Supporting Information

Running out of Lithium?

A Route to Differentiate between Capacity Losses and Active Lithium

Losses in Lithium-Ion Batteries

Florian Holtstiege^a, Andrea Wilken^a, Martin Winter^{a,b}, Tobias Placke^a

^a University of Münster, MEET Battery Research Center, Institute of Physical Chemistry,

Corrensstraße 46, 48149 Münster, Germany

^b Helmholtz Institute Münster, IEK-12, Forschungszentrum Jülich, Corrensstraße 46, 48149 Münster, Germany

| Table S1. Lithium, | , iron and phosphorus | s stoichiometry of pristing | e LFP electrodes, | measured by I | CP-OES and |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|------------|
| normalized to the ire | on content. SD: stand | ard deviation; RSD: relati | ve standard devia | tion. | |

| _ | Li | Fe | Р |
|---------------------------|-------|----|-------|
| _ | 1.112 | 1 | 1.110 |
| LFP electrodes (fresh) | 1.121 | 1 | 1.116 |
| | 1.121 | 1 | 1.107 |
| | 1.140 | 1 | 1.103 |
| _ | 1.155 | 1 | 1.117 |
| Arithmetic mean | 1.130 | 1 | 1.111 |
| SD | 0.015 | - | 0.005 |
| RSD / % | 1.4 | - | 0.5 |

Table S2. Lithium, iron and phosphorus stoichiometry of LFP electrodes which were cycled for 103 cycles against graphite, measured by ICP-OES and normalized to iron and percentage of active lithium loss.

| Cycled Cells | Li | Fe | Р | Relative lithium loss (by ICP-OES) | Relative lithium loss (by AIC) | ICP-OES AIC |
|-----------------|-------|----|-------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| А | 1.053 | 1 | 1.155 | 6.8% | 14.5% | 47% |
| В | 0.999 | 1 | 1.154 | 11.6% | 20.4% | 57% |
| С | 1.029 | 1 | 1.153 | 8.9% | 16.9% | 53% |
| D | 1.032 | 1 | 1.153 | 8.7% | 16.2% | 54% |
| Е | 1.024 | 1 | 1.151 | 9.3% | 16.8% | 56% |
| Range: | | | | | 53% ± 3% | |



Figure S1. Comparison of active lithium loss after 103 cycles, determined by ICP-OES and accumulated irreversible capacity (AIC).



Figure S2. Capacity loss (Q_{ALL}) determined by IRLC (red) and accumulated irreversible capacity (Q_{AIC} , black) after 1, 2, 3, 13, 53 and 103 cycles for three different cells. Standard cycling: Silicon-graphite composite as WE; LFP as CE; metallic lithium as RE; C-Rate: 1C; cut-off potentials: 0.02 V vs. Li/Li⁺ and 1.5 vs. Li/Li⁺. Discharge against RE: C-Rate: C/30; cut-off voltage: 4.1 V.



Figure S3. Capacity loss (Q_{ALL}) determined by IRLC (red) and accumulated irreversible capacity (Q_{AIC} , black) after 1, 2, 3, 13, 53 and 103 cycles for three different cells named A, B and C. Standard cycling: Carbon sphere as WE; LFP as CE; metallic lithium as RE; C-Rate: 1C; cut-off potentials: 0.02 V vs. Li/Li⁺ and 1.5 vs. Li/Li⁺. Discharge against RE: C-Rate: C/30; cut-off voltage: 4.1 V.



Figure S4. Average active lithium loss (n_{ALL}) of carbon spheres with regard to the electrode capacity.



Figure S5. Potential profile of the silicon/graphite composite electrode showing cycle 5, 50 and 51. Silicon/graphite composite as WE; LFP as CE; metallic lithium as RE; C-Rate: 1C; cut-off potentials: 0.02 V and 1.5 vs. Li/Li⁺.