An in silico study to geometrically optimize microfluidic trap array for trapping efficiency
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Abstract Microfluidic Trap Arrays (MTAs) appear as very promising tools for several applications like cancer understanding and treatment or immune synapse research. The MTAs principle is the following: samples are diluted inside a fluid going through a microfluidic chamber composed of an array of a large number of traps. While following the fluid flow, samples can encounter traps that isolate them or very small group of them from the others. However, it often appears that many traps stay empty, even after a long time which can drastically reduce the number of exploitable samples. In this paper we built a Computational Fluid Dynamic (CFD) Finite Element Model with a specific streamlines analysis to investigate how the MTA geometry affects its trapping efficiency and how it is possible to optimize the MTA geometry in order to maximize the trapping efficiency. Our results shows that optimization of MTA trapping efficiency is a complex and non-intuitive process and is about finding a compromise between combinations of geometric parameters values that can not be achieved with a purely experimental approach. Streamlines analysis suggests that the important feature is to deviate the particle trajectories that can be done with: a diagonal pressure gradient, the use of low
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hydrodynamic resistance in strategic zones and with the proximity and size of inlet and outlet channels. We showed that a MTA’s trapping efficiency can be easily increased of more than 20 % with a single parametric approach and more than 30 % with a multi-parametric approach. Finally, such an efficient MTA geometry can also be obtained introducing irregularities in the trap positions with randomized translated traps.
1 Introduction

Among the last discoveries in medicine and biology research, Microfluidic Trap Arrays (MTAs) appear as very promising tools [19] for several applications like anticancer therapeutics [5, 9] or the study of adhesion phenomena in immune synapse [17, 20]. This success is due to the fact that MTAs allow an accurate spatio-temporal control of quite numerous and various isolated objects such as human [11] or vegetal [10] single cells, droplets [3, 6, 15, 17, 20] or polystyrene beads [17, 18]. Moreover, because of fabrication simplicity, it is easy to combine several MTAs in parallel in a same microfluidic chip which is then called Microfluidic Cell Array (MCA), which increases the total number of isolated objects [1, 13]. MTAs working principle is the following: objects are diluted inside a fluid going through a microfluidic chamber constituted by an array of a large number of traps. While following the fluid flow, objects can be caught in the traps individually or by small groups.

Nonetheless, many traps can stay empty even after a long time which can drastically reduce the number of exploitable objects [17] and raises the important question of trapping efficiency optimization [4]. To tackle this issue, an alternative is to use much more complex geometries such as "U-shaped" [4] or "serpentine" [6, 14, 15] MCAs. Nevertheless, it is very difficult to have both a very large number of traps and a short trapping time with these complex geometries with respect to rectangular [17, 20] or triangular [2] MTAs with their high trap density.

In the literature, several numerical models based on Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) approach are proposed to investigate the fluid flow in MTAs. Such approaches precisely assess the MTAs trapping efficiency in the case of simple geometries. However, for multiscale geometries of MTAs like rectangular or triangular MTAs, only few articles focus on MTAs with high trap density [2, 17]. Moreover, in these models the trapping efficiency is not assessed. Thus, the trapping efficiency evaluation of dense MTAs remains a numerical challenge.

One way to numerically assess trapping efficiency is to calculate the ratio between fluid flow rate inside each traps and the total injected flow rate [4, 8, 12]. Some geometric optimization studies are based on the maximization of this ratio but are limited to a few number of tested geometric configurations and does not always allow an easy comparison of trapping efficiency between several geometries. More advanced models including the trapped objects could give an accurate and eventually more reliable estimation of the trapping efficiency by directly counting the number of filled traps. These models are based on the calculation of the mechanical stress of the fluid on the solid objects, their resulting displacement and the induced fluid flow modifications due to the objects motion at each time steps. This approach is also called Fluid-Structure Interaction (FSI) with "two ways coupled" physics [7, 13, 16, 18]. However, because of the high computational cost, this technique cannot be applied to MTAs with high trap density (multi-
scale geometry) and high number of trapped objects. In this paper, we show how a CFD model with a specific streamlines analysis can easily compare the trapping efficiency between several geometries and allows multiparametric optimization studies in a dense rectangular MTA. In section 2, we detail our numerical model as well as the parametric study whose results are presented and discussed in section 3. Finally in section 4 we draw our conclusion and propose some perspectives to improve the numerical model.
2 Method

The whole numerical model is developed using the commercial Finite Element software Comsol Multiphysics 5.3 while post-processing is done using Matlab 2018.

2.1 Parametrized geometry of the MTA

The geometry of the MTA is the same as the one employed for the experimental assays described in [17]. Because of geometrical symmetry, a two-dimensional (2D) model geometry is proposed which is built from parametrized geometric primitives (Figure 1A). A single trap is obtained with three rectangles and a symmetry operation and is repeated in two rectangular trap networks. The vertical distance between traps on a same column and horizontal distance between two columns are indicated as $\Delta y_{bt}$ and $\Delta x_{bt}$.

The entire trap network domain is called $\Omega_{net}$ and is included in a rectangular envelope of length $l_{net}$ and width $w_{net}$ (the subscript "net" stands for "network"). The microfluidic chamber domain $\Omega_{ch}$ is represented with a rectangle of length $l_{ch}$ and width $w_{ch}$. The fluid domain $\Omega_{f}$ is equal to the difference between $\Omega_{ch}$ and $\Omega_{net}$.

The MTA inlet $\Gamma_{in}$ and outlet $\Gamma_{out}$ are represented by segments of length $l_{io}$. All the other boundaries of $\Omega_{f}$ are considered as rigid walls and their union is noted $\Gamma_{w}$. Inside each trap, two frontiers are added in $\Omega_{f}$: $\Gamma_{freeze}$ a particle freezing frontier that helps to visualize the trapped streamlines and $\Gamma_{count}$ a streamline counter frontier.

The domain $\Omega_{f}$ is meshed with linear triangular elements with the automatic Comsol Multiphysics 5.3 meshing algorithm (Figure 1B). Particular attention is paid to have at least two elements in the smallest width $w_{s}$ (in the traps slot). All the geometric parameters of the model are reported Table 1.
Fig. 1 A: the model geometry, domains and boundaries. \( \Omega_{ch} \): microfluidic chamber domain, \( \Omega_f \): fluid domain, \( \Omega_{trap} \): trap domain, \( \Gamma_{in} \): inlet boundary, \( \Gamma_{out} \): outlet boundary, \( \Gamma_w \): wall boundary, \( \Gamma_{freeze} \): streamline freezing boundary, \( \Gamma_w \): streamline counter boundary. All independent parameter values are reported Table 1. B: linear triangular mesh of \( \Omega_f \), at least two elements are in the smallest width \( ws \).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed geometric parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>MTA’s height</td>
<td>14 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta y_{bt}$</td>
<td>Vertical distance between traps</td>
<td>30 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta x_{bt}$</td>
<td>Horizontal distance between traps</td>
<td>50 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{br}$</td>
<td>Trap big rectangle length</td>
<td>6 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{ch}$</td>
<td>Chamber length</td>
<td>1200 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{sr}$</td>
<td>Trap small rectangle length</td>
<td>5 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{trap}$</td>
<td>Trap length</td>
<td>27 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{traps}$</td>
<td>Number of traps in the MTA</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_s$</td>
<td>Width of the trap slot</td>
<td>4 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_{sr}$</td>
<td>Trap small rectangle width</td>
<td>10 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_{trap}$</td>
<td>Trap width</td>
<td>30 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_p$</td>
<td>Trap pillar width</td>
<td>7 µm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single parameter optimization Description Values*  
$C_{io}$ Inlet/outlet centering [0, 100] %  
$RW$ Relative cell width [55, 97] %  
$RL$ Relative cell length [3, 100] %  
$AR$ MTA’s aspect ratio 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.7, 1.1, 1.5, 2, 2.7, 3.8  
$WR_{io}$ Channel to cell width [10, 100] %  

Multi-parametric optimization Description Values**  
$RW$ - [55, 80] %  
$RL$ - [70, 97] %  
$AR$ - 0.4, 1.0, 1.5  
$WR_{io}$ - [10, 50] %  

Physical parameters Description Values  
$\mu$ Fluid dynamic viscosity 0.001 Pa s  
$N_s$ Number of streamlines 200  
$p_{in}$ Uniform inlet pressure 100 Pa  
$p_{out}$ Uniform outlet pressure 0 Pa  
$\rho$ Fluid density 1000 kg m$^{-3}$  
$R_p$ Fictive particles radius 2.5 µm  
$T_e$ Study time 3 s  

Numerical parameters Description Values  
$h_{max-elem}$ Maximum mesh element size allowed 40 µm  
$N_t$ Number of time steps for time dependent simulation 1000  

Table 1 The model parameters. (*) 10 parameters values are chosen to uniformly vary in the specified interval excepted for the $AR$ parameter where 9 values are chosen to have the same total number of traps ±3 traps. (**) 5 parameters values are chosen to uniformly vary in the specified interval excepted for the $AR$ parameter where 3 values are chosen to avoid too high simulation time.
2.2 Physics of the model

Our model lays on the following hypotheses:

– laminar regime due to low fluid velocity and chip dimensions (i.e. low Reynolds number);
– steady state of the fluid flow;
– in the corresponding experimental device, objects concentration is low enough such that object-object interactions can be neglected;
– the fluid flow is incompressible (i.e. low Mach number);
– gravity is neglected (i.e. low Froude number).

Some experimental conditions to verify in order to respect these hypotheses are provided in section 5.

In this framework the mechanical equilibrium of the fluid is given by the Stokes law:

\[-\nabla(p) + \mu \Delta(v) + f_v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_f\]

where \(\nabla\) is the first order gradient operator, \(p\) the fluid pressure, \(\mu\) the fluid dynamic viscosity, \(\Delta\) the first order laplacian operator, \(v\) the fluid velocity considered as a function of space and time (Eulerian description of motion) and \(f_v\) the volume force. The latter \(f_v\) includes the fictive drag volume force we use to consider the fluid adherence on the out-of-plane walls (i.e. shallow channel approximation):

\[f_v = -\frac{12\mu}{h^2} v \quad \text{in } \Omega_f\]

where \(h\) is the chamber depth in the out-of-plane direction.

With the incompressible flow hypothesis, the continuity equation is:

\[\text{div}(v) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_f\]

where \(\text{div}\) is the zero order divergence operator.

The streamlines are deduced from the fluid velocity field considering fictive particles which trajectories are merged to streamlines, hence, their velocity is the same as the fluid velocity at the point where they are instantly located:

\[v_p = v \quad \text{in } \Omega_f\]
where $v_p$ is the fictive particles velocity defined as function of the particle initial position and time (Lagrangian description of motion).

2.3 Boundary and initial conditions

Along $\Gamma_{in}$ a uniform pressure $p_{in}$ is imposed :

$$ p = p_{in} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{in} $$ (5)

on the outlet boundary $\Gamma_{out}$ a uniform null pressure $p_{out}$ is imposed :

$$ p = p_{out} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{out} $$ (6)

on the wall boundaries $\Gamma_w$ a viscous fluid-solid adherence condition is chosen :

$$ v = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_w $$ (7)

A fictive freezing particle boundary condition is imposed on $\Gamma_{freeze}$. This fictive freezing wall allows an easy visualisation of the streamlines that passes through traps because it stops the fictive particles motion but has no effect on the fluid flow.

$$ v_p = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{freeze} $$ (8)

The equations system (1)-(3)(5)-(7) is solved using the Finite Element Method. fictive particles are initially placed on $\Gamma_{in}$ where their velocity is considered as equal to the fluid velocity:

$$ v_p = v \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_{in} $$ (9)

$$ v_p(t = 0) = v \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_f $$ (10)

The equation system (4)(8)-(10) is solved using a Backward Differentiation Formula.

2.4 Single and multiple parametric studies

Five geometric parameters of the MTA are tested (Table 2):

- the inlet/outlet centering $C_{io}$ defined by :

$$ C_{io} = 1 - \frac{\Delta y_{io}}{\Delta y_{io max}} $$ (11)
where $\Delta y_{io}$ is the vertical distance between the inlet and outlet and $\Delta y_{io\ max}$ its maximal value given by:

$$\Delta y_{io\ max} = \frac{w_{ch} - l_{io}}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

- the relative cell width $RW$ defined by:

$$RW = \frac{w_{net}}{w_{ch}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

- the relative cell length $RL$:

$$RL = \frac{l_{net}}{l_{ch}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

- the trap network aspect ratio $AR$ defined by:

$$AR = \frac{N_l}{N_c}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where $N_l$ and $N_c$ are the number of lines and columns of the trap network.

- the channel to cell width ratio:

$$WR_{io} = \frac{l_{io}}{w_{ch}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

We define the comparative trapping efficiency $E$ of a given MTA geometry as the number of traps crossed by at least one streamline divided by the total number of traps:

$$E = \frac{N_{\text{cross}}}{N_{\text{traps}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

where $N_{\text{cross}}$ is the number of traps crossed by at least one streamline and $N_{\text{traps}}$ the total number of traps in the MTA. The value of $E$ depends on the number of studied streamlines and tends towards 100% if the number of studied streamlines tends towards infinity. However for a fixed number of streamlines $N_s$, $E$ seems to be a good tool for trapping efficiency comparison between several MTA geometries.

Our first optimization study is based on calculating $E$ for different parameters values with only one parameter varying between a minimal and a maximal value (single parameter optimization). For each parameter, 10 uniformly distributed values are tested between the minimal and maximal values included, excepted for the $AR$ parameter where 9 values are tested. Indeed it is impossible to test different $AR$ values without modifying $N_{\text{traps}}$, however we found 9 values that induce very small variation of $N_{\text{traps}}$ ($\pm 3$ traps) with a non-uniform $AR$ distribution between its minimal and maximal values. For each of these single parameter study the parameter
values are reported in Table 1.

With the streamlines plot in the best and worst geometric configurations for each single parameter study, we investigate the common features that make a geometry efficient or not. Moreover, we show the limitations of the single parameter optimization with the particle trajectories plot on the geometric configuration obtained from the combination of the best parameter values we found.

Finally, because of the interdependence of parameters on the value of $E$, we perform a multi-parametric optimization where all the combinations of parameter values are tested. To avoid high computational cost, we fixed the $C_{io}$ parameter to its optimal value from the single parametric study. This way, the optimization study begins at the best configuration we have at this point. For respectively $WR_{io}$, $AR$, $RL$ and $RW$, we have tested 5, 3, 5 and 5 values for a total of 375 tested combinations. For this multi-parametric study, the parameter values are reported in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Geometry for minimal value</th>
<th>Geometry for maximal value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{io} = 1 - \frac{\Delta y_{io}}{\Delta y_{io \ max}}$</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$RW = \frac{w_{net}}{w_{ch}}$</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$RL = \frac{l_{net}}{l_{ch}}$</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AR = \frac{N_{i}}{N_{c}}$</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$WR_{io} = \frac{l_{io}}{w_{ch}}$</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The 5 tested geometric parameters, the inlet is the green boundary, the outlet the red boundary. Image scales are voluntary modified to fit in the table, the traps size and distances between traps are not modified.
2.5 Randomized trap spatial distribution

Finally we have studied the influence of a randomized trap distribution on the MTA trapping efficiency. To do this so, a randomized translation along the horizontal and vertical directions is added to each trap position:

\[
\begin{align*}
  x_i &= x_{oi} + \delta x_i \quad i \in [1, N_{traps}] \\
  y_i &= y_{oi} + \delta y_i \quad i \in [1, N_{traps}]
\end{align*}
\]  

(18)

where \((x_i, y_i)\) are the coordinates of the \(i^{th}\) trap bottom left corner (\(M\) point Figure IA), \((x_{oi}, y_{oi})\) its original coordinates and \(\delta x_i\) and \(\delta y_i\) are the horizontal and vertical randomized translations of the \(i^{th}\) trap bottom left corner respectively. \(\delta x_i\) and \(\delta y_i\) are both defined using a uniform probability rule:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \delta x_i &= \text{rand}_u(-1, 1) \ R_f \ \Delta x_{bt} \quad i \in [1, N_{traps}] \\
  \delta y_i &= \text{rand}_u(-1, 1) \ R_f \ \Delta y_{bt} \quad i \in [1, N_{traps}]
\end{align*}
\]  

(19)

where \(\text{rand}_u(-1, 1)\) is a number randomly chosen in a uniform distribution of between \(-1\) and \(1\), \(R_f\) a constant called "random factor" chosen between 0, 1 and 0.5. The Table 3 shows some examples of randomized geometries obtained for different \(R_f\) values. \(R_f\) was limited to a maximal value of 0.5 to avoid trap overlapping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(R_f = 0.2)</th>
<th>(R_f = 0.4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="..." alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="..." alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Examples of randomized MTA geometries for different \(R_f\) values.
3 Results

3.1 Single parameter optimization

The Figure 2 below summarises the evolution of $E$ for the $C_{io}$, $RW$, $RL$, $WR_{io}$ and $AR$ parameters variations.

![Figure 2](image)

**Fig. 2** Trapping efficiency variations for different parameters values from the single parametric studies. Data are linearly interpolated to facilitate readability but do not predict any physical behaviour between points. The optimal parameters values are: 10 %, 89.6 %, 77.8 %, 64.8 %, $\frac{8}{12} \approx 0.67$ for the corresponding $E$ values: 53.0 %, 50.0 %, 73.5 %, 60.2 %, 61 % for $WR_{io}$, $RL$, $C_{io}$, $RW$ and $AR$ respectively.

According to the simulations results, the parameters values that separately maximise $E$ are : $WR_{io} = 10 \%$ (blue line with circles), $RL = 90 \%$ (red line with squares), $C_{io} = 78 \%$ (green line with triangles), $RW = 65 \%$ (yellow line with diamonds), and $AR = 0.67$ (8 lines and 12 columns, pink line with circles). Every parameter can be responsible of a variation of $E$ about $\pm 30 \%$ each. Setting these parameters is therefore crucial for MTAs design. We find that some configuration should be avoided: symmetric inlet and outlet (i.e. $C_{io} = 100 \%$) and large inlet and outlet canal (i.e. $WR_{io} = 100 \%$) which is consistent with the experimental observations in [17].

The $C_{io}$ single parametric study reveals that it is possible to fill more than 70 % of the traps for a relative inlet/outlet centering between 70 % and 80 % which is then our best configuration at this point.
3.2 An interpretation through the streamlines

In Table 4, streamlines are plotted in the best and worst cases for each single parameter optimization study. We notice that in all the cases streamlines tend to follow an upstream-downstream pattern between traps because the hydraulic resistance is lower between traps than within the traps. This phenomenon is almost impossible to avoid with a MTA because a small trap slot width $w_s$ (Figure 1A) is needed to trap small objects. For best cases, the streamlines are deviated but not always for the same reasons: for the $C_{io}$ study, the pressure gradient is directly deviated. For the $RW$ study, streamlines are deviated toward the low hydraulic resistance areas which compensate the waste of streamlines in these zones, however this advantage could be lost if the waste of streamlines is too high according to the $HR$ graph Figure 2. For the $RL$ study, the proximity of streamlines to inlet and outlet of the MTA allows a strong deviation through more MTA’s columns in the best than in the worst case. The $AR$ optimization result seems to be a good compromise between not too highly deviated streamlines and a high number of traps per column to maximize the effect of inlet/outlet proximity. Finally The $WR_{io}$ study simply shows that if the inlet and outlet boundaries are long, the streamlines deviation close to the inlet and outlet is lost and trapping efficiency decreases. We notice that the worst case of this study recreates the drawback of the $RL$ study’s worst case but with a smaller chamber: the angle of incidence between trajectories and the first encountered column of traps is close to zero.
Table 4  Streamlines and crossed traps in the MTA for the best (left column) and worst (right column) cases of the selected parameter variation. Crossed traps by streamlines are represented by a frozen fictive particle of the same colour as the corresponding streamline. To facilitate readability, the portion of streamlines that crosses traps are not displayed after the trapping site. Image scales are voluntary modified to fit in the table, the traps size and distances between traps are not modified. Colours correspond to positions of the intersection points between streamlines and the inlet: dark red for lowest streamlines on the inlet and dark blue for highest streamlines on the inlet. These best and worst cases are the corresponding configurations to the highest point and lowest point (Figure 2). The crossed traps plots without streamlines are provided in Figure 6 as supplementary information.
Figure 3A shows the streamlines and crossed traps when the optimum parameters values obtained from the single parametric study are combined together. As expected, this configuration does not lead to an efficient geometry: its comparative trapping efficiency is only about 48%. We can see that some streamlines are very deviated vertically which makes their angle of incidence with respect to the traps axis too high and leads to a non-efficient trapping. Conversely, the streamlines that have a smaller angle of incidence with respect to traps are more likely to be trapped (upper right corner of the trap network for the cyan and green streamlines, middle right area for the yellow streamlines).

These results suggest that an efficient MTA’s geometry can be obtained maximizing the number of traps where streamlines have an optimal angle of incidence. Moreover, MTA’s geometry can not be obtained with a single parametric approach because of parameters interdependence on MTA’s trapping efficiency. A multi-parametric approach based on simulating combinations of parameters values should be more relevant to optimize the MTA geometry.

3.3 Multi-parametric optimization

Figure 3B shows the streamlines for the optimal geometry obtained with the multi-parametric study. We can see that this geometry is very different in terms of $AR$, $RL$ and $WR_{io}$ values from the one obtained by the single parametric optimization (Figure 3A). Such a configu-
ration provides a comparative trapping efficiency about 81%. Some groups of streamlines are almost entirely trapped (orange to cyan) and some groups of streamlines (dark blue and red) are partially wasted. An intuitive idea would be to shrink the width of the chamber to force these wasted streamlines to encounter traps, however this lateral shrinking would increase the hydraulic resistance of the lateral sides of the chamber and decrease the angle of incidence of more centered streamlines leading to lower comparative trapping efficiency.

This result shows that optimization of MTA trapping efficiency is a complex and non-intuitive process and is about finding a compromise between combinations of geometric parameters values. Such an improved geometry can not be found with a purely experimental approach which needs to produce all the tested MTAs geometries or a complex and adjustable MTA geometry.

3.4 Randomized trap spatial distribution

Table 5 shows streamlines and crossed traps for different $R_f$ values in the case of a random spatial distribution of traps. We notice here that $R_f$ has a strong influence on the MTA comparative trapping efficiency. Indeed for $R_f = 0$, streamlines follow their upstream/downstream pattern and trapping is more efficient closed to the inlet and the outlet because of streamlines deviation.
### Table 5
Streamlines, crossed traps and comparative trapping efficiency evolution with respect to $R_f$.
The crossed traps plots without streamlines are provided in Figure 7 as supplementary information.
This upstream/downstream pattern can be explained by the fact that a streamline passing between two traps can be deviated either above (green streamline Figure 4 A) or below the next trap (yellow streamline Figure 4 B).

If the trap network is symmetric, the hydraulic resistance is equal for both paths and the streamlines above the symmetry axis of the next trap take the upper path (the inverse occurs for the streamlines below the symmetry axis). Thus, with a symmetric trap network and horizontal flow, streamlines that are not initially aligned with a trap symmetry axis tend to always follow the upstream/downstream pattern between traps.

If a trap is randomly translated, the trap network symmetry is broken (Figure 4 B) and the vertical distances between the trap and its neighbours on the same column ($\Delta y_{bt1}$ and $\Delta y_{bt2}$) are modified. Let’s consider the case of a positive vertical translation ($\Delta y_{bt1} < \Delta y_{bt2}$): the hydraulic resistance of the two possible paths are not equal and some streamlines that are supposed to go above the next trap are deviated down (green streamline Figure 4 B). However, this deviation is late and weak enough such that the streamline is not enough deviated to take the lower path: the streamline then crosses the trap.

**Fig. 4** A: schematic diagram of local streamline between two columns of a symmetric MTA with a horizontal flow. B: schematic diagram of local streamline between two columns of an irregular MTA with a randomized translation of the next encountered trap. Circles are plotted to represent the trajectory of a particle that ideally follows a streamline.
4 Discussion and conclusion

MTAs has shown a huge potential in the analysis of biological systems because they can isolate many objects. However the use of MTAs still constitutes a technical challenge because of the trapping efficiency issue. In the literature some studies investigate this problem but all of them focus on small microfluidic chambers with a low number of traps and trapped objects. In this paper we consider a MTA with a high number of traps (100 traps) and have developed a numerical model of the MTA’s multiscale geometry and simulated the fluid and flow within the chamber. The difference in trapping efficiency between several MTAs geometry is assessed by counting the ratio between the number of traps crossed by streamlines and the total number of traps. Our results show that MTAs trapping efficiency is influenced by its geometry and more precisely by: the centering between the inlet and the outlet, the cell array’s aspect ratio, the ratio in width and height between the chamber and the trap network. The streamlines analysis has highlighted the importance of the streamline deviation that may occur for different reasons: an oblique pressure gradient between the inlet and the outlet, zones with low hydraulic resistance and particle proximity to the inlet and the outlet. We have also shown with a single parametric study on the MTA geometry that its trapping efficiency can easily be improved about more than 20% and with a multi-parametric study about more than 30%. Moreover, the comparison between single and multiple parametric studies highlighted the fact that optimization of MTA trapping efficiency is a complex and non-intuitive process and is about finding a compromise between combinations of geometric parameters values, that can not be performed with a purely experimental approach. We finally shown that introducing some irregularities in trap positions can, as well as the multi-parametric optimization, increases about more than 30% the trapping efficiency of MTA due to a local variation of streamlines angle of incidence with respect to traps. Such outcomes confirm the high potential of dense rectangular MTAs with respect to its so called alternatives with higher trapping efficiency but with much more complex geometries, lower number of traps and higher trapping time.

Although our model has provided interesting and useful insights, it presents some hypotheses that must be verified. The exposed results can be experimentally used for particle trapping in the case of small objects and enough diluted solutions of particles, otherwise the proximity between two particles and even particle-particle interactions induce perturbations such that the real particles trajectories do not have the same shape as the streamlines calculated here. For instance, working with a particles concentration of $10^6 \text{ mL}^{-1}$ as in [1, 17] allows an average distance between particles of $62 \ \mu m$ which is more than 10 times their diameter and makes particle-particle interactions almost unlikely (calculation details are provided sec-
Moreover, the successive trapping of particles theoretically modifies the streamlines shapes in the MTA. Some supplementary simulations were performed for two specific geometries with totally fulfilled traps (without trap slot) and revealed that the streamlines shape and velocity field of the MTA are poorly modified by trapping, even very close to traps. In addition, on the same two geometries, a three-dimensional ($3D$) model was built and confirmed the hypothesis of planar flow inside the microfluidic chamber.

Nevertheless, as our study is based on streamlines analysis, it does not consider the particle-wall interactions that may occur in the real experimental device. When particle-wall interaction happens, the particle center of mass trajectory can switch from one streamline to another which could explain a difference between particle trajectories and the calculated streamlines here. However, the striking similarities between the particle trajectories in the experimental device exposed in [17] and our calculated streamlines seems to make the hypothesis of negligible particle-wall interaction acceptable.
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5 Supplementary information

5.1 Crossed traps by streamlines

Tables 6 and 7 show the crossed traps by streamlines for the configurations presented in Tables 4 and 5 respectively.
Table 6 Crossed traps by streamlines in the MTA for the best (left column) and worst (right column) cases of the selected parameter variation. The fluid and particles stream goes from right to left. Image scales are voluntary modified to fit in the table, the traps size and distances between traps are not modified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_f$ (%)</th>
<th>Crossed traps by streamlines</th>
<th>$E$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7** Crossed traps by streamlines evolution with respect to $R_f$. The fluid stream goes from right to left.
5.2 Experimental conditions

To experimentally reproduce the numerical results exposed here, the experimental conditions must be consistent to the model hypotheses. To stay in laminar regime, the Reynolds number $R_e$ must be very inferior to 1. Here with the proposed traps dimensions (Table 1) and a pressure drop between inlet and outlet $\Delta P = 100 \, Pa$, the Reynolds number between traps verifies:

$$R_e = \frac{\rho \Delta t_{bt} v_{moy}}{\mu} \quad (20)$$

where $\rho$ is the fluid density and $v_{moy}$ the averaged velocity between traps. If we consider the fluid velocity profiles in the reference geometric configuration exposed Figure 1, we have $v_{moy} \approx 1 \, mm \, s^{-1}$, thus:

$$R_e \approx 0.05 << 1 \quad (21)$$

which is consistent with the laminar regime hypothesis.

The numerical model neglects the particle-particle interactions. To be consistent with this hypothesis, the particles concentration must not be too important. If we consider the reference geometric configuration exposed Figure 1 and the worst case in terms of MTA volume (i.e. where every trap is totally fulfilled), the volume of the microfluidic chamber $V_{chamber}$ is:

$$V_{chamber} = (w_c l_c - N_{traps} w_{trap} l_{trap}) \, h = 7.3 \times 10^{-12} \, m^3 \quad (22)$$

If we consider uniformly distributed particles with a concentration $C = 10^6 \, mL^{-1}$ (which is the same as in [1, 17]), the number of particles in the microfluidic chamber is:

$$N_{particles} = C \, V_{chamber} \approx 8 \quad (23)$$

then the ratio between particles volume and chamber’s volume is:

$$R_{vol} = \frac{N_{particles}}{V_{chamber}} \frac{4}{3} \pi R_p^3 = 6.5 \times 10^{-5} \quad (24)$$

and one particle can be included in a spherical volume of fluid such that its radius is the average distance between particles $d_{particles}$:

$$d_{particles} = \left( \frac{3}{4} \pi N_{particles} V_{chamber} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \approx 62 \, \mu m \quad (25)$$
which is more than 10 times than the particles diameter ($5 \mu m$) which is consistent with the hypothesis of negligible particle-particle interactions.