

**VOLATILE FATTY ACID AND  
WATER EXTRACTION FROM  
RUMEN FLUID BY FORWARD  
OSMOSIS**

**By Jamshed Ali Khan**

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

under the supervision of Professor Long D. Nghiem and  
Professor Hokyong Shon

University of Technology Sydney  
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology  
April 2021

*This thesis is dedicated to my wife*

*Dr Shabana Ghaffar*

*For her priceless love and consistent support*

## **Certificate of Original Authorship**

I, **Jamshed Ali Khan** declare that this thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the award of **Doctor of Philosophy**, in the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Technology Sydney.

I also certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor it has been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. Any help that I have received in my research and preparation of the thesis has been acknowledged. Besides, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis. This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:  
Signature removed prior to publication.

Signature of student

Date: 01 April 2021

## **Acknowledgements**

This dissertation would have not been possible without the guidance and the support of several individuals who, in one way or another, contributed to my PhD journey and the completion of my research work.

First of all, I would like to express my heartiest gratitude and appreciation to my principal supervisor, Prof. Long D. Nghiem for his untiring support and guidance throughout my PhD journey. I found him not only a good supervisor but a great human being and an inspiring mentor who motivated me with his leadership to strive hard for the best outcomes. Besides, his encouragement and immense knowledge helped me a lot to conquer the challenges during my research work and thesis writing. I consider myself extremely lucky to work under his supervision and share this challenging but wonderful expedition with him.

I would like to appreciate and thank my co-supervisor, Prof. Hokyong Shon for his consistent encouragement and support during my PhD studies. I truly admire his valuable feedback on my research work.

I cannot forget to extend my sincere gratitude to the co-authors of my research work including Dr Luong N. Nguyen, Dr Hung C. Duong, Mr Minh T. Vu, and Miss Quynh Anh Nguyen. I want to acknowledge Dr Luong's help in performing ion chromatography analysis while Dr Hung was of great help to improve my technical writing skills. I greatly appreciate Mr Minh's assistance in performing the SEM and EDS analyses and Miss Quynh's support for DNA extraction and 16S rRNA sequencing. The much-needed encouragement from my colleagues; Dr Lei Zheng, Mr Asif Iqbal Khan, and Miss Chelsey Vu is highly appreciated. My heartiest gratitude covers all the laboratory staff for their help and support. I also want to thank the Higher Education Commission, the

University of Wollongong, and the University of Technology Sydney for their financial assistance and support.

Last but not least, I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to all of my family members especially my mother, Noor Jahan and my brother, Noor Ul Islam for their constant encouragement and love during my studies.

## Research Outcome Summary

### Journal papers

- 1) **Khan JA**, Shon HK, Nghiem LD. From the Laboratory to Full-Scale Applications of Forward Osmosis: Research Challenges and Opportunities. *Current Pollution Reports*. 2019;5(4):337-52.
- 2) **Khan JA**, Nguyen LN, Duong HC, Nghiem LD. Acetic acid extraction from rumen fluid by forward osmosis. *Environmental Technology & Innovation*. 2020;20:101083.
- 3) **Khan JA**, Vu MT, Nghiem LD. A preliminary assessment of forward osmosis to extract water from rumen fluid for artificial saliva. *Case Studies in Chemical and Environmental Engineering*. 2021:100095.

### In-preparation Journal Paper

- 4) **Khan JA**, Nguyen AQ, Vu MT, Shon HK, Nghiem LD. Biofouling characterization and evaluation of membrane cleaning techniques in a forward osmosis process to dewater rumen fluid. *Journal of Membrane Science* (in preparation)

# Table of Contents

Certificate of Original Authorship .....	i
Acknowledgements .....	ii
Research Outcome Summary .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	v
List of Figures .....	viii
List of Tables .....	xiii
List of Abbreviations .....	xiv
Abstract .....	xvi
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Economic assessment of lignocellulose conversion to VFAs .....	3
1.3 Objectives .....	8
1.4 Research questions and hypothesis .....	9
1.5 Thesis structure .....	10
Chapter 2 Literature Review .....	12
2.1 Introduction .....	12
2.2 FO applications .....	15
2.3 Membrane development .....	18
2.4 Draw solution .....	25
2.5 Transport phenomena .....	32
2.5.1 Reverse solute flux .....	32
2.5.2 Concentration polarization .....	34
2.6 Membrane fouling and cleaning .....	37
2.6.1 Membrane fouling .....	37

2.6.2 Membrane cleaning and other fouling mitigation strategies .....	39
2.7 Full-scale FO plants .....	45
2.8 Conclusion .....	46
Chapter 3 Evaluation of Acetic Acid Extraction Potential from Rumen Fluid by Forward Osmosis .....	48
3.1 Introduction.....	48
3.2 Materials and methods .....	51
3.2.1 The FO system and the feed and stripping solutions.....	51
3.2.2 Analytical methods.....	53
3.2.3 Characterisation of FO membranes .....	54
3.2.4 FO extraction of the acetic acid from the synthetic solution and rumen fluid	56
3.3 Results and discussions.....	56
3.3.1 Membrane characterisation .....	56
3.3.2 Acetic acid extraction from the synthetic solution .....	57
3.3.3 Acetic acid extraction from rumen fluid .....	61
3.3.4 Water transfer between the feed and stripping solutions .....	63
3.3.5 The pH of feed and stripping solution.....	65
3.4 Conclusion .....	67
Chapter 4 Assessment of Forward Osmosis to Extract Water from Rumen Fluid for Artificial Saliva .....	68
4.1 Introduction.....	68
4.2 Materials and methods .....	72
4.2.1 FO membrane .....	72
4.2.2 Feed and draw solutions .....	73
4.2.3 FO system.....	73
4.3 Experimental methodology.....	74
4.3.1 FO membrane characterization .....	74



4.3.2 Rumen fluid dewatering by FO .....	76
4.3.3 Analytical Methods .....	76
4.4 Results and discussion .....	77
4.4.1 Transport characteristic of FO membrane.....	77
4.4.2 Reference artificial saliva solution.....	78
4.4.3 Artificial saliva draw solution .....	80
4.4.4 Effects of temperature and membrane fouling.....	85
4.5 Conclusion .....	91
Chapter 5 Characterization of Biofouling and Evaluation of Membrane Cleaning Techniques in Forward Osmosis.....	92
5.1 Introduction.....	92
5.2 Materials and methods .....	96
5.2.1 Materials.....	96
5.2.2 FO experimental system.....	97
5.2.3 Experimental methodology .....	98
5.2.4 Analytical methods.....	101
5.2.5 DNA extraction and sequencing.....	101
5.3 Results and discussion .....	103
5.3.1 Membrane fouling impact on FO performance.....	103
5.3.2 Microbial community composition and diversity .....	106
5.3.3 Fouling behaviour of the FO membrane .....	113
5.3.4 Membrane cleaning .....	119
5.4 Conclusion .....	127
Chapter 6 Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Work.....	128
6.1 Conclusions.....	128
6.2 Recommendations.....	130
References .....	132

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Flow chart of VFAs production potential from all the available lignocellulosic biomass and their extraction by the FO system .....	5
Figure 1.2: Thesis outline.....	11
Figure 2.1: The percentage distribution of research papers on various industrial applications. ....	16
Figure 2.2: FO journal publications since 2005 (According to Web of Science). ....	19
Figure 2.3: Active and support layers of the FO membrane. ....	20
Figure 2.4: IP of PA skin layer .....	22
Figure 2.5: Multi-criteria comparison for different types of draw solutes.....	32
Figure 2.6: Illustration of ICP and ECP in the FO and PRO modes. $C_{\text{feed}}$ , $C_{\text{draw}}$ , and $J_w$ represent the feed solution concentration, draw solution concentration and water flux, respectively. ....	35
Figure 2.7: Membrane fouling during FO operation.....	38
Figure 2.8: Pictures of (a) A full-scale FO plant in Airdrie, Alberta (Canada) (b) A pilot FO plant at Nagasaki (Japan) (c) A pilot FO plant at University of Technology Sydney; and (d) A pilot FO plant at the Quyang Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), Shanghai (China).....	46
Figure 3.1: Schematic diagram of the lab-scale FO system.....	51
Figure 3.2: Standard curve for quantitative analysis of acetate ions in the stripping solution.....	53
Figure 3.3: Effect of membrane and pH on acetic acid permeation. Experimental conditions were as follows: acetic acid 50 mM solution feed, FO mode, feed and stripping solution CFV = 10.6 cm/s. The error bars represent the standard deviation of data obtained from two independent experiments. ....	58
Figure 3.4: Effect of membrane orientation on acetic acid permeation when (a) membrane was TFC-PA and stripping solution pH was 5.5-6.5, and (b) membrane was CTA and stripping solution pH was 9.0-10.0. Experimental conditions were as follows: synthetic acetic acid 50 mM solution feed, feed and stripping CFV = 10.6 cm/s. ....	61

Figure 3.5: Acetic acid permeation from a rumen fluid at two different pH values. Experimental conditions were as follows: rumen fluid with acetic acid 50 mM as the feed, CTA membrane, FO mode, feed and stripping CFV = 10.6 cm/s. The error bars represent the standard deviation of data obtained from two independent experiments..... 62

Figure 3.6: Changes in water flux as a function of extraction time when (a) the synthetic acetic acid 50 mM solution and (b) rumen fluid with acetic acid 50 mM was used as the feed..... 64

Figure 3.7: Changes in feed solution pH as a function of extraction time when (a) the acetic acid 50 mM solution and (b) rumen fluid with acetic acid 50 mM was used as the feed..... 66

Figure 3.8: Changes in stripping solution pH as a function of extraction time when (a) acetic acid 50 mM solution (b) rumen fluid with acetic acid 50 mM was used as the feed. .... 67

Figure 4.1: Lab-based FO system (a) FO system (b) schematic diagram of the FO system. 1. Refrigerated water bath 2. Computer system 3. Digital balance 4. Draw solution in a double-walled jacketed bottle 5. Gear pumps 6. Flow meters 7. Membrane module 8. Hot water bath 9. Feed solution. .... 74

Figure 4.2: Water flux of artificial saliva and rumen fluid as draw solutions with DI water as feed at room temperature of  $24 \pm 1$  °C. The error bars represent the standard deviation of two replicate experiments. .... 80

Figure 4.3: Effect of draw solution concentration on (a) water flux and (b) RSF with DI water as a feed solution at room temperature of  $24 \pm 1$  °C. The error bars represent the standard deviation of two replicate experiments (Note: DS stands for draw solution). . 81

Figure 4.4: Effect of draw solution concentration on (a) water flux and (b) RSF with rumen fluid as feed at room temperature of  $24 \pm 1$  °C. The error bars represent the standard deviation of data obtained from two replicate experiments. .... 83

Figure 4.5: Changes in feed solution and draw solution pH as a function of time when (a) DI water was used as a feed with (2x) concentrated saliva solution was as a draw solution (b) rumen fluid was used as a feed with (2x) concentrated saliva solution was as a draw solution (c) rumen fluid was used as a feed with (4x) concentrated saliva solution was as a draw solution (d) rumen fluid was used as a feed with (6x) concentrated saliva solution

was as a draw solution. The error bars represent the standard deviation of two replicate experiments. ....	85
Figure 4.6: Effect of temperature on (a) water flux and (b) RSF with rumen fluid as feed facing the membrane active layer (Note: FS stands for feed solution). ....	86
Figure 4.7: Changes in feed solution and draw solution pH as a function of time when (a) feed solution temperature was 30 °C (b) feed solution temperature was 40 °C with (2x) concentrated saliva solution at 20 °C as a draw solution. The error bars represent the standard deviation of two replicate experiments. ....	87
Figure 4.8: Membrane fouling when the feed solution temperature was 30 °C and draw solution temperature was 20 °C (a) camera image (b) SEM image (c) EDX analysis (d) EDX mapping of the membrane fouling layer. Note: Each colour in the elemental mapping image stands for the distribution of a specific element on the fouling layer with blue dots showing phosphorous, bright green dots showing oxygen, dark red dots showing sulphur, and the dark green dots showing the calcium ions. ....	89
Figure 4.9: FTIR spectra of the membrane fouling layer when the feed solution temperature was 30 °C and draw solution temperature was 20 °C. ....	90
Figure 5.1: Schematic diagram of the FO system. ....	98
Figure 5.2: Membrane module configurations (a) membrane module configuration 1 - membrane module horizontal with feed solution on top (b) membrane module configuration 2 - membrane module horizontal with feed solution at the bottom (c) membrane module configuration 3 - membrane module vertical. ....	99
Figure 5.3: Fouled membrane under membrane module configuration 1 with feed solution on top (a) before samples collection (b) after samples collection. ....	103
Figure 5.4: Changes in the (a) water flux and the (b) RSF over 6 days (3 cycles) FO operation. The error bars represent the standard deviation of two replicate experiments. ....	104
Figure 5.5: Membrane fouling on the active layer side at the end of experiment using (a) feed solution on top in membrane module (b) feed solution at the bottom in membrane module (c) membrane module vertical. ....	106
Figure 5.6: Rarefaction curves of 16S rRNA marker gene amplicon sequences at a maximum depth of 18,700 where inoculum-1 and inoculum-2 represent the duplicate samples of the non-filtered rumen fluid; filtered inoculum-1 and filtered inoculum-2	

represent the duplicate samples of the filtered rumen fluid; feed solution-1, feed solution-2, and feed solution-3 represent the three feed solution samples taken under the membrane module configurations 1, 2, and 3, respectively; biofilm 1-1 and biofilm 1-2 represent the duplicate biofilm samples under the membrane module configuration 1 with feed solution on top in the membrane module; biofilm 2-1 and biofilm 2-2 represent the duplicate biofilm samples under the membrane module configuration 2 with feed solution at the bottom in the membrane module; biofilm 3-1 and biofilm 3-2 represent the duplicate biofilm samples under the membrane module configuration 3 with vertical membrane module..... 107

Figure 5.7: Microbial diversity in terms of species richness and Shannon index in the inoculum, filtered inoculum, feed solution and biofilms where biofilm 1 represents the biofilm sample when the feed solution was on top in membrane module, biofilm 2 represents the biofilm sample when the feed solution was at the bottom in membrane module, and biofilm 3 represents the biofilm sample when membrane module was placed vertically on the surface. .... 109

Figure 5.8: Principal coordinates analysis showing the difference in microbial community structure using the Bray–Curtis dissimilarities metric. .... 110

Figure 5.9: Microbial composition of inoculum, filtered inoculum, feed solution and biofilms under different membrane module configurations..... 112

Figure 5.10: SEM and EDX mapping measurements of a fouled membrane surface after 6 days FO operation ((a) and (b)) feed solution on top in membrane module ((b) and (c)) feed solution at the bottom in membrane module ((e) and (f)) membrane module vertical. .... 115

Figure 5.11: EDX mapping of the membrane fouling layer (a) membrane active layer facing upward (b) membrane active layer facing downward (c) membrane active layer facing sideways..... 117

Figure 5.12: FTIR spectra of fouled membrane surfaces after 6 days of FO operation. .... 118

Figure 5.13: Water flux before fouling, during fouling, after fouling, and after cleaning under membrane module configuration 1 with feed solution flowing in the upper semi cell of the membrane module. The error bars represent the standard deviation of two replicate experiments. .... 121

Figure 5.14: SEM images of (a) clean membrane surface (b) after fouling (c) after hydraulic cleaning (d) after osmotic backwashing (e) after chemical cleaning (f) after osmotic backwashing and chemical cleaning combined..... 123

Figure 5.15: EDX carbon and oxygen mapping of (a) fouled membrane (b) membrane after hydraulic cleaning (c) membrane after osmotic backwashing (d) membrane after chemical cleaning (e) membrane after osmotic backwashing and chemical cleaning combined..... 126

## List of Tables

Table 1.1: Economics of acetic acid (with the spot price of \$795/ton) production from lignocellulosic biomass in a rumen reactor with 100,000 tons of lignocellulosic material processing capacity per year and acetic acid extraction by FO over 20 years of operation. ....	8
Table 2.1: Recent developments in FO membrane fabrication.....	20
Table 2.2: Types of draw solutions and some corresponding examples used in FO (# at osmotic pressure difference between the feed and draw solution of 2.8 MPa).....	26
Table 2.3: Pilot-scale FO studies reported to date in the literature.....	30
Table 2.4 Major chemicals used for cleaning different types of membrane fouling .....	41
Table 3.1: Key transport parameters of the CTA and TFC-PA FO membranes.....	56
Table 4.1: A, B, and S values of the FO membranes. The error values represent the standard deviation of at least two replicate experiments. ....	78
Table 4.2: Composition of the artificial saliva solution.....	79
Table 4.3: EDX elemental composition of the fouling layer .....	88
Table 5.1: Composition of the synthetic rumen solution. ....	97
Table 5.2: EDX elemental composition of the fouling layer .....	114
Table 5.3: EDX elemental composition of clean and fouled membranes.....	125

## List of Abbreviations

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
AOC	Assimilable organic carbon
CFV	Cross flow velocity
CTA	Cellulose triacetate
DI	Deionized
ECP	External concentration polarization
EDTA	Ethylene diamine tetra-acetic acid
EDX	Energy dispersive X-ray
EPS	Extracellular polymeric substances
FO	Forward osmosis
FTIR	Fourier transformed infrared
gMH	$\text{g}/\text{m}^2\cdot\text{h}$
ICP	Internal concentration polarization
IP	Interfacial polymerization
LMH	$\text{L}/\text{m}^2\cdot\text{h}$
MBR	Membrane bioreactor
MD	Membrane distillation
MED	Multi-effect distillation
MF	Microfiltration
mgMH	$\text{mg}/\text{m}^2\cdot\text{h}$
MPD	M-phenylenediamine
MSF	Multi-stage flash
NF	Nanofiltration
NMP	N-methyle-2-pyrrolidone



PA	Polyamide
PAI	Polyamide-imide
PcoA	Principal coordinates analysis
PEI	Polyethyleneimine
PES	Polyethersulfone
PET	Polyethylene terephthalate
PRO	Pressure retarded osmosis
PSF	Poysulfone
RO	Reverse osmosis
RSF	Reverse solute flux
SEM	Scanning electron microscopy
SRSF	Specific reverse solute flux
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TFC-PA	Thin-film composite polyamide
TMC	Trimesoyl chloride
UF	Ultrafiltration
VFAs	Volatile fatty acids
VS	Volatile solids

## **Abstract**

Nature offers elegant, efficient, and sustainable solutions to most of our problems. One such problem is to convert the most abundant natural resource of lignocellulosic biomass into a fermented solution for subsequent biochemicals extraction. An efficient, economical and eco-friendly technique or system has not been developed yet to address this problem. Nature has offered a robust solution to this problem in the form of ruminant's digestive system where a fermented solution (rumen fluid) is produced from the digestion of biomass in the fore-stomach (or rumen) with the help of diverse microbiota followed by volatile fatty acids (VFAs) absorption from the rumen fluid in the small intestine along with water absorption in the omasum and large intestine. This study aims to replicate the two important processes taking place inside the ruminant's digestive system with a membrane-based forward osmosis (FO) process. First is the use of FO for acetic acid extraction from rumen fluid by mimicking the VFAs absorption in the small intestine and second is employing FO for dewatering of rumen fluid by simulating the water absorption in the omasum and the large intestine. Besides, this study also covers the membrane biofouling that can occur as a result of resource recovery from rumen fluid in a long term FO operation and evaluates the various membrane cleaning strategies for flux recovery.

Unlike other FO applications to extract water and reduce the feed water volume, this study used FO to mimic the ruminant's small intestine for extracting acetic acid from rumen fluid to a clean matrix with a minimum water flux. Membrane characterisation results showed better separation performance by the thin-film composite polyamide (TFC-PA) membrane in terms of pure water permeability, solute rejection, and structural parameter compared to the cellulose triacetate (CTA) membrane. This was further endorsed by the higher acetic acid transport through the CTA membrane than the TFC-PA membrane.

Increasing the stripping solution pH from 5.5-6.5 to 9.0-10.0 increased the acetic acid transport through both the CTA and TFC-PA membranes. On the other hand, the membrane orientation had no discernible effect on the transport of acetic acid. Under the optimum conditions, the FO process using the CTA membrane exhibited negligible water flux and extracted 27% of the maximum attainable acetic acid from the synthetic solution within 8 hours of operation. The optimised conditions were used to elaborate the FO extraction of acetic acid from a real rumen fluid. Considerably lower extraction rate from the real rumen fluid was observed compared to the synthetic solution.

This study also explored the use of FO for extracting water from the rumen fluid by replicating the dewatering function of the large intestine and omasum in ruminant animals. The reference artificial saliva solution was determined by comparing its osmotic pressure to that of the rumen fluid. The concentrated saliva showed good pH buffering capacity with no significant pH changes during FO operation. High water flux and a low reverse solute flux (RSF) were observed using concentrated artificial saliva as a draw solution and clean water as the feed. However, the water flux decreased and the RSF increased significantly when rumen fluid was used as the feed. Membrane fouling was observed with the deposition of mainly biomolecules from the rumen fluid on the membrane surface and the high temperature of feed solution further exacerbated membrane fouling. Membrane fouling was evidenced by visual examination as well as scanning electron microscope (SEM), energy dispersive X-ray (EDX), and Fourier transformed infrared (FTIR) analysis of the membrane surface.

Membrane biofouling was investigated in a long term FO operation for water extraction from rumen fluid. Three of the possible membrane module configurations were used to assess their effect on the membrane fouling. In the horizontal membrane module configurations, the circulation of the feed solution on top of the membrane cell led to

more severe fouling compared to that from the bottom of the membrane module. The best resistance to fouling was observed in the vertical configuration of the membrane module. The results suggest that fouling is driven mostly by the gravity-driven deposition of foulants on the membrane surface. This was evidenced by the SEM-EDX and FTIR analyses of the fouling layers. The biofouling phenomenon was further characterized using the bioinformatics analysis of the inoculum, feed solution, and fouling layer microbial communities. A distinct biofilm microbial community with lower diversity and different composition from other samples were observed when feed solution was on top in the membrane module, due to the thick and more mature fouling layer. Aerobic and facultatively anaerobic microbial species such as *Pseudomonadaceae*, *Xanthomonadaceae* and *Arcobacteraceae* that were not detected in the inoculum emerged in the feed and thrived in biofilms under all membrane module configurations. Among these species, *Pseudomonadaceae* and *Xanthomonadaceae* were the most abundant, and both have been previously reported to possess superior attachment and biofilm-forming capacity. Different membrane cleaning techniques including hydraulic cleaning, osmotic backwashing, and chemical cleaning were applied to remove membrane fouling. A combination of chemical cleaning using 0.1% NaOCl and osmotic backwashing using NaCl 1M solution was found to be most effective with 70.0% flux recovery while hydraulic cleaning was the least effective that could only recover 14.1% flux. While the results are still preliminary, they highlight the potential for effective control of membrane fouling during water extraction from rumen fluid by FO.