

Supporting Information

Origins and characterization of oxygen loss phenomenon in layered oxide cathodes of Li-ion batteries

Junrun Feng^a, Zhuo Chen^a, Weihua Zhou^a, Zhangxiang Hao^{a,}*

Table S1 A summary of different types of LLMO cathodes, with typical examples and their characteristics related to oxygen loss phenomenon. Notes: the value of capacity and voltage hysteresis were obtained from the voltage and discharge/charge profile of these cathode materials.

Categories	LLMO composition	Capacity (mAhg ⁻¹)	voltage hysteresis (V vs. Li ⁺ /Li)	Gas formed during cycling	CEI composition	Thermal instable temperature (°C)
Traditional LLMO	LiCoO ₂ ¹⁻⁵	274	~4.5	O ₂ , CO ₂	LiF, Li ₂ CO ₃ , Li ₂ O, Li _x PF _y , Li _x PF _y O _z	240
	LiNiO ₂ ⁵⁻⁸	275	~4.6	O ₂ , CO ₂	Li ₂ CO ₃ , LiOH	200
	LiMnO ₂ ⁹	270	/	/	/	/
NMC-based LLMO	Li(Ni _{0.85} Mn _{0.075} Co _{0.075})O ₂ ^{10,11}	206	~4.2	O ₂ , CO ₂	Li ₂ CO ₃ , LiF, Li _x PF _y , Li _x PF _y O _z	225
	Li(Ni _{0.8} Mn _{0.1} Co _{0.1})O ₂ ¹¹⁻¹⁴	203	~4.2	O ₂ , CO ₂	Li _x PF _y O _z , LiOH, Li ₂ O ₃ , Li ₂ O	232
	Li(Ni _{0.7} Mn _{0.15} Co _{0.15})O ₂ ^{11,12}	194	4.3	O ₂ , CO ₂	/	242
	Li(Ni _{0.6} Mn _{0.2} Co _{0.2})O ₂ ^{11,12,15}	187	/	O ₂ , CO ₂	Li ₂ O ₃ , Li ₂ O	264
	Li(Ni _{0.5} Mn _{0.2} Co _{0.3})O ₂ ^{11,12,16}	175	/	O ₂ , CO ₂	Li _x PF _y , Li _x PF _y O _z , LiF	290
Ni-rich LLMO (Exclude NMC)	Li(Ni _{1/3} Mn _{1/3} Co _{1/3})O ₂ ^{11,12,17,18}	163	/	O ₂ , CO ₂	LiF, Li ₂ CO ₃	306
	Li[Ni _{0.5} Mn _{0.5}]O ₂ ^{19,20}	163	~4.3	/	Li _x PF _y O _z , Li ₂ CO ₃ , LiF	307.1
	Li[Ni _{0.6} Mn _{0.5}]O ₂ ¹⁹	165	~4.3	/	/	298.1
	Li[Ni _{0.7} Mn _{0.5}]O ₂ ¹⁹	171	~4.3	/	/	273.7
	Li[Ni _{0.8} Mn _{0.5}]O ₂ ¹⁹	205	~4.3	//	/	249
	Li[Ni _{0.9} Mn _{0.5}]O ₂ ¹⁹	212	~4.3	/	/	230.4
	LiNi _{0.94} Co _{0.06} O ₂ ²¹	~230	~4.1	/	/	191
	LiNi _{0.9} Co _{0.1} O ₂ ²²	~190	~4.2	/	/	/
	LiNi _{0.90} Co _{0.07} Mg _{0.03} O ₂ ²³	228.3	~4.3	/	/	243.7
	LiAl _{0.05} Ni _{0.95} O ₂ ²⁴	~200	~4.5	O ₂ , CO ₂	/	/
Li- and Mn-rich LLMO	Li(Ni _{0.8} Co _{0.15} Al _{0.05})O ₂ ²¹	~200	/	/	/	241
	xLi ₂ MnO ₃ (1-x) LiMO ₂ ^{6,25,26}	~300	~4.4	O ₂ , CO ₂	/	/
	Li _{1.286} Ni _{0.071} Mn _{0.643} O ₂ ²⁷	250	~4.25	O ₂ , CO ₂	/	/
	Li _{1.2} Ni _{0.2} Mn _{0.6} O ₂ ²⁸	~300	~4.2	/	/	/
	Li _{1.2} Co _{0.1} Mn _{0.55} Ni _{0.15} O ₂ ^{10,29}	~200	/	/	LiF, LiPO _y F _z , Li ₂ CO ₃	/

	$\text{Li}_{1.2}\text{Ni}_{0.13}\text{Mn}_{0.54}\text{Co}_{0.13}\text{O}_2$ ³⁰	~275	~4.5	O_2, CO_2	/	/
Other Li-rich LLMO	Li_2RuO_3 ^{31–34}	~164	~4.1	O_2, CO_2	$\text{Li}_2\text{CO}_3, \text{LiF}$	/
	$\text{Li}_2\text{Ru}_{0.75}\text{Ti}_{0.25}\text{O}_3$ ³⁵	~180	~4.0	O_2, CO_2	/	/
	$\text{Li}_2\text{Ru}_{0.75}\text{Mn}_{0.25}\text{O}_3$ ³⁵	~177	~4.0	O_2, CO_2	/	/
	$\text{Li}_2\text{Ru}_{0.75}\text{Fe}_{0.25}\text{O}_3$ ³⁵	~177	~3.9	O_2, CO_2	/	/
Other Mn-rich LLMO	$\text{Li}_{0.7}\text{Mn}_{0.78}\text{Co}_{0.22}\text{O}_2$ ³⁶	~260	~4.5	O_2, CO_2	/	/
	$\text{Li}_{0.75}\text{Mn}_{0.78}\text{Co}_{0.11}\text{Ni}_{0.11}\text{O}_2$ ³⁶	~245	~4.5	CO_2	/	/
	$\text{Li}_{0.74}\text{Mn}_{0.78}\text{Ni}_{0.22}\text{O}_2$ ³⁶	~230	~4.3	CO_2	/	/

Table S2 The contribution of highlighted methods and the modification strategies based on the study

Characterization methods	Phenomenon detected/ degradation mechanism	Modification strategies	Examples	Improvement (Retention, cycles, Current)	
DEMS/OMES Soft-XAS, RIXS	Gaseous products release at high voltage during cycles	Composition design& electrolyte additives	Al^{3+} substitution in LiNiO_2 : $\text{LiAl}_{0.1}\text{Ni}_{0.9}\text{O}_2$ ³⁷	$\text{LiAl}_{0.1}\text{Ni}_{0.9}\text{O}_2$: ~100%, 50, 0.4 mA cm ⁻² LiNiO_2 : 68%, 50, 0.4 mA cm ⁻²	
			Addition of Lithium fluoromalonate(difluoro)borate (LiFMDFB) ³⁸	LiFMDFB added: 85%, 200, 0.5; Without LiFMDFB: 40%, 200, 0.5	
EPR	Crystal structures changes during cycling and thermal treatment	Elemental doping	Yttrium surface gradient doping in $\text{LiNi}_{0.93}\text{Co}_{0.07}\text{O}_2$ (NC): $\text{LiNi}_{0.91}\text{Co}_{0.07}\text{Y}_{0.02}\text{O}_2$ (NCY) ³⁹	NC shows a structure transformation from layered to spinel that started at 200 °C, and to spinel at above 300 °C, while NCY shows a much better stability	
			Nd/Al dual doped $\text{Li}_{1.2}\text{Mn}_{0.533}\text{Ni}_{0.267}\text{O}_2$: $\text{Li}_{1.2}\text{Mn}_{0.533}\text{Ni}_{0.267}\text{O}_2$ ⁴⁰	Nd/Al dual doped $\text{Li}_{1.2}\text{Mn}_{0.533}\text{Ni}_{0.267}\text{O}_2$: 90.1, 200, 1C; $\text{Li}_{1.2}\text{Mn}_{0.533}\text{Ni}_{0.267}\text{O}_2$: 76.4, 200, 1C.	
TEM, XAS, XPS, NMR	The formation of CEI during the cycles, enhancing the oxygen loss	Coating layer	Li_2TO_3 coating on $\text{LiNi}_{0.5}\text{Mn}_{0.5}\text{O}_2$ ²⁰	Li_2TO_3 coated $\text{LiNi}_{0.5}\text{Mn}_{0.5}\text{O}_2$: 83, 100. 0.2; $\text{LiNi}_{0.5}\text{Mn}_{0.5}\text{O}_2$: 58, 100, 0.2.	
CT, TXM, ND	Cracks formed during the cycles, under cell, electrode, particle level	Modification of synthesis condition	Synthesis of layered nanorod gradient (NRG) $\text{Li}[\text{Ni}_{0.81}\text{Co}_{0.06}\text{Mn}_{0.13}]\text{O}_2$ cathode particle ⁴¹	NRG: 88.3%, 1000, 1C $\text{Li}[\text{Ni}_{0.82}\text{Co}_{0.14}\text{Al}_{0.04}]\text{O}$: 55.9%, 1000, 1C	
TXM	Inhomogeneous lithiation across the whole electrode and even single particle	To be developed			
CDI	Nano scaled Stain stress arises at particles under nano scales, inducing the following degradation				

- 1 A. Yano, M. Shikano, A. Ueda, H. Sakaebé and Z. Ogumi, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 2017, **164**, A6116–A6122.
- 2 H. Wang, Y. Jang, B. Huang, D. R. Sadoway and Y. Chiang, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 1999, **146**, 473–480.
- 3 J. N. Zhang, Q. Li, Y. Wang, J. Zheng, X. Yu and H. Li, *Energy Storage Mater.*, 2018, **14**, 1–7.

- 4 Sungjemmenla, S. K. Vineeth, C. B. Soni, V. Kumar and Z. W. Seh, *Energy Technol.*, 2022, **10**, 1–12.
- 5 D. D. MacNeil, Z. Lu, Z. Chen and J. R. Dahn, *J. Power Sources*, 2002, **108**, 8–14.
- 6 J. K. Papp, N. Li, L. A. Kaufman and A. J. Naylor, 1–28.
- 7 C. Lee, Y. Yokoyama, Y. Kondo, Y. Miyahara, T. Abe and K. Miyazaki, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2021, **11**, 1–8.
- 8 M. Bianchini, M. Roca-Ayats, P. Hartmann, T. Brezesinski and J. Janek, *Angew. Chemie - Int. Ed.*, 2019, **58**, 10434–10458.
- 9 A. R. ARMSTRONG and P. G. BRUCE, *Nature*, 1996, **381**, 499–500.
- 10 H. Q. Pham, M. Mirolo, M. Tarik, M. El Kazzi and S. Trabesinger, *Energy Storage Mater.*, 2020, **33**, 216–229.
- 11 H. J. Noh, S. Youn, C. S. Yoon and Y. K. Sun, *J. Power Sources*, 2013, **233**, 121–130.
- 12 S. Bak, E. Hu, Y. Zhou, X. Yu, S. D. Senanayake, S. Cho, K. Kim, K. Y. Chung, X. Yang and K. Nam, *Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2014, **6**, 22594–22601.
- 13 J. Wandt, A. T. S. Freiberg, A. Ogronik and H. A. Gasteiger, *Mater. Today*, 2018, **21**, 825–833.
- 14 W. Wang, Q. Yang, K. Qian and B. Li, *J. Energy Chem.*, 2020, **47**, 72–78.
- 15 H. Gao, F. Maglia, P. Lamp, K. Amine and Z. Chen, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2017, **9**, 44542–44549.
- 16 M. Hekmatfar, I. Hasa, R. Eghbal, D. V. Carvalho, A. Moretti and S. Passerini, *Adv. Mater. Interfaces*, 2020, **7**, 1–13.
- 17 F. La Mantia, F. Rosciano, N. Tran and P. Novák, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 2009, **156**, A823.
- 18 Y. Qian, P. Niehoff, M. Börner, M. Grützke, X. Mönnighoff, P. Behrends, S. Nowak, M. Winter and F. M. Schappacher, *J. Power Sources*, 2016, **329**, 31–40.
- 19 Y. K. Sun, D. J. Lee, Y. J. Lee, Z. Chen and S. T. Myung, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2013, **5**, 11434–11440.
- 20 G. Jia, S. Liu, G. Yang, F. Li, K. Wu, Z. He and X. Shangguan, *Ionics (Kiel)*, 2019, **25**, 399–410.
- 21 W. Li, A. Dolocan, J. Li, Q. Xie and A. Manthiram, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2019, **9**, 1–9.

- 22 D. Li, Z. Peng, H. Ren, W. Guo and Y. Zhou, *Mater. Chem. Phys.*, 2008, **107**, 171–176.
- 23 H. Li, P. Zhou, F. Liu, H. Li, F. Cheng and J. Chen, *Chem. Sci.*, 2019, **10**, 1374–1379.
- 24 N. Li, S. Sallis, J. K. Papp, B. D. McCloskey, W. Yang and W. Tong, *Nano Energy*, , DOI:10.1016/j.nanoen.2020.105365.
- 25 A. Manthiram, J. C. Knight, S. T. Myung, S. M. Oh and Y. K. Sun, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, , DOI:10.1002/aenm.201501010.
- 26 C. S. Johnson, N. Li, C. Lefief and M. M. Thackeray, *Electrochem. commun.*, 2007, **9**, 787–795.
- 27 Y. Zhang, X. Wen, Z. Shi, B. Qiu, G. Chen and Z. Liu, *J. Energy Chem.*, 2023, **82**, 259–267.
- 28 J. Dong, F. Wu, J. Zhao, Q. Shi, Y. Lu, N. Li, D. Cao, W. Li, J. Hao, X. Yang, L. Chen and Y. Su, *Energy Storage Mater.*, 2023, **60**, 102798.
- 29 X. Zhang, H. Jia, Y. Xu, L. Zou, M. H. Engelhard, B. E. Matthews, C. Wang, J. G. Zhang and W. Xu, *J. Power Sources Adv.*, , DOI:10.1016/j.powera.2020.100024.
- 30 T. Liu, J. Liu, L. Li, L. Yu, J. Diao, T. Zhou, S. Li, A. Dai, W. Zhao, S. Xu, Y. Ren, L. Wang, T. Wu, R. Qi, Y. Xiao, J. Zheng, W. Cha, R. Harder, I. Robinson, J. Wen, J. Lu, F. Pan and K. Amine, *Nature*, 2022, **606**, 305–312.
- 31 Y. Yu, P. Karayaylali, D. Sokaras, L. Giordano, R. Kou, C. Sun, F. Maglia, R. Jung, F. S. Gittleson and Y. Shao-horn, 2021, **2**, 2322–2334.
- 32 J. C. Hestenes, A. W. Ells, M. Navarro Goldaraz, I. V. Sergeyev, B. Itin and L. E. Marbella, *Front. Chem.*, 2020, **8**, 1–9.
- 33 B. G. Lee and Y. J. Park, *Sci. Rep.*, 2020, **10**, 1–11.
- 34 B. Li, R. Shao, H. Yan, L. An, B. Zhang, H. Wei, J. Ma, D. Xia and X. Han, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2016, **26**, 1330–1337.
- 35 Y. Yu, P. Karayaylali, D. Sokaras, L. Giordano, R. Kou, C. J. Sun, F. Maglia, R. Jung, F. S. Gittleson and Y. Shao-Horn, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2021, **14**, 2322–2334.

- 36 W. Huang, C. Lin, M. Zhang, S. Li, Z. Chen, W. Zhao, C. Zhu, Q. Zhao, H. Chen and F. Pan, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2021, **11**, 1–11.
- 37 S. H. Park, K. S. Park, Y. Sun Kook, K. S. Nahm, Y. S. Lee and M. Yoshio, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2001, **46**, 1215–1222.
- 38 J. G. Han, J. Bin Lee, A. Cha, T. K. Lee, W. Cho, S. Chae, S. J. Kang, S. K. Kwak, J. Cho, S. Y. Hong and N. S. Choi, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2018, **11**, 1552–1562.
- 39 Y. Wang, M. Gao, S. Liu, G. Li and X. Gao, , DOI:10.1021/acsami.0c21990.
- 40 W. Jiang, C. Zhang, Y. Feng, B. Wei, L. Chen, R. Zhang, D. G. Ivey, P. Wang and W. Wei, *Energy Storage Mater.*, 2020, **32**, 37–45.
- 41 H. H. Sun, J. A. Weeks, A. Heller and C. B. Mullins, *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, 2019, **2**, 6002–6011.