

Supplemental material

Table 1 compares various 3D microfluidics structure fabrication methods, which are referred in this paper to provide direct comparison between each one. This table includes the information of lateral resolution, layer thickness resolution, HAR, vias, interlayer deformability, and ability to bond structures between hard substrates of these different approaches.

Video 1 shows the tunable channel deformation when different pneumatic pressure values were applied to the side channel. The sidewalls of the microchannel can fully touch at pressure over 60psi.

Video 2 shows the focused single-stream fluorescent real-time video of GFP-E. Coli flowing at an average velocity about 14 cm/s. The medium conductivity is 30 mS/m. An a.c. signal (5MHz, 56.6V peak-to-peak) is applied, and the sidewall gap is deformed down to around 3 μm when 60psi is applied to the side channels.

Method	Lateral Resolution	Vertical Resolution	HAR	Vias	Interlayer Deformable Structure	Bonded between Hard Substrates
Hybrid Stamp (this paper)	6 μm	4 μm	5	Yes	Yes	Yes
Polymer-Film Stamp [14]	150 μm	100 μm	1	Yes	No	No
Glass Hard Stamp [13]	30 μm	160 μm	0.33	Yes	No	No
PDMS Curing Inhibiting Layer on Glass Hard Stamp [25]	100 μm	60 μm	0.33	Yes	No	No
PDMS Curing Inhibiting Layer Polymer-Film Stamp [26]	100 μm	50 μm	0.5	Yes	Yes	No
Regular PDMS Stamp [24]	100 μm	50 μm	0.5	Yes	No	No
Laser Cutting on Bulk PDMS Support [27]	800 μm	36 μm	0.045	Yes	No	Yes
Thermal Plastic Hot Embossing [15]	30 μm	90 μm	3	Yes	No	No
PDMS Spin	25 μm	36 μm	1.44	Yes	No	No

Coating [22]						
Air-Blowing [23]	130μm	70μm	1.86	Yes	No	Yes
Multi-Layer Soft Lithography [21]	50μm	9μm	0.18	No	Yes	No
Multilayer Photoresist Direct Patterning and Stacking [16]	200μm	20μm	0.1	Yes	No	Yes

Table 1 compares various 3D microfluidics structure fabrication methods, which are referred in this paper to provide direct comparison between each one.