Mechanistic Formalism for Membrane Transport Generated by Osmotic and Mechanical Pressure
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Abstract. Since the physical interpretation of practical Kedem–Katchalsky (KK) equations is not clear, we consider an alternative, mechanistic approach to membrane transport generated by osmotic and hydraulic pressure. We study a porous membrane with randomly distributed pore sizes (radii). We postulate that reflection coefficient ($\sigma_p$) of a single pore may equal 1 or 0. From this postulate we derive new (mechanistic) transport equations. Their advantage is in clear physical interpretation and since we show they are equivalent to the KK equations, the interpretation of the latter became clearer as well. Henceforth the equations allow clearer and more detailed interpretation of results concerning membrane mass transport.

This is especially important from the point of view of biophysical studies on permeation processes across biological membranes, cell membranes including.
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Introduction

Thermodynamic formalism of nonelectrolyte transport across membranes elaborated by Kedem and Katchalsky (1958, 1961, 1963); Katchalsky and Curran (1965) is a convenient and widely used as a scientific tool. Its main tools are the so-called practical equations describing membrane transport processes generated simultaneously by osmotic pressure $\Delta \Pi$ and mechanical pressure $\Delta P$. The equations were derived from principles of linear thermodynamics of irreversible processes. Their standard form is:

$$J_v = L_p \Delta P - L_p \sigma \Delta \Pi$$

$$j_s = \omega \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma) \varepsilon J_v$$
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where: $J_v, j_s$ – fluxes; $L_p, \sigma, \omega$ – coefficients (of filtration, reflection, and permeation, respectively); $\bar{c}$ – a suitably defined mean concentration. The equations hold for membrane systems with sufficiently diluted, well-mixed solutions. In biophysics the equations were used mainly in studies of passive transport processes across biological membranes (Katchalsky and Curran 1965; Sha’afi et al. 1970; Tyree 1970; Ginsburg 1971; Fiscus 1975, 1977, 1986; Sha’aﬁ and Gary-Bobo 1976; Steudle et al. 1987; Steudle and Brinckmann 1989; Tyree et al. 1994; Kargol and Kargol 2000 and others).

The phenomenological parameters appearing in these equations are defined as follows (Kedem and Katchalsky 1958, 1961, 1963; Katchalsky and Curran 1965):

\begin{align}
L_p &= \left( \frac{J_v}{\Delta P} \right)_{\Delta \Pi = 0} \\
\sigma &= \left( \frac{\Delta P}{\Delta \Pi} \right)_{J_v = 0} \\
\omega &= \left( \frac{j_s}{\Delta \Pi} \right)_{J_v = 0}
\end{align}

These formulae express the physical meaning of the parameters and to some extent they determine experimental techniques for measurement of parameters (Kedem and Katchalsky 1961; Katchalsky and Curran 1965; Grygorczyk 1978). Since its inception the Kedem-Katchalsky (KK) formalism has been in various ways modified, expanded and complemented (Kedem and Katchalsky 1961; Patlak et al. 1963; Siegler and Kedem 1966; Zelman 1972; Levitt 1974; Monticelli and Celentano 1983; Kargol and Ślęzak 1985; Del Castillo and Mason 1986; Imai 1989; Kargol and Kargol 1989; Ślęzak and Turczynski 1992; Kargol 1994, 1996; Kargol et al. 1997; Kleinhans 1998; Kargol 1999; Katkov 2000 and others) with the goal of expanding its scope as well as interpretation of processes already included. Several attempts are also known (Kedem and Katchalsky 1961; Katchalsky and Curran 1965; Zelman 1972; Levitt 1974; Sha’aﬁ and Gary-Bobo 1976; Kargol et al. 1997; Kleinhans 1998; Katkov 2000) aimed at reducing the number of phenomenological parameters from three to two.

In general one could say that the interpretation of KK equations is not entirely clear. In particular this issue concerns the solute flux equation. E.g. it is believed that the term $(1 - \sigma)cJ_v$ in this equation represents the convective flux carried by $J_v$. As we show this term should be understood differently. Moreover, one could also question the interpretation of coefficient $\omega$. These issues are discussed in more detail in the appendix.

Considerin known issues with the interpretation of these thermodynamic transport equations in this paper we present an alternative mechanistic analysis of processes of membrane substances transport generated by osmotic and hydraulic pressures.

We consider a generic porous membrane having a number $N$ of pores permeable to the solvent. Typically the pores vary in their size and spatial distribution. We
assume that their permeability to the solute is determined by the relative pore and solute molecules’ sizes and assign each pore a coefficient $\sigma_p$ equal either 1 (impermeable pores) or 0 (permeable pores) (Kargol and Kargol 2000; Kargol 2001; Kargol et al. 2001). Hence a number $n_a$ of smallest pores form an ideal barrier to this solute, while the remaining pores ($n_b = N - n_a$) are permeable. Based on this postulate we derive transport equations (for fluxes $J_v$ and $j_s$) with three phenomenological parameters, i.e. $L_p$, $\sigma$ and $\omega_d$, where the latter is a coefficient of diffusive solute permeation. We call them the mechanistic equations after the derivation method.

The interpretation of transport equations obtained in this work is entirely clear, contrary to the KK equations. We show, however, that the mechanistic equations are equivalent to the KK equations. Henceforth the latter gained in clarity of their interpretation. We also found correlation relations for membrane transport parameters. Consequently, both the KK and mechanistic equations were rewritten in reduced form involving not two but three transport parameters.

In this work we also show a comparative analysis of functioning of the KK and mechanistic equations. The authors believe that this work opens new possibilities for application of both KK and mechanistic equations in studies of nonelectrolyte transport in artificial and biological membranes. The two sets of equations together become a more sophisticated and better understood scientific tool.

Owing to the mechanistic transport equations obtained in this work, new and radically more favourable research possibilities have now developed, concerned with passive transport processes in biological membranes, cell membranes including. Moreover, results of former studies obtained on the basis of the KK equations, which were not amenable to clear interpretation before, can now be interpreted. The number of such research results is relatively large, as seen for instance in the papers (Katchalsky and Curran 1965; Sha’afi et al. 1970; Tyree 1970; Ginsburg 1971; Levitt 1974; Fiscus 1975, 1977, 1986; Sha’afi and Gary-Bobo 1976; Steudle et al. 1987; Steudle and Brinckmann 1989; Tyree et al. 1994). Their hitherto interpretation is most often fragmentary and ambiguous (at times wrong). It follows especially from the fact that the KK equations apply for homogenous membranes, a criterion, which is not met by cell membranes. Those membranes have their water and solute transporting channels differentiated geometrically. Hence follows a special utility of the mechanistic equations, which are concerned just with substance transport across membranes of differentiated pore sizes.

**Mechanistic analysis of membrane substances transport processes generated by osmotic and hydraulic pressures**

*Model membrane system with a generic porous membrane*

We consider the problem of membrane transport generated by mechanical and osmotic pressure differently from the method developed by KK. Our approach, initiated in our papers (Kargol and Kargol 2000; Kargol 2001; Kargol et al. 2001)
Figure 1. The model membrane system with well-mixed solutions ($M$ – membrane; $A, B$ – compartments; $K_p$ – capillary; $m$ – stirrer; $c_1, c_2$ – concentrations; $P_1, P_2$ – mechanical pressures). Fluxes are described in text.

is of mechanistic nature. The starting point for the analysis is a membrane system shown schematically in Fig. 1. Two compartments $A$ and $B$ filled with solutions $c_1$ and $c_2$ (respectively) of the same solute are separated by a generic selective porous membrane $M$. The solutions are well mixed by mechanical devices (stirrer $m$) and $c_1 < c_2$. The former compartment is subject to mechanical pressure $P_1$, and the latter $- P_2$, where $P_1 < P_2$. In such case there is an osmotic pressure:

$$\Delta \Pi = RT \Delta c = RT( c_2 - c_1)$$

as well as mechanical pressure $\Delta P = P_2 - P_1$ across the membrane.

We assume the membrane has a number $N$ of pores permeable to the solvent. Typically the pores are modeled as being approximately cylindrical and normal to the membrane surface. For a typical porous membrane, like cellophane, nephrophane, or collodion membranes, the pores vary randomly in their dimensions, i.e. the cross-section radii. Their spatial distribution in the membrane is random as well. For biological membranes the pores (if we treat certain types of channels, e.g. water channels, as such) are typically more uniform in size. The pores can be however ordered in a series according to their radii, from the smallest ($r_1^{\text{min}}$) to the largest ($r_N^{\text{max}}$):

$$r_1^{\text{min}} < r_2 < \cdots < r_i < \cdots < r_N^{\text{max}}$$

For such a membrane one can select a solute (with a molecular radius $r_s$) for which a number $n_a$ of the smallest pores (with radii $r$ such that $r_1^{\text{min}} \leq r < r_s$) form an ideal barrier. The remaining pores, a total of $n_b = N - n_a$, are permeable. This fact can be described by assigning a parameter $\sigma_p$ to each pore. The parameter can be only assume integer values either 1 (for impermeable pores) or 0 (for permeable
ones) and as we show later this postulate is closely related to the membrane reflection coefficient. As a justification of the postulate, let us assume that there is a relatively small number \( \Delta N \) of unstable pores (with radii close to \( r_s \)), i.e. pores that change their solute permeability properties. This could be caused e.g. by a transient blockage of a pore to solute by a passing molecule or a transient decrease in pore radius due to a conformational change of molecule complex forming the pore (e.g. proteins forming a channel). However, it seems reasonable to assume that at any given moment the number of pores regaining their permeability to solute equals the number of pores becoming impermeable. Henceforth, there is a clear and stable division of pores into permeable (\( \sigma_p = 0 \)) and impermeable (\( \sigma_p = 1 \)).

It follows that if a membrane as a whole (a complex of \( N \) pores) has all pores impermeable to the solute, its reflection coefficient \( \sigma = 1 \) and the membrane is called semipermeable. On the other hand, if all pores are permeable to solvent as well as solute, then \( \sigma = 0 \) and the membrane is permeable (non selective). If only a fraction \( n_a \) (of the total of \( N \) pores) is impermeable, while the remaining pores (\( n_b \)) allow solute flow, the membrane reflection coefficient has a fractional value \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \). Such a membrane is called selective and is a subject of our study. We might add that osmosis is understood as the solvent (water) transport across a semipermeable membrane driven by the osmotic pressure. This definition implies that in selective membranes osmosis takes place through pores \( n_a \) only, for which the total reflection coefficient is 1.

**Equation for the volume flux**

We begin our analysis of transport processes taking place in a system shown in Fig. 1, with an observation that as a result of pressures \( \Delta \Pi \) and \( \Delta P \) on the membrane \( M \), there is a solvent volume flux \( (J_{va} = J_{vwa}) \) in membrane pores \( n_a \) (for which \( \sigma_p = 1 \)). In pores \( n_b \) (with \( \sigma_p = 0 \)) there is a solution volume flux. The fluxes are given by the following equations:

\[
J_{va} = L_{pa} \Delta P - L_{pa} \Delta \Pi \quad (6)
\]

\[
J_{vb} = L_{pb} \Delta P \quad (7)
\]

where \( L_{pa} \) (resp. \( L_{pb} \)) is the filtration coefficient of pores \( n_a \) (resp. \( n_b \)) defined as:

\[
L_{pa} = \left( \frac{J_{va}}{\Delta P} \right)_{\Delta \Pi = 0}
\]

resp.

\[
L_{pb} = \left( \frac{J_{vb}}{\Delta P} \right)_{\Delta \Pi = 0}
\]

The fluxes flow in opposite directions as those indicated by arrows in Fig. 1. The net of the two, denoted \( J_v \):

\[
J_v = J_{va} + J_{vb} \quad (8)
\]

is called a volume flux.
One can easily notice in the above three equations that there is a value of pressure $\Delta P = \Delta P_m$ for which $J_v = 0$. Henceforth from equations (5) and (6) we get:

$$\Delta P_m = \frac{L_{pa}}{L_p} \Delta \Pi$$

(9)

where

$$L_p = L_{pa} + L_{pb}$$

(10)

is the total membrane filtration coefficient. Introducing the following notation:

$$\sigma_k = \frac{L_{pa}}{L_{pa} + L_{pb}} = \frac{L_{pa}}{L_p}$$

(11)

we obtain from equation (8):

$$\Delta P_m = \sigma_k \Delta \Pi$$

This relation holds if $J_v = 0$. Thus:

$$\sigma_k = \left( \frac{\Delta P_m}{\Delta \Pi} \right)_{J_v = 0}$$

(12)

The above formula is identical with a definition of reflection coefficient $\sigma$ given in the KK formalism (i.e. equation (4)), what implicates, that $\sigma_k \equiv \sigma$. Its physical interpretation is however different. In our framework the parameter $\sigma$ is a ratio of the filtration coefficient $L_{pa}$ (of pores $N_a$) to the total membrane filtration coefficient $L_p$, as shown by equation (11). Therefore if $L_{pa} = 0$, then according to equation (11) we get $\sigma = 0$. Such a membrane is permeable (non selective). On the other hand if $L_{pb} = 0$, then for $L_{pa} > 0$ we obtain $\sigma = 1$ meaning the membrane is semipermeable. For $0 < L_{pa} < L_p$ the reflection coefficient has a value $0 < \sigma < 1$ and the membrane is selective.

Parameters $L_{pa}$ and $L_{pb}$ are easy to determine provided $L_p$ and $\sigma$ are known. Namely, equation (11) yields:

$$L_{pa} = \sigma L_p$$

(13)

and recalling that $L_p = L_{pa} + L_{pb}$, we get also:

$$L_{pb} = (1 - \sigma)L_p$$

(14)

When $\Delta P \neq \Delta P_m$ a volume flux is induced in the system and using equations (6) and (7) we obtain from equation (8):

$$J_v = J_{va} + J_{vb} = (L_{pa} + L_{pb}) \Delta P - L_{pa} \Delta \Pi$$

Substituting (10) and (11) we finally get:

$$J_v = L_p \Delta P - L_p \sigma \Delta \Pi$$

(15)
The equation has the same form as the KK equation for a volume flux. However, interpretation of the coefficient $\sigma$ is somewhat different. In our framework it is given by equation (10), while in the KK formalism it is described by the Stavermann relation (Katchalsky and Curran 1965):

$$\sigma = -\frac{L_{pD}}{L_p}$$

where $L_{pD}$ is the so-called osmotic flux coefficient. We note that both in our approach and in the KK formalism the coefficient $L_p$ is defined by the same formula:

$$L_p = \left(\frac{J_v}{\Delta P}\right)_{\Delta \Pi = 0}$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

**Equation for the solute flux**

In this section we consider the solute flux across a membrane. The KK equation for the solute flow $j_s$ has a form:

$$j_s = \omega \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\tilde{c}J_v$$

It can also be written as:

$$j_s = j_{sk} + j_{kk}$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

where

$$j_{sk} = \omega \Delta \Pi$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

and the term:

$$j_{kk} = (1 - \sigma)\tilde{c}J_v$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

is treated as a convective flux, i.e. the solute flux carried in membrane pores by $J_v$. Let us now analyze the fluxes in the mechanistic framework. Again, our considerations are based on a system shown in Fig. 1. All fluxes induced either by mechanical pressure $\Delta P$ or osmotic pressure $\Delta \Pi$ are shown as arrows in Fig. 1. They are denoted by $J_{va}$, $J_{vb}$, $j_s$, $j_d$, $j_k$ and $J_{vwb}$, where $J_{va} = J_{vwa}$ is the solvent flux permeating pores $n_a$ (impermeable to the solute), $J_{vb}$ denotes the volume flux flowing in pores $n_{0b}$ permeable to the solute as well, $j_s$ is the solute flux, $j_d$ – the diffusive solute flux, and $j_k$ – the convective solute flux. We use a sign convention where fluxes directed to the right ($J_{vb}$, $j_s$, $j_d$, and $j_k$) are positive, and the others ($J_v$ and $J_{va}$) – negative. One might add that $J_v$ is negative if $|J_{va}| > |J_{vb}|$. We also recall that if $\Delta P \neq \Delta P_m$ then there is a nonzero volume flux ($J_v \neq 0$) in the system.

We begin our analysis of fluxes $j_d$ and $j_k$ with a more detailed discussion of equations (6) and (7). The former refers to pores $n_a$ (permeable to the solvent only). It follows that if both osmotic $\Delta \Pi$ and mechanical $\Delta P$ pressures are applied to the membrane, then the total volume flux $J_{va}$ generated within these pores equals the
solvent flux $J_{vwa}$. No solute flow takes place in these pores ($j_{sa} = 0$ since $\sigma_a = 1$). As for equation (6), it is concerned with pores $n_b$, i.e. pores permeable to both the solvent and the solute molecules. With the osmotic $\Delta \Pi$ and mechanical $\Delta P$ pressures across the membrane the equation can be rewritten as:

$$J_{vb} = L_{pb} \Delta P - L_{pb} \sigma_b \Delta \Pi = L_{pb} \Delta P$$

since the reflection coefficient $\sigma_b$ of pores $n_b$ equals 0. We note that the volume flux $J_{vb}$ has two components:

$$J_{vb} = J_{vwb} + J_{vsb} > 0 \quad (20)$$

where $J_{vwb}$ is the solvent (e.g. water) volume flux, and $J_{vsb}$ is the solute volume flux. Both fluxes are generated by simultaneous processes of filtration (induced by $\Delta P$) and diffusion (since $\Delta \Pi > 0$). In its full generality the problem is rather complex and we consider a simpler case when $\Delta P = 0$ and $\Delta \Pi > 0$ first. In this case only the solute and solvent diffusion in opposite directions takes place and the analogue of equation (20) has the form:

$$J_{vdb}^{\Delta \Pi} = J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi} + J_{vsb}^{\Delta \Pi} = 0 \quad (21)$$

where as before $J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi}$ is the solvent volume flux and $J_{vsb}^{\Delta \Pi}$ – the solute volume flux. They satisfy the condition:

$$|J_{vdb}^{\Delta \Pi}| = |J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi}| \neq 0 \quad (21a)$$

where $J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi} < 0$ and $J_{vsb}^{\Delta \Pi} > 0$, and can be expressed as:

$$J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi} = j_{wb}^{\Delta \Pi} \bar{v}_w$$

and

$$J_{vsb}^{\Delta \Pi} = L_{pb} \bar{c} \bar{v}_s \Delta \Pi$$

where $\bar{c} = \frac{1}{2}(c_1 + c_2)$, $\bar{c}$ is the mean solute concentration, and $\bar{v}_w$, $\bar{v}_s$ are partial molar volumes of the solvent ($w$) and the solute ($s$). Denoting the $J_{vsb}^{\Delta \Pi}$ by $J_{vs0}^{'}$ we get:

$$J_{vs0}^{'} = L_{pb} \bar{c} \bar{v}_s \Delta \Pi$$

Since $J_{vs0}^{'} = j_{s0}^{'} \bar{v}_s$, we can write:

$$j_{s0}^{'} = L_{pb} \bar{c} \Delta \Pi \quad (24)$$

Taking into account equation (14), i.e. $L_{pb} = (1 - \sigma)L_p$, we obtain the following expression for the solute flux generated under condition $\Delta P = 0$:

$$j_{s0}^{'} = \omega_{s} \Delta \Pi \quad (25)$$
where
\[ \omega'_0 = \bar{c}L_p(1 - \sigma) \]  
(26)

We note that \( j'_d = j_d \), where \( j_d \) is the diffusive solute flux, and thus \( \omega'_0 = \omega_d \) is the coefficient of diffusive solute permeation. The above equations can then be written as:
\[ j_d = \omega_d \Delta \Pi \]  
(27)

where
\[ \omega_d = \bar{c}L_p(1 - \sigma) \]  
(28)

The last step can be justified by revisiting equations (21), (21a), (22) and (23). From these equations we get:
\[ j_{wb} \bar{v}_w = j_{sb} \bar{v}_s \]
where \( j_{wb}^{\Delta \Pi} = j_{wb} \), and \( j_{sb}^{\Delta \Pi} = j_{sb} = L_{pb}\bar{c}\Delta \Pi \). Noting that \( j_{wb} = \bar{c}_w v_w \), and \( j_{sb} = \bar{c}v_s \) (where \( v_w \) and \( v_s \) are velocities of the solvent and the solute, respectively), we get:
\[ \bar{c}_w \bar{v}_w v_w = \bar{c}v_s \]
(29)

If the membrane separates diluted solutions, and this is the case we consider here, then we assume \( \bar{c}_w \approx 1 \). Moreover, in this case \( \bar{c}_w \gg \bar{c} \) as well. Therefore for solutes for which \( \bar{v}_w \) does not differ significantly from \( \bar{v}_w \) equation (29) yields \( \nu_w \ll \nu_s \). In other words in pores \( n_b \) the velocity \( \nu_w \) of solvent molecules is negligible compared to the velocity \( \nu_s \) of the solute molecules. We conclude that the velocity of solute convection by the solvent flow is negligible as well. This justifies putting \( j'_0 \approx j_d \). We emphasize that equation (28) represents a correlation relation among parameters \( L_p, \sigma \) and \( \omega_d \). It allows computation of any of the parameters if the other two are known. We elaborate this formula further later in the paper. For now let us only mention that, when equations (10) and (11) are substituted, this equation has a form:
\[ \omega_d = \frac{(L_{pa}L_{pb} + L_{pb}^2)\bar{c}}{L_p} \]

Let us consider now the convection flux \( j_k \). In our framework this flux is generated in pores \( n_b \) only and can be written as:
\[ j_k = \bar{c}J_{vb} \]  
(30)

Equations (7) and (14) yield:
\[ J_{vb} = L_{pb}\Delta P = (1 - \sigma)L_p\Delta P \]

hence we finally get:
\[ j_k = (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\Delta P \]  
(31)
This flux is generated by pressure $\Delta P$; it is practically not affected by the osmotic pressure $\Delta \Pi$ as we argued in the preceding paragraph. In summary, the total solute flux (which we for now denote $j'_s$) generated by both $\Delta P$ and $\Delta \Pi$ equals:

$$j'_s = j_d + j_k$$

Considering equations (27) and (34) we get:

$$j'_s = \omega_d \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma) \bar{c} L_p \Delta P$$

The above expression and equation (15) constitute the mechanistic transport equations.

**Functional comparison of mechanistic equations with the thermodynamic Kedem-Katchalsky equations. Formalism equivalence**

In this section we compare both sets of equations, mechanistic and Kedem-Katchalsky (KK), first the volume flux equation and then the solute flux equation. We show their equivalence and derive a correlation relation for the transport parameters appearing in the KK formalism.

**Equations for the volume flux**

Comparing the mechanistic equation for the volume flux (i.e. equation (15)) with the corresponding KK equation (i.e. equation (1)) we immediately notice they have identical form. Moreover, parameters $L_p$ and $\sigma$ have analogous definitions. Namely, in both equations the filtration coefficient is defined as:

$$L_p = \left( \frac{J_v}{\Delta P} \right)_{\Delta \Pi = 0}$$

Similarly for the reflection coefficient – given as:

$$\sigma = \left( \frac{\Delta P}{\Delta \Pi} \right) \Delta v = 0$$

It comes therefore as no surprise that both formalisms suggest similar experimental methods for measurements of both parameters. The equations are thus equivalent, even despite the fact that the interpretation of the reflection coefficient is somewhat different. In KK approach it is given as (Kedem and Katchalsky 1958, 1961, 1963; Katchalsky and Curran 1965):

$$\sigma = -\frac{L_{pD}}{L_p}$$

where $L_{pD}$ is called an osmotic flux coefficient. In our mechanistic formalism the same coefficient is interpreted as:

$$\sigma = \frac{L_{pa}}{L_p}$$
where, let us recall, $L_{\text{pa}}$ is the filtration coefficient of pores $n_a$ (i.e. impermeable to the solute). That suggests that parameters $L_{\text{pD}}$ and $L_{\text{pa}}$ should be treated as the same.

We want to emphasize that measurements of parameters $L_p$ and $\sigma$ are quite simple, even on biological membranes. We return to this point in section entitled: *Measurements of transport parameters. Sample results*, dealing with measurements of parameters $\omega$ and $\omega_d$.

**Solute flux equation. Correlation relation for transport parameters**

The solute flux is described in our mechanistic formalism by equation (25). Taking into account correlation relation for parameters $L_p$, $\sigma$ and $\omega_d$, i.e. equation (21):

$$\omega_d = (1 - \sigma)\tilde c L_p$$

the solute flux can be written as:

$$j'_s = (1 - \sigma)\tilde c L_p \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\tilde c L_p \Delta P$$

(33)

In the KK formalism the solute flux is given by equation (2), i.e.:

$$j_s = \omega \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\tilde c J_v$$

where $\omega$ is the solute permeation coefficient and $J_v$ – the volume flux (equation (1)).

We want to show that both expressions are equivalent. To that end, let us assume that a mechanical pressure:

$$\Delta P = \Delta P_m = \sigma \Delta \Pi$$

is applied to the membrane. The above equations thus assume the forms:

$$j'_s = j_{sm} = (1 - \sigma)\tilde c L_p (1 + \sigma) \Delta \Pi$$

(34)

and

$$j_s = j_{sm} = \omega \Delta \Pi$$

(35)

respectively. Here $j_{sm} = j'_s = j_s$ denotes the value of solute flux permeating in the membrane under this particular mechanical pressure $\Delta P = \Delta P_m = \sigma \Delta \Pi$. From equations (34) and (35) it follows:

$$\omega = (1 - \sigma)\tilde c L_p (1 + \sigma) = (1 - \sigma^2)\tilde c L_p = \omega_d (1 + \sigma)$$

(36)

This is a correlation relation for parameters $L_p$, $\sigma$ and $\omega$ introduced in KK equations.
Returning now to the general case of equations (33) and (2), we substitute relation (36) to (2). We obtain:

\[ j_s = (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p(1 + \sigma)\Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\Delta P - (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\sigma \Delta \Pi = \omega_d \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\Delta P = j'_s \]

Thus the KK equation is indeed equivalent to the mechanistic equation and the fluxes predicted by both equations are the same \((j_s = j'_s)\). Hence the mechanistic equation can finally be written as:

\[ j'_s = \omega_d \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\Delta P \quad (37) \]

Parameter \(\omega_d\) ought to be determined from condition:

\[ \omega_d = \left( \frac{j'_d}{\Delta \Pi} \right)_{\Delta P=0} \quad (38) \]

since for \(\Delta P = 0\) we have \(j_s = j_d\)

**Reduced equations**

Using relation (28) we can rewrite the mechanistic equations ((15) and (37)) in a reduced (using equation (36)) form containing only two phenomenological parameters:

\[ J_v = L_p \Delta P - L_p\sigma \Delta \Pi \quad (39) \]

\[ j'_s = (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\Delta P = (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p(\Delta P + \Delta \Pi) \]

Similarly, the KK equations (1) and (2) can be reduced to a form:

\[ j'_s = \omega_d \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p\Delta P \quad (37) \]

\[ J_v = L_p \Delta P - L_p\sigma \Delta \Pi \quad (40) \]

\[ j_s = (1 - \sigma^2)\bar{c}L_p\Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}J_v \]

**Measurements of transport parameters. Sample results**

Transport parameters \(L_p\) and \(\sigma\) introduced in KK equations, as well as in our mechanistic equations, can be conveniently measured based on the following equations:

\[ L_p = \left( \frac{J_v}{\Delta P} \right)_{\Delta \Pi=0} \]

and

\[ \sigma = \left( \frac{\Delta P}{\Delta \Pi} \right)_{j_v=0} \]
The situation is quite different for the permeation coefficient $\omega$ (in KK formalism) and $\omega_d$ (introduced in the mechanistic formalism). They are defined as:

$$\omega = \left(\frac{j_s}{\Delta\Pi}\right)_{J_v = 0}$$

and

$$\omega_d = \left(\frac{j_d}{\Delta\Pi}\right)_{\Delta P = 0}$$

Let us recall that according to equation (28) they are related:

$$\omega = \omega_d(1 + \sigma)$$

Accordingly, the coefficient $\omega_d$ ought to be measured with $\Delta P = 0$. On the other hand, the definition of $\omega$ requires condition $J_v = 0$, i.e. a situation when there is a nonzero mechanical pressure $\Delta P = \sigma \Delta \Pi$ on the membrane. In our mechanistic model such mechanical pressure drives a volume flux $J_{vb}$ in pores $n_b$ (permeable to the solute). It can be written as (Kargol and Kargol 2000; Kargol 2001):

$$J_{vb} = J_{vwb}^{\Delta P} + J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi} + J_{vd} + J_{vk} \quad (41)$$

where: $J_{vwb}^{\Delta P}$ – solvent flux driven by $\Delta P$, $J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi}$ – solvent flux driven by $\Delta \Pi$, $J_{vd}$ – solute volume flux generated diffusively, and $J_{vk}$ – convective solute volume flux. In this case, in order to determine the value of parameter $\omega$ we need to find $j_s$ first. The flux is measured as:

$$j_s = \frac{\Delta m}{S \Delta t}$$

where $\Delta m$ is the solute mass permeating across the membrane (with the active surface area $S$) during time $\Delta t$. Mass $\Delta m$ can be found as:

$$\Delta m = \Delta c_t V$$

where: $\Delta c_t$ is the change of concentration of solution on either side of the membrane occurring in time $\Delta t$, and $V$ – volume of that solution. From equation (31) we can see that the concentration change $\Delta c_t$, and therefore flux $j_s$ is affected by fluxes $J_{vwb}^{\Delta P}$, $J_{vwb}^{\Delta \Pi}$, $J_{vd}$ and $J_{vk}$. In other words parameter $\omega$ is determined under fairly complex conditions.

The case is somewhat clearer for coefficient $\omega_d$. However, still if $\Delta P = 0$ then fluxes $J_{vd}$ and $J_{vwa}$ affect the measured value of $\omega_d$. We conclude that experimental measurements of parameters $\omega$ and $\omega_d$ are difficult and sometimes impossible. In such cases of particular importance the correlation relations among transport parameters are derived in this paper, i.e. equations (21) and (28).

We illustrate these relations on selected membranes and solutes shown in Table 1. For all of these systems transport parameters $L_p$, $\sigma$ and $\omega = \omega_{ex}$ were
Table 1. Values of transport parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membrane</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>$L_p \times 10^{12}$ [m³/Ns]</th>
<th>$\omega_{ex} \times 10^{10}$ [mol/NS]</th>
<th>$\bar{c}$</th>
<th>$\omega \times 10^{10}$ [mol/m³]</th>
<th>$\omega_d \times 10^{10}$ [mol/NS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neprophane</td>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>21.0 ± 3.0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neprophane</td>
<td>Glucose</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0 ± 1.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellophane</td>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>6.3 ± 1.3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellophane</td>
<td>Glucose</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.3 ± 1.2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis membrane</td>
<td>Glucose</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.3 ± 1.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

measured using standard methods (Kedem and Katchalsky 1961; Katchalsky and Curran 1965; Grygorczyk 1978; Kargol 1994). Parameters $\sigma$ and $\omega_{ex}$ were measured for $J_v = 0$. The value of $\omega_{ex}$ is a mean of several measurements and the error reported – the average deviation from the mean. The last two columns in Table 1 show coefficients $\omega$ and $\omega_d$ (computed from equations (28) and (21)). The computed results show satisfactory agreement with the experiment. Also, values of $\omega_d$ are noticeably smaller than the corresponding $\omega$’s, as the difference in thermodynamic and mechanistic equations for the solute flux suggests.

Conclusion

1. We considered membrane transport processes generated by osmotic and mechanical pressure difference. New model and a new interpretation has been proposed for transport across a typical porous membrane having a number $N$ of pores of varying sizes. We assumed (Kargol and Kargol 2000; Kargol 2001; Kargol et al. 2001) that a single pore has a reflection coefficient (suitably re-defined) equal to 0 or 1.

2. We derived mechanistic transport equations which we believe have a clear physical interpretation. They have the form:

$$J_v = J_{vM} = L_p \Delta P - L_p \sigma \Delta \Pi$$
$$j'_s = j_{sM} = \omega_d \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma) \bar{c} L_p \Delta P$$

3. We showed that the mechanistic equations are equivalent to the KK equations, assuming:

$$\omega = (1 - \sigma) \bar{c} L_p (1 + \sigma)$$
and

$$\omega_d = (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p$$

These equations show correlation relations among the transport parameters $L_p$, $\sigma$, and $\omega$ (for the KK formalism) and $L_p$, $\sigma$, and $\omega_d$ (for the mechanistic approach). Accordingly, one of the parameters from each set can be computed if only the other two are known. In particular we refer here to parameters $\omega$ and $\omega_d$, measurements of which are typically rather difficult.

4. Considering the correlation relations, the mechanistic and KK equations were reduced to a form involving only two, as opposed to usual three, phenomenological transport parameters.

5. We believe that because of this work, the results concerning membrane mass transport (generated by osmotic and mechanical pressure) can be analyzed and interpreted in a clearer and more detailed way.

In particular, here we have in mind studies directed towards understanding the passive transport processes of water and solutes across cell membranes. It is sufficient to say that each cell has to exchange water and various substances with its medium in order to live. In other words it must take up water and solutes and excrete them with products of its metabolism. This exchange goes on across the cell membrane and with its active participation. Processes of this exchange belong to fundamental ones from the biological point of view. It is impossible to gain knowledge of them using only the KK equations. Radically more useful in this respect are the mechanistic transport equations. This is also substantiated by our recent result (in preparation).

**Appendix**

In general the KK equations (1) and (2) lack clarity of interpretation (Kargol and Kargol 2000; Kargol 2001). It concerns the solute flux (eq. (2)) in particular:

$$j_s = \omega \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}J_v$$

Parameter $\omega$ in the first term of the right hand side is given by:

$$\omega = \left( \frac{j_s}{\Delta \Pi} \right)_{J_v=0}$$

It expresses the magnitude of the solute flux generated by unit osmotic pressure, when $J_v = 0$, i.e. when there are both the osmotic pressure $\Delta \Pi$ and hydraulic pressure $\Delta P = \Delta P_m = \sigma \Delta \Pi$. It means that the flux $j_s$ is generated jointly by the pressures $\Delta \Pi$ and $\Delta P_m$. Hence it cannot be simply the diffusive flux and parameters $\omega$ should not be regarded as a measure of purely diffusive solute permeation. Frequently it is treated as such (Spiegler and Kedem 1966; Sha’afi et al. 1970; Steudle et al. 1987; Ślęzak 1989; Ślęzak et al. 1989; Ślęzak and Turczyński 1992;
Kargol and Kargol (1996 and others). We conclude that it is not clear what transport mechanisms the coefficient $\omega$ describes.

It is commonly stated that the second term in equation (2), i.e. the term $(1 - \sigma)\bar{c}J_v$ represents the convective solute flux (the flux carried by flow $J_v$). Although such interpretation may seem convincing, if we rewrite the equation into the form:

$$j_s = \omega \Delta \Pi + (1-\sigma)\bar{c}L_p \Delta P - (1-\sigma)\bar{c}L_p \sigma \Delta \Pi$$

then certain difficulties in the interpretation of the last two terms arise (i.e. terms $(1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p \Delta P$ and $(1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p \sigma \Delta \Pi$).

In the framework of mechanistic analysis (as performed in this work) one might notice that the above mentioned issues with interpretation of the KK solute flux equation result from a misleading form in which the equation is typically presented. If we rewrite it as:

$$j_s = [\omega - (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p \sigma] \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p \Delta P$$

and taking into account equations (28) and (36), i.e. $\omega_d = (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p$ and $\omega = \omega_d (1 + \sigma)$, we obtain:

$$j_s = \omega_d \Delta \Pi + (1 - \sigma)\bar{c}L_p \Delta P$$

where $\omega_d$ is the coefficient of the solute diffusive permeation across the membrane.
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