

NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

Lab Chip. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2013 April 24

Published in final edited form as:

Lab Chip. 2012 April 24; 12(10): 1890–1896. doi:10.1039/c2lc20956j.

Quantitative Modeling of the Behaviour of Microfluidic Autoregulatory Devices

Hyun-Joo Chang^a, Wubing Ye^b, and Emil P. Kartalov^{a,c}

Hyun-Joo Chang: hyunjoo@usc.edu; Emil P. Kartalov: kartalov@usc.edu ^aDept. of Pathology, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, 2011 Zonal Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90089-9092, USA

^bDept. of Mechanical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, 1200 E California Blvd, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

^cDept. of Electrical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, Mail Code 200-36, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA. Fax: 323-442-3049; Tel: 323-442-3211

Abstract

We develop a theoretical model for a fluidic current source consisting of a via, a detour channel, and a push-up type micro-valve. The model accurately describes the non-linear behaviour of this type of device, which has been previously measured experimentally. We show how various structural parameters and material properties of the device influence the saturated flow rate and the minimum driving pressure required for the device to function as a current source. Conversely, the model can be used to design a fluidic current source with a desired saturated flow rate and low operational pressure. The present model can be straightforwardly applied to microfluidic circuits composed of many functional autoregulatory devices.

Introduction

Multilayer soft lithography technique¹ has enabled a dense integration of micro-valves and pumps within a microfluidic circuit for various applications^{2–4}. In general, these device elements consist of shallow microfluidic channels and are characterized by laminar flows due to the low Reynolds number (Re)^{5, 6}. As a result, incompressible Newtonian fluid flow in an axially uniform microfluidic channel can be described by the well-known Poiseuille's law, which states that flow rate (Q) is proportional to applied pressure (P) while inversely proportional to the hydraulic resistance (R) of the flow channel.

However, a microfluidic device showing a nonlinear relationship between Q and P is in increasing demand in applications^{7–9}, where, for instance, maintaining a constant Q for a wide range of P will be useful^{10–12}. For example, in a drug delivery system, constant flow rate is critical¹³, so pressure fluctuations can be negated with an in-built current source. Yet in reality, obtaining the desired nonlinear behaviour has been a challenge and few studies have been successful. Groisman and co-workers have demonstrated fluidic current source operation by employing a complex winding microfluidic channel along with highly viscous polymer solution as a working fluid¹⁰. However, practical bio-medical applications need such nonlinear fluidic behaviour to be achieved with water-based biocompatible solutions, which are Newtonian fluids.

Correspondence to: Hyun-Joo Chang, hyunjoo@usc.edu.

Fortunately, autoregulatory devices^{11, 12, 14} offer an elegant and innovative solution to this problem. These devices automatically regulate flow with a combination of a detour channel and a three-dimensional fluidic junction, referred as 'via'^{12, 14}. Furthermore, the flow behaviour itself is very interesting from the perspective of basic physics, due to multiple features and effects: autoregulatory nonlinear behaviour with Poiseuille flow, saturation¹², and negative resistance (the "dip")¹⁴.

These devices are also interesting from the perspective of microfluidic engineering as they offer unique capabilities, thereby expanding the toolbox available for microfluidic applications. In particular, point-of-care biomedical diagnostics requires a challenging combination of low cost, flexibility, multiplexing, and portability, while complex function traditionally comes at the expense of complex external control^{15–18}. Herein lies the promise of autoregulatory devices, as they offer complex behaviour and function at minimal or no external control, thereby leading to smaller overall size of the diagnostic system.

In this paper, we take another step towards the widespread utilization of autoregulatory devices by providing a theoretical model for their behaviour, which has been confirmed by previous experimental data¹². This model can be used to predict the flow behaviour as a function of the Young's modulus of the material and of the device's architectural parameters such as length, height, and width of a microfluidic channel.

Specifically, we consider several aspects to reflect on the final modeling. First, we account for the PDMS microchannel swelling with applied pressure^{19, 20}, by incorporating Gervais's formula²¹ in our calculations. Second, we show that our experimentally confirmed theoretical model²³ for push-down valves can be used for push-up²² valves as well. Third, we demonstrate that the nonlinear response can be successfully modeled through a combination of Poiseuille's law and the above two aspects. Finally, we show that the resulting model is in good agreement with our experimental data on the current source.

Description of PDMS autoregulatory device

In Fig. 1, we show a schematic diagram of the fluidic current source, which is used for experimental measurements on pressure-driven flow presented in the previous literature¹². We develop an analytical model based on this data. A long straight main channel and a detour channel bypassing from the main channel to the micro-valve region are designed. This detour channel is one of the two important integral parts in the current source device; the other important part is a via, which choose either push-up or push-down configuration for the valve design. The valve membrane thickness, shown in Fig. 1b, is assumed to be 5μ m, which is estimated from the known spin-coating formula²⁴. Other structural parameters are dealt with in great detail in our earlier publication¹².

The PDMS microfluidic device was made of Sylgard 184. Mixing ratio between the base and the curing agent of the Sylgard as well as the curing time and the temperature can control the stiffness of the resulting PDMS, hence the Young's modulus of the PDMS²⁵. The rigidity of the material determines valve action and the channel deformation²¹ by internal pressure; therefore our final model should include the effect of the Young's modulus. Further detailed experimental procedures regarding the fabrication and the measurement can be found from our earlier literature¹².

Fig. 1(d) shows an optical microscope image of the 'via', connecting channels on two different levels – the control channel in the lower layer and the flow channel in the upper layer. This via enables propagation of the static pressure at the entrance of the detour channel to the dead-end point, where the micro-valve actuates to control the flow in the main channel. Note that the net upward pressure held across the valve membrane (blue

region in Fig. 1(b)) is equal to the pressure drop in the main channel between the detour entrance and the value region (ΔP_2).

Model for push-up valve

The current source device regulates flow rate passing through the main channel by means of the push-up valve. Studer and co-workers have performed the three-dimensional finiteelement method (FEM) to understand both push-up and push-down valves²². The numerical simulation has revealed that the required pressure needed to completely close the channel is 10 times smaller in the case of a push-up valve than a push-down valve with structural dimensions identical to the push-up valve. On the other hand, an experimentally confirmed model have been developed for the push-down case by combining three simpler linear models, a thick beam, a thin spring, and a thick spring models²³. Here, we extend the regime of the validity to include the push-up case by introducing a scaling factor *k*, which we refer to as a *membrane geometry factor*. Then, we can write the required 'net' closing pressure measured across the valve membrane as²³

$$\Delta p_{up}(H_0) = k \cdot E \ln \left[1 + \left(16 H_0^2 / 3 \right) \left(w_v^{-2} + l_v^{-2} \right) + 4H_0 \left(h^3 + 16 H_0^2 h / 3 - 16 H_0^3 / 5 \right) \left(w_v^{-4} + l_v^{-4} \right) \right]_{1/2}$$

where *E* is Young's modulus of the material (ratio of stress to strain), H_0 is height of the flow channel to be completely closed and w_v , I_v , and *h* are structural parameters for the geometry of the micro-valve – width, length, and membrane thickness. Though we will try to extract a proper *k* value through fitting processes with experimental data, we would like to note that *k* of 0.1 gives the best fit, which is consistent with the previous FEM simulation result.

Theoretical model

Effective channel model

Before developing a model for the realistic autoregulatory device shown in Fig. 1d, we will begin with a rather simple situation as depicted in Fig. 2(a). A straight flow channel with length of $L (=L_1 + \Delta + L_2)$ has a small bulge or a dimple with length of Δ (assumed to be much smaller than L_1 or L_2). Then, we define the deformation ratio as $\gamma = H_V / H_0$, where H_0 and H_V are the original and the deformed channel height, respectively. It should be noted that the presence of dimple (bulge) depicts a situation where a fluid flows in the forward (reverse) direction (See Fig. 3).

In this section, we will present the concept of effective channel height, which will be useful to model a flow channel with varying height. As is well known, various useful concepts in electrical circuit design can be adopted to the case of microfluidics. For example, in the electrical circuit system, the concept of effective resistance (R_{eff}) has been proved to be very useful when interpreting a composite of resistors. One can always find a certain R_{eff} for any given network of resistors. Then, the overall behaviour of electrical current is simply given by $I = V/R_{eff}$. On the other hand, in microfluidics, the hydraulic resistance R connects between Q and P through the Poiseuille's law. Then, we can make correspondence between $\{Q \text{ and } P\}$ and {current (I) and voltage (V)}, respectively.

Borrowing the concept of effective resistance in electrical circuit analysis, we can define effective height H_e such that hydraulic resistance of a uniform channel with H_e will result in the same Q for a given P. To derive H_e , we have used the fact that 1) Q is conserved throughout the entire channel and 2) the Poiseuille's law holds within a uniform section of the channel. In Fig. 2(b), we plot effective H_e as a function of γ , where we have fixed Δ at a constant of $0.01 \times L$. For example, in the case of $\gamma > 1.0$ (bulging), we find that H_e hardly changes. However, in the case of $\gamma < 1.0$ (dimple), H_e abruptly decreases when γ goes below 0.4. This result shows that the fluidic 'bottleneck' is a critical element to govern the overall flow dynamics though it only spans over a very small portion (1%) of the channel. This behaviour in the effective channel height captures the essential aspect of our autoregulatory system and shows how a constant flow rate can be generated. It should be noted that channel heights in the actual device is not such simple two stepwise but a continuously varying function of space in the form of H(x). Even in such general situation, we can always define an effective channel height, from which we can define an effective hydraulic resistance.

Poiseuille's law for rectangular cross-sectional channel

A cross-sectional geometry of a microfluidic channel determines hydraulic resistance²⁶ (*R*). For instance, in the case of a cylindrical cross-section, *R* is inversely proportional to the fourth power of its radius. In the case of rectangular cross-section with height H_0 and width $W(W >> H_0)$, *R* is inversely proportional to the third power of H_0 and the first power of *W*. When an actual geometry is slightly deformed from these ideal simple geometries, we can introduce a geometrical correction factor²⁷ α . The actual geometry of our microfluidic channel is not either a perfect circle or a rectangle but a wedge-like shape with a half-elliptical upper contour and a flat bottom¹. However, it turns out that taking α to be 1 is legitimate when the aspect ratio H_0/W is very small. Then, we can write *R* as

$$R = \frac{12\eta L}{H_0^3 W},\tag{2}$$

therefore the Poiseuille's law is given by²⁸

$$Q = \frac{H_0^3 W}{12\eta L} P.$$
(3)

Here, H_0 and W are height and width of a microfluidic channel. P denotes pressure drop across the main flow channel with length of L as shown in Fig. 1a and Fig. 3, that is, P = P (x = 0) - P(x = L). η is a dynamic viscosity of a working fluid.

Model for non-deformable PDMS channel

In this section, we develop a model for non-deformable PDMS channel. Fig. 3 shows a twodimensional layout of the main flow channel, the detour channel, the via, and the valve. We conceptually divide the main channel into four different sections with channel lengths of L_1 , L_2 , L_3 , and L_4 . We note that flow rates in all sections must be identical (conservation of mass). The total pressure drop across the entire system (from O to S) will be given by the sum of partial pressures in their respective sections such that

$$P = \Delta P_1 + \Delta P_2 + \Delta P_3 + \Delta P_4 = \frac{12\eta \ (L_1 + L_2)}{H_0^3 W} Q + \frac{12\eta \ L_3}{H_\nu^3 W} Q + \frac{12\eta \ L_4}{H_0^3 W} Q.$$
(4)

Note that the above expression for *P* now includes two unknowns, *Q* and H_v . Therefore, we need to construct one more equation to solve *P* as a function of *Q*.

If we apply Eq. (3) to the detour channel since Q remains constant along the channel, we obtain

$$Q = \frac{H_0^{3} W}{12\eta L_2} \Delta P_2.$$
 (5)

Here, ΔP_2 is pressure drop across L_2 , which is also equal to the net pressure held across the valve membrane. From Eq.(1), we know how much net pressure is required to completely close the flow channel with height H_0 In general, however, ΔP_2 is less than $\Delta p_{up}(H_0)$ and the channel height H_v lies between 0 and H0. Let us find out an expression for ΔP_2 in terms of $\Delta p_{up}(H)$. One plausible candidate is

$$\Delta P_2 = \Delta p_u \left(H_{p0} \right) -_u \Delta p_p \left(H_v \right). \tag{6}$$

The above equation indeed satisfies boundary conditions at the two extreme conditions: If the net pressure is vanishingly small ($\Delta P_2=0$), then we obtain a trivial solution of $H_v = H_0$. If the channel is near completely closed ($H_v \sim 0$), then the required net pressure to maintain this configuration must equal to $\Delta p_{up}(H_0)$. With this assumption, we can eliminate ΔP_2 in Eq. (5) such that

$$Q = \frac{H_0^{3} W}{12\eta L_2} \left[\Delta p_{up} (H_0) - \Delta p_{up} (H_v) \right].$$
(7)

Now we have two unknowns, Q and H_v , and two equations, Eq.(4) and Eq. (7). Therefore, we can obtain P(Q) curve or Q(P) curve by numerically solving them; first, one obtains Q as a function of H_v using Eq. (7). Then, the right hand side of Eq.(4) can be rewritten as a function of H_v , which means $P(H_v)$ is obtained. By comparing $Q(H_v)$ and $P(H_v)$, one can plot either P(Q) or Q(P) and this completes our problem.

Fig. 4a shows flow rate (Q) as a function of applied pressure P, which clearly shows nonlinear behaviour after a certain threshold value of P. At above this value, Q does not show noticeable change for a large variation in P, which is the required property to function as a fluidic current source. Mathematically, the saturation point is defined as the point at which the slope of the Q(P) curve becomes zero (Fig.4 (b)). In fact, after a certain threshold value of P, dQ/dP is already very small but approaches to true zero very slowly. This behaviour can also be seen from the evolution of H_V as shown in Fig. 4(c); H_V seems to saturate at a certain non-zero value but H_V will go down zero in the limit of large P(Q(P)will go to zero at complete closing of the flow channel. However, in practice, we will see the breakdown of microfluidic channels before reaching at this high pressure limit.).

Saturated flow rate and pressure required to reach the saturation

When designing a fluidic current source, there are two important considerations; 1) the pressure needed to reach the saturation point should be minimized and 2) we should be able to control a constant flow rate at the saturation. We will answer for these by directly solving Eq. (4) and Eq. (7), where we assume a perfectly rigid channel that does not suffer from the channel deformation. We also simplify the expression for the needed pressure for complete closing the valve (Eq.(1)) by assuming $h >> w_v$, I_v such that

$$\Delta p_{up}(H_{\nu}) \approx k \cdot E \ln \left[1 + \left(16 H_{\nu}^2 / 3 \right) \left(w_{\nu}^{-2} + l_{\nu}^{-2} \right) \right].$$
(8)

Using the above simplification, we can write $\Delta P_{up}(H_0) - \Delta P_{up}(H_v)$ at the saturation $(H_v \ll H_0)$ as

$$\Delta p_{up} (H_0) - \Delta p_{up} (H_v) \xrightarrow{H_v \ll H_0} k \cdot E \ln \left[1 + \left(16 H_0^2 / 3 \right) \left(w_v^{-2} + l_v^{-2} \right) \right]$$
(9)

We plug Eq.(9) into Eq.(7) to obtain the expression for the saturated flow rate in terms of structural parameters

$$Q_{sat} \approx \frac{H_0^3 W}{12\eta L_2} k E \ln \left[l + \left(l6 H_0^2 / 3 \right) \left(w_v^{-2} + l_v^{-2} \right) \right]$$
(10)

On the other hand, the initial slope in the Q(P) curve is given by

$$\left. \frac{dQ}{dp} \right|_{p=0} = \frac{H_0^3 W}{12\eta L}.$$
(11)

Note that H_v decreases with a rather steep slope from the beginning as shown in Fig. 4(c). However, the effective channel height H_e (Fig. 2(b)) decreases very slowly because the valve region occupies only a small portion of the entire flow channel. This is the reason the initial slope of the Q(P) curve does not change too much up to the saturation point. For ideal current source operation, it is important to maximize the initial slope so as to minimize the operational pressure. From Eq. (11), we can see that the channel height H_o seems to be the dominance factor, since the slope depends on the cube of H_o . The same cube dependence can be found from Q_{sat} (Eq.(10)). This observation raises a concern whether or not we can control Q_{sat} and the dQ/dP independently, which will be discussed in the Result section.

Model for deformable PDMS channel

Now we consider the effect of the PDMS deformation due to internal pressure by the flowing fluid itself. We will use the result developed for a straight PDMS channel in the previous literature²¹. The displacement from the original channel height will be described by a perturbation factor Λ , which is defined as

$$\Lambda(x) = c \frac{P(x)W}{EH_0}$$
(12)

and

$$H(x) = H_0 \cdot (1 + \Lambda(x)),$$
 (13)

where *c* is an unknown proportionality constant and P(x) denotes the internal pressure along the axis of the main flow channel. It should be noted that we will neglect this channel expansion in the transverse direction so that W(x) = W, which is legitimate since $W/H_0 >>$ 1. Now we can apply this perturbative approach to find corrections to the unperturbed flow rate in the absence of the channel deformation (the dotted line in Fig. 5). We can solve the reduced Navier-Stokes equation^{20, 21, 26, 29} for the above situation to obtain a new velocity profile. The proper surface integration of the velocity profile over the cross-section of the channel gives the corrected flow rate Q, which now includes *c* and *E*, properties of the PDMS used^{20,21}.

$$Q = \frac{H_0^4 E}{48c\eta L} \left[\left(1 + \frac{cW}{E H_0} P \right)^4 - 1 \right]$$
(14)

In Fig. 5, we plot the result of Eq. (14) along with the rigid Poiseuille's straight channel having the identical dimensions. At our typical working pressure of around 20 psi, errors between the two models can be as high as 20 %, which justifies the need for such correction.

Thus, Eq. (4) has to be changed to

$$P = \frac{E H_0}{cW} \left[\left(1 + \frac{48c\eta (L_1 + L_2)}{H_0^4 E} Q \right)^{1/4} - 1 \right] + \frac{12\eta L_3}{H_v^3 W} Q + \frac{E H_0}{cW} \left[\left(1 + \frac{48c\eta L_4}{H_0^4 E} Q \right)^{1/4} - 1 \right]$$
(15)

where applied pressure *P* is expressed as a function of H_V . We neglect this bulging effect for the valve region, since L_3 is just about 0.7% of the total length (= $L_1 + L_2 + L_3 + L_4$).

Following similar steps in Eqs. (5)–(7), we obtain the expression for flow rate Q as a function of H_V

$$Q = \frac{H_0^4 E}{48 \, c\eta \, L_2} \left[\left\{ 1 + \frac{cW}{E \, H_0} \left(\Delta p_{up} \, (H_0) - \Delta p_{up} \, (H_v) \right) \right\}^4 - 1 \right] \tag{16}$$

Therefore, comparing $P(H_v)$ [Eq.(15)] and $Q(H_v)$ [Eq.(16)], one can plot Q as a function of P.

Results

In Fig. 6, we plot various Q(P) curves as we vary various parameters. First let us look at results in Fig. 6a. We vary H_0 while fixing other parameters. As expected, as dQ/dPincreases Q_{sat} increases accordingly. To get a rather independent control of Q_{sat} over dQ/dP, we note that the expression for Q_{sat} [Eq.(10)] contains additional parameters, E and L_2 , which are not included in dQ/dP [Eq.(11)]. The evolution of Q_{sat} as a function of E and L_2 are presented in Fig. 6b and 6c, respectively. Within a reasonable range in E for PDMS, we can control Q_{sat} in the range of from 100 nL/sec to 400 nL/sec. However, E is a quantity fixed during the fabrication step. Therefore, to allow variations in Q_{sat} within the same PDMS microfluidic chip, we must control L_2 . Fig. 6c shows this result: Q_{sat} is inversely proportional to L_2 . This result shows that the detour channel is an essential part of our autoregulatory system. Finally, we also investigate the effect of PDMS bulging shown in Fig. 5. We vary a constant that controls the degree of the bulging; as expected, only a small variation in Q_{sat} could be obtained.

Now we are in a good position to apply our findings to the experimental data. As noted in the above, the slope is a very sensitive function of H_o . Therefore, we first try to obtain the most reasonable value for H_o while W, L, and h are fixed to some known values. In fact, when we apply pressure to the port S (reverse bias), the effect of the valve region can be neglected as proven by the effective channel height argument. As we decrease L_2 (or the detour ratio L_2/L), this assumption holds true more and more perfectly. Fig. 7 compares experimental data from our previous work¹² (dots) and a theoretical curve (solid line). Here, we try to fit the curve to the measurement data with $L_2/L = 0.23$. We find that the best fitted curve can be obtained with E/c = 4.14 MPa.

Then, we try to fit data obtained from the forward bias experiments (See Fig. 8). In this fitting, *E* and *c* are fitting parameters with a constraint of E/c = 4.14 MPa. This means only one fitting parameter is used to get good fitted results as shown in Fig. 8. The best fitted results are obtained with E = 1.2 MPa and c=0.29, both are within reasonable ranges.

Discussion and Conclusions

We develop a theoretical model that can explain how flow rate changes as we regulate the flow by employing the detour channel. The theoretical model predicts on how flow rate changes as a function of applied pressure – the Q(P) curve, which shows good agreement with the experimental data, though the model is based on a rather simple Poiseuille's law for incompressible, Newtonian fluids. Specifically, we verify that modeling parameters such as 1) flow channel height H_{0} , 2) Young's modulus of PDMS E, 3) detour channel ratio L_2/L , and 4) membrane geometry factor k have strong influence on the saturation pressure and the saturated flow rate. We also consider the expansion of microfluidic channel height, originated from the softness of PDMS, which would be of more significant concern at higher pressure.

The autoregulatory effect depends on the ratio of lengths of the "main channel" and "detour channel", rather than the lengths themselves^{12, 14}. Therefore, the size of such a current source unit is not limited by the length of the constituent channels. However, the device operation is dependent on the proper functioning of the valve, which has geometric limitations¹⁴ and thus limits the size of the unit to ~0.25 mm² by current technology. Still, such size allows device densities of over 2,500 /inch², which is very generous for most conceivable applications. The theoretical model presented here is a building block for the theory of such circuits, just as a single current source is a building block for their physical structure.

Microfluidic devices based on biocompatible fluids will be likely to be useful for a broad range of applications from basic biochemical studies on-a-chip to biomedical fields. Furthermore, it has been argued that the further miniaturization of microfluidic chip size has been hampered by a number of external ports (also known as Medusa) indispensible for controlled actuation of micro-valves²⁹. The via structure that connects the detour flow channel to the push-up valve allows three-dimensional systematic integration of microfluidic circuit elements, which would help to increase the number density of fluidic components and to enable ultimate device miniaturization. Therefore, we can expect huge reduction in the number of external ports by employing our autoregulatory systems based on these vias. In this context, our modeling will provide useful guidelines to the design of such devices as well as to understand physics behind their behaviour and operation.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grant 4R00EB007151.

Notes and references

- Unger M, Chou HP, Thorsen T, Scherer A, Quake SR. Science. 2000; 288:113. [PubMed: 10753110]
- Balagadde FK, You L, Hansen CL, Arnold FH, Quake SR. Science. 2005; 309:137. [PubMed: 15994559]
- 3. Hong JW, Studer V, Hang G, Anderson WF, Quake SR. Nat. Biotechnol. 2004; 22:435. [PubMed: 15024389]
- 4. Fu AY, Chou H, Spence C, Arnold and Stephen FH, Quake R. Annal. Chem. 2002; 74:2451.

- 5. Brody JP, Yager P, Goldstein RE, Austin RH. Biophys. J. 1996; 71:3430. [PubMed: 8968612]
- 6. Squires TM, Quake SR. Rev. Mod. Phys. 2005; 77:977.
- 7. Prakash M, Gershenfeld N. Science. 2007; 315:832. [PubMed: 17289994]
- 8. Huang C, Bazant MZ, Thorsen T. Lap Chip. 2010; 10:80.
- 9. Lin F, Saadi W, Rhee SW, Wang S, Mittal S, Jeon NL. Lab Chip. 2004; 4:164. [PubMed: 15159771]
- 10. Groisman A, Enzelberger M, Quake SR. Science. 2003; 300:955. [PubMed: 12738857]
- 11. Doh I, Cho Y. Lab Chip. 2009; 9:2070. [PubMed: 19568677]
- Kartalov EP, Walker C, Taylor CR, Anderson WF, Scherer A. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2006; 103:12280. [PubMed: 16888040]
- Ziaie B, Baldi A, Lei M, Gu Y, Siegel RA. Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev. 2004; 56:145. [PubMed: 14741113]
- Liu J, Chen Y, Taylor CR, Scherer A, Kartalov EP. J. Appl. Phys. 2009; 106:114311. [PubMed: 20057932]
- Yager P, Edwards T, Fu E, Helton K, Nelson K, Tam MR, Weigl BH. Nature. 2006; 442:412. [PubMed: 16871209]
- 16. Myers FB, Lee LP. Lab Chip. 2008; 8:2015. [PubMed: 19023464]
- Kartalov EP, Zhong JF, Scherer A, Quake SR, Taylor CR, Anderson WF. Biotechniques. 2006; 40:85. [PubMed: 16454045]
- Sista R, Hua Z, Thwar P, Sudarsan A, Srinivasan V, Eckhardt A, Pollack M, Pamula V. Lab Chip. 2008; 8:2091. [PubMed: 19023472]
- 19. Sirard SM, Green PF, Johnston KP. J. Phys. Chem. B. 2001; 105:766.
- 20. Hardy BS, Uechi K, Zhen J, Kavehpour HP. Lab Chip. 2009; 9:935. [PubMed: 19294304]
- 21. Gervais T, El-Ali J, Gunther A, Jensen KF. Lab Chip. 2006; 6:500. [PubMed: 16572212]
- 22. Studer V, Hang G, Pandolfi A, Ortiz M, Anderson WF, Quake SR. J. Appl. Phys. 2004; 95:393.
- 23. Kartalov EP, Scherer A, Quake SR, Taylor CR, Anderson WF. J. Appl. Phys. 2007; 101:064505.
- 24. Norrman K, Ghanbari-Siahkali A, Larsen NB. Annu. Rep. Prog. Chem. Sect. C. 2005; 101:174.
- 25. Armani, D.; Liu, C.; Aluru, N. Proceedings of IEEE Micro Electro Mechanical System (MEMS); 1999. p. 222
- 26. Bruus, H. Theoretical Microfluidics. USA: Oxford University Press; 2007.
- 27. Mortensen NA, Okkels F, Bruus H. Phys. Rev. E. 2005; 71:057301.
- Happel, J.; Brenner, H. Low Reynolds Number Hydrodynamics. New York: Prentice Hall; 1965. p. P34
- 29. Vyawahare S, Sitaula S, Martin S, Adalian D, Scherer A. Lap Chip. 2008; 8:1530.



Fig. 1.

Microfluidic current source device. **a** The device consists of two PDMS microfluidic layers. The upper one has the main flow channel and the detour channel, while the lower one has the control channel. Both channels are connected through via. **b** Cross-section view of the push-up valve. The valve has the flat membrane geometry whose thickness *h* is determined by the spin speed. The boundary of the flow channel is the rounded shape, while the control channel is the rectangular shape. **c**, **d** Photograph of the scale of fabricated current source and via (courtesy of *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, ref. 12, copyright © by the National Academy of Sciences).

Chang et al.



Fig. 2.

Effective channel height. **a** Three different channel segments are connected in series: channel 1 (2, 3) has length $L_1(\Delta, L_2)$ and height $H_0(H_v, H_0)$. The multiple channels can be regarded as a straight channel with length $L (=L_1 + \Delta + L_2)$ and effective channel height H_e . The length Δ and height H_v of the middle channel are expressed as εL and γH_0 , where ε and γ are the proportional constants. **b** When H_0 , L, ε are given by 20 µm, 14.2 mm, and 0.01, respectively, the deformable ratio γ has a strong effect on the effective channel height. For $\gamma > 1$ or $\gamma^3 > \varepsilon$, the effective channel height can be approximated as H_0 (blue box). While, for $\gamma^3 < \varepsilon$, the effective channel is lower than H_0 below γ of ~0.4 (red box).



Fig. 3.

Top view of the current source architecture. The channel in grey (red) indicates the flow (control) channel in the upper (lower) layer. The flow channel is connected to the control channel by via (green box). The black arrows indicate flow directions. The forward (reverse) bias allows positive (negative) pressure drop across the detour channel to actuate the push-up valve.

Chang et al.



Fig. 4.

Characteristics of the current source. **a** The *Q*-*P* curve shows the nonlinear behaviour. The flow rate remains constant beyond the saturation pressure. The slop at the initial condition is inversely proportional to the hydraulic resistance from Poiseuille's law. **b** The saturation pressure is defined as a point where the slope of dQ/dP(P) is zero. **c** The partial flow channel height H_V is deformed by pressure-actuated push-up valve. The $H_V(P)$ curve has the saturation pressure, resulting in the nonlinear hydraulic resistance.

1000 **Rigid channel Deformable channel** 800 Flow rate [nL/sec 600 400 200 0 3 18 12 6 9 15 0 **Applied pressure [Psi]**

Fig. 5.

Response of Q-P curve. Flow rate increases in the linear fashion in the rigid channel and its slope is inversely proportional to the hydraulic resistance, which is independent on the applied pressure, (dashed line). On the other hand, the resistance in the deformable PDMS channel is varied as increasing the applied pressure due to the channel bulging effect, leading to the upward curvature of the Q-P curve at high pressure (solid line).

Chang et al.



Fig. 6.

Simulation of the Q(P) curve for various values of **a** initial height of the flow channel H_{0} , **b** Young's modulus E, **c** detour ratio L_2/L , and **d** degree of PDMS deformation c. Tuning parameters assumed here are relevant to actual fabricated devices^{12, 14, 21, 25}.



Fig. 7.

Comparison of measurement and modeling data in reverse bias. Flow rates are measured as a function of applied pressure when given different detour channel ratios $L_2/L \blacksquare \land \land \diamond , \bullet$.). The fit of eqn (14) clearly shows a slight upward slop (red solid line). The fit parameter E/c of 4.14MPa is good agreement with measurement data.



Fig. 8.

Comparison of measurement and modeling data in forward bias. From eqn (14) and (15), the nonlinear fit curves (solid lines) are in good agreement with measurement data ($\blacksquare \land \bigstar, \diamondsuit$,) where fit parameters c and E are 0.29 and 1.2MPa, respectively. The saturation pressure and flow rate decrease as the detour channel ratio increases.