Here, we investigate experimentally and theoretically the factors that determine the size of the emulsion droplets produced by membrane emulsification in “batch regime” (without applied crossflow). Hydrophilic glass membranes of pore diameters between 1 and 10 μm have been used to obtain oil-in-water emulsions. The working surfactant concentrations are high enough to prevent droplet coalescence. Under such conditions, the size of the formed drops does not depend on the surfactant type and concentration, on the interfacial tension, or on the increase of viscosity of the inner (oil) phase. The drops are monodisperse when the working transmembrane pressure is slightly above the critical pressure for drop breakup. At higher pressures, the size distribution becomes bimodal: a superposition of a “normal” peak of monodisperse drops and an “anomalous” peak of polydisperse drops is observed. The theoretical model assumes that, at the moment of breakup, the hydrodynamic ejection force acting on the drop is equal to the critical capillary force that corresponds to the stability-instability transition in the drop shape. The derived equations are applied to predict the mean size of the obtained drops in regimes of constant flow rate and constant transmembrane pressure. Agreement between theory and experiment is established for the latter regime, which corresponds to our experimental conditions. The transition from unimodal to bimodal drop size distribution upon increase of the transmembrane pressure can be interpreted in terms of the transition from “dripping” to “jetting” mechanisms of drop detachment.

1. Introduction

The method of membrane emulsification has found broad applications in many fields in which the production of monodisperse emulsions is needed. One of them is for the fabrication of monodisperse colloidal particles: silica-hydrogel and polymer microspheres, porous and cross-linked polymer particles, microspheres containing carbon black for toners, and so forth. In the food industry, the method has been used for obtaining oil-in-water (O/W) emulsions (e.g., dressings, artificial milk, cream liqueurs) and for the preparation of some water-in-oil (W/O) emulsions (e.g., margarine and low-fat spreads). A third field is the production of multiple emulsions and microparticles with applications in pharmacy and chemotherapy. Detailed information can be found in recently published review articles.1–6 Closely related to membrane emulsification is the method employing capillary tubes or microchannels to produce monodisperse emulsions.7–9

The key problem of membrane emulsification is related to the explanation and prediction of the drop size as a function of the system’s parameters: pore diameter, surfactant type and concentration, interfacial tension, viscosity of the oil and water phases, and applied transmembrane pressure and crossflow in the continuous phase. Different approaches have been used to solve this problem: regression analysis of experimental data,9 modeling of the drop expansion and surfactant adsorption by a surface evolver,10,11 three-dimensional computational fluid dynamics simulations,12,13 and lattice Boltzmann simulations.14 The quantitative theoretical analysis demands one to determine the forces exerted on the growing emulsion drop and to establish the mechanism of drop detachment from the pores.

In a preceding work,15 we developed a quantitative theory of the hydrodynamic forces that are acting on the forming drop in the absence of crossflow in the continuous phase. These experimental conditions correspond to the “batch method” (Figure 1). The understanding and quantitative description of the processes in this simpler case represent a necessary step toward the analysis of the more complicated case when crossflow is present.

The flow of the disperse phase through the capillary, as it infiltrates the droplet, engenders a hydrodynamic ejection force that tends to detach the droplet from the pore.15,16 The hydrodynamic theory shows that, under typical experimental conditions, this process happens at small Reynolds numbers, for which the inertial terms in the Navier–Stokes equation are negligible.15 Hence, under such conditions, the ejection force...
has a predominantly viscous (rather than inertial) character. This force was expressed in terms of three universal functions of the drop diameter, which have been computed numerically, and interpolation formulas have been obtained for their easier calculation.\textsuperscript{15}

In the present study, we apply the results for the hydrodynamic forces from ref 15 to predict the size of the drops produced by membrane emulsification. First, we present new experimental data for the effects produced by various factors: surfactant type and concentration, interfacial tension, viscosities of disperse and continuous phases, pore size, and transmembrane pressure (sections 2–4). Next, the theory from ref 15 is upgraded by the formulation of a quantitative criterion for drop detachment from the membrane (section 5.2). This criterion is utilized to derive expressions for the mean drop size under conditions of constant flow rate (section 5.3) and constant transmembrane pressure (section 5.4). Finally, the theoretical expressions are applied to interpret the experimental data and to identify the main factors and effects that determine the drop-size distributions in the investigated emulsions (sections 5.5 and 6).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Membrane Emulsification Setup and Procedure. In our experiments, we used a Microkit membrane emulsification module (SPG Technology, Miyazaki, Japan), which works with conventional tubular type Shirasu porous glass (SPG) membranes of outer diameter 10 mm, thickness 1 mm, and working area of approximately 3 cm\textsuperscript{2} (see ref 17 about the conventional and novel types of SPG membranes). Membranes of different average pore diameter can be used, from 0.1 to 20 \textmu m. The porosity, that is, the surface fraction of the pores, is about 50\% according to the manufacturer. The working pressure difference is up to 300 kPa. As the membranes are made of hydrophilic glass, they are suitable for producing O/W emulsions, which is the type of emulsions we are investigating. All experiments were carried out at temperature $T = 23 \pm 2$ °C. (After hydrophobization, the membranes can also be used for obtaining W/O emulsions.)

To produce O/W emulsions, the oil phase is supplied inside the tubular membrane, and the oil drops are released in the outer aqueous phase (Figure 1). The higher pressure in the oil is provided by a gas (nitrogen) bottle. The only directed motion of the formed oil droplets in the water phase occurs under the action of the buoyancy force. There is no applied crossflow (batch method).\textsuperscript{18} The experimental setup is sketched in Figure 2.

In the beginning of each experiment, the tubular membrane is first fixed at the holder of the emulsification setup and immersed in the aqueous surfactant solution. Then, the oily phase is supplied under pressure. We start with an initial pressure that is insufficiently high for the oil to displace the aqueous phase from the pores of the membrane, and, consequently, emulsification is not observed. Next, the pressure is gradually and slowly increased until the emulsification begins at a certain critical (threshold) pressure, $P_c$.\textsuperscript{19} To investigate the effect of the applied transmembrane pressure, $P$, on the size of the produced emulsion drops, we varied $P$ in a certain range above $P_c$ (see section 4.5). In these experiments, the values of the critical pressure, $P_c$, were different because of the different interfacial tensions, $\gamma$, and pore diameters, $d_p$. After the end of each emulsification experiment, the used membrane was recovered by means of a procedure that is described in ref 3.

2.2. Materials. To investigate the effect of viscosity of the disperse phase, $\eta_d$, on the size of produced emulsion droplets, we used oils of different viscosities: \textit{n}-hexadecane, soybean oil (SBO), and silicone oil, with viscosities $\eta_d$ of 3, 50, and 500 mPa\textperiodcentered s, respectively. The \textit{n}-hexadecane (C\textsubscript{16}H\textsubscript{34}), a product of Sigma, was used without additional purification. The SBO was purified by passing through a glass column filled with the chromatoagraphic adsorbent Florisil (Fluka). The silicone oil was poly(dimethylsiloxane) (PDMS) DC 200 (Fluka) of viscosity 500 mPa\textperiodcentered s.

Four surfactants were used as emulsifiers in different series of experiments: sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS, Acros Organics), sodium dodecyl benzene sulfonate (SDBS, Aldrich, technical grade); sodium bis(2-ethyl-1-hexyl) sulfosuccinate (AOT, Sigma), and the zwitterionic surfactant cocamidopropyl betaine (CAPB, commercial name “Tego Betaine F50”, Goldschmidt Chemical Co., McDonald, PA). We did not use cationic surfactants because they could adsorb on the glass membrane, hydrophobize it, and create problems when producing O/W emulsions.

All aqueous solutions were prepared with deionized water from a Milli-Q Organex system (Millipore). Some of the solutions also contained NaCl (Merck, GR for analysis). The viscosity of the used surfactant solutions was very close to the viscosity of pure water, $\eta_b = 0.9$ mPa\textperiodcentered s. In a series of experiments, to increase the viscosity of the aqueous phase, $\eta_b$, we used surfactant solutions with added 62 wt % glycerol, whose viscosity is $\eta_g = 11$ mPa\textperiodcentered s.\textsuperscript{20} For this purpose, we used anhydrous glycerol from Sigma (ACS reagent-grade purity).

2.3. Measurements of Drop Diameters. Representative samples of the produced emulsions were observed in transmitted light by a Zeiss Axiosplan microscope with objectives \times 100, \times 50, and \times 20. The specimens were prepared by placing a small portion of the emulsion in a cytomteric glass cell (large ratio rectangle capillaries, 0.2 \times 4 mm). The microscopic pictures were recorded by means of a CCD camera and digital memory VCR (Panasonic WV-5490). The images were processed by using semi-automatic image analysis software, operating with a Targa+ graphic board (True Vision, USA). To determine the diameter of a given emulsion drop, at the computer

screen, a circle of variable size is adjusted at the drop periphery, and after that the diameter of the circle is automatically recorded by the computer program. To obtain the drop-size distribution for a given emulsion, the diameters of several thousand droplets (at least 1000) were measured. All droplets in a given frame were taken into account, even the smallest ones that were still visible. In our experiments, the lower limit for the measurement of drop diameter was about 0.8 μm.

3. Statistical Analysis of Drop Size Data

3.1. Theoretical Background. Our purpose is to compare the mean drop diameter predicted by the theoretical model (section 5) with the experimental mean diameter. For this goal, from the experimental data we determined the mean diameter by drop number (rather than by drop volume or surface area). The applied statistical analysis is outlined below.

First, the diameters of a set of $N$ emulsion droplets, measured as explained in section 2.3, are ordered in an ascending series, $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_K$, where $K$ is the total number of different drop diameters. Each drop diameter, $d_k$, appears $n_k$ times in the original data set, $k = 1, 2, \ldots, K$. (For example, if we have measured the diameters of 1000 drops, it could happen that four different drops have diameter $d_4 = 6.7$ μm; then, we set $n_4 = 4$.) The total number of drops is

$$N = \sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k \quad (3.1)$$

By definition, the cumulative function, $f(d_k)$, is equal to the number of drops whose diameter is $d \leq d_k$; the function $f(d_k)$ is normalized by the total drop number, $N$:

$$f(d_k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_j \quad (3.2)$$

By means of eq 3.2, one can calculate $f(d_k)$ for each experimentally measured drop diameter, $d_k$. We found that the experimental data obey the lognormal distribution. Its probability function is

$$p(d) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \ln \sigma} \exp \left[ -\frac{\ln^2(d/d_0)}{2 \ln^2 \sigma} \right], \quad (d > 0) \quad (3.3)$$

Here, $d_0$ is the mean diameter, and $\sigma$ is a dimensionless dispersion ($\sigma > 1$). The peak of $p(d)$ defined in eq 3.3 is non-symmetric. The diameters of 50% of the drops belong to the interval $d/d_0 \leq d \leq d_0$ that characterizes the drop polydispersity. In the limiting case $\sigma \rightarrow 1$, one can expand in series the logarithms in eq 3.3 and keep the leading terms; then, eq 3.3 reduces to the normal (Gaussian) distribution.\(^{21,22}\)

The cumulative function, $f(d)$, which corresponds to the lognormal distribution, (eq 3.3) is

$$f(d) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{d} p(d) \, d\hat{d} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \text{erf}(y) \right] \quad (3.4)$$

$$y \equiv \frac{\ln(d/d_0)}{\sqrt{2} \ln \sigma} \quad (3.5)$$

where $\hat{d}$ is an integration variable, and erf($y$) is the error function.\(^{23}\)

We fitted the experimental function $f(d_k)$ (eq 3.2) by means of the theoretical dependence $f(d)$ given by eq 3.4, and determined $d_0$, $\sigma$, $\alpha_1$, and $\alpha_2$ as adjustable parameters (see below).\(^{21,22}\)

3.2. Illustrative Examples. (a) Unimodal Distributions. Figure 3 shows typical experimental cumulative functions (dashed lines) and their fits by means of the lognormal cumulative function (solid lines) (eq 3.4). The agreement between the theoretical and experimental cumulative functions is so good that the dashed and solid lines coincide almost everywhere (Figure 3). The respective experimental data are obtained for n-hexadecane-in-water emulsions that have been produced by means of membrane emulsification (section 2) using an SPG membrane of average pore diameter $d_p = 5.1$ μm. The aqueous phase is a solution of 0.01 M NaCl and 10 mM SDS.

Figure 3. Plot of the cumulative function, $f$, vs the logarithm of the diameter, $d$, for different concentrations of SDS (0.01 mM and 10 mM) in the aqueous phase that also contains 10 mM NaCl. The experimental dashed lines, obtained from eq 3.2, coincide almost everywhere with the theoretical solid lines, which represent fits by means of eqs 3.4 and 3.5.

...
Figure 4. Plots of the probability function, \( p(d) \) (the solid lines), which are calculated from eq 3.3 using parameter values determined from the fits of the cumulative functions by lognormal distribution (Figure 3). The aqueous phase contains (a) 0.01 mM SDS + 10 mM NaCl and (b) 10 mM SDS + 10 mM NaCl. The bar chart represents the histogram of the experimental drop size distribution; \( d_d \) is the mean drop diameter; \( \sigma \) is the dimensionless dispersion.

0.01 or 10 mM SDS containing 10 mM added NaCl. The emulsion is generated at a transmembrane pressure, \( P \), which is slightly greater than the critical one, \( 1 < \text{PI/pcr} < 2 \).

The fits of the experimental cumulative functions with the theoretical ones (Figure 3) yield \( d_d = 33.1 \mu m \) and \( \sigma = 1.43 \) for the solutions with 0.01 mM SDS, and \( d_d = 18.8 \mu m \) and \( \sigma = 1.10 \) for the solutions with 10 mM SDS.

Having determined \( d_d \) and \( \sigma \), with the help of eq 3.3 we calculated the drop-size distribution, \( p(d) \). The solid lines in Figure 4a,b represent the \( p(d) \) functions corresponding to the two theoretical \( f(d) \) functions in Figure 3. The \( p(d) \) functions are compared with the respective histograms of the experimental data, which are presented as bar charts. The interval \( d_d/\sigma \leq d \leq d_d \) that contains 50% of the drops is also shown in the figures. For the lower SDS concentration (0.01 mM SDS, Figure 4a), the dimensionless dispersion, \( \sigma = 1.43 \), is markedly greater than 1, and, correspondingly, the distribution \( p(d) \) is non-symmetric. For the greater SDS concentration (10 mM SDS, Figure 4b), the dimensionless dispersion, \( \sigma = 1.1 \), is close to 1, and, correspondingly, \( p(d) \) is close to a symmetric Gaussian distribution.

Note that our fits of the experimental data have been intentionally carried out in terms of the cumulative function \( F(d) \) (Figure 3), rather than in terms of the probability function \( p(d) \) (Figure 4). The reason is that the experimental cumulative function \( (F(d)) \) is uniquely defined, whereas the choice of the intervals for the histogram bins (Figure 4) could introduce elements of subjectivism.

It should be also noted that the drop-size distribution is unimodal at relatively low applied transmembrane pressures, \( 1 < \text{PI/pcr} < 3 \). At greater applied pressures (\( 3 < \text{PI/pcr} < 11 \)), the drop-size distribution is bimodal.

(b) Bimodal Distributions. Figure 5a shows a typical experimental cumulative function (the dashed line) for the distribution of n-hexadecane emulsion droplets at intermediate pressures, \( 3 < \text{PI/pcr} < 11 \). In this specific experiment, the mean diameter of the membrane pores is \( d_p = 5.1 \mu m \), and the applied transmembrane pressure is \( \text{PI/pcr} = 8.75 \); the aqueous phase contains 250 mM SDS and 12 mM NaCl. The experimental cumulative function is fitted by means of eq 3.7. The experimental and theoretical curves (the dashed and solid lines) coincide almost everywhere in Figure 5a.

The parameters of the bimodal lognormal distribution (eq 3.6) determined from the best fit are \( d_1 = 18.2 \mu m, \sigma_1 = 1.12, d_2 = 5.44 \mu m, \sigma_2 = 1.91 \), and \( \beta = 0.887 \).

With the above parameter values, using eq 3.6, we calculated the respective drop-size distribution, \( p(d) \), which is shown in Figure 5b. The two constituent unimodal distributions (the two terms in eq 3.6) are shown in the figure by dashed lines. The peak of the bigger droplets (of mean diameter \( d_1 = 18.2 \mu m \)) is symmetric and relatively narrow: 50% of the drops are contained within the interval \( 16.3 \leq d \leq 20.4 \mu m \). In contrast, the peak of the smaller drops (of mean diameter \( d_2 = 5.44 \mu m \))
4. Influence of Various Factors

4.1. Effect of Surfactant Concentration. To investigate the effect of surfactant concentration, we determined experimentally the mean drop diameter, $d_\text{m}$, as a function of the concentration of SDS at a fixed concentration of NaCl (10 mM) (see Figure 6). The oil phase is n-hexadecane. In this series of experiments, the working pressure was $P/P_\text{cr} \approx 1.1$. Membranes of two different mean pore diameters were used: $d_p = 1.1 \mu m$ (Figure 6a), and $d_p = 5.1 \mu m$ (Figure 6b).

As seen in Figure 6, at the lower surfactant concentrations, the drops are bigger and polydisperse. The error bars correspond to the interval $d_\text{m} \pm 0.2 \mu m$ that contains 50% of the drops (see section 3). The asymmetric size distribution shown in Figure 4a (0.01 mM SDS) corresponds to this concentration range.

In contrast, beginning from a certain sufficiently high SDS concentration, which is 0.5 mM in Figure 6a,b, the oil drops are almost monodisperse, their size distribution is symmetric (Figure 4b), and their mean diameter, $d_\text{m}$, is independent of the surfactant concentration.

is asymmetric and relatively broad: 50% of the drops are contained within the interval $2.8 \leq d < 10.4 \mu m$.

The approach for data processing described in the present section is further applied to process all data for the drop size, which have been obtained to investigate the effects of surfactant concentration, interfacial tension, the viscosities of the two liquid phases, pore diameter, and applied transmembrane pressure (see below).

4.2. Effect of Interfacial Tension. The addition of NaCl considerably reduces the interfacial tension of the AOT solutions. We carried out interfacial tension measurements and membrane emulsification experiments with aqueous solutions containing 5 mM AOT at various NaCl concentrations. The interfacial tension, $\gamma$, of these solutions was measured by means of a drop shape analysis system (DSA 10, Krüss GmbH, Hamburg, Germany). One sees (Figure 7) that the decrease in $\gamma$ is 10-fold, from 4.5 mN/m (without NaCl) down to 0.44 mN/m (in the presence of 20 mM NaCl).

With the same series of AOT solutions, we carried out membrane emulsification experiments at $d_\text{m} = 1.1 \mu m$ and $P/P_\text{cr}$

---


We obtained a similar result (diameter ratio, d/dp of about 3) for two oil phases, PDMS and SBO, of viscosities ηb = 50 and 500 mPa·s, respectively. The aqueous surfactant solution contains 35 mM SDS and 10 mM NaCl. The experimental results from ref 27 correspond to SBO-in-water emulsions stabilized by lysophosphatidylcholine. The error bars represent the polydispersity interval of the lognormal distribution: d/dp < 3. The data in Figures 9 and 10 are for solutions of 5 mM SDS and 10 mM NaCl; 1 wt % SDBS is the same as that in Figure 9. For SBO, we have ηb = 50 mPa·s and ηs/ηb = 1.8 × 10−3; for the silicone oil (PDMS) we have ηs = 500 mPa·s and ηs/ηb = 1.8 × 10−1. The data in Figure 10 indicate that d/dp is insensitive to the pore diameter, dp: the mean value is d/dp = 3.17. A similar mean value, d/dp = 3.18, was obtained in ref 27 for SBO-in-water emulsions (see the square symbols in Figure 10). Values of d/dp of about 3 have also been reported in other membrane-emulsification experiments,2,3,6,16,18,19,28,29. Comparison of the values of d/dp in Figures 9 and 10 indicates that the decrease in the viscosity ratio, ηb/ηs, by orders of magnitude does not produce a significant effect on the diameter ratio d/dp.

To see how an increase in the viscosity ratio, ηb/ηs, would influence the diameter ratio, d/dp, in Figure 11 we show experimental data for emulsions in which the continuous (water) phase contains 62 wt % glycerol. This leads to ηs = 11 mPa·s, and ηs/ηb ≈ 3.7 (the oil phase is n-hexadecane). From the slope of the straight line in Figure 11 we calculate d/dp = 4.26 ± 0.09. Hence, for ηb/ηs ≈ 3.7, the ratio d/dp is markedly greater than in the cases with ηb/ηs ≤ 1 (Figures 9 and 10).

In summary, the experiments indicate that, for ηb/ηs ≤ 1, the diameter ratio, d/dp, is about 3.2 – 3.7, and d/dp is insensitive to the specific value of ηb/ηs. At a higher value of the viscosity ratio (ηb/ηs ≈ 3.7), the diameter ratio becomes greater (d/dp ≥...
4.3. This effect of the viscosities on the diameter of the produced drops is interpreted in sections 5.4 and 5.5.

4.4. Effect of Pore Diameter. Figures 9–11 also indicate that, at a given viscosity ratio, \( \eta_b / \eta_s \), the diameter ratio is practically independent of the pore diameter (i.e., \( d_d/d_p \approx \text{const} \)). In other words, the diameter of the produced drops, \( d_d \), is proportional to the diameter of the pores, \( d_p \). As mentioned in the beginning of section 4.3, this result is obtained at relatively low applied transmembrane pressures, \( 1 < P/P_{cr} < 3 \). At greater pressures, bimodal drop-size distributions are observed, as shown in Figure 5 and described in the next subsection.

4.5. Effect of Transmembrane Pressure. As illustrated in Figure 5, at \( P/P_{cr} > 3 \), the drops produced by membrane emulsification could have a bimodal size distribution. To investigate this effect, we carried out systematic experiments with membranes of two different pore diameters: \( d_p = 5.1 \) and 10.4 \( \mu \text{m} \). In these experiments, the aqueous phase contained 250 mM SDS + 12 mM NaCl, and the oil phase was \( n \)-hexadecane. (The high SDS concentration guarantees that the coalescence of drops is excluded.) Depending on the shape of the cumulative function, the data for the drop diameters were fitted by unimodal or bimodal lognormal distribution (see section 5).

At the lower transmembrane pressures, \( 1 < P/P_{cr} < 3 \) (region A in Figure 12), we observe only the “normal” unimodal drop-size distribution, whose peak corresponds to \( d_d/d_p \approx 3.2–3.7 \).

At greater transmembrane pressures, \( 3 < P/P_{cr} < 11 \) (region B in Figure 12), in addition to the “normal” peak, one observes an “anomalous” peak, with \( d_d/d_p = 0.8–2 \).

At the greatest investigated transmembrane pressures, \( P/P_{cr} > 11 \) (region C in Figure 12), the “normal” peak disappears, but the “anomalous” peak remains, and the drop-size distribution becomes unimodal again.

These results are presented in Figure 12, where the most probable drop diameters for the “normal” and “anomalous” peak are denoted by \( d_{d1} \) and \( d_{d2} \), respectively, and \( \beta \) denotes the probability for the appearance of the of the “anomalous” peak (see eq 3.6). The parameters \( d_{d1}, d_{d2}, \) and \( \beta \) are determined from the best fits of the respective cumulative functions as explained in section 3. As a rule, the “normal” peak is relatively monodisperse and symmetric (\( \sigma < 1 \)), whereas the “anomalous” peak is polydisperse and asymmetric (\( \sigma > 1.5 \)) (see Figure 5b). A possible explanation of the results for the effect of transmembrane pressure on the size of the produced drops (Figure 12) is proposed in sections 5 and 6.

5. Theoretical Modeling of Drop Detachment

Here, our purpose is to develop a theoretical model of drop detachment from the orifice of a pore and to compare the mean drop diameter predicted by the model with the experimental drop-size distributions.

5.1. Analogy with the Detachment of Pendant Drops. It is known that a drop suspended from a tube becomes unstable and detaches when its weight reaches a certain maximum value. This fact has been utilized by the maximum drop weight (volume) method for determining the surface tension. In other words, there is a maximum body force (gravitational force) exerted on a pendant drop beyond which the drop shape becomes unstable. It has been established that the maximum volume of the pendant...
drop, \( V_{\text{max}} \), which is determined from the solution of Laplace equation of capillarity,\(^{42-44}\) is approximately equal to the maximum drop volume, which corresponds to the solution of the respective stability problem.\(^{30-36}\)

In the case of emulsion drops ejected from a capillary, we will use the model assumption that the drop detaches when the hydrodynamic force acting on it becomes equal to the threshold body force that would cause instability of the drop profile and drop detachment.\(^{45}\) Below, we will first briefly consider the condition for detachment of pendant drops in a gravitational field.

The profile of an axisymmetric pendant drop satisfies the Laplace equation of capillarity, which can be expressed in the form\(^{42-44}\)

\[
\frac{\gamma d}{r} = \frac{2\gamma}{b} - \Delta \rho g z \tag{5.1}
\]

Here, \( r \) and \( z \) are the radial and vertical cylindrical coordinates; the coordinate origin is located at the apex of the drop surface; \( \gamma \) is the running meniscus slope angle, \( \tan \gamma = \frac{dz}{dr} \); \( b \) is the curvature radius at the bottom of the drop; \( \Delta \rho \) is the difference between the mass densities of the fluids inside and outside the drop; \( g \) is the acceleration due to gravity; and \( \gamma \) is the interfacial tension. The characteristic length-scale of this problem is determined by the capillary length:

\[
a = [\gamma/(\Delta \rho g)]^{1/2} \tag{5.2}
\]

Introducing dimensionless variables, \( \bar{r} = r/a, \bar{z} = z/a, \bar{b} = b/a \) (5.3) one can bring eq 5.1 into the following dimensionless form:

\[
1 \frac{d}{d\bar{r}} (\bar{r} \sin \bar{\gamma}) = \frac{2}{\bar{b}} - \bar{z} \tag{5.4}
\]

Further, with the help of eq 5.4, the whole stability analysis is carried out in terms of the dimensionless variables. It is convenient to also introduce the dimensionless drop volume and radius of the contact line (of the pore):

\[
\tilde{V} = V/a^3, \tilde{r}_p = r_p/a \tag{5.5}
\]

where \( r_p = d_p/2 \). Solving eq 5.4 for a series of \( \bar{b} \) values, one can calculate the respective values of \( \tilde{V} \) and of the dimensionless height of the pendant drop, \( \tilde{h} \). The plot of \( \tilde{V} \) versus \( \tilde{h} \) exhibits a maximum, \( \tilde{V}_{\text{max}} \), whose magnitude and position depend on the pore radius, \( \tilde{r}_p \). The theoretical analysis and experiments indicate that the drop is stable up to the point of the volume maximum, and becomes unstable at this point.\(^{33-36}\) Harkins and Brown\(^{38}\) expressed the maximum gravitational force (weight) for a pendant drop as follows:

\[
F^{(g)} = \Delta \rho g V_{\text{max}} = 2\pi r_p \gamma \tilde{f}_d \tag{5.6}
\]

where \( f_d \) is a correction factor. The original form of eq 5.6 involves the volume of the falling drop, \( V_f \); instead of \( V_{\text{max}} \). Because the volume of the residual drop (if any) is usually negligible, here we will work with \( V_f \approx V_{\text{max}} \). With the help of eqs 5.2 and 5.6, we obtain

\[
f_d = \frac{\Delta \rho g}{2\pi r_p \gamma} V_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2\pi \lambda} (\tilde{V}_{\text{max}})^{2/3} \tag{5.7}
\]

where the parameters \( \tilde{V}_{\text{max}} \) and \( \lambda \) are defined as follows:

\[
\tilde{V}_{\text{max}} \equiv \frac{V_{\text{max}}}{a^3}, \lambda = \frac{r_p}{V_{\text{max}}^{1/3}} = \frac{\tilde{r}_p}{\tilde{V}_{\text{max}}^{1/3}} \tag{5.8}
\]

By integration of the Laplace equation (eq 5.4), for various \( \tilde{r}_p \) one can calculate the dependence of \( V_{\text{max}} \) on \( \lambda \). The numerical calculations are complex and time-consuming. The obtained results are summarized in tables and interpolation formulas.\(^{38-42}\)

The interpolation formulas used by us are given in Appendix A. The fact that \( \tilde{V}_{\text{max}}(\lambda) \) is a universal function, independent of the capillary length, \( a \), is utilized by the drop volume method: From the experimental \( \tilde{r}_p \) and \( V_{\text{max}} \), one determines \( \lambda \) using eq 5.8. Then, from the respective interpolation formula (or tables) for \( V_{\text{max}}(\lambda) \) [or \( f_d(\lambda) \); see eq 5.7], one calculates \( \tilde{V}_{\text{max}} \). Further, one determines \( a = (V_{\text{max}}/V_{\text{max}})^{1/3} \), and finally, from \( a \) one obtains \( \gamma \) using the definition of the capillary length (eq 5.2; see, e.g., refs 40 and 41).

### 5.2. Condition for Drop Detachment from the Orifice of a Pore

Coming back to the case of membrane emulsification, we have to note that the emulsion droplets are so small that the gravitational deformation of their surfaces is completely negligible. However, the emulsion droplets, growing at the opening of a membrane pore, can be deformed by the hydrodynamic ejection force that is due to the inner liquid, which flows along the pores and inflates the droplets. The hydrodynamic ejection force can also induce elongation of the drop profile, like the gravitational force in the case of a pendant drop. An elongated drop has a limit of its stability (maximum volume), after which it becomes unstable and detaches from the pore. Here, we will make the model assumption that, at the moment of detachment, the hydrodynamic ejection force, \( F_h \), acting on the drop is equal to the critical capillary force that corresponds to the stability-instability transition in the drop profile:\(^{45}\)

\[
F_h = 2\pi r_p \gamma \tilde{f}_d \tag{5.9}
\]

(see also eq 5.6). As mentioned above, the Harkins–Brown factor \( f_d \) is independent of the capillary length, \( a \), and the gravity acceleration, \( g \). The hydrodynamic ejection force, acting on the forming emulsion drop, can be expressed in the following form:

\[
F_h = \eta f_p V_{\text{in}} \tilde{f}_h \tag{5.10}
\]

\[
f_h(\alpha) = f_{\text{in}}(\alpha) + \frac{\eta_b}{\eta_a} [f_{\text{in}}(\alpha) + f_{\text{in}}(\alpha)] \tag{5.11}
\]

where \( \eta_{\text{in}} \) is the mean velocity of the flow of the inner liquid in a pore of the membrane, and \( f_{\text{in}} \) is the hydrodynamic force coefficient; the angle \( \alpha \) characterizes the size of the drop protruding from the membrane: \( \sin \alpha = r_p \rho r \) (Figure 13). The force coefficient \( f_{\text{in}} \) in eq 5.11 is a superposition of three different contributions:\(^{15}\) (i) from the inner (disperse) phase, \( f_{\text{in}}(\alpha) \), (ii) from the outer (continuous) phase, \( f_b(\alpha) \), and (iii) from the interplay of the hydrodynamic flows in the two phases at the boundary between them (at the drop surface), \( f_{\text{bd}}(\alpha) \). The hydrodynamic problem is solved in ref 15 for the case of low Reynolds numbers, and tangentially immobile drop interface.
The value of relationship between which has a spherical shape of radius $r$. The oil—water interface is spherical, of radius $r$. At a given $r_p$, the “protrusion” angle $\alpha$ characterizes the size of the drop ($0 < \alpha < 180^\circ$). The $z$-axis is directed along the axis of the pore; the plane $z = 0$ corresponds to the orifice of the pore; $p_m$ is the pressure in the inner phase “a” at the level $z = -L$; $p_\infty$ is the pressure in the bulk of the outer phase “b”.

which has a spherical shape of radius $r$. The expressions for calculating the coefficients $f_{a,0}(\alpha)$, $f_a(\alpha)$, and $f_{a,\alpha}(\alpha)$ are given in Appendix A. All of them are universal functions of the protrusion angle, $\alpha$.

Substituting eqs 5.7 and 5.10 into eq 5.9, we obtain the following condition (criterion) for drop detachment:

$$f_{h,m} = \frac{V}{\lambda t_a} = \left[\frac{V_{\text{max}}(\lambda)}{\lambda t_a}\right]^{2/3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.12)

where $V_{\text{max}}(\lambda)$ is a universal function that can be calculated as explained in Appendix A. Substituting an appropriate expression for the mean velocity, $v_m$, in eq 5.12, we obtain an equation for determining $\lambda$. With the obtained value of $\lambda$, we can further find the diameter of the detached drop, $d_d$:

$$d_d = \frac{r_d}{r_p} = \frac{1}{r_p} \frac{3V_{\text{max}}}{4\pi} \left[\frac{V_{\text{max}}}{4\pi}\right]^{1/3} \approx \frac{0.62035}{\lambda}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.13)

We have used eq 5.8 and the fact that the volume of the detached drop is $V_{\text{max}} = (4/3)\pi r_d^3$. In the case of a spherical oil—water interface, the volume of the drop protruding from the pore is (Figure 13)

$$V = \frac{\pi r_p^3}{3} \left(1 + \cos \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \sin \alpha$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.14)

Setting $V = V_{\text{max}}$ in eq 5.14, and using eq 5.8, we derive a relationship between $\lambda$ and $\alpha$:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda^3} = \frac{\pi}{3} \left(1 + \cos \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \sin \alpha$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.15)

The value of $\alpha$ in eq 5.15 refers to the moment of drop detachment. Below, we consider two important special cases, corresponding to regimes of drop formation (i) at constant flow rate and (ii) at constant transmembrane pressure.

5.3. Regime of Constant Flow Rate. Experimentally, this regime could be realized when the disperse phase is supplied by

![Figure 13. Sketch of a drop protruding from a cylindrical pore of radius $r_p$. The oil—water interface is spherical, of radius $r$. At a given $r_p$, the “protrusion” angle $\alpha$ characterizes the size of the drop ($0 < \alpha < 180^\circ$). The $z$-axis is directed along the axis of the pore; the plane $z = 0$ corresponds to the orifice of the pore; $p_m$ is the pressure in the inner phase “a” at the level $z = -L$; $p_\infty$ is the pressure in the bulk of the outer phase “b”.
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a motorized syringe in a separate capillary channel. The flow rate can be expressed in the form

$$Q = V_{\text{max}} = \frac{r_d}{t_d}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.16)

where $t_d$ is the period of drop detachment from the orifice of the channel. The mean velocity of the liquid is

$$v_m = \frac{Q}{\pi r_d^2} = \frac{V_{\text{max}}}{\pi r_d^2 t_d} = \frac{r_d}{\pi \lambda^2 t_d}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.17)

Here, we used eqs 5.16 and 5.8. Substituting eq 5.17 into the condition for drop detachment (eq 5.12), one obtains

$$q = \frac{\eta f_{a,0}(\alpha) V_{\text{max}}(\lambda)^{2/3}}{\lambda}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.18)

where $q$ could be interpreted as a dimensionless flow rate.

To determine the dependence of $d_d/d_p$ on $q$, it is convenient to use the protrusion angle $\alpha$ as a parameter. The computational procedure is the following. First, for a given value of $\alpha$, we determine $\lambda$ from eq 5.15. Second, for these values of $\lambda$ and $\alpha$, using the expressions in Appendix A, we calculate $V_{\text{max}}(\lambda)$ and $f_{a,0}(\alpha)$, the latter at a given value of the viscosity ratio $\eta_\alpha/\eta_a$. Finally, from eqs 5.13 and 5.18, we determine $r_d/r_p$ and $q$.

Figure 14 shows the dependence of the drop diameter $d_d$ (scaled with the pore diameter, $d_p$), on the dimensionless flow rate, $q$, at different values of the viscosity ratio, $\eta_\alpha/\eta_a$. In general, the drop diameter decreases with the increase of $q$ and $\eta_\alpha/\eta_a$. The effect of $\eta_\alpha/\eta_a$ is not so strong because, in eq 5.11, the viscosity ratio is multiplied by the term $(f_0 + f_{a,0})$, which is considerably smaller than $f_0$.

Figure 14 indicates that all factors that increase the dimensionless flow rate, $q = \eta f_0/\eta_0 t_d$, lead to a decrease in the ratio $d_d/d_p$ for the produced drops. The dashed lines in this figure show that a 3-fold increase in $q$ decreases the sizes of the detached droplets by a factor of about 1.5. The increase in the viscosity of the inner phase $\eta_\alpha$ (at fixed all other parameters) leads to a greater $q$, and, in view of Figure 14, this should lead to the production of smaller drops in the regime of constant flow rate. Note, however, that our experiments are carried out in the regime of constant transmembrane pressure, for which the increase in the viscosity of the inner phase $\eta_\alpha$ has a very small, almost negligible effect (compare the values of $d_d/d_p$ in Figures 9 and 10); more details are discussed in the next subsection.
5.4. Regime of Constant Transmembrane Pressure. In membrane emulsification, a constant pressure difference, \( P \), is applied across the microporous membrane, usually, by connecting the experimental setup to a gas bottle (Figure 2).

Let us consider a drop that is growing at the orifice of a cylindrical pore of radius \( r_p \) and length \( L \) (Figure 13). The pressures in the inner and outer phases (denoted by subscripts “a” and “b”, respectively) can be presented in the form\(^\text{15}\)

\[
p_a \equiv p_m + \frac{2\gamma}{r_s} + p_{a,dyn} \quad p_b \equiv p_m + p_{b,dyn}
\]

(5.19)

Here, \( p_m \) is the pressure in the bulk of the outer phase “b”, \( 2\gamma/r_s \) is the capillary pressure of the oil–water interface, and \( p_{a,dyn} \) and \( p_{b,dyn} \) are the dynamic (viscous) contributions to the scalar pressure in the respective phases. In general, \( p_a, p_b, p_{a,dyn}, \) and \( p_{b,dyn} \) are functions of the position vector, \( \mathbf{r} \), and of the protrusion angle, \( \alpha \). The force balance (per unit area) at the apex of the drop surface, that is, at the point where the \( \mathbf{z} \)-axis pierces the oil–water interface (Figure 13), is\(^\text{15}\)

\[
\frac{2\gamma}{r_s} + \left( p_b - 2\eta_b \frac{\partial \omega_b}{\partial z} \right)_{ap} = \left( p_a - 2\eta_a \frac{\partial \omega_a}{\partial z} \right)_{ap}
\]

(5.20)

where the subscript “ap” means that the expression in the parentheses should be estimated at the apex of the drop surface; \( \omega_a \) and \( \omega_b \) are the vertical components of the fluid velocity in the phases “a” and “b”, and the terms with the derivatives of \( \omega_a \) and \( \omega_b \) represent the contributions from the viscous stress tensor to the total stress. Substituting \( p_a \) and \( p_b \) from eq 5.19 into eq 5.20, we obtain

\[
\left( p_{a,dyn} - 2\eta_a \frac{\partial \omega_a}{\partial z} \right)_{ap} = \frac{\eta_b \nu_m \nu_{ab}}{r_p} \frac{\partial \omega_b}{\partial z}
\]

(5.21)

where\(^\text{15}\)

\[
f_{ab} = \frac{r_p^2 \eta_b \nu_m}{\eta_b \nu_{ab}} \left( p_{b,dyn} - 2\eta_b \frac{\partial \omega_b}{\partial z} \right)_{ap}
\]

(5.22)

\( f_{ab} \) can be calculated as explained in Appendix A. It is convenient to work in terms of the dimensionless pressure \( \tilde{p}_{a,0}(r) \), which is defined as follows:\(^\text{15}\)

\[
\tilde{p}_{a,0}(r) = \frac{\eta_a \nu_m}{r_p} \tilde{p}_a(r) + \left( p_a - 2\eta_a \frac{\partial \omega_a}{\partial z} \right)_{ap}
\]

(5.23)

The last term in the parentheses is independent of \( r \). In the special case when \( r = (0, 0, -L) \), eq 5.23 reduces to

\[
p_m = \frac{\eta_a \nu_m}{r_p} \pi_0(L/r_p) + \left( p_a - 2\eta_a \frac{\partial \omega_a}{\partial z} \right)_{ap}
\]

(5.24)

Here, \( p_m \) is the value of the pressure \( p_a \) at level \( z = -L \) in the cylindrical channel (Figure 13); \( \pi_0 \) is the value of the dimensionless pressure \( \tilde{p}_{a,0}(r) \) at \( r = (0, 0, -L) \); \( \pi_0 \) depends on the ratio \( L/r_p \) (see eq 5.29 below). Further, substituting \( p_a \) from eq 5.19 in the right-hand side of eq 5.24, we obtain

\[
p_m = \frac{\eta_a \nu_m}{r_p} \pi_0(L/r_p) + \left( p_{a,dyn} - 2\eta_a \frac{\partial \omega_a}{\partial z} \right)_{ap} + \frac{2\gamma}{r_s}
\]

(5.25)

\[\text{Figure 15. Dependence of the dimensionless pressure } \pi_0 \text{ on the dimensionless distance from the orifice of the pore, } z/r_p. \]

With the help of eq 5.21 and the geometrical relationship \( r_p/r_s = \sin \alpha \) (Figure 13), we bring eq 5.25 in the form

\[
r_p \frac{P_L}{2\gamma} = \frac{\nu_{ab}}{2\nu_f} \left[ \pi_0(L/r_p) + \frac{\eta_f \nu_{ab}}{\eta_a \nu} \right] + \sin \alpha
\]

(5.26)

where

\[
\Pi = \frac{r_p \frac{P_L}{2\gamma}}{2\nu_f \nu_{ab} \nu} \left[ \pi_0(L/r_p) + \frac{\eta_f \nu_{ab}}{\eta_a \nu} \right] + \sin \alpha
\]

(5.28)

Here, \( \Pi \) is a dimensionless pressure (\( P_L \), scaled by the capillary pressure \( 2\gamma/r_s \)). Plots of \( \pi_0 \) versus \( z/r_p \), calculated as explained in Appendix B, are shown in Figure 15 for \( \alpha = 150^\circ, 160^\circ, \) and \( 170^\circ \). (From the experimental drop and pore diameters, one can estimate that the drop detachment usually happens at \( 150^\circ < \alpha < 170^\circ \).) One sees that \( \pi_0 \) is insensitive to \( \alpha \). Substituting \( z = -L \), we interpolated the dependence in Figure 15 and obtained the following formula for calculating \( \pi_0(L/r_p) \):

\[
\pi_0(L/r_p) = \frac{8}{r_p} + 4.863 \left[ 0.1197 - 1.2999 \left( \frac{r_p}{L} \right) + 0.6810 \left( \frac{r_p}{L} \right)^2 - 0.0497 \left( \frac{r_p}{L} \right)^3 \right] \exp \left( -\frac{4}{r_p} \right)
\]

(5.29)

where \( L/r_p \gtrsim 0 \) and \( 150^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 180^\circ \). The first term in the right-hand side of eq 5.29 corresponds to Poiseuille flow in the channel, whereas the other terms represent small corrections due to edge effects in the vicinity of the channel orifice.

For a given \( L/r_p \), from eq 5.29 one can determine \( \pi_0 \), and then from eq 5.28 one can calculate the dependence of \( \Pi \) on the diameter ratio, \( d_d/d_p \). The computational procedure is the following: The angle \( \alpha \) is used as a parameter. For a given \( \alpha \), one calculates \( \lambda \) from eq 5.15. Next, \( f_{ab}(\alpha), f_s(\alpha), \) and \( V_{\text{max}}(\lambda) \) are calculated as explained in Appendix A. Finally, the values of \( d_d/d_p \) and \( \Pi \) are obtained from eqs 5.13 and 5.28.

Dependences of \( \Pi \) on \( d_d/d_p \), calculated for three experimental values of the viscosity ratio \( \eta_f/\eta_a \) (Table 1), are shown in Figure
Table 1. Parameters of the Curves in Figure 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\eta_b/\eta_a$</th>
<th>$(d_0/d_p)_{cr}$</th>
<th>$\Pi_{cr}$</th>
<th>$\alpha(T)^*$</th>
<th>$\kappa_0$</th>
<th>$L r_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\approx 0$</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>161.6</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>166.4</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^*$ This value corresponds to the minimum of the respective curve in Figure 16.

Figure 16. Dependence of the dimensionless pressure $\Pi$ on $d_0/d_p$. The three curves are calculated from eq 5.28 for three fixed experimental values of the viscosity ratio, $\eta_b/\eta_a$ (Table 1). The minimum of each curve, $\Pi_{cr}$ (j = 1, 2, 3), corresponds to the critical pressure for drop detachment. For $\Pi < \Pi_{cr}$, drops cannot be released from the pores. For a given $\Pi > \Pi_{cr}$, the intersection point, $A$, of the respective horizontal line with the calculated curve determines the dimensionless diameter of the formed drops, $d_0/d_p$.

16. One sees that, at a certain value of the diameters ratio, $(d_0/d_p)_{cr}$, the dimensionless pressure has a minimum corresponding to $\Pi_{cr}$. The physical picture ensuing from the curves in Figure 16 is the following:

For pressures smaller than the critical one ($\Pi < \Pi_{cr}$), drops cannot be released from the pores. At $\Pi = \Pi_{cr}$, the first drops are released with size corresponding to $(d_0/d_p)_{cr}$. At a higher pressure, corresponding to point $A$ in Figure 16, the size of the detached drops can be determined by projecting the point $A$ on the horizontal axis.

In our experiments, the drops (with $d_0 = d_0$), Figure 12a) are produced at a pressure that is just above the critical pressure for drop detachment. For this reason, we could identify the experimentally determined diameter ratio (section 4.3 and Table 1) with $(d_0/d_p)_{cr}$, that is, with the position of the minimum of the respective dependence in Figure 16. The derivative of the right-hand side of eq 5.28 was set equal to zero (condition for the minimum), and the value of $L r_p$ was determined from the obtained equation using the experimentally determined $d_0/d_p$. The calculated values of $L r_p$ are close to 0.5 (see the last column of Table 1). This result calls for discussion.

5.5. Discussion. A porous medium (e.g., an SPG membrane) could be modeled both theoretically and experimentally as a system of channels (pores) and chambers (cavities) as well as a microporous membrane, which is a structural characteristic of the SPG membranes.

Experimentally, when the transmembrane pressure reaches its critical value, one observes the release of drops from isolated “active” pores that are separated at comparatively large distances from each other. With the further increase of the transmembrane pressure, one observes the “activation” of more pores without a noticeable increase in the frequency of drop release from a given pore. These observations are related to the polydispersity of the pores: one can expect that the larger pores are the first that begin to release drops, whereas the smaller pores can be “activated” at greater pressures.

At the critical pressure, at which only some isolated pores are active, the liquid is supplied to an active pore though a large number of channels in the interior of the membrane. Then, the flow rate in these channels will be relatively low, whereas the flow rate in the terminal channel (that feeds the growing droplet, Figure 17) will be much greater. Consequently, the critical pressure difference for the terminal channel, $P_{cr}$, should be approximately equal to (slightly smaller than) the experimental critical transmembrane pressure, $P_{cr}$.

The experimental results are in agreement with this picture. For example, in the case of n-hexadecane-in-water emulsions (Figure 12), for which the aqueous phase is a solution of 250 mM SDS + 12 mM NaCl, the interfacial tension is $\gamma = 5$ mN/m, and the viscosity ratio is $\eta_b/\eta_a = 0.3$; for pore diameter $d_0 = 10.4$ $\mu$m, the experimental critical transmembrane pressure is

$$P_{cr} = 3920 \text{ Pa} \quad (5.30)$$

For the minimum of the curve with $\eta_b/\eta_a = 0.3$ in Figure 16, we have $\Pi_{cr} = 1.81$ (see also Table 1). Then, in view of eq 5.28, we obtain the theoretical critical pressure difference for the terminal channel (of length $L$):

$$P_{cr} \approx \frac{4\gamma}{d_0} \Pi_{cr} = 3481 \text{ Pa} \quad (5.31)$$

The difference, $P_{cr} - P_{cr,exp} = 439$ Pa, can be interpreted as the pressure difference due to the flow through the channels in the interior of the membrane (see above). Similar results have been obtained under other experimental conditions. For example, for pore diameter $d_0 = 5.1$ $\mu$m (all other parameters being the same), we measured $P_{cr} = 7840$ Pa, whereas the calculations give $P_{cr,exp} = 7098$ Pa. Then, the pressure difference due to the channels in the membrane interior is $P_{cr} - P_{cr,exp} = 742$ Pa.

As mentioned above, when the total transmembrane pressure $P$ is increased, the number of active pores is also increased,
whereas the flow rate (and the pressure difference $P_L$) for each separate active pore remains almost the same. Thus, we could have $P \approx P_i \approx P_{L,\text{cr}}$. In this regime, despite the increase in $P$, the pressure difference for a pore, $P_i$, is always close to $P_{L,\text{cr}}$, that is, close to the minimum of the respective curve in Figure 16. Hence, the size of the released drops is insensitive to the magnitude of the applied pressure, $P$. This regime gives a possible explanation of the upper branch in Figure 12a (drops of diameter $d_1$), which corresponds to the “normal” peak (Figure 5b). The slight tendency of $d_1$ to decrease with the rise of $P$ (Figure 12a) could be attributed to a small increase of $P_i$ above $P_{L,\text{cr}}$ (see Figure 16). In conclusion, the mean drop diameter for the “normal” peak (that with $d_1 = d_2$) corresponds to the quantity $(d_1/d_2)_{\text{cr}}$ that represents the position of the minimum of the respective curve in Figure 16.

It is remarkable that, in view of eq 5.28, the position of the minimum, $(d_1/d_2)_{\text{cr}}$, is independent of the interfacial tension, $\gamma$. In fact, $\gamma$ is present in the right-hand sides of eqs 5.12 and 5.26, but $\gamma$ cancels when the latter two equations are combined to derive eq 5.28. The circumstance that $(d_1/d_2)_{\text{cr}}$ predicted by eq 5.28 is independent of $\gamma$ is in agreement with the experimental results in Figure 8.

Likewise, the viscosity of the disperse phase, $\eta_d$, is present as a multiplier in the right-hand sides of eqs 5.12 and 5.26, but $\eta_d$ cancels when the latter two equations are combined to derive eq 5.28. The value of $(d_1/d_2)_{\text{cr}}$ predicted by eq 5.28 depends on $\eta_d$ only through the relatively small term $(\eta_p/\eta_d)_{ab}$. The latter fact is in agreement with the experimental result (Figures 9 and 10) that the increase of the magnitude of $\eta_p$ by several orders of magnitude has a rather small effect on the ratio $d_1/d_2$ (see also the positions of the minima for the upper two curves in Figure 16).

In summary, the prediction of the drop diameter, $d_0$, based on the minimum of the curves in Figure 16 is in agreement with the experimental observations. One has to initially characterize a given type of membrane with the respective value of $L/r_p$ determined for a specific system, as explained above (see Table 1, where $L/r_p \approx 0.47$ was obtained for SPG membranes). Then, eq 5.28 enables one to predict the drop sizes in any other emulsions produced by the membranes of this type.

6. Possible Explanation of the Anomalous Peak

The comparison of theory and experiment (sections 5.4 and 5.5) indicates that the curves with the minima in Figure 16 could give a possible explanation of the “normal” peak in Figure 5b, which corresponds to the upper branch ($d_0 = d_{01}$) in Figure 12a. To find a possible explanation of the “anomalous” peak in Figure 5b that corresponds to the lower branch ($d_0 = d_{02}$) in Figure 12a, we carried out additional experiments, which are described below.

We formed drops at the tip of a glass capillary of inner diameter $d_p = 180 \mu m$. The outer phase was an aqueous solution of 100 mM SDS + 100 mM NaCl. The inner phase was silicone oil (PDMS) of viscosity 5 mPa·s. The mass densities of the water and oil phases is 0.08 g/cm³, so that the instabilities in this system are due mostly to capillary and hydrodynamic (rather than gravitational) effects. The oil was supplied with a constant flow rate by means of a motorized syringe. The only motion in the continuous phase is due to the breakup of oil drops from the capillary (there is no crossflow or other external flow in the continuous phase).

Figure 18a shows three consecutive video frames of the process of drop detachment at a $Q = 10$ mL/min flow rate of oil. The drop breakup happens close to the capillary tip, after the formation of a comparatively short neck. The detached drops are monodisperse, without formation of secondary smaller drops.

Figure 18b shows three consecutive video frames of the process of drop detachment at a $Q = 270$ mL/min flow rate of oil. In this case, an extended liquid filament (jet) is formed, which ends with a spherical oil drop. This drop is growing until it reaches a certain critical size, and then it breaks up as a result of capillary instability. Experimentally, the diameter of the drops that are formed in this way (Figure 18b) is about 2.6 times smaller than the diameter of the drops formed at the capillary tip (Figure 18a).

These two different mechanisms have been investigated in a number of studies, and have been called “dripping” and “jetting” modes of drop breakup. The transition between the two mechanisms occurs at a certain critical flow rate. From this viewpoint, the following explanation could be given to the two branches of drops with different diameters in Figure 12a.

The upper branch with $d_0 = d_{01}$ in Figure 12a (the normal peak in Figure 5b), can be identified with drop breakup in dripping mode. This interpretation is in agreement with our analysis in sections 5.4 and 5.5. The lower branch with $d_0 = d_{02}$ in Figure 12a (the anomalous peak in Figure 5b), could be explained with

Determining Drop Size in Membrane Emulsification


7. Summary and Conclusions

Here, we investigate experimentally and theoretically the factors that determine the size of the emulsion droplets produced by membrane emulsification in the “batch regime” (without applied crossflow). Hydrophilic glass membranes of pore diameters between 1 and 10 μm have been used to obtain O/W emulsions. If the surfactant concentration is high enough (> 0.5 mM for SDS), the surfactant stabilizes the drops against coalescence, and then their size becomes insensitive to further increase of surfactant concentration and to the type of surfactant used (Figures 6, 8, and 9). This was established in experiments with four emulsifiers: anionic SDS, SDBS, and AOT, and zwitterionic CAPB. All further experiments were carried out at sufficiently high surfactant concentrations that result in stability of the formed drops.

Although, in principle, one could expect that the oil–water interfacial tension, γ, could influence the drop breakup, we experimentally established that the size of the formed drops does not depend on γ (Figure 8). Moreover, the size of the formed drops is insensitive to the increase in the viscosity of the inner (oil) phase, ηi (see Figures 9 and 10). However, the produced drops become markedly bigger when the viscosity of the outer (water) phase, ηo, is increased (compare Figures 9 and 11). The drops are relatively monodisperse when the working transmembrane pressure is slightly above the critical pressure for drop detachment. At higher applied pressures, the drop-size distribution becomes bimodal: superposition of a “normal” peak of monodisperse drops and an “anomalous” peak of polydisperse drops is observed (Figures 5b and 12).

To interpret the experimental results, in section 5 we developed a quantitative theoretical model of drop detachment. Following an analogy with the breakup of pendant drops in gravitational field, we assumed that the detachment happens when the drop shape becomes unstable. In other words, the drop breakup is related to a transition from stable to unstable dynamic equilibrium, rather than to a lack of equilibrium (i.e., misbalance of the acting forces). The basic model assumption is that, at the moment of breakup, the hydrodynamic ejection force, Fh, acting on the drop is equal to the critical capillary force that corresponds to the stability—instability transition in the drop profile (eq 5.9). This leads to a mathematical formula (eq 5.12) that expresses the condition for drop detachment. Further, this expression is applied to predict the mean size of the obtained drops in regimes of constant flow rate (eq 5.18 and Figure 14) and constant transmembrane pressure (eq 5.28 and Figure 16). It turns out that the production of monodisperse drops at pressures slightly greater than the critical one corresponds to a working regime near the minima of the curves in Figure 16 (see sections 5.4 and 5.5).

Theoretically, the positions of the latter minima are insensitive to the variation of the interfacial tension and to the increase of viscosity of the inner (oil) phase at viscosity ratios in the range 0 < ηi/ηo < 0.3, in full agreement with the experimental findings. In addition, the transition from unimodal to bimodal drop size distribution upon increase of the transmembrane pressure (or flow rate) can be interpreted in terms of the transition from the “dripping” to the “jetting” mechanism of drop breakup (section 6).

Our results could be useful for a deeper understanding of the physicochemical factors and mechanisms that influence the process of membrane emulsification and could be helpful for prediction and control of the mean size and polydispersity of the drops in the produced emulsions.
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Appendix A. Calculation of \( V_{\text{max}}(\lambda) \) and \( f_h(\alpha) \)

Calculation of the Dimensionless Maximum Drop Volume, \( V_{\text{max}} \). For this goal, one can use accurate interpolation formulas from ref 40. Note that, in view of eq 5.13, smaller \( \lambda \) corresponds to bigger drops.

(i) For the biggest drops (\( \lambda \leq 0.101570 \)), one can use the expression

\[
\tilde{V}_{\text{max}} = (2\pi f_d \lambda)^{3/2} \tag{A.1}
\]

where \( f_d \) is given by the Gunde–Hartland asymptotic expansion:

\[
f_d = 0.99998 - 1.561285\lambda + 3.131809\lambda^2 - 4.048916\lambda^3 + 2.849794\lambda^4 - 0.761799\lambda^5 \tag{A.2}
\]

(ii) For drops of intermediate size (0.101570 ≤ \( \lambda \leq 0.341116 \)), one can use the expression \(^{40}\)

\[
\tilde{V}_{\text{max}} = \frac{-0.25713558 \times 10^{-13} + 1.8130156\lambda + 36.028621\lambda^2 - 196.028151\lambda^3 + 706.78973\lambda^4 - 1577.8383\lambda^5 + 2603.8524\lambda^6 - 3316.2890\lambda^7 + 2376.3198\lambda^8}{1577.8383\lambda^5 + 2603.8524\lambda^6 - 3316.2890\lambda^7 + 2376.3198\lambda^8} \tag{A.3}
\]

where

\[
\tilde{V}_{\text{max}} = \frac{-0.25713558 \times 10^{-13} + 1.8130156\lambda + 36.028621\lambda^2 - 196.028151\lambda^3 + 706.78973\lambda^4 - 1577.8383\lambda^5 + 2603.8524\lambda^6 - 3316.2890\lambda^7 + 2376.3198\lambda^8}{1577.8383\lambda^5 + 2603.8524\lambda^6 - 3316.2890\lambda^7 + 2376.3198\lambda^8} \tag{A.3}
\]
(iii) For the smallest drops (0.341116 ≤ \(\lambda\) ≤ 0.976264), one can use the expression\(^{40}\)
\[
\hat{V}_{\text{max}} = -6.4649722 + 92.566565 \lambda - 509.65058 \lambda^2 + 1642.2681 \lambda^3 - 3104.5603 \lambda^4 + 3512.2924 \lambda^5 - 2175.1711 \lambda^6 + 594.94227 \lambda^7 - 29.400607 \lambda^8
\]
From eq 5.13 we obtain that \(\lambda > 0.976264\) corresponds to \(d \dot{d}/d_{\alpha} < 0.6354\); for the processes investigated by us, smaller drops do not represent physical interest.

**Hydrodynamic Force Coefficient, \(f_{\text{w}}\).** To calculate this coefficient, we will use expressions derived in ref 15 for protrusion angles in the range 150° ≤ \(\alpha\) ≤ 180°, which corresponds to \(d \dot{d}/d_{\alpha} \geq 1.9914\) (see eqs 5.13 and 5.15). Thus, \(f_{\text{w}}(\alpha)\) is given by the expression\(^{15}\)
\[
f_{\text{w}}(\alpha) = f_{\text{w},0}(\alpha) + \frac{\eta_{\text{w}}}{\eta_{\text{a}}} (f_{\text{w}}(\alpha) + f_{\text{w},0}(\alpha))
\]
where
\[
f_{\text{w},0}(\alpha) \approx 15.4891 - 1.5710 \cos(2\alpha) - 3.0621 \cos^2(2\alpha) + 2.1847 \cos^3(2\alpha)
\]
\[
f_{\text{w}}(\alpha) \approx \frac{9}{2} \pi \frac{\xi}{\pi} \left[ 1 + \frac{1 - 433.64 \xi}{12.063 + 9255.6 \xi} \right] \xi \equiv (1 + \cos \alpha) \sin \alpha
\]
\[
f_{\text{w},0}(\alpha) \approx \frac{6\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\alpha}{2} \left[ 0.79381 - \ln(\pi - \alpha) + \frac{(\pi - \alpha)^2}{24} - \frac{(\pi - \alpha)^3}{1440} \right]
\]
The accuracy of eqs A.6–A.9 is given in ref 15.

**Appendix B. Calculation of \(\tau_0(L/r_p)\)**

To calculate the pressure along the axis of revolution in the inner phase “a” (Figure 13), we will use the \(z\)-component of the momentum balance equation. In terms of dimensionless variables, the latter can be expressed in the form\(^{15}\)
\[
\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{u}_a}{\partial z^2} = \frac{\partial \tilde{p}_{a,0}}{\partial z}
\]
where the dimensionless coordinates are \(\tilde{r} = r/r_p\) and \(\tilde{z} = z/r_p\), and the dimensionless pressure, \(\tilde{p}_{a,0}\) is defined by eq 5.23. Let us integrate eq B.1 along the axis of revolution (\(r = 0\)) from \(z = -L\) to the drop apex (Figure 13):
\[
\int_{-L/r_p}^{L/r_p} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial r} \right) dz + \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial z} \bigg|_{L/r_p} - \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial z} \bigg|_{-L/r_p} = \tilde{p}_{a,0} - \tau_0
\]
As usual, the subscript “ap” denotes that the respective quantity should be estimated at the drop apex. For the position vector \(r\) situated at the apex, the terms with \(\tilde{p}_{a,0}\) in the left- and right-hand sides of eq 5.23 cancel each other, and one obtains
\[
\tilde{p}_{a,0} \bigg|_{ap} = 2 \frac{r_p}{v_m} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial z} \bigg|_{ap}
\]
Substituting eq B.3 into eq B.2, we derive
\[
\tau_0 = - \int_{-L/r_p}^{L/r_p} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial r} \right) dz + \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial z} \bigg|_{L/r_p} - 2 \sin \alpha(1 + \cos \alpha)
\]
From eqs D.16 and D.17 in ref 15 (Appendix D), it follows
\[
\tau_0 = - \int_{-L/r_p}^{L/r_p} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial r} \right) dz + \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_a}{\partial z} \bigg|_{L/r_p} - 2 \sin \alpha(1 + \cos \alpha)
\]
Finally, with the help of eqs D.12 and D.21 in ref 15 (Appendix D), we obtain
\[
\tau_0 = \frac{8}{3} \int_{-L/r_p}^{L/r_p} \frac{\partial^3 \psi_a}{\partial z^3} dz - 2 \frac{\partial^3 \psi_a}{\partial z^3} \bigg|_{L/r_p} - 2 \sin \alpha(1 + \cos \alpha)
\]
where \(\psi_a\) is the dimensionless stream function defined and calculated in ref 15. From the numerical solution for \(\psi_a\), the derivatives and the integral in eq B.6 have been numerically calculated. The results are shown in Figure 15, where \(z = -L\).