© 2021 Wiley-VCH GmbH



Supporting Information

for Adv. Mater. Interfaces, DOI: 10.1002/admi.202100533

Aminoclay-Graphene Oxide Composite for Thin-Film Composite Reverse Osmosis Membranes with Unprecedented Water Flux and Fouling Resistance

Md Rabiul Islam, Pratishtha Khurana, Pillalamarri Srikrishnarka, Ankit Nagar, Madhuri Jash, Shantha Kumar Jenifer, Mohd Azhardin Ganayee, Mathava Kumar,* and Thalappil Pradeep*

Supporting Information

Aminoclay-Graphene Oxide Composite for Thin-Film Composite Reverse Osmosis Membranes with Unprecedented Water Flux and Fouling Resistance

Md Rabiul Islam,^{1#} Pratishtha Khurana,^{1#} Pillalamarri Srikrishnarka,¹ Ankit Nagar,¹ *Madhuri Jash*,¹ Shantha Kumar Jenifer,¹ Mohd Azhardin Ganayee,¹ Mathava Kumar^{2*} and *Thalappil Pradeep*^{1*}

¹DST Unit of Nanoscience and Thematic Unit of Excellence, Department of Chemistry, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai-600036, India

²Environmental and Water Resources Engineering, Division Department of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai-600036, India

[#] These authors are contributed equally to this work

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: pradeep@iitm.ac.in

Table of Contents

S. No	Description	Page
1	Schematic representation of the experimental set-up of RO skid	S-3
2	UV-Vis spectrum, Raman spectrum, XRD, and TEM image of the GO	S-4
3	FESEM images of AC with different magnification and SEM EDS of AC	S-5
4	Schematic and corresponding TEM image of AC	S-6
5	FESEM images of AC-GO with different magnification and SEM EDS of AC-GO	S-7
6	Possible interactions between AC and GO in AC-GO composites	S-8
7	FESEM images of fabric, blank PSf, loading dependent TFC/AC-GO membranes: (0.005 w% to 0.100 w%)(scale bar: 5 μm)	S-9
8	FESEM images of fabric, blank PSf, loading dependent of TFC/AC-GO membranes (0.005 w% to 0.100 w%)(scale bar: 500 nm)	S-10
9	FESEM images of M10 to M60 for time-dependent membrane formation study	S-11
10	The cross-sectional view of fabric+PSf, and different magnification images of 0.015 w% M30 membrane	S-12
11	FTIR analysis of (i) PSf, (ii) unmodified TFC, and (iii) AC-GO modified TFC (M30)	S-13
12	Water flux, % salt rejection and permeance for different RO membranes	S-14



Figure S1. Experimental set-up of the RO skid.



Figure S2. A) UV-Vis spectrum, B) Raman spectrum, C) XRD pattern, and D) TEM image of GO.



Figure S3. (A, B) FESEM images of AC at different magnifications. C) SEM EDS of AC.



Figure S4. A) Schematic and B) corresponding TEM image of AC showing the layered structure.



Figure S5. (A, B) FESEM images of AC-GO at different magnifications. C) SEM EDS of AC-GO.



Figure S6. Possible bond formation between AC and GO in AC-GO composites (yellow shade shows AC and GO interaction, green shade for AC and AC interaction, and red shade for GO and GO sheets interaction).



Figure S7. FESEM images of A) fabric, B) blank PSf and, loading dependent C) 0.005, D) 0.01, E). 0.015, F) 0.02, G) 0.025, H) 0.05 and I) 0.1 wt% of TFC/AC-GO membranes (scale bar for all images 5 μm).



Figure S8. FESEM images of A) fabric, B) blank PSf and, loading dependent C) 0.005, D) 0.01, E). 0.015, F) 0.02, G) 0.025, H) 0.05 and I) 0.1 wt% of TFC/AC-GO membranes (scale bar for all images 500 nm).



Figure 9. FESEM images of membrane: A) M10, B) M20, C) M30, D) M40, E) M50 and F) M60 (scale bar for all images 500 nm).



Figure 10. The cross-sectional view of A) fabric (scale bar 50 μ m), B) fabric+PSf (scale bar 50 μ m), C) M30 (scale bar 50 μ m) and D) M30 membrane at higher magnification (scale bar: 10 μ m).



Figure S11. FTIR analysis of i) PSf, ii) unmodified TFC, and iii) AC-GO modified TFC membrane (M30).

Table S1. Water flux, % salt rejection and permeance for PSf support layer, unmodifiedM30, and modified M30 membranes (0.015 w% of AC, GO, and AC-GO) at 2000 ppm saltconcentration and 20 bar pressure.

Membrane	Flux (L/m ² h)	Permeance (Lm ⁻² h ⁻¹ bar ⁻¹)	% salt rejection
PSf	8.04 ± 0.20	~ 0.402 ± 0.01	23.67 ± 1.58
РА	15.62 ± 0.36	~ 0.781 ± 0.02	97.03 ± 1.07
AC	32.02± 1.42	~ 1.601 ± 0.07	99.30 ± 0.36
GO	31.96 ± 1.55	~ 1.598 ± 0.08	99.51 ± 0.09
AC-GO	50.28 ± 1.69	~ 2.514 ± 0.08	99.51 ± 0.10

Table S2. Water flux and salt rejection studies of AC-GO modified M30 membrane at 20 barpressure and different salt concentrations (2000, 5000, and 10,000 ppm).

	Salt concentration (ppm)					
Membrane	2000 ppm		5000 ppm		10,000 ppm	
	Flux (L/m ² h)	% salt rejection	Flux (L/m ² h)	% salt rejection	Flux (L/m ² h)	% salt rejection
M10	19.79 ± 1.22	99.36± 0.18	14.80 ± 0.58	99.33 ± 0.14	10.21 ± 0.44	99.02 ± 0.08
M20	46.47 ± 1.38	99.49 ± 0.12	37.68 ± 1.18	99.22 ± 0.07	23.91 ± 0.88	99.11 ± 0.05
M30	50.28 ± 1.69	99.51±0.10	39.23 ± 1.16	99.41 ± 0.07	25.39 ± 0.80	99.21 ± 0.06
M40	47.42 ± 1.28	99.48 ± 0.08	36.32 ± 0.99	99.33 ± 0.07	23.07 ± 0.67	99.04 ± 0 11
M50	39.05 ± 1.08	99.29 ± 0.16	30.11 ± 0.69	99.24 ± 0.10	19.52 ± 0.40	98.70 ± 0.27
M60	40.13 ± 2.21	99.31 ± 0.07	29.04 ± 0.58	99.20 ± 0.11	20.69 ± 0.41	98.58 ± 0.05

Table S3. Pressure-dependent permeation studies of M30 membrane for feed water salt

 concentration of 2000 ppm.

Pressure (bar)	15	20	25	30	35	40
Flux (L/m ² h)	36.12 ± 0.99	50.28 ± 1.69	55.68 ± 1.94	66.63 ± 0.78	77.63 ± 1.73	85.60 ± 1.29