Supporting Information

Zeolitic octahedral metal oxide-based membranes for pervaporative desalination of concentrated brines

Chaomin Chen ^a, Wenhao Zeng ^a, Qianqian Zhu ^{a*}, Zhenxin Zhang ^{a*}, Yanshuo Li ^{a*}, Wataru Ueda ^b

1. Experimental details

1.1 Synthesis and ion-exchange of ZOMO-CTs

Referring to the method of synthesizing **ZOMO-CT** reported by Zhang et al.,¹ $(NH_4)_6H_2W_{12}O_{40}\cdot xH_2O$ (3.97 g, 1.34 mmol) as the W source, SeO₂ (0.284 g, 2.56 mmol) as the Se source, and C₄H₆CoO₄·4H₂O (0.400 g, 1.60 mmol) as the Co source were dissolved in 60 mL of water. The precursor solution for **ZOMO-CT** was obtained. The precursor solution was transferred to a Teflon-lined stainless autoclave and heated in an oven at 100 °C for 24 h. After the autoclace had been cooled to room temperature, the solid was collected by filtration and washed with water for several times and dried.

For ion-exchange procedure, 0.3 g of the as-synthesized **ZOMO-CT** was dispersed in 15 mL of water containing 3.5 wt% salts (i. g. NaCl, CaCl₂, KCl, AlCl₃·6H₂O, and MgCl₂·6H₂O) and stirred for 30 min. After the ion-exchanged process, the sample was recovered by filtration and dried.

1.2 Synthesis and ion-exchange of ZOMO-CT-Ms

ZOMO-CT-M was prepared on α -Al₂O₃ supports (60 mm length, 12 mm outside diameter, 8 mm inside diameter, 34.19 % porosity) by the same hydrothermal method. The precursor solution for the membrane synthesis was prepared by mixing (NH₄)₆H₂W₁₂O₄₀·xH₂O (3.97 g, 1.34 mmol), SeO₂ (0.284 g, 2.56 mmol), and C₄H₆CoO₄·4H₂O (0.400 g, 1.60 mmol). The mixture was transferred to a Teflon-lined stainless autoclave with the α -Al₂O₃ tube placed vertically and heated in an oven at 100 °C for 24 h. The semi-finished membrane was washed with water for 1 h. The membrane synthesis process was repeated once more with the same procedure. The as-synthesized **ZOMO-CT-M** was washed with water and dried at room temperature.

The ion-exchange process of **ZOMO-CT-M** was carried out by using the pervaporation process. **ZOMO-CT-M** was set in the feed solution (3.5 wt% NaCl, KCl, CaCl₂, MgCl₂·6H₂O, and AlCl₃·6H₂O) to do pervaporation for 30 min. The different ion-exchanged **ZOMO-CT-M**s were obtained.

1.3 ZOMO-Ca-CT-M regeneration

After using for desalination with 3.5 wt% of NaCl for 15 min, **ZOMO-Ca-CT-**M was regenerated in the feed solution (3.5 wt% CaCl₂) for 30 min by pervaporation. The regenerated membrane was tested again in 3.5 wt% NaCl for 15 min.

1.4 Characterizations

Powder X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns of the materials and the membranes were obtained on a Bruker, D8 Advance with operating conditions of voltage of 40 KV, current of 40 mA, scan speed of 8 °/min, and 20 range of $5 - 60^{\circ}$. Elemental compositions were determined by inductive coupling plasma (ICP-AES) method at analysis center of School of Material Science and Chemical Engineering, Ningbo University. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and Energy Dispersive Xray (EDX) observations were carried out on a FEI, Nova Nano SEM 450, operating at 15 kV. Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) was conducted on a Bruker Vertex 70. Water adsorption isotherms were performed on a Micromeritics (3FLEX) apparatus. Prior to measurement, the samples were activated at 80 °C under dynamic vacuum for 2 h.

1.5 Pervaporation measurement

The pervaporation measurement are shown in Figure S5. With a pressure difference between the both sides of the membrane, water was vaporized from the aqueous solution in one side of the membrane and condensed to a cold trap in another side of the membrane.

The flux is calculated by eq. 1, whereas the F, M, A, t represent the membrane flux (kg·m⁻²·h⁻¹), the permeate mass (kg), the membrane area (m²), and the time of desalination (h), respectively.

$$F = \frac{M}{At}_{\text{(eq. 1)}}$$

The salt rejection is also calculated by eq. 2. In this equation, the $C_{i,F}$ is the concentration of the feed solution, the $C_{i,p}$ means the concentration of the permeate solute, and the R_i represents the salt rejection.

$$R_{i} = \frac{C_{i,F} - C_{i,P}}{C_{i,F}} \times 100\%$$
(eq. 2)

To explain the transport of water molecule in pervaporation through **ZOMO-CT-M**s, the solution-diffusion model was used to determine permeances that were related to the intrinsic properties of **ZOMO-CT-M**s. Permeance is defined by the driving force normalized flux as eq. 3:

$$J_i = P_i \left(\alpha_i^f - \alpha_i^p \right) = P_i \left(x_i y_i p_i^{sat} - y_i p_i^p \right) \text{ (eq.3)}$$

Where P_i is the permeance of the component *i* through the membrane, α_i^f and α_i^p are the activity of component *i* in the feed and permeate; γ_i is the activity coefficient calculated by ENRTL model, p_i^{sat} is the saturated vapor pressure of component calculated by the Antoine equation, p^p is the total pressure on the permeate side, x_i and *i* are the weigh fraction of component *i* in the feed and permeate, respectively.

In this study, since the permeate side was in an absolute vacuum state, α_i^p was assumed to be 0. Therefore, as noted in eq. 4, permeance was given as:

$$P_i = \frac{J_i}{\alpha_i^p} = \frac{J_i}{x_i \gamma_i p_i^{sat}} (eq. 4)$$

The activation energy for the permeation flux was calculated by the Arrhenius equation, as shown in eq. 5:

$$\frac{dlnP_i}{dT} = \frac{E_P}{RT^2} (eq. 5)$$

Where E_P , T and R are the apparent activation energy (kJ·mol⁻¹), the feed temperature (K), and the gas constant (J·mol⁻¹·K⁻¹), respectively.

1.6 Computer based simulation

The structures of **ZOMO-CT** with different cation locations and different cation with water were optimized by the DFT calculation using the DMol³ program ^{2,3} in the Materials Studio package. The Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof (PBE) generalized gradient functional and DND basis set were used for calculation.



Figure S1. XRD patterns of a) **ZOMO-AI-CT**, b) **ZOMO-Mg-CT**, c) **ZOMO-Ca-CT**, d) **ZOMO-K-CT**, e) **ZOMO-Na-CT**, and f) **ZOMO-CT**.



Figure S2. FTIR spectra of a) **ZOMO-Al-CT**, b) **ZOMO-Mg-CT**, c) **ZOMO-Ca-CT**, d) **ZOMO-K-CT**, e) **ZOMO-Na-CT**, and f) **ZOMO-CT**.



Figure S3. XRD patterns of **ZOMO-CT-M**s.



Figure S4. a) SEM image and b) EDX elemental mapping image of **ZOMO-CT** on the α -Al₂O₃ support.



Figure S5. Pervaporation desalination scheme.



Figure S6. SEM image of the cross section of a) **ZOMO-CT-M** and b) **ZOMO-AI-CT-M**.



Figure S7. Permeation flux a) and salt rejection b) results of PV desalination as a function of 25 wt% NaCl feed solutions at 25 °C



Figure S8. Water adsorption isotherms of ion-exchanged ZOMO-CTs at 25 °C.



Figure S9. Simulated structures of **ZOMO-CT**, a) cation in A site, $\Delta E = -80.1$ kJ/mol, b) cation in B site, $\Delta E = 0$ kJ/mol, c) adsorbed structure of water in **ZOMO-CT**, d) adsorbed structure of water in **ZOMO-Na-CT**, e) adsorbed structure of water in **ZOMO-K-CT**, f) adsorbed structure of water in **ZOMO-Mg-CT**, g) adsorbed structure of water in **ZOMO-Ca-CT**, and h) adsorbed structure of water in **ZOMO-Al-CT**, W (blue), Se (yellow), Co (purple), O (red), N (deep blue), H (white), cation (green).

Membrane	Т (°С)	Salt rejection	Flux (kg·m ⁻ ² ·h ⁻¹)	Ref.
Hybrid organic-inorganic membrane		99.9%	11.7	4
Zeolitic imidazolate framework membranes		>99.8%	5.8 8.1 10.8 13.5	5
Hydrophilic SPEEK/PES composite membrane	70	>99%	6	6
NaA zeolite membrane		>99.9%	1.9	7
NaA zeolite membrane on coarse microporous α -Al ₂ O ₃ tubes	75	>99.9%	9.58	8
Zeolite FAU membrane	30 90	>99.8%	0.96 5.64	9
UiO-66-NH ₂ membranes	45 90	>99.7%	1.51 2.1	10
A novel zeolite 3A incorporated polyether-block-amide composite membrane	40	99.6%	4.57	11
A novel green silica/PVA membrane	60	>99.9%	12.3	12
Graphene oxide-sodium alginate membrane	60	99.41%	8.11	13
Natural zeolite membranes		>97.5%	2.5	14
Zeolite-like aluminophosphate membrane	—	>99%	2.14	15
Freestanding self-assembled sulfonated pentablock terpolymer membranes	25	99.5%	3.32	16
La/Y-codoped microporous organosilica membranes	25	100%	10.3	17
This work	65	>99%	13.38	

Table S1. Summary of present studies on pervaporation desalination by pervaporation

`	Co ²⁺	M ^a	$\mathrm{NH_4^+}$	W	Se
—	1.3	-	0.4	6	1
3.5 wt% AlCl ₃ ·6H ₂ O	0.3	0.8	0	6	1
$3.5 \text{ wt\% MgCl}_2 \cdot 6H_2O$	1.1	0.4	0	6	1
3.5 wt% CaCl ₂	1.3	0.2	0	6	1
3.5 wt% KCl	0.6	1.8	0	6	1
3.5 wt% NaCl	0.45	2.1	0	6	1

Table S2. ICP results for fresh and ion-exchanged soft framework

^a M = Na, K, Mg, Ca, or Al

Reference

- Z. Zhang, M. Sadakane, S. I. Noro, N. Hiyoshi, A. Yoshida, M. Hara and W. Ueda, *Chem. A Eur. J.*, 2017, 23, 1972–1980.
- 2 B. Delley, J. Chem. Phys., 2000, 113, 7759–7764.
- 3 B. Delley, J. Chem. Phys., 1990, 92, 508–517.
- 4 Z. Xie, D. Ng, M. Hoang, T. Duong and S. Gray, *Desalination*, 2011, 273, 220–225.
- 5 Y. Zhu, K. M. Gupta, Q. Liu, J. Jiang, J. Caro and A. Huang, Desalination, 2016, 385, 75–82.
- H. Zeng, S. Liu, J. Wang, Y. Li, L. Zhu, M. Xu and C. Wang, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2020, 250, 117265.
- 7 C. H. Cho, K. Y. Oh, S. K. Kim, J. G. Yeo and P. Sharma, J. Memb. Sci., 2011, 371, 226–238.
- 8 L. Wang, J. Yang, J. Wang, W. Raza, G. Liu, J. Lu and Y. Zhang, *Microporous Mesoporous Mater.*, 2020, **306**, 110360.
- 9 C. Zhou, J. Zhou and A. Huang, *Microporous Mesoporous Mater.*, 2016, 234, 377–383.
- L. Wan, C. Zhou, K. Xu, B. Feng and A. Huang, *Microporous Mesoporous Mater.*, 2017, 252, 207–213.
- 11 F. U. Nigiz, S. Veli and N. D. Hilmioglu, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2017, 188, 90–97.
- D. A. Reino Olegário da Silva, L. C. Bosmuler Zuge and A. de Paula Scheer, *Sep. Purif. Technol.*, 2020, 247, 116852.
- 13 F. Ugur Nigiz, *Desalination*, 2020, **485**, 114465.
- P. Swenson, B. Tanchuk, A. Gupta, W. An and S. M. Kuznicki, *Desalination*, 2012, 285, 68–72.
- 15 Y. Wang, X. Zou, L. Sun, H. Rong and G. Zhu, *Chem. Sci.*, 2018, 9, 2533–2539.
- E. R. Thomas, A. Jain, S. C. Mann, Y. Yang, M. D. Green, W. S. Walker, F. Perreault, M. L.
 Lind and R. Verduzco, *J. Memb. Sci.*, 2020, 613, 118460.
- H. Y. Zhang, J. L. Wen, Q. Shao, A. Yuan, H. T. Ren, F. Y. Luo and X. L. Zhang, *J. Memb. Sci.*, 2019, **584**, 353–363.