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**Abstract**—We provide a comparative study between two self-propelled microrobots, i.e., magnetotactic bacteria and microjets. This study includes characterization of their fluidic properties (linear and rotational drag coefficients) based on their morphologies and characterization of their magnetic properties using the rotating-field technique. Further, the control characteristics of our microrobots are evaluated in the transient- and steady-states. The average boundary frequencies of our magnetotactic bacteria and microjets are 2.2 rad/s and 25.1 rad/s, respectively. The characterized fluidic properties and magnetic properties of our microrobots. The average magnetic dipole moments of our magnetotactic bacteria and microjets are $1.4 \times 10^{-17}$ A.m$^2$ and $1.5 \times 10^{-13}$ A.m$^2$ at magnetic field of 2 mT and linear velocities of 32 $\mu$m/s (approximately 6 body lengths per second) and 119 $\mu$m/s (approximately 2 body lengths per second), respectively. These characterized magnetic dipole moments are utilized in the realization of closed-loop control systems for the magnetotactic bacteria and microjets. Our closed-loop control system positions the magnetotactic bacteria and the microjets within the vicinity of reference positions with average diameters of 23 $\mu$m (approximately 4 body lengths) and 417 $\mu$m (approximately 8 body lengths), respectively.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Self-propelled magnetic microrobots [1]-[5] benefit from the larger projection distance of the magnetic fields, as opposed to magnetic microrobots that are steered by the magnetic field gradients [6], [7]. These microrobots, i.e., magnetotactic bacteria and microjets (Fig. 1), have the potential to execute non-trivial tasks, such as microassembly [8], [9], micromanipulation [10] and microactuation [11], under the influence of the controlled magnetic fields.

Martel et al. used *Magnetospirillum gryphiswaldense* magnetotactic bacteria to manipulate a 3 $\mu$m bead at an average velocity of 7.5 $\mu$m/s [12]. Kim et al. also demonstrated the three-dimensional control of *Tetrahymena Pyriformis* cells using two sets of Helmholtz coils and a single electromagnet to control the planar and vertical motion of these cells, respectively [13]. *Serratia marcescens* were integrated to a microstructure to provide propulsion by Sakar et al. [14]. Khalil et al. demonstrated the point-to-point motion control of a magnetotactic bacterium (MTB), i.e., *Magnetospirillum magnetotacticum* (MS-1) inside capillary tubes and fluidic microchannels [15].

The aforementioned microrobots provide self-propulsion by their flagella or cilia, whereas microjets provide propulsion by the conversion of the chemical energy to kinetic energy through a catalytic reaction between their tubular layers and the surrounding solution [9], [16]. Sanchez et al. demonstrated the magnetic-based control of microjets inside the channels of a microfluidic system against the flow of a hydrogen peroxide solution [17]. It has been also shown that self-propelled microjets can selectively transport large amounts of particles on chip [9] and Murine Cath.a-differentiated cells by controlling the magnetic fields [10].

In this work, we provide a comparative study between two self-propelled microrobots, i.e., magnetotactic bacteria and microjets. This comparative study is achieved by characterizing the fluidic, magnetic and control properties...
of each microrobot. The fluidic properties are calculated based on the morphologies of the microrobots. The magnetic characterization includes the determination of the boundary frequencies and the magnetic dipole moments of our microrobots, whereas the control characteristics are determined by analyzing the transient and steady-state control characteristics of each microrobot. The boundary frequencies and magnetic dipole moments are determined by applying rotating magnetic fields at gradually increasing frequencies that range from 1 rad/s to 100 rad/s. At the boundary frequencies, the microrobots can no longer follow the rotating fields. The characterized boundary frequencies and magnetic dipole moments are used in the realization of the magnetic force-current maps for our magnetic system. The closed-loop control system is designed based on these maps.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section II provides a comparison between the fluidic and magnetic properties of magnetotactic bacteria and microjets. These properties are determined based on the characterized morphologies, and by applying rotating magnetic fields to determine the boundary frequencies and magnetic dipole moments of the microrobots. In Section III, we use the characterized magnetic dipole moments to design closed-loop control systems. These systems are used to achieve point-to-point positioning of the microrobots. Finally, Section IV concludes and provides directions for future work.

II. CHARACTERIZATION COMPARISON

Magnetotactic bacteria and microjets move in a growth medium [18] and hydrogen peroxide solution, respectively. Magnetotactic bacteria align themselves along the external magnetic field lines using the magnetite nanocrystals enveloped in their membranes (Fig. 2), whereas microjets align themselves using the iron layer of their tubular structure. Magnetotactic bacteria provide propulsion force by rotating their flagella, while microjets provide propulsion by the ejecting oxygen bubbles due to the catalytic decomposition of the hydrogen peroxide solution. Therefore, these self-propelled microrobots experience magnetic and drag forces and torques, and self-propulsion forces and torques.

A. Modeling of Self-Propelled Microrobots

In a low Reynolds number regime, motion of our self-propelled microrobots is governed by

\[ |\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{P})| + F_d + f = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{P})| + T_d + \Gamma = 0, \]  

where \( \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) and \( \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) are the magnetic force and torque experienced by our microrobots at position \( \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \), respectively. Further, \( F_d \) and \( T_d \) are the drag force and torque, respectively. The drag force and torque depend linearly on the linear and angular velocities of our microrobots. In (1), \( f \) and \( \Gamma \) are the self-propulsion force and torque, respectively. The magnetic force and torque are given by

\[ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{P}) = (\mathbf{m} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{m} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P}). \]  

In (2), \( \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) and \( \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) are the magnetic dipole moment of the microrobots and the induced magnetic field, respectively. The magnetic torque aligns our microrobots along the magnetic field lines, then their propulsion forces allow them to move. The drag forces \( \mathbf{F}_d(\mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) and torques \( \mathbf{T}_d(\mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) are determined by

\[ \mathbf{F}_d(\mathbf{P}) = \gamma \mathbf{P} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{T}_d(\mathbf{P}) = \alpha \mathbf{P}, \]  

where \( \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) and \( \mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1} \) are the linear and angular velocities of the microrobots, respectively. Further, \( \gamma \) is the linear drag coefficient and is given by [19]

\[ \gamma = 2\pi \eta \left[ \ln \left( \frac{2l}{d} \right) - 0.5 \right]^{-1}, \]  

where \( l \) and \( d \) are the length and diameter of an MTB or a microjet, respectively. Further, \( \eta \) is the dynamic viscosity of the fluid that is assumed to have the same dynamic viscosity as water \( (\eta = 1 \text{ mPa.s}) \). In (3), \( \alpha \) is the rotational drag coefficient and is given by [20]

\[ \alpha = \frac{\pi \eta l^3}{3} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{l}{d} \right) + 0.92 \left( \frac{d}{l} \right) - 0.662 \right]^{-1}. \]  

The linear and rotational drag coefficients have to be calculated to determine the drag forces and torques experienced by the microrobots.

B. Characterization of Fluidic Properties: Drag Coefficients

The linear and rotational drag coefficients are calculated using (4) and (5), respectively. This calculation is based on the characterized morphologies of magnetotactic bacteria and microjets. The morphology of the magnetotactic bacteria is determined from 15 Scanning/Transmission Electron Microscopy (SEM/TEM) images, whereas the morphology of microjets is derived from a single SEM image. The average length \( l \) and average diameter \( d \) of magnetotactic bacteria
are calculated to be $5.2 \ \mu m$ and $0.5 \ \mu m$, respectively. The length and outer diameter of the microjet are $50 \ \mu m$ and $5 \ \mu m$, respectively. Using the characterized morphologies of the microjet and (4), the linear drag coefficients of magnetotactic bacteria and microjets are $1.2 \times 10^{-8} \ \text{N.m}^{-1}.\text{s}$ and $1.2 \times 10^{-7} \ \text{N.m}^{-1}.\text{s}$, respectively. Using (5), the rotational drag coefficients of our magnetotactic bacteria and microjets are $8.3 \times 10^{-20} \ \text{N.m.s}$ and $7.5 \times 10^{-17} \ \text{N.m.s}$, respectively. These coefficients along with the characterized boundary frequencies are used to determine the magnetic dipole moments of our microrobots.

C. Characterization of Magnetic Properties

1) Boundary Frequency: The self-propelled microrobots undergo circular trajectories under the influence of rotating magnetic fields, as shown in Fig. 3. Increasing the frequency of the rotating fields increases the angular velocities of the microrobots. The relation between the magnetic torque and the angular velocity of the microrobot ($\Omega$) is given by

$$| \mathbf{m} | | \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P}) | \sin \beta + \alpha | \Omega | = 0,$$

where $\beta$ is the angle between the induced magnetic field and the magnetic dipole moment of the microrobot. Characterization of the magnetic dipole moment requires the determination of its boundary frequency ($\omega_b$). This frequency can be determined by gradually increasing the frequency of the rotating field and observing the frequency after which an MTB or a microjet can no longer follow the rotating magnetic fields, i.e., $| \Omega | = \omega_b$, when $\sin \beta = 1$. Therefore, (6) can be written as

$$| \mathbf{m} | | \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P}) | + \alpha \omega_b = 0.$$

Rotating magnetic fields are generated using our magnetic system (Fig. 1). The frequencies of these fields are increased from 1 rad/s to 100 rad/s to observe the boundary frequency of our microrobots. Fig. 3(a) shows a representative rotating field characterization experiment of an MTB. We repeated this experiment 10 times and the average boundary frequency is calculated to be 2.2 rad/s, at magnetic field of 2 mT. Similarly, Fig. 3(b) provides a representative rotating field characterization experiment of a microjet. The average boundary frequency is 25.1 rad/s, at magnetic field of 2 mT.

2) Magnetic Dipole Moment: We use the characterized rotational drag coefficients and boundary frequencies of our self-propelled microrobots to determine the magnetic dipole moments using (7). The average magnetic dipole moments of the magnetotactic bacteria and microjets are calculated to be $1.4 \times 10^{-17} \ \text{A.m}^2$ and $1.5 \times 10^{-15} \ \text{A.m}^2$ at magnetic field of 2 mT, respectively. The averages are calculated from 10 characterization experiments for each microrobot. The characterized magnetic dipole moments are used in the realization of the magnetic force-current maps that are used in the implementation of the closed-loop control system.

III. CONTROL COMPARISON

Our control strategy is based on orienting the magnetic fields towards a reference position without controlling the magnetic torque. The magnetic field and the magnetic force field have the same direction and are almost identical within the workspace of our magnetic system. Therefore, controlling the field lines is achieved through the following magnetic force-current map [7], [15]:

$$F(\mathbf{P}) = (\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}) \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P})I = A(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{P})I,$$
where $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n}$ is a matrix that maps the current vector ($\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$) into magnetic fields ($\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{P})$). Further, $\Lambda(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times n}$ is the actuation matrix that can be evaluated based on the dipole moment of each of the microrobots [7]. The pseudoinverse of the actuation matrix is evaluated for the implementation of the closed-loop control to calculate the currents at each of the electromagnets based on the desired magnetic force. We devise the following controlled magnetic force to orient the magnetic field lines towards a reference position ($\mathbf{P}_{\text{ref}} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$):

$$\mathbf{F}_c(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{K}_d \mathbf{e}, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{F}_c(\mathbf{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ is the controlled magnetic force. Realization of the controlled magnetic force is done using the inverse of the magnetic force-current map (8), by setting $\mathbf{F}_c(\mathbf{P})$ to $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{P})$. In (9), $\mathbf{K}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ and $\mathbf{K}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ are the controller positive-definite gain matrices. Further, $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ and $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ are the position and velocity tracking errors, respectively, and are given by

$$\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_{\text{ref}} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\mathbf{e}} = \dot{\mathbf{P}} - \dot{\mathbf{P}}_{\text{ref}} = \dot{\mathbf{P}}. \quad (10)$$

Substituting (9) into the force equation (1) yields the following error dynamics:

$$\dot{\mathbf{e}} + (\mathbf{K}_d + \gamma \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{e} = - (\mathbf{K}_d + \gamma \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{f}_u, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{u}$ is a unit vector of the self-propulsion force of our microrobots. Further, $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is the identity matrix. The error dynamics (11), indicates that the matrix $((\mathbf{K}_d + \gamma \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_p)$ must be positive definite. The self-propulsion force can be overcome by increasing the gain matrix ($\mathbf{K}_d$), which in turn results in better positioning accuracy in the vicinity of the reference position. However, this increase necessitates the generation of relatively large magnetic field gradients that cannot be generated using our magnetic system (maximum magnetic field gradient is 60 mT/m). Nevertheless, selecting the entries of the matrices ($\mathbf{K}_p$ and $\mathbf{K}_d$) such that $((\mathbf{K}_d + \gamma \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_p)$ is positive definite, ensures that our microrobots are oriented towards a reference position. Due to the self-propulsion force (right-hand side of (11)), the tracking error cannot be zero.

We only consider the motion control of microrobots in a two-dimensional space, i.e., the center plane of our magnetic system. In this plane, the vertical components of our magnetic fields are zero. Further, the reference positions are fixed ($\mathbf{P}_{\text{ref}} = 0$).

### A. Motion Control of Magnetotactic Bacteria

Motion control of an MTB is implemented inside a capillary tube with growth medium. The *Magnetospirillum magnetotacticum* MS-1 culture utilized in our experimental work is grown according to the protocol provided by Bertani et al. [18]. Our magnetotactic bacteria provide thrust force with an order of magnitude of $10^{-12}$ N using each of their flagella. This force is almost five orders of magnitude higher than the pulling magnetic force generated using our magnetic system (the average magnetic dipole moment is on the order of $10^{-17}$). Therefore, our control strategy is based on using (9) just to position an MTB within the vicinity of a given reference position within a planar workspace of $300 \, \mu m \times 200 \, \mu m$, inside a capillary tube (Fig. 1). Fig. 4 shows a representative motion control result of an MTB using control law (9). In this experiment the MTB is positioned at a velocity of $30 \, \mu m/s$. The control system positions the MTB within the vicinity of two reference positions with regions of convergence of 40 $\mu m$ and 20 $\mu m$ in diameter. This experiment is repeated 10 times using different magnetotactic bacteria from the same culture. The
average velocity and average region of convergence are 32 $\mu$m/s and 23 $\mu$m, respectively. Please refer to the attached video that demonstrates a representative result of the closed-loop control of a MTB.

B. Motion Control of Microjets

Motion control of microjets is implemented inside a petri dish with hydrogen peroxide solution, shown in the inset of Fig. 5(b). The petri dish contains 1 ml of hydrogen peroxide solution and Triton X at concentrations of 5% and 5%, respectively. The catalytic reaction between the hydrogen peroxide solution and the platinum layers of the microjet is observed after the addition of 100 $\mu$L of hydrogen peroxide solution at concentration of 15%. Similar to magnetotactic bacteria, microjets provide thrust force that cannot be overcome using the maximum magnetic field gradient generated by our magnetic system. Therefore, our control system only positions the microjet within the vicinity of the reference position. Fig. 5 shows a representative motion control result of a microjet. Three reference positions are tracked at a velocity of 90 $\mu$m/s. The control system positions the microjet within regions of convergence of 400 $\mu$m, 300 $\mu$m and 600 $\mu$m in diameter. This motion control experiment is repeated 10 times using different microjets. The average velocity and average region of convergence are 119 $\mu$m/s and 417 $\mu$m, respectively. Please refer to the attached video that demonstrates a representative result of the closed-loop control of a self-propelled microjet.

C. Magnetotactic Bacteria Versus Microjets

Magnetotactic bacteria and microjets have a similar propulsion mechanism. Both microrobots navigate in a low Reynolds number regime by converting the chemical energy into kinetic energy. Magnetotactic bacteria provide propulsion by their flagella, whereas microjets provide propulsion by the thrust force generated using the ejecting oxygen bubbles from one of their ends (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). These self-propulsion forces allow magnetotactic bacteria and microjets to overcome drag forces of 3.8 $\times$ 10$^{-16}$ N at 32 $\mu$m/s and 1.4 $\times$ 10$^{-14}$ N at 119 $\mu$m/s (drag forces are calculated using (3)), respectively. Further, the self-propulsion forces allow our magnetotactic bacteria and microjets to have average velocities of 6 and 2 body lengths per second, respectively.

The characterized average magnetic dipole moments of our magnetotactic bacteria and microjets are $1.4 \times 10^{-17}$ A.m$^2$ and $1.5 \times 10^{-13}$ A.m$^2$, respectively. These magnetic dipole moments are due to the magnetite nanocrystals (Fig. 2) and magnetic layers of the magnetotactic bacteria and microjets, respectively. The self-propelled microrobots use these magnetic dipole moments to generate magnetic torque and align along the external magnetic field lines. Magnetotactic bacteria and microjets overcome maximum rotational drag torques of $2.9 \times 10^{-20}$ N.m and $3.0 \times 10^{-16}$ N.m (drag torques are calculated using (3)), respectively. Our control system does not have influence on the linear velocities of the magnetotactic bacteria and the microjets. This is due to the difference between the maximum magnetic force which can be generated using our magnetic system and the propulsion forces generated by the microrobots. Magnetotactic bacteria are positioned within the vicinity of reference positions at an average velocity of 32 $\mu$m/s, whereas microjets are positioned at an average velocity of 119 $\mu$m/s. Further, magnetotactic bacteria are positioned within an average region of convergence of 23 $\mu$m, while microjets are positioned within an average region of convergence of 417 $\mu$m in diameter, respectively.
TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Magnetotactic bacteria</th>
<th>Microjets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length [µm]</td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter [µm]</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear drag [N.m⁻¹.s]</td>
<td>1.2 × 10⁻⁸</td>
<td>1.2 × 10⁻⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotational drag [N.m.s]</td>
<td>8.3 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>7.5 × 10⁻¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary frequency [rad/s]</td>
<td>2.2 ± 1.5</td>
<td>25.1 ± 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipole moment [A.m²]</td>
<td>1.4 × 10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>1.5 × 10⁻¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average velocity [µm/s]</td>
<td>32 ± 10</td>
<td>119 ± 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ROC [µm]</td>
<td>23 ± 10</td>
<td>417 ± 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I summarizes the results of our comparative study between the characterized morphological, fluidic, magnetic and control properties of the self-propelled microbiorobots. The morphological characteristics are determined using 15 SEM and TEM images of the magnetotactic bacteria, and single SEM image of the microjet.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

This work provides a comparative study between magnetotactic bacteria and microjets. Fluidic properties in terms of linear and rotational drag coefficients are calculated for the microbiorobots based on their characterized morphologies and the properties of their growth medium and hydrogen peroxide solution. Based on the morphological and fluidic properties, the magnetic dipole moments of the microbiorobots are characterized using the rotating field technique. Finally, we utilize the characterized magnetic dipole moments in the realization of closed-loop control systems. These control systems are used to provide a comparison between our microbiorobots in the transient- and steady-states (average velocity and average region of convergence). Our comparative study shows that magnetotactic bacteria and microjet move at velocities of 6 and 2 body lengths per second, and can be positioned within regions of convergence of 4 and 8 body lengths within the vicinity of reference positions, respectively.

As part of future work, our magnetic system will be integrated with an ultrasound imaging modality. In addition, our system will be redesigned to control magnetotactic bacteria and microjets in the three-dimensional space. Motion control of magnetotactic bacteria and microjets in microfluidic channels with time-varying fluid flow will be implemented.
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