

Direct measurements of hydrophobic slippage using double-focus fluorescence cross-correlation.

Olga I. Vinogradova,^{1,2,3,*} Kaloian Koynov,⁴ Andreas Best,⁴ and François Feuillebois²

¹*A.N. Frumkin Institute of Physical Chemistry and Electrochemistry,
Russian Academy of Sciences, 31 Leninsky Prospect, 119991 Moscow, Russia*

²*CNRS UMR 7636, ESPCI, 10 rue Vauquelin, 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France*

³*Institut für Technische Chemie und Makromolekulare Chemie,
RWTH Aachen, Pauwelsstr. 8, 52056 Aachen, Germany*

⁴*Max Planck Institute for Polymer Research, Ackermannweg 10, 55128 Mainz, Germany*

(Dated: February 9, 2022)

We report results of direct measurements of velocity profiles in a microchannel with hydrophobic and hydrophilic walls, using a new high precision method of double-focus spacial fluorescence cross-correlation under a confocal microscope. In the vicinity of both walls the measured velocity profiles do not turn to zero by giving a plateau of constant velocity. This apparent slip is proven to be due to a Taylor dispersion, an augmented by shear diffusion of nanotracers in the direction of flow. Comparing the velocity profiles near the hydrophobic and hydrophilic walls for various conditions shows that there is a true slip length due to hydrophobicity. This length, of the order of several tens of nanometers, is independent on electrolyte concentration and shear rate.

PACS numbers: 82.70.Dd, 83.80.Qr, 82.70.-y

For more than hundred years scientists and engineers have assumed and successfully applied no-slip boundary conditions to model experiments in fluid mechanics [1]. However, it has been recently well recognized, that the success of this famous no-slip postulate reflected mostly a macroscopic character and insensitivity of old experiments. Reducing the size of investigated systems to micro- and, especially, nanodimension led to a very definite conclusion that the no-slip condition does not always apply [2]. It is now clear that many systems should allow for an amount of slippage, described in terms of a slip length: $v_s = b\partial_z v$, where v_s is the slip (tangential) velocity at the wall and the axis z is normal to the surface. What, however, remains a matter of active debates is the amplitude of slip, and its variation with interfacial properties and parameters of the flow.

From the theoretical point of view the situation is reasonably clear. Slippage should not appear on a hydrophilic surface, except as at very high shear rate [3]. A slip length of the order of hundred nanometers or smaller is, however, expected for a hydrophobic surface [4, 5, 6]. On the experimental side, no consensus is achieved so far. While some experimental data are consistent with the theoretical expectations both for hydrophilic [7, 8, 9, 10, 11] and hydrophobic surfaces [7, 8, 9, 12], some other reports completely escape from this picture with both quantitative (slippage over hydrophilic surface, shear rate dependent slippage, rate threshold for slip, etc) and quantitative (slip length of several μms) discrepancies (for a recent review see [13]). Clearly, in order to rationalize the experimental situation, new data are necessary. These data should preferably be obtained with a new experimental technique.

Basically, two types of experimental methods were

used to study boundary conditions. High-speed force measurements performed with the surface forces apparatus (SFA) [8, 14] or atomic force microscope (AFM) [7] allows to deduce a drag force, with the subsequent comparison with a theory of a film drainage [4]. This approach, being extremely accurate at the nanoscale, does not provide visualization of the flow profile, so that this type of measurements should be identified as indirect. Direct approaches to flow profiling, or a velocimetry, take advantage of various optics to monitor tracer particles [15, 16, 17]. Their accuracy is normally much lower than that of force methods due to relatively low optical resolution, system noise due to polydispersity of tracers, and difficulties in decoupling of directed flow from diffusion. As a consequence, it is normally expected that a slippage of the order of a few tens nanometers cannot be detected by a velocimetry technique.

In this Letter we report direct high-precision measurements at the nanoscale performed with a new optical technique. As an alternative to the existing FTIR [15], $\mu\text{-PIV}$ [16, 17], and TIRV [12] methods we here use a recently suggested technique, based on a double-focus spacial fluorescence cross-correlation (DF FCS) [18]. Our method allows one to use much smaller tracers, an order of magnitude higher shear rates, and to get orders of magnitude better statistics as compared with the state of the art. These give us at least an order of magnitude improvement in accuracy compared with other velocimetry approaches. Results obtained for various experimental conditions allow us to deduce the true hydrophobic slip length, which is proven to be of the order of several tens of nanometers, and is independent on electrolyte concentration and shear rate.

Our microchannel was formed by a three-layer sand-




FIG. 1: Schematic of the experimental setup. Abbreviations are: MC - Microchannel, WP - Wollaston Prism, DBS - Dichroic Beamsplitter, EF - Emission Filter, APD - Avalanche Photodiode, and PH - Pinhole.

wich construction. The lowest layer was a standard microscope cover slide made of borosilicate glass with a thickness of $170\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, a root-mean-square roughness of the range $1\text{--}2\text{ nm}$. The water advancing contact angle on this slide was measured to be below 5° . The channel itself was created by cutting out a hole in an adhesive polymer film (Tessa, Germany) with a thickness of around $100\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, that forms the smallest dimension of the channel, directed along the z axis. The channel extension along the y axis (along the wall and perpendicular to the flow direction) is about 1.5 mm . Finally, the top layer was formed by a 1-mm-thick cover glass. Its surface was made hydrophobic by silanization and the water contact angle was measured to be $85\text{--}90^\circ$. An optically transparent polycarbonate block served as a support and for connection of the chamber to the external flow system. A hydrostatic pressure gradient was created by a system of two beakers at different heights, which allowed us to vary a shear rate near the wall in the range $\lambda = 800\text{--}3000\text{ s}^{-1}$. As a tracers we used fluorescently labeled latex spheres, carboxylate-modified FluoSpheres 580/605 (Molecular Probes, Eugene, Oregon). The particles had a radius of $R \sim 20\text{ nm}$ and a polydispersity of about 20%. Experiments were carried out in water and NaCl aqueous solutions with concentrations in the range between 10^{-5} mol/L and 10^{-2} mol/L .

The scheme of the DF FSC method is shown on Fig 1 and is described in details before [18]. Briefly, we used a commercial FCS setup (Carl Zeiss Jena, Germany) consisting of the module ConfoCor 2 and the inverted microscope model Axiovert 200. For the present experiments, we employed a water immersion objective (Zeiss, C-Apochromat $40\times$, NA 1.2). The optical system was modified so that an external laser beam could be coupled into




FIG. 2: Schematics of the basic idea of the double-focus spatial fluorescence cross-correlation method. Two laser foci are placed along the x axis separated by a distance of $6\text{ }\mu\text{m}$. They independently record the time-resolved fluorescence intensities $I_1(t)$ and $I_2(t)$. The forward cross-correlation of these two signals yields $G(t)$. Two foci are scanned simultaneously along the z axis to probe the velocity profile $v(z)$.

the confocal optics. For fluorescence excitation, the 543-nm line of a 1-mW helium-neon laser was used. The laser beam was split by means of a Wollaston prism. Behind the prism, the two beams are polarized perpendicularly to each other and exhibit an angular separation of 0.5° . After passing through two additional lenses these beams are fed into the confocal microscope. Our alignments result in two optically equivalent, almost diffraction-limited laser foci (diameter $\sim 400\text{ nm}$, height $\sim 3\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) separated by a distance of $6.0 \pm 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ in object space as is schematically shown in Fig. 2. As the fluorescence tracers are flowing along the channel they are crossing consecutively the two foci, producing two time-resolved fluorescence intensities $I_1(t)$ and $I_2(t)$ recorded independently from the avalanche photo-diodes APD 1 and APD 2. The time cross-correlation function of $I_1(t)$ and $I_2(t)$ can be calculated as $G(\tau) = \langle I_1(t)I_2(t + \tau) \rangle_t / \langle I_1(t) \rangle_t \langle I_2(t) \rangle_t$ and typically exhibit a local maximum. The position of this maximum τ_M is characteristic of the local velocity of the tracers.

To determine the velocity profile we have scanned the foci position across the channel. At each z position, a series of 10 independent data acquisitions was carried out. The acquisition time was either 30 s or 60 s , necessitating longer measurements close to the channel walls, where small flow velocities are found. Indeed, consider the worst case when the foci are centered on the wall. Since the concentration in particles is about 1 per femtoliter, the number of particles carried by the shear flow which enter the focus half-elliptical area during 60 s is about $N = 6 \times 10^4$. This gives a satisfactory signal to noise ratio $\sqrt{N}$ larger than 10^2 . The independent cross-




FIG. 3: Typical velocity profile $v(z)$ measured in a $\sim 100 \mu\text{m}$ channel with 10^{-4} mol/L NaCl solution. Inset: The observed velocity profile in the vicinity of the wall and schematics of the procedure for a determination of the apparent slip length ($b_{\text{app}} \sim 445$ nm) and the wall location ($z = 50.7 \mu\text{m}$).

correlation functions acquired at position z were fitted with a Gaussian function for more precise determination of $\tau_M(z)$, yielding the particle velocity $v(z) = \Delta s / \tau_M(z)$, where Δs is the distance between foci. For every salt concentration we have repeated experiments several times with freshly prepared channels and varied the pressure gradient.

A typical measured velocity profile is shown in Fig. 3. As expected, the central region, where the velocity of the tracer particles reflect that a liquid [18], the profile exhibits the parabolic shape predicted by the classical theory. However, when foci presumably enter the wall, this parabola does not turn to zero by giving a plateau of non-zero constant velocity. This is observed for both hydrophobic and hydrophilic surfaces. The apparent velocity at the plateau region is always higher for a hydrophobic surface and decreases with added salt and as shown in Fig. 4.

The apparent velocity at the wall is too large to reflect the true liquid slippage over it. Earlier estimates [18] suggested that in the vicinity of the wall the tracers are submitted to a Taylor dispersion, e.g. their diffusion is augmented by shear, enhancing a migration speed in the direction of flow. Now we model this effect precisely. Like in [18] we assume an ergodic system and interpret the time cross-correlation $G(\tau)$ as:

$$G(\tau) = \frac{\iint i_1(\mathbf{r}) i_2(\mathbf{r}') \Phi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \tau) d^3\mathbf{r} d^3\mathbf{r}'}{\bar{C}^2 \iint i_1(\mathbf{r}) i_2(\mathbf{r}') d^3\mathbf{r} d^3\mathbf{r}'} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = (x, y, z)$, $\mathbf{r}' = (x', y', z')$ and the average concentration of labelled particles is denoted by $\bar{C}$. The real-space detection efficiencies $i_1(\mathbf{r})$ and $i_2(\mathbf{r})$ for focus 1 and 2 were given as ellipsoidal Gaussian functions. The function Φ is given as the solution of the advection-diffusion equation from a point source in a flow field with uniform velocity. In the vicinity of the wall, the particles are repelled by an electrostatic force, F , so that they




FIG. 4: The apparent velocity at the plateau region, v_{app} , at the hydrophobic wall (triangles) and hydrophilic wall (circles) as a function of concentration of NaCl. Concentration 10^{-6} mol/L corresponds to a case of pure water. Dashed and solid curves show the values predicted for $b = 100$ nm and $b = 0$, correspondingly ($\lambda = 1750 \text{ s}^{-1}$). Inset shows typical calculated isoconcentration lines ($\bar{c}(x, z) = Ct$) distorted by dispersion together with isolines of light intensity profile at the downstream focus ($\bar{i}_2(x, z) = Ct$).

do not fill up completely the ellipsoidal Gaussian light-ened region. Keeping the same notation for the light intensity, we thus replace $i_1(\mathbf{r})$ by $i_1(\mathbf{r})c_e(\mathbf{r})$, where $c_e(\mathbf{r})$ is the particle equilibrium concentration profile at the upstream focus, to be detailed below. We also take into account the velocity gradient in the advection flows, thereby introducing the mechanism for Taylor dispersion. The advection-diffusion equation to be solved is:

$$\partial c_\tau + (\lambda z + b) \partial c_x + \partial(wc)_z = D \nabla^2 c \quad (2)$$

where $w = F/(6\pi R\mu)$ is the migration velocity of a particle along z in a fluid of viscosity μ and D is the Einstein diffusion coefficient. Here we neglect the hydrodynamic interactions between the particles and wall. Since the distance from the wall $h \gg R$, the energy of electrostatic interaction of a particle with the wall is $U = q\phi_1 \exp(-\kappa h)$, i.e. the particle is considered as a point charge q [Correspondingly, $F = -dU/dh$]. Here ϕ_1 is the surface potential of the wall at the given concentration of electrolyte with an inverse Debye length κ . The charge is given by $q = 4\pi R^2 q_s = 4\pi R \epsilon_0 \epsilon \phi_2 (\kappa R + 1)$, where q_s is the surface charge density, and ϕ_2 is the surface potential of the particle. Then, according to the Boltzmann law, the equilibrium concentration of particles in the vicinity of the wall is $c_e(\mathbf{r}) = c_0 \exp(-U/k_B T) = c_0 \exp(-A \exp(-\kappa h))$, where $A = 4\pi R \phi_1 \phi_2 \epsilon_0 \epsilon (1 + \kappa R)/(k_B T)$. For ϕ_1 we used data of [19, 20], data for ϕ_2 were smaller according to electrokinetic measurements. With these parameters the values of A were of the order of 25. Instead of solving for an initial point source, multiplying by $i_1(\mathbf{r})c_1(\mathbf{r})$ and calculating the integral on $\mathbf{r}$ like in the numerator of Eq.1, we may from linearity of Eq.2 solve for the initial cloud of illuminated particles with concentration $i_1(\mathbf{r})c_1(\mathbf{r})$. The




FIG. 5: Concentration at upstream focus from balance of Brownian motion and electrostatic repulsive forces for the typical case of 10^{-4} mol/L NaCl, and intensity at the upstream focus when centered at 100 nm from the wall. The concentration of illuminated particles is the product of these quantities.

result $c(\mathbf{r}, \tau)$ is then multiplied by $i_2(\mathbf{r}')$ and integrated. This integral goes through a maximum at some time τ_M , which is interpreted as the transit time between foci, like in Fig. 2. Typical distributions of the concentration c_e and the intensity i_1 are shown in Fig. 5.

For simplicity of the numerical analysis, we have reduced the 3D problem to a 2D one by integrating Eq. 2 along y . Then we obtain for $\bar{c} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} c dy$ an equation of the same form, with now $\nabla^2 = \partial_{x_2}^2 + \partial_{z_2}^2$. The initial condition also is similar. The non-penetration condition $\partial_z c = 0$ applies automatically at the wall as a result of the repulsive electrostatic force. The equation advection-diffusion with these initial and boundary conditions was solved with a commercial finite elements software (COMSOL). Experimental values of the shear rate were used. The calculation was repeated for several values of b in the interval from zero to 100 nm and for several values of the distance of the foci to the wall. In each case, the calculated τ_M provided the apparent transfer velocity between foci, $\Delta s / \tau_M$.

Our calculations allow one to reproduce both the velocity profile close to the wall and the plateau region (see the solid dots in the inset of Fig. 3). By superimposing these two parts of the velocity profile for a given concentration of salt, we unambiguously determine a position of the wall in the experiment. An apparent slip length was then obtained by fitting a straight line through the points of the velocity in term of the distance to the wall, similarly to the inset in Fig. 3. The apparent slip lengths is about 445 nm for all electrolyte solutions, but is much larger in pure water, being of the order of $2 \mu\text{m}$. These results slightly differ from previously reported [18] due to a different, not supported by our current model, way of determination of the wall position. As become evident from Fig. 3 the fit of experimental data always gives the values of the apparent slip close to predicted by the theory. Thus, we conclude that the large observed value of the apparent slip at the hydrophilic wall are fully at-

tributed to a Taylor dispersion affected by electrostatic interaction of nanotracers with the wall.

The velocity profiles calculated for a slip wall are consistent with data obtained near hydrophobic surfaces, and the apparent slip at the hydrophobic wall is found to be 60–70 nm larger than in case of a hydrophilic wall for all salt concentrations. It follows from our modelling that the contributions of the Taylor dispersion for the no-slip and slip are of the same order, so that the difference of the apparent slip lengths is close to the actual ones. Alternatively, the true hydrophobic slip length was determined by comparison the apparent velocities at plateau regions (see Fig. 4). This procedure is more accurate since it does not suffer from possible errors introduced by fitting and even does not depend of the choice of the wall location. Fig. 4 shows that the results for hydrophobic surfaces are always below the curve computed for $b = 100$ nm. Note that the presence of electrolyte has little effect on the value of the hydrophobic slip length. Neither found we a dependence of measured values on the shear rate. In the numerical and experimental examples we used here as an illustration of our approach the shear rate close to the wall (1750 s^{-1}) was larger than in [16, 17] and comparable to [12]. There are indications that shear rate strongly influence the value of apparent slip in all range of shear rates we used, but the true hydrophobic slip however remains the same as in the discussed data.

In summary, we have performed an experimental study of a flow of water-electrolyte solutions in microchannels by using a new velocimetry technique. Our experiment is in favor of no-slip boundary conditions for a hydrophilic surface [7, 8, 9, 10]. It is very unlikely that there exists some minimal slip over hydrophilic surfaces as suggested before [12, 17]. We have also demonstrated that there is no possibility that flow exhibits a hydrophobic slip length larger than 80-100 nm. Therefore, the slip effect is not as extreme as many authors have reported [13, 16]. However, it is quite large if we consider a simple molecular model for slip at our contact angle [5], which might be a good indication to a two-layer model [4, 6] ($b/\delta \approx \mu/\mu_g \approx 50$, where δ is the thickness of the adjacent to the hydrophobic surface gas layer with viscosity μ_g , which suggests $\delta \approx 1 - 2$ nm). Essentially, our DF FCS approach allowed us to use very small particles, to reach a very large shear rate, and to reduce dramatically an error in measurements due to orders of magnitude better statistics than known methods [21]. We thus believe our Letter concludes the discussion about boundary conditions at hydrophilic and hydrophobic surfaces.

This work was supported by a DFG through its priority program “Micro and Nanofluidics” (Vi 243/1-3). V.Lobaskin, P.Tabeling, and R.Tsekov are thanked for discussions.

* Corresponding author: oivinograd@yahoo.com

- [1] H. Lamb, *Hydrodynamics* (Dover, New York, 1932).
- [2] O. I. Vinogradova, Int. J. Miner. Process. **56**, 31 (1999).
- [3] P. A. Thompson and S. M. Troian, Nature **389**, 360 (1997).
- [4] O. I. Vinogradova, Langmuir **11**, 2213 (1995).
- [5] J. L. Barrat and L. Bocquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4671 (1999).
- [6] D. Andrienko, B. Dünweg, and O. I. Vinogradova, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 13106 (2003).
- [7] O. I. Vinogradova and G. E. Yakubov, Langmuir **19**, 1227 (2003).
- [8] C. Cottin-Bizonne, B. Cross, A. Steinberger, and E. Charlaix, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 056102 (2005).
- [9] L. Joly, C. Ybert, and L. Bocquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 046101 (2006).
- [10] O. I. Vinogradova and G. E. Yakubov, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 045302(R) (2006).
- [11] C. D. F. Honig and W. A. Ducker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 028305 (2007).
- [12] P. Huang, J. Guasto, and K. Breuer, J. Fluid Mech. **556**, 447 (2006).
- [13] E. Lauga, M. Brenner, and H. Stone, *Handbook of Experimental Fluid Dynamics* (Springer, 2005).
- [14] R. G. Horn, O. I. Vinogradova, M. E. Mackay, and N. Phan-Thien, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 6424 (2000).
- [15] P. Pit, H. Hervet, and L. Leger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 980 (2000).
- [16] D. C. Tretheway and C. D. Meinhardt, Phys. Fluids **14**, L9 (2002).
- [17] P. Joseph and P. Tabeling, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 035303 (2005).
- [18] D. Lumma, A. Best, A. Gansen, F. Feuillebois, J. O. Rädler, and O. I. Vinogradova, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 056313 (2003).
- [19] R. G. Horn, D. T. Smith, and W. O. Haller, Chem. Phys. Lett. **162**, 404 (1989).
- [20] W. A. Ducker, T. Senden, and R. M. Pashley, Langmuir **8**, 1831 (2002).
- [21] Indeed at every z our 10 independent data acquisitions have given us an information about $N > 5 \times 10^5$ particles. To the best of our knowledge in the μ -PIV [17] and TIRV [12] methods maximum $N \sim 10^3$ particles are normally analyzed.