Consequently, there is an urgent need for developing simple, efficient, non-toxic, selective, mild operating conditions, efficient, no need for chemical or thermal treatments, reliable purification, and eco-friendly [5]. In the last few decades, membrane technology has developed with the integration of filtration and adsorption processes [6,7]. Membrane-coated adsorbents were effectively applied in water desalination and removal of hazardous pollutants including heavy metal ions, anions, toxic organic compounds, and dyes from wastewater [8–10].

The excellent thermal and chemical stability, superior mechanical properties, and good film-forming characteristic of polysulfone (PS) [11–13], have attracted the attention of many membrane-interested researchers. The main drawbacks of PS membranes are the inherent hydrophobicity and non-wetting properties which facilitate the hydrophobic interaction and deposition of microorganisms and/or organic pollutants from the feed solution onto their surfaces, causing serious membrane biofouling [13–15], and consequently, poor permeation, diminishing water flux, and defects in the selectivity and durability of membrane. Both physical and chemical modifications can be applied to overcome these disadvantages. Using polymeric additives, dendrimers, inorganic fillers, inorganic nanoparticles, and carbon
nanomaterials during PS membrane fabrication, has been attracted a significant attention to enhance its hydrophilicity, antifouling properties, and performance [13,16,17].

Amongst membrane polymeric additives for water treatment, chitosan has been getting considerable attention [13,18,19], due to its eco-friendship, higher hydrophilicity, unique perm-selectivity for water [20], perfect thin film-forming ability, biodegradability, non-toxicity, acceptable anti-biofilm and antifouling properties [21], and dual ionic nature as it can be positively or negatively charged in an acidic or alkaline medium, respectively [22]. This charge fluctuation plays a key role in the performance of the membrane [23]. However, the main disadvantages of native chitosan such as poor acid stability, substandard mechanical characteristics [24], and low porosity and surface area [8], restrict their widespread applications in the water treatments. Again, physical and chemical refinements can be utilized to address these drawbacks. Chemical amendments can significantly enhance the chemomechanical stability of chitosan; however, these refinements usually are at the expense of its adsorption capacity, due to blocking medium, respectively [22]. This charge fluctuation plays a key role in the performance of the membrane [23]. However, the main disadvantages of native chitosan such as poor acid stability, substandard mechanical characteristics [24], and low porosity and surface area [8], restrict their widespread applications in the water treatments. Again, physical and chemical refinements can be utilized to address these drawbacks. Chemical amendments can significantly enhance the chemomechanical stability of chitosan; however, these refinements usually are at the expense of its adsorption capacity, due to blocking medium, respectively [22].

2. Materials and methods

Instrumentation: sources of materials; preparation of ionic liquid-based salicylaldehyde cross-linkers (3a,b), and low molecular weight chitosan (LMWC) are available in the electronic supplementary information (ESI).

2.1. Synthesis of poly(ionic) cross-linked chitosan Schiff bases (PICCSBs)

Generally, a solution of ionic liquid-based salicylaldehydes cross-linkers (3a,b) (equivalent to half molar N-content in LMWCs) in EtOH (30 mL) was added to a solution of LMWC (2 g) in 200 mL of a mixed solvent system of 2% aqueous acetic acid/ethanol under vigorous stirring over a period of 30 min at 70 °C. After stirring for further 24 h at the same temperature, the solution was partially evaporated under reduced pressure to give an oily residue which solidified by ultrasonic radiation in an excessive amount (300 mL) of ethyl acetate for 2 h. The isolated solids were collected by filtration and then washed with cold ethanol (3 x 10 mL). Finally, the desired products (PICCSB1,2) were dried in a vacuum oven at 40 °C for 24 h. The obtained products were characterized as follows:

2.1.1. Poly-N,N-(5-(N,N-dimethylammonium)pyridinium dichloride)-bis(salicylidene) chitosan (PICCSB1)

Yellow powder, yield (96%), FTIR (KBr, cm−1): 3441 (vs, br), 3169 (m, br), 1652 (vs, sh), 1628 (vs, sh), 1520 (m, sh), 1349 (m, sh), 1275 (m, sh), 1156 (s, sh), 1059 (m, sh), 891 (m, sh), 744 (m, sh).1H NMR (600 MHz, D2O) δ (ppm): 11.15 (s, 2H), 8.81 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 2H), 8.03–8.00 (m, 2H), 7.97 (dd, J = 6.5, 2.1 Hz, 2H), 7.84 (d, J = 2.4 Hz, 2H), 7.73 (dd, J = 8.7, 2.5 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 5.95 (s, 2H), 4.88 (s, 2H), 4.72 (s, 2H), 4.20–4.13 (m, 8H), 4.03 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 3.98–3.74 (m, 12H), 3.44 (s, 4H), 2.97 (s, 6H), 2.35 (s, 6H).

2.1.2. Poly-N,N-(5-(N,N-dimethylammonium)pyridinium dichloride)-bis(3-methylsalicylaldehyde) chitosan (PICCSB2)

Canary yellow powder, yield (96%), FTIR (KBr, cm−1): 3439 (vs, br), 3178 (m, br), 1650 (vs, sh), 1630 (vs, sh), 1522 (m, sh), 1356 (m, sh), 1276 (m, sh), 1157 (s, sh), 1063 (m, sh), 890 (m, sh), 749 (m, sh), and 556 cm−1.1H NMR (600 MHz, 1% CD3COOD/D2O 60 °C δ (ppm): D2O) δ (ppm): 11.15 (s, 2H), 8.83 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 2H), 8.11–8.00 (m, 2H), 7.96 (dd, J = 6.7, 2.1 Hz, 2H), 7.83 (d, J = 2.5 Hz, 2H), 7.76 (dd, J = 2.5, 2H), 5.92 (s, 2H), 4.85 (s, 4H), 4.72 (s, 2H), 4.25–4.13 (m, 8H), 4.03 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 3.98–3.82 (m, 8H), 3.81–3.69 (m, 4H), 3.44 (s, 4H), 2.95 (s, 6H), 2.84 (s, 6H), 2.15 (s, 6H).

2.2. Preparation of pristine PS membrane (M0)

The modified non-solvent induced phase inversion (NSIPI) technique was used to fabricate all membranes. In brief, a casting solution of PS was prepared by dissolving PS (3.8 g) in N-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) (15.21 g, 15.66 mL) under vigorous stirring at 60 °C for 1 h. Then, this solution was de-aerated under vacuum for 15 min. Afterward, the bubble-free casting solution was molded by either spreading over a nonwoven polyester fabric (novatex2483) and immersion into a non-solvent phase (milli-Q water) at the room temperature. The membrane should be stored in for 3 days in milli-Q water to get rid of the residual NMP.

2.3. Fabrication of mixed-matrix membranes (MMMs)

Generally, initially, homogenous solutions were prepared by dissolving PICCSBs (0.1 g) and PS (3.8 g), separately, in a mixed solvent system of 1% aqueous acetic acid/NMP (1:1 v/v, 10 mL) and NMP (9.20 g, 9.50 mL), respectively, by stirring (500 rpm) at 60 °C for 1 h. Then, the PICCSB solution was added in a very slow rate (1 drop/30 s) to the PS solution under vigorous stirring (1100 rpm) at 60 °C. An additional amount of NMP (0.93 mL) was added and the obtained turbid solution was vigorously stirred at 70 °C till obtaining a clear and homogeneous solution. Then, the casting solution was de-aerated under vacuum and molded using the NSIPI method as aforementioned. The compositions of all membranes are shown in Table 1.

2.4. Membrane physical characterization

Full details for the practical methods used for X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis, determination of the porosity, hydrophilicity, swelling,
and contact angles (Figs. S1 and S2, ESI†) of all membranes are described in the ESI†.

2.5. Membrane performance assessment

2.5.1. Pure water flux (PWF)

The PWF of each membrane with an effective surface area of 5 cm² was investigated using a lab-scale filtration apparatus (Fig. S3, ESI†) according to a protocol reported in our previous work [31]. The PWF ($J_w$) was calculated based on Eq. (1):

$$J_w = \frac{Q}{A \Delta t}$$

where $Q$ = amount of pure water permeate through a MMM of area $A$ (m²) at time $\Delta t$ (h) and $J_w$ is expressed in L/m²h.

2.5.2. Antifouling assessment

Bovine serum albumin (BSA) was chosen as a model protein to induce fouling to the surfaces of MMMs [34].

2.5.3. BSA ultrafiltration performance study

The fouling tendency of the membrane was assessed using the ultrafiltration experiment of an aqueous BSA solution through it. Initially, each MMM was compacted at a trans-membrane-pressure (TMP) of 0.1 MPa for 30 min. Then, the pressure on the membrane was raised to 0.3 MPa followed by filtration of pure water through the membrane. After 90 min of water flow, a steady-state water flux ($J_{w1}$) was calculated. Afterward, the pure water was replaced by an aqueous BSA solution (0.8 g/L), and the BSA flux ($J_{BSA}$) after 90 min flow was calculated. UV-Vis spectroscopy at 280 nm was used to monitor BSA rejection ($R\%$) which was calculated according to Eq. (2):

$$R\% = \left(1 - \frac{C_{BSA_{Permeate}}}{C_{BSA_{Feed}}} \right) \times 100$$

Here, $C_{BSA_{Permeate}}$ (mg/mL) and $C_{BSA_{Feed}}$ (mg/mL) represent the BSA concentration in permeate and feed, respectively. After the BSA filtration experiment, the MMM was flushed with milli-Q water for 15 min before measuring the steady-state PWF again ($J_{w2}$). Finally, the antifouling capacity of the membrane was calculated in terms of flux recovery ratio (FRR) based on Eq. (3):

$$FRR\% = \left(\frac{J_{w2}}{J_{w1}}\right) \times 100$$

The antifouling efficacies of membrane can be estimated from several parameters including FRR%, total fouling ($R_t$) ($R_t = 1 - J_{BSA}/J_{w1}$).

Scheme 1. Schematic flowchart of different chemical reactions used for the preparation of ammonium-pyridinium-based TSILs (crosslinking agents) (3a,b) and poly(ionic) crosslinked chitosan Schiff bases (PICCSBs, PICCSB₁ and PICCSB₂).
reversible fouling ($F_r$) ($F_r = (J_{w2} - J_{b0}) / J_{w1}$), and irreversible fouling ($F_i$) ($F_i = (J_{w1} - J_{w2}) / J_{w1}$) [35].

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Chemistry of synthesis of PICCSBs (PICCSB1 and PICCSB2)

New task-specific ionic liquids (TSILs) bearing ammonium and pyridinium cations have been fabricated starting from salicylaldehyde derivatives (3-R-Sal; $R = \text{H, Me}$) using a simple and common synthesis route that involves chloromethylation process to afford the chloromethyl salicylaldehyde derivatives (3-R-SalCl; $R = \text{H, Me}$) which were used for the quaternization of 4-dimethylaminopyridin (DMAP) to yield dual ammonium-pyridinium-based TSILs ($3a, b$) (See Scheme 1). These TSILs were applied as crosslinking agents for the as-prepared low molecular weight chitosan (LMWC) through Schiff base condensation reactions to prepare poly(ionic) crosslinked chitosan Schiff bases (PICCSBs; PICCSB1 and PICCSB2). These new antifouling agents were obtained in excellent yields (96–98%) and fully characterized (structurally and morphologically) based on elemental, spectral, and scanning electron microscopy (SEM) analysis.

3.2. Structural characterizations of LMWC and PICCSBs

3.2.1. Average molecular weight ($M_{av}$), degree of deacetylation (DD), and degree of cross-linking (DC)

The average molecular weight ($M_{av}$) for the LMWC sample was calculated from the intrinsic viscosity [$\eta$] values of its solution in CH$_3$COOH (0.3 mol/L) containing CH$_3$COONa (0.2 mol/L) according to the Mark-Houwink–Sakurada (MHS) Eq. (3) [36]:

$$[\eta] = K (M_{av})^\alpha$$

where $\eta$ is the intrinsic viscosity; $K$ and $\alpha$ are viscometric constants, $K = 0.93$ (mL/g) and $\alpha = 0.76$. The average molecular weight for LMWC samples was found to be 12.75 KDa.

Three different techniques (volumetric titration, FTIR, and elemental analysis (EA)) have been used for the calculation of the DD% for LMWC (see ESIF). The obtained results were collected in Table 2.

As the extent of crosslinking of LMWC with new TSILs is strongly correlated to the content of amino groups on the surface of LMWC, thus, the degree of crosslinking (DC) can be easily investigated through determining the amount of free amino groups on the surface of LMWC sample before and after crosslinking, using volumetric titration (see ESIF). Again, the obtained results were collected in Table 2.

3.2.2. Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR)

FTIR technique offers preliminary spectral evidence for the successful conversion of LMWC into PICCSBs. Comparing the FTIR spectra of the PICCSBs with the LMWC spectrum (Fig. 1A) revealed the retention of the main peaks that are characteristic for the LMWC backbone (3440 cm$^{-1}$, O-H and N-H; 1650 cm$^{-1}$, amid I C=O; 890 cm$^{-1}$, glycosidic bond) [26, 37], in the spectra of PICCSBs; confirming the successful formation of Schiff bases (PICCSBs).

In addition, the emergence of new absorption bands in the FTIR spectra of the PICCSBs around 1630 and 1275 cm$^{-1}$, characteristic for azomethine ($\text{H} = \text{C} = \text{N}$) and aryl–O fragments, respectively, of the salicylidene segment; prove the success of crosslinking of LMWC chains through Schiff base condensation between the amino and carbonyl groups of chitosan chains and ionic liquid based salicylaldehyde crosslinkers, respectively. In addition, the observation of three predominant peaks (1520 cm$^{-1}$, C=O; 749 cm$^{-1}$, Py ring; and 556 cm$^{-1}$, Her–N$^+$Cl$^-$), distinctive for the pyridinium-ammonium ionic liquid terminal [26], confirm the spreading of ionic liquid compartments on the surface of poly(ionic) cross-linked chitosan Schiff bases (PICCSBs).

3.2.3. NMR spectroscopy

The coexistence of major NMR peaks characteristic for the ammonium-pyridinium-based crosslinking agent ($3a$) and LMWC in the $^1$H NMR spectrum of poly(ionic) crosslinked chitosan Schiff base (PICCSB1) (Fig. 2) confirms its successful formation. As shown in Fig. 2, two sets of $^1$H signals were observed. The first group (framed with black rectangles) was noticed at chemical shift values 5.12,
4.19–3.44, and 2.35 ppm, are assignable to resonances of anomeric protons, H3–H6 connected to the non-anomeric carbons (C3–C6) in the glucopyranose ring, and acetyl H atoms (GlcNAc) in the chitosan backbone [26,38]. While the other set of peaks (framed with blue rectangles), distinctive for cross-linking agent (3a), was centered at δ (ppm); 11.16 (phenolic OH), 8.82–7.34 (azomethinic and aromatic protons), 5.95 (methylene H atoms), 4.88, 2.97, and 2.84 (different methyl H atoms). Furthermore, the disappearance of aldehyde proton signals in the spectrum of PICCSB1 (centered at 10.29 ppm in the spectrum of 3a), coupled with the great diminishing in the intensity of the peak characteristic for amino group (centered at 5.22 ppm in LMWC spectrum); confirms the formation of PICCSB1 by partial Schiff base condensation of aldehyde and amino groups of crosslinker (3a) and LMWC, respectively. Moreover, the 13C NMR spectrum of PICCSB1 emphasize the successful crosslinking of LMWC chains by ammonium-pyridinium-based crosslinker (3a) through Schiff base condensation reaction, as revealed from the emergence of new low-field peaks at 160.72, 160.62, and 154.87 ppm attributable for the resonance of azomethinic and phenolic carbon-atoms, respectively, of salicylidene backbone.

3.2.4. Morphological characterizations of PICCSBs

The SEM micrographs (Fig. S4, ESI†) were used to investigate the changes in the surface morphologies of PICCSBs in comparison to that of the native LMWC. As evident in Fig. S3, there are significant differences between the surface morphologies of PICCSBs and LMWCS. LMWCS displays a dense, smooth, and flat surface, while; PICCSBs show woven-like or sponge-like surfaces. This may be ascribed to the formation of additional hydrophilic (ionic charges, phenolic, and imine linkages) and hydrophobic sites (benzene rings) on the surfaces of PICCSBs that enhanced the interactions between LMWC chains in PICCSBs through H-bonding and hydrophobic interactions resulting in the formation of surfaces with cross-sectional pores and micro-void network.

3.3. Membranes characterization

3.3.1. Attenuated total reflection (ATR)-FTIR

Comparing the ATR-FTIR spectra of the as-fabricated MMMs (MMM1,2) with that of native PS membrane (M0)(Fig. 1B) offers preliminary evidence for the incorporation of PICCSBs into the matrix of polysulfone, confirming the successful fabrication of MMMs. To name few, as compared to the spectrum of M0, it is noticed that new spectral peaks were observed in the spectra of MMMs around 3450, 1660, 1579, 1281, and 858 cm⁻¹ which can assignable for the vibrations of N-H and O-H, azomethine (H-C=N), C=N, Ar–O, and R4N+Cl⁻ that belong to the chitosan, salicylidene, and ionic liquid segments of PICCSBs [30,31]. Moreover, the asymmetric and symmetric stretching vibration peaks of the O=S=O, that distinctive for PS backbone, were observed at ca 1295 and 1149 cm⁻¹, confirming the reserving of the structural features of PS after its surface modification with PICCSBs.

3.3.2. Morphology of the membranes

The thicknesses of new MMMs were measured using a micrometer screw gauge and were in the range of 98–115 μm. In addition, their surface and cross-section morphologies were inspected by SEM technique (Figs. 3 and S5, ESI†). Generally, the overall porosity of the membrane surface has significantly increased upon incorporation of PICCSBs into the matrix of PS, as shown in Fig. 3A–C. The surface of the native PS membrane (M0) is smooth and dense with a non-porous texture (Fig. 3A). Whereas, the surfaces of MMM1 and MMM2 are almost homogeneous porous networks with pore diameters (PD) in the ranges of 0.7–1.1 and 0.5–0.8 μm, respectively (Fig. 3B,C). On the other hand, it
is evident from the cross-sectional SEM micrographs (Fig. 3D–F) that both MMMs exhibited asymmetric extremely porous micro-void structures with many grooves and chancels on their respective upper layers (Fig. 3E,F), as compared with the parent PS membrane which has a layered structure with very few pores (Fig. 3D). Noteworthy, MMM1 has larger pores (diameters range 2.4–3.5 μm) than those in MMM2 (diameters range 1.1–1.5 μm). The significant enhancement in the membrane porosity upon the incorporation of PICCSBs could be ascribed to their extremely hydrophilic nature that enhances the overall hydrophilicity of the membrane to a great extent. This superior hydrophilicity has promoted the mutual diffusion of the membrane components from the casting solvent (NMP) to the non-solvent phase (coagulation solvent, water), and thus the coagulation time for the membrane will increases. Consequently, this slow coagulation allows longer phase inversion time coupled with a lower rate of segregation of PICCSB from casting medium up to the NMP-water interface, promoting the self-induced pore growth [31]. Interestingly, all new MMMs are typical ultrafiltration (UF) membranes with macro-pores upon the surface (PD 0.5–1.1 μm) and macro-voids (diameters range 1.1–3.5 μm) embedded across the membrane network.

The elemental composition of the MMMs was inspected using energy-dispersive X-ray (EDX) technique. The obtained results were represented as element mapping images (Fig. 3G,H) and EDX spectra (Figs. S6–S9, ESI†). The EDX element mapping results demonstrated the distribution of PICCSBs on the surface of PS. As the carbon, oxygen, and sulfur elements already exist in the PS surface, the element mapping of nitrogen and chlorine elements (from PICCSBs) was chosen to distinguish between the native PS membrane and MMMs. As shown in (Fig. 3G,H) and (Fig. S5), the nitrogen and chlorine elements can be detected only on the surface of MMMs.

### 3.3.3. Water uptake (hydration), contact angle and porosity measurements

The hydrophilicity of new membranes was assessed based on their respective water-contact angle (WCA) and water uptake (i.e. hydration) values. The WCA of the MMMs was decreased from 85.92° (M0) to 45.73° (MMM1) by adding PICCSB1 into the matrix of PS membrane (Fig. 4B). This can be attributed to the superior hydrophilic nature of PICCSB1 owing to the strong hydration effect of pyridinium and quaternary ammonium groups [39,40]. Noteworthy, MMM1 displayed a lower contact angle (WCA = 45.70°) than MMM2 (WCA = 50.11°), indicating that MMM2 has lower hydrophilic characters than MMM1. This may be ascribed to the presence of hydrophobic methyl groups in the crosslinker of PICCSB2 (incorporated in MMM2) which reduce its overall hydrophilicity and consequently its respective blend membrane (MMM2), as well. Additionally, as evident in Fig. 4A, the water uptake (WU) of the MMMs was sharply increased from 27.23% (M0) to 95.31% (MMM1) and 87.22% (MMM2) after incorporation of PICCSB1 and PICCSB2, respectively, into the matrix of M0. Generally, the incorporation of PICCSBs into the matrix of the PS has improved its hydrophilicity to a great extent. Noteworthy, WU performance is pH-dependent with maximum uptake from the acidic medium. For instance, MMM1 showed WU values; 95.3%, (pH 4), 89.84% (pH 7), and 83.73% (pH 9).
This may be attributed to the protonation of the unreacted amino and phenolic groups of PICCSBs at lower pH 4, increasing the hydration effects of these fragments.

As the performance of any membrane is strongly correlated with the pore size distribution (PSD) on the internal and external surfaces of the membrane, therefore, the PSD of new MMMs was investigated using A QUANTACHROME POREMASTER 60-GT, as shown in Fig. 4C. As evident in this figure and in Fig. S4, ESI†, both membranes (MMM1,2) exhibited many channels and pores. The surface of each membrane shows many channels with internal diameters in the ranges of 4.5–6.8 μm (MMM1) and 5.6–8.5 μm (MMM2). On the other hand, the core of each membrane involves many spherical and polygonal pores with a hierarchical pore size distribution ranging from small internal pores with PD values (MMM1, 0.7–1.3; MMM2, 1.3–3.7 μm) to large internal pores with PD values (MMM1, 57.5–77.4; MMM2, 76.3–104.5 μm).

3.4. Membranes performance

3.4.1. Zeta potential and ion-exchange capacity studies

The outer surface charge of native and mixed-matrix PS membranes was investigated using zeta (ζ) potential measurements. As evident from Fig. 5A, the native PS membrane displayed a very low positive ζ-potential at pH 4, whereas, it is exhibited a negative potential at pH > 4 (isoelectric pH (pl-pH) = 4.25). Therefore, the cationic additives (PICCSBs) could be readily deposited on the negatively-charged outer surface of PS to fabricate mixed-matrix PS membranes (MMMs). This leads to the acquisition of positive charges on the outer surfaces of these MMMs and consequently positive ζ-potentials. These positive values for ζ-potentials for MMMs were observed over a broad pH range (4–8) and are attributed to the spreading of quaternary ammonium and pyridinium groups onto the barrier interface of membranes, preventing the absorption of anions onto their surfaces in acidic medium [41]. Interestingly, the ζ-potentials of the MMM surfaces decreased systematically with an increase of pH of the medium. Moreover, at higher pH values (pH > 8.25) the ζ-potentials for these membranes became negatively charged. For instance, the ζ-potential of MMM1 has decreased from +51.2 mV (pH 4) to +8.1 mV (pH 6) and −9.0 (pH 9). These changes may be ascribed to the slight accumulation of anions (OH−, from the alkaline medium; Cl− from quaternary salt) on the surface of the membranes, diminishing their streaming potentials [42,43]. In addition, the deprotonation of salicylidene fragments in PICCSBs under pH > 6, forming phenolate anions [44], may also share in the dramatic decrease of the positive surface potentials to reach negative values at pH > 8, eventually. The isoelectric pH (pl-pH) values were found to be 8.25 and 8.26 for MMM1 and MMM2, respectively. Overall, these results confirm that the incorporation of PICCSBs into the matrix of the PS membrane imparts persistent positive charges onto its outer surface over a wide pH range.
The ion-exchange capacity (IEC) is a crucial feature for assessing the selectivity of membranes. Therefore, three different techniques were applied to determine the IEC of the nascent PS membrane (M0) and the new MMMs towards the nitrate anion (mimic to denitrification process); namely, elemental analysis (EA) (N%) and indirect titration or spectrophotometric determination of the NO$_3^-$ anion as represented in Fig. 5B. In general, blending of PICCSBs into PS membrane has greatly improved its anion-exchange capacity owing to spreading of active cationic sites (ammonium and pyridinium) on the surface of MMMs.

The theoretical (virtual) IEC values were calculated from the EA results using Eq. (4) [45]:

$$\text{IEC} = 10 \frac{X_N}{M_N} \text{ mmol g}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where, $X_N$ and $M_N$ represent the weight fraction of nitrogen (%) in the membrane, after NO$_3^-$ uptake, and its molar mass (g mol$^{-1}$), respectively. Based on N% in each membrane and Eq. (4), the IEC values of membranes M0, MMM1, and MMM2 were 0.64 ± 0.09, 2.33 ± 0.13, and 1.98 ± 0.11, respectively. However, the IEC calculated for the MMMs from EA are 6% ± 1% lower than that measured spectrophotometrically, whereas, they are 15% ± 2% lower than that obtained by titration. This discrepancy mainly arises from the existence of free basic aminogroups, due to PICCSBs blending, in the network of membranes [45]. These amine groups would surely affect the titration and spectrophotometric determination of the nitrate anion.

Generally, the different methods used for IEC determination show that the nitrate-exchange capacity of the PICCSB$_1$-incorporated membrane (MMM$_1$) is ~14% higher than that of the PICCSB$_2$-supported membrane (MMM$_2$). This preferable nitrate-uptake by MMM$_1$ could be attributed to the higher population of active cationic moieties (anion-selective groups) on its surface in comparison to MMM$_2$; a result attributed to the hydrophobic nature of the neat PS surface which enhances mutual interactions between M0 and BSA and increases the membrane hydrophilicity. As depicted in Fig. 6B, the PWF of M0 was remarkably decreased 23.86 L/m$^2$h which is 9.3-times higher than that of the neat PS membrane (M0)$_2$, whereas, the protein retention by MMM$_1$ was only 41.9%, (2.5-fold lower than that of the M0). On the other hand, the PWF and protein rejection for the MMM$_2$ membrane was 222.43 L/m$^2$h and 47.6%, respectively.

This amazing water permeation performance could be ascribed to the greatly enhanced surface hydrophilicity and porosity of PS owing to PICCSBs blending. Moreover, these hydrophilic additives (PICCSBs) will also enhance the interaction between the hydrophilic pores and pure water within the porous framework of MMMs; resulting in improved water mass transfer across them. Contrary, PICCSBs will diminish the hydrophobicity of membranes resulting in reducing their propensity to adsorb the organic contaminants (BSA) [46].

3.4.3. Anti fouling performance

The anti fouling performance of newly fabricated mixed-matrix membranes (MMM$_1$, MMM$_2$) was investigated as compared to the neat PS membrane (M0) using three consecutive ultrafiltration experiments (pure water-BSA solution (0.5 g/L)- pure water water) through each membrane under fixed operation conditions (P, 0.3 MPa; T, 26 °C). As depicted in Fig. 6B, the PWF of M0 was remarkably decreased upon exchanging the pure water (phase I, Fig. 6B) with a fouling-inducing protein (BSA) solution (phase II, Fig. 6B). This drop is attributed to the hydrophobic nature of the neat PS surface which enhances mutual interactions between M0 and BSA and increases the membrane fouling propensity to form a hydrophobic water-impermeable interface (M0-BSA) on the membrane surface. Thus, the native PS membrane demonstrated a very low flux recovery ratio (FRR) (37%, Fig. 7).
contrast, PICCSBs-supported PS membranes (MMM1, MMM2) present high permeability before, during, and after BSA ultrafiltration with elevated FRRs than that assigned for bare PS membrane. For instance, PICCSB1-PS membrane shows the highest permeability during all ultrafiltration stages (I–III) with little flux declining degree after filtration of the foulant solution (BSA) and a highest FRR% (91%, Fig. 7). Again, this can be attributed to the increase of the surface and pore hydrophilicity of MMM1, owing to the incorporation of PICCSB1, which reduces mutual interactions between MMM1 surface and BSA, reducing its fouling propensity, accordingly.

As aforesaid, the FRR is a key parameter in predicting the membrane fouling resistance, moreover, the results of fouling indices (total (Ft), reversible (Fr), and irreversible (Fir) fouling) are important in providing more detail concerning the fouling propensity and mechanism. In general, the FRR results (Fig. 7) proved that the incorporation of PICCSBs into PS matrix has remarkably improved its antifouling performance. The values of FRR for the bare, PICCSBγ, and PICCSBβ-supported PS membranes (M0, MMM1, MMM2) were 39.1, 91.9, and 87.1%, respectively; indicating the superior fouling impedance of the PICCSBs-blended membranes. Interestingly, the trend of FRR changes is in accordance with the results of WCA and PWF of the as-fabricated MMMs. The excellent fouling resistance of MMMs can be ascribed to the adsorption of water molecules over the hydrophilic surface of the membrane to form a thin hydration layer of water molecules upon the outer membrane surface that blocks the adsorption of organic foulants [48].

The fouling indices depicted in Fig. 7 revealed that the values of total, reversible, and irreversible fouling for all mixed-matrix membranes were less than that of bare PS membrane. For example, values of Ft, Fr, and Fir were reduced from 72.25, 38.78, and 33.95% for the native PS membrane (M0) to 25.88, 19.23 and 6.64%, respectively, for the most fouling-resistant membrane (MMM1). Notably the reversible fouling is due to the reversible adsorption-desorption processes of foulant molecules and the latter can be easily removed by a simple hydraulic cleaning (water flushing), whereas, the irreversible fouling arises from the stable adsorption of foulant molecules on the membrane surface and/or pores of the membrane and can be only removed by chemical processes. Once more, the better antifouling features of the PICCSBs-PS membranes over the native PS membrane can be explained by increased hydrophilicity of the modified membranes. The integration of PICCSBs into the membrane matrix imparted many accessible H-bond donor/acceptor sites (hydroxyl, carboxyl, amino, and azomethine groups) for the surface of the PICCSBs-supported membranes, inducing the formation of a thin hydration layer of water film by H-bonding interactions on the surface of PS membrane. This hydration layer prevents the adsorption of fouling-inducing molecules on the membrane surface and the subsequent fouling process, accordingly [48]. In brief, the potent hydrophilic additives (PICCSBs) have the capacity to form a hydration barrier that helps in reducing the adsorption of fouling-inducing molecules (BSA) on the membrane surface, minimizing membrane fouling. The results of fouling parameters have confirmed earlier results obtained from measurements of water contact angle and pure water flux.

Eventually, it would be interesting to compare our results with those previously reported in the literature as depicted in Table 3 [32,49–51]. Our membranes (MMM1 and MMM2) were more hydrophilic, as revealed from elevation of water contact angle (WCA) values, and consequently have greater water uptake (WU) than most reported PSF-based membranes. This in turn leads to higher pure water throughput along with low fouling propensity [31]. Where, MMM1 displayed very high pure water permeability, in comparison to other MMMs, as revealed from the elevated PWF values.

In addition, the decreasing in fouling indices, such as diminished BSA-rejection values coupled with higher flux recovery ratio (FRR), is

![Fig. 7. Results of fouling parameters; flux recovery ratio (FRR), total fouling (Ft), reversible fouling (Fr), and irreversible fouling (Fir) for the native PS membrane (M0) and mixed-matrix membranes (MMM1, MMM2).](image)

Table 3 Comparison of the physical parameters and performance indices of our as-fabricated membranes with those previously reported in the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membrane</th>
<th>WCA (°)</th>
<th>WU (% h)</th>
<th>PWF (L/m² h)</th>
<th>BSA-R (%)</th>
<th>FRR (%)</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS@PSF</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>76.215</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>[31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILCSBβPPS</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>129.17</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>[51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILCSBγTPNPPS</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>158.10</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>[31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS@PCNTuPPS</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>55.34</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>[49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS/NTCSO/CNTs/PS</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>[49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSCS@PPS</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>117.09</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>[50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPCS@PPS</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>118.53</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>[50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAPS</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>88.34</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>[51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO@QAPS</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>150.11</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>[51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMM1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>238.61</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>Our work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMM2</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>222.43</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>Our work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] WCA, water contact angle; WU, water uptake; PWF, pure-water flux; BSA-R, bovine serum albumin rejection; FRR, flux recovery ratio; PILCSB, poly-ionic liquid chitosan Schiff base; TNP, titanium oxide nanoparticles; CNTs, multiwall carbon nanotubes; CNTsCOOH, Carboxy functionalized carbon nanotubes; NSCS, N-succinyl chitosan; NPPCS, N-propylphosphonyl chitosan; QAPS, Quaternized ammonium polysulfone; GO, graphene oxide.
indicative for the extremely low fouling propensity of our as-fabricated membranes, as compared to the reported ones. In general, the new fabricated membranes in this work could be ranked in the forefront of PSF-based membranes in comparison to the earlier reported ones, and may offer promising ultrafiltration membranes for nitrate-polluted water remediation.

4. Conclusion

New poly(ionic) cross-linked chitosan Schiff bases (PICCSBs) have been successfully synthesized using a facile and straightforward chemical protocol. PICCSBs have been used to improve the main characteristics of PS membrane including hydrophilicity, porosity, permeability, and fouling-resistance, as well as, nitrate uptake. The positively-charged PS-PICCSBs mixed-matrix membranes (MMMs) were fabricated by the nonsolvent-induced phase separation (NIPS) technique. The results of elemental and spectral analysis as well as SEM-EDX examination confirm the successful fabrication of PICCSBs and MMMs. In general, the main properties of PS membrane (porosity, hydrophilicity, surface charge, and fouling-resistance) have been positively affected and greatly improved after blending with PICCSBs, compared to the native PS membrane. From SEM images it is evident that the new MMMs are typical ultrafiltration (UF) membranes with macro-pores spread over their surfaces with a pore diameter (PD) range 0.5–1.1 μm and macro-voids (PD range 1.1–3.5 μm) embedded into the membrane network. The water contact angle (WCA) has declined from 85.92° (M0) to 45.72° (MMM1) and 50.11° (MMM2); indicating increased hydrophilicity of the PICCSB-supported membranes. Simultaneously, the water uptake (WU) of the MMMs was sharply increased from 27.23% (M0) to 95.31% (MMM1) and 87.22% (MMM2) after incorporation of PICCSB1 and PICCSB2, respectively, into the matrix of M0. The PS membrane surface potential has switched from negative to positive values, over a broad pH range (4–8), by blending with PICCSBs as revealed from the measured zeta potentials. The pure water flux (PWF) values of PICCSBs-blended membranes were 238.6 L/m²h and 222.41 L/m²h for MMM1 and MMM2 which are 9.3-fold and 8.7-fold, respectively, higher than that of the neat PS membrane (M0). Meanwhile, the rejection of the fouling-inducing model (BSA) has declined from 96.61% in the case of M0 to 41.9% and 47.6% for MMM1 and MMM2, respectively, indicating minimized propensity of BSA adsorption on the membrane surface and consequently reduced fouling. These parameters are in accordance with the results of fouling indices (flux recovery ratio (FRR), total (Fr), reversible (Fr), and irreversible (Fr) fouling) of modified membranes. The FRR% has greatly increased for MMMs as compared to M0. In contrary, all types of fouling indices have remarkably reduced for MMMs in comparison to M0. In addition, the ion-exchange capacity (IEC), as investigated for the nitrate anion, of the PICCSB1-incorporated membrane (MMM1) is ~34% and ~14% higher than that of the native PS membrane (M0) and PICCSB2-supported membrane (MMM2), respectively. In essence, PICCSBs act as excellent membrane-upgrading modifiers for denitrification and wastewater treatment applications. The novelty of this study can be highlighted in the following achievements: (i) fabrication, for the first time, of dual (ammonium/pyridinium) ionic liquid crosslinking agents for chitosan, to give (poly(ionic) cross-linked chitosan Schiff bases (PICCSBs)); (ii) PICCSBs have effectively acted as synergistic hydrophilicity-modulators, antifouling, and pore-forming/stabilizing additives for a PS ultrafiltration membrane and thus increase its pure water throughput.
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