ChatGPT

1. Lithium-Ion Battery Performance Comparison (Graphite||NMC811 Cells)

Recent studies on Li-ion full cells with a graphite anode and NMC-811 cathode ($LiNi_{0.8}Mn_{0.1}Co_{0.1}O_2$) show high initial capacities and excellent efficiency. For example, an electrochemically fluorinated NMC811 cathode delivered ≈203 mAh·g^{-1} on first discharge (C/10 rate) with ~98% capacity retention after 100 cycles [1]. At 1 C, it provided ~180 mAh·g^{-1} with 86.4% capacity retention over 200 cycles, and an average Coulombic efficiency (CE) >99.5% [1]. In standard carbonate electrolyte without special additives, baseline cells typically exhibit slightly lower per-cycle efficiency (e.g. ~99.8% CE) and faster capacity fade. Björklund *et al.* reported that a graphite||NMC811 cell retained only ~66% of its initial capacity after 602 cycles without additives or coatings [2]. In their work, the average CE stabilized around ~99.83% per cycle (after the first formation cycle) [3]. Notably, this CE was *lower* than other reports of >99.9% CE for similar cells [4], indicating ongoing side reactions consuming a small fraction of charge each cycle. High CE (≥99.9%) is crucial for long-term stability – even a 0.1% irreversible loss per cycle can cumulate to significant capacity loss over hundreds of cycles [4].

Coulombic Efficiency (CE): Graphite||NMC cells typically show an initial CE around 80–90% on the first cycle (due to irreversible SEI formation), then ~99.5–99.9% in subsequent cycles [3] [4]. Efficient cells maintain CE ≥99.9%, indicating nearly all charged capacity is recovered on discharge [4].

Capacity Retention & Fade: Under moderate conditions (25 °C, ~C/2 rate), graphite||NMC811 cells can retain ~85–90% capacity after 200 cycles [1]. Capacity fade rates are often on the order of 0.05–0.1% per cycle for well-maintained cells. For instance, the cell in 【6】 lost ~13.6% over 200 cycles (≈0.068%/cycle). Without mitigations, Ni-rich NMC cells can fade faster; e.g. ~34% loss after 600 cycles (~0.056%/cycle) was observed in one study [2]. Capacity fading arises from a combination of active lithium loss (e.g. side reactions, SEI growth) and impedance rise (slower kinetics). The NMC811 cathode is often the primary source of rising impedance due to surface reactivity and transition-metal dissolution [5], while the graphite anode can contribute "slippage" loss (gradual shift in electrode balance) [6].

Cycling Stability: Graphite anodes are known for excellent long-term cyclability (thousands of cycles) if kept within proper voltage windows. NMC811 provides high energy but Ni-rich cathodes are prone to microcracking and surface degradation at high states of charge. Nevertheless, studies demonstrate stable cycling when voltages are limited (e.g. ≤4.2 V) and proper electrolyte additives are used [1]. Thapaliya *et al.* achieved >98% capacity retention for 100 cycles at C/10 and >85% after 200 cycles at 1C with a protected NMC811 cathode [1]. In general, maintaining near-100% CE is the key to long-term stability – any persistent side reaction will eventually consume capacity. Thus, research focuses on interfacial protections (coatings, stable SEI/CEI) to minimize cumulative irreversible losses [2] [4].

Capacity Fade Rates: The rate of capacity decline per cycle is often reported. As noted, high-Ni cells without protection can lose ~0.1% capacity per cycle [2], whereas optimized cells limit this to <0.05%/cycle [1]. Fade rates tend to accelerate at higher C-rates, elevated temperature, or extended high-voltage operation, due to increased mechanical/electrochemical stress. Overall, recent literature shows that with improved interfaces, graphite||NMC811 cells can achieve >500 cycles with <20% capacity loss, high CEs, and low fade, making them suitable for modern high-energy applications [1].

2. Diffusion Coefficient Values for $[Fe(CN)_6]^{3-/4-}$

The hexacyanoferrate redox couple in aqueous KCl has well-established diffusion coefficients in the literature. At 25 °C in 1–2 M KCl, the diffusion coefficient D is typically on the order of 6×10^{-6} to 7×10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ for the ferricyanide/ferrocyanide ions [7] [8]. For example, one source reports $D \approx 7.3\times10^{-6}$ $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ for $[Fe(CN)_6]^{3-/4-}$ at 25 °C [8]. Other literature values include 6.8×10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ and 6.4×10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ from older studies, all in good agreement [7]. These values apply for potassium ferri/ferrocyanide in water with excess supporting electrolyte (to ensure diffusion-controlled kinetics).

Comparison with Experimental Results: If one determines D from cyclic voltammetry (CV) via the Randles–Sevcik equation, from electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) via the Warburg impedance, or from chronopotentiometry via Sand's equation, the results should be on the same order of magnitude. In practice, slight discrepancies can occur due to experimental factors. Nonetheless, literature suggests that all three methods yield D in the 10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ range for ferri/ferrocyanide. For instance, a Randles–Sevcik plot (peak current vs. $\sqrt{\text{scan rate}}$) often gives D ~7×10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ [7], consistent with classical values. EIS measurements at the diffusion-limited Warburg tail can likewise be fitted to give D in the 5×10^{-6} – 8×10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ range (when performed at the redox formal potential) [9]. Chronopotentiometric measurements (constant current oxidation/reduction) analyzed via the Sand equation have also yielded values ~5×10^{-6} to 7×10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ in KCl solutions [9]. Minor differences between methods can be due to convection or uncompensated IR, but overall, your experimentally obtained diffusion coefficients (from CV, EIS, and galvanostatic transient) are expected to be in close agreement with the literature range of ~6×10^{-6}–7×10^{-6} $cm^2\cdot s^{-1}$ at room temperature.

3. Exchange Current Density (k^0) for $[Fe(CN)_6]^{3-/4-}$

The standard heterogeneous electron-transfer rate constant (k^0) for the ferri/ferrocyanide couple is relatively high, but can vary with the electrode material and surface conditions. Classic literature by Scherer and Willig (1977) reported an exchange current density $j_0 \approx 2.0$ $mA\cdot cm^{-2}$ for the $Fe(CN)_6^{3-/4-}$ couple (2 mM each in 1 M NaCl) at a Pt electrode (25 °C, Ag/AgCl reference) [10]. This corresponds to a standard rate constant on the order of k^0 ~10^{-2} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ (using $j_0 = nF\,k^0\,C$, with n=1, C=2 mM) [10]. In other words, on noble metal surfaces the $Fe(CN)_6^{3-/4-}$ couple is fast, often treated as a nearly reversible redox system.

However, k^0 can differ on less catalytically active electrodes. On carbon-based electrodes (e.g. glassy carbon or graphite), reported k^0 values are often slightly lower, on the order of 10^{-3} to 10^{-4} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ [11]. For example, a 2024 study found $k^0 \approx 6.3\times10^{-4}$ $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ on a bare carbon nanotube electrode, which improved to ~2.6×10^{-3} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ after surface functionalization [11]. These differences reflect the sensitivity of ferricyanide kinetics to surface chemistry (surface oxides, functional groups, etc.) [12] [13].

Comparison with Experimental Values: From EIS measurements of charge-transfer resistance (R_ct) in *Interface No.1*, one can estimate k^0. The relation is $k^0 \approx RT/(nF\,R\_ct\,A\,C)$ *for a one-electron reaction at the formal potential (where concentrations of oxidized and reduced forms at the interface are equal). If your R_ct (normalized to electrode area) is, say, a few ohm·cm², that would imply k^0 on the order of 10^{-2} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ – consistent with literature for a well-behaved ferri/ferrocyanide on a clean GC electrode [10]. Likewise, Tafel analysis of the rotating disk data (Interface No.2) will yield an exchange current density j_0. If performed at equal bulk concentrations (as in the lab, 2.3 mM each Fe^{2+}/Fe^{3+}), one might find j_0 on the order of 0.1–1 $mA\cdot cm^{-2}$, which again corresponds to k^0 ~10^{-3}–10^{-2} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ (falling in the expected range). Any discrepancies between the R_ct-derived k^0 and the Tafel-derived j_0 could stem from surface differences (the R_ct from EIS is at the stationary GC electrode, whereas the Tafel from the RDE might use a Pt disk or GC disk under forced* *convection). Nonetheless, literature values provide a benchmark: k^0 ~1×10^{-2} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$** on a fast electrode [10], and down to ~10^{-3} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ on typical carbon electrodes [11]. Your measured values should be in this ballpark; significant deviations would suggest either experimental error or that the system's kinetics were altered (e.g. by adsorption or surface fouling).

4. System Reversibility Classification ($Fe(CN)_6^{3-/4-}$)

Electrochemical redox systems are classified as **reversible**, **quasi-reversible**, or **irreversible** based on the relative speed of electron transfer versus mass transport. The criteria can be summarized as follows [14] [15]:

- **Reversible:** The electron transfer is fast enough that the redox equilibrium at the electrode is maintained during the experiment. In cyclic voltammetry, a reversible one-electron couple shows a peak-to-peak separation ΔE_p = 59 mV (at 25 °C) [16], and this separation is *independent* of scan rate. The oxidation and reduction peaks are symmetric and of equal height (i_{pa}/i_{pc} ≈ 1) [15]. Peak currents follow the Randles–Sevcik relation (∝ v^½) and the formal potential is simply the midpoint of the peak potentials [17].

- **Quasi-Reversible:** The electron transfer kinetics are intermediate. CV peaks are broader and the ΔE_p exceeds the 59 mV ideal and increases with increasing scan rate [18]. For instance, ΔE_p might grow by ~30 mV for a tenfold increase in v (approximately 30 mV/decade as a rough rule) [19]. The i_{pa}/i_{pc} can remain ~1 if both directions are kinetically similar, but both peaks may be somewhat suppressed compared to the diffusion-controlled reversible case. Essentially, the system shows some kinetic limitation, but not so slow as to eliminate the reverse peak. Nicholson's dimensionless kinetics parameter ψ is in an intermediate range for quasi-reversible systems (corresponding to k^0 typically between ~10^{-6} and 10^{-2} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$, depending on scan rate) [20] [21].

- **Irreversible:** Electron transfer is very slow relative to the timescale of the measurement. In CV, only one peak (for the forward reaction) may be visible, with the reverse peak essentially absent or extremely small [22]. Peak potentials are greatly shifted (the peak for an irreversible system occurs at a much larger overpotential than in the reversible case, and it shifts with scan rate). A criterion is that no well-defined oxidation peak appears on the reverse sweep (for a reduction, or vice versa) [22]. Kinetic parameters (like α and k^0) must be extracted from Tafel analysis of the single peak. Irreversible systems have very low k^0 (≪10^{-6} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$ typically) [20] [23].

Reversibility of $[Fe(CN)_6]^{3-/4-}$: In practice, the ferri/ferrocyanide couple is often considered a *quasi-reversible* system under typical conditions. While it is fast, it is not as ideal as the ferrocene/ferrocenium reference, for example. Many experimental CVs for $K_3Fe(CN)_6/K_4Fe(CN)_6$ on a bare GC electrode show a peak separation of ~70–100 mV at moderate scan rates (50–100 mV/s) – slightly larger than the 59 mV reversible limit. This indicates some kinetic limitation (finite k^0), classifying it as quasi-reversible in those cases [12] [13]. Indeed, a recent review notes that the hexacyanoferrate couple "is quite often a quasi-reversible one in view of the slow HET rates" on typical unmodified electrodes [12]. The apparent standard rate constant can be "significantly less than 2×10^{-2} $cm\cdot s^{-1}$" on carbon, leading to noticeable peak separations [13].

That said, $[Fe(CN)_6]^{3-/4-}$ can approach reversible behavior on some electrodes. On a clean polished gold or platinum surface with fresh solution, one might observe ΔE_p near 60 mV and i_{pa}/i_{pc} ≈ 1, indicating near-reversible kinetics [21]. For example, Cassidy *et al.* mention cases where a treated carbon electrode achieved almost ideally reversible CVs for ferricyanide (ΔE_p ~60 mV) [21]. Conversely, surface factors (oxide layers, contamination, or ion pairing) often slow the electron transfer. Ferri/ferrocyanide is somewhat notorious for interacting with surface oxides and undergoing "inner-sphere" behavior in some conditions [24] [25], which reduces its kinetic facility. This explains why the couple is sometimes not perfectly reversible.

Justification of Classification: Based on your experiments: if the CV peak separation at 10 mV/s was significantly above 59 mV and increased at 100 mV/s, and if the peaks were somewhat broadened, then the system is quasi-reversible. This is the expected outcome for $[Fe(CN)_6]^{3-}/^{4-}$ on a glassy carbon electrode in aqueous KCl. The presence of both anodic and cathodic peaks (i_{pa}/i_{pc} ≈ 1) confirms it is not totally irreversible – the reverse reaction does occur. But the deviation from the ideal 59 mV and any scan-rate dependence of peak positions point to finite kinetics. Literature backs this: hexacyanoferrate often shows ΔE_p in the 70–100+ mV range (quasi-reversible) on GC [12] [13], whereas a truly reversible redox (like ferrocene in non-aqueous) would give ~59 mV. Thus, $[Fe(CN)_6]^{3-}/^{4-}$ is best classified as **quasi-reversible** under typical lab conditions (and certainly not completely irreversible, since you do see a clear pair of redox peaks).

5. Electrochemical Characterization Techniques – Pros, Cons, and Applications

Voltammetric vs. Galvanostatic Methods (Battery Testing): In battery research, *voltammetric* techniques (like cyclic voltammetry or linear sweep voltammetry) and *galvanostatic* techniques (constant-current charge/discharge) serve different purposes.

- **Voltammetric (Potentiostatic) Techniques:** CV involves sweeping the cell voltage and measuring current. **Pros:** It can reveal the fundamental redox processes and phase transitions. For a battery electrode, CV identifies at what potentials lithiation/delithiation reactions occur, often showing distinct peaks for stage changes (e.g., Li–graphite staging plateaus appear as peaks in dQ/dV) [26] [27]. CV is useful for *material characterization* – determining the electrochemical window, the presence of any irreversible reactions (peaks for side reactions), and qualitative kinetics (via peak shape and separation). It's also good for detecting *SEI formation* or electrolyte decomposition (which would appear as additional currents). **Cons:** CV is not how batteries are normally operated, so it doesn't directly give capacity or cycle life. The results can be convoluted by capacitive currents and are harder to relate to practical performance metrics. Also, CV is typically done at slow scan rates for batteries (to avoid large diffusion limitations), thus it can be time-consuming for full cells. It is less suitable for measuring long-term cycling stability or capacity retention.

- **Galvanostatic Cycling (Charge–Discharge):** This is the standard for evaluating batteries. A constant current is applied to charge and discharge, and voltage vs. capacity is recorded. **Pros:** It directly measures **capacity** (mAh/g) and how it changes with cycle number [28]. One can determine **Coulombic efficiency** each cycle (discharge/charge capacity) [28], and track **cycle life** (capacity retention over many cycles) [28]. Galvanostatic curves also show voltage plateaus corresponding to phase transitions (which can be differentiated to yield dQ/dV plots, similar to CV peaks). It is the method that best simulates real battery use, thus giving data on rate capability (via different C-rates) and degradation under practical conditions [29]. **Cons:** It provides less insight into the *mechanistic* details of redox reactions. For instance, overlapping processes in a voltage plateau are not easily deconvoluted. There is no direct information about reaction kinetics or intermediate states aside from what can be inferred from voltage hysteresis. Galvanostatic methods also require selection of appropriate cut-off voltages; outside a proper window one might plate lithium or cause unwanted decomposition (whereas CV could hint at those by rising currents). In summary, voltammetry is great for **qualitative analysis** of electrode processes and kinetic behavior, whereas galvanostatic cycling is essential for **quantitative performance metrics** (capacity, efficiency, stability). In practice, both are used: CV at the beginning to fingerprint the electrode behavior, then long-term cycling galvanostatically to evaluate performance.

Voltammetric vs. Impedimetric Techniques: Voltammetry (CV/LSV) and electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) are complementary techniques, each with strengths:

- **Voltammetry (Dynamic, Non-linear response):** By sweeping potential (or current) and driving the system far from equilibrium, voltammetry probes the *active electrochemical reactions*. **Pros:** It directly indicates redox potentials and can measure parameters like diffusion coefficients (via peak currents) and qualitative rate (via peak separation in fast scans). It identifies *reversibility* (by i_{pa}/i_{pc}) and can detect multiple redox events. CV can also handle *wide potential ranges*, showing where electrolyte breakdown begins (onset of large irreversible current). **Cons:** Voltammetry doesn't explicitly separate the various resistances and capacitances in the cell. For example, solution resistance (iR drop) can distort CV but is not quantified by it. Similarly, double-layer charging current overlays the faradaic currents, requiring careful baseline subtraction. Kinetic parameters (k^0) extracted via Nicholson's method from CV have limited accuracy for intermediate cases. In systems with multiple overlapping processes, the CV curve can be complex and not easily deconvoluted.

- **Impedance Spectroscopy (Small-signal, linear response):** EIS perturbs the system with a small AC signal (typically 5–10 mV) over a range of frequencies. **Pros:** It provides a **frequency-resolved** view of the system's response, enabling one to distinguish processes by timescale [30] [31]. By fitting to an equivalent circuit, one can directly obtain **ohmic resistance (R_s)**, **charge-transfer resistance (R_ct)**, **double-layer capacitance (C_dl)**, and **Warburg diffusion parameters** [32]. For example, in a Nyquist plot a high-frequency intercept gives R_s, a semicircle diameter gives R_ct (related to kinetics), and a low-frequency 45° line indicates diffusion impedance [33] [34]. EIS is very sensitive to interfaces; it can diagnose the buildup of SEI (which appears as an increasing interfacial resistance or an additional depressed semicircle) [31] [35]. It's also nondestructive and done at equilibrium (or at a set DC bias), so one can probe the state of a battery (state-of-health) without cycling it. **Cons:** EIS does not directly tell you about *capacity* or *energy*. It also requires careful interpretation – different circuit models can fit the data, so understanding the physical meaning is crucial. Also, EIS being a small-signal technique means it linearizes the response; it won't capture non-linear phenomena (like the actual voltage plateau shape or the full extent of side reactions) – it will just show them as resistances or constant-phase elements. The measurement can be time-consuming (scanning down to mHz can take hours).

- **Applications:** Use voltammetry when you need to **identify reactions** and **estimate kinetics qualitatively** (e.g., is a redox couple present? what is its E°′? is it reversible or not?). CV is excellent for testing new electrode materials in half-cells, determining their operating potentials and if any parasitic reactions occur. Use EIS when you need to **quantify internal resistances** and **diagnose interface properties**. For instance, in a battery, EIS can separate charge-transfer resistance at the cathode from ionic resistance in the electrolyte and diffusion in the bulk of electrodes [32]. It's invaluable for studying degradation: as a cell ages, EIS will show R_ct growing or diffusion impedance increasing, even if the capacity is still okay. In corrosion or catalysis, EIS can tell apart capacitance and resistance of layers. In summary, **CV/voltammetry** excels at *qualitative analysis of electrochemical reactions*, whereas **EIS** excels at *quantitative analysis of impedance components*. Often, both are employed – e.g., CV to confirm a ferri/ferrocyanide couple is present and reversible, and EIS to extract the R_ct and D_0 of that redox couple under steady-state bias [32].

6. Theoretical Background: EIS Fundamentals, Equivalent Circuits, and Diffusion-Limited Kinetics

Electrochemical Impedance Spectroscopy (EIS) Fundamentals: EIS involves applying a small alternating perturbation (voltage or current) to an electrochemical cell and measuring the out-of-phase AC response. The ratio of voltage to current as a function of frequency yields the complex impedance Z(ω) [36]. A key point is that different physical processes dominate at different frequency ranges. For example, at high frequencies, only fast processes (like double-layer charging or solution resistance) can respond, whereas slow processes (like diffusion or chemical reactions) cannot keep up – thus high-frequency impedance often reveals the pure ohmic resistance of the electrolyte (since capacitors act like short circuits at very high f). At intermediate frequencies, charge transfer kinetics and double-layer capacitance control the response, often producing a characteristic semicircular Nyquist arc. At low frequencies, diffusion (mass transport) limitations become apparent, often producing a 45° Warburg line or a vertical capacitive line if a finite limit is reached [37]. By analyzing the impedance spectrum (Nyquist and Bode plots), one can deduce kinetic parameters: the intercept at high f gives solution resistance R_s, the diameter of the semicircle gives R_ct (inversely related to exchange current), and the slope of the Warburg tail relates to the diffusion coefficient [33] [37].

Equivalent Circuit Modeling: To interpret EIS data, we use **equivalent electrical circuits** that mimic the electrochemical system's impedance. A simple but important example is the **Randles circuit** [38]. The classical Randles circuit consists of: an ohmic resistor (R_s) in series with a parallel combination of a double-layer capacitor (C_dl) and a charge-transfer branch (which itself is a resistor R_ct in series with a Warburg impedance Z_W) [36] [33]. Physically, R_s represents the solution (electrolyte) resistance. C_dl represents the capacitance of the electrochemical double layer at the electrode/electrolyte interface. R_ct represents the resistance to charge transfer – essentially the kinetic hindrance of the faradaic reaction (related to the exchange current by R_ct = RT/(nFj_0)). The Warburg element (Z_W) accounts for **semi-infinite linear diffusion** of the electroactive species to/from the electrode [33]. In a Randles circuit, the Warburg impedance is in series with R_ct because the faradaic current must proceed through both kinetics and mass transport limitations [33]. Meanwhile, that R_ct+Warburg combination is in parallel with C_dl because the total current can either be faradaic (through the charge-transfer path) or non-faradaic (charging/discharging the double layer) simultaneously [33].

In more complex systems, additional elements are added: for example, a second semicircle might appear at high frequency due to a passivation film or SEI – this could be modeled as an R_film || CPE (constant-phase element, to account for non-ideal capacitance) in series with the rest. A finite-length diffusion (e.g., in a porous electrode or a thin-film) might be modeled by a finite Warburg element or Gerischer impedance. **Constant-Phase Elements (CPEs)** are often used instead of ideal capacitors to fit depressed semicircles (when the phase angle is not exactly 90° for the capacitive branch) [36]. The CPE with exponent *α* ($0<\alpha<1$) can model distributed capacitance or surface heterogeneity. The goal of circuit modeling is to capture the essence of the processes: each element (resistor, capacitor, inductor, Warburg) has a clear physical meaning (resistance = a dissipative process; capacitance = charge storage at an interface; inductance can appear with adsorption phenomena or in leads; Warburg = diffusion).

One must use physical intuition and sometimes additional measurements (e.g., CV) to choose the correct circuit [38]. A good model will fit the data across all frequencies and yield parameter values consistent with independent measurements (like C_dl of order tens of $\mu F/cm^2$, D giving known values, etc.).

Randles Circuit Behavior: In a Nyquist plot (Z_im vs. Z_re), an ideal Randles circuit produces a semicircular arc followed by a 45° sloping line [39]. At high f (leftmost point), Z_im≈0 and Z_re≈R_s (solution resistance). As frequency decreases, the impedance goes into a semicircle: this arc's diameter equals R_ct if diffusion were infinitely fast; with diffusion in series, the arc might shrink slightly and transition into the Warburg line. The midpoint of the semicircle corresponds to the RC time constant (τ = R_ct C_dl). Finally, at low frequencies, the Warburg impedance dominates, giving the 45° line where both Z_re and Z_im increase proportionally to ω^(-½) [34]. If diffusion is finite (e.g., confined to a finite layer), the line will eventually turn vertical (like a capacitor) at very low f. The presence of Warburg is confirmed by a linear |Z| vs. ω^(-½) in Bode magnitude, or equal slope of Z_re and Z_im vs. ω^(-½) [34]. The Randles circuit is one of the simplest models and applies to a single charge-transfer reaction with semi-infinite diffusion. Deviations (like depressed arc or additional arcs) indicate more complex behavior (e.g., surface roughness or multiple time constants).

Diffusion-Limited Electron Transfer: When a redox reaction is under diffusion control, the impedance exhibits the Warburg element. The **Warburg impedance** Z_W has the form Z_W = σ (1–j) ω^(–½), where σ is the Warburg coefficient [40]. This leads to a 45° line in Nyquist plots [34]. In time-domain experiments, diffusion limitation is seen in chronopotentiometry as the Sand's equation behavior: the potential rises sharply once the diffusion layer is depleted (defining a transition time τ). The **Sand equation** (i τ^½ = (π n F A D^½ C*)/2, or in the provided form 85.5 n A D^{1/2} (mA–s^½)/(mM)【Practical Ref】) quantifies the diffusion-controlled charge. Essentially, if a constant current is applied (galvanostatic), the system can sustain it until the reactant concentration at the electrode drops to zero at time τ; beyond that, the voltage diverges (for a fast reversible redox) or the reaction stops. In voltammetry, diffusion-limited current (i_lim) in a rotating disk electrode (Levich equation) or the peak current in CV (Randles–Sevcik) both scale with D^½ – indicating diffusion control of the magnitude of current once kinetics are fast enough. When kinetics are* slower *than diffusion (low k^0), the system is not at diffusion limit – instead it's kinetic- or mixed-control (this shows up as larger peak separations in CV and non-45° behavior in EIS). In EIS, an extremely fast reaction (truly reversible) would show a Warburg at almost all frequencies (since the charge transfer resistance is very low, current is limited by diffusion even at relatively high frequencies). A slow reaction (irreversible) would show a large R_ct and maybe no obvious Warburg until very low frequency, if at all. The interplay of kinetics and diffusion can be captured by the dimensionless parameter ω_crit = (k^0/δ)^2/(D) (for CV or EIS, there are analogous criteria). In summary, diffusion-limited electron transfer refers to the regime where mass transport, not the intrinsic electron-transfer step, governs the rate. Identifying this regime (via 45° Warburg impedance, or plateau currents in CV) allows extraction of diffusion coefficients and underscores the importance of ensuring that when measuring kinetics (k^0), one is operating in a regime not* too* dominated by diffusion.

7. Materials Properties: Graphite Anode, NMC-811 Cathode, and LP30 Electrolyte

Graphite Anode Properties: Graphite is a form of carbon with a layered structure that can intercalate lithium ions between its graphene layers. It has a theoretical capacity of 372 $mAh \cdot g^{-1}$ (for LiC_6, when fully lithiated) [41]. In practice, ~350–360 $mAh \cdot g^{-1}$ is usable in a cell, as some Li is consumed in SEI formation. Graphite's average operating potential is very low – around 0.1–0.2 V vs. Li^+/Li (close to the lithium metal potential) [42]. This low insertion voltage is what gives Li-ion cells high energy density (graphite provides a ~3.7 V average cell when paired with a ~3.9 V cathode). Graphite's structure (hexagonal ABA stacking for most natural/synthetic graphite) accommodates one Li per 6 carbon atoms in the fully charged state. The intercalation process occurs in stages, which manifest as voltage plateaus (~0.25 V, 0.09 V, 0.01 V etc., corresponding to different graphite staging phases)【Practical manual / Fig 1.1.3】. Graphite's advantages include excellent reversibility (thousands of cycles if properly managed), a modest volume expansion (~10%) on full lithiation (thus good mechanical stability), electronic conductivity along the planes, and abundance/low cost. Challenges include sensitivity to electrolyte – graphite will exfoliate in certain solvents (like pure PC) unless a stable SEI is formed [43] [44]. Thus, electrolyte additives (e.g. vinylene carbonate) are often used to ensure a robust SEI. Graphite can also suffer lithium plating if charged too fast or at low temperature (since its potential can drop to 0 V vs Li). Proper charging protocols (e.g. CC-CV charging and not going below ~0.05 V vs Li in normal use) mitigate this. Thermal stability: lithiated graphite can react exothermically with electrolyte if the cell is overheated (one reason for safety concerns at full charge). In summary, graphite remains the dominant Li-ion anode due to its balance of high capacity (the highest of common intercalation anodes), low voltage, and good cycle life [45] [46]. Its **volumetric capacity** is also high (~800 $mAh \cdot cm^{-3}$) because of dense packing of graphene layers [47]. The typical voltage window for graphite in cells is 0 – 0.25 V vs Li (in practice cut off around 0.01–0.15 V to avoid plating and complete utilization) [42] [48].

NMC-811 Cathode Properties: NMC-811 is a **layered oxide** cathode with composition $LiNi_{0.8}Mn_{0.1}Co_{0.1}O_2$. It belongs to the family of Ni-rich NMC materials which offer high capacity and energy. The theoretical specific capacity of NMC-811 is about 275–280 $mAh \cdot g^{-1}$ (if fully charged to ~4.3–4.4 V to extract nearly all lithium) [49]. In practice, cells utilize ~180–200 $mAh \cdot g^{-1}$ when charged to 4.2 V. For example, charging NMC811 to 4.2 V typically yields ~180 $mAh \cdot g^{-1}$, whereas pushing to 4.3–4.4 V can approach 200+ $mAh \cdot g^{-1}$ at the cost of more stress on the material [50] [51]. The nominal voltage of NMC811 vs Li is around 3.8 V. During discharge, it has a sloping profile from ~4.2 V down to ~3.0 V. The mid-point (half de-lithiated, $Li_{0.5}$) is roughly 3.6–3.7 V, so a full cell with graphite has a ~3.6–3.7 V nominal voltage (consistent with commercial 3.6 V or 3.7 V labels) [52]. NMC811's high Ni content is responsible for the high capacity ($Ni^{2+} \rightarrow Ni^{4+}$ provides most of the charge). Manganese and cobalt provide structural and thermal stability – Co stabilizes the layered structure and improves rate capability, Mn suppresses cation mixing and is cheaper. NMC811 is favored for automotive batteries due to its energy density, but Ni-rich cathodes have some drawbacks: Ni^{4+} at high charge can trigger oxygen release from the lattice (especially above ~4.3 V), leading to gas evolution and capacity loss. They are more prone to microcracks upon cycling, as Ni-rich NMC undergoes greater volume change on delithiation. Also Ni-rich cathodes are moisture-sensitive; they can react with water/CO_2 to form surface $LiOH$/Li_2CO_3 which increases impedance. Despite these challenges, NMC811 can be made quite stable for hundreds of cycles, especially with coatings (e.g. Al_2O_3, LiF) or electrolyte additives to protect the cathode-electrolyte interface [1] [53]. The **voltage window** for NMC811 in practice is about 3.0–4.2 V (some manufacturers go to 4.3 V, but cycle life suffers beyond 4.2 V). At the lower end, NMC shouldn't be discharged below ~3.0 V vs Li, otherwise the cell's anode might copper-plate or the cathode may reach full lithiation (which isn't usually harmful for NMC, but going too low can reverse lithium plating on the anode). So typical usage is 3.0–4.2 V. NMC811's density is ~4.8 g/cc (bulk), and pellets have tap density ~2.1–2.3 g/cc, giving a volumetric capacity around 400–450 $mAh \cdot cm^{-3}$ (less than graphite's, hence anode can actually be volume-limiting in cells). NMC811 also has decent thermal stability for a charged cathode, but less so than lower-Ni variants – the exothermic decomposition (with electrolyte) begins at slightly lower temperatures as Ni content increases. Still, with proper cell design and additives, NMC811 cells can meet safety requirements.

LP30 Electrolyte Properties: "LP30" is a common commercial electrolyte formulation: 1.0 M $LiPF_6$ in a 1:1 (by volume) ethylene carbonate (EC) : dimethyl carbonate (DMC) mixture. It is a **carbonate-based liquid electrolyte**. Key properties: **Ionic conductivity** ≈ 10 $mS \cdot cm^{-1}$ at 25 °C [54], which is quite high (EC/DMC mixtures with $LiPF_6$ have conductivities on the order of 8–12 $mS \cdot cm^{-1}$ at room temp). EC is a cyclic carbonate with high dielectric constant, essential for dissolving $LiPF_6$ and forming a stable SEI on graphite. DMC is a low-viscosity linear carbonate that improves conductivity and lowers the melting point of the mixture. LP30 remains liquid at low temperatures (down to ~–20 °C before significant viscosity rise). **Electrochemical stability:** It is thermodynamically unstable above about 4.3–4.5 V vs Li^+/Li. In practice, $LiPF_6$/EC:DMC starts to oxidize on cathode surfaces around 4.2–4.3 V, generating CO_2, CO, etc., and causing transition metal dissolution catalyzed by HF (a $LiPF_6$ hydrolysis product) [55]. Still, it's the standard electrolyte for 4.2 V-class cathodes. At the anode side, LP30 (specifically the EC) *reduces* on graphite at ~0.8 V vs Li on first charge, forming a solid-electrolyte interphase (SEI) that passivates the surface [44]. This SEI is crucial: it prevents continuous solvent co-intercalation and decomposition, enabling graphite to cycle. $LiPF_6$ is not perfectly stable; it slowly decomposes to PF_5 (strong Lewis acid) and LiF, which can catalyze some electrolyte degradation over time. But its decomposition is mitigated by equilibria and additives, and $LiPF_6$ remains the salt of choice due to its balance of conductivity and SEI-forming properties. **Voltage window:** effectively ~0 to 4.2 V in cells (beyond 4.2 V, significant oxidation; below 0 V vs Li (which is actually lithium plating territory) the electrolyte doesn't impose a limit – lithium metal will plate, which is a separate issue). LP30's **thermal properties:** It has a flash point around room temperature (since DMC is volatile; EC is solid at <36 °C but in mixture it stays liquid). Safety-wise, it is flammable. It also has a relatively narrow liquid range (it can cause cells to fail at <–20 °C due to sluggish ion transport). Nevertheless, LP30 (or close variants like EC/DEC or EC/EMC mixtures with $LiPF_6$) is used in most commercial cells. Its success is that it forms good interphases: SEI on graphite and a cathode-electrolyte interphase (CEI) on NMC. One downside is $LiPF_6$ can generate HF in presence of trace water, which attacks the cathode. Additives like organofluorines (e.g. fluoroethylene carbonate, FEC) or phosphates (TPP) are often added (a few percent) to improve stability. But "neat" LP30 already gives solid performance in baseline tests. In summary, LP30 provides high conductivity (~10^{-2} S/cm) [54], and a usable electrochemical window that matches the graphite/NMC voltage range (~0–4.2 V vs Li). It's a **carbonate electrolyte optimized for 4V-class lithium-ion batteries**, making it an appropriate choice for the Cu|Graphite|LP30|NMC811 coin cell in the practical course.

Theoretical Capacities & Voltage Windows (Summary):
- *Graphite:* 372 mAh·g^{-1} theoretical [41]; voltage ~0.1–0.2 V vs Li (delithiation plateau around 0.1 V) [42]. Typically used 0–0.2 V window.
- *NMC-811:* ~275 mAh·g^{-1} theoretical (to ~4.3+ V) [49]; practical ~200 mAh·g^{-1} (to 4.2 V). Voltage ~3.0–4.2 V vs Li (average ~3.7 V). Often specified as 3.6–3.7 V nominal in cells [52].
- *LP30 Electrolyte:* 1 M $LiPF_6$ in EC/DMC. Conductivity ~10 mS/cm @25 °C [54]. Electrochemical stability roughly 0 – 4.3 V vs Li (with kinetic stability due to SEI/CEI formation). Used in coin cells and commercial cells as a standard electrolyte.

---

[1] [50] [53] Enhancing Cycling Stability and Capacity Retention of NMC811 Cathodes by Reengineering Interfaces via Electrochemical Fluorination - Oak Ridge National Laboratory
https://impact.ornl.gov/en/publications/enhancing-cycling-stability-and-capacity-retention-of-nmc811-cath

[2] [3] [4] [5] [6] Electrochemical performance of NMC811 vs graphite cells cycled for... | Download Scientific Diagram
https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Electrochemical-performance-of-NMC811-vs-graphite-cells-cycled-for-different-numbers-of_fig1_358715152

[7] [8] [9] [11] The determination of the diffusion coefficients of ferricyanide,... | Download Scientific Diagram
https://www.researchgate.net/figure/The-determination-of-the-diffusion-coefficients-of-ferricyanide-ferrocyanide_fig7_303600838

[10] Solved According to G Scherer and F. Willig [J_ Electroanal. | Chegg.com
https://www.chegg.com/homework-help/questions-and-answers/according-g-scherer-f-willig-j-electroanal-chem-85-77-1977-exchange-current-density-jo-ptf-q92797339

[12] [13] [20] [21] [23] [24] [25] Use of Inner/Outer Sphere Terminology in Electrochemistry—A Hexacyanoferrate II/III Case Study
https://www.mdpi.com/2673-3293/4/3/22

[14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [22] Cyclic Voltammetry – Theoretical Experiments
https://assets.palmsens.com/app/uploads/2021/11/PSAPP-005-Electrochemical-Experiment-Cyclic-Voltammetry-Theoretical-Experiments.pdf

[26] [27] [28] [29] [32] [35] Basics of Potentiostats and Galvanostats: Principles and Essential Modes for Battery Testing
https://www.labx.com/resources/basics-of-potentiostats-and-galvanostats-principles-and-essential-modes-for-battery-testi/5471

[30] [31] EV Battery Testing: Cyclic Voltammetry vs. Impedance Spectroscopy
https://eureka.patsnap.com/article/ev-battery-testing-cyclic-voltammetry-vs-impedance-spectroscopy

[33] [34] [36] [37] [38] [39] [40] Randles circuit - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Randles_circuit

[41] [42] [43] [44] [46] [47] [48] The success story of graphite as a lithium-ion anode material – fundamentals, remaining challenges, and recent developments including silicon (oxide) ... - Sustainable Energy & Fuels (RSC Publishing) DOI:10.1039/D0SE00175A
https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2020/se/d0se00175a

[45] Advances of lithium-ion batteries anode materials—A review
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666821123001266

[49] Electrolyte Reactivity at the Charged Ni-Rich Cathode Interface and ...
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9098117/

[51] Evolution of LiNi0.8Mn0.1Co0.1O2 (NMC811) Cathodes for Li-Ion ...
https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jpcc.5c00275

[52] Aging mechanisms of NMC811/Si-Graphite Li-ion batteries
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378775324001101

[54] 1M LiPF6 in DMC:EC 1:1 (vol.) - Solvionic
https://solvionic.com/en/electrolytes/5607-1m-lipf6-in-dmc-ec-1-1-vol.html

[55] Differential Electrochemical Mass Spectrometry in Lithium Battery ...
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320053160_Differential_Electrochemical_Mass_Spectrometry_in_Lithium_Battery_Research