickness and smaller hydraulic diameter characteristics of the 3D spacers. In a simulation study, Taamenh and Bataineh [20] showed that significantly higher average shear stress was achieved by varying the top and bottom filament angle and when the angle of the spacers was closer to 90°. Hagedorn et al. [21] indicated that spacers with irregular filament surface and varying filament thickness contributed to better heat transfer efficiency and flow mixing. The higher turbulence and mixing with enhanced shear stress on the membrane surface with 3D spacers can be associated with the lower fouling deposition. Secondly, the factor of dead zone (restricted flow area) could likely contribute to higher fouling deposition onto the commercial spacer compared to the 3D spacers. Dead zone occurs when a spacer is in direct contact with the membrane which restricts flow velocity and accumulates deposits close to the membrane [14, 18]. Compared to a commercial spacer, 3D spacers are designed with TPMS topographies to generate surfaces (mean curvature of zero) with minimal contact area to the membrane [18]. The lower contact area to the membrane with 3D spacers reduces dead zone and results in lower fouling intensity compared to commercial spacers. Sreedhar et al. [18] observed higher biofouling development on RO membrane incorporated with commercial spacers than 3D spacers and this was attributed to the tendency of biofoulants to adhere especially around the contact area (dead zone) between the commercial spacer and the membrane.

In comparing the fouling performance with 3D spacer-filled channels, lower membrane fouling intensity was observed with Gyroid spacer over tCLP spacer on the basis of lower foulant mass.
deposition on the membrane (Table 3) as well as restored membrane hydrophobicity (Table 4). The variation in fouling deposition pattern between Gyroid and tCLP spacer could be explained in terms of their different design characteristics. Lower surface area/volume (Table 2) value of Gyroid (7.1 mm⁻¹) compared to tCLP (13.9 mm⁻¹) indicates that for a given channel volume the Gyroid spacer offers a lower surface area for foulant adhesion and entrapment. This translates to reduced dead zone and accumulation of foulants onto the membrane with Gyroid spacer. Spacer voidage (porosity) is also an important characteristic that influences spacer performance. However, in this case, the voidage for both the 3D spacers (Gyroid - 84%, tCLP - 88%) are closely similar. On the other hand, in closely examining the design of both spacers, the skeletal-based structure of the Gyroid spacer resembles a zigzag cubic shape with an infinite smooth surface. This condition most likely creates a wave-like flow mechanism that does not potentially retain the foulant. Comparatively, tCLP is a tetragonal sheet/layer which resembles a ‘pocket’ like shape. In the case of tCLP, the channels or protrusions aligned perpendicular to the feed flow direction creates high turbulence, which results in significantly higher permeate flux compared to Gyroid (Fig. 5a). However, it is highly likely that the combination of this turbulence in the presence of the pocket like shape promotes higher affinity for deposition of foulant onto the membrane as depicted in Fig. 10. Likewise, a recent study evaluating the performance of vibrating 3D spacers, reported on the superior membrane fouling mitigating by wave-like spacer compared to hill-like spacer (a similar resemblance to the tCLP pocket like shape) [33]. In that study, Tan et al [33] highlighted that although hill-like spacer does demonstrate higher local velocity, the protrusions of wave like spacers creates large fluid movement, which enhances the overall shear along the membrane, resulting in higher fouling mitigation.
Fig. 10 Depiction of fouling deposition mechanism in DCMD with 3D spacer-filled channel.

In summary, although tCLP spacer-filled channel enables to achieve enhanced permeate fluxes compared to the other spacers, the organic fouling evaluation highlights that the superior fouling mitigation capacity is with 3D Gyroid spacer. Moreover, the lower channel pressure drop of 3D Gyroid spacer is an added advantage over the tCLP spacer.

3.3 Practical spacer application for wastewater treatment in MD

Based on the above factors, conditions that emulate actual treatment and fouling pattern (high organic contents in the presence of inorganic salts) is necessary to further substantiate and establish the role and practical application of 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel towards fouling mitigation in MD. For this reason, evaluations were carried out with wastewater RO concentrate that contains high organics (similar to the model organic solutions) in a mixed composition with carbonate based inorganic salts (majorly Na, Ca, Mg) as listed in Table 1. At the same time, low organics wastewater RO concentrate (organic contents reduced through GAC adsorption) while maintaining the same inorganic salt concentration was used to compare and establish the role of organics in wastewater treatment with MD operation. Aspects such as permeate flux and quality and fouling pattern, potential pre-treatment requirement for enhancing the membrane durability as well as the adhesion of foulant onto the spacer and its reversible and reuse capacity was studied in detail.
3.3.1 Process performance

DCMD experiments with actual wastewater RO concentrate using both empty and Gyroid spacer-filled channels achieved initial permeate fluxes of 19.5±1.7 LMH (empty channel) and 37.0±0.4 LMH (3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel for high and low organics), closely similar to the initial fluxes with model organic solution (as reported in Section 3.2.1). However, at 85% water recovery, permeate fluxes declined by 21-27% (Fig. 11), which was almost 2 times higher compared to the 12-15% permeate flux decline rates with model organic solution (Fig. 5). Further, the low organic wastewater RO concentrate (with 1.5±0.5 mg/L organics) exhibited similar permeate flux trend as the actual wastewater RO concentrate (with 20.3±0.7 mg/L organics) (Fig. 11). These results suggest that, under the selected operating conditions, the inorganic ions at high saturation (concentration) levels in wastewater RO concentrate played a more dominant role in influencing the mass transport mechanism in DCMD rather than the organic contents.

In terms of permeate quality, the final permeate conductivity (18-22 uS/cm) increased slightly compared to the initial permeate conductivity (10-15 µS/cm) for the case scenario of empty channel. The rise in permeate conductivity reflected that partial wetting may have occurred. On the other hand, the operation with Gyroid spacer-filled channels did not show any increment in permeate conductivity, indicating the stability of the performance up to 85% water recovery rate.
**Fig. 11** DCMD permeate fluxes as a function of water recovery rate with empty and 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channels for wastewater RO concentrate treatment ($T_f = 55.0 \pm 2.0^\circ C$, $T_p = 22.0 \pm 2.0^\circ C$, $v_{t,v_p} = 0.13$ m/s) (Initial permeate fluxes: 19.5±1.7 LMH (empty channel) and 37.0±0.4 LMH (3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel for high and low organics)).

The used membrane with the empty channel showed large mud colloid-like mixture of humics with inorganic salt crystals (**Fig. 12a**). The crystal shape and EDX element analysis established CaCO$_3$ as the main inorganic scalant. Comparatively, the used membrane with 3D Gyroid spacer displayed only small isolated regions containing colloidal foulant (**Fig. 12b**). In the case of low organic wastewater RO concentrate, the used membrane with 3D Gyroid spacer showed a different pattern with small scattered foulants that were loosely deposited onto the membrane (**Fig. 12c**).
Fig. 12 SEM-EDX and contact angle of the used membrane upon DCMD operation using wastewater RO concentrate with (a) empty channel (high organics) (b) 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel (high organics) and (c) 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel (low organics) (SEM image scale bar = 300 µm).
Table 5 Water contact angle of the membranes (virgin, used and cleaned) for empty and 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channels DCMD operation with wastewater RO concentrate (Contact angle of new/virgin membrane =139.5±1.7°)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCMD operating condition</th>
<th>Wastewater RO concentrate</th>
<th>Membrane water contact angle (°)</th>
<th>Used membrane</th>
<th>*Cleaned Membrane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DI water</td>
<td>Acid (0.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty channel</td>
<td>High organics</td>
<td>5.2±2.7</td>
<td>7.4±0.8</td>
<td>10.4±0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Gyroid spacer</td>
<td>High organics</td>
<td>50.5±1.3</td>
<td>61.2±1.2</td>
<td>88.4±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low organics</td>
<td>66.3±1.1</td>
<td>87.2±1.3</td>
<td>129.7±1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Batch membrane cleaning (method as reported in Section 2.3.1)

In terms of membrane hydrophobicity, the used membrane with empty channel resulted in more than 95-97% contact angle reduction compared to the virgin membrane (Fig. 12a and Table 5). The high hydrophobicity loss could be correlated to the partial wetting phenomena, based on the permeate conductivity increment as reported in Section 3.3.1. Moreover, membrane cleaning (batch membrane cleaning) with neither water nor acid could restore the membrane, indicating irreversible fouling. It is also worth mentioning that the high humic content as a single solute (Table 4) minimally affected the membrane hydrophobicity and the membrane condition was easily reversed with only water cleaning. These results suggest that treating and concentrating actual wastewater RO concentrate containing high humics mixed with inorganic ions is a challenge and would detrimentally affect the long-term performance of MD. Comparatively, the incorporation of 3D Gyroid spacer showed less hydrophobicity loss (57-60% contact angle reduction to the virgin membrane) (Fig. 12b and Table 5). This highlights the importance of 3D Gyroid spacer as a barrier that improved MD performance for wastewater treatment. Nevertheless, in attaining 85% water recovery (highly concentrated wastewater), reversing the foulant deposition and membrane hydrophobicity was still a challenge. Meanwhile, the combination of low organic wastewater RO concentrate with the incorporation of 3D Gyroid spacer was effective.
in enabling to achieve high water recovery while restoring the membrane hydrophobicity with acid
membrane cleaning. These results clearly indicated the necessity for a simple organic pre-
treatment such as GAC filtration [4, 36] to maintain a stable MD performance in treating
wastewater containing high organics.

Overall, the aforementioned evaluation highlighted the capacity of MD to treat wastewater RO
concentrate and achieve high water recovery (85%) through a combination of GAC pre-treatment
of wastewater (low organics wastewater) and the use of 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channels.

Nevertheless, to establish the performance of MD for wastewater treatment, practical aspects such
as cleaning-in-place (cleaning the membrane and spacer while it is in the module) as well as
evaluation of membrane and spacer reuse capacity must be carried out. These aspects are
discussed in the subsequent section.

3.3.2 Membrane and spacer reuse capacity

Three repeated MD cycles with low organic wastewater RO concentrate using the same membrane
and 3D Gyroid spacer were carried out to establish the performance of MD for wastewater
treatment. At the end of each cycle, cleaning-in-place (cleaning the membrane and spacer while it
is the module) with water and chemical (0.1% citric acid with water flushing) was carried out to
determine the reuse capacity of both the membrane as well as the spacer.

The results showed the capability of MD incorporated with 3D spacers to achieve high water
recovery (85%) while maintaining stable permeate fluxes with low organic wastewater RO
concentrate in three repeated cycles with cleaning-in-place (Fig. 13). However, compared to the
water membrane cleaning (final average contact angle = 87.2±1.7°), acid membrane cleaning was
effective in maintaining the membrane hydrophobicity (final average contact angle = 130.7±1.7°)
close to the virgin membrane (average contact angle =139.5±1.7°) (Fig 14). Likewise, the SEM
images showed the presence of visible foulant deposition on the membrane with DI water cleaning.

![Fig. 13](image_url)

**Fig. 13** Repeated cycles of DCMD with 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channel using low organics wastewater RO concentrate with cleaning-in-place (DI water and citric acid) at the end of each cycle.

Meanwhile, minimal deposition was visible on the acid cleaned membrane (closely resembling the virgin membrane). It is also worth mentioning that the membrane contact angle results with the cleaning-in-place were closely similar to the batch membrane cleaning (**Table 5**), indicating the suitability of a simple cleaning-in-place approach for maintaining the membrane in MD operation. Both the cleaning-in-place and batch membrane cleaning results indicated the necessity for a simple acid membrane cleaning for reversing foulant deposition and maintaining the membrane durability to achieve repeated cycles of MD operation for wastewater treatment.
Fig. 14 Condition of the used membranes after three repeated DCMD cycles (low organic wastewater RO concentrate treatment feed solution with 3D Gyroid spacer-filled channels) upon cleaning-in-place with water and acid compared to the virgin membrane (SEM image scale bar = 200 µm).

Fig. 15 Condition of spacer (a) upon wastewater RO concentrate operation (b) upon cleaning in place in DCMD (image scale bar = 0.5 cm)

Foulant deposition on the 3D Gyroid spacer was evident from its condition observed upon DCMD operation (Fig. 15a). This is because the spacer acts as a barrier between the concentrated feed solution and the membrane, which is favorable in reducing foulant deposition onto the membrane. Nevertheless, inevitably, foulant tends to deposit onto the spacer. Hence, it is highly pertinent to evaluate foulant reversibility and reuse capacity of the spacer. The results of the study showed
minimal foulant deposition (Fig. 15b) on the spacer used for three repeated cycles of MD operation. This established the effectiveness of a simple cleaning-in-place for reversing foulants on the spacer. The ease of reversing foulant on the spacer could be attributed to the spacer design and material type that tend to repel foulant from adhering strongly on it. The reverse fouling and reuse capacity of the 3D Gyroid spacer established its suitability to be incorporated in MD for enhancing its performance for wastewater treatment.

4. Conclusion

This study evaluated the influence of 3D printed spacers in improving MD performance and organic fouling development for treating wastewater. Overall, the results of the study highlighted that:

- 3D spacers (Gyroid and tCLP) enabled to significantly enhance the performance of MD (up to 200% increase in permeate flux and energy efficiency) compared to the empty channel and up to 30-70% improved flux performance relative to the commercial spacer. This was attributed to the unique features of 3D spacers that enhanced turbulence and mass transfer; The trade-off of higher channel pressure drop with 3D spacers is inevitable.

- 3D Gyroid spacer showed better organic fouling mitigation capacity (based on the membrane hydrophobicity and lower organic mass deposition) compared to tCLP and this was attributed to the tortuous spacer design that can repel foulants;

- Treating and concentrating actual wastewater RO concentrate using MD without spacer resulted in partial wetting with significant and irreversible foulant deposition onto the membrane. This is attributed to the presence of organics in mixed constituents with inorganic ions, as the membrane foulant with singe solute organics (humics feed solution) was highly reversible;
• Repeated cycle of MD operation with a combination of low organics wastewater RO concentrate with 3D Gyroid spacer and cleaning-in-place established the importance of (i) a simple pretreatment to reduce organic content (ii) 3D spacers as a foulant barrier (ii) cleaning-in-place, for achieving high recovery rate and stable long-term MD operation with wastewater; and
• Cleaning-in-place established the foulant reversibility and reuse capacity of 3D Gyroid spacer in MD.
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S1 Energy Efficiency Calculation

The total heat exchanged by the feed \((Q_f)\) within the MD module, represented by Eq. 1, is the input source of energy within the system which is calculated as the difference between the sensible heat of the incoming feed stream and the outgoing feed stream.

\[
Q_f = \rho q C_w (T_{f,i} - T_{f,o})
\]  

(1)

where \(\rho\) is the density of water, \(q\) is the volumetric feed flow rate, \(C_w\) is the specific heat capacity of water, \(T_{f,i}\) is the temperature of the incoming feed water and \(T_{f,o}\) is the temperature of the outgoing feed water.

The heat lost from the feed contributes to the heat transport through the membrane (inclusive of the latent heat accompanying the vapor flux \((Q_v)\) and the heat conducted through the membrane) and the heat lost through the membrane module via conduction losses. As the membrane module is made from acrylic (low thermal conductivity material), the conduction heat losses is assumed to be negligible. The latent heat accompanying the vapor flux through the membrane can be calculated as per Eq. 2:

\[
Q_v = J A \rho H_v
\]  

(2)

where \(J\) is the water vapor flux through unit area of the membrane, \(A\) is the effective membrane area, and \(H_v\) is the latent heat of vaporization.

Thus, the system energy efficiency \((\eta)\) was calculated as the ratio of the latent heat transferred through the membrane and the heat losses at the feed side, indicated by Eq. 3.

\[
\eta = \frac{Q_f}{Q_v}
\]  

(3)
Table S1 Average DCMD permeate fluxes obtained with varying operating conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Velocity (m/s)</th>
<th>Feed Temperature(°C)</th>
<th>Flux (LMH) No spacer</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>3D Gyroid</th>
<th>3D CLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.68±0.92</td>
<td>12.19±1.49</td>
<td>17.33±1.19</td>
<td>21.54±1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.67±1.87</td>
<td>20.78±1.24</td>
<td>30.62±1.36</td>
<td>36.06±1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.26±1.45</td>
<td>31.75±0.76</td>
<td>47.28±1.18</td>
<td>54.07±0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12.42±0.66</td>
<td>17.28±0.89</td>
<td>20.83±1.26</td>
<td>26.21±1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.60±0.88</td>
<td>28.40±1.69</td>
<td>37.26±0.91</td>
<td>43.99±0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.81±1.77</td>
<td>44.83±1.88</td>
<td>58.06±1.30</td>
<td>67.43±1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.42±1.08</td>
<td>19.01±1.63</td>
<td>23.82±1.06</td>
<td>30.17±1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.48±1.79</td>
<td>32.90±1.53</td>
<td>42.28±1.44</td>
<td>49.29±1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.04±1.01</td>
<td>57.04±1.00</td>
<td>66.32±1.32</td>
<td>76.37±1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlights

- 3D spacers increased MD fluxes by 50-65% compared to a commercial spacer.
- Organics cause marginal flux decline but impact membrane hydrophobicity in MD.
- 3D Gyroid spacer with tortuous zigzag design was suitable for repelling foulants.
- MD with 3D Gyroid spacer achieved 85% water recovery from low organic wastewater.
- Cleaning-in-place and organic pre-treatment are vital for MD wastewater treatment.