Thin mixed matrix and dual layer membranes containing metal-organic framework nanosheets and Polyactive™ for CO₂ capture

Anahid Sabetghadam^{1*}, Xinlei Liu¹, Soraya Gottmer¹, Liangyong Chu², Jorge Gascon^{1,3} and Freek Kapteijn^{1*}

¹Catalysis Engineering, Department of Chemical Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Van der Maasweg 9, 2629HZ Delft, The Netherlands.

²Organic Materials and Interfaces, Department of Chemical Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Van der Maasweg 9, 2629HZ Delft, The Netherlands.

³KAUST Catalysis Center, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Advanced Catalytic Materials, Thuwal 23955, Saudi Arabia.

Email: f.kapteijn@tudelft.nl, a.sabetghadamesfahani@tudelft.nl

Abstract

Preparation methods are presented of thin dual layer membranes (DLM's) and mixed matrix membranes (MMM's) based on nanosheets of the Cu-BDC metal-organic framework (MOF, lateral size range 1-5 μm , thickness 15 nm) and commercially available poly(ethylene oxide)–poly(butylene terephthalate) (PEO–PBT) copolymer (Polyactive™) and their performances are compared in CO₂/N₂ separation. The MMMs and DLMs represent two extremes, on the one hand with well-mixed components and on the other hand completely segregated layers. Compared to the free-standing membranes, the thin PAN- and zirconia-alumina-supported MMMs showed significant enhancement in both permeance and selectivity. The support properties affect the obtained selective layer thickness and its resistance impacts the CO₂/N₂ selectivity. The permeance of thin DLM's is among the highest reported literature data of MOF based thin MMMs, but have a modest selectivity. Addition of the nanosheets in the thin MMMs improves the CO₂/N₂ selectivity of the already selective polymer further to 77. The nanosheets in the thin MMMs make a gutter layer on the PAN support superfluous. The small pore support ZrO₂-alumina does not need a gutter layer.

XRD analysis reveals that the spatial distribution of MOF nanosheets and polymer chains packing were responsible for differences in the permeation performance of the free-standing, thin dual layer and mixed matrix membranes.

Keywords: MOF nanosheets, Polyactive™, Cu-BDC, mixed matrix membranes, dual layer, gas separation, CO₂/N₂.

1. Introduction

The increasing global demand for energy-efficient separations in carbon capture has prompted international actions on searching for novel, high-performance separation membranes [1]. For industrial scale applications such as natural gas sweetening [2], CO₂ capture from flue gas [3] and H₂ separation from syngas [4], the use of highly permeable and selective membranes is essential. Industrial-scale gas separation applications require production of large membrane areas (e.g., 10⁵ to 10⁷ m²) with low defect densities (e.g., below 1 m² per 10⁵ m² of membrane surface area) [5]. Such a scale-up is often quite challenging and requires the production of thin, defect free membranes using industrial membrane fabrication methods [6]. Membranes with very thin selective layers (asymmetric or composite structure) typically in the range of 0.1–2 µm are required. The first thin asymmetric membrane was made by phase inversion and reported by Loeb-Surirajan in 1959. The asymmetric structure consisted of a 0.2-0.5 µm thin skin layer supported by a porous substructure with 0.1-1.0 µm pore size [7]. Another class of thin membranes can be prepared by coating a thin selective layer on a porous support which are known as thin supported membranes [8]. These membranes are cheaper to manufacture on industrial scale due to the lower consumption of material for the selective layer preparation and the use of commercial porous supports. The most widely used methods for preparing thin supported membranes are drop-casting [9], dip-coating [10] and spin coating [11].

Commonly, thin membranes may also have an intermediate layer known as gutter layer between the porous support and the selective layer. The gutter layer is mainly chosen from highly permeable polymers such as PDMS [9] or PTMSP [12] to afford a smooth and flat coating surface while preventing the upper selective layer penetration into the support. This method also heals defects in the support layer improving the membrane quality, constituted a breakthrough in the application of polymeric membranes [13, 14].

Regarding greenhouse gas emission reduction CO₂ selective membranes are subject of many studies. Membranes with CO₂/N₂ selectivities >30 and high permeances are required in post-combustion CO₂ capture to reduce the energetic impact [15, 16]. Glassy-rubbery polymers like Pebax and Polyactive™ types with selectivities around 50 are most studied. The Polaris membrane belonging to these materials [17] has shown excellent permeances as well [14]. The question arises if the separation performance of such polymeric membranes can be improved even further. High selectivities may reduce the required membrane area or even change the process lay-out [13]. A feasible approach to improve the selectivity is the incorporation of fillers (e.g., micro- or nanoparticles) in the polymeric matrix to form mixed matrix membranes (MMMs) [18]. However, thin MMMs potentially suffer from defect formation during the fabrication process due to a poor compatibility between filler and

matrix, which makes their large-scale production quite challenging. One strategy to prepare defect free ultra-thin mixed matrix membranes is using polymers that address the compatibility and ageing issues. Glassy-rubbery block copolymers such as Pebax[®] have been widely studied to make the defect-free MMMs due to their low glass transition temperature and chain flexibility, filling the gaps between filler and polymer.[19-21] Using Pebax[®] 1657 as the continuous matrix resulted in MMMs featuring moderate CO₂ permeability and relatively high selectivity over N₂ and CH₄, making it an attractive polymer for defect free thin membrane formation [10, 22-26]. Polyactive[™], composed of poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO) and poly(butylenes terephthalate) (PBT) segments, is another promising block copolymer for CO₂ separation which has been fabricated as thin membrane and used in pilot scale modules [27]. To fabricate defect-free thin membranes the use of high molecular weight polymer was needed [28].

Considering the compatibility issues in mixed matrix membranes, metal-organic frameworks are known as potential candidate with improved polymer-filler interaction. This is mainly ascribed to the organic linker functional groups that can interact with the polymer chains [29, 30].

Another approach to address difficulties in fabricating large-scale, defect-free thin MMMs is the use of nanomaterials with a high aspect ratio (e.g., carbon nanotubes [31], graphene [32], 2D zeolites [33] and MOF nanosheets [34]) as fillers [35, 36]. In this regard MOFs offer a number of advantages, since their morphology can be tuned in a relatively straightforward manner. As example, different morphologies of NH₂-MIL-53(Al) such as nanorod, microneedle, nanoparticle and nanosheet were synthesized via using various synthetic approaches [37, 38]. Cu-BDC bulk and nanosheet morphologies were compared by Rodenas *et al.* [39] and even the preparation of non-lamellar MOF nanosheets has recently been reported [38]. In general, two different synthesis routes have been reported for 2D MOF materials, which are globally (i) top-down and (ii) bottom-up synthesis approaches. The first approach relies on exfoliation of 3D materials that have some drawbacks such as crystal or morphological damage and re-aggregation of the exfoliated material [40, 41]. The second approach is preferably used in synthesis of ultra-thin sheets in which the aspect-ratio is possible to be tuned by either anisotropic crystal growth or thermodynamically limiting the layer stacking [42-44]. The main driving force for the bottom-up synthesis is the diffusion of the metal and ligand sources into the intermediate spacer layer which can be tuned by temperature as reported by Shete *et al.* [45].

Recently, an advancement of free-standing 2D MOF MMMs has been achieved by incorporating the Cu-BDC and NH₂-MIL-53(Al) nanosheets in Matrimid[®] and 6FDA-DAM membranes, showing a significant enhancement of CO₂/CH₄ selectivity relative to the pristine membranes [38, 39, 45, 46]. This confirms the role of lamellar morphology of the fillers with high aspect ratio that could facilitate

a perpendicular pore orientation and shorter diffusion paths for desired components, while increasing that for undesired components making their permeation pathway more tortuous [47]. More recently, the synthesis of thin 2D MOF MMMs has been reported by Cheng *et al.* [11]. Here, we report the scaled-up synthesis of Cu-BDC nanosheets and fabrication of free-standing and thin supported membranes comprising these Cu-BDC nanosheets and commercially available PEO-PBT block copolymer (Polyactive™). In order to demonstrate the scope of this approach, the influence of different fabrication methods on the permeation performance of two membrane extremes, viz. thin MMMs with well mixed and DLMs with completely segregated components, was studied in relation to CO₂ capture.

2. Experimental

2.1 Synthesis

Cu-BDC nanosheet scaled-up synthesis: Cu-BDC nanosheets were prepared following the bottom-up route introduced by Rodenas *et al.* [37]. In this study, the nanosheet synthesis was modified and scaled up where the amount of reactants and solvent was multiplied by 50. The linker layer was prepared by dissolving 1.5 g terephthalic acid (Sigma Aldrich, 99 %) in a mixture of 100 mL N,N-dimethylformamide (DMF, Sigma Aldrich, >99 %) and 50 mL acetonitrile (Sigma Aldrich, analytical grade) and was added to the 500 mL Duran® bottle as the bottom layer. The intermediate layer (spacer) consisted of 100 mL DMF and 100 mL acetonitrile and was added gently to the bottle. The top layer was prepared by dissolving 1.5 g Cu(NO₃)₂·3H₂O (Sigma Aldrich) in a mixture of 100 mL acetonitrile and 50 mL DMF and was added to the bottle without mixing. Then, the bottle was kept in the oven at 40 °C for 24h. The as-synthesized nanosheets were collected by centrifugation and after removing the supernatant, the solvent were replaced with fresh DMF. This procedure was repeated three times and the next step was using tetrahydrofuran (THF, Sigma Aldrich, >99 %) to centrifuge samples via identical procedure as DMF washing (in this study both chloroform and THF were used for comparison). Finally, the synthesized nanosheets were dispersed in chloroform (Sigma Aldrich, anhydrous) for membrane preparation.

Free-standing MMMs preparation via solution-casting: to fabricate the free-standing membranes, Polyactive™ (Mw~35000 g/mol, Polyvation, NL) granules were degassed for 2 h at 353 K under vacuum and then, 0.2 g dried polymer was dissolved in 2.5 mL chloroform. The proper amount of Cu-BDC nanosheet suspension in chloroform were ultrasonicated for 20 min. Then, 10 % of dissolved polymer was added to the suspension and was stirred for 2 h. The rest of the polymer solution was added to the mixture and stirred overnight. The solvent/filler-polymer weight ratio was kept constant (95/5) in all cases. The casting solution was poured on the Teflon petri dish and was covered

with a top-drilled box (30.5 cm length x 15.5 cm height x 23.0 cm width) overnight under chloroform-saturated atmosphere. Finally, the membranes were treated under vacuum at 353 K for 24 h. The neat membranes were also prepared with identical approach, without the addition of nanosheets.

Thin supported MMMs preparation via dip-coating: to prepare the thin supported MMMs, polyacrylonitrile (PAN; supplied from AMT® Co. Ltd) porous UF membrane with pore size around 100 nm and ZrO₂ coated alumina (supplied from Fraunhofer IKTS, Germany) with pore size around 3 nm were used as support. The dip-coating method was used to coat the supports with the polymer/nanosheet mixture (4 and 8 wt.% nanosheet in Polyactive™ solution). The mixture used for dip-coating was prepared in a similar way as for the free-standing membranes. However, the amounts were increased by 12 times to prepare the required volume for dip-coating process. The PAN support was pretreated by washing firstly with demi water, and keeping it in the mixture of water and ethanol (50/50) overnight to fill the pores of support. Prior to dip-coating, water droplets were smoothly wiped off from the surface of the support by filter paper. The support was sealed on the Teflon plate by Kapton® tape and was deeply soaked in 3 wt.% PDMS in hexane solution (Sylgard® 184 Silicone Elastomer). In order to cure the PDMS gutter layer, the support was heat-treated at 100 °C for 30 min. Then, the PDMS coated support was soaked in the polymer/nanosheet mixture vertically and left to dry in a closed Petri dish at room temperature for 24 h. The same procedure was used to prepare the thin membranes on the ZrO₂-alumina support. For the sample identification, the xns-yPA-PDMS-MMM abbreviation was used where x represents the weight percentage of nanosheet based on polymer and y refers to the polymer concentration in the coating solution.

Thin supported DLM preparation via drop-casting: to fabricate the thin dual layer membranes (DLM), the PAN support was firstly mounted in the vacuum filtration apparatus and was coated with 1 mL highly diluted Cu-BDC nanosheet suspension (0.05 wt.%). After drying, the surface of the nanosheets layer was coated with PDMS for the membranes with gutter layer, as described above. Then, 1 mL Polyactive™ solution (0.25 to 0.5 wt.% in Chloroform) was dropwise added on the PDMS or nanosheet layer and the membranes were dried at room temperature for 24 h. Similarly as above for the sample identification the xns-yPA-PDMS-DLM abbreviation was used

2.2 Characterization

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) analysis was carried out using a JEOL JEM-2010 microscope operated at 200 keV. Micrograph acquisition was performed with GATAN Digital Micrograph 1.80.70 software. A few drops of MOF dispersed in chloroform were added on a carbon-coated copper grid and then after drying it was placed on the specimen.

Field emission scanning electron microscopy (FE-SEM) was performed in Nova NanoSEM 450 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) operated at 10 kV. To get the cross section images of the membranes, the samples were immersed and fractured in liquid nitrogen and gold-coated prior to scanning.

Atomic force microscopy (AFM) was performed with a Veeco Multimode Nanoscope 3A microscope operating in tapping mode.

XRD patterns of nanosheets and MMMs were obtained in a Bruker-D8 Advance diffractometer using Co-K α radiation ($\lambda = 1.78897\text{\AA}$, 40 kV, 30 mA). The range of 5-60° of 2 θ was scanned using a step size of 0.02° and a scan speed of 0.2 s per step in a continuous scanning mode. The XRD patterns of thin MMMs were obtained by Bruker-D8 Discovery diffractometer and using Cu-K α radiation ($\lambda = 1.54059\text{\AA}$, 40 kV, 30 mA).

CO₂ and N₂ adsorption isotherms of Cu-BDC nanosheets were recorded in a Tristar II 3020 (Micromeritics) setup at 273 and 77 K, respectively. Prior to the measurements, the samples were degassed at 423 K under vacuum overnight.

2.3 Gas permeation experiments

The separation of CO₂ and N₂ mixtures at 298 K was conducted in a home-made setup described elsewhere [48]. The membrane samples (area: 1.13 or 3.14 cm²) were prepared and mounted in a flange between two Viton® O-rings. A macroporous stainless steel disc (316L, 20 μm nominal pore size) was used as support. The permeation module was placed inside a convection oven for controlling the temperature. A mixture (133 ml·min⁻¹, STP) of CO₂ (15 mol.%) and N₂ (85 mol.%) flow was used as feed and helium (3 ml·min⁻¹, STP) was used as a sweep gas. The feed pressure was adjusted to 2 bar (absolute pressure) using a back-pressure controller at the retentate side while the permeate side was kept at atmospheric pressure (1 bar absolute pressure) for all measurements. An online gas chromatograph (Interscience Compact GC) equipped with a packed Carboxen® 1010 PLOT (30 m x 0.32 mm) column and TCD detector was used to analyse the permeate stream.

Gas separation performance was defined by two parameters: the separation factor (α , or selectivity) and the gas permeability or permeance. The thin membranes performance mainly defined by permeance which is the pressure normalized flux of the membrane and is reported in Gas Permeation Unit (GPU) where 1 GPU = 1×10⁻⁶ cm³ (STP)/(cm²·s·cmHg) or 3.35×10⁻¹² mol·s⁻¹·m⁻²·Pa⁻¹. The permeance for the component i (P_i) was calculated as follows (Equation 1):

$$P_i = \frac{F_i}{Dp_i \times A} \quad (1)$$

Where F_i denotes the molar flow rate of compound i , Δp_i is the partial pressure difference of i across the membrane, and A is the membrane area.

The separation factor or mixed gas selectivity (α) of CO₂ over N₂ was defined as the ratio of their permeance and can be expressed as follows:

$$\alpha_{\text{CO}_2, \text{N}_2} = \frac{P_{\text{CO}_2}}{P_{\text{N}_2}} \quad (2)$$

Where P_{CO_2} and P_{N_2} represent the permeance of CO₂ and N₂, respectively.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Characterization scaled-up Cu-BDC nanosheets

Scaled up synthesis of Cu-BDC nanosheet was successfully performed by using the layered route (Figure 1a) reported by our group [44]. Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) and electron diffraction show the morphology and plane orientation of nanosheets. The equal d -spacing of the basal planes in the xy direction indicates the tetragonal projection of the crystal structure. (Figure 1b and 1c) [45]. Atomic force microscopy (AFM) images of the nanosheets presented in Figure 1d and 1e show the square platelet structures with lateral sizes of 1-5 μm and an approximate thickness of 15 nm (Figure 1e). XRD results of the sample before and after washing with THF indicate no significant difference in crystallinity. CO₂ and N₂ adsorption of the scaled-up sample (Figure 1g, 1h) show an uptake of CO₂ of 0.8 mmol·g⁻¹ at 1 bar and a BET area of 55 m²·g⁻¹. These results are in good agreement with the reported adsorption capacity and BET area of the samples of the original synthesis [39]. The calculated yield of the scaled up synthesis, however, was lower than original synthesis (4% vs. 8%), which might be attributed to the dominant influence of the interfacial area in the three layers approach. Although the amount of reactants was increased up to 50 times, the interface area in scaled-up synthesis was approximately 3.8 times larger than in the original synthesis (Figure 1a). This confirms the key role of interface area in promoting the yield of reaction by providing the sufficient surface to contact the reactants by diffusional transport.

Figure 1. Cu-BDC nanosheet original and scaled-up synthesis (a), TEM images and electron diffraction pattern of region shown in inset (b, c), AFM image showing the thickness of Cu-BDC nanosheets (d, e), XRD patterns of original [39] and scaled-up synthesis using chloroform and THF (f), CO₂ and N₂ adsorption of Cu-BDC nanosheets at 273 and 77 K (g, h) (the open and closed symbols represent the adsorption and desorption data, respectively).

3.2 MMM characterization

Thin supported membranes comprising Cu-BDC nanosheets and Polyactive™ were prepared on porous PAN and ZrO₂-alumina supports using two approaches; *i*) Dip-coating and, *ii*) Drop-casting to obtain mixed matrix and dual layer thin membranes, respectively (Figure 2 & S1).

2D and 3D AFM images of thin MMM (8ns-3PA; 8 wt.% nanosheets in 3 wt.% Polyactive™ solution) prepared *via* dip-coating are shown in Figure 3a & 3b. Cross-sectional FE-SEM images of this membrane coated on ZrO₂-alumina and PAN supports (without PDMS gutter layer) are shown in Figure 3(c-f). The cross-sectional FE-SEM images reveal that the thin layer formation was successful without polymer penetration in to the finger-like pores of the PAN support, which could be attributed to the fast solvent (CHCl₃) evaporation and vertical orientation of membrane during drying (Figure S1) [49]. Comparing the thin MMMs coated on PAN and on ZrO₂-alumina revealed that the thickness was 50% lower in case of ZrO₂-alumina support (351 vs. 708 nm) (Figure 3c & 3d). This is ascribed to the lower top surface roughness of ZrO₂-alumina (pore size ~3 nm) and adherence of less coating solution to the support.

In contrast, using drop-casting resulted in a smooth surface of the thin membranes, representing horizontally aligned nanosheets by vacuum filtration on the support (Figure 4a & 4b) and an adequate coverage of the nanosheets by the polymer layer (Figure 4c & 4d).

XRD patterns of Cu-BDC nanosheets and free-standing membranes are compared in Figure 5a. PolyactiveTM neat membrane shows a certain degree of crystallinity [50]. However, by addition of Cu-BDC nanosheets into PolyactiveTM, the reflections of the polymer that appeared in the range of $2\theta \sim 22-27^\circ$ became wider and overlapped (Figure 5a). Moreover, the polymer reflection slightly shifted to higher 2θ (lower d -spacing), showing reduction in polymer chains spacing as was previously reported by Zornoza *et al.* [48, 51]. Further, the typical reflections of Cu-BDC nanosheets which were indexed as $(-2\ 0\ 1)$ and $(-4\ 0\ 2)$ shifted slightly and their intensity decreased. In turn, the reflections of the $(1\ 1\ 0)$, $(0\ 4\ 0)$ planes (Figure 5c & 5d), are more visible in the MMMs. These results indicate a change in the orientation of the nanosheets in free-standing MMMs which might have arisen from shear forces during membrane preparation and solvent evaporation [11, 52]. In contrast, thin supported neat PolyactiveTM membranes and the relevant thin MMMs showed different patterns as indicated in Figure 5b. This might be attributed to the ultrafast drying of the thin layer during the dip-coating process, changing the polymer chain packing and resulting in broadened reflections of thin supported membranes compared to free-standing membranes. The addition of nanosheets to the polymer slightly changed the crystallinity of the neat membrane and the nanosheet reflections corresponding to $(-2\ 0\ 1)$ and $(1\ 1\ 0)$ planes with direction toward pore accessibility were observed. However, the reflections attributed to $(0\ 0\ 1)$, $(0\ 4\ 0)$ and $(-4\ 0\ 2)$ planes were not strong enough which might be due to the less loading of nanosheets or different orientation in the thin membranes.

Figure 2. Scheme of thin supported dual layer (*top*) and mixed matrix (*bottom*) membranes prepared *via* dip-coating and drop-casting methods.

Figure 3. AFM 2D and 3D topography images (a, b) and FE-SEM images of thin MMMs on ZrO₂-alumina (c, d) and PAN support (e, f) prepared by dip-coating in the mixture of 8 wt.% nanosheet in Polyactive™ (8ns-3PA-MMM).

Figure 4. FE-SEM images of surface (a) and cross-section (b) of nanosheets coated on PAN and cross-section images of dual layer thin membranes on PAN prepared by drop-casting (ns-0.25PA-PDMS-DLM) (c, d).

Figure 5. XRD patterns of Cu-BDC nanosheets, free-standing membranes (using $\text{Co-K}\alpha$) (a) and thin membranes (using $\text{Cu-K}\alpha$ -radiation) (b), crystal structure of Cu-BDC showing $(-2\ 0\ 1)$ (c) and $(1\ 1\ 0)$, $(0\ 4\ 0)$ and $(0\ 0\ 1)$ planes (d).

3.3 Gas separation performance

The free-standing membranes fabricated by solution casting were tested under identical condition as reported previously [30]. Table 1 shows their CO_2 and N_2 separation performance parameters. The increase in nanosheet loading (from 0 to 16 wt.%) resulted in a monotonous improvement in selectivity (from 56 to 66) along with a decrease of gas permeance. The obtained permeation results are in good agreement with reported data of MMMs using Cu-BDC nanosheets with Matrimid® or 6FDA-DAM as the continuous matrix [39, 45, 46]. The decrease in permeance of the MMMs is in line with XRD patterns of the free-standing membranes, showing reduction in polymer chains distance and a partial change in orientation of nanosheets towards non-accessible porosity of MOF in MMMs. Further, the flexible polymer chains might penetrate into pores of the nanosheets and partially block the porosity of MOF [50].

The thin membranes prepared by two different approaches (dip-coating and drop-casting methods) were tested under identical conditions as for the free-standing membranes. The permeation results of thin supported MMMs prepared by dip-coating with and without using PDMS as gutter layer are presented in Figure 6a. The selectivity of the neat thin membrane was very low (~ 10) which could be attributed to the large pore size of the PAN support and defect formation. Coating with a PDMS

gutter layer improved slightly the selectivity. In order to fabricate a thin neat Polyactive™ membrane with expected intrinsic selectivity, a double coating approach was applied. However, a considerable drop in CO₂ permeance to ~6 GPU resulted (still above the free standing sample) along with an increase in selectivity to 54, similar as for the pure Polyactive™ membrane. For thin MMMs prepared under identical conditions with single coating, an increase in selectivity (ranging from 58 to 72) was achieved even with an improvement of permeance. The performance of thin MMMs prepared with PDMS gutter layer was only slightly different from the membranes without gutter layer. Therefore, high aspect ratio fillers (nanosheets) could make the PDMS gutter layer and its optimization superfluous with the advantage of obtaining higher selectivity.[1, 53] Interestingly, using a lower concentration of polymer solution (3 wt.%) resulted in certain improvement in permeance of the thin MMM (to ~40 GPU) and increasing the selectivity up to 77 (Figure 6a; purple symbol). The selectivity is even higher than the optimized free standing MMM (table 1) which might be attributed to the different polymer chains packing and nanosheet orientation as revealed by XRD studies [11].

To investigate the role of support properties, ZrO₂-alumina with much smaller pore size (~3 nm) was used to prepare thin membranes via dip-coating (Figure 6b). The neat thin Polyactive™ membrane without PDMS gutter layer was apparently defect-free showing higher selectivity and permeance than the PAN supported membrane. The thin MMMs coated on ZrO₂-alumina showed a simultaneous improvement in permeance and in selectivity, whereas the relevant PAN supported thin MMMs (without PDMS gutter layer) only showed improvement in selectivity and decrease in permeance. The thin MMMs coated on PAN, however, showed a higher selectivity using the same formulation, which might be attributed to the influence of support resistance on selectivity by Knudsen diffusion as reported by Kattula *et al.* for polymeric membranes [1, 53] and by Kapteijn *et al.* for zeolite membranes [54]. Decreasing the polymer concentration from 5 to 3 wt.% in the ZrO₂-alumina supported thin MMMs resulted in a further increase in permeance to ~40 GPU while selectivity hardly changed (65) (Figure 6b; purple symbol). Considering the thickness, the FE-SEM images (Figure S2) showed a 50-60% reduction in the thickness of the thin membranes. The same dilution for the PAN supported membranes resulted in an improvement of permeance from 25 to 40 GPU and selectivity from 72 to 77. This higher selectivity is attributed to the lower resistance of the PAN support compared to the small pore size ZrO₂-alumina support [1, 55]. Finally, 3 wt.% was found the lower limit for diluting the polymer concentration using dip-coating; at lower concentrations no defect-free thin film was obtained.

To utilize the morphological advantages of high aspect ratio nanosheets more efficiently in thin film formation, thin PAN-supported dual layer membranes (DLMs) were prepared by drop-casting (Figure 2). Their permeation properties are indicated in Figure 6c. The higher permeance of the thin DLMs than MMMs confirms that the polymer chains packing and the orientation of the nanosheets were

not influenced. However, the selectivity of the dip-coated thin MMMs was higher than the thin DLMS, which signifies the role of spatial distribution of nanosheets and the polymer chains distance on the selectivity in thin MMMs [56]. A PDMS gutter layer had a more pronounced influence on the permeation performance of thin dual layer membranes. The permeance with a PDMS gutter layer was 66% higher than without PDMS while the selectivity did not change significantly (Figure 6c; blue & green arrows). Decreasing the Polyactive™ concentration in the drop-casting solution from 0.5 to 0.25 wt.% further improved the permeance (2.5 times) of the thin membranes while selectivity was slightly decreased (16%). As a result, it can be concluded that preparing thin dual layer membranes via drop-casting is promising in terms of permeance. However, the spatial distribution of nanosheets, like in MMMs, is an essential parameter to effectively improve the selectivity of the thin membranes.

Table 1. Permeation performance of the free-standing MMMs comprising Cu-BDC nanosheets and Polyactive™ at 2 bar and 25 °C.

Membrane	CO ₂ Permeance (GPU)	N ₂ Permeance (GPU)	α_{CO_2/N_2} -	δ (μm)
Neat PA	3.9 ± 0.2	0.07 ± 0.00	56 ± 2	28 ± 1
4 wt.% ns/PA	2.6 ± 0.1	0.04 ± 0.00	59 ± 1	37 ± 1
8 wt.% ns/PA	2.5 ± 0.2	0.04 ± 0.00	62 ± 0	35 ± 1
16 wt.% ns/PA	3.3 ± 0.2	0.05 ± 0.00	66 ± 2	20 ± 1

Figure 6. CO_2 and N_2 separation performance of dip-coated thin MMMs on (a) PAN, and (b) ZrO_2 -alumina support, (c) thin dual layer membranes drop-casted on PAN support at 298 K and 2 bar absolute feed pressure (mixed gases). In the sample identification x represents the weight percent of nanosheets based on polymer and y refers to the polymer concentration in the coating solution.

Figure 7. Effective Robeson limit of CO_2 / N_2 separation performance of PAN supported thin membranes (blue line, calculation in SI) and the comparison of thin supported MMMs (purple circles) and dual layer membranes (green circles) at 298 K and 2 bar absolute feed pressure (CO_2/N_2 mixed gases 15/85 by volume). Experimental and literature data of MOF-based thin supported and asymmetric MMMs are shown for comparison and listed in Table 2 (open symbols) and Table S1 (closed symbols).

Comparison with reported MOF based thin supported and asymmetric MMMs, the thin membranes in this study showed a superior CO₂/N₂ separation performance when utilizing high aspect ratio nanosheets, even in combination with a selective polymer (Table 2). The selectivity of the studied membranes exceeded most of the reported values of MOF based thin MMMs. Although different types of MOF fillers were incorporated in the glassy and rubbery polymer matrix, the results show that by using small pore size ZIFs and high aspect ratio nanosheets in rubbery polymers the selectivity can be enhanced. This is attributed to the defect covering properties of the nanosheets and their perpendicular orientation towards gas permeation when homogeneously dispersed in the MMM. For the other extreme, the fully segregated polymer and nanosheet layers in the dual layer membrane, their permeance was promising in comparison with most reported thin MOF-based MMMs, although the selectivity was lower than for the homogeneous MMM.

Table 2. Separation performance of MOF based thin supported and asymmetric MMMs reported in literature and the comparison with this study.

Thin MMMs	Feed conditions <i>p</i> (bar), <i>T</i> (°C)	Feed gas CO ₂ /N ₂ ratio	CO ₂ Permeance (GPU)	$\alpha_{\text{CO}_2/\text{N}_2}$ -	Data no. ³	Ref
Cu-MOF/POZ (1500 nm)	2, 25	Single gas	6	30	12	[57]
Cu-BTC/Matrimid (asymmetric)	5, 35	35/65	19	23	13	[58]
Cu-MOF/Pebax (1500 nm)	2, 25	Single gas	14	47	14	[59]
MIL-53/Matrimid (asymmetric)	5, 35	35/65	21	24	15	[58]
ZIF-8/Matrimid (asymmetric)	5, 35	35/65	20	20	16	[58]
S-MIL-53/Ultem(asymmetric)	5, 25	Single gas	24	41	17	[60]
ZIF-7/ Pebax (500 nm)	3.5, 25	Single gas	291	67	19	[61]
Dual layer Cu-BDC/Polyactive (600 nm) ¹	2, 25	15/85	129	35	11	This study
MMM Cu-BDC/Polyactive (700 nm) ²	2, 25	15/85	40	77	7	This study

¹ With PDMS as gutter layer on PAN support (ns-0.25PA-PDMS)

² Without PDMS as gutter layer on PAN support (8ns-3PA)

³ Data number refers to Figure 7.

4. Conclusions

In summary, utilizing Cu-BDC nanosheets prepared in a scaled-up synthesis and the selective PolyactiveTM polymer to fabricate supported thin MMMs and DLMs was demonstrated to results in membranes with improved separation performance. The main role of nanosheets was found to cover the defects during the thin membrane formation, making a gutter layer superfluous, and improving the CO₂/N₂ selectivity of the thin membranes up to 77.

Mixed matrix and dual-layer thin membranes of Cu-BDC nanosheets and polymer, prepared via dip-coating and drop-casting, were compared as two extreme systems with homogeneously mixed or completely segregated components for their separation performance. Using Cu-BDC nanosheets well dispersed in thin supported mixed matrix membranes significantly improved the selectivity, even higher than identical free-standing membranes (77 vs. 60), and the CO₂ permeance to 40 GPU.

Comparison of PAN and ZrO₂-alumina as supports shows that pore size, porosity and thickness affect the obtained separation layer thickness and their resistance can negatively affect the CO₂/N₂ selectivity. The findings in this study are relevant in development of optimized preparation methods of defect-free thin supported MMMs.

Acknowledgments

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under *grant agreement* n° 608490.

References

- [1] H.B. Park, J. Kamcev, L.M. Robeson, M. Elimelech, B.D. Freeman, Maximizing the right stuff: The trade-off between membrane permeability and selectivity, *Science*, 356 (2017) 1-10.
- [2] X. He, Membranes for Natural Gas Sweetening, in: E. Drioli, L. Giorno (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Membranes*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, (2016), 1266-1267.
- [3] C.A. Scholes, M.T. Ho, A.A. Aguiar, D.E. Wiley, G.W. Stevens, S.E. Kentish, Membrane gas separation processes for CO₂ capture from cement kiln flue gas, *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 24 (2014) 78-86.
- [4] E. Sjöberg, L. Sandström, O.G.W. Öhrman, J. Hedlund, Separation of CO₂ from black liquor derived syngas using an MFI membrane, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 443 (2013) 131-137.
- [5] J.M.S. Henis, M.K. Tripodi, The Developing Technology of Gas Separating Membranes, *Science*, 220 (1983) 11-17.
- [6] R.W. Baker, *Membrane technology and application*, second ed., John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2004.
- [7] H. Strathmann, P. Scheible, R.W. Baker, A rationale for the preparation of Loeb-Sourirajan-type cellulose acetate membranes, *Journal of Applied Polymer Science*, 15 (1971) 811-828.
- [8] W.J. Lau, A.F. Ismail, N. Misdan, M.A. Kassim, A recent progress in thin film composite membrane: A review, *Desalination*, 287 (2012) 190-199.
- [9] Y. Shen, H. Wang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhang, MoS₂ Nanosheets Functionalized Composite Mixed Matrix Membrane for Enhanced CO₂ Capture via Surface Drop-Coating Method, *Acs Appl Mater Inter*, 8 (2016) 23371-23378.
- [10] M. Karunakaran, R. Shevate, M. Kumar, K.V. Peinemann, CO₂-selective PEO-PBT (PolyActive[trade mark sign])/graphene oxide composite membranes, *Chem Commun*, 51 (2015) 14187-14190.
- [11] Y. Cheng, X. Wang, C. Jia, Y. Wang, L. Zhai, Q. Wang, D. Zhao, Ultrathin mixed matrix membranes containing two-dimensional metal-organic framework nanosheets for efficient CO₂/CH₄ separation, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 539 (2017) 213-223.
- [12] J. Peter, K.V. Peinemann, Multilayer composite membranes for gas separation based on crosslinked PTMSP gutter layer and partially crosslinked Matrimid® 5218 selective layer, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 340 (2009) 62-72.
- [13] L. Liu, W.L. Qiu, E.S. Sanders, C.H. Ma, W.J. Koros, Post-combustion carbon dioxide capture via 6FDA/BPDA-DAM hollow fiber membranes at sub-ambient temperatures, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 510 (2016) 447-454.
- [14] H.Q. Lin, Z.J. He, Z. Sun, J.M. Vu, A. Ng, M. Mohammed, J. Knip, T.C. Merkel, T. Wu, R.C. Lambrecht, CO₂-selective membranes for hydrogen production and CO₂ capture - Part I: Membrane development, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 457 (2014) 149-161.
- [15] L.S. White, K.D. Amo, T. Wu, T.C. Merkel, Extended field trials of Polaris sweep modules for carbon capture, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 542 (2017) 217-225.
- [16] R. W. Baker, J.G. Wijmans, T. C. Merkel, H. Lin, R. Daniels, S. Thompson, Gas separation process using membranes with permeate sweep to remove CO₂ from combustion gases, in: *US Patent, Membrane Technology and Research Inc, US*, (2008).
- [17] X. He, The latest development on membrane materials and processes for post-combustion CO₂ capture: A Review, *SF J Material Chem Eng*, 1 (2018) 1009-1018.
- [18] P. Bernardo, E. Drioli, G. Golemme, Membrane Gas Separation: A Review/State of the Art, *Ind Eng Chem Res*, 48 (2009) 4638-4663.
- [19] T.T. Moore, W.J. Koros, Non-ideal effects in organic-inorganic materials for gas separation membranes, *Journal of Molecular Structure*, 739 (2005) 87-98.
- [20] Z. Dai, L. Ansaloni, L. Deng, Recent advances in multi-layer composite polymeric membranes for CO₂ separation: A review, *Green Energy & Environment*, 1 (2016) 102-128.
- [21] A. Sabetghadam, X. Liu, M. Benzaqui, E. Gkaniatsou, A. Orsi, M.M. Lozinska, C. Sicard, T. Johnson, N. Steunou, P.A. Wright, C. Serre, J. Gascon, F. Kapteijn, Influence of Filler Pore Structure and

Polymer on the Performance of MOF-Based Mixed-Matrix Membranes for CO₂ Capture, *Chemistry – A European Journal*, 24 (2018) 7949-7956.

[22] S. Zhao, X. Cao, Z. Ma, Z. Wang, Z. Qiao, J. Wang, S. Wang, Mixed-Matrix Membranes for CO₂/N₂ Separation Comprising a Poly(vinylamine) Matrix and Metal–Organic Frameworks, *Ind Eng Chem Res*, 54 (2015) 5139-5148.

[23] Y. Chen, L. Zhao, B. Wang, P. Dutta, W.S. Winston Ho, Amine-containing polymer/zeolite Y composite membranes for CO₂/N₂ separation, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 497 (2016) 21-28.

[24] A. Halim, Q. Fu, Q. Yong, P.A. Gurr, S.E. Kentish, G.G. Qiao, Soft polymeric nanoparticle additives for next generation gas separation membranes, *J Mater Chem A*, 2 (2014) 4999-5009.

[25] C. Zou, Q. Li, Y. Hua, B. Zhou, J. Duan, W. Jin, Mechanical Synthesis of COF Nanosheet Cluster and Its Mixed Matrix Membrane for Efficient CO₂ Removal, *Acs Appl Mater Inter*, 9 (2017) 29093-29100.

[26] Y. Ban, Y. Li, Y. Peng, H. Jin, W. Jiao, X. Liu, W. Yang, Metal-Substituted Zeolitic Imidazolate Framework ZIF-108: Gas-Sorption and Membrane-Separation Properties, *Chemistry – A European Journal*, 20 (2014) 11402-11409.

[27] T. Brinkmann, C. Naderipour, J. Pohlmann, J. Wind, T. Wolff, E. Esche, D. Müller, G. Wozny, B. Hoting, Pilot scale investigations of the removal of carbon dioxide from hydrocarbon gas streams using poly (ethylene oxide)–poly (butylene terephthalate) PolyActive™ thin film composite membranes, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 489 (2015) 237-247.

[28] W. Yave, A. Car, J. Wind, K.-V. Peinemann, Nanometric thin film membranes manufactured on square meter scale: ultra-thin films for CO₂ capture, *Nanotechnology*, 21 (2010) 395301-395308.

[29] M. Etxeberria-Benavides, O. David, T. Johnson, M.M. Łozińska, A. Orsi, P.A. Wright, S. Mastel, R. Hillenbrand, F. Kapteijn, J. Gascon, High performance mixed matrix membranes (MMMs) composed of ZIF-94 filler and 6FDA-DAM polymer, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 550 (2018) 198-207.

[30] A. Sabetghadam, X. Liu, A.F. Orsi, M.M. Lozinska, T. Johnson, K.M.B. Jansen, P.A. Wright, M. Carta, N.B. McKeown, F. Kapteijn, J. Gascon, Towards High Performance Metal–Organic Framework–Microporous Polymer Mixed Matrix Membranes: Addressing Compatibility and Limiting Aging by Polymer Doping, *Chemistry – A European Journal*, 24 (2018) 12796-12800.

[31] M.H.-O. Rashid, S.F. Ralph, Carbon Nanotube Membranes: Synthesis, Properties, and Future Filtration Applications, *Nanomaterials*, 7 (2017) 99-127.

[32] R.K. Joshi, S. Alwarappan, M. Yoshimura, V. Sahajwalla, Y. Nishina, Graphene oxide: the new membrane material, *Applied Materials Today*, 1 (2015) 1-12.

[33] Z. Han, X. Qiang, G. Xianghai, L. Najun, K. Prashant, R. Neel, J.M. Young, A.-T. Shaeel, N. Katabathini, B.S. Nasir, T. Berna, O.F. J., M.C. W., M.K. Andre, T. Michael, Open-Pore Two-Dimensional MFI Zeolite Nanosheets for the Fabrication of Hydrocarbon-Isomer-Selective Membranes on Porous Polymer Supports, *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 55 (2016) 7184-7187.

[34] Y. Peng, Y. Li, Y. Ban, H. Jin, W. Jiao, X. Liu, W. Yang, Metal-organic framework nanosheets as building blocks for molecular sieving membranes, *Science*, 346 (2014) 1356-1359.

[35] K. Varoon, X. Zhang, B. Elyassi, D.D. Brewer, M. Gettel, S. Kumar, J.A. Lee, S. Maheshwari, A. Mittal, C.-Y. Sung, M. Cococcioni, L.F. Francis, A.V. McCormick, K.A. Mkhoyan, M. Tsapatsis, Dispersible Exfoliated Zeolite Nanosheets and Their Application as a Selective Membrane, *Science*, 334 (2011) 72-75.

[36] C. Sunho, C. Joaquin, J. Edgar, O. Weontae, N. Sankar, O. Frank, S.D. F., T. Michael, Layered Silicates by Swelling of AMH-3 and Nanocomposite Membranes, *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 47 (2008) 552-555.

[37] A. Sabetghadam, B. Seoane, D. Keskin, N. Duim, T. Rodenas, S. Shahid, S. Sorribas, C.L. Guillouzer, G. Clet, C. Tellez, M. Daturi, J. Coronas, F. Kapteijn, J. Gascon, Metal Organic Framework Crystals in Mixed-Matrix Membranes: Impact of the Filler Morphology on the Gas Separation Performance, *Advanced Functional Materials*, 26 (2016) 3154-3163.

[38] A. Pustovarenko, M.G. Goesten, S. Sachdeva, M. Shan, Z. Amghouz, Y. Belmabkhout, A. Dikhtiarenko, T. Rodenas, D. Keskin, I.K. Voets, B.M. Weckhuysen, M. Eddaoudi, L.C.P.M. de Smet, E.J.R. Sudhölter, F. Kapteijn, B. Seoane, J. Gascon, Nanosheets of Nonlayered Aluminum Metal–

Organic Frameworks through a Surfactant-Assisted Method, *Advanced Materials*, 30 (2018) 1707234-1707242.

[39] T. Rodenas, I. Luz, G. Prieto, B. Seoane, H. Miro, A. Corma, F. Kapteijn, I.X.F.X. Llabres, J. Gascon, Metal-organic framework nanosheets in polymer composite materials for gas separation, *Nat Mater*, 14 (2015) 48-55.

[40] A. Corma, V. Fornes, S.B. Pergher, T.L.M. Maesen, J.G. Buglass, Delaminated zeolite precursors as selective acidic catalysts, *Nature*, 396 (1998) 353-356.

[41] Y. Hernandez, V. Nicolosi, M. Lotya, F.M. Blighe, Z. Sun, S. De, I.T. McGovern, B. Holland, M. Byrne, Y.K. Gun'Ko, J.J. Boland, P. Niraj, G. Duesberg, S. Krishnamurthy, R. Goodhue, J. Hutchison, V. Scardaci, A.C. Ferrari, J.N. Coleman, High-yield production of graphene by liquid-phase exfoliation of graphite, *Nature Nanotechnology*, 3 (2008) 563-568.

[42] M. Choi, K. Na, J. Kim, Y. Sakamoto, O. Terasaki, R. Ryoo, Stable single-unit-cell nanosheets of zeolite MFI as active and long-lived catalysts, *Nature*, 461 (2009) 246-249.

[43] G. Hu, N. Wang, D. O'Hare, J. Davis, One-step synthesis and AFM imaging of hydrophobic LDH monolayers, *Chem Commun*, (2006) 287-289.

[44] T. Rodenas, M. van Dalen, P. Serra-Crespo, F. Kapteijn, J. Gascon, Mixed matrix membranes based on NH₂-functionalized MIL-type MOFs: Influence of structural and operational parameters on the CO₂/CH₄ separation performance, *Micropor Mesopor Mat*, 192 (2014) 35-42.

[45] M. Shete, P. Kumar, J.E. Bachman, X. Ma, Z.P. Smith, W. Xu, K.A. Mkhoyan, J.R. Long, M. Tsapatsis, On the direct synthesis of Cu(BDC) MOF nanosheets and their performance in mixed matrix membranes, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 549 (2018) 312-320.

[46] Y. Yang, K. Goh, R. Wang, T.-H. Bae, High-performance nanocomposite membranes realized by efficient molecular sieving with CuBDC nanosheets, *Chem Commun*, 53 (2017) 4254-4257.

[47] X. Li, Y. Cheng, H. Zhang, S. Wang, Z. Jiang, R. Guo, H. Wu, Efficient CO₂ Capture by Functionalized Graphene Oxide Nanosheets as Fillers To Fabricate Multi-Permselective Mixed Matrix Membranes, *Acs Appl Mater Inter*, 7 (2015) 5528-5537.

[48] B. Zornoza, A. Martinez-Joaristi, P. Serra-Crespo, C. Tellez, J. Coronas, J. Gascon, F. Kapteijn, Functionalized flexible MOFs as fillers in mixed matrix membranes for highly selective separation of CO₂ from CH₄ at elevated pressures, *Chem Commun*, 47 (2011) 9522-9524.

[49] D. Grosso, How to exploit the full potential of the dip-coating process to better control film formation, *Journal of Materials Chemistry*, 21 (2011) 17033-17038.

[50] M. Shan, B. Seoane, E. Andres-Garcia, F. Kapteijn, J. Gascon, Mixed-matrix membranes containing an azine-linked covalent organic framework: Influence of the polymeric matrix on post-combustion CO₂-capture, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 549 (2018) 377-384.

[51] L. Ma, F. Svec, T. Tan, Y. Lv, Mixed Matrix Membrane Based on Cross-Linked Poly[(ethylene glycol) methacrylate] and Metal–Organic Framework for Efficient Separation of Carbon Dioxide and Methane, *ACS Applied Nano Materials*, 1 (2018) 2808-2818.

[52] X. Wang, C. Chi, K. Zhang, Y. Qian, K.M. Gupta, Z. Kang, J. Jiang, D. Zhao, Reversed thermo-switchable molecular sieving membranes composed of two-dimensional metal-organic nanosheets for gas separation, *Nature Communications*, 8 (2017) 14460-14470.

[53] M. Kattula, K. Ponnuru, L. Zhu, W. Jia, H. Lin, E.P. Furlani, Designing ultrathin film composite membranes: the impact of a gutter layer, *Scientific Reports*, 5 (2015) 15016-15025.

[54] W.Z. F. Kapteijn, J.A. Moulijn, T.Q. Gardner, Zeolite membranes: modeling and application, in: J.A.M. A. Cybulski (Ed.) *Structured catalysts and reactors*, CRC Taylor & Francis, USA, (2006), 700-746.

[55] F.T. de Bruijn, L. Sun, Ž. Olujić, P.J. Jansens, F. Kapteijn, Influence of the support layer on the flux limitation in pervaporation, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 223 (2003) 141-156.

[56] T. Rodenas, M.v. Dalen, E. García-Pérez, P. Serra-Crespo, B. Zornoza, F. Kapteijn, J. Gascon, Visualizing MOF Mixed Matrix Membranes at the Nanoscale: Towards Structure-Performance Relationships in CO₂/CH₄ Separation Over NH₂-MIL-53(Al)@PI, *Advanced Functional Materials*, 24 (2014) 249-256.

[57] S.Y. Lim, J. Choi, H.-Y. Kim, Y. Kim, S.-J. Kim, Y.S. Kang, J. Won, New CO₂ separation membranes containing gas-selective Cu-MOFs, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 467 (2014) 67-72.

- [58] S. Basu, A. Cano-Odena, I.F.J. Vankelecom, MOF-containing mixed-matrix membranes for CO₂/CH₄ and CO₂/N₂ binary gas mixture separations, *Separation and Purification Technology*, 81 (2011) 31-40.
- [59] J. Kim, J. Choi, Y. Soo Kang, J. Won, Matrix effect of mixed-matrix membrane containing CO₂-selective MOFs, *Journal of Applied Polymer Science*, 133 (2016) 42853-42861.
- [60] H. Zhu, L. Wang, X. Jie, D. Liu, Y. Cao, Improved Interfacial Affinity and CO₂ Separation Performance of Asymmetric Mixed Matrix Membranes by Incorporating Postmodified MIL-53(Al), *Acs Appl Mater Inter*, 8 (2016) 22696-22704.
- [61] T. Li, Y. Pan, K.-V. Peinemann, Z. Lai, Carbon dioxide selective mixed matrix composite membrane containing ZIF-7 nano-fillers, *Journal of Membrane Science*, 425-426 (2013) 235-242.