

Electrowetting with contact line pinning: Computational modeling and comparisons with experiments

Shawn W. Walker,^{1,a)} Benjamin Shapiro,^{2,b)} and Ricardo H. Nochetto^{3,c)}

¹*Department of Mathematics, Courant Institute, New York University, New York, New York 10012, USA*

²*Department of Bio-Engineering and the Institute for Systems Research, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA*

³*Department of Mathematics and the Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA*

(Received 19 March 2009; accepted 20 August 2009; published online 30 October 2009)

This work describes the modeling and simulation of planar electrowetting on dielectric devices that move fluid droplets by modulating surface tension effects. The fluid dynamics are modeled by Hele-Shaw type equations with a focus on including the relevant boundary phenomena. Specifically, we include contact angle saturation and a contact line force threshold model that can account for hysteresis and pinning effects. These extra boundary effects are needed to make reasonable predictions of the correct shape and time scale of liquid motion. Without them the simulations can predict droplet motion that is much faster than in experiments (up to 10–20 times faster). We present a variational method for our model, and a corresponding finite element discretization, which is able to handle surface tension, conservation of mass, and the nonlinear contact line pinning in a straightforward and numerically robust way. In particular, the contact line pinning is captured by a variational inequality. We note that all the parameters in our model are derived from first principles or from independent experiments except one (the parameter D_{visc} that accounts for the extra resistive effect of contact angle hysteresis and is difficult to measure directly). We quantitatively compare our simulation to available experimental data for four different cases of droplet motion that include splitting and joining of droplets and find good agreement with experiments. © 2009 American Institute of Physics. [doi:10.1063/1.3254022]

I. INTRODUCTION

Electrowetting refers to the local modification of surface tension by applied electric actuation to precisely manipulate two-phase flows on the microscale.^{1–15} By applying electric fields via actuating electrodes (see Fig. 1), surface tension and electrical effects compete,^{5,16,17} and this competition can create spatially and temporally varying forces that are used to shape, move, split, merge, and mix fluids in microscale devices. Applications of electrowetting include reprogrammable lab-on-a-chip systems,^{4,11} autofocus cell phone lenses,¹ and colored oil pixels for laptops and video-speed smart paper.^{3,9,10}

This paper is concerned with modeling and simulating fluid motion in planar electrowetting on dielectric (EWOD) systems, such as the UCLA electrowetting system^{2,17–19} against which the numerical results in this paper are compared. It focuses on device length (micrometer) and device time scale (millisecond) simulations and it addresses the next major item required to better predict electrowetting behavior: the inclusion of contact line pinning and depinning behavior in an experimentally motivated phenomenological and *numerically sound* manner.

The subject of this paper, modeling and simulation of electrowetting, is needed to further understand the physics

and to design, optimize, and better control next generation devices. For instance, our results on feedback flow control to steer and sort single particles in planar electrowetting systems, a new capability for electrowetting,²⁰ was predicated on and would not have been possible without our prior electrowetting modeling work.²¹ Modeling for design and control must strike a balance between model accuracy (the model must sufficiently predict the experimental behavior) and model complexity. To enable design, optimization, and control, the models created must be small enough to fit within design, optimization, and control tools, e.g., control analysis and synthesis methods,^{22,23} which can handle tens to tens of thousands of states, but not millions.

Effectively modeling electrowetting at device length and time scales is challenging. Electrowetting includes a complex set of physical phenomena, and aspects related to fine-scale fluid dynamics and chemistry are still under debate in the literature. Nevertheless, the key modeling issues and necessary tasks have become clear (see, for example, our previous work^{17,21,24–26} and the review⁵). The following are crucial and recognized modeling issues that must be included:

- (1) In electrowetting, liquid packets are held together by surface tension and are actuated by electric fields, so any model must include surface tension and electrical phenomena.
- (2) For fast motion, which certainly occurs in electrowetting systems (millisecond splitting of droplets, video-speed

^{a)}Electronic mail: walker@cims.nyu.edu.

^{b)}Electronic mail: benshap@eng.umd.edu.

^{c)}Electronic mail: rhn@math.umd.edu.




FIG. 1. (Color online) An example of electrowetting (schematic). The activated electrode (darker pad) effectively and locally decreases the surface tension of the liquid touching it, causing it to move to the right. (Figure is courtesy of Jeong-Yeol Yoon at the University of Arizona.)

actuation of colored oils), fluid *dynamic* effects must be included.

- (3) Liquid/gas interfaces must be tracked accurately and successfully through large deformations including topological changes such as split and join events. Such events are central to the operation of laboratory-on-a-chip electrowetting systems that aim to manipulate, combine, and partition small packets of liquid to carry out precision chemical and biological reactions on chip.
- (4) Loss mechanisms, such as contact angle saturation^{2,17,18,27-37} and hysteresis,³⁸⁻⁴⁷ which are two major phenomena in electrowetting systems, can severely limit device performance and must be included.

The current status of electrowetting physical modeling can be summarized as follows. We know the dominant physics that must be included to characterize the bulk flow. Equilibrium behavior of sessile (isolated) drops is understood.^{16,17,33,40,48} The bulk fluid *dynamics* of electrowetting has been addressed by us as well as by others. Our prior work²¹ developed a model in two dimensions that successfully tracked moving and splitting interfaces by the level-set method and, to the best of our knowledge, was the first to predict electrowetting dynamics from physical first principles (see also the model of Lu *et al.*³⁴). We compared that model²¹ to the UCLA experiments and showed that it captures the leading order effects (i.e., it is quantitatively correct in most cases, for example, it correctly predicts bulk flow splitting times).

Numerical advances for tracking the dynamic two-phase microscale flows that occur in electrowetting devices include our prior research in Refs. 21, 25, and 26 as well as the results of others.^{34,49-52} Earlier work on electrowetting focused mainly on equilibrium and quasistatic behavior of droplets^{49,50} (i.e., no internal fluid dynamics). More recent methods simulate the full dynamics of electrowetting driven motion in various physical settings.^{34,51,52} However, none of these methods/models account for the effects of contact line pinning or hysteresis. It is also not apparent how to generalize the above listed numerical techniques to include these two phenomena.

In summary, this paper presents a partial differential equation (PDE) model of EWOD fluid dynamics that is able to approximately capture the evolution of the fluid's liquid-gas interface in two dimensions. In our prior modeling work we correctly accounted for the internal fluid dynamics, the boundary conditions due to surface tension, and electrowetting actuation, but we only had a heuristic model for contact

line pinning and hysteresis.²¹ Now we include a phenomenological force threshold model for line pinning and depinning as motivated by the experiments described in Refs. 5, 41, and 53. It is simply not feasible to include atomistic or molecular dynamic descriptions for contact line dynamics explicitly as their length and time scales are dramatically smaller (i.e., 10 000 and 100 times smaller than device length and time scales, respectively), but we do include insights from them in our formulation (see Sec. II D and Refs. 54-57). We combine sophisticated numerics, a semi-implicit front-tracking method for the interface motion and a variational/weak formulation of the governing PDE, which we discretize by finite elements.²⁵ The variational method is key to implementing our contact line pinning model in a clean and robust manner, as well as providing a stable calculation of curvature, and ensuring accurate mass conservation. Our simulation tool is able to handle pinching and merging of droplets,²⁶ which are central to the operation of electrowetting systems. Our simulations with the added contact line physics and new numerical methods provide a better match to experimental data than those in Refs. 21, 34, and 52 and they still run in between 5 and 15 min on a laptop. We show direct comparison between our simulation and experiments conducted at UCLA in Sec. IV.

II. ELECTROWETTING MODEL

This section describes our modeling approach. A list of physical parameters for the device geometry and other symbols used in the text are given in Table I.

A. Description of the EWOD system

Figure 2 shows a schematic of an EWOD device. EWOD actuation relies on a competition between surface tension and dielectric energy storage in an underlying solid dielectric layer.^{5,17} This effectively allows each electrode to change the surface tension properties immediately above it. This change can be used to move droplets from electrode to electrode, to split droplets (by pulling on either side using three electrodes), to join droplets by making them collide, and to mix fluid in droplets by making the droplets execute complex paths.

TABLE I. Nomenclature: list of important symbols used in the text. The physical parameters of the UCLA EWOD device for the experiments described in Sec. IV are given in Table III.

Symbol	Definition
σ_{lg}	Surface tension
μ	Dynamic viscosity
ρ	Density
H	Channel height
L_{Elec}	Electrode length
L	Length scale
U_0	Velocity scale
$t_0=L/U_0$	Time scale
$P_0=\sigma_{lg}/L$	Pressure scale
$Re=\rho U_0 H/\mu$	Reynolds number
$Ca=\mu U_0/\sigma_{lg}$	Capillary number
α, β	Momentum equation coefficients
\mathbf{u}	Vector velocity
p	Pressure
λ	Pinning variable
Λ	Convex set (for λ)
κ	Curvature of Γ
\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{t}	Unit normal and tangent vectors of Γ
E	EWOD force
P_{pin}	Maximum pinning pressure
D_{visc}	Viscous interface drag
δt	Numerical time step
Ω	Two dimensional fluid domain
Γ	One dimensional liquid-gas interface
∇_{Γ}	Surface gradient operator
Δ_{Γ}	Laplace–Beltrami operator

B. Base fluid model

1. Hele-Shaw

The flow of liquid between two narrowly spaced parallel plates, surrounded by air, is governed by the Hele-Shaw equations,^{58,59} with a pressure boundary condition given by the Young–Laplace relation at the liquid-gas interface.




FIG. 2. (Color online) Schematic of sample EWOD device (figure courtesy of C. J. Kim, UCLA and Sung Kwon Cho, University of Pittsburgh) (Refs. 2 and 21). This EWOD system consists of two parallel plates with the top plate (transparent) acting as a ground electrode and the bottom plate containing a grid of embedded electrodes. The bottom plate also contains an extra dielectric layer to enhance device performance (not shown). A single droplet is shown near the center, but there may be many droplets of arbitrary shape between the two plates. Note that the height of each droplet is small compared to its horizontal size (these droplets are very thin puddles).




FIG. 3. Example EWOD device geometry (Ref. 2). The coordinate axes are defined such that the top and bottom plates of the device lie in planes parallel to the x - y plane. In this example, a 3×3 grid of electrodes is shown, each with side length L_{Elec} , with one electrode active (the shaded square). Two liquid droplets are shown moving toward the active electrode to merge into one droplet. The domain of the liquid is denoted by Ω and the liquid-gas interface is labeled Γ . The bold parts of Γ indicate “pinned” parts of the boundary due to contact line pinning. Note that only a subset of the boundary may be pinned; other parts may still move. A side view of the device is shown at the bottom (note: “droplet no. 2” is not shown here). The contact angles of the droplet, measured through the liquid, are denoted θ_t and θ_b (top and bottom). The physical parameters of the device, for each experimental setup, are listed in Tables I and III.

Therefore, the two dimensional fluid equations inside (possibly many) droplets actuated by EWOD are given in nondimensional form as (see Refs. 21 and 25 for details)

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \beta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\nabla^2 p &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where Ω is the domain of the fluid (liquid-phase, see Fig. 3), boldface \mathbf{u} is the vector velocity field (in the plane of the device), and p is the pressure. The nondimensional constants α and β depend on the fluid parameters and geometry of the device:

$$\alpha = \left(\frac{\rho L U_0}{\mu} \right) Ca, \quad \beta = 12 \left(\frac{L}{H} \right)^2 Ca, \quad Ca = \frac{\mu U_0}{\sigma_{lg}},$$

where ρ is fluid density, H is the height between the parallel plates, L is the planar liquid length scale, U_0 is the velocity scale, μ is the dynamic viscosity, Ca is the capillary number, and σ_{lg} is the surface tension of the liquid-gas interface (here denoted by Γ).²¹

2. Interface motion

We need an equation to describe the motion of the two-phase droplet boundary Γ . In particular, the droplet may deform into an arbitrary shape. The change in droplet shape is only due to the normal component of velocity $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$; the tangential component only reparametrizes the interface. Thus, for each point \mathbf{x} on the boundary the change in position is given by

$$\partial_t \mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}, t)] \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit outer normal vector of the boundary. However, it is convenient in our implementation to use the full velocity to advance the interface position:

$$\partial_t \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (3)$$

This makes no difference for the droplet evolution and simplifies our numerical method. In the numerical implementation of our model (see Sec. III F), we have an explicit representation of the liquid domain Ω by a mesh of triangles. This naturally contains a mesh of the liquid-gas interface Γ (i.e., the boundary of Ω), which allows for easily enforcing boundary conditions and computing surface tension forces (see Sec. III). Hence, our method falls into the category of semi-implicit front tracking.

C. Boundary conditions for the liquid

We now discuss the physical phenomena occurring at the liquid-gas interface, how these effects are modeled and how they affect the boundary conditions.

1. Surface tension

We first review the pressure boundary conditions for pure surface tension driven flow, and then show how electrowetting actuation is introduced (details are given in our prior paper²¹). The Young–Laplace relation⁵⁹ for the pressure in Eq. (1) gives the boundary condition on the liquid-gas interface Γ in dimensional form (denoted by $\tilde{}$)

$$\tilde{p} = \sigma_{lg}(\tilde{\kappa}_1 + \tilde{\kappa}_2) \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\kappa}_1$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_2$ are the principle curvatures⁶⁰ of the two dimensional liquid-gas surface. Following Ref. 21, the principle directions of curvature are taken to be orthogonal, with one direction in the plane of the device and the other along the channel height. Therefore, the boundary condition can be decomposed as

$$\tilde{p} = \sigma_{lg}(\tilde{\kappa} + \tilde{\kappa}_z) \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{\kappa}$ is the curvature in the plane of the device and $\tilde{\kappa}_z$ is along the height. Since our fluid model is in two dimensions, we have no information on the liquid-gas interface shape along the channel height. *Ergo*, we assume that $\tilde{\kappa}$ only depends on the shape of the one dimensional boundary Γ , and we estimate $\tilde{\kappa}_z$ by assuming the liquid-gas interface profile is circular along the channel height. This is a reasonable assumption so long as the horizontal extent of the droplet is large compared to the height of the EWOD device. This is certainly the case in the UCLA devices where droplets usually span at least one electrode (1.4–1.5 mm length) while

the device height is 70–100 μm . Then knowing the contact angles that the droplet makes with the top and bottom plates, at each point \mathbf{x} on Γ , fully determines $\tilde{\kappa}_z$ as a function on Γ .²¹ The contact angle only depends on a local force balance,^{61,62} so it does not depend on the channel height. Therefore, $\tilde{\kappa}_z = \kappa_z/H$, where κ_z is the nondimensional z curvature given by

$$\kappa_z = -[\cos(\theta_t) + \cos(\theta_b)] \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (6)$$

where θ_t and θ_b are the top and bottom contact angles (see Fig. 3). The dimensional curvature of Γ is given by $\tilde{\kappa} = \kappa/L$, where κ is nondimensional. Hence, the nondimensional pressure is given by

$$p = \kappa + \frac{L}{H} \kappa_z \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (7)$$

where $p = \tilde{p}/P_0$ and $P_0 = \sigma_{lg}/L$ is the pressure scale.

2. EWOD forcing

The contact angle of the liquid (on the bottom plate) depends on the voltage of the electrode pad directly underneath (see Fig. 3). Meaning the contact angle at a point \mathbf{x} , on the interface Γ , only depends on the electrode voltage at position \mathbf{x} ,¹⁷ i.e., $\theta_b(\mathbf{x}) = \theta_b[V(\mathbf{x})]$. Hence, $\kappa_z(\mathbf{x}) = \kappa_z[V(\mathbf{x})]$ is voltage dependent.

Let E be the EWOD force coming from the z curvature component of the Laplace pressure on the interface. The above implies

$$E(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{L}{H} \kappa_z[V(\mathbf{x})], \quad (8)$$

which rewrites Eq. (7) as

$$p = \kappa + E \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (9)$$

Computing E requires evaluating the voltage in the plane of the device.

3. Contact angle versus voltage: Saturation

The initial model of contact angle variations versus voltage is the Young–Lippmann equation,²⁷ which predicts a parabolic curve relating contact angle to the capacitive voltage V across the bottom plate, i.e.,

$$\cos \theta = \frac{\sigma_{sg} - \sigma_{sl} + C_{cap} V^2/2}{\sigma_{lg}}, \quad (10)$$

where θ is the contact angle, σ_{sg} and σ_{sl} are the surface tensions of the solid-gas and solid-liquid layers, respectively, and C_{cap} is the capacitance per unit area for the charging layer underneath the electrode. However, in real electrowetting applications, there are loss mechanisms that lead to contact angle saturation.^{2,17,18,27–37} These limit the amount of contact angle variation (i.e., $\Delta\theta_b$) that can be actuated, which in turn limits the range of values of the EWOD forcing E . If the Young–Lippmann model is used, simulated droplet speeds far exceed what is actually seen in experiments.²¹ The saturation effect is subtle and nonobvious, and its root causes are the subject of vigorous debate in the electrowetting community. See the previous references for more information on contact angle saturation.

TABLE II. Available contact angle vs voltage data for the experiments in Secs. IV A–IV D.

Voltage (V)	Contact angle (deg)		
	Glycerin ^b	Water ^c	Water ^a
0	107.35	117.0	111.62
25	... ^d	90.0	...
50	68.46
60	64.32	...	70.01

^aUsed in Sec. IV D.

^bUsed in Secs. IV A and IV C.

^cUsed in Sec. IV B (Refs. 2 and 21).

^dThese data are not needed.

For the experiments in Secs. IV A–IV D we need the experimental contact angle versus voltage data given in Table II. The bottom contact angle θ_b is interpolated between electrode gaps to ensure a smooth variation along the interface Γ ; θ_t is constant and determined by the 0 V value listed in Table II.

D. Contact line force threshold model

Contact line pinning (or sticking) is a readily observed phenomenon in most wetting applications.^{38–44,63–69} It is not a fluid viscous effect but rather a kind of molecular adhesion that occurs at the three-phase contact line of the droplet. Line pinning is also related to an effect called contact angle hysteresis which acts to retard interface motion. Ignoring pinning and hysteresis leads to simulations that predict droplet motion up to ten times faster than is seen in experiments.²¹

As of today, the nature of pinning and hysteresis is still controversial. Most modeling of contact line pinning uses molecular dynamics simulations,^{65–68} which are computationally very expensive (state-of-the-art simulations are restricted to $\approx 10^4$ atoms, and/or nanometer length scales and (at best) nanosecond time periods). The following sections describe a modification of the pressure boundary conditions to account for both contact line pinning and the retardation effect of hysteresis in a physically meaningful way. This is in contrast with our prior work,²¹ which had no pinning model and used an *ad hoc* model of contact angle hysteresis.

1. Phenomenological approach

Macroscopic experiments^{5,41,53} of droplet motion on an inclined plane indicate that the net line pinning force acting on a droplet has a threshold value. In other words, the contact line exerts a force equal and opposite to a body force (e.g., gravity), which prevents the droplet from moving, but only up to a threshold value. If the body force exceeds the threshold, then motion does occur. This behavior is very reminiscent of mechanical (Coulombic) friction, in which case the friction force always opposes motion and cannot exceed a certain threshold value. It was also found^{5,41} that the maximum total pinning forces on the droplet scales with the length of the contact line, i.e.,




FIG. 4. Contact line force averaging (cross-sectional slice of EWOD device shown; z -axis is in the vertical direction). Contact line friction is a force that is active along the three-phase contact line. On the left, the contact line pinning force is shown concentrated at the contact line (at both the floor and ceiling). On the right, the pinning force has been redistributed over the channel height. Since the governing EWOD fluid equations have been averaged along the channel height, we average the contact line pinning force across the channel height also. This redistributes the force from a length of contact line (at floor and ceiling) to a vertical strip along the liquid-gas interface. This allows the line pinning force to be included in the pressure boundary conditions as an additional pressure term [see Eq. (13)].

$$F_{\max} = c_{\text{pin}} L_{\text{cl}}, \quad (11)$$

where F_{\max} is the maximum total force that can resist motion of the droplet, L_{cl} is the total contact line length, and c_{pin} is the line pinning coefficient with units of force per length (units of surface tension). So the constant c_{pin} represents the maximum force per unit length that a piece of contact line can exert against the droplet to prevent its motion. In view of Eq. (11), we model line pinning as a *local* effect, meaning that a local piece of contact line only resists the local motion of that portion of the liquid-gas interface, but will assume that the maximum threshold force on that piece of contact line cannot exceed its length times the coefficient c_{pin} . For our setup, this is achieved by modifying the pressure boundary conditions (see Sec. II D 2 for more details).

Our model is a rough approximation of the actual physics at the three-phase contact line, but it does capture some insights from fine scale modeling of interfaces, such as in Refs. 54–57, on moving contact lines. In particular, Ref. 54 shows a discontinuous jump in the local applied force versus local interface velocity. The essential contribution of our work is to develop a modeling and numerical framework that will allow inclusion of such results into electrowetting modeling of entire devices for design and optimization. To do this it is necessary to use a phenomenological approach to incorporate the pinning effect into our continuum model. This is done to avoid a molecular/atomistic description. Recently,^{62,70,71} some new models for contact line dynamics have been proposed that avoid a purely atomistic description and are designed to be incorporated into a continuum model; these also make note of insights from molecular dynamics. As noted by us and others, it is clearly desirable to have tractable contact line models at device/system length and time scales.

2. Including line pinning into the governing equations

Since the EWOD governing equations are posed in two dimensions, we must average the above line force threshold model over the device height in order to incorporate it into the pressure boundary conditions. This is done by averaging the maximal line pinning coefficient c_{pin} over the channel height H of the EWOD device (see Fig. 4). This gives a




FIG. 5. A two dimensional droplet (top view) with parts of the boundary pinned (electrode grid not shown). The pinned regions are denoted by a solid line; unpinned regions are shown as a dashed line with velocity arrows indicating direction of motion. An outward motion is considered positive ($\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} > 0$) and an inward motion is negative ($\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} < 0$). The pinning variable λ is defined on the boundary Γ of the droplet. On the unpinned regions, the value of λ saturates to $\pm P_{\text{pin}}$. On the pinned regions ($\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$), λ varies between $-P_{\text{pin}}$ and $+P_{\text{pin}}$ (see Fig. 6). In our simulations, $|\lambda| < P_{\text{pin}}$ is used to indicate where the boundary is pinned.

maximal “pinning pressure” $\tilde{P}_{\text{pin}} = 2c_{\text{pin}}/H$ (in dimensional form), which represents the maximum opposing force per liquid-gas interface area that the contact line can apply *against* motion of the interface. The factor of “2” accounts for the interface contact line pinning at the floor and ceiling of the EWOD device. The nondimensional pinning pressure is then given by

$$P_{\text{pin}} = \frac{1}{P_0} \frac{2c_{\text{pin}}}{H}, \quad (12)$$

where P_0 is the dimensional reference pressure scale (force per unit of area).

This allows us to introduce a locally defined pinning pressure λ into the boundary conditions (in nondimensional form)

$$p = \kappa + E + \lambda, \quad (13)$$

$$\lambda = P_{\text{pin}} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}).$$

In other words, if the normal velocity of the liquid-gas interface is positive, then the pinning pressure will push back with maximum positive pressure $+P_{\text{pin}}$ to limit the motion. Likewise, if the normal velocity is negative, the pinning pressure will push back in the opposite direction $-P_{\text{pin}}$. And if the normal velocity is zero, then λ takes on a value between $\pm P_{\text{pin}}$ and acts as a Lagrange multiplier to enforce the constraint that the interface does not move (also see Fig. 5). This definition of λ ensures $|\lambda| \leq P_{\text{pin}}$ and so is consistent with the experimental observation in Sec. II D 1.

Numerical implementation of this simple phenomenological model is difficult because of the discontinuity [the sign function of Eq. (13), see Fig. 6]. This discontinuity, however, is essential. If it was replaced by a smooth function then no droplet could ever be pinned in a noncircular shape, something that *does* occur in the experiments (see Fig. 12 below). To show this, we argue by contradiction. Assume no




FIG. 6. A more realistic relationship between the resistive pressure at the interface and the normal velocity. Here, $[\lambda + D_{\text{visc}} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}]$ is plotted as the thick line. Note how the interface pressure increases with increasing velocity. The dashed line depicts a slightly more nonlinear relationship $[\lambda + D_{\text{visc}} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} + G_{\text{fric}}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})]$ [see Eq. (16)]. The qualitative form of the dashed line has been shown in the work of Refs. 54–57. Note: the dashed line asymptotes toward the thin line $D_{\text{visc}} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$.

EWOD forcing, so the boundary pressure is given by $p = \kappa + \lambda$ [from Eq. (13)]. Suppose the droplet has become completely pinned in a noncircular shape but the function relating λ to the normal front velocity $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ is smooth. Any symmetric smoothed version f of the sign function “sgn” must have $\lambda = P_{\text{pin}} f(0) = 0$, which implies $p = \kappa$ by Eq. (13). But if the droplet is pinned in a noncircular shape, then κ will not be constant around the droplets circumference, hence the pressure field inside the droplet will not be constant.⁷² By Eq. (1), the velocity \mathbf{u} will not be zero which contradicts the droplet being pinned. Note that a smooth but steep function f will lead to a slowly creeping liquid, but only a discontinuous f can truly pin the liquid. Moreover, our model with the sgn function is a physically motivated description.^{5,38–44,63–68}

Our model, with Eq. (13), is nonlinear and introduces the velocity into the pressure boundary conditions. Moreover, it is local, meaning that multiple parts of the boundary Γ can be pinned and unpinned simultaneously. Furthermore, the regions where the droplet is pinned/unpinned are not known *a priori*; this must be determined as part of the solution. Our pinning model is similar to the Signorini problem in elasticity,⁷³ which models the deformation of an elastic body against a rigid obstacle and utilizes a contact variable to enforce the rigid constraint similarly to our λ . Our model can be increased in complexity (see Sec. II D 3) to account for more interesting contact line dynamics.^{54–57} We are able to include this model into our variational formulation of Sec. III, and we have a method of solving for the velocity, pressure, and λ .^{25,74} Knowing λ immediately yields where the boundary is pinned/unpinned.

One important issue here is the three-phase line singularity,^{75–77} which originates because of an apparent paradox between the no-slip boundary condition on the walls of the device and the fact that the contact line moves. Our formulation is only a two dimensional description, as appropriate for planar devices. We do not track the location of the three-phase line in our model in three dimensions; we only have an “averaged” description of the liquid-gas interface. Recall that the velocity field in the z direction is parabolic; a fundamental assumption in Hele-Shaw flow. Thus, in our

TABLE III. Simulation parameters for all experiments in Sec. IV. Note the large viscosity of glycerin, which varies significantly with the volume fraction of water. $\theta_{b,0\text{ V}}$, $\theta_{b,25\text{ V}}$, $\theta_{b,50\text{ V}}$, and $\theta_{b,65\text{ V}}$ are the contact angles on the bottom plate of the EWOD device at 0, 25, 50, and 65 V, respectively. Each simulation uses a different value of U_0 so the maximum nondimensional velocity is close to unity. This also causes Re, Ca, α , β , and t_0 to differ.

	Moving glycerin ^a	Splitting water ^b	Splitting glycerin ^c	Joining water ^d	Units
σ_{lg}	0.064 22	0.071 99	0.0657	0.071 99	J/m ²
μ	384.467	0.89	59.9	0.89	g/m s
ρ	1240.40	996.93	1208.5	996.93	kg/m ³
H	0.1	0.07	0.1	0.1	mm
L_{Elec}	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5	mm
L	3.0	4.2	4.5	4.5	mm
U_0	0.8	20	2	15	mm/s
t_0	3750	210	2250	300	ms
P_0	21.41	17.14	14.6	15.998	N/m ²
c_{pin}	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	J/m ²
D_{visc}	5.000	0.359	5.100	1.995	N s/m ²
Re	2.5810×10^{-4}	1.57	4.0351×10^{-3}	1.6802	nondim.
Ca	4.7894×10^{-3}	2.4726×10^{-4}	1.8234×10^{-3}	1.8544×10^{-4}	nondim.
α	3.7085×10^{-5}	2.3265×10^{-2}	3.3110×10^{-4}	1.4021×10^{-2}	nondim.
β	51.725	10.6815	44.310	4.5063	nondim.
$\theta_{b,0\text{ V}}$	107.35	117.0	107.35	111.62	deg
$\theta_{b,25\text{ V}}$...	90.0	deg
$\theta_{b,50\text{ V}}$	68.46	deg
$\theta_{b,65\text{ V}}$	64.32	70.01	deg

^aSection IV A, 90%/10% glycerin/water mixture.

^bSection IV B.

^cSection IV C, 80%/20% glycerin/water mixture.

^dSection IV D.

model the contact line singularity is not present. Other explanations have been posed recently that resolve the paradox and imply that there is no singularity.^{62,67,68,70,71}

3. Including hysteresis into contact line dynamics

Our model can be extended to include more interesting contact line dynamics. Contact angle hysteresis, which refers to the difference in contact angles between the advancing and receding fronts, acts as an additional type of resistance to interface motion.²¹ It is a direct consequence of contact line pinning and can be seen when water droplets stick to the side of a solid surface. For more information see Refs. 38–44.

The main effect of contact angle hysteresis is to limit the speed of motion of droplets moving on substrates. If only contact line pinning is assumed, with experimentally measured values for c_{pin} , then our model predicts EWOD driven droplet motion up to ten times faster than in experiment.²¹ In our prior work,²¹ this was compensated by introducing an *ad hoc* “hysteresis constant.”

In the present paper, we can account for hysteresis by adding another term to the pressure boundary conditions:

$$p = \kappa + E + \lambda + D_{\text{visc}} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad (14)$$

where $D_{\text{visc}} > 0$ is a constant. The $D_{\text{visc}} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ term is a straightforward modification of the interface force threshold model in the previous section (see Fig. 6). Increasing D_{visc} locally reduces the speed of droplet interface motion. This can account for the extra resistive effect of contact angle hysteresis.

Moreover, we can modify the linear term to be slightly non-linear, e.g.,

$$p = \kappa + E + [\lambda + D_{\text{visc}} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} + G_{\text{fric}}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})], \quad (15)$$

where, for example, G_{fric} is a monotone decreasing function,

$$G_{\text{fric}}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) := -\frac{P_{\text{pin}}}{\pi/2} \arctan\left(\frac{D_{\text{visc}}}{P_{\text{pin}} / \frac{\pi}{2}} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}\right). \quad (16)$$

This type of force versus velocity relationship for contact line motion can incorporate insights from atomistic or molecular dynamic studies, such as in the work of Refs. 54–57. It introduces a “damping” effect that retards local interface motion. Choosing D_{visc} properly captures the correct time scale of interface motion. This is the *only* fitting parameter in our model; the value of c_{pin} for the line pinning was obtained independently through an in-house inclined plane droplet experiment (see Table III). We emphasize that available data for c_{pin} and D_{visc} are not readily available in the literature.

E. Final equation summary

We rewrite the governing equations in an equivalent form, which will be convenient for our numerical implementation:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \beta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$p\mathbf{n} - \kappa\mathbf{n} - \lambda\mathbf{n} - D_{\text{visc}}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n} = E\mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma,$$

where the first equation is conservation of momentum and the second is conservation of mass; E is the electrowetting forcing from Sec. II C 2. The third equation is the pressure boundary condition multiplied by the outward pointing unit normal vector \mathbf{n} ; this will be useful in the next section. For simplicity, we omit the extra G_{fric} term. As noted previously, the pinning variable λ is defined by

$$\lambda = P_{\text{pin}} \operatorname{sgn}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (18)$$

Note that Laplace's equation for pressure [see Eq. (1)] has been replaced by the second equation in Eq. (17) (incompressibility).⁷⁸ The equations in Eq. (17) are more convenient because they give rise to a mixed variational formulation of the PDE model that allows the pressure boundary condition to be included as a natural boundary condition, which permits computing the curvature κ implicitly (see Sec. III B). Lastly, we recall the interface motion equation (3) from Sec. II B 2

$$\partial_t \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (19)$$

III. VARIATIONAL FORMULATION

We present a time discretization of the EWOD fluid equations with contact line pinning followed by a variational formulation of the governing PDE. Variational forms appear in elasticity under the name of virtual displacements. They are standard⁷² and allow the use of finite element methods^{79,80} which are among the most efficient, flexible, and accurate numerical techniques in science and engineering for solving PDEs.

A. Time-discrete EWOD equations

Next, we derive the time-discrete version of Eqs. (17) and (19) by first partitioning the time axis into time steps δt_i , for i in some finite index set. Let Ω^i and Γ^i be the fluid domain and liquid-gas interface at time t_i , respectively (see Figs. 3 and 5, and the nomenclature in Table I). Then the semi-implicit, time-discrete version of Eq. (17) is listed as

$$\alpha \frac{\mathbf{u}^{i+1} - \mathbf{u}^i}{\delta t_{i+1}} + \beta \mathbf{u}^{i+1} + \nabla p^{i+1} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^i, \quad (20)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^{i+1} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^i,$$

$$p^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i - \kappa^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i - \lambda^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i - D_{\text{visc}}(\mathbf{u}^{i+1} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i) \mathbf{n}^i = E^i \mathbf{n}^i \quad \text{on } \Gamma^i,$$

where \mathbf{u}^i is the (known) vector velocity at time index t_i , and \mathbf{n}^i is the outward pointing normal vector of Γ^i . Here, we used a backward Euler finite difference approximation of the time derivative term $\partial_t \mathbf{u}$. The geometry is kept explicit in Eq. (20) and the solution variables (\mathbf{u}^{i+1} , p^{i+1} , λ^{i+1}) are implicit. The curvature κ^{i+1} is an approximation of the curvature of Γ^{i+1} and is treated semi-implicitly (see Sec. III B).

Treating the solution variables implicitly while keeping the domain explicit is called a *semi-implicit* method. We chose this because it is more convenient to compute on the current domain Ω^i than the future unknown domain Ω^{i+1} . If

there is no pinning (i.e., $\lambda=0$), then it leads to a linear set of equations that describes the velocity and pressure at each time step. This is useful in our iterative method when solving the system with pinning $\lambda \neq 0$ (see Sec. III F). Keeping the solution variables implicit ensures numerical stability, while avoiding an unnecessarily small time step.^{81,82} This is especially true for the curvature.⁸³⁻⁸⁵

Now we can approximate how a point on the interface moves using a time-discrete version of Eq. (19),

$$\mathbf{x}^{i+1} := \mathbf{x}^i + \delta t_{i+1} \mathbf{u}^{i+1}(\mathbf{x}^i), \quad (21)$$

where \mathbf{u}^{i+1} is the velocity (defined on Ω^i) at the next time index, \mathbf{x}^i is a point on Γ^i , and \mathbf{x}^{i+1} is the corresponding point on Γ^{i+1} .

B. Implicit curvature calculation

The curvature κ^{i+1} is treated in an implicit way to avoid an unnecessarily small time-step restriction to guarantee stability.⁸³ In the following, we show how to discretize (in time) the vector curvature $\kappa^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i$.

First, we briefly review some differential geometry.^{60,86,87} The ‘‘surface gradient’’ on a surface Γ is denoted ∇_Γ and is a vector operator. If Γ is a one dimensional curve, $\nabla_\Gamma = \mathbf{t} \partial_s$ (i.e., ∂_s is the derivative with respect to arc length, \mathbf{t} is the unit tangent vector). The Laplace–Beltrami operator or ‘‘surface Laplacian’’ is defined as $\Delta_\Gamma = \nabla_\Gamma \cdot \nabla_\Gamma$, and is just the second derivative with respect to arc length in the case of a one dimensional curve. The vector curvature $\kappa^i = \kappa^i \mathbf{n}^i$ of Γ^i satisfies

$$\kappa^i = -\Delta_\Gamma \mathbf{x}^i, \quad (22)$$

treating \mathbf{x}^i as a parametrization of the interface Γ^i , with \mathbf{n}^i being the outward pointing unit normal vector of Γ^i . Equation (22) is general in that it is true for curves and surfaces.

For the purpose of our time-discrete problem, we need to calculate $\kappa^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i$ because it appears in the pressure boundary condition. This is accomplished by defining an appropriate approximation⁸³ and using Eq. (21),

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i &= -\Delta_\Gamma \mathbf{x}^{i+1} = -\Delta_\Gamma (\mathbf{x}^i + \delta t_{i+1} \mathbf{u}^{i+1}) \\ &= \kappa^i \mathbf{n}^i - \delta t_{i+1} \Delta_\Gamma \mathbf{u}^{i+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which is semi-implicit because everything is computed on the current boundary Γ^i .

C. Variational form

We proceed to derive a variational formulation of the PDE by the standard means,^{72,80} as that will facilitate the use of a finite element method. Let \mathbf{v} be an arbitrary smooth vector field test function for the velocity \mathbf{u} . Multiply the first equation in Eq. (20) by \mathbf{v} and integrate

$$\frac{\alpha}{\delta t_{i+1}} \int_{\Omega^i} (\mathbf{u}^{i+1} - \mathbf{u}^i) \cdot \mathbf{v} + \beta \int_{\Omega^i} \mathbf{u}^{i+1} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \int_{\Omega^i} \nabla p^{i+1} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0. \quad (24)$$

Next, integrate the pressure gradient term by parts, plug in the boundary condition in Eq. (20), and rearrange to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{\alpha}{\delta t_{i+1}} + \beta \right) \int_{\Omega^i} \mathbf{u}^{i+1} \cdot \mathbf{v} - \int_{\Omega^i} P^{i+1} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} + \int_{\Gamma^i} \lambda^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i \cdot \mathbf{v} \\
& + D_{\text{visc}} \int_{\Gamma^i} (\mathbf{u}^{i+1} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i)(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i) + \int_{\Gamma^i} \kappa^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i \cdot \mathbf{v} \\
& = \frac{\alpha}{\delta t_{i+1}} \int_{\Omega^i} \mathbf{u}^i \cdot \mathbf{v} - \int_{\Gamma^i} E^i \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i. \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

The semi-implicit curvature is rewritten by using Eq. (23),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Gamma^i} \kappa^{i+1} \mathbf{n}^i \cdot \mathbf{v} = - \int_{\Gamma^i} \Delta_{\Gamma^i} (\mathbf{x}^i + \delta t_{i+1} \mathbf{u}^{u+1}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \\
& = \int_{\Gamma^i} \nabla_{\Gamma^i} (\mathbf{x}^i + \delta t_{i+1} \mathbf{u}^{u+1}) \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{v}, \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

and integration by parts on Γ^i of $\Delta_{\Gamma^i} = \nabla_{\Gamma^i} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma^i}$. Hence, the momentum equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{\alpha}{\delta t_{i+1}} + \beta \right) \int_{\Omega^i} \mathbf{u}^{i+1} \cdot \mathbf{v} - \int_{\Omega^i} P^{i+1} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} + \int_{\Gamma^i} \lambda^{i+1} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i \\
& + D_{\text{visc}} \int_{\Gamma^i} (\mathbf{u}^{i+1} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i)(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i) + \delta t_{i+1} \int_{\Gamma^i} \nabla_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{u}^{u+1} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{v} \\
& = \frac{\alpha}{\delta t_{i+1}} \int_{\Omega^i} \mathbf{u}^i \cdot \mathbf{v} - \int_{\Gamma^i} E^i \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}^i - \int_{\Gamma^i} \nabla_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{x}^i \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma^i} \mathbf{v}. \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

The variational form of the second (conservation of mass) equation in Eq. (20) is obtained simply by multiplying by an arbitrary smooth test function q and integrating

$$\int_{\Omega^i} q \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^{i+1} = 0. \quad (28)$$

In the following sections, we define $\mathbf{u}^{\text{old}} := \mathbf{u}^i$ and we drop the time-index i notation to simplify the presentation.

D. Variational inequality for pinning

The variational formulation provides a natural way to include the contact line pinning model. This is a crucial instance where the variational technique is able to improve on our previous level set method.²¹ It is not known, to the best of our knowledge, how to implement the discontinuous switch (see Fig. 6) in a stable and accurate way within the level set method.

In our framework, we treat λ as an extra unknown that must be solved for and acts as an inequality constraint on the velocity \mathbf{u} . Hence, an additional equation to Eqs. (27) and (28) is required to close the system. Therefore, we append a variational inequality to our previous variational form.^{74,88,89}

The derivation is as follows.

First, let Λ be the set of functions on Γ defined by

$$\Lambda = \{ \mu : |\mu| \leq P_{\text{pin}} \}, \quad (29)$$

which is a convex set. Physically, it is the set of (nondimensional) pressure functions on the interface with absolute value limited to P_{pin} . Assume that the pinning relation is true [i.e., $\lambda = P_{\text{pin}} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})$]. Then the following inequality:

$$(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \mu \leq (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \lambda, \quad (30)$$

is true for all μ in Λ for the following reason. If $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$, Eq. (30) is clearly satisfied. If $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} > 0$, then $\lambda = P_{\text{pin}}$ so

$$\mu \leq \lambda, \quad (31)$$

because μ is in Λ . Multiplying Eq. (31) by $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} > 0$ gives Eq. (30). If $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} < 0$, then $\lambda = -P_{\text{pin}}$ thus

$$\mu \geq \lambda, \quad (32)$$

because μ is in Λ . Multiplying Eq. (32) by $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} < 0$ gives Eq. (30). Equation (30) is called a *complementarity* condition between the normal velocity and the pinning variable. Upon rearranging Eq. (30) and integrating, we get

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mu - \lambda) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \text{ in } \Lambda, \quad (33)$$

which is the *variational inequality* we need to complete our formulation. The preceding argument shows that assuming the pinning model $\lambda = P_{\text{pin}} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})$ implies Eq. (33). It is also true that Eq. (33) implies the pinning model,^{74,88} so they are equivalent. We omit the details.

The variational inequality allows us to treat λ as an additional unknown and embeds the relation (18) into the act of solving the weak formulation. This is advantageous because it avoids introducing a discontinuous function into our method and it captures the inequality constraint exactly.

E. Variational equations

For convenience, we introduce the following notation. We define the bilinear and linear forms,

$$\begin{aligned}
a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{\delta t} + \beta \right) \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \delta t \int_{\Gamma} \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{v} \\
& + D_{\text{visc}} \int_{\Gamma} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}), \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

$$b(\mathbf{v}, q) = - \int_{\Omega} q \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}, \quad (35)$$

$$\chi(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{\alpha}{\delta t} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u}^{\text{old}} \cdot \mathbf{v} - \int_{\Gamma} E \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \int_{\Gamma} \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{v}. \quad (36)$$

With Eqs. (34)–(36), we can rewrite the variational form more concisely: find a solution (\mathbf{u}, p, λ) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + b(\mathbf{v}, p) + \int_{\Gamma} \lambda(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) &= \chi(\mathbf{v}), \\
b(\mathbf{u}, q) &= 0, \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mu - \lambda) \leq 0,$$

for all smooth test functions \mathbf{v} and q defined on Ω and all μ in Λ . This is called a mixed variational formulation and falls into the framework of Refs. 78 and 90. Thus, our algorithm

consists of solving Eq. (37) to obtain the velocity, at each time step t_i , followed by using the update equation (21) to move the droplet domain Ω . The proper function spaces to use in Eq. (37) and its well posedness are discussed in Ref. 25 and a future publication.

F. Finite element method

1. Solving the variational equations

The variational setting that we transformed our model into naturally facilitates the use of finite elements.^{79,80,90} In solving Eq. (37), we use a finite element discretization. This involves expanding the solution variables (\mathbf{u}, p, λ) and the test functions (\mathbf{v}, q, μ) using a finite-dimensional set of basis functions. This translates Eq. (37) into a finite dimensional linear system that must be solved at each time step. In our case, there is an inequality constraint on part of the solution vector due to the third equation in Eq. (37). This requires the use of an iterative method to solve the system in order to compute the pinning model correctly.²⁵

The finite-dimensional basis functions are obtained by first partitioning the domain Ω (and Γ) into a set of triangles (and sides). On each triangle, we represent the velocity \mathbf{u} with quadratic polynomials for each component, and a linear polynomial for the pressure p ; the piecewise polynomials for \mathbf{u} and p are globally continuous (Taylor–Hood elements^{78,90}). On each side of the polygonal boundary, λ is represented by a constant value. In addition, we use piecewise quadratic curves to represent the interface Γ (i.e., the triangles on Γ have a curved side on Γ). For the “curved” triangles, isoparametric elements are used;^{79,80,90} this is done to ensure accurate computation of surface tension forces (i.e., the curvature).²⁵

2. Updating the interface

Updating the domain mesh can be done using \mathbf{u} and Eq. (21) evaluated at the mesh node positions. However, if the droplet develops a thin neck region, then the gradient of velocity can be quite large across the neck. Updating the mesh with this velocity would lead to severe mesh distortion. A simple remedy for this is to use a smooth extension of $\mathbf{u}|_{\Gamma}$ to a new vector function \mathbf{u}_{ext} defined on all of Ω for updating the domain. This can be done by letting \mathbf{u}_{ext} solve the following vector Laplace equation (harmonic extension):²⁶

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_{\text{ext}} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u}_{\text{ext}} &= \mathbf{u} \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

This guarantees that the shape of the domain will update the same (because $\mathbf{u}_{\text{ext}} = \mathbf{u}$ on Γ). It is a classical result that the solution of Eq. (38) minimizes⁷² $\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \mathbf{u}_{\text{ext}}|^2$, which is desirable because large gradients in the velocity cause mesh distortion.²⁶ This allows for smoothly updating the mesh node positions at each time step. Of course, in the case of large deformations even this method will fail, and a remedy for this is discussed in the next section.

3. Handling large deformations and topological changes

One of the drawbacks of using the front tracking method is the presence of the mesh. Because the interface is moving, the underlying mesh must move with it. If the droplet is undergoing a large deformation, such as a splitting motion, this can cause mesh distortion (i.e., elongated triangles in the droplet triangulation and/or inverted triangles). It is known that distorted meshes can adversely affect the accuracy of the finite element solution.^{79,91} Therefore, any explicit front tracking method must also have a mechanism to correct severe mesh distortion.

We handle large mesh deformations by using harmonic extension (see the previous section), mesh smoothing, and periodic remeshing. Allowing for topological changes requires a more advanced method. In this paper, we use a hybrid variational/level-set method developed in Ref. 26, which hinges on the fact that topological changes are rare events in time and local in space—we use the level-set method only when and where we need it. The hybrid method, to be reported in a future publication, exploits the best characteristics of both the level set and variational front tracking methods. We give some highlights of the algorithm in the following list. For more details, see Ref. 26.

- (1) Mesh smoothing and remeshing. We use standard techniques, such as optimization based mesh smoothing⁹² and remeshing with the program “TRIANGLE.”⁹³
- (2) Updating mesh topology. We use the level set method during just one time step to guide the evolution of the explicit finite element mesh through a topological change.
- (3) Mesh reconstruction after the topological change. We use an active contour-based minimization approach to adjust the mesh in the local region of the topological change and conform to the zero level contour of the level set function. This provides a new numerically sound Lagrangian mesh for continuation of the variational front-tracking finite element method.

IV. RESULTS

We present direct visual comparisons and quantitative error measurements between our simulation method and four different experiments available from our collaborators at UCLA. In each section, we describe the experimental setup and the corresponding simulation results. The inclusion of contact line pinning and depinning in our model is required to predict the experimentally observed fluid shapes. Without it, the simulated fluid would always return to perfectly circular shapes under the action of surface tension, something that does not happen in experiments (see especially Fig. 12 below). Simulations for all experiments were run using the parameters listed in Table III.

A physical parameter D_{visc} was fit to the cases that we compare to. Accurate data for D_{visc} for realistic substrates/liquids are not easily available thus we experimented with different values for D_{visc} . For example, the splitting water droplet experiment in Sec. IV B splits at time $t=131.4$ ms




FIG. 7. Visual description of our error metric [Eq. (39)]. Experimental and simulated droplet boundaries are taken from the last frame of Fig. 9 and are replotted three times above for clarity. The shaded region in the left panel corresponds to the numerator of Eq. (39), i.e., the set of points denoted by $\Omega_{\text{exp}} \cup \Omega_{\text{sim}} - \Omega_{\text{exp}} \cap \Omega_{\text{sim}}$. The center panel highlights the experimental droplet (shaded region). The right panel highlights the simulated droplet.

for $D_{\text{visc}} = 0.359 \text{ N s/m}^2$ (see Table III). Increasing D_{visc} by 20% increases the time to split by 16.8%. Decreasing D_{visc} by 20% decreases the time to split by 16.7%. This suggests a reasonable sensitivity for this parameter. We note that the general shape evolution looks visually the same (disregarding the time scale) when varying D_{visc} .

We illustrate where the interface is pinned and not pinned in the visual comparisons by evaluating the behavior of λ and plotting the pinned portion of that boundary in gray. If $|\lambda| < P_{\text{pin}}$ on some region of the interface, then we say that region is pinned since this guarantees that $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ (recall Sec. III D). However, if $|\lambda| = P_{\text{pin}}$, this does *not* imply that $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \neq 0$. It is still possible that $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$, which is consistent with our formulation. In other words, a droplet could have zero velocity everywhere but certain portions of the boundary may barely overcome the pinning force yet not have enough force left to move.

For experiments exhibiting topological changes, a numerical tolerance was used in allowing pinchoff of thin neck regions. Since the assumed vertically averaged Hele-Shaw model is meaningless for horizontal length scales much smaller than the channel height H , setting this pinchoff tolerance to $H/2$ is reasonable (recall that the device height H is approximately 20 times smaller than the electrode pitch and typical droplet size).

The error between the experiment and simulation, at each time, is defined as the area of the liquid domain mismatch (left panel in Fig. 7) divided by the sum of the areas of the experimental and simulated domains (center and right panels in Fig. 7),

$$\text{error}(t) = \frac{|\Omega_{\text{exp}}(t) \cup \Omega_{\text{sim}}(t) - \Omega_{\text{exp}}(t) \cap \Omega_{\text{sim}}(t)|}{|\Omega_{\text{exp}}(t)| + |\Omega_{\text{sim}}(t)|}. \quad (39)$$

Here Ω_{exp} and Ω_{sim} denote the measured and simulated liquid regions, $|\cdot|$ denotes the area of each region, and \cup , \cap , and $-$ denote set union, intersection, and difference, respectively. If the experiment and simulation match perfectly, then $\text{error} = 0$; if they are completely disjoint, $\text{error} = 1$. We computed Eq. (39) via image processing tools contained in MATLAB, in addition to using a level set active contour algorithm⁹⁴ to extract a closed polygon representing the experimental droplet's boundary. With this definition, the quantitative error between the experiment and our simulation, for all the experiments, is shown in Fig. 8.

The order of cases is organized from the easiest to the most difficult to model. We start with motion of just one droplet on a simple path (Sec. IV A), then we consider splitting of a single droplet, of water, and then glycerin (Secs. IV B and IV C), and we end with the joining of two water droplets that leads to a final combined droplet that remains pinned in a significantly noncircular shape (Sec. IV D), a shape that could not be modeled without the inclusion of pinning.

A. Moving glycerin droplet

The EWOD device in this experiment has only two electrodes arranged in a horizontal fashion with a droplet of glycerin being actuated. A voltage of 50 V is first applied to the left electrode with 0 V on the right. This causes the droplet to flow to the left electrode. The voltage actuation is




FIG. 8. Error between experimental droplet shape and simulated shape vs normalized time for all experiments. The error was measured using Eq. (39). Not all experiments have the same number of video frames (i.e., the experiment corresponding to Fig. 10 has only six video frames for the whole experiment). The overall error is reasonable. We also measured the frame-to-frame error for all experiments except Fig. 10. The frame-to-frame error is defined as the difference, via Eq. (39), between the extracted polygonal representation of the experimental drop in consecutive video frames. The average frame-to-frame error (over each experiment) for extracting a polygonal representation of the experimental droplet boundary is less than 0.7%. The maximum frame-to-frame error is less than 2%.




FIG. 9. Moving glycerin droplet experimental results with simulation overlay. The solid curve represents the simulated droplet boundary with small grayed regions (near the electrode edge) denoting pinned portions of the boundary. Frames show video snapshots of the experiment (experimental data courtesy of C. J. Kim and Jian Gong at UCLA). The applied voltage (50 V) switches between the left and right electrodes every 2 s. Each electrode is square with a side length of 1.5 mm. Simulation and device parameters are given in Table III. Note the large time scale because glycerin is highly viscous. The simulation follows the experiment fairly well, except there is some lagging in the “tail” region (enhanced online). [URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3254022.1>]

kept constant for two seconds when it switches to 0 V on the left, 50 V on the right, which causes the droplet to switch direction of motion. Again, the voltage actuation is kept constant until after two seconds it switches back, causing the droplet to also switch its direction of travel. This process repeats.

Figure 9 shows a comparison between the simulation and the experiment. There is some uncertainty in the physical parameters of the fluid in this case. Glycerin is highly hygroscopic⁹⁵ and, in particular, its viscosity varies significantly with only a small volume fraction of water;⁹⁵ viscosity values vary by a factor of 20 for water percentages from 0% to 20%. Moreover, temperature also has a large effect: a 10 °C change (for low water volume fraction) can affect its viscosity by a factor of 2. The experiments were not performed in a humidity controlled environment, thus there is some uncertainty in the actual viscosity of the fluid. After discussing the details of the experiments with our UCLA collaborators, we found it reasonable to assume a water percentage between 20% and 10% at 20 °C. Because there is no way of ascertaining the exact composition of the fluid, we had no other choice.

The pinning coefficient $c_{\text{pin}}=3.0$ mN/m was taken to be the same as for water. We do not have data for the pinning coefficient of glycerin, but we do have data for water (from our past inclined plane experiments which were conducted with a range of liquids that included water but not glycerin). The drag coefficient $D_{\text{visc}}=5.0$ N s/m² was fit to ensure that the simulated droplet moved with the same speed as in the experiment. The value of D_{visc} is much higher than for water (see Sec. IV B). This is reasonable given the higher viscosity of glycerin. Also recall that viscosity affects the time scale of motion, which varies considerably with water volume fraction. In this case, we assumed a 90%/10% glycerin/water mixture. Assuming a higher water percentage produces significantly higher values for D_{visc} , but this does not significantly affect the shape evolution of the droplet.

B. Splitting water droplet

In Fig. 10, an overhead view of an EWOD device with three electrodes running left to right is depicted with a splitting droplet. The voltage actuation, from left to right, is 25, 0, and 25 V, and is constant throughout the split. In the first frame, an initial near-circular droplet is shown just before voltage activation. After the voltage is turned on, the liquid-gas interface over the left and right electrodes deforms and induces a low pressure region there. The regions where no voltage is activated remain at high pressure. In the subsequent frames, the droplet is pulled from the left and right sides, while it is pushed in from the top and bottom. The droplet elongates along the horizontal dimension and is being pinched in the vertical direction. This causes two daughter droplets to form on the left and right sides, with a thin neck joining them. The neck eventually gets so thin that it snaps due to capillary instability. The two smaller droplets then continue moving to the left and right electrodes because of the pressure differential created from the voltage actuation. Finally, the two droplets come to rest on the two 25 V electrodes. The total time of this experiment is approximately 167 ms.

The contact line pinning coefficient is taken from our past, independent inclined-plane experiments and was found to be $c_{\text{pin}}=3$ mN/m. The interface drag constant is chosen to make the simulation time scale match the experiment: $D_{\text{visc}}=0.359$ N s/m². See Fig. 10 for an overlay of the variational simulation with the experiment. The value of D_{visc} is reasonable and is comparable to the values listed in Ref. 96 for a column of fluid comprised of de-ionized water between two parylene coated electrodes.

C. Splitting glycerin droplet

The EWOD device in this experiment has three electrodes arranged in a horizontal fashion with a glycerin droplet being actuated to split apart. The device construction is




FIG. 10. Splitting water droplet experimental results with simulation overlay (solid curve is the simulation). Six frames show video snapshots of the experiment (experimental data courtesy of C. J. Kim and Sung Kwon Cho at UCLA) (Ref. 21). The three electrodes shown in each frame have activation voltages (from left to right) of 25, 0, and 25 V. Each electrode is approximately square with a side length of 1.4 mm. The gray regions of the simulated boundary indicate where the interface is pinned (i.e., cannot move in the normal direction). Only one parameter D_{visc} was fit to the simulation in order to match the time scale of the experiment.

not the same as in the previous cases (see Table III). A voltage of 65 V is applied to the left and right electrodes, with 0 V applied on the center electrode which causes the droplet to pull apart. The voltage actuation is constant throughout the experiment. Eventually, a thin neck develops between two smaller droplets and the neck pinches.

Figure 11 shows a comparison between the simulation and the experiment. Just as in Sec. IV A, there is some uncertainty in the physical parameters of the fluid. Here, we assume an 80%/20% glycerin/water mixture with similar values for the pinning coefficient and viscous damping as in Sec. IV A ($c_{\text{pin}}=3$ mN/m and $D_{\text{visc}}=5.1$ N s/m²). The value of c_{pin} was taken to be the same as for water and D_{visc} was fit to match the time scale of this experiment. If we

assumed the same glycerin/water mixture as in Sec. IV A (i.e., 90%/10%), then even with setting $c_{\text{pin}}=0$ and $D_{\text{visc}}=0$ the simulated droplet moved significantly slower than the experiment. In other words, the viscosity was overestimated. Therefore, we thought it reasonable to assume a higher water percentage in this case (lower effective viscosity). This experiment was not run simultaneously with the experiment in Sec. IV A, so there is no reason to assume the fluid parameters to be the same.

D. Joining water droplets

This experiment uses the same EWOD device as in Sec. IV C, except that two droplets of water are being actuated to




FIG. 11. Splitting glycerin droplet experimental results with simulation overlay (solid curve is the simulation). Frames show video snapshots of the experiment (experimental data courtesy of C. J. Kim and Jian Gong at UCLA). The applied voltage (65 V on the left and right electrodes) causes the droplet to be pulled apart and eventually split. Each electrode is approximately square with a side length of 1.5 mm. The match between the simulation and experiment is very good. In particular, note the relaxation of the interface immediately after pinchoff ($t=1100$ ms). The only difference is that, in the experiment, slightly more fluid flows into the left satellite droplet than into the right droplet (as compared to the simulation). Also note the grayed regions of the boundary indicating pinned portions of the interface (enhanced online). [URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3254022.2>]




FIG. 12. Joining water droplets experimental results with simulation overlay (solid curve is the simulation). Frames show video snapshots of the experiment (experimental data courtesy of C. J. Kim and Jian Gong at UCLA). The applied voltage (65 V on the center electrode only) causes the two side droplets to flow together and eventually merge. Each electrode is approximately square with a side length of 1.5 mm. The simulation matches the experiment fairly well in the first four frames. However, the pinning behavior in the experiment is significantly different than the simulation in the last two frames. We believe that the sharp snap together of the droplets during coalescence makes this case more sensitive to modeling uncertainties than the move or split cases (enhanced online). [URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3254022.3>]

join together. A voltage of 65 V is applied to the center electrode, with 0 V applied to the left and right electrodes, which causes the two droplets to flow together. The voltage actuation is constant throughout the experiment. Eventually, the two droplets connect and merge together. Figure 12 shows a comparison between our simulation and the experiment. The grayed regions of the solid curve in the figure represent pinned portions of the boundary (i.e., these regions of the interface do not move in the normal direction). In the last frame, the droplet has essentially come to rest. The lack of pinned regions is because the droplet is asymptotically approaching a pinned state. Running the simulation to a time level of $t=2.8$ s shows a more completely pinned droplet. However, the experimental recording was terminated much earlier. The difference between the simulated droplet in the last frame of Fig. 12 and the pinned state at $t=2.8$ s is of the order of micrometers.⁹⁷

V. CONCLUSION

We presented a model of fluid droplet motion in planar EWOD devices. Our model is derived from first principles, where possible, is based on independent experimental data where first-principles descriptions are not feasible, and it contains only one fitting parameter. The fluid dynamics is modeled by Hele-Shaw type equations with a focus on including the relevant boundary phenomena. Specifically, we included a physically meaningful contact line force-threshold pinning model, which was motivated by experimental observations in the literature. This description is sufficiently simple to be incorporated into device length and time scale simulations yet it enables much improved predictions of device behavior.

We also presented a semi-implicit variational front-tracking method that is able to handle surface tension, conservation of mass, our nonlinear contact line pinning description, and viscous interface damping in a straightforward manner. The model was discretized via the finite element

method using MATLAB/C++ and yields simulations that evaluate between 5 and 15 min on a laptop and that compared very well to experiments. Specifically, we compared our simulations to prior available experimental data for four different cases of droplet motion that include splitting, joining, and partial pinning of droplets and observed good agreement. Our model is fast but accurate. To our best knowledge, it is the only model currently available that can simulate total system dynamics, on device length and time scales, but includes key loss effects due to both contact angle saturation and line pinning. The model better predicts experimentally observed electrowetting behavior and is appropriate for system design, optimization, and control.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to acknowledge the experimental data provided by C.-J. Kim, Sung Kwon Cho, and Jian Gong at UCLA. For funding support, we acknowledge the NSF-VIGRE grant of the Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park. R.H.N. was also partially supported by NSF Grant Nos. DMS-0505454 and DMS-0807811. B.S. and R.H.N. are currently supported by NSF Grant No. CBET 0754983 (program managers Maria Burka and William Schultz) for this research.

¹B. Berge and J. Peseux, "Variable focal lens controlled by an external voltage: An application of electrowetting," *Eur. Phys. J. E* **3**, 159 (2000).

²S. K. Cho, H. Moon, and C.-J. Kim, "Creating, transporting, cutting, and merging liquid droplets by electrowetting-based actuation for digital microfluidic circuits," *J. Microelectromech. Syst.* **12**, 70 (2003).

³R. A. Hayes and B. J. Feenstra, "Video-speed electronic paper based on electrowetting," *Nature (London)* **425**, 383 (2003).

⁴J. Lee, H. Moon, J. Fowler, T. Schoellhammer, and C.-J. Kim, "Electrowetting and electrowetting-on-dielectric for microscale liquid handling," *Sens. Actuators, A* **95**, 259 (2002).

⁵F. Mugele and J.-C. Baret, "Electrowetting: From basics to applications," *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **17**, R705 (2005).

⁶M. G. Pollack, R. B. Fair, and A. D. Shenderov, "Electrowetting-based actuation of liquid droplets for microfluidic applications," *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **77**, 1725 (2000).

- ⁷C. Quilliet and B. Berge, "Electrowetting: a recent outbreak," *Curr. Opin. Colloid Interface Sci.* **6**, 34 (2001).
- ⁸H. Ren, R. B. Fair, M. G. Pollack, and E. J. Shaughnessy, "Dynamics of electro-wetting droplet transport," *Sens. Actuators, B* **87**, 201 (2002).
- ⁹T. Roques-Carmes, R. A. Hayes, B. J. Feenstra, and L. J. M. Schlangen. "Liquid behavior inside a reflective display pixel based on electrowetting," *J. Appl. Phys.* **95**, 4389 (2004).
- ¹⁰T. Roques-Carmes, R. A. Hayes, and L. J. M. Schlangen, "A physical model describing the electro-optic behavior of switchable optical elements based on electrowetting," *J. Appl. Phys.* **96**, 6267 (2004).
- ¹¹F. Saeki, J. Baum, H. Moon, J.-Y. Yoon, C.-J. Kim, and R. L. Garrell, "Electrowetting on dielectrics (ewod): Reducing voltage requirements for microfluidics," *Polym. Mater. Sci. Eng.* **85**, 12 (2001).
- ¹²E. Seyrat and R. A. Hayes, "Amorphous fluoropolymers as insulators for reversible low-voltage electrowetting," *J. Appl. Phys.* **90**, 1383 (2001).
- ¹³H. J. J. Verheijen and W. J. Prins, "Reversible electrowetting and trapping of charge: Model and experiments," *Langmuir* **15**, 6616 (1999).
- ¹⁴C. G. Cooney, C.-Y. Chen, M. R. Emerling, A. Nadim, and J. D. Sterling, "Electrowetting droplet microfluidics on a single planar surface," *Microfluid. Nanofluid.* **2**, 435 (2006).
- ¹⁵N. Kumari, V. Bahadur, and S. V. Garimella, "Electrical actuation of electrically conducting and insulating droplets using ac and dc voltages," *J. Micromech. Microeng.* **18**, 105015 (2008).
- ¹⁶B. Berge, "Électrocapillarité et mouillage de films isolants par l'eau (including an English translation)," *C. R. Acad. Sci., Ser. II: Mec., Phys., Chim., Sci. Terre Univers* **317**, 157 (1993).
- ¹⁷B. Shapiro, H. Moon, R. Garrell, and C.-J. Kim, "Equilibrium behavior of sessile drops under surface tension, applied external fields, and material variations," *J. Appl. Phys.* **93**, 5794 (2003).
- ¹⁸S. K. Cho, H. Moon, J. Fowler, S.-K. Fan, and C.-J. Kim, "Splitting a liquid droplet for electrowetting-based microfluidics," in *International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition*, New York, NY, November 2001 (ASME, New York, 2001).
- ¹⁹J. Gong, S. K. Fan, and C. J. Kim, "Portable digital microfluidics platform with active but disposable lab-on-chip," in *17th IEEE International Conference on Micro Electro Mechanical Systems (MEMS)*, Maastricht, The Netherlands, January 2004 (IEEE, Piscataway, 2004), pp. 355–358.
- ²⁰S. W. Walker and B. Shapiro, "A control method for steering individual particles inside liquid droplets actuated by electrowetting," *Lab Chip* **5**, 1404 (2005).
- ²¹S. W. Walker and B. Shapiro, "Modeling the fluid dynamics of electrowetting on dielectric (ewod)," *J. Microelectromech. Syst.* **15**, 986 (2006).
- ²²K. J. Aström and R. M. Murray, *Feedback Systems: An Introduction for Scientists and Engineers* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008).
- ²³A. Isidori, *Nonlinear Control Systems (Communications and Control Engineering)* (Springer, New York, 1995).
- ²⁴B. Shapiro, H. Moon, R. Garrell, and C.-J. Kim, *Proceedings of the 16th Annual International Conference on Micro Electro Mechanical Systems (MEMS)*, Kyoto, Japan, January 2003, pp. 201–205.
- ²⁵S. W. Walker. "Modeling, simulating, and controlling the fluid dynamics of electro-wetting on dielectric," Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, 2007.
- ²⁶S. W. Walker, "A hybrid variational-level set approach to handle topological changes," M.S. thesis, University of Maryland at College Park, 2007.
- ²⁷G. Lippmann, "Relations entre les phénomènes électriques et capillaires," *Ann. Chim. Phys.* **5**, 494 (1875).
- ²⁸J.-L. Lin, G.-B. Lee, Y.-H. Chang, and K.-Y. Lien, "Model description of contact angles in electrowetting on dielectric layers," *Langmuir* **22**, 484 (2006).
- ²⁹M. Vallet, M. Vallade, and B. Berge, "Limiting phenomena for the spreading of water on polymer films by electrowetting," *Eur. Phys. J. B* **11**, 583 (1999).
- ³⁰V. Peykov, A. Quinn, and J. Ralston, "Electrowetting: A model for contact-angle saturation," *Colloid Polym. Sci.* **278**, 789 (2000).
- ³¹T. B. Jones, "On the relationship of dielectrophoresis and electrowetting," *Langmuir* **18**, 4437 (2002).
- ³²T. D. Blake, A. Clarke, and E. H. Stattersfield, "An investigation of electrostatic assist in dynamic wetting," *Langmuir* **16**, 2928 (2000).
- ³³C. Decamps and J. De Coninck, "Dynamics of spontaneous spreading under electrowetting conditions," *Langmuir* **16**, 10150 (2000).
- ³⁴H.-W. Lu, K. Glasner, A. L. Bertozzi, and C.-J. Kim, "A diffuse-interface model for electrowetting drops in a Hele-Shaw cell," *J. Fluid Mech.* **590**, 411 (2007).
- ³⁵A. Quinn, R. Sedev, and J. Ralston, "Contact angle saturation in electrowetting," *J. Phys. Chem. B* **109**, 6268 (2005).
- ³⁶A. G. Papathanasiou, A. T. Papaioannou, and A. G. Boudouvis, "Illuminating the connection between contact angle saturation and dielectric breakdown in electrowetting through leakage current measurements," *J. Appl. Phys.* **103**, 034901 (2008).
- ³⁷J.-C. Baret, B. Cross, A. Kumar, F. Mugele, and M. Pluntke, "Finite conductivity effects and apparent contact angle saturation in ac electrowetting," *Mater. Res. Soc. Symp. Proc.* **899E**, 69 (2005).
- ³⁸R. S. Burdon, *Surface Tension and the Spreading of Liquids* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1949).
- ³⁹*Apparent and Microscopic Contact Angles*, edited by J. Drelich, J. S. Laskowski, and K. L. Mittal (VSP BV, Zeist, The Netherlands, 2000).
- ⁴⁰P.-G. de Gennes, F. Brochard-Wyart, and D. Quéré, *Capillarity and Wetting Phenomena: Drops, Bubbles, Pearls, Waves* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004).
- ⁴¹E. Wolfram and R. Faust, *Wetting, Spreading and Adhesion* (Academic, Leicestershire, England, 1978).
- ⁴²E. Schaffer and P. Z. Wong, "Dynamics of contact line pinning in capillary rise and fall," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 3069 (1998).
- ⁴³E. B. Dussan, "On the ability of drops or bubbles to stick to non-horizontal surfaces of solids. Part 2. Small drops or bubbles having contact angles of arbitrary size," *J. Fluid Mech.* **151**, 1 (1985).
- ⁴⁴A. Hennig, K.-J. Eichhorn, U. Staudinger, K. Sahre, M. Rogalli, M. Stamm, A. W. Neumann, and K. Grundke, "Contact angle hysteresis: Study by dynamic cycling contact angle measurements and variable angle spectroscopic ellipsometry on polyimide," *Langmuir* **20**, 6685 (2004).
- ⁴⁵J. Berthier, P. Dubois, P. Clementz, P. Claustrate, C. Peponnet, and Y. Fouillet, "Actuation potentials and capillary forces in electrowetting based microsystems," *Sens. Actuators, A* **134**, 471 (2007).
- ⁴⁶F. Li and F. Mugele, "How to make sticky surfaces slippery: Contact angle hysteresis in electrowetting with alternating voltage," *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **92**, 244108 (2008).
- ⁴⁷J. S. Kuo, P. Spicar-Mihalic, I. Rodriguez, and D. T. Chiu, "Electrowetting-induced droplet movement in an immiscible medium," *Langmuir* **19**, 250 (2003).
- ⁴⁸P.-G. de Gennes, "Wetting: Statics and dynamics," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57**, 827 (1985).
- ⁴⁹J. Lienemann, A. Greiner, and J. G. Korvink, "Modeling, simulation, and optimization of electrowetting," *IEEE Trans. Comput.-Aided Des.* **25**, 234 (2006).
- ⁵⁰K. Brakke, "The surface evolver," *Exp. Math.* **1**, 141 (1992).
- ⁵¹K. Mohseni and A. Dolatabadi, "An electrowetting microvalve: Numerical simulation," *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **1077**, 415 (2006).
- ⁵²C. Eck, M. Fontelos, G. Grün, F. Klingbeil, and O. Vantzos, "On a phase-field model for electrowetting," *Interfaces Free Boundaries* **11**, 259 (2009).
- ⁵³V. Berejnov and R. E. Thorne, "Effect of transient pinning on stability of drops sitting on an inclined plane," *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 066308 (2007).
- ⁵⁴M. O. Robbins and J. F. Joanny, "Contact angle hysteresis on random surfaces," *Europhys. Lett.* **3**, 729 (1987).
- ⁵⁵J. P. Stokes, M. J. Higgins, A. P. Kushnick, S. Bhattacharya, and M. O. Robbins, "Harmonic generation as a probe of dissipation at a moving contact line," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1885 (1990).
- ⁵⁶J. F. Joanny and M. O. Robbins, "Motion of a contact line on a heterogeneous surface," *J. Chem. Phys.* **92**, 3206 (1990).
- ⁵⁷S. Kumar, D. H. Reich, and M. O. Robbins, "Critical dynamics of contact-line motion," *Phys. Rev. E* **52**, R5776 (1995).
- ⁵⁸H. S. Hele-Shaw, "The flow of water," *Nature (London)* **58**, 34 (1898).
- ⁵⁹G. K. Batchelor, *An Introduction to Fluid Dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1967).
- ⁶⁰M. P. do Carmo, *Differential Geometry of Curves and Surfaces* (Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1976).
- ⁶¹R. F. Probstein, *Physicochemical Hydrodynamics: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1994).
- ⁶²Y. D. Shikhmurzaev, *Capillary Flows with Forming Interfaces*, 1st ed. (Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2007).
- ⁶³*Lecture Notes in Physics: Capillarity Today*, edited by G. Pêtre and A. Sanfeld (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990).
- ⁶⁴J. A. Marsh, S. Garoff, and E. B. Dussan, "Dynamic contact angles and hydrodynamics near a moving contact line," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2778 (1993).
- ⁶⁵P. A. Thompson and M. O. Robbins, "Simulations of contact-line motion: Slip and the dynamic contact angle," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 766 (1989).

- ⁶⁶M. Haataja, J. A. Nieminen, and T. Ala-Nissila, "Molecular ordering of precursor films during spreading of tiny liquid droplets," *Phys. Rev. E* **52**, R2165 (1995).
- ⁶⁷G. He and N. G. Hadjiconstantinou, "A molecular view of Tanner's law: molecular dynamics simulations of droplet spreading," *J. Fluid Mech.* **497**, 123 (2003).
- ⁶⁸V. M. Samsonov and A. S. Ratnikov, "Comparative molecular dynamics study of simple and polymer nanodroplet spreading," *Colloids Surf., A* **298**, 52 (2007).
- ⁶⁹D. Bonn, J. Eggers, J. Indekeu, J. Meunier, and E. Rolley, "Wetting and spreading," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 739 (2009).
- ⁷⁰T. D. Blake, "The physics of moving wetting lines," *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **299**, 1 (2006).
- ⁷¹T. Qian, X. P. Wang, and P. Sheng, "A variational approach to moving contact line hydrodynamics," *J. Fluid Mech.* **564**, 333 (2006).
- ⁷²L. C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998).
- ⁷³F. Ben Belgacem, Y. Renard, and L. Slimane, "A mixed formulation for the Signorini problem in nearly incompressible elasticity," *Appl. Numer. Math.* **54**, 1 (2005).
- ⁷⁴R. Glowinski, *Numerical Methods for Nonlinear Variational Problems* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984).
- ⁷⁵E. B. Dussan, "The moving contact line: The slip boundary condition," *J. Fluid Mech.* **77**, 665 (1976).
- ⁷⁶P. A. Durbin, "Considerations on the moving contact-line singularity, with applications to frictional drag on a slender drop," *J. Fluid Mech.* **197**, 157 (1988).
- ⁷⁷Y. D. Shikhmurzaev, "Singularities at the moving contact line: Mathematical, physical and computational aspects," *Physica D* **217**, 121 (2006).
- ⁷⁸V. Girault and P. A. Raviart, *Finite Element Methods for Navier–Stokes Equations: Theory and Algorithms* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986).
- ⁷⁹S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, 2nd ed. (Springer, New York, 2002).
- ⁸⁰T. J. R. Hughes, *The Finite Element Method: Linear Static and Dynamic Finite Element Analysis*, 1st ed. (Dover, Mineola, NY, 2000).
- ⁸¹G. Evans, J. Blackledge, and P. Yardley, *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations* (Springer-Verlag, London, 2000).
- ⁸²S. Larsson and V. Thomée, *Partial Differential Equations with Numerical Methods*, Texts in Applied Mathematics, 1st ed. (Springer, New York, 2008).
- ⁸³E. Bänsch, "Finite element discretization of the Navier–Stokes equations with a free capillary surface," *Numerische Mathematik* **88**, 203 (2001).
- ⁸⁴E. Bänsch, P. Morin, and R. H. Nochetto, "A finite element method for surface diffusion: The parametric case," *J. Comput. Phys.* **203**, 321 (2005).
- ⁸⁵G. Dziuk, "An algorithm for evolutionary surfaces," *Numerische Mathematik* **58**, 603 (1990).
- ⁸⁶D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order* (Springer, New York, 2001).
- ⁸⁷T. Aubin, *Nonlinear Analysis on Manifolds: Monge–Ampère Equations* (Springer, New York, 1982).
- ⁸⁸D. Kinderlehrer and G. Stampacchia, *An Introduction to Variational Inequalities and Their Applications* (SIAM, Philadelphia, 1987).
- ⁸⁹G. Duvaut and J. L. Lions, *Inequalities in Mechanics and Physics* (Springer, New York, 1976).
- ⁹⁰F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991).
- ⁹¹P. G. Ciarlet, *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems: Classics in Applied Mathematics*, 2nd ed. (SIAM, Philadelphia, 2002).
- ⁹²J. M. Escobar, G. Montero, R. Montenegro, and E. Rodríguez, "An algebraic method for smoothing surface triangulations on a local parametric space," *Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng.* **66**, 740 (2006).
- ⁹³J. R. Shewchuk, "Triangle: Engineering a 2D quality mesh generator and Delaunay triangulator," *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.* **1148**, 203 (1996).
- ⁹⁴S. Osher and R. Fedkiw, *Level Set Methods and Dynamic Implicit Surfaces* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003).
- ⁹⁵*Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 82th ed., edited by D. R. Lide (CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002).
- ⁹⁶K.-L. Wang and T. B. Jones, "Electrowetting dynamics of microfluidic actuation," *Langmuir* **21**, 4211 (2005).
- ⁹⁷See EPAPS supplementary material at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3254022> for a short writeup on deriving the Young–Lippman equation via shape differentiation.