HIGREEW First Project Workshop

In Pilsen and Online

Activated vs nonactivated: quantitative assessment of reactivity for optimizing RFB electrodes

Mathieu Etienne, Ranine El Hage, Vincent Feynerol, Mariela Brites Helú, Liang Liu, Rafael-Luan Sehn-Canevesi, Vanessa Fierro

CNRS, 3.02.2022



The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union under Grant Agreement no. 875613

HIGREEW - 875613 - 1st Project workshop

Carbon Felt characterization



In-situ and operando measurements, close to real-device applications

Microscale

- Geometry complexity (porosity, compact tangled fibers, high specific surface)
- Difficult to quantify certain parameters (e.g. kinetics)



Macroscale

Local

Experimental setup for porous macro felt studies

Side/3D view



Working electrode: studied carbon felt (SGL GFD 4.6 mm, non-activated and commercially activated); d = 1 cm

- Reference electrode: Ag/AgCl pseudo-reference
- Counter electrodes: carbon felt; d = 5 cm

<u>Studied electrolytes</u>: TEMPO derivate molecule: 10^{-4} M in 1 M NaCl Ammonium ferrocyanide: 10^{-4} M in 1 M NH₄Cl



Top view





(a) TEMPO-based molecule
(b) Ammonium hexacyanoferrate
Figure 1: Typical cyclic voltammograms (scan rate: 10 mV.s⁻¹) on SGL graphite felts with (a) TEMPO-based[□]
molecule and (b) ammonium hexacyanoferrate

4

Theory of cyclic voltammetry in random arrays of cylindrical microelectrodes applied to carbon felt electrodes for vanadium redox flow batteries



Table 3 Kinetic and geometric parameters obtained from the fit

Felt	n '	$T \mathrm{K}^{-1}$	$A \ \mathrm{cm}^{-2}$	c/mol I	$L^{-1} D_{\rm R}/c$	$m^2 s^{-1}$	$D_{\rm O}/{\rm cm}^2$	$s^{-1} a/\mu m$
6 mm fresh 6 mm aged 8 mm fresh 8 mm aged	1 2	296	26.5 26.5 45 49	0.16	2.72	imes 10 ⁻⁶	2.5×10	0^{-6} 4.2
Felt	α	$k^{0}/$	cm s ⁻¹	k_p/s^{-1}	k_{-p}/s^{-1}	k_f/s^{-1}	k_{-f}/s^{-1}	$\nu/\mathrm{mV}~\mathrm{s}^{-1}$
6 mm fresh 6 mm aged 8 mm fresh 8 mm aged	0.6 0.5 0.6 0.5	54 6.8 55 3.2 54 6.8 55 3.2	$10^{-5} \times 10^{-5} \times 10^{-5} \times 10^{-5} \times 10^{-5} \times 10^{-5}$	0.0028	0.0015	0.0006	0.0003	1.0



Fig. 4 SEM data acquired for pristine (A and B) and electrochemically aged (C and D) GFD4.6 carbon felt electrodes. From A and C it can be seen, that the assumption of just one fiber radius is sufficient. From B and D the approximate fiber radius of 4.2 μ m was extracted.

Système VO²⁺/VO₂⁺

T. Tichter, D. Andrae, J. Mayer, J. Schneider, M. Gebhard, C. Roth, Theory of cyclic voltammetry in random arrays of cylindrical microelectrodes applied to carbon felt electrodes for vanadium redox flow batteries, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 21 (2019) 9061–9068. doi:10.1039/c9cp00548j.



Figure 2: Simulation of Cyclic Voltammetry with "Statistically Weighted External Cylindrical Finite Diffusion" model using Polarographica software (in red) compared with compensated experimental data (in black) on non-activated SGL graphite felt with TEMPO-based system (left) and ammonium hexacyanoferrate (right). Scan rate: 10 mV.s⁻¹. Concentration: 10⁻⁴ M in supporting electrolyte.



Figure 3: Nyquist diagrams of EIS experiments on SGL graphite felt with TEMPO-based molecule (left) at estimated formal potential ($E^0' = 0.66$ V vs Ag/AgCl quasi-reference) and with (NH_4)₄Fe(CN)₆ molecule (right) at estimated formal potential ($E^0' = 0.25$ V vs Ag/AgCl quasireference)

For analysis of the impedance spectra with graphite felts, the macrohomogeneous model developed by Paasch, Micka and Gersdorf was used, in addition to some minor modifications.

 R_{ohm} : Ohmic resistance [Ω]

C: Double-layer capacitance [*F.cm*⁻²]

γ: CPE exponent

*k*⁰: Heterogeneous charge transfer kinetic constant [cm.s⁻¹]

I_p: *Diffusion layer thickness [cm]*

S_c: *Specific surface area* [*cm*².*cm*⁻³]

f_p: Tortuosity coefficient

φ: Non-uniform diffusion exponent

G. Paasch, K. Micka, and P. Gersdorf, "Theory of the electrochemical impedance of macrohomogeneous porous electrodes," *Electrochim. Acta*, vol. 38, no. 18, pp. 2653–2662, 1993, doi: 10.1016/0013-4686(93)85083-B.

Table 2: Averaged optimized parameters' values (calculated from the three replications) and their standard deviation values for EIS experiments carried out on SGL graphite felt with TEMPO-based molecule (left) at estimated formal potential of 0.66 V vs Ag/AgCl and with ammonium hexacyanoferrate (right) at estimated formal potential of 0.25 V vs Ag/AgCl

÷‡•

		TEMP	O-based		$(NH)_4 Fe(CN)_6$				
	Non-activated		Activated		Non-activated		Activated		
	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	
R_{ohm} [Ω]	19.1	17.7	31.1	2.3	64.0	48.2	51.2	41.1	
$C [\text{F.cm}^{-2}.\text{s}^{\gamma-1}]$	1.02E-04	3.51E-06	9.56E-05	1.34E-05	5.27E-05	7.34E-06	9.04E-05	2.21E-06	
γ [-]	0.97	0.002	0.99	0.01	1.00*	0.00	1.00	0.00	
k^0 [cm.s ⁻¹]	1.57E-03	7.26E-05	5.77E-02	3.97E-02	2.20E-03	3.70E-04	3.27E-02	2.26E-02	
<u>l</u> _p [cm]	0.0011	0.00003	0.0020	0.0001	0.0010	0.00009	0.0019	0.00004	
$S_c \ [{\rm cm}^2.{\rm cm}^{-3}]$	331.8	4.1	286.4	23.4	294.6	9.6	278.1	35.7	
<u>f</u> _R [-]	3.01	0.24	1.21	0.11	6.44	0.87	1.31	0.21	
$oldsymbol{\phi}$ [-]	0.91 [*]	0.00	0.91 [*]	0.01	0.81	0.02	0.91*	0.01	

*value fixed during optimization

Carbon Felt characterization



Microelectrodes: Fibers extracted from the same carbon felt



- Ex-situ measurements
- Well-defined geometry
- Relatively more time-consuming process





(a) TEMPO-based molecule (b) Ammonium hexacyanoferrate *Figure 4: Typical cyclic voltammograms (scan rate: 100 mV.s⁻¹) on carbon fibre microelectrode plotted on microfibres extracted from SGL graphite felt with (a) TEMPO-based molecule and (b) ammonium hexacyanoferrate*

The representation of cyclic voltammograms was done according to the method presented by Compton, Laborda and Ward [2]

[2] R. G. Compton, E. Laborda, and K. R. Ward, Understanding Voltammetry. 2014.

Table 3: Average of optimized parameters' values (calculated from the three replications) and their standard deviation values for microelectrodes' cyclic voltammograms with TEMPO-based compound (left) and ammonium hexacyanoferrate (right). The resulting ratio between optimized surface area and measured geometric area is also given.

		TEMP	O-based		(NH) ₄ Fe(CN) ₆				
	Non-activated		Activated		Non-activated		Activated		
	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	
<i>k</i> ⁰ [cm.s ⁻¹]	6.87E-04	3.22E-04	6.58E-03	4.16E-03	1.89E-05	9.32E-06	4.76E-03	2.46E-03	
$A [cm^2]$	7.10E-04	1.41E-04	8.08E-04	2.03E-04	6.42E-04	8.82E-05	7.79E-04	1.32E-04	
Att/Agee [-]	0.96	0.14	1.07	0.05	0.85	0.19	1.05	0.12	
A: Electrode geome	tric area (cr	acc coction f	or carbon fol	t cylindor a	no for micro	alactroda) [cm ² 1		

A: Electrode geometric area (cross section for carbon felt, cylinder area for microelectrode) [cm²]



Carbon fibres microelectrodes can be reasonably represented as cylindrical electrodes and impedance at their surface can then simply be modelled with a Randle circuit.

Landon-Lane and co-authors mentioned problems in convergence when using this expression and suggested the use of a simplified equation with errors in real and imaginary parts not exceeding 4% of their original values [21].

[21] L. Landon-Lane, A. T. Marshall, and D. A. Harrington, "EIS at carbon fiber cylindrical microelectrodes," *Electrochem. commun.*, vol. 109, no. September, p. 106566, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.elecom.2019.106566.

 R_{ohm} : Ohmic resistance [Ω]

 Y_0 : Pseudo-capacitance (for microelectrode model)[F.cm⁻².s^(\gamma - 1)]

γ: CPE exponent

D: Diffusion coefficient [cm².s⁻¹]

m_o: Mass transfer coefficient [cm.s⁻¹]

		TEMP	O-based		(NH)₄Fe(CN) ₆				
	Non-ae	ctivated	Activated		Non-activated		Activated		
	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	Average	Std Dev	
R_{ohm} [Ω]	534.4	172.2	2605.0	3736.3	569.0	187.4	2090.4	1555.5	
Y_0 [F.cm ⁻² .s ^{γ-1}]	2.68E-06	5.10E-07	2.56E-05	1.58E-05	3.64E-06	2.05E-06	1.08E-04	5.63E-05	
γ [-]	0.96	0.01	0.84	0.04	0.96	0.02	0.79	0.02	
k^{0} [cm.s ⁻¹]	9.00E-04	1.75E-04	5.81E-03	3.63E-03	1.76E-05	6.44E-06	5.95E-03	3.84E-03	
$D \ [\text{cm}^2.\text{s}^{-1}]$	4.47E-06	1.44E-06	3.88E-06	5.59E-07	1.26E-05	5.58E-06	4.38E-06	9.17E-07	
m_{Q} [cm.s ⁻¹]	-	-	-	-	1.00E-03	1.63E-04	-	-	

Conclusions

 k^0 values analysed from micro-fibres are systematically lower than that analysed from macro-fibres where the differences may reach *ca*. two orders of magnitude in some cases.

The reason for these discrepancies is unclear but one possible explanation could be the analytical model for macro-felts, where the geometrical approximations might not always correspond well to the experimental systems.

From the practical point of view, direct measurements on macro-felts are more convenient and straightforward.

On the other hand, measurements on extracted micro-fibres may reveal more sensitively the kinetic difference for electrode materials undergoing different treatments. Moreover, they may also provide information on the heterogeneity of the felt by extracting fibres randomly from different areas

Possible outlook: non destructive measurement at microscale to extract kinetic information



Carbon Felt characterization





Targeting individual fibers in the felt: Scanning Gel Electrochemical Microscope

- Target particular areas of the substrate (e.g. bending parts)
- In-situ measurements
- Non-destructive
- Fast kinetics



Quantitative assessment of several activation protocols



Degradation of activation over time

- Degradation of the kinetic response of ferrocyanide was noticed some time after activation of the initial carbon felt
 - Measurement 1.5 and 3 months after activation for the "optimal" activation of each technique



Degradation during characterization





Any reaction beyond -1.4 V impacts irreversibly the electrode



In the operating potential range of the battery, the electrode appears to be stable

Conclusions:

>Quantitative kinetic data were obtained for graphite felt materials

Different material treatments were tried, and their influence on the electron transfer kinetic was determined

> Optimal materials for the Higreew electrolytes were determined

> Microscale measurement gives also an opportunity to evaluate aging/degradation of the electrodes





Thank you!





The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union under Grant Agreement no. 875613





Disclaimer/ Acknowledgment



Copyright ©, all rights reserved. This document or any part thereof may not be made public or disclosed, copied, or otherwise reproduced or used in any form or by any means, without prior permission in writing from the HIGREEW Consortium. Neither the HIGREEW Consortium nor any of its members, their officers, employees, or agents shall be liable or responsible, in negligence or otherwise, for any loss, damage or

expense whatever sustained by any person because of the use, in any manner or form, of any knowledge, information or data contained in this document, or due to any inaccuracy, omission or error therein contained.

All Intellectual Property Rights, know-how and information provided by and/or arising from this document, such as designs, documentation, as well as preparatory material in that regard, is and shall remain the exclusive property of the HIGREEW Consortium and any of its members or its licensors. Nothing contained in this document shall give, or shall be construed as giving, any right, title, ownership, interest, license, or any other right in or to any IP, know-how and information.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 875613. The information and views set out in this publication does not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf, may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

