

Faraday Discussions

Accepted Manuscript



This manuscript will be presented and discussed at a forthcoming Faraday Discussion meeting. All delegates can contribute to the discussion which will be included in the final volume.

Register now to attend! Full details of all upcoming meetings: <http://rsc.li/fd-upcoming-meetings>



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Effect of the Alkali Insertion Ion on the Electrochemical Properties of Nickel Hexacyanoferrate Electrodes

Hyun-Wook Lee,^a Mauro Pasta,^a Richard Y. Wang,^a Riccardo Ruffo^b and Yi Cui^{*a,c}

DOI: 10.1039/b000000x

Nickel hexacyanoferrate (NiHCF_e) is an attractive cathode material in both aqueous and organic electrolytes due to a low-cost synthesis using earth-abundant precursors and also due to its open framework, Prussian Blue-like crystal structure that enables ultra-long cycle life, high energy efficiency, and high power capability. Herein, we explored the effect of different alkali ions on the insertion electrochemistry of NiHCF_e in aqueous and propylene carbonate-based electrolytes. The large channel diameter of the structure offers fast solid-state diffusion of Li⁺, Na⁺, and K⁺ ions in aqueous electrolytes. However, all alkali ions in organic electrolytes and Rb⁺ and Cs⁺ in aqueous electrolytes show a quasi-reversible electrochemical behavior that results in poor galvanostatic cycling performance. Kinetic regimes in aqueous electrolyte were also determined, highlighting the effect of the size of the alkali ion on the electrochemical properties.

Introduction

The demand of advanced energy storage devices has greatly increased recently, and current research efforts focus on solving scientific issues associated with this formidable challenge.^{1,2} Depending on the targeted application, researchers in this area look for improvements in power output^{3,4} and energy density^{5,6} for portable applications and for cycle/calendar life and cost for grid-scale stationary energy storage systems (GSES).⁷⁻⁹ Li-ion batteries (LIBs) based on conventional organic electrolytes have been widely used and studied for portable applications due to their high energy density (deriving from the high operating voltage and low electrochemical equivalent weight of lithium) and reasonable durability, which allow them to meet current market requirements.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the constant increase in the demand of Li raw materials and their limited availability could lead to a considerable rise in the cost of LIBs in the near future.¹¹ In this regard, Na or K-ion based secondary batteries are often proposed as promising alternatives due to the ready and lower-cost availability of the raw materials.¹²

In the case of GSES applications, the key performance metrics are cost, environmental compatibility, cycle life, energy efficiency, and response time rather than energy density. In fact, the \$/kWh cost of the stored energy should be comparable to the price of the energy delivered by the primary source. Therefore, long calendar life and high energy efficiencies are required to reduce their lifetime cost.¹³ Aqueous rechargeable batteries can meet these requirements, and previous research efforts in this area have been very promising.¹⁴⁻¹⁶

Open-framework Prussian Blue analogues (PBAs) have recently received a great

deal of attention as alkali-ion rechargeable battery electrodes due to their impressive electrochemical cyclability, their straightforward and low-cost synthetic processes, and the possibility of using them in both aqueous and organic electrolytes.^{17–19} This class of materials contains large interstitial sites that allow for the insertion of alkali²⁰ and divalent²¹ ions with very little crystallographic lattice strain. However, the insertion of different cations results in very different electrochemical behavior in both aqueous and organic electrolytes.²² Hence, a deeper understanding of the effect of the nature of the inserting ion in aqueous and organic electrolytes on the electrochemical features of PBAs is required to achieve improved battery performance.

Herein, we investigated the electrochemical behavior of nickel hexacyanoferrate (NiHCF_e) in different aqueous and organic electrolytes with particular emphasis on the role of the guest cation. Among different PBAs, we chose NiHCF_e as a model system because of its chemical stability in both water and propylene carbonate and because of its redox behavior potential well within the electrochemical stability window of the investigated electrolytes.

Materials and Methods

NiHCF_e nanoparticles were prepared by a simple co-precipitation method^{22,23} in which 120 mL of a 40 mM aqueous solution of Ni(NO₃)₂ and 120 mL of a 20 mM solution of K₃Fe(CN)₆ were simultaneously added dropwise into 60 mL of deionized water with vigorous stirring. The precipitation was carried out at a constant temperature of 70° C until a yellow-orange precipitate formed. The precipitate was then filtered, washed several times with deionized water, and dried under vacuum at 40° C for 12 h. High-resolution powder X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns were obtained at 12 keV ($\lambda = 1.0332 \text{ \AA}$) at BL 2-1 at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource (SSRL) using zero-background quartz holders in reflection geometry with a monochromator and Soller slits. The structural analysis was performed on the XRD data with the Rietveld refinement method using the EXPGUI interface for the General Structure Analysis System (GSAS).^{24–26} Morphology and particle size were investigated with transmission electron microscopy (TEM, Tecnai G² F20 X-Twin).

The electrochemical investigation was carried out on electrodes prepared by casting a slurry made of 80 wt.% NiHCF_e, 10 wt.% carbon (Timcal Super P Li), and 10 wt.% polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF, Kynar HSV 900) dispersed in 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) on a carbon cloth (Fuel Cell Earth/Ballard AvCarb) current collector. The electrodes were then dried under vacuum at room temperature for 10 h, resulting in an active material loading of about 8–10 mg cm⁻². The electrodes were tested in a flooded, three-electrode electrochemical cell equipped with a commercial Ag/AgCl (4 M KCl) reference electrode and an activated carbon counter electrode. In-depth kinetics experiments were carried out in a Swagelok, three-electrode cell equipped with a pseudo-reference Ag/AgCl electrode, an activated carbon counter electrode, and an active electrode- prepared by coating the surface of a stainless steel current collector with the slurry previously described, achieving an active material loading of about 1 mg cm⁻². The Ag/AgCl pseudo-reference electrode was calibrated before and after each measurement in both aqueous and organic electrolyte using a commercial Ag/AgCl 3.5M reference electrode and the Fc⁺/Fc⁰ redox couple,²⁷ respectively. All the potentials were converted relative to the standard hydrogen electrode (SHE). 1 M aqueous solutions of LiNO₃, NaNO₃, KNO₃,

RbNO₃, CsNO₃ and 1 M LiClO₄, NaClO₄, and 0.8 M KPF₆ solutions in propylene carbonate were prepared and tested. The acidity of all aqueous electrolytes was increased to a pH of 2 by the addition of HNO₃ to take advantage of the lower solubility of PBAs in acidic conditions.²⁸

5 Results and Discussion

Physicochemical Characterization

The as-synthesized NiHCF_e has the general perovskite-type open framework crystal structure, shown in **Figure 1(a)**, in which hexacyanoferrate complexes and nickel ions bound by cyanide linkages form a face-centered cubic structure. In the framework, guest cations can occupy large interstitial A sites around the center of each cube, as confirmed by high-resolution synchrotron powder diffraction measurements (**Figure 1(b)**). Sharp peaks indicate the high crystallinity of the powder, and the absence of secondary peaks verifies the presence of a single phase and the absence of impurities. Rietveld refinement of the XRD data confirms that NiHCF_e has a perovskite structure with a face-centered cubic phase (*fm-3m*, $a_0 = 10.211 \text{ \AA}$) that closely matches the crystal structure of Prussian Blue (JCPDS No. 73-0687). The TEM image in **Figure 1(c)** shows spherical particles with an average diameter of about 20-50 nm, which is beneficial for increasing the surface area (better contact with the electrolyte and the conductive additive) and reducing diffusion lengths of the charge carriers (both ions and electrons). In **Figure 1(d)** and **(e)**, the HR-TEM image and its corresponding inverse fast Fourier transform (FFT) show an interplanar distance of about 2.076 Å, which well matches the (422) crystal plane.




Figure 1. (a) Schematic illustration of the unit cell of the open-framework NiHCFe structure with carbon-coordinated Fe ions and nitrogen-coordinated Ni ions. (b) Rietveld-refined XRD data of the as-synthesized NiHCFe. Black dots and red lines indicate the observed and the calculated patterns, respectively. The blue line at the bottom indicates the difference between observed and calculated patterns. The magnified patterns (x 6.5) are shown for clarity above 25°. (c) Transmission electron microscope (TEM) images (black scale bar, 100 nm) and (d) high-resolution TEM images of NiHCFe nanopowders. (e) The inverse fast Fourier transform (FFT) of (d) (white scale bar, 1 nm).

Effect of insertion ion and solvent on the electrochemical properties of NiHCFe

The effect of the insertion ion on the insertion potential of NiHCFe bulk electrodes in aqueous electrolytes was investigated in a previous study by our research group.^{22,23} In that study, increases in the insertion potential were observed for ions further down Group I on the periodic table. This behavior has been previously interpreted by Scholz et al.^{29–31} They suggested that the change in Gibbs free energy due to the alkali ion insertion ΔG_i (corresponding to the insertion potential: $\Delta G_i = -nF\Delta E_i$) is equal to the difference between the Gibbs free energy of “solvation” of the alkali ion in the NiHCFe lattice (ΔG_l) and the Gibbs free energy of solvation of the alkali ion in the solvent (ΔG_s).²⁹

$$\Delta G_i = -nF\Delta E_i = \Delta G_l - \Delta G_s$$

ΔG_l corresponds to the free energy of any residual hydration of the alkali ion after insertion. The magnitude of this value is smaller than the free energy of solvation in

solution (ΔG_s) because insertion ions are mostly dehydrated as they go into the structure. Fully hydrated ions cannot fit in the interstitial sites, which are about 3.2 Å in diameter, because they are much larger in diameter.³² Thus, the variation in insertion potential for different insertion ions is mainly a function of just the Gibbs free energy of solvation (hydration in the case of water) of the insertion ion. ΔG_i decreases as the ionic radius of the ion increases further down Group I of the periodic table since larger ions have lower hydration energies in solution.³³ In the present study, the same behavior is observed (Figure 2a and Table 1).




Figure 2. Cyclic voltammetry (CV) curves of NiHCFE. The scan rate is 0.1 mV s^{-1} . (a) CV curves using aqueous electrolytes of Li^+ , Na^+ , and K^+ ions. (b) CV curves (in blue, red, and black) are measured by using 1 M LiNO_3 in H_2O (pH 6, controlled by HNO_3), 1 M LiNO_3 in H_2O (pH 2, controlled by HNO_3), and 1 mM HNO_3 in H_2O electrolytes, respectively. (c) 7 cycles of CV in pH 6, 1 M LiNO_3 in H_2O electrolyte. The oxidation and reduction peaks of NiHCFE electrode decrease with cycling. (d) Propylene carbonate (PC) is used as the electrolyte solvent. 1 M LiClO_4 , 1 M NaClO_4 , and 0.8 M KPF_6 are used as salts in PC.

Table 1. The redox potentials (E_{half}), the potential difference between the oxidation and reduction reactions (ΔE) recorded in cyclic voltammograms, and the specific capacities from galvanostatic cycling of NiHCFE electrodes in propylene carbonate and aqueous electrolytes.

	PC			Aqueous		
	E_{half} [V]	ΔE [V]	Specific capacity [mAh g ⁻¹]	E_{half} [V]	ΔE [V]	Specific capacity [mAh g ⁻¹]
Li^+	0.327	0.107	53.4	0.379	0.049	57.8
Na^+	0.492	0.111	49.6	0.583	0.032	57.4
K^+	0.665	0.17	43.7	0.721	0.02	57.7

²⁰ The CV data were measured at 0.1 mV s^{-1} and the all capacities in galvanostatic curves were characterized at 1C.

It is worth noticing the presence of multiple electrochemical processes between 0.3 and 0.8 V versus SHE in the case of Li^+ at pH 6 (**Figure 2b**, blue line). Since the concentration of H^+ is so low in this experiment, all the peaks can be attributed to the insertion of Li^+ . The peaks are at different potentials because of the varying levels of hydration of Li^+ when in the structure. This is only observed for Li^+ because its small ionic radius allows for a significant degree of hydration even when in the structure. In other words, ΔG_1 takes on varying values for Li^+ and has a more significant impact on the change in Gibbs free energy for ion insertion. The reduction peak is located at the lowest potential because the ions are almost fully dehydrated as they diffuse through the channels in the framework, but once they insert into interstitial sites, they may be partially rehydrated by mobile water molecules in the structure.²⁹ At pH 2 (**Figure 2b**, red line), we see an additional electrochemical process developing at 0.6 V that is ascribed to the insertion of hydronium ions, as confirmed by CV cycling in an acidified lithium-free cell at pH 3 (**Figure 2b**, black line). Data obtained at pH 6 (**Figure 2c**) clearly show the capacity fading upon cycling caused by the higher solubility of NiHCFe .²⁸ The solubility of NiHCFe at pH 2 and 1 M salt solution is infinitesimal and definitely not enough to affect the measurements. In the case of K^+ and Na^+ insertion, the H_3O^+ peak is not observed because of the higher insertion potentials of these ions, which indicates that K^+ and Na^+ insertion are more thermodynamically favored processes.

In organic propylene carbonate-based electrolytes (PC), the same trend is observed (**Figure 2d**). The insertion potential differences between the different cations in aqueous and organic electrolytes are similar due to the similarities in the solvation energies of the ions in water and PC.^{30,34} There is only a single redox peak for each ion insertion process due to the lack of H_3O^+ insertion in PC and also due to the fact that ions cannot be resolvated in the structure because there are no mobile solvent molecules within the structure when in PC.

The cyclic voltammetry (CV) profiles suggest very different kinetics in aqueous and organic electrolyte. The CVs in aqueous conditions show symmetric anodic/cathodic peaks that demonstrate the reversibility and fast kinetics of aqueous ion insertion. In propylene carbonate, the peaks show asymmetry and a quasi-Nernstian behavior (the difference in potential between the anodic and cathodic peaks is larger than 100 mV) due to slower kinetics of ion insertion relative to the aqueous system. This behavior can be ascribed to different ion diffusion mechanisms within the structure in aqueous and organic electrolytes.³⁵ A Grotthus-like mechanism may enable the extremely rapid kinetics of ion insertion in water; this has previously been suggested for driving proton conductivity in hexacyanochromates.³⁵ Zeolitic water molecules exist throughout the structure, and ligand water molecules bond to the N-coordinated metal ions adjacent to hexacyanometallate vacancy sites. The N-coordinated metal ion acts as a Lewis acid, and protons are carried through the 3D hydrogen-bonding network, which is composed of zeolitic water and ligand water molecules. These different properties result in very different battery performance as described in the following section.

NiHCFe's battery performance comparison in aqueous and organic electrolyte

Galvanostatic charge-discharge curves are reported in **Figure 3**. In all aqueous electrolytes, specific capacities of about 60 mAh g^{-1} were obtained at 1C. The voltage profiles reflect the properties already observed during the CV experiments. In the presence of Li^+ ions (**Figure 3a**), the potential spans from 0.3 to 0.7 V versus

SHE. In particular, the potential hysteresis associated with Li^+ insertion is significantly greater than that associated with Na^+ or K^+ because of the partial rehydration of Li^+ after insertion as previously described. Curves obtained in the presence of Na^+ (**Figure 3b**) and K^+ (**Figure 3c**) show remarkably low potential hysteresis (high energy efficiency) and a higher reaction potential in the presence of K^+ relative to that of Na^+ . The rate capability of the material in the presence of Li^+ , Na^+ , and K^+ / PC solutions is reported in **Figures 3d, e, and f**, respectively, and the comparison between electrolytes is summarized in **Figure 4**. The results show that the kinetics are much better in aqueous than in organic electrolytes.




Figure 3. Comparison of hysteresis in galvanostatic potential profiles at 1C between aqueous and PC electrolytes. (a) Li^+ , (b) Na^+ , and (c) K^+ ion systems. Typical charge and discharge potential profiles of NiHCFe electrodes at different C rates (0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, and 5 C) with (d) Li^+ , (e) Na^+ , and (f) K^+ ions in PC.

15




Figure 4. Discharge capacity retention in aqueous and PC electrolytes with different insertion ions at varying C rates.

Effect of the inserting ion on the kinetic features of NiHCFe's electrochemistry in aqueous electrolyte

The kinetic properties are not only affected by the nature of the solvent but also by the nature of the guest ion. To explore this effect, we have performed a set of measurements using the Swagelok experimental setup described in the Experimental Section. The Swagelok setup, besides allowing us to perform electrochemical experiments in a convenient three-electrode setup configuration, offers a consistent distance between positive and negative electrode, which minimizes the varying effects of electrolyte resistance on kinetics experiments. Due to the use of flat, smooth stainless steel current collectors instead of porous carbon cloth, the active material loading is lower (about 1 mg cm^{-2}) but still many orders of magnitude higher than that in thin film electrodes.³⁶ Therefore, these electrodes in the Swagelok configuration can still be considered as bulk systems.

To highlight the kinetic properties of NiHCFe in different electrolytes, we performed CV scans at different scan rates (**Figure 5**). We focused our attention on aqueous electrolytes because of the better electrochemical properties and the possibility of including Rb^+ and Cs^+ in the comparison since their nitrate salts have the required solubility (1 M). **Figure 5a** shows the CV profiles obtained in 1 M solutions at a 1 mV s^{-1} scan rate. The peak positions are in perfect agreement with those obtained in the flooded configuration. The redox potentials corresponding to the different electrolytes are summarized in **Table 2**, which also reports the separation between the reduction and the oxidation peaks (ΔE). In a previous study,²⁹ the electrochemical reactions of hexacyanometallates were thought to be diffusion-limited, but our results suggest a different kinetic limitation for NiHCFe. The peak separation is too low for a one-electron reaction under diffusion-controlled kinetic conditions.




Figure 5. CV curves of NiHCFE using the three-electrode Swagelok cell configuration in aqueous electrolytes. The scan rate is 1 mV s^{-1} . (a) CV curves of Li^+ , Na^+ , K^+ , Rb^+ , and Cs^+ ions. CV curves of (b) Li^+ , (c) Na^+ , (d) K^+ , (e) Rb^+ , and (f) Cs^+ ions at different scan rates from 0.25 to 5.00 mV s^{-1} .

Table 2. The redox potentials in different aqueous electrolytes as measured in the three-electrode Swagelok configuration.

	E_{half} [V]	ΔE [V]
LiNO_3	0.350	0.015
NaNO_3	0.615	0.01
KNO_3	0.715	0.01
RbNO_3	0.920	0.06
CsNO_3	1.275 (0.870 ^(a))	0.12 (0.05 ^(a))

^aThe CV data were measured at 0.1 mV s^{-1} and stopped at 1.12 V.

The kinetic regime can be better understood by analyzing the relationship between the CV scan rate and the corresponding peak current. The analysis was

carried out at different scan rates from 0.25 to 5 mV s⁻¹ for different guest ions (Figure 5b-f). In the presence of small alkali cations (Li⁺, Na⁺, and K⁺), very small potential shifts are observed for the redox processes, even at the highest scan rate. The corresponding peak currents show a linear relationship versus the scan rate (see Figure 6a-c), which highlights the diffusionless behavior wherein the maximum current is only limited by the number of electroactive species at/in the electrode. This kind of behavior is typical of thin film electrodes,^{37,38} and, to our knowledge, NiHCFe is the first case of diffusionless behavior in bulk systems. In the thin layer electrode treatment, the linear relationship between the peak current and the scan rate is ruled by:³⁷

$$i_{peak} = \frac{n^2 F^2}{4RT} \times A \times \Gamma_0^* \times v_{rate}$$

where n is the number of electrons involved in the reaction, F the Faraday constant (C/mol), R the gas constant (J/mol K), T the temperature (K), A the surface area (cm²), Γ_0^* the concentration of active sites (mol/cm²), and v_{rate} the scan rate (mV s⁻¹). The Γ_0^* parameters obtained from the slopes of the straight lines in Figures 6a-c are used to calculate the electrode specific capacity reported in Table 2, which are in good agreement with the values obtained in Figure 4. The reduction and reoxidation processes in the presence of both Rb⁺ and Cs⁺ ions show asymmetrically shaped peaks. However, the kinetic properties differ greatly between the two guest ions. In the case of Rb⁺, the ΔE is small (around 60 mV) and comparable with the value in the diffusion-controlled kinetic regime. In fact, the peak current depends linearly on the square root of the scan rate (Figure 6d), whose dependency is given by:³⁷

$$i_{peak} = 0.4463 \times \sqrt{\frac{n^3 F^3}{RT}} \times \sqrt{D} \times C_0 \times \sqrt{v_{rate}}$$

where D is the average diffusion coefficient (cm²/s) in the whole composition range and C₀ the concentration of active sites (mol/cm³). The slope can thus be used to determine the diffusion coefficient once C₀ and n are known. If we consider the reaction as monoelectronic and estimate C₀ from the specific capacity (60 mAh/g), we can calculate the diffusion coefficient D to be 5.7±1.0×10⁻⁶ cm² s⁻¹, which is two times lower than that of Rb⁺ in aqueous RbCl solution (2.06×10⁻⁵ cm² s⁻¹)³⁹ but still remarkably high for solid-state diffusion. On the other hand, in the presence of Cs⁺ ions the reaction is quasi-reversible, and no kinetic analysis can be carried out. The high hysteresis is a result of the size of Cs⁺, which is larger than the channel size and smaller than the size of A-site, likely resulting in complete dehydration of the ion before insertion. The dehydration of the Cs⁺ ion in this case is similar to the results in organic electrolytes as shown in Figure 2d. In organic electrolytes, guest ions must also be fully desolvated before insertion, which results in high charge transfer energy.




Figure 6. The relationship between the peak currents and corresponding scan rates of (a) Li⁺, (b) Na⁺, (c) K⁺, and (d) Rb⁺ ions in aqueous electrolytes.

Conclusions

5 The effect of the inserting alkali ion on the electrochemical properties of NiHCF_e, which has the characteristic open framework crystal structure of Prussian Blue analogues, was investigated in both aqueous and organic (propylene carbonate) electrolytes. A linear relationship between the insertion potential and the size of the alkali ion has been highlighted in both electrolyte systems. In particular, a smaller

10 insertion ion has a higher solvation energy that needs to be overcome before insertion in the host structure and therefore a lower insertion potential.

On the other hand, profound kinetic dissimilarities between the two electrolyte systems were demonstrated. CVs in aqueous conditions show symmetric anodic/cathodic peaks that demonstrate the reversibility and fast kinetics of aqueous

15 ion insertion. Moreover, smaller alkali ions like Li, Na and K show a diffusionless behavior wherein the maximum current is only limited by the number of electroactive species at/in the electrode. This enables the minimal hysteresis in the galvanostatic charge/discharge curves (extremely high energy efficiency) and the exceptionally long cycle life exhibited by nickel hexacyanoferrate and PBAs in

20 general.

In propylene carbonate, the CV peaks show asymmetry and a quasi-Nernstian behavior that results in poor galvanostatic cycling performance. We believe that the different behavior could be ascribed to a different diffusion mechanism in the open framework crystal structure. Therefore, an aqueous electrolyte system is needed - to

25 guarantee the extremely long cycle life and energy efficiencies required by grid scale energy storage applications.¹³

Acknowledgments

This work as well as use of the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences under Contract No. DE-AC02-5 76SF00515 through the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory LDRD project and the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Further support comes from the Office of Vehicle Technologies of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231, Subcontract No. 6951379, under the Batteries for Advanced Transportation Technologies (BATT) Program. H.W.L. 10 acknowledges support from the Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology under Contract No. 2012038593. M.P. acknowledges support from the Fondazione Oronzio e Niccolò De Nora. R.Y.W. acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship and 15 the National Defense Science & Engineering Graduate Fellowship. We thank Dr. Johanna N. Weker, Dr. Badri Shyam, and Dr. Kevin H. Stone for help with synchrotron X-ray diffraction.

Notes and References

- ^a Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California 20 94305, United States
- ^b Dipartimento di Scienza dei Materiali, Università di Milano Bicocca, via Cozzi 55 20125, Milan, Italy
- ^c Stanford Institute for Materials and Energy Science, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, California 94025, United States
- 25 *E-mail: yicui@stanford.edu.
1. J.-M. Tarascon and M. Armand, *Nature*, 2001, **414**, 359–367.
 2. M. Armand and J.-M. Tarascon, *Nature*, 2008, **451**, 652–657.
 3. K. Kang, Y. S. Meng, J. Bréger, C. P. Grey, and G. Ceder, *Science*, 2006, **311**, 977–80.
 - 30 4. H. Lee, P. Muralidharan, R. Ruffo, C. M. Mari, Y. Cui, and D. K. Kim, *Nano Lett.*, 2010, **10**, 3852–6.
 5. C. Chan, H. Peng, G. Liu, and K. McIlwrath, *Nat. Nanotechnol.*, 2008, **3**, 31–35.
 6. P. G. Bruce, S. A. Freunberger, L. J. Hardwick, and J.-M. Tarascon, *Nat. Mater.*, 2012, **11**, 19–29.
 - 35 7. B. Dunn, H. Kamath, and J.-M. Tarascon, *Science*, 2011, **334**, 928–935.
 8. Z. Yang, J. Zhang, M. C. W. Kintner-Meyer, X. Lu, D. Choi, J. P. Lemmon, and J. Liu, *Chem. Rev.*, 2011, **111**, 3577–3613.
 9. G. L. Soloveichik, *Annu. Rev. Chem. Biomol. Eng.*, 2011, **2**, 503–527.
 10. M. S. Whittingham, *Chem. Rev.*, 2004, **104**, 4271–301.
 - 40 11. J.-M. Tarascon, *Nat. Chem.*, 2010, **2**, 510.
 12. S.-W. Kim, D.-H. Seo, X. Ma, G. Ceder, and K. Kang, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2012, **2**, 710–721.
 13. C. Barnhart and S. Benson, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2013, **6**, 1083–1092.
 14. W. Li, J. Dahn, and D. Wainwright, *Science (80-.)*, 1994, **264**, 1115–1118.
 - 45 15. R. Ruffo, C. Wessells, R. A. Huggins, and Y. Cui, *Electrochem. commun.*, 2009, **11**, 247–249.
 16. J. Luo, W. Cui, P. He, and Y. Xia, *Nat. Chem.*, 2010, **2**, 760–765.
 17. Y. Lu, L. Wang, J. Cheng, and J. B. Goodenough, *Chem. Commun.*, 2012, **48**, 6544–6546.
 18. L. Wang, Y. Lu, J. Liu, M. Xu, J. Cheng, D. Zhang, and J. B. Goodenough, *Angew. Chemie Int. Ed.*, 2013, **52**, 1964–1967.
 - 50 19. T. Matsuda, M. Takachi, and Y. Moritomo, *Chem. Commun.*, 2013, **49**, 2750–2752.
 20. C. D. Wessells, R. A. Huggins, and Y. Cui, *Nat. Commun.*, 2011, **2**, 550.
 21. R. Y. Wang, C. D. Wessells, R. A. Huggins, and Y. Cui, *Nano Lett.*, 2013, **13**, 5748–5752.

22. C. D. Wessells, S. V. Peddada, M. T. McDowell, R. a. Huggins, and Y. Cui, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 2012, **159**, A98–A103.
23. C. D. Wessells, S. V Peddada, R. A. Huggins, and Y. Cui, *Nano Lett.*, 2011, **11**, 5421–5425.
- 5 24. H. M. Rietveld, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 1969, **2**, 65–71.
25. A. C. Larson and R. B. Von Dreele, *Los Alamos Natl. Lab. Rep.*, 1994, **LAUR 86-74**.
26. B. H. Toby, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 2001, **34**, 210–213.
27. G. Gritzner, *Pure Appl. Chem.*, 1990, **62**, 1839–1858.
28. Y. Yang, C. Brownell, and N. Sadrieh, *Clin. Toxicol.*, 2007, **45**, 776–781.
- 10 29. F. Scholz and A. Dostal, *Angew. Chemie Int. Ed.*, 1996, **34**, 2685–2687.
30. A. Domenech, N. Montoya, and F. Scholz, *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 2011, **657**, 117–122.
31. M. Tissandier and K. Cowen, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 1998, **5639**, 7787–7794.
32. J. Mähler and I. Persson, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2012, **51**, 425–438.
33. Y. Marcus, *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.*, 1991, **87**, 2995–2999.
- 15 34. M. Salomon, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1970, **74**, 2519–2524.
35. S.-I. Ohkoshi, K. Nakagawa, K. Tomono, K. Imoto, Y. Tsunobuchi, and H. Tokoro, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 6620–6621.
36. A. Eftekhari, *J. Power Sources*, 2004, **132**, 291–295.
37. A. J. Bard and L. R. Faulkner, *Electrochemical methods: fundamentals and applications*, John Wiley, New York, 2nd edn., 1980.
- 20 38. J. Heinze, B. Frontana-Uribe, and S. Ludwigs, *Chem. Rev.*, 2010, **110**, 4724–4771.
39. H. Harned and M. Blander, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1953, **159**, 1951–1953.