Virus harvesting in perfusion culture: Choosing the right type of hollow fiber membrane
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Abstract
The use of bioreactors coupled to membrane-based perfusion systems enables very high cell and product concentrations in vaccine and viral vector manufacturing. Many virus particles, however, are not stable and either lose their infectivity or physically degrade resulting in significant product losses if not harvested continuously. Even hollow fiber membranes with a nominal pore size of 0.2 μm can retain much smaller virions within a bioreactor. Here, we report on a systematic study to characterize structural and physicochemical membrane properties with respect to filter fouling and harvesting of yellow fever virus (YFV; ~50 nm). In tangential flow filtration perfusion experiments, we observed that YFV retention was only marginally determined by nominal but by effective pore sizes depending on filter fouling. Evaluation of scanning electron microscope images indicated that filter fouling can be reduced significantly by choosing membranes with (i) a flat inner surface (low boundary layer thickness), (ii) a smooth material structure (reduced deposition), (iii) a high porosity (high transmembrane flux), (iv) a distinct pore size distribution (well-defined pore selectivity), and (v) an increased fiber wall thickness (larger effective surface area). Lowest filter fouling was observed with polysulfone (PS) membranes. While the use of a small-pore PS membrane (0.08 μm) allowed to fully retain YFV within the bioreactor, continuous product harvesting was achieved with the large-pore PS membrane (0.34 μm). Due to the low protein rejection of the latter, this membrane type could also be of interest for other applications, that is, recombinant protein production in perfusion cultures.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

Viral vaccine and viral vector production can be intensified by culti-

tivating animal cells in perfusion mode. The increased cell con-

centration allows for higher virus titers. To retain cells in the bioreactor vessel, cell retention devices are required that are typi-

cally classified by their physical separation principle such as filtration,

dedimentation, ultrasonic fixation, or dielectrophoretic exclusion

(Castilho & Medronho, 2002). Due to their scalability, simplicity, and
efficient cell retention, hollow fiber-based systems are today widely

applied for manufacturing of recombinant proteins (Bielsler, Wolf,

Souquet, Broly, & Morbidelli, 2018). In addition, there is a growing
interest for their use in the production of viral vaccines (Gallo-

Ramirez, Nikolay, Genzel, & Reichl, 2015; Tapia, Vázquez-Ramirez,

Genzel, & Reichl, 2016). With increasing cell concentrations, larger
 quantities of viruses and other particles are typically released into

the medium. In contrast to recombinant protein production, virus
infection triggers cell apoptosis, which results in cell degradation and
lysis increasing the overall burden of impurities. Besides virus par-

ticles and extracellular vesicles, high amounts of DNA and proteins
can accumulate. During continuous harvesting this can cause pore
narrowing and eventually membrane blockage. In the recent years,
numerous studies have reported on such unwanted filter fouling even
when large-pore hollow fiber membranes have been applied (Bolton

& Apostolidis, 2017; Genzel et al., 2014; Nikolay, Castilho, Reichl,

& Genzel, 2018; Nikolay, Léon, Schwamborn, Genzel, & Reichl, 2018;

Walther, McLarty, & Johnson, 2018; S. Wang et al., 2017). Product
retention was in each case correlated to filter fouling, but a sys-
tematic characterization of membrane properties and the perform-
ance of retention devices in virus particle harvesting is still missing.

Membrane fouling is studied intensively for downstream pro-
cessing (DSP), but only a very limited number of studies was per-
formed regarding the use of membranes in upstream processing, that
is, for perfusion cultivations. However, product retention has gained
more attention as novel production systems aim towards process inten-
sification and continuous biomanufacturing. Three mechanisms
are mainly relevant for filter fouling leading to a reduced trans-
membrane flux and increased membrane resistance (Trzaskus, de

Vos, Kemperman, & Nijmeijer, 2015):

(1) Internal fouling: adsorption of membrane-compatible particles to
the filter material leading to pore narrowing (particle size <
pore size);

(2) Partial or complete pore blocking: steric pore clogging with
particles or agglomerates (particle size ~ pore size);

(3) Gel/cake layer formation: additional solute layer formation of
larger particles on top of the membrane by adsorption and sub-
sequent compression by smaller particles (particle size > pore
sizes).

While internal fouling typically narrows pore channels, pore
blockage, and cake layer formation equally contribute to a reduction
in the effective membrane cutoff leading to membrane blockage and
filtration termination. The fouling behavior of a hollow fiber module
is closely associated with the properties of the membrane, in parti-
cular, its pore size distribution, porosity, surface and material
roughness, and inner membrane surface charge. Overall properties
do not only depend on the specific membrane material used, but also
on fabrication procedures and postmodifications (Cornelissen, 1997;

Rana & Matsuura, 2010; Ullbricht, Richau, & Kamusewitz, 1998). Due

to the high complexity of cell culture processes (e.g., large variation
in particles sizes, different surface charges and concentrations, and
diverse transport properties), the description of fouling is typically
limited to (semi-)empirical models.

Besides the choice of the membrane, specific operational strate-
gies can be established to minimize the risk of filter blockage that take
additionally into account the shear sensitivity of animal cells (Futselaar,
1993). First, concentration polarization and boundary layer res-
tances should be reduced to increase mass transfer coefficients.
This can be achieved by increasing the cross-flow velocity (resulting
in higher Reynolds numbers) in the filter lumen (e.g., higher flow rate
and smaller hollow fiber diameter) or by reducing the transmembrane
flux (e.g., lower permeate flow rate and increased membrane area).
An-
other option is the inversion of the tangential flow filtration (TFF)
direction resulting in an alternating (bidirectional) tangential flow
(ATF). At a given frequency using high flow pulses, this increases the
Reynolds number and potentially vortex formation so that foulants
are removed more effectively. Second, hydraulic backflushing can
be considered by reversing the permeate flow direction across the
membrane. This can lift loose deposits on the membrane surface
(Hiller, Clark, & Blanch, 1993; Kelly et al., 2014). Likewise, fast
versions of the feed flow direction, as described for ATF systems, can
be applied. Thereby, membrane sections along the fiber change peri-
odically the flow direction across the membrane facilitating continuous
backflushing with each pump cycle (Radoniqi, Zhang, Bardliving,
Shamlou, & Coffman, 2018; Figure 1). Although these hydraulic
cleaning methods can be effective, they may increase the shear stress
on cells and reduce the net flux. Therefore, it is much more favorable
to select a membrane where little fouling occurs, and a stable flux
can be easily maintained to reduce the number of hydraulic cleaning steps.

In this study, we investigated different membrane materials and
their properties for continuous virus particle harvesting via the
permeate for perfusion cultivation. To cover a large variety of dif-
f erent commercial hollow fiber membranes, polyethersulfone (PES),
modified PES (mPES), polysulfone (PS), mixed ester (ME, consisting
of cellulose acetate and cellulose nitrate), and polyethylene (PE) mem-
branes were tested. If available, two pore sizes (based on nominal
cutoff) were investigated to either retain or harvest the virus parti-

cles over the cultivation period and to understand filter fouling in
dependence of the pore size. This resulted in a sample set of eight
hollow fiber modules.

We first characterized different hollow fiber membranes with
respect to their potential fouling behavior. In a second step, we

tested the membranes in TFF operation for filter fouling and virus

particle harvesting. For this, suspension-adapted baby hamster kid-

ney (BHK-21SUS) cells were cultured in a bioreactor with an external
TFF cell retention device (recirculation loop), and the cells were subsequently infected with yellow fever virus (YFV; ~50 nm). Filter fouling was monitored in real time using transmembrane pressure sensors, and virus particle, DNA, and protein concentrations were measured in the permeate flow to relate membrane structure measurements to process performance.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Hollow fiber membranes

Eight commercial hollow fiber membranes (Table 1) were characterized and tested for filter fouling in unidirectional TFF operation.

2.2 Pore size distributions

To determine pore size distributions, a dry single hollow fiber (50 mm length) was potted with a hot glue gun into a PE tubing (5 mm inner diameter [ID]). The end of the fiber was closed with glue and subsequently wetted with the pore-filling liquid fluorinert FC-43 (3 M). The pore size distribution was measured with a Porolux 500 (Porometer) following the method described by Trzaskus et al. (2015). Based on the measured pore size distribution, the exclusion limits (cutoffs) of the membranes were calculated as defined to retain 90% of a minimum particle size (relates to the cumulative distribution at 90%; in short D90). To evaluate the pore size distribution, the width was determined at the 90th percentile (relates to the range from D5 to D95) eliminating measurement noise at lowest and highest pore sizes.

2.3 Membrane surface charge

To determine the zeta potential of the inner membrane surface, a single hollow fiber (90 mm length) was potted in a PE tube (80 mm length and 5 mm ID) filled completely with two-component epoxy resin and dried overnight. Protruding glued ends were cut and the potted membrane was mounted between clamping cells of a SurPASS electrokinetic

| # | Material | Effective length (mm) | Surface areaa (cm²) | Inner diameter (mm) | Number of fibers per module | Fiber wall thicknessb (mm) | Flow velocityc (mm/s) |
|---|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | mPES     | 200                   | 20                  | 0.5                 | 6                          | 0.15                      | 125                 |
| 2 | mPES     | 200                   | 15                  | 0.7                 | 3                          | 0.15                      | 175                 |
| 3 | PES      | 200                   | 28                  | 0.5                 | 9                          | 0.10                      | 125                 |
| 4 | PES      | 200                   | 13                  | 1.0                 | 2                          | 0.10                      | 250                 |
| 5 | PS       | 200                   | 28                  | 0.5                 | 9                          | 0.13                      | 125                 |
| 6 | PS       | 250                   | 50                  | 1.4                 | 5                          | 0.45                      | 350                 |
| 7 | ME       | 200                   | 20                  | 0.6                 | 5                          | 0.15                      | 150                 |
| 8 | PE       | 200                   | 45                  | 7.3                 | 1                          | 2.75                      | 1,825               |

Note: Product names and nominal pore sizes as provided by suppliers are not disclosed due to confidentiality agreements.

Abbreviations: ME, mixed ester; mPES, modified polyethersulfone; PE, polyethylene; PES, polyethersulfone; PS, polysulfone.
aSurface area as stated by suppliers.
bMeasured with digital vernier caliper with a standard error of ±0.05 mm.
cFlow velocity in fibers differed among hollow fiber modules to operate all filtration experiments at a fixed shear rate.

FIGURE 1 Minimizing filter fouling during perfusion cultivations. (a) A typical unidirectional flow (TFF) can counter fouling by increased/pulsed inlet flow velocity (green dotted arrow). (b) Inversion of flow direction results in a bidirectional tangential flow supporting the removal of foulants (green double arrow). (c) Hydraulic backflushing can be achieved by inverting the permeate flow (red double arrow). A similar effect of reversed transmembrane flow (blue arrow) along the membrane is described for certain membrane lengths and diaphragm pumps such as the XCell™ ATF from Repligen [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]
2.4 | Cell broth zeta potential

The zeta potential of the crude cell broth was measured in triplicates
using 1.5 ml samples filled in a folded capillary zeta cell using a the
Zetasizer Nano ZS (Malvern Instruments). The cell culture medium
was measured as dispersant with a refractive index (RI) of 1.33,
based on refractometry measurements (RE40D Refractometer,
Mettler Toledo). Assuming a very low Debye length relative to the
size of the colloids in the broth, the Smoluchowski approximation
was used to calculate the zeta potential based on the electrophoretic
mobility (Swan & Furst, 2012), and each sample was measured
30 times at 25°C following the manufacturer’s recommendations.

2.5 | Scanning electron microscopy

Native and fouled membranes were either cut manually or frozen in
liquid nitrogen before being broken manually. In brief, membrane
fractions were fixed with carbon conductive tapes and carbon paint
(DAG-T-502, Ted Pella) on specimen mounts, and vacuum-dried at
30°C overnight. A 10 nm chromium layer was sputtered on the
sample with a Quorum Q150T ES (Quorum). The cross-section and
surface morphology of the membranes was obtained using a scanning
electron microscope (SEM; JSM-6010LA, JOEL) at 5 kV.

2.6 | Membrane filtration setup and experiment

Suspension-adapted BHK-21Sus cells (derived from adherent BHK-21
cells, kindly provided by Dr. Boris Hundt, IDT Biologika) were cultivated
in serum-free basal growth medium (BGM) in a 2.5 L DasGip
glass bioreactor connected to a DasGip DCU controller (Eppendorf).
Cells were infected with YFV-17D (kindly provided by Prof. Dr. Ma-
thias Niedrig, Robert Koch Institute Berlin) at multiplicity of infection of
10⁻² based on the plaque assay as described below. All membranes
were prewetted with deionized water (dH₂O), subsequently gently
drained and connected to an external recirculation loop with a per-
istaltic pump (Watson–Marlow 120U). The membranes were con-
ssectively tested in TFF mode at a fixed shear rate (γ) of 2,000 s⁻¹.
Therefore, volumetric flow rates J (ml/min) were adjusted based on
the cross-sectional areas of all fibers of each module:

\[ J = \frac{V_p}{A} \]  

where \( f_n \) is the number of hollow fibers and \( r \) the inner fiber lumen
radius of individual fibers (mm). The permeate pump was set to a
permeate flux rate \( J \) of about 33 L/hr/m² describing the ratio of the
permeate flow rate \( V_p \) (L/hr) to the total filtration surface area \( A \) (m²)
of all fibers in one module:

\[ J = \frac{V_p}{A} \]  

The permeate was transferred back into the bioreactor. Inlet,
outlet, and permeate pressure were measured with inline single-use
PS pressure transducers (either TC or luer lock, ACPM-799-01N,
Spectrum Labs). Transducers were connected to a digital pressure
monitor (KrosFlo Digital Pressure Monitor, Spectrum Labs) or to the
peristaltic pump controller (KR2i, Spectrum Labs) to record data at
5 s sampling intervals (Excel sheet KF Comm Complaint Workbook
with interface software package from Ofni Systems). The total re-

distance \( R \) (m⁻¹) was calculated based on Darcy’s law:

\[ R = \frac{\ln \frac{V_p}{J}}{\eta_{dn}} \]  

with \( V \) as maximum permeate volume (L).

Samples of the bioreactor vessel and the permeate line were taken
regularly, centrifuged at 2,000×g for 3 min and optionally stored at
−80°C until use. The pH of the cell broth was measured with a pH
probe (405 DPAS SC K8S, Mettler Toledo), the osmolality with the
Vapro 5520 pressure osmometer (Wescor), and the turbidity at 880 nm
with a turbidity Dencyte probe (Hamilton). The cell concentration, cell
diameter, and cell viability (based on trypan blue exclusion) were de-
termined with an automated cell counter (ViCell XR, Beckman Coulter)
from a total number of 100 images per measurement.

2.7 | Virus quantification

Infectious YFV titers were quantified by plaque assay using stable
porcine (PS) cells as described previously (Nikolay et al., 2018). In
brief, PS cells were seeded as monolayer into 24-well plates and
infected with diluted virus samples. A viscous overlay was added and
after an incubation period of 3 days, virus-induced plaques were
counted. Virus titers were expressed as plaque-forming units per
volume (PFU/ml) with a coefficient of variation of 15%.

2.8 | DNA and protein quantification

Protein and double-stranded (ds) DNA concentrations were estimated
using the Bradford assay (in triplicates) and the PicoGreen assay (in
duplicates) as described elsewhere (Wickramasinghe, Kalbfuß, Zimmermann, Thom, & Reichl, 2005). In brief, bioreactor and permeate samples were centrifuged at 2,000 g for 2 min at 4°C. The supernatant was inactivated at 80°C for 2 min and by overnight incubation with 0.5% (v/v) formaldehyde at 4°C. Protein samples were diluted in dH2O and well mixed with Coomassie brilliant blue (Quick Start Bradford Protein Assay, Bio-Rad) in transparent flat bottom 96-well microtiter plates. The maximum of the absorption spectrum was measured at 595 nm (InfiniteM 200 PRO). For dsDNA quantification, PicoGreen dye (Quant-IT PicoGreen dsDNA Assay Kit, Thermo Fisher Scientific) was added to the sample and mixed well. Subsequently, samples were excited at 480 nm and the fluorescence emission intensity measured at 520 nm (InfiniteM 200 PRO). A standard solution was prepared from lambda DNA (D1501, Promega).

### 2.9 Rejection coefficient

The rejection coefficient $\sigma_{\text{reject}}$ was introduced to describe the fraction of product retained by the membrane and calculated as

$$\sigma_{\text{reject}} = 1 - \frac{C_p}{C_v}$$

(5)

where $C_p$ is the YFV (PFU/ml), DNA or protein concentration (μg/ml) in the permeate flow, and $C_v$ (PFU/ml or μg/ml) the respective concentration in the bioreactor vessel.

### 3 RESULTS

#### 3.1 Structural and physicochemical membrane properties

The fiber wall thickness of most hollow fiber membranes was in a range between 0.10 and 0.15 mm, whereas large-pore PS (#6) and PE (#8) membranes were significantly thicker with 0.45 and 2.75 mm (Table 1).

Pore size distributions of membranes were determined by capillary flow porometry. The membrane-specific exclusion limit (cutoff) of the cumulative pore size distribution at 90% (relates to $D_{90}$) ranged from 0.08 μm to 1.69 μm (Table 2). Interestingly, the measured pore sizes differed from manufacturer’s specifications. Compared with nominal pore sizes (cannot be provided due to confidentiality agreements) four membranes had a larger effective cutoff by factors between 0.2 and 5.9, and four a smaller effective cutoff by factors of 0.1–0.8 (not shown here).

The width of the pore size distribution was described with the pore size width at 90th percentile and expressed in relation to the measured cutoff. Large-pore PE membranes tended to have a broader pore size width, while the PS membranes had very distinct pore sizes (Table 2; Figure S1).

Next, all membranes were examined with SEM imaging to investigate structural details. The material roughness was mainly assessed based on the frontal view of the inner membrane (Figures 2 and S2). While a highly jagged material surface was found for the large-pore mPES fiber, the roughness decreased from ME, PES (0.18 μm), PS (0.08 μm) materials to very smooth PS (0.34 μm), and PE structures. In addition, the porosity of the inner surface was qualitatively evaluated. SEM imaging revealed a remarkably high surface porosity for the PS (0.34 μm) membrane, which decreased from ME, the two PES, and the PE to the PS (0.08 μm) membrane. Due to the highly jagged material, visual evaluation of the mPES membrane was difficult. However, funnel-shaped pores were present, as equally observed for the PE membrane turning both membranes potentially susceptible for rapid particle entrapment.

Subsequent cross-section and frontal SEM imaging of the inner membrane helped to characterize surface roughness and overall porosity (Figures S3 and S4). The mPES membrane had a very high surface roughness with distinct and deep valleys. The PES (0.18 μm) and ME membranes, whereas, had a flatter inner surface structure than the PS (0.34 μm), and PE membranes revealing a wavy surface. The mPES material had a high porosity, followed by decreasing porosities with the large-pore PS, ME, PES, PE, and finally small-pore PS membranes. In particular, the front view of the outer surface revealed a strong asymmetric structure for most membranes except for the PE membrane (Figure S4). A closer examination of the large-pore PS membrane revealed a high overall porosity in the first inner half, which then became more compact to the outer side (Figure S5).

Finally, the electrophoretic potential of membranes and potential foulers was assessed. First, the streaming potential of each membrane material was measured at pH 7.2 and 5 mM KCl solution to calculate the zeta potential. The zeta potential was about −24 mV for most materials, whereas the mPES material showed a slightly lower surface charge with −19.7 mV (Table S1). Then, the zeta potential of the culture broth containing infected cells (with extracellular vesicles, virions, and debris) was calculated. Based on the electrophoretic

### Table 2 Overview on measured cutoff and pore size width (indicates pore size distribution) of hollow fiber membranes

| # Material | Cut-off (μm; $D_{90}$) | Pore size width (μm) |
|------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 mPES     | 0.09                   | 0.03 (33%)           |
| 2 mPES     | 1.08                   | 0.51 (47%)           |
| 3 PES      | 0.18                   | 0.04 (22%)           |
| 4 PES      | 0.37                   | 0.16 (43%)           |
| 5 PS       | 0.08                   | 0.01 (13%)           |
| 6 PS       | 0.34                   | 0.07 (21%)           |
| 7 ME       | 0.25                   | 0.07 (28%)           |
| 8 PE       | 1.68                   | 1.87 (111%)          |

Abbreviations: ME, mixed ester; mPES, modified polyethersulfone; PE, polyethylene; PES, polyethersulfone; PS, polysulfone.

Measure cutoff for a cumulative distribution at 90%.

Pore size width at 90th percentile of pore size distribution (value in brackets expresses width in percentage to cutoff).
mobility of all particles, a zeta potential of $-16.4 \pm 0.4$ mV was determined at pH 7.2 and ionic strength of the cell broth.

### 3.2 Filter fouling in TFF perfusion mode

In this study, a set of process conditions suitable for perfusion operation with animal cell culture was defined and applied to all membranes as a direct one-to-one comparison. Thereby, effective membrane lengths of 200–250 mm, relatively high flow velocities of 125 mm/s or larger (in accordance to a fixed shear rate; Table 1) and fixed permeate flux of about 33 L/hr/m² were chosen to allow a uniform flux distribution and homogenous membrane fouling. The hollow fiber membranes (#1–#8) were tested consecutively. During filtration experiments, the infected BHK-21SUS cell culture had a concentration of $5.2 \times 10^6$ cells/ml with a viability of 80.2% and an average cell diameter of 15.4 μm. The virus titer was determined to $9 \times 10^4$ PFU/ml. Protein and dsDNA impurity levels were at 255 μg/ml and 13.7 μg/ml, respectively. The cell broth had a pH of 7.2, an osmolality of 236 mmol/kg and a turbidity of 6.90 NTU.

During the filtration experiment, the membrane resistance increased fast for the two mPES, both PES and the ME membranes with only short periods of slower resistance development (Figure 3). At maximum technical resistance, the permeate flow dropped and the silicone tubing on the permeate side collapsed due to low pressure at permeate side. Thereby, a $V_p$ of around 9–18 L/m² until termination was reached for most membranes (Table 3). For the tested PS membranes (0.08 and 0.34 μm), it took significantly longer before the maximum resistance was achieved resulting in permeate volumes of 30 L/m² and 75 L/m², respectively.
Subsequently, a selection of blocked membranes was subjected to SEM imaging. In particular, the mPES, the PES, and the ME membranes exhibited strong filter cake formation. Interestingly, the large-pore PS membrane did neither show surface-related deposition nor indications of pore blockage and cake layer formation (Figure S6).

### 3.3 | Virus retention during TFF

While membranes were challenged, samples from the bioreactor broth and permeate were routinely taken and analyzed for infectious virus titer as well as DNA and protein concentrations. In the early filtration phase of small-pore membranes, virus titers in the permeate were already significantly reduced compared with the bioreactor vessel \((9.0 \times 10^4\text{ PFU/ml};\) Figure 4). The small-pore mPES \((0.09\text{ μm})\) and PS \((0.08\text{ μm})\) membranes retained more than 99% of the infectious virus material, whereas almost 90% of the infectious material was retained by mid-pore PES \((0.18\text{ μm})\) and ME membranes \((0.25\text{ μm})\). The large-pore PS \((0.34\text{ μm})\), PES \((0.5\text{ μm})\), mPES \((1.08\text{ μm})\), and PE \((1.68\text{ μm})\) membranes were highly permeable for virus particles.

| # Material | Cutoff (μm) | Max. specific permeate volume \((\text{L/m}^2)\) |
|------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1 mPES     | 0.09        | 13                                          |
| 2 mPES     | 1.08        | 11                                          |
| 3 PES      | 0.18        | 09                                          |
| 4 PES      | 0.37        | 11                                          |
| 5 PS       | 0.08        | 30\(^a\)                                    |
| 6 PS       | 0.34        | 75\(^b\)                                    |
| 7 ME       | 0.25        | 11                                          |
| 8 PE       | 1.68        | 18                                          |

Abbreviations: ME, mixed ester; mPES, modified polyethersulfone; PE, polyethylene; PES, polyethersulfone; PS, polysulfone.

\(^a\)Maximum specific permeate volume was reached with the cessation of permeate flow and collapse of silicon tubing (maximum membrane resistance).

\(^b\)Distinctly increased filtration performance; data derived from Figure 3.
With progressing filter fouling (increasing membrane resistance), virus retention increased further for all membranes. The small-pore membranes retained the virus fully (below the limit of detection of about 10 PFU/ml), while fouling for the PS membrane (0.08 μm) was notably delayed. For the mid-pore membranes, viral titers decreased in the permeate below 1%. For the large-pore group, that is, PES (0.5 μm) and mPES (1.08 μm) membranes, virus titers in the permeate rapidly decreased to ~10%. In contrast, fouling of the PS membrane (0.34 μm) developed only slowly and the membrane remained highly permeable for infectious virions. At the end of the filtration experiment, a high fraction of virions still passed the membrane (about 35%). The PE membrane with largest pores (1.68 μm) did not retain significant virus amounts, but despite the pore size a compete membrane blockage occurred unexpectedly early (18 L/m²).

Similar to decreasing virus titers, the small-pore mPES and small-pore PS membranes revealed an initially high rejection for protein and, in particular, for DNA impurities. Notably, as the membrane resistance evolved slower for the PS membrane, a high specific permeate volume with reduced DNA levels of 97% (equals to < 0.2 μg/ml) was maintained. In addition, it showed the highest protein rejection of 75% with a reduced protein load of about 70 μg/ml in the permeate flow. Mid-pore size range membranes showed a similar behavior with increasing rejection rates with evolving membrane resistance and fouling. Interestingly, the PE (1.68 μm) and PS membranes (0.34 μm) showed high rejection rates in the beginning, which then stabilized with a rejection coefficient of about 10% (Figure 5).

4 | DISCUSSION

From a wide range of hollow fiber modules developed for various TFF applications (e.g., bioreactor perfusion, concentration, diafiltration, and clarification), eight commercially available membranes were selected and characterized for virus retention, DNA and protein contamination removal, and filter fouling. If available, a small- and large-pore
membrane was selected from the same filter material to better understand the impact of the material or the measured cutoff on virus retention. While small-pore membranes can be suitable to accumulate the product in the bioreactor, large-pore membranes can potentially be employed to continuously harvest virions (for YFV ~50 nm). In both cases, it is desired to keep filter fouling to a minimum as it terminates the filtration process, and potentially ends in a complete product loss.

4.1 Impact of general and physicochemical membrane properties on membrane fouling

To evaluate the impact of general and physicochemical membrane properties on membrane fouling and membrane blockage, observations were classified to predict their potential impact on membrane fouling. A high fiber thickness, a narrow pore size distribution and a high repulsion of foulants are considered to reduce filter fouling, while large pores allow general virus permeability (Table 4).

An increased fiber wall thickness is generally assumed to decrease permeate fluxes per driving force. In addition, a large contact surface allows for the adsorption of colloids, whereas intramembranous fluxes are increased in porous membranes that reduce membrane fiber blockage. The pore size distribution of membranes can be controlled to a certain extent by the manufacturing process, but is typically characteristic for the used material (Zeman & Zydney, 2017). For the PES, PS, and ME membranes, the 90th percentile of all pores was in a distinct range of about 25% in relation to the cutoff. The large-pore mPES and PE membranes, however, spread above 47%. Heterogeneous pore distributions are considered more susceptible to fouling as significant variation in filtrate flux along the length of the module occur, which turns large pores with higher local fluxes prone for concentration polarization and deposition until pore blockage. Thus, narrow pore size distributions have a uniform flux distribution and are generally considered better suited for long-term filtration operation (Jonsson, 1985; Table 4). The zeta potential was determined to assess repulsion effects. In theory, similarly charged colloids beyond the critical zeta potential (magnitude of ~10 mV) are repulsive and reduce filter cake formation desirable (Breite, Went, Prager, & Schulze, 2016; Cai et al., 2016). Thus, an advantageous repulsive effect for all tested membranes

**FIGURE 5** Percentage DNA and protein rejection of different hollow fiber membranes tested for continuous virus harvesting during perfusion operation. Contamination levels were determined from the supernatant of infected BHK-21 SUS cells growing in BGM medium. DNA and protein samples were taken from the bioreactor vessel and permeate. Increments of DNA (green circle) and protein concentrations (blue circle) were expressed as rejection coefficients. Red dotted vertical line indicates complete membrane blockage. BHK-21 SUS, suspension-adapted baby hamster kidney cell; BGM, basal growth medium; ME, mixed ester; mPES, modified polyethersulfone; PE, polyethylene; PES, polyethersulfone; PS, polysulfone [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]
Finally, measured membrane cutoffs allowed to group each membrane as strong virus‐rejecting membrane (≤0.09 μm; mPES and PS), average rejecting membrane (0.25 μm; PES and ME), and low rejecting membrane (≥0.34 μm; mPES, PES, PS, and PE; Table 4).

(4.2) Impact of membrane structures on membrane fouling

SEM imaging revealed significant structural differences of tested membrane materials, and properties can be equally assessed regarding their potential fouling behavior (Table 5). While a high roughness of the inner membrane surface can hinder direct pore blocking (stERIC exclusion of particles and nonflush deposition on highly fissured surfaces), a reduced overflow velocity in valley‐like structures can equally enhance deposition (Marshall, Munro, & Trägårdh, 1993). Such loose deposits are particularly sensitive for cake compression, when negative pressure on the permeate side increases (Vrijenhoek, Hong, & Elimelech, 2001). This could be assumed especially for mPES membranes, which additionally possess a high specific surface area that potentially enhances particle adsorption. Deep valley‐like pore channels, as observed for the PE membrane, and narrowed pores are also unfavorable due to enhanced particle entrapment and membrane blockage. In contrast, the PS membrane (0.34 μm) has a very smooth material and open pore structure, as well as a high overall porosity so that foulants can freely penetrate the membrane, but are finally retained in deeper, more dense layers. This can enable high initial fluxes, but as deposits enrich within the membrane and physical countermeasures (e.g., increased flow velocity and backflushing) may not allow to overcome corresponding problems, full blockage will be inevitable. A size‐selective and flat membrane surface, as observed especially for small‐pore PS, but also for PES and ME membranes, enables thin boundary layers and optimum abrasive effects of the surface velocity (Choi, Zhang, Dionysiou, Oerther, & Sorial, 2005). This reduces concentration polarization (tendency for accumulation of foulants). However, if the surface porosity is low, such filters can react sensitive on pore narrowing with increasing membrane resistance. In dependence on the pore size and the size of foulants, small‐pore membranes (in the range of ultrafiltration application) may be even less affected by fouling due to stERIC exclusion for pore narrowing or pore blocking (i.e., 0.08 μm PS membrane).

TABLE 4 Structural and physicochemical membrane properties and their potential impact on membrane fouling

| Membrane (μm) | Fiber thickness | Pore size | Pore size distribution | Repulsion of foulants with membrane |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| mPES (0.09)   | o               | o         | o                      | +                                 |
| 2 mPES (1.08) | o               | +         | –                      | +                                 |
| 3 PES (0.18)  | o               | o         | +                      | +                                 |
| 4 PES (0.37)  | o               | +         | –                      | +                                 |
| 5 PS (0.08)   | o               | +         | –                      | +                                 |
| 6 PS (0.34)   | +               | +         | +                      | ?                                 |
| 7 ME (0.25)   | o               | o         | o                      | +                                 |
| 8 PE (1.68)   | o               | o         | o                      | ?                                 |

Note: Increased fiber thickness, narrow pore size distribution, and high repulsion (based on zeta potential measurements) are considered to reduce filter fouling. Properties are categorized in (−) unfavorable, (○) neutral, (+) beneficial, or (?) unknown for reduced fouling. The more (+), the less susceptible to fouling and the better the membrane.

TABLE 5 Structural membrane properties (based on SEM imaging) and their potential impact on membrane fouling

| #  | Material (μm) | Material roughness | Surface porosity | Pore structure | Surface roughness | Overall porosity |
|----|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 2  | mPES (1.08)   | –                  | ?                | –              | –                | +                |
| 3  | PES (0.18)    | o                  | o                | o              | +                | o                |
| 5  | PS (0.08)     | +                  | –                | o              | +                | –                |
| 6  | PS (0.34)     | +                  | +                | o              | o                | o                |
| 7  | ME (0.25)     | o                  | o                | o              | o                | +                |
| 8  | PE (1.68)     | +                  | –                | –              | o                | –                |

Note: Only a reduced selection of most important membranes could be assessed via SEM imaging while covering the broad availability of materials used in biotechnological applications. Low material roughness, high surface porosity, open pore structure, low surface roughness, and high overall porosity are considered to reduce fouling. Properties are categorized in (−) unfavorable, (○) neutral, (+) beneficial, or (?) unknown for reduced fouling. The more (+), the less susceptible to fouling and the better the membrane.

Abbreviations: ME, mixed ester; mPES, modified polyethersulfone; PE, polyethylene; PES, polyethersulfone; PS, polysulfone; SEM, scanning electron microscope.
Overall, the large-pore PS membrane seems to combine suitable physicochemical and structural properties that can lead to a higher resistance against filter fouling, while enabling continuous virus permeability.

4.3 | Membrane fouling dynamics and its impact on product retention

To confirm previous assumptions on properties for filter fouling and virus retention, all membranes were tested consecutively in the same experimental setup in bioreactor perfusion mode. Each filtration experiment was performed once to ensure stable process conditions (e.g., cell broth pH, cell viability, and virus titer) throughout the test period. Therefore, conclusions or inferences should not be drawn from minor variations in the dynamics of the membrane resistance without looking at the entire set of membranes more as categories based on their structural and physicochemical properties. For those categories, there are repeated factors allowing a detailed interpretation. An immediate increase of membrane resistance is likely due to a combination of concentration polarization (reversible accumulation of rejected particles in the boundary layer) and a short period of deposition. The fast progression of fouling for both mPES membranes is potentially due to their rough material and surface promoting immediate deposition. Wide pore size distributions lead to an early blockage of larger pores, and accelerate subsequent blocking of smaller ones (Cho, Amy, & Pellegrino, 2000; Cornelissen, 1997). The increasing TMP (data not shown) compresses the filter cake, leading to full membrane blockage (Rana & Matsuura, 2010). A similar fouling tendency was observed for the small-pore PES membrane with low porosity. High permeate fluxes narrow scattered pores on the surface causing a quick reduction in the pore size, filter cake compression, and full blockage (Trzaskus et al., 2015). The short plateau in the development of membrane resistance for large-pore PES and ME membranes is, most likely, due to an equilibrium between deposition and foulant removal by overflow velocity until deposition dominates and the flux finally collapses. The PE membrane blocks potentially due to pore constriction and substantial pore closure. Interestingly, the PS membranes block only at notably high specific permeate volumes making them a candidate for long-term filtration operation. The fouling progression indicates an initial pore narrowing for the small-pore membrane, and an extended equilibration phase between deposition and foulant removal. The large-pore PS membrane with high porosity seems to be hardly affected by initial foulant-membrane adsorption and pore narrowing. Its relatively high membrane thickness (approximately four times larger than other membranes) did not noticeably contribute to lower intrinsic permeability. Instead, it seems to provide a larger effective separation surface area contributing to a better resistance against overall filter fouling. The round-shaped material structure enables high fluxes across and within the membrane and mitigates adhesion of foulant particles. However, due to its asymmetric membrane structure and pore narrowing, an irreversible particle deposition in deeper layers of the membrane can eventually not be avoided (Henry & Brant, 2012; F. Wang & Tarabara, 2008). This is in agreement with SEM imaging of the blocked membrane. While a strong cake is formed on fast fouling membranes such as mPES, PES, and ME, the large-pore PS membrane does not exhibit any obvious foulants on the surface (Figure S6, note that specimens were dried for observation, so that actual height of the cake layer could even have been greater during filtration operation). Therefore, foulants may be expected to be present at high quantities in deeper membrane structures. Notably, the observed membrane fouling progression is in close agreement with findings obtained for microfiltration processes (Trzaskus et al., 2015; Xiao, Shen, & Huang, 2013). It should be noted that the fouling of membranes is strongly linked to the material and process conditions tested. In accordance to the intrinsic membrane permeability (e.g., pore sizes, density, and physicochemical properties), optimal flow velocities and permeate fluxes can vary to achieve homogeneous fluxes along and through the membrane. Suboptimal conditions can otherwise favor local deposition and accelerate the progress of fouling.

Having understood fouling principles for the different membranes, product retention can be directly associated with membrane fouling dynamics. In the case of DNA and protein concentrations, here considered as impurities, their percentage rejection increased, possibly due to steric exclusion in narrowing pore channels, and increased repulsion from adsorbed foulants. Interestingly, the overall rejection was significantly higher for DNA than for proteins. Notably, the percentage rejection with PS (0.34 μm) and PE (1.68 μm) membranes showed a contrary trend. This observation may be explained by initial adsorption of DNA and protein to the membrane materials. Once the adsorptive membrane capacity is reached, impurities may migrate unimpaired through the large-pore channels into the permeate (Cornelissen, 1997). Hence, the use of PS membranes can be equally important for related perfusion processes where expressed proteins are considered as product, but retained by PES membranes with a nominal cutoff of 0.2 μm (Karst, Serra, Villiger, Soos, & Morbidelli, 2016; Kelly et al., 2014). Alternatively, other studies identified the use of large-pore membranes of 2 μm and larger as a solution for production retention (Pinto, Napoli, & Brower, 2019; S. B. Wang, Godfrey, Radonique, Lin, & Coffman, 2019). However, based on presented results, it is not the nominal cutoff but the membrane material and its associated properties that are of primary importance for membrane fouling and continuous product harvest via the permeate. Of results reported for the PES and PE membranes, the 0.34 μm PS membrane may be equally suitable for the continuous harvest of recombinant proteins and viral vectors.

5 | CONCLUSION

Our results highlight the importance of choosing the right membrane for intensified virus production and continuous product harvesting. We show that a selection based solely on nominal membrane pore size values reported by manufacturers may not be sufficient. Instead,
membrane material and associated structural and physicochemical properties are decisive factors that determine filter fouling and eventually the "true" membrane pore size causing product retention. The widely used PES (0.18 μm measured cutoff) membrane fouled quickly, so that YFV titers but also protein concentrations decreased rapidly in the permeate flow. In contrast, the 0.34 μm PS membrane was highly permeable for YFV particles and enabled continuous product harvest in small-scale hollow fiber modules and TFF mode. In this context, different process conditions (e.g., flow velocity and permeate flux) and filtration operations (e.g., hydrodynamic backflushing, inverting flow directions, and pulsed flow) can be investigated to improve performance of the PS-based perfusion processes even further.
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NOMENCLATURE
γ s⁻¹ shear rate at membrane wall
ηₘPa s dynamic viscosity of medium
σξ rejection coefficient
A m² total filtration surface area
Cₚ PFU/ml or μg/ml YFV, DNA or protein concentration in permeate flow
Cₙ PFU/ml or μg/ml YFV, DNA or protein concentration in bioreactor vessel
n number of hollow fibers
J L/hr/m² surface-specific permeate flux rate
r mm inner fiber lumen radius
R m⁻¹ total resistance
V L maximum permeate volume
Vₘ ml/min volumetric flow rate
Vₚ L/m² membrane-specific fouling capacity
V₆ L/hr permeate flow rate
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