

Journal of Power Sources 68 (1997) 497-500



# Effect of carbon dioxide on lithium anode cycleability with various substrates

Tetsuya Osaka \*, Toshiyuki Momma, Yasuhiro Matsumoto, Yuji Uchida

Department of Applied Chemistry, School of Science and Engineering, Kagami Memorial Laboratory for Materials Science and Technology, Waseda University, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan

Accepted 13 January 1997

#### Abstract

The effect on the enhancement of the charge/discharge behavior of electrodeposited lithium metal on various substrates with  $CO_2$  was investigated in LiClO<sub>4</sub>/propylene carbonate electrolyte. The lithium cycleability was enhanced with  $CO_2$  addition to the electrolyte solution when using nickel and titanium substrates, whereas no apparent enhancement was observed with copper and silver substrates. The results obtained from voltammetry indicated that the reduction of  $CO_2$  did not occur on nickel and titanium, but on copper and silver. It is suggested that the enhancement with  $CO_2$  addition is effective with the substrates which do not reduce  $CO_2$  in the electrolyte before lithium deposition. © 1997 Elsevier Science S.A.

Keywords · Lithium anodes, Cycleability, Carbon dioxide

## 1. Introduction

A rechargeable lithium battery with lithium metal anode has a great advantage in energy density; it has been widely studied, because lithium has the lowest electrochemical equivalent and the most negative redox potential. However, the charge/discharge cycleability of the lithium metal anode is degraded by the formation of dendritic deposits, which causes the isolation of active lithium metal and also short circuit with the cathode [1,2]. Another reason for the poor cycleability of lithium anode is the formation of a passivating layer with low or no ionic and electronic conductivity, which is formed by the reaction of the solution components such as the solvent, the electrolyte, and traces of contaminants (water, oxygen, etc.) because of the high reactivity of lithium metal. Recent studies on lithium anode are focused on the detailed analysis of the surface layer [3.4] and there are some modifications using various methods for preventing the dendritic deposition [5,6].

Carbon dioxide as well as  $Al_2O_3$ ,  $SO_2$ , and p-conjugated organic compounds, etc., have been known as additives to promote cycle efficiency of the lithium anodes [2,5,7,8]. We have already reported that  $CO_2$  dissolved in electrolyte solutions enhances the cycleability of lithium deposited on nickel substrate when  $CO_2$  is present during lithium deposition [9,10]. In this paper, we report the correlation between the substrate and the effect of  $CO_2$  on lithium cycleability, and discuss the working mechanism of  $CO_2$  in the electrolyte.

#### 2. Experimental

Propylene carbonate, PC (Tomiyama pure chemical, lithium battery grade) was used with 1.0 M LiClO<sub>4</sub> (Tomiyama pure chemical, lithium battery grade) as a supporting electrolyte. The water content of the solvent and the supporting electrolyte was less than 20 and 26 ppm, respectively. Gaseous CO<sub>2</sub> with 99.99% purity was dissolved until saturation in the electrolyte solutions before lithium deposition. Substrates for lithium deposition were nickel, titanium, copper and silver. All the substrates were mechanically polished to produce mirror-like surfaces. The electrochemical cell was constructed with a Li/Li<sup>+</sup> reference electrode and a lithium foil counter electrode.

The charge/discharge cycling tests were conducted by the following procedure proposed by Goldman et al. [11]: 1.0 C cm<sup>-2</sup> of lithium was initially deposited on the substrate at 1.0 mA cm<sup>-2</sup> of constant current and 0.2 C cm<sup>-2</sup> of lithium was stripped and then deposited at the same current density. This charge/discharge cycle was repeated until the discharge potential reached  $\pm 1$  V versus Li/Li<sup>+</sup>. From this cycling

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author, Tel. +81-3-5286 3202; Fax: +81-3-3205 2074.

<sup>0378-7753/97/\$17.00 © 1997</sup> Elsevier Science S A. All rights reserved *PH* S 0378-7753 ( 97 ) 02596-2

tests, the average efficiency per cycle,  $E_a$ , was calculated according to Eq. (1)

$$E_{\rm a} = \frac{Q_{\rm c} - Q_{\rm ex}/n}{Q_{\rm c}} \times 100(\%)$$
 (1)

where  $Q_c$  is the cycling charge of Li (0.2 C cm<sup>-2</sup> for each cycle),  $Q_{ex}$  is the charge of excess Li (0.8 C cm<sup>-2</sup>) and *n* is the number of apparent 100% cycles.

The electrochemical reaction occurred on the substrate in the electrolyte was monitored by voltammetry at a scan rate of 5 mV s<sup>-1</sup> in the potential range from open-circuit potential (~2.9 V) to 0 V. The electrochemical impedance was measured using 10 mV (zero to peak) a.c. voltage over a frequency range from 10 Hz to 20 kHz with a galvanostat/potentiostat (Hokuto Denko HA-501G) and a frequency response analyzer (NF Electric Instruments FRA S-5720C). Cell assembly and electrochemical measurements were conducted under dry argon gas atmosphere.

#### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Charge/discharge cycleability with various substrates

Table 1 shows the cycle number which was repeated during the cycling test. These numbers are representative results depending on the initial deposition charge and the cycling charge. When the initial deposition was scaled up to 10 C  $cm^{-2}$  the cycle life (at 2% depth-of-discharge (DOD)) became more than 3000 cycles (more than  $E_a = 99.8\%$ ) for the case of lithium deposited on nickel in the presence of  $CO_2$ , as compared with 115 cycles ( $E_a = 96.5\%$ ) for 1 C  $cm^{-2}$  of this case (at 20% DOD). In the case of electrolyte solutions without additives, lithium deposited on nickel substrate showed the best cycleability, compared with titanium, copper and silver substrates to/in which the cycleability of lithium was poor. With CO<sub>2</sub> addition, the cycleability of lithium on titanium substrates was enhanced, as well as on nickel. However, it was hardly noticed when copper and silver substrates were used. The effect of  $CO_2$  has already been studied using nickel substrate and showed the following features:

Table I

Cycleability o	f lithium anode	deposited on the	various substrates
----------------	-----------------	------------------	--------------------

Substrate	1 M L1ClO <sub>4</sub> /PC			
	without CO <sub>2</sub>	with CO <sub>2</sub>	with CO <sub>2</sub> reduction <sup>a</sup>	
Nı	58 ( $E_a = 93.1\%$ )	$115 (E_a = 96.5\%)$	$103 (E_a = 96.1\%)$	
Tı	29 ( $E_a = 86.2\%$ )	$136 (E_a = 97 1\%)$	$118 (E_a = 96.6\%)$	
Cu	22 ( $E_a = 81.8\%$ )	$26 (E_a = 84.6\%)$	2	
Ag	$15 (E_a = 73.3\%)$	$18 (E_a = 77.8\%)$	$12 (E_a = 66.7\%)$	

<sup>a</sup> Treatment of reduction of  $CO_2$  was conducted at +1.4 V vs.  $L_1/L_1^+$  for 3 min before deposition of lithium.

- The interfacial resistance of lithium, which was obtained by in situ galvanostatic a.c. impedance method and estimated from the diameter of the semi-circle of the Cole– Cole plots obtained (regarded as a charge-transfer process) in the high frequency region, was lowered with CO<sub>2</sub> addition [10].
- The dendritic form of lithium deposition observed in the CO<sub>2</sub>-free solutions was suppressed in the presence of CO<sub>2</sub> during lithium deposition [12].
- 3. The reactivity of lithium against water was much reduced, which indicates the modification of the surface layer on lithium due to the presence of  $CO_2$  [10].

As a result of the impedance measurements, lowering the lithium interfacial resistance in the presence of  $CO_2$  is common to all the substrates. However, the cycleability of lithium on copper and silver substrates was hardly enhanced even in the presence of  $CO_2$ . Thus, it is suggested that the behavior of the lithium anode is affected also by the other factors.

In order to better understand the interaction between the substrates and  $CO_2$  in the electrolyte solutions, the electrochemical behavior of the solutions on various substrates before lithium deposition was investigated by voltammetry.

#### 3.2. Electrochemical behavior on various substrates

The electrochemical behavior of traces of contaminants (water, oxygen, etc.) in a non-aqueous electrolyte gives an important indication about the state of the electrode since they are reduced on substrates before lithium deposition and form a passivating layer [13]. In the case of nickel substrate, two cathodic peaks appear at +1.9 and +0.5 V, as shown in Fig. 1(a). These peaks are attributed to the reduction of oxygen or nickel oxide and the underpotential deposition (UPD) of lithium, respectively. With CO<sub>2</sub> addition, no change of this cathodic behavior is observed. Fig. 1(b) shows similar results on titanium substrate, except for the absence of the cathodic peak around +1.9 V. On the other hand, in the case of copper and silver substrates, the cathodic behavior is changed and new peaks are observed with CO<sub>2</sub> addition as shown in Fig. 1(c) and (d). On a silver substrate, a new cathodic peak appears at about +1.4 V with CO<sub>2</sub> addition, which is considered to be attributed to the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> dissolved in the electrolyte. On copper, the new cathodic peak is observed at +1.2 V with CO<sub>2</sub> addition. Thus, it is considered that the reduction of CO2 occurs on these substrates, and this reduction leads to the degradation of the lithium cycleability. To investigate the interaction between the lithium cycleability and the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub>, substrates were held at +1.4 V in the CO<sub>2</sub>-containing electrolyte solution before lithium deposition. Then, the cycleability of lithium was estimated as shown in Table 1. In the case of nickel and titanium, where no change with  $CO_2$  addition is observed in Fig. 1(a) and (b), the lithium cycleability is degraded only slightly by the reduction of  $CO_2$  at the potentials higher than that of Li/



Fig. 1. Voltammograms of (a) nickel, (b) titanium, (c) copper and (d) silver substrates in 1.0 M LiClO<sub>4</sub>/PC with or/of without CO<sub>2</sub> addition at a scan rate:  $5 \text{ mV s}^{-1}$ 

Li<sup>+</sup>. As compared with these results, the cycleability of lithium on copper and silver, especially copper, is pronouncedly degraded when  $CO_2$  is reduced on the substrates. Therefore, it is suggested that the precipitation products of the  $CO_2$ reduction on these substrates before lithium deposition prevent the reaction between lithium metal and  $CO_2$ , otherwise, these products make adhesion of the deposited lithium weak. Consequently, the addition of  $CO_2$  does not increase the cycleability of lithium in this situation.

# 3.3. Effect of the surface oxide on substrates

Cycling tests were also carried out using nickel and copper substrates whose surface oxides were eliminated by immersing ~10 vol.%  $H_2SO_4$  solution for 1 min. The anode cycleability was improved when copper substrates were used but very slightly improved with nickel substrates, as shown in Table 2. The addition of  $CO_2$  to the solutions while using the oxide-free copper substrates clearly increased the cycleability. Fig. 2 shows a voltammogram for the oxide-free copper substrate. Comparing Figs. 2 and 1(c), it is clear that using the oxide-free copper substrates, the cathodic peak around 1.9 V is decreased. As has already been reported [1], the copper oxide reacts with lithium ion through several stages, and copper and Li<sub>2</sub>O are produced finally. When using the oxide-free substrates, the suppression of this reduction seems to improve the lithium cycleability. It is also suggested that elimination of the oxide from copper surfaces leads to the positive effect of the presence of CO<sub>2</sub> on the lithium cycleability. When using the copper substrate with the oxide on Table 2

Cycleability of lithium anode deposited on the various substrates eliminated the surface oxide by immersing in  $\sim 10$  vol.%  $H_2SO_4$  for 1 min

Substrate	I M LiClO <sub>4</sub> /PC		
	without CO <sub>2</sub>	with CO <sub>2</sub>	
Ni no treatment	58 ( $E_a = 93.1\%$ )	115 ( $E_a = 96.5\%$ )	
Ni-eliminated surface oxide	$69 (E_a = 94.2\%)$	$130 (L_a = 96.9\%)$	
Cu no treatment	22 ( $E_a = 81.8\%$ )	$26 (L_3 = 84.6\%)$	
Cu-eliminated surface oxide	50 ( $E_a = 92.0\%$ )	92 ( $E_a = 95.7\%$ )	



Fig. 2 Voltammograms of copper substrate, immersed in ~10 vol.%  $H_2SO_4$  solution in 1.0 M LiClO<sub>4</sub>/PC with and without CO<sub>2</sub> addition at a scan rate 5 mV s<sup>-1</sup>.

surface, an  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$  layer may be produced before lithium deposits and it may prevent the cycling enhancement effect by  $\text{CO}_2$ . In the case of an oxide-free copper substrate, the surface of the deposited lithium metal forms the ionic conductive layer by the reaction between lithium metal and  $CO_2$ , which depresses the dendritic deposition of lithium, as already discussed in the previous paper [12].

### 4. Conclusions

An enhancement of the lithium cycleability in the presence of  $CO_2$  in LiClO<sub>4</sub>/PC electrolyte occurred with nickel and titanium substrates, while with copper and silver substrates this effect is small. The non-active copper and silver substrates reduce  $CO_2$  in the electrolyte solution before reaching lithium deposition, and they decrease the cycleability of lithium deposited.

#### Acknowledgements

This work was financially supported by Yazaki Memorial Foundation for Science and Technology.

#### References

- [1] J.P. Gabano, Lithium Batteries, Academic Press, New York, 1983.
- [2] Y Matsuda, Nippon Kagaku Kaishi, 1989 (1989) 1.
- [3] D. Aurbach, M.L. Daroux, P.W. Faguy and E. Yeager, J. Electrochem. Soc., 134 (1987) 1611.
- [4] D. Aurbach, M Daroux, G. McDougall and E.B. Yeager, J. Electroanal Chem, 358 (1993) 63.
- [5] D. Aurbach, Y. Gofer, M. Ben-Zion and P. Aped, J. Electroanal. Chem., 339 (1992) 451
- [6] S. Shiraishi, K. Kanamura and Z. Takehara, J. Appl. Electrochem., 25 (1995) 584.
- [7] D.W. Murphy, J. Broadhead and B.C.H Steele, Materials for Advanced Batteries, Plenum, New York, 1980.
- [8] R.D. Rauh and S.B. Brummer, Electrochim Acta, 22 (1977) 75
- [9] T. Osaka, T. Momma and T. Tajima, Denki Kagaku, 62 (1994) 451.
- [10] T. Osaka, T. Momma, T. Tajima and Y. Matsumoto, J Electrochem. Soc., 142 (1995) 1057.
- [11] J.L. Goldman, R.M. Mank, J.H. Young and V.R. Koch, J Electrochem. Soc., 127 (1980) 1461.
- [12] T. Osaka, T. Momma, Y. Matsumoto and Y. Uchida, J. Electrochem. Soc., 144 (1997) 1709.
- [13] D. Aurbach, M. Daroux, P. Faguy and E. Yeager, J. Electrochem. Soc., 297 (1991) 225.