UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Exploring the Ion Solvation Environments in Solid-State Polymer Electrolytes through Free-Energy Sampling

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2488g43t>

Journal

Macromolecules, 54(18)

ISSN

0024-9297

Authors

Sundararaman, S
Halat, DM
Choo, Y
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2021-09-28

DOI

10.1021/acs.macromol.1c01417

Peer reviewed

Exploring the Ion Solvation Environments in Solid-State Polymer Electrolytes through Free-Energy Sampling

Siddharth Sundararaman,* David M. Halat, Youngwoo Choo, Rachel L. Snyder, Brooks A. Abel, Geoffrey W. Coates, Jeffrey A. Reimer, Nitash P. Balsara, and David Prendergast

Cite This: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.macromol.1c01417>

Read Online

ACCESS |

Metrics & More

Article Recommendations

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: The success of polyethylene oxide (PEO) in solid-state polymer electrolytes for lithium-ion batteries is well established. Recently, in order to understand this success and to explore possible alternatives, we studied polyacetal electrolytes to deepen the understanding of the effect of the local chemical structure on ion transport. Advanced molecular dynamics techniques using newly developed, tailored interaction potentials have helped elucidate the various coordination environments of ions in these systems. In particular, the competition between cation–anion pairing and coordination by the polymer has been explored using free-energy sampling (metadynamics). At equivalent reduced temperatures, with respect to the polymer-specific glass-transition temperature, two-dimensional free-energy plots reveal the existence of multiple coordination environments for the lithium (Li) ions in these systems and their relative stabilities. Furthermore, we observe that the Li-ion movement in PEO follows a serial, stepwise pathway when moving from one coordination state to another, whereas this happens in a more continuous and concerted fashion in a polyacetal such as poly(1,3-dioxalane) [P(EO-MO)]. The implication is that interconversion between coordination states of the Li ions may be easier in P(EO-MO). However, the overarching observation from our free-energy analysis is that Li-ion coordination is dominated by the polymer (in either case) and contact-ion pairs are rare. We rationalize the observed higher increase in glass-transition temperature (T_g) with salt loading in polyacetals as due to intermolecular Li-ion coordination involving multiple polymer chains, rather than just one chain for PEO-based electrolytes. This interchain coupling in the polyacetals, resulting in the higher T_g , works against any gains due to variations in Li-ion coordination that might enhance transport processes over PEO. Further research is required to overcome the interdependence between local coordination and macroscopic properties to compete with PEO electrolytes at the same absolute working temperature.

INTRODUCTION

Lithium-ion batteries are high-energy-density power sources that find uses in the automobile industry for electric cars and various portable devices like smartphones and laptops.^{1,2} There are strong motivations for developing solid-state electrolytes, with solid polymer electrolytes (SPEs) being prime candidates, since they have strong mechanical stability and avoid safety concerns associated with the combination of flammable liquid electrolytes and cell shorting due to lithium dendrite growth in the current technology.^{3–9} Since the early work of Wright^{10,11} and Armand,¹² poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO) has been studied extensively and has remained one of the more promising SPEs.^{6,13,14} Polymer electrolytes usually behave as hosts for the ions in the system, with the ions having the ability to move

through the free volume of the polymers assisted by the segmental motion, with reasonable conductivity possible above the glass-transition temperature.⁶ Therefore, effective dissolution of the cations and a low glass-transition temperature are key to good ionic properties in these systems.¹³ Unfortunately, slow ionic conductivities and low transference numbers in

Received: July 2, 2021

ACS Publications

© XXXX American Chemical Society

A

<https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.macromol.1c01417>
Macromolecules XXXX, XXX, XXX–XXX

42 SPEs at battery working temperatures have significantly
 43 hindered their performance for practical applications.^{6,13–18}
 44 Standard molecular dynamics (MD) protocols have been
 45 used extensively to explore the ion coordination environments
 46 and try to understand the transport mechanism in PEO/
 47 lithium bis(trifluoromethanesulfonyl)imide (LiTFSI) sys-
 48 tems.^{19–28} Borodin and Smith²¹ used a quantum chemistry-
 49 based many-body polarizable force field to look at the local ion
 50 coordination environment, ion aggregation, and various
 51 contributions to cation transport. They found in their
 52 simulations that Li-ion motion is a combination of motion
 53 along the polymer chains, along with the segmental motion of
 54 PEO, and ion hopping from one segment to another at
 55 different timescales. Motivated by experimental findings,²⁹
 56 Diddens and Heuer confirmed that at lower salt concen-
 57 trations, all Li ions are coordinated by PEO chains and that the
 58 improved Li-ion transport with addition of ionic liquids was
 59 due to the plasticizing effect of the ionic liquid molecules.²²
 60 Recently, Molinari and co-workers²⁴ showed that asymmetrical
 61 negatively charged clusters at high LiTFSI concentrations are a
 62 possible reason for experimental negative transference
 63 numbers. Standard MD protocols are however plagued by
 64 drawbacks of system size effects, starting configuration
 65 dependence, and limited sampling as compared to residence
 66 times in coordination environments that can affect the
 67 accuracy of the various ensemble averages calculated in spite
 68 of the long times that are usually used in these simulations.
 69 Recent work by Baskin and Prendergast^{30,31} illustrated the use
 70 of free-energy sampling methods like umbrella sampling^{32,33}
 71 and metadynamics^{34,35} in the framework of both classical and
 72 ab initio MD to overcome some of these deficiencies and gain
 73 more rigorous insight into ion solvation environments.
 74 In our previous work,^{36,37} the design strategy that was
 75 employed was to maintain a high oxygen to carbon ratio in the
 76 backbone of the polymer to provide sufficient well-connected
 77 solvation sites for the Li cation by incorporating methylene
 78 oxide (O–CH₂ or MO) repeat units into the polymer
 79 backbone along with ethylene oxide (O–CH₂–CH₂ or EO).
 80 A series of such polyacetals with varying ratios of EO and MO
 81 in the repeat units, P(*n*EO-*m*MO), were synthesized³⁶ and
 82 systematically studied electrochemically³⁷ and through pulsed
 83 field gradient nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy
 84 measurements and MD simulations.³⁶ The polymers studied
 85 previously were P(EO-2MO), P(EO-MO), P(2EO-MO),
 86 P(3EO-MO), and P(4EO-MO) compared to PEO with
 87 LiTFSI salt. Polyacetal–LiTFSI SPEs were studied at similar
 88 reduced temperatures ($T - T_g$) as the glass-transition
 89 temperatures in the presence of LiTFSI varied significantly.
 90 It was observed that at a given reduced temperature, the cation
 91 self-diffusion coefficient was higher in each polyacetal
 92 derivative as compared to PEO. It was also observed that
 93 P(EO-MO) and P(EO-2MO) exhibit significantly lower anion
 94 self-diffusion coefficients as compared to the polyacetals in the
 95 series. Preliminary MD simulations revealed that the MO
 96 repeat units containing polymers (i.e., polyacetals) have
 97 additional ether oxygens close to the cation coordination
 98 environment in a second coordination shell, which distort the
 99 primary coordination environment and possibly improve Li-
 100 ion transport at a given reduced temperature in these systems.
 101 In the present work, we use MD simulations and free-energy
 102 sampling (metadynamics) to gather further atomic level insight
 103 into the different coordination environments that exist in these
 104 systems, their relative stabilities, and how they might affect

transport mechanisms. Our goal is to understand the
 underlying structural differences in the lithium coordination
 environments in these poly(ether-acetal) systems and how
 interchangeable they are. For simplicity, we compare PEO to
 P(EO-MO), the most efficacious polymer of the polyacetals
 studied previously.³⁷ We observe from metadynamics simu-
 lations the existence of multiple stable coordination environ-
 ments with differing numbers of coordinating oxygen atoms
 from the polymer and TFSI. The importance of running
 advanced free-energy calculations as compared to a regular
 MD protocol is most notable upon examination of the relative
 stabilities of various coordination environments, which might
 easily form irreversibly during tractable MD simulations,
 thereby overestimating their statistical significance. Further-
 more, PEO exhibits a serial, stepwise minimum free-energy
 pathway to convert from one coordination state to another,
 while P(EO-MO) has a more direct, continuous pathway with
 the transition occurring in a more concerted fashion. However,
 we know that the polyacetals experience a larger increase in T_g
 upon addition of LiTFSI salt, which works against any
 enhanced transport mechanisms at the same absolute temper-
 ature. Our simulations indicate that this is due to enhanced
 interchain connectivity through Li-ion coordination in the
 polyacetals. Overall, these insights provide a fundamental
 understanding of the structural differences between local
 coordination of Li ions in both systems and indicate that
 reducing the T_g increase upon salt loading should be key to
 defining new chemistries for SPEs and improving performance
 for Li-ion battery applications.

134 METHODS

The **Methods** section is divided into three parts. In the first part, we
 describe the MD protocol that we use to prepare the polymer systems
 with ions at various concentrations. In the second part, we delve into
 the functional form of the force field and the methods used to
 optimize the existing generalized AMBER force field (GAFF)
 interaction potential³⁸ to predict the angles, bonds, dihedrals, and
 bulk properties, such as density, more reliably over a wide range of
 compositions. Finally, we elaborate on the free-energy calculations
 performed using these newly optimized potentials to reveal the
 prevalent coordination environments of the ions and to explore the
 mechanism of contact-ion-pair formation.

MD Protocol. MD simulations were performed using the large-
 scale atomic/molecular massively parallel simulator (LAMMPS)
 code³⁹ using an interaction potential with the GAFF³⁸ functional form

$$E_{\text{tot}} = \sum_{\text{bonds}} K_r(r - r_0)^2 + \sum_{\text{angles}} K_\theta(\theta - \theta_0)^2 \\ + \sum_{\text{dihedrals}} K_\phi[1 + d \cos(n\phi)] \\ + \sum_{i < j} \left(4\epsilon_{ij} \left[\frac{\sigma_{ij}^{12}}{r_{ij}^{12}} - \frac{\sigma_{ij}^6}{r_{ij}^6} \right] + \frac{q_i q_j}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r_{ij}} \right) \quad (1)$$

where K_r , K_θ , and K_ϕ are force constants; r_0 , θ_0 , and ϕ_0 are the
 equilibrium bond length, bond angle, and dihedral angle, respectively;
 n is the multiplicity; the σ_{ij} and ϵ_{ij} parameters characterize a Lennard-
 Jones (LJ) non-bonded interaction; and q_i is the partial charge on the
 atoms. The total energy E_{tot} is hence expressed as a summation of
 harmonic bond, angle, and dihedral terms that are primarily intrachain
 in nature and LJ and electrostatic interactions that largely determine
 interchain interactions (although they are relevant if the polymer
 chain is highly curved or forms loops). The partial charges were
 calculated using the restrained electrostatic potential (RESP) model⁴⁰
 after ab initio optimization of isolated molecules with the B3LYP
 hybrid density functional and the 6-311++gss basis set using

162 TeraChem.^{41–43} The charges on the ions were scaled by 0.8 based on
 163 ab initio results and suggestions from the previous literature^{44,45} to
 164 emulate polarization effects. Geometric mixing rules were used for
 165 unlike LJ parameters (σ_{ij} , ϵ_{ij}). Intramolecular pairwise LJ and
 166 coulombic interactions separated by one and two bonds were set to
 167 0, while those separated by three were set to 0.8 and 0.5, respectively.
 168 The short-range cutoff was set to 13 Å, while the electrostatic
 169 interactions were cut off at 14 Å. The time step used for all our MD
 170 simulations was 1 fs unless otherwise specified.

171 A multi-step annealing protocol was used to create the MD
 172 structures used in this work (see the top panel of Figure 1). A single

interchain interactions are determined by LJ and electrostatic
 interactions. Hence, we can reasonably separate the optimization of
 the intrachain parameters to predict the correct bonds, angles, and
 dihedrals, while holding the charge and the LJ parameters fixed, and
 modify the latter to optimize bulk properties, such as mass density.

Optimizing the existing GAFF interaction potential³⁸ first required
 a reliable set of reference data for bonds, angles, and dihedrals which
 were produced by relaxing various isolated structures of the monomer
 or dimer using density functional theory, as described in the previous
 section. As mentioned previously, the partial charges for the
 optimization were calculated using the RESP model,⁴⁰ with the
 charges on the ions scaled by 0.8 based on ab initio results and
 suggestions from the previous literature^{44,45} to emulate polarization
 effects. Figure 2 shows the density predicted by the new optimized

Figure 1. Top: Schematic for ion–polymer system preparation; bottom: saturation of density with annealing cycles.

173 chain of the polymer with a chain length of 15–20 monomer units
 174 was first created and relaxed in the NVT ensemble [where NVT
 175 implies a constant number of particles (N), volume (V), and
 176 temperature (T)] at 300 K. A total of 30 such relaxed chains were
 177 placed in a large box at a very low density (0.1–0.25 g/cm³) to avoid
 178 any overlap, and the correct amount of Li and TFSI ions for the
 179 specific composition were randomly distributed. Salt concentrations
 180 studied in this work ranged from $r = 0$ to 0.16, where $r = [\text{Li}]/[\text{O}]$
 181 (the ratio of Li ions to polymer oxygens), with the upper bound
 182 defined by involvement of all available O atoms in Li-ion
 183 coordination, assuming an average of 6 coordinating O atoms per
 184 Li ion. Each annealing cycle consisted of first heating the system from
 185 300 to 900 K in steps of 60 K, relaxing at each step for 20 ps at a
 186 nominal heating rate of 3 K/ps, relaxing the system for 100 ps at that
 187 temperature and slowly cooling down the system again in steps of 60
 188 K at a nominal cooling rate of 3 K/ps in the NVT ensemble, followed
 189 by a room-temperature relaxation in the NPT ensemble [where NPT
 190 implies a constant number of particles (N), pressure (P), and
 191 temperature (T)] at 300 K at atmospheric pressure (1 bar) for 50 ps,
 192 allowing for the density to change. The variation of density with each
 193 annealing cycle is shown in the bottom panel of Figure 1. Based on
 194 these data, we chose to perform 20 annealing cycles for each system to
 195 ensure that the system has reached an equilibrium density. The
 196 resulting samples were then heated to various temperatures and
 197 relaxed for 50–100 ns in the NVT ensemble for further structural
 198 analysis.

199 **Potential Optimization.** As stated above, the first three terms in
 200 eq 1 that define polymer interactions are intrachain in nature, largely
 201 determining the bonds, angles, and dihedrals, respectively, while the

Figure 2. Density predicted by the newly optimized potential for PEO and P(EO-MO) at varying salt loadings compared to available experimental results for PEO.⁴⁶

potential for two systems of interest, PEO and P(EO-MO), compared
 with experimental data for PEO.⁴⁶ It is observed that our new
 potential performs well in predicting the measured density of PEO for
 a wide salt concentration range (see Tables S1–S4 for details).

Furthermore, when we tested the interaction potentials for
 oligomers of different lengths, we observed that the original
 (unoptimized) GAFF interaction potential was unable to predict
 the densities correctly over a range of lengths (see Figure S1). Our
 optimized potential performed well for the longer oligomers
 (approximating the polymer) but was not able to predict the density
 correctly at shorter lengths (approximating a molecular liquid). To
 address this issue, we modified the LJ interaction for terminal carbons
 in each chain to be slightly more repulsive (by increasing σ by a factor
 of 1.25 and reducing ϵ by the same factor)—terminal interactions
 necessarily begin to dominate for shorter oligomers. With this
 modification (see Table S5 for modified parameters), we see that the
 previously observed accuracy in predicting the density of long
 oligomers (>8 repeat units) remains unaffected, but now, we can also
 reproduce the density for shorter chain lengths. We include this detail
 for future work. However, the metadynamics simulations for longer
 oligomers reported below were performed using our first density-
 optimized potential and were not repeated to include this
 modification of termini repulsion. Smaller-scale simulations for
 these approximations to polymer systems showed no discernible
 differences with either potential.

Metadynamics. Polymer conformations produced using the
 aforementioned simulated annealing protocol were used as initial
 configurations to perform free-energy calculations using the
 metadynamics approach. It is important to note that the T_g values
 predicted by our potential are relatively high as compared to
 experimentally determined T_g values and, hence, for similar
 phenomenological results, we studied these systems at similar effective
 temperatures as compared to experiments. The PEO and P(EO-MO)
 electrolytes studied here had the same salt concentration, $r = 0.08$, 249

Figure 3. Radial distribution function of the Li ions with respect to the oxygen atoms from the (a) polymer and (b) TFSI and the corresponding CNs (c,d), respectively.

Figure 4. Pathways: 2D free-energy analysis of solvation of the Li cation and TFSI anion in PEO and P(EO-MO). Coordination with respect to oxygens of ether/acetyl and oxygens of TFSI anions are used as collective variables. Serial process: PEO shows distinct stepwise pathways to move from one coordination state to another (arrows for guide show the polymer oxygen forming a bond in the first step and then the TFSI oxygen bond breaking in the second step). Concerted process: P(EO-MO) shows a more direct path that implies that bond breaking and forming happen in a more concerted way that allows for easier switching among cation coordinations.

250 and were held at effective temperatures ($T_{\text{eff}} = T - T_g$) of about 120
251 K, corresponding to absolute temperatures of 573 and 648 K,
252 respectively. The first collective variable used in this analysis was the
253 coordination number (CN) of a Li ion with respect to oxygen atoms
254 from the anion (TFSI). The other collective variable was the CN of a
255 Li ion with respect to the oxygen atoms of the polymer. These
256 collective variables together represent the enthalpy of solvation of the
257 lithium ion in different coordination environments. The CN is
258 calculated as follows:

$$\text{CN}(\text{type 1, type 2}) = \sum_{i \in \text{type 1}} \sum_{j \in \text{type 2}} \frac{1 - \left(\frac{|r_i - r_j|}{r_0}\right)^6}{1 - \left(\frac{|r_i - r_j|}{r_0}\right)^{12}} \quad (2)$$

259

260 where type 1 is a specific Li ion in our simulations, type 2 is either
261 oxygen of the anion or oxygen of the polymer, and r_0 is the cutoff

distance defined for the two groups of atoms. This definition of CN⁴⁷
262 provides a continuous function, which is why we can have non-
263 integral CNs in our simulations. The various parameters used for the
264 metadynamics simulations such as height (H , kcal/mol) and width
265 (W , unitless) of the Gaussian hills, frequency of hill addition (F , freq,
266 steps), cutoff used for measuring the CN of the Li ion with the
267 polymer and TFSI oxygen atoms ($r_0^{\text{Li-poly}}$ and $r_0^{\text{Li-TFSI}}$, Å), and the
268 simulation time of the calculations (t , ns) are all listed in Table S6 for
269 both the initial tests and the production runs. 270

These simulations are performed at a finite salt concentration, with
271 a fixed number of Li ions in the simulation cell, but our analysis
272 focuses on a single, randomly chosen Li ion. Therefore, we checked
273 for independence of our results on the specific choice of the Li ion.
274 Metadynamics simulations were performed based on using CNs
275 centered around three different Li ions for each system with different
276 starting coordination environments (see Table S7). Irrespective of the
277 Li ion chosen or its initial coordination environment, the resulting
278

Figure 5. 1D cut of the free-energy curves at different numbers of oxygens from TFSI for (a) PEO and (b) P(EO-MO), at different numbers of oxygens from the polymer for (c) PEO and (d) P(EO-MO), and along a diagonal from (4,1) to (5,0) for (e) PEO and (5,1) to (6,0) for (f) P(EO-MO).

free-energy landscapes are practically identical (see Figure S2). Based on this sensitivity analysis, we continued running only one of the simulations for each system to conserve computational time.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section is divided into two parts: first, we investigated the local structural differences in the Li-ion coordination environments within PEO and P(EO-MO) and then performed free-energy calculations at the same effective temperature ($T_{\text{eff}} = T - T_g$) to reveal the relative stability of distinct ion coordinations and the energy barriers to their interconversion. Next, we delved into the effect of salt loading on T_g in the poly(ether-acetal) series to understand why each polymer derivative responds differently and how this affects the performance of SPEs for battery applications.

Understanding Coordination Environments. MD simulations using our optimized interaction potentials have

helped to reveal subtle differences in the Li-ion coordination environment in the poly(ether-acetal) series (see Figure 3a for radial distribution functions and Figure 3c for average CN with respect to polymer oxygen atoms). In our previous work,³⁶ we observed that polymers containing MO units exhibit a second oxygen coordination shell around the Li ion, which appears to distort the first coordination shell [see the second peak in the P(EO-MO) radial distribution function, between 3 and 4 Å, the inset of Figure 3a]. Our presumption is that this may create a more open cage structure around the Li ion that facilitates ion transport from one cage to another. The distorted Li-ion coordination environment may also assist in the formation of a lower coordination transition state while the Li ions move from one cage to another. We also see that Li ions in P(EO-MO) have a higher average CN (CN = 7) as compared to PEO (CN = 6), but the increased CN is limited to intermediate distances (3–4 Å).

Table 1. Probability of Finding a Li Ion in Different Coordination Environments in PEO

coordination state	energy (kT)	probability (metadynamics)	probability (regular MD protocol) 50 ns	probability (regular MD protocol) 100 ns
(2,2)	12.480	1.252×10^{-5}	0.0009	0.0016
(3,2)	6.941	0.003185	0.0071	0.0078
(4,2)	8.892	4.527×10^{-4}	0.0073	0.0056
(3,1)	9.717	1.984×10^{-4}	0.0074	0.0074
(4,1)	4.169	0.0510	0.0904	0.0914
(5,1)	5.530	0.0130	0.0639	0.0631
(6,1)	17.04	1.310×10^{-7}	0.0076	0.0072
(4,0)	9.907	1.641×10^{-4}	0.0200	0.0192
(5,0)	2.648	0.2330	0.2946	0.3022
(6,0)	1.550	0.6990	0.4612	0.4578
(7,0)	11.59	3.048×10^{-5}	0.0397	0.0368

Table 2. Probability of Finding a Li Ion in Different Coordination Environments in P(EO-MO)

coordination state	energy (kT)	probability (metadynamics)	probability (regular MD protocol) 50 ns	probability (regular MD protocol) 100 ns
(2,2)	11.80	1.266×10^{-5}	0.0025	0.0029
(3,2)	7.288	0.0012	0.0042	0.0044
(4,2)	8.701	2.807×10^{-4}	0.0033	0.0034
(3,1)	9.688	1.046×10^{-4}	0.0039	0.0043
(4,1)	6.334	0.0030	0.0466	0.0476
(5,1)	4.200	0.0253	0.0476	0.0483
(6,1)	6.699	0.0021	0.0129	0.0129
(5,0)	5.490	0.0070	0.2175	0.2205
(6,0)	1.110	0.5560	0.4206	0.4162
(7,0)	1.455	0.3940	0.2090	0.2078
(8,0)	4.986	0.0012	0.0319	0.0317

Our MD simulations indicate a reduced propensity for cation–anion pairs in P(EO-MO) versus PEO [see the reduced intensity in the first peak of the radial distribution function (see Figure 3b) and the overall reduction in average CN with respect to O atoms in TFSI (see Figure 3d)]. We rationalize this observation as due to the more negative partial charge on the MO oxygen atoms as compared to the oxygen atoms of EO moieties. In this sense, P(EO-MO) can compete more effectively than PEO against the TFSI anion for coordinating Li ions, thereby resulting in a lower number of ion pairs.

Free-energy calculations further elucidate the relative stabilities of the distinct Li–O coordination environments and the possible pathways to move between them (see Figure 4). Our results suggest that multiple Li-ion coordination environments coexist in both PEO and P(EO-MO), as evidenced by multiple deep minima.

In PEO, we observe that the deepest free-energy minimum is close to coordinations (5,0) and (6,0), that is, with 5–6 oxygen atoms from the polymer (O_{polymer}) and no oxygen atoms from the TFSI anion (O_{TFSI}). The second most stable coordination states are at (5,1) and (4,1), that is, with 1 O_{TFSI} and 4–5 O_{polymer} , and further less stable minima are found near (2,2), (3,2), (4,2), (3,1), (6,1), (4,0), and (7,0). Similarly in P(EO-MO), we observe that the deepest minimum is close to (6,0) and (7,0), that is, with no O_{TFSI} and 6–7 O_{polymer} . The second most stable coordination state is at (5,1), and further

less stable minima are found near (2,2), (3,2), (4,2), (3,1), (4,1), (6,1), (5,0), and (8,0).

Figure 5a,b shows horizontal one-dimensional (1D) free-energy cuts for PEO and PEOMO through the two-dimensional (2D) landscapes for various O_{TFSI} (Figure 5c,d shows similar vertical cuts for various O_{polymer}) and Figure 5e,f shows a cut along a diagonal from (4,1) to (5,0) for PEO and (5,1) to (6,0) for P(EO-MO).

Based on the free energies of each minimum, we calculated the approximate probability of a Li ion being in a given coordination state by using an approximate partition function. If ΔG_i is the relative free energy of a specific coordination environment, then the probability of finding a Li ion in that environment (p_i) is given by eq 3

$$p_i = \frac{e^{-\beta \Delta G_i}}{\sum_j e^{-\beta \Delta G_j}} \quad (3)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$. The probability of finding Li ions in each of the distinct coordination environments considered is calculated based on this partition function and summarized in Table 1 for PEO and Table 2 for P(EO-MO). Direct comparison is provided based on MD sampling over 50 and 100 ns from regular (unbiased) trajectories in the NVT ensemble at the same temperature.

Our free-energy calculations show that the most likely Li-ion coordination environment involves 6 polymer oxygen atoms in both PEO and P(EO-MO), with no coordination to the oxygen atoms from the TFSI anion. The second most stable coordination state of the Li ion in both cases also excludes the anion, with a higher coordination state, (7,0), preferred in P(EO-MO) but the lower coordination state (5,0) preferred in PEO. In addition, P(EO-MO) exhibits a higher relative probability for the second coordination state versus PEO. We observe that the MD protocol and the free-energy calculations in both systems give the same order of relative stability for the various coordination environments. However, we see significant differences between the MD-sampled Li-ion coordination state probabilities and those estimated based on the relative free energies derived from metadynamics [see especially state (5,0) for P(EO-MO) in Table 2]. Overall, the low-probability coordination environments have higher populations in the MD trajectories, which we consider to be overestimates. This can be attributed to the relatively high residence times of certain ion coordination environments as compared to the total duration of the MD simulations of 50 ns and 100 ns in the regular MD protocol. It is also important to note that the probability of the various coordination states does not change significantly in the 50 ns between these two regular MD simulations. This would imply either that the regular MD protocol has equilibrated or the more likely scenario that it is stuck in a deep local minimum. Without foresight on the depth of the free-energy landscape, we cannot predict the convergence time. This further establishes the need for free-energy calculations, such as metadynamics, to avoid such pitfalls in regular MD protocols. Metadynamics has an inbuilt mechanism to iteratively add bias to the system to permit exploration of the various coordination environments in a reasonable amount of time. Furthermore, from Figure 4, we also confirm our previous hypothesis that the coordination environment in P(EO-MO) is more diffuse than in PEO as evidenced from the much wider minima in the free-energy curves.

Figure 6. Representative snapshots of some of the coordination environments along with the energy barriers to transition from one state to another in (a) PEO at 573 K and (b) P(EO-MO) at 648 K.

Another important insight gained from these calculations are the minimum free-energy pathways between different coordination environments (see Figure 4). PEO exhibits a serial, stepwise minimum free-energy pathway of bond making and breaking to move from one coordination state to another (Figure 4). To go from the (4,1) state to the (5,0) state in PEO, the minimum energy pathway for the Li ion is to first form an additional bond with a polymer oxygen atom, that is, (4,1) to (5,1), which requires an activation energy of about 1 kT (see Figure 5a), followed by breaking a TFSI oxygen bond, that is, (5,1) to (5,0), which requires an activation energy of about 1.5 kT (see Figure 5c). To go directly from the (4,1) to (5,0) state, PEO would require an activation energy of about 3 kT (see Figure 5e). The energy barriers for some of these transitions along with representative snapshots of the coordination states are summarized in Figure 6a.

P(EO-MO), on the other hand, has a more direct free-energy minimum pathway with the bond breaking and forming happening in a more concerted fashion. To go from (5,1) to (6,0) in P(EO-MO), the minimum energy pathway is a diagonal connecting the two states with the TFSI oxygen bond breaking and polymer oxygen bond forming happening

simultaneously with an energy barrier of about 2 kT (see Figure 5f). A stepwise pathway of first going from (5,1) to (6,1) would require overcoming an energy barrier of 2.5 kT first (see Figure 5b), followed by another 0.5–1 kT to move from (6,1) to (6,0) (see Figure 5d), which is energetically unfavorable. The energy barriers for some of these transitions along with representative snapshots of the coordination states are summarized in Figure 6b. Even though the net energy barriers for the minimum energy pathways for both systems are similar, a concerted direct process in P(EO-MO) allows for easier transport from one cage to another as compared to the stepwise process in PEO. We also observe that for a Li ion to transition from a fully polymer oxygen coordinated state to one with at least one oxygen from the TFSI anion has much higher thermal activation energies on average in P(EO-MO) as compared to PEO, which would further elucidate why there is a much lower ion-pair concentration in P(EO-MO).

Understanding Li-Polymer Connectivity. In the previous section, we observed that the transport mechanism for the most efficacious³⁷ of the MO-containing polymers, P(EO-MO), is probably more efficient at the same effective temperature. Unfortunately, even though the neat polymers

Figure 7. (a) Effect of salt loading on glass-transition temperatures from experiments.³⁶ (b) Average number of chains for different polymers required to coordinate a Li ion. (c) Representative snapshot of single-chain coordination of a Li atom observed in our simulations in PEO and both single-chain and multi-chain coordination in P(EO-MO). (d) Normalized frequency of finding a Li ion coordinated by different numbers of chains for PEO and (e) P(EO-MO) at 363 K.

have similar glass-transition temperatures, it was observed in our previous work³⁶ that addition of salt to the MO-containing polymers results in a larger increase in glass-transition temperature as compared to PEO, as seen in the left panel of Figure 7a.

This increase in the glass-transition temperature can be directly correlated with the number of polymer chains involved

in coordinating Li ions (see Figure 7b). It is observed that in the MO-containing polymers, multiple chains are involved in coordinating individual Li ions. A single chain of PEO on the other hand is more easily able to provide all the required oxygen atoms to fully coordinate the Li ion. Figure 7c shows representative snapshots of 6-fold coordinated Li ions in PEO coordinated by a single chain and in P(EO-MO) coordinated 456

by a single chain and two chains. We observe from a 50 ns simulation in the NVT ensemble at 363 K that in PEO, a Li ion on average is 80% coordinated by a single chain but only about 20% by two chains, with a negligible amount of three-chain coordination (see Figure 7d). On the other hand, in P(EO-MO), two-chain coordination predominates (70%), with single-chain and three-chain coordination being comparable to each other at about 15% (see Figure 7d).

We can speculate from the above data that in PEO, ion transport along polymer chains is much more common, with two-chain coordination occurring when the ion hops from one chain to another. In contrast, in P(EO-MO), Li-ion hopping between polymer chains occurs more frequently due to an inability to move along a single chain or that fully coordinated states are more energetically favorable when they involve two polymer chains. If the former is true, then P(EO-MO) facilitates a more three-dimensional ion transport mechanism, as compared to quasi-1D transport along single chains in PEO. Either way, the binding of multiple chains by the Li ions results in an undesirable increase in the T_g . The direct consequence of this is that in the polymers we have studied, even though the transport mechanism is possibly more efficient in the MO-containing polyacetals, their higher glass-transition temperature leads to lower performance at battery working temperatures with respect to PEO. Free-energy calculations to elucidate the relative stabilities of the binding motifs in these polymers and the energetics of moving along chains and between chains are currently ongoing, with the aim to help design new polymer electrolytes with favorable glass-transition temperatures and transport mechanisms.

CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we predominantly study two systems from the series of polymer electrolytes studied in our previous work,^{36,37} PEO and P(EO-MO) with LiTFSI, to gain insight into local ion coordination environments. Advanced free-energy sampling methods show the existence of multiple distinct coordination environments and their relative stabilities. The ordering of the associated populations of the coordinations is consistent with standard MD sampling; however, we view the MD-sampled populations as overestimates. We observe that the P(EO-MO) electrolyte on the whole prefers ion coordination environments with higher CNs as compared to PEO and has much more diffuse coordination environments. Furthermore, PEO has a less efficient, stepwise free-energy minimum pathway for interconversion of coordination states that involves sequentially forming and breaking bonds, while P(EO-MO) has a more direct path between coordination environments and achieves this in a more concerted and efficient way. However, performant electrolytes for battery materials require efficient mechanisms of transport coupled with low glass-transition temperatures. Even with a possibly less efficient transport mechanism at a given effective temperature, PEO still has a lower glass-transition temperature at specific salt loading and hence is still the most suited in this series of polymers for electrolyte materials for battery applications. We observe that a possible reason for this is single-chain coordination in PEO as compared to a higher propensity for multi-chain coordination in polyacetal systems. Further research to understand the energetics of these different binding motifs and transport along and between chains is currently ongoing to understand the correlation between the

local structure and macroscopic properties to guide future design of polymers that can compete with PEO electrolytes.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge at <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.macromol.1c01417>.

Details of the parameters used in the MD simulations for the LJ, bond, angle, and dihedral interactions for the potential used; details on the modifications to LJ parameters of the terminal carbons for fixing the density of shorter-chain-length polymers for future work along with the comparison of densities predicted by these potentials for oligomers of different lengths; details of the parameters used in the metadynamics simulations; starting configurations for initial tests; and comparison of these preliminary simulations (PDF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

Siddharth Sundararaman – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, the Molecular Foundry, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-4746-879X; Email: ssundararaman@lbl.gov

Authors

David M. Halat – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and College of Chemistry, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, United States; Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-0919-1689

Youngwoo Choo – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United States; orcid.org/0000-0003-2715-0618

Rachel L. Snyder – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Baker Laboratory, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-0569-0704

Brooks A. Abel – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Baker Laboratory, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-2288-1975

Geoffrey W. Coates – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Baker Laboratory, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-3400-2552

Jeffrey A. Reimer – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and College of Chemistry, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, United States; Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-4191-3725

Nitash P. Balsara – Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and College of Chemistry, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, United States; Joint Center for Energy Storage Research, Materials Sciences Division,

577 Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California
578 94720, United States; orcid.org/0000-0002-0106-5565
579 David Prendergast – Joint Center for Energy Storage
580 Research, the Molecular Foundry, Lawrence Berkeley
581 National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United
582 States; orcid.org/0000-0003-0598-1453

583 Complete contact information is available at:
584 <https://pubs.acs.org/10.1021/acs.macromol.1c01417>

585 Notes

586 The authors declare no competing financial interest.

587 ■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

588 This work was fully supported by the Joint Center for Energy
589 Storage Research (JCESR), an Energy Innovation Hub funded
590 by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic
591 Energy Sciences. All simulations were performed at the
592 Molecular Foundry, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

593 ■ REFERENCES

- 594 (1) Whittingham, M. S. Lithium batteries and cathode materials.
595 *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 4271–4302.
596 (2) Lu, L.; Han, X.; Li, J.; Hua, J.; Ouyang, M. A review on the key
597 issues for lithium-ion battery management in electric vehicles. *J. Power*
598 *Sources* **2013**, *226*, 272–288.
599 (3) Xu, K. Nonaqueous liquid electrolytes for lithium-based
600 rechargeable batteries. *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 4303–4418.
601 (4) Tarascon, J.-M.; Armand, M. Issues and challenges facing
602 rechargeable lithium batteries. *Nature* **2010**, *171*–179.
603 (5) Wong, D. H. C.; Thelen, J. L.; Fu, Y.; Devaux, D.; Pandya, A. A.;
604 Battaglia, V. S.; Balsara, N. P.; DeSimone, J. M. Nonflammable
605 perfluoropolyether-based electrolytes for lithium batteries. *Proc. Natl.*
606 *Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **2014**, *111*, 3327–3331.
607 (6) Xue, Z.; He, D.; Xie, X. Poly (ethylene oxide)-based electrolytes
608 for lithium-ion batteries. *J. Mater. Chem. A* **2015**, *3*, 19218–19253.
609 (7) Diddens, D.; Heuer, A. Simulation study of the lithium ion
610 transport mechanism in ternary polymer electrolytes: the critical role
611 of the segmental mobility. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2014**, *118*, 1113–1125.
612 (8) Armand, M.; Tarascon, J.-M. Building better batteries. *nature*
613 **2008**, *451*, 652–657.
614 (9) Christie, A. M.; Lilley, S. J.; Staunton, E.; Andreev, Y. G.; Bruce,
615 P. G. Increasing the conductivity of crystalline polymer electrolytes.
616 *Nature* **2005**, *433*, 50–53.
617 (10) Fenton, D. E.; Parker, J. M.; Wright, P. V. Complexes of alkali
618 metal ions with poly (ethylene oxide). *Polymer* **1973**, *14*, 589.
619 (11) Wright, P. V. Electrical conductivity in ionic complexes of poly
620 (ethylene oxide). *Br. Polym. J.* **1975**, *7*, 319–327.
621 (12) Armand, M. Polymer solid electrolytes-an overview. *Solid State*
622 *Ionics* **1983**, *9–10*, 745–754.
623 (13) Mindemark, J.; Lacey, M. J.; Bowden, T.; Brandell, D. Beyond
624 PEO—Alternative host materials for Li⁺-conducting solid polymer
625 electrolytes. *Prog. Polym. Sci.* **2018**, *81*, 114–143.
626 (14) Meyer, W. H. Polymer electrolytes for lithium-ion batteries.
627 *Adv. Mater.* **1998**, *10*, 439–448.
628 (15) Di Noto, V.; Lavina, S.; Giffin, G. A.; Negro, E.; Scrosati, B.
629 Polymer electrolytes: Present, past and future. *Electrochim. Acta* **2011**,
630 *57*, 4–13.
631 (16) Manuel Stephan, A.; Nahm, K. S. Review on composite
632 polymer electrolytes for lithium batteries. *Polymer* **2006**, *47*, 5952–
633 5964.
634 (17) Quartarone, E.; Mustarelli, P.; Magistris, A. PEO-based
635 composite polymer electrolytes. *Solid State Ionics* **1998**, *110*, 1–14.
636 (18) Xu, K. Electrolytes and interphases in Li-ion batteries and
637 beyond. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 11503–11618.

- (19) Müller-Plathe, F.; van Gunsteren, W. F. Computer simulation
of a polymer electrolyte: Lithium iodide in amorphous poly (ethylene
oxide). *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *103*, 4745–4756.
(20) Borodin, O.; Smith, G. D. Molecular dynamics simulations of
poly (ethylene oxide)/LiI melts. 2. Dynamic properties. *Macro-*
molecules **2000**, *33*, 2273–2283.
(21) Borodin, O.; Smith, G. D. Mechanism of ion transport in
amorphous poly (ethylene oxide)/LiTFSI from molecular dynamics
simulations. *Macromolecules* **2006**, *39*, 1620–1629.
(22) Diddens, D.; Heuer, A. Lithium ion transport mechanism in
ternary polymer electrolyte-ionic liquid mixtures: A molecular
dynamics simulation study. *ACS Macro Lett.* **2013**, *2*, 322–326.
(23) Do, C.; Lunkenheimer, P.; Diddens, D.; Götz, M.; Weiss, M.;
Loidl, A.; Sun, X. G.; Allgaier, J.; Ohl, M. Li⁺ transport in poly
(ethylene oxide) based electrolytes: neutron scattering, dielectric
spectroscopy, and molecular dynamics simulations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*
2013, *111*, 018301.
(24) Molinari, N.; Mailoa, J. P.; Kozinsky, B. Effect of salt
concentration on ion clustering and transport in polymer solid
electrolytes: a molecular dynamics study of peo–litfsi. *Chem. Mater.*
2018, *30*, 6298–6306.
(25) Merinov, B. V.; et al. Molecular Dynamics Simulations of Ionic
Diffusion in PEO–LiTFSI Polymer Electrolyte: Effect of Temperature,
Molecular Weight, and Ionic Concentration. *ECS Meet. Abstr.* **2018**,
DOI: 10.1149/ma2018-02/6/467.
(26) Gartner, T. E., III; Jayaraman, A. Modeling and simulations of
polymers: a roadmap. *Macromolecules* **2019**, *52*, 755–786.
(27) Gudla, H.; Zhang, C.; Brandell, D. Effects of solvent polarity on
Li-ion diffusion in polymer electrolytes: An all-atom molecular
dynamics study with charge scaling. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2020**, *124*,
8124–8131.
(28) Brooks, D. J.; Merinov, B. V.; Goddard, W. A., III; Kozinsky, B.;
Mailoa, J. Atomistic description of ionic diffusion in PEO–LiTFSI:
Effect of temperature, molecular weight, and ionic concentration. *Macromolecules* **2018**, *51*, 8987–8995.
(29) Joost, M.; Kunze, M.; Jeong, S.; Schönhoff, M.; Winter, M.;
Passerini, S. Ionic mobility in ternary polymer electrolytes for lithium-
ion batteries. *Electrochim. Acta* **2012**, *86*, 330–338.
(30) Baskin, A.; Prendergast, D. “Ion Solvation Spectra”: Free
Energy Analysis of Solvation Structures of Multivalent Cations in
Aprotic Solvents. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2019**, *10*, 4920–4928.
(31) Baskin, A.; Prendergast, D. Ion Solvation Engineering: How to
Manipulate the Multiplicity of the Coordination Environment of
Multivalent Ions. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2020**, *11*, 9336–9343.
(32) Kästner, J. Umbrella sampling. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.: Comput.*
Mol. Sci. **2011**, *1*, 932–942.
(33) Ferguson, A. L. BayesWHAM: A Bayesian approach for free
energy estimation, reweighting, and uncertainty quantification in the
weighted histogram analysis method. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2017**, *38*,
1583–1605.
(34) Laio, A.; Gervasio, F. L. Metadynamics: a method to simulate
rare events and reconstruct the free energy in biophysics, chemistry
and material science. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **2008**, *71*, 126601.
(35) Barducci, A.; Bonomi, M.; Parrinello, M. Metadynamics. *Wiley*
Interdiscip. Rev.: Comput. Mol. Sci. **2011**, *1*, 826–843.
(36) Halat, D. M.; Snyder, R. L.; Sundararaman, S.; Choo, Y.; Gao,
K. W.; Hoffman, Z. J.; Abel, B. A.; Grundy, L. S.; Galluzzo, M. D.;
Gordon, M. P.; et al. Modifying Li⁺ and Anion Diffusivities in
Polyacetal Electrolytes: A Pulsed-Field-Gradient NMR Study of Ion
Self-Diffusion. *Chem. Mater.* **2021**, *33*, 4915–4926.
(37) Snyder, R. L.; Choo, Y.; Gao, K. W.; Halat, D. M.; Abel, B. A.;
Sundararaman, S.; Prendergast, D.; Reimer, J. A.; Balsara, N. P.;
Coates, G. W. Improved Li⁺ Transport in Polyacetal Electrolytes:
Conductivity and Current Fraction in a Series of Polymers. *ACS*
Energy Lett. **2021**, *6*, 1886–1891.
(38) Wang, J.; Wolf, R. M.; Caldwell, J. W.; Kollman, P. A.; Case, D.
A. Development and testing of a general amber force field. *J. Comput.*
Chem. **2004**, *25*, 1157–1174.

- (39) Plimpton, S. Fast parallel algorithms for short-range molecular dynamics. *J. Comput. Phys.* **1995**, *117*, 1–19.
- (40) Bayly, C. I.; Cieplak, P.; Cornell, W.; Kollman, P. A. A well-behaved electrostatic potential based method using charge restraints for deriving atomic charges: the RESP model. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *97*, 10269–10280.
- (41) Ufimtsev, I. S.; Martínez, T. J. Quantum chemistry on graphical processing units. 1. Strategies for two-electron integral evaluation. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2008**, *4*, 222–231.
- (42) Ufimtsev, I. S.; Martínez, T. J. Quantum chemistry on graphical processing units. 2. Direct self-consistent-field implementation. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2009**, *5*, 1004–1015.
- (43) Ufimtsev, I. S.; Martínez, T. J. Quantum chemistry on graphical processing units. 3. Analytical energy gradients, geometry optimization, and first principles molecular dynamics. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2009**, *5*, 2619–2628.
- (44) Zhang, Y.; Maginn, E. J. A simple AIMD approach to derive atomic charges for condensed phase simulation of ionic liquids. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2012**, *116*, 10036–10048.
- (45) Youngs, T. G. A.; Hardacre, C. Application of static charge transfer within an ionic-liquid force field and its effect on structure and dynamics. *ChemPhysChem* **2008**, *9*, 1548–1558.
- (46) Pesko, D. M.; Timachova, K.; Bhattacharya, R.; Smith, M. C.; Villaluenga, I.; Newman, J.; Balsara, N. P. Negative transference numbers in poly (ethylene oxide)-based electrolytes. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2017**, *164*, No. E3569.
- (47) Iannuzzi, M.; Laio, A.; Parrinello, M. Efficient exploration of reactive potential energy surfaces using Car-Parrinello molecular dynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2003**, *90*, 238302.