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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

Magnetic fields and magnetic materials have promising microfluidic applications. For example, magnetic micro-convection can enhance mixing considerably. However, previous studies have not explained increased effective diffusion during this phenomenon. Here we show that enhanced interface smearing comes from a gravity induced convective motion within a thin microfluidic channel, caused by a small density difference between miscible magnetic and non-magnetic fluids. This motion resembles diffusive behavior and can be described with an effective diffusion coefficient. We explain this with a theoretical model, based on a dimensionless gravitational Rayleigh number, and verify it by numerical simulations and experiments with different cell thicknesses. Results indicate the applicability and limitations for microfluidic applications of other colloidal systems. Residual magnetic micro-convection follows earlier predictions.

1. Introduction

Concepts of microfluidics and lab-on-a-chip systems are attractive for various biological and medical problems, however, simple and effective solutions are still needed to overcome typical limitations and enable applications [1]. Diffusion limited mixing of fluids in the laminar microfluidics flow is one of them. Use of magnetism and magnetic materials offer multiple effective and simple mechanisms to improve mixing, as has been shown in recent reviews [2, 3, 4].

A particularly interesting type of magnetic micromixers are based on a phenomenon called magnetic micro-convection, discovered by Maiorov and Čebers [5]. It is a convective fingering pattern (for example, see Fig.1) that emerges on an interface of miscible magnetic and nonmagnetic fluids when exposed to an external magnetic field, which is perpendicular to the fluid plane. This comes from the rivalry between diffusion and self-magnetic field of magnetic fluid. Due to complex nature and simple implementation, this phenomenon has been widely studied for various conditions and applications, including a flat cell [6, 7], radial geometry [8, 9], including an interplay with Rosensweig instability [10], microfluidic mixing [11] and surface patterning in sessile drops [12], both experimentally and theoretically. In [13] we have updated the theoretical model to an extent that it quantitatively describes the experimental observations. However, for this comparison, an effective diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{eff}}$ was used, instead of the experimentally measured diffusion coefficient of magnetic nanoparticles $D$. Moreover, $D_{\text{eff}}$ was estimated to be two order of magnitude larger than $D$. In this paper we investigate the reasons behind this extraordinary situation.

It turns out that a small density difference between miscible fluids can be important even in microchannels. If a magnetic micro-convection experiment is performed in a system turned sideways, where the denser magnetic fluid is below the less dense nonmagnetic fluid, one can observe normal diffusion with a coefficient $D$ [14]. Here we start with revisiting a model for gravity induced concentration smearing on the interface, as proposed in [7], and using numerical simulations show how it causes a density difference induced convective motion within the thickness of the channel. We perform experiments in thinner channels and compare numerical and experimental results, introducing an effective diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{eff}}$.

2. Models, materials and methods

2.1. Theoretical model for magnetic micro-convection and interface diffusion

For the magnetic micro-convection we consider two miscible magnetic and non–magnetic fluids, which are confined in a horizontal Hele-Shaw cell and exposed to a homogeneous magnetic field perpendicular to the cell. At time $t = 0$ we assume a straight interface with a concentration step, where $c = 1$ corresponds to magnetic fluid and $c = 0$ to non–magnetic fluid. The process can be theoretically mod-
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  \caption{Characteristic fingering pattern of magnetic micro-convection phenomena. Finger size $\lambda$ approximately agrees with the cell thickness $h$. (a) $\lambda \approx h = 130 \, \mu$m, (b) $\lambda \approx h = 50 \, \mu$m, (c) $h = 25 \, \mu$m and $\lambda \approx 35 \, \mu$m.}
\end{figure}
elled with a system of Brinkman, continuity and convection-diffusion equations, as described in [13]. Without going into details, we note that the phenomenon is characterized with a dimensionless magnetic Rayleigh number \( Ra_m = \frac{(xH)\hbar^2}{2\Delta \eta} \), where \( \chi \) is the susceptibility of magnetic fluid, \( H \) is magnetic field, \( h \) is the cell thickness, \( \eta \) is the fluid viscosity, assumed to be equal across the fluid, and \( D \) is the diffusion coefficient of magnetic nanoparticles. For the instability to appear a critical field \( H_c \) is necessary and it corresponds to a critical magnetic Rayleigh number \( Ra_m^{crit} \approx 6 \), while finger size \( \lambda \) is approximately equal to cell thickness \( h \) and does not depend on \( Ra_m \) [13].

If no magnetic field is applied, the magnetic fluid should slowly mix with non-magnetic fluid via diffusion. This can be described by Fick’s law and, for the case of an initial concentration step, solved, resulting in a relation \( c(x,t) = c_0/[1 - \text{erf}(x/(2\sqrt{D}t))] \), where \( \text{erf} \) is the Gaussian error function and \( c_0 \) is the initial concentration. Concentration profiles \( c(x) \) can be measured experimentally and used to calculate a diffusion coefficient. For easier comparison between different concentration profiles, we use concentration gradients \( \partial c/\partial x \) at the initial interface \( x = 0 \). One can show that \( \partial c/\partial x \) is linked to the diffusion coefficient \( D \) via relation

\[
(4\pi \left( \frac{\partial c}{\partial x} \right)^2) = Dt.
\]

2.2. Theoretical model for gravitational influence

A model from [7] characterizes gravitational influence on a miscible fluid interface when there is a density difference between the fluids. Resulting effect in \( x - z \) plane (see coordinate definition in Fig.1) can be illustrated by the Stokes model with the concentration \( c \) dependent gravity force and the diffusion equation. The corresponding set of partial differential equations (PDEs) in dimensionless form is

\[
-\nabla p + \Delta \vec{u} - c \vec{e}_c = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + Ra_s(\vec{u} \cdot \nabla)c = \Delta c,
\]

where \( Ra_s = \Delta \rho gh^2/8D\eta \) is the gravitational Rayleigh number. It is obtained by scaling time by \( h^2/4D \), length by \( h/2 \) and the velocity by \( \Delta \rho gh^2/4\eta \), where \( \Delta \rho \) is the density difference, \( g = 981 \text{ cm s}^{-2} \) is standard gravity and \( h, D \) and \( \eta \) were introduced previously.

2.3. Numerical simulations

Numerical simulations are performed in COMSOL, as done in [7]. The simulation is defined with PDEs for a two dimensional side view of a cell in \( x - z \) plane with a slightly smeared normalized step-like concentration interface (closer to experiments) and no-slip boundary conditions. The cell is defined in dimensionless units with a thickness 2 and the width is 30 for \( Ra_g > 1000 \) and 10 for smaller \( Ra_g \). Solutions are searched from times \( t = 0.1 \) with a \( \Delta t = 0.001 \) interval for many gravitational Rayleigh number \( Ra \) values.

To be able to quantify numerical simulation results and compare them with experimental observations, it is useful to average the concentration along the thickness of the cell. This gives the same information as in a microscopy image. We arrive at an average concentration profile along \( x \) axis

\[
\bar{c}(x) = \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h c(x,z)\,dz,
\]

where factor 1/2 comes from the cell thickness which is 2. This step can be directly implemented in COMSOL, using \textit{linproj}l operator.

2.4. Microfluidics and microscopy

To observe the phenomena, we use an inverted microscope Leica DMi3000B, which is equipped with a pair of coils for creating homogeneous field \( H = 0.150 \text{ Oe} \), perpendicular to the plane of observation. (along \( z \) axis in Fig.1).

In experiments we use two fluids. Water based magnetic fluid is made by a co-precipitation method, forming magnetite nanoparticles which are stabilized with citrate ions and have a volume fraction \( \Phi = 2.8\% \), average diameter \( d = 7.0 \text{ nm} \), saturation magnetization \( M_{sat} = 8.4 \text{ G} \) and magnetic susceptibility \( \chi_m = 0.016 \), as determined by a vibrating sample magnetometer (Lake Shore 7404). Dynamic Light Scattering (Malvern NanoZS) and Force Rayleigh Scattering (setup at PHENIX lab, Sorbonne University) give particle diffusion coefficient \( D \approx 2.5 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-1} \). For non-magnetic fluid we take distilled water. We assume viscosities to be equal to that of water \( \eta = 0.01 \text{ P} \). The density difference between the two is \( \Delta \rho_g = 0.148 \text{ g/cm}^3 \).

To bring fluids to a sharp interface in a flat cell, we use microfluidics chips with a \( Y \) channel shape. We fabricate chips with 3 different thicknesses - \( h = 130 \mu \text{m}, h = 50 \mu \text{m} \) and \( h = 25 \mu \text{m} \). Fluids are driven at a flowrate \( Q \) by a syringe pump PHD Ultra from Harvard Apparatus and via FEP tubing (IDEX). Fluid velocity in channel we approximate as \( v = Q/(\omega \cdot h) \), where \( \omega \) is channel width.

The thickest chip \( h = 130 \mu \text{m} \) is made by welding a precut Parafilm spacer of the desired channel shape between two glass slides. Holes are made in one of the glass slide to glue in tubing connectors. For micro-convection experiments a channel shape that allows to merge two droplets is used, as explained in [13]. For no-field experiments we exploit a continuous microfluidics channel, as described in [14]. In this way it is possible to quickly obtain channels of the desired configuration with a width \( w \approx 1 \text{ mm} \) (for example, see Fig.4(a)).

Two thinner cells \( h = 50 \mu \text{m} \) and \( h = 25 \mu \text{m} \) are made by following the rapid prototyping routine [15]. We use molds with SU8 photoresist features on a glass substrate, fabricated in the Institute of Solid State Physics of the University of Latvia. PDMS (SYlgard 184, Dow corning) is mixed and then cured in an oven for 4 hours at 65°C. After removing PDMS from mold, holes for tubing connections are made. Then surface of PDMS is treated with a Corona SB plasma cleaner from BlackHoleLab. The same is done for a a 24×24 mm² 0.19 mm thin microscope glass slide. After treatment both pieces are put together and left for a few hours. The resulting chip has two 200 \mu \text{m} wide channels merging into one \( w = 400 \mu \text{m} \) wide channel (for example,
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![Figure 2: Numerical simulation results of concentration field dynamics as viewed from the side of the cell for three different gravitational Rayleigh numbers Ra = 10,000, 750, and 0.001. Decrease in Ra terminates convective motion, leaving only diffusion.](image)

Figure 2: Numerical simulation results of concentration field dynamics as viewed from a side of the cell for three different gravitational Rayleigh numbers $Ra = 10^5$, 750, and 0.001. Decrease in $Ra$ terminates convective motion, leaving only diffusion.

see Fig.4(b) & (c)).

Experiments are filmed with several different microscope cameras in brightfield mode. Image intensities are related to concentration fields via Beer-Lambert law. To improve the extracted data quality from images, especially for thinner cells, manual image processing is done, including filtering, masking areas with dirt, averaging, etc.

3. Results and discussion

The experimental conditions of previous experiments [13] at which we have observed the characteristic fingering pattern of the magnetic micro-convection, as visible in Fig.1(a), had a cell thickness $h = 130 \mu m$ and fluid density difference $\Delta \rho_0 = 0.148 g/cm^3$. According to the model of gravitational influence, described in §2.2, this corresponds to a gravitational Rayleigh number $Ra_g = 13^5500$. It is much larger than 1 and suggests a significant gravitational effect.

To investigate this in detail, we perform numerical simulations of the dimensionless model for the case of no magnetic field. We find the concentration plot dynamics of $x-z$ plane (side–view of the cell) for a variety of $Ra_g$, ranging from $10^{-3}$ to $10^4$. Characteristic results can be seen in Fig.2. For a large $Ra_g$ (e.g. $Ra_g = 10^5$), the denser magnetic fluid (red) quickly slides underneath the less dense water (blue). Eventually the diffusive mixing takes over and smears the deformed interface. Also for a medium $Ra_g$ (e.g. $Ra_g = 750$), the denser magnetic fluid quickly slides underneath the less dense water, however, the deformed interface is much smaller and diffusion takes over faster. For small $Ra_g$ (e.g. $Ra_g = 0.001$) no interface deformation can be seen and diffusion slowly mixes both fluids.

Due to limitations of the experimental system, it is impossible to observe concentration field dynamics in $x-z$ plane directly. For comparison, as explained in §2.3, it is worth to calculate the average concentration profiles $\bar{c}(x,t)$. Examples for such profiles are given in Fig.3. Similar profiles can be seen in all cases. A notable difference is only visible close to $c = 0$ and $c = 1$. For large $Ra_g$, the transition to the non-mixed areas are sharp (Fig.3(a)), while for smaller $Ra_g$ the transition is smooth (Fig.3(c)). These differences can be used to identify the convective motion within the cell.

From the definition of gravitational Rayleigh number $Ra_g$, it is clear that the gravitational influence for this system can be decreased by reducing the thickness of the cell $h$. For experiments we microfluidics cells with three different thicknesses as described in §2.4. The corresponding gravitational Rayleigh numbers are $Ra_g = 13^5500$, $Ra_g = 900$ and $Ra_g = 110$. Measurements are done in continuous microfluidics regime, where both magnetic and nonmagnetic fluids are brought to a contact and the change in the interface is observed down the microfluidic channel. Sample images with the same magnification are given in Fig.4. Fluids flow from the left to right.

Flowrates $Q$ are chosen so that the fluid velocity in channels is similar. For the thickest channel $h = 130 \mu m$ it is $v \approx 440 \mu m/s$. A clear smearing of the interface is visible, reaching around $400 \mu m$ by the end of the field of view (Fig.4(a)). For both thinner channels velocity is $v \approx 333 \mu m/s$ and much smaller smearing is visible. In Fig.4(b) with $h = 50 \mu m$ it reaches $\approx 150 \mu m$, while for with $h = 25 \mu m$ in Fig.4(c) smearing is only $\approx 50 \mu m$. Qualitatively we observe that the gravity induced convection is terminated.

From images in Fig.4 we obtain average concentration $\bar{c}(x,t)$ dynamics in experiments. Concentrations are found from intensity maps via Lambert-Beer law, while, assuming a constant fluid velocity $v$, translation along $y$-axis can be converted to time $t = y/v$. Characteristic average concentrations $\bar{c}$ from experiments for two times $t$ are shown in Fig.5(a)-(c). For the thickest cell (Fig.5(a)) a similar sharp
transition of concentration profile near non-mixed areas as in Fig.3(a) can be seen, confirming that the smearing is induced by gravity effects. It is visible that the concentration profile is not symmetric and a slight bump can be seen for concentrations just above $c = 0.5$. Our recent results show that this might come from nonlinear response of microscope camera and can be corrected by concentration calibration step [16]. For thinner cells the concentration data are much noisier, however it is visible that smearing is smaller and slower.

The interface formation even in microfluidics is not perfect. As can be seen in Fig.4, already the initial interface (at small $y$) is smeared (a) or creates an optical effect of bright and dark accents (b)&(c). This makes analysis for concentration profiles at small $y$, i.e. short times $t$, impossible. Therefore, concentration profiles for earlier times are fitted with linear curves (red lines), which give the effective diffusion coefficients $D_{\text{eff}}$. Subplots (a) and (b) show experimental data for the three different cell thicknesses $h$. For $h = 130 \mu m$ (diamonds in Fig.6(a)) the interface smearing grows linearly with time and is much faster than for two thinner cells. Also results for $h = 50 \mu m$ (circles in Fig.6(b)) and $h = 25 \mu m$ (upward pointing triangles in Fig.6(b)) indicate linear behavior, while the growth is slower. The slopes for all series are fitted with linear curves, where applicable. For that we find $\delta c/\delta x$ for each concentration profile (see fitted slopes that are marked with dotted lines in Fig.5). Following relation $\delta c/\delta x = 1/(4\pi \left(\frac{\delta c^{2}}{\delta x^{2}}\right))$ as a function of time $t$ in Fig.6. The slope we call effective diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{eff}}$.

Subplots (a) and (b) show experimental data for the three different cell thicknesses $h$. For $h = 130 \mu m$ (diamonds in Fig.6(a)) the interface smearing grows linearly with time and is much faster than for two thinner cells. Also results for $h = 50 \mu m$ (circles in Fig.6(b)) and $h = 25 \mu m$ (upward pointing triangles in Fig.6(b)) indicate linear behavior, while the growth is slower. The slopes for all series are fitted with linear curves (red lines), which give the effective diffusion coefficients $D_{\text{eff}}$. Subplots (a) and (b) show experimental data for the three different cell thicknesses $h$. For $h = 130 \mu m$ (diamonds in Fig.6(a)) the interface smearing grows linearly with time and is much faster than for two thinner cells. Also results for $h = 50 \mu m$ (circles in Fig.6(b)) and $h = 25 \mu m$ (upward pointing triangles in Fig.6(b)) indicate linear behavior, while the growth is slower. The slopes for all series are fitted with linear curves (red lines), which give the effective diffusion coefficients $D_{\text{eff}}$.

We use the concentration profiles to characterize dynamics, check for diffusive behavior in concentration smearing and find diffusion coefficients, where applicable. For that we find $\delta c/\delta x$ for each concentration profile (see fitted slopes that are marked with dotted lines in Fig.5). Following equation $\delta c/\delta x = 1/(4\pi \left(\frac{\delta c^{2}}{\delta x^{2}}\right))$ as a function of time $t$ in Fig.6. The slope we call effective diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{eff}}$.

Subplots (a) and (b) show experimental data for the three different cell thicknesses $h$. For $h = 130 \mu m$ (diamonds in Fig.6(a)) the interface smearing grows linearly with time and is much faster than for two thinner cells. Also results for $h = 50 \mu m$ (circles in Fig.6(b)) and $h = 25 \mu m$ (upward pointing triangles in Fig.6(b)) indicate linear behavior, while the growth is slower. The slopes for all series are fitted with linear curves (red lines), which give the effective diffusion coefficients $D_{\text{eff}}$. Subplots (a) and (b) show experimental data for the three different cell thicknesses $h$. For $h = 130 \mu m$ (diamonds in Fig.6(a)) the interface smearing grows linearly with time and is much faster than for two thinner cells. Also results for $h = 50 \mu m$ (circles in Fig.6(b)) and $h = 25 \mu m$ (upward pointing triangles in Fig.6(b)) indicate linear behavior, while the growth is slower. The slopes for all series are fitted with linear curves (red lines), which give the effective diffusion coefficients $D_{\text{eff}}$.

To evaluate the interface smearing dependence on gravitational Rayleigh number $Ra_g$, we plot numerical results for $D_{\text{eff}}/D_0$ as a function of $Ra_g$. This is shown in Fig.7 using log–log coordinates for clearer visibility, as the investigated region includes several orders of magnitude. Two different dependencies can be observed. For small $Ra_g < 100$, the effective diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{eff}}$ is equal to real diffusion coefficient of particles $D_0$. For larger $Ra_g > 100$, the effective diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{eff}}$ grows linearly with gravitational Rayleigh number $Ra_g$, following relation:

$$D_{\text{eff}}/D_0 = 0.053 \cdot (Ra_g - Ra_g^{\text{crit}}),$$ (4)
where $Ra^c_H = 105$ is critical gravitational Rayleigh number. More details can be found in [17].

For comparison, we calculate $D_{\text{eff}}/D_0$ for experimental data. Using $D = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-1}$, we get $D_{\text{eff}}/D_0 = 670$ for $h = 130 \mu m$, $D_{\text{eff}}/D_0 = 15.2$ for $h = 50 \mu m$ and $D_{\text{eff}}/D_0 = 5.2$ for $h = 25 \mu m$. These points are shown with black squares in Fig.7. Errorbars are calculated from uncertainties in fits of $D_{\text{eff}}$. One can see a reasonably good agreement. This confirms the gravitational influence on the magnetic micro–convection.

Similar gravity-induced interface reorientation between two liquids of different densities in microfluidics have been previously observed experimentally in [18, 19]. It has also been investigated numerically [20]. However, these studies have neglected the diffusion of particles. In the case of water based magnetic fluid and water interface the colloidal diffusion and density difference form particular conditions, where intermediate effects can be observed. This has allowed us to develop a theoretical model that predicts the gravitational influence and can be useful for development of many applications.

Changing the thickness of the cell $h$ allows to expand the verification of the magnetic micro–convection theoretical model [13], introduced in §2.1. One of the predictions is the change of finger size. Fingering patterns of instability for the three cells are shown in Fig.1. One can observe that for $h = 50 \mu m$ the characteristic finger size has reduced to $\lambda = 50 \mu m$ (see Fig.1(b)), exactly as predicted previously. However, for the thinnest cell $h = 25 \mu m$ the observed finger size is $\lambda = 35 \mu m$ and is slightly larger than thickness $h$.

The difference might come from the fact that this image is made for a slowly moving interface and the initial smearing varies along it.

Another parameter to verify is the change in critical magnetic field $H_c$ needed for different thicknesses. As for thinner cells we are unable to have an interface with at no flow conditions, we look for a critical magnetic field $H_c$ for different flow rates $Q$, as was done in [14]. This allows to extrapolate critical magnetic field at zero flow rate. This means trying multiple magnetic fields $H$ for each flow rate $Q$, until no more instability is observed on the interface. A characteristic image series of magnetic micro–convection dynamics is shown in Fig.8, where a situation with magnetic field rather far from the critical field can be seen. A clear fingering instability appears.

Results of critical magnetic fields $H_c$ for the two thinner cells and several flow rates $Q$ are summarized in Fig.9. Similar to results in [14], critical magnetic field shows a linear dependence on flow rate $Q$. We fit the data with linear curves (red dashed lines in Fig.9) and extrapolate critical magnetic fields at zero flow rate, $H_c = 21$ Oe for $h = 50 \mu m$, $H_c = 34$ Oe for $h = 25 \mu m$. From measurements in [13] the critical magnetic field for $h = 130 \mu m$ was found to be $H_c = 19$ Oe.

Using critical magnetic Rayleigh number $Ra^c_m \approx 6$ and the measured effective diffusion coefficients $D_{\text{eff}}$ for each cell thickness $h$, we can calculate $H_c = \sqrt{12\eta D Ra^c_m/(\chi \cdot h)}$. This gives $H_c = 53$ Oe for $h = 130 \mu m$, $H_c = 21$ Oe for $h = 50 \mu m$ and $H_c = 24$ Oe for $h = 25 \mu m$. Experimental measurements agree well only for $h = 50 \mu m$.

---

Figure 5: Average concentration $\bar{c}(x,t)$ dynamics. Experimental results for (a) $h = 130 \mu m$, (b) $h = 50 \mu m$ and (c) $h = 25 \mu m$. Numerical simulation results for (d) $Ra_q = 15'000$, (e) $Ra_q = 1000$ and (f) $Ra_q = 100$. Dotted lines are fits of concentration gradient $\delta \bar{c}/\delta x$ near $x = 0$. Rivalry in micro-convection
while for \( h = 130 \, \mu m \) the experimentally measured value is more than two times smaller. However, the value is close to the characteristic field where transition between straight and bent fingers appear \( H \approx 40 \, \text{Oe} \) [13]. This might indicate that the reason for appearance of straight fingers might not come from the magnetic micro–convection. The differences for \( h = 25 \, \mu m \) are smaller and might come from the flow fluctuations. At the moment our experimental system often experiences pressure oscillations, as typical for small microfluidics channels. Hence, taking into account these clarifications, also critical field observations are consistent with the model predictions in [13].

4. Conclusions

We have investigated the interplay of magnetic, diffusive and gravitational effects on the magnetic micro-convection. A small density difference between miscible magnetic and non-magnetic fluids is sufficient to form a gravity induced convection within a thin cell. A theoretical model, depending on a single dimensionless gravitational Rayleigh number \( Ra_g \), explains the phenomenon. We verify it with numerical simulations and experiments with different cell thicknesses. Characteristic interface smearing recalls diffusive behavior and parasitic gravitational convection disappears in a cell that is thin enough. When gravity is excluded, magnetic micro-convection can still be described by previously developed Brinkman model.

In addition, gravitational Rayleigh number \( Ra_g \) can be used to estimate potential gravitational influence on any colloidal system in microfluidics. This can be helpful for various applications.
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Figure 9: Critical magnetic field $H_c$ dependence on flow rate $Q$, µL/min for two different cell thicknesses $h = 50 \, \mu m$ (diamonds) and $h = 25 \, \mu m$ (circles). Red dashed lines are linear fits.
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