# Tarabara research group: Overview of recent and current projects

PI: Volodymyr (Vlad) Tarabara, Professor

tarabara@msu.edu



Last updated: March 25, 2019



- Virus removal by membranes
  - in drinking water treatment (ceramic MF). Hybrid MF-UV.
  - In water reuse (MBRs)
  - Sample concentration for virus detection
- Virus adhesion: to membranes, paints, PCPs
  - Experimental (QCM-D, bench-scale membrane tests)
  - Modeling (XDLVO)
- Separation of emulsions by membranes and hydrocyclones
  - Experimental (DOTM, QCM-D, bench-scale membrane tests)
  - Modeling (XDLVO, contact mechanics)
- Coagulation and flocculation
  - As pretreatment for membranes
  - Natural coagulants: mechanisms





crosscutting themes:

functional membranes for reactive separations
understanding and managing membrane fouling



### International collaborations







time, d

Water Res. 88 (2016) 750



# Virus removal by micro- and ultrafilters

for drinking water safety







### Microfiltration of emulsified oil

for produced water treatment

Direct observation through membrane (DOTM)





Tummons, E. N.; Tarabara, V. V. Chew, J. W.; Fane, A. G. *J. Membr. Sci. 2016, 2017* 



### Photocatalytic membranes

for virus removal and inactivation









Uncoated membrane



LbL-coated membrane



CVD-coated membrane



# Sample concentration/processing

for virus detection





Sacrificial ("snake-skin") coatings to maximize virus recovery and enable near real time detection

The **goal** is to develop a technology that enables <u>fast</u>, <u>efficient</u> and <u>reproducible</u> concentration of viruses from high-volume water samples for near real time detection

- 1. <u>Instrumental value for quantifying viral loads and developing accurate mass balances for viruses in treatment utilities.</u>
- 2. Informing risk assessment and <u>helping formulate design guidelines for</u> current and future <u>treatment plants</u> to increase virus removal
- 3. Enabling acquisition of data in support of regulatory decision making.
- 4. Advancing fundamental understanding of virus adhesion to surfaces





Email: tarabara@msu.edu Phone (office): (517) 432-1755 Phone (laboratory): (517) 432-2418

Mailing address: Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering 3564 Engineering Building 428 South Shaw Lane Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824-1226 USA



### Human Adenovirus 40

pH dependence of the aggregation state

TEM: ~ 80 nm DLS: ~ 99 nm







40

30

20

Q

### Human Adenovirus 40

Hydrophobicity, surface charge  $\rightarrow$  virus-virus interactions



MICHIGAN STATE

$$\sigma = \frac{2\varepsilon_r \varepsilon_0 \kappa kT}{ze} sinh\left(\frac{ze\zeta}{2kT}\right) \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\kappa \frac{d_p}{2}} \frac{2}{cosh^2}\left(\frac{ze\zeta}{4kT}\right) + \frac{1}{\left(\kappa \frac{d_p}{2}\right)^2} \frac{8\ln\left[cosh\left(\frac{ze\zeta}{4kT}\right)\right]}{sinh^2\left(\frac{ze\zeta}{2kT}\right)}}$$

------ in 0.1 mM NaCl

 $\bigcirc$ 

(1)

 $\odot$ 

in tap water

in 10 mM Tris-HCl + 1 mM EDTA

н

In ultrapure water (pH 5.8-6.0):  $\theta_w$  = 68 °  $\Delta G_{vwv} = -30.4 \text{ mJ/ } \text{m}^2$ 









Image source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michigan



2014 - present







# Virus removal in a bench-scale MBR

Effects of cleaning (pressure relaxation and backflush)

MICHIGAN STATE





### Virus removal in a bench-scale MBR

Effects of cleaning (pressure relaxation and backflush)

MICHIGAN STATE

Step 1: Four bilayer PAA/PDADMAC coating

Step 2: TiO<sub>2</sub> deposition

Poly(acrylic acid)

Polydiallyldimethylammonium chloride







Image credit: Decher, G. Science 277, 1997

 $300 \text{ mg}(\text{TiO}_2)/\text{L}$ 

Degussa P25 photocatalyst

Deposition time: 30 min.

Step 3: Sintering

ramp rate of 4.0 °C/min up to 500 °C

stay at 500 °C for 45 min

lower to 20°C at 4.0 °C/min



## Virus removal in a bench-scale MBR

Effects of cleaning (pressure relaxation and backflush)

MICHIGAN STATE





### Recovery of P22 bacteriophage

using polyelectrolyte-coated membranes







Membrane-virus interactions

assessed by XDLVO modeling



	$\zeta$ potential at pH = 6	Water contact angle
Calf serum-blocked membrane	+ 3 ± 2 mV	66 ± 13°
PEM-coated membrane	- 7 ± 3 mV	36 ± 3°
P22 phage	-17 ± 5 mV	$49 \pm 8^{\circ}$
Notice of the second se	30 virus-membrane interaction energy, -4 × KI units -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -	CS-blocked membrane CS-blocked membrane 0 15 20 25 30 
-8 distance, nm	-8 L'	distance, nm



# Effect of the propagation method

on MS2 size determination









### Effect of the purification method

MICHIGAN STATE

on virus size and charge determination





MICHIGAN ST

with protein-blocked and PEM-coated membranes

pre-elution
post-elution (no EDTA in eluent)
post-elution (EDTA in eluent)

