Modulating Leidenfrost-like Prompt Jumping of Sessile Droplets on Microstructured Surfaces

Wenge Huang ^a, Lei Zhao ^{b, *}, Yang Li ^a, Xukun He ^a, C. Patrick Collier ^c, Zheng Zheng ^d, Jiansheng Liu ^d, Jiangtao Cheng ^{a, *}

^a Department of Mechanical Engineering, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA

^b State Key Laboratory of High-performance Precision Manufacturing, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, PR China

^c Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA

^d School of Electronic and Information Engineering, Beihang University, 37 Xueyuan Road, Beijing 100191, China

*Corresponding author: Lei Zhao, leizhao@dlut.edu.cn

Jiangtao Cheng, <u>chengjt@vt.edu</u>

Abstract

The Leidenfrost effect, namely the levitation and hovering of liquid drops on hot solid surfaces, generally requires a sufficiently high substrate temperature to activate the intense liquid vaporization. Here we report the agile modulations of Leidenfrost-like prompt jumping of sessile water microdroplets on micropillared surfaces at a remarkably mitigated temperature. Compared to traditional Leidenfrost effect occurring above 230 °C, the fin-array-like micropillars enables Wenzel-state water microdroplets to levitate and jump off within 1.33 ms at an unprecedently low temperature of 130 °C by triggering the inertia-controlled growth of individual vapor bubbles at the droplet base. We demonstrate that droplet jumping, resulting from the momentum interactions between the expanding vapor bubble and the droplet, can be deftly modulated by simply tailoring the thermal boundary layer thickness via pillar heights, which acts to regulate the bubble expansion between the inertia-controlled mode and the heat-transfer-limited mode. Intriguingly, the two bubble growth modes give rise to distinct droplet jumping behaviors characterized by constant velocity and constant energy schemes, respectively. This strategy allows the facile purging of wetting liquid drops on rough or structured surfaces in a controlled manner, inspiring promising applications in rapid removal of fouling even settled in surface cavities.

Research on the Leidenfrost effect dates back to Johann Gottlab Leidenfrost's observation of water droplets' blistering motion on a hot surface in the 18th century.^{1, 2} Since then, intensive research has been attempted to this intriguing phenomenon due to its critical importance in various applications such as boiling heat transfer³, spray cooling⁴, electrospray printing^{5, 6} and additive manufacturing⁷. It is widely accepted that the continuous vapor cushion⁸ formed beneath the Leidenfrost droplet eliminates the physical contact between the droplet and the surface⁹ and consequently minimizes the interfacial hydrodynamic resistance¹⁰ associated with the contact line pinning and solid-liquid friction¹¹, which is particularly useful for the agile droplet manipulation^{12,} ¹³ and sustainable liquid transport^{10, 14}. However, the thermally-insulating vapor cushion also incurs a large thermal resistance³ and leads to the severe degradation¹⁵ of the solid-liquid heat transfer, which is why a substantial surface temperature, *i.e.*, Leidenfrost point (LFP), should be at least reached to sustain the intense liquid vaporization essential for droplet levitation. For water droplets on smooth metal surfaces, LFP is usually around 250 $^{\circ}C^{10}$ whereas the effective heat flux is only one third of that on 110 °C substrate^{16, 17}. Therefore, how to activate the Leidenfrost-like droplet levitation without sacrificing the heat transfer performance deserves further research. Possible measures include surface engineering and wettability modifications¹⁸ that can alter liquid vaporization and vapor bubble dynamics during the phase-change heat transfer.

As such, achieving maneuverable droplet levitation on hot engineered surfaces also finds various applications in highly demanding heat transfer devices^{19, 20}. One of the prominent examples is the purging of surface fouling²¹, *i.e.*, the deposition of contaminating particulates on heat exchanging surfaces, which severely impairs the performance of thermal systems like boilers, condensers, and heat exchangers by impeding the effective heat exchange between the working liquids and the solid surface. In particular, this problem becomes further exacerbated for engineered heat transfer surfaces²² that incorporate corrugations, posts, pyramids, and fins. In this scenario, neither Leidenfrost droplets nor cold droplets, such as in spray cooling and tap water rinsing, can effectively remove the sticky fouling materials from surface roughness and cavities. The presence of a continuous vapor layer prevents Leidenfrost droplets from penetrating surface structures and getting in contact with the fouling, whilst factors such as contact line pinning and interfacial friction also hinders the capability of cold droplets to effectively dislodge contaminants from the wetted surfaces²³. Methods to address these imperative problems of fouling removal

include the re-design of surface textures that allows the controllable wetting²⁴ and self-purging²³ of sessile droplets in a controllable manner, but still remain a challenge.

In this work, we report a new discovery where the controllable levitation and purging of sessile Wenzel-state droplets can be achieved at a temperature way below traditional LFP on an engineered surface decorated with micropillar arrays. We show that the fin-like micropillar array penetrating into the droplet base significantly enhances the solid-liquid heat transfer and facilitates the propagation of the thermal boundary layer (TBL)²⁵, which fosters a superheated environment for the inertia-controlled bubble growth²⁶. The immense momentum gained from the dropletbubble interaction eventually stimulates the prompt droplet levitation and instant jumping at an unprecedently low temperature of 130 °C. Decreasing the micropillar height switches the vapor bubble growth to a heat-transfer-limited mode²⁷ where the otherwise continuous bubble growth is interrupted by vapor condensation at the bubble-droplet interface, causing significant and prolonged vibration of droplet prior to its jumping. We reveal the mechanisms underlying the tunable Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping by developing appropriate physical models to elucidate the roles of the fine surface structures on vapor dynamics. Especially, we demonstrate its applications in the facile removal of fouling materials from the cavities of hot engineered surfaces.



Figure 1. Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping dynamics on hot micropillared surface. a Selected snapshots of Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping on the micropillared substrate ([D, L, H] = [20, 120, 80] µm) with surface temperature T_w of 130 °C. The inset in (**a**) is the scanning electron micrography (SEM) of the micropillared substrate. **b** Height variation of the center of mass of the droplet shown in (**a**). The time t = 0 ms denotes the onset of the interfacial deformation. Supplementary Movie S1 provides additional details.

The surface, which consists of a square lattice of round posts with uniform diameter ($D = 20 \,\mu\text{m}$), post-to-post spacing ($L = 120 \,\mu\text{m}$) and height ($H = 80 \,\mu\text{m}$), hereafter named as [D, L, H] = [20, 120, 80] μm , was fabricated on a silicon wafer by means of photolithography and deep reactive ion etching.²⁸ A thin layer of fluoropolymer was then applied via spin-coating to lower the surface energy of the substrate. The droplet levitation experiment was conducted by recording the dynamic behaviors of a sessile water droplet (~2 mm in diameter D_d) by a high-speed camera at the rate of 10000 frames per second (Fig. S1). At room temperature, the droplet stayed in a stable Wenzel state²⁹ with a static contact angle of 118° and a sliding angle of 67° (Fig. S2), due to the sparse distribution of micropillars. After the sessile droplet and the substrate were gently transferred onto a hot plate maintained at 130 °C, the droplet could be levitated and jump off in a Leidenfrost-like manner, *i.e.*, prompt droplet levitation enabled by the liquid vaporization.

Fig. 1a shows selected snapshots of the Leidenfrost-like prompt jumping of a sessile water microdroplet. To investigate the kinematic dynamics of the droplet, the onset of the droplet shape deformation, resulting from the capillary perturbations caused by surface heating, was defined as

t = 0 ms. After that, the droplet was levitated and directly jumped off the substrate within only 1.33 ms. In contrast to the conventional thermally-driven droplet actuations, as in the case of the trampolining drops in Leidenfrost effect³⁰, the droplet in this scenario exhibited an explosive upward motion. In Fig. 1b, its center of mass monotonically rose with time without any discernible oscillations and eventually reached the maximum jumping height of 2.3 mm at t = 15.33 ms, suggesting a distinct mechanism for droplet actuations.



Figure 2. Rapid vapor bubble expansion for Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping. a Top-view snapshots of vapor bubble growth on substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 80] \mu m$ at 130 °C. The scalebar bar is 1 mm. Supplementary Movie S2 provides additional details. **b** Temporal evolution of vapor bubble radius from (**a**). **c** Diagram of vapor bubble expansion via momentum interaction with the surrounding liquid. **d** Equivalent upward force generated by the rapid bubble expansion.

We show that the Leidenfrost-like prompt droplet jumping results from the rectification of the kinetic energy carried by the growing vapor bubble into the upward momentum that is sufficient to lift the entire droplet. At surface temperature $T_w = 130$ °C, contact boiling¹⁷ occurred at the droplet base, leading to the successive nucleation and growth of individual vapor bubbles²⁷. Fig. 2a shows that an individual vapor bubble firstly nucleated at t = 0 ms. After that, the vapor

bubble expanded rapidly and reached the droplet's periphery at t = 1.32 ms. The striking coincidence between this timescale and the droplet's dwelling time (1.33 ms) implies that the Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping is contingent on the momentum interactions between this individual vapor bubble and the sessile droplet.

A detailed inspection on the vapor bubble growth in Fig. 2b reveals a bubble expanding velocity as fast as $V_e \approx 4$ m/s, leading to an average Reynolds number of $Re = \frac{V_e D_d}{v} \approx 2 \times 10^4$ and Mach number of $Ma = \frac{V_e}{c} \approx 2 \times 10^{-3}$, where v is water kinematic viscosity and c is the speed of sound. Therefore, the effect of viscous dissipation and vapor compressibility could be neglected, indicating that the vapor bubble expansion follows an inertia-controlled mode²⁷. This allows us to treat the vapor bubble expansion using the Rayleigh-Plesset equation in a potential flow approach²⁷:

$$\rho_{\rm l} R \ddot{R} + \rho_{\rm l} \frac{3\dot{R}^2}{2} = \left(P_{\nu} - P_{\infty} - \frac{2\sigma}{R} \right) \sin^2 \beta \tag{1}$$

where *R* is the bubble contact radius, $\rho_{\rm I}$ is the water density, $P_{\rm v}$ is pressure inside the bubble, P_{∞} is the pressure of bulk water, β is the bubble contact angle and σ is the surface tension, as shown in Fig. 2c. Eq. (1) describes how the overpressure-induced potential energy stored in the expanding vapor bubble is converted into the kinetic energy of the droplet (Supplementary Discussion 2). The vaporization-induced bubble overpressure could be estimated by the Clausius-Clapeyron equation²⁷ as $P_{\rm v} - P_{\infty} = \left(\frac{\Delta T}{T_{\rm sat}}\right) h_{\rm lv} \rho_{\rm v}$, where ΔT is the vapor bubble superheat , $T_{\rm sat}$ is the water saturation temperature, $h_{\rm lv}$ is specific evaporation enthalpy, and $\rho_{\rm v}$ is the vapor density. Generally, ΔT would vary with time and the position in bubble, but a constant ΔT could be assumed in case of a strong thermal diffusion that makes the temperature gradient inside the bubble negligible³¹. This approximation holds true as long as the characteristic diffusion length $L_H \sim \sqrt{2\alpha t}$ is larger than the bubble size *R*, where α is the thermal diffusivity of water vapor. Using $\Delta T = 30$ K gives a rough estimation of $P_{\rm v} - P_{\infty} \approx 1.08 \times 10^5$ Pa. As shown in Fig. 2b, the detected vapor bubble growth started from R = 90 µm, yielding the Laplace pressure $\frac{2\sigma}{R} \leq 1.31 \times 10^3$ Pa. Therefore, the Laplace pressure term in Eq. (2) is neglected. In the first stage of the bubble expansion with a constant ΔT , Eq. (1) was solved analytically as:

$$R(t) = \left[\frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{\Delta T}{T_{\text{sat}}(P_{\text{a}})}\right) \frac{h_{\text{lv}} \rho_{\text{v}}}{\rho_{\text{l}}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sin\beta \cdot t$$
(2)

The linear increase of $R(t) \sim t$ in Eq. (2) implies that the bubble expansion $(R \sim t)$ would eventually surpass the thermal diffusion³¹ $(R \sim t^{0.5})$, after which the cooling effect of vaporization³¹ causes ΔT to greatly deteriorate at the liquid-vapor interface. The overpressure would quickly relax to zero³², resulting in $P_v - P_{\infty} - \frac{2\sigma}{R} \approx 0$. This prediction aligns well with the sharp turning of bubble radius curve at $t_1 \approx 0.1$ ms in Fig. 2b. At this moment, the bubble expansion was solely sustained by the droplet inertia and the total kinetic energy of the bubble-droplet system was conserved: $\frac{d}{dt}(\rho_1 R^3 \dot{R}^2) = 0$. The contact bubble radius R for $t > t_1$ can be solved as:

$$R = \left(R_1^{3/2} \dot{R}_1 t\right)^{0.4} \tag{3}$$

where R_1 is the contact radius at t_1 . Fig. 2b shows a remarkable agreement between the experimental results of bubble expansion and the two-stage theoretical model proposed by us, further confirming the dominant role of the overpressure and inertia effect in controlling the bubble growth in the Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping.

The inertia-controlled bubble growth contributes to the droplet levitation by its momentum exchange with the water droplet. The propulsive force is obtained by taking the derivative of the droplet's upward momentum M_z (Supplementary Discussion 3).

$$F_{\rm z} = \frac{dM_{\rm z}}{dt} \approx \frac{(4 - 3\cos\beta)\cos\beta\pi\rho_{\rm l}R^2\dot{R}^2}{\sin^4\beta} \tag{4}$$

Combining Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) gives an estimated value for $F_z \approx 2.44 \times 10^{-3}N$. As illustrated in Fig. 2d, the droplet gravity $G = 4.16 \times 10^{-5}N$, which is orders of magnitude smaller than F_z . Notably, the growing vapor bubble gradually separates the physical contact between the droplet base and the substrate, causing a consecutively decreasing surface adhesion. Therefore, with the rectified kinetic energy overwhelming the resistance, the water droplet became levitated and instantaneously jumped off the substrate without apparent oscillations, rendering a Leidenfrost-like manner but at an unprecedented low $T_w = 130$ °C.



Figure 3. Droplet vibration jumping dynamics on hot surface. a Selected snapshots of droplet's vibrational jumping on the micropillared substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 20] \mu m$ heated to 130 °C. The inset in (a) is the SEM image of the micropillared substrate. b Height variation of the center of mass of the droplet shown in (a). Supplementary Movie S3 provides additional details.

We find the Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping breaks down on substrates with shorter pillars as the droplet dynamics becomes different. Fig. 3a presents the selected snapshots of a droplet's actuation on a substrate with short micro-pillars ($H = 20 \mu$ m). In contrast to the direct levitation as observed in Leidenfrost-like jumping, the droplet experienced substantial vertical stretching and vibrations until it ultimately jumped off the substrate after an extended dwelling time of t =941 ms, more than 700 times greater than that for Leidenfrost-like jumping. In Fig. 3b, the droplet actuations could be generally divided into two stages. Before t = 600 ms, the droplet fluctuated randomly with a small magnitude and no apparent periodicity. After t = 600 ms, the oscillations became more pronounced with an evident frequency of 41.6 Hz, which is consistent with the characteristic frequency of a water spring in bouncing drops³³. Therefore, we term this phenomenon as vibrational droplet jumping, as the droplet's dwelling time is increased by hundreds of times due to the prolonged vibrations.



Figure 4. Vapor bubble shrinking during the vibrational droplet jumping. a Top-view snapshots of vapor bubble growth on substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 20] \,\mu\text{m}$ at 130 °C. b Temporal evolution of vapor bubble radius on substrates with different micropillar heights ($H = 20, 60, 80 \,\mu\text{m}$). Supplementary Movie S4 and S5 provide additional details. c Schematic illustrations of superheated interfacial water layer impacting the bubble growth. The growing vapor bubble condensates after meeting the subcooled water outside the thin thermal boundary layer.

To unveil the mechanism of vibrational droplet jumping, we investigated the dynamics of individual growing bubble as represented by the snapshots in Fig. 4a. Initially, the vapor bubble followed an inertia-controlled expansion (Fig. 4b) because the bubble expansion is always initiated by the vaporization-induced overpressure. However, the bubble growth in vibrational droplet jumping was interrupted by an apparent bubble shrinking process (from 0.9 ms to 4 ms), causing the bubble radius to decrease for several milliseconds and then rise again as shown in Fig. 4b. This is attributed to the limited propagation of the TBL, within which the liquid becomes superheated due to surface heating but remains subcooled elsewhere. As depicted in Fig. 4c, the vapor inside the bubble would inevitably condensate once its outer edge breaches the TBL. The bubble growth can continue only if the heat transfer from the substrate eventually overcomes the energy loss via condensation, indicating a heat-transfer-limited mode. Therefore, we use the energy balance

equation to describe the bubble expansion herein:

$$h_{\rm lv}\rho_{\rm v}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\frac{(2+\cos\beta)(1-\cos\beta)^2}{\sin^3\beta}R^3\right) = 2\pi R^2 q_{\rm b}$$
(5)

where q_b represents the heat flux from the silicon substrate to the bubble base. Specifically, the convective heat flux can be estimated as $q_b = h_c(T_w - T_{sat})$, where h_c is the convective heat transfer coefficient. As a result, the temporal evolution of vapor bubble radius in this stage follows:

$$R(t) \sim \frac{q_{\rm b}}{h_{\rm lv}\rho_{\rm v}} \frac{2\sin^3\beta}{(2+\cos\beta)(1-\cos\beta)^2} \cdot t$$
(6)

Such a linear increase of bubble radius is validated by our experimental results as shown in Fig. 4b.

The propulsive force provided by the heat-transfer-limited bubble growth can be evaluated by combining Eqs. (4) and (6), yielding $F_z \approx 2.16 \times 10^{-6}N$. Given the droplet gravity $G = 4.16 \times 10^{-5}N$, the water droplet could not be completely levitated by an individual thus-expanding bubble. The droplet hence entered the trampolining mode where the collective motion of bubble clusters led to strong interfacial oscillations, until it built up sufficient kinetic energy for subsequent jumping^{30, 34, 35}.

A detailed analysis on the droplet jumping velocity v_j versus the droplet volume V_0 reveals two distinct jumping modes as delineated by the two master curves in Fig. 5a. For Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping, the kinetic energy E_k of the jumping droplet originates from the overpressure potential energy of an individual bubble, which is mainly determined by the superheat. The initial potential energy stored in the vapor bubbles, which are formed in droplets with varying volumes, can be taken at the same level, considering the droplets are deposited on the substrate with identical surface temperature. As a result, the kinetic energy $E_k \sim \frac{1}{2} \rho_l V_0 v_j^2$ is approximately constant for different droplet volume V_0 , yielding a scaling of $v_j \sim V_0^{-0.5}$ as manifested by Leidenfrost-like droplet jumping (Fig. 5a). For vibrational jumping, the droplet needs to overcome the gravity Gand surface adhesion from the substrate F_A . The surface adhesion F_A is proportional to the pillar perimeter³⁶ $\sigma \pi D$ and the number of pillars under the droplet base $\left(\frac{D_d}{L}\right)^2$, giving $F_A \sim \frac{\sigma \pi D}{L^2} D_d^2 \approx$ $1.27 \times 10^{-3}N$ The gravity $G = 4.16 \times 10^{-5}N$ is orders of magnitude smaller than F_A and thus is neglected in the force analysis. The propulsive force is scaled by considering the temporal variation of momentum as $F_z \sim \rho_l D_d^3 \frac{v_l}{D_d/v_j}$. A threshold velocity acquired by $F_z = F_A$ marks the onset of droplet levitation, yielding $v_j \sim \sqrt{\frac{\sigma D}{L^2 \rho_1}}$ for vibrational jumping. This prediction suggests that all water droplets jump with a constant velocity, aligning well with the observed jumping velocities as shown in Fig. 5a.



Figure 5. Droplet jumping velocity and equivalent thermal boundary layer thickness. a Jumping velocity of droplets with different volumes during vibrational jumping (on substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 20] \mu m$) and Leidenfrost-like jumping (on substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 80] \mu m$). b Simulated results of temperature distribution of quiescent TBL on the substrates with micropillar height $H = 20 \mu m$ and $H = 80 \mu m$, respectively. c Thickness of equivalent TBL on substrates with different micropillar heights (from 20 μm to 80 μm) and different substrate temperatures (from 120 °C to 140 °C). d Phase map of occurrence of droplet jumping behaviors on substrates with different micropillar heights placed on hot plate at different temperatures.

Based on our analysis, the inertia-controlled growth of vapor bubbles entails a liquid superheat that is sufficiently large to trigger the ultrafast bubble growth and a superheated interfacial region in the form of TBL to accommodate the continuous bubble expansion. However, the inertiacontrolled vapor bubble growth may be interrupted and reversed by the vapor condensation when the vapor bubble goes beyond the superheated region and interacts with the subcooled bulk liquid, leading to the heat-transfer-limited growth.

To verify the effect of pillar height on the vapor dynamics, we carried out a series of convective heat transfer simulations on COMSOL® 5.6 (Supplementary Discussion 4). We find that increasing substrate micropillar from 20 μ m to 80 μ m improves heat transfer flux q'' by 50% from 127 kW/m² to 190 kW/m², a value comparable to that between a normal Leidenfrost droplet and a 300 °C smooth substrate (Supplementary Discussion 4). Specifically, Fig. 5b shows that the superheated liquid region almost complies with the span of micropillars, suggesting a profound influence of the pillar height in extending the domain of TBL (h_{TBL}). We quantitatively analyzed h_{TBL} as a function of substrate surface temperature T_{w} and the pillar height H as shown in Fig. 5c. Increasing T_w from 120 °C to 140 °C only marginally increases h_{TBL} from 80 µm to 90 µm, demonstrating the minor impact of T_w on TBL propagation. For $T_w = 130$ °C, h_{TBL} increases from 30 µm to 90 µm when the pillar height is increased from 20 µm to 80 µm, indicating that the taller micropillars create a thicker superheated region. This prediction is in line with our observations of droplet jumping behaviors concluded in Fig. 5d. Region 3 corresponds to a small $T_{\rm w}$ where no droplet levitation is observed, as the heat flux herein is insufficient for bubble formation. Region 1 and 2 represent cases where either Leidenfrost-like or vibrational droplet jumping is observed. The separation between region 3 and regions 1 and 2 in Fig. 5d suggests that $T_{\rm w} \approx 120$ °C is the threshold temperature to trigger droplet jumping, while the boundary between region 2 and 3 implies that a minimum pillar height of 60 µm is necessary to sustain a rapidly propagating TBL for the inertia-controlled bubble growth.



Figure 6. Rapid droplet purging on different substrates and surface fouling removal. a Droplet sliding on substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 20] \mu m$ at 130 °C. b Droplet sliding on substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 80] \mu m$ at 130 °C. c Schematic (top) and experimental snapshots (bottom) of dislodging and removal of fouling from surface roughness by sliding droplet on tilted substrate $[D, L, H] = [20, 120, 20] \mu m$ at 130 °C. All the substrates are tilted at 16°. Supplementary Movie S6 and S7 provide additional details.

We demonstrate that engineering surface microstructures to manipulate the growth of bubble expansion and droplet jumping behaviours can be employed as an effective strategy for rapid droplet shedding on hot substrates. Figs. 6a and 6b show time-lapsed images of ejection of sessile water droplets on tilted substrates with different pillar heights. For the tilted substrate [*D*, *L*, *H*] = [20, 120, 20] µm, the vibrating droplet initiated the out-of-plane jumping and then the water droplet landed softly on the substrate remaining in the low-friction Cassie state until it slid off the substrate. For the tilted substrate [*D*, *L*, *H*] = [20, 120, 80] µm, the explosive droplet jumping caused the droplet to jump off the substrate with a maximum height of 6 mm, which is three times as large as the droplet diameter. Then the droplet experienced repetitive rebounding and falling for several cycles before it finally rolled off the substrate.

The rapid shedding of initially sticky droplets on heated substrates is of particular relevance to the fouling removal on the highly-demanding heat exchanger surfaces. Under spray cleaning or water rinsing conditions, neither Leidenfrost nor cold droplets effectively eliminate deposited particulates from surface roughness. A continuous vapor layer restricts Leidenfrost droplets from accessing surface structures, while factors like contact line pinning and interfacial friction impede the ability of cold droplets to remove contaminants. Fig. 6c illustrates an alternative process of removing surface fouling in the interstitial cavities of surfaces by leveraging the explosive droplet jumping discovered by this work. The contaminant used in the experiments was prism polishing powder (~ 3 μ m in diameter), which mimics the gradual deposition of particulate matters on the surface of heat exchangers. At first, the droplet was in Wenzel state, which allows it to penetrate into the interstitial cavities to catch the contaminants. As the surface temperature was heated up to a moderate level ($\Delta T = 30$ °C), the generation of vapor bubbles effectively dislodged the residual contaminant particles and drove them to suspend in the droplet. Along with the droplet jumping, the fouling even in surface roughness and cavities can be effectively purged.

We envisage that this facile actuations of sessile liquid droplets in an ultrafast, yet controlled manner, will find a range of applications in high demanding heat transfer and fluid manipulation scenarios. Particularly, this strategy paves a new path for the removal of fouling settled in surface cavities, a critical factor that tend to lead to the severe performance degradation of engineered surfaces with various surface structures. From a broader perspective, the exploration of minimizing the thermal cost associated with the vapor-mediated droplet levitation, as in the case of the traditional Leidenfrost effect, represents an important advance in our understanding of the complicated transport of momentum, mass and heat in the phase change heat transfer process, enabling the rational design of surfaces with exceptional heat transfer performance, extended durability, and excellent anti-fouling properties.

References

1. Leidenfrost JG. *De aquae communis nonnullis qualitatibus tractatus*. Ovenius, 1756.

- 2. Leidenfrost JG. On the fixation of water in diverse fire. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 1966, **9**(11): 1153-1166.
- 3. Vakarelski IU, Patankar NA, Marston JO, Chan DY, Thoroddsen ST. Stabilization of Leidenfrost vapour layer by textured superhydrophobic surfaces. *Nature* 2012, **489**(7415): 274-277.
- 4. Liang G, Mudawar I. Review of spray cooling–Part 1: Single-phase and nucleate boiling regimes, and critical heat flux. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 2017, **115**: 1174-1205.
- 5. Abdelaziz R, Disci-Zayed D, Hedayati MK, Pöhls J-H, Zillohu AU, Erkartal B, *et al.* Green chemistry and nanofabrication in a levitated Leidenfrost drop. *Nature Communications* 2013, **4**(1): 2400.
- 6. Jiang YY, Wu CC, Li LR, Wang K, Tao Z, Gao F, *et al.* All electrospray printed perovskite solar cells. *Nano Energy* 2018, **53**: 440-448.
- Galliker P, Schneider J, Eghlidi H, Kress S, Sandoghdar V, Poulikakos D. Direct printing of nanostructures by electrostatic autofocussing of ink nanodroplets. *Nature communications* 2012, 3(1): 890.
- 8. Biance A-L, Clanet C, Quéré D. Leidenfrost drops. *Physics of fluids* 2003, **15**(6): 1632-1637.
- 9. Quéré D. Wetting and roughness. *Annu Rev Mater Res* 2008, **38**: 71-99.
- 10. Bouillant A, Mouterde T, Bourrianne P, Lagarde A, Clanet C, Quéré D. Leidenfrost wheels. *Nature Physics* 2018, **14**(12): 1188-1192.
- 11. Bourrianne P, Lv C, Quéré D. The cold Leidenfrost regime. *Science Advances* 2019, **5**(6): eaaw0304.
- 12. Linke H, Alemán B, Melling L, Taormina M, Francis M, Dow-Hygelund C, *et al.* Self-propelled Leidenfrost droplets. *Physical review letters* 2006, **96**(15): 154502.
- 13. Lagubeau G, Le Merrer M, Clanet C, Quéré D. Leidenfrost on a ratchet. *Nature Physics* 2011, **7**(5): 395-398.
- 14. Sun Q, Wang D, Li Y, Zhang J, Ye S, Cui J, *et al.* Surface charge printing for programmed droplet transport. *Nature materials* 2019, **18**(9): 936-941.
- 15. Jiang M, Wang Y, Liu F, Du H, Li Y, Zhang H, *et al.* Inhibiting the Leidenfrost effect above 1,000 C for sustained thermal cooling. *Nature* 2022, **601**(7894): 568-572.

- 16. Cengel RA. Introduction to thermodynamics and heat transfer. McGraw-Hill, 2008.
- 17. Dhir VK. BOILING HEAT TRANSFER. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 1998, **30**(1): 365-401.
- 18. Arnaldo del Cerro D, Marín ÁG, Römer GR, Pathiraj B, Lohse D, Huis in't Veld AJ. Leidenfrost point reduction on micropatterned metallic surfaces. *Langmuir* 2012, **28**(42): 15106-15110.
- 19. Li J, Hou Y, Liu Y, Hao C, Li M, Chaudhury MK, *et al.* Directional transport of high-temperature Janus droplets mediated by structural topography. *Nature Physics* 2016, **12**(6): 606-612.
- 20. Liu C, Lu C, Yuan Z, Lv C, Liu Y. Steerable drops on heated concentric microgroove arrays. *Nature Communications* 2022, **13**(1): 3141.
- 21. Bohnet M. Fouling of heat transfer surfaces. *Chemical engineering & technology* 1987, **10**(1): 113-125.
- 22. Attinger D, Frankiewicz C, Betz AR, Schutzius TM, Ganguly R, Das A, *et al.* Surface engineering for phase change heat transfer: A review. *MRS Energy & Sustainability* 2014, **1**: E4.
- 23. Lu Y, Sathasivam S, Song J, Crick CR, Carmalt CJ, Parkin IP. Robust self-cleaning surfaces that function when exposed to either air or oil. *Science* 2015, **347**(6226): 1132-1135.
- 24. Tian D, Song Y, Jiang L. Patterning of controllable surface wettability for printing techniques. *Chemical society reviews* 2013, **42**(12): 5184-5209.
- 25. Kim DE, Yu DI, Jerng DW, Kim MH, Ahn HS. Review of boiling heat transfer enhancement on micro/nanostructured surfaces. *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* 2015, **66:** 173-196.
- 26. Prosperetti A. Vapor bubbles. *Annual review of fluid mechanics* 2017, **49:** 221-248.
- 27. Carey VP. Liquid-vapor phase-change phenomena: an introduction to the thermophysics of vaporization and condensation processes in heat transfer equipment. CRC Press, 2020.
- 28. Cheng JT, Vandadi A, Chen CL. Condensation heat transfer on two-tier superhydrophobic surfaces. *Appl Phys Lett* 2012, **101**(13).
- 29. Wenzel RN. Surface roughness and contact angle. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* 1949, **53**(9): 1466-1467.

- 30. Graeber G, Regulagadda K, Hodel P, Küttel C, Landolf D, Schutzius TM, *et al.* Leidenfrost droplet trampolining. *Nature Communications* 2021, **12**(1): 1727.
- 31. Dhillon NS, Buongiorno J, Varanasi KK. Critical heat flux maxima during boiling crisis on textured surfaces. *Nature Communications* 2015, **6**(1): 8247.
- 32. Benusiglio A, Quéré D, Clanet C. Explosions at the water surface. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 2014, **752**: 123-139.
- 33. Okumura K, Chevy F, Richard D, Quéré D, Clanet C. Water spring: A model for bouncing drops. *Europhysics Letters* 2003, **62**(2): 237.
- 34. Pham JT, Paven M, Wooh S, Kajiya T, Butt H-J, Vollmer D. Spontaneous jumping, bouncing and trampolining of hydrogel drops on a heated plate. *Nature Communications* 2017, **8**(1): 905.
- 35. Schutzius TM, Jung S, Maitra T, Graeber G, Köhme M, Poulikakos D. Spontaneous droplet trampolining on rigid superhydrophobic surfaces. *Nature* 2015, **527**(7576): 82-85.
- 36. Joanny JF, de Gennes PG. A model for contact angle hysteresis. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 1984, **81**(1): 552-562.

Methods

Substrate preparation

Polished P-type silicon wafers of 150 mm diameter and 550 \pm 25 µm thickness were used as substrates in this work. Standard photolithography process was performed with a SUSS MicroTech Contact Aligner. Then the substrates were etched with Oxford PECVD to fabricate the well-defined micropillar arrays. The micro-pillared substrates were conformally coated with fluoropolymer (PFC 1601V, Cytonix Corporation) using a spin coater at 3000 rpm for 30 s and then baked at 100 °C for 1 hour. Substrate micropillar diameter, height and periodicity (pitch-to-pitch distance) are donated with *D*, *H* and *L*, respectively. More detailed information about the substrates is given in Supplementary Table 1 and Fig. S2.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by NSF CBET under grant number 2133017 and NSF ECCS under grant number 1808931. L.Z. acknowledges financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant number 52105174. Device fabrication, and a portion of the analysis and manuscript preparation were performed at the Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences, which is a US DOE Office of Science User Facility.

Author contributions W.H, L.Z. and J.C conceived the research. L.Z. and J.C. supervised the research. W.H. designed and carried out the experiments, W.H., L.Z. and J.C. analyzed the data and wrote the original manuscript. W.H., X.H., P.C. and J.C. prepared the samples. All authors wrote and edited the manuscript.

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.