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A method is presented for measurements of secondary acoustic radiation forces acting on solid particles in a plain ultrasonic standing wave. The method allows for measurements of acoustic interaction forces between particles located in arbitrary positions such as in between a pressure node and a pressure antinode. By utilizing a model that considers both density- and compressibility-dependent effects, the observed particle–particle interaction dynamics can be well understood. Two differently sized polystyrene micro-particles (4.8 and 25 μm, respectively) were used in order to achieve pronounced interaction effects. The particulate was subjected to a 2-MHz ultrasonic standing wave in a microfluidic channel, such as commonly used for acoustophoresis. Observation of deflections in the particle pathways shows that the particle interaction force is not negligible under this circumstance and has to be considered in accurate particle manipulation applications. The effect is primarily pronounced when the distance between two particles is small, the sizes of the particles are different, and the acoustic properties of the particles are different relative to the media. As predicted by theory, the authors also observe that the interaction forces are affected by the angle between the inter-particle centerline and the axis of the standing wave propagation direction.


I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, a multitude of microfluidic devices utilizing acoustic forces for cell manipulation and separation in biomedical applications has been developed (Gröschl, 1998; Antfolk and Laurell, 2017). In such devices, acoustic effects originating from either primary radiation forces, secondary radiation forces, or acoustic streaming are combined in order to determine the final particle trajectories during manipulation. Among these effects, the primary acoustic radiation force and acoustic streaming (Wiklund et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2014) have been widely investigated and used in various devices for cell separation (Li et al., 2015), cell trapping (Nilsson et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2013; Tenje et al., 2015), bacteria trapping (Hammarström et al., 2012; Hammarström et al., 2014a), cell sorting (Li et al., 2015), tissue culture (Li et al., 2014), and cell, particle, and fluid manipulation (Dual et al., 2012; Barani et al., 2016).

The radiation force acting on a particle in the acoustic field is called the primary radiation force, $F_{rad}^{\text{rad}}$, which was theoretically introduced by King (1934), and further developed by Yosioka and Kawasima (1955), Gorkov (1962), and Doinikov (2002). Recently, Karlsen and Bruus (2015) improved the theory by considering the effect of a thermoviscous boundary layer.

They also considered the effect of acoustic streaming on the fluid flow which can influence particles or cell manipulation by Stokes drag force.

In addition to these forces, the secondary radiation force can be influential in the case where two or more particles are close to each other (Gröschl, 1998). Under this condition, particles that are exposed to the acoustic field sense secondary acoustic forces due to the scattered wave from other particles (Sepherirahnama et al., 2015) as well as the primary acoustic force. This force was theoretically investigated by Bjerknes (1906) already in 1906. He studied the acoustic interaction forces between a pair of air bubbles in stationary acoustic field and assumed that the surrounding fluid is inviscid and incompressible. This theoretical work was followed up by Crum (1975) who experimentally studied the Bjerknes forces acting on a pair of air bubbles in a stationary sound field. In 1984, Weiser et al. (1984) studied the mutual interaction between particles in a standing wave both theoretically and experimentally. They considered the case when the gravitational and time-averaged acoustic forces were in balance with each other and compared their theory with experimental observations. In 1995, Zheng and Apfel (1995) investigated the acoustic interaction forces between two fluid spheres in a plane acoustic wave field. They mentioned that the direction and the magnitude of the inter-particle force depends strongly on the orientation of the centerline distance between two particles, relative to the acoustic field. By considering the incompressible viscous fluid, Doinikov (2002)
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calculated the time-averaged interaction forces between the two gas bubbles in an acoustic field. He showed that for small bubbles there is a wide parameter range that causes bubbles to repel each other, which was contrary to the classical Bjerknes theory.

More recently, several studies have addressed the effect of Bjerknes forces on bubbles experimentally and theoretically (Doinikov, 1999; Yamakoshi and Koganezawa, 2005; Yasui et al., 2008; Garcia-Sabaté et al., 2014). For example, Garcia-Sabaté et al. (2014) introduced an experimental method for measuring the inter-particle force between two solid particles. They used a 2.5 MHz nominal frequency transducer to generate standing wave in the channel. They extracted an inter-particle force on the order of $10^{-14}$ N for latex particles of size range 5–15 μm when particles were located in the pressure nodal line. Silva and Bruus (2014) presented a theoretical expression for inter-particle forces between small spherical particles (much smaller than the acoustic wavelength) in an ideal fluid. The method that they presented is applicable for either standing waves or traveling plane waves. Their results show that in the wave propagation direction an aggregation region appears while in the transverse direction repelling and attraction can occur. Baasch et al. (2017) implemented a semi-analytical method to simulate the trajectory of particles considering the interaction of particles as well as the primary forces. Habibi et al. (2017) also studied the effect of material properties and particle size on primary and secondary acoustic forces. In their study, they used large particle diameters up to the acoustic wavelength. In another study, Lopes et al. (2016) theoretically analyzed the acoustic interaction forces and torques between Mie particles having sizes comparable to the wavelength. In more recent work Mohapatra et al. (2018) measured the inter-particle acoustic forces in the case where two particles are in close proximity while approaching the pressure nodal plane with the center to center lined up perpendicular to the wave propagation direction. Their results show remarkable difference between the experimental results of secondary acoustic force related to the value predicted by theoretical estimation.

Due to the complexity of measurements of particle interaction forces, for example, the challenge in decoupling primary and secondary force effects, studies until now focused on solid particles in the nodal pressure line (Garcia-Sabaté et al., 2014) or bubbles (Crum, 1975; Engebrecht, 2009; Pelekasis et al., 2004). In the case of bubbles, they are dominated by compressibility effects of the secondary acoustic radiation force and the dipole effect is therefore negligible. In the case of studying solid particles located in the pressure nodal plane in an ideal one-dimensional standing wave, the situation is simplified since there are no primary acoustic radiation forces in this nodal plane. Instead, any measured particle motion can then be considered to originate from the secondary acoustic radiation force, given that gravity and other non-acoustic forces can be neglected. This means that for such solid particles in the pressure nodal plane, the compressibility-dependent monopole effect vanishes.

In the current study we designed a new method for characterizing the inter-particle forces between particles by considering both monopole and dipole effects of secondary acoustic radiation forces. Based on this method we observed the inter-particle forces for polystyrene particle located outside of the pressure node for the first time. Therefore, this investigation also addresses the angle dependency of the dipole effect in acoustic particle–particle interaction force.

To reach the goal of this study and investigate the inter-particle forces outside the pressure node, we chose two different polystyrene particles with sizes 4.8 and 25 μm, respectively, to achieve significant and measurable interaction forces. Particle tracking velocimetry (PTV) was used to extract the acoustic particle interaction forces and acoustic energy in the channel. This method has previously been used to measure the energy density and particle velocity by Barnkob et al. (2010) and Augustsson et al. (2011). By fixing the larger particle to a static position in the channel and observing deflection in the pathway of a moving smaller particle we showed that this force could be significant during certain conditions. To compare the experimental results with theory, the semi-quantitative model by Gröschl (1998) has been used. We have also analyzed the relative positions of particle pairs at the termination of direct particle–particle contacts, and at various positions in between a pressure node and a pressure antinode. We believe our results will be important when designing future refined acoustophoresis systems taking into account both primary and secondary acoustic radiation force effects.

### II. Theory of the Secondary Acoustic Radiation Force

When a particle is exposed to an acoustic standing wave it will experience a time-averaged force known as the primary acoustic force, $F_{pr}$, which in an ideal fluid in a one-dimensional acoustic wave can be expressed as (Gor’kov, 1962)

$$F_{pr} = 4πr^3 E_{ac} k \phi \sin(2ky),$$

(1)

$$\phi = 1 - \frac{\kappa_p}{\kappa_f} + \frac{3(p_p - p_f)}{2\rho_p + \rho_f}.$$  

(2)

Here, $E_{ac}$ is acoustic energy density, $\phi$ is acoustic contrast factor, $k$ is wave number, and $y$ is distance from the first pressure node. Furthermore, $\rho_f$ is fluid density, $\rho_p$ is the particle density, $\kappa_p$ is the particle compressibility, and $\kappa_f$ is the fluid compressibility. In addition to primary acoustic radiation forces, secondary acoustic radiation forces also can be influential. Such secondary forces refer to interaction forces between two bubbles or particles and can be divided in two major components relating to compressibility and density difference of the particle and the medium. The effect of compressibility is considered in the formula derived by Apfel (1988) where the secondary acoustic force, $F_{se}$ is described as

$$F_{se} = -\frac{2\pi \rho_f}{9} (\kappa_f \omega P_a)^2 \left( 1 - \frac{K_p}{K_f} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{K_p}{K_f} \right) \left( \frac{A^3}{p_1 p_2 / d^2} \right),$$

(3)

where $P_a$ is the pressure amplitude and index 1 and 2 refer to the two different particles or bubbles, $d$ is center to center distance between two objects, and $\omega$ is the angular frequency.
In the case where we have two rigid spherical particles, the inter-particle force depends on the angle of centerline and the wave propagation direction, \( \theta \), as well as difference of density of particles and medium. Based on Weiser et al. (1984), this force can be evaluated for two particles with the radius of \( r_{p1} \) and \( r_{p2} \) in the following forms:

\[
F_0 = \frac{2\pi(\rho_p - \rho_1)^2 r_{p1}^3 r_{p2}^3}{3\rho_0 d^4},
\]

\[
F_{se} = F_0(3 \cos^2 \theta - 1),
\]

where \( v_{se} \) is the acoustic velocity of the incident acoustic wave at the position of the sphere. As shown in above equations, the monopole and dipole effects are considered separately. Gröschl (1998) introduced an approximate formula based on the study by Crum (1971) using superposition of forces and considering the effect of the particle position, \( y \), in the channel:

\[
F_{se}(y) = 4\pi \rho_0 \left\{ \frac{(\rho_p - \rho_1)^2 (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1)}{6\rho_0 d^2} \right\} v^2(y) \\
- \frac{\omega^2 \rho(k_p - k_1)^2}{9d^2} p^2(y)
\]

where \( v(y) \) and \( p(y) \) are the unperturbed incident velocity and pressure fields at the particle position, respectively. The first term in this equation contains the density effect and is orientation dependent as well as particle position dependent. This term causes either attraction or repulsion depending on the line-up angle between two particles. For this first density-dependent term (the dipole term), the dependency of the interaction force on the distance decays with \( d^{-3} \). The second compressibility-dependent term (the monopole term) is not orientation dependent and has a distance dependence decaying with \( d^{-2} \). The monopole term is position dependent and in the pressure node of a one-dimensional standing wave it is eliminated while on the other hand, the dipole term is eliminated in the pressure antinode. However, in between the pressure node and the antinode, both term contributes to the secondary radiation force, which is the case studied in this work.

Recently, Silva and Bruus (2014) expressed a detailed formulation based on scalar potential theory with no restriction on center to center particle distances. This model is compared with the Gröschl (1998) formulation [Eq. (5)] when analyzing our experiments (cf. Sec. III).

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. Experimental apparatus

The acoustofluidic device, previously described by Manneberg et al. (2008), consisted of a 2-MHz half-wave-length microchannel etched in silicon with the cross-section area \( 375 \times 110 \mu m^2 \) (width \times height). Top and bottom of the channel are sealed using glass, and a lead zirconium titanate (Pz-26, Ferroperm AC, Denmark) transducer with a 2-MHz serial resonance is attached using a thermally conductive gel (Tensive Adhesive, Parker Laboratories, Fairfield, NJ).

The acoustic field was generated by actuating the transducer with a signal generator (DS345, Stanford Research Systems, CA) with a maximum output voltage of 10 Vpp. At this voltage, the expected temperature increase in our device is at most on the order of a few °C (Svennebring et al., 2007), and the corresponding relative resonance frequency shift is of the \( 10^{-3} \) (Hammarström et al., 2014b). Signal monitoring was carried out with a digital oscilloscope (TD620B, Tektronix Inc., Beaverton, OR). In order to control the fluid flow, stop-valves were used at both the inlet and the outlet of the channel. The monitoring system of particle motion includes an optical microscope and a monochromatic camera (Point Grey, Grasshopper3-GS3-U3-41C6M-C) connected to a computer. An overview of the experimental setup is shown in Fig. 1.

B. Fluid and particle properties

Polystyrene micro-beads with diameters 4.8 and 25 \( \mu m \) (Polystyrene micro-particles, KISKER) were used in the experiments. Polystyrene suspended in water was selected for this study since it has well-known material properties. These properties are listed in Table I.

C. Experimental procedure

The micro-channel was first primed by flushing deionized (DI) water. Subsequently, 25 \( \mu m \) polystyrene particles in pure DI water were injected, and these particles were allowed to settle for 2h and stick to the channel bottom at arbitrary positions due to the absence of detergents. Thus, the positions of the 25 \( \mu m \) particles were fixed during all experiments. This was achieved by 2h of incubation, resulting in adhesion forces between the 25 \( \mu m \) particles and the channel bottom dominating over all other forces acting on the particles, including the acoustic radiation forces. After this anchoring procedure of the larger particles at fixed positions in the channel, 4.8 \( \mu m \) particles in DI water supplemented with 0.01% Tween-20 (Sigma Aldrich, MO) were injected to the channel. The concentration of Tween-20 detergent was sufficient to prevent any fixation of the 4.8 \( \mu m \) particles, while the experiment time was short enough to retain all 25 \( \mu m \) particles at their fixed positions despite the presence of the detergent. During ultrasonic actuation, the 4.8 \( \mu m \) particles were driven to the pressure nodal plane in the center of the channel. However, we only analyzed the rare event where 4.8 \( \mu m \) particles passed nearby a fixed 25 \( \mu m \) particle at a distance causing a measurable deflection in the predicted particle path due to the primary radiation force, and within the same z plane close to the channel bottom [cf. Fig. 1(a)].

To enhance the effects of secondary forces in relation to the primary forces the particle sizes were carefully selected. As the secondary forces are known to scale with the volume of both particles a large size difference (25 \( \mu m \) versus 4.8 \( \mu m \)) were used in order to achieve significant secondary forces on the smaller particles. Simultaneously, the size of the small particles still needs to be large enough such that primary radiation forces dominated over acoustic streaming effects.
Once events where smaller and larger particles located in close proximity were identified, a sinusoidal signal with frequency of 2-MHz was activated and videos of particle trajectories were recorded. The particle movement was captured in 13 frame per second (fps) and in the gray-scale mode.

Before investigating acoustic inter-particle forces, we first measured the acoustic energy density in the channel by the use of the PTV method. Then, various observed events of particle–particle interaction dynamics (with and without direct contact) were considered in order to compare the experimental results with theory. For the measurements of particle interaction without any direct particle–particle contact, we studied the cases where the distance between two particles was sufficient to deflect the trajectory of the 4.8 \( \mu \)m particle while passing by the fixed 25 \( \mu \)m particle. We also studied events where the small 4.8 \( \mu \)m particle got in contact with the 25 \( \mu \)m particle. For these events, we analyzed the particle positions when the contact was terminated by measuring the separation angle between the particle–particle centerline and the sound field gradient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density (kg/m(^3))</th>
<th>Speed of sound (m/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polystyrene</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Inter-particle force estimation

In order to analyze the data, the velocity of moving particles in \( x \) and \( y \) directions were extracted separately. By considering the Stokes drag, \( F_{\text{drag}} = 6\pi \eta r_p v \), in laminar flow the net force in \( x \) and \( y \) direction was evaluated. In this formula, \( \eta \) is dynamic viscosity, \( v \) relative velocity of particle and surrounded medium, and \( r_p \) is particle radius. Since the velocity of the particle can be measured in each video frame, \( F_{\text{drag}} \) can be calculated. This force was considered as the force balancing all acoustic forces acting on a particle, although other forces may contribute to the total force as discussed in Sec. IV C below. The force in perpendicular direction to the wave propagation was considered to be purely an inter-particle acoustic force in this direction. This assumption is based on considering the standing wave field as a purely one-dimensional field, which was also confirmed from the energy density measurements. The force component was compared with the theory [cf. Eq. (5)]. Effect of compressibility and density on particle interaction force were evaluated by implementing the Gröschl model. In the case that contact occurred between two particles the data in the contact region has been eliminated. All captured videos were analyzed using Tracker, an open source particle tracing software (Brown, 2017).
B. Estimating acoustic energy in the channel from single-particle tracks

The energy density in the channel was obtained by the use of Stokes drag force and the Gor’kov equation [Eqs. (1) and (2)] for one-dimensional acoustic fields, and combined with the PTV method by tracking the paths of 4.8 μm polystyrene particles from three independent experiments. The normalized velocities of particles are depicted in Fig. 2 and compared with the velocity obtained by the Stokes and the Gor’kov’s equation with the same level of energy. By using this method, the energy density of the channel was found to be 3.5–7 J/m³ at the utilized actuation voltage 10 Vpp, and we also confirmed that there was no significant particle motion in the direction of the channel axis during this calibration procedure.

C. Non-acoustic force effects

It is of interest to discuss other forces that may affect the particles while they are passing by each other at close distance. Such possible forces that may influence the trajectory of the smaller particles are related to hydrodynamic interactions, van der Waals interaction and lubrication forces.

1. Hydrodynamic interaction

Based on the study of Mohapatra et al. (2018), the effect of hydrodynamic interaction between two particles could be consider by using the following equation:

\[
\begin{cases}
    U_1 \\
    U_2 
\end{cases} = \frac{1}{6\pi \eta a} \begin{pmatrix}
    1 & C \\
    C & 1
\end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix}
    F_1 \\
    F_2
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( U, C, \) and \( F \) are velocity, a dimensionless parameter dependent on particle size and position, and force acting on each particle, respectively. Index 1 and 2 also refer to first and second particle. In our case the larger particle is fixed, which means that there is no motion of this particle relative the fluid medium. Using Eq. (6), we may calculate the magnitude of the hydrodynamic interaction effect relative the drag force from the simple Stokes theory. For the particle–particle distances observed in our experiments, the average absolute deviation from Stokes theory is 16% when comparing Stokes theory with hydrodynamic interaction, with a maximum deviation of 49%. This needs to be taken into account when comparing experimental results with the theory.

Furthermore, when a particle gets close to a wall the drag force acting on the particle increases with a coefficient related to the particle–wall distance and the direction of particle motion relative the wall. Brenner (1961) as well as Happel and Brenner (1983) defined formulas to calculate this force for different particle–wall distances and for the Reynolds number larger than 0.1. Even at low Reynolds number (in our case in the range of 10⁻²) the effect may be significant, in particular when particles are translated close to a wall (Leach et al., 2009). In our case, the analyzed particles are always close to the channel bottom, which may contribute to a non-negligible but constant additional drag force.

2. Van der Waals force

Over small, nanometer range, distances between two particles the van der Waals force may play an important role. The van der Waals force in the proximity of two close spherical particles can be estimated by the following formula (Israelachvili, 2011):

\[
F_{\text{Van}} = -\frac{A r_1 r_2}{6 h_0 (r_1 + r_2)},
\]

where \( A \) is the Hamaker constant which is 6.6–7.9 × 10⁻²⁰ J for polystyrene, \( h_0 \) is the distance between the particle surfaces, and \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) are the two particle radii. In our experiments we cannot measure distances on the nanometer scale. Nonetheless, we believe van der Waals forces may be significant in the case where we measure the particle positions at terminated particle–particle contacts (cf. Sec. IV F).

3. Lubrication force

In the case where two particles get close to each other, due to the fluid in between the particles, the lubrication force can be important. This force depends on the distance between the two particles as well as their relative velocity. For two rigid particles this force can be estimated by following formula (Barnocky and Davis, 1989; Davis et al., 1989):

\[
F_{\text{Lub}} = 6\pi \mu W / h_0,
\]

where \( W \) is the relative velocity between two particles and \( \mu \) is the dynamic viscosity. This force acts on the particles both at close distances, and at direct contact. The lubrication force is effective at surface distances (Vázquez-Quesada and Ellero, 2016; Lambert et al., 2018) of 0 < \( h_0 < c r \) where 0 < \( c \ll 1 \). It means that, in our case, the lubrication force is relevant over nanometer distances which cannot be measured accurately in our experiment.

D. Lateral movement of particle due to existence of inter-particle force

To investigate the lateral movement of particles undergoing acoustophoresis due to inter-particle forces, we

![Particle Velocity in the Channel](image)
analyzed events where a 4.8 μm particle is driven towards the pressure node while at the same time passing by a fixed 25 μm particle located somewhere in between the pressure antinode and pressure node. Here, lateral movement is defined relative the pressure gradient in the standing wave field, i.e., in the direction parallel with the channel and perpendicular to the pressure gradient. Under this condition the trajectory in the x-y plane of small particles are observed. In Fig. 3 a fixed 25 μm particle and the trajectory of small particles are shown in three different fixed particle positions and for eight different particle paths. It is clear that the small particle’s path was deflected laterally (along x) by the presence of the fixed larger particle even though the moving and fixed particles are physically separated during the whole path. The small moving particles were attracted towards the larger fixed particle from both sides, Fig. 3(b). The centerline distance between the two particles influences the deflection in such a way that when this distance decreases, larger deflection in the pathway occurs. Qualitatively, the observed behavior agrees well with the secondary force interaction predicted by theory [Eq. (5)]. In addition, particles with similar starting positions repeatedly show the same behavior in the pathway deflection.

In the following two experiments, by considering the minimum contact or no contact between moving and fixed particles we studied further details of inter-particle forces and compared with theory. Here, degree refers to the angle θ between the line connecting the centers of the two particles and the wave propagation direction (the latter being equal to the direction of the pressure gradient in the one-dimensional standing wave).

As seen in Fig. 4, significant particle attraction due to inter-particle forces is observed in both cases (a,b and c,d, respectively) when the angle θ is close to 90°. As shown, the pathway of small moving particles is almost constant before and after the vicinity of the fixed particle. Comparison between experimental and theoretical results of inter-particle forces is shown in Figs. 4(b) and 4(d). Here, we compared with both the Gröschl (1998) model, as well as with the Silva and Bruus (2014) model. In the graphs negative and positive y coordinates indicate the positions of small moving particles before and after reaching the fixed particle, respectively. Here, the origin of the coordinate system is set to the center of the fixed particle. As seen in Fig. 4, although the behavior of interaction force from experimental data is in agreement with theory, there are important differences as well. In the first case [Figs. 4(a) and 4(b)], where the minimum particle–particle distance is very small, we notice a significant difference in the magnitude of the secondary acoustic force compared to what is predicted by the theory. We also notice a significant difference between the two theoretical models. It confirms that theory does not include all the possible effective parameters on secondary acoustic force at very close particle–particle distances, as discussed in the Sec. IV C. Similar results were obtained by Mohapatra et al. (2018) who reported a difference between theory and experimental data of similar magnitude. In the second case, however [Figs. 4(c) and 4(d)], where the minimum particle–particle distance is relatively larger compared to the first case, we notice a better agreement between experimental and theoretical data, as well as between the two theoretical models. RMSE values for these two cases are 29.5 fN and 11.7 fN, respectively. Effects of acoustic primary and secondary forces on separation position are studied further in Sec. IV F.

E. Particle pathway deflection due to acoustic force ratio

To compare the magnitude of the secondary radiation force relative the primary radiation force as a function of particle–particle distance, we analyzed these two forces under decoupled conditions. This situation is obtained when the forces are orthogonal, i.e., when the secondary radiation forces are orthogonal.
force only has an x-component (along the channel) and the primary radiation force only has a y-component (across the channel). Figure 5 shows this ratio $F_x/F_y$ calculated from five different experiments when the moving and fixed particles are lined up in perpendicular direction relative to the wave propagation (or pressure gradient) direction, e.g., $\theta$ is equal to $90 \pm 7$ deg. This angle is important for being able to decouple the primary and secondary acoustic radiation forces. Furthermore, to eliminate the position dependency of Gröschl theory [cf. Eq. (5)], fixed particles with almost the same position, less than $0.05 \times \lambda/2$ difference in particles’ center position in the wave propagation direction, close to the pressure antinode is chosen. In these cases, it is expected that the role of the dipole effect will be strongly reduced, and the compressibility term will dominate in the inter-particle force. The reason is primarily that close to the pressure antinode, the acoustic velocity has small magnitude and consequently also the dipole term in Eq. (5) is less effective. In Fig. 5, the fitted power curve shows that the relation of the force ratio with center to center distances is almost equal to power of $-2$ which is in agreement with the compressibility part of Gröschl theory. Here, we recall that inter-particle forces in Gröschl theory are related to distance to the power $-4$ for the dipole effect and to the distance to the power of $-2$ for the monopole effect [cf. Eq. (5)]. It is also notable that the secondary radiation force can reach magnitudes on the order of 10%–20% of the primary force at typical distances around 20 $\mu$m for our settings. This means that the secondary radiation force should be taken into account in many
of today’s acoustophoresis applications where the particle concentration most often is relatively high.

However, different inter-particle distances were also considered in Fig. 3(c). For example, there is no significant impact from secondary radiation forces on the particle path for “Particle A” in Fig. 3(c). This particle has a distance more than five times diameter of the small particle during its whole path. This means that even if the secondary radiation force has a predicted magnitude on the order of 10%–20% of the primary force, this force only acts during a very limited time and position compared to the primary acoustic radiation force. However, for larger particle concentrations, the secondary radiation force should be taken into account for accurate acoustophoresis modelling.

F. Inter-particle forces at direct particle–particle contact

Another aspect of the effect of primary and secondary acoustic radiation forces on the behavior of particles while they are in contact with each other is related to the separation angle and corresponding force ratio, see Fig. 6. Here, the separation angle is defined between the particle–particle centerline and the pressure gradient direction, when the particle–particle contact is terminated (cf. Fig. 6). To find this angle, the distance between two particles was considered. When particles get in contact with each other, the particle–particle distance is almost constant (corresponding to the sum of their radii). At a certain separation position where the particle–particle contact is terminated, the distance between particles suddenly increases. In Fig. 6, we measured the force acting on x direction (perpendicular to wave propagation direction) to force in y direction ratio as a function of the corresponding angle between particles (relative the pressure gradient) at the separation position. Here, the force ratio depends primarily on the y coordinate of the fixed particle, i.e., the position of the fixed particle relative the pressure node. Results show that by decreasing this force ratio \( F_x/F_y \), the moving particle separates earlier compared to the case when the force ratio is considerably higher, which corresponds to two particles being in contact with each other during a longer time. Furthermore, we also note one interesting case in Fig. 6 where the force ratio is larger than 1. This means that the secondary acoustic force is larger than the primary force, which is the case for particle pairs located close to the pressure nodal line where the primary force vanishes. This result is also important in, e.g., acoustophoretic separation processes, where particles get close to each other and often have contacts. This may lead to increasing or decreasing purity of the separation.

V. CONCLUSION

We have investigated a new method that was introduced to measure the inter-particle secondary acoustic radiation forces outside of the pressure node in a standing wave acoustophoresis micro-channel. Our results show that the inter-particle forces can play an important role in acoustophoretic particle manipulation applications and cause deflection in the particle pathway, especially in the case where the size difference between the particles is significant and particles are close to each other. The results also show that when two particles are in contact with each other, the ratio of the inter-particle forces to the primary forces can cause either rapid separation or postpone the separation when the force ratio is low and high, respectively. This can be beneficial if taken into account when designing acoustophoresis devices intended for high particle concentrations. The inter-particle forces can cause particles to make contact with each other over small distances and therefore affect the separation purity. Results also show that for inter-particle distances about five times of the diameter of a moving particle, the pathway deflection is negligible for polystyrene beads, even when interacting with a fixed particle of diameter five times larger. The presented method also provides a way to measure and decouple the monopole and dipole effects of inter-particle forces. Still, there is a significant difference in magnitude between experimental data and theoretical models. This needs to be taken into account in future studies aiming for higher quantitative precision, for example by including detailed modelling of non-acoustic force contributions. Nonetheless, the current study is to our knowledge the first experimental measurement of inter-particle acoustic radiation forces between elastic particles outside of the pressure node in a standing wave with arbitrary particle pair orientations relative the pressure gradient.
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