Energy & Environmental Science



PAPER



Cite this: Energy Environ. Sci., 2022, **15**, 1325

A self-regulated gradient interphase for dendritefree solid-state Li batteries†

Tengrui Wang,[‡]^a Jian Duan,[‡]^a Bao Zhang,[‡]^b Wei Luo, ^(D)*^a Xiao Ji,^b Henghui Xu,^{cd} Ying Huang,^a Liqiang Huang,^a Zhenyou Song,^a Jiayun Wen,^a Chunsheng Wang, ^(D)*^b Yunhui Huang ^(D)*^d and John B. Goodenough ^(D)*^c

Solid-state Li metal batteries (SSLMBs) have emerged as an important energy storage technology that offers the possibility of both high energy density and safety by combining a Li metal anode (LMA), a high-capacity cathode and a nonflammable solid-state electrolyte (SSE). However, the major challenges of poor LMA/SSE interface wetting and the easy growth of Li dendrites in SSEs remain unsolved. Here, we have addressed these challenges by using a functional gradient Li anode (FGLA), which is formed through a self-regulated reaction between molten Li and AlF₃. A composition gradient of Li–LiAl–LiF is spontaneously formed from the reaction of molten Li with AlF₃ due to the large difference in interfacial energy between Li/LiAl and Li/LiF, where the LiAl reduces the interface resistance and LiF suppresses Li dendrites. The FGLA not only dramatically reduces the resistance at the FGLA/Li_{6.5}La₃Zr_{1.5}Ta_{0.5}O_{1.2} (LLZTO) garnet SSE interface to ~1 Ω cm⁻², but also largely increases the critical current density (CCD) to over 3.0 mA cm⁻² at room temperature. Moreover, the full cells paired with LiNi_{0.5}Co_{0.2}Mn_{0.3}O₂, sulfur and thick LiFePO₄ cathodes (~2.8 mA h cm⁻²) also show excellent cycling performances. The FGLA design provides a great opportunity for safe and high-energy SSLMBs.

Received 18th November 2021, Accepted 1st February 2022

DOI: 10.1039/d1ee03604a

rsc.li/ees

Broader context

The overwhelming consumption of fossil energy calls for the development of renewable and clean energies, of which energy storage technologies play an essential role. Recently, solid-state Li metal batteries (SSLMBs), which combine a high-energy cathode, a Li metal anode and a solid-state electrolyte (SSE), show great potential to simultaneously achieve high energy density and high safety. However, SSEs suffer from an easy short-circuit at a low critical current density (CCD) at room temperature due to the penetration of Li dendrites, which limits their practical applications. Although extensive efforts have been made aimed at increasing the CCDs, SSEs can generally be shorted at a current density of about 1.0 mA cm⁻². Here, we have demonstrated a self-regulated functional gradient Li anode, where a LiF-rich layer faces SSEs to block electrons and it gradually changes to a LiAl alloy layer. The gradient interphase simultaneously enables a low interface resistance and a high capacity of Li dendrite suppression. Benefiting from this unique gradient design, garnet-type Li_{6.5}La₃Zr_{1.5}Ta_{0.5}O₁₂ (LLZTO) SSEs exhibit a CCD of over 3.0 mA cm⁻² at room temperature and show excellent cycling stabilities in full-cells with various cathodes.

Introduction

New battery technologies are highly in demand to tackle the deficiencies that have been identified in conventional lithiumion batteries (LIBs): energy density and safety.^{1–3} To increase

^c Materials Science and Engineering Program and Department of Mechanical Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin 78712 TX, USA.

^d State Key Laboratory of Material Processing and Die & Mould Technology, School of Materials Science and Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China. E-mail: huangyh@hust.edu.cn

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: 10.1039/d1ee03604a

‡ Equal contribution.

the energy density of a LIB, a Li metal anode (LMA), the "holygrail" anode, has been recognized to be the ultimate choice due to its high specific capacity (3861 mA h g^{-1}) and low anode potential $(-3.04 \text{ V } \nu s. \text{ the standard hydrogen electrode}).^{4,5}$ However, the LMA suffers from severe Li dendrite growth, low Coulombic efficiency, and poor cycle life, as well as safety concerns in organic liquid electrolytes.^{6,7} To circumvent these limitations, nonflammable solid-state electrolytes (SSE) are being intensively pursued.⁸⁻¹² Among all high Li-ion conductive SSEs, the garnet-structured oxide Li₇La₃Zr₂O₁₂ is more stable with LMA than other SSEs.^{13–16} However, the garnet still faces two critical challenges: high contact resistance and severe Li dendrite growth.^{17,18} The formation of Li dendrites depends on the potential distributions of Li near a Li/LLZTO interface (Fig. 1a). E_{Li}^0 and E_{SSE}^0 are defined as the thermodynamic equilibrium potentials of the LMA and garnet, respectively,

^a Institute of New Energy for Vehicles, School of Materials Science and Engineering, Tongji University, Shanghai 201804, China. E-mail: weiluo@tongji.edu.cn

^b Department of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, University of Maryland College Park, College Park, Maryland, 20742, USA. E-mail: cswang@umd.edu

E-mail: jgoodenough@mail.utexas.edu



Fig. 1 Diagram of the potential distribution of Li near a Li/LLZTO interface during the plating process. (a) Li metal exhibits a poor interfacial contact with a LLZTO pellet. Dendritic Li and a short-circuit occur at a very low CCD (0.1 mA cm^{-2}) due to the large interfacial resistance and electron conducting interface. (b) A lithiophilic LiAl alloy can achieve an intimate contact with LLZTO. (c) Coating LLZTO with a layer of electronic insulating, lithiophobic LiF with a high interfacial energy can increase the E_{SSE} within LLZTO and prevent Li dendrites from depositing inside LLZTO. (d) Engineering a gradient FGLA anode effectively increases the E_{SSE} of LLZTO without sacrificing the interface contact. The gradient anode can suppress Li dendrite formation under a current density over 3.0 mA cm⁻² at RT and 25 mA cm⁻² at 60 °C.

and $E_{\rm Li}$ and $E_{\rm SSE}$ are the real potentials of the LMA and garnet, respectively, under an overpotential η . If $E_{\rm SSE}$ is lower than 0 V, Li can nucleate and grow inside the SSE. The poor contact of the garnet with LMA is due to the formation of lithiophobic Li₂CO₃ on the garnet surface, which significantly increases the interfacial resistance and polarization.^{19–21} The electronic conductivity of 10⁻⁸ S cm⁻¹ in the garnet may reduce the potential of the garnet ($E_{\rm SSE}$) to below zero at a high Li plating current, resulting in Li deposition inside the garnet (Fig. S1a, ESI⁺).²²

Extensive efforts have been devoted to reducing the interface resistance and the overpotential (η) . Coating lithiophilic materials, such as Al₂O₃²³ and Al,²⁴ on the garnet can wet the garnet with LMA because these coating materials can react with Li to form a lithiophilic Li-alloy interphase. However, these lithiophilic layers or alloys have high electronic conductivity and low interfacial energy against Li, which promote both Li dendrite growth from the Li metal anode and direct Li deposition inside the garnet (Fig. 1b).^{22,25} Consequently, LLZO still has a low critical current density (CCD) of typically less than 1.0 mA cm^{-2} . In contrast, a lithiophobic and electronic insulating interlayer was used to suppress the Li dendrites because the lithiophobic interlayer with weak bonding to Li promotes plane Li diffusion along the Li/interface and suppresses the vertical growth through the interlayer for Li anodes.^{26,27} Moreover, the low electronic conductivity of the interlayer also prevents the $E_{\rm SSE}$ from dropping to <0 V even at a high current, thus suppressing Li deposition inside the LLZO electrolytes. LiF has the highest interfacial energy and the lowest electronic conductivity ($\sim 10^{-31}$ S cm⁻¹) among all interlayers, which can effectively suppress Li dendrite growth into SSE and Li deposition inside SSE even at a high Li plating overpotential. However, the super-lithiophobic LiF layer also leads to an ultra-poor contact and an ultra-high interfacial resistance at Li/LiF (Fig. 1c). The challenge is how to design an interphase layer that can simultaneously achieve a low interface resistance (lithiophilicity) and a high Li dendrite suppression capability (lithiophobicity), which is almost impossible with the reported strategies.

In nature, biological functional gradient materials exist widely in living organisms, such as bone, wood and nacre, where the structural and chemical gradients have unprecedented functionalities compared to the conventional materials. More importantly, functional gradient materials can effectively fulfill multifunctional requirements within limited space and components.^{28,29} Inspired by the biological functional gradient structure, we developed a functional gradient Li metal anode (FGLA) that simultaneously solves the problems of poor contact and easy dendrite formation within a SSE (Fig. 1d). The unique FGLA can be obtained by a simple reaction between AlF₃ and excess molten Li, in which the formed LiAl spontaneously separates from LiF at high temperature resulting from the large interfacial energy differences between LiAl/Li and LiF/Li. In the LiF-Li₉Al₄ composition gradient layer, the LiF-rich component faces the garnet SSE side and the Li₉Al₄-rich component faces the Li side. Lithiophobic LiF on the garnet surface can suppress Li dendrite penetration due to a high interface energy of LiF against Li, while the extremely low electronic conductivity of LiF also prevents the garnet potential $(E_{SSE}(x))$ from dropping to <0 V, inhibiting direct Li deposition within the garnet (Fig. 1d). Moreover, lithiophilic Li₉Al₄ significantly reduces the interface resistance between the Li garnet as well as the overpotential. The nature-inspired FGLA simultaneously reduced the interfacial resistance to $\sim 1~\Omega~cm^{-2}$ and increased the critical current density (CCD) to over 3.0 mA cm^{-2} at room temperature (RT). Moreover, the cycling stability was extended to 600 h at RT. Full cells by pairing FGLA with LiNi_{0.5}Co_{0.2}Mn_{0.3}O₂, sulphur, or thick LiFePO₄ cathodes (~ 3.0 mA h cm⁻²), exhibited superior comprehensive performances. The concept of forming a gradient layer is distinguished from previously reported AlF₃modified separators and Li-AlF₃ composites in liquid batteries, where only a lithiophobic-lithiophilic mixture was formed on Li anodes.^{30,31}

Results and discussion

Phase separation in multiple compositions has been widely used to design functional gradient materials. Phases with quite different surface and interface energies tend to separate from each other. FGLA was formed by adding AlF₃ powder (Fig. 2a and Fig. S2, S3, ESI†) into molten Li, where AlF₃ experienced conversion and alloying reactions to generate a LiAl and LiF composite (more details on the synthetic procedure are available in the experimental procedures section). The final composite at a different mass ratio of Li to AlF₃ can be obtained from the ternary phase diagram of the Li–Al–F₂ system (Fig. 2b) and thermodynamic calculations (Table S1, ESI†). To balance the interface wettability and the specific capacity of FGLA, the Li/ AlF₃ mass ratio was optimized as 2:1 (Fig. S4 and S5, ESI†). X-Ray diffraction (XRD) patterns in Fig. 2c confirm that the Li–AlF₃ (2:1) composite consists of LiF, Li₉Al₄, and excess Li.

The phase separation of FGLA was analyzed with thermodynamical derivation and DFT calculations. In a Li-X binary phase system (*X* represents the other phase), the distribution of *X* on the surface (n_X) or in the bulk (N_X) of the Li composite depends on the total energy and can be quantified (see Note N1, ESI† for more details),

$$\frac{n_X}{n_{\rm Li}} = \frac{N_X}{N_{\rm Li}} \times e \frac{0.5(\gamma_X - \gamma_{X-\rm Li}) \times S_X}{kT}$$

where *n* and *N* are the numbers of particles on the surface and in the bulk, respectively. γ_X is the surface energy of *X*, while γ_{X-Li} is the interfacial energy between *X* and Li. S_X is the surface area of a single *X* particle. *k* and *T* are the Boltzmann constant and the absolute temperature. According to the thermodynamic analysis, the difference between the surface energy (γ_X) of *X* and the interfacial energy (γ_{X-Li}) of *X*/Li can serve as the driving force for phase separation in the Li-X system. In the case of $\gamma_X < \gamma_{X-Li}$, $\frac{n_{\text{LiF}}}{n_{\text{Li}}}$ is larger than $\frac{N_{\text{LiF}}}{N_{\text{Li}}}$, indicative of a higher concentration of *X* on the surface. On the contrary, *X* presents a higher concentration in the bulk where $\gamma_X > \gamma_{X-\text{Li}}$. For Li–AlF₃ with a mass ratio of 2 : 1, Li–Al is a liquid at 300 °C (see the Li–Al phase diagram³³ in Fig. S7, ESI† and its corresponding description) while the formed LiF is in the solid state, since the melting point of LiF is as high as 848.2 °C. LiF is strongly

> LiF▼ Li ♦ Li₉Al₄ FGLA

> > Li metal

60 70

40 20 50

С

(a. u.)

Intensity

10 20 30



AIE

LigAld LizAl LizAl2 LiAl

LiF

Li-AIF

lithiophobic at a high temperature of ~300 °C as evidenced by a high contact angle of about 120° (Fig. S16c and e, ESI†). According to the Young equation ($\gamma_{\text{LiF}}-\gamma_{\text{LiF}-\text{Li}} = \gamma_{\text{Li}}\cos\theta$), $\gamma_{\text{LiF}}-\gamma_{\text{LiF}-\text{Li}}$ is about -0.21 J m⁻² at ~300 °C.³² Assuming that the radius of the LiF particle is about 5 nm, $\frac{n_{\text{LiF}}}{n_{\text{Li}}}$ is more than e^{1000}

times larger than $\frac{N_{\text{LiF}}}{N_{\text{Li}}}$, suggesting that LiF is enriched on the surface of the liquid Li-Al composite. The process of LiF migration from the liquid LiAl alloy to the surface was shown in Fig. S8 (ESI[†]). After solidification, the surface energy (LiF and Li₉Al₄) and interfacial energy (LiF/Li and Li₉Al₄/Li) were further calculated using DFT methods (for more details see Note N1, ESI[†]). Fig. 2d presents the atomic structures of LiF and Li₉Al₄, as well as the interface models of LiF/Li and ${\rm Li}_9{\rm Al}_4/{\rm Li}.$ As shown in Fig. 2e, LiF exhibits an extreme lithiophobicity ($\gamma_{\text{LiF}} - \gamma_{\text{LiF}-\text{Li}} =$ -0.47 Jm^{-2}) in the solid-state,²⁶ thus it would maintain a high concentration on the surface. In contrast, Li₂Al₄ has a low interface energy $\gamma_{Li9Al4-Li}$ of 0.004 J m⁻², but a high surface energy γ_{Li9Al4} of 0.83 J m⁻². Therefore, Li₉Al₄ is highly lithiophilic and tends to exist within the bulk composite. Apparently, such a large energy difference drives the Li-Li₉Al₄-LiF composite to thermodynamically form a FGLA, as shown in Fig. 2f.

The composition gradient of the FGLA was validated using depth-profiling time-of-flight secondary-ion mass spectroscopy (ToF-SIMS) in a negative mode (Fig. S9, ESI[†]). As shown in Fig. S10, (ESI⁺) the F⁻ signal, which represents LiF, maintained a high level on the surface layer and began to gradually decrease after 2000 s sputtering. In sharp contrast, the Alsignal is too weak to be detected on the surface of the FGLA and gradually increases after 2000 s sputtering. The phase gradient of LiF and Li₉Al₄ in FGLA was clearly demonstrated. Accordingly, Fig. 2g-i show the corresponding 3D images of FGLAs with sputtering time, which obviously indicates a gradient composition that is in line with the results predicted by the DFT calculations. X-Ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) combined with Ar⁺ ion sputtering also confirmed the successful formation of a FGLA by reacting AlF₃ with molten Li (see Fig. S11, ESI[†] and its descriptions).

A garnet-type Li_{6.5}La₃Zr_{1.5}Ta_{0.5}O₁₂ (LLZTO) SSE was adopted in this study due to its high conductivity and stability against Li metal for the following tests. The details of the synthetic procedure and characterization of the LLZTO pellets can be found in the experimental procedures and Fig. S12 (ESI⁺). The wettability of Li on LLZTO was evaluated by measuring the contact angle (CA) of liquid Li metal droplets. Pristine Li exhibits a spherical shape on the LLZTO surface with a CA of $\sim 105^{\circ}$ due to the existence of a Li₂CO₃ surface (Fig. S16a, ESI⁺). Using the Li-Al alloy (Fig. S13, ESI[†]), the CA was reduced to $\sim 70^{\circ}$ (Fig. S16b, ESI⁺), showing better interface contact. After coating a thin layer of LiF on LLZTO (see more details in the Methods section and in Fig. S14 and S15, ESI⁺), the CA of Li or LiAl on LLZTO increased to 120° (Fig. S16c, ESI[†]). However, the FGLA droplet can easily spread on LLZTO with a small CA of 70° (Fig. S16d, ESI[†]), which demonstrates that lithiophilic Li₉Al₄ in the composite greatly improves the interface wetting and the *in situ* formed LiF on LLZTO does not affect the interface contacts. Next, the interface contacts between LLZTO and different Li anodes were characterized with SEM. Obviously, gaps appeared at the interface of Li/LLZTO and Li/LiF-coated LLZTO while intimate contact was observed in LiAl/LLZTO or FGLA/LLZTO interfaces (Fig. S17, ESI†). This observation highlights the importance of wettability in the interface contact.

The composition gradient at a FGLA/LLZTO interface was also thermodynamically analyzed with DFT calculations. The atomic structures of LiF-LLZO (Li₉Al₄-LLZO) and corresponding interfacial energies are displayed in Fig. 3a and Fig. S6 (ESI[†]). LiF shows a lower $\gamma_{\text{LiF-LLZO}}$ (0.65 J m⁻²) than $\gamma_{\text{LiF-Li}}$ (0.79 J m⁻²), indicating an enrichment of LiF at the Li-LLZTO interface, while Li₉Al₄ presents a much higher $\gamma_{\text{Li9Al4-LLZO}}$ (0.75 J m⁻²) than $\gamma_{\text{Li9Al4-Li}}$ (0.004 J m⁻²), tending to concentrate in the bulk of Li (see Note N1, ESI⁺ for more details). These results suggest that a FGLA can be constructed at a Li/LLZTO interface, as displayed in Fig. 3b. We further employed energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) and ToF-SIMS measurements to characterize the gradient structure of the FGLA/LLZTO interface. The composition changes along a line from FGLA to LLZTO near the interface (Fig. 3c and d) were monitored with EDX. Inside the FGLA anode ($\sim 0.2 \ \mu m$ from the scanning), LiF presents a low concentration while the LiAl alloy delivers a higher concentration, depicting the higher concentration of lithiophilic LiAl than lithiophobic LiF in the bulk FGLA. Upon reaching the FGLA/LLZTO interface, the concentration of LiF increases rapidly while LiAl quickly decreases. In the region of 0.5 to 1.3 µm, LiF maintains a much higher content than LiAl, and then LiF starts to drop to a low value after crossing the FGLA/LLZTO interface at 1.3 µm, while LLZTO starts to increase quickly after 1.5 µm, proving the existence of a LiF-rich layer on the LLZTO surface. Furthermore, depth-profiling ToF-SIMS images were collected on the FGLA/ LLZTO interface as well (Fig. 3e-h). Obviously, the F⁻ signal, representing LiF, exhibits a much higher intensity within $\sim 2 \ \mu m$ of the interface than in the bulk FLGA, strongly demonstrating the enrichment of LiF near the interface. Overall, the FGLA not only presents great wettability with LLZTO, but also forms a gradient structure on the LLZTO surface to suppress Li dendrites.

The Li plating/stripping performance of three Li anodes (Li, LiAl, and FGLA) were evaluated at 25 °C in solid-state symmetrical cells with LLZTO as the SSE. The interface resistances of these cells were evaluated with electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS). A large interface area-specific resistance (semi-circle) >1070 Ω cm⁻² was given in a Li|garnet|Li symmetric cell due to the poor contact of pristine Li on LLZTO (EIS, Fig. 4a). Coating LiF on LLZO further increased the interface resistance to ~1.8 × 10⁵ Ω cm⁻², Fig. 4c. Notably, the LiAl|garnet|LiAl cell with LiAl alloy electrodes exhibits a much smaller interfacial resistance (<7 Ω cm⁻²), which is beneficial for a significantly improved interface wetting (Fig. 4b). As expected, a FGLA|LLZTO|FGLA cell further reduced the interfacial resistance to ~1 Ω cm⁻², demonstrating the superior properties of the *in situ* formed Li–LiAl–LiF gradient.



Fig. 3 The composition distribution of FGLA at the FGLA/LLZTO interface. (a) The atomic structures of the Li, LiF, LLZO and Li₉Al₄, as well as their interfacial energies. (b) A schematic diagram of the FGLA on the LLZTO surface. (c) SEM and (d) corresponding EDX line scanning images of the FGLA/LLZTO interface. (e–h) Depth-profiling ToF-SIMS images of the FGLA/LLZTO interface. F^- and LaO⁻ signals represent LiF and LLZTO, respectively.

For a solid-state Li metal battery, an essential parameter for the solid state electrolyte is the critical current density (CCD), which is defined as the current density above which the Li dendrite grows through a SSE and leads to a short-circuit. CCD represents the capability of the electrolyte for Li dendrite suppression. The CCDs of these symmetrical cells at room temperature were measured in galvanostatic Li plating/stripping cycles at stepwise current densities; each plating/stripping time was fixed at 0.5 hour. As shown in Fig. 4d, a short-circuit occurs quickly in the Li|LLZTO|Li cell at a low CCD of about 0.1 mA cm^{-2} . Due to the enhanced interface wetting and smaller interfacial resistance, the LiAl|LLZTO|LiAl cell showed a CCD of 0.8 mA cm⁻² (Fig. 4e). When LiF is coated on the LLZTO surface, the Li|LiF-coated LLZTO|Li cell shows a large Li plating/stripping overpotential of 5.0 V at a low current of 0.05 mA cm^{-2} (Fig. S18, ESI[†]) due to a large interface resistance at the Li|LiF surface. As expected, the FGLA|LLZTO|FGLA cell shows stable plating/stripping performances even at a high current density of 3.0 mA cm⁻² and a high capacity of 1.5 mA h cm⁻² (Fig. 4f) due to the perfect interface contact and the in situ formed LiF layer on the LLZTO surface. More importantly, at a high current density of 3.0 mA cm^{-2} , voltage polarization reaches 5.0 V, but a short-circuit is still not observed (EIS profiles of the cell before and after CCD measurement are shown in Fig. S19, ESI⁺), indicative of a dendrite-free plating/stripping behavior. The increase in polarization may be caused by void accumulations near the interfaces.34,35 To reduce the influence of voids, the charging/discharging capacity was fixed to measure the CCDs of FGLA|LLZTO|FGLA cells. Surprisingly, CCDs of 9.0 mA cm $^{-2}$ at RT (Fig. S20a, ESI†) and 25.0 mA cm⁻² at 60 °C (Fig. S20b, ESI^{\dagger}) were achieved (CCD comparison between this work and previous studies is shown in Table S3, ESI[†]). The FGLA|LLZTO|FGLA cell also exhibits low and stable overpotentials upon long-term cycling for 670 h (Fig. 4g). Moreover, the symmetrical cell with FGLA electrodes delivers stable and smooth cycling plateaus at large current densities of 2.0 and 5.0 mA cm^{-2} at RT (Fig. 4h). The overall investigations on interfacial resistance, CCD, and cycling durations clearly indicate that the FGLA can provide a superior interface compatibility and dendrite suppression ability with an LLZTO electrolyte, enabling fast charging/discharging of solid-state garnet Li batteries.

Given the highly stable FGLA|LLZTO interface, FGLA was further evaluated in full cells by pairing with $LiNi_5Co_2Mn_3O_2$ (NCM523), sulfur (S) or thick LiFePO₄ (LFP) cathodes. To reduce the interfacial resistance between the LLZTO pellet



Fig. 4 Electrochemical characterization of FGLA in a solid-state symmetrical cell and comparisons to reference Li metal-based anodes. (a) Electrochemical impedance spectra (EIS) of symmetrical cells with FGLA or other Li-based electrodes at room temperature. (b) Image expansion corresponding to the area outlined by the orange square in (a). (c) EIS of Li|LiF-coated LLZTO|Li symmetrical cells at room temperature. The resistance comparison agrees well with the result of interface wettability. CCD measurements of (d) Li|LLZTO|Li, (e) LiAl|LLZTO|LiAl, and (f) FGLA|LLZTO|FGLA symmetrical cells. (g) Cycling performance of FGLA|LLZTO|FGLA symmetrical cell, showing long-term stability at room temperature. (h) Galvanostatic cycling of the FGLA|LLZTO|FGLA symmetrical cell at 2.0 and 5.0 mA cm⁻², at room temperature.



Fig. 5 Electrochemical characterizations of the FGLA in full cells at RT. (a) Nyquist plot of a FLGA|LLZTO|NCM523 cell at RT. (b) The charge–discharge curves of the 1st cycle and the 300th cycle of the FGLA|LLZTO|NCM523 cell at 1 C. (c) Cycling stability of the FGLA|LLZTO|NCM523 cell at 1 C (170 mA g^{-1}). (d) Cycling stability comparison of the FGLA|LLZTO|S cell *versus* the liquid Li-S cell at 0.2 C (1 C = 1675 mA g^{-1}). 15 μ L liquid electrolyte was added at the cathode side.

and cathode, a tiny amount of liquid electrolyte was added at the cathode side, which is a commonly used strategy in garnet-based full cells.^{23,24} Details of the cell assembly are available in the Methods section. The EIS result of the FGLA|LLZTO|NCM523 cell is shown in Fig. 5a. The total impedance of the FGLA|LLZ-TO NCM523 cell contains the resistance of the LLZTO pellet and interfacial resistances between the LLZTO pellet and electrodes. The LLZTO pellet shows an impedance of about 72 Ω cm⁻². Benefiting from the ignorable interfacial resistance between LLZTO and FGLA and the improved interface contact at the cathode side with a liquid electrolyte, the overall resistance is as small as 155 Ω cm $^{-2}$. As shown in Fig. 5b, the FGLA|LLZTO|NCM523 cell delivers a specific capacity of 165 mA h g^{-1} (0.46 mA h cm⁻²) at 1 C. Moreover, an average Coulombic efficiency of $\sim 99.3\%$ as well as a high capacity retention of 85.5% for 300 cycles is given (Fig. 5c). Furthermore, full cells with a higher NCM523 mass loading were tested at a higher current density. The solid-state cell exhibits a capacity of 139 mA h g^{-1} (0.53 mA h cm⁻²) at 2 C and retains 80% of the specific capacity after 200 cycles (Fig. S21, ESI⁺).

To demonstrate the versatility of the FGLA, FGLA|LLZTO|S full cells were assembled with a sulfur/carbon (S/C) cathode. This chemistry promises an attractive theoretical energy density.³⁶ Although Li-S batteries have been well-investigated, their cyclability has always been hindered by the dissolution and shuttle effect of a S cathode as well as by an unstable Li metal anode in a liquid electrolyte system.^{37,38} As expected, the capacity of a conventional liquid Li-S cell started to decay from the beginning (Fig. 5d). After 300 cycles at 0.2 C, the liquid Li-S cell only delivers a capacity of 181 mA h g^{-1} and exhibits an average Coulombic efficiency of only 79.6%, which corresponds to a capacity retention of 18% (Fig. S22, ESI⁺). On the other hand, the FGLA|LLZTO|S cell offered a capacity of 870.0 mA h g^{-1} (0.96 mA h cm⁻²) after 300 cycles with an average Coulombic efficiency of 99.9%, corresponding to a much higher capacity retention of 71%. More critically, the FGLA|LLZTO|S cell can still deliver a capacity of 620 mA h g^{-1} with an average capacity decay of 0.024% per cycle over 2000 cycles (Fig. S23, ESI⁺), far exceeding the liquid Li-S cell (0.080%, 300 cycles, Fig. 5d). As shown in Fig. S23b, (ESI⁺) we can find that the interfacial resistance of the FGLA|LLZTO|S cell is nearly the same before and after 2000 cycles. All the improvements can be credited to the effectiveness of a dense LLZTO for eliminating the shuttle effect and the superiority of the highly stable FGLA|LLZTO interface. Next, a thick LFP cathode with a mass loading of about 18 mg cm⁻² was paired with FGLA|LLZTO to further evaluate the performance of the FGLA. As shown in Fig. S24a, (ESI[†]) the FGLA|LLZTO|LFP cell exhibits an areal capacity of about 2.85 mA h cm^{-2} . More importantly, the cell achieved a stable cycling performance of 80 cycles with a capacity retention of 93% (Fig. S24b, ESI[†]), exhibiting the great capability of the FGLA/LLZTO interface to stabilize a large areal capacity. Apparently, the FGLA with its unique gradient structure on LLZTO SSE, enables full cells with an excellent cycling performance and an areal capacity that has not been observed in any LLZTO based full cells known thus far (Table S4, ESI[†]).

Conclusion

Driven by the large interfacial energy differences between Li/ LiAl and Li/LiF, we have developed a self-regulated FGLA that displays all the benefits of interface enhancement. Intimate contact of the Li with an *in situ* formed lithiophilic Li₉Al₄ layer reduces the interfacial resistance, while the in situ formed lithiophobic LiF layer effectively suppresses Li dendrites due to a high interfacial energy to Li and low electronic conductivity, which was proven by a high critical current density over 3.0 mA cm⁻² at room temperature. The as-prepared solid-state symmetrical cell with the gradient FGLA can deliver stable plating/stripping for up to 670 h with limited polarization at RT. Leveraging the unprecedented performance of a FGLA|LLZTO interface, the corresponding assembled full cells all showed excellent performances. For example, the FGLA|LLZ-TO NCM523 full cell delivers a cyclability with an 85.5% capacity retention after 300 cycles at 1 C. Even in the more challenging Li-S system, the FGLA|LLZTO|S cell also offers a high capacity of 620 mA h g^{-1} after 2000 cycles. In particular, the exciting capability of FGLA with thick LFP electrodes (with a loading of 2.85 mA h cm⁻²) shows great potential to be practically applied. In general, the universal concept of selfregulated FGLA can effectively reduce interface resistance and suppress Li dendrites at the same time, which is also applicable to other solid-state battery systems and even to liquid Li batteries for practical applications.

Experimental procedures

Synthesis of FGLA and LiAl alloy

To prepare FGLA, Li foil was placed in a stainless-steel container and heated at 300 °C on a hot plate. The native surface film was removed carefully to give shiny liquid Li. A certain amount of AlF₃ powder was added slowly to the container and vigorously stirred for about 0.5 h. Then, the container was cooled down to room temperature by moving from the hot plate. The resulting solid was collected. The preparation of LiAl alloy is similar to the procedure for preparing FGLA by replacing AlF₃ with Al foil. Note that all the synthesis processes were carried out in an Argon-filled glovebox with concentrations of moisture and oxygen < 0.1 ppm.

Material characterizations

The ternary phase diagram and corresponding computational data were from the Materials Project (MP).³⁹ XRD patterns were obtained using a DX2700 (shjingmi corporation) at a scanning speed of 10° min⁻¹. The morphology was investigated *via* scanning electron microscopy (SEM, Sigma 300 vp, ZEISS). Surface chemical composition analysis was characterized with XPS (American Thermo Fisher Scientific ESCALAB 250Xi). The depth-profiling XPS analysis was conducted with Ar⁺ ion sputtering. The sputtered thickness was determined by the sputtering time multiplied by the sputtering speed (2.7 Å s⁻¹). ToF-SIMS analysis was taken using an instrument (IONTOF

Paper

GmbH) from Münster, Germany, with a pulsed Ga^{3+} primary ion beam in a negative mode.

Computational methods

DFT calculations^{40,41} were performed using the Vienna Abinitio Simulation Package (VASP)⁴² with the Projector Augmented Wave (PAW) method.⁴³ And the exchange–correlation energy is described by the functional of Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof (PBE) form^{44,45} including van der Waals corrections (DFT-D3 method).⁴⁶ The kinetic energy cutoff for electron wave functions is 520 eV. The geometry optimizations were performed by using the conjugated gradient method, and the convergence threshold is set to be 10^{-4} eV in energy and 0.02 eV Å⁻¹ in force. The Brillouin zone is sampled by using the Monkhorst–Pack scheme.⁴⁷ The interface energy was evaluated using the same method as in a previous work.²⁶ Visualization of the electrolyte structures are made by using VESTA.⁴⁸

Contact angle measurements

LLZTO pellets were prepared according to previous reports and carefully polished with sandpaper to give a smooth surface. LiFcoated LLZTO was obtained by coating a polished LLZTO pellet with LiF. The detailed preparation and coating parameters can be found in the ESI. Various Li metal-based materials, polished LLZTO pellets, and LiF-coated LLZTO pellets were placed on a hot plate at 300 °C. Liquid droplets of pure Li, Li–Al alloy or Li– AlF₃ composite were then deposited onto the testing pellets to measure the CA. Note that all the measurements were carried out in an argon-filled glovebox with concentrations of moisture and oxygen < 0.1 ppm.

Electrochemical performance measurements

2032-Type coin cells were used in this study. The stacking pressures were ~3.4 MPa during cell assembly. We did not apply extra stress during cell testing and the pressure conditions for all cells were the same. To sandwich LLZTO with two FGLA electrodes, we prepared one side by one side. Typically, FGLA in a stainless-steel container was placed on a hot plate (300 °C) in an Ar-filled glovebox. Then, a LLZTO pellet was placed on the FGLA and rubbed in the container. After about 1 minute, one side of the LLZTO pellet was fully covered by FGLA. Then, another side was treated using the same method. After both sides were covered with FGLA, the sandwich structure was kept at 300 °C to form a self-regulated gradient interphase, followed by cooling down to room temperature and coin-cell assembling.

The Li|LiF-coated garnet|Li symmetrical cell was sandwiched by two identical pure Li electrodes at 300 °C. An AC amplitude of 10 mV and frequencies from 1 MHz to 10 mHz were utilized to measure the EIS profiles. EISs were tested with a Biologic workstation (VMP3) at RT.

CCD measurements were conducted with gradually increasing current densities and each charge/discharge step was fixed at 30 min. As for the CCD tests at 60 $^{\circ}$ C, the capacity was fixed with stepwise current densities.

To fabricate full cells, different cathodes were prepared, and 2032-type coin cells were used. NCM523 electrodes were prepared by mixing NCM523, carbon black and polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) binder with a mass ratio of 90:5:5 in Nmethyl-2-pyrrolidinone (NMP) to form a slurry, which was then cast onto Al foil and dried at 90 °C under vacuum overnight. The S/C cathode was prepared via a simple freeze-drying method. 80 wt% sulfur/Kejten black was mixed with 10 wt% super P and 10 wt% LA133 binder. After being cast onto carboncoated Al foil, the electrode was frozen to dry at -20 °C under vacuum. The mass loading of sulfur was ~ 1.1 mg cm⁻². A thick LFP cathode was commercially available and the loading was about 2.8 mA h cm $^{-2}$. The fabrication process of the anode side was the same as that in the symmetrical cells and 15 μ L of electrolyte was dropped on the cathode side to wet the cathode/ garnet interface.

To assemble Li|liquid|NCM523 full cells, celgard-2400 membranes and 60 μ L electrolyte (1.0 M LiPF₆ in EC/DEC(v/v = 1:1) with 10% FEC and 1% VC as additives) were used. In the Li-S cells, the electrolyte was 1.0 M lithium bis(trifluoromethane-sulfonyl)imide (LiTFSI) dissolved in tetraethylene glycol dimethyl ether (TEGDME) solvent with 0.1 M Li₂S and 0.1 M P₂S₅ as additives. To assemble liquid Li-S full cells, 60 μ L of electrolyte was added with celgard-2400 separators. In the Li|liquid|LFP full cells, 60 μ L of electrolyte (1.0 M LiPF₆ in EC/DEC(v/v = 1:1) with 10% FEC and 1% VC as additives) was added with celgard-2400 separators. Symmetrical cells and full cells were tested with a Neware CT-4008T-5V20mA-164 battery tester.

Author contributions

W. L., T. R. W., C. S. W., Y. H. H. and J. B. G. conceived the idea for the project. T. R. W. and J. D. prepared the samples and constructed the tests. B. Z., J. X., and C. S. W. conducted the theoretical computations. T. R. W., J. D., H. H. X., Y. H., L. Q. H., Z. Y. S and J. Y. W. prepared the electrodes and conducted the battery tests. W. L., T. R. W., B. Z., C. S. W., Y. H. H. and J. B. G. prepared the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (92163120) and "Shanghai Rising-Star Program" (19QA1409300). We acknowledge Prof. Xiangxin Guo and Prof. Ning Zhao from Qingdao University for their assistance on preparing garnet pellets. We acknowledge Prof. Huanan Duan and Mr Hongpeng Zheng from Shanghai Jiaotong University for their assistance with the ToF-SIMS measurements.

References

- 1 X. L. Ji, Energy Environ. Sci., 2019, 12, 3203.
- 2 X. W. Shen, Y. T. Li, T. Qian, J. Liu, J. Q. Zhou, C. L. Yan and J. B. Goodenough, *Nat. Commun.*, 2019, **10**, 900.
- 3 A. M. Hafez, Y. C. Jiao, J. J. Shi, Y. Ma, D. X. Cao, Y. Y. Liu and H. L. Zhu, *Adv. Mater.*, 2018, **30**, 1802156.
- 4 W. Xu, J. Wang, F. Ding, X. Chen, E. Nasybulin, Y. Zhang and J.-G. Zhang, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2014, 7, 513–537.
- 5 Y. Lu, Z. Tu and L. A. Archer, Nat. Mater., 2014, 13, 961–969.
- 6 J. Li, S. Basu, Y. P. Wang, Z. Z. Chen, P. Hundekar,
 B. W. Wang, J. Shi, Y. F. Shi, S. Narayanan and
 N. Koratkar, *Science*, 2018, 359, 1513–1516.
- 7 X. B. Cheng, R. Zhang, C. Z. Zhao and Q. Zhang, *Chem. Rev.*, 2017, **117**, 10403–10473.
- 8 Z. Y. Tu, S. Choudhury, M. J. Zachman, S. Y. Wei, K. H. Zhang, L. F. Kourkoutis and L. A. Archer, *Nat. Energy*, 2018, 3, 310–316.
- 9 J. Janek and W. G. Zeier, Nat. Energy, 2016, 1, 16141.
- 10 A. Manthiram, X. Yu and S. Wang, Nat. Rev. Mater., 2017, 2, 16103.
- 11 H. Y. Huo, J. Gao, N. Zhao, D. X. Zhang, N. G. Holmes, X. N. Li, Y. P. Sun, J. M. Fu, R. Y. Li, X. X. Guo and X. L. Sun, *Nat. Commun.*, 2021, **12**, 176.
- 12 F. P. Zhao, Q. Sun, C. Yu, S. M. Zhang, K. Adair, S. Z. Wang, Y. L. Liu, Y. Zhao, J. W. Liang, C. H. Wang, X. N. Li, X. Li, W. Xia, R. Y. Li, H. Huang, L. Zhang, S. Q. Zhao, S. G. Lu and X. L. Sun, *ACS Energy Lett.*, 2020, 5, 1035–1043.
- 13 R. Murugan, V. Thangadurai and W. Weppner, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2007, **46**, 7778–7781.
- 14 S. Afyon, F. Krumeich and J. L. M. Rupp, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2015, **3**, 18636–18648.
- 15 T. Krauskopf, R. Dippel, H. Hartmann, K. Peppler, B. Mogwitz, F. H. Richter, W. G. Zeier and J. Janek, *Joule*, 2019, **3**, 2030–2049.
- 16 J. van den Broek, S. Afyon and J. L. M. Rupp, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2016, **6**, 1600736.
- 17 R. H. Basappa, T. Ito and H. Yamada, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 2017, **164**, A666–A671.
- 18 E. J. Cheng, A. Sharafi and J. Sakamoto, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2017, 223, 85–91.
- L. Cheng, E. J. Crumlin, W. Chen, R. M. Qiao, H. M. Hou, S. F. Lux, V. Zorba, R. Russo, R. Kostecki, Z. Liu, K. Persson, W. L. Yang, J. Cabana, T. Richardson, G. Y. Chen and M. Doeff, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2014, 16, 18294–18300.
- 20 A. Sharafi, E. Kazyak, A. L. Davis, S. Yu, T. Thompson, D. J. Siegel, N. P. Dasgupta and J. Sakamoto, *Chem. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 7961–7968.
- 21 J. F. Wu, B. W. Pu, D. Wang, S. Q. Shi, N. Zhao, X. X. Guo and X. Guo, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2019, **11**, 898–905.
- 22 F. D. Han, A. S. Westover, J. Yue, X. L. Fan, F. Wang, M. F. Chi, D. N. Leonard, N. J. Dudney, H. Wang and C. S. Wang, *Nat. Energy*, 2019, 4, 187–196.
- 23 X. G. Han, Y. H. Gong, K. Fu, X. F. He, G. T. Hitz, J. Q. Dai, A. Pearse, B. Y. Liu, H. Wang, G. Rubloff, Y. F. Mo,

V. Thangadurai, E. D. Wachsman and L. B. Hu, *Nat. Mater.*, 2017, **16**, 572–579.

- 24 K. K. Fu, Y. H. Gong, B. Y. Liu, Y. Z. Zhu, S. M. Xu, Y. G. Yao,
 W. Luo, C. W. Wang, S. D. Lacey, J. Q. Dai, Y. N. Chen, Y. F. Mo,
 E. D. Wachsman and L. B. Hu, *Sci. Adv.*, 2017, 3, e1601659.
- 25 Y. L. Song, L. Y. Yang, W. G. Zhao, Z. J. Wang, Y. Zhao,
 Z. Q. Wang, Q. H. Zhao, H. Liu and F. Pan, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2019, 9, 1900671.
- 26 X. L. Fan, X. Ji, F. Han, J. Yue, J. Chen, L. Chen, T. Deng, J. J. Jiang and C. S. Wang, *Sci. Adv.*, 2018, 4, eaau9245.
- 27 X. Ji, S. Hou, P. F. Wang, X. Z. He, N. Piao, J. Chen, X. L. Fan and C. S. Wang, *Adv. Mater.*, 2020, **32**(46), 2002741.
- 28 X. Y. Li, L. Lu, J. G. Li, X. Zhang and H. J. Gao, Nat. Rev. Mater., 2020, 5, 706–723.
- 29 Z. Q. Liu, M. A. Meyers, Z. F. Zhang and R. O. Ritchie, *Prog. Mater. Sci.*, 2017, 88, 467–498.
- 30 H. S. Wang, D. C. Lin, Y. Y. Liu, Y. Z. Li and Y. Cui, *Sci. Adv.*, 2011, 3, e1701301.
- 31 L. L. Wang, S. Y. Fu, T. Zhao, J. Qian, N. Chen, L. Li, F. Wu and R. J. Chen, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2020, 8, 1247.
- 32 F. Aqra and A. Ayyad, Metall. Mater. Trans. A, 2011, 42, 2680–2684.
- 33 H. Okamoto, J. Phase Equilib. Diffus., 2012, 33, 500.
- 34 J. Kasemchainan, S. Zekoll, D. S. Jolly, Z. Y. Ning, G. O. Hartley, J. Marrow and P. G. Bruce, *Nat. Mater.*, 2019, 18, 1105–1111.
- 35 T. Krauskopf, H. Hartmann, W. G. Zeier and J. Janek, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2019, 11, 14463–14477.
- 36 X. Liu, J. Q. Huang, Q. Zhang and L. Q. Mai, *Adv. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 1601759.
- 37 A. Manthiram, Y. Z. Fu, S.-H. Chung, C. X. Zu and Y. S. Su, *Chem. Rev.*, 2014, **114**, 11751–11787.
- 38 W. J. Xue, Z. Shi, L. M. Suo, C. Wang, Z. Q. Wang, H. Z. Wang, K. P. So, A. Maurano, D. W. Yu, Y. M. Chen, L. Qie, Z. Zhu, G. Y. Xu, J. Kong and J. Li, *Nat. Energy*, 2019, 4, 374–382.
- 39 A. Jain, S. P. Ong, G. Hautier, W. Chen, W. D. Richards, S. Dacek, S. Cholia, D. Gunter, D. Skinner, G. Ceder and K. A. Persson, *APL Mater.*, 2013, 1, 011002.
- 40 R. Nityananda, P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.*, 1964, 136, B864.
- 41 W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev., 1965, 140, A1133.
- 42 G. Kresse, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1993, 47, 558.
- 43 P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1994, 50, 17953.
- 44 G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1996, 54, 11169.
- 45 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, 77, 3865.
- 46 S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich and H. Krieg, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **132**, 154104.
- 47 H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, *Phys. Rev. B: Solid State*, 1976, **13**, 5188.
- 48 K. Momma and F. Izumi, J. Appl. Crystallogr., 2011, 44, 1272–1276.