

DEVELOPMENT OF SENSITIVE AND SPECIFIC TESTS FOR
DETECTION OF ENTEROCOCCUS
FAECALIS SERIAL

LEE GIA JIA

FACULTY OF SCIENCE DAN TEKNOLOGI
UNIVERSITAS MALAYA, SEREMBANG

2007

DEVELOPMENT OF PERMSELECTIVE MEMBRANES FOR APPLICATION
OF *ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS* REMOVAL

By

LEE CIA JIA

Research Report submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Technology (Environmental)

DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE
FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA TERENGGANU

2007

1100051080



**JABATAN SAINS KEJURUTERAAN
FAKULTI SAINS DAN TEKNOLOGI
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA TERENGGANU**

**BORANG PENGAKUAN DAN PENGESAHAN LAPORAN
PROJEK PENYELIDIKAN I DAN II**

Adalah ini diakui dan disahkan bahawa laporan penyelidikan bertajuk:

DEVELOPMENT OF PERMSELECTIVE MEMBRANES FOR APPLICATION OF *ENTEROCOCCUS FAECALIS* REMOVAL oleh LEE CIA JIA No. Matrik UK8803 telah diperiksa dan semua pembetulan yang disarankan telah dilakukan. Laporan ini dikemukakan kepada Jabatan Sains Kejuruteraan sebagai memenuhi sebahagian daripada keperluan memperoleh Ijazah SARJANA MUDA TEKNOLOGI (ALAM SEKITAR), Fakulti Sains dan Teknologi, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu.

Disahkan oleh,

Penyelia Utama

Nama: Dr. Nora'aini binti Ali

Cop Rasmi: **DR. NORA'AINI BINTI ALI**
Ketua
Jabatan Sains Kejuruteraan
Fakulti Sains dan Teknologi
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
21030 Kuala Terengganu

Tarikh: 24/5/07

Penyelia Kedua

Nama: Dr. Mariam binti Taib

Cop Rasmi: **DR. MARIAM TAIB**
Pensyarah
Jabatan Sains Biologi
Fakulti Sains dan Teknologi
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
21030 Kuala Terengganu.


Tarikh: 24/5/07

Penyelia Ketiga

Nama: En. Asmadi bin Ali @ Mahmud

Cop Rasmi: **ASMADI ALI @ MAHMUD**
Pensyarah
Jabatan Sains Kejuruteraan
Fakulti Sains dan Teknologi
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
21030 Kuala Terengganu.

24/5/07



Ketua Jabatan Sains Kejuruteraan

Nama: Dr. Nora'aini binti Ali

Cop Rasmi: **DR. NORA'AINI BINTI ALI**
Ketua

Jabatan Sains Kejuruteraan
Fakulti Sains dan Teknologi
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
21030 Kuala Terengganu

Tarikh :

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Words alone could not express the sincere thanks and gratitude to people who involved directly or indirectly lending their hand to accomplish this task.

Nevertheless, the author would like to express her acknowledgement to the supervisor, Dr. Nora'aini for invaluable guidance, constructive criticisms, objectives discussions, continuous encouragement and endless support throughout the course of this study. Sincere thanks to Dr. Mariam and Mr. Asmadi who had given suggestions and advices in order to accomplish this project successfully as the co-supervisors.

The author is grateful to all lecturers and staffs of Department of Engineering Science and Department of Biology Science for their kindness and cooperation throughout this study. Besides, the help, information sharing and cooperation rendered by the Mr. Rahman, Mr. Razali, Bryant and all the coursemates are also greatly appreciated.

Lastly, the author would like to thank her family, especially her parents for their undying love, support and understanding and those who had been helping in order to complete this project on time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PAGE OF TITLE	i
APPROVAL AND CONFIRMATION OF REPORT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
ABSTRACT	xvii
ABSTRAK	xviii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Problem statement	5
1.3 Objectives of research	7
1.4 Scope of research	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Ultrafiltration	8

2.2	Permselectivity	11
2.3	Polymer- Polysulfone (PSf)	13
2.4	Solvent – N-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone (NMP)	15
2.5	Non-solvent additive	16
2.5.1	<i>Polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP)</i>	17
2.5.2	<i>Polyethylene glycol (PEG)</i>	18
2.6	Membrane characterization by permeation and rejection	20
2.7	Bacteria removal	22
2.8	<i>Enterococci faecalis</i>	24

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1	Procedures of membrane development	30
3.1.1	<i>Preparation of binary dope</i>	31
3.1.2	<i>Titration method</i>	32
3.1.3	<i>Calculation</i>	34
3.1.4	<i>Preparation of casting solution</i>	35
3.1.5	<i>Fabrication of flat sheet membrane</i>	36
3.1.6	<i>Shear rate</i>	38
3.1.7	<i>Morphology of membrane by SEM</i>	40
3.1.8	<i>Membrane Performance Testing</i>	41
3.1.9	<i>Preparation of stock solution (0.1M NaCl)</i>	47

3.2	Procedures of membrane application	49
3.2.1	<i>Procedure of Enterococcus faecalis</i>	
	<i>Cultivation</i>	49
3.2.2	<i>Aseptic technique</i>	50
3.2.3	<i>Serial dilution</i>	52
3.2.4	<i>Bacterial filtration</i>	54

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1	Pure water permeation test	57
4.1.1	<i>Membranes with different polymer concentrations</i>	58
4.1.2	<i>Membranes with different additives</i>	59
4.2	Sodium chloride rejection	61
4.2.1	<i>Comparisons among membranes with different polymer concentrations</i>	61
4.2.1	<i>Comparisons among membranes with different additives</i>	65
4.3	Determination of pore radius, r_p	67
4.4	Comparisons among the produced membranes by their morphology with SEM	69
4.4.1	<i>Comparisons among membranes with different polymer concentrations</i>	70
4.4.2	<i>Comparisons among membranes with different additives</i>	72

4.5	Application of performance test on bacterial removal	74
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1	Conclusions	76
5.2	Recommendations	77
	REFERENCES	78
	APPENDICES	83
	VITAE	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
2.1	Physical and chemical factors contributing to the main mechanisms of rejection by an ultrafiltration membrane	22
2.2	The scientific classification of <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	26
2.3	Species of the genera <i>Enterococcus</i> and <i>Streptococcus</i> of faecal origin	27
3.1	Composition for each chemical for each membrane (Binary system)	32
3.2	Weight of each binary solution used in titration method and quantity of PVP required to obtained cloud point	34
3.3	Actual composition for each dope to be used for titration method using PVP as additive.	34
3.4	Composition for ternary system solution with PVP as additive	34
3.5	The solute radius and diffusivity of each ions and solute	47
3.6	The obtained values of diffusion coefficient for selected salts	47
3.7	Linear equation for calibration curve of conductivity versus concentration	49
4.1	Permeability coefficient for membrane with different concentration of PSf	59

4.2	Permeability coefficient for membrane with different additive	60
4.3	Salt water flux produced by membranes with different polymer concentrations	62
4.4	Percentage of solute rejection by membranes with different polymer concentrations	64
4.5	Salt water flux produced by membranes with different additives	65
4.6	Percentage of solute rejection by membranes with different additives	67
4.7	Pore radius, ratio of solute radius to pore radius and solute rejection of produced membranes	69
4.8	Concentration of bacteria before and after filtration with produced membranes	75

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.		Page
2.1	Chemical structure of PSf	13
2.2	Chemical structure of NMP	15
2.3	Chemical structure of PVP	17
2.4	Chemical structure of PEG	18
3.1	Apparatus set up for solution preparation	32
3.2	Equipment and apparatus set up for titration method	33
3.3	The outer shell of semi-automated electrically control casting machine	37
3.4	Membrane production during coagulation bath	37
3.5	Illustration procedure of membrane development	38
3.6	Scanning Electron Microscopy apparatus set up	40
3.7	The membrane specimen sputtered with thin film of gold using automatic sputter coater (JFC 1600)	41
3.8	Sterlitech stirred cell (dead end operation) on a magnetic stirrer	42
3.9	Serial dilutions to obtain diluted bacterial concentrations	53
3.10	Illustration of cultivation of <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	56
4.1	Comparison among pure water flux produced with pressure given for membrane with different polymer concentrations	58

4.2	Comparison among pure water flux produced with pressure given for membrane with different additives	60
4.3	Comparison of flux with applied pressures (1 to 5 bar) for 0.01M NaCl rejection among produced membranes with different polymer concentrations	62
4.4	Comparison of solute rejection with applied pressures (1 to 5 bar) for 0.01M NaCl rejection among produced membranes with different polymer concentrations	63
4.5	Comparison of rejection versus flux for 0.01M NaCl rejection among membranes with different polymer concentration	64
4.6	Comparison of flux with applied pressures (1 to 5 bar) for 0.01M NaCl rejection among produced membranes with different additives	65
4.7	Comparison of solute rejection with applied pressures (1 to 5 bar) for 0.01M NaCl rejection among produced membranes with different additives	66
4.8	Comparison of rejection versus flux for 0.01M NaCl rejection among membranes with different additives	67
4.9	Image of SEM for membranes cross-section with: (a) PSf 10, (b) PSf 15 and (c) PSf 16	71
4.10	Image of SEM for membranes cross-section with: (a) PSf 15, and (b) PSf 15*	73

4.11	Comparison of flux with applied pressures (1 to 5 bar) for <i>E. faecalis</i> removal among four produced membranes	75
------	---	----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation

cfu	Colony forming units
DMAc	N-N-dimethylacetamide
DMF	N, N-dimethylformide
DMSO	Dimethylsulfoxide
Gv	Coagulation value
INOS	Institute of Oseanography
M	Molar
MF	Microfiltration
MP	Morpholene
MPN	Most Probably Number
MWCO	Molecular weight Cut-off
NaCl	Sodium chloride
NA	Nutrient agar
NMP	<i>N</i> -methyl-2-pyrrolidinone
NSA	Non-solvent additive
PEI	Polyetherimide
PEG	Polyethylene glycol
PES	Polyethersulfone
PI	Polyimide

PSf	Polysulfone
PVP	Polyvinylpyrrolidone
PWP	Pure Water Permeation
RO	Reverse Osmosis
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
T _g	Glass transition temperature
UF	Ultrafiltration
UMT	University Malaysia Terengganu

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix No.		Page
A	MF and UF studies Documenting bacteria removal efficiency	84
B	Schematic set up for permeation test	85
C	Preparation of stock solution	86
D	Dilution Table for Salt Solution	87
E	Graft of Conductivity versus Concentration	88
F	Procedure of application of membrane in <i>E. faecalis</i> removal	89
G	Raw Data for PSf 13% PVP	91
H	Raw Data for PSf 15% PVP	92
I	Raw Data for PSf 17% PVP	93
J	Raw Data for PSf 13% PEG	94
K	Raw Data for Flux of Application for <i>E. faecalis</i> Removal	95

ABSTRACT

Enterococcus continues to create new therapeutic problems and dilemmas since it has the ability to spread penicillin and vancomycin resistance to other gram positive species. In order to ensure removal and inactivation of enterococcus, increasing the dose for chemical disinfectant, chlorine, is required which may result in higher concentration of oxidation by-product that may cause cancer. Membranes are now being used for bacteria removal as it can improve the water quality while avoiding formation of carcinogens. This study is conducted to develop membranes with different polymer concentrations which were 10%, 15% and 16% as well as different additives (PVP and PEG) and obtain the best formulation which can produce high performance ultrafiltration membrane in removal of *Enterococcus faecalis*. PSf 10 achieved the highest permeability for pure water permeation test and sodium chloride rejection for solute rejection test as well as highest flux and 100% rejection in removing of *E. faecalis*. The sponge-like and macrovoids structure of PSf 10 as shown in SEM image has demonstrated the highest permeability characteristic of the membrane. The result obtained shows that the use of additives also influences the flux and solute rejection as well as application of membrane. The uniform and larger finger-like structure of membrane fabricated with PVP shown in SEM images can support the reason it exhibits higher flux and NaCl rejection compared to PEG. These findings support PSf 10 as the best formulation in this studies which eventually being chosen as the best formulation in bacteria removal application.

ABSTRAK

Enterococcus menyebabkan masalah dan dilema yang berterusan kerana kebolehannya untuk menyebarkan penentang penisilin dan *vancomycin* kepada bacteria gram positif yang lain. Untuk memastikan penyingkiran dan ketidakgiatan enterococcus, dos tambahan bahan kimia diperlukan, akibatnya menyebabkan peningkatan kepekatan bahan sampingan penyebab kanser yang terhasil. Membran telah digunakan pada masa kini untuk rawatan air di samping mengelakkan pembentukan *carcinogen*. Kajian ini dijalankan untuk menghasilkan membran dengan kepekatan polimer yang berbeza iaitu 10%, 15% dan 16% serta penggunaan aditif yang berbeza serta memilih antara yang terbaik dari segi ketelapan dan kebolehpilihan serta kecekapan penyingkiran *Enterococcus faecalis*. PSf 10 mencapai ketelapan air suling dan kebolehpilihan air garam yang paling tinggi antara semua membran yang dihasilkan serta menunjukkan ketelapan dan kebolehpilihan yang tertinggi dalam aplikasi penyingkiran *E. faecalis*. Struktur span yang dipaparkan dalam imej SEM menunjukkan ciri-ciri fizikalnya dalam mencapai kebolehpilihan yang paling tinggi dalam penyelidikan. Penggunaan aditif yang berbeza mempengaruhi kecekapan membran dalam ketelapan dan kebolehpilihan serta aplikasi membran. Imej SEM menunjukkan struktur PVP dengan *finger-like* yang teratur menerangkan alasan membrane yang dihasilkan dengan PVP menunjukkan ketelapan dan kebolehpilihan yang lebih tinggi berbanding PEG. Penemuan dalam kajian ini menunjukkan PSf 10 adalah formulasi yang paling baik dalam penyelidikan ini yang akhirnya dipilih sebagai formulasi membran yang paling baik dalam aplikasi penyingkiran *E. faecalis*.