

Cite this: *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2017, 5, 13161

MgFeSiO₄ as a potential cathode material for magnesium batteries: ion diffusion rates and voltage trends†

Jennifer Heath, Hungru Chen and M. Saiful Islam *

Developing rechargeable magnesium batteries has become an area of growing interest as an alternative to lithium-ion batteries largely due to their potential to offer increased energy density from the divalent charge of the Mg ion. Unlike the lithium silicates for Li-ion batteries, MgFeSiO₄ can adopt the olivine structure as observed for LiFePO₄. Here we combine advanced modelling techniques based on energy minimization, molecular dynamics (MD) and density functional theory to explore the Mg-ion conduction, doping and voltage behaviour of MgFeSiO₄. The Mg-ion migration activation energy is relatively low for a Mg-based cathode, and MD simulations predict a diffusion coefficient (D_{Mg}) of 10^{-9} cm² s⁻¹, which suggest favourable electrode kinetics. Partial substitution of Fe by Co or Mn could increase the cell voltage from 2.3 V vs. Mg/Mg²⁺ to 2.8–3.0 V. The new fundamental insights presented here should stimulate further work on low-cost silicate cathodes for Mg batteries.

Received 12th April 2017
Accepted 30th May 2017

DOI: 10.1039/c7ta03201c

rsc.li/materials-a

1. Introduction

The Li-ion battery currently dominates the portable energy storage market, powering mobile phones, laptop computers and electric vehicles. But the next generation of electronics will rapidly overtake the limit of what is theoretically possible with traditional Li-ion systems. While there are new approaches, such as the development of Na-ion batteries and solid-state Li-ion batteries, that could potentially offer cost, specific energy and safety advantages, there are few options to improve energy density. One strategy to improve energy density beyond the capability of Li⁺ systems is to utilise multivalent cations, specifically the Mg²⁺ ion, owing to its similar size to Li⁺.^{1–6} Improvements in energy density originate from the ability to use a metal anode rather than an insertion structure. In addition, dendrite formation, which prevents the use of Li metal anodes for Li-ion batteries, does not occur with Mg metal anodes.²

Due to the difficulty of Mg²⁺ insertion/extraction in host structures, the choice of cathode materials for Mg batteries is limited. This is thought to be due to stronger ionic interactions and harder charge redistribution of Mg²⁺ ions in comparison to Li⁺ ions.³ Approaches used to improve the diffusivity of Mg²⁺ ions in cathode materials have included decreasing the particle size of the cathode,⁷ charge shielding of the inserted Mg²⁺

ions^{8,9} and redistribution of the electrons donated by Mg to transition metal clusters.^{3,10–12}

Various potential cathode materials for Mg batteries have been considered, such as V₂O₅,^{13–17} polymorphs of MnO₂,^{18–24} molybdenum chalcogenides,^{1,3,25} and spinel sulphides and oxides.^{26–29} Recently, olivine-type Mg silicates have been reported to show promising cathode performance for Mg batteries, with some indication of reversible Mg intercalation.^{30–36} This follows extensive work on lithium-based silicates, Li₂FeSiO₄ and Li₂MnSiO₄, as possible low-cost and stable cathodes due to the high natural abundance of silicon and the strong Si–O bonds.³⁷

It has previously been reported that the olivine phase of MgFeSiO₄ exhibits a degree of mixing between octahedral Mg and Fe crystallographic sites.^{38–40} However, ordered phases of the MgFeSiO₄ structure have been synthesised through high temperature methods. A synthesis temperature of up to approximately 900 °C yields a structure where Mg²⁺ occupies M2 octahedral sites and Fe²⁺ prefers M1 octahedral sites. However above this temperature, the site preference switches, with Mg²⁺ and Fe²⁺ residing in M1 and M2 positions, respectively.³⁸ Therefore, above 900 °C MgFeSiO₄ can be synthesised with a structure analogous to LiFePO₄, where the Mg²⁺ ions form one-dimensional channels along the *c*-axis.

In previous studies, Mg²⁺ has been inserted into disordered olivine FePO₄ with a measured capacity of only ~13 mA h g⁻¹. This poor performance was found to be linked to surface amorphisation that prevented the electrochemical reaction from penetrating the bulk, rather than poor Mg²⁺ mobility in the structure.⁴¹ A first-principles study on the magnesium silicates reports the redox and thermodynamic behaviour of these

Department of Chemistry, University of Bath, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK. E-mail: m.s.islam@bath.ac.uk

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: 10.1039/c7ta03201c



compounds,³³ revealing a similarity between lithium- and magnesium-insertion processes. However, these calculations did not consider kinetic processes, such as the transport of Mg^{2+} ions in the host lattice, which are essential to the performance of ion intercalation electrodes.

It is well established that the underlying transport and electronic properties of battery cathode materials are crucial to the greater understanding of their electrochemistry, but are not fully characterised for MgFeSiO_4 . Here we investigate the solid-state features that influence the electrochemical performance of ordered MgFeSiO_4 (with a structure analogous to olivine LiFePO_4), by employing advanced modelling methods to probe the Mg-ion transport properties and voltage trends from transition metal doping.

2. Methods

The methods used here are well established and detailed elsewhere.^{42,43} Previous studies on inorganic solids have successfully applied these potential-based methods, including olivine-structured LiFePO_4 and NaFePO_4 (ref. 44–46) and Li and Na silicate cathode materials.^{47–50} Interactions between ions in the silicate framework were described using the Born-model framework, with a long-range coulombic term and a short-range term to model electron–electron repulsions and van der Waals interactions. The inclusion of a three-body term was necessary in order to model the angle-dependent nature of the SiO_4 unit.⁴⁷ The shell model⁵¹ was used to account for the ionic polarisability effects. The interatomic potentials used here (listed in Table S1 in ESI†) were taken from previous studies on related oxides and silicates.^{47,49,52} The Mott–Littleton approach is used to simulate the lattice relaxation around defects and migrating ions, which is incorporated within the GULP code.⁵³

Molecular dynamics (MD) calculations, which introduce kinetic energy to the system by solving Newton's equations of motion for an ensemble of ions at finite temperatures, were performed using the LAMMPS code.⁵⁴ The calculations were carried out on a simulation box, with periodic boundary conditions, made up of $12 \times 6 \times 10$ unit cells, consisting of 20 160 atoms. The initial configuration of the structure contained 10% Mg vacancies (and corresponding Fe^{3+} species), which were randomly distributed. The Pedone model⁵⁵ was used for the MD simulations, which was employed successfully in recent studies on Na-ion conducting battery materials.^{50,56} Three initial configurations were investigated and the results of the three structures were averaged. Simulation runs were carried out using the NVT ensemble and a time step of 2 fs for long runs of 6 ns, at temperatures in the range 300–1500 K. Pre-equilibrium runs of 4 ps with NVE and NPT ensembles were first used for stable configurations. Computer simulations have been used to investigate a range of materials for lithium and sodium batteries.^{40,42,56–59}

Density functional theory (DFT) calculations were performed using a plane wave basis set implemented in the VASP code.⁶⁰ A cutoff energy of 440 eV and k -point mesh of $2 \times 4 \times 5$ were needed to converge the forces and energies. PAW potentials^{61,62} and the spin-polarized generalised gradient approximation

(GGA) with the PBEsol functional⁶³ were used. DFT+U methodology was used to account for the metal d-orbitals with an effective Hubbard $U_{\text{eff}} = U - J = 4.3, 3.9, 3.3$ and 6.0 eV ($J = 1.0$ eV) for Fe, Mn, Co and Ni, respectively.⁵⁶ A ferromagnetic arrangement of the unpaired 3d electrons was assumed. The Mg^{2+}/Mg cell voltage for the $\text{Fe}^{2+}/\text{Fe}^{3+}$ redox couple was calculated using the following equation:

$$V = \frac{\varepsilon\{\text{MgFeSiO}_4\} - \varepsilon\{\text{Mg}_x\text{FeSiO}_4\} - (x)\mu\{\text{Mg}\}}{2x} \quad (1)$$

The chemical potential of magnesium ($\mu\{\text{Mg}\}$) was calculated using Mg metal. Such DFT techniques have been applied to other battery materials^{29,42,57,59} including Li-ion silicate cathodes.^{58,64}

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Structural modelling

The olivine-type structure of the cation-ordered MgFeSiO_4 belongs to the $Pmnb$ space group (Fig. 1),³⁴ and consists of corner sharing FeO_6 octahedra along the bc plane. SiO_4 tetrahedra share corners and edges with the FeO_6 octahedra. Mg ions are located in channels along the c -axis. The starting point of the study was to reproduce the experimentally observed structure of MgFeSiO_4 . A comparison between the calculated unit cell parameters based on effective potentials and those of the experimental structures is given in Table 1 (and further details on potential models are given in Table S2†).

The lattice parameters were computed to within 1% of the experimental values. Reproduction of the lattice parameters adds validity to the interatomic model used for simulating defects and Mg-ion migration.

3.2 Energetics and pathways for Na-ion migration

Examination of the intrinsic Mg-ion mobility in MgFeSiO_4 is of interest when considering its use as a cathode material for magnesium batteries. In the olivine structure there are three potential pathways for Mg-ion migration, as shown in Fig. 2a. The activation energies of Mg migration along these pathways in MgFeSiO_4 are listed in Table 2, along with the Mg–Mg distances. The activation energy is significantly lower for pathway A (parallel to the c -axis) than for pathways B and C. This




Fig. 1 Olivine-type structure of MgFeSiO_4 (orange octahedra: FeO_6 , purple tetrahedra: SiO_4 , light blue spheres: Mg^{2+} ions).



Table 1 Calculated and experimental lattice parameters and bond lengths for MgFeSiO₄

Parameter	Experimental ³⁸ (Å)	Calculated (Å)	Δ (Å)
<i>a</i>	4.807	4.854	0.047
<i>b</i>	10.376	10.336	-0.040
<i>c</i>	6.061	6.026	-0.035
Mg–O	2.168	2.131	-0.037
Fe–O	2.125	2.140	0.015
Si–O	1.624	1.639	0.015

Table 2 Mg–Mg separations and activation energies of Mg migration in MgFeSiO₄

Pathway	Mg–Mg distance (Å)	<i>E_a</i> Mg (eV)
A	3.01	0.60
B	4.85	5.18
C	5.71	5.43




Fig. 2 (a) Mg-ion migration pathways in olivine MgFeSiO₄. (b) Lowest energy Mg-ion curved pathway, parallel to *c*-axis (brown octahedra: FeO₆, purple tetrahedra: SiO₄, blue spheres: Mg²⁺ ions); (c) Mg density plot from MD simulations showing Mg diffusion pathways (brown spheres: Fe²⁺ ions; dark blue spheres: Mg²⁺ ions; purple spheres silicon; red spheres: oxygen. Light blue channels mark diffusion pathway).

is similar to the results obtained for olivine LiFePO₄,⁴⁴ where the lowest energy pathway is along open channels that run parallel to the *b*-axis. The activation energies for pathways B and C are both prohibitively high and so Mg ion migration is not likely in

these directions. This can be rationalised by considering the structure of MgFeSiO₄; the distance between neighbouring Mg²⁺ ions in pathways B and C is greater than pathway A. In addition, pathway B has a smaller channel size than pathway A. Pathway C would involve migration directly past both Fe–O and Si–O bonds, both of which would contribute to the high migration energy found.

Fig. 2b shows the curved pathways along which Mg-ion migration is predicted to take place in MgFeSiO₄. These same migration pathways have also been simulated in olivine LiFePO₄,⁴⁴ and subsequently confirmed by diffraction measurements and maximum entropy studies.⁶⁵ The calculated migration energy for this pathway was 0.60 eV, just 0.05 eV higher than that calculated for LiFePO₄.⁴⁴

A previous first-principles study carried out by Rong *et al.*⁶⁶ reports the migration energies of different multivalent ions in olivine FePO₄, layered NiO₂ and spinel Mn₂O₄. Here Mg²⁺ diffusion in the olivine structure was calculated to require approximately 0.7 eV, lower than multivalent cation diffusion in the layered and spinel structures, calculated at approximately 1.1 and 0.8 eV, respectively. The relatively low migration energies predicted for both olivine FePO₄ and MgFeSiO₄ suggest favourable Mg²⁺ ion transport in the olivine structure.

MD techniques, used here at long timescales, are well suited to examine ion motion. The curved pathways predicted using energy minimisation techniques were also generated using MD, as shown in the energy density plot in Fig. 2c.

A small degree of anti-site defects (the exchange of Mg²⁺/Fe²⁺ on neighboring sites) is found in the MD calculations; an example can be seen in Fig. 2c, where Mg-ion density is found near the Fe sites. These defects were anticipated given the high levels of Mg/Fe mixing in the thermodynamically stable form of MgFeSiO₄.^{38–40} This type of defect has been reported to cause blocking of the 1D migration pathways in olivine LiFePO₄.⁶⁷ However, major blocking of the Mg channels was not observed in our MD simulations, which is likely to be important for reversible Mg intercalation. Hence, we predict that while anti-site defects may form causing a localised blocking effect, the Fe²⁺ ions are able to migrate back into their original sites allowing Mg²⁺ ions to diffuse through uninterrupted channels. Also there was no evidence of inter-channel hopping of the displaced Mg²⁺ ions.

The mean squared displacement (MSD) of Mg ions, $[r(t)]^2$, for MgFeSiO₄ is shown in Fig. 3. The MSD data can be used to derive the Mg-ion diffusion coefficient (*D*_{Mg}) using:






Fig. 3 Representative mean squared displacement (MSD) data for magnesium ions in MgFeSiO₄ at 500 K (green), 800 K (red) and 1000 K (blue).

$$D = \left(\frac{1}{6t} \right) \langle [r(t)]^2 \rangle \quad (2)$$

At 300 K a D_{Mg} value of $1.1 \times 10^{-9} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ was calculated. To our knowledge there no experimental or calculated diffusion coefficients for ordered MgFeSiO₄ for direct comparison. A previous study on tavorite FeSO₄F as a potential cathode for Mg batteries, quoted an estimated D_{Mg} in the range of $10^{-9} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, the same order of magnitude as observed for Li diffusion in the same structure.⁶⁸ Interestingly, Mg batteries may be more suitable for high temperature environments where the diffusion rate (and electrode kinetics) would be higher.

An Arrhenius plot for Mg²⁺ diffusion in MgFeSiO₄ is shown in Fig. 4, which can be used to estimate the activation energy of migration. An activation energy of 0.79 eV was derived. While this value is slightly higher than that predicted using energy minimisation, it is still relatively low for a Mg-based cathode material. This result and the prediction of D_{Mg} in the range of Li-ion cathode materials, suggests favourable Mg²⁺ intercalation kinetics for ordered MgFeSiO₄.




Fig. 4 Arrhenius plot of Mg-ion diffusion coefficients D_{Mg} for MgFeSiO₄.

3.3 Dopant substitution

Previous dopant studies on lithium-ion battery cathodes have suggested that the incorporation of dopants on certain sites could potentially improve the capacity of the material by increasing the amount of lithium available for extraction through formation of lithium interstitial defects.⁴⁷ Doping strategies could also be beneficial for magnesium-ion cathode materials. While the divalent nature of the magnesium ion offers increased energy density over monovalent lithium, many structures only allow for the de/intercalation of half of the available magnesium. The incorporation of dopants could create Mg interstitial defects that could consequently improve the capacity of the cathode material.

Here we investigate trivalent doping (Al, Ga and V) on the Si site within the MgFeSiO₄ structure. The doping process is described using the following equation (where M = Al, Ga or V):



M³⁺ doping on the Si site is charge compensated by the formation of an Mg interstitial. We note that the alternative charge-compensation mechanism involving oxygen vacancies is less favourable by more than 4 eV. Trivalent doping on other sites in the structure would yield Fe vacancy as compensation, which would not improve the capacity or Mg diffusion in the material.

The dopant substitution reaction energies were calculated by combining the appropriate defect and lattice energy terms, listed in Table 3. Interatomic potentials used to model the corresponding binary oxides of the dopant cations were used in each case (Table S3[†]). This systematic approach to dopant incorporation has been applied successfully to other silicate systems.⁴⁷

The large incorporation energies (in Table 3) for trivalent Al, Ga and V doping in MgFeSiO₄ to create Mg interstitials are unfavourable, and suggest a low degree of dopant solubility. Therefore, we conclude such trivalent doping of MgFeSiO₄ is not a viable method to improve its capacity or Mg diffusion properties.

3.4 Cell voltage trends

One challenge to overcome when developing new cathode materials for magnesium-ion batteries is to establish an adequate operating voltage (in the range of approximately 2.0–3.0 V) while simultaneously retaining a high reversible capacity.^{69,70} V₂O₅ is reported to have a voltage of 2.66 V when paired with Mg/Mg²⁺, within the appropriate range. However, as a cathode material it suffers from slow magnesium diffusion.⁷¹

Table 3 Calculated energies of trivalent dopant incorporation on the Si site in MgFeSiO₄

Dopant	Energy (eV)
Al ³⁺	5.64
Ga ³⁺	8.99
V ³⁺	8.59






Fig. 5 Trends in cell voltage (vs. Mg/Mg²⁺) as a function of increasing dopant (M = Co, Ni, Mn) on the Fe site in MgFeSiO₄.

Other potential cathode materials for Mg batteries have displayed voltages much lower than the optimal window, such as the Chevrel phase Mo₆S₈ and spinel MgTi₂S₄ both of which display a cell voltage of 1.2 V (ref. 1 and 26) and the cation-disordered phase of MgFeSiO₄ at 1.6 V.⁷²

DFT was used to calculate the cell voltage of cation-ordered MgFeSiO₄. Similar to the potential-based calculations, the experimental structure was reproduced to a high degree of accuracy (Table S4[†]). To carry out the calculations relevant Mg²⁺ ions were removed from the optimised structure; various different vacancy configurations were considered and the voltage was calculated using eqn (1) with the lowest energy configuration.

First, the cell voltage of ordered MgFeSiO₄ was calculated to be 2.35 V vs. Mg/Mg²⁺, within the operating window, and in good accord with electrochemical data showing an average voltage of 2.4 V.³⁴ Transition metal doping can be used to tailor the cell voltage for optimal energy density. Here we investigate how doping on the transition metal site affects the cell voltage of MgFeSiO₄. The voltage trends of MgFe_{1-x}M_xSiO₄ (M = Ni, Co and Mn) vs. Mg/Mg²⁺ with varied x values are shown in Fig. 5. MgFe_{1-x}M_xSiO₄ structures, where x = 0.5, follow the trend Mn (2.8 V) < Co (3.0 V) < Ni (3.4 V); we note that olivine-structured LiMPO₄ cathode materials follow a similar trend.^{73,74} The cell voltage values of the Ni doped structures are above the adequate operating voltage for current Mg-ion electrolytes, while the Mn and Co doped structures are within this electrochemical stability window. We note that future work could include examining conversion reactions as a result of transition metal doping, a topic that goes beyond the scope of this current study.

4. Conclusions

Our fundamental study of olivine-structured MgFeSiO₄ as a potential cathode material for Mg batteries shows good reproduction of the experimentally observed structure and reveals key atomic-scale insights into its electrochemical properties. First, we derive an Mg-ion migration energy of 0.6 eV along the 1D channel through a curved pathway (similar to

LiFePO₄), and a diffusion coefficient (D_{Mg}) of 10⁻⁹ cm² s⁻¹ at 300 K from large-scale MD. These ion transport results suggest favourable Mg²⁺ intercalation kinetics.

Secondly, doping of trivalent Al, Ga or V ions on Si sites is unfavourable and suggests low dopant solubility.

Finally, the DFT derived cell voltage for MgFeSiO₄ of 2.35 V vs. Mg/Mg²⁺ agrees well with the available electrochemical data. Mn or Co doping of this structure on the Fe site is predicted to increase the cell voltage to greater than 2.70 V. However, in the case of Ni doping this brings the voltage outside of the useable electrochemical stability range of current electrolytes. Overall, the fundamental insights presented here will inform the future optimisation of silicate electrodes for magnesium batteries.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge support from the EPSRC for the Energy Materials Programme grant (EP/K016288) and Archer HPC facilities through the Materials Chemistry Consortium (EP/L000202). J. H acknowledges PhD funding from the University of Bath URS Studentship. We also thank Dr Pieremanuele Canepa (Bath) for useful discussions.

References

- 1 D. Aurbach, Z. Lu, A. Schechter, Y. Gofer, H. Gizbar, R. Turgeman, Y. Cohen, M. Moshkovich and E. Levi, *Nature*, 2000, **407**, 724–727.
- 2 H. D. Yoo, I. Shterenberg, Y. Gofer, G. Gershinsky, N. Pour and D. Aurbach, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2013, **6**, 2265–2279.
- 3 E. Levi, Y. Gofer and D. Aurbach, *Chem. Mater.*, 2010, **22**, 860–868.
- 4 R. Van Noorden, *Nature*, 2014, **507**(7490), 26–28.
- 5 P. Canepa, G. Sai Gautam, D. C. Hannah, R. Malik, M. Liu, K. G. Gallagher, K. A. Persson and G. Ceder, *Chem. Rev.*, 2017, **117**, 4287–4341.
- 6 J. Muldoon, C. B. Bucur and T. Gregory, *Chem. Rev.*, 2014, **114**, 11683–11720.
- 7 N. Amir, Y. Vestfrid, O. Chusid, Y. Gofer and D. Aurbach, *J. Power Sources*, 2007, **174**, 1234–1240.
- 8 P. Novak and J. Desilvestro, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 1993, **140**, 140–144.
- 9 P. Novak, W. Scheifele, F. Joho and O. Haas, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 1995, **142**, 2544–2550.
- 10 E. Levi, E. Lancry, A. Mitelman, D. Aurbach, O. Isnard and D. Djurado, *Chem. Mater.*, 2006, **18**, 3705–3714.
- 11 E. Levi, E. Lancry, A. Mitelman, D. Aurbach, G. Ceder, D. Morgan and O. Isnard, *Chem. Mater.*, 2006, **18**, 5492–5503.
- 12 E. Levi, A. Mitelman, O. Isnard, M. Brunelli and D. Aurbach, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2008, **47**, 1975–1983.
- 13 D. B. Le, S. Passerini, F. Coustier, J. Guo, T. Soderstrom, B. B. Owens and W. H. Smyrl, *Chem. Mater.*, 1998, **10**, 682–684.
- 14 S. H. Lee, R. A. DiLeo, A. C. Marschilok, K. J. Takeuchi and E. S. Takeuchi, *ECS Electrochem. Lett.*, 2014, **3**, 87–90.
- 15 N. Y. Sa, H. Wang, D. L. Proffit, A. L. Lipson, B. Key, M. Liu, Z. X. Feng, T. T. Fister, Y. Ren, C. J. Sun, J. T. Vaughey,



- P. A. Fenter, K. A. Persson and A. K. Burrell, *J. Power Sources*, 2016, **323**, 44–50.
- 16 Y. W. Cheng, Y. Y. Shao, V. Raju, X. L. Ji, B. L. Mehdi, K. S. Han, M. H. Engelhard, G. S. Li, N. D. Browning, K. T. Mueller and J. Liu, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2016, **26**, 3446–3453.
- 17 S. Tepavcevic, Y. Z. Liu, D. H. Zhou, B. Lai, J. Maser, X. B. Zuo, H. Chan, P. Kral, C. S. Johnson, V. Stamenkovic, N. M. Markovic and T. Rajh, *ACS Nano*, 2015, **9**, 8194–8205.
- 18 R. G. Zhang, X. Q. Yu, K. W. Nam, C. Ling, T. S. Arthur, W. Song, A. M. Knapp, S. N. Ehrlich, X. Q. Yang and M. Matsui, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 2012, **23**, 110–113.
- 19 N. Kumagai, S. Komaba and H. Sakai, *J. Power Sources*, 2001, **97**, 515–517.
- 20 X. Q. Sun, V. Duffort, B. L. Mehdi, N. D. Browning and L. F. Nazar, *Chem. Mater.*, 2016, **28**, 534–542.
- 21 C. Ling, R. G. Zhang, T. S. Arthur and F. Mizuno, *Chem. Mater.*, 2015, **27**, 5799–5807.
- 22 K. W. Nam, S. Kim, S. Lee, M. Salama, I. Shterenberg, Y. Gofer, J. S. Kim, E. Yang, C. S. Park, S. S. Lee, W. S. Chang, S. G. Doo, Y. N. Jo, Y. Jung, D. Aurbach and J. W. Choi, *Nano Lett.*, 2015, **15**, 4071–4079.
- 23 L. Wang, K. Asheim, P. E. Vullum, A. M. Svensson and F. Vullum-Bruer, *Chem. Mater.*, 2016, **28**, 6459–6470.
- 24 R. Zhang, T. S. Arthur, C. Ling and F. Mizuno, *J. Power Sources*, 2015, **282**, 630–638.
- 25 L. W. F. Wan, B. R. Perdue, C. A. Appleby and D. Prendergast, *Chem. Mater.*, 2015, **27**, 5932–5940.
- 26 X. Q. Sun, P. Bonnicks, V. Duffort, M. Liu, Z. Q. Rong, K. A. Persson, G. Ceder and L. F. Nazar, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2016, **9**, 2273–2277.
- 27 J. C. Knight, S. Therese and A. Manthiram, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2015, **7**, 22953–22961.
- 28 C. Kim, P. J. Phillips, B. Key, T. H. Yi, D. Nordlund, Y. S. Yu, R. D. Bayliss, S. D. Han, M. N. He, Z. C. Zhang, A. K. Burrell, R. F. Klie and J. Cabana, *Adv. Mater.*, 2015, **27**, 3377–3384.
- 29 M. Liu, Z. Q. Rong, R. Malik, P. Canepa, A. Jain, G. Ceder and K. A. Persson, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2015, **8**, 964–974.
- 30 Z. Feng, J. Yang, Y. NuLi, J. Wang, X. Wang and Z. Wang, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 2008, **10**, 1291–1294.
- 31 Y. NuLi, Y. Zheng, Y. Wang, J. Yang and J. Wang, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2011, **21**, 12437–12443.
- 32 Y. NuLi, Y. Zheng, F. Wang, J. Yang, A. I. Minett, J. Wang and J. Chen, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 2011, **13**, 1143–1146.
- 33 C. Ling, D. Banerjee, W. Song, M. Zhang and M. Matsui, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2012, **22**, 13517–13523.
- 34 Y. Orikasa, T. Masese, Y. Koyama, T. Mori, M. Hattori, K. Yamamoto, T. Okado, Z. D. Huang, T. Minato, C. Tassel, J. Kim, Y. Kobayashi, T. Abe, H. Kageyama and Y. Uchimoto, *Sci. Rep.*, 2014, **4**, 5622.
- 35 Y. Zheng, Y. NuLi, Q. Chen, Y. Wang, J. Yang and J. Wang, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2012, **66**, 75–81.
- 36 T. Mori, T. Masese, Y. Orikasa, Z. D. Huang, T. Okado, J. Kim and Y. Uchimoto, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, **18**, 13524–13529.
- 37 M. S. Islam, R. Dominko, C. Masquelier, C. Sirisopanaporn, A. R. Armstrong and P. G. Bruce, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2011, **21**, 9811–9818.
- 38 S. A. T. Redfern, G. Artioli, R. Rinaldi, C. M. B. Henderson, K. S. Knight and B. J. Wood, *Phys. Chem. Miner.*, 2000, **27**, 630–637.
- 39 S. Chatterjee, S. Sengupta, T. Saha-Dasgupta, K. Chatterjee and N. Mandal, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2009, **79**, 115103.
- 40 S. Chatterjee, S. Bhattacharyya, S. Sengupta and T. Saha-Dasgupta, *Phys. Chem. Miner.*, 2011, **38**, 259–265.
- 41 R. G. Zhang and C. Ling, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2016, **8**, 18018–18026.
- 42 M. S. Islam and C. A. J. Fisher, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2013, **43**, 185–204.
- 43 C. R. A. Catlow, *Computer Modelling in Inorganic Crystallography*, Academic Press, 1997.
- 44 M. S. Islam, D. J. Driscoll, C. A. J. Fisher and P. R. Slater, *Chem. Mater.*, 2005, **17**, 5085–5092.
- 45 C. Tealdi, J. Heath and M. S. Islam, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2016, **4**, 6998–7004.
- 46 R. Tripathi, S. M. Wood, M. S. Islam and L. F. Nazar, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2013, **6**, 2257–2264.
- 47 N. Kuganathan and M. S. Islam, *Chem. Mater.*, 2009, **21**, 5196–5202.
- 48 C. A. J. Fisher, N. Kuganathan and M. S. Islam, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2013, **1**, 4207–4214.
- 49 A. R. Armstrong, N. Kuganathan, M. S. Islam and P. G. Bruce, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2011, **133**, 13031–13035.
- 50 J. C. Treacher, S. M. Wood, M. S. Islam and E. Kendrick, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, **18**, 32744–32752.
- 51 B. G. Dick and A. W. Overhauser, *Phys. Rev.*, 1958, **112**, 90–103.
- 52 G. V. Lewis and C. R. A. Catlow, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.*, 1985, **18**, 1149–1161.
- 53 J. D. Gale and A. L. Rohl, *Mol. Simul.*, 2003, **29**, 291–341.
- 54 S. Plimpton, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 1995, **117**, 1–19.
- 55 A. Pedone, G. Malavasi, M. C. Menziani, A. N. Cormack and U. Segre, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2006, **110**, 11780–11795.
- 56 S. M. Wood, C. Eames, E. Kendrick and M. S. Islam, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2015, **119**, 15935–15941.
- 57 A. R. Armstrong, C. Lyness, P. M. Panchmatia, M. S. Islam and P. G. Bruce, *Nat. Mater.*, 2011, **10**, 223–229.
- 58 C. Eames, A. R. Armstrong, P. G. Bruce and M. S. Islam, *Chem. Mater.*, 2012, **24**, 2155–2161.
- 59 Y. Yuan, C. Zhan, K. He, H. Chen, W. Yao, S. Sharifi-Asl, B. Song, Z. Yang, A. Nie, X. Luo, H. Wang, S. M. Wood, K. Amine, M. S. Islam, J. Lu and R. Shahbazian-Yassar, *Nat. Commun.*, 2016, **7**, 13374.
- 60 G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1996, **54**, 11169–11186.
- 61 G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1999, **59**, 1758–1775.
- 62 P. E. Blochl, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1994, **50**, 17953–17979.
- 63 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865–3868.
- 64 M. E. Arroyo-de Dompablo, M. Armand, J. M. Tarascon and U. Amador, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 2006, **8**, 1292–1298.



- 65 S.-I. Nishimura, G. Kobayashi, K. Ohoyama, R. Kanno, M. Yashima and A. Yamada, *Nat. Mater.*, 2008, **7**, 707–711.
- 66 Z. Q. Rong, R. Malik, P. Canepa, G. S. Gautam, M. Liu, A. Jain, K. Persson and G. Ceder, *Chem. Mater.*, 2015, **27**, 6016–6021.
- 67 C. Tealdi, C. Sprefico and P. Mustarelli, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2012, **22**, 24870–24876.
- 68 J. D. Wu, G. H. Gao, G. M. Wu, B. Liu, H. Y. Yang, X. W. Zhou and J. C. Wang, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2014, **16**, 22974–22978.
- 69 M. M. Huie, D. C. Bock, E. S. Takeuchi, A. C. Marschilok and K. J. Takeuchi, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2015, **287**, 15–27.
- 70 P. Saha, M. K. Datta, O. I. Velikokhatnyi, A. Manivannan, D. Alman and P. N. Kumta, *Prog. Mater. Sci.*, 2014, **66**, 1–86.
- 71 G. Gershinsky, H. D. Yoo, Y. Gofer and D. Aurbach, *Langmuir*, 2013, **29**, 10964–10972.
- 72 Z. Z. Feng, J. Yang, Y. N. NuLi and J. L. Wang, *J. Power Sources*, 2008, **184**, 604–609.
- 73 A. Yamada, M. Hosoya, S. C. Chung, Y. Kudo, K. Hinokuma, K. Y. Liu and Y. Nishi, *J. Power Sources*, 2003, **119**, 232–238.
- 74 C. Masquelier and L. Croguennec, *Chem. Rev.*, 2013, **113**, 6552–6591.

