

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

**Author/s:**

Kanehashi, S;Chen, GQ;Ciddor, L;Chaffee, A;Kentish, SE

**Title:**

The impact of water vapor on CO<sub>2</sub> separation performance of mixed matrix membranes

**Date:**

2015-10-05

**Citation:**

Kanehashi, S., Chen, G. Q., Ciddor, L., Chaffee, A. & Kentish, S. E. (2015). The impact of water vapor on CO<sub>2</sub> separation performance of mixed matrix membranes. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 492, pp.471-477. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2015.05.046>.

**Persistent Link:**

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/55654>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **The impact of water vapor on CO<sub>2</sub> separation**  
8  
9  
10 **performance of mixed matrix membranes**  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 **Shinji Kanehashi,<sup>1</sup> George Chen,<sup>1</sup> Lachlan Ciddor,<sup>2</sup> Alan Chaffee<sup>2</sup> and**  
23  
24 **Sandra E. Kentish\*<sup>1</sup>**  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 <sup>1</sup> Peter Cook Centre for Carbon Capture and Storage, Department of Chemical and  
33 Biomolecular Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia  
34

35 <sup>2</sup> School of Chemistry, Monash University, Victoria 3800, Australia  
36  
37  
38

39 \* Correspondence to Sandra E. Kentish

40  
41 Tel : +61-3-8344-6682, Fax : +61-8344-4153

42  
43 E-mail : sandraek@unimelb.edu.au  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Abstract

1  
2 A series of mixed matrix membranes (MMMs) using nanoparticles involving carbons, porous  
3  
4 organic polymers and metal organic frameworks were prepared to investigate the impact of  
5  
6 water vapor on CO<sub>2</sub> separation performance. The water uptake of MMMs using hydrophilic  
7  
8 MOFs increased relative to more hydrophobic particles such as POP and carbons and this  
9  
10 trend was reflected in the water vapor permeability, which varied by a factor of three between  
11  
12 the hydrophobic and hydrophilic MMMs. These changes in water vapor permeability were  
13  
14 strongly correlated with the water solubility, indicating that it is this solubility that is the  
15  
16 controlling parameter. The calculated water diffusivity was consistent with previously  
17  
18 published results. The gas permeability of MMMs in the presence of water vapor was also  
19  
20 strongly affected by the nanoparticle hydrophobicity, with membranes composed of  
21  
22 hydrophobic fillers out-performing hydrophilic fillers of comparable porosity. However in  
23  
24 general, the differences in performance between MMMs and the pure polymer narrowed in  
25  
26 the presence of water vapor.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 **Keywords:** Water; Mixed matrix membrane; solubility; diffusivity; carbon capture  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## INTRODUCTION

1  
2 Global warming has emerged as one of the serious environmental problems all over the world.  
3  
4 This problem results from an increase in the emissions of greenhouse gases such as carbon  
5  
6 dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane, and perfluorocarbons to produce the requisite energy for our daily  
7  
8 life. The separation of CO<sub>2</sub> from large emission sources such as power, iron and cement  
9  
10 plants and its subsequent storage (*i.e.*, carbon capture and storage) would reduce the total CO<sub>2</sub>  
11  
12 emissions [1, 2]. Applications for clean energy production involving hydrogen recovery[3,  
13  
14 4], natural gas sweetening [5, 6] and methane recovery from biogas [7] also require the  
15  
16 separation of carbon dioxide and have received much attention in recent years. Polymeric  
17  
18 membrane-based separation technology is an attractive approach to such gas/vapour  
19  
20 separation due to its ease of operation, energy efficiency and cost-effectiveness, relative to  
21  
22 absorption, adsorption, and cryogenic distillation, and has been applied in industrial  
23  
24 applications [2, 8, 9]. However, minor components in the gas processing stream can have a  
25  
26 large impact on the separation performance of these membranes [10]. In particular, water  
27  
28 vapor is almost always present in industrial gas streams. This water vapor can cause a  
29  
30 reduction in the CO<sub>2</sub> separation performance through competitive sorption and water  
31  
32 clustering effects as the water molecules in the membrane occupy free volume that would  
33  
34 otherwise be occupied by CO<sub>2</sub> [11, 12].  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Generally, polymer membranes are easier to fabricate and more cost-effective than  
45  
46 inorganic membranes. However, conventional polymeric membranes for gas separation  
47  
48 have a typical tradeoff relationship between gas permeability and selectivity [13, 14]. An  
49  
50 effective strategy to overcome this trade-off involves the use of polymer composites, so called  
51  
52 mixed matrix membranes (MMMs), which combine the benefits of both polymer substrates  
53  
54 and organic and/or inorganic fillers [15, 16]. MMMs have become attractive for gas  
55  
56 separation applications in recent years not only because of their enhanced thermal, chemical,  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 and mechanical stability, but also their improved gas permeation/separation properties, when  
2 compared to homogeneous polymer membranes. To date, a large number of MMMs using  
3 carbon [17-21], zeolite [22-25], silica [26-30], metal organic frameworks (MOF) [31-33] and  
4 porous organic polymers (POP) [34] have been shown to be promising candidates for gas  
5 separation applications. Carbon materials are likely to be available at more moderate cost  
6 than other additives such as MOFs [35, 36]. MOFs and POPs have been widely investigated  
7 for gas storage and catalysis applications in recent years [37-41]. The stability of these  
8 materials is also of critical concern. For example, Zr (IV)-based MOFs such as UiO-66  
9 [Zr<sub>6</sub>O<sub>4</sub>(OH)<sub>4</sub>(BDC)<sub>6</sub>] and its functionalized derivatives have been identified as more  
10 thermally and chemically stable than other MOFs [42]. In addition, UiO-66 has been shown  
11 to be very stable under 90RH% at 40°C, while surface degradation was observed in Cu-BTC  
12 under the same conditions [43]. These issues are further elaborated in a recent review paper  
13 [44]. Porous organic polymers (POPs) might be expected to be more hydrophobic and  
14 recently a triarylamine-based POP has indeed been shown to display a low water uptake [41].  
15 In general, these MMMs are tested in isolation and are rarely compared to each other.  
16 Herein, a comparative study of the effect of water impact on the CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> separation  
17 performance through various MMMs containing a variety of different nanoparticles involving,  
18 carbon, MOF, and POP has enabled important new insights into the factors that impact  
19 membrane performance. The use of processing conditions consistent with those that might  
20 be observed in natural gas or biogas processing provides an indication of membrane  
21 performance under such conditions [45].  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

## 53 **EXPERIMENTAL**

### 54 **Materials**

55 Aromatic polyimide, Matrimid<sup>®</sup>5218 (3,3,4,4-benzophenone tetracarboxylic dianhydride  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 diaminophenylidane) polyimide was purchased from Huntsman Advanced Materials Americas  
2 Inc, America for use as the host matrix. The Matrimid was purified by solution and  
3 re-precipitation using methanol (Analytical reagent, Chem-Supply, Australia) and  
4 dichloromethane (DCM, Analytical reagent, Chem-Supply, Australia). Graphitized  
5 mesoporous carbon (Carbon A), mesoporous carbon (Carbon B), and ZIF-8 (Basolite Z-1200)  
6 were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Inc., America. Carbon C was produced from briquetted  
7 Victorian brown coal via mild steam activation at 800 °C for 90 min, in a fixed bed reactor  
8 under a flow of N<sub>2</sub>/H<sub>2</sub>O (3 L/min and 0.25 cm<sup>3</sup>/min, respectively). POP-2 [46], Cu-BTC  
9 ([Cu<sub>3</sub>(BTC)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>3</sub>H<sub>2</sub>O, also known as HKUST-1 where BTC = benzene-1,3,5-tricarboxylate)  
10 [47], and UiO-66 [48] were synthesized in house according to the previous literature. All  
11 polyimide and commercial nanoparticles were dried at 100°C overnight under vacuum to  
12 remove moisture before use.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 Membrane Preparation

32 Pure Matrimid and MMMs were prepared by a solvent casting method. The loading of  
33 nanoparticle was calculated based on the following equation;  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

$$39 \text{ Filler loading (wt\%)} = \frac{w_{filler}}{w_{polymer} + w_{filler}} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

40 where  $w_{polymer}$  and  $w_{filler}$  are weight of polymer and filler, respectively. DCM solutions of 3-4  
41 wt% filler and polymer were separately prepared. These separate solutions were stirred  
42 overnight at room temperature and then sonicated (Unisonics, Australia) for 30 minutes  
43 within an ice bath. The well dispersed solutions were mixed together and then again treated  
44 by physical stirring overnight and ultrasonication for 30 minutes. Base Matrimid  
45 membranes and mixed matrix membranes of different filler loadings (*e.g.* 10, 20, and 30 wt%)  
46 were prepared from such solutions by a standard casting method [49]. A homogeneous  
47 polymer/filler solution was cast onto a glass petri dish which was covered to prevent  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 contamination and left at room temperature for 24-48 hours. The homogeneous membranes  
2 were then removed from the petri dish using a small amount of distilled water. The  
3 membrane was placed in a vacuum oven at 35°C for 24 hours and further dried at 100°C for  
4 24 hours. The thickness of the well-dried membrane was on average 80 μm, as measured by  
5 a micrometer (IP65, Mitsutoyo, Japan), giving an accuracy of ± 1 μm.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 **Characterization**

12 Nitrogen adsorption–desorption measurements of the nanoparticles was conducted on a  
13 ASAP2010 (Micromeritics, USA) apparatus at 77 K. The internal surface area was then  
14 calculated by the BET method [50]. The particle size distribution of the nanoparticles was  
15 measured by dynamic light scattering (DLS) using a Zetasizer 2000 (Malvern, UK)  
16 instrument. The membrane density ( $\rho$ ) was determined based on the Archimedean principle  
17 using an analytical balance (Mettler Toledo AB204-5) at room temperature ( $23 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ ) [51],  
18 The water uptake of the membrane was determined by immersion in purified water at  $35 \pm$   
19  $1^\circ\text{C}$  until equilibrium water sorption was attained. The water uptake was calculated based  
20 on the following equation;  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

$$39 \text{ Water uptake (wt\%)} = \frac{w_{wet} - w_{dry}}{w_{dry}} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

40 where  $w_{wet}$  and  $w_{dry}$  are the weight of a water-swollen membrane at equilibrium state and a  
41 well-dried membrane respectively.  
42

43 Dry and humidified gas permeability in mixtures of 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub> were determined at  
44 35 °C and 7.5 bar by a constant pressure variable volume apparatus designed and built  
45 in-house [12]. For all gas permeability measurements helium was used as a sweep gas on  
46 the permeate side. CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> permeabilities were determined through a mass flowmeter  
47 (GFC mass flowmeter, Aalborg, USA), and gas chromatography (CP-3800, Varian, Inc.,  
48 Australia). Water permeability was also measured through humidity probes (HMT, Probe  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 type 334 Vaisala Oyj, Finland) on the feed and permeate side. Concentration polarization  
2 can readily occur under humidified conditions due to the formation of a concentration  
3 gradient at either surface of the membrane, as water permeates much faster than other gases  
4 [12, 45, 52, 53]. To eliminate these effects in the present work, stainless steel wool was  
5 placed on both sides of the membrane to increase turbulence within the boundary layer.  
6  
7 Further, the feed and sweep permeate flowrates were increased to a point where the  
8 measurement was independent of this parameter. Under these conditions, the water vapor  
9 concentration on the membrane surface approaches the bulk concentration. In the present  
10 case, a feed flowrate of 1.6 L/min and a helium sweep gas flowrate of 50 ml/min was used to  
11 eliminate such concentration polarization. The water activity,  $\alpha$  or relative humidity was  
12 determined by  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

$$\alpha = \frac{P_{H_2O}}{P_{sat}} \quad (3)$$

27 where  $p_{H_2O}$  is the water vapor partial pressure and  $p_{sat}$  the saturation water vapor pressure at  
28 35°C (5.64 kPa).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 39 Characterization

40 The nanoparticle properties are summarized in Table 1. The crystal density of the  
41 nanoparticles is cited from manufacturer information and the literature [33, 54-56]. The  
42 surface area increases with increasing pore volume, consistent with data reported for MOFs  
43 and carbon aerogels [57, 58]. The membrane density of pure Matrimid and 20 wt% MMMs  
44 are summarized in Table 2. The density of pure Matrimid was 1.223 g/cm<sup>3</sup>, which is in good  
45 agreement with the literature value [59]. The fractional free volume (*FFV*) in each  
46 membrane can be determined from the density of the membrane, the base polymer and the  
47 nanoparticles using a previously established method [60] and this data is also presented in  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Table 2. We have previously shown that the permeability of pure single gases through these membranes can be correlated directly to this *FFV* value, suggesting that the gas transport mechanism of these MMMs at low feed pressure is controlled by the gas diffusivity [60].

Figure 1 presents the water uptake values of MMMs as a function of filler loading, while Figure 2 shows how this uptake varies with pore volume. The water uptake value of pure Matrimid is 2.8 wt% at 35°C which is in good agreement with the reported value [61]. The water uptake of the MMMs reflects the nature of the fillers with the water uptake values for Carbon A and for POP-2 membranes below that of the host matrix. On the other hand, the water uptake of other membranes increased with increasing filler loading. The highest water uptake was observed in Cu-BTC and in UiO-66, related to the high porosity of these materials (Table 1 and Figure 2) and the presence of hydroxyl groups coordinated into each structure [43, 44]. The pore volume for the hydrophobic ZIF-8 and POP-2 materials is less important, with little correlation with this parameter seen in Figure 2. Changes in pore volume probably contribute to the differences in water uptake for the three carbon materials. Water uptake in activated carbon materials is usually related to a combination of both pore volume and the extent of surface oxide functionalization [62, 63].

### **Water vapor permeation and its impact**

Figure 3 presents the water vapor permeability through the MMMs compared to the base polymer, Matrimid. As has been observed previously, the water vapor permeability of Matrimid increases as water activity increases, ranging from 3200 to 3750 in CH<sub>4</sub> and from 3650 to 3900 in 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub>. This increase is generally related to the increase in the water vapor solubility at higher humidities [12, 64, 65]. In addition, the water vapor permeability of all membranes in a stream of 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub> at a water activity of 0.8 is about 10% higher than that in a pure CH<sub>4</sub> gas. This is because the CO<sub>2</sub> induces some

1 membrane plasticization. The water permeability of the MMMs at these humidities varied  
2 from 2800 to 9400 barrer in humidified CH<sub>4</sub>, and from 2900 to 10000 barrer in 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in  
3 CH<sub>4</sub>; giving an over threefold difference in permeability between the hydrophobic and  
4 hydrophilic MMMs. This data is plotted on a Robeson's plot for H<sub>2</sub>O/CO<sub>2</sub> in [Figure 4](#). The  
5 slope of the theoretical upper bound of H<sub>2</sub>O/CO<sub>2</sub> is calculated using the approach from  
6 Freeman (1999) [14]. The Matrimid-based MMMs exist below the upper bound for these  
7 gas pairs, which is similar to the performance of other aromatic polyimides.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
It should be noted that this data is collected with a dry sweep gas, so that the water  
concentration within the membrane varies significantly across the cross-section. In turn, this  
means that the degree of plasticization of the Matrimid matrix and the extent of water  
clustering also varies. As noted by Koester *et al.*, increases in the permeate humidity will  
change the nature of both plasticization and clustering and will likely lead to changes in the  
data [52]. Similarly, changes to the thickness of the membrane could also change the  
recorded permeability [66]. However, the influence of the nanoparticle within the mixed  
matrix structure should remain unaffected.

It should also be noted that these results are recorded in a gas stream that contains relatively  
low partial pressures of carbon dioxide. At higher partial pressures, the water permeability  
through the Matrimid matrix is likely to increase, particularly at lower water humidities,  
reflecting additional plasticization or swelling from this gas [12]. In turn, this is likely to  
lead to an overall increase in the MMM permeability.

The water vapor permeability of the 20 wt% MMMs at  $\alpha = 0.8$  is strongly correlated  
with the water uptake (water vapor solubility at  $\alpha = 1.0$ ) as presented in [Figure 5](#). This graph  
shows that there is a linear relationship between the water permeability ( $P$ ) and the water  
solubility ( $S$ ). If the permeability can be described by the simple relationship  $P = D \times S$ , then  
the gradient of this line can be considered as an estimate of the water diffusivity in these

1 systems. Indeed, the calculated values of this gradient ( $3.41 \pm 0.15 \times 10^{-8}$  cm<sup>2</sup>/s in pure CH<sub>4</sub>  
2 and  $3.63 \pm 0.16 \times 10^{-8}$  cm<sup>2</sup>/s in 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub>) are highly consistent with previously  
3 published values of the water permeability through pure Matrimid at  $\alpha = 0.8$  ( $3.05 \times 10^{-8}$   
4 cm<sup>2</sup>/s) [11]. This result suggests that the water vapor permeability through Matrimid-based  
5 MMMs is determined by the water vapor solubility rather than the diffusivity. This result is  
6 in contrast to our previous work which showed that the permeability of light gases such as  
7 CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> was dominated by the diffusivity, with increases in permeability directly  
8 correlated with increases in free volume [60]. The slight increase in diffusivity for 10% CO<sub>2</sub>  
9 in CH<sub>4</sub> relative to pure CH<sub>4</sub> may result from CO<sub>2</sub> induced plasticization, although the  
10 difference is within the experimental error margin.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 **Figure 6** presents the CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> permeability, and CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> selectivity under  
25 humidified conditions at 35°C for each MMM. As has been previously described, the water  
26 vapor causes a loss of both permeability and selectivity for these light gases in pure Matrimid,  
27 due to a combination of competitive sorption and water clustering (anti-plasticisation), which  
28 reduces the diffusivity of the gases [11]. In the present case, the loss of permeability is  
29 greater for the more hydrophilic MMMs such as Cu-BTC, UiO-66, and ZIF-8, while that for  
30 the hydrophobic POP-2 and carbon nanoparticles is less. These changes in the gas  
31 permeability again reflect changes in the water solubility, which affect the extent of both  
32 competitive sorption and water clustering. The changes in CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> selectivity for all  
33 membranes is of the order of 10% of the base value and within experimental error, no clear  
34 trend can be established.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 The net impact of water on the Robeson's plot for CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> is provided in **Figure 7**.  
52 While MMMs with the highly porous Cu-BTC provide the best performance in a dry system,  
53 this behaviour is reversed once water is added. Under these circumstances, the more  
54 hydrophobic, but still porous filler materials, such as POP-2, Carbon C and ZIF-8 provide  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 better results. The poorest performance is provided by materials that are either hydrophilic  
2 or lacking in free volume. In general, the performance of all MMMs is closer to that of pure  
3 Matrimid and hence it may be difficult to justify the added expense of manufacturing these  
4 materials relative to a simple polymer.  
5  
6  
7

## 8 **CONCLUSIONS**

9  
10  
11 Matrimid-based MMMs using a range of nanoparticles were prepared and tested in the  
12 presence of water vapor. Incorporation of hydrophobic nanoparticles such as Carbon A and  
13 POP-2 into the polyimide matrix decreased the water uptake values, suggesting that the  
14 membranes were becoming more hydrophobic. A linear correlation was observed between  
15 the water vapor permeability of MMMs and the water vapor solubility and the gradient of this  
16 line indicated a water diffusivity consistent with published results. The presence of water  
17 vapor in the feed gas leads to a drop of gas permeability of all MMMs, however, the impact is  
18 less for the more hydrophobic materials. These results suggest that MMMs prepared using  
19 highly porous, hydrophobic nanoparticles can be effective in gas separation applications such  
20 as natural gas sweetening, biogas purification and post-combustion carbon capture, when  
21 water vapor is present as an impurity. However, the advantages of a MMM reduce in these  
22 circumstances and a case to prepare these more complicated structures would need to be  
23 carefully assessed.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

46  
47 This research was supported by the Scientific and Industry Endowment Fund in Australia  
48 (SIEF Grant ID RP02-035) and a Grant-in-Aid for the Japan Society for the Promotion of  
49 Science Fellows (JSPS Grant ID 2410856).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Mikkelsen, M. Jorgensen, F.C. Krebs, The teraton challenge. A review of fixation and transformation of carbon dioxide, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 3 (2010) 43-81.
- [2] T.C. Merkel, H. Lin, X. Wei, R. Baker, Power plant post-combustion carbon dioxide capture: An opportunity for membranes, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 359 (2010) 126-139.
- [3] T. Yang, T.-S. Chung, High performance ZIF-8/PBI nano-composite membranes for high temperature hydrogen separation consisting of carbon monoxide and water vapor, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 38 (2013) 229-239.
- [4] T. Yang, Y. Xiao, T.-S. Chung, Poly-/metal-benzimidazole nano-composite membranes for hydrogen purification, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 4 (2011) 4171-4180.
- [5] R.W. Baker, K. Lokhandwala, Natural gas processing with membranes: an overview, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 47 (2008) 2109-2121.
- [6] C.A. Scholes, G.W. Stevens, S.E. Kentish, Membrane gas separation applications in natural gas processing, *Fuel*, 96 (2012) 15-28.
- [7] S. Basu, A.L. Khan, A. Cano-Odena, C. Liu, I.F.J. Vankelecom, Membrane-based technologies for biogas separations, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 39 (2010) 750-768.
- [8] R.W. Baker, *Membrane Technology and Applications*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 2000.
- [9] B.D. Freeman, Y. Yampolskii, *Membrane Gas Separation*, John Wiley & Sons, West Sussex, 2010.
- [10] C.A. Scholes, S.E. Kentish, G.W. Stevens, Effects of minor components in carbon dioxide capture using polymeric gas separation membranes, *Sep. Purif. Rev.*, 38 (2009) 1-44.
- [11] G.Q. Chen, C.A. Scholes, C.M. Doherty, A.J. Hill, G.G. Qiao, S.E. Kentish, Modeling of the sorption and transport properties of water vapor in polyimide membranes, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 409-410 (2012) 96-104.
- [12] G.Q. Chen, C.A. Scholes, G.G. Qiao, S.E. Kentish, Water vapor permeation in polyimide membranes, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 379 (2011) 479-487.
- [13] L.M. Robeson, The upper bound revisited, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 320 (2008) 390-400.
- [14] B.D. Freeman, Basis of Permeability/Selectivity Tradeoff Relations in Polymeric Gas Separation Membranes, *Macromolecules*, 32 (1999) 375-380.
- [15] G. Dong, H. Li, V. Chen, Challenges and opportunities for mixed-matrix membranes for gas separation, *J. Mat. Chem. A*, 1 (2013) 4610-4630.
- [16] M. Rezakazemi, A. Ebadi Amooghin, M.M. Montazer-Rahmati, A.F. Ismail, T. Matsuura, State-of-the-art membrane based CO<sub>2</sub> separation using mixed matrix membranes (MMMs): An overview on current status and future directions, *Prog. Polym. Sci.*, 39 (2014) 817-861.
- [17] D.Q. Vu, W.J. Koros, S.J. Miller, Mixed matrix membranes using carbon molecular sieves: I. Preparation and experimental results, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 211 (2003) 311-334.
- [18] M. Anson, J. Marchese, E. Garis, N. Ochoa, C. Pagliero, ABS copolymer-activated carbon mixed matrix membranes for CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> separation, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 243 (2004) 19-28.

- 1 [19] A. Singh, W.J. Koros, Significance of entropic selectivity for advanced gas separation  
2 membranes, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 35 (1996) 1231-1234.
- 3 [20] J. Marchese, M. Anson, N.A. Ochoa, P. Prádanos, L. Palacio, A. Hernández, Morphology  
4 and structure of ABS membranes filled with two different activated carbons, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*,  
5 61 (2006) 5448-5454.
- 6 [21] M.G. García, J. Marchese, N.A. Ochoa, High activated carbon loading mixed matrix  
7 membranes for gas separations, *J Mater Sci*, 47 (2012) 3064-3075.
- 8 [22] M. Rostamizadeh, M. Rezakazemi, K. Shahidi, T. Mohammadi, Gas permeation through  
9 H<sub>2</sub>-selective mixed matrix membranes: Experimental and neural network modeling, *Int. J.*  
10 *Hydrogen Energy*, 38 (2013) 1128-1135.
- 11 [23] R. Mahajan, W.J. Koros, Mixed matrix membrane materials with glassy polymers. Part 1,  
12 *Polym. Eng. Sci.*, 42 (2002) 1420-1431.
- 13 [24] S. Kanehashi, H. Gu, R. Shindo, S. Sato, T. Miyakoshi, K. Nagai, Gas permeation and  
14 separation properties of polyimide/ZSM-5 zeolite composite membranes containing liquid  
15 sulfolane, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, Accepted (2012).
- 16 [25] Y. Zhang, K.J. Balkus Jr., I.H. Musselman, J.P. Ferraris, Mixed-matrix membranes  
17 composed of Matrimid® and mesoporous ZSM-5 nanoparticles, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 325 (2008)  
18 28-39.
- 19 [26] T.C. Merkel, B.D. Freeman, R.J. Spontak, Z. He, I. Pinnau, P. Meakin, A.J. Hill,  
20 Ultrapermeable, reverse-selective nanocomposite membranes, *Science*, 296 (2002) 519-522.
- 21 [27] Z. He, I. Pinnau, A. Morisato, Nanostructured poly(4-methyl-2-pentyne)/silica hybrid  
22 membranes for gas separation, *Desalination*, 146 (2002) 11-15.
- 23 [28] T.C. Merkel, B.D. Freeman, R.J. Spontak, Z. He, I. Pinnau, P. Meakin, A.J. Hill, Sorption,  
24 transport, and structural evidence for enhanced free volume in  
25 poly(4-methyl-2-pentyne)/fumed silica nanocomposite membranes, *Chem. Mat.*, 15 (2002)  
26 109-123.
- 27 [29] B.D. Reid, F.A. Ruiz-Trevino, I.H. Musselman, K.J. Balkus, J.P. Ferraris, Gas  
28 permeability properties of polysulfone membranes containing the mesoporous molecular  
29 sieve MCM-41, *Chem. Mat.*, 13 (2001) 2366-2373.
- 30 [30] S. Kim, E. Marand, J. Ida, V.V. Gulians, Polysulfone and mesoporous molecular sieve  
31 MCM-48 mixed matrix membranes for gas separation, *Chem. Mat.*, 18 (2006) 1149-1155.
- 32 [31] S. Japip, H. Wang, Y. Xiao, T. Shung Chung, Highly permeable zeolitic imidazolate  
33 framework (ZIF)-71 nano-particles enhanced polyimide membranes for gas separation, *J.*  
34 *Membr. Sci.*, 467 (2014) 162-174.
- 35 [32] L. Ge, W. Zhou, V. Rudolph, Z. Zhu, Mixed matrix membranes incorporated with  
36 size-reduced Cu-BTC for improved gas separation, *J. Mat. Chem. A*, 1 (2013) 6350-6358.
- 37 [33] Q. Song, S.K. Nataraj, M.V. Roussanova, J.C. Tan, D.J. Hughes, W. Li, P. Bourgoin, M.A.  
38 Alam, A.K. Cheetham, S.A. Al-Muhtaseb, E. Sivaniah, Zeolitic imidazolate framework  
39 (ZIF-8) based polymer nanocomposite membranes for gas separation, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 5  
40

(2012) 8359-8369.

[34] H. Zhao, Z. Jin, H. Su, J. Zhang, X. Yao, H. Zhao, G. Zhu, Target synthesis of a novel porous aromatic framework and its highly selective separation of CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub>, *Chem. Comm.*, 49 (2013) 2780-2782.

[35] J. Wang, L. Huang, R. Yang, Z. Zhang, J. Wu, Y. Gao, Q. Wang, D. O'Hare, Z. Zhong, Recent advances in solid sorbents for CO<sub>2</sub> capture and new development trends, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, (2014).

[36] M. Sevilla, R. Mokaya, Energy storage applications of activated carbons: supercapacitors and hydrogen storage, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 7 (2014) 1250-1280.

[37] J.-R. Li, J. Sculley, H.-C. Zhou, Metal–Organic Frameworks for Separations, *Chem. Rev.*, 112 (2011) 869-932.

[38] K. Sumida, D.L. Rogow, J.A. Mason, T.M. McDonald, E.D. Bloch, Z.R. Herm, T.-H. Bae, J.R. Long, Carbon dioxide capture in metal–organic frameworks, *Chem. Rev.*, 112 (2011) 724-781.

[39] Z. Zhang, Z.-Z. Yao, S. Xiang, B. Chen, Perspective of microporous metal-organic frameworks for CO<sub>2</sub> capture and separation, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 7 (2014) 2868-2899.

[40] J. Liu, P.K. Thallapally, B.P. McGrail, D.R. Brown, J. Liu, Progress in adsorption-based CO<sub>2</sub> capture by metal-organic frameworks, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 41 (2012) 2308-2322.

[41] C. Hua, A. Rawal, T.B. Faust, P.D. Southon, R. Babarao, J.M. Hook, D.M. D'Alessandro, Exploiting stable radical states for multifunctional properties in triarylamine-based porous organic polymers, *J. Mat. Chem. A*, 2 (2014) 12466-12474.

[42] J.H. Cavka, S. Jakobsen, U. Olsbye, N. Guillou, C. Lamberti, S. Bordiga, K.P. Lillerud, A new zirconium inorganic building brick forming metal organic frameworks with exceptional stability, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 130 (2008) 13850-13851.

[43] J.B. DeCoste, G.W. Peterson, B.J. Schindler, K.L. Killops, M.A. Browe, J.J. Mahle, The effect of water adsorption on the structure of the carboxylate containing metal-organic frameworks Cu-BTC, Mg-MOF-74, and UiO-66, *J. Mat. Chem. A*, 1 (2013) 11922-11932.

[44] N.C. Burtch, H. Jasuja, K.S. Walton, Water stability and adsorption in metal–organic frameworks, *Chem. Rev.*, 114 (2014) 10575-10612.

[45] G.Q. Chen, S. Kanehashi, C.M. Doherty, A.J. Hill, S.E. Kentish, Water vapor permeation through cellulose acetate membranes and its impact upon membrane separation performance for natural gas purification, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 487 (2015) 249-255.

[46] D. Hua, Y.K. Ong, Y. Wang, T. Yang, T.-S. Chung, ZIF-90/P84 mixed matrix membranes for pervaporation dehydration of isopropanol, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 453 (2014) 155-167.

[47] B. Xiao, Q. Yuan, R.A. Williams, Exceptional function of nanoporous metal organic framework particles in emulsion stabilisation, *Chem. Comm.*, 49 (2013) 8208-8210.

[48] K. Tulig, K.S. Walton, An alternative UiO-66 synthesis for HCl-sensitive nanoparticle encapsulation, *RSC Adv.*, 4 (2014) 51080-51083.

[49] M. Valero, B. Zornoza, C. Téllez, J. Coronas, Mixed matrix membranes for gas

1 separation by combination of silica MCM-41 and MOF NH<sub>2</sub>-MIL-53(Al) in glassy polymers,  
2 Microporous Mesoporous Mater., 192 (2014) 23-28.

3 [50] S. Brunauer, P.H. Emmett, E. Teller, Adsorption of gases in multimolecular layers, J. Am.  
4 Chem. Soc., 60 (1938) 309-319.

5 [51] G.Q. Chen, C.A. Scholes, C.M. Doherty, A.J. Hill, G.G. Qiao, S.E. Kentish, The  
6 thickness dependence of Matrimid films in water vapor permeation, Chem. Eng. J., 209  
7 (2012) 301-312.

8 [52] S. Koester, F. Roghmans, M. Wessling, Water vapor permeance: The interplay of feed  
9 and permeate activity, J. Membr. Sci., 485 (2015) 69-78.

10 [53] S.J. Metz, W.J.C. van de Ven, J. Potreck, M.H.V. Mulder, M. Wessling, Transport of  
11 water vapor and inert gas mixtures through highly selective and highly permeable polymer  
12 membranes, J. Membr. Sci., 251 (2005) 29-41.

13 [54] S.S.-Y. Chui, S.M.-F. Lo, J.P.H. Charmant, A.G. Orpen, I.D. Williams, A chemically  
14 functionalizable nanoporous material [Cu<sub>3</sub>(TMA)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>3</sub>]<sub>n</sub>, Science, 283 (1999) 1148-1150.

15 [55] S. Basu, A. Cano-Odena, I.F.J. Vankelecom, Asymmetric Matrimid@[Cu<sub>3</sub>(BTC)<sub>2</sub>]  
16 mixed-matrix membranes for gas separations, J. Membr. Sci., 362 (2010) 478-487.

17 [56] I. Senkovska, S. Kaskel, High pressure methane adsorption in the metal-organic  
18 frameworks Cu<sub>3</sub>(btc)<sub>2</sub>, Zn<sub>2</sub>(bdc)<sub>2</sub>dabco, and Cr<sub>3</sub>F(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub>O(bdc)<sub>3</sub>, Microporous Mesoporous  
19 Mater., 112 (2008) 108-115.

20 [57] Y. Ming, J. Purewal, D.a. Liu, A. Sudik, C. Xu, J. Yang, M. Veenstra, K. Rhodes, R.  
21 Soltis, J. Warner, M. Gaab, U. Müller, D.J. Siegel, Thermophysical properties of MOF-5  
22 powders, Microporous Mesoporous Mater., 185 (2014) 235-244.

23 [58] C. Scherdel, G. Reichenauer, M. Wiener, Relationship between pore volumes and surface  
24 areas derived from the evaluation of N<sub>2</sub>-sorption data by DR-, BET- and t-plot, Microporous  
25 Mesoporous Mater., 132 (2010) 572-575.

26 [59] T.-S. Chung, S.S. Chan, R. Wang, Z. Lu, C. He, Characterization of permeability and  
27 sorption in Matrimid/C<sub>60</sub> mixed matrix membranes, J. Membr. Sci., 211 (2003) 91-99.

28 [60] S. Kanehashi, G.Q. Chen, C.A. Scholes, B. Ozcelik, C. Hua, L. Ciddor, P.D. Southon,  
29 D.M. D'Alessandro, S.E. Kentish, Enhancing gas permeability in mixed matrix membranes  
30 through tuning the nanoparticle properties, J. Membr. Sci., 482 (2015) 49-55.

31 [61] B.W. Rowe, B.D. Freeman, D.R. Paul, Effect of sorbed water and temperature on the  
32 optical properties and density of thin glassy polymer films on a silicon substrate,  
33 Macromolecules, 40 (2007) 2806-2813.

34 [62] E. Dimotakis, M. Cal, J. Economy, M. Rood, S. Larson, Water Vapor Adsorption on  
35 Chemically Treated Activated Carbon Cloths, Chemistry of Materials, 7 (1995) 2269-2272.

36 [63] S.S. Barton, J.E. Koresh, Adsorption interaction of water with microporous adsorbents.  
37 Part 1.-Water-vapour adsorption on activated carbon cloth, Journal of the Chemical Society,  
38 Faraday Transactions 1: Physical Chemistry in Condensed Phases, 79 (1983) 1147-1155.

39 [64] J. Potreck, K. Nijmeijer, T. Kosinski, M. Wessling, Mixed water vapor/gas transport  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

through the rubbery polymer PEBAX® 1074, J. Membr. Sci., 338 (2009) 11-16.

[65] H. Sijbesma, K. Nymeijer, R. van Marwijk, R. Heijboer, J. Potreck, M. Wessling, Flue gas dehydration using polymer membranes, J. Membr. Sci., 313 (2008) 263-276.

[66] H. Azher, C.A. Scholes, G.W. Stevens, S.E. Kentish, Water permeation and sorption properties of Nafion 115 at elevated temperatures, J. Membr. Sci., 459 (2014) 104-113.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 **Figure Captions**

2  
3  
4 Fig. 1. Liquid water uptake of MMMs at 35°C, as a function of filler loading.

5  
6 Fig. 2. Liquid water uptake of MMMs at 35°C, as a function of pore volume of the  
7  
8 nanoparticles.

9  
10  
11 Fig. 3. Water vapor permeability of Matrimid and 20wt% MMMs at water activity of 0.8, at  
12  
13 35°C. The balance gas is (a) CH<sub>4</sub> and (b) mixed 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub>.

14  
15  
16 Fig. 4. Robeson's plot of water vapor (H<sub>2</sub>O) against CO<sub>2</sub> in polymeric membranes,  
17  
18 highlighting the position of pure Matimid (PI) and 20wt% MMMs relative to the  
19  
20 upper bound.

21  
22  
23 Fig. 5. Water vapor permeability of 20 wt% MMMs at water activity of 0.8 as a function of  
24  
25 water vapor solubility (at a water activity of 1.0).

26  
27 Fig. 6. (a) CO<sub>2</sub> and (b) CH<sub>4</sub> permeability, and (c) CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> selectivity of 20 wt% MMMs at  
28  
29 water activity of 0.8 at 35°C, relative to that of the same membrane in a dry gas.  
30  
31 The balance gas is mixed 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub>.

32  
33  
34 Fig. 7. CO<sub>2</sub>/CH<sub>4</sub> separation performance of 20 wt% MMMs at (a) dry pure gas (b) dry  
35  
36 mixed 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub>, and (c) humidified mixed 10% CO<sub>2</sub> in CH<sub>4</sub> at 35°C.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 **Table Captions**

43  
44  
45 Table 1 Physical properties of the nanoparticles

46  
47  
48 Table 2 Physical properties of pure Matrimid and 20 wt% Mixed Matrix Membranes  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Figure 1  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 6  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Table 1 Physical properties of the nanoparticles

Property	Carbon A	Carbon B	Carbon C	POP-2 <sup>[41]</sup>	UiO-66	ZIF-8	Cu-BTC
Type	Carbon	Carbon	Carbon	POP	MOF	MOF	MOF
Surface area (m <sup>2</sup> /g) <sup>(a)</sup>	77	252	534	781	1267	1497±32	1725±150
Pore volume (cm <sup>3</sup> /g) <sup>(a)</sup>	0.194	0.286	0.329	0.554	0.654	0.687±0.015	0.762±0.066
Particle size (nm) <sup>[60]</sup>	290	180	260	< 300	< 300	210	280
Absolute density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	1.828 <sup>(b)</sup>	1.887 <sup>(b)</sup>	1.90	1.33	□	0.95 <sup>[33]</sup>	1.05±0.17 <sup>[54-56]</sup>
Fractional Free volume	0.35	0.54	0.63	0.74	□	0.65±0.02	0.80±0.07

(a) Determined from N<sub>2</sub> BET sorption analysis

(b) Cited from supplier information

Table 2 Physical properties of pure Matrimid and 20 wt% MMMs

Sample	Filler content (wt%)	Filler content (vol%)	Density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	FFV <sup>(a)</sup>	Water uptake (wt%)
PI	0	0	1.223 ± 0.019	0.167	2.8 ± 0.4
Carbon A	20	14.3	1.297 ± 0.006	0.194	2.2 ± 0.5
Carbon B	20	13.9	1.301 ± 0.009	0.219	3.4 ± 0.5
Carbon C	20	13.9	1.276 ± 0.008	0.238	4.0 ± 0.2
POP-2	20	18.7	1.189 ± 0.008	0.273	1.9 ± 0.2
UiO-66	20	□	1.231 ± 0.005	□	6.8 ± 0.8
ZIF-8	20	24.3	1.147 ± 0.008	0.284	5.0 ± 0.2
Cu-BTC	20	20.3	1.207 ± 0.007	0.295	7.8 ± 0.3

(a) Determined from density data as per Kanehashi *et al.* [60]