# **Electronic Supplementary Information**

# Interfacing centrifugal microfluidics with linear-oriented 8-tube strips and multichannel pipettes for increased throughput of digital assays

Yu-Kai Lai<sup>ab</sup>, Yu-Ting Kao<sup>b</sup>, Jacob Hess<sup>ab</sup>, Silvia Calabrese<sup>a</sup>, Felix von Stetten<sup>ab</sup> and Nils Paust<sup>ab\*</sup>

# S1: PCR buffer (1×) preparation

1 fold Supermix dilution in water was used for disperse phase for droplet size characterization. 2× ddPCR Supermix for probes (Bio-Rad Laboratories Inc., Hercules, CA, USA) was diluted to 1:1 (v/v) in distilled water (UltraPure DNase/RNase free, Invitrogen Corp., Carlsbad, CA, USA). Viscosity measurement was carried out by Physica MCR 101 rheometer (Anton Paar, Graz, Austria) at 20 °C. The measured viscosity is 1.653  $\pm 0.003$  mPa·s. The density was measured by weighing 1 ml of the buffer in lab tube. The value is ~1000 kg/m<sup>3</sup>.

## S2: Viscosity of emulsion flow

We noted that multiple factors (viscosity of disperse phase and continuous phase, number of droplet in the channel, droplet morphology, etc.) affect the viscosity of emulsion flow  $\eta_{eml}$ . Since we design identical fluidic condition as the work from Schulz et al. [1], we also expect that the  $\eta_{eml}$  derived from the reference work would cover other factors (e.g. capillary pressure at nozzle).  $\eta_{eml}$  was determined as follows: First, a series of solutions for  $\bar{Q}_{spl}$  in the proposed network simulation model (described in the manuscript) using geometry from previous work [1] were solved by sweeping potential  $\eta_{eml}$  from 2 to 18 mPa·s at intervals of 0.1 mPa·s. Secondly, the corresponding  $\eta_{eml}$  was interpolated with the measured  $\bar{Q}_{spl}$ . The result is shown in Fig. S2. A linear function was applied for an estimation of  $\eta_{eml}$  and therefore  $\eta_{eml}$  was obtained  $\sim 10.5$  mPa·s in the case  $\eta_{spl} = 1.65$  mPa·s.



Figure S1 Squeezed droplet in the outlet channel.



Figure S2 the fitting  $\eta_{eml}$  as a function of  $\eta_{spl}.$ 

## S3: Design geometry:

Abbreviation	Description	Value				
d <sub>oil</sub>	Depth oil supply channel	37 μm				
W <sub>oil</sub>	Width oil supply channel	49 μm				
L <sub>oil</sub>	Length oil supply channel	Varies on DGU case				
$\rho_{oil}$	Density fluorinated oil	1614 Kg·m <sup>-3</sup>				
η <sub>oil</sub>	Dynamic viscosity fluorinated oil	1.24 mPa·s				
d <sub>spl</sub>	Depth sample supply channel	58 μm				
W <sub>spl</sub>	Width sample supply channel	62 μm				
L <sub>spl</sub>	Length sample supply channel	Varies on DGU case				
$ ho_{ m spl}$	Density sample	~1000 Kg⋅m <sup>-3</sup>				
$\eta_{spl}$	Dynamic viscosity sample	1.653 ±0.003 mPa·s				
d <sub>nzl</sub>	Depth nozzle	25 μm				
W <sub>onzl</sub>	Width nozzle	40 µm				
L <sub>nzl</sub>	Length nozzle	500 μm				
d <sub>out</sub>	Depth outlet channel	100 µm				
W <sub>out</sub>	Width outlet channel	100 µm				
Lout	Length outlet channel	Varies on DGU case				

**Table S1** List of geometry and material parameters used in the microfluidic design.

#### Table S2 List of outlet channel length (unit: mm)

Abbreviation	DGU1	DGU2	DGU3	DGU4	DGU5	DGU6	DGU7	DGU8
L <sub>out</sub>	13.53	13.41	13.59	13.66	13.91	14.13	14.35	14.35

#### S4: Geometry verification after manufacturing

The key feature for step emulsification are the nozzle dimensions. Hence, we checked the nozzle dimension after CNC milling of the PMMA substrate. The nozzles were measured by confocal microscopy (DUO Vario, Confovis GmbH, Jena, Germany). Here, we averaged the dimension of 8 nozzles from corresponding DGU for each DGU case.

Table S3 Measured nozzle dimensions by profilometer. (unit: µm)

Abbreviation	DGU1	DGU2	DGU3	DGU4	DGU5	DGU6	DGU7	DGU8
d <sub>nzl</sub>	24.6 ± 0.38	24.6 ± 0.19	24.7 ± 0.24	25.4 ± 0.13	26.0 ± 0.18	26.2 ± 0.19	26.3 ± 0.21	24.6 ± 0.22
W <sub>nzl</sub>	43.7 ± 0.90	43.0 ± 0.59	42.9 ± 0.84	42.3 ± 1.23	42.7 ± 0.49	42.6 ± 0.92	43.2 ± 0.64	42.4 ± 1.05

The channel dimensions were also measured. The measured dimensions are listed below:

Abbreviation	DGU1	DGU2	DGU3	DGU4	DGU5	DGU6	DGU7	DGU8
$d_{oil}$	36.3	36.4	35.7	35.9	36.3	35.9	36.1	35.6
W <sub>oil</sub>	52.7	53.3	52.0	55.1	53.3	51.2	52.4	53.1
d <sub>spl</sub>	61.1	61.4	61.6	61.5	60.7	60.3	61.8	59.8
W <sub>spl</sub>	63.6	63.0	64.5	61.9	62.4	64.5	64.9	61.8
d <sub>out</sub>	96.7	97.2	96.6	97.3	96.9	96.1	96.0	96.0
W <sub>out</sub>	100.8	102.1	97.5	105.2	105.4	99.4	99.0	99.9

Table S4 Measured channel dimensions by profilometer. (unit:  $\mu m$ )

#### S5: Description of the droplet diameter evaluation in MATLAB

Stitched bright field images were acquired by the microscope Observer Z1 (Zeiss GmbH, Germany), followed by circle recognition based on build-in Hough algorithm in MATLAB. As shown in the Fig. S3, the droplets are detected and outlines are marked in the image (see Fig. S3 b). Diameter profile of 2000 droplets were extracted for further plotting in Origin Pro 9 (OriginLab Corporation, USA).



Figure S3 Circle recognition done by customized MATLAB script.



# S6: ddPCR result from individual DGU

Figure S4 Result of ddPCR from each DGU case. Red lines mark linear regression.

## **Reference:**

1. Martin Schulz, Sophia Probst, Silvia Calabrese, Ana R. Homann, Nadine Borst, Marian Weiss, Felix Von Stetten, Roland Zengerle and Nils Paust, Versatile Tool for Droplet Generation in Standard Reaction Tubes by Centrifugal Step Emulsification, *Molecules*, 2020, **25**, 1914.