Published in final edited form as:

J Micromech Microeng. 2011 September ; 21(9): 095027-1–095027-11. doi:
10.1088/0960-1317/21/9/095027.

Microfluidic laminate-based phantom for diffusion tensor-magnetic resonance imaging (DT-MRI)

R Samuel¹, H J Sant¹, F Jiao², C R Johnson², and B K Gale¹

R Samuel: raheel.samuel@utah.edu; H J Sant: himanshu.sant@utah.edu; F Jiao: fjiao@sci.utah.edu; C R Johnson: crj@sci.utah.edu; B K Gale: bruce.gale@utah.edu

¹State of Utah Center of Excellence for Biomedical Microfluidics, University of Utah, 50 S. Central Campus Dr., Rm. 2110, Salt Lake City, UT 84112

²Scientific Computing and Imaging Institute, University of Utah, 72 S Central Campus Dr. Rm. 3750, Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Abstract

This paper reports fabrication of a magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) phantom created by stacking of multiple thin polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) layers. PDMS is spin coated on SU-8 molds to obtain the desired layer thickness and imprints of the microchannel patterns that define the phantom geometry. This paper also identifies the unique challenges related to the fabrication and assembly of multiple thin layers and reports for the first time assembly of a large number of thin laminates of this nature. Use of photolithography techniques allows us to create a wide range of phantom geometries. The target dimensions of the phantoms reported here are (i) a stack of 30 thin PDMS layers of 10 μm thickness (ii) curved 5 μm $\times$ 5 μm microchannels with 8.7 μm spacing, and (iii) straight 5 μm $\times$ 5 μm microchannels with 3.6 μm spacing. SEM scans of the assembled phantoms show open microchannels and a monolithic cross-section with no visible interface between PDMS layers. Based on the results of diffusion tensor magnetic resonance imaging (DT-MRI) scan, the anisotropic diffusion of water molecules due to the physical restriction of the microchannels was detected, which means that the phantom can be used to calibrate and optimize MRI instrumentation.

1. Introduction

Molecular diffusion refers to the random movement of molecules through space, driven by their internal thermal energy. It is a process that is highly sensitive to the physical structure of the microscopic environment. Diffusion Tensor Magnetic Resonance Imaging (DT-MRI) has been used to measure the diffusivity of water and metabolites noninvasively at microscopic length scales [1,2]. DT-MRI measures the restricted random Brownian motion of water molecules [3]. During the MRI measurement interval (ms), the water molecule can diffuse a distance of 5~20 microns while the diffusion tensor at each voxel measures the local diffusion profile. For the standardization of DT-MRI machines, standard physical models (also known as phantoms) are required with well-defined microscopic architecture. A proposed design for an MRI phantom is shown in Figure 1. Artificial fiber diffusion phantoms have been fabricated using hemp, linen, polyamide, polyester, polyethylene and rayon [1]. However, it is important to develop artificial phantoms that can be reproduced in order to produce a particular MRI scan result; which will help in efforts for the validation of MRI technology. The quality of a phantom is typically dependent on the anisotropy of water diffusion (restricted random Brownian motion of water molecules) and the amount of water

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed.

in the phantom, which in turn determines the phantom design. The size of the PDMS based phantom developed in this work was $1.5 \text{ cm} \times 1.5 \text{ cm} \times 0.3 \text{ mm}$ to obtain an image of about 15×15 voxels of 0.5 mm or 1 mm cubes.

PDMS is a popular material for biomedical applications because of its outstanding material properties and the simplicity with which it can be cast onto microstructured molds [4]. Most PDMS based microfabricated products require micromolding of microchannels in PDMS layers and later bonding of these layers to glass/silicon or to another PDMS surface for the realization of the final product. Currently, soft lithography-based PDMS layer fabrication uses two approaches: spin-casting or the membrane-sandwich method [5,6]. However, PDMS has its own microfabrication challenges. Peeling off a freely suspended spin-cast, $\sim 10 \mu\text{m}$ thick PDMS layer from a molding substrate such as a silicon wafer is a significant challenge. Such thin layers are very delicate and once torn, are easily damaged during the peeling process [7]. However, in some cases PDMS layers as thin as 70 nm and without embedded structures have been spun-cast and later peeled off. Demolding these layers requires the presence of an adhesion reduction layer between PDMS and silicon substrate [8]. There are further hurdles in stacking these ultra-thin, spin-coated layers — the occurrence of air bubbles and wrinkles. However, researchers have been able to efficiently stack five relatively thick ($120 \mu\text{m}$) PDMS layers for 3D microfluidic channel realization by using the membrane sandwich method [6] and a variation of the same method was used to assemble six ($50 \mu\text{m}$ thick) layers [9]. In the membrane sandwich method, uncured PDMS is placed between a SU-8 mold and a flat rigid plate. The flat rigid plate is pressurized from the top, which in turn squeezes the PDMS in-between the mold and plate. Different layer thickness can be achieved by varying the applied pressure. After applying the required pressure, the whole assembly is heated and the PDMS layer cures, which is then peeled off the mold. The membrane sandwich method [5, 6] allows great control in the fabrication process [10], but is limited to relatively thick and mechanically weaker layers ($>20 \mu\text{m}$) [11].

The geometry of the phantoms described in this paper was determined by the requirement of high MRI signal to noise ratio. During MRI scanning, high signal to noise ratios can be achieved if the phantoms can retain large amounts of water (i.e. a high ratio of combined microchannel volume/phantom volume) and high diffusion anisotropy. Consequently, each phantom layer necessitated a dense array of parallel microchannels and the layers needed to be as thin as could be handled easily and manufactured with high reproducibility. Based on these design criteria, the thickness of the PDMS layers was set to $10 \mu\text{m}$. Fabricating a $10 \mu\text{m}$ thick layers with thousands of $5 \mu\text{m} \times 5 \mu\text{m}$ (approximately) patterned parallel microchannels in an area of $1.5 \text{ mm} \times 1.5 \text{ mm}$ is more feasible when they are spin-cast on SU-8 molds in standard photoresist spinners (available in almost all microfabrication labs) than with the previously mentioned membrane-sandwich methods (with reference to their relatively large microchannel dimensions, larger layer thickness and low microchannel density per layer) [6, 9]. Another variation of the membrane sandwich approach used by Zhang et al [9] for thin PDMS layer stacking is the use of fluorosilanes for selective transfer of the PDMS microstructure from mold to final assembly with an intermediate transfer step [9]. Success of such an approach remains to be investigated when very thin PDMS layers ($<20 \mu\text{m}$) for a dense network of molded microchannels need to be assembled. In contrast, our approach utilizes spin cast PDMS layers that are mechanically stronger than standard casting as the stretching of polymer chains in the radial direction on spinning at high spin speeds improves mechanical strength significantly [11]. This helps in proper release of the highly patterned layer from the mold, without any damage and permanent deformation of the layer. However, stacking a large number (~ 30) of thin ($<20 \mu\text{m}$) spin-cast patterned PDMS layers has so far not been demonstrated in the literature.

This work reports a unique fabrication process for fabricating patterned 10 μm thick PDMS layers cast from a standard SU-8 soft lithographic mold into a 30-layer laminate. Each layer includes thousands of microchannels that are filled with deionized (DI) water. The layers are created using conventional spin casting techniques on a large mold area and later stacked and bonded by a repeatable and uniform stacking method. The unique features of this method are the use of a thick transfer ring, made from PDMS as well to transport and assemble the thin PDMS layers, while allowing the use of a unique air-pressure technique to bond stacked layers activated by a corona discharge. This special air pressure technique helps in stacking the layers without any trapped air bubbles or wrinkles. When the 30 layers are stacked, they are immersed in DI water and then sealed in a PDMS block before being used as a MRI phantom. By taking MR images of this phantom, researchers will be able to improve imaging characteristics of MRI machines.

2. Methods

The fabrication process used in this work is simple but can be best explained using three separate illustrations (Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4), with the main steps designated in order and identified with a step number from A to M which is referred to in the description of the relevant process-step.

2.1. SU-8 Mold Fabrication and Pretreatment (step A, Figure 2)

The individual patterned microfluidic laminates were created using SU-8 micromolding and PDMS soft lithography techniques in a normal room environment on a 4-inch silicon wafer (Silicon Qwest International Inc., Santa Clara, CA).

SU-8 2005 (Micro Chem, Newton, MA) was spun on the silicon wafer at 2500 rpm for 30 s at a ramp of 300 rpm/s and soft baked at 95 °C for 2 minutes on a leveled hot plate. The phantoms were fabricated using two mask patterns. One mask pattern generated a SU-8 mold with curved 5 μm wide channels with 8.7 μm channel spacing. The other mask pattern generated straight 5 μm wide channels with 3.6 μm channel spacing. An exposure bandpass filter (PL-360 LP, Omega Optical, Brattleboro, VT) was used to allow transmission of 365 nm wavelength light. A dose of 100 mJ/cm² was used to expose ~5 μm thin SU-8 through the appropriate mask. The exposure time was set to 9 seconds on a mask aligner (EV-420, EV Group Inc. Tempe, AZ). After exposure, the substrate was post-baked for 3 minutes at 95 °C and later developed in SU-8 developer for 2 minutes followed by isopropanol rinsing and drying with nitrogen gas. The patterned wafer was hard baked on a hotplate at 150 °C for 2 minutes.

Prior to micromolding the PDMS, the SU-8 mold was coated with a thin layer (~ 400 nm) of Cytop (CTL-809M, Asahi Glass Co. Ltd., Ibaraki, Japan). Cytop acts as an adhesion reduction layer between PDMS and silicon [8]. After the SU-8 hard bake, Cytop was spin coated at 5000 rpm for 1 minute with a 300 rpm/s ramp and cured at 180 °C on a leveled hotplate for 1 hour.

2.2. PDMS Molding (step B, Figure 2)

Once the SU-8 mold was completed, the next step was to cast the PDMS layers on the mold. All the PDMS (Slygard® 184 Silicone Elastomer, Dow Corning, MI) used in this paper was made using a 5:1 ratio of PDMS base to curing agent.

For layer fabrication, uncured PDMS was spun on the SU-8 mold with the overlying Cytop layer at 5000 rpm for 1 minute (~ 12 μm thick) (step B). The layer was cured at 100°C for 10 minutes on a hot plate with an aluminum foil-cover to minimize foreign particulate contamination.

2.3. PDMS layer picking and Assembly (step C– D, Figure 2)

At $\sim 10\ \mu\text{m}$, PDMS spin-cast layers have significant stress and are difficult to handle and tend to fold onto themselves. One of the challenges in this work was to remove such thin PDMS layers off the 4 inch SU-8 mold (large surface area) without damaging the very small molded microchannels on the layer or the layer itself or any of the microstructures across the substrate. To facilitate easy removal of the thin PDMS layer, a 3 mm thick transfer ring was made which had an outer diameter of 135 mm and inner diameter of 68 mm. The transfer ring was used as a holder that bonds the ends of the PDMS layer to lift the thin layer. Furthermore, the transfer ring provided a mechanical support to the thin layer after peeling it off from the mold. The ring was made using standard PDMS casting process to make a PDMS slab and then a razor was used to core out the ring shaped PDMS. In preparation for picking up the thin layers, uncured PDMS was applied using a spatula to the ends of the PDMS layer overlying the SU-8 mold. The application of the uncured PDMS was done such that it formed a ring on the overlying PDMS layer. This ring of uncured PDMS had an outer diameter the same as that of the mold (100-mm) and inner diameter of approximately 75-mm. In this way, the uncured PDMS did not interfere with the patterned microstructures (in the center of the layer) on the thin PDMS layer, overlying on the SU-8 mold. The transfer ring was placed on the mold such that it made a good contact with the uncured PDMS (step C). Both the mold and transfer ring on top of the PDMS were placed on a hotplate at $100\ ^\circ\text{C}$ for 5 minutes. This process resulted in adhesion of the thin layer to the transfer ring. For PDMS layer removal, the transfer ring was first gently separated from the mold's edges. The transfer ring was then slowly pulled up from the mold from one end to the other, and the thin PDMS layer was brought with it, ensuring peeling of the thin PDMS layer without tearing (step D).

2.4. Stacking of the layers (step E, Figure 2; steps F–H, Figure 3; steps I–L, Figure 4)

Each molded layer had up to 16 distinct phantom designs on it. A single microfluidic phantom was a 30 layer-laminate of only one of these 16 distinct designs (we used two of these designs to make two distinct microfluidic phantoms mentioned in this paper).

The main challenge of this work was the stacking of large number of highly flexible thin PDMS layers (at least 30 layers, to reach the minimum stack height for the MRI scanner used in this study), without the presence of any trapped air bubbles, wrinkles and delamination of the bonded layers. The stacking methodology had to be simple enough to be carried outside the cleanroom without the use of any complicated hardware, so as to be cost effective.

A Petri dish (Part # 0875713, Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA) was used as the base while stacking the layers, as the polystyrene Petri dishes have low adhesion between Petri dish surface and cured PDMS, which provides for easy removal of the stacked PDMS laminates. After peeling the PDMS layer from the mold, it was placed on a Petri dish gently by using air pressure to lay it flat (step E). Care was taken to make sure no air bubbles formed between the PDMS layer and the Petri dish. Wrinkles and bubbles were avoided by bringing one end of the suspended layer in contact with the Petri dish surface and pressing it flat with air pressure (using a low-pressure compressed-air nozzle), starting from one end and progressively moving to the other end. The PDMS layer was separated from the transfer ring with a knife cut to release the transfer ring. There was enough room for the knife cut, so as to avoid any permanent damage to the molded structures located near the center of the wafer. For addition of the second layer, both mating surfaces were activated with a corona/glow discharge (LM4243-05, Enercon Industries Corporation, WI). The second layer was gently placed on top of the first layer using the same air pressure technique and knife cut as described earlier (step F). No special hardware is used for layer alignment and is done by the

naked eye using phantom borders as alignment marks. The same procedure was repeated to assemble six separate 5-layer stacks (step G). The phantom design for this study required a stack of 30 thin layers of PDMS microstructures. For optimal phantom performance, each layer had to be flat without any wrinkles, trapped air bubbles or any layer detachment. For efficient layer stacking and consistent fabrication yield, 6 separate stacks of 5 layers each were fabricated and then stacked on each other to make a single 30-layer stack.

To facilitate the handling of 5-layer stacks, a smaller PDMS transfer ring was used. Corona (glow discharge) treatment was done on top of one of the 5-layer stack to be used as a base stack on which other 5-layer stacks would be stacked. One side of the smaller transfer ring was also activated by corona discharge and that face was placed on top of the base stack and pressed for 2 minutes before peeling off the base stack from the Petri dish (step H and step I). The bottom surface of the base stack which was previously in contact with the Petri dish was activated with corona and placed on top of a cured and corona-treated PDMS substrate of 10 mm thickness (step J). The base stack was laid flat on PDMS substrate using the same compressed air pressure technique that was described earlier and cut free from the transfer ring with a sharp knife. The entire assembly procedure was repeated until a phantom prototype with 30 layers was created (steps K and L).

2.5. Device testing

To ensure that the microchannels had not collapsed and were filled with DI water, scanning electron microscope (SEM) scans of a phantom model's (5-layer stack) cross section after immersing it in a pool of polystyrene beads and DI water were collected. The purpose was to fill the microchannels with water, which will carry the polystyrene particles along with it. When the water is evaporated the entrained polystyrene particles can be detected by imaging the cross section (approximately mid-way across the length of the channels) of the 5-layer stack, which will confirm that the channels are being filled with DI water.

To accomplish the filling of the phantom with water, the phantom model was placed in a Petri dish. The Petri dish was filled with DI water containing 10% (by volume) polystyrene microspheres of 0.202 μm diameter (Part # 07304, Polysciences Inc., PA). The Petri dish was placed in a vacuum chamber at moderate vacuum (-26 inHg) for 2 minutes, which degassed the microchannels and filled them with water. The stack was washed with DI water and dried in an oven at 62°C for 2 hours. Later, the stack was cut in the middle, across the channels by a fine blade. The newly exposed cross section was imaged by SEM.

2.6. Device Assembly (Step M, Figure 4)

The 30 layers laminated in the end of step L in Figure 4 were pressed flat by a small roller to ensure that all the layers were evenly bonded and no layer delamination occurred. The microchannels of the phantom prototypes were opened by cutting the edges of the channels with a fine blade. The entire phantom was sealed using a PDMS cap that was corona-bonded to the PDMS substrate (step M). The PDMS cap also outlined a reservoir area around phantom that contained DI water. A 2 mm thick PMMA (Polymethyl methacrylate) sheet ($25\text{ mm} \times 25\text{ mm}$) was bonded with double-sided tape in a polystyrene Petri dish, to make a mold for the PDMS cap. The entire phantom assembly was cured overnight in an oven at 65°C to improve the bond strength between different layers of phantom and ensure a leak-proof seal between the PDMS substrate and the cap. After cooling of the phantom prototype, DI water was injected through the PDMS cap using a syringe with a 27G needle until the reservoir containing the phantom was completely filled. The holes made by the syringe needle were sealed using silicone elastomer (734 Flowable Sealant, Dow Corning, MI) to prevent any DI water leaking out of reservoir. The submerged phantom was placed in a

vacuum chamber at moderate vacuum (-26 inHg) for 2 minutes to degas the microchannels and to ensure that they were completely filled with water.

2.7. MRI Imaging Details

Imaging experiments of the MRI phantom were conducted on a Bruker Biospec 7-T horizontal-bore system (Bruker Inc, Billerica, MA) controlled by Paravision 5.0 software. For data acquisition, a standard 3D diffusion-weighted spin-echo sequence was used (in-plane resolution is 0.78125×0.78125 mm, and the slice thicknesses is 0.5 mm, diffusion-weighting b-value is 800 s/mm^2). For post processing, diffusion tensors were computed on a voxel-by-voxel basis via weighted nonlinear least squares fitting to extract the eigenvalues and its corresponding eigenvectors of the tensor matrix. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors correspond to the ensemble diffusivity and the ensemble diffusion directions of the local water molecules correspondingly.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. SU-8 mold fabrication

Figure 5 is the SU-8 mold on a 4" silicon wafer. This mold contained 16 distinct phantom designs on a $15 \text{ mm} \times 15 \text{ mm}$ footprint. Exposure of the micropatterns was done such that the phantom of interest was placed at the center of the wafer. The patterns produced by the mold were found to be reproducible and meet the target width and spacing of the microstructures. Figure 6 shows an SEM scan of the cross-section of the SU-8 mold used for phantom fabrication. The mold was diced in two by a wafer dicing machine (DAD 641, DISCO Corp., Tokyo, Japan) and the newly exposed cross-section was imaged by SEM. The channel wall height of the mold was measured from the SEM scan and found to be $4.00 \mu\text{m}$ for an SU-8 2005 spun at a spin speed of 2500 rpm for 30 s, with about a $\sim 400\text{nm}$ overlying Cytop layer.

It should be noted that the same SU-8 mold was used to obtain all 30 layers for fabricating a microfluidic phantom. No damage or permanent deformation of the mold's microstructures was observed in the entire fabrication process of a single phantom.

3.2. PDMS molding: layer thickness and strength

In order to produce layers with precise thickness, the spinner was calibrated to achieve near- $10 \mu\text{m}$ thick layers. Figure 7 shows a spin curve for PDMS spun on a 100-mm silicon wafer with a 400 nm overlying layer of Cytop. The thickness of each PDMS layer was measured by imaging the cross-section of the layer under an optical microscope (Nikon Optiphot 88, Nikon Instruments Inc., Melville, NY). This method has been demonstrated to have reasonable accuracy (0.2%) for thin PDMS layer thickness measurements [12].

To determine the average thickness of each layer of the phantom, thicknesses of three individual 5-layer stacks were measured at three distinct points. A total of 9 data points was used to obtain an average individual layer thickness as $11.6 \pm 0.5 \mu\text{m}$.

Interestingly, these thin PDMS membranes even with phantom microstructures proved to be very strong even at $\sim 10 \mu\text{m}$ thickness. Figure 8 shows a picture of the PDMS layer attached to the transfer ring (weighing 30 g) being held at the center with the tip of a finger. This result is in accord with Liu et al [11] and very useful while picking up the layers and aligning them to fabricate a stack of multiple laminates.

3.3. PDMS layer picking and Assembly

Figure 8 and Figure 9 show the transfer ring that is used to pick up individual PDMS layers from the SU-8 mold. While, some of the microstructures are lost because of the transfer ring overlay (Figure 9), the single layer can be lifted off the mold cleanly without any effect to the layer structural integrity. In addition, this loss of microstructures due to the transfer ring overlay did not warrant any changes to phantom design as the patterns in the center of the mold were of interest and used to fabricate all the phantoms we described in this paper. The *usable* phantom can be selected easily while aligning the mask to the SU-8 mold during exposure. However, the size of the uncured adhesive PDMS ring can be further optimized to provide the least overlay of the transfer ring onto the mold. Furthermore, a larger wafer can also be used to leave enough distance from the edge of the mold to achieve the same effect.

The PDMS ring was 3 mm thick. We found that a thicker PDMS ring would not be flexible enough to facilitate peeling of the thin layers while a thinner ring would be too flexible to provide sufficient mechanical support to avoid folding of the thin layer on itself. We were able to peel off at least 20 layers from a single PDMS ring before discarding it. After peeling-off about 20 layers the PDMS ring was not able to bond evenly to the thin layers and resulted in increased tearing of the thin layers during the peeling process. Bonding of the PDMS transfer ring to the thin PDMS layer on the SU-8 mold (shown in Figure 5) was crucial for successful removal of the layer from the SU-8 mold. The bond had to be sufficiently strong and uniform at the ring and layer interface to overcome the stresses during peeling without tearing. We used two approaches to bond the PDMS ring to the PDMS layer overlying on the SU-8 mold: corona-discharge method and uncured PDMS as adhesive. While the corona-discharge method was fast, it resulted in burnt PDMS particles on the thin layers (overlying the SU-8 mold) resulting in a damaged surface, which made the layer peeling very difficult. For this reason, a thin layer of uncured PDMS was used as adhesive to bond the transfer ring to the thin layer on the SU-8 mold. Furthermore, different types of PDMS-to-PDMS bonding techniques have been evaluated for their bond strengths and using uncured PDMS as an adhesive for bonding has been shown to have the highest bond strength [13].

3.4. Stacking of the layers

The thin PDMS layers (containing microchannels) needed to be stacked with the least axial misalignment. The stacking in this case was done with the naked eye (with phantom borders as alignment marks) and may have some minor axial misalignments; but these misalignments can be reduced by stacking under a microscope or by utilizing an aligner specially designed to align PDMS layers [14]. The angular alignment of the microchannels along the length is very important for this application such that all the channels should point in same direction to achieve high resolution and accuracy of the MRI scan. In future, a PDMS aligner may be used for more accurate alignment.

Figure 10 shows SEM (Quanta 600 FEG, FEI, OR) scans of the phantom model composed of a 5-layer stack. The channels have a smooth trapezoidal cross-section. The trapezoidal cross section is due to the overlying 400 nm Cytop layer, which was spin coated after the SU-8 mold was made by photolithography. While the trapezoidal cross-section of the channels does not affect the phantom performance, a thinner passivation layer can be obtained using fluoropolymers (monolayer thickness) that can be deposited by chemical vapor deposition [15], ion-sputtering deposition [16] or vacuum deposition [17] and subsequent evaporation if needed. The effect of using such a deposition approach on PDMS thin layer peeling remains to be investigated. Nevertheless, the large aspect ratio (channel length to height) and not the microchannel profile, ensures anisotropic diffusion, the key requirement for MRI phantoms. Figure 11 shows the SEM scan of a 16-layer stack

(consistent bonding between each individual layer should be noted). Figure 11 clearly shows no delamination for a stack of 16 layers, an important achievement for successful phantom fabrication.

In Figure 10 the height of the channels in the layers is $3.57\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and about $0.43\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ smaller than the channel wall height ($4.00\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) in the mold. Possible reasons for this $0.43\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ difference is (i) shrinkage of PDMS on curing at a reasonably high temperature (100°C) [18], (ii) relative stretching of the PDMS layer (during the bonding process) with respect to the previous bonded layer and (iii) due to variation in Cytop coating across the substrate. But such differences in channel parameters were allowable for this application. Layer channel height of $5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ (if desired) can be obtained by varying the channel wall height in the mold to compensate for PDMS shrinkage and other effects. Furthermore, a Cytop layer of thickness less than 400 nm can be obtained by utilizing Cytop thinners available from Asahi Glass Co. Ltd, Japan.

3.5. Device Testing

The newly exposed cross-sections in the device testing (articulated in section: 2.5) of the phantom was imaged by SEM, and polystyrene particles were seen stuck on the inner microchannel walls in multiple scans (Figure 12). This confirmed that the channels were being filled with DI water and the polystyrene particles were carried inside the microchannels.

3.6. Device Assembly

Figure 13 shows the fully fabricated MRI phantoms. The phantoms are immersed in a PDMS reservoir with DI water. The water infusion and air bubble withdrawal was done with 27 G non-coring needles attached to plastic syringes.

3.7. Diffusion tensor imaging

Figure 14 shows the visualization of the B_0 image and the diffusion tensor image on MRI scan of the phantom shown in Figure 13 left. For the diffusion tensor image, the color was coded by the direction of the major eigenvector of each single tensor. If the major eigenvector is aligned with x direction, the local tensor will be red. If the major eigenvector is aligned with y direction, the local tensor will be green. If the major eigenvector is aligned with z direction, the local tensor will be blue. The single tensor with an intermediate major eigenvector direction will be the interpolated color. From this figure, one can see clearly that the phantom was filled with water without any air bubbles (as the white area represents water and dark area represents absence of water). The water molecule shows a certain degree of anisotropic diffusion. Due to the influence of the imaging background noise and possibly the misalignment between each stack, the anisotropy of each tensor is not as strong as expected. Also, the MRI instrumentation may not yet be able to adequately measure at these scales, so additional software development may be needed to better represent the movement of molecules in the phantom. Finally, the relative volume of water in the phantom may need to be increased to increase the signal available to the MRI instruments. Higher relative volumes of water would require higher aspect ratio channels with thicker layers, which is an ongoing effort.

4. Conclusion

A simple method of stacking patterned spin-coated $\sim 10\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ thick PDMS layers with densely packed microstructures has been developed and demonstrated. The stacking of up to 30 such layers has been performed without the presence of any trapped air bubbles or wrinkles. The unique layer-stacking technique can be used to fabricate MRI diffusion phantoms as gold

standards for MRI machines. Furthermore, the methods developed in this project can be used to fabricate 3D structures in thin spin-coated PDMS layers; leading to sophisticated microfluidic chips fabricated with automated aligners for higher precision. The stacked layers were easy to handle once assembled and microchannels retained their cross-section as evidenced by SEM scans. Additionally, the methods shown in this work allow for assembly of large areas of thin layers with dense networks of microstructures with high repeatability and reproducibility. While, the MRI phantoms reported here were fabricated in a normal laboratory environment, even better fabrication results in terms of layer bonding can be predicted if fabrication is carried out in a clean room environment.

Overall, we have presented a 30-layer MRI phantom fabricated with microfluidic laminates for the first time. A high signal to noise ratio during phantom scanning requires high water diffusion anisotropy and high water content inside the phantom channels, a significant challenge. Optimal dimensions and arrangements for the MRI phantom still need to be developed to improve the function of the phantom, though the methods presented here provide sufficient function to begin optimization of MRI algorithms for imaging of small fluid structures.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded in part by the NIH NCRR Center for Integrative Biomedical Computing (www.sci.utah.edu/cibc), NIH NCRR Grant No. 5P41RR012553-11 and NIH grant S10 RR023017 for supporting the Small Animal Imaging Facility. The authors thank Brian Baker and the nanofabrication facilities at the University of Utah for their help with this project.

References

1. Fieremans E, Deene YD, Delpitte S, Ozdemir MS, Achten E, Lemahieu I. The design of anisotropic diffusion phantoms for the validation of diffusion weighted magnetic resonance imaging. *Physics in Medicine and Biology*. 2008; 53:5405–5419. [PubMed: 18765890]
2. Tournier J-D, Yeh C, Calamante F, Cho K, Connelly A, Lin C. Resolving crossing fibres using constrained spherical deconvolution: Validation using diffusion-weighted imaging phantom data. *NeuroImage*. 2008; 42:617–625. [PubMed: 18583153]
3. Basser PJ, Mattiello J, Lebihan D. Estimation of the Effective Self-Diffusion Tensor from the NMR Spin Echo. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Series B*. 1994; 103(3):247–254. [PubMed: 8019776]
4. McDonald JC, Whitesides GM. Poly(dimethylsiloxane) as a Material for Fabricating Microfluidic Devices. *Accounts of Chemical Research*. 2002; 35(7):491–499. [PubMed: 12118988]
5. Chiu DT, Jeon NL, Huang S, Kane RS, Wargo CJ, Choi IS, Ingber DE, Whitesides GM. Patterned deposition of cells and proteins onto surfaces by using three-dimensional microfluidic systems. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 1999; 97:2408–2413. [PubMed: 10681460]
6. Jo B, Van Lerberghe LM, Motsegood KM, Beebe DJ. Three-Dimensional Micro-channel Fabrication in PDMS Elastomer. *J. Microelectromech. Syst.* 2000; 9:76–81.
7. Sarma S, Krishnan S. A process for manufacturing very thin PDMS films. *Transactions of NAMRI/SME*. 2009; 37:277–283.
8. Thangawng AL, Ruoff RS, Swartz MA, Glucksberg MR. An ultra-thin PDMS membrane as a bio/micro–nano interface: fabrication and characterization. *Biomed Microdevices*. 2007; 9:587–595. [PubMed: 17516172]
9. Zhang M, Wu J, Wang L, Kang X, Wen W. A simple method for fabricating multi-layer PDMS structures for 3D microfluidic chips. *Lab on a Chip*. 2010; 10:1199–1203. [PubMed: 20390140]
10. Moraes C, Sun Y, Simmons CA. Solving the shrinkage-induced PDMS alignment registration issue in multilayer soft lithography. *J. Micromech. Microeng.* 2009; 19
11. Liu M, Sun J, Sun Y, Bock C, Chen Q. Thickness-dependent mechanical properties of polydimethylsiloxane membranes. *J. Micromech. Microengineering*. 2009; 19

12. Zhang WY, Ferguson GS, Tatic-Lucic S. Elastomer supported cold-welding for room temperature wafer level bonding. IEEE Conf. MEMS 2004 Technical Digest, Maastricht, The Netherlands. 2004; 04CH37517:741–744.
13. Eddings MA, Johnson MA, Gale BK. Determining the optimal PDMS-PDMS bonding technique for microfluidic devices. Journal of Micromechanics and Microengineering. 2008; 18:1–4.
14. Kim JY, Baek JY, Lee KA, Lee SH. Automatic aligning and bonding system of PDMS layer for the fabrication of 3D microfluidic channels. Sensors and Actuators A:Physical. 2005; 119:593–598.
15. Lee K, Bhushan B, Hansford D. Nanotribological characterization of fluoropolymer thin films for biomedical micro/nanoelectromechanical systems applications. Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology A: Vacuum, Surfaces, and Films. 2005; 23(4):804–810.
16. Quaranta F, Valentini A. Ion-beam sputtering deposition of fluoropolymer thin films. Applied Physics Letters. 1993; 63(1):10–11.
17. Chen J, Ko F, Hsieh K, Chou C, Chang F. Effect of fluoroalkyl substituents on the reactions of alkylchlorosilanes with mold surfaces for nanoimprint lithography. J. Vac. Sci. Technol., B. 2004; 22(6):3233–3241.
18. Lee SW, Lee SS. Shrinkage ratio of PDMS and its alignment method for the wafer level process. Microsystem Technologies. 2008; 14(2):205–208.

Figure 1.

Left figure: A 3D schematic of the envisioned multilayer phantom (not to scale), the targeted dimensions are height: 0.3 mm, width: 1.5 cm, length: 1.5 cm. Each layer is 10 μm thick with 5 $\mu\text{m} \times 5 \mu\text{m}$ channels. Spacing between channels (3.6 μm or 8.7 μm) and the orientation (curved channels or straight channels) is varied for each phantom. The diffusional direction of water molecules is shown by the double-headed arrow.

Right figure: A magnified view of the cross-sectional area marked by a black square in the left picture (small microchannels can be observed). With microfabrication techniques we can reproduce such highly parallel, multilayered microchannels consistently.

Figure 2. A schematic diagram of the phantom fabrication showing the PDMS softlithography steps, the use of the SU-8 mold and the transfer ring for the assembly of thin PDMS layers.

Figure 3.

Summary of the fabrication process, depicting stacking of 30 layers to make six separate 5-layer stacks. This approach improves the yield as any error during fabrication is limited to smaller stacks.

Figure 4. Summary of the fabrication process, depicting stacking of six 5-layer stacks to make a single 30-layer stack and encasement of the stack by a PDMS cap for the realization of the final product.

Figure 5.
Photograph of the SU-8 mold with 16 distinct patterns, made using a 4-inch silicon wafer.

Figure 6.
Picture showing SEM scan of the cross-section of diced end of the SU-8 mold.

Figure 7. Plot of PDMS layer thickness (μm) versus spinner spin speed (RPM). The PDMS used for this work has 5:1 ratio of base: curing agent.

Figure 8.
Picture of a PDMS transfer ring (weighing 30 g) being supported by $\sim 10\ \mu\text{m}$ thin membrane at the tip of a finger.

Figure 9. Picture of a PDMS transfer ring used to support and peel the thin layers of PDMS with microstructures. A supported PDMS layer with 16 distinct patterns (molded areas) can be seen in the picture.

Figure 10.
Image of a SEM scan of a 5-layer stack of PDMS layer showing the measured geometrical dimensions.

Figure 11.

Image of a SEM scan of a 16-layer PDMS stack; the stack of layers after curing results in a monolithic structure with no visible interface separating the layers.

Figure 12. Images of SEM scans of microchannel cross-sections showing polystyrene particles stuck on channel walls (particles marked by circles).

Figure 13.

The pictures of two assembled MRI phantoms (left: with curved channels, right: with straight channels) along with a US quarter coin. Each phantom is placed in a square water reservoir formed by the PDMS cap and PDMS substrate. No air bubble can be seen in the phantom assembly.

Figure 14.
The B0 image (left hand side) and the diffusion tensor image (right hand side) of the phantom.