Micro-Scale Engineering –IV Dielectrophoresis and Single-Cell Encapsulation

### Y. C. Lee

Department of Mechanical Engineering University of Colorado Boulder, CO 80309-0427 leeyc@colorado.edu

February 13, 2014

### Dielectrophoresis



Two different particles in a non-uniform electric field. The particle on the left is more polarisable than the surrounding medium and is attracted towards the strong field at the pin electrode, whilst the particle of low polarisability on the right is directed away from the strong field region.

# Electrochemical double layer → Capacitance





much lower than that of its cytoplasm by an inhomogeneous AC electric field of frequency f may be approximated as:

$$F_{\rm DEP} = 2\pi\varepsilon_{\rm s}\varepsilon_0 r^3 \cdot \left(\frac{f^2 - f_{\rm CO}^2}{f^2 + 2f_{\rm CO}^2}\right) \cdot \nabla E^2 \tag{1}$$

where *r* is the cell radius,  $\nabla E^2$  is the gradient of the meansquared field strength,  $\varepsilon_s \varepsilon_0$  is the electric permittivity of the suspending medium, and  $f_{CO}$  is the cell crossover frequency, which is proportional to the rate at which the plasma membrane capacitance (C) can be charged in the ionic milieu of the suspending medium in response to an applied electric field. The DEP force is null and changes direction when the applied electric field frequency is  $f_{CO}$ . At DEP frequencies well below 1 MHz, a spherical mammalian cell under these conditions has a crossover frequency that may be approximated by the expression:

$$f_{\rm co} \approx \frac{\sigma_{\rm s}}{\sqrt{2}\pi . r. C_{\rm mem}},$$
 (2)

where  $\sigma_s$  is the medium conductivity [27, 29, 30]. We and others have shown that  $C_{mem}$ , the capacitance per unit area of the cell plasma membrane, varies substantially between different cell types [31], cells in different states of differentiation [26, 27, 32], in different stages of the cell cycle [33, 34]

#### Dielectrophoresis Force and Cutoff Frequency

#### Dielectrophoresis-Based Sample Handling in General-Purpose Programmable Diagnostic Instruments



### Field Flow Fractionation (FFF)



### Field Flow Fractionation (FFF)

- Narrow channel with the maximum velocity along the centerline.
- Large particles → Small diffusion
  coefficients → Closer to the wall → Leave
  the column late.
- Particles susceptible to the field applied  $\rightarrow$ Closer to the wall  $\rightarrow$  Leave the column late.

### Field Flow Fractionation (FFF)





### **DEP** Collection Spectra



### Parameters Affecting Cell Properties

- Membrane thickness
- Effective area
- Dielectric constant
- Electrical conductivity

 $0.8 \ \mu F/cm^2$  for smooth biological membrane  $15 \ \mu F/cm^2$  for highly convoluted hepatocyte membrane  $1.2 \text{ to } 4 \ \mu F/cm^2$  are typical for mammalian cells



# Particles in a Flow Stream with Negative DEP



Eletrosmear for normal and cultured tumor cells



At their crossover frequencies, cells touch down on the slide surface and are captured by the binding agent.



#### Magnetaphoretic-dielectrophoretic FFF for Cells with Magnetically Labeled Surface Markers



#### Alternative: Dielectrically Engineered Carrier Beads



2.5 to 10 um in diameter.

# Carrier Beads with Different Chain Lengths



#### Correlations between the dielectric properties and exterior morphology of cells revealed by dielectrophoretic field-flow fractionation

1046 P. R. C. Gascoyne et al.

Electrophoresis 2013, 34, 1042-1050

Table 1. Dielectric and exterior morphological parameters for the NCI-60 panel and blood cells

Cell type	Method	Tissue type	<i>r</i> (μm)	<i>f<sub>co</sub></i> (kHz)	C <sub>mem</sub> (mF∕m)	C <sub>tot</sub> (pF)	Folding(φ)	M = (F + P + R)/3
Basophils	DCO [31]	Blood	3.58 ± 0.03	169 ± 18.8	11.2 ± 1.3	1.8 ± 0.2	1.24 ± 0.14	1.38
B-lymphocytes	R0T [49]	Blood	$3.29\pm0.03$	163 $\pm$ 45.3	$12.6~\pm~3.5$	$1.7~\pm~0.5$	$1.40~\pm~0.39$	1.25
	DCO [31]		$3.09\pm0.22$	$221\pm17.8$	$9.9\pm0.8$	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.10~\pm~0.09$	
CD34 <sup>+</sup> HSC	R0T [50]	Blood	$3.50~\pm~0.05$	189 $\pm$ 27.8	$10.2~\pm~1.5$	$1.6~\pm~0.2$	$1.13 \pm 0.17$	1.25
Eosinophils	DCO [31]	Blood	$4.19\pm0.07$	$172~\pm~7.3$	$9.4~\pm~0.4$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$1.04~\pm~0.04$	1.13
Erythrocytes	ROT [51]	Blood	$3.10~\pm~0.02$	$218\pm21.8$	$10 \pm 1.0$	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.11 \pm 0.11$	1.31
	DCO [51]		$3.10~\pm~0.02$	185 $\pm$ 23.5	$11.8 \pm 1.5$	$1.4 \pm 0.2$	$1.31 \pm 0.17$	
	R0T [14]		$2.8~\pm~0.1$	$268\pm23.8$	$9~\pm~0.8$	$0.9~\pm~0.1$	$1.00~\pm~0.09$	
Granulocytes (mixed)	R0T [49]	Blood	$4.71~\pm~0.23$	130 $\pm$ 37.9	$11 \pm 3.2$	$3.1\pm0.9$	$1.22 \pm 0.36$	
	DFF		$4.70~\pm~0.23$	$95~\pm~13.9$	$15.1~\pm~2.2$	$4.2\pm0.6$	$1.68~\pm~0.24$	
Lymphocytes-mitototic	ROT	Blood	$4.54~\pm~0.63$	92 ± 17.8	$16.1 \pm 3.1$	$4.2\pm0.8$	1.79 $\pm$ 0.34	1.80
Monocytes	R0T [49]	Blood	$4.63~\pm~0.36$	$95~\pm~26.8$	15.3 $\pm$ 4.3	$4.1 \pm 1.2$	$1.70~\pm~0.48$	1.50
	DCO [31]		$4.21~\pm~0.05$	$113 \pm 6.4$	$14.2\pm0.8$	$3.2\pm0.2$	$1.58~\pm~0.09$	
Neutrophils	DCO [31]	Blood	$4.06~\pm~0.06$	$170 \pm 1.2$	$9.8~\pm~0.1$	$2.0\pm0.0$	$1.09\pm0.01$	1.13
T-lymphocytes	R0T [14]	Blood	$3.5~\pm~0.2$	$176 \pm 17.6$	$11 \pm 1.1$	$1.7 \pm 0.2$	$1.22 \pm 0.12$	1.38
	DCO [31]		$3.40~\pm~0.08$	149 $\pm$ 20.2	13.3 $\pm$ 1.8	$1.9~\pm~0.3$	$1.48~\pm~0.20$	
	ROT [33]		$3.04~\pm~0.26$	184 $\pm$ 22.8	$12.1 \pm 1.5$	$1.4 \pm 0.2$	$1.34 \pm 0.17$	
	DFF		$3.40~\pm~1.29$	155 $\pm$ 35.2	12.8 $\pm$ 2.9	$1.9~\pm~0.4$	$1.42\pm0.32$	
BT-549	DFF	Breast	10.36 $\pm$ 3.53	$45~\pm~15.7$	14.4 $\pm$ 5.0	$20~\pm~6.8$	1.6 $\pm$ 0.56	2.00
HS 578T	DFF	Breast	$8.88~\pm~3.63$	$40.9 \pm 12.4$	$18.5~\pm~5.6$	$19~\pm~5.6$	$2.05\pm0.62$	

NCI-60 utilizes 60 different human tumor cell lines, representing leukemia, melanoma and cancers of the lung, colon, brain, ovary, breast, prostate, and kidney

19

#### MicroPrep: Chip-based dielectrophoretic purification of mitochondria

Electrophoresis 2010, 31, 2655–2663

Micro



# Ultrahigh-throughput screening in drop-based microfluidics for directed evolution



<u>Agresti et al., PNAS, 2010</u>; screen ~10<sup>8</sup> individual enzyme reactions in only 10 h, using <150  $\mu$ L of total reagent volume; compared to robotic screening systems, we perform the entire assay with a 1,000-fold increase in speed and a 1-million-fold reduction in cost.