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ABSTRACT

Removal of ammoniacal nitrogen from residual waters traditionally relies on energy-consuming biochemical processes, while more novel alternative strategies focus on the recovery of total ammoniacal nitrogen for the production of fertilisers or the generation of energy. The recovery of total ammoniacal nitrogen as gaseous ammonia is more effective at high ammonia concentrations in the liquid feed. Typically, chemicals are added to increase the solution pH, while bipolar membrane electrodialysis can be used to convert salt solutions to acid and base solutions by using only electricity. In this study, we used bipolar membrane electrodialysis to remove ammonium from water and to simultaneously produce concentrated dissolved ammonia, without using chemicals. The energy consumption and current efficiency to transport ammonium from the diluate (the feed water) were assessed throughout sequencing batch experiments.

The total ammoniacal nitrogen removal efficiency for bipolar membrane electrodialysis ranged between 85 and 91% and the energy consumption was stable at 19 MJ $\text{kg-N}^{-1}$, taking both electrochemical and pumping energy into account. The base pH increased from 7.8 to 9.8 and the total ammoniacal nitrogen concentration increased from 1.5 to 7.3 g L$^{-1}$, corresponding to a final ammonia concentration of 4.5 g L$^{-1}$ in the base. Leakage of hydroxide, diffusion of dissolved ammonia and ionic species from the base to the diluate all contributed to a loss in current efficiency. Due to the increase in operational run time and concentration gradients throughout the sequencing batch experiments, the current efficiency decreased from 69 to 54%. We showed that bipolar membrane electrodialysis can effectively be used to simultaneously remove ammonium from water and produce concentrated dissolved ammonia while avoiding the use of chemicals. Moreover, the energy consumption was competitive with that of the combination of electrodialysis and the addition of chemicals (22 MJ $\text{kg-N}^{-1}$).

© 2020 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

1.1. Emission of ammoniacal nitrogen to the environment

Ammonia ($\text{NH}_3$) is one of world’s most-produced chemicals and is mainly used for the production of fertilisers. According to the review of Erisman et al. (2007), half of the produced $\text{NH}_3$ eventually ends up in the global environment and contributes to eutrophication and subsequent biodiversity loss. The direct discharge of domestic and industrial residual (waste) waters containing ammoniacal nitrogen largely contributes to the global nitrogen pollution.

1.2. Treatment of residual waters containing ammoniacal nitrogen

To limit the ammoniacal nitrogen emission to the aqueous environment, residual waters are treated before discharge. Ammoniacal nitrogen can be present in water in two forms, of which the distribution mainly depends on the temperature and pH of the water. The presence of ammoniacal nitrogen is therefore
often described by the total ammoniacal nitrogen (TAN) concentration, which is the sum of both dissolved NH₃ and ammonium (NH₄⁺). In residual waters, TAN is predominantly present as NH₄⁺. Traditionally, NH₄⁺ is removed by biochemical conversion of NH₄⁺ to nitrogen gas by the energy-intensive nitrification-denitrification process. More recently, less energy-intensive concepts based on anammox processes are increasingly applied for residual waters with high TAN concentrations (>0.1 g L⁻¹) (Gonzalez-Martinez et al., 2018). However, in literature it is described that the application of nitrification-denitrification and anammox processes results in the generation and emission of harmful oxidised nitrogen species such as NO₂⁻ (Kampschreur et al., 2009).

### 1.3. Recovery of ammoniacal nitrogen from residual waters

Alternative TAN removal strategies aim to recover TAN as (raw material for) fertiliser from residual waters with high TAN concentrations, using mature technologies such as struvite precipitation and air stripping in combination with acid scrubbing (Mehta et al., 2015). However, these technologies depend heavily on the use of chemicals, which are typically produced elsewhere and need to be safely transported and stored. Moreover, (electrochemical) membrane technologies such as (bio-)electrochemical cells and electrodialysis (ED) are widely studied to recover TAN without use of chemicals as fertiliser from residual waters such as reject water and urine (Kunke et al., 2018; Xie et al., 2016).

Besides the recovery of TAN as (raw material for) fertiliser, new strategies comprise the recovery of TAN from residual waters for the generation of electrical and thermal energy in a solid oxide fuel cell (SOFC) (Grasham et al., 2019; Saadabadi et al., 2019). Since SOFCs use gaseous fuels, TAN must be converted into NH₃ gas, which can be achieved by vacuum (membrane) stripping. In SOFC, NH₃ is converted (together with oxygen) to nitrogen gas and water vapour, while no oxidised nitrogen species are formed (Okanishi et al., 2017; Staniforth and Ormerod, 2003). Therefore, SOFCs allow for the clean conversion of NH₃ while simultaneously energy is generated. However, because stripping NH₃ under vacuum also results in the evaporation of water (El-Bourawi et al., 2007; He et al., 2018), the gaseous permeate consists of a mixture of NH₃ gas and water vapour. Interestingly, Cinti et al. (2016) showed that it is actually possible to directly use gaseous NH₃-water mixtures as fuel for SOFC and that for higher concentrations of NH₃ in the fuel, the SOFC power density increases. Furthermore, El-Bourawi et al. (2007) showed that when the NH₃ concentration in the feed water of vacuum membrane stripping is increased, higher NH₃ fluxes and higher NH₃ concentrations in the gaseous permeate (NH₃-water mixture) are obtained. When higher NH₃ fluxes and higher NH₃ concentrations in the gaseous NH₃-water mixture can be obtained, the dimensions of the vacuum (membrane) stripping and SOFC units can be minimised. Therefore, high concentrations of NH₃ will lead to more efficient recovery and use of gaseous NH₃ for fertiliser production and energy generation purposes. By concentrating residual waters, high TAN concentrations can be obtained, as shown in previous studies in which TAN was concentrated as NH₃ by ED (Mondor et al., 2008; van Linden et al., 2019; Ward et al., 2018). However, because the pH of the concentrated streams were not actively increased, chemicals must be added to obtain concentrated dissolved NH₃.

### 1.4. Chemical addition to convert NH₄⁺ to dissolved NH₃

The amount of added chemicals to increase the solution pH at standard temperature and pressure conditions (T = 25 °C and p = 101,325 Pa) to a certain value depends on the buffer capacity and the ionic strength of the solution. Various residual waters with high TAN concentrations, such as urine, reject water and industrial condensates contain buffering anions, such as bicarbonate (HCO₃⁻). Fig. 1A depicts the effect of the buffer capacity on the required addition of sodium hydroxide (NaOH) to increase the solution pH from 7.8 to 10 for solutions with various TAN concentrations. Because HCO₃⁻ reacts with hydroxide (OH⁻) to form carbonate (CO₃²⁻), less OH⁻ is available to effectively increase the pH. Therefore, almost double the amount of NaOH is required to increase the pH in buffered solutions (NH₄HCO₃), compared to non-buffered solutions (NH₄Cl).

Besides, the ammoniacal nitrogen equilibrium pH (pK₈) increases when the ionic strength of the solution increases. Fig. 1B shows the distribution of NH₄⁺ and NH₃ at standard conditions as a function of the pH for solutions with various TAN (as NH₄HCO₃) concentrations. The pK₈ for a solution with a TAN concentration of 1.5 g L⁻¹ is 9.4, while for 10 g L⁻¹ the pK₈ is 9.6, meaning that the pH must be further increased for solutions with TAN concentrations of 1.5 g L⁻¹ to have the same amount of NH₄⁺ and NH₃, compared to solutions with TAN concentrations of 10 g L⁻¹.

### 1.5. Bipolar membrane electrodialysis for NH₄⁺ removal from waters

To avoid the addition of chemicals, bipolar membrane electrodialysis (BPMED) can be used to change the solution pH in situ by only using electrical energy (Mani, 1991; Tongwen, 2002). BPMED can be used to remove ions from a feed stream (the diluate) and simultaneously concentrate cations in a base stream (the base) and anions in an acid stream (the acid). The cations are combined with hydroxide ions (OH⁻) in the base, while the anions are combined with protons (H⁺) in the acid, which are produced in the bipolar membranes by dissociating water when an electric current is applied.

Previous studies showed that BPMED can be applied for the treatment of residual waters containing TAN mainly as NH₄⁺. Various studies assessed the application of BPMED to produce dissolved NH₃ and acids such as HCl and HNO₃ from industrial residual waters containing NH₄Cl and NH₄NO₃, respectively (Ali et al., 2004; Graillon et al., 1996; Li et al., 2016; Lv et al., 2018). In addition, Pront et al. (2006) and Shi et al. (2018) used BPMED for the recovery of nitrogen and phosphorus from source-separated urine and pig manure hydrolysate, respectively. Finally, Shuangchen et al. (2015) applied BPMED to recover CO₂ from spent NH₃-based carbon capture solutions.

### 1.6. Problem description

In previous studies, the efficiency of BPMED to use supplied electric charge (current efficiency) to produce acid and base was mainly limited by leakage of H⁺, while also diffusion of NH₃ and leakage of OH⁻ through the membranes comprised the current efficiency (Ali et al., 2004; Graillon et al., 1996). However, these studies were conducted with high concentrations of NH₄⁺ in the diluate (ranging 2–4 mol L⁻¹ NH₄⁺), at high current densities (ranging 480–900 A m⁻²) and in absence of buffering anions such as HCO₃⁻ (Ali et al., 2004; Li et al., 2016; Lv et al., 2018). These feed water compositions and operational conditions are not representative for the application of BPMED on residual waters such as (sludge) reject water and industrial condensates, which have a typical NH₄⁺ concentration ranging from 0.5 to 2.5 g L⁻¹ (Gonzalez-Martinez et al., 2018). Besides, the previously conducted studies merely focused on the current efficiency of acid and base production, rather than on the current efficiency to transport NH₄⁺ from the diluate (Ali et al., 2004; Li et al., 2016; Shuangchen et al., 2015).

Finally, to our best knowledge, there are no studies available that assess the actual energy consumption to remove NH₄⁺ from water by BPMED.

---

N. van Linden et al. / Journal of Cleaner Production 259 (2020) 120788
1.7. Research objective

Therefore, in this study, we assessed the current efficiency and energy consumption to remove NH$_4^+$ from water by BPMED, while simultaneously producing concentrated dissolved NH$_3$. We focused on the processes affecting the current efficiency to transport NH$_4^+$ from the diluate. Furthermore, we compared the energy consumption of BPMED to the energy consumption of ED in combination with the addition of chemicals to remove NH$_4^+$ from water and produce concentrated dissolved NH$_3$.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Materials

We used a bench-scale PC-Cell 64004 ED cell, consisting of a Pt/Ir-MMO coated and Ti-stretched metal anode and a stainless-steel cathode, both with a surface area of 8 $\times$ 8 cm$^2$. The cell contained a BPMED membrane stack consisting of ten cell triplets. Each cell triplet consisted of a cation exchange membrane (CEM), an anion exchange membrane (AEM) and a bipolar membrane (BPM), as depicted in Fig. 2. Two PCA SC cation exchange end membranes (CEEM) were placed next to the electrodes, similar to the studies conducted by Graillon et al. (1996) and Pronk et al. (2006) on (CEEM) were placed next to the electrodes, similar to the studies conducted by Graillon et al. (1996) and Pronk et al. (2006) on BPMED and similar to our previous study on NH$_4$ conducted by van Linden et al. (2019). The rest of the BPMED membrane stack consisted of ten PCA Acid-60 AEMs, nine PCA SK CEMs and ten PCA BPMs. Specific membrane characteristics can be found through the supplier (PCA, 2016). The membranes and electrodes were separated by 0.5 mm thick wire mesh spacers with a void fraction of 59% made from silicon/polyethylene sulfone to form diluate, acid and base (flow) cells and electrode rinse compartments.

The electric current was applied by a Tenma 72–2535 power supply, having an electric current and electric potential range of 0.001–3.000 A and 0.01–30.00 V, respectively.

The diluate, acid, base and electrode rinse solutions were stored in 1 L borosilicate bottles and were continuously mixed by magnetic stirrers on a mixing plate. The solutions were recirculated through the BPMED membrane stack by a calibrated peristaltic Watson-Marlow 520S pump with separate Watson-Marlow 313 pump heads for each solution. The pump was set at a flow rate of 19 L h$^{-1}$, corresponding to a cross-flow velocity of 2 cm s$^{-1}$ in the diluate, acid and base cells. The diluate, acid and base pH were measured in the respective bottles, using three calibrated IDS SenTix 940 pH sensors and a WTW Multi 3630 IDS multimeter. The acid and base EC were also measured in the respective bottles, using two calibrated TetraCon 925 EC-sensors and a separate multimeter. The diluate EC was measured in the respective bottle with a separate EC-sensor and multimeter. Fig. 3 presents a schematic representation of the complete experimental BPMED set-up. TAN concentrations were measured with Machery-Nagel NANO COLOR Ammonium 200 (range: 0.04–0.2 g L$^{-1}$) and 2,000 (range: 0.4–2.0 g L$^{-1}$) test kits. We used calibrated volumetric cylinders to determine the solution volumes.

The initial diluate, acid and base solutions contained 6.6 g NH$_4$HCO$_3$ in 1 L of demi water, corresponding to an NH$_4^+$ concentration of 1.5 g L$^{-1}$, which is a representative concentration of residual waters such as (sludge) reject water and certain industrial condensates. The initial electrode rinse solutions consisted of 1 M NaNO$_3$ (addition of NaNO$_3$ to 1 L of demi water). It must be noted that due to BPMED membrane stack configuration (equipped with CEEMs) and the use of NaNO$_3$ in the initial electrode rinse solution, NH$_4^+$ can be transported to the electrode rinse at the cathode, while sodium (Na$^+$) can be washed-out from the electrode rinse at the anode, as depicted in Fig. 2.

Finally, for the NH$_3$ diffusion experiment, Acros Organics 25% NH$_4$OH and NaCl were used. All used salts were of analytical grade (Sigma Aldrich Reagent Plus, > 99%). All experiments were conducted at a temperature of 24 ± 2 °C (AVG ± STD, n = 20).

2.2. Methods

2.2.1. Removal of NH$_4^+$ and production of concentrated dissolved NH$_3$

To assess the current efficiency and energy consumption to remove NH$_4^+$ from water by BPMED, while simultaneously producing concentrated dissolved NH$_3$, we performed duplicate sequencing batch experiments (SBEs). For the first batch of the SBEs, new diluate, acid, base and electrode rinse solutions were used. The diluate EC of each consecutive batch was decreased to 1 mS cm$^{-1}$ by applying dynamic current density, as described in our previous work (van Linden et al., 2019), where we showed that the decrease of the diluate EC to 1 mS cm$^{-1}$ corresponds to 90% removal of NH$_4^+$ from the new diluate solutions. The removal of NH$_4^+$ by 90% is comparable to state-of-the-art NH$_4^+$ removal technologies such as anammox and air stripping. In both ED and BPMED, the diluate is determining for the limiting current density. Therefore, because the same diluate solution, spacer geometry and cross-flow velocity were used, the same procedure of dynamic current density application as in our previous study was followed.
Fig. 2. The membrane and (flow) cell sequence in the BPMED membrane stack and the intended ion transport (electro-migration and water dissociation) as a result of the applied current. In the acid, \(\text{H}^+\) and \(\text{HCO}_3^-/\text{CO}_3^{2-}\) are combined and react to \(\text{CO}_2\), while in the base \(\text{OH}^-/\text{CO}_3^{2-}\) and \(\text{NH}_4^+\) are combined and react to \(\text{NH}_3\). At the cathode, \(\text{NH}_4^+\) is transported to the electrode rinse, while at the anode, both \(\text{Na}^+\) and \(\text{NH}_4^+\) are transported to the base, resulting in the accumulation of \(\text{NH}_4^+\) in the electrode rinse and the wash-out of \(\text{Na}^+\) to the base.

Fig. 3. The used experimental set-up, including the cell (1), the BPMED membrane stack (2), power supply (3), laptop (4), multimeters (5), EC-sensors (6), pH-sensors (7), peristaltic pumps (8) and the diluate (D), acid (A), base (B) and electrode rinse (E) bottles and solutions.
using a safety factor of 0.62 (van Linden et al., 2019). When the diluate EC was decreased from 8 to 1 mS cm\(^{-1}\), the treated diluate batch was replaced by a new diluate batch, while the acid, base and electrode rinse batches were recycled. Solution volumes and TAN concentrations were measured at the beginning and end of each batch to assess the water and TAN mass balance. In addition, the electric current and electric potential were automatically logged every 5 seconds, while the EC and pH of the electrode rinse were manually measured at the beginning and end of each batch.

2.2.2. Diffusion of NH\(_4^+\) through the BPMED membrane stack

Additionally, we performed a diffusion experiment to study the diffusion of NH\(_4^+\) through the BPMED stack. During this experiment, a 1 L base solution containing NH\(_4^+\) (NH\(_4\)OH in demi water) was recirculated through the same BPMED membrane stack as used in the SBEs. In addition, 1 L diluate and acid solutions without NH\(_3\) (demi water) were also recirculated through the BPMED stack. NaCl was added to the diluate, acid and base, to obtain equal ionic strengths (corresponding to an EC of 8 mS cm\(^{-1}\)) to minimise osmotic water transport. A 1 L solution consisting of 1 M NaNO\(_3\) was again used as electrode rinse. The same hydraulic conditions were used for the diffusion experiment as during the SBEs, but no electric current was applied. TAN concentrations were measured in all solutions every hour and the diluate, acid, base and electrode rinse pH and EC were measured and logged automatically every 5 min. Finally, initial and final solution volumes were again determined to assess the water and TAN mass balance.

2.2.3. Avoiding accumulation of TAN in the electrode rinse

Finally, we aimed to limit the accumulation of TAN in the electrode rinse. To this end, we constructed a BPMED membrane stack equipped with AEEMs, by replacing the CEEMs of the original BPMED membrane stack by additional identical AEMs used in the original BPMED membrane stack. The membrane sequence was adjusted in such a way that again ten cell triplets were formed. A schematic representation of the BPMED membrane stacks equipped with CEEMs and AEEMs can be found in the Supporting Information (Fig. SI.1). We repeated only the first batch of the SBEs with the adjusted BPMED membrane stack (in duplicate), at identical operational conditions and applied settings and used the same analytical procedures.

2.3. Performance indicators

As a measure for the utilisation of electric charge to transport NH\(_4^+\) from the diluate, we assessed the NH\(_4^+\) current efficiency. The NH\(_4^+\) current efficiency represents the efficiency to transport NH\(_4^+\) by electro-migration from the diluate through the CEMs. Ideally, the charge transported as NH\(_4^+\) is equal to the supplied electric charge, but diffusion and leakage processes and the transport of other cations through the CEM all decrease the NH\(_4^+\) current efficiency. The NH\(_4^+\) current efficiency was determined by the ratio between the charge equivalent transported as NH\(_4^+\) and the supplied electric charge (Eq. (1)).

\[
\eta_{\text{NH}_4^+} = \frac{zF \sum_{t=0}^{t=L} I_{t+} \cdot \Delta t}{N \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{t=L} U_{t+} \cdot \Delta t} \times 100\%
\]  

(1)

Where \(\eta_{\text{NH}_4^+}\) = NH\(_4^+\) current efficiency (unitless), z = ion valence (unitless, z = 1 for NH\(_4^+\)), F = Faraday constant (in C mol\(^{-1}\), F = 96,485 C mol\(^{-1}\)), \(I_{t+}\) = current at time \(t\), \(U_{t+}\) = electric potential at time \(t\), \(N\) = number of cell triplets in the BPMED membrane stack (unitless, \(N = 10\)), \(I_{t+}\) = average electric current during each time interval (in A = C s\(^{-1}\)) and \(\Delta t\) = time interval (in s).

Furthermore, we determined the electrochemical energy consumption to transport NH\(_4^+\) from the diluate by BPMED, based on the consumed electrical energy and the transported NH\(_4^+\) mass (Eq. (2)).

\[
E_{e} = \sum_{t=0}^{t=L} \left( U_{t+} \cdot I_{t+} \cdot \Delta t \right) \frac{m_{\text{NH}_4^+}}{d}
\]  

(2)

Where \(E_{e}\) = electrochemical energy consumption (in J g-N\(^{-1}\)), \(U_{t+}\) = average electric potential during each time interval (in V) and \(m_{\text{NH}_4^+}\) = amount of transported NH\(_4^+\) from the diluate (in g-N).

3. Results

3.1. Removal of NH\(_4^+\) and production of concentrated dissolved NH\(_3\)

The reported values represent the average results of the duplicate SBEs, unless indicated differently. The deviation (minimum and maximum) of the duplicate results was always below 10%. Fig. 4A presents the diluate, acid and base EC over the cumulative electrochemical energy consumption throughout one SBE. In the Supporting Information, the evolution of the EC and pH throughout the duplicate SBE is presented (Fig. SI.2). The diluate EC for each new batch was decreased from 8 to 1 mS cm\(^{-1}\). For each consecutive diluate batch, more time was needed to decrease the diluate EC to 1 mS cm\(^{-1}\). The operational run time increased from 66 min for the first batch to 89 min for the tenth batch. However, the increase in operational run time did not result in an increase in electrochemical energy consumption per batch, as for the first batch 18.7 kJ was used and for the tenth batch 18.1 kJ was used. The base EC increased steadily throughout the SBEs and finally reached 18 mS cm\(^{-1}\). The acid EC only increased from 8 to 10 mS cm\(^{-1}\) during the first three batches. Subsequently, the increase in acid EC accelerated and the acid EC exceeded the base EC after six batches. The acid EC reached a final value of 25 mS cm\(^{-1}\).

Fig. 4B presents the pH of the diluate, acid and base. The base pH increased during the first five batches and subsequently reached a plateau at 9.8. The acid pH decreased from 7.8 to 6.5 after the first two batches and subsequently increased for each consecutive batch, eventually reaching 7.3 after the tenth batch. The new diluate batches had an average pH of 7.8 and for each batch after the first batch, the diluate pH increased and reached 9.1 after the tenth batch.

According to Fig. 5A, the decrease in diluate EC to 1 mS cm\(^{-1}\) corresponded to a TAN removal efficiency ranging 85–91%. The amount of transported NH\(_4^+\) was 1.3 ± 0.1 g (AVG ± STD, \(n = 20\)) for consecutive batches in duplicate. For the first five batches, at least 90% of TAN was removed from the diluate, but the TAN removal efficiency decreased to 85% for the tenth batch. The TAN concentration in the base increased from 1.5 to 7.3 g L\(^{-1}\), corresponding to a concentration factor of 5. Based on the intended ion transport (Fig. 2), no NH\(_4^+\) transport should take place to the acid. However, the TAN concentration in the acid increased from 1.5 to 5.4 g L\(^{-1}\) and showed a first-order kinetics trend (accelerating increase). Finally, the TAN concentration also increased in the electrode rinse, from 0 to 3.4 g L\(^{-1}\) in the Supporting Information, the evolution of the TAN and NH\(_3\) concentrations throughout the duplicate SBE is presented (Fig. SI.3). The water and TAN mass balance of all batches fitted with an average error of 3%. Fig. 5B presents the actual NH\(_3\) concentrations throughout the
SBEs, as calculated based on the measured TAN concentrations, temperature, pH and ionic strength in the various solutions. The concentration of NH₃ in the base increased from 0 to 4.5 g L⁻¹ after the tenth batch. On the other hand, the NH₃ concentration in the diluate, acid and electrode rinse throughout the SBE never exceeded 0.2 g L⁻¹. Due to the accumulation of NH₃ in the base, an NH₃ concentration gradient, ranging 0.7–4.5 g L⁻¹, established between the base and diluate and the base and acid. Fig. 6A shows that the NH₄⁺ current efficiency decreased from 69% for the first batch to 54% for the tenth batch throughout the SBEs. Interestingly, according to Fig. 6B, the electrochemical energy consumption to remove NH₄⁺ by 85–91% was stable at 18 ± 1MJ·kg-N⁻¹ (AVG ± STD, n = 20).

3.2. Diffusion of NH₃ through the BPMED membrane stack

Fig. 7 presents the NH₃ concentrations throughout the additionally conducted diffusion experiment, during which no electric current was applied. The NH₃ concentrations are again calculated based on the measured TAN concentrations, temperature, pH and ionic strength of the solutions. The pH of the diluate, acid and electrode rinse throughout the SBE never exceeded 0.2 g L⁻¹. Due to the accumulation of NH₃ in the base, an NH₃ concentration gradient, ranging 0.7–4.5 g L⁻¹, established between the base and diluate and the base and acid.

Fig. 6A shows that the NH₄⁺ current efficiency decreased from 69% for the first batch to 54% for the tenth batch throughout the SBEs. Interestingly, according to Fig. 6B, the electrochemical energy consumption to remove NH₄⁺ by 85–91% was stable at 18 ± 1MJ·kg-N⁻¹ (AVG ± STD, n = 20).

3.2. Diffusion of NH₃ through the BPMED membrane stack

Fig. 6A shows that the NH₄⁺ current efficiency decreased from 69% for the first batch to 54% for the tenth batch throughout the SBEs. Interestingly, according to Fig. 6B, the electrochemical energy consumption to remove NH₄⁺ by 85–91% was stable at 18 ± 1MJ·kg-N⁻¹ (AVG ± STD, n = 20).

3.3. Avoiding accumulation of TAN in the electrode rinse

During the duplicate SBEs, 27 ± 11% (AVG ± STD, n = 20) of the TAN transported from new diluate batches ended up accumulated as NH₄⁺ in the electrode rinse, resulting in a final TAN concentration in the electrode rinse of 3.4 g L⁻¹. The observed accumulation of TAN in the electrode rinse was similar to the findings in our previous study (van Linden et al., 2019), in which we used ED to remove TAN as NH₄⁺ from the same diluate. Fig. 8 shows that during the first batch of the duplicate SBEs 26% of the TAN transported from the diluate accumulated in the electrode rinse when the BPMED membrane stack was equipped with CEEMs. Concurrently, only 64% of the TAN transported from the diluate accumulated in the base.
During the experiments with a BPMED membrane stack with AEEMs, the fraction of TAN that accumulated in the electrode rinse was negligible, while the fraction of TAN that accumulated in the base increased to 94%.

4. Discussion

4.1. Removal of NH₄⁺ and production of concentrated dissolved NH₃

4.1.1. Evaluation of the diluate

The decrease in diluate EC from 8 to 1 mS cm⁻¹ (Fig. 4A) was the result of the effective removal of NH₄⁺ and HCO₃⁻ from the diluate. The diluate pH increased during the treatment of new diluate batches (Fig. 4B), in contrast to multiple previous studies (Li et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2018). Two phenomena probably caused the increase in diluate pH. Firstly, diffusion of NH₃ from the base, which was validated to take place in the diffusion experiment (3.3), resulted in the consumption of H⁺ in the diluate to form NH₄⁺, leading to the diluate pH increase. Secondly, the diluate pH increased due to leakage of OH⁻ from the base to the diluate. OH⁻ is prone to leak through CEMs due to, amongst others, its high diffusivity (H. Strathmann, 2010). The effect of NH₃ diffusion and OH⁻ leakage on the diluate pH became more apparent at the end of each batch (Fig. 4B), when the concentration gradients were highest and the buffer capacity of the diluate was decreased, due to the removal of NH₄⁺ and HCO₃⁻. Apparently, NH₃ diffusion and OH⁻ leakage affected the diluate pH more than any diffusion of CO₂ or leakage of H⁺ from the acid, which would cause a decrease in the diluate pH. Because the operational run time and the NH₃ and OH⁻ concentration gradients between the base and diluate increased throughout the SBEs, the final diluate pH increased from 7.7 for the first batch to 9.1 for the tenth batch. The decrease in NH₄⁺ removal efficiency from 91 to 85% over the consecutive batches was also a result of the diluate pH increase throughout each batch. Due to the pH increase, a fraction of the NH₄⁺ was converted to NH₃ and was therefore not transported by electro-migration.

4.1.2. Evaluation of the base

The base pH reached a plateau at pH = 9.8 (Fig. 4B), whereas in previous studies pH values higher than 11 were achieved (Li et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2018). One of the causes of the plateauing of the base pH was the consumption of OH⁻ by NH₄⁺, resulting in the formation of NH₃ (and water). Therefore, a certain fraction of OH⁻ produced by the BPMs was not translated to an increase in base pH. Besides, in contrast to previous studies, the initial base contained HCO₃⁻, which reacted with the produced OH⁻ to CO₃²⁻. Finally, any diffusion of CO₂ from the acid also contributed to the plateauing of the base pH, as CO₂ reacts with OH⁻ to HCO₃⁻. Therefore, not all produced OH⁻ was available to increase the pH effectively. The OH⁻ concentration gradient between the base and diluate increased from 1.2 × 10⁻⁵ to 4.9 × 10⁻⁵ mol L⁻¹ throughout the SBEs. At a final
base pH of 9.8, a temperature of 24 °C and an EC of 18 mS cm⁻¹, 71% of the TAN was present as NH₃. The NH₃ concentration in the base increased from 0 to 4.5 g L⁻¹, while the NH₄⁺ concentration in the base increased from 1.5 to 2.9 g L⁻¹. Eventually, only 48 ± 21% (AVG ± STD, n = 20) of the NH₄⁺ transported from the diluate accumulated in the base. The residual NH₄⁺ transported from the diluate accumulated in the acid and the electrode rinse. As mentioned in 2.1, the transport of NH₄⁺ to the electrode rinse led to the wash-out of Na⁺ from the electrode rinse, resulting in the accumulation of Na⁺-species (such as NaOH, NaHCO₃ and Na₂CO₃) in the base. NH₄⁺ and Na⁺ accumulated with the anions OH⁻, HCO₃⁻ and CO₃²⁻ in the base, explaining the increase in base EC (Fig. 4A). Of these anions, OH⁻ was produced by the BPMs, while HCO₃⁻ either diffused as CO₂ (as mentioned by Pronk et al. (2006)) or as HCO₃⁻-species from the acid and CO₃²⁻ was formed by OH⁻ and HCO₃⁻. The NH₃ and NH₄⁺ concentration gradients between the base and diluate ranged 0.04–0.27 mol L⁻¹ and 0.08–0.15 mol L⁻¹, respectively.

4.1.3. Evaluation of the acid

The limited increase in acid EC after the first three batches (Fig. 4A) was a result of the formation of uncharged CO₂ from the protonation of H⁺ and the transported HCO₃⁻ in the acid. Because CO₂ has a relatively low solubility (1.5 g L⁻¹ at T = 24 °C, based on the Henry's constant and thermodynamic data taken from Sander (2015)), it became supersaturated in the acid, indicated by the observation of obvious gas bubbles. The transport of gas bubbles to the headspace of the acid solution bottle indicated spontaneous stripping of CO₂ from the acid. In previous studies, H⁺ accumulated in the acid with ions such as Cl⁻, resulting in H⁺ leakage from the acid to the diluate and ultimately a decrease in diluate pH (Li et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2018). Because in this study HCO₃⁻ was the main anion, accumulation of H⁺ in the acid and leakage of H⁺ to the diluate was limited because a part of H⁺ reacted with HCO₃⁻ to form CO₂ (and water). Interestingly, after the batch, the increase in acid EC and also TAN concentration accelerated (Figs. 4A and 5A). Because the operational run time and the NH₄⁺ concentration gradient between the base and acid both increased throughout the SBEs, more NH₄⁺ diffusion to the acid took place. The diffused NH₄⁺ reacted in the acid with H⁺, causing the accelerated increase in acid EC and TAN concentration. Besides, the acid pH increased each consecutive batch after the first two batches (Fig. 4B), due to NH₃ diffusion and OH⁻ leakage from the base.

4.1.4. Assessment of the NH₄⁺ current efficiency

For the treatment of each consecutive diluate batch, a loss in NH₄⁺ current efficiency was observed (Fig. 6B). The loss in NH₄⁺ current efficiency was caused by the leakage of OH⁻, the diffusion of dissolved NH₃ and diffusion of ionic species (such as Na⁺-species and TAN-species). Because a concentration gradient was present, TAN-species such as NH₄HCO₃ could diffuse from the base back to the diluate. Therefore, to decrease the diluate EC to 1 mS cm⁻¹, NH₄⁺ was transported back and forth, at the expense of additional electric charge. Besides, the accumulated Na⁺-species could also diffuse from the base to the diluate and therefore contribute to the loss in NH₄⁺ current efficiency. The mentioned OH⁻ leakage, dissolved NH₃ diffusion and diffusion of TAN-species and Na⁺-species (the ionic species) all took place from the base, through the CEMs, to the diluate. The contribution of H⁺ leakage in the form of proton or hydronium (H₃O⁺) ions was neglected, because the H⁺ concentration gradient was at least two orders of magnitude lower than the NH₃, OH⁻ and ionic species concentration gradients between the base and the diluate. Also, electro-migration of H⁺ was neglected because the amount of charge in the new diluate batches represented by H⁺ was only 1·10⁻³ C, compared to approximately 8.000 C for NH₄⁺ (corresponding to 1.5 g NH₄⁺).

Because a fixed amount of TAN mass was transported per batch of new diluate, a fixed amount of charge as NH₄⁺ was transported. Therefore, according to Eq. (1), the loss in NH₄⁺ current efficiency was a result of additionally supplied electric charge. Because the leakage and diffusion processes partially counteracted the intended decrease in diluate EC, the operational run time to treat the new diluate batches increased and more electric charge was supplied. As a result, the NH₄⁺ current efficiency decreased over consecutive batches, as depicted in Fig. 6A. Ultimately, the decrease in NH₄⁺ current efficiency throughout the SBEs was a result of both the increase in operational run time and concentration gradients, which led to more OH⁻ leakage and dissolved NH₃ and ionic species diffusion. However, based on the available data, no conclusions can be drawn on what process (OH⁻ leakage, dissolved NH₃ or ionic species diffusion) had the largest contribution to the loss in NH₄⁺ current efficiency.

4.1.5. Assessment of the electrochemical energy consumption

Even though the NH₄⁺ current efficiency decreased over the consecutive batches, the electrochemical energy consumption to remove NH₄⁺ by 85–91% was stable at 18 MJ kg⁻¹ N (Fig. 6B). The decrease in NH₄⁺ current efficiency was compensated by a decrease in electric potential throughout the SBEs. Fig. 9 shows that the average electric potential throughout a batch decreased over the consecutive batches. The average electric potential was 15.5 V for the first batch and dropped to 12.6 V for the tenth batch. The decrease in electric potential was a result of the increase in acid and base EC throughout the SBEs (Fig. 4A), which led to a decrease of the electrical resistance of the BPMED membrane stack.

4.2. Diffusion of NH₃ through the BPMED membrane stack

During the diffusion experiment (Fig. 7), diffusion of NH₃ took probably place from the base (through the BPMs) to the acid (and through the CEMs) to the diluate, as the NH₃ concentration gradients between the base and acid and the base and diluate (ranging 3.3–12.5 g L⁻¹) were at least four times higher than the NH₃ concentration gradient that between the diluate and acid (ranging 0.0–0.8 g L⁻¹). Furthermore, the decelerated changes (first-order kinetics) in NH₃ concentrations in the base, acid and diluate during the diffusion experiment were caused by the decrease in NH₃.
concentration gradients, which is typical for diffusion experiments. The NH₃ concentration in the acid was always higher than in the diluate, suggesting that NH₃ diffused more easily from the base, through the BPMs, to the acid than from the base, through the CEMs, to the diluate. Even though diffusion of NH₃ through CEMs and BPMs is reported previously (Ali et al., 2004), drawing firm conclusions on what membranes are more susceptible to NH₃ diffusion requires the determination of membrane permeability constants.

4.3. Avoiding accumulation of TAN in the electrode rinse

According to the results of the diffusion experiment in 3.3, the transport of TAN to the electrode rinse by diffusion of NH₃ from the base was negligible. Therefore, the main mechanism responsible for the transport of TAN to the electrode rinse was electro-migration of NH₃⁺, while TAN-species could also diffuse from and to the electrode rinse. During the SBEs, TAN was transported as NH₃⁺ by electro-migration from the diluate, through the CEEEM at the cathode, to the electrode rinse. Because the electrode rinse consisted of NaNO₃, both Na⁺ and NH₃ were transported from the electrode rinse, through the CEEEM at the anode, to the base (Fig. 2), resulting in the accumulation of NH₄⁺ in the electrode rinse and the wash-out of Na⁺.

By replacing CEEEMs by AEEEMs in the BPMED membrane stack, electro-migration to the electrode rinse was prevented and the transport of TAN to the base increased (Fig. 8), suggesting that higher TAN and NH₃ concentrations potentially can be achieved in the base when the same amount of diluate is treated. Furthermore, the use of AEEEMs in the BPMED membrane stack also resulted in an increase in NH₄⁺ current efficiency from 69 to 78% and a decrease in electrochemical energy consumption from 18 to 16 MJ kg⁻¹. The observed increase in NH₄⁺ current efficiency and decrease in energy consumption may be explained by the avoided diffusion of Na⁺⁻ species from the base to the diluate, as wash-out of Na⁺ was avoided.

The results show that the use of AEEEMs instead of CEEEMs in the BPMED membrane stack effectively prevented the accumulation of TAN in the electrode rinse, without notable negative side-effects. However, in this membrane stack configuration and the use of NaNO₃ as initial electrode rinse solution, HCO₃⁻ can accumulated in the membrane stack, at the expense of the anion initially present in the electrode rinse (NO₃⁻). To avoid the wash-out of NO₃⁻ from the electrode rinse, it could be considered to use HCO₃⁻ as an anion in the initial electrode rinse, to further limit accumulation and wash-out of ions. Another option is to equip the BPMED membrane stack with CEEEMs and use NH₄⁺ as cation for the initial electrode rinse. The latter would not require an adjustment in the initially used BPMED membrane stack configuration containing CEEEMs.

4.4. Energetic evaluation of BPMED and ED in combination with the addition of chemicals

The electrochemical energy consumption to transport NH₄⁺ by BPMED was three times as much compared to the 5.4 MJ kg⁻¹ reported for ED in our previous study (van Linden et al., 2019). The difference in electrochemical energy consumption is partially explained by the lower NH₄⁺ current efficiency of BPMED, compared to ED. The NH₄⁺ current efficiency of BPMED ranged 54−69%, whereas the NH₄⁺ current efficiency of ED ranged 83−96%. Thus, for BPMED more electric charge was required to transport the same amount of NH₄⁺. In addition, the average electric potential during a batch for BPMED (ranging 12.6−15.2 V) was higher than for ED (ranging 5.7−7.0 V). The higher electric potential for BPMED was a result of the presence of additional cells and the presence of BPMs. While ED membrane stacks contain cell pairs (diluate and concentrate), BPMED membrane stacks contain cell triplets (diluate, acid and base). The addition of extra cells introduces additional electrical resistance of the membranes, liquids and the spacers. Besides, BPMED makes use of BPMs, which introduce an electrical resistance and an additional electric potential for the dissociation of water, depending on the pH gradient between the acid and base (Mani, 1991). For BPMED, 30% more electric charge was required than for ED, whereas the electric potential for BPMED was 130% higher than for ED. Together, the extra electric charge and the higher electric potential explain the higher electrochemical energy consumption of BPMED to transport NH₄⁺.

Besides the energy to drive the electrochemical processes, energy is required to pump the solutions through the ED cell. We determined the pumping energy based on additional hydraulic pressure measurements over the membrane stack and the respective hydraulic flow rates. The hydraulic pressure loss at a flow rate of 19 L h⁻¹ was 9.3 kPa for the diluate, acid and base, having ten cells each. In addition, the hydraulic pressure loss for the electrode rinse was 8.4 kPa. With a maximum operational run time of 89 min for BPMED and 66 min for ED, the pumping energy was 1.0 kJ and 0.5 kJ, respectively. More information on the determination of the pumping energy is presented in the Supporting Information.

In our previous study, we produced a concentrate solution with a TAN concentration of 10 g L⁻¹, which was present as NH₄HCO₃ (van Linden et al., 2019). To compare the energy consumption of BPMED and ED for the removal of NH₄ and simultaneous production of NH₃, an equal NH₃ concentration should be taken as a reference point. In this study, after ten batches, we produced a base solution with a TAN concentration of 7.3 g L⁻¹ at a pH of 9.8, corresponding to an NH₃ concentration of 4.5 g L⁻¹. To achieve this, in total 13 g of TAN was transported as NH₄⁺ from the diluate by BPMED. For ED, seven identical diluate batches (1 L solutions containing 1.5 g L⁻¹ TAN as NH₄HCO₃) were treated the same way (decrease of EC to 1 mS cm⁻¹) to produce a concentrate solution with a TAN concentration of 7.3 g L⁻¹, corresponding to the transport of 10 g of TAN as NH₄⁺ from the diluate. However, the final pH of the ED concentrate only reached 8.8. Therefore, we determined with PHREEQC software how much NaOH must be added to increase the pH to 9.8 and calculated how much energy is associated with the industrial production of NaOH. According to the study of Hong et al. (2014) on the life cycle analysis of NaOH production, 2,176 kWh of electricity is consumed to produce one ton of NaOH by electrolysis, which corresponds to 7.8 kJ g⁻¹NaOH⁻¹.

Table 1 presents the amount of required NaOH to increase the pH from 8.8 to 9.8 of the ED concentrate. When the energy consumption for driving the electrochemical processes, pumping and chemical production is considered, BPMED appears to be energetically competitive to ED in combination with the addition of chemicals. The energy consumption to produce 4.5 g L⁻¹ NH₄⁺ by BPMED and ED with the addition of chemicals was 19 and 22 MJ kg⁻¹N⁻¹, respectively.

4.5. Future outlook

We showed that BPMED can be applied successfully to remove 85−91% NH₄⁺ from water and simultaneously produce concentrated dissolved NH₃. We identified OH⁻ leakage, dissolved NH₃ diffusion and ionic species diffusion as main processes limiting the current efficiency to transport NH₄⁺. By increasing the NH₄⁺ current efficiency, the electrochemical energy consumption to remove NH₄⁺ by BPMED can be decreased. To this end, the effect of OH⁻ leakage, dissolved NH₃ diffusion and ionic species diffusion must be minimised.
Since concentration gradients cannot be avoided in BPMED due to the production of concentrated NH₃ in the base, the permeability of the CEMs for OH⁻ leakage, dissolved NH₃ diffusion and ionic species diffusion must be decreased. The OH⁻ permeability of CEMs may be decreased by adjusting the membrane materials and structure, as was successfully done for the H⁺ permeability of AEMs (Gineste et al., 1996). Furthermore, Ali et al. (2004) used various CEMs in their study and mentioned that the NH₃ permeability of certain CEMs was lower than for others, indicating that the permeability of NH₃ depends on the type of CEM, suggesting that the use of other CEMs than we used in this study could limit the diffusion of NH₃.

Furthermore, the NH₄⁺ current efficiency can be increased by decreasing the operational run time. The latter can be achieved by increasing the cross-flow velocity, allowing for a higher limiting current density (Heiner Strathmann, 2004). The current density can also be increased by increasing the applied safety factor for dynamic current density. However, it remains unclear whether the increase in current density will actually lead to the desired increase in NH₄⁺ current efficiency and a decrease in electrochemical energy consumption, because an increase in current density will probably also result in higher concentrations gradients between the base and diluate, leading to more leakage and diffusion. Furthermore, the increase in current density will also increase the applied electric potential, which eventually can lead to a higher electrochemical energy consumption.

Finally, the electric potential can be decreased by lowering the electrical resistance of the BPMED membrane stack by using thinner spacers, which lowered the electrical resistance in reverse electrodialysis (Vermaas et al., 2011).

### 5. Conclusions

BPMED proved to be able to remove 85–91% of the NH₄⁺ from feed water with an initial NH₄⁺ concentration of 1.5 g L⁻¹ as NH₄HCO₃. The pH in the base was effectively increased from 7.8 to 9.8 and the NH₃ concentration in the base was increased from 0 to 4.5 g L⁻¹. These results show that BPMED can be effectively used to simultaneously remove NH₄⁺ from water and produce concentrated dissolved NH₃ in the base. The removal of NH₄⁺ from water by BPMED allows for the production of both clean water and NH₃, which can both be reused while avoiding the emission of harmful oxidised nitrogen species and the use of chemicals.

27% of the NH₃ transported from the diluate accumulated in the electrode rinse after being transported by electro-migration. Replacing the CEEMs by AEEMs in the BPMED membrane stack prevented the transport to the NH₃ to the electrode rinse and therewith the accumulation of NH₃ in the electrode rinse. The amount of TAN transported to the base increased to 94%, opening opportunities to produce higher concentrations of NH₃ in the base.

The energy consumption for BPMED remained stable at 19 MJ kg⁻¹ N⁻¹, comprising the required energy for the transport of NH₄⁺ from the diluate, the dissociation of water for the production of H⁺ and OH⁻ and the pumping energy to recirculate the solutions. The NH₄⁺ current efficiency decreased from 69 to 54% throughout the SBEs. The losses in NH₄⁺ current efficiency were caused by the leakage of OH⁻ and the diffusion of dissolved NH₃ and ionic species from the base to the diluate. Because the operational run time and the concentration gradients of OH⁻, NH₃ and ionic species between the base and diluate increased throughout the SBEs, the NH₄⁺ current efficiency decreased. The electrochemical energy consumption eventually remained stable because the decrease in NH₄⁺ current efficiency was compensated by a decrease in electric potential, caused by a decrease in the electrical resistance of the BPMED membrane stack as a result of an increase in the acid and base EC.

Finally, an energetic evaluation showed that the energy consumption of BPMED to remove NH₄⁺ and simultaneously produce concentrated dissolved NH₃ was competitive to the combination of ED and addition of chemicals (22 MJ kg⁻¹ N⁻¹). With opportunities for further improvements on the efficiency of NH₄⁺ transport and in-situ pH change, BPMED makes a good candidate for simultaneous NH₄⁺ removal and concentrated dissolved NH₃ production from residual waters.
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