

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Erratum

- | | | | |
|---------|-------------|-----------|--|
| Page 1 | paragraph 5 | line 4 | “were” should be “was” |
| Page 25 | paragraph 5 | line 4 | “arising” should be “carried” |
| Page 28 | paragraph 1 | line 1 | “periodical” should be “periodic” |
| Page 29 | paragraph 2 | lines 1-3 | should be “An alternative method of hydraulic cleaning is back-pulsing; short bursts of backpressure, alternative pressurising and depressurising and reversing the feed flow direction with the permeate exit closed (Scott, 1995).” |
| Page 31 | paragraph 2 | lines 4-5 | should be “Only a few are actually compatible with membranes (Krack, 1995).” |
| Page 35 | paragraph 1 | line 5 | “avoid” should be “prevent” |
| Page 85 | paragraph 3 | line 2 | “decreased” should be “increased” |
| Page 86 | paragraph 3 | lines 1-8 | should be “This work also assisted in highlighting that further work needs to be conducted to evaluate the performance of enzyme cleaners on a commercial scale. These are probably capable of removing foulants not easily removed by other cleaners and have the advantage of being gentle to membranes and of possibly increasing membrane lifespan. They also present fewer chemical disposal problems compared with caustic/acidic based cleaners. However, better performance must be achieved with these in order to realise their benefits.” |

Evaluation and Development of Chemical Solutions for Membrane Cleaning in the Dairy Industry

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Technology in Food Science at
Massey University, Albany, New Zealand

Nisha Maria D'Souza
1999

Abstract

Membranes must be cleaned regularly to remove organic material deposited on the surface from the food or biological fluids processed. Cleaning is a compulsory step in maintaining the permeability and selectivity of the membrane and is also necessary to return the plant to its original capacity, to avoid bacteriological contamination, and to produce products with a long shelf-life. Without cleaning, the flux of solution through the membrane would decline to uneconomic levels.

Caustic, acidic and enzymatic based cleaners may be used for membrane cleaning. Such cleaners affect the lifetime and performance of a membrane and should thus be surface-active, soluble, rinsable, non-corrosive, safe, effective and easy to use. The primary objective of work carried out was to evaluate a range of cleaning chemicals and cleaning regimes on a pilot-scale.

Cleaning regimes employing conventional caustic and acidic cleaners, and enzymatic detergents have been evaluated for a Desal ultrafiltration membrane. The membrane was reproducibly fouled during the processing of skim milk and skim milk concentrate on a pilot-scale plant supplied by Tuchenhausen (N.Z.) Limited and compared favourably with an industrial plant. A spiral wound membrane of polyethersulfone with an active area of 7.4 m² and a 10,000 molecular weight cut-off was selected. A transmembrane pressure of 2.5 bar, a retentate flow rate of 60%, a temperature of 18.5°C, and a recirculation flow rate of 7 m³h⁻¹ was kept constant during filtration. A combination of flux recovery after cleaning and solute resistance removal was used to assess cleaning performance.

Higher flux recoveries (87.3-93.6%) were achieved with surfactant based formulations compared with enzymatic detergents. This was attributed to the wetting action of surfactants which when used in conjunction with a high strength blended alkali solution, aided the convective cleaning solution flow through the membrane pores.

Enzymatic cleaning was found to be milder to the membrane. While the enzyme-sanitiser regime yielded good flux recoveries (68.4-87.3%), the enzyme-acid and acid-enzyme regimes were not capable of restoring membrane permeability, resulting in low flux recoveries 64.2-78.9%. The acid in these regimes caused the membrane pores to shrink, restricting the ability of the enzymatic detergent or rinse water to penetrate the foulant and remove it. Based on these results, a new formulation (DR292) with more surfactant action was developed and evaluated. Flux recovery using this new formulation increased by 3.5%.

Regimes incorporating non-ionic surfactants and high strength alkali solutions were found to successfully restore membrane permeability because a higher level of surfactant was obtained from the mixture. Further experiments using enzyme-acid and acid-enzyme regimes, and the new formulation need to be trialed on new membranes to determine their long-term effect on membrane permeability and selectivity.

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my deepest thanks to God for blessing me with the health, patience, motivation and skill required to successfully complete this project.

My sincere thanks to my supervisors Dr. John Mawson at Massey University and Mr. Paul Hofland and Dr. Terry Smith at Orica (N.Z.) Limited, for their guidance, advice and encouragement throughout this project. They have enabled me to gain an understanding of the principles of membrane technology as well as helped me improve my research skills which will aid me in future work.

I also wish to thank The Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (FRST), for funding this project and to Tuchenhagen (N.Z.) Limited for supplying the pilot plant.

I would like to thank all those who helped me access information regarding this project and to all those at Anchor Products, Lichfield, for their invaluable assistance during the period of my research.

A big thankyou to Ms. Marian Holdaway and her family who opened their hearts and home to me while conducting research at Anchor Products, Lichfield.

Last but not least, I am honoured to have a loving family who have constantly supported and encouraged me to carry on when things got difficult. I am deeply grateful to them for everything and God bless them always.

Table Of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgments | iii |
| Table of Contents | iv |
| List of Figures | vii |
| List of Tables | x |
| 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| 2.0 Literature Review | 3 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 3 |
| 2.2 Ultrafiltration | 5 |
| 2.2.1 Ultrafiltration of whey | 6 |
| 2.2.2 Ultrafiltration of milk | 8 |
| 2.3 Membrane materials | 9 |
| 2.3.1 Polymeric membranes | 10 |
| 2.3.2 Mineral or ceramic membranes | 11 |
| 2.4 Membrane configurations | 11 |
| 2.4.1 Tubular | 12 |
| 2.4.2 Hollow Fibre and Capillary | 12 |
| 2.4.3 Plate and Frame | 12 |
| 2.4.4 Spiral wound | 12 |
| 2.5 Theoretical aspects | 14 |
| 2.5.1 Fouling and Concentration polarisation | 17 |
| 2.5.2 Fouling with dairy fluids | 20 |
| 2.5.3 Physico-chemical factors affecting fouling | 21 |
| 2.5.3.1 Role of Calcium salts | 21 |
| 2.5.3.2 pH and Heat treatment | 23 |
| 2.5.3.3 Proteins | 24 |
| 2.5.3.4 Lipids | 24 |
| 2.5.3.5 Phosphate interactions | 25 |
| 2.5.4 Factors affecting flux: Operating parameters | 25 |
| 2.5.4.1 Temperature | 25 |
| 2.5.4.2 Shear rate | 26 |
| 2.5.4.3 Pressure | 27 |
| 2.5.4.4 Feed Concentration | 27 |
| 2.6 Membrane cleaning | 28 |
| 2.6.1 Introduction | 28 |
| 2.6.2 Chemical cleaning and cleaning agents | 30 |
| 2.6.2.1 Alkalis | 31 |
| 2.6.2.2 Acids | 31 |
| 2.6.2.3 Surfactants | 31 |
| 2.6.2.4 Enzymes | 33 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 2.6.2.5 Disinfectants | 34 |
| 2.6.3 Physical aspects of membrane cleaning | 35 |
| 2.6.3.1 Temperature | 35 |
| 2.6.3.2 Mechanical aspects | 35 |
| 2.6.3.3 Module design | 36 |
| 2.6.4 Chemical aspects of membrane cleaning | 37 |
| 2.6.4.1 Water quality | 37 |
| 2.6.4.2 Influence of soil composition | 38 |
| 2.6.5 Sanitation | 38 |
| 2.6.6 Cleaning Procedures | 39 |
| 2.6.7 Comparison of cleaning regimes | 40 |
| 2.6.7.1 Effect of cleaning concentration using conventional cleaners | 40 |
| 2.6.7.2 Effect of cleaning concentration using formulated detergents | 41 |
| 2.6.7.3 Effect of cleaning order | 42 |
| 2.6.7.4 Effect of cleaning frequency | 43 |
| 2.6.7.5 Effect of cleaning temperature | 43 |
| 2.6.7.6 Effect of pH on cleaning | 43 |
| 2.6.7.7 Effect of cleaning velocity | 46 |
| 2.6.8 Methods of checking the cleaning efficiency | 46 |
| 2.7 Conclusions | 47 |
| 3.0 Materials and methods | 49 |
| 3.1 Materials | 49 |
| 3.1.1 Membrane | 49 |
| 3.1.2 Cleaning agents | 50 |
| 3.1.3 Feed solutions | 51 |
| 3.2 Method | 51 |
| 3.2.1 Pilot plant setup | 51 |
| 3.2.2 Fouling and cleaning experiments | 55 |
| 3.2.2.1 Clean water flux | 55 |
| 3.2.2.2 Fouling | 55 |
| 3.2.2.3 Rinsing | 56 |
| 3.2.2.4 Cleaning | 56 |
| 3.2.3 Miscellaneous methods | 58 |
| 3.2.3.1 Standardisation of instruments | 58 |
| 3.2.3.2 Measurement of enzyme activity | 58 |
| 3.2.3.3 Chlorine measurement | 59 |
| 3.2.3.4 Titration curves | 60 |
| 4.0 Results and Discussion | 61 |
| 4.1 Calibration of the pilot plant | 61 |
| 4.2 Experiments performed on the pilot plant | 62 |
| 4.2.1 Fouling conditions | 62 |
| 4.2.1.1 Effect of feed material | 62 |
| 4.2.1.2 Effect of fouling time | 64 |
| 4.2.1.3 Effect of operating temperature | 65 |
| 4.2.2 Cleaning regimes | 67 |
| 4.2.2.1 Cleaning Efficiency | 67 |
| 4.2.2.2 Dosages of Orica cleaners | 71 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 4.2.2.3 Comparison of alkali cleaners | 75 |
| 4.2.2.4 Effectiveness of enzyme cleaners | 76 |
| 4.2.2.5 Concentration of Orica cleaners versus pH | 77 |
| 4.2.3 Industrial versus Pilot-scale | 81 |
| 4.2.3.1 Circulation volumes of the two plants | 84 |
| 5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations | 85 |
| 6.0 References | 87 |
| Appendices | |
| Appendix 1: Operating details for the pilot plant | 92 |
| Appendix 2: Calibration of the pilot plant (permeate and retentate flowmeters) | 94 |
| Appendix 3: Calibration of the FOSS NIRSystems LiquiFlow Analyser (NLA) | 97 |
| Appendix 4: Titration data for Reflux chemicals | 98 |
| Appendix 5: Industrial plant flux data | 100 |
| Appendix 6: t-Tests | 101 |
| Appendix 7: Summary of experiments using cleaning regimes A,B,C,D,E,F, and G | 105 |
| Appendix 8: Flux data based on skim milk fouling | 108 |
| Appendix 9: Flux data based on skim milk concentrate fouling | 108 |
| Appendix 10: Flux data based on fouling at volume concentration factor (VCF) 2 | 108 |
| Appendix 11: Flux data based on demineralised water | 108 |

List Of Figures

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Figure 2.1 | Schematic drawing of a single module design | 6 |
| Figure 2.2 | Structure of polysulfone | 10 |
| Figure 2.3 | Construction of a spiral wound module | 13 |
| Figure 2.4 | Generalised correlation between operating parameters and flux, indicating the areas of pressure control and mass transfer control | 15 |
| Figure 2.5 | Schematic of concentration polarisation during ultrafiltration of colloidal and macromolecular solutes, showing built-up gel-polarised layer and associated boundary layer | 16 |
| Figure 2.6 | Conceptual stages of flux decline in ultrafiltration with constant pressure | 18 |
| Figure 2.7 | Effect of back flushing on membrane flux rate | 29 |
| Figure 2.8 | A surfactant molecule with hydrophilic and hydrophobic ends | 32 |
| Figure 2.9 | General recommendation for cleaning RO, NF and UF membrane equipment | 36 |
| Figure 3.1 | Process and Instrumentation diagram of the pilot plant | 52 |
| Figure 3.2 | Front and side views of the pilot plant | 54 |
| Figure 4.1 | Effect of transmembrane pressure on flux behaviour during ultrafiltration (demineralised water, 25°C) | 61 |
| Figure 4.2 | Effect of transmembrane pressure on flux behaviour during ultrafiltration (demineralised water, 50°C) | 61 |
| Figure 4.3 | Effect of feed material on ultrafiltration flux (18.5°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , recirculation flow rate $7 \text{ m}^3\text{h}^{-1}$) | 63 |
| Figure 4.4 | Effect of feed concentration on ultrafiltration flux (140 minutes, 18.5°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , recirculation flow rate $7 \text{ m}^3\text{h}^{-1}$) | 64 |
| Figure 4.5 | Flux behaviour during a 3 and 6 hour fouling with skim milk (18.5°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , $7 \text{ m}^3\text{h}^{-1}$) | 64 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|----|
| Figure 4.6 | Flux behaviour during a 2 and 4 hour fouling with skim milk concentrate (SMC) (18.5°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7 m ³ h ⁻¹) | 65 |
| Figure 4.7 | Effect of operating temperatures on flux behaviour during the ultrafiltration of skim milk (3 hours, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹). | 66 |
| Figure 4.8 | Effect of operating temperatures on flux behaviour during the ultrafiltration of skim milk concentrate (SMC) (4 hours, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7 m ³ h ⁻¹) | 66 |
| Figure 4.9 | Cleaning effect of cleaning regimes A to F - final water flux and flux recovery after cleaning following fouling with skim milk and SMC (25°C, 2.1 bar ΔP_{TM}) | 68 |
| Figure 4.10 | Cleaning effect of cleaning regimes A to F - flux recovery and solute resistance removal (SRR) after cleaning following fouling with skim milk and SMC (25°C, 2.1 bar ΔP_{TM}) | 68 |
| Figure 4.11 | Cleaning effect of cleaning regimes A and G - final water flux and flux recovery after cleaning (25°C, 2.1 bar ΔP_{TM} , skim milk and SMC concentrated to VCF 2) | 69 |
| Figure 4.12 | Cleaning effect of cleaning regimes A to G - flux recovery and solute resistance removal (SRR) after cleaning (25°C, 2.1 bar ΔP_{TM} , skim milk and SMC concentrated to VCF 2) | 70 |
| Figure 4.13 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners B610, R400 and S800 used for cleaning regime A after fouling with skim milk SMC at 18.5°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 71 |
| Figure 4.14 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners B610, R400 and S800 used for cleaning regime A after fouling with skim milk and SMC at 50°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7 m ³ h ⁻¹) | 72 |
| Figure 4.15 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners B620, R400 and S800 used for cleaning regime B after fouling with skim milk and SMC at 18.5°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 72 |
| Figure 4.16 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners A230, B610, R400 and S800 used for cleaning regime C after fouling with skim milk and SMC at 18.5°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 73 |
| Figure 4.17 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners E1000, B610 and S800 used for cleaning regime D after fouling with skim milk and SMC at 18.5°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 73 |
| Figure 4.18 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners E1000 and R400 used | |

| | | |
|-------------|--|----|
| | for cleaning regimes E and F after fouling with skim milk and SMC at 18.5°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 74 |
| Figure 4.19 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners B610, R400 and S800 used for cleaning regime A after fouling with skim milk and SMC concentrated to VCF 2 at 18.5°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 74 |
| Figure 4.20 | Dosage volumes of Reflux cleaners DR292, R400 and S800 used for cleaning regime G after fouling with skim milk concentrated to VCF 2 at 18.5°C (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 75 |
| Figure 4.21 | Concentration of Reflux B610 versus pH used for cleaning regimes A, C and D following fouling with skim milk and SMC (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7 m ³ h ⁻¹) | 77 |
| Figure 4.22 | Comparison of pH versus concentration of Reflux B610 with titration curves | 77 |
| Figure 4.23 | Concentration of Reflux B620 versus pH used for cleaning regime B following fouling with skim milk and SMC (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7m ³ h ⁻¹) | 78 |
| Figure 4.24 | Comparison of pH versus concentration of Reflux B620 with titration curves | 78 |
| Figure 4.25 | Concentration of cleaner DR292 versus pH used for cleaning regime G following fouling with skim milk (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7 m ³ h ⁻¹) | 78 |
| Figure 4.26 | Concentration of Reflux R400 versus pH used for cleaning regimes A, B, C, E, F and G following fouling with skim milk and SMC (50°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , 7 m ³ h ⁻¹) | 79 |
| Figure 4.27 | Comparison of pH versus concentration of Reflux R400 with titration curves | 79 |
| Figure 4.28 | Comparison of flux behaviour during ultrafiltration on pilot-scale (18.5°C, 2.5 bar ΔP_{TM} , VCF 2, 7.4 m ² membrane area) and on industrial scale (~10°C, 3.2 bar ΔP_{TM} , VCF 2.7, 1583.4 m ² membrane area) | 82 |
| Figure 4.29 | Comparison of flux behaviour on pilot and industrial scale after correcting for temperature differences | 83 |
| Figure 4.30 | Comparison of flux behaviour on pilot and industrial scale after correcting for concentration differences | 83 |

List Of Tables

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 2.1 | Comparison of major pressure-driven membrane processes | 4 |
| Table 2.2 | Applications of Whey protein concentrates | 7 |
| Table 2.3 | Compositions of typical liquid dairy streams (%w/v) | 8 |
| Table 2.4 | Qualitative comparison of four membrane configurations | 13 |
| Table 2.5 | Cleaning agents and their general properties | 30 |
| Table 2.6 | Recommended water quality guidelines for membrane cleaning and rinsing | 37 |
| Table 2.7 | Cleaning regimes used in ultrafiltration equipment installed in the dairy industry | 40 |
| Table 2.8 | Cleaning regimes used by different researchers | 44 |
| Table 3.1 | Characteristics of the Desal polyethersulfone ultrafiltration membrane | 49 |
| Table 3.2 | Characteristics of cleaning agents used | 50 |
| Table 3.3 | Properties of cleaning agents used | 51 |
| Table 3.4 | Component list of the pilot plant | 53 |
| Table 3.5 | Fouling conditions for different experimental runs | 55 |
| Table 3.6 | Cleaning regimes used to clean the pilot plant | 57 |
| Table 3.7 | Properties of chlorine reagents used in the chlorine test kit | 59 |
| Table 4.1 | Characteristics of the Industrial plant | 81 |
| Table A2.1 | Calibration data for the pilot plant at 25°C using demineralised water | 94 |
| Table A2.2 | Calibration data for the pilot plant at 50°C using demineralised water | 95 |
| Table A2.3 | Nomenclature | 96 |
| Table A3.1 | Calibration data for the FOSS NIRSystems Analyser using skim milk powder (SMP) samples | 97 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table A4.1 | Titration data for Reflux B610 at 25°C | 98 |
| Table A4.2 | Titration data for Reflux B620 at 25°C | 98 |
| Table A4.3 | Titration data for Reflux R400 at 25°C | 99 |
| Table A5.1 | Flux data for the Industrial plant | 100 |
| Table A7.1 | Summary of experiments using cleaning regime A after fouling at 18.5°C | 105 |
| Table A7.2 | Summary of experiments using cleaning regime A after fouling at 50°C | 105 |
| Table A7.3 | Summary of experiments using cleaning regime B | 105 |
| Table A7.4 | Summary of experiments using cleaning regime C | 106 |
| Table A7.5 | Summary of experiments using cleaning regime D | 106 |
| Table A7.6 | Summary of experiments using cleaning regime E | 106 |
| Table A7.7 | Summary of the experiment using cleaning regime F | 106 |
| Table A7.8 | Summary of experiments using cleaning regimes A and G | 107 |
| Table A7.9 | Summary of the experiment using demineralised water | 107 |