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I. INTRODUCTION

The leveling dynamics of thickness variations in thin liquid films has been studied extensively in the context of ripples and other irregularities in solution-deposited coatings and molten glass films as well as brush marks in paint layers. Orchard presented a Fourier series solution of the Stokes equation for the leveling process, considering both surface tension and gravity as the driving forces and allowing for temporal variations of surface tension and viscosity. retaining the time derivatives in the Navier-Stokes equation, Woo considered one-dimensional and axisymmetric disturbances on molten glass surfaces. Degani and Gutfinger in addition conducted time-resolved measurements of the leveling dynamics and presented a numerical solution of governing equations for the case of large amplitudes. Khesgh and Scriven focused their attention on large amplitude shear-thinning on the evolution of coating defects. Stillwagon and Larson studied the leveling of thin films deposited on topographically patterned substrates. Overdiep, Wilson, and Eres et al. considered the influence of evaporation as well as concentration- and surface-tension gradients on the leveling process. The effect of surfactants has been studied by Schwartz et al. and Eres et al.

In the past decade, inkjet printing has matured as a flexible deposition technique for laterally structured coatings of solvent- or melt-based ink formulations. For many applications, it is desirable to obtain a smooth film without ripples or other morphological traces of the individual droplets that had originally been deposited. The degree of leveling and the final ink morphology that are crucial for print quality typically improve with time. On the other hand, ink redistribution effects, for example, due to equilibration of capillary pressure or surface energy differences on the substrate, are usually unwanted. As an illustrative example, Fig. 1 shows the light emission patterns of two organic light emitting diode (OLED) devices fabricated by inkjet printing using an Agfa Orgacon hole injection layer and Merck Livilux light emitting polymer. A large line pitch caused the occurrence of striations, that is, individual printed lines are distinguishable in the light output. After process optimization, a perfectly homogeneous light emission is visible in Fig. 1(b).

II. EXPERIMENTAL

For our experiments, we used a commercially available dispersion of 1 wt. % poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene) poly(styrenesulfonate) (PEDOT:PSS, Orgacon™ HILHC5-JJ, Agfa Gevaert N.V.) in water. Due to the high surface tension of water, surfactants are added to improve print quality. Depending on surfactant additives, the equilibrium surface
tension of the PEDOT:PSS dispersion ranges between $\gamma_\infty = 25 - 40$ mN/m. Its viscosity at nominal concentration is $\mu = (12 \pm 2)$ mPa-s, its density $\rho = 1000$ kg/m$^3$.$^{32}$

A piezoelectrically actuated Spectra Galaxy PH 256/50 AAA inkjet printhead with 256 nozzles with a diameter of 42 $\mu$m and a nozzle pitch of 254 $\mu$m was used for deposition. The lateral separation $d_l$ of neighboring inkjet-printed lines was varied by adjusting the azimuthal orientation of the printhead with respect to the direction of substrate motion. The drop volume $V_d$ and drop ejection frequency $f_d$ were kept constant at 50 pl and 1 kHz, respectively.

The distance between individual inkjetted droplets along the $y$-direction is denoted $d_d = U_{sub}/f_d$. The cross-sectional area (volume per unit length) $A_{sl} = V_d/d_d = V_d f_d/U_{sub}$ of a single inkjet-printed line can be adjusted by means of the substrate speed $U_{sub}$. The width of a single printed line $w_{sl}$ depends on the ink-substrate contact angle $\theta$ as illustrated in Fig. 2(a). For uniform, narrow single lines $w_{sl} \ll \ell_c \equiv \sqrt{\gamma/(\rho g)}$, the equilibrium line width is given by $^{31} w_{sl} = 2 \sin \theta \sqrt{A_{sl}/(\ell - \sin \theta \cos \theta)}$. For narrow and thin single lines, that is, if $h_d \ll w_{sl}$, the cross-sectional profile is to good approximation parabolic and thus $A_{sl} = \frac{h}{2} h_d w_{sl}$. Disregarding end effects, the average height of a multi-line is given by $h = A_{sl}/d_l$. Here, $h_d$ is the center height of a printed single line, $g$ is the gravitational acceleration and $\ell_c$ is the so-called capillary length, a material parameter that typically ranges between 1.5 and 3 mm. For dimensions below $\ell_c$, the influence of gravity on the leveling and redistribution process can to good approximation be neglected for horizontally oriented substrates.

Generally, patterns were printed such that the center-to-center distance of neighboring lines was smaller than the line width, $d_l < w_{sl}$, which guarantees a certain minimum overlap [Fig. 2(b)]. Moreover, $d_d$ was kept much smaller than $d_l$, such that the leveling dynamics in the printing direction ($y$ axis) proceeds much faster than perpendicular to it. For this reason, only the lateral leveling along the $x$-axis will be considered in this manuscript, and the ink thickness profile $h(x, y, t)$ is assumed to be independent of $y$. For industrial applications, it is desirable to maximize $d_l$ and $U_{sub}$ because then a larger area can be patterned with the same number of nozzles in shorter time.

Figure 3 shows four series of inkjet-printed PEDOT:PSS multi-lines of various width that were deposited on a flat, non-porous substrate using different line-pitch values $d_l$ between 50 and 200 $\mu$m. The width of a single line was approximately $w_{sl} = 200$ $\mu$m. The gray scale contrast of the microscope images is mostly due to interference effects of the substrate-PEDOT:PSS and PEDOT:PSS-air interfaces and reflects the thickness profile of the printed stripes. Figure 3(a) shows separated individual lines that have not merged laterally at all. The onset of coalescence is clearly observed in Fig. 3(b). The grayscale contrast in Fig. 3(c) is very uniform, indicating near-optimal leveling. In Fig. 3(d), a very small line pitch was chosen that resulted in a larger overall film thickness. The grayscale distribution indicates that the thickness profiles of the stripes are not flat but more closely resemble parabolas as a consequence of capillary redistribution.
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**FIG. 1.** (Color online) Inkjet-printed organic light emitting diode devices based on Merck Livilux light emitting polymer and an (a) large and (b) optimized line pitch.

**FIG. 2.** (Color online) Definition of geometric parameters. (a) Inkjet droplets of volume $V_d$ impinge on an impenetrable substrate moving with velocity $U_{sub}$ in the $y$ direction to form a single line of width $w_{sl}$, centerline height $h_d$ and cross-sectional area $A_{sl}$. (b) Wide lines and thin films of average film thickness $b$ can be formed by controlled coalescence of single lines deposited with a spacing $d_l < w_{sl}$. 
redistribution is avoided, resulting in inkjet-printed multi-lines with a homogeneous layer thickness.

The width of a multi-line $w$ depends on the number of lines $N$, $d_l$, and $w_{\text{dd}}$ and may change in time as a consequence of ink spreading or retraction. We shall assume, however, that the contact lines remain pinned, for example, as a consequence of contact angle hysteresis. Moreover, although the viscosity gradually increases during the solvent evaporation process, we consider the case of a constant Newtonian viscosity and neglect any influence of the solvent volatility.

### A. Insoluble surfactants

In the case of small aspect ratios $\varepsilon \equiv h_{\text{dd}}/w_{\text{dd}} \ll 1$, the so-called lubrication approximation\textsuperscript{35} can be applied to describe the leveling dynamics. In this limit, the equations describing the evolution of the height profile and the surfactant surface distribution of an insoluble surfactant are\textsuperscript{36,37}

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( h \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - \frac{h^2}{2\mu} \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial x} - \frac{h^3}{3\mu} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \right) = 0 
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial x} - \frac{h^2}{2\mu} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - D_s \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial x} \right) = 0
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
p = -\gamma \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2} + \rho gh,
\end{equation}

where $\Gamma$ is the surfactant surface concentration, $p$ is the augmented pressure\textsuperscript{35} and $D_s$ is the surface diffusion constant. An assumption implicit in Eqs. (2)–(4) is that the substrate is oriented horizontally with its surface normal parallel to the positive $z$-direction, whereas gravity acts in the negative $z$-direction. This formalism can be applied when the ink-substrate contact angle is not too large, an upper limit\textsuperscript{38} is on order of 30°.
For the evaluation of the surface tension $\gamma$, we have used the equation of state

$$\gamma = \gamma_\infty + \Pi_{\text{max}} \exp \left( -A \frac{\Gamma^2}{\Gamma_c^2} \right)$$

(5)
depicted in Fig. 5. The parameter values were chosen as $\gamma_\infty = 39$ mN/m, $\Pi_{\text{max}} = 24$ mN/m, $\Gamma_c = 3.5 \mu_l/m^2$, and $A = 6.125$, which to good approximation resembles the equation of state of oleic acid on glycerol.\(^\text{39,40}\)

For numerical simulations of the leveling dynamics, we first use the initial conditions

$$h(x, t = 0) = \langle h \rangle + a_0 \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} x \right)$$

(6)

$$\Gamma(x, t = 0) = \Gamma_0$$

(7)

that is, we initially consider only the center region close to $x = 0$ as sketched in Fig. 4. In a second step, we discuss end-effects in the vicinity of the contact lines in Sec. IV B. Here $a_0$ is the amplitude of the ink thickness variations and $\lambda$ is the ripple wavelength, which is determined by $d_i$, Equation (7) corresponds to a uniform initial surfactant concentration along the surface, which means that Marangoni stresses are induced by the leveling process. Although nonuniform initial surfactant distributions after inkjet deposition are conceivable, the authors are not aware of any existing experimental, theoretical or numerical data regarding $\Gamma(x, t = 0)$.

Equations (2)-(5) were nondimensionalized using the following scales

$$\bar{x} \equiv x/\lambda, \quad \bar{h} \equiv h/\langle h \rangle, \quad \bar{\Gamma} \equiv \Gamma/\Gamma_c$$

$$\bar{p} \equiv p/p_0, \quad \bar{\gamma} \equiv \gamma/\Pi_{\text{max}}, \quad \bar{t} \equiv t/t_0$$

(8)

where $p_0 \equiv \gamma a_0/\lambda^2$ and $t_0$ is defined in Eq. (10).

**B. Perturbation analysis for small amplitudes and insoluble surfactants**

Using a Fourier series solution of the Stokes equation, Orchard\(^\text{2}\) derived the expression

$$t_0 = \frac{3}{16\pi^4} \frac{\mu}{\langle h \rangle^4} \left( \Gamma + \rho g \lambda^2/4\pi^2 \right)^{-1} \gamma$$

(10)

for the leveling time of long-wavelength ripples on thin liquid films, that is, in the limit $2\pi\langle h \rangle/\lambda \ll 1$, in the absence of surfactants. This result can also be derived from a linearization of Eqs. (2) and (4) for the case when the ripple amplitude $a_0 \ll \langle h \rangle$ in Eq. (6).

Schwartz et al.\(^\text{18,19}\) considered the effects of surfactants on the leveling dynamics for the case of an idealized linear equation of state and when gravitational effects are negligible. We follow their procedure to derive an expression for the leveling time scale in the presence of surfactants for a realistic, nonlinear equation of state and with gravitational effects included. We consider the following harmonic variations of the height profile and surfactant concentration

$$h(x, t) = \langle h \rangle + h_1(t) \cos kx$$

(11)

$$\Gamma(x, t) = \Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1(t) \cos kx$$

(12)

$$\gamma(x, t) = \gamma(\Gamma_0) + \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial \Gamma}(\Gamma_0) \Gamma_1(t) \cos kx$$

(13)

and determine the time dependence of the amplitudes $h_1$ and $\Gamma_1$ from linearized versions of Eqs. (2)-(4), that is, for the case when $h_1 \ll \langle h \rangle$ and $\Gamma_1 \ll \Gamma_0$. We point out that the Or- chard time $t_0$ from Eq. (10), which we use for nondimensionalizing time in Eq. (9), depends on surface tension $\gamma(\Gamma_0)$ and thus on $\Gamma_0$, that is, the linearization point in Eqs. (12) and (13). The following system of linear and homogeneous ordinary differential equations results

$$\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{3\partial \gamma}{\partial \Gamma}(\Gamma_0) \Gamma_0 \Gamma_1 + \tilde{h}_1 = 0$$

(14)

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma_1}{\partial t} + \frac{3\partial \gamma}{\partial \Gamma}(\Gamma_0) \Gamma_0 \Gamma_1 + \frac{3\Gamma_0}{2} \tilde{\Gamma}_1 + \tilde{Z} \Gamma_1 = 0$$

(15)

which we solve for the initial conditions $\tilde{h}_1(\tilde{t} = 0) = \tilde{a}_0 \equiv a_0/\langle h \rangle$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_1(\tilde{t} = 0) = 0$ and find

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{a}_0} \tilde{h}_1 = \frac{1 + N_-}{N_- N_+} \exp(N_+ T) - \frac{1 + N_+}{N_- N_+} \exp(N_- T)$$

(16)

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_1 = \frac{3\Gamma_0}{2} \frac{\tilde{a}_0}{N_- N_+} (\exp(N_+ T) - \exp(N_- T))$$

(17)

where the rate constants $N_{\pm}$ are given by

$$N_{\pm} \equiv -\left( \frac{1}{2} \left( S \pm \sqrt{S^2 - Q \Gamma_0 - 4z} \right) \right)$$

(18)

and we defined

$$Q \equiv \frac{-3\partial \gamma}{\partial \Gamma}(\Gamma_0) \left( \gamma(\Gamma_0) \Gamma_0^2 + \rho g \Pi_{\text{max}} \langle h \rangle^2 \right)$$

(19)
We note that for $Q = 0$, Eq. (16) reduces to the Orchard solution $\tilde{h}_1 = \tilde{a}_0 \exp(-\tilde{t})$. Had we chosen a locally non-uniform initial surfactant distribution $\Gamma_1(\tilde{t} = 0) \neq 0$, then the numerical prefactors of the exponential terms in Eqs. (16) and (17) would be different, but the rate-constants would remain unaffected.

For most surfactant systems, $\partial \sigma / \partial \Gamma \leq 0$, which implies that $Q \geq 0$ and that the rate constants $N_\pm$ are negative (semi-definite, $N_\pm \leq 0$. This corresponds to a decay of both the ripples in the height profile and the surfactant concentration variations in the limit of long times. Because $|N_-| < |N_+|$, the rate constant $N_+$ determines the long-time behavior.

C. Soluble surfactants

Jensen and Grotberg$^{41}$ presented a theoretical model for the dynamics of thin liquid films in the presence of nonuniform distributions of a soluble surfactant. They assumed a linear equation of state for the dependence of surface tension on bulk concentration, $\gamma(C)$, for the soluble surfactant sodium dodecylsulfate (SDS) in glycerol,$^{33}$ which yielded the parameters $\Gamma_{\infty} = 4.2 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ mol/m}^2$, $k_2/k_1 = 1.7 \cdot 10^6 \text{ m}^{-1}$ as well as the maximum spreading pressure $\Pi_{\text{max}} = 23.7 \text{ mN/m}$. Because we do not take the presence of surfactant micelles into account, the validity of this model is restricted to concentrations below the so-called critical micelle concentration (cmc).

We introduce the following new scaled variables

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{\rho \lambda^2}{(\bar{\rho}) \Pi_{\text{max}}}, \quad \hat{\Gamma} = \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma_s}$$

The scale $\Gamma_s$ is chosen such that a nondimensional bulk concentration $\hat{\Gamma} = 1$ corresponds to a nondimensional surface concentration $\hat{\Gamma} = 1$ in the scaled version of Eq. (27), that is, $\Gamma_s = \Gamma_{\infty} / 2$. We arrive at the following dimensionless equations

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial \hat{t}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{x}} \left[ \hat{h} \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial \hat{y}} - \frac{\epsilon^2 \text{Bo} \hat{h} \Gamma \partial \hat{h}}{2} - \frac{\epsilon^2 \text{Bo} \hat{h} \Gamma \partial \hat{\rho}}{2} \right] = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\Gamma}}{\partial \hat{t}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{x}} \left[ \hat{h} \frac{\partial \hat{\Gamma}}{\partial \hat{y}} - \frac{\epsilon^2 \text{Bo} \hat{h} \Gamma \partial \hat{h}}{2} - \frac{\epsilon^2 \text{Bo} \hat{h} \Gamma \partial \hat{\rho}}{2} \right] = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\chi}}{\partial \hat{t}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{x}} \left[ \hat{h} \frac{\partial \hat{\chi}}{\partial \hat{y}} - \frac{\epsilon^2 \text{Bo} \hat{h} \Gamma \partial \hat{h}}{2} - \frac{\epsilon^2 \text{Bo} \hat{h} \Gamma \partial \hat{\rho}}{2} \right] = 0$$

where $\Gamma_{\infty}$ is the maximum surface concentration at complete coverage of the surface. The nonlinear equation of state derived from the Gibbs adsorption isotherm$^{42}$ follows as

$$\gamma = \gamma(0) + R T \Gamma_{\infty} \ln \left( 1 - \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma_{\infty}} \right)$$

where $R$ is the universal gas constant and $T$ is the absolute temperature. We used Eqs. (27) and (28) to fit experimental data for the dependence of surface tension on bulk concentration, $\gamma(C)$, for the soluble surfactant sodium dodecylsulfate (SDS) in glycerol,$^{33}$ which yielded the parameters $\Gamma_{\infty} = 4.2 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ mol/m}^2$, $k_2/k_1 = 1.7 \cdot 10^6 \text{ m}^{-1}$ as well as the maximum spreading pressure $\Pi_{\text{max}} = 23.7 \text{ mN/m}$. Because we do not take the presence of surfactant micelles into account, the validity of this model is restricted to concentrations below the so-called critical micelle concentration (cmc).
The Bond number $Bo$ quantifies the relative importance of hydrostatic and capillary pressure gradients, whereas the Peclet numbers $Pe_x$ and $Pe_y$ compare the effects of convective and diffusive surfactant transport.

The initial conditions for the film thickness and surfactant surface concentration are the same as in the case of insoluble surfactants, Eqs. (6) and (7). We assumed that the height-averaged bulk concentration is initially uniform and in equilibrium with the surface concentration. Using the non-dimensional version of Eq. (27), we find $C(x, t = 0) = \Gamma_0/(2 - \Gamma_0)$.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Leveling dynamics

During leveling, liquid locally flows from the elevated regions toward the regions of reduced film thickness, which leads to a converging flow in the valleys and surface expansion on the hills. Considering an initially uniform surfactant concentration distribution, this surface compression and expansion induces Marangoni stresses, which oppose flow driven by capillary and hydrostatic pressure gradients and thereby slow down the leveling dynamics.

We solved Eqs. (2)–(5) and (31)–(33) numerically with the finite element software COMSOL MULTIPHYSICS 3.5 using quadratic basis functions. Figure 6 illustrates the relative increase of the leveling time $t_{lev}/t_{lev}(\Gamma_0 = 0)$ when an insoluble surfactant is present at the air-liquid interface. The solid lines correspond to numerical solutions for different values of $\bar{\alpha}_0$. The crosses indicate the results of the perturbation analysis according to Eq. (16) for $\bar{\alpha}_0 = 0.01$, which agrees very well with the corresponding numerical solution.

When $\Gamma_0 = 0$, the leveling time ratio is unity by definition. For $\Gamma_0 \gg 1$, that is, in the saturation regime of the equation of state, a small change in the surfactant surface concentration has no effect on the surface tension. Consequently, $t_{lev}/t_{lev}(\Gamma_0 = 0)$ becomes independent of $\Gamma_0$ in the limit $\Gamma_0 \gg 1$. The saturation value corresponds to capillary/hydrostatic leveling with the reduced surface tension $\gamma_{\infty}$. In the intermediate regime $0 < \Gamma_0 < 1$, the influence of flow-induced surfactant concentration gradients substantially increases $t_{lev}$ above $t_{lev}(\Gamma_0 = 0)$. The addition of surfactants thus can significantly slow down the leveling dynamics by more than a factor of 8.

Larger values of the ripple amplitude induce larger overall variations of the surfactant surface concentration $\Delta \Gamma = \max(\Gamma) - \min(\Gamma)$. This tends to flatten the dependence of $t_{lev}/t_{lev}(\Gamma_0 = 0)$ because a larger fraction of the concentration range relevant for the equation of state is involved in determining the dynamics. These larger variations are also the reason why the leveling time ratio increases with the ripple amplitude for $\Gamma_0 > 1$, although $\gamma(\Gamma_0)$ is already in the flat region of Fig. 5. We note that although the ratio $t_{lev}/t_{lev}(\Gamma_0 = 0)$ primarily decreases for increasing ripple amplitudes above 0.5 in the region $\Gamma_0 \leq 1$, the absolute leveling time $t_{lev}$ typically increases due to a reduced mobility of the liquid film in the thin regions.

To illustrate the leveling dynamics, we plotted the dimensionless ripple amplitude $\bar{h}(x = 0, t) = 1 - a_0/\bar{h}$ for different initial surfactant concentrations $\Gamma_0$ in Fig. 7(a). The straight, black solid line corresponds to purely capillary leveling, that is, $\Gamma = 0$, for which the globally fastest leveling is observed. The remaining curves all exhibit two distinct time-scales corresponding to the rate constants $N_\pm$ given in Eq. (18). The non-monotonic behavior visible in Fig. 6 is a consequence of the superposition of these two processes. The curve for $\Gamma_0 = 0.3$ shows the fastest asymptotic decay rate $N_\pm$, because the equation of state [Eq. (5)] attains its maximum slope $\partial \gamma/\partial \Gamma$ approximately at $\Gamma \approx 0.3$ (see Fig. 5) and $Q$ in Eq. (19), thus, its maximum value.

Figure 7(b) shows the variation of the surfactant surface concentration $\bar{\Gamma}(x = 0, t) - \Gamma_0$ for $a_0/\bar{h} = 0.01$ and different initial surfactant concentrations $\Gamma_0$ as plotted in Fig. 7(a). The maximum concentration variation appears to increase with increasing $\Gamma_0$. According to Eqs. (16) and (17), the asymptotic slopes of the curves are identical with the corresponding ones in Fig. 7(a).

Figures 8(a) and 8(b) show the relative increase of the leveling time when a soluble surfactant is present in the bulk liquid as well as at the liquid-air interface. A small value of the adsorption rate parameter $K$ corresponds to a surfactant for which bulk-surface exchange cannot occur on the time scale of the leveling process. As in the case of insoluble surfactants, a significantly longer leveling time results. A large value of $K$ implies that on the time scale of the flow the surfactant is always in equilibrium with the underlying bulk liquid, which strongly reduces its influence on the leveling process. In addition for sufficiently thick films, the height-averaged bulk concentration does not change much as a consequence of adsorption or desorption, and Marangoni stresses are strongly diminished. In this case, the capillary leveling dynamics are effectively recovered, and the only effect of the surfactant is to reduce the overall surface tension. For an equation of state like SDS in glycerol, this slows...
down leveling by a factor of up to about 1.5, but for other surfactant/solvent combinations by typically no more than a factor of 2–3.

Figure 8(b) also illustrates the effect of the ripple amplitude. As in the case of insoluble surfactants, a larger ripple amplitude tends to somewhat lessen the retarding effect for small values of $K \leq 1$ and provided $\Gamma$ remains considerably below $\Gamma_s$. For large values of $K > 1$, Marangoni stresses are diminished and any remaining influence of the surfactant on the leveling time ratio becomes independent of the ripple amplitude.

B. Redistribution time of inkjet printed multi-lines

So far we have considered the leveling dynamics in the interior of a line array. If a uniform thickness is desired then the overall redistribution time $t_{\text{red}}$ constitutes an upper bound for the device fabrication process. In this section, we discuss how $t_{\text{red}}$ depends on the width of the multi-line $w$ and the lateral line pitch $d_l$ in the presence of insoluble surfactants.

For $\lambda < \ell_c$, the capillary leveling time scales as $t_{\text{lev}} \sim \lambda^4 / \langle h \rangle^3$ [Eq. (10)], where $\lambda$ and $\langle h \rangle$ had been considered as independent parameters. For inkjet-printed structures, they are both, however, determined by the line pitch, $\lambda \sim d_l$ and $\langle h \rangle \sim 1 / d_l$, such that we expect the leveling time to scale as $t_{\text{lev}} \sim d_l^4$. Provided that $w < \ell_c$, an equivalent scaling is expected for the multi-line redistribution time, if the wavelength $\lambda$ is replaced by the width of the multi-line $w = (N - 1) d_l + w_{sl}$, leading to $t_{\text{red}} \sim w^4 d_l^4$. The exact definition of $t_{\text{red}}$ that we have used is illustrated in Fig. 9(a), where we plotted the time evolution of the center height of a multi-line array $\tilde{h}(x, \tau)$. Here, $\tilde{h}$ is defined as $\tilde{h} \equiv h / h_{\text{red}}$. For $\tilde{t} > t_{\text{lev}}$ and sufficiently large $N \gg 1$, $\tilde{h}(0, \tilde{t})$ reaches a first plateau value, which we denote $\tilde{h}_{\text{lev}}$. After completion of the redistribution, $\tilde{h}(0, \tilde{t})$ reaches a second plateau value denoted as $\tilde{h}_{\text{red}}$. The redistribution time $t_{\text{red}}$ is defined as the instant when the center height reaches a value halfway between the two plateau values, $\tilde{h}(0, t_{\text{red}}) = (\tilde{h}_{\text{lev}} + \tilde{h}_{\text{red}}) / 2$. 
The effect of initially uniform surfactant distributions is to delay leveling and redistribution by a factor of up to approximately 8. Due to the highly nonlinear dependence of the leveling time $t_{lev}$ on the line pitch $d_l$, the most crucial parameter for the leveling process is $d_l$. The redistribution time for narrow line widths $w < \ell_c$ scales as $t_{red} \sim w^4 \sim N^2$, that is, the process window for achieving leveling while avoiding significant redistribution effects becomes wider for larger $N$.

For wide lines $w \gg \ell_c$, we expect a different scaling owing to Eq. (10); however, for typical parameter values, $t_{red}$ then becomes so large that this regime may not be of practical relevance.

Two obvious strategies for avoiding or minimizing surfactant-related leveling delays is to either not add surfactants at all or to increase the surfactant concentration well beyond $\Gamma_s$, that is, $\Gamma_0 > 1$, because then the leveling time ratio $t_{lev}/t_{lev}(\Gamma_0 = 0)$ plotted in Fig. 6 is both reduced and remains unaffected by small processing-related variations in $\Gamma_0$. In the case of soluble surfactants, rapid adsorption and desorption rates effectively eliminate Marangoni stress-related effects for thick enough films, and the only retardation left is due to the reduced value of the surface tension, which amounts to typically no more than a factor of 2 or 3.

Whether these are viable solutions that are beneficial for the entire printing process depends not only on the functionality of the coating but also on the influence of the surfactant on, for example, solvent evaporation and the wettability of the solution on the substrate. For instance, in the context of organic electronic devices, the device performance and efficiency may be adversely affected by a high surfactant concentration.

Our results have been obtained with two particular yet typical and representative equations of state. In the case of soluble surfactants, we considered the regime where surfactant concentration equilibration occurs rapidly compared to the leveling time scale, which is appropriate for thin films.

**V. SUMMARY**

We have studied the leveling and redistribution dynamics of inkjet-printed multi-lines in the presence of soluble and insoluble surfactants. While insoluble surfactants can slow down the leveling process up to a factor of approximately 8, the retarding effect of soluble surfactants can be lower in the case of fast rates of surfactant bulk-surface exchange. We presented numerical simulations as well as scaling relations for both the leveling and redistribution times of multi-lines as a function of the number of individual lines, the lateral pitch, and the average line height and width, which provide a basis for estimating optimal process conditions.
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