Phase transition model of high-nickel positive electrodes: Effects of loss of active material and cyclable lithium on capacity fade
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Abstract
Nickel-rich layered oxides have been widely used as positive electrode (PE) materials for higher-energy-density lithium ion batteries. However, their severe degradation has been limiting battery lifetime. Here we present a phase transition model at the particle level to describe the structural degradation in terms of loss of active material (LAM), loss of lithium inventory (LLI), and resistance increase. The particle degradation model is then incorporated into a cell-level physics-based model (e.g., P2D) to explore the effects of LAM and LLI on capacity fade in cyclic aging tests. It is found that loss of PE active material will terminate the discharging earlier with less PE material to take lithium, thereby diminishing the discharging capacity. The loss of cyclable lithium changes the stoichiometry range of the NE but does not contribute to capacity loss in the simulated cases where LAM dominates the collective response. The shell layer resistance, similar to the SEI resistance at the negative electrode side, suppresses the accessible voltage and power. The work offers insights into the diagnosis of degradation modes from the change pattern of the state of charge curve. The model has been implemented into PyBaMM and made available as open source codes.
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1. Introduction

The pursuit of high energy density has driven the widespread application of layered lithium nickel manganese cobalt (NMC) oxides as positive electrode (PE) materials [1, 2] of lithium ion batteries, especially those with high nickel ratio like NMC811. However, nickel-rich PEs suffer from fast capacity decay and low cycling stability due to a multitude of degradation phenomena, among which a major one is the phase transition from the layered structures to disordered spinel and finally to rock-salt structures at low degrees of lithiation. Here we quantify the degradation with loss of active material, loss of cyclable lithium, and resistance increase by accounting for the phase transition within a particle model and reveal how the degradation leads to cell capacity loss by embedding the particle degradation model into the DFN model framework within PyBaMM [3].

The degradation in nickel-rich PEs results from collective effects of multiple mechanisms intertwined with each other. In general, two types of degradation mechanisms have been widely recognized and reported in the literature: structural and chemical decomposition [2, 4–6]. The first is the structural change through irreversible phase transition of the layered NMC oxides to disordered spinel and rocksalt phases [7, 8] that lose the ability to intercalate lithium. The driving force of the phase transition is that the spinel and rocksalt phases are thermodynamically more stable than deintercalated layered oxides [4]. The phase transition is often accompanied with release of lattice oxygen that eventually leads to formation of oxygen gas (O\textsubscript{2}) [9, 10]. The reaction of O\textsubscript{2} with the electrolyte then results in other gases byproducts such as CO\textsubscript{2} and CO [2, 9]. The second mechanism of chemical decomposition refers to the chemical and electrochemical reactions at the interface between the NMC active material and electrolyte, which is likely to be coupled with the first mechanism of phase transition. The surface reactions can result in the dissolution of transition metals (abbreviated as TM and referring to Ni, Mn and Co) and formation of a thin surface layer called pSEI (positive solid electrolyte interphase) [2]. The pSEI layer, consisting of several compounds such as TM fluoride (MF2) and TM carbonates, could impede lithium transport and consume cyclable lithium. The dissolved transition metal ions may migrate through the electrolyte and react on the negative electrode (NE) particle surface, promoting SEI formation at the NE side that consumes lithium ions and raises impedance [11–13]. Other degradation mechanisms like mechanical fracturing can further impair the PE by exposing newly formed surface to the electrolyte [2] and enabling further structural and chemical degradation.

In spite of the light shed by existing experimental studies, the causes of degradation are still not fully understood [4] due to the complex intertwining of various mechanisms. Lai et al. [6] claimed that whether the phase transition or the solid-solution reaction causes the degradation remains an open question. Zhang [10] attributed almost all known problems of NCM811 to the release of lattice oxygen occurring in the irreversible phase transition of layered \( \rightarrow \) spinel \( \rightarrow \) rocksalt and suggested to focus on suppression of oxygen evolution for degradation mitigation. Ko et al. [1] believed that the degradation stems from closely related chemical and structural changes, which cannot be interpreted independently. Apparently, a more clear picture of the degradation mechanisms is urgently needed, and further elucidation are expected from continuing experimental studies.

Meanwhile, how these degradation mechanisms eventually lead to cell capacity fade, which could be better understood by quantitative modeling studies, is also not clear and has been barely touched by researchers. Ghosh et al.
[14] have recently proposed a shrinking-core model to describe the structural phase transition and oxygen release and diffusion through the passivation layer. By allowing the passivation layer to grow, this model predicts capacity fade in a charging cycle caused by the loss of active material and loss of lithium inventory. Other relevant modeling works were conducted by Lin et al. [15] who considered manganese dissolution, electrolyte oxidation, and salt decomposition on the PE and SEI growth and manganese deposition on the NE, and by Jana et al. [16] who considered electrolyte oxidation and chemo-mechanically induced fracture at the PE side.

Instead of elucidating the complex mechanisms, this paper aims to offer another perspective to the PE degradation problem by revealing how a single mechanism leads to capacity fade through physics-based modeling. Based on current experimental understandings, we choose to model the phase transition mechanism and its impact on cell capacity fade. The irreversible phase transition is universally recognized as an inevitable degradation mechanism especially for nickel-rich layered materials, and it seems to be the most important one because of two observations. First, the electrolyte oxidation and chemical reactions (including pSEI) mainly occur at the initial stage, much like the SEI formation at the NE side [2], while the phase change and oxygen evolution accompany the whole life of the batteries [10]. Second, according to the summary of Edge et al. [2], the spinel and rocksalt layer have been reported to have thickness of from 15 to 100 nm for different battery chemistries at different cycling, operating, and storage conditions, while a surface layer of up to around 10 nm was found to build up on NMC811 positive electrodes, which is believed to be the pSEI.

Following the shrinking-core idea in Ghosh et al. [14], we model the phase transition as a progressive process within a single PE particle from the surface to the center. However, the degradation is described in a different way—it is twofold here: the primary degradation modes [17], directly caused by the phase transition, encompasses the loss of active material, the loss of cyclable lithium, and resistance increase, while the secondary degradation refers to the capacity loss and power loss caused by the primary degradation modes. The assumptions, different from those in Ghosh et al. [14], directly relate the phase transition to the primary degradation modes. Specifically, the passivation layer, formed by phase transition, is assumed to constitute the loss of active material and trap some cyclable lithium that leads to loss of cyclable lithium (Section 2.2). Furthermore, the passivation layer is assumed to retard lithium ion transport and thus increases resistance (Section 2.3) following similar ideas to SEI layer [18]. A particle model considering these assumptions is developed (Section 2) to quantify the primary degradation modes and then incorporated into a cell-level model framework (Section 3) to explore more realistic cycling behavior. The primary degradation modes caused by the phase transition is demonstrated in Section 4.1 for the purpose of model verification. We then demonstrate the model capability of reproducing experimentally observed phenomenon (Section 4.2) by exaggerating the degradation speed in cyclic test simulations, focusing on revealing the effects of LAM and LLI (primary degradation modes) on the cell-level capacity fade (secondary degradation).

2. Particle degradation model

This paper models the specific degradation mechanism of phase transition of active material in PEs at extremely low state of lithiation (i.e., high cell SoC). In this section, we start with developing a shrinking-core degradation model
Fig. 1. Schematic showing degradation of a PE particle during positive electrode delithiation (cell charging). The degradation is manifested by moving phase boundary resulting into shrinking core and growing shell. Concentrations $c_{p,t}$, $c_{p,b}$, and $c_s$ are the active core concentrations at 100% SoC, core concentrations at 0% SoC, and fixed concentration trapped in the degraded shell. This plot is inspired by Ref. [19].

for a single particle in the PE, following which the particle degradation model will be embedded into the DFN model framework in the next section to simulate the cell performance. The degradation is assumed to proceed with the core-shell phase boundary moving towards the particle center. The PE delithiation (cell charging) process is sketched in Fig. 1 with phase transition occurring at the end of delithiation. Model assumptions are as follows.

- The active core denotes the undegraded material with layer structure and thus allows lithium to (de)intercalate (concentration varies between $c_{p,b}$ and $c_{p,t}$ in Fig. 1).

- The degraded shell represents the spinel and rocksalt phases and traps a fixed amount of lithium ($c_s$ in Fig. 1) inside; it also serves as lithium ion conductor but with increased resistance causing overpotential across the shell.

- The shell layer growth depends on the lithium concentration and oxygen concentration at the phase boundary.

- The degradation is defined as the phase transition from the core to shell phases and quantified by primary degradation modes of loss of lithium inventory (LLI), loss of active material (LAM) in the PE, and shell layer resistance.

Based on these assumptions, the governing equations as well as boundary conditions are outlined in Section 2.1, and the mass conservation of lithium across the moving phase boundary is deduced to define the moving boundary conditions. The phase transition induced LAM and LLI are then formulated and calculated in Section 2.2, and the shell layer resistance and overpotential are discussed in Section 2.3.

2.1. Governing equations and boundary conditions

The active core enables lithium to be inserted or extracted, and thus lithium diffusion is considered and modeled. As phase transition proceeds at the core-shell phase boundary, oxygen is released and then diffuses out through the
shell. The governing equations for lithium diffusion in the core and oxygen diffusion in the shell are

\[
\frac{\partial c_c}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{h}_c = 0, \quad (1a)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial c_o}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{h}_o = 0, \quad (1b)
\]

where the mass fluxes for lithium and oxygen are expressed as \( \mathbf{h}_c = -D_c \nabla c_c \) and \( \mathbf{h}_o = -D_o \nabla c_o \), respectively. At the particle center, due to the geometry symmetry, we have the Neumann boundary condition

\[
\mathbf{h}_c|_{r=0} = 0 \quad (2)
\]

for the lithium diffusion equation. At the shell surface, the oxygen concentration is assumed to be null as we assume any oxygen species will react fast:

\[
c_o|_{r=R} = 0. \quad (3)
\]

The boundary condition for Eq. (1a) at the moving core-shell interface will be derived from lithium conservation across the moving interface as follows. At the core-shell interface, the concentration at the shell side is constant at \( c_s \) as assumed, while the concentration at the core side is the field variable \( c_c \) that is undetermined. Consider Fig. 2a where fresh phase transition of a thin layer is sketched. Recall that the core-shell phase boundary moves towards the particle center with time: at time \( t = t_0 \), the phase boundary is located at \( r = s(t_0) \); later at \( t = t_1 \), it moves to \( r = s(t_1) \). During the small time interval \( \Delta t = t_1 - t_0 \), a thin layer of the particle \( (s(t_1) < r < s(t_0)) \) has undergone phase transition from active core to degraded shell. Meanwhile, the lithium concentration change in this layer is \( \Delta c(t) = c_s - c_c(t) \), and the total lithium increase is

\[
\Delta M = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} 4\pi s^2(t) [\Delta c(t)] \, dt, \quad (4)
\]

where \( \dot{s}(t) \) is the time rate of phase boundary location and the negative sign in the bracket is to ensure positive volume of the thin layer. By mass conservation, it is naturally to assume that the total lithium increase Eq. (4) is equal to the lithium flowing into the layer from the core and the shell:

\[
\Delta M = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} 4\pi s^2(t) [\mathbf{h}_c \cdot \mathbf{n}_r + \mathbf{h}_s \cdot (-\mathbf{n}_r)] \, dt, \quad (5)
\]

where \( \mathbf{n}_r \) denotes the unit vector along the \( r \) direction at the interface (Fig. 2a). Substituting Eq. (4) into Eq. (5), we have

\[
\int_{t_0}^{t_1} 4\pi s^2(t) [\dot{s}(t)\Delta c(t) + \mathbf{h}_c \cdot \mathbf{n}_r - \mathbf{h}_s \cdot \mathbf{n}_r] \, dt = 0. \quad (6)
\]

Because the above equation holds for all intervals of integration \([t_0, t_1]\), it follows that the integrand must vanish
Fig. 2. Schematic of the shrinking-core degradation model for a positive electrode particle. The core represents the active material while the shell denotes the degraded surface layer due to phase transition. (a) Moving of core-shell phase boundary within a small time interval $\Delta t = t_1 - t_0$ from $r = s(t_0)$ to $r = s(t_1)$ with a thin layer of active material transformed to shell phase. $\mathbf{n}_r$ denotes the unit vector along the $r$ direction, and $j_p$ represents the interfacial current density leaving the particle. (b) Illustration of the shell layer overpotential and potentials used in Butler-Volmer equation.

Identically

$$\dot{s}(c_s - c_e) + \mathbf{h}_c \cdot \mathbf{n}_r - \mathbf{h}_e \cdot \mathbf{n}_e = 0. \quad (7)$$

The mass flux term from the core side can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{h}_c \cdot \mathbf{n}_r = -D_c \frac{\partial c_e}{\partial r} \mathbf{n}_r \cdot \mathbf{n}_e = -D_c \frac{\partial c_e}{\partial r}, \quad (8)$$

and the mass flux term associated with the shell phase is related to the interfacial current density according to mass conservation in the shell:

$$\mathbf{h}_e \cdot \mathbf{n}_e = (R/s)^2 j_p \frac{F}{F}, \quad (9)$$

where the interfacial current density $j_p$ is positive when lithium leaves the shell and $F$ is Faraday constant. Inserting Eqs. (8) and (9) into Eq. (7), we arrive at

$$\dot{s}(c_s - c_e) - D_c \frac{\partial c_e}{\partial r} - (R/s)^2 j_p \frac{F}{F} = 0. \quad (10)$$

Following the same procedures, we can obtain the boundary condition for Eq. (1b) at the core-shell interface via oxygen conservation across the moving interface. Analogy to Eq. (7), for oxygen conservation we have

$$\dot{s}(c_o - c_{oc}) - \mathbf{h}_o \cdot \mathbf{n}_r = 0, \quad (11)$$

where $c_{oc}$ is the fixed oxygen concentration in the core stored in oxide compounds, and $c_o$ is the field variable at the
interface at the shell side. This relation suggests that chemical reaction and phase transition release the stored oxygen in the core into an oxygen species that will diffuse out through the shell. Applying the same operation as in Eq. (8), we can reformulate \( h_0 \cdot n \) and rewrite Eq. (11) as

\[
\dot{s}(c_o - c_{oc}) + D_o \frac{\partial c_o}{\partial r} = 0. \tag{12}
\]

We remark that the field variables \( c_c \) and \( c_o \) are unknowns at \( r = s(t) \), and thus the two boundary conditions Eqs. (10) and (12) are of Robin type, expressing mass conservation of lithium and oxygen across the moving phase boundary.

To complete Eqs. (10) and (12), the time rate of the moving phase boundary location needs to be specified. The inwards moving of the phase boundary in general depends on lithium and oxygen concentrations at interface, as well as temperature. Often the temperature speeds up the degradation. Due to the lack of experimental data for direct validation, we do not aim to model the degradation at the real-world rate, and thus the temperature effect is out of the scope of this paper. We follow the relation in Ghosh et al. [14] and describe the time rate of phase boundary as

\[
\dot{s} = \begin{cases} 
-(k_1 - k_2 c_o), & \text{if } c_c < c_{\text{thd}}; \\
0, & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases} \tag{13}
\]

where \( c_c \) and \( c_o \) takes values at \( r = s(t) \).

2.2. LAM and LLI

Like other degradation mechanisms, the phase transition induced degradation leads to loss of PE active material (LAM\(_{pe}\)) and loss of lithium inventory (LLI). We assume the shell phase is completely degraded with no capacity and is only a conductor of lithium ions. The LAM\(_{pe}\) is thus defined as the volume fraction of the shell phase over the whole particle:

\[
\text{LAM}_{pe} = 1 - \frac{V_{\text{core}}}{V_{\text{particle}}} = 1 - \left( \frac{s}{R} \right)^3, \tag{14}
\]

where \( V_{\text{core}} = 4\pi s^3/3 \) is the volume of the active core and \( V_{\text{particle}} = 4\pi R^3/3 \) denotes the particle volume.

The loss of lithium inventory (LLI) is defined through the difference between the current lithium content and the initial content in both positive and negative electrodes. By convention, the lithium content refers to the total lithium \( M_{\text{tot}} \) in the electrodes and is calculated as follows:

\[
M_{\text{tot},p} = c_c \times (1 - \text{LAM}_{pe}) \times V_{a,p}, \tag{15a}
\]

\[
M_{\text{tot},n} = c_n \times V_{a,n}, \tag{15b}
\]

where \( c_c \) and \( c_n \) represent lithium concentration in the positive core and negative particle, respectively, and \( V_a \) is
active material volume in the PE ("p") and NE ("n"). The LLI in terms of total lithium is then defined as

$$\text{LLI}_{\text{tot}} = 1 - \frac{M_{\text{tot}}}{M_{\text{tot},0}} = 1 - \frac{M_{\text{tot,p}} + M_{\text{tot,n}}}{M_{\text{tot,p},0} + M_{\text{tot,n},0}},$$

(16)

where subscript "0" indicates the initial state. As phase transition proceeds, the degraded shell layer grows and traps more and more lithium that cannot be used in cycling. Therefore, the total lithium in both electrodes is always lost with phase transition, and thus LLI$_{\text{tot}}$ is always positive during the phase transition.

However, not all the lithium in the active material will be used to shuttle between the PE and NE. As shown in Fig. 3, the experimental operating protocol determines the 0% and 100% SoCs, corresponding to, respectively, the top value of lithium concentration $c_{p,t}$ in the PE paired with the bottom value of concentration $c_{n,b}$ in the NE (shaded in light blue) and the bottom value $c_{p,b}$ in the PE paired with the top value $c_{n,t}$ in the NE (light pink). The difference between the top and bottom values represents the cyclable lithium. The portion $c_{p,b}$ (also $c_{n,b}$) is not cycled between the PE and NE, and thus its loss may have no impact. It appears the loss of cyclable lithium matters most importantly. To this end, we further define the total cyclable lithium, based on the 0% and 100% SoCs, as

$$M_{\text{cyc,p}} = (c - c_{p,b}) \times (1 - \text{LAM}_{\text{pe}}) \times V_{\text{a,p}},$$

(17a)

$$M_{\text{cyc,n}} = (c - c_{n,b}) \times V_{\text{a,n}}.$$  

(17b)

Here we deduct the real-time concentration $c_c$ and $c_n$ by their respective bottom limit values. The corresponding LLI in terms of total cyclable lithium is

$$\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}} = 1 - \frac{M_{\text{cyc}}}{M_{\text{cyc},0}} = 1 - \frac{M_{\text{cyc,p}} + M_{\text{cyc,n}}}{M_{\text{cyc,p},0} + M_{\text{cyc,n},0}}.$$  

(18)

The phase transition occurs when the lithium concentration in the PE is low (see Eq. (13)), and therefore the amount of lithium which is trapped, denoted as $c_s$, should also be low. If $c_s$ is equal to $c_{p,b}$, we infer that LLI$_{\text{cyc}}$ (Eq. (18)) will be null, although LLI$_{\text{tot}}$ (Eq. (16)) is positive. Because of no loss of cyclable lithium, the cell performance may not be affected. If $c_s$ is not equal to $c_{p,b}$, the cyclable lithium can however increase or decrease, resulting in negative or positive LLI$_{\text{cyc}}$, respectively.

### 2.3. Shell resistance and overpotential

As the shell is considered as being fully degraded, we assume that the intercalation reaction occurs at the core surface. Meanwhile, the shell layer is also assumed to be ion-conductive so that lithium ions can be transferred to the core surface. The ion-transferring process results in a potential drop across the shell layer, which needs to be considered in the calculation of overpotential for interfacial current density. The consideration of the shell is much similar to the conventional treatment of SEI layer at the NE side [18].

We assume the resistivity of the shell layer is constant and uniform that is denoted as $\rho$. Since the shell is generally thin, we approximate it as a flat shell with thickness $\delta = R - s$ and surface area $A = 4\pi R^2$. The shell layer resistance is
Fig. 3. Illustration for cyclable lithium shutting between PE and NE. With the cell SoC varying between 0 and 100%, the lithium concentration \( c_p \) in the PE particle varies between two limit values \([c_{p,b}, c_{p,t}]\), and concentration \( c_n \) in the NE particle varies between \([c_{n,b}, c_{n,t}]\). The 0% cell SoC is defined by \( c_{p,t} \) in PE paired with \( c_{n,b} \) in NE, while 100% cell SoC by \( c_{p,b} \) in PE with \( c_{n,t} \) in NE. The trapped lithium in degraded shell layer is constant at \( c_s \), which is comparable to \( c_{p,b} \).

Formulated as

\[
R_{\text{shell}} = \frac{\rho \delta}{A},
\]

and the potential drop across the shell is

\[
\eta_{\text{shell}} = IR_{\text{shell}} = \rho \delta j_{p,\text{ave}},
\]

where \( I \) is the current flowing from the particle to the electrolyte and \( j_{p,\text{ave}} = I/A \) is the averaged interfacial current density.

By convention we use Butler-Volmer equation to describe the intercalation reaction at the PE active core surface, and the interfacial current density \( j_p \) is expressed as

\[
j_p = j_0 \left[ \exp \left( \frac{0.5F}{RT} \eta_p \right) - \exp \left( -\frac{0.5F}{RT} \eta_p \right) \right],
\]

where \( j_0 \) is the exchange current density and \( \eta_p \) is the reaction overpotential. The current density \( j_p \) is defined positive when lithium leaves the active material particles. The exchange current density \( j_0 \) is written as

\[
j_0 = k F c_s^{0.5} c_e^{0.5} \left( c_{s,\text{max}} - c_s \right)^{0.5},
\]

where \( k \) (m\(^2\)mol\(^{-0.5}\)s\(^{-1}\)) is the rate constant of the charge transfer reaction, \( c_{s,\text{max}} \) is the maximum saturation concentration of intercalated lithium, \( c_s \) is the surface lithium concentration of the active core, and \( c_e \) is the lithium ion concentration in the electrolyte.
Referring to Fig. 2b, the reaction overpotential $\eta_p$ at the PE in Eq. (21) is expressed, by definition, as

$$\eta_p = \phi_s - \phi'_e - U_{ocv},$$

where the equilibrium potential $U_{ocv}$ is a function of the surface concentration $c_{s,s}$ of the active core, and $\phi_s$ is the cell-level electric potential of the solid phase. Following the same idea of Safari et al. [18] in addressing the SEI layer overpotential, we relate the ion-conductive phase potential $\phi'_e$ at the interface to the electrolyte potential $\phi_e$ via

$$\phi'_e = \phi_e + \eta_{shell}, \quad (23)$$

and thus the PE reaction overpotential $\eta_p$ in Eq. (21) is finally formulated as

$$\eta_p = \phi_s - \phi_e - \eta_{shell} - U_{ocv}. \quad (24)$$

### 3. Full-cell model

The particle degradation model developed in Section 2 describes a single particle in the PE. It must then be incorporated into a framework with cell-level descriptions for the cell degradation estimation, in place of the microscale fickian diffusion model of lithium. The widely-used DFN model is in general used as the cell-level framework, and the remaining equations are outlined in the following (Sections 3.1 and 3.2) for completeness. Readers are referred to literature [20, 21] for more details.

#### 3.1. Lithium diffusion in negative particles

In negative electrode, lithium diffusion without any degradation is modeled within each particle, and the governing equations reads

$$\frac{\partial c_n}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (-D_n \nabla c_n) = 0, \quad (25)$$

where $D_n$ is the diffusivity in negative particles. The same Neumann boundary condition as in Eq. (2) applies to Eq. (25). At the particle surface, the following Neumann boundary condition is applied

$$-D_n \frac{\partial c_n}{\partial r} = j_n/F, \quad (26)$$

where the interfacial current density is also obtained through Butler–Volmer equation in Eq. (21) except that the contribution from the shell layer is not included in overpotential $\eta$ calculation (Eq. (24)) and parameters need to change to those associated with negative electrode.

#### 3.2. Conservation equations at cell level

A cell consists of the NE, separator, and PE. At the cell level, both the NE and PE have solid phase where electronic conduction $\phi_s$ is modeled and electrolyte phase where ionic conduction $\phi_e$ and lithium ion transport $c_e$ are considered.
The separator only has the electrolyte phase. Conservation of electric charge in the solid phase of two electrodes implies that
\[
\nabla \cdot \left( -\sigma^{\text{eff}} \nabla \phi_s \right) = -aj,
\]
where \(\sigma^{\text{eff}}\) and \(\phi_s\) denote the effective electronic conductivity and electric potential inside the electrode phase, respectively. Here \(j\) is the interfacial current density from the active particle to the electrolyte (charge sink), and \(a\) denotes the active particle surface area per unit electrode volume:
\[
a = \frac{4\pi R^2}{4/3\pi R^3 \epsilon_s} = \frac{3\epsilon_s}{R},
\]
where \(\epsilon_s\) denotes the active material volume fraction and \(R\) active particle radius. Conservation of lithium ion in the electrolyte phase of the whole cell (two electrodes and separator) can be expressed as
\[
\epsilon_e \frac{\partial c_e}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left( -D_{e}^{\text{eff}} \nabla c_e \right) = (1 - t_e) a j F,
\]
where \(c_e\) denotes the lithium-ion concentration, \(\epsilon_e\) is the volume fraction of electrolyte phase, \(D_{e}^{\text{eff}}\) is the effective diffusion coefficient, \(t_e\) is the lithium-ion transference number, and \(F\) is Faraday’s constant. Conservation of electric charge in the electrolyte phase of the whole cell is written as
\[
\nabla \cdot \left( -k^{\text{eff}} \nabla \phi_e + \kappa_D^{\text{eff}} \nabla \ln c_e \right) = aj,
\]
where \(k^{\text{eff}}\) is the effective ionic conductivity, \(\phi_e\) is the electric potential, and \(\kappa_D^{\text{eff}}\) is expressed as
\[
\kappa_D^{\text{eff}} = \frac{2RTk^{\text{eff}}}{F} \left( 1 + \frac{\partial \ln f_e}{\partial \ln c_e} \right) (1 - t_e),
\]
where \(T\) is the temperature and \(f_e\) is the mean activity coefficient. The effective electronic conductivity \(\sigma^{\text{eff}}\), effective electrolyte diffusivity \(D_{e}^{\text{eff}}\), and ionic conductivity \(\kappa^{\text{eff}}\) are given by Bruggemen’s relation:
\[
\sigma^{\text{eff}} = \sigma \epsilon_s^{\alpha}, \quad D_{e}^{\text{eff}} = D_e \epsilon_e^{\alpha}, \quad \kappa^{\text{eff}} = \kappa \epsilon_e^{\alpha},
\]
where \(\alpha = 1.5\) by convention, and \(\sigma\) \((\epsilon_s)\), \(D_e\) \((\epsilon_e)\), and \(\kappa\) \((\epsilon_e)\) are bulk material properties and they can be concentration dependent.

3.3. Cell voltage

The DFN model resolves the variation of field variables in the through-cell direction and thus is especially needed for cases of (dis)charging at high C-rates. However, for the cases where averaged quantities over the electrode thickness are more relevant, a simpler and more suitable choice is the Single Particle Model (SPM). Likewise, to include the PE phase transition we can replace the fickian diffusion model for the PE particle in the SPM with the developed
particle degradation model. The simplification from the DFN model to SPM can be found for example in Marquis et al. [21], and here we just detail the cell terminal voltage calculation in the SPM for better interpretation of the following simulation results.

Similar to PE reaction overpotential in Eq. (24), the NE reaction overpotential is expressed as

$$\eta_n = \phi_{n,s} - \phi_e - U_{n,ocv}, \tag{32}$$

except for the shell overpotential term $\eta_{shell}$. The difference between the solid phase potential of the PE and that of the NE is defined as the cell terminal voltage and can be obtained by subtracting the two equations Eqs. (24) and (32):

$$V_t = \phi_{p,s} - \phi_{n,s} = U_{p,ocv}(c_{p,s}) - U_{n,ocv}(c_{n,s}) + \eta_p - \eta_n + \eta_{shell}. \tag{33}$$

where we attach subscript “p” to $\phi_s$ and $U_{ocv}$ in Eq. (24) for differentiation from the NE quantities. Note that in the SPM, we ignore the electrolyte effect and consider equal33 electrolyte potential in both the PE and NE.

4. Results and discussion

This section examines the capability of the proposed model in describing the phase transition induced LAM$_{pe}$, LLI$_{cyc}$, and shell layer resistance $R_{shell}$ and how they finally contribute to capacity fade. We first verify the model in Section 4.1 by checking the simulation results against our prediction in the simple setting of storage aging. Then we run cyclic aging tests to demonstrate the effects of LAM$_{pe}$, LLI$_{cyc}$, and $R_{shell}$ on capacity fade in Section 4.2. In the first two sections, the particle degradation model is embedded into the Single Particle Model (SPM in PyBaMM) that is more convenient but enough for us to interpret the simulation results and understand the underlying mechanisms. We then plug the particle degradation model into the Doyle-Fuller-Newman model framework (DFN in PyBaMM) to demonstrate degradation variation in the electrode thickness direction at high current rates (Section 4.3).

The battery cell used for the numerical simulation is a commercial lithium-ion cell with NMC811 cathode and SiC anode. The simulation parameters are taken from Refs. [14, 22]. We do not present these parameters her but post them together with model implementation codes on the public PyBaMM repository.

4.1. LAM and LLI in storage aging

In this section we quantify three types of degradation: LAM$_{pe}$, LLI$_{cyc}$, and shell resistance in storage aging at low levels of PE lithiation (high cell voltage). The LAM$_{pe}$ and shell resistance are straightforward to calculate as they directly depends on the shell layer thickness as shown in Eqs. (14) and (19). However, the LLI$_{cyc}$ defined in Eq. (18) does not directly depend on the extent of degradation and thus needs further study. We assumed that the lithium in the degraded shell is fixed and no longer contributes to any capacity of the cell. Thus, the parameter $c_s$ of the fixed lithium concentration in the shell, although not explicitly appearing in Eq. (17a), is a key factor impacting the calculation of LLI$_{cyc}$. To understand how cyclable lithium is lost, we also investigate the effect of the parameter $c_s$. To this end, we charge the cell at a low C-rate (0.5C) to the upper cut-off voltage 4.2 V and then store it for 6 hours,
Fig. 4. Effect of the trapped lithium content $c_s$ on loss of total lithium $\text{LLI}_{\text{tot}}$ and loss of total cyclable lithium $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$. Three cases are considered: (I) $c_s = 0.182 c_{p,\text{max}} < c_{p,b}$, (II) $c_s = 0.222 c_{p,\text{max}} = c_{p,b}$, and (III) $c_s = 0.324 c_{p,\text{max}} > c_{p,b}$. The experimental protocol is the same for all three cases, and thus the applied current $I$ (a) keeps unchanged. The phase boundary location $s/R$ and LAM (c) do not depend on $c_s$ and hence the three cases share the same plots. Subplots (e) and (h) present, respectively, the LLI and lithium concentration at three time instants during the 6-hour rest for case (I). Case (II) and (III) are referred to in the remaining subplots.

during which degradation occurs. Three cases are considered: (I) $c_s = 0.182 c_{p,\text{max}} < c_{p,b}$, (II) $c_s = 0.222 c_{p,\text{max}} = c_{p,b}$, and (III) $c_s = 0.324 c_{p,\text{max}} > c_{p,b}$.

As shown in Fig. 4, the storage starts at $t = 2.34$ h and ends at $t = 8.34$ h. The degradation is triggered at the end of charging process ($t = 1.62$ h). The specified protocol is manifested by the current profile as shown in Fig. 4a. The parameter $c_s$ however does not affect the progress of phase transition. Therefore, the core-shell phase boundary location $s/R$ and LAM$_{\text{pe}}$ behave in the same way for all the three cases as shown in Fig. 4b-c: they stay constant at the initially specified value before $t = 1.62$ h as no degradation occurs and then decreases/increases in accordance with the phase transition.

The loss of lithium inventory ($\text{LLI}_{\text{tot}}$ and $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$) are shown in Fig. 4e–g for the all three cases. Since the trapped lithium $c_s$ in the shell is considered as pure loss and not counted in the total lithium calculation in Eq. (15a), the $\text{LLI}_{\text{tot}}$...
should always be positive and increases with time and degradation. From case (I) to (III), we can see the higher the $c_s$ value, the more loss of total lithium ($\text{LLI}_\text{tot}$) when the degradation and shell volume growth are the same for all the cases. Note that however they share the same initial value 3.89% because of the manually-set non-zero initial shell thickness for which the same amount of lithium loss is considered.

In contrast, the variation of $\text{LLI}_\text{cyc}$ depends on $c_s$ relative to $c_{p,b}$: it decreases with progressive phase transition when $c_s < c_{p,b}$ (case I), suggesting that extra cyclable lithium is harvested due to the phase transition; when $c_s > c_{p,b}$ (case III), we observe positive $\text{LLI}_\text{cyc}$ increasing with degradation; if $c_s = c_{p,b}$ (case II), $\text{LLI}_\text{cyc}$ stays null, regardless of phase transition. The explanation is as follows. In the core, the portion of lithium $c_{p,b}$ in Fig. 3 is not cycled and thus can be viewed as “trapped” in the core, and only the rest portion is taken into account in the calculation of total cyclable lithium (Eq. (17a)). Consider the transition of a thin layer of active core to shell phase (see Fig. 2a) when $c_s = c_{p,b}$. The phase transition just moves the trapped lithium in the transformed core to the newly-formed shell and pushes all the remaining cyclable lithium in the transformed core to the untransformed active core due to the mass conservation across the phase boundary. In this process, there is no loss and gain of cyclable lithium. If $c_s > c_{p,b}$, some cyclable lithium in the transformed core will be consumed to fill the gap between the trapped lithium concentration in shell and that in the core, leading to positive $\text{LLI}_\text{cyc}$. If $c_s < c_{p,b}$, some part of the trapped lithium in the transformed core, together with the rest cyclable lithium, will be pushed to the remaining untransformed active core and thus converted to be cyclable again. We remark that this harvesting of cyclable lithium does not violate physics as $c_{p,b}$ and the cyclable lithium are user-defined.

The lithium concentration change in the active core is shown in Fig. 4h–j as phase transition proceeds. After the voltage control ($t = 2.34 \text{ h}$), the concentration in the active core is approximately $c_c = 11.27 \text{ kmol/m}^3$, which is always higher than $c_{p,b} = 10.95 \text{ kmol/m}^3$ at 100% cell SoC. In case I and II, the values of $c_s$ are 9 kmol/m$^3$ and 10.95 kmol/m$^3$, respectively, and lower than the lithium concentration in the core 11.27 kmol/m$^3$. Hence, the lithium concentration in the core undergoing phase transition will take a drop from $c_c$ to $c_s$, and the difference is pushed back to the untransformed core due to the conservation law. This explains the lithium concentration increases slightly in the core as phase transition proceeds; see the concentration profiles at three time instants in Fig. 4h and i. However, in case (III), $c_s = 16 \text{ kmol/m}^3$ is higher than the lithium concentration $c_c = 11.27 \text{ kmol/m}^3$ in the core. The lithium must go from the core to the shell to fill the concentration gap and thus decreases with time as shown in Fig. 4j. In conclusion, the change of lithium concentration in the active core, unlike the $\text{LLI}_\text{cyc}$, depends on the comparison of its value against the $c_s$ value.

4.2. Capacity fade in cyclic aging

We demonstrated in the previous section that the phase transition causes $\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}}$, $\text{LLI}_\text{cyc}$, and shell resistance, and in this section we run cyclic tests to explore their effects on cell capacity fade. Three scenarios are simulated: (I) only $\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}}$, (II) $\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}} + \text{LLI}_\text{cyc}$, and (III) $\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}} + \text{LLI}_\text{cyc} +$ shell resistance. A typical cycle is specified as
and 20 cycles are repeated for all scenarios under manually-specified accelerated degradation. Here we add the voltage control and rest for an hour after the constant current charging in order to allocate more time for degradation, and for symmetry the same procedures are applied after the discharging process.

The results of scenario I are shown in Fig. 5 to explore the effect of LAM_{pe} exclusively. In this case, we set the parameter $c_s = c_{p,b}$ so that there is no loss of cyclable lithium (see null LLI_{cyc} in Fig. 5c) and $\rho = 0$ so that there is no shell resistance and null overpotential across the shell layer (not shown here). The null LLI_{cyc} in Fig. 5c can also be cross-checked by the constant total cyclable lithium $M_{cyc} = M_{cyc,p} + M_{cyc,n}$ in both PE and NE particles in Fig. 5e.

As shown in Fig. 5a, the normalized phase boundary location $s/R$ decreases with time, suggesting phase transition occurs towards the particle center as we assumed. However, it is not decreasing all the time, and this is because of the condition specified in Eq. (13) that the phase transition only occurs when the core surface concentration is lower than the threshold value. Hence, the phase transition occurs and phase boundary location decreases mainly at the end of charging and in the following voltage control process and rest period; it stays unchanged otherwise. Correspondingly, the LAM_{pe} increases with time (Fig. 5b) in the similar fashion to the phase boundary location, as governed by Eq. (14). Note that we specify an non-zero initial shell thickness to avoid numerical issues.
Fig. 5d shows the variation of cell SoC with time. The SoC is calculated through coulomb counting for cell discharging.

\[
\text{SoC} = -\frac{1}{Q} \int_0^t I(t) \, dt,
\]

where \( Q \) is the nominal capacity and \( I \) is the current being positive for cell discharging. As a cycle begins, the SoC first increases in the charging process and the following voltage control process, and then it stays constant in the rest period; in the latter half of a cycle, the SoC decreases in the discharging and voltage control processes and then stays unchanged during the rest period. This variation pattern is repeated from cycle to cycle. However, the difference between the maximum and minimum SoC values keeps changing with cycle number; specifically, the SoC range is shrinking with cycle number, leading to capacity fade. To be more precise, the SoC upper limit stays unchanged while the lower limit increasing as cycle number goes up.

The shrinkage of SoC range is due to the phase transition induced degradation, and the specific changing pattern is caused by the increasing LAM\(_{pe}\) and null LLI\(_{cyc}\), as explained below. At the end of charging, all cyclable lithium is supposed to be shuttled into the NE particle. The NE particle is not degraded in our model and thus is able to accommodate all the cyclable lithium, regardless of the cycle number. In this scenario, there is no loss of cyclable lithium; therefore, the SoC upper limit at the end of charging does not vary with cycle number. This is also confirmed by the unvarying upper limit of cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc,n} \) in the NE particle in Fig. 5e that equals the total cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc} \). Now consider the other side. As the discharging starts, the cyclable lithium is transferred back to the PE particle. However, due to the LAM\(_{pe}\), the PE is not able to take all the cyclable lithium. The more degradation and more LAM\(_{pe}\), the less lithium the PE particle can take and the more lithium is left in the NE particle at the end of discharging. This is verified by the observation in Fig. 5e that the upper limit of cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc,p} \) in the PE particle is decreasing while the lower limit of cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc,n} \) in the NE particle is increasing. Therefore, with increasing cycle number and LAM\(_{pe}\), the lower limit of SoC is pushed higher.

Fig. 5f shows the particle surface concentrations in the PE \( (c_{surf,p}/c_{max,p}) \) and NE \( (c_{surf,n}/c_{max,n}) \) normalized by respective maximum concentrations. Two observations follow. First, the upper limit of normalized concentration in the NE particle basically does not change, and so does the lower limit of normalized concentration in the PE particle. Second, in accordance with the increasing lower limit of \( M_{cyc,n} \) in Fig. 5e, the lower limit of normalized surface concentration in the NE particle keeps increasing with cycle number, and this increase drives its counterpart—the upper limit of normalized surface concentration in the PE particle to increase slightly to meet the fixed lower cut-off terminal voltage (2.8 V) that indicates the potential difference between the two electrodes (see Fig. 6 and relevant discussion for more details). Note that this resultant slight increase in the PE particle does not conflict with the decreasing upper limit of total cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc,p} \) in Fig. 5e because of the LAM\(_{pe}\).

The normalized surface concentration can be interpreted as stoichiometry at the particle surface that determines the electrode potential. The variation of the two limit values of the normalized surface concentrations reflects the degradation effect on the stoichiometry ranges of both particles and the matching between them. We thus pick the first and last cycles and show in Fig. 6 the terminal voltage, PE potential, and NE potential of the discharging process versus the SoC. Corresponding to the first observation from Fig. 5f, all the three voltage curves start almost at the same
point (fully charged state), showing negligible difference between the first and last cycles. The difference lies in the PE particle, in which degradation is progressed and more LAM\(_{\text{pe}}\) is incurred. However, the cyclable lithium \(M_{\text{cyc,pe}}\) in the PE particle at the starting point (lower limit in Fig. 5e) is null for both the first and last cycles, and the concentration in the core takes the bottom value \(c_{p,b}\) that equals the trapped concentration \(c_{s}\) in the shell. The progressive phase transition has no impact when the PE particle has null cyclable lithium.

As explained above, the discharging in the last cycle terminates earlier than the first cycle due to the LAM\(_{\text{pe}}\). This is manifested by the increase of the SoC lower limit from 0.04 in the first cycle to 0.36 in the last cycle. Since the NE particle has no degradation, the potential curve of the last cycle just covers the left-hand part of the first-cycle potential curve. Hence, the NE potential of the last cycle at the end of discharging is lower than that of the first cycle, but the same lower cut-off voltage (2.8 V) is imposed to the terminal voltage—compare the solid and dashed purple lines. It follows that the PE potential is driven to be lower. A lower PE potential suggests higher surface concentration and stoichiometry, corresponding to the second observation from Fig. 5f. Thus, the stoichiometry range of the PE particle is expanded due to the shrinkage of the NE stoichiometry range, leading to a re-matching of stoichiometry range.

We remark that, in spite of the null LLI\(_{\text{cyc}}\), the loss of total lithium is always increasing, in pace with the phase transition, but it is not a key factor. Rather, it is the loss of cyclable lithium that matters, which will be further discussed in scenario II. We can conclude that the capacity fade in this scenario is exclusively caused by the loss of PE active material (LAM\(_{\text{pe}}\)) that terminates the discharging earlier—LAM\(_{\text{pe}}\) shrinks the SoC range by lifting its lower limit. The lower side of the stoichiometry range of the NE particle is shrunk due to LAM\(_{\text{pe}}\), and this shrinkage causes the expanding of the upper side of the stoichiometry range of the PE particle.

Compared to scenario I, scenario II has additional loss of cyclable lithium LLI\(_{\text{cyc}}\), and the positive LLI\(_{\text{cyc}}\) is achieved by setting \(c_{s} > c_{p,b}\). In Fig. 7c, the LLI\(_{\text{cyc}}\) increases with time (and degradation), which is cross-checked by the decreasing total cyclable lithium \(M_{\text{cyc}}\) in Fig. 7e. Note that we still keep \(\rho = 0\) to have null shell resistance and overpotential in this scenario.
Results of scenario II as shown in Fig. 7 are similar to those of scenario I in Fig. 5, except for some differences caused by the introduced non-zero LLI_{cyc}. First, the direct effect of LLI_{cyc} is the decrease of the SoC upper limit with cycle number from 0.95 to 0.86 as shown in Fig. 7d, which is evident if we apply the same reasoning behind the constant upper limit at 0.95 in the case of null LLI_{cyc}. The effect can also be seen from Fig. 5e that the upper limit of cyclable lithium in the NE particle \( M_{cyc,n} \) keeps decreasing at the same pace with the total cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc} \).

Second, although the SoC lower limit also increases with cycle number due to the LAM_{pe}, the increase (0.26) in Fig. 7d is smaller than that (0.36) in Fig. 5d. The smaller increase is completely due to the LLI_{cyc}, explained as follows. The LAM_{pe} in scenario II is the same as that in scenario I (44.71% in Fig. 5b and Fig. 7b), and hence the decrease of the upper limit of cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc,p} \) in the PE particle, due to LAM_{pe}, does not change from scenario I to scenario II (0.12 to 0.075 in both Fig. 5e and Fig. 7e). Thus, the lifting effect of LAM_{pe} on lower limit of \( M_{cyc,n} \) should be the same in both scenarios; the difference is that in scenario II the decrease of total cyclable lithium \( M_{cyc} \) (i.e., LLI_{cyc}) further drops the lower limit of \( M_{cyc,n} \), diminishing the lifting effect of LAM_{pe}.

The impact of LLI_{cyc} on the SoC range is exerted in the way that it hammers the right-hand side of the SoC curve downwards with the left-hand side fixed (compare Fig. 5d with Fig. 7d). However, the difference between the upper and lower limits almost keeps unchanged from scenario I to II, suggesting no further capacity loss by LLI_{cyc}. The contribution to capacity loss is mainly from the dominant effect of LAM_{pe}, but this conclusion is exclusive to the setting in this scenario. Imagine a case where the LLI_{cyc} effect is dominant over the LAM_{pe} effect, e.g., the drop of \( M_{cyc} \) in Fig. 7e (LLI_{cyc}) is larger than the decrease of the upper limit of \( M_{cyc,p} \) due to LAM_{pe}. In such a case, the LLI_{cyc} will lead to capacity loss.
The downwards shifting of the SoC range in Fig. 7d is also reflected in Fig. 8. The NE potential-SoC curve of the last cycle still overlay that of the first cycle but is slightly shifted to the right-hand side, compared to Fig. 6. Accordingly, the starting points of PE potential and terminal voltage of the last cycle are moved to the right-hand side. The slight cell SoC decrease (0.95 to 0.86) from the first to the last cycles suggests that the NE is progressively less lithiated at the end of charging due to the LLI\_cyc. The NE potential thus becomes higher and consequently leads to a higher PE potential under the constraint of fixed upper cut-off terminal voltage (4.2 V). A higher PE potential at the end of charging will further accelerate the PE degradation, acting as a positive feedback. In Fig. 8, the increase of the NE and PE potentials is extremely slight because the potential curve we used for SiC NE in our simulations is basically flat at high lithiation levels. In this scenario, the NE stoichiometry range is shrunk at both ends: one by the LAM\_pe and the other by the LLI\_cyc. Accordingly, the PE stoichiometry range is expanded at both ends, and a re-matching between their stoichiometry ranges occurs.

We remark that the model prediction of higher PE potential and accelerated PE degradation is confirmed by experimental aging studies [23] of graphite/NMC811 full cells. In Dose et al. [23], the progressively less lithiated graphite is attributed to the electrode slippage, which is also named stoichiometry drift and related to the stoichiometry range re-matching in our simulations. Our simulation results also offer a possible explanation for the underlying mechanism of electrode slippage—loss of cyclable lithium LLI\_cyc.

Besides LAM\_pe and LLI\_cyc discussed above, we further consider the resistance of the shell layer and the resultant overpotential in scenario III. As indicated by Eq. (20), the overpotential depends on the current and shell layer thickness. The variation of shell overpotential \( \eta_{\text{shell}} \) is shown in Fig. 9b: its amplitude increases with cycle number because of the growing shell layer thickness (alternatively, decreasing phase boundary \( s/R \) in Fig. 9a); its frequency and variation pattern follows the current change (not shown here but can be imagined according to the test protocols).

The shell layer overpotential impacts the terminal voltage as can be seen in Eq. (33). During discharging, lithium goes into the PE particle and the shell layer overpotential \( \eta_{\text{shell}} \) is calculated to be negative according to Eq. (20). The difference incurred is as follows. In Figs. 6 and 8, the starting terminal voltage of the discharging process in the first
and last cycles is 4.14 V. In Fig. 10, the starting terminal voltage drops to 4.1 V in the first cycle and to 3.65 V in the last cycle. The terminal voltage continues to be diminished during the following discharging process, depressing the available power of the cell.

Furthermore, since the lower cut-off voltage is fixed, the extra shell layer overpotential leads to earlier termination of the discharging process, i.e., the discharging ends at a higher SoC value (0.27 in Fig. 8 versus 0.33 in Fig. 10). This means the shell layer overpotential narrows down the SoC range from the bottom side (end of discharging): from \([0.26, 0.86]\) in Fig. 7d without shell layer overpotential to \([0.32, 0.84]\) in Fig. 9d with overpotential. Accordingly, the stoichiometry range of the NE in the last cycle is shrunk from scenario II to III. Note that there is a minor difference in the SoC lower limits between Fig. 10 (0.33) and Fig. 9d (0.32), and this is because the following voltage control process after the discharging process slightly pulls down the SoC. The same phenomena and reasoning apply to Fig. 8 and Fig. 7d.

We also observe that the SoC upper limit is also smaller in Fig. 9d than in Fig. 7d, and this small shrinkage is mainly due to the enlarged loss of cyclable lithium \(\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}\), as can be seen in Fig. 9b and Fig. 7b. The higher \(\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}\), as well as lower \(s/R\) value, is caused by longer time (119 hours) to complete 20 cycles in scenario III than 108 hours in scenario II. The extra time in scenario III is consumed by the voltage control process after charging.

Finally, we plot the discharging capacity fade for all the three scenarios in Fig. 11. The difference between scenario I and II is negligible because, as we discussed above, the \(\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}}\) effect is dominant over the \(\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}\) effect and the additional \(\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}\) does not result in extra capacity loss. The capacity in scenario III drops apparently faster because of the extra shell layer overpotential.
Fig. 10. Scenario III: terminal voltage, PE potential, and NE potential during the discharging process of the first and last cycles.

Fig. 11. Discharging capacity fade for scenario I considering LAM\textsubscript{pe}, scenario II considering LAM\textsubscript{pe} and LLI\textsubscript{cyc}, and scenario III considering LAM\textsubscript{pe}, LLI\textsubscript{cyc}, and shell layer resistance.
4.3. Degradation heterogeneity in through-cell direction

In the previous section, we present the degradation in the average sense and disregard its variation in the electrode thickness direction. Here we present the degradation heterogeneity across the electrode thickness under 1C constant current charging followed by voltage control and a half-hour rest. In this case, the particle degradation model is implemented within the DFN model framework in PyBaMM.

The current variation, in accordance with the specified protocol, is shown in Fig. 12a, in which the decreasing current period is under voltage control. Here we pick four time instants, corresponding to point A-D in Fig. 12a, and show the positive core surface concentration $c_{c,surf}$, phase boundary location $s/R$, and loss of PE active material $LAM_{pe}$ in subplots b-d, respectively. The three quantities in b-d not only change with time but also are functions of $x$ that denotes the depth through the PE relative to the current collector at the NE side (98.7 µm is the thickness of NE and separator). At the starting point A, the lithium concentration is set to be uniform across the electrode and also inside the core of each PE particle, and the core surface concentration (Fig. 12b) is thus constant in the $x$ direction. The phase boundary location (Fig. 12c) is also set to be constant at the initial value in the whole electrode. During the constant-current charging and voltage control processes, lithium are removed from the PE and inserted into the NE, leading to continuous decrease of the PE core (surface) concentration. In particular, the surface concentration is lower at the separator side of the PE, and this is because the interfacial flux is larger for particles close to the separator as the resistance for current flow is smaller. At point B, the core surface concentration has dropped dramatically to the extent that the surface concentration at the separator side (left-hand side in Fig. 12b) is lower than the phase transition threshold value. Hence, the phase boundary moves inwards for particles close to the separator; the lower the surface concentration, the more phase transition and the lower the $s/R$ value. The surface concentration in the right-hand side is still above the phase transition threshold value, and thus there is no phase transition at higher $x$ values in Fig. 12c. After point B, the cell charging gradually fades until the current vanishes. Accordingly, we observe the slight decrease of surface concentration from B to C and D in Fig. 12b. However, the phase boundary location $s/R$ keeps decreasing (B→C→D) as the surface concentration stays at low levels. The low concentration enables the phase transition to proceed across the whole electrode, and the time rate of $s/R$ in Eq. (13) is basically uniform in the $x$ direction. Therefore, $s/R$ as a function of $x$ moves downwards as a whole in Fig. 12c. The $LAM_{pe}$ at the four time instants in Fig. 12d show similar profiles and behavior to the phase boundary $s/R$ because of the definition Eq. (14).

Fig. 13 shows the oxygen concentration contours at the four picked time instants. The oxygen concentration resides in the shell phase of each particle across the entire electrode thickness. The horizontal axis denotes the electrode thickness ($x$) direction, and the vertical axis represents the radial $r$ direction of a particle. Note that the phase boundary $s$ is moving all the time due to phase transition; thus, the actual height of the four subplots expands gradually with time. Initially, the oxygen concentration is uniform in both direction and stays null. Corresponding to point B, as phase transition occurs first in the left-hand side, the oxygen stored in the core starts to be released into the shell, and this explains the concentration hot point in the lower left corner. The concentration decay in the $r$ direction is due to diffusion of oxygen in the shell, while the decay in the $x$ direction is due to the lower level of phase transition at location away from the separator (Fig. 12c). With phase transition spreading from the left-hand side (B)
Fig. 12. Degradation heterogeneity in electrode thickness direction in numerical test of cell charging followed by voltage control and rest. (a) The current $I$ variation with time in minutes. (b) Positive core surface concentration $c_{c,surf}$, (c) phase boundary location $s/R$, and (d) loss of PE active material LAM\textsubscript{pe} at four time instants corresponding to four points A-D in (a). The PE is represented by $98.7 \leq x \leq 164.9 \mu m$ in thickness direction.
to the whole electrode (C and D), the generated oxygen is flooding into the whole electrode, and the longer time of phase transition, the higher value of oxygen concentration (C vs D). However, the oxygen concentration gradient remains in the $r$ direction due to the boundary condition of null oxygen at the shell surface.

5. Conclusion

We developed a shrinking-core particle model to describe the degradation mechanism of phase transition for high-nickel PEs and presented a two-step strategy to understand the degradation effects. The progress of phase transition directly results in primary degradation modes of loss of active material of PE ($\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}}$), loss of lithium inventory ($\text{LLI}_{\text{tot}}$ and $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$), and additional shell layer resistance (Section 4.1); the primary degradation modes then deteriorate the cell performance in terms of capacity and power (Section 4.2).

It is found that the $\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}}$ lifts the lower limit of the SoC range by terminating the discharging process earlier, while the $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$ suppresses the upper limit of the SoC range; in our simulated cases, the $\text{LAM}_{\text{pe}}$ is the dominant factor contributing to capacity loss. The shell layer overpotential shrinks the SoC range from both ends, leading to power reduction and further capacity fade under fixed voltage window operation. The primary degradation modes narrow the stoichiometry range of the NE and consequently expand the PE stoichiometry range for a re-matching. The PE potential increase at the end of charging is slight due to the flat open circuit potential of the NE used in our simulation at high lithiation; however, for a NE with steeper potential curve, we expect a noticeable PE potential increase caused by the $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$, being a positive feedback and accelerating the PE degradation.

It is the $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$, not $\text{LLI}_{\text{tot}}$, that impacts the cell performance, and thus we suggest to explicitly differentiate the cyclable lithium from the total lithium in the calculation of LLI. $\text{LLI}_{\text{tot}}$ is always occurring with phase transition, but it is not the case for $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$; the $\text{LLI}_{\text{cyc}}$ depends on the concentration of lithium ($c_s$) trapped in the degraded materials, which is assumed as a constant in our model. Thus, the calibration of parameter $c_s$ from experiments is key to identifying the LLI effects.
The study of LAM and LLI effects on capacity fade has offered insights into experimental diagnosis of battery degradation modes. Specifically, we can differentiate the contribution to degradation by LAM from that by LLI according to the cell SoC variation curve and especially its change pattern. With the primary degradation modes captured, the model can qualitatively reproduce experimentally observed phenomena (e.g., capacity fade and stoichiometry drift). However, challenges remain in model calibration and validation against specifically designed experiments.
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Appendix A. Numerical implementation in PyBaMM

The particle degradation model is implemented as a submodel in PyBaMM [3], which is an open-source python programming package aimed at solving physics-based electrochemical DAE models. The submodel can then be called by the Single Particle Model and Doyle-Fuller-Newman model available in PyBaMM, in place of the original particle model that only considers fickian diffusion. The nondimensionalization of equations and boundary conditions and implementation (codes) can be found in the public PyBaMM repository.

Regarding the degradation particle model, there are two numerical challenges to address. The first is that the computational domains of the core and shell are changing with time due to the moving phase boundary. To fix this problem, we follow the same numerical trick as in Refs. [14, 19] and define two new spatial variables $\eta$ and $\chi$ for the core and shell, respectively:

$$\eta = \frac{r}{s}, \chi = \frac{r - s}{R - s},$$

where $r$ is the spatial coordinate in the radial direction, $s$ denotes the phase boundary location, and $R$ is the particle radius (see Fig. 2). Now the computational domains of the core and shell both reduce to $\eta, \chi \in [0, 1]$.

The second is the discretization of the Robin-type boundary condition (10). Referring to Fig. A.14, the discretized version can be expressed as

$$\bar{s}(c_s - c_{cb}) - D_c \frac{2 c_{cb} - c_{cN}}{I_1} - (R/s) \frac{\bar{j}_p}{F} = 0. \quad (A.1)$$

The boundary value $c_{cb}$ is solved from Eq. (A.1) and used to express the boundary flux term (the middle term), and then the flux term is applied in the same way as the normal Neumann boundary condition. The same procedure applies to the boundary condition (12) for oxygen diffusion.

---

1Monica pls help to check and rephrase this paragraph.
2Monica could u pls check this discretized bc.
Fig. A.14. Schematic of discretization of the moving phase boundary condition (10).
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