

Lithium–Oxygen Batteries Hot Paper

 How to cite:
 Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 16661–16667

 International Edition:
 doi.org/10.1002/anie.202006303

 German Edition:
 doi.org/10.1002/ange.202006303

A Li-air battery usually composes of a porous carbon

The Stabilization Effect of CO₂ in Lithium–Oxygen/CO₂ Batteries

Kai Chen⁺, Gang Huang⁺, Jin-Ling Ma, Jin Wang, Dong-Yue Yang, Xiao-Yang Yang, Yue Yu, and Xin-Bo Zhang^{*}

Abstract: The lithium (Li)-air battery has an ultrahigh theoretical specific energy, however, even in pure oxygen (O_2) , the vulnerability of conventional organic electrolytes and carbon cathodes towards reaction intermediates, especially O_2^{-} , and corrosive oxidation and crack/pulverization of Li metal anode lead to poor cycling stability of the Li-air battery. Even worse, the water and/or CO_2 in air bring parasitic reactions and safety issues. Therefore, applying such systems in open-air environment is challenging. Herein, contrary to previous assertions, we have found that CO₂ can improve the stability of both anode and electrolyte, and a high-performance rechargeable $Li-O_2/CO_2$ battery is developed. The CO_2 not only facilitates the in situ formation of a passivated protective Li₂CO₃ film on the Li anode, but also restrains side reactions involving electrolyte and cathode by capturing O_2^- . Moreover, the Pd/CNT catalyst in the cathode can extend the battery lifespan by effectively tuning the product morphology and catalyzing the decomposition of Li_2CO_3 . The $Li-O_2/CO_2$ battery achieves a full discharge capacity of 6628 mAhg^{-1} and a long life of 715 cycles, which is even better than those of pure $Li-O_2$ batteries.

Introduction

Pursuing energy storage systems with higher energy densities has continued since the last century, and this trend has been accelerated by the fast development of clean energy utilization and electronic devices and vehicles in recent years. Among the large number of available choices, the ultrahigh theoretical specific energy density (ca. 3500 Whkg⁻¹) of Li-air battery makes it an ideal candidate for next-generation energy supplier.^[1] However, many challenges are waiting to be resolved before Li-air batteries can be applicable.

[*] K. Chen,^[+] J.-L. Ma, J. Wang, D.-Y. Yang, X.-Y. Yang, Y. Yu, Prof. X.-B. Zhang State Key Laboratory of Rare Earth Resource Utilization, Changchun Institute of Applied Chemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences Changchun, Jilin 130022 (China) E-mail: xbzhang@ciac.ac.cn K. Chen,^[+] D.-Y. Yang, Y. Yu, Prof. X.-B. Zhang University of Science and Technology of China Hefei, Anhui 230026 (China) G. Huang^[+] Physical Science and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology Thuwal, 23955-6900 (Saudi Arabia) [⁺] These authors contributed equally to this work. Supporting information and the ORCID identification number(s) for the author(s) of this article can be found under: https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.202006303.

material as air electrode, a non-aqueous electrolyte and a Li plate as anode. During discharge, O2 from air can react with Li^+ to form Li_2O_2 , which subsequently decomposes during recharge.^[1b,c] Despite the overall reaction is simple, even in pure oxygen (O₂), the vulnerability of conventional organic electrolytes and carbon cathodes towards reaction intermediates, especially O₂⁻, and the corrosive oxidation and crack/ pulverization of Li metal anode render the system complicated and severely limit the cycling stability of the Li-air battery.^[2] Currently, no method can solve these problems simultaneously. The situation is even worse when operating the system in air, since the H₂O and/or CO₂ in air are reported to bring more serious parasitic reactions and safety issues.^[3] As a result, most significant improvements have been achieved in pure oxygen to avoid these issues.^[4] Applying these kinds of Li-O₂ batteries in practical conditions will reduce the overall energy density and increase the cost because of the O₂ supply systems. Therefore, realizing the ultimate goal of applying such systems in an open-air environment is challenging.

Many groups noticed that CO_2 could deteriorate the battery performances, and claimed that CO_2 participated in the discharge process in a complexed way to form Li₂CO₃, which was more difficult to be decomposed than Li₂O₂.^[3c,5] This results in high charge overpotentials, low coulombic efficiencies (CEs), and short battery lifespan. Therefore, researchers suggest that CO_2 should be completely removed from the Li–air batteries to make the reactions easier.^[3a-c,5a,6] Based on these results, the impact of CO_2 seems to be fully understood and subsequently, the investigations on CO_2 in Li–O₂ batteries have not received much attention. However, CO_2 is an indispensable component in air, we cannot bypass this obstacle on the way towards Li–air battery, thus devoting efforts to unveiling the true role of CO_2 is critical.

Contrary to previous assertions, herein we show that CO_2 could improve the stability of the battery components, including the cathode, electrolyte, and Li anode. It is well established that the side product, Li_2CO_3 in $Li-O_2$ batteries is stable with electrolytes and cathodes while the discharge product of Li_2O_2 is not.^[7] Since the product in our $Li-O_2/CO_2$ battery is solely Li_2CO_3 , the battery stability can be boosted. Furthermore, CO_2 can promote the formation of Li_2CO_3 on the Li surface to protect it from H_2O and other offensive intermediates. The mechanism of Li_2CO_3 formation is then discussed in detail. After in-depth research in the stability of cathode and electrolyte by NMR and FTIR spectroscopy, it has also been confirmed that CO_2 can capture O_2^- to reduce its nucleophilicity. Therefore, the introduction of CO_2 into the O_2 reaction gas stabilizes the whole battery system, and thus

a high performance $\text{Li}-\text{O}_2/\text{CO}_2$ battery has been obtained. In $2 \text{Li} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{Li}_2\text{O}_2$ addition, we have added CO₂ in Na (K)-O₂ batteries and the

Results and Discussion

performances have been greatly improved as well.

A prototype ECC-AIR Li-O₂/CO₂ battery was assembled based on Pd/CNT cathode (CNT: carbon nanotube) with flowing O_2/CO_2 (1:1) at 1 atm. The composition and structure information of the synthesized Pd/CNT can be found in Figures S1-S3 in the Supporting Information and the structure of ECC-AIR type cell is shown in Figure S4. Compared with CNT cathode, an obvious decrease in charge overpotential can be observed for the Pd/CNT cathode (Figure S5), revealing its effectiveness in promoting the decomposition of the discharge product. The evolution of Pd/CNT cathode after discharge and charge has been recorded by FTIR and Raman spectra. In the FTIR spectra (Figure 1A), typical peaks at 1437 cm⁻¹ and 878 cm⁻¹ corresponding to Li₂CO₃ appear in the discharged cathode and these peaks almost vanish after subsequent recharge, implying the formed Li₂CO₃ discharge product can be reversibly decomposed during the charge process. Similar results can also be observed in the Raman spectra with the emergence and disappearance of the Li₂CO₃ peak at 1084 cm⁻¹ in the discharged and recharged cathodes (Figure 1B). SEM characterization was then conducted to further confirm the formation and decomposition of Li₂CO₃ during the cycling process of the Li-O₂/ CO₂ batteries (Figures 1 C-E). A more detailed evolution of the discharge product can be seen in Figure S6. All these results affirm that the designed Li-O₂/CO₂ battery permits reversible formation and decomposition of Li₂CO₃.

It is widely accepted that the discharge reaction proceeds according to Equation (1) in $Li-O_2$ batteries.



Figure 1. The rechargeability of Li–O₂/CO₂ battery. A) FTIR spectra and B) Raman spectra of the pristine, discharged, and charged cathodes. C)–E) The corresponding SEM pictures of the cathodes. F) The pressure change during cycling of Li–O₂ battery. G) The pressure change during cycling of Li–O₂/CO₂ battery. Current density is 0.1 mA (88.5 μ A cm⁻²) for (F) and (G).

 $L_1 + O_2 \rightarrow L_{12}O_2$

While in the Li– O_2/CO_2 battery, since the gas atmosphere has been changed to O_2/CO_2 (1:1), the fundamental reaction mechanisms are still unclear. To elucidate this, operando pressure test has been conducted (Figure S7). As a comparison, the pressure change during cycling of Li– O_2 battery has also been given. From Figure 1F we can see that the Li– O_2 battery follows the 2.07 e/ O_2 coefficient during discharge, in line with the theoretical value of 2 e/ O_2 in Equation (1). With the introduction of CO₂ into the reaction gas, the number of electrons transferred per gas molecule changes to 1.30 (1.30 e/ gas) during discharge of the Li– O_2/CO_2 (1:1) battery (Figure 1G). Considering that Li₂CO₃ is the exclusive discharge product as above proved, the overall discharge reaction formula in Li– O_2/CO_2 (1:1) battery is as follows [Eq. (2)], whose theoretical value is 1.33 e/gas.

$$2\operatorname{Li} + 1/2\operatorname{O}_2 + \operatorname{CO}_2 \rightarrow \operatorname{Li}_2\operatorname{CO}_3 \tag{2}$$

It is clear that the pressure cannot recover to the initial states in both Li– O_2 and Li– O_2/CO_2 batteries after recharging the same capacity, probably due to the existence of side reactions. The side reactions are resulted from the electrolyte decomposition and/or carbon degradation induced by the intermediates, such as O_2^- and ${}^{1}O_2$.^[8] In the first charge, 6.02 e/gas and 3.17 e/gas are achieved, respectively in the Li– O_2 and Li– O_2/CO_2 batteries, indicating more parasitic reactions happen in the Li– O_2 battery than in the Li– O_2/CO_2 battery. The differential electrochemical mass spectra (DEMS) during charge of Li– O_2/CO_2 battery was then tested. The generation of O_2 , CO and CO₂ as well as some fragments resulted from electrolyte decomposition can be clearly observed from Figure S8, confirming the occurrence of side reactions.

In Li-O₂ batteries, the Li anodes are easy to be corroded by H_2O , generating porous LiOH layer,^[2a] which allows H_2O to continuously diffuse across, and thus constantly consuming the remaining Li anode and finally leading to the exhaustion of the Li anode and death of the batteries. When disassembling the cycled Li-O₂/CO₂ battery, we found that the Li anode was very stable in this system without corrosion. Figure 2A vividly shows the difference of the Li anodes after cycling in Li-O₂ and Li-O₂/CO₂ batteries. To clarify the origin of this phenomenon, the cycled Li anode in Li-O₂/CO₂ battery has been systematically characterized. Figures 2B,C give the C1s and Li1s XPS spectra of the cycled Li anode. The strong C1s and Li1s peaks of Li2CO3 at 289.6 and 55.1 eV can be clearly observed,^[1f] confirming the formation of Li₂CO₃ on the Li anode surface. The other C 1s peaks show the CH₃OCO₂Li at 287.9 eV and C-C bond at 284.8 eV, which may arise from the SEI film formed on the Li surface.^[9] Moreover, the Raman spectrum of the cycled Li anode also reveals a Li₂CO₃ peak at 1084 cm⁻¹ (Figure 2D), which is consistent with the XPS results.

The SEM image in Figure 2 E displays that nanosheet-like, dense Li_2CO_3 covers the surface of the cycled Li anode, which can be further confirmed by the zoom-out SEM images in Figures S9A and 9B. However, the cycled Li anode in Li–O₂ battery exhibits a porous surface composed of LiOH (Fig-



Figure 2. A) Schematic representation of the Li anode in a $\text{Li}-O_2$ battery and the Li₂CO₃ protection effect on the Li anode in a Li–O₂/ CO₂ battery. B),C) XPS spectra of C 1s and Li 1s, D) Raman spectrum, and E) SEM image of the Li anode after cycling in a Li–O₂/CO₂ battery. F) Li anode stability towards air after cycling in Li–O₂/CO₂ and Li–O₂ batteries for 80 h. The time is the exposure time in air (relative humidity: 40%). G) The optical pictures of Li anodes after 100 h running in Li–O₂ batteries with pre-cycled Li anode in a Li–O₂/CO₂ battery and an uncycled Li anode. The pre-cycled Li anode ran in the Li–O₂/CO₂ battery for 80 h and the uncycled Li anode was rested under the same conditions for 80 h.

ures S9C,D). The surface morphology of the Li anode after cycling in $\text{Li}-O_2/\text{CO}_2$ battery is similar to the paper reported by Asadi et al.^[1f] Nevertheless, the Li anode protection induced by our design is much easier without the need of pre-cycling the Li anode in another system and tedious battery assembly and disassembly processes.

The Li anode protection effects induced by different systems are further shown in Figure 2F by exposing the original Li plate and the Li plates cycled in $\text{Li}-O_2/\text{CO}_2$ and $\text{Li}-O_2$ batteries to open air. It can be observed that, even after 60 min, the Li₂CO₃ protected Li plate still not totally darken and the central part remains stable, demonstrating the superior stability of the Li plate cycled in $\text{Li}-O_2/\text{CO}_2$ battery than that cycled in $\text{Li}-O_2$ battery. Moreover, the anode protection effect in our system can be reinforced with the increase of cycle number, because the protective Li₂CO₃ will continuously form on the Li anode surface (Figure 2G and Figure S10). By comparing the Li anodes after cycling in Li-O₂ and Li-O₂/CO₂ batteries for 120 h, Figure S11 demonstrates the vital role of the CO₂ for protecting the Li anode.

Note that the Li_2CO_3 layer is very useful for protecting the Li anode, we need to elucidate its formation mechanism. There are three possible routes for the formation of Li_2CO_3 film (Table 1). The first route is the direct reaction between Li and CO_2 to form C and Li_2CO_3 . According to the Raman result in Figure 2D, no peaks for C are detected, so route I can be ruled out. The difference between routes II and III (Table 1) is whether O_2 or H_2O participates in the reactions. This can be identified by whether cycling is requested for the

Angewandte

Chemie

Routes	Reactions
I	$4\text{Li} + 3\text{CO}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{Li}_2\text{CO}_{3+}\text{C}$
II	$2 \operatorname{Li} + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{O}_2 + \operatorname{CO}_2 \rightarrow \operatorname{Li}_2 \operatorname{CO}_3$
111	$\text{Li}_{(s)} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_{(sol)} \rightarrow \text{LiOH}_{(sol)} + \frac{1}{2}\text{H}_{2(g)}$
	$2 \operatorname{LiOH}_{(sol)} + \operatorname{CO}_{2(sol)} \rightarrow \operatorname{Li}_2 \operatorname{CO}_{3(s)} + \operatorname{H}_2 \operatorname{O}_{(s)}$
	$\label{eq:total:2Li} \text{Total:} 2\text{Li}_{(s)} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_{(sol)} + \text{CO}_{2(sol)} \rightarrow \text{Li}_2\text{CO}_{3(s)} + \text{H}_{2(g)}$

formation of Li₂CO₃ layer, because H₂O mainly comes from electrolyte decomposition during cycling. A contrast experiment was conducted by using two Li-O2/CO2 batteries: one resting for 80 h while the other one cycling for 80 h. Subsequently, the gas environment of the batteries was changed to pure O2. After cycling for another 100 h, the pre-cycled Li anode is less corroded compared with the resting Li anode (Figure 2G), which is completely dark without observable protection effect, and is very similar to the Li anode in Li– O_2 battery without resting in O_2/CO_2 (see Figure S11A). Even though pre-cycling of Li anode in $Li-O_2/$ CO₂ battery can generate Li₂CO₃ protection layer, the Li anode can still be corroded during cycling in Li-O₂ battery by the penetration of H₂O across the Li₂CO₃ film in the long run, indicating that the presence of CO_2 is indispensable for the continuous anode protection. Another comparison by resting the Li anodes in Li-O₂/CO₂ and Li-O₂ batteries further confirms that the Li₂CO₃ protection film cannot be formed by simply stewing Li anode in Li–O₂/CO₂ battery (Figure S12). These experiments indicate that cycling is indispensable for the formation of Li₂CO₃ protection film, in other words, the H₂O generated by the decomposition of the electrolyte during cycling is critical for the formation of Li₂CO₃ protection film. Therefore, route II can be excluded. The H₂O in the cycled battery will react with Li anode to form LiOH and H₂, followed by the reaction between LiOH and CO₂. Since the reactions in route III is very fast, CO2 can capture LiOH once it forms.^[10] On the basis of above analysis, we speculate that route III is the most reasonable mechanism for the Li₂CO₃ formation on the Li anode. Furthermore, to directly visualize the CO₂ induced protective effect on Li anode, a simulation experiment has been designed, please see the results and discussions in Figure S13. In addition, we also immersed Li plates in the electrolytes pre-saturated with O₂ and O₂/CO₂ and exposed them to air. As indicated in Figure S14, the Li plate can be stabilized more than 10 days with the help of CO_2 .

Superoxide radical, a strong nucleophilic reagent, has been widely proved to be the main origin of side reactions in Li–O₂ batteries, including electrolyte decomposition and cathode oxidation.^[2b,c,11] Therefore, capturing superoxide is very meaningful to stabilize the battery system. In 1984, Julian et al. confirmed that O₂⁻ was prone to bind CO₂ through reactions in Equations (3) and (4),^[12] which was further supported by the theoretical calculation conducted by Lim et al.^[5b] So we can reasonably speculate that CO₂ can capture O₂⁻ to reduce the disproportionation reaction in Li–O₂/CO₂ battery, thus parasitic reactions can be greatly alleviated (Figure 3A). Furthermore, since singlet oxygen, another cause for parasitic reactions in Li–O₂ batteries, forms by

disproportionation of superoxide (O_2^{-}) [Eq. (5)],^[8c,13] if O_2^{-} is captured, its disproportionation no longer happens, further reducing the side reactions.

$$O_2^- + CO_2 \rightarrow CO_4^- \tag{3}$$

 $CO_4^- + O_2^- + CO_2 \rightarrow C_2O_6^{2-} + O_2$ (4)

$$O_2^- + O_2^- \rightarrow O_2^{2-} + x^3 O_2 + (1-x)^1 O_2$$
 (5)

The above speculation can be confirmed by comparing the ring currents of the rotating ring-disk electrode (RRDE) in O₂ and O₂/CO₂ atmospheres. In the RRDE experiment, O₂ is first reduced to O_2^- at the disk, followed by the detection and oxidization at the ring. If the O_2^{-1} is captured by CO_2 , it cannot be oxidized anymore, thus there is almost no ring current can be detected. Figures 3B, C show the ring currents in the O_2 and O_2/CO_2 systems. It is clear that the I_{ring} decreases sharply to nearly zero after involving CO₂, showing that CO₂ can indeed capture O_2^- (Figures 3B,C and Figure S15), in good consistence with previous reports.^[12,14] The stability of different electrolytes towards O_2^- and CO_2 captured O_2^- are compared and discussed in detail in Figure S16. The evolution of TEGDME electrolytes after cycling was checked by ¹H and ¹³C nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectra (Figures 3D, E). After discharge for 10 h, the electrolytes in both systems are decomposed with the appearance of new chemical shifts at 36 ppm in ¹³C spectra and 2.6 ppm in ¹H



Figure 3. A) The proposed reaction routes of capturing O_2^- by CO₂. B),C) The RRDE experiments in O_2 and O_2/CO_2 with 0.1 M LiCF₃SO₃/ TEGDME electrolyte. D),E) ¹³C and ¹H NMR spectra of the cycled electrolytes dissolved in D₂O.

spectra. As expected, the impurity peak intensities of Li–O₂/CO₂ battery are much lower than those of Li–O₂ battery. Furthermore, after 20 cycles, the differences are more obvious with almost no impurities can be seen for Li–O₂/CO₂ battery while peaks for the side products appear significantly in Li–O₂ battery. Even using commercial electrolyte for Li-ion batteries, the Li–O₂/CO₂ battery still outlives the Li–O₂ battery (180 vs. 109 cycles, Figure S17) because of less electrolyte decomposition with the help of CO₂ induced stabilization effect. The above evidences demonstrate that the introduction of CO₂ into the reaction gas can effectively alleviate the electrolyte decomposition.

Angewandte

Chemie

To confirm whether the side reactions can be attenuated at the cathode, the composition and morphology evolutions of the CNT and Pd/CNT cathodes at the end of discharge and charge states after multiple cycles were checked by FTIR and SEM. As indicated in the FTIR spectra in Figures 4A, B, after 10th discharge and charge, no obvious peaks corresponding to Li₂CO₃ and other species can be detected for CNT and Pd/ CNT cathodes, probably due to the limited cycling capacity and good charge efficiency in this short cycling time. However, after 50 cycles, Li₂CO₃ peak at 880 cm⁻¹ is clearly seen for CNT cathode, indicating the remnant of undecomposed Li₂CO₃ discharge product. In addition, C-O stretching vibrations related peaks around 940-1230 cm⁻¹ and HCOOLi peak at 785 cm⁻¹ also emerge, revealing the instability of CNT cathode and the electrolyte decomposition induced by high charge voltage or attacks from intermediate species during cycling.^[15] In contrast to CNT cathode, there are no peaks at 940-1230 cm⁻¹ or 785 cm⁻¹ associated with the decomposition of CNT or electrolyte can be observed for Pd/CNT cathode after 50 cycles, manifesting its high stability to withstand the rigorous cycling conditions. Although Li2CO3 peak at 880 cm⁻¹ appears at the 50th discharge, its intensity decreases after charge, disclosing the good catalytic effect of Pd/CNT. Similar results are also confirmed by Raman spectra in



Figure 4. FTIR spectra and SEM pictures of the cycled CNT and Pd/ CNT cathodes at the end of discharge and charge states. A),B) FTIR spectra of the CNT and Pd/CNT cathodes. C)–F) SEM pictures of the CNT cathodes. G)–I) SEM pictures of the Pd/CNT cathodes. The batteries were cycled with a cutoff capacity of 1000 mAh g^{-1} at 500 mA g^{-1} . Scale bar: 2 µm.

16664 www.angewandte.org

© 2020 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

Figure S18. The discrepancy between CNT and Pd/CNT cathodes can be further clarified by SEM. After 10th discharge, the surfaces of the CNT and Pd/CNT cathodes are covered by amorphous Li_2CO_3 (Figures 4C,G). Then, most of the Li₂CO₃ product decomposes after 10th charge, leaving uncovered CNT and Pd/CNT cathodes (Figures 4D, H). Even after 50 cycles, the morphology of the Pd/ CNT cathode can almost recover to the initial state (Figures 4 I, J), revealing that Pd/CNT can effectively facilitate the decomposition of the Li₂CO₃ to extend the battery life, while the CNT cathode cannot recover after 50th charge (Figures 4E, F). The above results show minimal side products (HCOOLi and CH₃COOLi) originating from cathode and electrolyte decomposition in the Li-O₂/CO₂ battery with Pd/ CNT cathode, which is superior to Li-O2 batteries with severe side products just after 20 cycles,^[15] proving the participation of CO₂ can truly stabilize the Pd/CNT cathode and reduce parasitic reactions.

Considering the high catalytic effect and stability of Pd/ CNT cathodes, stabilized electrolytes and Li anodes in the Li-O₂/CO₂ batteries, their electrochemical performances need to be amply studied. Figure S19 has proven that O₂ is indispensable in the feeding gas to ensure a high capacity and CO_2 plays a positive role to further increase the capacity. Figure 5 A compares the full discharge and charge performances of the CNT and Pd/CNT based Li-O₂/CO₂ batteries in a fixed voltage window of 2.0-4.5 V. In the 1st cycle, the Pd/CNT based battery achieves a high discharge capacity of 6628 mAh g^{-1} , much higher than the 4384 mAh g^{-1} capacity of CNT based battery delivered. At 5th cycle, the capacity of Pd/CNT based battery fades to 2726 mAh g⁻¹, but still nearly two times the capacity of CNT based battery (1562 mAh g^{-1}). Moreover, at a limited cycling capacity of 1000 mAh g^{-1} , the battery with Pd/CNT cathode exhibits a lower voltage gap than the battery with CNT cathode: 1.68 V vs. 1.88 V (Figure S5). The 0.2 V difference, in the long run, can keep the decomposition of Li₂CO₃ at a lower charge potential to reduce electrolyte decomposition (Figure S20). After this, electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) analysis has been conducted to check the interfacial stabilities of the batteries at different stages (Figure 5B). Except for the initial stage, the interfacial impedance of the battery with Pd/CNT cathode is always lower than that of the battery with CNT cathode, indicating more stable electrode/electrolyte interphases are formed in the Pd/CNT based battery.

Figures 5C and D give the cycling performance of Pd/ CNT based Li-O₂/CO₂ batteries with fixed capacities of 500 and 1000 mAh g⁻¹, respectively. Accordingly, long cycling life of 715 and 255 cycles can be achieved for the batteries. As a comparison, the cycling performance of CNT based Li-O₂/ CO_2 battery with a fixed capacity of 1000 mAh g⁻¹ is shown in Figure S21A, which can only realize 56 cycles. For Li-O₂ battery with Pd/CNT cathode, it only runs for 94 cycles (Figure S21B), much shorter than the 255 cycles of $Li-O_2/CO_2$ battery. In addition, the terminal potential of charges experiences no obvious increase even changing the discharge product from Li₂O₂ in Li-O₂ battery to Li₂CO₃ in Li-O₂/CO₂ battery (Figure S21C). Excellent rate capability can also be realized in the Pd/CNT based Li-O2/CO2 batteries (Figure S22). These inspiring cycling and rate performances have never been achieved by previous Li-CO₂ (O₂) or Li-O₂/CO₂ batteries (see Table S1). Thanks to the synergistic effects of the Pd/CNT cathode and CO₂ enabled benefits on the whole battery, the cycling life of the designed Li–O₂/CO₂ battery even exceeds those of advanced Li-O2 battery systems.^[16] Although the charge overpotential of the Pd/CNT based Li-O₂/CO₂ battery is higher than some reported Li–O₂ batteries, its ultra-long lifetime can offset this disadvantage, because the price of consuming extra energy for charging the battery is much cheaper than the cost of manufacturing six new Li-O₂ batteries if we suppose a Li-O2 battery can run for 100 cycles at the same condition. If intermittent energy (wind or solar energy) is employed, the cost can be further reduced. The cycling performances of Li-O2 and Li-O2/CO2 batteries at higher capacities have also been compared in Figure S23. The performances of Li-O2/CO2 batteries again markedly exceed those of Li-O₂ batteries.

The above investigations are based on $LiCF_3SO_3/TEGDME$ electrolyte, an electrolyte with low-donor-number (DN) TEGDME as solvent. To prove the universality of CO_2



Figure 5. Electrochemical performances of $Li-O_2/CO_2$ batteries with CNT and Pd/CNT cathodes. A) Full discharge and charge curves of the two batteries in a fixed voltage window of 2.0–4.5 V. B) Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) at initial stage, after 6th and 24th charge. C) Cycling performance of $Li-O_2/CO_2$ battery with Pd/CNT cathode at a fixed capacity of 500 mAh g⁻¹. D) Cycling performance of $Li-O_2/CO_2$ battery with Pd/CNT cathode at a fixed capacity is 500 mA g⁻¹ for (A)–(D). E) The properties of $Li-O_2$ and $Li-O_2/CO_2$ batteries.

Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 16661-16667

© 2020 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

induced electrochemical performance improvement, Li-O₂/ CO₂ batteries with high-DN DMSO based electrolyte have been investigated (see details in Figures S24-S27). As expected, the introduction of CO₂ into the reaction gas not only promotes the lifetime but also elevates the energy efficiency of DMSO-based Li-O₂ batteries. The reason for the Li-O₂/ CO₂ battery failure after 715 cycles has been investigated in detail (Figures S28–S30) and it is found that the failed cathode is the origin of the battery failure rather than the Li metal anode. Now that the Li-O₂/CO₂ battery can sustain such a long life, the Li anode stability after hundreds of cycles has been checked. Figure S31 demonstrates that the Li loss is only 6.23% after 500 cycles in the Li–O₂/CO₂ battery, making the Li plate can live more than 8000 cycles if the cathode is changed every 500 cycles. In sharp contrast, the Li plate in the Li–O₂ battery shows a high loss of 25.77 % after just 50 times cycling and only 194 cycles can be achieved theoretically. The huge difference in Li loss between these two batteries can be explained by the anode stability revealed by Figure S32.

Above results have shown great success of introducing CO₂ into the Li–O₂ battery system. In view that high activity and instability of metal anodes is a common issue in metal-O₂ batteries, we hypothesize that this concept is applicable in other metal–O₂ battery systems, such as Na–O₂ and K–O₂ batteries. Figures S33–S35 give the cycling performance of Na/K-O₂ batteries with/without introduction of CO₂. The Na-O₂/CO₂ battery can sustain 129 stable cycles, two times that of the Na–O₂ battery achieves a life of 294 cycles, far exceeding the 5 cycles of the K–O₂ battery. The successful adoption of O₂/CO₂ in these two battery systems has proven the versatility of CO₂ usage in metal–air batteries.

Conclusion

In summary, we have demonstrated a high-capacity and long-life rechargeable Li-O₂/CO₂ (1:1) battery by using Pd/ CNT as cathode. Thanks to the high catalytic Pd/CNT cathode, the Li₂CO₃ discharge product can be efficiently decomposed. The introduction of CO₂ into the feeding gas can induce a passivated Li₂CO₃ film formed on the Li anode surface during cycling, which can protect the Li anode from attack by H₂O and intermediates. Moreover, the presence of CO_2 can also capture O_2^- to reduce side reactions related to the electrolyte and cathode. Even though Li-O₂/CO₂ batteries have been reported previously, the gas mixtures' protection effect on the Li anode and its stabilization role on electrolyte and cathode were not noted. Herein we propose and confirm these new functions that CO₂ brings. Owing to the optimizations brought by catalytic Pd/CNT cathode and CO₂, the Li-O2/CO2 battery achieves high performances with a full discharge capacity of 6628 mAhg⁻¹ and a long life of 715 cycles. Instead of deteriorating the Li-O₂ batteries as previously considered, CO₂ actually plays a positive role that promotes the battery performance and lifetime. Such a good performance has surpassed most of the state-of-the-art Li-O₂ batteries. In addition, the strategy we adopt is applicable in other battery systems, such as Na- and K-O₂/CO₂ batteries. We believe that this work deepens our understanding towards $Li-O_2/CO_2$ and $Li-O_2$ batteries, and makes an important attempt to prompt the applications of $Li-O_2$ batteries in openair environments.

Acknowledgements

We thank the National Key R&D Program of China (2017YFA0206700), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (21725103, 51702314), the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (XDA21010210), the K. C. Wong Education Foundation (GJTD-2018-09) and the National & local united engineering lab for power battery.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Keywords: carbon dioxide · lithium–oxygen battery · side-reaction prevention · stabilization · superoxide capture

- a) P. G. Bruce, S. A. Freunberger, L. J. Hardwick, J. M. Tarascon, *Nat. Mater.* 2012, *11*, 19–29; b) A. C. Luntz, B. D. McCloskey, *Chem. Rev.* 2014, *114*, 11721–11750; c) J. Lu, L. Li, J. B. Park, Y. K. Sun, F. Wu, K. Amine, *Chem. Rev.* 2014, *114*, 5611–5640; d) Z. L. Wang, D. Xu, J. J. Xu, X. B. Zhang, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2014, *43*, 7746–7786; e) Z. Lyu, Y. Zhou, W. Dai, X. Cui, M. Lai, L. Wang, F. Huo, W. Huang, Z. Hu, W. Chen, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2017, *46*, 6046–6072; f) M. Asadi, B. Sayahpour, P. Abbasi, A. T. Ngo, K. Karis, J. R. Jokisaari, C. Liu, B. Narayanan, M. Gerard, P. Yasaei, X. Hu, A. Mukherjee, K. C. Lau, R. S. Assary, F. Khalili-Araghi, R. F. Klie, L. A. Curtiss, A. Salehi-Khojin, *Nature* 2018, *555*, 502–506.
- [2] a) J. L. Shui, J. S. Okasinski, P. Kenesei, H. A. Dobbs, D. Zhao, J. D. Almer, D. J. Liu, *Nat. Commun.* **2013**, *4*, 2255; b) S. A. Freunberger, Y. Chen, Z. Peng, J. M. Griffin, L. J. Hardwick, F. Barde, P. Novak, P. G. Bruce, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 8040– 8047; c) Y. Chen, S. A. Freunberger, Z. Peng, F. Barde, P. G. Bruce, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 7952–7957.
- [3] a) Y. C. Lu, E. J. Crumlin, T. J. Carney, L. Baggetto, G. M. Veith, N. J. Dudney, Z. X. Liu, Y. Shao-Horn, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 2013, *117*, 25948–25954; b) Y. S. Mekonnen, K. B. Knudsen, J. S. G. Mýrdal, R. Younesi, J. Højberg, J. Hjelm, P. Norby, T. Vegge, *J. Chem. Phys.* 2014, *140*, 121101; c) S. R. Gowda, A. Brunet, G. M. Wallraff, B. D. McCloskey, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* 2013, *4*, 276–279; d) Z. Guo, X. Dong, S. Yuan, Y. Wang, Y. Xia, *J. Power Sources* 2014, *264*, 1–7.
- [4] a) J. Lu, Y. J. Lee, X. Luo, K. C. Lau, M. Asadi, H. H. Wang, S. Brombosz, J. Wen, D. Zhai, Z. Chen, D. J. Miller, Y. S. Jeong, J. B. Park, Z. Z. Fang, B. Kumar, A. Salehi-Khojin, Y. K. Sun, L. A. Curtiss, K. Amine, *Nature* 2016, *529*, 377–382; b) T. Liu, M. Leskes, W. Yu, A. J. Moore, L. Zhou, P. M. Bayley, G. Kim, C. P. Grey, *Science* 2015, *350*, 530–533; c) Z. Peng, S. A. Freunberger, Y. Chen, P. G. Bruce, *Science* 2018, *361*, 777–781.
- [5] a) W. Yin, A. Grimaud, F. Lepoivre, C. Yang, J. M. Tarascon, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. **2017**, *8*, 214–222; b) H. K. Lim, H. D. Lim, K. Y. Park, D. H. Seo, H. Gwon, J. Hong, W. A. Goddard 3rd, H. Kim, K. Kang, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2013**, 135, 9733–9742; c) R.

Wang, X. Q. Yu, J. M. Bai, H. Li, X. J. Huang, L. Q. Chen, X. Q. Yang, *J. Power Sources* **2012**, *218*, 113–118.

- [6] G. Wang, L. Huang, S. Liu, J. Xie, S. Zhang, P. Zhu, G. Cao, X. Zhao, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 2015, 7, 23876–23884.
- [7] B. D. McCloskey, A. Speidel, R. Scheffler, D. C. Miller, V. Viswanathan, J. S. Hummelshoj, J. K. Norskov, A. C. Luntz, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. 2012, 3, 997–1001.
- [8] a) N. Mahne, S. E. Renfrew, B. D. McCloskey, S. A. Freunberger, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2018, 57, 5529-5533; Angew. Chem.
 2018, 130, 5627-5631; b) S. X. Yang, P. He, H. S. Zhou, Energy Environ. Sci. 2016, 9, 1650-1654; c) N. Mahne, B. Schafzahl, C. Leypold, M. Leypold, S. Grumm, A. Leitgeb, G. A. Strohmeier, M. Wilkening, O. Fontaine, D. Kramer, C. Slugovc, S. M. Borisov, S. A. Freunberger, Nat. Energy 2017, 2, 17036; d) J. Wandt, P. Jakes, J. Granwehr, H. A. Gasteiger, R. A. Eichel, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2016, 55, 6892-6895; Angew. Chem. 2016, 128, 7006-7009.
- [9] L. Ye, M. Liao, H. Sun, Y. Yang, C. Tang, Y. Zhao, L. Wang, Y. Xu, L. Zhang, B. Wang, F. Xu, X. Sun, Y. Zhang, H. Dai, P. G. Bruce, H. Peng, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2019**, *58*, 2437–2442; *Angew. Chem.* **2019**, *131*, 2459–2464.
- [10] a) T. M. Ticich, J. Chem. Educ. 2011, 88, 189–191; b) Z. Zho,
 V. A. Chashchin, A. V. Vishnyakov, Theor. Found. Chem. Eng. 2007, 41, 577–584.
- [11] a) R. Black, S. H. Oh, J. H. Lee, T. Yim, B. Adams, L. F. Nazar, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 2902–2905; b) J. Lai, Y. Xing, N.

Chen, L. Li, F. Wu, R. Chen, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 2974–2997; Angew. Chem. 2020, 132, 2994–3019.

- [12] L. R. Julian, Jr., S. C. Thomas, T. S. Donald, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 4667.
- [13] E. Mourad, Y. Petit, R. Spezia, A. Samojlov, F. Summa, C. Prehal, C. Leypold, N. Mahne, C. Slugovc, O. Fontaine, S. Brutti, S. A. Freunberger, *Energy Environ. Sci.* 2019, 12, 2559–2568.
- [14] L. Johnson, C. Li, Z. Liu, Y. Chen, S. A. Freunberger, P. C. Ashok, B. B. Praveen, K. Dholakia, J. M. Tarascon, P. G. Bruce, *Nat. Chem.* 2014, 6, 1091–1099.
- [15] J. J. Xu, Z. W. Chang, Y. Wang, D. P. Liu, Y. Zhang, X. B. Zhang, *Adv. Mater.* 2016, 28, 9620–9628.
- [16] a) Z. D. Yang, X. Y. Yang, T. Liu, Z. W. Chang, Y. B. Yin, X. B. Zhang, J. M. Yan, Q. Jiang, *Small* 2018, 14, 1800590; b) J. J. Xu, D. Xu, Z. L. Wang, H. G. Wang, L. L. Zhang, X. B. Zhang, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2013, 52, 3887–3890; *Angew. Chem.* 2013, 125, 3979–3982; c) J. J. Xu, Z. L. Wang, D. Xu, F. Z. Meng, X. B. Zhang, *Energy Environ. Sci.* 2014, 7, 2213; d) Z. Jian, P. Liu, F. Li, P. He, X. Guo, M. Chen, H. Zhou, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2014, 53, 442–446; *Angew. Chem.* 2014, 126, 452–456; e) F. J. Li, Y. Chen, D. M. Tang, Z. L. Jian, C. Liu, D. Golberg, A. Yamada, H. S. Zhou, *Energy Environ. Sci.* 2014, 7, 1648–1652.

Manuscript received: April 30, 2020 Accepted manuscript online: June 14, 2020 Version of record online: July 20, 2020