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ADVERTISEMENT
Topology optimization of viscoelastic rectifiers

Kristian Ejlebjerg Jensen,1,a) Peter Szabo,2 and Fridolin Okkels1
1Department of Micro- and Nanotechnology, Technical University of Denmark, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark
2Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

(Received 2 November 2011; accepted 18 May 2012; published online 8 June 2012)

An approach for the design of microfluidic viscoelastic rectifiers is presented based on a combination of a viscoelastic model and the method of topology optimization. This presumption free approach yields a material layout topologically different from experimentally realized rectifiers, and simulations indicate superior performance for the optimized design in the regime of moderate elasticity. © 2012 American Institute of Physics. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4728108]

Micropumps are needed for medical delivery as well as lab-on-a-chip systems, and they can be constructed using a variety of actuation principles.1 Interest has gathered around lab-on-a-chip systems, and they can be constructed using a properties of the fluid for their working mechanism.2 In no-moving-parts valves/rectifiers, which rely on the inertial possibilities of combining an oscillating diaphragm with the mechanism of inertial rectifiers, however decreases as devices are scaled down. Viscoelastic effects on the other hand do not vanish at the micro scale, and therefore rectifiers have been suggested3,4 on this basis.

Topology optimization with a memory free non-Newtonian fluid has been demonstrated,6 but the working mechanism of viscoelastic rectifiers is related solely to the memory of the fluid due to past deformations. Topology optimization considering fluid memory has not previously been demonstrated and a statistical average, such that

\[
\begin{align*}
-k(A) &= \frac{DA}{Dt} - \left[ A \cdot \nabla v + (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla^T) \cdot A \right],
\end{align*}
\]

(1) $\frac{DA}{Dt}$ is the material derivative, $\mathbf{v}$ is the velocity, $\dot{\gamma}$ is the dumbbell relaxation time, $\frac{D}{Dt}$ is the material derivative, $\eta_p$ is a dumbbell viscosity, and $k(A)$ can be thought of as a nonlinear spring constant modification.

where $I$ is the identity matrix, $\mathbf{v}$ is the velocity, $\dot{\gamma}$ is the dumbbell relaxation time, $\frac{D}{Dt}$ is the material derivative, $\eta_p$ is a dumbbell viscosity, and $k(A)$ can be thought of as a nonlinear spring constant modification. $\tau$ is the dumbbell stress tensor, which is put into the Stokes equation, when assuming a creeping isothermal and incompressible viscoelastic fluid. Adding the usual continuity equation for mass conservation yields

\[
0 = \mathbf{v} \cdot (\mathbf{p} + \eta_s \dot{\gamma} + \mathbf{\tau}),
\]

(4) $0 = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v}$, (5)

where $\mathbf{p}$ is the pressure, $\eta_s$ is the solvent viscosity, and $\dot{\gamma} = \mathbf{v} \cdot (\nabla^T \mathbf{v})$ is the rate of deformation tensor. It has been shown that the solution of Eqs. (1)–(5) with the finite element method is troubled by the existence of discontinuous velocity gradients $\nabla \mathbf{v}$ at element borders.10 The remedy is to construct a continuous approximation $\mathbf{G}$ for use on the right hand side of Eq. (1) and to add $\eta_p (\dot{\gamma} - \mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}^T)$ as a zero on the right hand side of the Stokes Eq. (4). A significant development occurred with the introduction of the log-conformation method2 involving a substitution $A = e^\varepsilon$, such that Eq. (1) is transformed to take the form

\[
\frac{D\varepsilon}{Dt} = \mathbf{R}(s, \mathbf{G}),
\]

where the computation of the reaction term $\mathbf{R}$ as well as the conformation tensor $e^\varepsilon$ involves calculation of eigenvectors and eigenvalues of $e^\varepsilon$7,12 This change of variables guarantees
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the positive definiteness of the conformation tensor, making it a much more robust formulation. It however also complicates the equations and associated linearizations significantly, and therefore, the optimization in this work relies heavily on a commercial high level finite element package and related implementation of topology optimization.

We implement topology optimization by adding the usual Darcy damping term $-2\alpha(D)\tau_a$ to the right hand side of the Stokes equation (4). The idea is that wherever the design variable $\rho$ is equal to unity, the damping term vanishes such that the governing equation for a fluid domain is recovered; conversely, where the design variable is equal to zero, it results in very large damping terms $\alpha_{\max}$, such that the velocity becomes marginal, and the no slip boundary condition is enforced in an approximative way. A continuous condition is enforced in an approximative way. A continuous characteristic length scale $L$ provides the driving pressure is fixed, and inertia can be neglected.

Hence, excessively large $D_a$ will give a bad approximation of Boger fluids and used widely in benchmarks of numerical algorithms for this reason. To avoid early transition to unsteady flows $\alpha_{\max} = 100$ can be used, and with this we are able to perform optimizations at $We = 5$ without serious issues with unsteady solutions. The driving pressure is set at 7.17 $\Delta p^{*}$ to give a unity average velocity for the initial empty design and thus also an effective We number closer to the imposed. Finally, we find that the optimization performs well with a characteristic mesh size $h = L/10$, $L_{\text{min}} = h$, $Da = 10^{-5}$, $q = 4 \cdot 10^{-6}$, and $\xi = 10$.

Optimizations with and without imposed symmetry both result in a contraction followed by an obstacle as shown in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b). The working mechanism is best understood by considering Figs. 2(c)–2(g) specific to the symmetric case, while adopting the dumbbell fluid picture and focusing on the strongly accelerating nature of the flow in the obstacle wake close to the rear stagnation point: The acceleration will cause the forward dumbbell mass to move

![FIG. 1. Optimization setup with periodic velocity vector and conformation domain](image-url)

where the arrows indicate the flow configuration. We compute the objective function gradient $\partial \phi/\partial \rho$, with an adjoint method and combine it with the method of moving asymptotes for updating the design variables.

In terms of model parameters we choose $\beta = 0.59$, as it is representative of Boger fluids and used widely in benchmarks of numerical algorithms for this reason. To avoid early transition to unsteady flows $\alpha_{\max} = 100$ can be used, and with this we are able to perform optimizations at $We = 5$ without serious issues with unsteady solutions. The driving pressure is set at 7.17 $\Delta p^{*}$ to give a unity average velocity for the initial empty design and thus also an effective We number closer to the imposed. Finally, we find that the optimization performs well with a characteristic mesh size $h = L/10$, $L_{\text{min}} = h$, $Da = 10^{-5}$, $q = 4 \cdot 10^{-6}$, and $\xi = 10$.

Optimizations with and without imposed symmetry both result in a contraction followed by an obstacle as shown in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b). The working mechanism is best understood by considering Figs. 2(c)–2(g) specific to the symmetric case, while adopting the dumbbell fluid picture and focusing on the strongly accelerating nature of the flow in the obstacle wake close to the rear stagnation point: The acceleration will cause the forward dumbbell mass to move
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faster than the rear mass, and in this way, a wake of elongated dumbbells appears, Figs. 2(c) and 2(d). The dumbbells are particularly elongated in the reverse flow configuration due to the high flow velocity in the contraction, and the wake causes a damping that gives rise to a local velocity minimum in the contraction center, Figs. 2(e)–2(g).

As indicated in Fig. 2, the effective size of the obstacle is smaller than a plot of the filtered design variable on a linear scale suggests. This is due to the relation between the filtered design variable and the damping term (Eq. (8)), and it means that the projected design variable should be thresholded around \( \frac{2}{C_1} = 10^{-4} \) to produce a performing design without porous material. It however seems that it is the curvature in the left region of the obstacle that is essential, which allows for the use of a significantly larger airfoil like obstacle.

The results of symmetric simulations with a state-of-the-art hyperbolic design\(^5\) and a design derived from topology optimization are shown\(^17\) in Fig. 3 in the case of boundary conditions and model parameters identical to that of the topology optimization. Although unsteady flows are often encountered, the objective function shows clear convergence up to \( \text{We} = 5 \) with respect to spatial discretization and simulation time (not shown). The simulations indicate that the contraction-obstacle-design not only has superior performance in the considered regime but also that the rectification effect sets in strongly at small Weissenberg numbers.

In conclusion, we have presented results for topology optimization of a viscoelastic rectifier and found a design that promises superior performance in the regime of moderate elasticity.

\(^1\)B. Iverson and S. Garimella, Microfluidics Nanofluidics 5, 145 (2008).
\(^17\)See supplementary material at http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4728108 for non-dimensional equations, implementation validation plot and additional simulation figures.

The implementation uses default parameters,\(^13\) and it has been verified against a Ref. 7 in a benchmark geometry.\(^17\)