Hydrogel Draw Agents for Seawater Forward Osmosis: Osmotic Design, Water Flux, and Regeneration

Literature review and conceptual analysis

Abstract

Hydrogels are attractive forward-osmosis draw agents because their cross-linked networks can generate water uptake while greatly reducing the reverse diffusion associated with small dissolved draw solutes. Their central weakness is equally distinctive: water held by the network must move through the gel and later be released at acceptable rate and energy. This literature review examines hydrogel draw agents as coupled thermodynamic, transport, mechanical, and regeneration systems, with particular attention to the sodium alginate-graphene oxide material reported by Tang et al. The study advances the field by applying Flory-Rehner theory and interaction-energy calculations to osmotic-pressure regulation and by demonstrating operation against simulated seawater at 35,000 ppm sodium chloride. Its initial and average flux values, porous structure, compression-based recovery, and continuous-operation evidence are assessed alongside earlier work on polymer hydrogels, particle size, electric and thermal responsiveness, alginate chemistry, graphene-based water transport, and forward-osmosis limitations. The review argues that optimization should target recoverable water productivity rather than equilibrium swelling alone. It proposes a design map linking polymer-solvent affinity, fixed charge, cross-link density, filler interfaces, diffusion length, modulus, and regeneration work, and identifies the measurements needed to compare hydrogel draws under saline conditions.

1. The Draw Agent Defines the Process

Forward osmosis uses a difference in water chemical potential to move water through a selectively permeable membrane. A concentrated draw phase pulls water from the feed while the membrane retains salts and other solutes. The conceptual simplicity masks a systems problem. The membrane reduces the usable osmotic difference through concentration polarization, the draw solute may diffuse backward, and the diluted draw stream must be separated to obtain product water. Cath et al. (2006) emphasize that these factors are intrinsic to practical forward-osmosis design.

A draw agent must therefore satisfy requirements that can conflict. It should create high osmotic pressure, remain on the draw side, have low viscosity near the membrane, avoid toxicity and corrosion, resist fouling, be inexpensive, and regenerate with little work. Small salts produce large numbers of dissolved species and hence strong osmotic pressure, but can cross the membrane and require an additional separation. Macromolecules and particles reduce reverse flux but often raise viscosity and slow mass transfer.

Hydrogels move the draw phase into a cross-linked solid or soft solid. Hydrophilic or ionic groups lower water chemical potential inside the network. Cross-links retain the polymer and provide shape. An external stimulus or mechanical load can release water. This arrangement potentially integrates draw containment and recovery, but it also introduces internal diffusion and elastic resistance. The draw agent is no longer only a solution composition; it is a material architecture.

2. Thermodynamics of Swelling Pressure

Hydrogel swelling is governed by a balance. Mixing favors entry of solvent when polymer-solvent interactions are favorable. Fixed ionic groups add an osmotic contribution through mobile counterions. Network elasticity opposes deformation. The Flory-Rehner framework expresses the equilibrium between mixing and elastic terms in a cross-linked polymer network (Flory & Rehner, 1943). More elaborate treatments are needed for charged, heterogeneous, or strongly interacting gels, but the framework remains valuable because it makes tradeoffs explicit.

Increasing hydrophilicity can increase water uptake, yet absorbed water is not automatically useful draw capacity. If the network is too weak, it may fragment or deform irreversibly. If it is too highly cross-linked, elastic resistance suppresses swelling. If water is strongly bound, regeneration becomes difficult. The design target is a reversible pressure-volume cycle: high enough swelling pressure to overcome feed activity and transport losses, followed by efficient release under a practical stimulus.

Wang et al. (2020) review hydrogel draw solutes and identify osmotic pressure, swelling rate, particle size, membrane properties, and regeneration as linked variables. Their synthesis is important because many reports optimize one variable in isolation. A high equilibrium swelling ratio measured in deionized water does not demonstrate useful operation against saline feed, where the external osmotic pressure directly opposes uptake.

3. The Sodium Alginate-Graphene Oxide Case

Tang et al. (2024) report a sodium alginate-graphene oxide hydrogel designed through osmotic-pressure regulation rather than composition screening alone. The authors use Flory-Rehner theory to guide the hydrogel and calculate interaction energy to interpret how molecular interactions regulate pressure. The resulting material is described as a homogeneous porous network from which water can be recovered through compression.

The feed condition is a major feature. The SA-GO-1 hydrogel was tested against simulated seawater containing 35,000 ppm sodium chloride. It reportedly produced an initial water flux of 0.4429 L m-2 h-1 and an average flux of 0.1783 L m-2 h-1. Stable performance was reported during continuous forward-osmosis operation. These values should be read together: the difference between initial and average flux reveals time dependence and the approach toward a lower driving condition as the gel swells and local concentration polarization develops.

The study addresses a recognized limitation of hydrogel draws, which had often been demonstrated with feed concentrations below 8,000 ppm. Performance against 35,000 ppm suggests that the regulated network maintains a chemical-potential advantage under a much stronger saline challenge. It does not mean that the gel's osmotic pressure alone explains observed flux. Membrane resistance, support-layer polarization, gel-membrane contact, pore-scale transport, and hydrodynamics remain part of the measured system.

The material choice is mechanistically plausible. Alginate is an anionic polysaccharide whose carboxylate groups and ion-mediated gelation provide water affinity and tunable mechanics. Lee and Mooney (2012) show that alginate properties depend on molecular composition, cross-linking ion, and network design. Graphene oxide presents oxygen-containing groups and high-aspect-ratio sheets that can alter water affinity, pore structure, and mechanical response. Nair et al. (2012) demonstrated unusual water permeation through graphene-oxide laminates, although transport through a dispersed hydrogel composite is physically different from transport through a stacked membrane. The relevance is the sensitivity of water behavior to GO surface chemistry and nanostructure, not a direct equivalence of pathways.

4. What Earlier Hydrogel Studies Established

Li et al. (2013) systematically examined polymer hydrogels as forward-osmosis draws and varied draw composition, particle size, feed concentration, and membrane type. Incorporating carbon filler increased swelling and flux under some conditions, but excessive filler reduced swelling. Smaller hydrogel particles improved draw performance because they shortened diffusion paths and increased interfacial area. Higher feed salinity reduced flux, and membrane selection altered results. These observations anticipate the multivariable design problem faced by SA-GO materials.

Razmjou et al. (2013) focused on particle size in stimuli-responsive hydrogels. Smaller particles supported stronger forward-osmosis performance, while particle dimensions also influenced water release under thermal stimulation. The study illustrates a recurring tradeoff: small particles speed mass transfer but may be harder to retain, pack, compress, and recover. A practical process may need a supported layer, monolith, or structured bed rather than an unconstrained powder.

Stimulus selection changes the recovery mechanism. Cui et al. (2018) studied electric-responsive AMPS/DMAEMA hydrogels and used an external field to dewater the draw. Electric triggering can avoid bulk heating and provides controllability, but electrode reactions, field uniformity, ion migration, and electrical efficiency enter the balance. Zhang et al. (2020) constructed a thermo-responsive PNIPAM/gamma-PGA/PEG network with a reported lower critical solution temperature near 35.2 degrees C and rapid dewatering. Thermal responsiveness can use low-grade heat, but heating and cooling the gel-water mass and transferring heat across cycles can dominate process energy.

Compression is attractive because mechanical work can be applied directly and rapidly. The hydrogel must be sufficiently porous for water escape and sufficiently strong for repeated loading. Tang et al. (2024) place compression within the material design rather than treating dewatering as an afterthought. The next question is quantitative: how much acceptable product water is recovered at a specified pressure and strain, and how does that recovery change across hundreds or thousands of cycles?

5. A Coupled Design Map

Six variables organize hydrogel draw-agent design. The first is polymer-solvent affinity. Favorable mixing increases uptake but can make water release less complete. The second is fixed charge density. Ionic groups increase osmotic pressure, although counterion condensation, external ionic strength, and divalent-ion exchange can reduce the ideal contribution.

The third variable is cross-link density. More cross-links increase modulus and dimensional stability while reducing swelling and mesh size. The fourth is filler loading and interface chemistry. Graphene oxide or carbon particles can increase reinforcement, hydrophilicity, and porosity, but aggregation and immobilized chains can reverse those gains. A composition optimum is therefore expected.

The fifth variable is diffusion length. Water must travel from the membrane-facing interface through the network. Thin films and small particles respond quickly; thick monoliths are easier to handle but develop gradients. The sixth variable is regeneration coupling. The network must translate thermal, electrical, chemical, optical, or mechanical input into water release without degradation.

These variables should be optimized against a process objective rather than a material property. One possible objective is net recovered-water productivity: the volume of water meeting quality criteria per membrane area and cycle time, multiplied by the fraction released, divided by draw-material inventory and regeneration energy. This objective makes clear why a very high swelling ratio can be inferior if the gel releases little water or cycles slowly.

6. Membrane and Boundary-Layer Coupling

Forward-osmosis flux is often represented as proportional to an effective osmotic-pressure difference across the active layer, moderated by membrane water permeability. The effective difference can be much smaller than the bulk difference because the membrane support traps concentration gradients. Hydrogel draws create an additional interface whose contact and local water activity may not match a well-mixed liquid solution.

The membrane orientation, support structural parameter, cross-flow velocity, temperature, and spacer geometry must be reported. Direct comparison of hydrogel formulations across different membranes can otherwise attribute a system effect to the gel. Cath et al. (2006) and later reviews treat concentration polarization as a defining limit of forward osmosis; hydrogel research should integrate that membrane literature rather than report swelling and flux as if the draw were isolated.

Fouling also changes the boundary. A low-pressure process may show different fouling reversibility from reverse osmosis, but real seawater contains colloids, organics, microorganisms, and multivalent ions. Graphene oxide and alginate surfaces may interact with these species. Werber et al. (2016) argue that next-generation water-treatment materials must combine molecular selectivity with fouling resistance, fabrication, and stable performance. The same systems perspective applies to the draw side.

7. Salinity, Ion Specificity, and Real Water

Sodium chloride concentration is a necessary first axis because it sets feed osmotic pressure. Real seawater adds ion specificity. Calcium can cross-link alginate and change its modulus and swelling. Magnesium and sulfate alter ionic strength and activity. pH affects ionization of carboxyl groups and GO surfaces. These changes can alter both draw pressure and regeneration.

A staged test matrix can isolate mechanisms. Stage one varies sodium chloride concentration to map the thermodynamic threshold. Stage two uses synthetic multi-ion seawater and selectively omits calcium or magnesium to identify ion effects. Stage three adds representative organic matter and colloids. Stage four tests natural water across seasons. At every stage, the gel should be analyzed after exposure for composition, swelling pressure, modulus, mass loss, and structural change.

Tang et al. (2024) establish feasibility at 35,000 ppm sodium chloride. Extending that evidence to real seawater is not a routine confirmation; it is a mechanistic test of whether the alginate-GO network maintains its designed interactions in a multicomponent electrolyte.

8. Regeneration and Energy Accounting

Forward osmosis does not create fresh water merely when water crosses the membrane. The water must leave the draw phase. Elimelech and Phillip (2011) emphasize that desalination technologies remain constrained by thermodynamics and by complete-system energy. An FO process that uses little pumping but high regeneration work is not intrinsically low energy.

Mechanical compression should be reported as a pressure-volume path. Required pressure, expressed-water fraction, cycle time, residual water, elastic recovery, and mechanical losses can be integrated to estimate specific work. Equipment efficiency and pumping remain. The quality of expressed water must be tested for polymer fragments, graphene oxide, ions, and organics. If a polishing step is necessary, it belongs inside the process boundary.

Durability changes energy and environmental performance. Gel replacement consumes material and creates waste. Loss of graphene oxide raises both cost and water-quality questions. Life-cycle assessment is premature without a stable formulation and process, but material and energy inventories can begin at laboratory scale. Reporting them makes later assessment possible.

9. Experimental Priorities

First, measure swelling pressure directly across salinity and composition, not only equilibrium mass uptake. Second, separate membrane resistance from gel diffusion through controlled geometries and independent membrane characterization. Third, report time-resolved flux and cumulative transfer until a defined fraction of equilibrium is reached. Fourth, quantify compression work and recovered-water quality.

Fifth, conduct long-cycle experiments with periodic chemical and mechanical characterization. Three or five cycles identify gross reversibility; hundreds reveal fatigue and leaching. Sixth, compare the SA-GO material with at least one liquid draw and one established hydrogel under the same membrane and feed. Seventh, test multivalent ions and natural-water constituents. Eighth, report batch-to-batch variation in GO dispersion, cross-linking, pore structure, and performance.

The comparison should not be reduced to maximum flux. Hydrogel draws may justify lower flux if they achieve negligible reverse loss, low recovery work, durable operation, and simple product separation. The research objective is a favorable system tradeoff.

10. Limits of Current Evidence

The Tang et al. (2024) study provides a coherent mechanism-guided design and an important saline-feed demonstration. Its reported average flux is below the initial value and remains modest in absolute terms. Whether that level supports a practical module depends on material loading, membrane area, cycle time, and recovery rate. Continuous stability is encouraging, while long-cycle compression fatigue, real-seawater chemistry, and full energy accounting remain open.

Earlier responsive hydrogels show that high initial flux or dewatering percentage under dilute feeds does not settle the process question (Cui et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2020). Different stimuli shift rather than eliminate energy and equipment needs. The field should welcome designs that reveal the tradeoff clearly, even when one metric is not record-setting.

Conclusion

Hydrogel draw agents transform forward osmosis from a draw-solution problem into a soft-material cycle. Osmotic pressure, diffusion, mechanics, membrane coupling, and regeneration must all work within the same architecture. Tang et al. (2024) advance this architecture by applying polymer-network theory and interaction calculations to a sodium alginate-graphene oxide hydrogel, operating against simulated seawater, reporting both initial and average flux, and recovering water through compression.

The most productive next step is not simply to maximize swelling. It is to design a reversible pressure-volume material that produces acceptable water at useful rate, survives realistic ions and repeated cycles, and returns more energy and simplicity than it consumes. A coupled design map and consistent reporting can make hydrogel studies comparable and reveal where material innovation genuinely improves the desalination process.

References

Tang, B., Gao, S., Gui, C., Luo, Q., Wang, T., Huang, K., ... & Jiang, H. (2024). Osmotic pressure regulated sodium alginate-graphene oxide hydrogel as a draw agent in forward osmosis desalination. *Desalination*, *586*, 117863.

Cath, T. Y., Childress, A. E., & Elimelech, M. (2006). Forward osmosis: Principles, applications, and recent developments. *Journal of Membrane Science, 281*(1-2), 70-87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2006.05.048

Cui, H., Zhang, H., Yu, M., & Yang, F. (2018). Performance evaluation of electric-responsive hydrogels as draw agent in forward osmosis desalination. *Desalination, 426*, 118-126.

Elimelech, M., & Phillip, W. A. (2011). The future of seawater desalination: Energy, technology, and the environment. *Science, 333*(6043), 712-717. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1200488

Flory, P. J., & Rehner, J., Jr. (1943). Statistical mechanics of cross-linked polymer networks II: Swelling. *The Journal of Chemical Physics, 11*(11), 521-526. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1723792

Lee, K. Y., & Mooney, D. J. (2012). Alginate: Properties and biomedical applications. *Progress in Polymer Science, 37*(1), 106-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2011.06.003

Li, D., Zhang, X., Simon, G. P., & Wang, H. (2013). Forward osmosis desalination using polymer hydrogels as a draw agent: Influence of draw agent, feed solution and membrane on process performance. *Water Research, 47*(1), 209-215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2012.09.049

Nair, R. R., Wu, H. A., Jayaram, P. N., Grigorieva, I. V., & Geim, A. K. (2012). Unimpeded permeation of water through helium-leak-tight graphene-based membranes. *Science, 335*(6067), 442-444. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1211694

Razmjou, A., Simon, G. P., & Wang, H. (2013). Effect of particle size on the performance of forward osmosis desalination by stimuli-responsive polymer hydrogels as a draw agent. *Chemical Engineering Journal, 215-216*, 913-920. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2012.11.088

Wang, J., Gao, S., Tian, J., Cui, F., & Shi, W. (2020). Recent developments and future challenges of hydrogels as draw solutes in forward osmosis process. *Water, 12*(3), 692. https://doi.org/10.3390/w12030692

Werber, J. R., Osuji, C. O., & Elimelech, M. (2016). Materials for next-generation desalination and water purification membranes. *Nature Reviews Materials, 1*, 16018. https://doi.org/10.1038/natrevmats.2016.18

Zhang, K., Li, F., Wu, Y., Feng, L., & Zhang, L. (2020). Construction of ionic thermo-responsive PNIPAM/gamma-PGA/PEG hydrogel as a draw agent for enhanced forward-osmosis desalination. *Desalination, 495*, 114667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2020.114667