Publications and Research                              New York City College of Technology

2017

# The influence of the electrode dimension on the detection sensitivity of electric cell−substrate impedance sensing (ECIS) and its mathematical modeling

Xudong Zhang

William Wang

Anis Nurashikin Nordin

Fang Li

Sunghoon Jang

*See next page for additional authors*

## Authors

Xudong Zhang, William Wang, Anis Nurashikin Nordin, Fang Li, Sunghoon Jang, and ioana Voiculescu

**The influence of the electrode dimension on the detection sensitivity of electric cell-substrate impedance sensing (ECIS) and its mathematical modeling**

Xudong Zhang, William Wang, Anis Nurashikin Nordin, Fang Li, Andres Rivera, Sunghoon Jang, Ioana Voiculescu.

**Abstract**

Detection sensitivity is a crucial criterion in the design and application of ECIS sensors. The influence of sensing electrode dimension on detection sensitivity is investigated in this paper. Eight types of ECIS sensors were fabricated, and their experimental results reveal that smaller-radius working electrodes generate more sensitive impedance shift to cell density change. Also, the smaller radius of working electrodes yield higher impedance values, which improves signal-to-noise ratio. In a range from 1.0 mm to 3.5 mm, the distance between the working and counter electrodes does not affect impedance measurements. However, the distance should be large enough to prevent the current from directly bypassing the cells between the electrodes. A mathematical model has been developed to analyze the distribution of electric potential and current over the sensing electrodes of ECIS sensors, which is helpful in understanding the mechanisms of ECIS. This mathematical model, supported by experimental data and finite element analysis, is able to illustrate a quantitative relationship between cell impedance and cell characteristics. This model can be used to optimize the design of ECIS sensors and interpret cell behavior.

Keywords: ECIS; Sensitivity; Model; Electrodes; Design.

## 1. Introduction

The electric cell-substrate impedance sensing (ECIS) technique can analyze cell migration, attachment, invasion, proliferation, and barrier function [1-5]. The measured impedance data can provide information on cell membrane capacitance, cytoplasm conductivity, and intercellular junction condition, which are all related to cell behavior and morphology [1-9]. Live cells attach and spread on the surface of ECIS electrodes after seeding, and behave like an insulating medium that limits the current flow between the electrodes, thus the measured impedance increase between the electrodes [10-18]. The measured impedance will stabilize after the cells form a monolayer on the sensor. Changes in measured impedance correspond to variations of the monolayer caused by cell-cell interactions, cell-substrate interactions, or changing cell electrical properties due to chemical, biological, or physical stimuli [19].

Detection sensitivity is a crucial criterion in the applications of ECIS sensors. It depends on sensor configuration, such as electrode dimension and the distance between the electrodes. Wang et al. have fabricated coplanar interdigital ECIS sensors using different working electrode dimensions to investigate their detection sensitivity [20]. However, no study has been reported about the influence of sensor dimension on the detection sensitivity of circular coplanar ECIS sensors.

Mathematical modeling can provide more information that cannot be obtained directly through experimental data, including cell membrane capacitance, dielectric resistance, and morphology, which are useful to analyze the cell behavior. The membrane capacitance of nerve cells plays an

1

important functional role in synaptic integration and signal propagation [21]. The embryonic carcinoma cells show specific dielectric resistance profiles during induced differentiation [22]. Several mathematical models have been developed to analyze the relationship between measured cell impedance and cell characteristics [1-10, 23-28]. Some of these models assumed that cell membrane was a capacitor, cell cytoplasm a resistor, and cell impedance calculated as a combination of the capacitors and resistors [24-28]. Furthermore, the current flows either through the cells or around the cells. However, in reality, the current may switch from one path to another, creating a hybrid path. Other models have considered all of these three paths [1-10, 23]. Nevertheless, these models assumed that the current flows radially between the ventral surface of the cell and the substratum and the electric potential is constant inside the cell. However, if the current flow through the entirety of the cell, the electric potential cannot be constant inside the cell. Therefore, Ohm's law invalidates this assumption.

In this paper, ECIS sensor arrays were fabricated to investigate the influence of sensor dimension on detection sensitivity. Also, a new mathematical model has been developed to illustrate the distribution of current and electrical potential, and the relationship between measured cell impedance and cell characteristics.


## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1 Cell culture and preparation
Bovine aortic endothelial cells (BAECs, VEC Technologies, Rensselaer, NY) were used in this study. The BAECs were cultured in Minimum Essential Medium (MEM, GIBCO, Grand Island, NY) with 10 % fetal bovine serum (FBS, GIBCO, Grand Island NY) under standard mammalian cell culturing conditions ($37^\circ$C and 5% $CO_2$).


### 2.2 Fabrication of ECIS sensor arrays
The ECIS arrays were fabricated on glass by thin film deposition and lift-off photolithography technique, as shown in Fig. 1(a). After patterning the photoresist AZ5214E (MicroChemicals, Somerville, NJ), 10 nm chromium (Cr) followed by 100 nm gold (Au), was thermally evaporated onto the substrate to form the sensor's electrodes.  After the lift-off process, the photoresist SU-8 (Microchem, Westborough, MA) was used to partially cover the connection leads of sensor array. The sensor arrays were treated with 95% sulfuric acid at 80°C for 10 seconds followed by washing with DI water, and was treated with 10% APTES at 50°C for 2 hours to increase the surface biofuncationality [29]. Finally, commercial cell culture wells (Lab-Tek 8-well culture wares) were glued onto sensor arrays. Fig. 1(b) shows the fabricated ECIS sensor array and its configuration. Tab. 1 shows the configuration of ECIS sensors. $R_i$ is the radius of the working electrode, $R_{co}$ the outer radius of the counter electrode, $d_{io}$ the distance between the edges of the electrodes, $S_1$ and $S_2$ are the area of the working and counter electrode respectively.


### 2.3 Experimental system setup
Impedance analyzer Agilent 4294 and ECIS Z system (Applied Biophysics, Troy, NY) were used to measure the cell impedance. The Tektronix oscilloscope DPO2014B was used to monitor the AC signal applied on cells. Two MAXIM DG408 Multiplexers, controlled by an NI USB-

6008 multifunction data acquisition card, were used as a 16-channel multiplexer between the impedance analyzer and the sensor arrays. The NI USB-6008 and Agilent 4294 were controlled by LabView programs to acquire impedance from ECIS sensor arrays. The experimental setup is shown in Fig. 2. The ECIS sensor arrays, seeded with mammalian cells, were kept inside an incubator with 37°C and 5% $CO_2$ during the impedance measurement.

*2.4 Finite Elements Analysis of the ECIS*

There are mainly five physical layers in an ECIS sensor. From the bottom to the top of the sensor, they are the sensing substrate layer, electrode-electrolyte layer, thin cell culture medium layer, cell layer, and cell culture medium layer. A simplified axisymmetric finite element ECIS model for a few cells was established to analyze the distribution of electric potential and current on thin cell culture medium layer, as shown in Fig. 3. A gap was assumed to divide the working electrode zone and counter electrode zone, shown as the yellow line in Fig. 3. That gap prevents the current from transmitting from the working electrode to counter electrode directly without passing through the cells. The parameters related to the electrical properties and geometric dimension used in the finite element model and the following mathematical model were the same, as shown in Tab. 2.

# 3 Mathematical model of electric cell-substrate impedance sensing (ECIS)

A new model was proposed to analyze the distribution of current and electric potential. The graphical representations of the current paths were established in cylindrical coordinates ($r, \theta, z$) as shown in Fig. 4. Because the model is axisymmetric, this model was simplified into 2-dimensional coordinates ($r, z$),

$$\rho\left(\frac{I_1}{2\pi rz}e_r + \frac{I_2}{\pi r^2}e_z\right) = E \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial r}e_r + \frac{\partial V}{\partial z}e_z = -E \tag{2}$$

$$I_1 + I_2 = I_1 + dI_1 + I_2 - dI_2 \tag{3}$$

Where: $\rho$ is the resistivity of the cell culture medium. $I_1$ and $I_2$ are the current flowing through the point ($r,z$) in the $r$ and $z$ directions respectively. $e_r$ and $e_z$ are unit vectors in the $r$ and $z$ directions. $E$ is the electric field at any point ($r,z$). $V$ is the electric potential at the point ($r, z$). $dI_1$ and $dI_2$ are the infinitesimally small current of $I_1$ and $I_2$. $dI_1$ and $dI_2$ have the same sign.

Eq. (1) can be obtained from the differential form of Ohm's Law, $I_1/2\pi rz$ and $I_2/\pi^2$ are the current density in the $r$ and $z$ directions respectively. The gradient of electric potential is related to the electric field, and it can be decomposed into $\partial V/\partial r$ and $\partial V/\partial z$, as shown in Eq. (2). According to Kirchhoff's circuit law, the sum of currents flowing into the node ($r, z$) is equal to the sum of the current flowing out of the node, as shown in Eq. (3).

$$\frac{2\pi z}{-\rho}\left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial r} + r\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial r^2}\right) - \frac{2\pi r}{-\rho}\left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial z}\right) = 0 \tag{4}$$

$$V(r,z) = AI_0(2cr)e^{2c^2z^2} + D \tag{5}$$

Where: $I_0(2cr)$ is the modified Bessel function of the first kind, and A, D and c are coefficients

After substituting Eq. (1) and (2) into Eq. (3), the governing equation of the electric potential at any point $(r, z)$ can be obtained, as shown in Eq. (4). Eq. (5) is the solution of Eq. (4). When the variable $z$ is held constant, Eq. (5) is the same as the solution of electric potential in Dr. Giaever's ECIS model [3, 23].

Boundary Condition 1: $V_c - V(r = 0, z = h_1) = \lim\limits_{r \to 0} \frac{Z_n}{\pi r^2} I_2$ (6)

Boundary Condition 2: $V(r_e, z = 0) = 0$ (7)

Boundary Condition 3: $I_j = I_1(r_c, h_1) + I_2(r_c, h_1)$ (8)

Where: $V_c$ is the electric potential applied on the working electrode. $Z_n$ is the specific impedance of the electrode-medium interface (unit $\Omega m^2$). $r_e$ is the radius of the positive electrode. $h_1$ is the average distance between the ventral surface of cell and electrode-electrolyte interface. $h_2$ is the average thickness of the cell layer. $d$ is the average horizontal distance of the intercellular junction. The vertical intercellular junction length is $\alpha h_2$ ($0 \le \alpha \le 1$). $r_c$ is the average radius of a single cell. $I_j$ is the current flowing through the intercellular junction gap.

Three boundary conditions were needed to determine the three unknown coefficients, $A$, $D$ and $c$ in Eq. (5). First, the relationship between electric potential difference and current at the points ($r=0$, $z=100$ nm) should be consistent with Ohm's law, as shown in Eq. (6). Secondly, the electric potential at the edge of the positive (working) electrode should be zero, as shown in Eq. (7). Finally, the current flowing through the intercellular junction gap ($I_j$) is mainly from $I_1$ and $I_2$ at the edge of the cell, as shown in Eq. (8). $I_j$ is equal to the quotient of the electric potential difference on the edge of the intercellular junction over the resistance of intercellular junction. These three coefficients $A$, $D$ and $c$ were calculated using the parameters shown in Tab. 2. [30-36].

*3.1 Quantification of the impedance of electrode-electrolyte interface and cell culture medium*
The equivalent circuit of electrode-electrolyte interface is a double layer capacitance ($C_{dl}$), shunted by a Faradic impedance [37-39]. The double layer capacitance is 60 $\mu F/cm^2$ with the solution relative permittivity around 80 [40]. The Faradic impedance comprises a charge transfer resistance ($R_{ct}$) and a Warburg impedance ($Z_w$) in series. The value of $R_{ct}$ was determined by the electron transfer rate and was estimated to be $5.03 \times 10^6$ $\Omega cm^2$ [41]. $Z_w$ was related to the mass diffusion process occurring in the electrode-electrolyte interface and was neglected due to the characteristics of the electrode material [42-44]. The specific impedance of electrode-electrode interface ($Z_n$) can be calculated, as shown in Eq. (9).

$$Z_n = \frac{R_{ct}}{2\pi f C_{dl} \times R_{ct} + 1} \tag{9}$$

Where: $f$ is the measurement frequency.

For a round planar working electrode with an infinitely large counter electrode, the impedance of the culture medium ($R_s$) can be estimated as $\frac{\rho}{4R_i}$ [42, 45-47]. For a finite size of counter electrode, $R_s$ can be calculated by integrating the series resistance of electrolyte shells moving outward from the working to counter electrode, as shown in Eq. (10) [43, 48].

$$R_s = \int_{R_i}^{R_i + d_{io}} dR = \int_{R_i}^{R_i + d_{io}} \frac{\rho}{2\pi r h} dr = \frac{\rho}{2\pi h} ln \frac{R_i + d_{io}}{R_i} \tag{10}$$

Where: $\rho$ is the resistivity of the electrolyte. $h$ is the height of cell culture medium in culture wells (5 mm in this study).

The impedance generated from the cell culture medium between the ventral surface of cell and electrode-electrolyte interface ($Z_{cell\text{-}sub}$) also needed to be considered. $Z_{cell\text{-}sub}$ can be calculated by dividing the electric potential difference between the edge and center of a single cell by the total current flowing through and around the cell as shown in Eq. (11).

$$Z_{cell\_sub} = \frac{V(0,h_1) - V(r_c, h_1)}{I_2 + I_j} = \frac{\rho(I_0 - 1)\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (2\pi f \varepsilon \varepsilon_0)^2}}{\pi(4c^2 h_1)\left[r_c^2 I_0\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (2\pi f \varepsilon \varepsilon_0)^2} + \frac{r_c d}{\rho \alpha h_2}\left(\rho_1 h_2\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (2\pi f \varepsilon \varepsilon_0)^2} + 2t\right)(2I_0 + 2cr_c I_1)\right]} \tag{11}$$

Where: $V(0, h_1) - V(0, h_1)$ is the difference in electric potential between the edge and center of a single cell, which was expressed in Eq. (5). $I_2$ is the current flowing through a single cell and can be calculated from Eq. (1). $I_j$ is the current flowing through the intercellular junction gap, which is also equal to the current flowing around the cell. $I_j$ can be calculated from Eq. (8). $\rho_1$ is the resistivity of cell cytoplasm. $t$ and $\sigma$ are the thickness and conductivity of the cell membrane respectively. $\varepsilon$ is the relative permittivity of the cell membrane. $\varepsilon_0$ is the vacuum permittivity, which is $8.85 \times 10^{-12}$ F/m.

*3.2 The calculated impedance of a single cell*

The impedance of a single cell ($Z_{single\ cell}$) can be calculated by dividing the electric potential difference between the apical and ventral surfaces of a single cell by the total current flowing through and around the cell, as shown in Eq. (12).

$$Z_{single\ cell} = \frac{V(r_c, h_1) - V(r_c, h_1 + h_2)}{I_2 + I_j}$$
$$= \frac{(\rho_1 h_2\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (2\pi f \varepsilon \varepsilon_0)^2} + 2t)(2I_0 + 2cr_c I_1)}{2\pi[r_c^2 I_0\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (2\pi f \varepsilon \varepsilon_0)^2} + \frac{r_c d}{\rho \alpha h_2}\left(\rho_1 h_2\sqrt{\sigma^2 + (2\pi f \varepsilon \varepsilon_0)^2} + 2t\right)(2I_0 + 2cr_c I_1)]} \tag{12}$$

Where: $V(r_c, h_1) - V(r_c, h_{1+} h_2)$ is the difference of electric potential between the apical cell membrane and the basal cell membrane.

*3.3 The calculated impedance of the cell monolayer covering an ECIS sensor*

In this model, the impedance of the ECIS sensor ($Z$) can be calculated as the sum of the impedance generated at the working electrode zone ($Z_{working}$), the impedance generated at the counter electrode zone ($Z_{counter}$), and $R_s$, as shown in Eq. (13).

$$Z = Z_{working} + Z_{counter} + R_s$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{S_1} + \frac{1}{S_2}\right)\left[Z_n + \frac{S(Z_{single\ cell}+Z_{cell\_sub})}{n}\right] + R_s \tag{13}$$

Where: $S_1$ and $S_2$ are the surface area of the working and counter electrode respectively. $S$ is the total surface area of the ECIS sensor, which contains the working electrode, counter electrode and non-electrode area. $Z$ is the calculated impedance from the ECIS sensor. $n$ is the number of cells seeded on the ECIS sensor. The rest of parameters were noted in the previous sections.

## 4. Results and discussion

*4.1 The impedance response from the fabricated ECIS sensor arrays*

The optimal measurement frequency allows the sensors to obtain the largest difference in measured impedance between a sample with and without cells [19]. In this study, the optimal measurement frequency was 8000 Hz in both the mathematical and finite element models. The inherent impedance of the Au/Cr electrodes was 19 Ω at 8000 Hz measured by microwave probe station and impedance analyzer, as shown in Fig. S1. The inherent impedance of the sensor can be neglected, because it is much lower than the measured cellular impedance in the thousands of ohms. Fig. 5 shows the BAECs impedance responses and morphology in the first 19 hours after seeding onto the ECIS sensor array. The cell impedance increased until the 8 hour mark, which indicates the initial formation of a loose monolayer, and the impedance plateaued until the end of the experiment. After the formation of the cell monolayer was confirmed under microscope, the impedance readings were used to represent the impedance of the cell monolayer for cell-based assays.

*4.2 The design guidelines of electrode dimensions of ECIS sensors*

*4.2.1 The radius of working electrode ($R_i$)*

The experimental and simulated impedance using different $R_i$ are shown in Fig. 6(a). Fig. 6(b) illustrates the cell morphology on those sensors. The experimental and simulated impedances using smaller $R_i$ sensors are usually higher.

The ECIS sensors usually contain working and counter electrodes. There are many paths for the current to flow through the cell monolayer between the working and counter electrodes. The counter electrodes are used to provide adequate current paths to enable circuit connection, which needs the counter electrode to have adequate sensing area. The smaller $R_i$ working electrode provides less current paths, which increases the corresponding impedance. The higher impedance values can improve data quality by increasing signal-to-noise ratio. It is useful particularly for observing small changes in cell behavior. However, the working electrode should not be too small in order to measure an adequate number of cells and to guarantee sufficient cell-to-cell contact area.

The maximum difference between the simulated and the experimental impedances is calculated to be 13.29% in Fig. 6(a). That difference is acceptable when considering the fluctuation of experimental impedance. The simulated impedance curve matches the experimental data closely for the $R_i$ range from 100 μm to 400 μm, as shown in Fig. 6(a). The consistency of the simulated impedance with the experimental impedance validates this model's ability to optimize the $R_i$ according to the range of measured cell number and expected output impedance level during sensor designing.

### 4.2.2 The distance between the edges of the sensing electrodes ($d_{io}$)

The distance between the edges of the sensing electrodes (working electrodes and counter electrodes) ($d_{io}$) is another factor that needs to be considered in designing ECIS sensors. The green triangles show the relationships between $d_{io}$ and the experimental impedance as shown in Fig. 6(c). When the $d_{io}$ changed from 1000 μm to 3500 μm, the average experimental impedance slightly changed from 12.50 KΩ to 12.52 KΩ. This indicates $d_{io}$ in the range of 1000 μm to 3500 μm only has a little influence on the impedance. $d_{io}$ influenced the impedance of medium, which is only a small portion of measured impedance. Thus, the $d_{io}$ cannot dramatically influence the measured impedance. However, $d_{io}$ should not be too small to avoid the current from flowing under the cell monolayer between sensing electrodes.

The blue line in Fig. 6(c) shows the relationship between $d_{io}$ and the simulated impedance calculated using Eq. (13). In Eq. (13), the natural logarithm of the quotient of $(R_i + d_{io})$ and $R_i$ make the influence of $d_{io}$ on simulated impedance more slightly. Consequently, the $d_{io}$ only slightly influence the simulated impedance. The simulated impedance is consistent with the experimental data with 0.63% as the maximum difference. The consistency of the simulated impedance with the experimental impedance validates the model.

### 4.3 The influence of electrode dimensions on the detection sensitivity of ECIS.

Detection sensitivity in cell-based assays is reflected by the fineness of impedance response to cell changes. Because the standard commercial ECIS sensor (Applied Biophysics, Troy, NY) haves an 125 μm $R_i$. Sensors with $R_i$ of 100 μm and 150 μm (Type 1 and 2 in Table 1b) were used to study the influence of working electrode dimension on detection sensitivity. 90,000, 100,000 and 110,000 cells/cm$^2$ cell confluent densities were used to observe the relationship between cell density and impedance. Fig. 7(a) shows the impedance shifts to the cell density changes using the sensors with $R_i$ of 100 μm and 150 μm. Fig. 7(b) shows the corresponding cell morphology on the ECIS sensors. When the cell density change is 10,000 cells/cm$^2$ (from 90,000 to 100,000 cells/cm$^2$), the impedance increased 597 Ω and 350 Ω for the sensors with $R_i$ of 100 μm and 150 μm respectively. When the cell density change is 20,000 cells/cm$^2$ (from 90,000 to 110,000 cells/cm$^2$), the impedance increased 1336 Ω and 880 Ω for the sensors with $R_i$ of 100 μm and 150 μm respectively. The sensors with smaller $R_i$ provided larger impedance changes to the same cell density changes. Thus, the sensors with smaller $R_i$ are able to detect finer changes in cell density. Therefore, ECIS sensors with smaller dimension working electrodes illustrate better detection sensitivity on changes in cell density. Another benefit is that smaller $R_i$ requires fewer cells in cell-based assays.

*4.4 Analyzing the distribution of current density beneath the ventral surface of cells from the mathematical model and finite element model*

In several ECIS models, the current was assumed to flow radially between the ventral surface of the cell and the substratum [1-5]. The distribution of electric potential was calculated from Eq. (5) and the resultant equipotential lines are nearly vertical, as shown in Fig. 8(a). Because the direction of current density is the same as the gradient of the electric potential, the current is proven to flow radially between the ventral surface of cell and the electrode-electrolyte interface. The density of equipotential lines in areas far from the cell's center is higher than that in the center, meaning the amount of current flowing around the cell is larger than that through the cell. The distribution of electric potential and current density was also analyzed by the finite element model, as shown in Fig. 8(b). It shows that the current flows radially, which is consistent with the analyzed results from the mathematical model.

The quantative comparison of electric potential distribution calculated from the mathematical and finite element model is shown in Fig. 8(c). Both distributions were 50 nm over the electrode-electrolyte interface from the center of the cell to its edge. The maximum difference in electric potential between the mathematical and finite element model is 4.3% (at 12 µm on the horizontal axis). Perhaps $d_{io}$ was too short in the finite element model compared to that in mathematical model. As a result, the electric potential decreases with larger extent in the finite element model.

*4.5 The relationship between impedance and cell morphology and electrical properties from the mathematical modeling*

Cell morphology, including the thickness and radius of cells, and electrical properties, including membrane capacitance and cytoplasm resistivity, can affect impedance. The volume of a endothelial single cell was assumed to be constant during a specific period with the cell thickness ($h_2$) being 5 µm and cell radius ($r_c$) being 12 µm [49]. The relationship between the calculated impedance of a single cell and $r_c$, $h_2$, membrane capacitance and cytoplasm resistivity ($\rho_1$) can be extracted from the Eq. (12), as shown in Fig. S2 . The model shows that cell morphology and electrical properties influence impedance. This model can provide a more quantitative relationship between the impedance and parameters related to the morphology and electrical properties of cells.

## 5. Conclusions

Sensor dimension influences the detection sensitivity of ECIS sensors. The experimental results reveal that smaller radius working electrodes generate more sensitive impedance responses to cell density change. Also, the smaller radius yields higher impedance values, which improves the signal-to-noise ratio. The counter electrodes need adequate sensing area to provide sufficient current paths for circuit connection. The distance between the edges of the sensing electrodes does not influence the measured impedance largely.

The proposed mathematical model was validated through experimental results and finite element analysis. This model can be used to calculate the distribution of electric potential and current over ECIS sensor electrodes. Also, it is able to provide a quantitative relationship between measured cell impedance and parameters including cell radius, thickness, membrane capacitance, and cytoplasm resistivity. This model can be used to optimize the design of ECIS sensors, such as the dimension of the working electrodes and the distance between the working electrode and counter electrode.

## Acknowledgements

## References

[1] I. Giaever, C. Keese, Monitoring fibroblast behavior in tissue culture with an applied electric field, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 81(1984) 3761-4.

[2] I. Giaever, C.R. Keese, Use of electric fields to monitor the dynamical aspect of cell behavior in tissue culture, IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, (1986) 242-7.

[3] I. Giaever, C.R. Keese, Micromotion of mammalian cells measured electrically, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 88(1991) 7896-900.

[4] C.R. Keese, K. Bhawe, J. Wegener, I. Giaever, Real-time impedance assay to follow the invasive activities of metastatic cells in culture, Biotechniques, 33(2002) 842-51.

[5] C.-M. Lo, C.R. Keese, I. Giaever, Cell–substrate contact: another factor may influence transepithelial electrical resistance of cell layers cultured on permeable filters, Experimental cell research, 250(1999) 576-80.

[6] P. Mitra, C.R. Keese, I. Giaever, Electric measurements can be used to monitor the attachment and spreading of cells in tissue culture, Biotechniques, 11(1991) 504-10.

[7] C. Tiruppathi, A.B. Malik, P.J. Del Vecchio, C.R. Keese, I. Giaever, Electrical method for detection of endothelial cell shape change in real time: assessment of endothelial barrier function, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 89(1992) 7919-23.

[8] C.-M. Lo, C.R. Keese, I. Giaever, Monitoring motion of confluent cells in tissue culture, Experimental cell research, 204(1993) 102-9.

[9] Z. Pei, C.R. Keese, I. Giaever, H. Kurzawa, D.E. Wilson, Effect of the pSV2-neo plasmid on NIH 3T3 cell motion detected electrically, Experimental cell research, 212(1994) 225-9.

[10] C.R. Keese, I. Giaever, A biosensor that monitors cell morphology with electrical fields, IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine, 13(1994) 402-8.

[11] H.E. Ayliffe, A.B. Frazier, R.D. Rabbitt, Electric impedance spectroscopy using microchannels with integrated metal electrodes, Journal of Microelectromechanical systems, 8(1999) 50-7.

[12] A. Han, E. Moss, R.D. Rabbitt, K.L. Engisch, A.B. Frazier, A single cell multi-analysis system for electrophysiological studies,  TRANSDUCERS, Solid-State Sensors, Actuators and Microsystems, 12th International Conference on, 2003, IEEE2003, pp. 674-7.

[13] A. Han, E. Moss, A.B. Frazier, Whole cell electrical impedance spectroscopy for studying ion channel activity, The 13th International Conference on Solid-State Sensors, Actuators and Microsystems, 2005 Digest of Technical Papers TRANSDUCERS'05, IEEE2005, pp. 1704-7.

[14] A. Han, L. Yang, A.B. Frazier, Quantification of the heterogeneity in breast cancer cell lines using whole-cell impedance spectroscopy, Clinical Cancer Research, 13(2007) 139-43.

[15] K. Solly, X. Wang, X. Xu, B. Strulovici, W. Zheng, Application of real-time cell electronic sensing (RT-CES) technology to cell-based assays, Assay and drug development technologies, 2(2004) 363-72.

[16] Y. Qiu, R. Liao, X. Zhang, Real-time monitoring primary cardiomyocyte adhesion based on electrochemical impedance spectroscopy and electrical cell-substrate impedance sensing, Analytical chemistry, 80(2008) 990-6.

[17] K.S.-C. Ko, C.-M. Lo, J. Ferrier, P. Hannam, M. Tamura, B.C. McBride, et al., Cell–substrate impedance analysis of epithelial cell shape and micromotion upon challenge with bacterial proteins that perturb extracellular matrix and cytoskeleton, Journal of microbiological methods, 34(1998) 125-32.

[18] J. Suehiro, R. Hamada, D. Noutomi, M. Shutou, M. Hara, Selective detection of viable bacteria using dielectrophoretic impedance measurement method, Journal of Electrostatics, 57(2003) 157-68.

[19] X. Zhang, F. Li, A.N. Nordin, J. Tarbell, I. Voiculescu, Toxicity studies using mammalian cells and impedance spectroscopy method, Sensing and bio-sensing research, 3(2015) 112-21.

[20] L. Wang, H. Wang, K. Mitchelson, Z. Yu, J. Cheng, Analysis of the sensitivity and frequency characteristics of coplanar electrical cell–substrate impedance sensors, Biosensors and Bioelectronics, 24(2008) 14-21.

[21] L.J. Gentet, G.J. Stuart, J.D. Clements, Direct measurement of specific membrane capacitance in neurons, Biophysical Journal, 79(2000) 314-20.

[22] S. Öz, C. Maercker, A. Breiling, Embryonic carcinoma cells show specific dielectric resistance profiles during induced differentiation, PloS one, 8(2013) e59895.

[23] C.-M. Lo, C.R. Keese, I. Giaever, Impedance analysis of MDCK cells measured by electric cell-substrate impedance sensing, Biophysical journal, 69(1995) 2800.

[24] F. Asphahani, M. Zhang, Cellular impedance biosensors for drug screening and toxin detection, Analyst, 132(2007) 835-41.

[25] M.E. Spira, A. Hai, Multi-electrode array technologies for neuroscience and cardiology, Nature nanotechnology, 8(2013) 83-94.

[26] H. Li, Q. Zou, L. Zou, Q. Wang, K. Su, N. Hu, et al., Detection of cardiovascular drugs and marine toxins using a multifunctional cell-based impedance biosensor system, Analytical Methods, 7(2015) 7715-23.

[27] J. Wang, C. Wu, N. Hu, J. Zhou, L. Du, P. Wang, Microfabricated electrochemical cell-based biosensors for analysis of living cells in vitro, Biosensors, 2(2012) 127-70.

[28] S.E. Anderson, H.H. Bau, Electrical detection of cellular penetration during microinjection with carbon nanopipettes, Nanotechnology, 25(2014) 245102.

[29] P. Xue, J. Bao, Y.J. Chuah, N.V. Menon, Y. Zhang, Y. Kang, Protein covalently conjugated SU-8 surface for the enhancement of mesenchymal stem cell adhesion and proliferation, Langmuir, 30(2014) 3110-7.

[30] J. Chen, Y. Zheng, Q. Tan, E. Shojaei-Baghini, Y.L. Zhang, J. Li, et al., Classification of cell types using a microfluidic device for mechanical and electrical measurement on single cells, Lab on a Chip, 11(2011) 3174-81.

[31] J. Chen, Y. Zheng, Q. Tan, Y.L. Zhang, J. Li, W.R. Geddie, et al., A microfluidic device for simultaneous electrical and mechanical measurements on single cells, Biomicrofluidics, 5(2011) 014113.

[32] S. Park, Y. Zhang, T.-H. Wang, S. Yang, Continuous dielectrophoretic bacterial separation and concentration from physiological media of high conductivity, Lab on a Chip, 11(2011) 2893-900.

[33] N.S. McNutt, R.S. Weinstein, The ultrastructure of the nexus A correlated thin-section and freeze-cleave study, The Journal of cell biology, 47(1970) 666-88.

[34] J. Bohnert, Effects of time-varying magnetic fields in the frequency range 1 khz to 100 khz upon the human body: Numerical studies and stimulation experiment: KIT Scientific Publishing; 2014.

[35] Y. Iwanaga, Cell-substrate distance measurement in correlation with distribution of adhesion molecules by fluorescence microscopy: Technische Universität München; 2000.

[36] Q. Lang, Y. Wu, Y. Ren, Y. Tao, L. Lei, H. Jiang, AC electrothermal circulatory pumping chip for cell culture, ACS applied materials & interfaces, 7(2015) 26792-801.

[37] J.E.B. Randles, Kinetics of rapid electrode reactions, Discussions of the faraday society, 1(1947) 11-9.

[38] H. Schwan, Electrode polarization impedance and measurements in biological materials, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 148(1968) 191-209.

[39] E. Warburg, Ueber das Verhalten sogenannter unpolarisirbarer Elektroden gegen Wechselstrom, Annalen der Physik, 303(1899) 493-9.

[40] V.F. Lvovich, Impedance spectroscopy: applications to electrochemical and dielectric phenomena: John Wiley & Sons; 2012.

[41] T.A. Nguyen, T.-I. Yin, D. Reyes, G.A. Urban, Microfluidic chip with integrated electrical cell-impedance sensing for monitoring single cancer cell migration in three-dimensional matrixes, Analytical chemistry, 85(2013) 11068-76.

[42] W. Franks, I. Schenker, P. Schmutz, A. Hierlemann, Impedance characterization and modeling of electrodes for biomedical applications, IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, 52(2005) 1295-302.

[43] N. Joye, A. Schmid, Y. Leblebici, An electrical model of the cell-electrode interface for high-density microelectrode arrays, 2008 30th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, IEEE2008, pp. 559-62.

[44] Y.f. Alberto, O. Alberto, Cell Biometrics Based on Bio-Impedance Measurements, (2011).

[45] H.K. Henisch, Rectifying semi-conductor contacts: Clarendon Press; 1957.

[46] G.T. Kovacs, Introduction to the theory, design, and modeling of thin-film microelectrodes for neural interfaces, academic Press, san Diego1994, pp. 121-65.

[47] D.K. Schroder, Semiconductor material and device characterization: John Wiley & Sons; 2006.

[48] A. Yúfera, A. Olmo, D. Cañete, P. Daza, Cell biometrics based on bio-impedance measurements: INTECH Open Access Publisher; 2011.

[49] W. Wang, Y. Sun, M. Zhang, R. Anderson, L. Langille, W. Chan, A system for high-speed microinjection of adherent cells, Review of scientific instruments, 79(2008) 104302.