Atomic-Resolution Visualization of Distinctive Chemical Mixing Behavior of Ni, Co, and Mn with Li in Layered Lithium Transition-Metal Oxide Cathode Materials
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ABSTRACT: Capacity and voltage fading of layered structured cathode based on lithium transition-metal oxide is closely related to the lattice position and migration behavior of the transition-metal ions. However, it is scarcely clear about the behavior of each of these transition-metal ions in this category of cathode material. We report direct atomic resolution visualization of interatomic layer mixing of transition metals (Ni, Co, Mn) and lithium ions in layered structured oxide cathodes for lithium-ion batteries. Using chemical imaging with an aberration-corrected scanning transmission electron microscope (STEM) and density function theory calculations, we discovered that, in the layered cathodes, Mn and Co tend to reside almost exclusively at the lattice site of transition-metal (TM) layer in the structure or little interlayer mixing with Li. In contrast, Ni shows a high degree of interlayer mixing with Li. The fraction of Ni ions resides in the Li layer followed by a near linear dependence on total Ni concentration before reaching saturation. The observed distinctively different behavior of Ni with respect to Co and Mn provides new insights on both capacity and voltage fade in this class of cathode materials based on lithium and TM oxides, therefore providing scientific basis for selective tailoring of oxide cathode materials for enhanced performance.

1. INTRODUCTION
Layered lithium transition-metal (TM) oxides as cathode materials for lithium-ion batteries (LIBs) have attracted extensive investigations due to their high-energy density which is critical for mobile energy storage such as portable electronics and electrical vehicle applications.1-10 Their unique crystallographic structure, Li layer and TM-rich layer stacked alternatively with an oxygen layer, enables a fast two-dimensional Li-ion diffusion and high theoretical capacity. As most well-known layered cathodes, LiCoO₂ has been commercialized for several decades. However, the high cost and safety issues of Co forced the community to seek for alternative elements that are low cost and environmentally benign. Under worldwide concerted efforts in the past decade, new family members of layered cathodes, such as Li–Mn-rich (LMR) and LiMO₂ (M = Mn, Co, and Ni) layered cathodes, have been demonstrated to have the potential to meet the high-energy density, low cost, and safety requirements of next-generation LIBs.11-13 In the new series of layered cathodes, the lattice site position, valence, and coordinate environment of the TM ions and their dynamic behavior and interaction with other ions during the battery operation play a crucial role in battery performance.

Taking Ni as an example, it has been found that Ni plays many conflicting roles in controlling cathode performance. On one hand, Ni substituent in Mn-based layered cathodes not
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only participates in the redox process during charge/discharge but also stabilizes the layered structure. On the other hand, Ni can also play detrimental roles. First, during material processing, Ni is prone to segregate at the particle surface to form an electrochemical inactive surface layer in pristine materials. Second, it has been observed that, during the battery cycling, Ni further migrates from the bulk lattice to the surface, leading to the gradual formation of a Ni-rich surface layer. Furthermore, the interlayer mixing between Li and Ni, which is the exchange of Li and Ni between TM and Li layers, can directly affect the function of the cathode. Experimental observation indicates that for LMR cathodes higher Li/Ni interlayer mixing leads to better performance than those with lower Li/Ni interlayer mixing. However, theoretical calculations indicate that a high Li/Ni interlayer mixing can result in a smaller Li-layer spacing and consequently high-energy barrier for Li-ion hopping, which may be the main cause of the relatively low rate capability of Ni-contained layered cathodes.

For the case of Co, LiCoO₂ layered cathode is a well-studied example. It was found that there is negligible interlayer cation mixing between Li layer and Co layer in the LiCoO₂. An intuitive explanation for this is the large ionic size difference between Li⁺ (0.76 Å) and Co³⁺ (0.545 Å). However, for Ni-containing layered cathodes, the possibility of Li⁺/Ni²⁺ exchange is much higher considering the similar ionic size of Ni²⁺ (0.69 Å) and Li⁺ (0.76 Å). Therefore, a small portion of Ni can seat in the Li layer, which has been confirmed by both X-ray diffraction (XRD) and neutron diffraction. Although XRD and neutron diffraction are two well-known methods for determining crystal structure with coordination chemical information, they have inherent limitations on local structure and coordinate chemical information determination. Results from Rietveld refinement of XRD and neutron diffraction patterns are averaged over a large amount of sample, coupled with contributions from many factors that could lead to large errors, especially for nanoscale materials with mixed ions. Particularly for layered cathode materials, XRD and neutron diffraction cannot differentiate the effects originating from surface and grain boundary, inhomogeneous composition, plane defects (stacking faults and rotation domains), and particle shape and size (especially for nanoparticles). Transmission electron microscopy, as an alternative approach, is very suitable for local area micro-analysis. Advances in scanning transmission electron microscopy (STEM) have made it possible to perform atomic level chemical imaging using STEM-EDS (EDS, energy-dispersive spectroscopy) and STEM-EELS (EELS, electron energy-loss spectroscopy).

For the complex lithium transition-metal oxide cathode system, it is far from clear how the TM and Li ions coordinate with each other in the lattice and how their interaction evolve upon battery cycling. Precise and high spatial determination of local atomic information is essential. In this work, for the first time, we use atomic resolution STEM-EDS mapping to probe the local coordinate chemical information in six types of layered cathode materials for LIBs, enabling us to directly visualize and compare the TM element distributions at the atomic level. On the basis of the atomic resolution EDS maps and quantitative analysis, we demonstrate significantly different intermixing.

Figure 1. Li₁₋₂Ni₀.₂Mn₀.₆O₂ (20N-LMR) sample. (a) STEM-HAADF image from the [010] zone axis. (b) EDS mapping region. (c) Surface plot of Mn K map. (d) Surface plot of Ni K map. (e) Integrated line scan profile showing X-ray counts distribution across the layered structure. (f) Based on counts ratio from the TM layer and Li layer, 38% Ni was estimated to seat in the Li layer due to interlayer Li/Ni mixing. (g) Optimized crystal model for 20N-LMR based on EDS mapping results.
characteristics for Li/Mn, Li/Co, and Li/Ni. The distribution of substituents is not uniform in the Li layers, which may also influence the Li-ion transportation properties during battery cycling. This work provides unprecedented knowledge for correlating atomic structure with battery properties and insights on the role of each TM ion, therefore guiding the smart design of new cathode materials required for advanced LIBs.

2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

2.1. Material Synthesis. Li$_{1.2}$Ni$_{0.2}$Mn$_{0.6}$O$_2$ (20N-LMR), Li$_{1.2}$Ni$_{0.13}$Co$_{0.13}$Mn$_{0.54}$O$_2$ (NC-LMR), and LiNi$_{0.5}$Mn$_{0.5}$O$_2$ (NM55) were synthesized via a coprecipitation method. The detailed description of the synthesis procedure has been reported in prior publications.\textsuperscript{46} Li$_{1.2}$Ni$_{0.13}$Co$_{0.13}$Mn$_{0.54}$O$_2$ (NC-LMR) was synthesized by using a molten salt method as described in a previous publication.\textsuperscript{47} LiNi$_{0.5}$Mn$_{0.5}$O$_2$ (NCM424) and LiNi$_{0.5}$Co$_{0.1}$Al$_{0.5}$O$_2$ (NCA) are commercially available materials manufactured by TODA KOGYO company (provided by CAMP Facility at Argonne National Laboratory).

2.2. Material Characterization. The six layered cathodes were investigated by a JEOL JEM-ARM2000CF microscope which is operated at 200 kV. This microscope is equipped with a probe spherical aberration corrector and a JEOL SDD detector with a 100 mm$^2$ X-ray sensor, enabling subangstrom resolution in STEM mode and highly efficient X-ray collections that are 10 times faster than a traditional detector with excellent noise-to-signal ratio, respectively. For the STEM-HAADF (HAADF, high-angle annular dark-field) imaging, the inner and outer collection angles of an annular dark field detector are 68 and 280 mrad, respectively. For atomic level EDS mapping, signal was collected by scanning the same region multiple times with dwell time of 0.1 ms. The frame size for all four samples were 128 × 96 pixels. The probe current was minimized to 11 pA to suppress possible beam-induced damage. The EDS data were collected and processed by using Analysis Station 3.8.0.52 (JEOL Engineering Co., Ltd.). The EDS images presented in this work were plotted using DigitalMicrograph (Gatan Inc., Version 2.30.542.0) with the surface plot function.

2.3. DFT Calculations. All calculations are performed using the plane-wave projector-augmented wave method\textsuperscript{48} with an energy cutoff of 450 eV, as implemented in the Vienna ab initio simulation package. The Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof (PBE) form\textsuperscript{49} of generalized gradient approximation is chosen as the exchange-correlation potential. The PBE+U approach\textsuperscript{50} is employed to take account of the strong on-site Coulomb interaction (U) presented in the localized 3d electrons of Mn, Co, and Ni, with the U values set to 3.5, 3.3, and 6.9 eV for them, respectively. All the layered structures are fully relaxed and optimized to their energetically favorable structure. Antiferromagnetic structure is applied in these structures to obtain their minimum energy structure.\textsuperscript{51} We build a supercell comprised by 5 unit cells containing 30 formula units with the prototypical R$3$$\bar{m}$ layered structure. The percentage of exchange defects is 3.3%. K-points array is set as $4 \times 4 \times 2$ for sampling Brillouin zone.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Selective Atomic Mixing of Ni, Co, and Mn with Li in Li Layer—LMR Cathodes. Two LMR cathodes, Li$_{1.2}$Ni$_{0.2}$Mn$_{0.6}$O$_2$ (20N-LMR) and Li$_{1.2}$Ni$_{0.13}$Co$_{0.13}$Mn$_{0.54}$O$_2$ (NC-LMR), have been studied. Before EDS mapping was conducted, the working electrodes were first tilted to [010] zone axis according to the monoclinic $C2/m$ structure. To achieve atomic level EDS mapping, each atomic column must be well-resolved in STEM-HAADF imaging. Figure 1a is a typical STEM-HAADF image, showing good resolution (~1.1 Å, estimated from fast Fourier transformation). Figure 1b–d shows EDS maps obtained from the region highlighted in (a). Because of smaller image pixels (128 × 96) and shorter dwell time (0.1 ms), the STEM-HAADF image obtained in EDS mapping (Figure 1b) has relatively poor resolution, but the layered structure is clearly resolved. The distribution of Mn and Ni was shown in parts (c) and (d), respectively, of Figure 1. The Mn map clearly reveals that Mn ions mainly reside in the TM layers while the Ni map shows a rather random distribution. Even though parts (c) and (d) of Figure 1 are showing relative intensity distribution, we still can conclude that there is a considerable amount of Ni in the Li layers. Thus, with atomic level EDS mapping, for the first time, we directly visualized the interlayer mixing of Ni ions in the layered oxide cathode. By summation of the signal counts along the layer direction, an integrated line scan profile with direction perpendicular to the layers is shown in Figure 1e.

Quantitative STEM-EDS analysis is based on the Cliff-Lorimer method. For a binary alloy A–B the X-ray peak intensities $I_A$ and $I_B$ are related to the concentrations of $C_A$ and $C_B$ in wt % by the relationship

$$\frac{C_A}{C_B} = \frac{k_{AB}}{k_{BA}} I_A / I_B$$

where $k_{AB}$ and $k_{BA}$ are the ratio factors for the chemical systems of A and B, with the factor $k_{AB}$ for the system A–B and vice versa. These factors are not constants. In the current work, for each EDS mapping series the sample thickness is very similar and other experimental conditions were kept as the same. Therefore, we can sum up each element X-ray counts from TM layers and Li layers separately and apply the Cliff-Lorimer method to calculate their concentration ratios in TM layers and Li layers. However, because of a variety of factors, the electron beam will spread while going through the specimen. Therefore, even with subangstrom probe size of the beam, the collected EDS signal from STEM-EDS still suffers contributions from neighboring atom columns. Thus, for example, in Figure 1e considerable Mn X-ray signal was detected from Li layers, even though negligible Mn is residing there according to previous XRD and neutron diffraction analysis.\textsuperscript{52} Thus, in Figure 1e, Mn signal counts from Li layers are treated as background noise which comes from neighboring TM layers. Assuming no interlayer mixing between Mn and Li, we used Mn map as the reference to calculate Mn X-ray count ratio between TM layers and Li layers, that is, $R_{ML} = I_{ML}/I_{LM}$ ($R_{ML}$ indicates Mn X-ray ratio and $I_{ML}$ and $I_{LM}$ indicate the total X-ray counts of Mn from TM layers and Li layers, respectively). Such ratio values ($R_{ML}$) were used to calibrate Ni X-ray counts ratio ($R_{NL}$) where $R_{NL} = I_{NL}/I_{LN}$ ($I_{MN}$ and $I_{LN}$ indicate the total X-ray counts of Ni from TM layers and Li layers, respectively). Since the Mn map and Ni map were collected simultaneously, the difference between $R_{ML}$ and $R_{NL}$ is a direct result of Mn and Ni distribution difference, that is, the interlayer mixing level difference between Mn/Li and Ni/Li. Taking the background noise level as uniform, we estimated approximately 38% Ni seated in Li layers (Figure 1f). Thus, in 20N-LMR there is around 7.6% (38% × 0.2) Li ions being substituted by Ni in the Li layer; in other words, Ni interlayer mixing level is around 7.6% in 20N-LMR, which is higher than the result of 4.1% deduced from XRD refinement.\textsuperscript{19} On the basis of our EDS measurement, a modified crystal model for 20N-LMR cathode is presented in Figure 1g. The calculated Ni value is relative to that of Mn, which makes it more reliable compared to the value estimated from absolute signal counts; as in this case the electron beam propagation effects (channeling, dechanneling, delocalization, and scattering...
Figure 2. Li$_{1.2}$Ni$_{0.13}$Co$_{0.13}$Mn$_{0.54}$O$_2$ (NC-LMR) sample. (a) [010] zone axis STEM-HAADF image showing the EDS mapping region. (b) Surface plot of Mn K map. (c) Surface plot of Co K map. (d) Surface plot of Ni K map. (e) Integrated line scan profile showing X-ray counts distribution across the layered structure. (f) On the basis of counts ratio from the TM layer and Li layer, 4% Co and 41% Ni were estimated to seat in the Li layer due to interlayer mixing. (g) Optimized crystal model for NC-LMR based on EDS mapping results.

The substituent elements Co and Ni, surprisingly, behave differently. While the Co K map (Figure 2c) shows a well-resolved layered structure, Ni K map (Figure 2d) appears very similar to that observed in the 20N-LMR sample (Figure 1d), revealing a fairly random distribution of Ni. The integrated line scan profile (Figure 2e) provides quantitative X-ray counts for Mn, Co, and Ni, which shows that the total counts for Co and Ni are at a similar level but their profiles are quite different. Again, the Co and Ni interlayer mixing is calculated by setting the profile of Mn as the reference with no interlayer mixing between Mn and Li. As shown in Figure 2f, only 4% Co resides in Li layers while 41% Ni resides in Li layers. Thus, for the NC-LMR cathode, Co has a negligible interlayer mixing, but Ni shows significantly high interlayer mixing. Ni interlayer mixing level is around 5.3% (41% × 0.13) in NC-LMR. A suggested crystal model for NC-LMR is shown in Figure 2g.

3.2. Selective Atomic Mixing of Ni, Co, and Mn with Li in Li-Layer—Layered Cathodes with R3m Structure. With the increasing ratio between TM and Li, layered cathodes transform from monoclinic C$2/m$ structure into hexagonal R3m layered structure. However, in STEM-HAADF imaging conditions, the [100] zone in the R3m layered structure is exactly the same as the [010] zone in the C$2/m$ layered structure. For comparison purposes, we tilted the four R3m layered cathodes, LiNi$_{0.4}$Co$_{0.2}$Mn$_{0.4}$O$_2$ (NCM424), LiNi$_{0.5}$Mn$_{0.5}$O$_2$ (NM55), LiNi$_{0.6}$Co$_{0.2}$Mn$_{0.2}$O$_2$ (NCM622), and LiNi$_{0.8}$Co$_{0.15}$Al$_{0.05}$O$_2$ (NCA), to the [100] zone axis before subsequent EDS mapping. Figure 3a is the STEM-HAADF image of the EDS mapping region for the NCM424 sample, which shows the same layered structure as the LMR cathodes (Figures 1 and 2). Elemental mapping images for Mn, Co, and Ni further confirm the layered structure (Figure 3b–d). The difference between the three maps can be seen in the integrated line scan profiles (Figure 3e), where the Ni profile shows extra peaks in the Li-layer positions (marked by arrows). Using Mn as the baseline, we estimated 4% Co and 31% Ni reside in the Li layers (Figure 3f). Thus, the interlayer mixing level for Ni is about 12.4% (31% × 0.4) and that of Co is about 0.8% (4% × 0.2). The crystal model for NCM424 is shown in Figure 3g. EDS analysis of the NM55 layered cathode suggests the Ni interlayer mixing level is about 14.5% (see Figure S2 in the Supporting Information for details).
With further increasing Ni concentration, the layered cathode transformed into a Ni-based structure or Ni-rich layered cathode. Figure 4 shows the EDS mapping results from NCM622, where it shows 6% Co and 25% Ni reside in Li layers. Thus, the Ni interlayer mixing level is about 15% in NCM622. Assuming 6% Co in the Li layer in the NCA sample, Ni interlayer mixing is about 14% (Figure S3). Therefore, it seems the Ni interlayer mixing level does not continue to increase with increasing Ni concentration in the Ni-rich region. It is saturated around 15%, which reveals intriguing behavior of Ni in the layered cathodes.

### 3.3. New Insights from Atomic Resolution EDS Mapping

Three novel points revealed from the above EDS analysis are discussed below. First of all, Ni, Co, and Mn show significantly different tendencies toward interlayer mixing with Li. Essentially, Mn shows near zero interlayer mixing and Co shows slightly higher interlayer mixing compared to Mn but was often negligible, while Ni shows a much higher tendency toward interlayer mixing. To better understand the different interlayer mixing levels among Li/Ni, Li/Co, and Li/Mn, we performed DFT calculations using NM424 cathode as an example. The antisite defect pairs due to Li/TM interlayer exchange are shown in Figure 5. According to the DFT calculation results (shown in Table 1), Li/Ni antisite defect pairs show much lower total energy increase than those of Li/Co and Li/Mn, which indicates Li/Ni interlayer mixing is the easiest one to make happen, while Li/Co and Li/Mn interlayer mixing are unlikely to occur. Thus, as the two important substituents for Mn-based layered cathodes, Co and Ni are clearly different as far as structural coordination chemistry is concerned. Co behaves similar to Mn and it almost exclusively seats in the TM layers. In contrast, Ni has a relatively weak preference in occupying TM layers, especially at low substitution levels. Such difference may explain the different electrochemical behaviors observed on Co- and Ni-containing cathodes. For example, in LMR cathodes, increasing Co substitution level led to poor performance, while Kim et al. found that increasing the Ni level enhanced cell performance.

Second, our EDS analysis suggested a higher Ni interlayer mixing level as compared to the previous results from XRD and neutron diffraction studies. As shown in Figure 6, we summarized our EDS measurements and previous published results on Ni interlayer mixing as a function of the total Ni concentration in the oxides. It is amazing that the EDS and XRD yield similar trends with respect to the dependence of Ni interlayer mixing on the total Ni concentration, despite the values from EDS being slightly higher than those from XRD. The main difference observed in the low Ni content range may come from both experimental and analysis methods. First, the physical model used for XRD refinement is incorrect for LMR cathodes. Only R3̅m structure was used as a crystal model in both Fell’s work and Lu’s work, while in reality, there is a
large portion of $\text{C2}/m$ structure in LMR cathodes.\textsuperscript{25,27,31,49} Second, the lower Ni level can increase its uncertainty due to a weaker signal from Ni, which has a similar influence on both EDS and XRD analysis. For the high Ni content cathodes, XRD indicated that Ni interlayer mixing decreases with increasing Ni.

Figure 4. LiNi$_{0.6}$Co$_{0.2}$Mn$_{0.2}$O$_2$ (NCM622) sample. (a) [100] zone axis STEM-HAADF image showing the EDS mapping region. (b) Surface plot of Ni K map. (c) Surface plot of Mn K map. (d) Surface plot of Co K map. (e) Integrated line scan profile showing X-ray counts distribution across the layered structure. (f) 6% Co and 25% Ni were estimated to seat in the Li layer due to interlayer mixing. (g) Optimized crystal model for NCM622 based on EDS mapping results.

Figure 5. Crystal models showing interlayer exchange of Li/Ni, Li/Co, and Li/Mn in the NCM424 cathode. $\Delta E$ indicates total energy increase due to Li/TM exchange.

Table 1. Total Energy Increase for Each Li/TM Antisite Defect Pair and Three Possible Configurations in NCM424 (LiNi$_{0.4}$Mn$_{0.4}$Co$_{0.2}$O$_2$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Increase</th>
<th>Li/Ni exchange</th>
<th>Li/Mn exchange</th>
<th>Li/Co exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta E$</td>
<td>1.374 eV</td>
<td>0.549 eV</td>
<td>0.596 eV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Comparison between our EDS measurement and previous XRD and neutron diffraction measurements on Li/Ni interlayer mixing levels as a function of Ni contents.
content. However, to differ in some way, our EDS results indicate Ni interlayer mixing will reach a saturated level in the Ni-rich region rather than decreasing as suggested by XRD.24

The third novel point is that constituent elements are not evenly distributed within bulk lattice. As shown in Figures 1–3 for Mn-rich layered cathodes, even within the nanometer-scale region, Ni and Co both show intensity fluctuation. For Ni-rich layered cathodes in Figures 4 and S3, Mn and Co also show concentration variation on the sub-nanoscale level. Such local composition fluctuation may lead to local lattice distortion and consequent influence on Li-ion transportation and structure stability. Therefore, crystal models that are based on even distribution of TMs are not in accordance with the real materials, and local composition fluctuation should be considered to better understand cathode behavior.

It has been demonstrated that, upon cycling of Li12Ni0.2Mn0.6O2 (20N-LMR) cathode, Ni gradually migrates to the particle surface, leading to Ni depletion in the bulk.18 Structure instability, and consequently cathode voltage and capacity fade. DFT calculations indicated that when Ni resides in the Li layer, the migration barrier for Ni is even lower than that for Li.16 Apparently, to reduce the migration of Ni to the particle surface during battery operation, the interlayer mixing of Ni into the Li layer should be minimized, which should be taken into consideration during material processing. Furthermore, previous studies indicated that Ni could migrate from the TM layer into the Li layer and result in structure instability.50,51 However, direct evidence is lacking and its mechanism is also unclear, even though considerable computational work has been carried out.52–55 Cation migration is the fundamental science for LIBs and demands more efforts along this direction. The present work using atomic resolution EDS chemical imaging provides a new approach. The observation on the drastically different behavior of Ni, Co, and Mn in terms of atomic level mixing indicates that regulating or guiding Ni behavior constitutes one of the crucial steps for mitigating capacity and voltage fade in this class of layer cathode oxides.

4. CONCLUSIONS

For the first time, atomic resolution STEM-EDS mapping was successfully used to probe the structural coordination chemical information, that is, the interlayer mixing between TM and Li in the layered cathodes. Using atomic level mapping, we captured unprecedented and indisputable evidence on the vastly different behaviors of Mn, Co, and Ni toward interlayer mixing with Li. While Mn and Co tend to reside almost exclusively at the lattice site of the TM layer in the structure, Ni shows a significantly higher degree of interlayer mixing with Li layer. The fraction of Ni ions residing in the Li layer has a near linear dependence on the total Ni concentration before reaching saturation in the Ni-rich region. The present atomic level direct observation of distinctly different degrees of selective mixing of Ni, Co, and Mn with Li provides a new way to further understand the electrochemical behavior of LIB cathodes as well as the scientific basis for selective tailoring of new materials with improved performance.

Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.chemmater.5b02016.
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