Transport barriers to self-propelled particles in fluid flows
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We present theory and experiments demonstrating the existence of invariant manifolds that impede the motion of microswimmers in two-dimensional fluid flows. One-way barriers are apparent in a hyperbolic fluid flow that block the swimming of both smooth-swimming and run-and-tumble Bacillus subtilis bacteria. We identify key phase-space structures, called swimming invariant manifolds (SwIMs), that serve as separatrices between different regions of long-time swimmer behavior. When projected into xy-space, the edges of the SwIMs act as one-way barriers, consistent with the experiments.

Dynamically defined transport barriers [1, 2] impede the motion of passive particles in a wide range of fluids, from microbiological and microfluidic flows to oceanic, atmospheric, and stellar flows. For steady and time-periodic flows, transport barriers are identified with invariant manifolds of fixed points and Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser surfaces [3–5]. More recently, these ideas have been extended to aperiodic and turbulent flows [6–10]. However, in many systems of fundamental and practical importance, the tracers are active rather than passive. Examples include propagating chemical reaction fronts [11, 12], aquatic vessels [13], and artificial and biological microswimmers [14, 15], including Janus particles [10, 17] and flagellated bacteria [18, 19].

Invariant manifold theory has previously been extended to incorporate propagating reaction fronts in a flow [20–24]. This theory identifies analogs of passive transport barriers, called burning invariant manifolds (BIMs), which are one-way barriers to front propagation. Experiments on front propagation in driven fluid flows [25–28] demonstrate the physical significance of these theories. Despite this success with reaction fronts, a comparable understanding for more general active systems is lacking.

This Letter presents theory and supporting experiments for an invariant manifold framework that describes barriers for general self-propelled tracers in a fluid flow. Our theory predicts the existence of swimming invariant manifolds (SwIMs) that act as guiding and limiting structures for active mixing. BIM theory for reaction fronts [20] is a special case of the general approach presented here. Our experiments use smooth-swimming and run-and-tumble strains of *Bacillus subtilis* bacteria (Fig. 1 inset) as active tracers in a laminar, hyperbolic flow in a microfluidic cross-channel (Fig. 1). Absent Brownian motion, passive tracers in a linear hyperbolic flow cannot traverse the passive invariant manifolds (separatrices) forming a cross along the channel centerlines (dashed lines in Fig. 1), whereas self-propelled tracers can. Nevertheless, we show that barriers to active particles, i.e. swimmers, still exist. We also present theory extending our analysis to the mixing of swimmers in a vortex flow.

In our model, an ellipsoidal swimmer in two dimensions (2D) is described by \( \mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \hat{\mathbf{n}}) \), comprising its position \( \mathbf{r} = (x, y) \) and swimming direction \( \hat{\mathbf{n}} = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta) \). Absent noise and active torques, a swimmer with a fixed swimming speed \( v_0 \) in a fluid velocity field \( \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}) \) obeys [14, 15, 29–30]

\[
\dot{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{u} + \nu_0 \hat{\mathbf{n}}, \quad \dot{\theta} = \frac{\omega_z}{2} + \alpha \hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \mathbf{E} \hat{\mathbf{n}},
\]

where \( \omega_z = \mathbf{z} \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \) is the vorticity, \( \hat{\mathbf{n}} = (-\sin \theta, \cos \theta) \) is a unit vector perpendicular to \( \hat{\mathbf{n}} \), and \( \mathbf{E} = (\nabla u +

---

Figure 1. (a) Cross-flow experiment; data is obtained in the red square. Inset: 100X image of a fluorescent *B. subtilis*. (b) SFPs and SwIM edges (in red/blue) of the hyperbolic flow; \( \alpha > 0 \). Arrows indicate the direction of \( \hat{\mathbf{n}} \) (and the blocking direction) for the equilibria and the SwIM edges. Streamlines of the flow are plotted in black. (c) Stable SwIMs (blue surfaces) of the \( \mathbf{q}^E \) SFPs for \( \alpha = 1 \). The black (gray) planes are stable (unstable) invariant surfaces. The yellow curves are heteroclinic orbits connecting pairs of SFPs. (d) Constant y cross-section of the swimmer phase space. The blue orbits are cross-sections of the stable SwIMs.
\(\nabla u^T/2\) is the symmetric rate-of-strain tensor. The shape parameter \(\alpha\) equals \((\gamma^2 - 1)/(\gamma^2 + 1)\), where \(\gamma\) is the aspect ratio of the ellipse; \(\alpha\) varies from \(-1\) to \(1\), where \(\alpha = 0\) is a circle, and \(|\alpha| = 1\) is a rod. Positive (negative) values of \(\alpha\) correspond to swimming parallel (perpendicular) to the major axis. The case \(\alpha = -1\) coincides with the dynamics of a propagating front element \([20]\) and the optimal (least-time) swimmer trajectories \([13, 31]\).

Equation (1) with \(v_0 = 0\) models passive transport. The linear hyperbolic flow, \(u = (Ax, -Ay)\) has a passive saddle fixed point at \(r = 0\). The \(y\)- and \(x\)-axes are the stable and unstable manifolds, respectively, defined as invariant sets whose points approach the passive fixed point forwards and backwards in time. Passive particles cannot cross these passive manifolds (Fig. 1d).

For swimmers in the hyperbolic flow, Eq. (1) becomes

\[
\dot{\tilde{x}} = \tilde{x} + \cos \theta, \quad \dot{\tilde{y}} = -\tilde{y} + \sin \theta, \quad \dot{\theta} = -\alpha \sin(2\theta),
\]

with dimensionless variables \(\tilde{r} = (\tilde{A}/v_0) r\) and \(\tilde{t} = At\). Note that the angular velocity \(\dot{\theta}\) is independent of \(r\). Hence, four invariant planes exist in phase space, one for each solution of \(\tilde{\theta} = 0\); these correspond to the fixed orientations \(\hat{n} = \pm \tilde{y}, \pm \tilde{x}\) (see Fig. 1).

The natural analogs of the passive fixed point are the fixed points of Eq. (2), called swimming fixed points (SFPs) \([22]\). There are four SFPs, one for each invariant constant-\(\theta\) plane. Two SFPs lie on the \(y\)-axis with the swimmer facing outward: \(q^\text{out}_{\pm} = (\pm \tilde{y}, \pm \tilde{x})\). The remaining SFPs lie on the \(x\)-axis with the swimmer facing inward: \(q^\text{in}_{\pm} = (\pm \tilde{x}, \mp \tilde{x})\). The SFPs are plotted in Fig. 1d. These equilibria are saddles, for all \(v_0\) and \(\alpha\).

We now set \(\alpha = 1\), approximating the shape of the elongated \(B.\ subtilis\) as a rod. Because the SFPs are saddles, they possess stable and unstable manifolds in the \(x\tilde{y}\) phase space, which we call swimming invariant manifolds (SwIMs), to distinguish them from those for passive advection. For \(\alpha > 0\), the inward SFPs have two stable and one unstable direction. Hence, they each possess a 2D stable SwIM (Fig. 1I) which together form a warped sheet in phase space, referred to simply as the SwIM. The SwIM separates phase space into two regions: to the left [right] of the SwIM, all swimmer trajectories are ultimately leftward-escaping (LE) [rightward-escaping (RE)] (Fig. 1I).

In addition to being an impenetrable barrier in 3D phase space, the SwIM seen in Fig. 1I produces one-way barriers to swimmers in the \(x\tilde{y}\) plane. Note that along the line \(\tilde{x} = -1\) in the \(x\tilde{\theta}\) plane, all non-stationary trajectories move leftward (Fig. 1I). This implies that no swimmer with \(\tilde{x} < -1\) can cross the line \(\tilde{x} = -1\) in the \(x\tilde{y}\) plane. Therefore, this line is a one-way barrier, preventing rightward motion but not leftward. Geometrically, Figs. 1I and 1H show that the line \(\tilde{x} = -1\) is the leftmost extent of the 2D SwIM projected into the \(x\tilde{y}\) plane, i.e. it is the left edge of the SwIM. By symmetry, the right SwIM edge \(\tilde{x} = 1\) is also a one-way barrier, which allows swimmers to pass through it from left to right, but not vice-versa. Hence, the stable SwIM edges form barriers to inward-swimming particles. Similarly, the horizontal edges of the 2D unstable SwIMs of the outward SFPs form one-way barriers, blocking outward-swimming particles (Fig. 1I).

We test our theoretical predictions with microfluidic experiments on swimming bacteria. We fabricate polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) cells with channels of width and depth 1 mm in a cross-shaped geometry (Fig. 1I). Fluid is pumped into both ends of the vertical channel and out both ends of the horizontal channel using syringe pumps. Passive tracer analysis reveals the flow in the center (red square in Fig. 1I) is well-approximated by a 2D linear hyperbolic flow. The bacteria used are \(B. subtilis\), either a smooth-swimming strain OI4139 in a CAP medium \([19]\), or a green-fluorescent-protein-expressing (GFP) run-and-tumble strain 1A1266 in LB broth \([33]\).

The bacteria’s swimming speeds \(v_0\) in the flow have a mean of 25 \(\mu m/s\) and 16 \(\mu m/s\) and standard deviation 11 \(\mu m/s\) and 6 \(\mu m/s\) for the smooth-swimming and tumbling GFP strains, respectively. A small fraction of the smooth-swimming bacteria tumbled (evidenced by large, abrupt changes in \(\theta\)) and were discarded from our analysis.

Dilute bacteria suspensions are injected into the PDMS channel through both the upper and lower inlets, and microscopy movies are recorded in the center of the channel at 40x. Bacteria trajectories are extracted using standard particle tracking algorithms \([34]\). The swimming speed \(v_0\) and the orientation \(\theta\) of each bacterium are determined by subtracting the hyperbolic flow velocity from the velocity of the trajectory: \(v_0\hat{n} = \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{u}(r)\) \([35, 36]\).

Figure 2 shows trajectories of smooth-swimming bacteria, some of which overlap (Fig. 2A). Trajectories of passive tracers in the same flow would be blocked by the vertical passive separatrix (dashed line in Fig. 2A) and would therefore not overlap. In fact, non-swimming bacteria in the same experiment do not cross this passive separatrix. Hence, the region in Fig. 2A where the LE and RE swimmer trajectories overlap is a signature of the self-propulsion of the swimmers. Our theory predicts that the width of this region is the distance between the vertical SwIM edges shown in Fig. 1I, i.e. 2\(v_0/A\). In the experiments, \(v_0\) is approximately constant in time for individual bacteria; however, different bacteria have different values for \(v_0\) \([37]\). Consequently, the width of the overlap region is undetermined in Fig. 2A.

Variations in \(v_0\) are accounted for by rescaling each trajectory by the corresponding value of \(v_0/A\), as in Eq. (2). The scaled trajectories’ coordinates \(\tilde{x}\) and \(\tilde{y}\) are shown in Figs. 2B–E. The location of the inward SFPs and
their SwIM edges is revealed by plotting trajectories for right-swimming and left-swimming bacteria separately (Figs. 2b and 2c). The behavior of inward-swimming bacteria near an inward SFP is similar to a passive tracer moving near the hyperbolic fixed point. The key difference is that active tracers moving near SFPs can cross the SwIM edge from $|\tilde{x}| < 1$ to $|\tilde{x}| > 1$, but not in the other direction.

The experimental data are consistent with the theoretically predicted one-way barrier property of the SwIM edges. This is clearest when we use the symmetry of Eqs. (2) $[\tilde{y}, \theta] \mapsto (-\tilde{y}, -\theta)$ and $[\tilde{x}, \theta] \mapsto (-\tilde{x}, \pi - \theta)$ to rectify the trajectories, such that all trajectories are displayed as though entering from the upper inlet and escaping to the right. Under this transformation, Fig. 2d shows that all trajectories are bounded from the left by the SwIM edge at $\tilde{x} = -1$, in agreement with the theory. Indeed, any bacterium crossing this SwIM edge from left to right would violate the one-way barrier property. Furthermore, all bacteria that enter with $|\tilde{x}| > 1$ (Fig. 2e, rectified such that initial $\tilde{x} < -1$) are swept away from the center of the cell, consistent with the SwIM edges at $|\tilde{x}| = 1$ as barriers to inward-swimming bacteria.

The delineation between LE and RE swimmers by the SwIM in the $\tilde{x}\theta$ plane is shown experimentally in Fig. 3. Most of the trajectories in Fig. 3a respect this barrier, although there is a slight breach of the SwIM for some of the bacteria. The SwIM is only a strict phase-space barrier for perfectly smooth-swimming tracers. Even for our “smooth-swimming” bacteria, however, the swimming direction fluctuates somewhat; bacteria wiggle as they swim due to the kinematics of swimming with helical flagella [38] and rotational diffusion [36, 39]. These fluctuations — which can cause momentary crossings of the SwIM — are revealed in Fig. 3b by the scatter in $\theta$ for individual trajectories.

Angular fluctuations are, of course, particularly pronounced for the tumbling strain of bacteria (Fig. 4a), leading to highly irregular $\tilde{x}\theta$ trajectories. Clearly, the SwIM is not a phase-space barrier for swimmers with a
reorientation mechanism distinct from the fluid torque. However, for bacteria with well-defined tumble events, the \( \vec{x}\theta \) trajectories (Fig. 3b) give insight into the short-term direction (right or left) of their \( \vec{x}\vec{y} \) motion (Fig. 3a). The bacterium in these two plots begins to the right of the SwIM; the corresponding \( \vec{x}\vec{y} \) trajectory moves to the right during this period. The bacterium undergoes a significant tumble at \( \vec{x} = 0.2 \), jumping above and to the left of the SwIM (Fig. 3b), with a corresponding change in direction in the \( \vec{x}\vec{y} \) plane (Fig. 3c).

Despite the dramatic fluctuations in the orientations of the tumbling bacteria, their \( \vec{x}\vec{y} \) trajectories appear to respect the vertical lines \( \vec{x} = \pm 1 \) as one-way barriers. Specifically, any RE trajectory must have entered with \( \vec{x} > -1 \) (Fig. 4), and any trajectory that enters with \( \vec{x} < -1 \) must move leftward, away from the vertical line (Fig. 4b). Furthermore, though the trajectories in Fig. 4 cross the horizontal passive manifold, they do not cross the lower red line at \( \vec{y} = -1 \), respecting its outward-blocking nature.

SwIM edges do not generally act as barriers for tumbling bacteria. (See vortex analysis below.) The bounding behavior occurs in these experiments because the SwIM edges coincide with the BIMs for linear hyperbolic flows. Specifically, the stable BIMs are the 1D stable manifolds of the fixed points of Eq. (1) with \( \alpha = -1 \). Despite the difference in \( \alpha \), these BIMs form the same vertical lines \( \vec{x} = \pm 1 \), but they are now recognized as one-way barriers to front propagation, preventing the passage of fronts across the BIMs in the outward direction. We make the crucial observation that BIMs act as one-way barriers for all swimmers of a fixed swimming speed \( \nu_0 \), regardless of their shape or motility pattern. Indeed, even swimmers exhibiting rotational diffusion, tumbling, or other reorientation mechanisms are subject to these barriers, so long as their swimming speed remains fixed. This can be seen as a consequence of the optimal swimmer trajectory interpretation (13) of Eq. (1) with \( \alpha = -1 \): no least-time swimmer trajectory can cross a BIM in the \( \vec{n} \) direction; therefore no suboptimal swimmer can similarly cross the BIM. Although the SwIM edges and BIMs coincide for a hyperbolic flow, they depart from each other for more general nonlinear flows. The SwIM edges are more relevant for perfect smooth swimmers, whereas the BIMs are more relevant for noisy swimmers, as we illustrate with the following example.

We consider the swimmer dynamics Eq. (1) in the vortex-lattice flow (14, 15, 32) \( \vec{u} = (\sin(2\pi\vec{x}) \cos(2\pi\vec{y}), -\cos(2\pi\vec{x}) \sin(2\pi\vec{y})) \), where we use non-dimensional coordinates \( \vec{r} = \vec{r}/L \) and \( \vec{t} = tU/L \) for a flow with maximum speed \( U \) and length scale \( L \). Near the origin \( \vec{r} = 0 \), the flow is approximately the linear hyperbolic flow, with \( A = 2\pi \). Thus, the origin is surrounded by SFPs analogous to those of Eq. (2) [32]. See Fig. 5a.

In analogy with the preceding microfluidic experiments that identified the positions of RE trajectories, we perform the following numerical experiment. We integrate the initial conditions of swimmers selected at random inside a single vortex cell but outside the grey square shown in Fig. 5a. We then plot only those initial positions for which the swimmer trajectory enters the grey square at the upper edge \( \vec{y} = 0.25 \) and subsequently exits through the right edge at \( \vec{x} = 0 \). These trajectories are analogous to the RE trajectories in the experimental hyperbolic flow. Figure 5a shows the result of the calculation for perfect smooth swimmers, along with the SwIM edge for the 2D stable SwIM of the vortex flow (solid curve) and the corresponding BIM (dotted curve). Clearly, these initial conditions are bounded by the SwIM edge, showing that the SwIM edge again bounds those trajectories that exit right, even in a nonlinear flow. We repeat the calculation with a moderate-intensity white noise term added to \( \vec{\theta} \) in Eq. (1) to simulate rotational diffusion for realistic smooth-swimming bacteria [32]. The resulting set of initial conditions (Fig. 5b) breaches the SwIM edge, but it remains bounded by the BIM, consistent with the absolute one-way barrier property of BIMs for all swimmers, regardless of their reorientation mechanism.

In summary, we have shown theoretically and experimentally that the trajectories of self-propelled particles in externally-driven fluid flows are constrained by the presence of one-way barriers, i.e. SwIM edges and BIMs. Despite the simplicity of our model, we are able to fully explain certain properties of the trajectories of swimming bacteria in an externally-driven microfluidic flow. Our SwIM framework provides a fundamental basis for understanding the critical barrier structures that dominate the mixing of a wide range of self-propelled tracers in laminar flows. We expect that this approach can be generalized to more complicated, time-periodic, time-aperiodic and weakly turbulent flows. Furthermore, a SwIM analysis should shed light on directed transport

![Figure 5. Bounding properties of SwIM edges and BIMs in a vortex flow; \( \nu_0/U = 0.1 \), \( \alpha = 1 \). (a) Initial positions (black dots) of smooth-swimmers that enter the grey square from the upper side and exit it on the right side (magenta arrow). The stable SwIM edge and stable BIM of the lower-right SFP are shown as solid blue and dotted blue curves, respectively. (b) Same as panel (a) for swimmers with rotational diffusivity \( D_r \); \( D_r L/U = 0.86 \).](image)
systems, such as gyrotaxis [11, 42], or the combined mixing of self-propelled organisms and the nutrients to which they are chemotactic. It also remains an open question how our approach may apply to the trajectories of self-propelled agents in active matter systems featuring self-driven flows, such as individual bacteria within a swarm [43] or motile defects in active nematics [44–46].
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[33] The bacteria are incubated overnight at 37°C (with shaking), re-inoculated in fresh medium, incubated for 4–5 hours, and diluted to an optical density (OD)000 ~ 0.03 or 0.02 for the smooth-swimming and GFP strains, respectively.