

**DRAFT: REVIEW OF DESIGN AUTOMATION FOR CONTINUOUS FLOW  
MICROFLUIDIC CHIPS**

**Sophia Nielsen**

Center of Excellence for Biomedical Microfluidics  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112  
Email: sophi.nielsen@utah.edu

**FLOW ROUTING**

A significant focus of synthesis algorithms for flow-based microfluidic chips is in flow-routing. A small number of algorithms target naive flow routing, taking only the input of a set of control pins and generating an [optimal automated] routing path between those pins [1]. The remainder of flow-routing papers target specific applications or variations of the flow-routing problem such as obstacle-aware routing, timing-aware routing, and component-aware routing.

**Obstacle-Aware Routing**

Another set of fluid-routing algorithms focuses on fluid-routing for obstacle avoidance [2–5]. The typical and demonstrated most effective approach approach, introduced first by Ajwani et al. in 2011 [2] then by Huang et al. in 2013 [3], is to route the flow using a Steiner tree construction [2] and optimize the path using particle swarm optimization [3]. Steiner tree construction typically only allows for 90 degree angles, but with certain constructions, other angles such as 45 and 135 degree angles, can be allowed [4], but this demonstrates little improvement in computation time or optimal routing. Recent improvements on obstacle-avoidance algorithms have been demonstrated [5] using a Physarum-inspired (bio-inspired swarm) routing algorithm with demonstrated computational and wire-length improvement on existing algorithms such as Huang et al. 2015 [4].

**Timing-Aware Routing**

Additionally, some fluid-routing algorithms consider and optimize the timing and scheduling of chip operation [6,7]. Timing constraints are added to the inputs of these algorithms in addition to the typical pin and/or obstacle constraints. Adding timing constraints improves the timing behavior of the chip resulting in an improved assay completion time, an improvement demonstrated both in simulation [7] and experimentally [6].

**Component-Aware Routing**

Component-aware routing algorithms as the last sub-set of flow-routing algorithms bridges the gap between flow routing and component placement, typically treated as discrete algorithmic steps, and can improve real-world performance of algorithms that are not innately physics aware. These algorithms [8–10] consider additional constraints caused by components such as valves or pumps that cannot simply be modeled as control pins. Awareness of pumps and the pressure-route constraint [10] improves timing behavior of chips by decreasing congestion. Awareness of valves and minimization of valve actuations [9] can improve reliability and chip life. Integrating the component placement and flow routing steps with sequence-pair representation of components [8] improves chip area and channel crossings in optimal routings.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Su, Y., Ho, T. Y., and Lee, D., 2016. “A routability-driven flow routing algorithm for programmable microfluidic devices”. In Proceedings of the Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference, ASP-DAC, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., pp. 605–610.
- [2] Ajwani, G., Chu, C., and Mak, W., 2011. “Foars: Flute based obstacle-avoiding rectilinear steiner tree construction”. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, **30**(2), February, pp. 194–204.
- [3] Huang, X., Liu, G., Guo, W., and Chen, G., 2013. “Obstacle-avoiding octagonal steiner tree construction based on particle swarm optimization”. In Proceedings - International Conference on Natural Computation, Vol. **9**, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 539–543.
- [4] Huang, X., Liu, G., Guo, W., Niu, Y., and Chen, G., 2015. “Obstacle-avoiding algorithm in x-architecture based on discrete particle swarm optimization for vlsi design”. *ACM Transactions on Design Automation of Electronic Systems*, **20**(2), February.
- [5] Guo, W., and Huang, X., 2020. “Pora: A physarum-inspired obstacle-avoiding routing algorithm for integrated circuit design”. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, **78**, February, pp. 268–286.
- [6] Minhass, W., McDaniel, J., Raagaard, M., Brisk, P., Pop, P., and Madsen, J., 2018. “Scheduling and fluid routing for flow-based microfluidic laboratories-on-a-chip”. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, **37**(3), March, pp. 615–628.
- [7] Huang, X., Ho, T., Chakrabarty, K., and Guo, W., 2019. “Timing-driven flow-channel network construction for continuous-flow microfluidic biochips”. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, **39**(6), June, pp. 1314–1327.
- [8] Wang, Q., Ru, Y., Yao, H., Ho, T. Y., and Cai, Y., 2016. “Sequence-pair-based placement and routing for flow-based microfluidic biochips”. In Proceedings of the Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference, ASP-DAC, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., pp. 587–592.
- [9] Tseng, T., Li, B., Li, M., Ho, T. Y., and Schlichtmann, U., 2016. “Reliability-aware synthesis with dynamic device mapping and fluid routing for flow-based microfluidic biochips”. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, **35**(12), December, pp. 1981–1994.
- [10] Lai, G., Lin, C., and Ho, T., 2018. “Pump-aware flow routing algorithm for programmable microfluidic devices”. In Proceedings of the 2018 Design, Automation and Test in Europe Conference and Exhibition, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., pp. 1405–1410.