POROSIMETRIC CHARACTERIZATION OF POLYSULPHONE ULTRAFILTRATION MEMBRANES BY IMAGE ANALYSIS AND LIQUID-LIQUID DISPLACEMENT TECHNIQUE.
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ABSTRACT

Structural and surface properties of two commercial polysulfone ultrafiltration membranes have been evaluated by different techniques. Pore size distributions have been determined by Liquid-Liquid Displacement Porosimetry (LLDP) as well as by image analysis performed onto Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscopy (FESEM) images of the membrane surfaces. Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) has been used to investigate membrane composition, and in particular, to obtain proper information on the presence of additive within the membrane structure.

Porosimetric results obtained by the two independent techniques compared reasonably well and the Molecular Weight Cut Off (MWCO) of the two membranes estimated from LLDP pore size distribution were found to be in good agreement with the nominal values given by manufacturers.
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INTRODUCTION

Ultrafiltration (UF) is a pressure driven process where membranes are used to separate macromolecules from fluid streams. In such process, the selectivity is mainly determined by the porous structure, since retention is determined for these membranes by a sieving mechanism.

In that sense, sieving curves are the usual way to evaluate the selectivity of UF membranes. These curves are obtained plotting the retention of some selected solutes, called tracers, versus their molecular mass and analysis of such plots lead to define the so-called Molecular Weight Cut-Off (MWCO), a key parameter in selecting membranes for given applications. This parameter has reached the category of a “de facto” standard, [1], for the characterization of UF membranes, but also for nanofiltration (NF) ones, [2].

In effect, for membrane manufacturers and end-users as well, MWCO value is a very valuable parameter because it gives an idea about the molecular weight of species being separated by such membrane.

Manufacturers generally specify for their membranes a nominal MWCO defined as the molecular mass of the solute that is (or would be) 90% retained by the membrane. However, it has been often pointed out, [3–8], that the reported values of cut-off for a given membrane may be strongly dependent on the different methodologies and/or experimental test conditions used. Effectively, the influence of important experimental factors as, for example, device configuration and operational parameters as channel geometry or feed turbulence degree on the membrane surface, which prevent concentration polarization and fouling phenomena, are quite often neglected. Moreover, these factors are not always controlled or clearly stated, [1].

Moreover the results of retention tests cannot be really considered as a characteristic parameter of the membrane because they also depend on the shape, flexibility and molecular weight distribution of the macromolecules used for these tests, [9], and their interaction with the membrane materials. So, it can be concluded that the results from retention tests could be sometimes far from what might be expected from the actual membrane pore size, [10].

Another aim when determining MWCO is to evaluate the pore size distribution of membranes in order to know, from such structural information, which molecules can be retained or passed through the membrane pores. Once a unique relationship between retention results and the actual structural characterization of the membrane is assumed, the knowledge of the actual structure of the pores in the membrane will be really informative because it could be translated into retention characteristics for each particular solute.

Many characterization methods like permporometry, thermoporometry, mercury porosimetry, gas adsorption-desorption, nuclear magnetic resonance, gas-liquid and liquid–liquid porosimetry along with several microscopic techniques, both electronic as scanning and transmission electron microscopy and atomic as atomic force microscopy, have been used to analyze the pore structure and pore size distribution of the membrane, [11]. Each of these methods has different features, principles of operation and need different theoretical considerations to convert the direct results into pore sizes. In any case, the information given by all these methods must not be considered as competitive but rather complementary, since all results should contribute to a complete picture of the pore characteristics.

UF membranes usually present pores in the range from some nanometers to 50 nanometers (0.05 μm) and a proper knowledge of the size distribution of those pores actually open for the flux
(active pores) is of great interest to estimate the sort of macromolecules retained. Techniques, such as those based on the bubble point test that have gained enormous relevance for the characterization of microfiltration membranes, cannot be properly applied to UF membranes due to the high pressure (more than 10 bar) to be applied in order to evaluate pore sizes below 0.1 µm, owing to the high value of the surface tension ($\gamma = 72 \text{ mN/m}$) between air and the wetting liquid (water), [11]. On the contrary Liquid-Liquid Displacement Porosimetry (LLDP), because it uses a pair of immiscible liquids with very low interfacial tension is very suitable for characterizing UF membranes at relatively low applied pressures. Tung et al., [12], consider the technique as relatively new although, in fact, it comes from earlier works of Erbe, [13], who proposed the principles of the methodology as an extension of the well-known bubble point technique previously proposed by Bechhold, [14]. After several years of scant attention; in recent times, more and more research groups are getting interesting results using LLDP for the characterization of ultrafiltration membranes, [15-18].

Some of us in the frame of a long-term collaboration, have designed and built-up powerful LLDP devices, fully automated and very precise, for obtaining an exhaustive porosimetric characterization of UF membrane with different MWCO and configuration, [19-25].

In this work, porosity and pore size distribution of two different kinds of commercial polymeric UF membranes evaluated by LLDP will be used to estimate their MWCO according to a procedure previously developed, [26].

In addition to LLDP experiments, FESEM pictures will be obtained and used to get information on pore size distributions. Image analysis of several microscopic images is frequently used because it gives a good view of the membrane surface that can be used to study surface membrane modifications, [27-29]. In this case such image analysis was performed in order to obtain independent information on the porosimetric characteristics of the membrane.

Finally FTIR combined with Attenuated Total Reflectance (ATR) and Photoacoustic Spectroscopy (PAS), allows analyzing the membrane composition and provides an useful help for a better understanding of some anomalous results we obtained at the initial steps of LLDP measurements.

**EXPERIMENTAL**

**Membranes and Chemicals**

Two commercial UF membranes (GR61PP and GR70PE) were kindly supplied by Alfa-Laval. Both membranes are made from polysulphone and have a MWCO of 20 kDa, according to the manufacturer, [30].

All membrane discs were bathed in Milli-Q water for 24 hours to eliminate any previous soaking of preservative agent, before being used for LLDP analysis.

Isobutanol from Scharlab (analysis grade, purity > 99.5 %) was used as received without further purification. Water was bidistilled and Milli-Q treated freshly prior to use.

**Liquid-liquid Displacement Porosimetry**

The porosimeters used in the analysis consist in two twin automated devices developed in parallel in SMAP (University of Valladolid) and DCCI (University of Genoa) laboratories, [19, 20].
A detailed description of the equipment and the experimental procedure can be seen elsewhere, [20], while a scheme of the experimental setup has been published in several previous papers, see for example, [26]. The main feature of the equipment is the use of a precise syringe pump ISCO-250D, allowing accurate and very stable fluxes without fluctuations that make unnecessary any sort of dampening. The experimental procedure allows relating the applied pressure and the corresponding pore radius opened at a given applied pressure according to the Cantor equation, [31], provided that the contact angle between the liquid-liquid interface and the membrane material could be assumed to be zero,

\[ \Delta p = \frac{2\gamma}{r_p} \]  

(1)

where \( \Delta p \) is the applied pressure, \( \gamma \) the interfacial tension (1.9 mN/m in our experimental conditions) and \( r_p \) the equivalent pore radius.

By increasing the applied pressure stepwise, corresponding pore radii and flux values, represented as the permeability of the membrane (flux/pressure ratio), are obtained and form what we call porogram. Therefore, by measuring the equilibrium pressure drop corresponding to each increment of flux, a pore size distribution of the membrane can be evaluated.

For that it is supposed pores are cylindrical and normal, then Hage-Poiseuille equation for convective flow applies to correlate the volumetric flow, \( F \), and the number of pores, \( n_k \), having a pore radius, \( r_k \). For each pressure step, \( p_i \), the corresponding flow measured, \( F_i \), can be correlated in such a way with the number of pores opened in that and all previous steps by:

\[ F_i = \sum_{k=1}^{i} \frac{n_k \pi r_k^2}{8\eta l} p_i \]  

(2)

where \( \eta \) is the dynamic viscosity of the displacing fluid (aqueous phase of liquid mixture, then a value of 0.89 mPa·s, for water at 25 ºC, was used in calculations), \( l \) is the pore length (membrane thickness for symmetric membranes while for asymmetric ones must be evaluated as the active layer thickness). \( n_k \) and \( r_k \) are, respectively, the number of pores and the radius of such pores opened up during the k-th step (for \( k = 1, \ldots, i \)).

It should be noted that this pore size corresponds to the narrowest section along the pore found across the whole membrane. Even with membranes having a so complicated pore structure (hourglass like) as those here studied, this technique focuses in the part of the pores which presents the narrowest section. This section is what effectively governs fluid transport and also retention capabilities.

The liquid mixture used to perform the LLDP measurements has been a 1:1 w/w mixture of water/isobutanol. The mixtures were prepared by pouring proper amounts of Milli-Q grade water and alcohol into a separator funnel and shaking it vigorously. The mixtures were then allowed to stand overnight. The separated alcohol-rich phase was drained off and used as the wetting liquid and the aqueous-rich phase was used as the displacing liquid.

Previous tests on different membranes showed that using isobutanol for wetting leaded frequently to better results as compared with analysis in which water phase was used for wetting and alcoholic one pushed out the other phase. In any case this possibility of choosing among both liquids which one acts as wetting phase and which one as pushing liquid, is one of the interesting
features of LLDP, [23], and would be determined by the interaction of the wetting phase with the membrane active layer material.

Wet samples were then placed in the measurement cell and aqueous phase was used to push out the wetting liquid.

**Cut-Off Estimation**

LLDP offers a simple and fast method to estimate cut-off molecular weight for UF membranes. In order to perform such estimation, it is necessary to complete the LLDP to get the number pore size distribution. This distribution can be presented as cumulative, i.e. plotting the number of pores with radii below each given pore size. In such a representation the biggest pore corresponds to the first one opened while the smallest one should be opened when the 100% of the flux has been reached. A graphical determination of the pore size such that 90% of the pores are smaller, and only 10% of the total pores are bigger, should define what we will use to estimate the molecular weight cut-off for the membrane, [26]. In this estimation, a semiempirical correlation between molecular weight, diffusion coefficient and molecule Stoke’s radius, valid for dextran molecules, [32], will be used.

This approach relates the diffusion coefficient of dextran molecules at infinite dilution in water, $D_\infty$, to the molecular weight of the dextran (M) as follows:

$$\log D_\infty = -4.1154 - 0.47752 \log(M)$$

From this value, the Stoke radius of the dextran molecule can be obtained with the well-known equation:

$$r_s = \frac{k_B T}{6 \pi \eta D_\infty}$$

being $k_B$ the Boltzmann’s constant, $T$ the absolute temperature and $\eta$ the water viscosity at such temperature.

Using this approach, the MWCO, corresponding to the pore size with 90% of the smaller pores, can be determined. Obviously this estimation is based on pseudo-empirical molecular-weight versus size correlations for dextrans. Similar correlations can be found for PEG’s or other molecules commonly used as tracers, giving slightly different cut-off estimation values.

**SEM Microscopy**

Two kinds of electron microscopes have been used. Firstly some membrane pieces, after fracturation in liquid nitrogen, to give sharp cross sections, were viewed in a conventional Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) apparatus (LEO Stereoscan 440). Samples were previously sputtered with a thin layer of gold and then imaged to evaluate the active layer thickness which would be used as input parameter in the porosimetric calculations.

Some other pieces of each membrane were top surface viewed in a FESEM equipment (Zeiss Supra 40 VP), using a thin deposited layer of Chromium to increase contrast. Those images were digitalized and analyzed using commercial Image Analysis software (ScanPro from Jandel),
able to count and measure all the pores present in the picture. Feret equivalent radii were determined by using this software and results were converted in a pore size distribution.

**FTIR**

FTIR (ATR and PAS) spectra were recorded by using a Bruker IFS66 spectrometer with 2 cm⁻¹ resolution. Details on sampling technique and experimental procedure used for these type of measurements are reported elsewhere, [33].

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**LLDP**

A first series of LLDP measurements was carried out with membranes (after water bathing as previously described) by using the isobutanol phase as displacing liquid. However in the case of GR61PP this procedure did not lead to good results since the behavior of the flux vs. applied pressure appeared very peculiar and different from that found for the GR70PE membrane which presented a S-shape curve typical of displacing porosimetry, [11]. So, taking profit of the feature that both liquids can interchange their roles, a new series of measurements were done by using now the alcohol rich phase as wetting liquid. In this case the porosimetric curves coming from both membranes presented a similar S-shape. An example for such curves is presented for GR70PE (see Figure 1) with a nil flux up to achieve the minimum pressure necessary to overcome the interfacial forces inside the bigger pores. This initial flux can be matched with the bubble point of a bubble pressure measurement.

**Figure 1**

Using the raw porosimetric data of a given membrane sample, we can obtain the permeability distributions (Fig. 2) as the simple contribution of each pore size yet opened to the whole membrane permeability (in this case the ordinates axis has been shown as the percent of the final permeability of the sample).

**Figure 2**

Then using the Hagen-Poiseuille model for convective transport of fluid inside cylindrical parallel capillaries, we can convert the permeability distribution into a pore number distribution (Fig. 3), [26]. This figure presents the percentage of pores in each pore class which is needed to obtain the permeabilities shown in the previous figure (Fig. 2).

**Figure 3**

Clearly both pore-size distributions (from permeabilities and from pore numbers) along with others similarly based on a transport model, as for example, pore areas distribution, can be shown as cumulative values. Examples of such cumulative distributions are shown in Fig. 4 again for the GR70PE membrane. In this case we have shown permeability, area and pore number distributions together and it can be seen how all them show a clear shift to lower pore sizes when compared to the direct permeability data. The reason is related to the fourth power dependence of the flow rate with pore radius, according to Hagen-Poiseuille law, which means that a lot of small pores are needed to obtain the same permeability contribution given by a much lower amount of bigger pores.
Finally the area of the pores is proportional to the square of pore size, so the corresponding area distribution relies between permeability and pore number ones.

**Figure 4**

The cumulative distribution of pore numbers can be used to get an estimation of the molecular weight cut-off, MWCO, of the membranes. This procedure, as explained above, is based on accounting for the pore size over 90% of the whole pore population. This calculation is made graphically with the aid of the dotted lines shown in Fig. 4.

Once the way to obtain the porosimetric information from typical LLDP experiments has been described, in the following figures (Figs. 5 and 6) we are presenting the comparative results of such porosimetric analysis for both the studied membranes. The figures present the porosimetric runs for several samples made both in Genoa and Valladolid. It could be remarked the fair agreement of the experimental data collected in both laboratories, especially as coming from not commercial devices. Here, we have presented the size distribution as obtained from direct permeability data, which is more reliable as does not need any transport model or structural hypothesis which could result in a poor accordance with the actual membrane pattern. The resulting pore size distributions are centered in values around 3 nm for GR61PP and roughly about 6 nm for GR70PE (mean size for this membrane is lower since the sharp increase in the flux-pressure curves happens at lower pressures, around 5 bars, as compared with that of GR61PP, with increasing flux after achieving more than 10 bars). Finally pore size distributions for both membranes show nice reproducibility as previously shown in LLDP analysis, [34].

**Figure 5**

**Figure 6**

The data conversion algorithm based, as commented previously, on applying the Hagen-Poiseuille model for the transport inside the pores, needs a previous knowledge of the pore length (which can be matched with the active layer thickness). To this aim, cross-sections of both membranes were observed with a SEM to obtain an appraisal of such thicknesses. Figures 7a and 7b show such cross-sectional images, for GR61PP and GR70PE, respectively. From those images it is apparent that the active layer thickness of the first membrane is considerably lower. For our calculations we assumed an average active layer thickness of 12 µm for GR61PP and 42 µm for GR70PE, that approximately correspond to the distance between the membrane surface and the top of the large cavities.

Regarding these values, it must be considered that, as it is well known, asymmetric membranes present a continuous and gradual increase in the pore size from the top layer to the inner of the membranes. Then it is very complicated to accurately define the pore length since it depends not only on the skin layer thickness (which in turn is not so easy to determine) but also on the pore tortuosity factor. In any case, the pore length affects the final values of porosity and pore density, along with the absolute number of pores present in each class while has no effect on the relative frequency of each pore size in the pore number distributions and the whole permeability distribution, and, correspondingly, the mean pore sizes in each distribution.

**Figure 7**
The most representative data derived from the LLDP analysis (porosity, mean pore radius: two values, from permeability and from pore number) for both GR membranes are reported in table 1, along with the estimated values of MWCO.

Table 1

FTIR

On the basis of the anomalous behavior observed at the beginning of the LLDP measurements we decided to obtain a deeper information on the membrane composition with the help of FTIR instrument by using the attenuated total reflection (ATR) technique in order to better characterize the thin surface active layer of the membrane (which controls the membrane performance) and to avoid any possible interference by the macroporous polyolefinic nonwoven support. Moreover the PAS sampling technique was employed to obtain the spectra of the pure components of the membrane. The ATR spectra of both membranes, analyzed as received (Fig. 8) present a broad peak around 3600 and 3000 cm$^{-1}$ (OH) along with a narrower one centered at 1030 cm$^{-1}$ (CO) that, as the same figure reveals, practically disappears after bathing both membranes in pure water.

Figure 8

A comparison of these spectra with that of glycerol reported in Fig. 9 allows ascribing the disappeared peaks, to this type of polyalcohol–which is a common preservative added to the polymeric membrane.

Figure 9

Further comparison of Figs. 8 and 9 allows concluding that both membranes are made of polysulfone (PSF) as trunk material as demonstrate the absorption bands around 1150 cm$^{-1}$ and 1295 cm$^{-1}$ (SO2), 1250 cm$^{-1}$ and 1020 cm$^{-1}$ (C-O), 1590 cm$^{-1}$ and 1500 cm$^{-1}$ (aromatic ring), [35]. However a more accurate inspection of the spectra of the GR70PE membrane reveals the presence of a foreign component which can be ascribed to polyvinylpyrrolidone, PVP, as show (Fig. 9), the absorption bands around 1667 cm$^{-1}$ (amide carbonyl), 1220 cm$^{-1}$ (C-N) and in the 1500-1350 cm$^{-1}$ region (Cyclic CH2), [36]. It is worth remembering that PVP is often added to PSF in order to prepare membranes with a better hydrophilic character, [37, 38]. On the basis of this finding it is possible to conclude that the initial unreliable LLDP results obtained for GR61PP membrane are due to the hydrophobic character of this type of PSF membrane that is not completely wetted upon immersion in water as it occurs for the hydrophilic (PSF-PVP) GR70PE membrane. The spectra shown in Fig. 10 clearly demonstrate that presence of PVP even after two consecutive LLDP measurements.

Figure 10

FESEM images

Examples of the FESEM images obtained for top views of both membranes are presented in Fig. 11. After a proper refining of the images (mainly increasing the contrast and definition of pore borders, [39]) the resulting images were used to measure the size (Feret diameter) of the pores present in the picture.

Figure 11
Resulting distributions are presented in Figs. 12a and 13a for both membranes, and main parameters resulting from such distributions are also presented in table 1. In these figures, the distribution of pore sizes obtained from image analysis are compared with that of number of pores evaluated from LLDP data after modeling (an example of such number distributions is presented in Fig. 3). We can see that image analysis and LLDP distributions are centered on quite similar values of pore radius but those coming from FESEM images appear much broader. This is partially due to the higher range of minimum pore sizes detectable with LLDP (around 2 nm at the maximum applied pressures, while FESEM can apparently detect pores of 0.5 nm), but the major reason of this disagreement is that FESEM images have lower resolution for these small pores leading to confusion between actual pore entrances and simply darker areas of polymeric surface. Even so, the accordance between mean pore sizes from both techniques is really reasonable, showing the accuracy of the analysis done.

Figure 12

Figure 13

In any case, these pore number distributions can be used to estimate the MWCO of the membranes, following the previously explained procedure, yet used for LLDP data. That estimation is presented in Figs. 12b and 13b, where cumulative distributions of pores sizes for both membranes are presented, some coming from LLDP data and the others as resulting from FESEM images analysis. The microscopy results clearly would lead to an overestimation of MWCO, as can be expected from their wide distribution.

This overestimation can be due firstly to the appearance of many small pores due to image artifacts (shadows, surface defects…) that the software considers as real pores. Moreover big pores are differently detected by both the techniques. Microscopy accounts for pore entrances, as seen in the membrane surface, while LLDP only takes into account the smallest section of the pore across the whole active layer.

Note that, as mentioned, the estimations coming from LLDP results are quite reasonable. For the sake of comparison, single arrows mark in both membranes the MWCO corresponding to the nominal value (as claimed by manufacturer) of both membranes, which is in turns equal. The accordance between our estimations and the nominal values is really remarkable, showing the power of LLDP characterization to give a complete picture not only about structural parameters of analyzed membranes (mean pore size or porosity) but also giving a reasonable estimation of performance related parameters, specially MWCO, a key parameter in terms of selection of membranes for given applications.

Finally the values of porosity present in table 1 merit a brief comment. Those are largely the worst values in terms of comparison, not only from LLDP to SEM outputs but also when coming from different labs. In that sense, it must be remembered that, as commented previously, the porosity results in the case of LLDP analysis are strongly affected by the values used for pore length (assumed as active layer thickness, once zero tortuosity assumed). And this value, obtained from SEM cross sectional images, is subjected to some uncertainty. On the other side, porosity value coming from top view of FESEM images is affected by the image definition.

CONCLUSIONS
LLDP has been used to obtain the structural information of two commercial UF membranes. This porosimetric technique supplied very precise and repetitive results which allowed to estimate for both membranes a MWCO close to the one quoted by manufacturer.

Moreover, LLDP results have been compared with those coming from image analysis of FESEM pictures. Taking into account that this later information refers only to membrane surface, the mean pore sizes for both membranes match reasonably with those given from LLDP characterization (which accounts not for surface opening but for the narrowest section of the pore present across its way through the membrane). Nevertheless the agreement is not so good when comparing MWCO estimations from both techniques. FESEM images lead to clear overestimation of MWCO due to the presence of multiple pores and artifacts, difficult to avoid when analyzing so small pores very close to the maximum resolution of the technique. This overestimation being also related with the fact that FESEM only accounts for the pore entrance, while LLDP refers to the narrowest section present across the pore length.

Finally the use of FTIR-ATR analysis allowed acquiring proper information on the membrane composition, especially on the presence of additives which affect the membrane wettability, thus providing an important help for defining the more appropriate way to carry out LLDP measurements and obtain reliable data.
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LEGEND TO FIGURES

Fig. 1.- Typical porosimetric run for a GR70PE membrane.
Fig. 2.- Permeability distribution evaluated from data of Fig. 1.
Fig. 3.- Pore number distribution obtained by using Hagen-Poiseuille transport model.
Fig. 4.- Cumulative distributions of permeability, pore number and pore area, showing the calculation of the Stokes radius used for cut-off estimations.
Fig. 5.- Porosimetric results: a) porosimetric runs and b) permeability distributions, for several samples of GR61PP membrane.
Fig. 6.- Porosimetric results: a) porosimetric runs and b) permeability distributions, for several samples of GR70PE membrane.
Fig. 7.- Cross sectional SEM image of a) GR61PP membrane and b) GR70PE membrane, showing the active layer and macroporous support.
Fig. 8.- FTIR-ATR spectra of GR membranes as received and after water leaching.
Fig. 9.- FTIR-PAS spectra of the trunk polymer and additives of GR membrane.
Fig. 10.- FTIR-ATR spectra of GR70PE membrane before and after LLDP measurements.
Fig. 11.- Top view SEM image of the active layer of: a) GR61PP and b) GR70PE membranes.
Fig. 12.- a) Pore number distributions for GR61PP membrane from LLDP and SEM results; b) Cumulative number distributions for same membrane from LLDP and SEM results, versus MW of a dextran molecule. For the sake of comparison the nominal MWCO value of the membrane is shown as an arrow.
Fig. 13.- a) Pore number distributions for GR70PE membrane from LLDP and SEM results; b) Cumulative number distributions for same membrane from LLDP and SEM results, versus MW of a dextran molecule. For the sake of comparison the nominal MWCO value of the membrane is shown as an arrow.
# TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membrane</th>
<th>Porosity / %</th>
<th>( r_{pp} / \text{nm} )</th>
<th>( r_{pp}/ \text{nm} )</th>
<th>MWCO / Da</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GR61PP</td>
<td>25 ± 6</td>
<td>2.84 ± 0.27</td>
<td>2.42 ± 0.35</td>
<td>19600 ± 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDP-Valladolid</td>
<td>48 ± 10</td>
<td>2.90 ± 0.14</td>
<td>2.03 ± 0.05</td>
<td>21200 ± 3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image analysis</td>
<td>1.54 ± 0.60</td>
<td>2.52 ± 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>82000 ± 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR70PE</td>
<td>7.25 ± 0.70</td>
<td>6.9 ± 1.3</td>
<td>3.24 ± 0.05</td>
<td>27700 ± 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDP-Genoa</td>
<td>9.42 ± 0.56</td>
<td>10.7 ± 3.5</td>
<td>3.28 ± 0.83</td>
<td>25600 ± 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image analysis</td>
<td>1.84 ± 0.05</td>
<td>3.21 ± 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>65000 ± 4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.- LLDV and SEM results of analysis of both membranes.
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a) Histogram showing the distribution of pore sizes (Rp) for GR70PE with two different methods: SEM and LLDP.

b) Cumulative values of pore distribution (dimensionless) plotted against molecular weight (MW) for GR70PE with the same methods.