Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2019



#### **S1. The operational parameters on the MD flux**

### **Temperature**

 The water flux linearly increase with the increase of feed water temperature. When 35 the feed water increase from 50 to 95 $\degree$ C, the water flux almost increased from 6.13×10<sup>-7</sup> 36 to  $3.77 \times 10^{-6}$  m/s with the feed velocity increased from 0.4 (corresponding to Reynolds number of 33.68) and the cold water velocity of 12.90 cm/s (corresponding to the Reynolds number of 21.67) (Fig. S1). The flux was proportional to the vapor pressure across the membrane. According to Antoine equation, the vapor pressure of pure water (*P0*) at the liquid–vapor interface exponentially increased with temperature [1, 2]. Therefore, the vapor pressure difference across the membrane increased and the driving force increased as feed temperature increased. Moreover, viscosity of feed water decrease with the increase of temperature, and thus decrease the mass transfer boundary layer thickness and increase water flux.

### **Velocity**

 The feed and permeate water temperature was respectively maintained at 5 and 95 ◦C with the cold water velocity of 12.90 cm/s (corresponding to the Reynolds number 48 of 21.67). Under these conditions, water flux linearly increased from  $3.56 \times 10^{-6}$  to 49 5.90 $\times$ 10<sup>-6</sup> m/s with the feed velocity increased from 0.4 (corresponding to Reynolds number of 33.68) to 1.45 cm/s (corresponding to Reynolds number of 121.85) (Fig. S2). With feed velocity further increase of to 2.24 cm/s (corresponding to Reynolds 52 number of 188.13), the water flux only slightly increased to  $6.07\times10^{-6}$  m/s. Previous studies [3, 4] also indicated that permeate flux increased as feed velocity increased and reach an asymptotic value when feed velocity increased. The optimal cross-flow velocity was 1.5 cm/s for feed water and 12.90 cm/s for cold water.





58 Fig.S. 1. Water flux change with the variation of feed water temperature.







# 61 **S2. The concentration factor for MD under different scenarios.**



63 Fig.S. 3. Concentration factors of MD process with different pretreatment as the feed 64 water.

62





 Fig.S. 4. The elements composition of the crystallization in the membrane surface (a) Raw water (b) Pretreated by coagulation (c) Pretreated by coagulation+UF1 (d) Pretreated by coagulation+UF1+UF2.

## **References**

- [1] L.D. Tijing, Y.C. Woo, J.-S. Choi, S. Lee, S.-H. Kim, H.K. Shon, Fouling and its
- control in membrane distillation—A review, J. Membr. Sci., 475 (2015) 215-244.
- [2] J. Wu, K.R. Zodrow, P.B. Szemraj, Q. Li, Photothermal nanocomposite membranes
- for direct solar membrane distillation, Journal of Materials Chemistry A, 5
- (2017).23712-23722
- [3] X. Yang, R. Wang, A.G. Fane, Novel designs for improving the performance of
- hollow fiber membrane distillation modules, J. Membr. Sci., 384 (2011) 52-62.
- [4] X. Yang, R. Wang, L. Shi, A.G. Fane, M. Debowski, Performance improvement of
- PVDF hollow fiber-based membrane distillation process, J. Membr. Sci., 369 (2011) 437-447.
-