

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Reinforced Fluorinated Copolymer and Polyurethane Electrospun Layered Nanofiber-Based Membranes for Effective Model Water Dead-End Microfiltration

Dusan Kimmer  | Miroslava Kovarova | Muhammad Yasir  | Lenka Lovecka | Jaroslav Cisar | Lenka Musilova | Josef Osicka | Vladimír Sedlařík

Centre of Polymer Systems, University Institute, Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Zlín, Czech Republic

Correspondence: Dusan Kimmer (kimmer@utb.cz)

Received: 10 February 2025 | **Revised:** 25 April 2025 | **Accepted:** 29 April 2025

Funding: This work was supported by the Centre of Polymer Systems, Tomas Bata University in Zlin, DKRVO (RP/CPS/2024-28/002), Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic (CZ.02.01.01/00/23_021/0009004, CZ.10.03.01/00/22_003/0000045).

Keywords: backwashing | flux | membrane | morphology | nanofiber | reinforcement

ABSTRACT

The research presented herein describes the preparation of electrospun homogeneous nanofibrous structures with customized morphology and properties, as well as textile support for necessary reinforcement for microfiltration applications. Findings report membranes comprising a polyurethane or fluorinated copolymer nanofibrous layer and polyethylene terephthalate non-woven textile as support were evaluated. The investigation encompassed various constructions of materials, which include the influence of nanostructure morphology, the process of membrane cleaning by backwashing, and factors affecting flux, filtration efficacy, and working life. Application of membrane support made from polyethylene terephthalate with a large distribution of polymer chain provides a sufficiently strong connection with a layer of nanofibers with minimum penetration into the nanostructure involved in flux improvement. It was discerned that nanostructures with a morphology of six layers from thick (fiber diameter ~ 500 nm) and thin (fiber diameter ~ 180 nm) nanofibers with mean pore size $0.67 \mu\text{m}$ in comparison with membranes prepared from thin nanofibers only (mean pore size $0.26 \mu\text{m}$) exhibited improved flux (17 times higher after 150 min of filtration process). In contrast, the filtration efficacy of both membranes for filtering submicron particles remained stable and highly efficient. It also proved to smooth out the surfaces of the novel membranes, which simplifies the removal of caked-up debris. Cleaning the filter by backwashing renewed the efficacy of the developed membranes for filtration and extended their working life. Finally, repeatedly backwashing the thin nanofiber layer membrane raised the water flux measured as $230 \text{ L m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$, that is, six times higher than without backwashing.

1 | Introduction

Water is gaining importance as a strategic raw material, and its economic use is crucial [1]. About 40% of the global population inhabits areas with a lack of water, while 20% live where drinking water is contaminated. Estimates suggest this number will exceed 50% by 2025 [2]. The rationale and motive for this study were to develop novel, reinforced, nanostructured

microfiltration (MF) membranes with improved properties that could contribute to overcoming issues connected with insufficient drinking water. Emphasis was placed on enhancing the flux of the microfiltration materials, extending their working life, and maintaining a desired level of filtration efficacy (FE). Numerous papers have been published over the past three decades on fabricating submicron fibers and their potential water treatment applications [3–6]. Polymeric

nanofibers prepared by electrospinning result in an effective membrane material with the advantages of a large surface area, a high surface-to-volume ratio, and an interconnected porous structure [7–11].

A widely employed effective method for liquid purification is a pressure-driven separation process called microfiltration [12]. The pore sizes of microfiltration membranes vary between 0.1 and 10 μm in diameter, and such pores are uniformly distributed throughout the material. The electrospun nanofibrous membranes can overcome some of the drawbacks of conventional porous polymeric membranes, such as low flux and extensive fouling. The properties of presented microfiltration membranes can be controlled by varying specific parameters, that is, the diameters of their nanofibers, pore sizes, and the temperature and pressure applied during the preparation stage. A membrane of this type is applicable as either a depth (dead-end filtration) or surface (crossflow filtration) filter. In *dead-end filtration*, the main direction of flow is perpendicular to the membrane. Suspended particles are continuously dragged towards it and deposited on the surface or inside its pores. **Particles** intercepted in this manner build up, continuously increasing the resistance to flow and diminishing the permeate flux rate. In the case of *crossflow mode* (tangential flow), the primary direction of flow is tangential to the membrane. This kind of flow essentially scours particles from the surface of the membrane, thus limiting particle capture. Applying a MF membrane with a smooth, nanostructured surface would enhance the efficacy of the crossflow process.

Two main approaches exist for preparing nanofibrous MF membranes with controlled pore sizes, electrospinning conditions, and chemical or physical modification of the given material [13–15]. Thus, nanostructures exhibiting valuable properties for microfiltration are prepared, including high porosity, the random orientation of fibers, and weak interaction between fibers, which ushers in drawbacks of poor strength and toughness; unfortunately, this limits options for the practical application of MF membranes [16]. The diameters of fibers, their orientation, crystallinity, and bonding degree directly affect the mechanical properties of nanofibrous membranes [17]. In addition to boosting mechanical properties by the standard heat press method [18], alternative approaches to such improvement exist [19], for example, adding fillers [20–23], thermal stretching [24–26], utilizing mixed solvents [27] or mixed polymers [28, 29], solvent vapor welding [15, 30], solvent-induced fusion of submicron fibers [27, 31–35], furthering fiber orientation [33, 34] and self-supported hydrogel filtration membranes [36].

The mechanical strength of nanofiber mats can be raised by depositing or laminating them onto conventional textiles or synthetic polymer substrates [35]. Polyethylene terephthalate (PET) is frequently utilized as membrane support to overcome the mechanical limitations of nanostructured membranes for water treatment. It functions well as a layer for capturing nanofibers [37, 38]. A material commonly employed in nanofiber collecting pads is polypropylene (PP) nonwoven textile (NT), which has also proven suitable as a membrane support [39].

MF membranes typically consist of two or three layers. A tough, nonwoven fibrous material forms the bottom one, providing mechanical strength and support to the upper layer, which has the required barrier properties. A third adhesive layer is often included between them: heat-activated adhesive coating on a given textile (e.g., by dot coating) or application of welding nets. After being repeatedly cleaned, the potential exists for the resultant composite textiles to retain their desirable characteristics, such as mechanical strength, nanofiber morphology, and fluid flux [40, 41]. However, it should be mentioned that the microfiltration area consisting of nanofibers is decreased because the thermo-activated adhesive fouls the nanostructure [18]. This explains why new approaches are needed to minimize the contact area between the nanofibers and the substrate. The application of a bicomponent NT or NT surface treated by polymeric melting glues causes a flow of melted glue into the nanostructure and, consequently, a reduction in the filtration area. The described novel method of anchoring polymeric nanostructure into support NT connects the nanostructure to the support material with minimum loss of filtration area and effects on required membrane reinforcement.

This work describes the preparation of electrospun homogeneous nanofibrous structures with customized morphology and properties, as well as textile support for necessary reinforcement. There are practical approaches investigated to enhance the mechanical properties of nanostructured membranes by supplementing them with polyethylene terephthalate nonwoven textile containing polymeric chains that melt and soften at low temperatures, such as a type with a broad distribution of molecular weights (BD PET NT). Employing an electrospun nanofibrous membrane as a microfilter for purifying liquid requires the textile substrate to be reinforced to obtain a suitable strength, permeability, and smooth surface [42].

Fouling constitutes a significant issue when using MF membranes to treat contaminated water. This is a common phenomenon for MF membranes, hindering their efficacy for filtration, diminishing flux, and causing a high drop in pressure [43]. Nanofiber-based membranes outperform conventional membrane types in this respect due to their structure, choice of polymeric materials, and the possibility of using fouling-suppressing additives [44–46]. Extensive studies have been carried out, targeting photocatalyst immobilization in the nanofibrous structure to promote photocatalytic degradation of fouling and retention of open morphological structure towards exhibiting high performance in wastewater treatment [47]. Wastewater tertiary treatment based on *Daphnia* filtration as a polishing system was successfully developed for both particle removal and disinfection [48].

Nanofibrous microfiltration membranes have a higher flux, consuming less energy during application. As a consequence of their relatively high porosity and fully interconnected open-pore structure, this aspect lends them excellent permeability for water filtration. Microfiltration membranes are efficient in separating microparticles and bacteria from wastewater [49]. For instance, applying electrospun nanofibers with 100 nm diameters as a screen filter permits efficient separation of particles exceeding 300 nm in size [50]. A linear relationship exists between

pore size and fiber diameter for membranes with a nonwoven structure and high porosity [51].

A practical method used to regenerate membranes, that is, removing deposited particles or microorganisms from their surface, is washing, wiping, or shaking off. A membrane lacking a proper connection between its two layers, e.g., a thermal adhesive, can only be cleaned by the vibrating method, as backwashing for regeneration is unsuitable. The reason is pressure-related delamination phenomena, which lead to the separation of the nanofiber layer from the membrane support.

Initial efforts were directed at reinforcing the material, after which samples were prepared that differed in the morphology of the nanostructure, while constructions varied in the placement of layers. A discussion is given on filtration efficacy, the influence of smoothing the upstream layer, flux, and changes in the latter induced by backwashing.

The primary novelties of this work lie in (i) modification of polyethylene terephthalate nanofiber collecting substrate, a conjunction between the layer of nanofibers and spun-bond support microstructure made of PET with a large distribution of polymer chains that enables optimal membrane reinforcing and smoothing, (ii) retrieval of the effectual way for additional membrane reinforcing by polyethylene—polypropylene—polyethylene trilaminar mesh, and (iii) effect of lamination nanostructure layers formed by lower and higher nanofiber diameter consequently pore size enhancing the flux of the microfiltration materials with retention of a desired level of filtration efficacy. All of those novelties extend the working life of microfiltration materials and maintain a desired level of filtration efficacy.

2 | Experimental

2.1 | Materials

All the chemicals utilized were of reagent grade. *N,N*-dimethylformamide (DMF) and toluene, employed as a solvent and cosolvent for the polymer solutions, were purchased from Lach-Ner (Czech Republic). Additives used to increase the conductivity of the polymer solutions, that is, citric acid and sodium tetraborate decahydrate, were obtained from PENTA s.r.o. (Czech Republic); tetraethyl ammonium bromide came from Sigma-Aldrich (Germany).

The polymers comprised polyvinylidene fluoride copolymer with hexafluoropropylene (PVDF-HFP) Kynar-Flex 2801-00 by the Arkema Group and a solution of polyurethane (PU) Permuthane SU-22-542 purchased from Stahl Europe (The Netherlands).

2.2 | Preparation of the Nanofibrous Structures

For the electrospinning of base nanofibrous layers for two- and five-layer membranes, the solutions of fluorinated copolymer in DMF at the concentration of about 20% by weight were used.

Electrical conductivity was increased to $150 \mu\text{Scm}^{-1}$ by adding sodium tetraborate decahydrate and citric acid at the ratio of 1:3. The viscosity of the solution equaled 1.5 Pa·s; the solution of fluorinated copolymer was utilized to prepare layers of nanofibers with the mean fiber diameter of approximately 170 nm. These nanostructures were fabricated at a width of 40 cm on a Spin Line 40 (SPUR, Czech Republic) electrospinning device equipped with 32 nozzles arranged in two lines for forming nanofibers.

A nanostructure (nNT = nano nonwoven textile) comprising six layers of PU nanofibers, in an arrangement alternating between thin and thick fibers, was prepared from two PU solutions in DMF. The electrical conductivity of the 20% solution for the thin nanofibers (mean fiber diameter of approx. 180 nm) was adjusted to $320 \mu\text{Scm}^{-1}$, using tetraethyl ammonium bromide for this purpose; the viscosity of the solution was 0.7 Pa·s. The electrical conductivity of the 20% PU solution in DMF and toluene for the thick fibers (mean fiber diameter of approx. 500 nm) equaled $37 \mu\text{Scm}^{-1}$ without any additional conductivity adjustment; the viscosity of the solution was 1.7 Pa·s. The aforementioned PU nanostructures made up of alternating layers of thick and thin nanofibers were fabricated at the width of 120 cm on a Spin Line 120 (SPUR, Czech Republic) pilot line unit, operating with 96 nozzles arranged in six lines (spinning electrodes). The first, third, and fifth lines were fed with a higher electrical conductivity PU solution to make the thin fibers, whereas the PU solution for forming the thick fibers ran through the second, fourth, and sixth lines.

The PVDF-HFP or PU nanofibers were collected on PET NT, prepared from polymer with a large distribution of polymer chains (BD PET NT—Neaustima, Lithuania; 60 gm^{-2} in basic weight). The fundamental parameters of the electrospinning process and the resultant nanofibrous structures are presented in Table 1.

2.3 | Membrane Preparation

In all cases, the nanofibers were deposited directly on the BD PET NT support substrate; the conditions for sample preparation are summarized in Table 2. The reinforced, two-layer membrane referred to as MFL consisted of PVDF-HFP nanofibers layered on the BD PET NT support textile (Figure 1A). It was pressed at 135°C at a pressure of 600 kPa for a contact time of 10 s. A glossy separative paper (Multicast, Arjowiggins, Spain) was employed to obtain a smooth surface on the nanostructured membrane. In order to achieve even better stiffening and ensure a still smoother surface on both sides of the membrane, a five-layer membrane was made, referred to as (MFL)₂3L (Figure 1B). This involves laminating together two MFL membranes by means of a polyalkene trilaminar (PE-PP-PE) stiffening mesh (Claf, JX Nippon, Japan), the latter being sandwiched between the rear surfaces of two MFL membranes; lamination occurred under a pressure of 600 kPa at 125°C for 20 s.

Another membrane fabricated in a similar manner was based on PU nanofibers (MPU), wherein layers of thick and thin nanofibers


TABLE 1 | Fundamental parameters of the electrospinning process and nanofibrous structures.

Parameter	Unit	PVDF-HFP	PU thin/thick nanofibers
Voltage	kV	65–75	60
Current	mA	0.65	0.2
Dosing of polymer solution	mL min ⁻¹	0.4	1.1 (first, third, fifth lines of nozzles)/0.9 (second, fourth, sixth lines of nozzles)
Substrate movement rate	m min ⁻¹	0.1	0.2
Distance between electrodes	mm	200	210
Temperature	°C	23	24
Relative humidity	%	32	33
Basic weight of nanofibers	g m ⁻²	2.4	1.9
Expected nanofiber diameter	nm	170	180/500

TABLE 2 | Compositions of the tested membranes.

Sample designation	Unit	MFL	(MFL) ₂ 3L	MPU
Support		BD PET NT	BD PET NT	BD PET NT
Chemical composition of nanofibers		PVDF-HFP	PVDF-HFP	PU
Basic weight of nNT	g m ⁻²	2.4	2 × 2.4	1.9
Average nanofiber diameter	nm	170.4 ± 52.6	170.4 ± 52.6	181.1 ± 31.3/505.4 ± 94.7
Number of layers		2	5	2
Layering		nNT on PET	nNT on PET/PE-PP-PE trilaminate/PET with nNT	Alternating three thick and three thin nNT on PET
Temperature of pressing	°C	135	125	125 ^a
Lamination pressure	kPa	600	600	400 ^a
Contact time	s	10	20	15 ^a

^aMeyer lamination line at a speed of 4 m min⁻¹ with a slot of 0.5 mm.

**FIGURE 1** | Applied membrane constructions consisting of BD PET NT support and PVDF-HFP nanofibers arranged in two (A) or five layers (B) and BD PET NT support with PU nanostructure formed from six layers of thick and thin PU nanofibers (C).

were arranged in a six-layer nanostructure (Figure 1C); a laminating line at the width of 120 cm by Maschinenfabrik Herbert Meyer GmbH (Tomatex, Czech Republic) was employed for this purpose.

2.4 | Characterization of the Membranes

The membranes were characterized in terms of the morphology of their nanofibrous layers, basic weight, pore size

characteristics, measurement of flux, and filtration properties. Thermal analysis of the substrate material was also performed.

The nanostructure morphology was analyzed in the membranes by scanning electron microscopy (SEM) on a Vega 3 unit (Tescan, Czech Republic). SEM was used to image electrospun fibers to observe the surface morphology and any defects, such as a bead in the structure, that might be incorporated during electrospinning and to determine the desired diameter of nanofibers. The electron beam was operated at an accelerating voltage of 10 kV. The samples were coated with a thin layer of palladium to increase their electrical conductivity prior to taking SEM images. The mean diameter of fibers was measured via ImageJ version 1.52a software (National Institutes of Health and the Laboratory for Optical and Computational Instrumentation (LOCI, University of Wisconsin), Madison, Wisconsin (USA)).

Characteristics relating to the pore sizes of the membranes were assessed on a flow porosimeter (SPUR, Czech Republic) in accordance with ASTM F316-03 (2011); Galpor (Porometer NV, Belgium) was used as a wetting liquid. Dry and wet tests were conducted on three circular samples cut out from the given materials, and mean values were reported for them. The resulting porosity measurements encompassed the mean pore diameters of the nanostructures, the maximum pore diameter, and the permeability of the nanostructured membranes for dry air. Pore size distribution was counted as well.

The thermal behavior of the PET support materials was evaluated by differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) on a DSC 1 STAR (Mettler Toledo, Belgium) instrument. All measurements during thermal analysis were studied in an inert nitrogen atmosphere (50 mL min^{-1}). The rate of heating and cooling was set at $10^\circ\text{C min}^{-1}$. The samples were initially heated from $+25^\circ\text{C}$ to 270°C , kept at 270°C for 5 min to erase their thermal history, and then cooled to -30°C ; the second heating cycle ranged from -30°C to 300°C .

Mechanical testing of layered only (heat pressure untreated) and reinforced membranes was carried out on samples with dimensions of $50 \text{ mm} \times 300 \text{ mm}$. The measurement was done on the tensile-testing machine Testometric MT350-5CT (Testometric, Rochdale, UK) according to the EN ISO 2903-3 standard with an active length of 200 mm. Prepared samples were tested at a speed of 100 mm min^{-1} with a preload of 0.2 N. Six measurements were done for each type of membrane sample.

The model filtrated medium utilized in all the experiments was utility water (UW), which contained high iron salts and oxides (dry extract of solids equaled 0.23% by weight). A magnetic stirrer or pump was employed to scatter and disperse solid particles in the water homogeneously.

The apparatus for gauging flux at the hydrostatic pressure of 20 kPa consisted of a 2 m long water column tube and a module, the latter comprising two rectangular membranes ($600 \text{ mm} \times 200 \text{ mm}$) adhered to a PP frame by silicone sealant and separated from each other by a wire pad to prevent contact during backwashing (Figure 2). An opening with a diameter of 5 mm functioned as an outlet for permeating from the

space between the membranes. These plastic frame modules with fixed membranes were wetted for 3 h in drinking water. Cycles occurred for 4–5 min of flux at 20 kPa pressure, while the aforementioned backwashing test required the additional step of about 1 min of backwashing at 20 kPa.

The filtration efficacy of the membranes was evaluated by determining the mean sizes of particles before and after filtering experiments. Laser diffraction (LD) and dynamic light scattering (DLS) were carried out for this purpose; the latter detects particles ranging from 0.3 nm to $10 \mu\text{m}$, whereas LD gauges particles from 0.01 to $3500 \mu\text{m}$ in size. DLS was performed on a Zetasizer Nano ZS unit (Malvern, UK), which detected the intensity of diffused light at an angle of 173° and a temperature of 25°C . A Mastersizer 3000 device (Malvern, UK) was employed for the LD analysis, wherein red (633 nm) and blue (470 nm) laser rays were applied at laboratory temperature. The blue ray lent greater accuracy to the measurement of submicron particles since the wavelength of its light in the diffraction of electromagnetic radiation was comparable to the sizes of such particles. The values presented are mean particle sizes calculated from five separate measurements taken for each sample.

3 | Results and Discussion

3.1 | Morphology of Nanostructures

The morphology of the nanostructured layers was characterized by comparing SEM images and measuring the diameters of nanofibers (Figure 3). The data obtained on the distribution of values for all the tested nanostructures were processed graphically. The requested morphologies of nanostructures prepared were accomplished by useful variation of the conditions for electrospinning and properties of the treated solutions. Characterization of materials by SEM analysis reveals that the electrospun nanofibers were produced without beads or defects, as desired (Figure 3A,C). In case of six-layer combined PU nanostructure the nanofiber diameters were calculated for both alternating nanostructures formed by thin (Figure 3D) and thick (Figure 3E) nanofibers. The exact values of calculated average fiber diameters from SEM pictures and further properties of the prepared nanostructure are mentioned in Table 2.

3.2 | Membrane Reinforcement

Excellent results were obtained by applying the support material (substrate), which was based on a PET NT created from polymer chains with a broad distribution of molecular weights. Such a distribution ensured the low molecular weight fraction of the PET softened and partially melted during the heat-pressing process, giving rise to a good connection between the nanofibers and reinforcing support of the membrane (Figure 4A,B) [52]. Heat pressing of the BD PET NT with a 2.4 gm^{-2} layer of PVDF-HFP nanofibers across the range of temperatures of 130°C – 140°C caused fixation between the nanofibers and partially melted PET polymer chains, affording a good connection between the nanostructured and support layers. The membranes that possessed a smooth surface afterward could be cleaned by backwashing. Upon reaching the temperature




FIGURE 2 | Membrane preparation and arrangements of filtration tests.

of 160°C, however, the nanostructure of the membranes had become deformed, that is, partially melted (Figure 4C). The effects on pore size and air permeability exerted by the applied temperatures when preparing the membranes are detailed in Figure 5.

Figure 6 contrasts differential scanning calorimetry charts for the partially degraded, recycled PET with a broad distribution (BD) of molecular weights and PET with a narrow distribution (ND) of molecular weights (ND PET). The comparison took place with the aim of comprehending the process behind the reinforcement of the membrane. Partial melting of low molecular fractions in the BD PET NT occurred at 146°C, with the likelihood of softening at still lower temperatures, while the ND PET started at 209°C. This variance in temperature is pertinent when preparing reinforced MF membranes where nanofibers are affixed to the surfaces of the PET microfibers. Minimal loss in the active filtration area transpires in relation to this connection, much less than when a thermo-activated adhesive is utilized, as the melted adhesive flows into the nanostructure. The DSC data in Figure 6 illustrates the differences in the initial melting temperatures of crystalline phase two of the PET

polymers. Membranes prepared from PET with a higher melting temperature (generally exceeding the softening temperature of the polymer utilized in the preparation of the nanofibers) were unable to connect with the nanofibers properly; the filtration layer could be easily removed from the membrane by the stream of backwashing water.

The enhancement in the mechanical properties of the BD PET NT reinforced membrane in comparison with thermal and pressure untreated layered membrane is demonstrated in Table 3 and Figure 7. Processing variables to reach the requested membrane reinforcing were a temperature of 135°C, a pressure of 0.6 MPa, and a pressing time of 10 s. The MFL membrane pressed of two layers (reinforcing support and nanostructure) exhibits about a 16-fold increase in Young's modulus, a 7-fold enhancement in stress at break, and two times improvement in ultimate strength. The values of strain at break are comparable, as expected. Pressing the membrane at a higher temperature or applying pressure for a longer time would vary (decrease) the pore size, which decreases the flux, but the surface of the membrane is becoming smoother and easily cleaned by backwashing or streaming of water.




FIGURE 3 | SEM images of fluorinated copolymer (A) and polyurethane (C) fabricated nanostructures and corresponding distributions of nano-fiber diameters based on (B) PVDF-HFP, (D) PU thin nanofibers, and (E) PU thick nanofibers.




FIGURE 4 | Influence of temperature on PVDF-HFP nanostructures affixed to the BD PET NT microfibers: (A) a layer of default nanofibers; (B) a surface of MFL membrane formed at 135°C, with nanofibers adhered to the BD PET NT substrate; (C) the broken surface of a nanostructure formed at 160°C.

3.3 | Porosity of the Reinforced Microfiltration Membranes

The small diameters of the nanofibers lent them a degree of flexibility, in addition to which their nanostructures, being open and porous in morphology, ensured high flux for fluids. A strong correlation existed between filtration performance and the physical parameters of the nanofibrous membrane, such as membrane thickness, fiber diameter, and distribution of the same, which

determined the pore size and related distribution across the membrane. The following characterizations of the membrane solely pertain to materials based on BD PET NT since they demonstrated the best reinforcing effect with potential for industrial application. Table 4 and Figure 8 present characteristics of pore size determined for the MF membranes, which underwent dry and wet tests following ASTM F316-03. The most critical aspects of the porosity of the nanostructure are its essential weight and fiber diameter, which significantly affect the mean diameter of the inherent pores,

the maximum diameter of the pores, the permeability of the nanostructure for dry air, and the pore size distribution. Each material under inspection was designated according to the value for mean pore diameter. In this context, values are reported for the following: two-layer membranes referred to as MFL 0.41 and MFL 0.26, which differed in mean pore size (0.41 and 0.26 μm , respectively); five-layer membrane (additionally reinforced) labeled as (MFL)₂3L with a mean pore size of 0.21 μm ; and membrane MPU 0.67 made up of six alternating layers of thick and thin PU nanofibers, with a mean pore size of 0.67 μm .




FIGURE 5 | Decrease in membrane pore size and air permeability during the heat-pressing process.




FIGURE 6 | DSC data from the second heating cycle, as measured on the BD PET NT and ND PET.

TABLE 3 | Average values of mechanical properties of layered and reinforced membranes.

Mechanical property	Young's modulus	Stress at break	Strain at break	Ultimate strength
Unit	MPa	MPa	%	N
Reinforced membrane	311.2 ± 39.5	12.9 ± 1.0	25.0 ± 2.2	93.1 ± 8.4
Layered membrane	20.1 ± 3.3	1.9 ± 0.3	29.8 ± 2.2	48.4 ± 3.7

Preparing the MFL 0.26 membrane involved the additional heat pressing of MFL 0.41 at 140°C for 15 s, which is why it possessed lower values for the mean diameter of pores and a narrower pore size distribution. Comparing the characteristics of the MFL 0.41 and MFL 0.26 membranes confirmed the expectation that pressing at a higher temperature would vary pore size. However, a decrease in the mean value of this through the application of heat pressing had limits. Indeed, the authors were unsuccessful in the preparation of ultrafiltration membranes with a mean pore size of less than 100 nm by heat pressing a microfiltration nanostructure consisting of nanofibers with or without collecting PET or PP support layer.

A five-layer membrane was prepared from two MFL membranes fixed together with PE-PP-PE trilaminate mesh. The membrane possessed a smooth nanostructured layer on both sides, meaning that any retentate could be removed simply from an inlet site while its outlet site would clog up less when backwashing. It has been found that the utilization of mesh formed by polyethylene–polypropylene–polyethylene trilaminate presents a straightforward and effective way to prepare and reinforce nanostructured filtration membranes.

An MPU membrane was formed by alternating layers of thick and thin PU nanofibers (six layers with essential weight each of ca. 0.3 g m⁻²) on the BD PET NT support and conducting subsequent lamination. The nanostructures were affixed properly in the PET support; however, the inlet side of the MPU membrane made up of thick fibers was more open. Since the mean and maximum pore diameters were high (0.67 and 1.00 μm , respectively), it was expected that flux would be too.

3.4 | Influence of Membrane Construction and Nanostructure Morphology on Utility Water Filtration

The test was performed on four different nanostructured MF membranes with a BD PET NT support fastened to purpose-built plastic frames to form a plate module (Figure 2). The modules were immersed in filtered utility water (UW) with the presence of contaminants (0.23% by weight, primarily oxides and salts of iron). Experiments were devised to discern the influence of membrane construction and nanostructure morphology on the flux of the MF membranes. Figure 9 contains a graph plotting the dependence of flux against the filtration time of the samples.

Table 5 details the total amounts of UW filtered through 0.24 m² of the area of the membrane and fluxes expressed in L m⁻² h⁻¹ after 150 and 215 min of the filtration process. The best results were achieved using the membrane based on thick and




FIGURE 7 | The course of stress during the mechanical tensile test as a function of strain at a speed of 100 mm min^{-1} for layered (blue) and reinforced (red) membranes.

TABLE 4 | Filtration characteristics of the MF membranes.

Nanostructured membrane	Unit	MFL 0.26	MFL 0.41	(MFL) ₂ 3L 0.21	MPU 0.67
The basic weight of the nanostructure	g m^{-2}	2.4	2.4	2×2.4	1.9
Mean pore diameter ^a	μm	0.26	0.41	0.21	0.67
Maximum pore diameter ^b	μm	0.34	0.52	0.26	1.00
Permeability for dry air	$\text{L min}^{-1} \text{ bar}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$	32	59	22	103

^aStandard deviation $\pm 10\%$.

^bStandard deviation $\pm 8\%$.




FIGURE 8 | Pore size distributions of the MF membranes based on the BD PET NT support.

thin nanofibers (MPU) since alternating layers with larger and smaller pores helped to increase the flow.

The dependencies plotted in Figure 9 confirmed that flux through the two-layer MFL membrane with a larger mean pore size was significantly higher than through a membrane with finer pores. The quantity of UW that flowed through membrane MFL 0.41 after 150 min at 20 kPa was 4.9 times greater than for MFL 0.26. The finding that higher fluxes were achieved with the five-layer membrane (MF)₂3L could be surprising, considering its lesser mean pore size of just $0.21 \mu\text{m}$.

The best flux was observed for the MPU membrane, as its mean pore size of $0.67 \mu\text{m}$ would suggest. The quantity of UW that had passed through the MPU 0.67 membrane after 150 min of dead-end filtration was 2.9 times higher than for the five-layered (MFL)₂3L 0.21 membrane, 3.5 times over MFL 0.41, and 17.2 times greater than MFL 0.26. The morphology of alternating layers of thick and thin nanofibers in a six-layer nanostructure resulted in higher values for flux at the commencement of filtration for the PU membrane than the rest. Although the MFL

membranes have a smooth surface that reduces the build-up of a filter cake during the filtration experiment (fall away of filtration debris correlating with the wave-like curve for flux), the particles filtered by the MPU membrane with a six-layer nanostructure become stuck in the nanostructure, as depicted in the SEM image in Figure 10B. This is because the nanostructure applied on the inlet side for UW filtration is formed by thick nanofibers (Figure 10A). The findings for flux through the (MFL)₂3L 0.21 and MPU 0.67 membranes after 215 min of dead-end microfiltration are almost identical, probably as a consequence of

frequent self-acting removal of filter cake (sudden changes on flux curve for (MFL)₂3L membrane) from the smooth surface of (MFL)₂3L and the gradual clogging of the MPU membrane. It has been found that flux can be positively influenced by membrane construction (layering thick and thin nanofibers), whereas high filtration efficacy was maintained. The right combination of particular processing variables can be used to tailor nanostructured microfiltration membranes.

3.5 | Filtration Efficacy

A comparison was made for the PVDF-HFP-based membrane (MFL)₂3L, which was anticipated to have the best filtration efficacy, and the PU-based membrane (MPU), with potentially worse capability, thereby revealing significant differences in the morphological arrangement of the nanostructures. Unfortunately, it was not possible to electrospin a membrane with a PVDF-HFP nanostructure of alternating layers of thick and thin nanofibers.

A matter of great interest was finding out if the layered arrangement of the nanofibrous structure of the PU membrane impacted the filtration process in any way; the techniques of LD and DLS were employed to this end. The graph in Figure 11A shows the dependence of volumetric particle size distribution on the size of particles (in μm) in the UW prior to filtration through the (MFL)₂3L 0.21. Figure 11B details the determination of volumetric distributions concerning particle sizes (in μm) for five samples (filtration




FIGURE 9 | Flux through the MF membranes at the pressure of 20 kPa.

TABLE 5 | Filtration capacity of the MF membranes.

Nanostructured membrane	Unit	MFL 0.26	MFL 0.41	(MFL) ₂ 3L 0.21	MPU 0.67
Quantity of UW that flowed after 150 min	L	14.1	68.5	83.6	242.1
Flux after 150 min	$\text{L m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$	14.8	46.0	119.5	140.3
Quantity of UW that flowed after 215 min	L			110.3	276.1
Flux after 215 min	$\text{L m}^{-2} \text{h}^{-1}$			91.5	101.5




FIGURE 10 | The six-layer PU nanostructure of thick (on the top) and thin nanofibers (A) before the filtering process and (B) after the filtration of UW.




FIGURE 11 | Measurement of particle size distributions. (A) Volumetric particle size distribution concerning particle size in the UW used for filtration, as gauged by LD (B) reproducibility of determination volumetric particle size distributions concerning particle sizes of UW used for filtration, as assessed by LD (C) intensity-weighted particle size distribution after 215 min of filtration through (MFL)₂,3L 0.21 membrane, as gauged by DLS (D) intensity-weighted particle size distribution after 226 min of filtration through MPU 0.67 membrane, as gauged by DLS.

through MPU 0.67 membrane), and the findings proved that the testing method applied was both very reliable and repeatable.

Analysis by DLS of the particle size distribution (in nm) in the permeate after filtration through the membranes as intensity-weighted distribution is given in Figure 11C,D. The lowest *Z*-average of particle size (661 ± 46 nm) was observed for (MFL)₂,3L (see Figure 11C). The permeate contained two populations of particles, one of size 370 ± 34 nm accounting for 84% of particles in the permeate, and another of particle size 82 ± 20 nm for the remaining 16%. The sizes of particles passed into permeate for membranes MFL 0.41 and MFL 0.21 were almost identical to sizes passed through membrane (MFL)₂,3L 0.21, the same basic microfiltration material being the reason. The corresponding values for the MPU membrane (Figure 11D) with six altering layers of nanofibers were 590 ± 35 nm (94%) and 87 ± 6 nm (6%). The filtration efficacy of (MFL)₂,3L concerning particle size exceeded that of the MPU membrane, as anticipated. Nevertheless, the sizes of particles filtered by the PU membrane (mean pore size 670 nm) were surprisingly low. The presence of finer fibers in three layers of MPU nanostructure can ensure good filtration efficacy at higher flux in comparison with (MFL)₂,3L with a mean pore size 210 nm only. The morphological arrangement of the six-layer MPU nanostructure facilitated heightened filtration efficacy, so no significant changes in final values for consequent

filtration efficacy were observed in comparison with MFL membranes. The LD and DLS techniques have been found to be handy tools for the assessment of filtration performance (separation of submicron particles from water) by means of nanostructured membranes.

3.6 | Module Filtration of Utility Water With Repeated Backwashing

The SEM images in Figure 12A–C reveal the varying state of the MFL 0.41 membrane during the filtration test. The filtering medium was UW with the presence of solids (equal to the dry extract of 0.23% by weight).

An investigation was conducted involving repeated backwashing to raise the capacity for UW filtration by devising a module based on plastic frames equipped with the MFL 0.41 membrane. The filtering cycle comprised 4–5 min of flux and 1 min of backwashing, both at the pressure of 20 kPa. Backwashing facilitated an approximate six-fold rise in flux between 220 to $280 \text{ L min}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ after 3 h of filtration, in comparison with the $40 \text{ L min}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ measured for the module without backwashing (see Figure 13). All the novel smoothed-out MF membranes showed no permanent tendency to foul, meaning their performance could be partially recovered by backwashing with clean water, depending on the




FIGURE 12 | SEM images of the nanostructured MFL 0.41 membrane; (A) the nanofibers of the prepared MFL membrane prior to filtration; (B) clogging after 2 h of filtration; (C) the surface after backwashing.




FIGURE 13 | Clogging of the MFL 0.41 membrane by UW with and without backwashing at 20 kPa.

size of the particles being filtered. The opposite backwashed sites of all the tested microfiltration membranes after filtration were observed to be clean, that is, white without any red dots of iron particles that indicate defects in the material.

4 | Conclusions

The primary purpose of this study was the preparation of a microfiltration membrane with maximum flux and concurrently maximum filtration efficacy. PVDF-HFP and PU membranes were successfully prepared using the electrospinning technique and characterized for model utility water microfiltration. Limitations are experienced when applying nanostructured membranes consisting of nanofibers relating to tensile strength and toughness. The primary and significant conclusions based on the obtained results were:

- Utilizing a support substrate enhanced the applicability of the nanostructured membranes, herein a PET nonwoven textile with a broad distribution of molecular weights. The novel approach developed for connecting a nanostructure and supporting layer resulted in minimal loss of the nanostructured area for filtration.

- Applying nanostructures comprising a combination of thin and thick nanofibers enhanced the flux of the microfiltration membranes. The quantity of utility water that flowed through a type of membrane consisting of thick and thin layers of nanofibers (MPU) was up to 17 times greater in the given test interval (150 min) in comparison with a membrane prepared with a basic unique nanostructure morphology (MFL).
- The application of polyethylene-polypropylene-polyethylene trilaminate mesh was validated for the possibility of additional reinforcement of microfiltration membranes.
- High filtration efficacy for submicron particles was proven by gauging particle distribution prior to and following filtration. The LD and DLS techniques have been found to be very useful tools for the assessment of micron and submicron particle sizes.
- Membrane reinforcing at a temperature of 135°C, a pressure of 0.6 MPa, and a pressing time of 10 s brought a smooth membrane inlet site, which facilitated the removal of the filter cake. This was cleaned by backwashing, thereby restoring the flux of the material, decreasing the tendency for clogging, and lengthening the working life of the microfiltration membranes. Repeated backwashing raised the flux of utility water through the two-layer nanostructured membrane at a settled state around 230 L m⁻² h⁻¹ at the applied pressure of 20 kPa, six-fold higher than without backwashing. The novel smoothed MF membranes exhibited no permanent tendency for fouling at high flux levels compared to commercial alternatives. Thus, modified membranes can potentially be used for efficient wastewater treatment applications.

Out of the various methods that exist for treating water, advanced nanostructured membranes have the most significant potential to solve difficulties relating to matter across the globe.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the European Just Transition Fund within the Operational Programme: Just Transition under the aegis of the

Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic, project CirkArena number CZ.10.03.01/00/22_003/0000045 and Operational Programme Johannes Amos Comenius OP JAC "Application potential development in the field of polymer materials in the context of circular economy compliance (POCEK)", number CZ.02.01.01/00/23_021/0009004. The authors are further grateful for co-funding from the development process of the Centre of Polymer Systems, Tomas Bata University in Zlin, program DKRVO (RP/CPS/2024-28/002) supported by the Ministry of Education Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

1. M. A. Tofighy, T. Mohammadi, and M. H. Sadeghi, "High-Flux PVDF / PVP Nanocomposite Ultrafiltration Membrane Incorporated With Graphene Oxide Nanoribbons With Improved Antifouling Properties," *Journal of Applied Polymer Science* 138 (2021): 49718, <https://doi.org/10.1002/app.49718>.
2. X. Wang and B. S. Hsiao, "Electrospun Nanofiber Membranes," *Current Opinion in Chemical Engineering* 12 (2016): 62–81, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coche.2016.03.001>.
3. F. Klaessig, M. Marrapese, and S. Abe, "Current Perspectives in Nanotechnology Terminology and Nomenclature," in *Nanotechnology Standards*, ed. V. Murashov and J. Howard (Springer, 2011), 21–52.
4. W. E. Teo and S. Ramakrishna, "A Review on Electrospinning Design and Nanofibre Assemblies," *Nanotechnology* 17 (2006): R89–R106, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0957-4484/17/14/R01>.
5. L. T. H. Nguyen, S. Chen, N. K. Elumalai, et al., "Biological, Chemical, and Electronic Applications of Nanofibers," *Macromolecular Materials and Engineering* 298 (2013): 822–867, <https://doi.org/10.1002/mame.201200143>.
6. R. HMTShirazi, T. Mohammadi, A. A. Asadi, and M. A. Tofighy, "Electrospun Nanofiber Affinity Membranes for Water Treatment Applications: A Review," *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 47 (2022): 102795, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2022.102795>.
7. D. Kimmer, I. Vincent, J. Fenyk, et al., "Morphology of Nano and Micro Fiber Structures in Ultrafine Particles Filtration," *AIP Conference Proceedings* 1375 (2011): 295–311, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3604490>.
8. D. Kimmer, I. Vincent, L. Lovecka, T. Kazda, A. Giurg, and O. Skoran, "Some Aspects of Applying Nanostructured Materials in Air Filtration, Water Filtration and Electrical Engineering," *AIP Conference Proceedings* 1843 (2017): 060001, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4983003>.
9. D. H. Reneker and I. Chun, "Nanometre Diameter Fibres of Polymer, Produced by Electrospinning," *Nanotechnology* 7 (1996): 216–223, <https://doi.org/10.1088/0957-4484/7/3/009>.
10. Z.-M. Huang, Y.-Z. Zhang, M. Kotaki, and S. Ramakrishna, "A Review on Polymer Nanofibers by Electrospinning and Their Applications in Nanocomposites," *Composites Science and Technology* 63 (2003): 2223–2253, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0266-3538\(03\)00178-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0266-3538(03)00178-7).
11. D. Kimmer, P. Slobodian, D. Petráš, M. Zatloukal, R. Olejník, and P. Sába, "Polyurethane/Multiwalled Carbon Nanotube Nanowebs Prepared by an Electrospinning Process," *Journal of Applied Polymer Science* 111 (2009): 2711–2714, <https://doi.org/10.1002/app.29238>.
12. M. Ulbricht, "Advanced Functional Polymer Membranes," *Polymer* 47 (2006): 2217–2262, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymer.2006.01.084>.
13. S. Kaur, Z. Ma, R. Gopal, G. Singh, S. Ramakrishna, and T. Matsuura, "Plasma-Induced Graft Copolymerization of Poly(Methacrylic Acid) on Electrospun Poly(Vinylidene Fluoride) Nanofiber Membrane," *Langmuir* 23 (2007): 13085–13092, <https://doi.org/10.1021/la701329r>.
14. M. Moslehi and H. Mahdavi, "Preparation and Characterization of Electrospun Polyurethane Nanofibrous Microfiltration Membrane," *Journal of Polymers and the Environment* 28 (2020): 2691–2701, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10924-020-01801-z>.
15. L. Huang, J. T. Arena, S. S. Manickam, X. Jiang, B. G. Willis, and J. R. McCutcheon, "Improved Mechanical Properties and Hydrophilicity of Electrospun Nanofiber Membranes for Filtration Applications by Dopamine Modification," *Journal of Membrane Science* 460 (2014): 241–249, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2014.01.045>.
16. R. Zhao, X. Li, B. Sun, H. Ji, and C. Wang, "Diethylenetriamine-Assisted Synthesis of Amino-Rich Hydrothermal Carbon-Coated Electrospun Polyacrylonitrile Fiber Adsorbents for the Removal of Cr(VI) and 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic Acid," *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* 487 (2017): 297–309, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2016.10.057>.
17. H. Na, Q. Li, H. Sun, C. Zhao, and X. Yuan, "Anisotropic Mechanical Properties of Hot-Pressed PVDF Membranes With Higher Fiber Alignments via Electrospinning," *Polymer Engineering and Science* 49 (2009): 1291–1298, <https://doi.org/10.1002/pen.21368>.
18. Y. Chen, N. Wang, M. Jensen, and X. Li, "Low-Temperature Welded PAN/TPU Composite Nanofiber Membranes for Water Filtration," *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 47 (2022): 102806, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2022.102806>.
19. R. Xin, H. Ma, S. Venkateswaran, and B. S. Hsiao, "Electrospun Nanofibrous Adsorption Membranes for Wastewater Treatment: Mechanical Strength Enhancement," *Chemical Research in Chinese Universities* 37 (2021): 355–365, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40242-021-1095-5>.
20. Y. C. Woo, L. D. Tijing, W.-G. Shim, et al., "Water Desalination Using Graphene-Enhanced Electrospun Nanofiber Membrane via Air Gap Membrane Distillation," *Journal of Membrane Science* 520 (2016): 99–110, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2016.07.049>.
21. R. Augustine, H. N. Malik, D. K. Singhal, et al., "Electrospun Polycaprolactone/ZnO Nanocomposite Membranes as Biomaterials With Antibacterial and Cell Adhesion Properties," *Journal of Polymer Research* 21 (2014): 347, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10965-013-0347-6>.
22. P. Pascariu Dorneanu, C. Cojocaru, P. Samoila, N. Olaru, A. Airinei, and A. Rotaru, "Novel Fibrous Composites Based on Electrospun PSF and PVDF Ultrathin Fibers Reinforced With Inorganic Nanoparticles: Evaluation as Oil Spill Sorbents," *Polymers for Advanced Technologies* 29 (2018): 1435–1446, <https://doi.org/10.1002/pat.4255>.
23. I. K. Januariyasa, I. D. Ana, and Y. Yusuf, "Nanofibrous Poly(Vinyl Alcohol)/chitosan Contained Carbonated Hydroxyapatite Nanoparticles Scaffold for Bone Tissue Engineering," *Materials Science and Engineering: C* 107 (2020): 110347, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msec.2019.110347>.
24. B. He, L. Tian, J. Li, and Z. Pan, "Effect of Hot-Stretching on Morphology and Mechanical Properties of Electrospun PMIA Nanofibers," *Fibers and Polymers* 14 (2013): 405–408, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12221-013-0405-z>.
25. X. Hou, X. Yang, L. Zhang, E. Waclawik, and S. Wu, "Stretching-Induced Crystallinity and Orientation to Improve the Mechanical Properties of Electrospun PAN Nanocomposites," *Materials and Design* 31 (2010): 1726–1730, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2009.01.051>.
26. J. Ji, G. Sui, Y. Yu, et al., "Significant Improvement of Mechanical Properties Observed in Highly Aligned Carbon-Nanotube-Reinforced Nanofibers," *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* 113 (2009): 4779–4785, <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp8077198>.
27. K. Yoon, B. S. Hsiao, and B. Chu, "Formation of Functional Polyethersulfone Electrospun Membrane for Water Purification by Mixed

- Solvent and Oxidation Processes,” *Polymer* 50 (2009): 2893–2899, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymer.2009.04.047>.
28. X. Liu, H. Ma, and B. S. Hsiao, “Interpenetrating Nanofibrous Composite Membranes for Water Purification,” *ACS Applied Nano Materials* 2 (2019): 3606–3614, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsanm.9b00565>.
29. M. Sun, X. Li, B. Ding, J. Yu, and G. Sun, “Mechanical and Wettability Behavior of Polyacrylonitrile Reinforced Fibrous Polystyrene Mats,” *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* 347 (2010): 147–152, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2010.03.026>.
30. H. Li, C. Zhu, J. Xue, Q. Ke, and Y. Xia, “Enhancing the Mechanical Properties of Electrospun Nanofiber Mats Through Controllable Welding at the Cross Points,” *Macromolecular Rapid Communications* 38 (2017): 1600723, <https://doi.org/10.1002/marc.201600723>.
31. J. Bae, I. Baek, and H. Choi, “Mechanically Enhanced PES Electrospun Nanofiber Membranes (ENMs) for Microfiltration: The Effects of ENM Properties on Membrane Performance,” *Water Research* 105 (2016): 406–412, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2016.09.020>.
32. L. Huang, S. S. Manickam, and J. R. McCutcheon, “Increasing Strength of Electrospun Nanofiber Membranes for Water Filtration Using Solvent Vapor,” *Journal of Membrane Science* 436 (2013): 213–220, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2012.12.037>.
33. S.-H. Wu and X.-H. Qin, “Uniaxially Aligned Polyacrylonitrile Nanofiber Yarns Prepared by a Novel Modified Electrospinning Method,” *Materials Letters* 106 (2013): 204–207, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2013.05.010>.
34. L. Yu, Z. Shao, L. Xu, and M. Wang, “High Throughput Preparation of Aligned Nanofibers Using an Improved Bubble-Electrospinning,” *Polymers* 9 (2017): 658, <https://doi.org/10.3390/polym9120658>.
35. X. Han, Z. Huang, C. He, L. Liu, and Q.-S. Wu, “Coaxial Electrospinning of PC(Shell)/PU(Core) Composite Nanofibers for Textile Application,” *Polymer Composites* 29, no. 5 (2008): 579–584, <https://doi.org/10.1002/pc.20180>.
36. R. Cai, Y. Zhou, J. Hu, et al., “A Novel Sodium Alginate/Cellulose Nanofiber Self-Supported Hydrogel Membrane and Its Filtration Performance,” *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 50 (2022): 103303, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2022.103303>.
37. S. S. Homaeigohar, K. Buhr, and K. Ebert, “Polyethersulfone Electrospun Nanofibrous Composite Membrane for Liquid Filtration,” *Journal of Membrane Science* 365 (2010): 68–77, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2010.08.041>.
38. M. Barani, C. H. Riahi, V. Heidari, and S. Bazgir, “Pilot-Scale Continuous Bacterial Filtration Using Nanofibrous Filters,” *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 48 (2022): 102925, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2022.102925>.
39. J. Lev, M. Holba, L. Kalhotka, P. Mikula, and D. Kimmer, “Improvements in the Structure of Electrospun Polyurethane Nanofibrous Materials Used for Bacterial Removal From Wastewater,” *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Nanotechnology* 1 (2012): 16–20, <https://doi.org/10.11159/ijtan.2012.003>.
40. L. Sumin, D. Kimura, A. Yokoyama, K. H. Lee, J. C. Park, and I. S. Kim, “The Effects of Laundering on the Mechanical Properties of Mass-Produced Nanofiber Web for Use in Wear,” *Textile Research Journal* 79 (2009): 1085–1090, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040517508101622>.
41. L. Sumin, D. Kimura, K. H. Lee, J. C. Park, and I.-S. Kim, “The Effect of Laundering on the Thermal and Water Transfer Properties of Mass-Produced Laminated Nanofiber Web for Use in Wear,” *Text & Speech Research* 80 (2010): 99–105, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040517508102308>.
42. M. N. Pervez, M. E. Talukder, M. R. Mishu, et al., “Fabrication of Polyethersulfone/Polyacrylonitrile Electrospun Nanofiber Membrane for Food Industry Wastewater Treatment,” *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 47 (2022): 102838, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2022.102838>.
43. X. Ke, S. Ribbens, Y. Fan, et al., “Integrating Efficient Filtration and Visible-Light Photocatalysis by Loading ag-Doped Zeolite Y Particles on Filtration Membrane of Alumina Nanofibers,” *Journal of Membrane Science* 375 (2011): 69–74, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2011.02.024>.
44. J. Yu, Y.-G. Kim, D. Y. Kim, S. Lee, H. I. Joh, and S. M. Jo, “Super High Flux Microfiltration Based on Electrospun Nanofibrous m-Aramid Membranes for Water Treatment,” *Macromolecular Research* 23 (2015): 601–606, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13233-015-3086-1>.
45. M. Ahsani, F. A. Oghyanous, J. Meyer, M. Ulbricht, and R. Yegani, “PVDF Membranes Modified With Diblock Copolymer PEO-b-PMMA as Additive: Effects of Copolymer and Barrier Pore Size on Filtration Performance and Fouling in a Membrane Bioreactor,” *Chemical Engineering Research and Design* 184 (2022): 678–691, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2022.05.051>.
46. X.-T. Yuan, L. Wu, H.-Z. Geng, et al., “Polyaniline/Polysulfone Ultrafiltration Membranes With Improved Permeability and Anti-Fouling Behavior,” *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 40 (2021): 101903, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2020.101903>.
47. A. M. Nasir, N. Awang, J. Jaafar, et al., “Recent Progress on Fabrication and Application of Electrospun Nanofibrous Photocatalytic Membranes for Wastewater Treatment: A Review,” *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 40 (2021): 101878, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2020.101878>.
48. T. Serra, A. Barcelona, N. Pous, V. Salvadó, and J. Colomer, “Disinfection and Particle Removal by a Nature-Based Daphnia Filtration System for Wastewater Treatment,” *Journal of Water Process Engineering* 50 (2022): 103238, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2022.103238>.
49. D. Kimmer, I. Vincent, J. Lev, et al., “Nanofiber Structures in Bacteria Deactivation and Removal From Wastewater and Polluted Air,” in *Conference Proceedings FILTECH 2013* (FILTECH Exhibitions Germany GmbH & Co KG, 2013), 12.
50. R. Barhate and S. Ramakrishna, “Nanofibrous Filtering Media: Filtration Problems and Solutions From Tiny Materials,” *Journal of Membrane Science* 296 (2007): 1–8, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2007.03.038>.
51. H. Ma, C. Burger, B. S. Hsiao, and B. Chu, “Ultra-Fine Cellulose Nanofibers: New Nano-Scale Materials for Water Purification,” *Journal of Materials Chemistry* 21 (2011): 7507, <https://doi.org/10.1039/c0jm04308g>.
52. D. Kimmer, I. Vincent, L. Lovecká, et al., “Method of Manufacturing a Filter Membrane,” CZ Patent No. 308593.