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Abstract

Optical trapping is a tool used throughout a wide variety of disciplines ranging from precisely probing and manipulating sub-micron organisms in biology to analyzing fundamental charge transfer in colloidal physics. This thesis presents research involving optical tweezer force measurements of polystyrene and silica microspheres. In addition, preliminary work in tweezer-based surface charge measurements is developed to examine surface charge at the solid-liquid interface of silica microspheres.

The main purpose of constructing, and testing the tweezer apparatus is to utilize its trapping capability for experiments involving charge measurements. The optical tweezer related research provides information pertaining to force measurements of a single beam optical tweezer trap equipped with an independent back focal-plane laser position detection system. Calibration methods and experimental power dependence for 1µm-diameter polystyrene and silica microspheres provide proof-of-principle results that exhibit expected linear power dependence to within an experimental error of 10.5%.

The research involving charge measurements provide preliminary the framework for studying charging/discharging dynamics of 1µm-diameter colloidal silica spheres. Studying (dis)charging dynamics on nano-scale levels is difficult, however, the methods presented in this thesis uses an ultrasensitive technique adopted from Roberts et al.¹ to measure the effective surface charge of particles dispersed in water. This is performed by conducting

electrophoresis experiments designed to track the movement of an optically trapped particle in the presence of an applied (AC) electric-field. Experimental results demonstrate the ability to measure the effective surface charge. The proof-of-principle experiments show that for a 1µm silica microsphere the surface charge is found to be in the range of $66q_{el} - 113q_{el}$, as compared to Roberts et al. nonpolar suspended PMMA particles $14q_{el}$, yet similar to Behrens et al. measurements of silica in deionized water $471q_{el} - 2200q_{el}$.

The preliminary work documented in this thesis sets forth the necessary groundwork to examine charging dynamics of molecular-coated silica microspheres, and further experiments are being designed to study ADT-TES-F coatings at varying electric-field frequencies.

---
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The interaction of light with matter is a fundamental method commonly used in research as a tool to manipulate and analyze properties of materials. Research exploring organic optical materials, as opposed to inorganic, is of interest due to their low cost and the ability to tune particular properties by synthetic modifications [1]. Slight alterations can change optical, structural, and electrical properties. These modifications can provide enhancements tailored for particular applications in solar cells, thin-film transistors, and light-emitting diodes (LED) [2, 3]. This thesis consists of (1) the experimental design, development, and testing of a single-beam optical tweezer trap that utilizes a separate laser-based position detection scheme, and (2) preliminary work in conducting optical tweezer-based surface charge measurements of silica microspheres.

1.1 Optical Tweezer Overview

Optical tweezer traps provide the ability to manipulate and measure pico-Newton forces of sub-micron dielectric particles. Tweezer traps are produced by taking advantage of radiation pressure. Ashkin [4] first discovered that a tightly focused laser beam could accelerate microparticles, and by arranging two counterpropagation lasers, focused at the same spot, had the
ability to confine a particle in three dimensions. From this research he identified the radiation pressure to be the central criterion in the technique of optical trapping and sub-micron particle manipulation.

Contemporary optical tweezers have been commonly used throughout the experimental field of physics, chemistry, and biology due in part by their capability to confine, manipulate, and apply picoNewton forces on sub-micron particles [5]. Having the ability to move particles in the realm of nanometers and apply small force free from optical damage has been particularly useful in the study of biological systems [6]. Recently, optically trapped charged particles have been used as force probes to map electric fields generated by microelectrodes and to measure effective surface charge [7, 8, 9].

The work in optical trapping presented in this thesis is similar to the applications above, in that an optical tweezer apparatus is constructed, tested, and used for experiments to explore charge carrier dynamics of organic molecules. The optical trapping portion of this thesis is presented as follows: Chapter 2 presents an overview of optical trapping theory, including the Mie (2.1) and Rayleigh (2.2) regime. Chapter 3 describes the optical tweezer setup (3.1) and sample cell preparation (3.2). Chapter 4 describes the model (4.2), and analysis (4.3) involved in particle trapping. Chapter 5 describes the calibration process and the factors involved. Chapter 6 presents optical trapping experiments, including power dependence (6.2), sphere-to-sphere variation (6.3), and sample depth dependence measurements (6.4).

1.2 Surface Charge Measurement Overview

Understanding how molecules donate and accept charge is an important aspect in (opto)electronic applications. The OPE group at Oregon State University have been utilizing single-molecule fluorescence spectroscopy to studying intermolecular interactions of organic molecules. In particular, functionalized anthradithiophene (ADT) with triethylsilylethynyl (TES) side-groups and fluorinated (F) end-groups (ADT-TES-F). However, optical tweezer-
based charge measurements may provide an alternative approach to analyze charging dynamics of specific organic molecules. This type of application involving tweezer trapping is relatively new, therein lies potential for improvement and sophistications that may provide detailed information about mechanisms involved in (dis)charging dynamics at sub-micron scale.

Within recent years, highly sensitive techniques involving optical tweezers have been developed to investigate the surface charge carried on isolated dielectric microparticles in nonpolar liquid with elementary charge ($q_{el}$) resolution [8, 9, 10]. Studying charge transfer on the nanometer scale requires extremely precise measurements that are particularly challenging in practice. Surface charge measurements are most readily performed through electrophoresis experiments, that is, measuring a particle’s position in the presence of an applied (AC) electric-field.

Preliminary research involving surface charge measurements presented in this thesis is similar to the work of Roberts et al. [8]. In that, the methods described in [8] will be used to measure the effective surface charge carried on 1$\mu m$-diameter silica microsphere suspended in water. The results are compared to the known surface charge for silica microspheres and serve as a control in further experiments.

Research involving optical tweezer-based electrophoresis experiments in Chapter 7 are outlined as followed: Section 7.1 explores the model and basic principles governing electrophoresis experiments. Section 7.2 covers the preliminary work in electrophoresis experiments, including sample cell preparation, modifications (7.2), and (AC) electric-filed frequency dependent measurements on silica microspheres (7.2.1), followed by the results and discussion(7.2.1).
Chapter 2

Principles of Optical Trapping

Optical trapping and manipulation of dielectric particles has been achieved throughout a vast range of particle size from nanometers to hundreds of micrometers. As a consequence of differing length scales there is no single theory, or model, accurately describing this scale range. As a result, two regimes are traditionally used to describe the optical forces of trapping for conflicting particle length scales relative to the trapping laser wavelength $\lambda$. When the target particle diameter $d$ is much larger than the trapping wavelength ($d \gg \lambda$) the conditions for Mie scattering are satisfied. In such cases, a simple ray optics model can be used to within a good approximation for most trapping applications. For particles much smaller than the trapping wavelength ($d \ll \lambda$) the conditions for Rayleigh scattering are satisfied, and electromagnetic theory can be used by treating the particle as a point dipole [11, 12, 13].

2.1 Geometric (ray) Optics Model: Mie Regime ($d \gg \lambda$)

Particle trapping within the Mie regime originates from the transfer of momentum between the incident laser beam and the particle surface through a
Principles of Optical Trapping scattering process [14]. When a transparent dielectric microsphere is near the beam-focus it experiences forces due to constant bombardment of photons. This process is denoted as radiation pressure [4, 11]. Impinging photons on the surface of the particle are traditionally decomposed into two contributing force components: (1) scattering forces ($F_{scat}$), and (2) gradient forces ($F_{grad}$). This traditional\footnote{The traditional approach is an approximation which neglects the contributions of absorption forces ($F_{abs}$), for further information regarding this force see Ref. [15, 12]} model is simply an intuitive approach to examine the complete optical force contributions as a whole [12].

The scattering forces ($F_{scat}$) can be thought of as an infinite stream (ray) of photons striking the particle surface. Since photons have momentum, each interaction exerts a force which tends to push the particle away from the beam focus. As a result, the scattering force acts in the direction of light propagation and is proportional to the incident laser intensity.

For most situations incident light intensity is distributed uniformly, in which case the scattering force dominates. However, in the case of a steep intensity gradient, such as one produced at the focal point, the gradient force component ($F_{grad}$) contributes largely to the overall optical forces acting on an object. The transmitted light is refracted, resulting in a change of momentum as it enters and exits the particle. The gradient forces ($F_{grad}$) arise from Newton’s three law, the refracted light momenta transfer between particle surface and its surrounding medium. Thus, the gradient force acts in the direction of the focal point and is proportional to the gradient of the laser intensity hence the gradient force.

### 2.2 Rayleigh Regime ($d \ll \lambda$)

In general, the criteria for Rayleigh scattering theory is that the particle is smaller than $\lambda/20$ ($d \ll \lambda$) [16]. Within the Rayleigh regime the incident laser light cannot be represented by an infinite number of rays. Instead, the spherical particle is considered a point dipole that scatters light [13, 14].
The gradient force \((\vec{F}_{\text{grad}})\) arise from the interaction between the inhomogeneous electric-field of the trapping laser and the dielectric particle material\(^2\). Unlike conductors, dielectrics are composed of atoms with tightly attached electrons to their respected nuclei, thus within the presence of an external electric-field, electrons are unable to roam about the material, as is true for electrons in conductors. However, the tightly attached electrons (within their respective orbital cloud) can change orientation direction (shift or rotate) within the bounds of their respected atom or molecule [17]. When placed in an inhomogeneous electric-field (the laser focus) the individual atoms can be thought of as tiny dipoles that align to the direction of the electric-field. The polarization alignment, and fluctuation imposed by the field yield a force on each dipole in the direction of highest intensity (laser focus). Thus, for dielectric particles the gradient force is proportional to the intensity gradient at the focus and the particles polarization [12, 17]. It is within this interaction between the dipoles and the electric-field fluctuations, near the focus, that creates the gradient restoring force. A pictorial description of this interaction is illustrated in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1 depicts the gradient force vector \((\vec{F}_{\text{grad}})\) that arises from in-

\(^2\)Laser light is usually linear-polarized in a particular orientation orthogonal to the direction of propagation. The polarization (direction of E-field) alternates sinusoidally thus changing from positive to negative, and back to positive in one wavelength-time
duced dipoles within a dielectric microsphere near the center of an optical trap. For this particular snapshot in time the intensity gradient causes the force pulling all the positive dipole ends towards the right to be greater than the negative dipole ends pulling to the left. At a later time when the electric-field switches direction each dipole will also shift slightly in orientation, as above, resulting in a net force pointing toward the center of the laser focus.

To generate a stable three dimensional trap, the axial ($\hat{z}$) components of the gradient force pulling the particle towards the focus must overcome the scattering components pushing the particle away from the focus. In order to satisfy this condition, the trapping laser must exhibit a steep intensity gradient at the focus. This condition can be achieved by using a high numerical aperture ($N_A$) microscope objective that tightly focuses the trapping laser down to a diffraction-limited spot [12]. Oil immersed objectives ($N_A \approx 1.26$) are commonly used in particle trapping applications due to their ability to gain a near diffraction-limited focus without sacrificing trapping power at increased depth.
Chapter 3

Optical Tweezer Design and Construction

Optical tweezers are typically used to apply or measure small forces and displacements of sub-micron dielectric particles. This type of instrument is designed to be highly sensitive, allowing measurements on the order of picoNewtons and nanometers. The basic components of any optical tweezer instrument is merely a trapping laser, basic beam steering (mirrors), expansion (lenses), and filtration devices. A high numerical aperture (NA) objective, condenser, and some sort of detection or monitoring system are required to track the specimen’s movement.

The instrument constructed in this research thesis is a single-beam gradient-force optical tweezer trap that utilizes a separate laser-based position detection system (Figure 3.1). The optical trap is a reconstruction of Mark Kendrick’s optical trap previously built in 2007\(^1\) with slight modifications.

\(^1\)See Ref. [13, 15] for alternative information involving the construction.
3.1 Optical Tweezer Setup

The tweezer trap depicted in Figure 3.1 is constructed around a custom inverted microscope that is equipped with an oil immersed objective (Edmund Optics, 100X, NA 1.26, 160 mm tube length), which collects and tightly focuses inbound laser light. A beam expansion lens pair (L2 & L4) is used to overfill the objective’s back aperture, while mirrors (M1 & M2) are adjusted to steer the beam over the aperture. A lower powered Helium-Neon (He-Ne) detection laser (633nm) is also expanded to overfill the back aperture (L3 & L4). L3 is mounted on an adjustable x-y-z-plane stage, which is used to adjust the detection laser focal plane.

A quadrant photodiode (QPD) is used to measure the confined particle’s displacement fluctuations (Brownian motion). The QPD collects the detection laser’s forward scattered light from the particle and produces a voltage output signal that is proportional to the particles displacement relative to the center of the trap (focus). A data acquisition card (DAQ) (NI-6221) collects the voltage signal, which is then captured by a custom LabVIEW program.
(Mark Kendrick). A custom Mathematica program (Dr. David McIntyre) is used to obtain the trap stiffness and a MATLAB program is further used to analyze multiple data collection sets if necessary. An active picture of the experimental setup is shown in Appendix A.1.

3.2 Sample Cell Preparation

For trap stiffness experiments there are two types of microspheres normally used. Polystyrene (PS) microspheres of diameter \( d = 0.99\mu m \pm 0.02\mu m \) (Duke Scientific) and silica (Thermo Scientific 8100 series) of diameter \( d = 0.99\mu m \pm 0.02\mu m \). Particles are dispersed separately in deionized-water (DI-H\(_2\)O) (\( \varepsilon=80 @20^\circ C \)) 10% by weight.

The mixture is inserted into a custom-made sample cell shown schematically in Figure 3.2a. The sample cell is prepared by placing a double-sided adhesive Secure-seal spacer (thickness \( \approx 120\mu m \) cut-out diameter = 20mm) on a clean glass microsphere slide (thickness \( \approx 100\mu m \)). Approximately 37\( \mu L \) of the mixture is placed within the circular cut-out spacer cell and a clean glass microscope cover-slip (22x22mm) is placed over the spacer cell sealing the mixture within the sample cell chamber.

![Sample slide](image1.png)  ![Sample Position](image2.png)

**Figure 3.2:** (a) Depiction of a sample slide consisting of a glass cover-slip, adhesive spacer, and a glass sample slide, taken from Ref. [19]. The solution is placed within the spacer, between the sample slide and cover-slip. (b) Sample orientation within the optical trap. The sample is placed on a sample holder that places the sample between the objective and condenser with the cover-slip facing the objective.
The sample is then placed on a sample holder of the setup within the xy-plane, which is located between the objective and condenser (Figure 3.2b). The sample is positioned such that the cover-slip is facing the objective, and the immersion oil (type HF) is placed on the points of contact between the sample cover-slip and objective lens.

The use of immersion oil in optical trapping serves multiple purposes: (1) it is desirable to use an immersion oil that matches the index of refraction of the glass cover-slip. This property helps to minimize the loss of light, and thus trapping power when laser light passes through the glass, (2) usually, immersion oil exhibits low fluorescence allowing the laser light to pass through with relatively low absorption, and (3) aids in protecting against optical damage, such as scratches, to the objective lens.
Chapter 4

Transverse Forces, Measurements, and Analysis

This section describes the forces on an optically trapped particle and the techniques used to model and calculate the optical trap strength, i.e spring constant $k$. Topics include the forces acting on a trapped particle, Brownian motion contributions, the mass-spring model, and the computational methods used to analyze a trapped microsphere.

4.1 Thermal Fluctuations of a Free Particle

In order to understand the forces on a trapped particle we first must discuss its motion in the absence of a trapping laser. A particle suspended in liquid undergoes random position fluctuations known as Brownian motion [20]. In short, Brownian motion arises from random forces due to thermal fluctuations of the surrounding medium, which can be envisioned as constant bombardment of molecules striking the particle surface. The theory of Brownian motion will not be discussed in this thesis, for further understanding on this topic see [20, 21, 22].

In one-dimensional space $\hat{x}$, the forces on a particle undergoing Brownian
motion are described through Newton’s second law;

\[ \sum_i F_i = m \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = F_B(t) - \beta \frac{dx}{dt} \]

\[ \Rightarrow F_B(t) = m \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} + \beta \frac{dx}{dt} \tag{4.1} \]

where \( \beta = 6\pi \eta a \) is the Stokes’ drag coefficient for a submerged particle of mass \( m \) and radius \( a \) in a liquid of viscosity \( \eta \), and \( F_B(t) \) is the fluctuating force due to Brownian motion. Eqn 4.1 is known as the Langevin Equation [23] of a free particle in a liquid [21]. It is important to note that \( F_B(t) \) is random, and therefore its average\(^1\) value is zero \( \langle F_B(t) \rangle = 0 \), further details regarding this property will be discussed in Section 4.3.

### 4.2 Force Model of a Trapped Particle

In the presence of an optical trap the Brownian motion of a particle is suppressed, confining the particle to a region near the trapping laser focus. For small positional fluctuations within this region, coupled forces between the trapping laser and particle are (to a good approximation) linearly proportional to the displacement from equilibrium (laser focus). Therefore, the trapping laser applies a linear restoring force \( F_{\text{trap}} \) in 3-dimensions. This restoring force is comparable to a spring constant \( k \) in a mass-spring system, which is governed by Hooke’s law \( F = -kx \). Thus, the only adaptation to the current model Eqn. (4.1) is inclusion of this restoring force;

\[ F_B(t) = m \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} + \beta \frac{dx}{dt} + k_{\text{trap}}x(t) \tag{4.2} \]

where \( k_{\text{trap}} \) denotes the trapping spring constant. The Langevin equation presented Eqn. (4.2) is known as the Brownian motion of a simple harmonic oscillator [21].

---

\(^1\)The mean value (or average) will be denoted with angle brackets \( \langle \rangle \).
Typically, when modeling the motion of sub-micron particles in a viscous fluid the Reynolds numbers are low \((R_e < 1)\), which implies that \(m\ddot{x} \ll (\beta \dot{x} + kx)\). This condition suggests neglecting the inertial (acceleration) term in Eqn. (4.2) resulting in

\[
F_B(t) = \beta \frac{dx}{dt} + k_{\text{trap}} x. \tag{4.3}
\]

This model\(^2\) describing a thermally driven particle motion is commonly used in optical trapping analysis. As one may notice, Eqn. (4.2) is only dependent on three forces, the \textbf{restoring force} \(k_{\text{trap}}\), the \textbf{drag force} \(\beta \frac{dx}{dt}\), and the Brownian, or rather \textbf{thermal forces} \(F_B(t)\) that are driving the harmonic oscillator. A cartoon depiction of these forces and how they relate to a mass-spring system is shown in Figure 4.1.

\(^2\)Note that gravitational effects have been neglected in this model.
4.3 Analysis of Trapping Force: Spring Constant $k_{trap}$

There are two independent methods used to determine the trapping force (spring constant) $k_{trap}$ by acquiring the Brownian motion of a trapped particle. Employing multiple methods is particularly useful in cross-examining spring constant values, which provide key details involving the accuracy and reliability of the trapping apparatus.

The first method is through the equipartition theorem, from which the spring constant can be determined by the positional variance of a trapped particle’s Brownian motion. Techniques also includes applying the equipartition theorem to a Gaussian fit of the position histogram and a quadratic fit to a reconstructed optical potential well. This method is useful for determining the trapping spring constant because the analysis is independent of the particle’s radius $a$ and surrounding viscosity $\eta$.

The second method, and usually considered the most reliable [24], is through a one-sided power spectrum analysis of the particle’s position. The trapping spring constant is determined by fitting a Lorentzian and relating the corner frequency. Unlike the equipartition method, the power spectrum analysis relies on the particle’s physical properties as well as its surrounding medium.

4.3.1 Method 1: Equipartition Theorem Analysis

*Positional Variance*

The equipartition theorem states that at a temperature $T$ the average energy of any quadratic degree of freedom is $k_B T/2$. This theorem applies to *all* forms of energy (i.e. translational, rotational, vibrational, and elastic energy) for which the formula is a quadratic function of a dependent coordinate. This condition is met by our elastic potential energy model for the
spring constant

\[ E(x) = -\int F_{\text{trap}} \, dx = \frac{1}{2} k_x x^2 \]

yielding a harmonic potential (up to an integration constant). By relating positional variance and the equipartition theorem this becomes;

\[ \frac{1}{2} k_x \sigma_x^2 = \frac{1}{2} k_B T \]

\[ \Rightarrow \quad k_x = \frac{k_B T}{\sigma_x^2} \quad (4.4) \]

where \( k_B \) is Boltzmann’s constant. Thus, by measuring a particle’s Brownian motion and computing the positional variance the trapping spring constant is readily determined through Eqn. (4.4). Figure 4.2 displays the typical positional variance of a 1µm trapped polystyrene sphere.

**Figure 4.2:** Positional variance of a trapped 1µm diameter transparent polystyrene sphere. Data collection perform with trapping laser power \( \approx 37 \text{mW} \) at a depth of \( \approx 16\mu\text{m} \) from the sample cover slip (date: August 4, 2012).

**Position Histogram**

The spatial probability density function of a trapped particle over time can be described by Boltzmann statistics [25];

\[ p(x)dx = Ce^{-\frac{E(x)}{k_B T}}. \quad (4.5) \]

The quantity \( p(x)dx \) interpreted as the infinitesimal probability of finding a
particle at a position \( x \) over a infinitesimal space \( dx \) [26] in a potential \( E(x) \), and \( C \) is a normalization constant. Since the energy for a harmonic potential is \( E(x) = k_x \sigma_x^2/2 \), Boltzmann statistics (Eqn. (4.5)) imply;

\[
p(x)dx = Ce^{-\frac{E(x)}{k_BT}} = Ce^{-\frac{k_x \sigma_x^2}{2k_BT}} \to k_H = \frac{k_B T}{\sigma_x^2}, \tag{4.6}
\]

which is precisely the outcome (Eqn. (4.4)) of the previous positional variance technique.

This positional histogram technique may seem counterproductive and rather pointless based on the fact that the outcome Eqn. (4.6) is determined by implementing the equipartition theorem as was done in Eqn. (4.4). However, by fitting the histogram with a Gaussian curve and extracting the fitting parameters (constants) the spring constant \( k_H \) can be determined.

Note that the spring constant is labeled with the subscript \( H \), meaning the \( \hat{x} \) directional spring constant deduced by the position histogram technique\(^3\). Figure 4.3 displays the positional histogram (red bins) and Gaussian fit (black curve) of the Brownian particle from Figure 4.2.

\[\text{Figure 4.3: Typical position histogram and Gaussian fit of a trapped 1}\mu m\text{ diameter transparent polystyrene sphere. Data collection performed with trapping laser power } \approx 37mW\text{ at a depth of } \approx 16\mu m\text{ from the sample cover slip (date: August 4, 2012).}\]

\(^3\)The position histogram technique is a form of data compression called windowing, see Ref. [27] for more information involving data compression and optical tweezers.
The height of each histogram bar \( p(x) \) corresponds to the number of occurrences the particle was detected at a particular distance from the center of the optical trap. The spread (width) of the Gaussian distribution curve is proportional to the trapping spring constant \( k_H \), assuming room temperature \( T = 298K \). Thus, by fitting the histogram with a Gaussian distribution the \( k_H \) can be determined.

**Potential Well**

The final technique used to obtain the trapping spring constant is by reconstruction of the potential well from the position histogram and fitting a parabola. According to Florin [25] the potential \( E(x) \) experienced by the particle is found by taking the logarithmic of Eqn. (4.5):

\[
E(x) = -k_B T \ln(p(x)) + k_B T \ln(C),
\]

where the term \( k_B T \ln(C) \) is the well offset (average value, which in theory is zero) and will be neglected.

Next, consider the potential energy of a particle in a harmonic potential well modeled by a mass-spring system, which is proportional to the squared displacement;

\[
U = -\int F_s(x) \, dx = \frac{1}{2} k_{trap} x(t)^2
\]

\[
\frac{1}{2} k_{trap} x(t)^2 = ax(t)^2
\]

Eqn. (4.8) states that it is possible to extract the spring constant by fitting a parabola and extracting the fitting parameters. This expression is related to the analytical solution of Eqn. (4.7),

\[
E(x) = \frac{1}{2} k_{trap} x(t)^2 = -k_B T \ln(p(x))
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \quad k_w = \frac{-2k_B T}{x(t)^2} \ln(p(x)).
\]

(4.9)
For this reason the spring constant, denoted as $k_w$, is obtained by fitting a parabola to the logarithmic values of the positional histogram and extracting the fitting parameters.

Figure 4.4 displays the potential well of the histogram occurrences (dots), which is fitted to a parabola (black line). Notice that the histogram data (dots) near the ends of the plot tends to have a larger spread from the fit. This is due to the small sample size at large distances from the trapping center. Meaning that the trapping forces cause the particle to spend more time in the middle (i.e. lower potential energies) rather than at large distances from the laser focus.

Figure 4.4: Typical potential well and fit of a trapped $1\mu m$ diameter transparent polystyrene sphere. Data collection performed with trapping laser power $\approx 37mW$ at a depth of $\approx 16\mu m$ from the sample cover slip (date: August 4, 2012).

4.3.2 Method 2: Power Spectrum Analysis

The power spectral density (power spectrum or PSD) of a trapped particle is a method used to analyze its motion signal in the frequency domain $x(f)$, as opposed to the time domain $x(t)$ in Figure 4.2. This analysis method is considered the most reliable [24] and is particularly useful in cross-referencing with the equipartition techniques outlined in Section 4.3.1 because it takes into consideration the physical properties of the trapped specimen and its surrounding liquid. Mapping to the frequency domain is achieved by taking the Fourier transform of the Brownian motion $F_B(t)$ with respect to time of
the particle’s trajectory \( x(t) \) represented in Figure 4.2. The central purpose of this transformation is that the frequency response of the particle’s motion reveals an attribute that is related to the trap stiffness.

Brownian motion is presented theoretically as the Langevin equation illustrated in Eqn (4.3), which is once again;

\[
F_B(t) = \beta \frac{dx}{dt} + k_{trap} x. \quad (4.10)
\]

The solution to this equation can be found by taking the Fourier transform,

\[
F_B(t) = \beta \frac{dx}{dt} + k_{trap} x \xrightarrow{F} \tilde{F}_B(f) = (i\beta 2\pi f + k_{trap})\tilde{x}(f). \quad (4.11)
\]

and taking the square of the complex norm;

\[
|\tilde{F}(f)|^2 = (\beta^2 4\pi^2 f^2 + k^2)|\tilde{x}(f)|^2. \quad (4.12)
\]

\(|\tilde{F}(f)|^2\) holds physical value of the energy content per unit frequency interval, namely power spectrum. Whereas, the power spectrum \(|F(t)|^2\) is proportional to the total energy of the oscillatory system. Accordingly, both \(|\tilde{F}(f)|^2\) and \(|F(t)|^2\) are interprets of energy [28].

As mentioned in Section 4.1 the thermal fluctuations of a trapped particle is considered random with zero mean \( \langle F_B(t) \rangle = 0 \). R. Kubo describes in a report on the classical Langevin equation [29]; under the assumptions that \( F_B(t) \) is (1) a Gaussian process, and (2) its correlation time is infinitely short, the power spectrum of \( F_B(t) \) is equal to a constant. These characteristics imply that the random Brownian force \( F_B(t) \) has a white spectrum and is considered white noise\(^4\). Thus, the constant\(^5\) denoting the one-sided thermal power spectral density per unit time is [30, 21];

\[
G_o = |\tilde{F}(f)|^2 = 4 \beta k_B T. \quad (4.13)
\]

\(^4\)White noise is a random signal with a flat (constant) power spectral density.
\(^5\)For the relation of Eqn. (4.13) and further explanation see Appendix A.2.1.
Relating Eqn. (4.12) and (4.13) gives,

\[ 4\beta k_B T = (\beta^2 4\pi^2 f^2 + k^2)|\tilde{x}(f)|^2 \]

\[ |\tilde{x}(f)|^2 = S_{xx}(f) = \frac{k_B T}{\pi^2 \beta (f_c^2 + f^2)^2}. \] (4.14)

For a particle in a harmonic potential, \( S_{xx}(f) \) corresponds to the expected one-sided power spectral density per unit time, which is that of a Lorentzian curve with corner frequency \( f_c \) that is proportional to the trap strength \( f_c = k_{\text{trap}} / 2\pi\beta \). Therefore, by expressing a trapped particle’s position \( x(t) \) in terms of frequency components a Lorentzian fit to the power spectrum \( S_{xx}(f) \) will yield the trap spring constant \( k_s [31, 12, 30] \).

Figure 4.5 displays the power spectrum of a trapped 1\( \mu m \) polystyrene sphere corresponding to the trajectory \( x(t) \) shown in Figure 4.2. From the Lorentzian fit (black line) of the windowed data (dots) the corner frequency can be easily determined.

![Figure 4.5: Typical power spectrum (dots) and Lorentzian fit (solid line) of a trapped 1\( \mu m \) diameter transparent polystyrene sphere. Data collection perform with trapping laser power \( \approx 37 mW \) at a depth of \( \approx 16 \mu m \) from the sample cover slip (date: August 4, 2012).](image)

For details pertaining to the methods included in this section see [27, 32].
Chapter 5

Force Measurement
Calibrations

Techniques described in this section are designed to calibrate the quadrant photodiode (QPD) detection signal in order to accurately track a trapped particle’s movement. As Neuman and Block state in their 2004 overview of optical trapping [12], “accurate position calibration lies at the heart of quantitative optical trapping.” There are several position calibration methods, which are dependent upon the chosen position detection scheme and the ability to move the trap and/or sample holder stage [12].

The main ideas behind the calibration procedure is to ensure proper coalignment (overlap) between the trapping and detection laser at the trapping plane and centering the back focal plane image onto the QPD detection sensor. Detection laser calibrations consists of two calibration methods, one preformed by imagining a particle attached to the cover-slip, and then imagining a trapped particle at the intended trapping depth from the surface of the microscope cover-slip. Depth calibration presented in the following sections are all preformed at $\approx 16\mu m$ from the cover-slip surface, into the sample.
5.1 Optical Tweezer Calibrations

The sample-slide is placed on an adjustable $xy$-plane sample holder. The holder positions the sample-slide within the trapping plane of the inverted microscope, which lies between the objective and the condenser. An encoder-mike controller (Oriel 18011) is used to move the objective in the axial-direction ($\hat{z}$). This therefore moves the trapping plane towards the cover-slip and into the sample. The images produced by the inverted microscope are projected into a CCD (charged-coupled device) camera and viewed on a monitor shown in Figure 5.1. By moving the trapping plane into the sample

![Figure 5.1: Picture taken of the viewing monitor from a depth of 16µm within a sample of polystyrene spheres. The white circular rings are diffraction fringes produced by the detection laser. Three microspheres are shown.](image)

we are able to identify when the trapping laser focal point passes the cover-slip and enters into the sample by viewing the diffraction pattern on the CCD camera. At this point the objective is stopped and a sphere attached to the cover-slip is found by manually moving the sample holder. Attached spheres are those that do not undergo random Brownian motion and are physically stuck to the cover-slip. Differentiating the two is quite simple. Stuck spheres do not move.
5.1.1 Cover-slip Calibrations: Immobilized Particle

Cover-slip calibration is achieved by inducing particle movement and mapping the displacement of the sphere relative to the focus. The sample holder is oscillated with a piezo-electric material, which changes lengths when an electric potential is applied. By oscillating the stage with a sinusoidal potential while mapping the particles displacement with the detection laser we are able to analyze its displacement in terms of output voltage from the QPD. We expect the restoring force to be linear through the equilibrium position of the trap, which coincides with the mass-spring model. In addition, the particle position should be symmetric about the equilibrium point because the stage is being driven by a symmetric (AC) electric-field.

Figure 5.2 displays the oscilloscope response of an attached bead to the cover-slip when the piezo-electric stage is driven by a continuous 300mV sinusoidal waveform. The voltage response is produced by a quadrant photodiode (QPD) detector, which produces voltage response proportional to the bead’s displacement through the detection laser. Calibrations and measurements are usually performed using a QPD gain setting of 100.

![Oscilloscope response cover-slip calibration](image)

**Figure 5.2:** Oscilloscope response of an immobilized sphere in continuous mode. Function generator settings: 300mV$_{pp}$ frequency: 61Hz QPD gain: 100

Figure 5.2 display typical QPD responses for the specified function gen-
erator settings. As mentioned, the key features of these calibrations is to gain a symmetric response about the zero axis, and linear response through the axis. Both quantities correspond to the alignment and projection of the detection laser into the QPD. In addition, these procedures also gain insight into how well the trapping laser is aligned through the objective-condenser pair.

5.1.2 Depth Calibration: Brownian Motion

The second procedure in the calibration process is analyzing the displacement of a trapped sphere at a known depth within the sample. For reliable and reproducible results, I have chosen to use a depth of 16µm for all of my depth calibration. I chose this depth because trap strength measurements will be conducted at this depth, for that reason a calibration at the same depth is logical in producing the best possible consistent results. This calibration resembles the cover-slip calibration process, in that, calibrations are performed first with a continuous wave (cw) potential mode, and then a 2-cycle burst mode.

Methods using the cw mode is comparable to those used in the cover-slip calibration. A sphere is trapped using at 10mW and the displacement signal is viewed on the oscilloscope (Figure 5.3a). The signal produced by the

![Figure 5.3: Depth calibration oscilloscope response for a trapped sphere in continuous and burst mode](image)
oscilloscope is expected to resemble an amplitude response comparable to the cover-slip calibration (Figure 5.2), except for a slightly minimized amplitude response caused by the trapping laser forces.

The main goal of this calibration procedure is to ensure the detection laser is properly overlapping the trapping laser at the intended trapping depth. At this point it is easy to see whether or not the overlapping of the trapping and detection laser is reasonable. Slight “tweaking” of L3, which controls the path of the detection laser, may be needed to produce a symmetric oscilloscope response. The 2-cycle burst mode calibration (Figure 5.3b) is one of the best indications of the overlapping. This mode allows observation of the Brownian motion response after the burst. It has been observed that for optimal trap stiffness measurements the “tailing” noise (Brownian motion) exhibits rapid decay after the burst that leads into symmetric noise, as seen in Figure 5.3b.
Force Measurement Calibrations
Chapter 6

Trap Strength Experiments

Experiments performed in this chapter are designed to measure the trapping force on colloidal microspheres suspended in water. Numerous experiments were organize to investigate the reproducibility and accuracy of the measured trapping spring constant $k$ and calibration factor $1/\rho$ (Eqn. (6.1)). Experiments and their results in this chapter include: Chapter 6.2 power dependence, Chapter 6.3 sphere-to-sphere variation, and Chapter 6.4 depth dependence.

6.1 Determining Trap Stiffness: An Example

Trap stiffness $k$ and calibration $1/\rho$ quantities are obtained by acquiring the transverse $\tilde{x}$ time series displacement of a trapped particle undergoing Brownian motion (Figure 6.1a). These experiments are essentially testing how well the trapping laser is aligned through the inverted microscope while simultaneously testing the coalignment of the detection laser to the trapping laser, as well as the detection subsystem accuracy. Details regarding these characteristics will be further examined in each result discussion section proceeding the experiment.

\textsuperscript{1}The terms spring constant, trap strength, and trap stiffness are equivalent in meaning and are used interchangeably throughout.
All experimental spring constant values are determined by analyzing the LabVIEW signal response through a custom Mathematica program. This program applies the analysis methods outlined in Section 4.3 with slight experimental adjustments that involve a calibration factor $\rho$.

The calibration factor is, as it sounds, a constant value that calibrates the QPD voltage signal into usable values of displacement, namely nanometers. This is achieved by adjusting the PSD in Eqn (4.14) to the QPD signal by adding a linear calibration constant denoted$^2$ as $\rho$, which holds units of voltage per unit of displacement $[V/nm]$.

For example, the spring constant $k_x$ of a $1\mu m$ polystyrene sphere having a measured displacement variance from equilibrium $\sigma_x^2=(14.5nm)^2$ (Figure 6.1a) is first acquired through the equipartition theorem (Eqn. (4.4));

$$\frac{1}{2}k_B T = \frac{1}{2}k_x \sigma_x^2 \implies k_x = \frac{k_B T}{\sigma_x^2},$$

yielding a value of $k_x=19.36 \ pN/\mu m$.

$^2$Note that the calibration factor corresponding to $cal$ within the Mathematica computations is equivalent to the inverse of $\rho$, $cal = 1/\rho$
Determining Trap Stiffness: An Example

Figure 6.1: Mathematica data analysis of the suppressed Brownian motion of a 1µm polystyrene sphere at a sample depth of ≈16µm and trapping laser power 37mW at 795nm wavelength. a) Time series of the suppressed Brownian motion from which $k_x$ is computed through the equipartition theorem. b) Histogram (bin) of the particle’s displacement from the mean, from which $k_H$ is computed through extracting fit parameters. c) Power spectral density (PSD) from which $k_s$ is computed by obtaining the corner frequency. d) Potential well analysis of the histogram from which $k_w$ is computed through fitting parameters.

The $k_s$ spring constant is next obtained by analyzing the calibrated power spectrum of the particle’s position fluctuations, which is related to the Fourier transform of Figure 6.1a;

$$S_{vo}(f) = \rho^2 \frac{k_B T}{\pi^2 \beta (f_0^2 + f^2)},$$

where $\beta=6\pi\eta a$ is defined as the viscous drag coefficient (Stokes) in water, $f$ is the frequency (Hz), and $f_c=k_s/2\pi\beta$ is the corner frequency. The results shown in Figure 6.1c yields a corner frequency of $f_c=330$ Hz with a displacement-to-voltage calibration factor of $1/\rho=475$ nm/V. Thus, by relating the corner frequency and spring constant we obtain $k_s=19.5$ pN/µm.

The trap stiffness is also obtained by fitting a Gaussian (normal distribu-
Trap Strength Experiments

Presentation) curve to the positional histogram in Figure 6.1b. A byproduct of this method is the optical potential well, which is essentially fitting the histogram distribution in units of energy, i.e. logarithmic scale Figure 6.1d.

\[ p(x) \propto \exp \left( -\frac{U}{k_B T} \right) = \exp \left( \frac{k_h x^2}{2k_B T} \right). \]

The fitting parameters are then extracted yielding a trap strength for the histogram fit of \( k_H = 19.2 \) pN/µm, and \( k_w = 19.3 \) pN/µm for the potential well fit. The required specification for a reliable and accurate trap is that all four methods yield a spring constant to within 10%.

6.2 Power Dependence Measurements

Experiments involving power dependence measurements were performed on 1µm (σ=0.02µm) diameter transparent polystyrene (Duke Scientific) and 0.99µm (σ=0.02) silica (Thermo Scientific) microspheres suspended deionized water. Sample cells were prepared by the techniques outlined in Chapter 3.2. Measurements were taken with a trapping wavelength near 800nm and optical powers ranging from 10mW to 37mW (as measured before DM2 Figure 3.1) at a trapping-plane depth of \( \approx 16 \mu m \) from the sample cell cover slip.

Figure 6.2 displays the measured spring constant \( k_x \) over a span of optical powers ranging from 10-30mW. Each power dependence measurement was conducted on the same microsphere as a control to eliminate uncertainties involving sphere-to-sphere diameter deviations.

The plotted points in Figure 6.2 correspond to the average measured spring constant computed via Mathematica. Each data collection set contains four 30 second data runs, yielding four values for the spring constant within a standard two minute testing time. The \( k_x, k_h, k_s, k_w \), and calibration factor \( 1/\rho \) values are imported into a custom MATLAB program. The MATLAB program averages each spring constant method value over each
30 second run, computes the standard deviation, fits a linear regression to the average values for the range of optical powers, and plots the spring constants and calibration factors with error bars corresponding to the standard deviation from the mean.

Figure 6.2: Trap strength power variance measurements for polystyrene and silica microspheres suspended in deionized water. Inset: Linear fit parameters obtained from the Mathematica trap stiffness methods $k_x, k_h, k_s, k_w$.

For example, a four data run set corresponding to an optical power of 10mW is circled in Figure 6.2. This particular dataset produced spring constants $k_x = 5.34, 5.28, 5.12,$ and $5.14$ (pN/µm). The MATLAB program computes and plots the mean value $k_{\text{mean}} = 5.22$ (pN/µm) and standard deviation $k_{SDw} = 0.11$ (pN/µm). Similarly, the calibration factors are averaged and plotted in the same manner Figure 6.3.

Figure 6.3 displays the displacement-to-voltage calibration factor $1/\rho$ corresponding to Figure 6.2 for each optical trapping power. The calibration factor is the value needed to convert the QPD voltage signal to displacement (nm), which is used within the Mathematica computations to resolve each spring constant value via power spectrum. The calibration factors are first approximated in the initial trap stiffness computation and later re-iterated with a more accurate value.
Figure 6.3: Averages of the displacement-to-voltage calibration factors used in the Mathematica computations to resolve the trap stiffness.

To ensure reproducibility, power dependence measurements were performed on multiple samples over an extended time period between experiments. Figure 6.4 displays trap stiffness measurements conducted during different trial days for polystyrene spheres. Each experiment was performed under the condition of total realignment and calibration of the apparatus.

Figure 6.4: Polystyrene power reproducibility.
Figure 6.4 displays power reproducibility values of all polystyrene power dependence experiments (circles) between August 2012 to February 2013. Error bars are the standard deviation from the mean, which is fitted to a linear best fit (solid line) using the least squares method. (Dashed lines) the maximum and minimum slopes within the limits of the error bars. **Note:** Measurements at power 37mW is not included in the fitting due to limited data.

**Discussion**

The trap strength spring constants presented in Figure 6.2 exhibit a linear dependence with optical trapping powers. This response is expected from the assumptions and analysis outlined in Section 4, in the view of the fact that trap stiffness is determined by modeling the trapped particle as a mass-spring system. Thus, increasing the power of the trapping laser is analogous to attaching a stiffer spring to the system in Figure 4.1.

From Figure 6.2 it is easy to see a large differentiation between the trap stiffness of silica and polystyrene spheres. One important factor is that the Mathematica program used to compute the trapping spring constant is designed for polystyrene microspheres based on [27], which does not account for the relative index of refraction between the particle and its surroundings. This discrepancy is not too worrisome, in that, further experiments including silica spheres can be normalized to the trapping spring constants of polystyrene, which are well known. Work on this relation has been modeled and simulated in [13].

The calibration factor results shown in Figure 6.3 display a constant relation over the range of powers. This trend is expected because the calibration factor \(1/\rho\) is the factor used in converting the QPD signal from a measure of electric potential (Volts) to displacement (nm), which should not change with increasing/decreasing powers. The main concern in calibration factor is large ‘drifting’ to either higher or lower values between experiments.

Figure 6.4 exhibits some rather interesting effects, in that, it shows how
the trap stiffness deviation from the mean starts to increase at higher pow-
ers, which can be seen from the maximum and minimum fit lines. This
development is actually expected, because the expansion lens (L3 Figure 3.1)
is positioned/calibrated for trapping near 10mW. As the powers increase
the radiation pressure (incident photon force) increases, pushing the parti-
cle deeper into the sample. As a result, the detection laser focal plane isn’t
centered ‘on’ (or near) the center of the trapped particle, instead it is higher
(or deeper into the sample). Thus, the diffraction-limited focal point of the
detection laser has begun to spread out, which not only changes the geometry
of the back-focal plane interferometer but it also begins to veer.

6.3 Sphere-to-Sphere Variation Measurements

Sphere-to-sphere variation measurements are performed in this section on
1µm-diameter polystyrene beads at a trapping depth ≈ 16µm from the glass
cover-slip. These experiments serve to provide an experimental estimate on
the particle diameter uncertainties. The polystyrene spheres used in the
following experiment are known to have ±0.02µm diameter deviation.
Discussion

Figure 6.5 displays spring constant results for eight different polystyrene microspheres in water. The plot displays spring constant values \( k_x, k_h, k_s, k_w \) corresponding to the Mathematica calculation methods described in section 4.3. The error bars correspond to the standard deviation between the number of data runs acquired during each trial. In this particular experiment there were only two data runs per trial dataset. Because of the low number of data runs the standard deviation is only a comparison between two values. For more accurate results, increased data runs are needed.

6.4 Depth Dependence Measurements

Trapping spring constant \( k_x \) depth dependence for 1µm polystyrene sphere were also explored. Depth dependence measurements insure proper depth to eliminate thermal contribution from the glass cover-slip. It is expected to see large trap strength variations near the cover-slip and at large depths, due to the limiting numerical aperture of the oil immersed objective. Measurements were performed on the same sphere over a range of 2µm-22µm, results for \( k_x \) are shown in Figure 6.6.

![Spring Constant k_x Sample Depth Dependence](image)

**Figure 6.6:** Trap spring constant \( k_x \) and calibration factor (inset) sample depth dependence, with standard deviation error bars.
Discussion

As expected, near the cover-slip, there are large thermal contributions coupled with the trapping forces, resulting in a lower trapping spring constant. It is important to note that this type of experiment is much trickier than it seems because it’s extremely difficult to exactly co-align the detection and trapping lasers during the alignment procedure. In consequence, as the trapping plane goes to increased depths into the sample the detection laser tends to veer. To compensate, at each depth measurement presented in Figure 6.6 a quick calibration was performed to roughly overlap both lasers.

6.5 Conclusion

From the discussion and results presented in section 6.2, it has been shown that the optical tweezer apparatus exhibits, as expected, linear power dependence for polystyrene and silica trap stiffness constant $k_{\text{trap}}$. We can conclude from this that our procedures provide reproducible trap stiffness value to within an experimental uncertainty of 10.5% for 1µm polystyrene microspheres at trapping powers near 15mW. This confirms that these procedures can provide accurate trapping measurements in the transverse $\hat{x}$ direction near trapping powers of 15mW. However, large variations in spring constant values have been observed at increasing powers due to underlying effects. These effects have been hypothesized to be caused by increase radiation pressure at powers $>20mW$.

In addition, the findings presented in sections 6.3 show the expected constant trend between multiple polystyrene microspheres. Similar results for 1µm-diameter silica spheres have also been observed (not shown). Section 6.4 confirms that at small trapping depths ($<4\mu m$) thermal fluctuations contribute greatly in measuring the trapping spring constant. At increased depths ($<22\mu m$) constant trap stiffness values are obtained as expected. This confirms that at a trapping depth of $\approx16\mu m$ there are minimal to no thermal contributions.
Chapter 7

Preliminary Surface Charge Measurements

This chapter presents preliminary studies involving optical tweezer-based surface charge measurements of colloidal silica microspheres dispersed in water. Techniques developed by [8] are implemented to establish methods necessary to preform, detect, and measure electrophoretic contribution. The electrophoresis experiment in this section is designed to measure the effective surface charge $Z_{\text{eff}}$ response at relatively low (AC) electric-field frequencies near the optical trap corner frequency.

7.1 Basic Principles and Model

Surface charge measurements are most readily preformed through electrophoresis experiments, that is, measuring a particle’s displacement in the presence of an (AC) electric-field perturbation. The electric-field introduces Coulomb-force interacts with charges near the particle surface creating an electrokinetic force, which induces particle movement. As the particle moves through the liquid, surrounding ions are continually binding to, and dissociating from, the particle surface yielding a fluctuating effective surface charge value. However, the amount by which the particle is displaced is related to the electric-field
perturbation amplitude $E_{AC}$.

With the electric-field perturbation addition there are now three forces acting on the optically trapped microsphere: (1) photonic restoring forces $F_{\text{trap}}$, (2) Stokes frictional forces $F_{\text{drag}}$, and (3) a harmonic electric-field force $F_{AC} = A\sin(2\pi f Et + \phi)$. The equation of motion is the superposition of these three forces, namely;

$$m\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} + \beta \frac{dx}{dt} + k_{\text{trap}}x(t) = A\sin(2\pi f Et + \phi) + F_B(t). \quad (7.1)$$

Where $F_B(t)$ represents the random thermal Brownian motion (Gaussian process), and defining the effective\(^\text{1}\) electrokinetic surface charge $Z_{\text{eff}} = A/E_{AC}$, which holds units of fundamental charge $q_{el}$ [8].

The motion equation Eqn. (7.1) can be averaged together to get a correlations function $\mathcal{C}(t)$ which then can be expressed as a normalized function in terms of the parameter $\gamma^2$, a scaled ratio between the mean-square electric-field force and the Brownian thermal forces;

$$\gamma^2 = \frac{\langle F_E^2 \rangle / \langle F_{Ei}^2 \rangle}{1 + (\omega_E/\omega_c)^2} \quad (7.2)$$

where $\langle F_E^2 \rangle = Z_{\text{eff}}^2 e^2 E^2/2$ and $\langle F_{Ei}^2 \rangle = k_B T k_{\text{trap}}$. This scaling ratio $\gamma$ is the most common value extracted in practice [8], and solving for the effective surface change $Z_{\text{eff}}$ comes easily;

$$|Z_{\text{eff}}| q_{el} = \frac{\gamma \beta}{E} \sqrt{\frac{2k_B T}{k_{\text{trap}}} (\omega_E^2 + \omega_c^2)} \quad (7.3)$$

where $\beta = 6\pi n d$ Stokes’ drag constant and $E = V/d$ is the amplitude of the applied (AC) electric-field measured in units of volts per meters. Taking the

\(^{\text{1}}\)The effective value of an alternating quantity is merely the expected value, or root-mean-square.
Fourier transform of Eqn. (7.3) yields:

$$\tilde{x}(\omega) = \frac{k_B T}{\pi \beta} \frac{1}{(\omega^2 + \omega_c^2)} + \frac{k_B T \gamma^2}{2 k_{\text{trap}}} \left[ \delta(\omega - \omega_E) + \delta(\omega + \omega_E) \right].$$  (7.4)

Eqn. (7.4) describes the power spectral density function of the trapped particle within the presence of an applied (AC) electric-field\(^2\). Notice that the first term exhibits Lorentzian properties comparable to a Brownian particle in a harmonic potential well. As expected, this term is equivalent to the power spectral density of a trapped panicle, that is, Eqn. (4.14). However, the second term is a superposition of two delta functions, which arises from the (AC) electric-field perturbation, where \(\omega_E = 2\pi f_E\) is the driving frequency. The delta functions are defined as being equal to one if \(\omega_E = \omega\). Therefore, we would expect the PSD to contain a peak-value at the electric-field frequency that is proportional to \(\gamma^2\), which can be found extracting the electric-field PSD contribution and integrating over all frequencies [8].

In short, by tracking a trapped particle within the presence of an external (AC) electric-field and expressing its motion in frequency components (PSD), a peak at the driving voltage frequency will occur. The peak value is proportional to the scale ratio \(\gamma^2\), and thus, the effective surface charge \(Z_{\text{eff}}\) Eqn. (7.3) carried by the particle. An estimate for the effective surface charge can be calculated by finding the area under the peak value of the PSD.

**Corollary**

It is important to note that this method is only valid for small ion concentrations where the zeta potential (electrokinetic potential) at the hydrodynamic slipping plane boundary of the double layer is small. In which case the Huckel limit is valid and the electrophoretic mobility is proportional to the surface charge. Outside of this limiting case, increased ion concentrations form a

---

\(^2\)Eqn. (7.4) describes the two-sided PSD, which is composed of real and imaginary parts, in practice the one-sided PSD is normally used, yielding only one delta function.
thickened cloud (double layer) around the particle, results in large screening effects. Upon particle movement, the thickened double layer is more susceptible to large deformation, in which case the relaxation effects perturb the electrophoretic mobility, consequently giving rise to disproportionality between the mobility and zeta potential.

7.2 Preliminary Surface Charge Experiments

Modified Sample Cell Preparation

Samples are prepared in a custom sample cell holder similar to the procedures outlined in section 3.2, with slight modifications. Modifications include fastened electrodes and the ability to reuse the sample cell. Electrophoresis sample cell are prepared dry by gluing two thin aluminum strips separated by about 100µm to a microscope cover-slip. A small slit is cut through the microscope slide using a DREMEL rotary diamond wheel (545), used to load/reload and wash out the sample cell.

An adhesive spacer is placed on the microscope slide and a small channel ≈ 1mm wide is cut out and removed to allow fluid flow while cleaning and reloading the cell. The electrode/cover-slip is placed on the spacer and the edges are glued to help prevent leakage through the spacer walls. Silica microspheres (Thermo Scientific 8100 series) of diameter \( d = 0.99\mu m \pm 0.02\mu m \) dispersed in deionized-water (\( \varepsilon = 80 \) @20°C) 10% by weight and is injected into the sample cell through the slit in the microscope slide.

7.2.1 Silica Frequency Dependence

Electrophoresis experiments were performed on silica particles with a laser trapping power of 10mW, 790nm wavelength, at a trapping depth of ≈ 16µm from the cover-slip. The electrode separation was measured to be ≈ 106µm along the \( \hat{x} \)-direction of the sample. A trapped sphere was positioned at the midpoint between the electrodes and a (AC) electric-field was applied across
the electrode channel using a Tektronix function generator (AFG 3021). The electric-field strength was calculated under the assumption of ideal parallel-plate, \( E = V/d \). A sinusoidal potential with zero DC offset 8.533\(V_{pp} \) was supplied to the electrode connections by the function generator, resulting in \( E_{AC} \approx 40kV/m \). Figure 7.1 shows the electrode sample cell positioning within the optical tweezer apparatus.

The particle displacement was acquired by a quadrant photodiode and trapping spring constant measurements were analyzed by the power spectrum method described in section 4.3.2. Electrophoresis measurements were taken as a function of the applied (AC) electric-field frequency near the optical trapping corner frequency with trapping power \( \approx 10mW \). Figure 7.2 displays the PSD response for electric-field frequencies ranging from 18\(Hz \) to 118\(Hz \) in increments of 10\(Hz \).

At each frequency increment, one dataset consisting of four data runs was acquired at a sampling frequency of 10\(kHz \) (2\(^{18} \) samples per data run), and one data run was acquired in the absence of the electric-field before and after each electrophoresis dataset. Over the four data runs for each electrophoretic frequency the displacement response was binned (windowed) to eliminate noise, averaged, and plotted (colored lines) in Figure 7.2.
Results and Discussion

The PSD responses in Figure 7.2 exhibit peak-like trends corresponding to the frequency of the applied electric-field, which is in agreement with Eqn. (7.4), the expected response. For each frequency dependent electrophoresis experiment the PSD response was fit with a Lorentzian and the corner frequency (trap stiffness) was extracted. The fit was subtracted from the experimental data and the remaining contributions was integrated over all frequencies. From the integration value, $\gamma^2$ was determined and the effective surface charge $Z_{eff}$ was calculated through Eqn. (7.3). The calculated effective surface charge value corresponding to each electric-field frequency is presented in the table inset of Figure 7.2 and in Appendix A.3.
For this particular experiment, values for the effective surface charge $Z_{eff}$ range from $\approx 66q_{el} - 113q_{el}$. These values are an order of magnitude larger than experiments involving PMMA microspheres in low dielectric suspension, dodecane ($\epsilon = 2$) [8, 9, 33]. However, similar electrophoretic experiments [34] involving deionized water have measured the effective surface charge of silica within a range of $\approx 471q_{el} - 2200q_{el}$. Discrepancies between [34] and the results presented in this section is most likely due to two assumption made for determining the effective surface charge. (1) The electric-field at the particle surface is approximately $E = V/d$, which is not the case because the dielectric constant of water ($\epsilon = 80$) was not taken into consideration. (2) Each computation is based on a model that assumes the Hückel limiting case, which does not account for nonlinear double layer relaxation effects.

**Summary**

The preliminary work presented in this section has accomplished the goals set-forth to instill supporting evidence that the experimental setup is capable of detecting and measuring electrophoretic effects. From these results we (OPE) now have a control to test the effects of monolayer coated silica spheres. Particularly, organic coating such as ADT-TES-F, an anthradithiophene (ADT) derivative functionalized with triethylsilylethynyl (TES) and fluorinated (F) side groups. Pending on the results of coated spheres, further electrophoretic experiments will be tweaked to investigate the charging nature. Such as, the charge in nonpolar liquid and adopting similar methods of [9] to analyze the discrete charging nature of each coating.

Experiments may include surface charge measurements and the dependence on the surrounding environment. That is, creating a more/less viscous, or polar liquid suspension and exploring how particular organic coatings respond to these changes. This approach may hold potential to pioneer a method for analyzing charge carrier dynamics of specific organic molecules and mechanisms involved with sub-elementary charge $q_{el}$ resolution.
Appendix A

Additional Material
A.1 Optical Tweezer Setup

Optical Tweezer Setup Picture

Figure A.1: Picture of the optical tweezer setup constructed including all active components

Figure A.1 displays the optical tweezer setup constructed and used for the work in this thesis. The following list of active components were used:

- Trapping laser IR (green): Mini ti:sapphire 800nm
- Detection laser He-Ne (red): Low powered 633nm
- M(x): Silver mirrors
- L1 and L2: Thor LA1608-B 75mm
- L3: 100nm doublet
- L4: Pcx1303 50mm
- DM1: 660DCLP
Optical Tweezer Setup

- DM2: Thor 43955
- DM3: Newport 05B20UF.25
- ND: E640SP and Thor FES0650
- Objective: 100/1.25 oil 160/0.17
- Condenser: Edmund DIN 20 0.40
- DAQ: National Instruments NI-6221
- CCD: Marshall V-1050A
- Transcoder Mike and Controller: ORIEL 18011 Encoder mike controller
- Function generator: Tektronix AFG 3021
- Custom build quadrant photodiode detector QPD (Mark Kendrick and Mark Warner)
- Custom LabVIEW acquisition program (not shown, Mark Kendrick 2007)
- Custom Mathematica data analysis program (not shown, Dr. David Mcintyre)
A.2 Force Measurements

This sections contains some supporting material corresponding to Chapter 4.

A.2.1 One-sided PSD constant $G_o$

The relation shown in this section corresponds to Einstein’s diffusion constant and how it relate a Brownian particle’s random thermal fluctuations to its mobility. This essentially relates fluctuation quantities and dissipation, which is also known as fluctuating dissipation theory, refer to [29] for more information on this topic.

The following relation is based from the writings of Thermal cantilever calibration by W. Trevor King [35].

**Prelude**

This relation utilizes the following Fourier transform properties and theorems [28].

- **Equipartition theorem:**
  \[
  \frac{1}{2} k_b T = \frac{1}{2} k_{trap} \langle x(t) \rangle^2 
  \]
  (A.1)

  where $\langle \rangle$ denotes the variance. Fourier transform normalization:

  \[
  \mathcal{F}_f \{ x(t) \} (f) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x(t)e^{-i2\pi f t} dt 
  \]
  (A.2)

- **Fourier property:**
  \[
  \mathcal{F} \left( \frac{d^n x(t)}{dt^n} \right) = (i2\pi f)^n \tilde{x}(f) 
  \]
  (A.3)

- **Parseval’s theorem:**
  \[
  \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x)|^2 dx = int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 dk 
  \]
  (A.4)
We can translate Eqn. (A.2) to the one-sided power spectral density per unit time PSD:

\[
PSD_f(x, f) \equiv \lim_{t_T \to \infty} \frac{1}{t_T} 2|\mathcal{F}_f\{x(t)\}(f)|^2
\]  
(A.5)

where \( t_T \) is the total time for the acquired data. This relates to the variance of \( x(t) \) through Parseval’s theorem;

\[
\langle x(t)^2 \rangle = \int_0^\infty PSD_f(x, f) df
\]  
(A.6)

**One-sided thermal PSD constant per unit time \( G_o \)**

For the highly damped case, mapping the Langevin equation of motion into the frequency domain via Fourier transform yields;

\[
F_B(t) = \beta \frac{dx}{dt} + k_{trap} x(t) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} \tilde{F}_B(f) = (i\beta 2\pi f + k_{trap})\tilde{x}(f),
\]  
(A.7)

and taking the square complex norm of Eqn (A.7) and solving for \( |\tilde{x}(f)|^2 \);

\[
|\tilde{F}_B(f)|^2 = (\beta^2 4\pi^2 f^2 + k^2)|\tilde{x}(f)|^2
\]  
(A.8)

\[
\Rightarrow |\tilde{x}(f)|^2 = \frac{|\tilde{F}_B(f)|^2}{(2\pi\beta f)^2 + k_{trap}^2}.
\]  
(A.9)

Computing the PSD by inserting Eqn. (A.9) into Eqn. (A.5) gives the one-sided thermal power spectral density constant \( G_o \) per unit time;

\[
PSD_f(\tilde{f}_B, f) = G_o = \lim_{t_T \to \infty} \frac{1}{t_T} 2|\tilde{f}_B(t)|^2
\]  
(A.10)

Inserting Eqn. (A.10) into Eqn. (A.9) gives;

\[
PSD(x, f) = \frac{G_o}{(2\pi\beta f)^2 + k_{trap}^2}.
\]  
(A.11)

Integrating Eqn. (A.11) over all positive frequencies gives the total power per
unit time;
\[
\int_0^\infty PSD(x, f) df = \int_0^\infty \frac{G_o}{\beta^2 4 \pi^2 f^2 + k_{trap}^2} = \frac{G_o}{4 \beta k_{trap}} \quad (A.12)
\]

Now inserting this into Parseval’s theorem relating the variance Eqn. (A.6) gives;
\[
\langle (t)^2 \rangle = \int_0^\infty PSD_f(x, f) df = \frac{G_o}{4 \beta k_{trap}} \quad (A.13)
\]
\[
\Rightarrow \langle (t)^2 \rangle = \frac{G_o}{4 \beta k_{trap}} \quad (A.14)
\]

Relating the variance in Eqn. (A.14) with the equipartition theorem Eqn. (A.1) gives;
\[
\langle (t)^2 \rangle = \frac{k_B T}{k_{trap}} = \frac{G_o}{4 \beta k_{trap}} \quad (A.15)
\]
\[
\Rightarrow G_o = 4 \beta k_B T \quad (A.16)
\]
A.3 Surface Charge Measurements

Effective Surface Charge of Silica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-field $F_{AC}$ [Hz]</th>
<th>$F_{corner}$ [Hz]</th>
<th>$Z_{eff}$ [qel]</th>
<th>Spring Constant $k_{PSD}$ [pN/nm]</th>
<th>Calibration Factor [nm/V]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.271</td>
<td>65.891</td>
<td>2.2071</td>
<td>1240.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>80.696</td>
<td>2.3107</td>
<td>1154.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39.351</td>
<td>83.99</td>
<td>2.3302</td>
<td>1192.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.454</td>
<td>82.806</td>
<td>2.2179</td>
<td>1227.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>38.134</td>
<td>96.921</td>
<td>2.2582</td>
<td>1160.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td>98.022</td>
<td>2.0596</td>
<td>1125.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>35.885</td>
<td>105.02</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>1059.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>35.781</td>
<td>113.28</td>
<td>2.1189</td>
<td>1004.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>35.957</td>
<td>103.43</td>
<td>2.1293</td>
<td>1133.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>104.54</td>
<td>1.9595</td>
<td>1155.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>34.465</td>
<td>105.46</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1: Effective surface charge of 1µm-diameter silica spheres dispersed in water. Experiments were conducted at a trapping depth of $\approx 16\mu m$ from the cover-slip with laser trapping power $\approx 10mW$. The electrode separation was measured to be $\approx 106.6\mu m$ with an estimated electric-field strength of $E = V/d \approx 40kV/m$ resulting in the listed corner frequencies $f_c$, trapping spring constants $k_{PSD}$, calibration factor $cal = 1/\rho$, and effective surface charge $Z_{eff}$ holding units of elementary charge $q_{el}$.

Comments

As mentioned at the end of chapter 7, there are other methods besides [8] that have been developed and critique in more recent years. The work of Semenov et al. [10] have been exploring the effects of both electrophoresis and electroosmosis in colloidal systems. Their method is similar to [8], in that the maximal displacement amplitude induced by the electric-field is linearly proportional to the electrophoretic mobility.

The collaborative work between Strubbe and Beunis et al. [9, 33, 36, 37] have provided a particularly interesting method that is capable of measuring the discrete dynamics of elementary charge. This method uses a data-windowing technique with sub-sampling frequencies larger than the observed
charging cycles. In turn, the discrete nature of single charging events $q_{el}$ near the particle surface is measured.

These measurements are rather simple, based upon a high (AC) electric-field frequency and utilizing a weighted sum of the two-sided PSD during each sampling window. The main benefit of this method is (1) rapid sampling frequency provide bare surface charge measurements (not effective), (2) analysis of the two-sided PSD preserves the sign of charge measurements, and (3) measurements are capable of resolving discrete, elementary charging events, that is, the error in each windowing measurement is smaller than the magnitude of an electron charge $q_{el}$. Preliminary experiments utilizing this technique have been implemented involving non-coated silica spheres, which yield promising results, and further experiments are being considered.

**Further Interests**

- Explore the techniques developed in [9] for silica in nonpolar liquid
- Begin analyzing coated silica spheres
- Explore the electric field dependence at high frequencies using [9]
- Explore the possibilities of adding a band-pass filter to eliminate external frequency noise
- Measure electroosmosis in differing frequency regimes
- incorporate a modulated signal to sweep through certain regions of frequencies
- Determine the trapping power need to minimize low frequency lag contributions
- Add a DC filter to amplifier
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