

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

A direct comparison between membrane adsorber and packed column chromatography performance

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Boi C., Malavasi A., Carbonell R.G., Gilleskie G. (2020). A direct comparison between membrane adsorber and packed column chromatography performance. JOURNAL OF CHROMATOGRAPHY A, 1612, 1-9 [10.1016/j.chroma.2019.460629].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/709091> since: 2019-12-18

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2019.460629>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

A direct comparison between membrane adsorber and packed column chromatography performance

Cristiana Boi^{1*}, Andrea Malavasi^{1,2}, Ruben G. Carbonell², Gary Gilleskie²

¹DICAM, Alma Mater Studiorum-Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy,

²Golden Leaf Biomanufacturing Training and Education Center (BTEC), NC State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

Abstract

The purpose of this work was to compare side by side the performance of packed bed and membrane chromatography adsorption processes for protein purification. The comparison was performed using anion exchange media with the same ligand immobilized on the adsorbing surface, namely the strong Q quaternary ammonium group, R-CH₂-N⁺-(CH₃)₃, and bovine serum albumin (BSA) as a model protein. In addition, the stationary phase volume was held constant for each geometry (3 mL) and runs were executed using the same mobile phase superficial velocity. As expected, the packed bed column showed higher equilibrium binding of BSA at 66.9 mg/mL versus 43.04 mg/mL for the membrane adsorber. Dynamic binding capacities were also higher in the packed bed; for example, at 97.5 cm/h, a capacity of 62.8 mg/mL was measured for the packed bed versus 20.7 mg/mL for the membrane adsorber. The higher equilibrium and dynamic capacities of the packed bed are likely due to the higher surface area per unit volume of the resin. However, the maximum productivity for the membrane adsorber was 111 mg/(mL h) a value that was 3.3 times higher than the one of the packed column. The bed utilization – defined as the ratio of the dynamic binding capacity at 10% breakthrough to the saturation binding capacity - was also higher for the packed column at long residence times and lower at short residence times confirming the better performance of membrane chromatography at high flow rates.

Keywords

Chromatography; Membrane adsorber; Packed column; Binding capacity; Productivity.

* Corresponding author at:

Via Terracini 28, 40131 Bologna, Italy

Tel. +39 051 2090432

Email: cristiana.boi@unibo.it

40 1. Introduction

41
42 Packed bed chromatography is by far the most common technique used for high resolution
43 separations of proteins, both as an analytical tool and as a process unit operation [1]. In a
44 conventional process the column is operated in a capture mode, using highly porous resins with
45 different functionalities according to the mode of operation. Among all chromatographic
46 techniques, ion exchange has been the most widely employed method for protein purification
47 since the development of cellulosic ion exchangers in the 1950s [2].

48 Membrane chromatography is a relatively new technique developed with the purpose of
49 operating at higher flow rates and at reduced process time relative to bead-based column
50 chromatography. Higher flow rates are possible with membranes because the resulting
51 pressure drop is significantly lower than in traditional packed-column chromatography
52 processes, and because solute transport in membrane devices is primarily by convection to the
53 membrane internal surface, rather than the much slower intraparticle diffusion that is rate
54 controlling in chromatography beads [1, 3-4]. In addition, since membrane adsorbers are
55 generally less costly to manufacture, they can potentially be used as single-use devices that
56 eliminate the difficulties and costs often associated with packing a chromatographic column,
57 and the cleaning and validation steps required of multi-use columns [5].

58 One significant drawback associated with the use of membrane adsorbers in a capture mode is
59 that their binding product capacities are generally lower than those of column chromatography
60 resins. As a result, the industrial application of membrane adsorbers has been largely limited to
61 flowthrough polishing applications in biopharmaceutical production processes in which small
62 concentrations of impurities bind to the chromatography media, while product flows through
63 [3-16]. Indeed, with the development of novel membrane materials with higher binding
64 capacities the use of membrane adsorbers for product capture is of increasing interest [17-21].
65 Among those, cation exchange membranes made by porous polyacrylate hydrogels on a
66 polypropylene support have been used for monoclonal antibody capture obtaining IgG dynamic
67 binding capacities higher than 60 mg/mL at 10% breakthrough [6-7]. Comparable binding
68 capacities were reported for high capacity multimodal cation exchanger membranes prepared
69 by immobilizing poly(glycidyl methacrylate) tentacles on cellulosic membranes [8]. More recent
70 work reports novel membranes with improved material structure: the use of polymer brushes
71 and membrane based on electrospun nanofibers and nonwovens are the strategies that have
72 been mostly employed [22-24]. These improved structures have resulted in high binding
73 capacities. In addition, recent work has looked at the behavior of membrane adsorbers in
74 different flow configurations [25-26] and has focused on developing interesting novel module
75 designs that have resulted in improved performance [27-28].

76 The comparison of performance for different types of chromatographic supports has been
77 considered by several authors, but most papers have reported results of experiments targeted
78 to a specific application with columns of different volumes or experiments in which the
79 operating conditions were not chosen with the aim of direct comparison. Ribero *et al.*
80 investigated the performance of different chromatographic supports to be used for purification
81 of recombinant Factor IX. They tested two different anion exchange resins, a membrane
82 adsorber and a monolithic column and chose to continue with the monolith due to its higher
83 binding capacity for the target molecule [29], based on their goal of finding the best material

84 for the purification of Factor IX. The higher value of the dynamic binding capacity was the main
85 criteria of choice among different stationary phases together with the resolution and
86 selectivity. However, the comparison did not keep column volume and superficial velocity
87 constant among options.

88 Liu *et al.* tested commercial cation exchanger membranes and compared them to monoliths
89 and packed columns for antibody capture with interesting results. Ultimately, they chose to
90 operate with the protein A column for capture, despite the fact that the cation exchanger
91 membrane adsorber, operated in overloaded isocratic mode, was more effective in the removal
92 of host cell proteins and high molecular weight impurities [30]. Although Bhut *et al.* considered
93 stationary phases of the same volume and the same weak anion exchange functionality, they
94 presented newly designed membranes that were not commercially available with high binding
95 capacity and compared them with standard materials: a regenerated cellulose membrane and
96 an agarose resin [31]. However, superficial velocities between devices were not held constant.
97 Similarly, in a pioneering work, Kubota *et al.* performed a very thoughtful comparison between
98 hollow fiber membranes and a packed bed column of the same volume and the similar ion-
99 exchange functionality; however, they did not operate the two supports at the same superficial
100 velocity, which is an aspect that is often disregarded [32].

101 Comparisons between packed bed and membrane chromatography are rare in the literature
102 and they are often undertaken to highlight the high throughput of novel membrane materials.
103 The majority of the works that report such comparisons generally consider binding capacity as
104 the major performance parameter for evaluation of the different options without looking at
105 other chromatographic performance parameters such as resolution, productivity, or bed
106 utilization.

107 Because of the numerous advantages that membrane chromatography potentially offers, this
108 study aims to more directly compare properties and performance of the membrane and more
109 traditional column geometries. The work presented in this paper considers porosity, binding
110 capacity, mass transfer rate, bed utilization and productivity between the two geometries more
111 fully than has been done in previous studies [29-32]. To do this, a side-by-side comparison of
112 each geometry, using a membrane adsorber and chromatography resin that are commercially
113 available, have the same strong anion exchange functionality, are readily scalable, and have
114 identical bed volumes, 3 mL, was performed. Bovine serum albumin (BSA) is used as a model
115 protein and the columns were operated in non-competitive conditions at the same superficial
116 velocity to properly evaluate the transport phenomena limitations of the chromatographic
117 supports. Comparison was also performed by looking at performance parameters with respect
118 to residence time, even though due to the different bed geometries and packing characteristics
119 it was not possible to operate the packed column at the same low residence times, i.e. high
120 flow rates, of the membrane adsorbers.

121

122

123 **2. Experimental**

124

125 **2.1 Materials**

126 The membrane adsorber used during the experiments was an anion exchange Sartobind® Q
127 Nano 3 mL, produced by Sartorius Stedim Biotech GmbH. This is a radial flow module consisting

128 of 30 membrane layers. The volume of the membrane bed is 3 mL and the membrane surface
129 area available for flow is 110 cm². Liquid flows around the bed, then radially through the
130 membrane layers into a central channel and finally through the outlet channel. The membranes
131 present in the module have a base matrix of stabilized and reinforced cellulose with an
132 immobilized quaternary ammonium group. This adsorber is a strong anion exchanger and has a
133 long-term pH stability range from 2-12. The average membrane pore diameter is 3-5 μm. The
134 module can be operated at a maximum pressure of 4 bar, the recommended flow rate is 10-15
135 mL/min, and the BSA binding capacity reported by the vendor is 29 mg/mL (conditions
136 unspecified).

137 Q Sepharose™ Fast Flow resin, produced by GE Healthcare Life Sciences, was used as adsorbent
138 for column experiments. This anion exchange resin has a matrix comprised of Sepharose™ (6%
139 cross-linked agarose) and, like the Sartobind® Q Nano, the strong quaternary ammonium
140 ligand. Beads are spherical with a diameter ranging from 45 to 165 μm and an average size of
141 90 μm as reported by the vendor. They can be used at superficial velocities up to 700 cm/h. The
142 exclusion limit for globular proteins is 4 MDa, but the size distribution of intraparticle and
143 interparticle pores is unknown. Beads are stable from pH 2 to 12 and they are resistant to all
144 commonly used aqueous buffers (e.g. 1 M NaOH, 8 M urea, 8 M guanidine hydrochloride). A
145 summary of the properties for each of the chromatographic media is given in Table 1.
146 All solution components, NaCl (USP/FCC/EP/BP grades), NaOH (NF/FCC grades), Tris (molecular
147 biology grade), and HCl (reagent grade) for pH adjustment for Tris, used in these experiments
148 were purchased from ThermoFisher Scientific. Lysozyme, molecular weight (MW) of 14388 Da
149 and isoelectric point (pI) of 11.0 [33] was purchased from ThermoFisher Scientific [34]. Bovine
150 Serum Albumin (BSA), MW 66430 and pI 4.7, was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich with a purity ≥
151 96% [35]. BSA and lysozyme solutions were filtered with 0.21 μm cellulose nitrate membrane
152 filters (Whatman) before experiments. The filter material was hydrophilic as to minimize non-
153 specific protein adsorption.

154

155 **2.2 Equipment**

156 The characterizations of the chromatographic devices tested was performed on an
157 ÄKTAexplorer 100, manufactured by GE Healthcare Life Sciences and controlled by UNICORN™
158 software. Experimental runs were carried out in parallel with both the Sartobind® Q Nano 3 mL
159 module and with a column packed with Q Sepharose™ Fast Flow resin with a total bed volume
160 of 3 mL.

161 For experiments that required a packed column, Q Sepharose™ Fast Flow resin was flow packed
162 in an Econoline® Column from Sorbent Technologies Inc. The external tube is made of
163 borosilicate glass with an inner diameter of 1 cm and an adjustable bed height from 0 to 12.5
164 cm. The pressure limit for the column is 80 bar.

165

166 **2.3 Methods**

167 **2.3.1 Column packing**

168 Resin was packed under flow with high purity water at a flow rate of 5 mL/min. To calculate the
169 amount of resin slurry required for a bed volume of 3 mL, equal to the volume of the
170 membrane unit, a packing factor of 1.1 was used. The resulting bed had a height of 3.8 cm,
171 corresponding to a volume of 2.98 mL.

172 To assess the quality of packing, a pulse injection of a 2 M NaCl solution was made on the
173 column equilibrated with 0.5 M NaCl to calculate the height equivalent of a theoretical plate
174 (HETP) and the asymmetry factor of the packed column. Following the pulse injection,
175 additional 0.5 M NaCl was fed to the column at 2 mL/min, which corresponds to a superficial
176 velocity of 153 cm/h, to move the 2 M NaCl pulse through the column. Analysis of the
177 conductivity peak from the column resulted in a reduced HETP value ($=\text{HETP}/d_p$, where d_p is the
178 resin diameter) of 3.31 and an asymmetry value of 1.68.

179

180 **2.3.2 Porosity determination**

181 The porosities of the chromatographic media were determined by statistical moment analysis
182 on experimental data obtained using lysozyme as a tracer [36-37]. Lysozyme has an isoelectric
183 point of 11 [33] and therefore at pH 8 does not bind to the positively charged groups of the
184 chromatographic supports; in addition, 0.25 M NaCl was added to the lysozyme solution to
185 further prevent binding to the media. After equilibrating the membrane adsorber or the packed
186 column with 50 mM Tris, 0.25 M NaCl, pH 8, a solution of 2.5 mg/mL lysozyme in equilibration
187 buffer was injected using a 100 μL loop. Lysozyme in the column effluent was monitored by UV
188 absorbance at 280 nm. For the membrane adsorber, injections were performed both with and
189 without the membrane adsorber attached to the AKTAexplorer system. For the packed column,
190 injections were performed both with a packed column attached to the AKTA system and an
191 unpacked column with the plungers set to 0 mL.

192 Lysozyme injections were performed for each system setup (with membrane adsorber, without
193 membrane adsorber, with packed column, and with unpacked column) at five different
194 superficial flow velocities; lysozyme retention volume values were calculated as the averages of
195 the results at each of the five superficial velocities. The superficial velocities were held constant
196 between the experiments with the membrane capsule and those with the packed column. The
197 experiments with the membrane unit were performed at 5, 7.5, 10, 12.5 and 15 mL/min, the
198 latter being the operational flow rate recommended by the manufacturer. The superficial
199 velocity corresponding to each of these flow rates was determined as an integral average of the
200 radial velocity from the outer radius to the inner radius of the membrane bed, and the resulting
201 formula is reported in eq. (1):

202

$$203 \quad u_{MA} = \frac{F}{2\pi L(R_{ext} - R_{int})} \ln \left(\frac{R_{ext}}{R_{int}} \right) \quad (1)$$

204

205 where F is the volumetric flow rate, L is the length of the membrane bed, and R_{ext} and R_{int} are
206 the outer and inner radii of the membrane bed, respectively. The resulting superficial velocity
207 values were also used for the packed column experiments, but in this case, the corresponding
208 volumetric flow rate was calculated from the definition of superficial velocity in a packed
209 column:

210

$$211 \quad u_{PB} = \frac{F}{\pi R_{col}^2} \quad (2)$$

212

213 where R_{col} is the inner radius of the column. Volumetric flow rates and superficial velocity
214 values used in the porosity measurements are summarized in Table 2.

215 After each experiment, the chromatographic media, membrane adsorber or packed column,
216 was regenerated with 2 M NaCl and sanitized with 1 M NaOH. During these steps, no UV
217 absorbance peaks were observed, demonstrating that lysozyme in fact did not bind to the
218 chromatographic media.
219 Once retention volumes for lysozyme were measured, the porosity of the membrane adsorber
220 (designated MA in the equations below) was determined as follows. The total void volume of
221 the membrane adsorber, including both membrane pores and other membrane volume
222 contributions, was calculated by subtracting the retention volume of lysozyme with no module
223 connected from the retention volume of lysozyme with a module connected:

$$225 \quad V_{\text{total voids, MA}} = V_{\text{sys with MA}} - V_{\text{sys without MA}} \quad (3)$$

226
227 For the membrane adsorbers, the resulting void volume not only includes the membrane pores,
228 but also includes the voids related to the various flow channels within the membrane module
229 housing and the liquid distributors in the module. To determine the membrane module dead
230 volume, the membrane adsorber was broken open and its internal dimensions were measured
231 with a gauge. The volume of these additional contributions was then subtracted from the total
232 void volume calculated with Eq. (3) to obtain the volume of the membrane pores.

$$234 \quad V_{\text{pores}} = V_{\text{total voids, MA}} - V_{\text{module}} \quad (4)$$

235
236 The porosity is then calculated as the ratio of V_{pores} to the reported volume of the membrane
237 adsorber, 3 mL.

238 The procedure is similar for the packed bed, with column voids – both interparticle and
239 intraparticle - calculated as:

$$241 \quad V_{\text{total voids, PB}} = V_{\text{sys with packed column}} - V_{\text{sys with empty column}} \quad (5)$$

242
243 And again, the porosity is calculated as the ratio of $V_{\text{total voids, PB}}$ to the total volume of the
244 packed bed, 3 mL.

246 **2.3.3 Adsorption isotherm determination**

247 Adsorption isotherms for BSA on the solids supports were measured with two different
248 procedures, in batch mode for Q Sepharose™ Fast Flow resin and with the AKTAexplorer system
249 for the Sartobind® Q Nano membrane adsorber. Batch measurements were not possible for the
250 membranes because at the time of this study, they were only available as part of a module and
251 not as loose membrane sheets.

252 Adsorption isotherms for BSA in 50 mM Tris, pH 8.0 on Q Sepharose™ Fast Flow resin were
253 measured in batch experiments at room temperature. First, a kinetic study was performed to
254 determine the time necessary for the BSA in solution to reach the equilibrium with the
255 adsorbent. Based on this study, a time of 180 minutes was shown to be sufficient. The isotherm
256 was obtained using 12 mL Poly-Prep (Biorad) columns as the adsorption vessels, filled with 140
257 μL of resin slurry. BSA concentration in the feed ranged from 0.008 to 9.21 mg/mL. Fresh resin
258 was loaded to the vessels and washed four times with 50 mM Tris at pH 8; during each wash,

259 the containers were placed for 10 min on an orbital shaker. Then buffer supernatants were
260 removed. Successively, BSA solutions were loaded to the vessels, and they were incubated on
261 the orbital shaker for 180 min at room temperature. BSA concentration was measured with UV
262 absorbance readings at 280 nm and the mass of BSA adsorbed on the resin was calculated as
263 the difference in the mass of BSA in the loading solution and the mass of BSA measured in the
264 supernatant sample. The value was divided by the volume (mL) of solid resin to determine the
265 value of the binding capacity, q , the mass (in mg) of BSA bound per unit volume (in mL) of resin.
266 q is plotted against the final equilibrium concentration of BSA in Tris buffer.
267 The adsorption isotherm for BSA on Sartobind® Q Nano membranes was measured in
268 breakthrough experiments performed using BSA, at different concentration values, in 50 mM
269 Tris, pH 9.0. Specifically, BSA solutions with concentrations ranging from 0.023 to 2.01 mg/mL
270 were fed to the membrane adsorber at a fixed flow rate of 10 mL/min. Feeding continued until
271 saturation was achieved, as determined by a UV trace that asymptotically flattened out.
272 Following the breakthrough run, BSA was eluted from the membrane adsorber using 2M NaCl.
273 The amount of BSA recovered in the eluate was quantified by UV absorbance. This value was
274 divided by the volume of the membrane adsorber to determine the BSA binding capacity. Upon
275 completion of elution with 2M NaCl, the membrane was re-equilibrated and used again for
276 another concentration of BSA.

277

278 **2.3.4. Dynamic characterization**

279 Breakthrough studies were conducted on the membrane adsorber and packed bed column to
280 determine the dynamic binding capacity at 10% breakthrough ($DBC_{10\%}$) using solutions of 1
281 mg/mL BSA in 50 mM Tris, pH 8. These solutions were loaded to the column until, when the
282 concentration of BSA, based on UV absorbance at 280 nm, plateaued. Experiments for each
283 geometry were performed at 5 different flow rates in order to study the influence of the
284 superficial velocity on dynamic binding capacity. The superficial velocities used are the same for
285 both the membrane adsorber and packed bed and are equal to those used for porosity
286 measurements (see Table 2). Upon completion of each breakthrough run, BSA was eluted from
287 the relevant stationary phase using 0.5 M NaCl; the chromatographic media was then
288 regenerated with 1 M NaOH for membranes and 2 M NaCl for the packed bed column, and then
289 equilibrated with 50 mM Tris, pH 8 prior to the next experiment.

290 The $DBC_{10\%}$ value was determined by first calculating, from a mass balance, the amount of BSA
291 that was bound to the media at 10% breakthrough:

292

$$293 \quad m_{\text{ads},10\%} = c_0 V_{\text{loaded},10\%} - c_0 V_{\text{sys}} \quad (6)$$

294

295 where $m_{\text{ads},10\%}$ is the mass of BSA adsorbed, c_0 is the concentration of BSA in the feed, $V_{\text{loaded},10\%}$
296 is the volume of BSA solution loaded at 10% breakthrough, and V_{sys} is the total system dead
297 volume that was determined in a separate tracer experiment [38]. The last term of the
298 equation introduces an approximation, since the concentration of biomolecule is considered
299 uniform over the entire system and equal to the feed concentration, while, downstream of the
300 column and, in particular, between the column outlet and the UV detector where the
301 concentration is measured, it is lower. However, an estimate of the volume downstream of the

302 chromatographic column shows that the volume between the outlet and UV detector is only
303 approximately 3% of the total dead volume; therefore the assumption that the concentration of
304 BSA over the entire dead volume is equal to the concentration of BSA in the feed does not give
305 rise to a significant error.

306 $DBC_{10\%}$ was then calculated by dividing $m_{ads,10\%}$ by the volume of the stationary phase.
307 For a more exhaustive comparison, process parameters such as bed utilization and productivity
308 of the two different chromatographic processes have been evaluated. Bed utilization is defined
309 as the amount of protein adsorbed at a given breakthrough point, with respect to the amount
310 of protein adsorbed at complete saturation [39]; in particular, bed utilization at 10%
311 breakthrough can be written as:

312

$$313 \quad \text{Bed Utilization} = \frac{DBC_{10\%}}{DBC_{100\%}} \quad (7)$$

314

315 Productivity, P , is defined as the mass of the target biomolecule recovered in the elution step
316 per unit volume of media per unit time of the complete chromatographic cycle; that is the sum
317 of the equilibration, adsorption (load), washing, elution and regeneration times. In symbols:

318

$$319 \quad P = \frac{m_{eluted\ product}}{V_{media} t_{chromatographic\ cycle}} \quad (8)$$

320

321

322 **3. Results and Discussion**

323

324 **3.1 Porosity**

325 For the Sartobind® Q Nano module, the porosity determined using the lysozyme tracer
326 procedure previously described was 58%. For the Econoline® column packed with Q
327 Sepharose™ Fast Flow resin, the resulting porosity was 64%. This value includes both intra-
328 particle and inter-particle pores. As expected, the porosity of the packed bed is greater than
329 that of the membrane adsorber given its higher specific surface area.

330 In addition to estimating porosity using lysozyme as a tracer, a similar procedure using 2 M NaCl
331 as a tracer in a packed column equilibrated with 0.5 M NaCl was executed. Interestingly, the
332 resulting packed column porosity determined with NaCl was 80%, significantly higher than the
333 porosity measured by the lysozyme method. If it is assumed that the interparticle porosity of
334 the bed is 0.36, the theoretical value for a bed of randomly packed hard spheres, the resulting
335 intraparticle porosity values using lysozyme and NaCl as a tracer are 0.69 and 0.44, respectively.
336 The value calculated using NaCl is in agreement with what has been reported previously for
337 Sepharose FF resins [40-41], while the value for lysozyme is significantly lower. This suggests
338 that a portion of resin pores is not accessible to lysozyme. The difference in porosity values
339 using lysozyme and NaCl was not expected, given that the exclusion limit for Q Sepharose FF

340 resin is 4 MDa for globular proteins, while the molecular weight of lysozyme is only 14.4 kDa.
341 However, the pore size distribution of the resin is unknown, therefore it is likely that this
342 distribution is sufficiently broad to determine the difference observed. In addition, it is possible
343 that the NaCl method for porosity determination overestimates porosity due to some binding
344 interactions of NaCl to the anion exchange resin.

345

346 **3.2 Adsorption isotherms**

347 The equilibrium binding capacity of BSA on both stationary phases can be well represented by
348 the Langmuir isotherm model:

349

$$350 \quad q_{eq} = \frac{c_{eq} q_{max}}{c_{eq} + K_d} \quad (9)$$

351

352 In which the symbols q_{eq} and c_{eq} indicate the equilibrium values of the protein concentration on
353 the surface and in the liquid solution, respectively, q_{max} indicates the maximum adsorption
354 capacity, and K_d is the dissociation constant.

355 The equilibrium isotherm for BSA adsorption onto Q Sepharose™ Fast Flow resin is reported in
356 Figure 1 as a function of the protein concentration in solution at equilibrium. The experimental
357 results have been fitted using the Langmuir adsorption isotherm expression in Equation (9),
358 which gives a maximum equilibrium binding capacity q_{max} , of 66.9 mg/mL and a dissociation
359 constant, K_d , of 0.0836 mg/mL.

360 As discussed in the Experimental section, §2.3.3, the adsorption isotherm for the membrane
361 was obtained in breakthrough experiments since the only format available for membranes was
362 the Sartobind® Q Nano commercial unit. The data are shown in Figure 2, and are fitted to the
363 Langmuir isotherm with a maximum binding capacity of 43.04 mg/mL and a dissociation
364 constant, K_d , of 0.011 mg/mL.

365 Although the two supports are functionalized with a quaternary ammonium ligand, the
366 dissociation constants differ by a factor of 7.6. This could be ascribed to the different base
367 materials, the different immobilization chemistry, the possible use of spacers or brushes in the
368 membrane adsorbers, and differences in the chemistry of the ligand itself. Similar or even
369 higher differences have been observed by Hahn *et al.* in a comparison of different commercial
370 protein A resins [42], suggesting that even chromatography media with the “same” chemistry
371 might have significantly different K_d values. For both supports, the membrane and resin, the
372 dissociation constant is extremely low, comparable to those observed in affinity
373 chromatography processes [42-45]; a K_d of the same order of magnitude was reported by Tao
374 *et al.* for BSA dissolved in 50 mM Tris pH 8.2 on DEAE-Sephadex ion exchange resin [46]. This
375 means that BSA dissolved in Tris buffer at a pH close to 8 has a very high affinity for adsorbents
376 that contain positively charged amine groups.

377 As expected, the maximum binding capacity of BSA onto the Q Sepharose™ FF resin is higher
378 than on the Sartobind® Q Nano membrane, despite the fact that the isotherm data for the
379 membrane were measured at a slightly higher pH (pH = 9) than the isotherm data for the resin
380 (pH = 8). It is also worth noting that the ratio of the maximum binding capacity of the resin
381 (66.9 mg/mL) with respect to the membrane (43.04 mg/mL) equals 1.55 and this value is lower
382 than the ratio of the average ligand density of the two supports that equals 1.68 (0.21

383 mmol/mL vs. 0.13 mmol/mL), which indicates a slightly better level of ligand accessibility for
384 the membrane adsorbers.

385

386 **3.3 Dynamic characterization**

387 The effect of flow rate on dynamic binding capacity was investigated for the two stationary
388 phases in experiments performed by feeding 1 mg/mL BSA solutions. For the membrane
389 adsorber, the breakthrough curves at different flow rates overlap very well from the onset to
390 complete breakthrough as can be observed in Figure 3. This suggests that the dynamic binding
391 capacity is independent of flow rate, thus confirming the dominant convective mass transport
392 in the membrane adsorber [1, 3-4]. Conversely, for the packed column, breakthrough curves at
393 different flow rates deviate significantly from one another; specifically, as the flow rate
394 increases the curves broaden and the steepest curve corresponds to the lowest flow rate as
395 illustrated in Figure 3. This is the behavior expected when intraparticle diffusion limits solute
396 mass transfer as is the case with the packed bed.

397 It is worth noting that the breakthrough curves for the membrane device show a consistent
398 “kink” starting at a volume of just more than 100 mL. In the Sartobind® Q Nano capsules used
399 in this study, the membrane is wound to form a cylinder, with flow from the exterior of the
400 cylinder through the layers of membrane, to the interior. The kink in the breakthrough curve
401 shows up as the membrane adsorber nears complete saturation with BSA. Notably,
402 breakthrough curves for the packed bed do not show similar behavior. A possible explanation
403 is that as the BSA front moves to the interior of the membrane capsule, it may encounter an
404 irregularity in the winding of the membrane that causes dispersion of the front and results in
405 the kink.

406 The behavior of the dynamic binding capacity with respect to flowrate is better illustrated by
407 plotting the dynamic binding capacity at 10% breakthrough as a function of the superficial
408 velocity and of residence time for both supports. These plots are shown in Figure 4. As
409 expected, the $DBC_{10\%}$ of the membrane adsorber remains constant, and it is almost 70% of the
410 binding capacity obtained at saturation (data not shown), which corresponds to the bed
411 utilization as defined in Eq. 7. Conversely, the $DBC_{10\%}$ of the packed column decreases at
412 increasing flow rate as the breakthrough curves broaden. This result confirms that, in the range
413 of flow rates tested, the membrane adsorber is not affected by solute mass transfer and kinetic
414 limitations, thus this device can be used up to 300 cm/h without any decrease in binding
415 capacity. Similar conclusions can be drawn from the behavior of $DBC_{10\%}$ as a function of
416 residence time shown in Figure 4b. In this plot the $DBC_{10\%}$ of the two media— both actual values
417 and values that have been extrapolated to the residence times that were out of the operating
418 range of the device tested – are shown. The values for the membrane adsorbers were obtained
419 by averaging the $DBC_{10\%}$ values at all flow rates ($DBC_{10\%}=20.619 \pm 0.177$), whereas the data for
420 the packed column were fitted with an exponential trendline using the function implemented in
421 Microsoft Excel 2010 with a value of $R^2 = 0.9971$. It is interesting to note that at residence times
422 lower than 0.5 minutes the $DBC_{10\%}$ of the membrane adsorber is larger than that of the packed
423 column. Mass transfer limitations in membrane adsorbers are much less important than in
424 conventional chromatographic columns where the loss in $DBC_{10\%}$ under the range of flow rates
425 considered in this study is nearly 50%; this is in agreement with data from previous studies that
426 measured the effect of flow rate on the DBC of antibodies on protein A resins [42,47].

427 Although values of dynamic binding capacity are higher for the bead-based chromatographic
428 process, these values taken alone do not represent a complete evaluation of the process
429 performance, which also requires consideration of buffer consumption, number of cycles for
430 resin and/or membrane adsorber replacement, bed utilization and productivity. Even though a
431 complete process evaluation was not the purpose of this work, data from the breakthrough
432 studies was used to evaluate membrane and packed column bed utilization and productivity as
433 simple tools to properly compare the two supports.

434 Since chromatographic processes are often operated at 10% breakthrough, bed utilization is an
435 interesting parameter to compare the two different stationary phases. The results obtained for
436 our experimental systems confirm that at low values of the residence time, i.e. at higher flow
437 rates, bed utilization is higher for the membrane adsorber, as shown in Figure 5. In this figure
438 bed utilization was plotted as a function of the residence time. Indeed, at low residence times
439 the convective media outperforms the packed bed column, while at higher residence times the
440 column binding capacity can be fully exploited and bed utilization becomes higher for the resin
441 (Figure 5).

442 Since the two stationary phases were characterized in complete bind and elute studies, it is
443 worth to compare the elution peaks obtained at different flow rates for both configurations.
444 From the elution data reported in Figure 6, it can be observed that the profiles obtained with
445 the membrane adsorber do not depend on flow rate, while the dependence on flow rate for the
446 elution from the packed column shows only a small amount of tailing. However, the packed
447 column peaks are not completely defined due to the high concentration of BSA recovered that
448 was above the detection limit of the UV detector of the FPLC as can be noticed from their
449 profiles (Figure 6).

450 Finally, the data from the breakthrough studies was used to estimate membrane and packed
451 column productivity. Following each breakthrough run, BSA was eluted from the membrane
452 adsorber and packed column. The amount of BSA eluted was divided by the cycle time, which
453 was the sum of the time needed for all the chromatographic steps, namely equilibration, load,
454 wash and elution, and a bed volume of 3 mL for each geometry. The results are plotted for the
455 two stationary phases as a function of linear velocity as reported in Figure 7. The productivity of
456 the membrane adsorber shows a linear dependence on the superficial velocity, since the
457 dynamic binding capacity at 10% breakthrough is independent of flow rate in the range
458 inspected. The productivity with the packed column slightly increases with superficial velocity,
459 indicating that when the flow rate increases, the advantage related to the reduction of cycle
460 duration overcomes the disadvantage related to $DBC_{10\%}$ decrease, but it is always lower than
461 the productivity achieved with the membrane adsorber. The difference between the two
462 technologies is greater at higher superficial velocities. The Sartobind® Q Nano capsule achieves
463 a higher productivity than the column even if its binding capacity is lower because the
464 membrane bed has a bigger cross section than the resin bed, thus the volumetric flow rate at a
465 given superficial velocity with the module is higher and the cycle duration is lower. The
466 maximum productivity with the membrane adsorber is 3.3 times higher than the maximum
467 productivity obtained with the packed column. It is necessary to point out that the
468 experimental protocols with the packed column were not optimized for the washing and
469 elution steps and cycle duration can be reduced. However, even if the duration of the washing
470 and elution steps in the cycles with the column were considered equal to that in the cycles with

471 the membrane module, the maximum productivity with the Sartobind® membrane module
472 would be 3 times higher than the maximum productivity with the column.

473
474

475 **4. Conclusions**

476

477 Despite the development of new membranes with improved binding capacity, packed bed
478 chromatography in bind-and-elute mode continues to be the dominant mode of purification,
479 with the use of membrane adsorbers for bioprocessing relegated to flow through mode for
480 polishing steps. While membrane chromatography, in which solute mass transfer is dominated
481 by convection, is a fast process, packed bed chromatography has a higher binding capacity. In
482 this work a direct comparison between the two chromatographic geometries was executed
483 using an integrated approach that combines theory and experiments.

484 The performance of membrane adsorbers and packed bed columns has been experimentally
485 studied in detail using the same bench-scale chromatography system. The results obtained
486 using BSA as a model protein have been used to compare the two geometries in terms of
487 binding capacity – both equilibrium and dynamic, productivity and bed utilization. As expected
488 the maximum equilibrium binding capacity of the packed column is higher than that of the
489 membrane adsorber, reflecting the greater surface area per unit volume in the packed bed.
490 Likewise, the packed bed showed higher dynamic binding capacity values at 10% breakthrough
491 over all superficial velocities studied. However, the percent difference in $DBC_{10\%}$ between the
492 packed bed and membrane was significantly reduced at the higher superficial velocities. This
493 results because the $DBC_{10\%}$ values for the membrane were independent of superficial velocity
494 due to convective solute transport, while $DBC_{10\%}$ for the packed bed decreased significantly due
495 to intraparticle mass transfer limitations.

496 The advantage of not having intraparticle transport limitations in the membrane device become
497 more apparent when performance parameters like bed utilization and productivity are
498 calculated. Bed utilization is significantly higher for the membrane device, even when solute
499 fluid residence times are lower. Further, the productivity of the membrane adsorber is at least
500 3 times higher and this represents the true advantage of membrane chromatography, which
501 can be successfully operated at high flow rates. Indeed, the obtained results confirm the
502 potential of membrane adsorbers in bind-and-elute mode and the methodology employed
503 might be used as a guide for process characterization of novel chromatographic membranes
504 and improved membrane adsorber modules.

505

506 **Acknowledgements**

507

508 The Golden LEAF Biomanufacturing Training and Education Center (BTEC), NC State University
509 for supporting the experimental work. The Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna for
510 supporting Andrea Malavasi.

511

512

513 **References**

514

- 515 [1] R. Ghosh, Protein separation using membrane chromatography: opportunities and challenges, *J.*
516 *Chromatogr. A* 952 (2002) 13-27. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673\(02\)00057-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673(02)00057-2)
- 517 [2] G. Choudary, C. Horvath, Ion-exchange chromatography, *Methods Enzymol.* 270 (1996) 47-82.
- 518 [3] C. Boi, Membrane adsorbers as purification tools for monoclonal antibodies purification, *J.*
519 *Chromatogr. B* 848 (2007) 19-27.
- 520 [4] V. Orr, L. Zhong, M. Moo-Young, C.P. Chou, Recent advances in bioprocessing application of
521 membrane chromatography, *Biotechnol. Advances* 31 (2013) 450–465.
- 522 [5] U. Gottschalk, Disposables in downstream processing, *Adv. Biochem. Eng. Biotechnol.* 115 (2010)
523 171–183.
- 524 [6] H.L. Knudsen, R.L. Fahrner, Y. Xu, L.A. Norling, G.S. Blank Membrane ion-exchange chromatography
525 for process-scale antibody purification, *J. Chromatogr. A* 907 (2001) 145–154.
- 526 [7] U. Gottschalk, L. Giovannoni, M. Ventani, Antibody purification using membrane adsorbers,
527 *BioPharm Int.* 21 (2008) 48-52.
- 528 [8] J. Weaver, S.M. Husson, L. Murphy, S.R. Wickramasinghe, Anion Exchange Membrane Adsorbers for
529 Flow-Through Polishing Steps: Part I. Clearance of Minute Virus of Mice, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 110
530 (2013) 491-499.
- 531 [9] J. Weaver, S.M. Husson, L. Murphy, S.R. Wickramasinghe, Anion Exchange Membrane Adsorbers for
532 Flow-Through Polishing Steps: Part II. Virus, Host Cell Protein, DNA Clearance, and Antibody
533 Recovery, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 110 (2013) 500-510.
- 534 [10] M. Phillips, J. Cormier, J. Ferrence, C. Dowd, R. Kiss, H. Lutz, J. Carter, Performance of a membrane
535 adsorber for trace impurity removal in biotechnology manufacturing, *J. Chromatogr. A* 1078 (2005)
536 74-82.
- 537 [11] J.X. Zhou, T. Tressel, Basic concepts in Q membrane chromatography for large scale antibody
538 production, *Biotechnol. Prog.* 22(2006) 341–349.
- 539 [12] M. Kuczewski, N. Fraud, R. Faber, G. Zarbis-Papastoitsis, Development of a polishing step using a
540 hydrophobic interaction membrane adsorber with a PER.C6-derived recombinant antibody,
541 *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 105 (2010) 296–305.
- 542 [13] R. Chen, J. John, A. Lavrentieva, S. Müller, M. Tomala, Y. Zhao, R. Zweigerdt, S. Beutel, B. Hitzmann,
543 C. Kasper, U. Martin, U. Rinas, F. Stahl, T. Scheper, Cytokine production using membrane adsorbers:
544 human basic fibroblast growth factor produced by *Escherichia coli*, *Eng. Life Sci* 12 (2012) 29–38.
545 <https://doi.org/10.1002/elsc.201100045>
- 546 [14] M. Woo, N.Z. Khan, J. Royce, U. Mehta, B. Gagnon, S. Ramaswamy S, N. Soice, M. Morelli, K.-S.
547 Cheng, A novel primary amine-based anion exchange membrane adsorber, *J. Chromatogr A* 1218
548 (2011) 5386–5392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2011.03.068>
- 549 [15] W. Riordan, S. Heilmann, K. Brorson, K. Seshadri, Y. He, M. Etzel, Design of salt-tolerant membrane
550 adsorbers for viral clearance, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 103 (2009) 920–929.
551 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.22314>
- 552 [16] W.T. Riordan, S.M. Heilman, K. Brorson, K. Seshadri, M.R. Etzel, Salt tolerant membrane
553 adsorbers for robust impurity clearance, *Biotechnol. Prog.* 25 (2009) 1695–1702.
- 554 [17] Y. Hou, M. Brower, D. Pollard, D. Kanani, R. Jacquemart, B. Kachuik, J. Stout, Advective hydrogel
555 membrane chromatography for monoclonal antibody purification in bioprocessing, *Biotechnol.*
556 *Prog.* 31 (2015) 974-982.
- 557 [18] M. Kuczewski, E. Schirmer, B. Lain, G.A. Zarbis-Papastoitsis, Single-use purification process for the
558 production of a monoclonal antibody produced in a PER.C6 human cell line, *Biotechnol. J.* 6 (2011)
559 56–65.
- 560 [19] B. Bhut, S. Wickramasinghe, S. Husson, Preparation of high-capacity, weak anion-exchange
561 membranes for protein separations using surface initiated atom transfer radical polymerization, *J.*
562 *Memb. Sci.*, 325 (2008) 176-183.

- 563 [20] J. Wang, E.W. Jenkins, J.R. Robinson, A. Wilson, S.M. Husson, A new multimodal membrane
564 adsorber for monoclonal antibody purifications, *J. Memb. Sci.* 492 (2015) 137–146.
- 565 [21] M. Heller, R. Wimbish, P.V. Gurgel, B. Pourdeyhimi, R.G. Carbonell, Reducing diffusion limitations in
566 ion exchange grafted membranes using high surface area nonwovens, *J. Memb. Sci.* 514 (2016) 53-
567 64.
- 568 [22] M.X. Hu, X. Li, J. N. Li, J.J. Huang, G.R. Ren, Multilayer affinity adsorption of albumin on polymer
569 brushes modified membranes in a continuous-flow system, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1538 (2018) 94–103.
570 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2018.01.031>
- 571 [23] J. Ye, X. Wang, J. Chu, D. Yao, Y. Zhang, J. Meng, Electrospun poly(styrene-co-maleic anhydride)
572 nanofibrous membrane: A versatile platform for mixed mode membrane adsorbers *Appl. Surf. Sci.*
573 484 (2019) 62–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsusc.2019.04.106>
- 574 [24] I.S. Ng, C.P. Song, C.W. Ooi, B.T. Tey, Y.H. Lee, Y.K. Chang, Purification of lysozyme from chicken egg
575 white using nanofiber membrane immobilized with Reactive Orange 4 dye, *Int. J. Biol. Macromol.*
576 134 (2019) 458–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2019.05.054>
- 577 [25] L. Voswinkel, M.R. Etzel, U. Kulozik, Adsorption of beta-lactoglobulin in anion exchange membrane
578 chromatography versus the contacting mode and temperature, *LWT - Food Sci. Technol.* 79 (2017)
579 78-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2017.01.016>
- 580 [26] G. Gieseler, I. Pepelanova, A. Meyer, L. Villain, S. Beutel, U. Rinas, T. Scheper, Considerations on the
581 flow configuration of membrane chromatography devices for the purification of human basic
582 fibroblast growth factor from crude lysates, *Eng. Life Sci.* 16 (2016) 697–705.
583 <https://doi.org/10.1002/elsc.201600006>
- 584 [27] P. Madadkar, Q.Wu, R. Ghosh, A laterally-fed membrane chromatography module, *J. Membr. Sci.*
585 487 (2015)173–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2015.03.056>
- 586 [28] G. Chen, U. Umatheva, L. Alforque, H. Shirataki, S. Ogawa, C. Kato, R. Ghosh, An annular-flow,
587 hollow-fiber membrane chromatography device for fast, high-resolution protein separation at low
588 pressure. *J. Membr. Sci.* 590 (2019) 117305-117312.
589 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2019.117305>
- 590 [29] D.A. Ribeiro, D.F. Passos, H.C. Ferraz, L.R. Castilho, Anion-exchange purification of recombinant
591 factor IX from cell culture supernatant using different chromatography supports, *J. Chromatogr. B*
592 938 (2013) 111–118.
- 593 [30] H.F. Liu, B. McCooey, T. Duarte, D.E. Myers, T. Hudson, A. Amanullah, R. van Reis, B.D. Kelley,
594 Exploration of overloaded cation exchange chromatography for monoclonal antibody purification, *J.*
595 *Chromatogr. A* 1218 (2011) 6943–6952.
- 596 [31] B.V. Bhut, K.A. Christensen, S.M. Husson, Membrane chromatography: Protein purification from *E.*
597 *coli* lysate using newly designed and commercial anion-exchange stationary phases, *J. Chromatogr.*
598 *A*, 1217 (2010) 4946–4957.
- 599 [32] N. Kubota, S. Miura, K. Saito, K. Sugita, K. Watanabe, T. Sugo, Comparison of protein adsorption by
600 anion-exchange interaction onto porous hollow-fiber membrane and gel bead-packed bed, *J.*
601 *Memb. Sci.* 117 (1996) 135-142.
- 602 [33] G. Alderton, W.H. Ward, H.L. Fevold, Isolation of lysozyme from egg white, *J. Biol. Chem.* 157
603 (1945) 43-58
- 604 [34] Thermofisher Scientific, Lysozyme properties
605 <https://www.thermofisher.com/order/catalog/product/89833> consulted on 08/08/2019.
- 606 [35] Sigma-Aldrich, Bovine Serum Albumin properties
607 [https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/content/dam/sigma-](https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/content/dam/sigma-aldrich/docs/Sigma/Product_Information_Sheet/a2153pis.pdf)
608 [aldrich/docs/Sigma/Product_Information_Sheet/a2153pis.pdf](https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/content/dam/sigma-aldrich/docs/Sigma/Product_Information_Sheet/a2153pis.pdf) consulted on 08/08/2019.
- 609 [36] G. Guiochon, A. Felinger, D.G. Shiradzi, A.M. Katti, *Fundamentals of preparative and nonlinear*
610 *chromatography*, second ed., Elsevier Inc., San Diego, California, 2006.

- 611 [37] M.O. Herigstad, S. Dimartino, C. Boi, G.C. Sarti, Experimental characterization of the transport
612 phenomena, adsorption, and elution in a protein A affinity monolithic medium, *J. Chromatogr. A*,
613 1407 (2015) 130-138.
- 614 [38] C. Boi, S. Dimartino, G.C. Sarti, Modeling and simulation of affinity membrane adsorption, *J.*
615 *Chromatogr. A*, 1162 (2007) 24-33.
- 616 [39] S. Dimartino, O.M. Herigstad, C. Boi, E. Lalli, G. Sarti, Experimental and Theoretical Analysis to
617 Assess the Use of Monolithic Columns in Process Chromatography, *Chem. Eng. Trans.* 49 (2016) 25-
618 30.
- 619 [40] P. DePhillips, A.M. Lenhoff, Pore size distributions of cation-exchange adsorbents determined by
620 inverse size-exclusion chromatography, *J. Chromatogr. A* 883 (2000) 39–54.
- 621 [41] V. Natarajan, S. Cramer, A methodology for the characterization of ion-exchange resins, *Sep. Sci.*
622 *Technol.* 35 (2000) 1717-1742.
- 623 [42] R. Hahn, R. Schlegel, A. Jungbauer, Comparison of protein A affinity sorbents, *J. Chromatogr. B*, 790
624 (2003) 35-51.
- 625 [43] H. Bak, O.R.T. Thomas, J. Abildskov, Lumped parameter model for prediction of initial breakthrough
626 profiles for the chromatographic capture of antibodies from a complex feedstock, *J. Chromatogr. B*,
627 848 (2007) 131-141.
- 628 [44] C. Boi, S. Dimartino, G.C. Sarti, Performance of a new protein A affinity membrane for the primary
629 recovery of antibodies, *Biotechnol. Prog.* 24 (2008) 640-647.
- 630 [45] H. Yang, P. Gurgel, R.G. Carbonell, Purification of human immunoglobulin G via Fc-specific small
631 peptide ligand affinity chromatography, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 1216 (2009) 910-918.
- 632 [46] Z. Tao, C. Yu, H. Zhang, Y. He, Comparative study of adsorption isotherms of BSA on DEAE and CM-
633 Dextran- type ion exchangers, *React. Funct. Polym.* 32 (1997) 257-262.
- 634 [47] K. Swinnen, A. Krul, I. Van Goidsenhoven, N. Van Tichelt, A. Roosen, K. Van Houdt, Performance
635 comparison of protein A affinity resins for the purification of monoclonal antibodies, *J. Chromatogr.*
636 *B* 848 (2007) 97-107.
- 637

638

Figure Captions

639

640 **Figure 1:** Equilibrium adsorption isotherm of BSA on Q Sepharose Fast Flow resin.

641

642

643 **Figure 2:** Equilibrium adsorption isotherm of BSA on Sartobind® Q Nano membranes.

644

645

646 **Figure 3:** Effect of flow rate on breakthrough curves of BSA solutions on membrane adsorber (a) and
647 packed column (b).

648

649

650 **Figure 4:** Effect of superficial velocity (a) and residence time (b) on dynamic binding capacity of BSA
651 solutions for the two chromatographic media.

652

653

654 **Figure 5:** Comparison of bed utilization values between membrane adsorbers and packed column as a
655 function of residence time.

656

657

658 **Figure 6:** Elution profiles at different flow rates obtained in experiments at 100% breakthrough for the
659 membrane adsorber (a) and the packed column (b)

660

661 **Figure 7:** Productivity obtained in experiments at 10% breakthrough as a function of linear velocity:
662 comparison between membrane adsorbers and packed column.

663

664

665