

Lab on a Chip

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Increasing Hybridization Rate and Sensitivity of DNA Microarrays Using Isotachophoresis

Crystal M. Han,¹ Evaldas Katilius,² and Juan G. Santiago¹

¹*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, CA 94305, USA.*

²*SomaLogic Inc., CO 80301, USA.*

Abstract

We present an on-chip electrokinetic method to increase the reaction kinetics and sensitivity of DNA microarray hybridization. We use isotachophoresis (ITP) to preconcentrate target molecules in solution and transport them over the immobilized probe sites of a microarray, greatly increasing the binding reaction rate. We show theoretically and experimentally that ITP-enhanced microarrays can be hybridized much faster and with higher sensitivity than conventional methods. We demonstrate our assay using a microfluidic system consisting of a PDMS microchannel superstructure bonded onto a glass slide on which 60 spots of 20-27 nt ssDNA oligonucleotide probes are immobilized. Our 30 min assay results in 8.2 fold higher signal than the conventional overnight hybridization at 100 fM target concentration. We show rapid and quantitative detection over 4 orders of magnitude dynamic range of target concentration with no increase in nonspecific signal. Our technique can be further multiplexed for higher density microarrays, and extended for other reactions of target-surface immobilized ligands.

1. Introduction

The DNA microarray is now a mature technology that enables investigation of several millions of probe sequences in parallel.¹ Its high-throughput capability and sensitivity have been leveraged in a wide range of applications including gene expression analysis,²⁻⁴ diagnosis of diseases,⁵⁻⁷ single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP),^{8,9} and aptamer-based analysis of protein biomarkers.^{10,11} DNA arrays use hybridization between targets suspended in a bulk sample solution and probes immobilized on a solid substrate. Despite its proven success, application of DNA arrays to rapid screening of samples remains a challenge.¹² In conventional microarray assays, the hybridization step alone typically requires overnight (15-24 h) incubation to yield measurable signal from a wide range of target concentrations.^{13,14} This constraint has impeded the application of microarrays to point-of-care applications where short sample-to-answer turnaround time is desirable. Reduction in hybridization time is also favorable because extended incubation times are associated with solution-dependent cleavage of the linkage chemistry between the probe and the solid support, negatively affecting the reproducibility and sensitivity.¹⁵

There are two main challenges in speeding up hybridization processes: overcoming the slow diffusion-limited target transport and the slow reaction rates associated with low target concentrations.¹⁶ The vast majority of work toward speeding up DNA array hybridization has involved addressing the first of these limitations with active pumping and/or mixing of liquid solution containing the target molecules.¹⁷ Successful microarray hybridization speed-up has been demonstrated using a wide variety of approaches. These include syringe-pump-driven mixing,¹⁸ microfluidic

integrated peristaltic pump mixing,¹⁹ mixing using 7 mm scale magnetic stir bars,²⁰ pumping and mixing discrete sample plugs through serpentine microchannels,²¹ acoustic microstreaming,²² pumping with displacement micropumps,²³ centrifugal liquid pumping,²⁴⁻²⁶ pneumatically driven mixing,^{27,28} and electrokinetic sample dispensing and washing.²⁹

The aforementioned methods of active pumping and vigorous mixing can increase hybridization rate as they avoid entering the diffusion-limited regime by driving fresh sample at its original concentration toward ligands on the surface. However, these approaches do not address the challenge of slow 2nd order reactions whose reaction rate is dictated by the kinetic parameters and trace concentration of targets. Kinetically limited reactions between suspended DNA and surface-bound cDNA can take hours to reach equilibrium due to the inherent dynamics of bulk-to-surface reactions (even for the perfectly mixed regime).^{30,31} Kinetically limited hybridization is therefore not addressed by pumping or mixing, but rather by preconcentration of target species or methods of increasing kinetic parameters themselves (e.g., by varying temperature). An example of preconcentration-driven microarray enhancement is the work of Edman et al.,³² who reported 30-fold increased hybridization rate by electrophoretically accumulating DNA species at the capture probes immobilized on the surface of positively biased microelectrodes. This method received much attention for a brief time, but has been largely abandoned by the field. We hypothesize this abandonment is due to its strict requirement of microfabrication, and the strong sensitivity of hybridization reactions to the effects of electrochemical reactions (which can damage DNA, dramatically change local pH, and/or generate bubbles).

Here we present a novel technique to accelerate and control microarray hybridization using isotachopheresis (ITP) focusing of targets. We use ITP to focus and transport target molecules over an array of probe sites in relatively simple microfluidic devices. ITP strongly increases the local target concentration and simultaneously enhances the local mixing through secondary flows and non-axial electric field components near the ITP focus zone.³³ ITP is an electrophoretic focusing technique, where target analyte ions are focused selectively between leading and trailing electrolyte ions of the two buffers. Relevant to the current work, ITP has been used to enhance the speed and sensitivity of 2nd order hybridization between suspended species. For example, Persat and Santiago³⁴ and Bercovici et al.^{35,36} used ITP to enhance homogeneous DNA hybridization between a molecular beacon probe and its complementary target species demonstrating as much as 14,000 fold acceleration. Bahga et al.³⁷ showed detection of two target species sharing a common portion in their sequences by integrating ITP-enhanced, free-solution hybridization with capillary zone electrophoresis. ITP has been also used to enhance the surface hybridization reaction between a suspended target and an immobilized probe. Garcia and Santiago^{38,39} used ITP to speed up reactions between a single ssDNA species in solution and its complimentary capture probe immobilized into a polyacrylamide gel. Recently (in work published during preparation of this manuscript), Karsenty et al.⁴⁰ showed an ITP aided reaction between a single target DNA and a single complementary cDNA immobilized on a surface of paramagnetic beads. However, we know of no studies toward integration of ITP with DNA arrays. Further, we also know of no studies combining ITP-enhanced reactions and multiplexing with three or more target species.

In the current paper, we significantly extend the ITP-accelerated reactions to multiplexed detection of 20 target species using 60 spots of surface-immobilized probes (3 replicates per each target). We leverage high accumulation power of ITP to achieve both rapid and sensitive microarray hybridization. We present a simple analytical model for ITP hybridization, which predicts order 1,000 fold speed up per a column of spots and approximately 10 fold increase in sensitivity compared to the kinetically limited reaction with no preconcentration. Our system consists of a single layer PDMS superstructure bonded to a glass slide containing a standard microarray with 60 probe spots exposed to the liquid within the PDMS channel. Our technique enables quantitative detection of 26 nt single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) over a dynamic range of 4 orders of magnitude. We experimentally demonstrate 30 min assay time with 8.2 fold increase in sensitivity compared to conventional overnight microarray hybridization at 100 fM target concentration.

2. Overview of ITP-enhanced DNA Array Hybridization

Figure 1a presents schematics of our ITP-enhanced microarray hybridization assay performed in three steps: initial focusing, a diffusive homogenization step, and hybridization and transport. In the focusing step, we apply a relatively high electric field to rapidly extract DNA targets from the input reservoir and accumulate them at the moving ITP interface. The number of molecules accumulated in this step is determined by the volume of the focusing channel and buffer composition.^{41,42} During this stage, high electric field can cause some amount of Joule heating and electrokinetic flow instabilities⁴³ which result in non-uniform distribution of target along the spanwise width of the channel (vertical direction in the figure). To correct this, the ITP zone is positioned within a narrow constriction in the channel wherein we deactivate the electric field for about 2 min. This process redistributes the sample via molecular diffusion. We then re-apply relatively low electric field, which avoids further instabilities and migrates the focused targets at constant velocity over the microarray. See ESI for a visualization of ITP zones before and after the constriction shown in Figure 1a. Microarray spots located immediately downstream of the constriction are exposed to highly focused target DNA for a finite, local residence time of the moving ITP zone (typically order 50-250 s per a column of spots depending on applied electric field). The hybridization reaction is greatly accelerated at the probe sites within the ITP zone, and the progression of the ITP zone downstream subsequently acts as an electrokinetic “wash” where unbound targets are removed from probe spots and collected at the migrating ITP zone. After the sequence of events depicted in Figure 1a, the channel containing the array is washed with wash buffers and dried with air prior to scanning on the microarray scanner.





Figure 1. Schematic and demonstration of ITP hybridization assay. (a) illustrates the three step protocol of ITP hybridization: focusing, diffusion, and hybridization. Target ssDNA electromigrates and accumulates at the interface of TE and LE under high electric field during the focusing step. When the ITP zone reaches the constriction of the channel, electric current is turned off, and diffusion redistributes target DNA for 2 min. In the subsequent hybridization step, lower electric field is applied to avoid further instability, and the focused targets sweep over the immobilized probes. (b) Experimental demonstration of ITP microarray hybridization with fluorescence images taken at three times. The ITP-focused Cy3 labeled ssDNA targets migrated over the surface immobilized complementary probes. After the ITP zone swept by, we observed specific fluorescence signal increases at the probe sites. The initial concentration of targets in this visualization was 100 pM. Note that these images are taken during the hybridization step of our method depicted in part (a).

3. Theory

We here present an analytical framework, which we use to compare ITP-enhanced surface hybridization with conventional hybridization. Our analysis also serves to guide design and optimization of ITP hybridization experiments. In all cases, we model the surface binding reaction as a second order reaction with reaction off- and on-rate constants, k_{off} and k_{on} , respectively, and dissociation constant $K = k_{\text{off}} / k_{\text{on}}$. The reaction between immobilized probe (P) and suspended target (T) forming a hybrid species (H) can be expressed as follows:⁴⁴



where \tilde{C}_H and \tilde{C}_{H0} respectively denote molar surface concentration of hybrid pairs and of free binding sites at $t = 0$ in units of mol/m^2 . C_T is volumetric target concentration at the immediate vicinity of the immobilized probes with units of mol/m^3 . The value of C_T is determined by convective-diffusion processes in the bulk liquid.

We here develop an approximate relation to characterize these reactions in the limit of perfect mixing where hybridization is entirely limited by reaction kinetics. In this regime, target concentration remains unchanged from the initial concentration, C_{T0}

everywhere above the immobilized probes for all time. Therefore, substituting C_{T0} for C_T in Equation (1-ii) yields the solution for the fraction of surface probes hybridized expressed as

$$h_{\text{kin}} = \frac{C_0^*}{C_0^* + 1} (1 - \exp(-(C_0^* + 1)k_{\text{off}}t)) \quad (2)$$

where $C_0^* = C_{T0} / K$ and h_{kin} denotes fraction of hybridized immobilized probe defined as $\tilde{C}_H / \tilde{C}_{H0}$. This is a well-established analytical solution for kinetically limited hybridization reactions applicable to well-mixed cases.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷ From Equation (2), the fraction of hybridized probes at the equilibrium, h_{eq} can be easily derived by setting $t \rightarrow \infty$;

$$h_{\text{eq}} = \frac{C_0^*}{C_0^* + 1}. \quad (3)$$

The above relation shows that the fraction of the hybridized probe is directly proportional to the initial target concentration for $C_0^* \ll 1$, which is the desired design criterion for quantitative microarray analyses. Further, the initial target concentration limits the theoretical maximum signal of the assay. This limitation has prompted the use of long incubation times, in efforts to approach thermodynamic equilibrium and maximize sensitivity.^{48,49} We note Equation (3) is also applicable to the equilibrium state of diffusion-limited reactions under the assumption that spots consume negligible amount of target from the solution through binding reactions.⁵⁰

We model ITP hybridization assay as a kinetically limited reaction at an elevated, characteristic target concentration associated with the ITP preconcentration. Increased concentration both improves the rate of capture and increases the maximum signal attainable from a given target concentration. ITP is also known to cause secondary flows³³ and this helps avoid diffusion-limited regimes. We assume ITP-enhanced surface hybridization is kinetically limited because typical ITP hybridization time scale (residence time of ITP zone) is smaller than the time scale of depletion zone formation, which indicates the onset of the diffusion limitation. We verified the validity of this assumption using typical parameter values for our system and extrapolating from Pappaert and Desmet's⁴⁸ nondimensional analysis on heterogeneous DNA hybridization. We summarize the values of typical parameters for our system in Table 1, and with these we calculate the five dimensionless numbers identified by Pappaert and Desmet's work,⁴⁸ and summarize these in Table 2. Da is the Damkohler number defined as a ratio of reaction rate to the diffusive mass transfer rate. C_0^* denotes the ratio of maximum forward to backward reaction rate. α is a ratio of spot radius to fluid layer height, and C_0' is the ratio of number of targets in solution above the spot to the number of binding sites in the spot at $t = 0$. Lastly, τ is a dimensionless reaction time for ITP hybridization.

Pappaert and Desmet⁴⁸ plot the fraction of hybridized probes versus dimensionless time for their numerical solution of the microarray surface reaction problem for values of C_0' ranging from 10^{-5} to 10^{-1} . The transition from the reaction-limited phase to the diffusion-limited phase can be found as the time when the numerical solution deviates from the kinetically limited analytical solution. Based on their solution for $C_0' = 1 \times 10^{-5}$, we estimate the dimensionless transition time is 0.01 for ITP

hybridization associated with $C_0' = 2 \times 10^{-5}$. Other nondimensional parameters used in their solution were $C_0^* = 10^{-3}$, $\alpha = 5$, and $Da = 1$. In comparison, our α is 7 fold lower and Da is 14 fold lower, while C_0^* is approximately the same. The same paper by Pappaert and Desmet⁴⁸ respectively showed that the transition time from kinetic- to diffusion-limited regime is increased for lower Da and α . The latter suggests that the dimensionless transition time associated with our parameters may be longer than 0.01, implying the reaction stays longer in the kinetically limited regime. Thus we conclude that the dimensionless ITP reaction time, 0.01, is smaller than the transition time to diffusion limited phase, hence ITP hybridization is kinetically limited.

Table 1. Typical parameter values for our ITP hybridization in SI units

Parameter	Name	Value
D_{mol}	molecular diffusion coefficient for target lengths 20-27 nt	$9.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^{51,52}$
k_{on}	kinetic on-rate constant	$76 \text{ m}^3 / (\text{mol} \cdot \text{s})$
k_{off}	kinetic off-rate constant	$4.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$
K	dissociation constant	$5.7 \times 10^{-7} \text{ mol}/\text{m}^3$
a	array spot radius	$3.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$
d	channel height	$4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$
\tilde{C}_{H_0}	molar surface concentration of immobilized probes	$2 \times 10^{-9} \text{ mol}/\text{m}^2$
C_{T_0}	reservoir concentration of target	$10^{-9} \text{ mol}/\text{m}^3$
t_{ITP}	ITP hybridization time	235 s
p	ITP fold preconcentration level	549

Table 2. Estimates of nondimensional parameters as defined by the analysis of Pappaert and Desmet⁴⁸ and evaluated using the values given in Table 1.

Nondimensional parameter	Estimation
$Da = \frac{k_{\text{on}} \tilde{C}_{H_0} d}{D_{\text{mol}}}$	0.07
$C_0^* = \frac{C_{T_0} k_{\text{off}}}{k_{\text{on}}}$	0.0017
$\alpha = \frac{a}{d}$	0.75
$C_0' = \frac{C_{T_0} d}{\tilde{C}_{H_0}}$	2×10^{-5}
$\tau = k_{\text{off}}(1 + pC_0^*)t_{\text{ITP}}$	0.01

As a simple approximation, we model the concentration profile of ITP focused targets as a top-hat pulse with a characteristic target concentration value of pC_{T0} and characteristic ITP zone width of δ_{ITP} , traveling at a known, constant velocity of V_{ITP} . Here p denotes the fold preconcentration level of the target species in the ITP zone compared to the reservoir concentration. Under this simple model of an ITP zone, we estimate the duration during which an immobilized probe is exposed to the high concentration target as the form $t_{ITP} = \delta_{ITP} / V_{ITP}$. That is, we model that ITP hybridization is performed at concentration of pC_{T0} for a short, finite ITP reaction time of t_{ITP} , during which the reaction is yet kinetically limited. We derive an approximate analytical model for ITP hybridization by simply substituting pC_{T0} for C_{T0} and t_{ITP} for t in Equation (2) to obtain

$$h_{ITP} = \frac{pC_0^*}{pC_0^* + 1} (1 - \exp(-(pC_0^* + 1)k_{off}t_{ITP})), \quad (4)$$

where h_{ITP} denotes the fraction of surface probes hybridized after ITP zone passes. This simple model yields insight into ITP-aided hybridization dynamics and will serve as a comparison case for the well-mixed surface hybridization with no preconcentration. A similar analysis on the ITP hybridization was provided recently by Karsenty et al.⁴⁰ We will use these analytical models to characterize ITP enhanced hybridization in comparison to kinetically limited hybridization.

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Buffers, reagents and DNA sequences

We used twenty synthetic target-probe molecule pairs composed of perfectly complementary DNA and cDNA. We provide sequences of target and probe DNA oligonucleotides in ESI. We arbitrarily named target-probe pairs by numbers from 1 to 20. The target sequences were synthesized with Cy3 dye at the 5' terminus. Capture probes were synthesized with amine group on a C6 linker at the 5' end with additional hexa-ethylene glycol linker (HEG) separating from the DNA sequence. Targets and the respective partner probes had the same length ranging from 20 to 27 nt. Additionally, we purchased and used as corner markers synthetic DNA with amino modifier C6 at the 5' terminus and Cy3 at the 3' terminus. All oligonucleotides were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies (IDT, Coralville, IA), and 100 μ M of their stock solutions were stored at -20°C.

For ITP hybridization, the aqueous LE buffer inside the channel, LE1, contained 250 mM HCl, 500 mM Tris, 5 mM MgCl₂, 0.1% w/w 1 MDa poly(vinylpyrrolidone) (PVP), 10% Formamide, and 0.01% w/w Tween20. We chose the concentration of HCl and Tris as a good compromise between strong ITP focusing and Joule heating. The gel-phase LE buffer in the LE reservoir, LE2, was composed of 250 mM HCl, 500mM Tris, and 25% w/v Pluronic F-127. At 25% concentration of Pluronic F-127, the solution is a liquid below +4°C, but quickly changes to a solid-phase as it is transferred to the reservoir and exposed at room temperature.⁵³ We used this thermal gelation property to prevent pressure driven flow in the channel during ITP.^{42,54} The aqueous TE buffer contained 25 mM HEPES, 50 mM Bis-tris, 1% PVP, and varying concentrations of mixture of ssDNA targets. The loading volume of the TE buffer in the reservoir was 20 μ l. Thus we used 2 attomoles of each sequence for the hybridization of 100 fM target concentration. For conventional hybridization, target DNA was mixed to the LE1 buffer

to final concentrations ranging from 100 fM to 10 nM. We used total 21.6 μl of the LE1 buffer each experiment, and we estimate the channel contained only 1.6 μl . So, for example, 2 attomoles and 0.16 attomoles of each target sequence were used, respectively, in the reservoirs and in the channel for the 100 fM target concentration experiments.

HCl, HEPES, Tris, Bis-tris, MgCl_2 , Pluronic F-127, Tween20 were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). PVP was obtained from Polysciences, Inc. (Warrington, PA). Formamide was purchased from Invitrogen (Grand Island, NY). All solutions were prepared in UltraPure DNase free distilled water (GIBCO Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA).

4.2. Microarray

The microarrays were custom designed and manufactured by Applied Microarrays, Inc. (AMI, Tempe, AZ) using proprietary non-contact piezoelectric spotting equipment. Glass slides with epoxysaline coating (Schott Nexterion Slide E, Elmsford, NY) were used as the substrate for immobilization. Each slide had 6 identical microarrays; each array consisting of 8 repeated spots for 20 probe sequences (total 160 spots). The spot diameter was 60 μm , and the center-to-center distance between spots was 150 μm . The corner marker DNA was immobilized to indicate the location and the direction of the microarrays. The detailed array geometry is described in ESI. Since we purchased blocked arrays, we performed no further blocking before hybridization. Once opened from their packaging, we stored the unused microarrays in a vacuumed desiccator (Bel-Art Scienceware, Wayne, NJ).

4.3. Fabrication of microfluidic device

We designed a single layer polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) microfluidic superstructure. When bonded to the microarray glass substrate, this structure created a simple channel over the array consisting of an inlet and an outlet reservoir. This simple structure was used to extract target DNA from the inlet, focus it, and perform rapid ITP hybridization. We used the identical PDMS and glass substrate system to perform conventional hybridization without ITP or mixing. The fluidic microchannel was 80 mm long and had a uniform depth of 40 μm . Most of the channel had a 500 μm width, except for a smooth, 200 μm wide constriction fabricated into the region just upstream of the probe sites. Optimized, low-dispersion turns (not shown in Figure 1) were also used to minimize dispersion of sample at turns.^{54,55}

We used a SU-8 master mold fabricated by the Stanford Microfluidics Foundry as a positive cast for the microfluidic superstructure. To optimize bonding, we experimented with several ratios of precursor-to-curing agent (Sylgard 184, Dow Corning, Menlo Park, CA), and found a ratio of 20:1 (w/w) formed a spontaneous seal between the PDMS slab and epoxysaline-coated glass slide with no plasma treatment. We degassed the reagents for 30 min, thoroughly mixed, poured into the mold, and cured at 65 °C for at least 6 h. We then peeled off the PDMS slab and punched holes to form inlet and outlet reservoirs. We manually aligned the PDMS superstructure and microarray slide based on the alignment markers on the PDMS, and created a reversible contact bond between them. We observed no leakage of these bonds. The final microfluidic system contained 40-60 spots within the fluidic channel, depending on the alignment.

4.4. ITP Hybridization and conventional hybridization

Immediately before each experiment, we primed a channel by flushing with 50% ethanol (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) for 5 min. This mitigated problems with air bubble formation during filling.⁵⁶ We dried the ethanol by flowing air with a vacuum line for 2 min before filling the channel with LE1. As depicted in Figure 1a, ITP hybridization required three buffers: LE1, LE2, and TE. After filling the entire channel with LE1 buffer, we rinsed the two reservoirs using distilled water, and emptied the reservoirs thoroughly with vacuum. We pipetted 20 μL of aqueous TE buffer and gel-phase LE buffer (LE2) into the input and output reservoirs, respectively. We then placed platinum wire electrodes into the each reservoir. The LE2 buffer changed from liquid to solid phase immediately after it was pipetted into the well from the ice bath, preventing unwanted pressure driven flow. We initiated ITP enhanced hybridization experiments by applying 1100 V to the LE well and grounding the TE well using a high voltage sourcemeter (2410, Keithley Instruments, Cleveland, OH). We turned off the field as the ITP zone arrived the constriction, and waited for 2 min. Hybridization was then performed at room temperature by applying constant currents of 2 μA for Figures 2, 3 and 4 and 4 μA for Figure 1b. Higher currents result in a shorter assay time but lower sensitivity (as residence time over each spot is decreased). For all quantitative experiments, we selected 2 μA as a good compromise between the duration and sensitivity of assay.

For conventional hybridization experiments, we primed a channel in the same way, filled it with the LE1 buffer containing target DNA, and then filled two reservoirs with 10 μl of the same buffer. We taped PCR sealer film (Microseal B Adhesive Sealer, MSB-1001, BIO-RAD) on top of the PDMS superstructure to prevent evaporation, and wrapped the entire device with aluminum foil. The microfluidic system was then incubated at room temperature for 15 h.

After each ITP and conventional hybridization experiment, we emptied both reservoirs, and filled the channel with 1Xsaline-sodium citrate (SSC, Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) for 1 min, then completely dried the channel by flowing air with a vacuum line for 2 min. We then peeled off the PDMS channel superstructure, and carried out an additional two-step washing inside a 50 ml centrifuge tube. For the latter, the microarray slide was first immersed in a solution containing 0.1XSSC and 0.1% w/w TritonX (Sigma-Aldrich St. Louis, MO) for 1 min, and then transferred to 0.1XSSC for additional 1 min incubation. At the end of this serial wash, we dried the microarray slides completely by blowing air from a duster type compressed gas can.

4.5. Detection

For the on-chip visualization of microarray hybridization shown in Figure 1b, we used an inverted epifluorescence microscope (Eclipse TE300, Nikon, Tokyo, Japan) equipped with a 10X objective (Plan, NA 0.45, Nikon, Tokyo, Japan). We used a mercury lamp and a filter cube (XF102-2, Omega Optical, Brattleboro, VT) for excitation of Cy3 fluorophore. We recorded images with generation III, intensified CCD camera (IPentaMAX; Roper Scientific, Trenton, NJ), controlled with Winview32 (Princeton Instruments, Trenton, NJ).

For all other results presented here, we scanned the microarray slides using a GenePix 4000B array scanner (Axon Instrument, CA) located in Stanford Functional

Genomic Facilities (SFGF). We used hardware settings of 100% laser power, 5 μm resolution, and either 400 or 800 PMT gain. We used GenePix Pro 6.0 software (Axon Instrument, CA) to extract images and obtain quantitative estimates of fluorescence intensity from each spot.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1. Demonstration of microarray hybridization acceleration

We first performed on-chip visualization experiments of the ITP hybridization process using standard epifluorescence microscopy with CCD camera imaging. In Figure 1b, we present images taken from a single ITP microarray hybridization experiment at three times at a fixed location. Here, we focused twenty Cy3 labeled ssDNA target sequences at 100 pM initial concentration, and let the ITP zone sweep over the immobilized probe spots. Initially, the probes were in contact with aqueous LE1 solution containing no target species, thus we observed no fluorescence signal. After the ITP zone passed over the reaction spots, we observed fluorescence intensity increase, as expected. The background signal in these images is higher in the trailing zone of ITP peak as the TE here contains target species. These images serve as a qualitative description of the assay.

5.2. Experimental conditions and parameters required for our model predictions

Our analytical model predicts that preconcentration with ITP can enhance hybridization in three ways: speeding up reaction, improving sensitivity, and enabling quantitative detection. First, the speed-up in the rates of hybridization reaction by ITP preconcentration scales with p (e.g., which can be seen by taking derivative of Equation (4) with respect to t_{ITP}) compared to kinetically limited hybridization without preconcentration. As usual with reaction acceleration schemes for microarrays, we compare the time to obtain the same signal intensity from both methods. To this end, we calculate 99% characteristic time; i.e., the time required to reach 99% of the equilibrium signal, h_{eq} , defined in Equation (3) for a given target concentration. In Figure 2, dashed contour lines represent the ratio of kinetically limited hybridization time to ITP hybridization time. For a common range of p and C_0^* values presented here, we see an order 1,000-fold speedup is predicted.

Second, we predict an increase of sensitivity for ITP enhanced hybridization. In Figure 2 solid contour lines represent the ratio of fraction hybridized of hybridization with and without ITP versus the nondimensional time, $k_{\text{off}} t_{\text{ITP}}$, and preconcentration level, p . A ratio higher than unity is achieved for the range of parameters highlighted by the gray area. For example, for a typical k_{off} value of order 10^{-4} s^{-1} , residence times of 50 s or greater result in $h_{\text{ITP}}/h_{\text{eq}}$ values greater than unity for preconcentration factors of about 300 or greater. Such preconcentration values and residence times are easily achievable with ITP for a wide variety of targets and sample types.⁴² We note that the abscissa and ordinate coordinates of Figure 2 are not completely orthogonal since p and t_{ITP} are each functions of electric field. We chose this representation because these dimensionless parameters facilitate comparison with experimental conditions. We refer readers to ESI for an alternate representation using a contour plot showing explicitly the

effect of electric field on the ratio of fraction hybridized of ITP and conventional hybridization.

Third, ITP hybridization enables quantitative detection for a wide dynamic range, fulfilling a primary criterion as an analytical technique. For conventional hybridization at equilibrium, the fraction of the hybridized probe is directly proportional to the initial target concentration, $h_{\text{kin}} \approx C_{T0} / K$ for conditions satisfying $C_0^* \ll 1$. Similarly, in ITP hybridization, a Taylor series expansion for the limiting case of $(pC_0^* + 1)k_{\text{off}}t_{\text{ITP}} \ll 1$ yields the linear proportionality of $h_{\text{ITP}} \approx pk_{\text{on}}t_{\text{ITP}}C_{T0}$. In both cases, the assays result in a linear relation between the initial target concentration and fraction hybridized h . However for the conventional hybridization case, absolute amount of captured target depends on calibration for a sequence specific equilibrium constant K , whereas it depends on the product $pk_{\text{on}}t_{\text{ITP}}$ for the ITP case. The latter includes both a sequence-specific parameter k_{on} , and an ITP conditions parameter pt_{ITP} . This offers flexibility in assay design as we have found that ITP conditions can be easily controlled and very reproducible. In summary, conventional hybridization relies on achieving near-equilibrium using long incubation times (and appropriate mixing) for some initial target concentration. Its sensitivity and time are therefore typically limited by K and either a slow reaction rate or a slow diffusion time. In contrast, ITP strongly promotes the forward reaction by pre-concentration (and mixing via secondary flow). Therefore despite the shorter reaction time, ITP's pre-concentration can achieve a higher value of hybridized molecule fraction, h . Our protocol then effectively "freezes" this higher value of h by drying out (with air) the reaction surface.

We next describe the experimental conditions and dimensional parameters we require to apply our analytical model. We measured ITP velocity, V_{ITP} , ITP interface width, δ_{ITP} , and pre-concentration level, p , from independent ITP hybridization experiments ($N = 5$). For these calibration experiments, we obtained images of the migrating ITP zone containing twenty Cy3 labeled targets (each with 250 pM reservoir concentration) under a 2 μA constant current condition with an ICCD gain of 40, exposure time of 1 s, and 0.1 Hz frame rate. Note here we used the same experimental conditions associated with Figure 3 and 4 below. We first performed image analysis on the raw image (I) to subtract background intensity (BG) and correct the non-uniform illumination by flat field image (FF) according an equation of the form

$$I_{\text{corr}} = \frac{I - BG}{(FF - BG) / \max(FF - BG)}, \quad (5)$$

where I_{corr} denotes corrected intensity of the image. We experimentally observed that ITP concentration profile was approximately Gaussian in shape. We fit the experimental data with Gaussians distribution of the form of $Ae^{-(x-\mu)^2/2\sigma^2}$ where A is the amplitude, μ is the mean, and σ is the standard deviation (c.f. Figure S4b for experiment vs. Gaussian fit vs. top hat approximation in ESI). Our titration experiments resulted in a calibration equation of the form $I_{\text{corr}} = 1.02 \times 10^{10} C_{T0} + 41$ (see ESI) to convert the corrected intensity of ITP zone into concentration of targets. In our analytical model, we approximated ITP concentration profile as a top-hat pulse with a characteristic ITP interface width, δ_{ITP} . To this end, we set δ_{ITP} to be the $\pm 2\sigma$ width of the Gaussian peak. We determined the magnitude of the top-hat pulse, pC_{T0} , such that the area under the pulse, $4\sigma pC_{T0}$, was equal to the area under the Gaussian peak, $\sqrt{2\pi} A \sigma$. This provided estimate for the ITP

zone width and preconcentration level; $\delta_{\text{ITP}} = 746 \pm 32 \mu\text{m}$ and $p = 549 \pm 49$. Further, the ITP velocity was measured by dividing the average displacement distance of Gaussian fit obtained from thirty pairs of images taken with 10 s image-to-image delays. The estimated value of V_{ITP} at $2 \mu\text{A}$ was $3.2 \pm 0.05 \mu\text{m/s}$. Dividing the value of δ_{ITP} by V_{ITP} , we obtained the characteristic ITP reaction time as $t_{\text{ITP}} = 235 \pm 12 \text{ s}$. For all ITP parameters, we reported mean values from five experiments along with 95 % confidence interval based on the Student's t -distribution.

Next, we used the measured ITP parameters and estimated kinetic parameters $K = 5.7 \times 10^{-10} \text{ M}$ and $k_{\text{off}} = 4.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (see Section 5.3) to obtain the model prediction of speed-up and sensitivity increase for our experiments. We show the predictions with a square symbol in Figure 2. Our simple theory predicts increase in sensitivity of order 5.6 fold, while we experimentally observe an 8.2 fold increase in signal (see Section 5.3). As shown with the experiments, ITP's high accumulation power can easily achieve sensitivity improvement over hybridization methods without preconcentration. Further, we compare the assay time of hybridization with and without ITP preconcentration. The 99% characteristic time for well mixed and ITP hybridization are respectively 28.7 h and 41 s using $C_0^* = 0.01$, which implies 5.7 pM. This indicates the speedup in ITP hybridization constitutes 2,500 fold for each column of spots in the microchannel (along the span-wise direction). For multiple columns, the total ITP hybridization time is increased by the product of the total length of the array to the ITP zone width δ_{ITP} .




Figure 2. Comparison of sensitivity and hybridization time between ITP and well-mixed (kinetically limited) surface hybridization. Dashed contours represent the ratio of characteristic time to reach 99% of the equilibrium with kinetically limited reaction to that with ITP, $t_{99,\text{kin}} / t_{99,\text{ITP}}$, for a common range of C_0^* and p . We defined C_0^* as a dimensionless parameter, C_0 / K . Solid contour lines represent the ratio of fraction of hybridized probes of ITP hybridization to that from well-mixed case at equilibrium, $h_{\text{ITP}} / h_{\text{eq}}$, and shown here for a relevant values nondimensional time $t_{\text{ITP}}k_{\text{off}}$ and p . For the solid lines, we set C_0^* at 10^{-4} , but we note these contours have a negligible dependence on C_0^* for $C_0^* < 10^{-2}$. The gray area represents the range of parameters $t_{\text{ITP}}k_{\text{off}}$ and p which result in an ITP assay with higher sensitivity than the kinetically limited reaction. The square symbol represents the model prediction for the estimated experimental conditions used in Figures 3 and 4 ($p = 549$, $t_{\text{ITP}} = 235 \text{ s}$, and $k_{\text{off}} = 4.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$), and $h_{\text{ITP}} / h_{\text{eq}}$ is 5.6 at this

condition. The uncertainty bars on this point represents 95% confidence intervals based on a propagation of error analysis.

5.3. Rapid, quantitative and high-sensitivity detection

We demonstrate wide quantitative detection dynamic range, high sensitivity, and hybridization acceleration of our technique by comparing titration curves for ITP and conventional hybridization with no mixing. In Figure 3, we present experimental data of fraction of hybridized probes against six concentrations for ITP (triangle) and conventional hybridization (circle) cases. The hybridization experiments were performed using a mixture of twenty target sequences at initial/reservoir concentrations varying from 100 fM to 10 nM. Here we show results from only target 1, but we include additional data analyses for other targets in ESI. There, we also provide discussion on limit of detection and experiment-to-experiment reproducibility of our method. The fraction of hybridized probe was estimated from experiments by normalizing the background-subtracted fluorescence signal with the maximum value for the respective methods. In both cases, we observed that the fraction of hybridized probe proportionally increased with increasing concentration over a dynamic range of 4 orders of magnitude. The fraction hybridized for ITP hybridization was higher than that of conventional hybridization for all concentrations, showing improved sensitivity by the preconcentration effect of ITP. For example at 100 fM, the average fraction hybridized for the ITP and conventional hybridizations were respectively 1.2×10^{-3} and 3.2×10^{-5} . Using the probe surface density and spot dimension given in Table 1, we calculate that the ITP hybridization recovered 6.7×10^{-21} moles (4.0×10^3 copies) and conventional hybridization recovered 1.8×10^{-22} moles (1.1×10^2 copies). ITP has approximately 1 order of magnitude higher capture amount than conventional hybridization. In the inset, we compare the raw fluorescence intensities for ITP and conventional hybridization (here, without background subtraction) for the lowest concentration case (100 fM) and a negative control of no target in solution. The intensity increase relative to the negative control was 1.7 for conventional and 14 for ITP hybridization, which translates to an 8.2 fold increase in sensitivity for ITP hybridization. The ITP assay total duration (for all spots) was 30 min, compared to 15 h for the conventional hybridization; hence the increased sensitivity was accompanied by a 30-fold speed up for the process.

Shown together with the experimental data set are analytical models for the conventional and ITP hybridization (dashed and solid lines). To obtain these theoretical curves, we first fit the conventional hybridization data with the equilibrium model of Equation (3) using K as a single, global fitting parameter. The fitting parameter was determined as $K = 5.7 \times 10^{-10}$ M using 'nlinfit' nonlinear fitting function of Matlab. For the ITP model, we used the same value of K combined with independently measured estimate values of $p = 549$ and $t_{\text{ITP}} = 235$ s from Section 5.2. A single additional fitting parameter for the ITP hybridization predictions was determined as $k_{\text{on}} = 7.6 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. These hybridization parameter values are typical for heterogeneous hybridization.^{31,57,58} For ITP, we observed good qualitative agreement of predicted trends and our experimental data. For conventional hybridization, we observed good qualitative agreement at higher concentrations, but a slight discrepancy at concentrations below 1 pM. We hypothesize that the overprediction by the model of the fraction hybridized is due to the fact that the conventional hybridization did not reach equilibrium despite its

15 h incubation. We believe hybridization is diffusion limited at these low target concentrations, and thus requires longer time to reach equilibrium.^{49,59}




Figure 3. Experimental data demonstrating quantitative and sensitive detection of a target sequence using ITP microarray hybridization, and its comparison to conventional array hybridization. Titration curves shown here were obtained for 26 nt ssDNA (target 1) concentrations ranging from 100 fM to 10 nM. Along with experimental data (symbols), we show results of analytical models with a single fitting parameter for the conventional (dashed) hybridization, and an additional fitting parameter for the ITP case (solid). The inset compares raw fluorescence intensity from $C_{T0} = 100$ fM hybridization data of both methods and the negative control with no target. The increase of fluorescence intensity over the negative control was 1.7 for conventional and 14 for ITP hybridization. ITP creates an 8.2 fold increase in sensitivity and a 30 fold decrease in assay time. The range bar in the inset was used to indicate maximum and minimum values of data points across repetitions ($N = 3$).

5.4. Comparison of non-specific signal for ITP and conventional hybridization

In Figure 4, we present measurements of specific and non-specific signal obtained with conventional and ITP hybridization. For this demonstration, we included only one target (target 1) at an initial concentration of 100 pM, and performed conventional and ITP-aided hybridizations. After hybridization, we recorded the raw fluorescence intensity from all 20 probe sequences. The bar plots represent the background-subtracted fluorescence intensity resulting from specific (for target 1, white) and nonspecific (for target numbers 2-20, gray) hybridization. For most of the sequences, the non-specific signal was lower than the local background signal, indicating negligible non-specific binding of DNA or dye to the array surface. To obtain a quantitative measure for specificity, we calculated a specificity index defined as the ratio of specific signal to the highest nonspecific signal (target 4). The specificity index was 160 for conventional hybridization and 2130 for ITP hybridization. The over a 10 fold increase in specificity index was achieved mainly by the increased specific signal of ITP hybridization. Importantly, the nonspecific signals for both conventional and ITP hybridization were of the same order of magnitude. This confirms that ITP hybridization enables sensitivity increase with no negative effects on the specificity of the assay.




Figure 4. Comparison of specific and nonspecific signal between conventional and ITP hybridization. Plotted is background subtracted fluorescence signal for each target on a log scale. We here hybridized target 1 alone at 100 pM concentration, and measured fluorescence intensity from the all 20 probe sequences across the 60 spots (3 spots per sequence). Data shown is the average intensity from three experiments with range bars representing the absolute range of measured values. A negative value of the background-subtracted intensity indicates that non-specific binding was not observed. Ratio of the specific signal to the highest nonspecific signal was 160 for conventional, and 2130 for ITP hybridization.

6. Conclusions

We demonstrated the acceleration and sensitivity improvement of DNA microarray hybridization using ITP. Our method leverages high preconcentration power of ITP to overcome the slow reaction kinetics of surface hybridization. We focus target molecules into a narrow (order 100 μm) ITP zone, transport them over immobilized probes, and speed-up the surface binding reaction. Our approach enabled 30 fold shorter hybridization assay time compared to the overnight conventional hybridization, and at the same time improved the sensitivity by nearly 1 order of magnitude without increasing nonspecific signal. The current paper is also the first ITP-based hybridization work demonstrating the quantitative analysis for significant multiplexing (here 20 sequences across a total 60 spots). We believe that our technique can be easily adapted for high density DNA array by upscaling the dimension of the device. Furthermore, the current study can be merged with ITP's nucleic acid extraction functionality to create an integrated on-chip nucleic acid analysis system that inputs complex sample and outputs multiplexed quantitation of sequences (e.g., without amplification). We hypothesize that the method presented here is generally applicable to accelerate other target-receptor binding processes such as antigen-antibody, protein-aptamer, and aptamer-cDNA. Rapid and sensitive ITP microarray hybridization holds the potential to speed-up traditionally long processes of biomarker discovery, clinical diagnosis, and SNP analyses.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge support from Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under contract number HR0011-12-C-0080. C.M.H. gratefully acknowledge support by a Robert and Katherine Eustis Stanford Graduate Fellowship.

References

1. D. Okou, K. Steinberg, and C. Middle, *Nat. Methods*, 2007, **4**, 1109–1111.
2. D. T. Ross, U. Scherf, M. B. Eisen, C. M. Perou, C. Rees, P. Spellman, V. Iyer, S. S. Jeffrey, M. Van de Rijn, M. Waltham, A. Pergamenschikov, J. C. Lee, D. Lashkari, D. Shalon, T. G. Myers, J. N. Weinstein, D. Botstein, and P. O. Brown, *Nat. Genet.*, 2000, **24**, 227–235.
3. A. Adomas, G. Heller, A. Olson, J. Osborne, M. Karlsson, J. Nahalkova, L. Van Zyl, R. Sederoff, J. Stenlid, R. Finlay, and F. O. Asiegbu, *Tree Physiol.*, 2008, **28**, 885–897.
4. M. Schena, D. Shalon, R. W. Davis, and P. O. Brown, *Science*, 1995, **270**, 467–470.
5. J. Marx, *Science*, 2000, **289**, 1670–1672.
6. R. W. Wallace, *Mol. Med. Today*, 1997, **3**, 384–389.
7. Y. Shen and B.-L. Wu, *Clin. Chem.*, 2009, **55**, 659–669.
8. J. G. Hacia, J. B. Fan, O. Ryder, L. Jin, K. Edgemon, G. Ghandour, R. A. Mayer, B. Sun, L. Hsie, C. M. Robbins, L. C. Brody, D. Wang, E. S. Lander, R. Lipshutz, S. P. Fodor, and F. S. Collins, *Nat. Genet.*, 1999, **22**, 164–167.
9. X. Chen and P. F. Sullivan, *Pharmacogenomics J.*, 2003, **3**, 77–96.
10. L. Gold, D. Ayers, J. Bertino, C. Bock, A. Bock, E. N. Brody, J. Carter, A. B. Dalby, B. E. Eaton, T. Fitzwater, D. Flather, A. Forbes, T. Foreman, C. Fowler, B. Gawande, M. Goss, M. Gunn, S. Gupta, D. Halladay, J. Heil, J. Heilig, B. Hicke, G. Husar, N. Janjic, T. Jarvis, S. Jennings, E. Katilius, T. R. Keeney, N. Kim, T. H. Koch, S. Kraemer, L. Kroiss, N. Le, D. Levine, W. Lindsey, B. Lollo, W. Mayfield, M. Mehan, R. Mehler, S. K. Nelson, M. Nelson, D. Nieuwlandt, M. Nikrad, U. Ochsner, R. M. Ostroff, M. Otis, T. Parker, S. Pietrasiewicz, D. I. Resnicow, J. Rohloff, G. Sanders, S. Sattin, D. Schneider, B. Singer, M. Stanton, A. Sterkel, A. Stewart, S. Stratford, J. D. Vaught, M. Vrkljan, J. J. Walker, M. Watrobka, S. Waugh, A. Weiss, S. K. Wilcox, A. Wolfson, S. K. Wolk, C. Zhang, and D. Zichi, *PLoS One*, 2010, **5**, e15004.
11. S. Kraemer, J. D. Vaught, C. Bock, L. Gold, E. Katilius, T. R. Keeney, N. Kim, N. A. Saccomano, S. K. Wilcox, D. Zichi, and G. M. Sanders, *PLoS One*, 2011, **6**, e26332.
12. F. Teles and L. Fonseca, *Talanta*, 2008, **77**, 606–623.
13. P. Hegde, R. Qi, K. Abernathy, C. Gay, S. Dharap, R. Gaspard, J. E. Hughes, E. Snesrud, N. Lee, and J. Quackenbush, *Biotechniques*, 2000, **29**, 548–562.
14. V. G. Cheung, M. Morley, F. Aguilar, A. Massimi, R. Kucherlapati, and G. Childs, *Nat. Genet.*, 1999, **21**, 15–9.
15. C. Situma, M. Hashimoto, and S. a Soper, *Biomol. Eng.*, 2006, **23**, 213–231.
16. K. Pappaert, P. Van Hummelen, J. Vanderhoeven, G. V. Baron, and G. Desmet, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 2003, **58**, 4921–4930.
17. L. Wang and P. C. Li, *Anal Chim Acta*, 2011, **687**, 12–27.

18. M. K. McQuain, K. Seale, J. Peek, T. S. Fisher, S. Levy, M. A. Stremmler, and F. R. Haselton, *Anal. Biochem.*, 2004, **325**, 215–226.
19. J. Liu, B. a Williams, R. M. Gwartz, B. J. Wold, and S. Quake, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.*, 2006, **45**, 3618–3623.
20. P. K. Yuen, G. Li, Y. Bao, and U. R. Muller, *Lab Chip*, 2003, **3**, 46–50.
21. C.-W. Wei, J.-Y. Cheng, C.-T. Huang, M.-H. Yen, and T.-H. Young, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 2005, **33**, e78.
22. R. H. Liu, R. Lenigk, R. L. Druyor-Sanchez, J. Yang, and P. Grodzinski, *Anal. Chem.*, 2003, **75**, 1911–1917.
23. J. Rupp, M. Schmidt, S. Münch, M. Cavalari, U. Steller, J. Steigert, M. Stumber, C. Dorrer, P. Rothacher, R. Zengerle, and M. Daub, *Lab Chip*, 2012, **12**, 1384–1388.
24. L. Wang and P. C. H. Li, *Anal. Biochem.*, 2010, **400**, 282–288.
25. R. Peytavi, F. R. Raymond, D. Gagné, F. J. Picard, G. Jia, J. Zoval, M. Madou, K. Boissinot, M. Boissinot, L. Bissonnette, M. Ouellette, and M. G. Bergeron, *Clin. Chem.*, 2005, **51**, 1836–44.
26. H. Chen, L. Wang, and P. C. H. Li, *Lab Chip*, 2008, **8**, 826–829.
27. X. Wang, X. Chen, X. Ma, X. Kong, Z. Xu, and J. Wang, *Talanta*, 2011, **84**, 565–571.
28. N. B. Adey, M. Lei, M. T. Howard, J. D. Jensen, D. A. Mayo, D. L. Butel, S. C. Coffin, T. C. Moyer, D. E. Slade, M. K. Spute, A. M. Hancock, G. T. Eisenhoffer, B. K. Dalley, and M. R. McNeely, *Anal. Chem.*, 2002, **74**, 6413–6417.
29. D. Erickson, X. Liu, U. Krull, and D. Li, *Anal. Chem.*, 2004, **76**, 7269–7277.
30. Y. Gao, L. K. Wolf, and R. M. Georgiadis, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 2006, **34**, 3370–3377.
31. Y. Okahata, M. Kawase, K. Niikura, F. Ohtake, H. Furusawa, and Y. Ebara, *Anal. Chem.*, 1998, **70**, 1288–1296.
32. C. F. Edman, D. E. Raymond, D. J. Wu, E. Tu, R. G. Sosnowski, W. F. Butler, M. Nerenberg, and M. J. Heller, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 1997, **25**, 4907–4914.
33. G. Garcia-Schwarz, M. Bercovici, L. a. Marshall, and J. G. Santiago, *J. Fluid Mech.*, 2011, **679**, 455–475.
34. A. Persat and J. G. Santiago, *Anal. Chem.*, 2011, **83**, 2310–2316.
35. M. Bercovici, G. V Kaigala, K. E. Mach, C. M. Han, J. C. Liao, and J. G. Santiago, *Anal. Chem.*, 2011, **83**, 4110–4117.
36. M. Bercovici, C. M. Han, J. C. Liao, and J. G. Santiago, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2012, **109**, 11127–11132.
37. S. S. Bahga, C. M. Han, and J. G. Santiago, *Analyst*, 2013, **138**, 87–90.
38. G. Garcia-Schwarz and J. G. Santiago, *Anal. Chem.*, 2012, **84**, 6366–6369.
39. G. Garcia-Schwarz and J. G. Santiago, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.*, 2013, **52**, 11534–11537.
40. M. Karsenty, S. Rubin, and M. Bercovici, *Anal. Chem.*, 2014, **86**, 3028–3036.
41. T. K. Khurana and J. G. Santiago, *Anal. Chem.*, 2008, **80**, 6300–6307.
42. A. Rogacs, L. A. Marshall, and J. G. Santiago, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 2014, **1335C**, 105–120.
43. A. Persat and J. G. Santiago, *New J. Phys.*, 2009, **11**, 075026.
44. R. Levicky and A. Horgan, *Trends Biotechnol.*, 2005, **23**, 143–149.

45. R. A. Vijayendran, F. S. Ligler, and D. E. Leckband, *Anal. Chem.*, 1999, **71**, 5405–5412.
46. T. M. Phillips, J. A. Thompson, and H. H. Bau, *J. Chromatogr. B*, 2010, **878**, 228–236.
47. M. F. Hagan and A. K. Chakraborty, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **120**, 4958–4968.
48. G. Bhanot, Y. Louzoun, J. Zhu, and C. DeLisi, *Biophys. J.*, 2003, **84**, 124–135.
49. M. Sartor, J. Schwanekamp, D. Halbleib, I. Mohamed, S. Karyala, M. Medvedovic, and C. R. Tomlinson, *Biotechniques*, 2004, **36**, 790–796.
50. K. Pappaert and G. Desmet, *J. Biotechnol.*, 2006, **123**, 381–396.
51. V. Chan, D. J. Graves, and S. E. McKenzie, *Biophys. J.*, 1995, **69**, 2243–2255.
52. A. E. Nkodo, J. M. Garnier, B. Tinland, H. Ren, C. Desruisseaux, L. C. McCormick, G. Drouin, and G. W. Slater, *Electrophoresis*, 2001, **22**, 2424–2432.
53. M. Vadnere, G. Amidon, S. Lindenbaum, and J. L. Haslam, *Int. J. Pharm.*, 1984, **22**, 207–218.
54. L. A. Marshall, A. Rogacs, C. Meinhart, J. G. Santiago, Proceedings of American Institute of Chemical Engineers Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 2013.
55. J. I. Molho, A. E. Herr, B. P. Mosier, J. G. Santiago, T. W. Kenny, R. a. Brennen, G. B. Gordon, and B. Mohammadi, *Anal. Chem.*, 2001, **73**, 1350–1360.
56. A. Spehar, S. Koster, V. Linder, S. Kulmala, N. F. de Rooij, E. Verpoorte, H. Sigrist, and W. Thormann, *Electrophoresis*, 2003, **24**, 3674–3678.
57. M. R. Henry, P. Wilkins Stevens, J. Sun, and D. M. Kelso, *Anal. Biochem.*, 1999, **276**, 204–214.
58. K. Tawa and W. Knoll, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 2004, **32**, 2372–2377.
59. C. Gadgil, A. Yeckel, J. J. Derby, and W.-S. Hu, *J. Biotechnol.*, 2004, **114**, 31–45.