## **Supporting Information**

## Role of Solvation Site Segmental Dynamics on Ion Transport in Ethylene-Oxide based

## **Side-Chain Polymer Electrolytes**

Peter Bennington<sup>a</sup>, Chuting Deng<sup>a</sup>, Daniel Sharon<sup>d</sup>, Michael A. Webb<sup>c</sup>, Juan J. de Pablo<sup>a,b\*</sup>, Paul F. Nealey<sup>a,b\*</sup>, Shrayesh N. Patel<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Pritzker School of Molecular Engineering, University of Chicago, 5640 S Ellis Ave, Chicago, IL 60637, United States

<sup>b</sup> Materials Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Lemont, IL 60439, United States

<sup>c</sup> Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Princeton University, 41 Olden Street, Princeton, NJ 08540, United States

<sup>d</sup> Institute of Chemistry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

\*depablo@uchicago.edu, nealey@uchicago.edu, shrayesh@uchicago.edu

## **Contents:**

- 1. RAFT Polymerization reaction schemes
- 2. GPC data
- 3. Raw Li<sup>+</sup> ion MSD vs. time data
- 4. DSC thermograms and VTF fitting parameters
- 5. Solvation site connectivity as a function of  $x_{EO}$
- 6. Radial Distribution Functions
- 7. Full FTIR spectra
- 8. Raman data and estimates of free ion fraction
- 9. NMR of POEM<sub>9</sub>-*r*-PMMA random copolymer
- 10. Field Parameters for MD Simulations
- 11. Molecular Dynamics Simulation Protocols
- 12. Simulated Fictive Temperatures

## 1. RAFT Polymerization reaction schemes



Scheme S1 – General reaction scheme for RAFT polymerization of homopolymer  $POEM_x$  and

POEA<sub>9</sub>



Scheme S2 – Reaction scheme for copolymerization of OEM<sub>9</sub> and MMA

# 2. GPC Data



Fig. S1 – Differential refractive index (dRI) *vs.* elution time data taken from GPC-MALS measurements of synthesized polymers in THF. Molecular weight and dispersity are taken from these data assuming a differential refractive index of dn/dc = 0.073 mL g<sup>-1</sup>.



# 3. Raw Li<sup>+</sup> ion mean-squared displacement (MSD) data

**Fig. S2** – Li<sup>+</sup> ion MSD data in (a) PEO, (b) POEM<sub>9</sub>, (c) POEM<sub>5</sub>, (d) POEM<sub>3</sub>, (e) POEA<sub>9</sub> and (f) POEM<sub>9</sub>-*r*-PMMA used to calculate MSD ratios in Fig. 3, Fig. 6, and Fig. 7 of the text.

# 4. DSC thermograms and VTF fitting parameters



Fig. S3 – DSC thermograms of neat and r = 0.05 samples. These curves represent the third heating cycle, and  $T_g$  is taken as the midpoint in the inflection in the heat flow rate.

_		11 I'll I al'allic		1017 0.05 Electrolytes		
	Material	A (S cm <sup>-1</sup> )	$E_a$ (J mol <sup>-1</sup> )	<i>T</i> <sub>0</sub> (K)		
	PEO	0.0581	3784	228.2		
	POEM <sub>9</sub>	0.262	8754	186.6		
	POEM <sub>5</sub>	0.317	11890	176.4		
	POEM <sub>3</sub>	0.204	11986	189.0		

Table S1. VTF Fit Parameters for r = 0.05 Electrolytes

# 5. Solvation site connectivity as a function of $x_{EO}$



**Fig. S4** – Normalized solvation site edge density ( $\kappa/\kappa_{PEO}$ ) as a function of ether oxygen mole fraction.  $x_{EO}$  is defined as the ratio of ether oxygens in a repeat unit to the total number of atoms (not including hydrogens).

## 6. Radial Distribution Functions



**Fig. S5** – Radial distribution functions (RDF) between Li ion and oxygen atoms in PEO and POEM<sub>x</sub> at 150K above  $T_g$ . The Li-OET RDF are shown both in full scale (a) and in zoomed scale (b). The Li-OKE RDFs (c) and Li-OKT RDFs (d) are computed for POEM<sub>x</sub> only. Note that the RDFs are normalized by the concentration of each oxygen type, so the relative heights of the peaks do not necessarily relate to the composition.

#### 7. Full FTIR spectra



Fig. S6 – Full ATR-FTIR spectra of POEM<sub>9</sub>, POEM<sub>5</sub>, and POEM<sub>3</sub>, both neat and at r = 0.05.

#### 8. Raman data and estimates of free ion fraction



**Fig. S7** – Raman spectra and fits for POEM<sub>9</sub>, POEM<sub>5</sub> and POEM<sub>3</sub> r = 0.05 electrolytes. Black open circles represent the raw data, dotted red lines are fits to individual peaks at 741 cm<sup>-1</sup> (free TFSI) and 744 cm<sup>-1</sup> (associated TFSI), and solid red lines are the combined fit. Raman data is fit to two Voigt peaks, which converge in the case of POEM<sub>9</sub> and POEM<sub>3</sub>. The free ion fraction is taken from the area fraction under the 741 cm<sup>-1</sup> peak.

#### 9. NMR of POEM<sub>9</sub>-*r*-PMMA random copolymer



Fig. S8 – <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra of POEM<sub>9</sub>-*r*-PMMA in CDCL<sub>3</sub>. The ratio of peak integrals for the ether side-chain end methyl group (c,  $\delta = 3.38$  ppm) to the methacrylate backbone methyl group (a,  $\delta = 0.7 - 1.5$  ppm) was used to determine the mol fraction of POEM<sub>9</sub> in the copolymer.  $I_c/I_a = 0.273 = x_{POEM9}$ .

#### **10. Force Field Parameters for MD Simulations**

In this study, the TraPPE-UA force field<sup>1–3</sup> is used for all inter- and intramolecular interactions between polymer atoms. Instead of rigid bonds used in TraPPE-UA force field, the generalized CHARMM bonding parameters are used<sup>4</sup>. Parameters for the lithium cation are adapted from a previous simulation study<sup>5</sup>. Fig. S9 provides reference labels for the different atom types in polymer for assigning the appropriate force field parameters.

#### 10.1 United Atom Model: Terminal Groups, Tacticity, and Atom Type Assignments

For PEO and POEM simulation cells, a single, long polymer chain with approximately 10,000 interaction sites is used. The use of single, long polymer chain has been adopted in other simulation studies for SPEs to eliminate the co-diffusion of Li<sup>+</sup> ion with polymer chain<sup>6</sup>. The degree of polymerization and approximate molecular weights for simulated chains are listed below. For PEO, the termini at both ends are methoxyl end groups as noted in (OET-CE3) in Fig. S9. For POEM<sub>x</sub> and POEM<sub>9</sub>-r-PMMA, the terminal at either end is a CH<sub>3</sub> that is connected to a CT interaction site. For POEA<sub>9</sub>, the terminal at either end is a CH<sub>3</sub> that is connected to a C1 interaction site. POEM<sub>x</sub> in this study are atactic. When generating the atactic POEM<sub>x</sub> chains, the stereochemistry of each chiral center is randomly chosen as S or R with equal probabilities, respectively. The stereochemistry of POEM<sub>9</sub> monomers in the random copolymer is also randomly chosen as S or R with equal probability.



Fig. S9 – Reference labels for atom types in force field parameters.

Material	Ν	$M_n$ (g mol <sup>-1</sup> )
PEO	3333	147000
POEM <sub>9</sub>	300	149000
POEM <sub>5</sub>	455	146000
POEM <sub>3</sub>	625	145000
POEA <sub>9</sub>	300	145000
POEM <sub>9</sub> -r-PMMA	620	140000

Table S2. Molecular weight of simulated polymer chains

#### **10.2** Non-bonded Interaction Parameters

The nonbonded interactions includes Lennard-Jones interactions and Coulombic interactions. For united atoms i and j, their nonbonded interaction is:

$$u_{nb}(r_{ij}) = 4\epsilon_{ij} \left[ \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}} \right)^6 \right] + \frac{q_i q_j}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r_{ij}},\tag{1}$$

where  $r_{ij}$  is the separation distance between atoms *i* and *j*,  $\sigma_{ij}$  is the Lennard-Jones diameter,  $\sigma_{ij}$  is the Lennard-Jones interaction strength,  $\varepsilon_0$  is the vacuum permittivity.  $q_i$  and  $q_j$  are the partial charges of atoms *i* and *j*.

Unlike LJ interactions are computed with Lorentz-Berthelot mixing rules. For 1-2, 1-3, and 1-4 bonded interaction sites, the Lennard-Jones interactions are turned off. Coulomb interactions are turned off for 1-2 and 1-3 bonded interaction sites and scaled to 0.5 for 1-4 bonded interactions. The non-bonded interaction parameters are listed in Table S3.

atom	m (amu)	σ <sub>ii</sub> (Å)	$\epsilon_{ii} ( {kcal \over mol} )$	q (e)
CE2	14.027	3.950	0.091411	0.25
CE3	15.035	3.750	0.194746	0.25
OET	15.999	2.850	0.109296	-0.50
CH2	14.027	3.950	0.091411	0.00
CH3	15.035	3.750	0.194746	0.00
СТ	12.011	6.400	0.000994	0.05
C1	13.019	4.680	0.019870	0.05
CE	12.011	3.820	0.079488	0.55
OKT	15.999	3.050	0.156989	-0.45
OKE	15.999	2.800	0.109296	-0.40

Table S3. Bonding potential parameters for polymer atoms

# **10.3 Bonding Potential Parameters**

1-2 bonded united atoms interact via a harmonic bonding potential in the form:

$$u_{bond}(r_{ij}) = k_{bond}(r_{ij} - r_{ij}^{(0)})^2,$$
(2)

Where  $r_{ij}$  is the separation distance between atoms *i* and *j*,  $k_{bond}$  is the force constant and  $r_{ij}^{(0)}$  is the equilibrium bond length. The bonding interaction parameters are listed in Table S4.

bond	k <sub>bond (</sub> kcal mol∙Å <sup>2</sup> )	$r_{ij}^{(0)}$ (Å)	bond	k <sub>bond (</sub> kcal mol · Å <sup>2</sup> )	$r_{ij}^{(0)}(\text{\AA})$
CE2-CE2	225.0	1.54	CE2-OKE	360.0	1.41
CE2-OET	360.0	1.41	CE-CT	200.0	1.52
CE3-OET	360.0	1.41	CE-C1	200.0	1.52
СН3-СТ	225.0	1.54	CE-OKT	360.0	1.20
CH2-CT	225.0	1.54	CE-OKE	360.0	1.34
CH3-C1	225.0	1.54	CE3-OKE	360.0	1.34
CH2-C1	225.0	1.54	CH2-CH2	225.0	1.54

Table S4. Bonding potential parameters for polymer atoms

# **10.4 Bending Potential Parameters**

1-2-3 bonded united atoms interact via a harmonic bending potential in the form:

$$u_{bend}(\theta_{ijk}) = k_{bend}(\theta_{ijk} - \theta_{ijk}^{(0)})^2,$$
(3)

Where  $k_{bend}$  is the force constant,  $\theta_{ijk}$  is the angle between united atoms *i*, *j*, and *k*, and  $\theta_{ijk}^{(0)}$  is the equilibrium angle. The bending interaction parameters are listed in Table S5.

bend	$\frac{k_{bend}}{kcal} (\frac{kcal}{mol \cdot rad^2})$	$\theta_{ijk}^{(0)}(\text{\AA})$	bend	$rac{k_{bend}}{kcal} ( rac{kcal}{mol \cdot rad^2} )$	$\theta_{ijk}^{(0)}(\text{\AA})$
CE2-OET-CE2	60.0136	112.0	OKT-CE2-CE2	49.9782	112.0
CE2-OET-CE3	60.0136	112.0	CH2-CT-CE	62.1000	109.5
CE2-CE2-OET	49.9782	112.0	CT-CE-OKT	62.1000	125.0
CH2-CT-CH2	62.1000	109.5	CT-CE-OKE	70.1483	110.0
CH3-CT-CH2	62.1000	109.5	CH3-CT-CE	62.1000	109.5
СТ-СН2-СТ	62.1000	114.0	СНЗ-СТ-СНЗ	62.1000	109.5
CH2-C1-CH2	62.1000	109.5	CH2-C1-CE	62.1000	109.5
СН3-С1-СН2	62.1000	109.5	C1-CE-OKT	62.1000	125.0
C1-CH2-C1	62.1000	114.0	C1-CE-OKE	70.1483	110.0
CE-OKE-CE2	62.1000	115.0	CH3-C1-CE	62.1000	109.5
CE-OKE-CE3	62.1000	115.0	СНЗ-С1-СНЗ	62.1000	109.5
OKT-CE-OKE	62.1000	125.0	OKE-CE2-CE2	49.9782	112.0

Table S5. Bending potential parameters for polymer atoms

## **10.5** Torsional Potential Parameters

The torsional potentials for 1-2-3-4 bonded united atoms take the form:

$$u_{tors}(\phi_{ijkl}) = \frac{K_1}{2} [1 + \cos(\phi_{ijkl})] + \frac{K_2}{2} [1 - \cos(2\phi_{ijkl})] + \frac{K_3}{2} [1 + \cos^{(0)}(3\phi_{ijkl})] + \frac{K_4}{2} [1 - \cos^{(0)}(4\phi_{ijkl})],$$
(3)

Where  $c_1, c_2$ , and  $c_3$  are coefficients and  $\phi_{ijkl}$  is the dihedral angle defined by atoms i, j, k, and l. The torsional interaction parameters are listed in Table S6.

torsion	$K_1 \frac{kcal}{(mol)}$	$K_{2} \frac{kcal}{(mol)}$	$K_3 \left(\frac{kcal}{mol}\right)$	$K_4 \left(\frac{kcal}{mol}\right)$
OKE-CE2-CE2-OET	1.888000	-1.888000	0.000000	0.000000
OET-CE2-CE2-OET	1.888000	-1.888000	0.000000	0.000000
CE2-CE2-OET-CE2	2.882840	-0.650809	2.218510	0.000000
CE2-CE2-OET-CE3	2.882840	-0.650809	2.218510	0.000000
СНЗ-СТ-СН2-СТ	0.000000	0.000000	1.833350	0.000000
CH2-CT-CH2-CT	0.000000	0.000000	1.833350	0.000000
CT-CH2-CT-CE	0.000000	0.000000	1.833350	0.000000
CH3-CT-CE-OKT	-0.919280	0.229880	-0.609280	0.000000
CH2-CT-CE-OKT	-0.919280	0.229880	-0.609280	0.000000
CH3-CT-CE-OKE	0.915310	0.216840	0.609670	0.000000
CH2-CT-CE-OKE	0.915310	0.216840	0.609670	0.000000
CT-CE-OKE-CE2	9.689610	7.678560	1.387070	0.000000
CH3-C1-CH2-C1	0.000000	0.000000	1.833350	0.000000
CH2-C1-CH2-C1	0.000000	0.000000	1.833350	0.000000
C1-CH2-C1-CE	0.000000	0.000000	1.833350	0.000000
CH3-C1-CE-OKT	-0.919280	0.229880	-0.609280	0.000000
CH2-C1-CE-OKT	-0.919280	0.229880	-0.609280	0.000000
CH3-C1-CE-OKE	0.915310	0.216840	0.609670	0.000000
CH2-C1-CE-OKE	0.915310	0.216840	0.609670	0.000000
C1-CE-OKE-CE2	9.689610	7.678560	1.387070	0.000000
CT-CE-OKE-CE3	9.689610	7.678560	1.387070	0.000000
CE-OKE-CE2-CE2	-2.988080	2.142010	-0.087834	0.203768
OKT-CE-OKE-CE3	-9.669740	7.376500	-1.045270	0.000000
OKT-CE-OKE-CE2	-9.669740	7.376500	-1.045270	0.000000

Table S6. Torsional potential parameters for polymer atoms

#### **11. Molecular Dynamics Simulation Protocols**

To prepare the starting configuration, a single polymer chain with approximately 10,000 interaction sites is initiated in a large box. To equilibrate the initial configuration, the polymer chain is first relaxed under NVT ensemble at 500K for 30 ns. Then a 20 ns NPT equilibration at 500K and 1 bar is performed to ensure the density does not drift. The process of introduction of Li ions is as follows: TFSI ions are introduced at random positions in the equilibrated neat polymer at the designated ratio of r = 0.05 = [LiTFSI]/[EO]. To remove any steric clashes in the simulation cell, the system is relaxed under NVE ensemble for 10,000 steps, where the maximum displacement of an atom is limited to 0.1 Å per step. The system is subsequently equilibrated for 15 ns under NPT at 400 K and 1 bar.

To perform simulation at each temperature, the salt-doped polymer is equilibrated at the designated temperature under NPT for 10ns. Then the system is further equilibrated for 10ns under NVT ensemble. At the beginning of this NVT equilibration, the box size is scaled to reflect the ensemble average density during at the last 3 ns of NPT equilibration. Then, the trajectory for analysis is collected from a 100-ns production simulation under NVT ensemble.

#### **12. Simulated Fictive Temperatures**

Fictive temperature  $(T_f)$  is used as a proxy for  $T_g$  that can be estimated from simulation. The simulated  $T_{\rm g}$  referred to in the text is in fact the fictive temperature. To determine  $T_{\rm f}$  the polymer is cooled from 400K to 100K at a cooling rate of 10K/ns at 1 bar under NPT ensemble. The density is plotted as a function of temperature. Two linear segments are fitted to for the glass and liquid region respectively. The  $T_{\rm f}$  is determined as the intercept of the extrapolated linear fit lines. This procedure to calculate  $T_{\rm f}$  is sensitive to the fitting range of the two segments. Therefore, the end points of the fitting segments are systematically sampled in the following manner. The starting point of the glassy segment was fixed at 50 K, while the end point of the glassy segment was randomly sampled between 180K and 200K. Similarly, the starting point of the liquid segment was fixed at 400K, whereas the end point of the liquid segment was sampled between 300K and 320K. The fitting intervals for the glassy segment and the liquid segment are randomly drawn within the sampling interval defined above, the intersections between which yield a set of  $T_{\rm f}$ values. Only  $T_{\rm f}$  values that fall between the end points of fitting segments are kept. The  $T_{\rm f}$ calculation described above was repeated for another independent sample. For each sample, combinations of glassy and liquid fitting ranges are generated 10,000 times. The mean and standard deviation of the set of  $T_{\rm f}$  values collected from both samples are reported. Table S7 lists the average and uncertainty of  $T_{\rm f}$  obtained using the protocol described above. Fig. S10 includes the cooling curve and the distribution of resulting  $T_{\rm f}$  values collected.

Material	$T_{ m f}$
PEO	$262 \pm 3 \text{ K}$
POEM <sub>9</sub>	$250 \pm 2 \text{ K}$
POEM <sub>5</sub>	$246\pm 2\ K$
POEM <sub>3</sub>	$252 \pm 3 \text{ K}$
POEA <sub>9</sub>	$245 \pm 2 \text{ K}$
POEM9-r-PMMA	$259\pm2~K$

Table S7. Simulated fictive temperatures for polymers studied.



**Fig. S10** – Fictive temperatures ( $T_f$ ) in simulations at r = 0.05. (a) Representative density as a function of temperature. Example fitting lines for liquid and glassy regions are shown in red and blue, respectively. The fitting range for the example linear fits are [100K,200K] for the glassy

region and [300K,400K] for the liquid region. (b) Normalized histograms of collected  $T_{\rm f}$  values. Histograms from different samples are plotted in different colors.

#### References

- 1 M. G. Martin and J. I. Siepmann, J. Phys. Chem. B, 1998, 102, 2569–2577.
- 2 J. M. Stubbs, J. J. Potoff and J. I. Siepmann, J. Phys. Chem. B, 2004, 108, 17596–17605.
- K. A. Maerzke, N. E. Schultz, R. B. Ross and J. I. Siepmann, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2009, 113, 6415–6425.
- K. Vanommeslaeghe, E. Hatcher, C. Acharya, S. Kundu, S. Zhong, J. Shim, E. Darian, O.
   Guvench, P. Lopes, I. Vorobyov and A. D. Mackerell, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2009, NA-NA.
- 5 N. C. Lopes and B. Pascal, J. Chem. Phys. B, 2004, **108**, 16893–16898.
- D. M. Pesko, M. A. Webb, Y. Jung, Q. Zheng, T. F. Miller, G. W. Coates and N. P.
   Balsara, *Macromolecules*, 2016, 49, 5244–5255.