From Additive to Cosolvent: How Fluoroethylene Carbonate Concentrations Influence Solid–Electrolyte Interphase Properties and Electrochemical Performance of Si/Gr Anodes

Lydia Gehrlein, Christian Njel, Fabian Jeschull, and Julia Maibach*

ABSTRACT: Silicon-containing anodes perform best when the solid–electrolyte interphase (SEI) accommodates the high volume changes of silicon particles, as this reduces side reactions and extends the cell lifetime. With this work, we investigate the influence of different fluoroethylene carbonate (FEC) electrolyte concentrations on the SEI composition and thickness and correlate these SEI properties to the electrochemical performance. Three electrolytes (i.e., 2FEC:98LP30, 20FEC:80DMC, and 50FEC:50DMC) are cycled with 9% Si/Gr anodes, and their SEIs are characterized postmortem using photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS). We propose a fitting model for the XPS results in which FEC decomposition yields −C−O, DO (1,3-dioxolan-2-one), −CO3Li, Li2CO3, and LiF. −C−O, DO, and −CO3Li are most probably incorporated in a cross-linked polymeric network. Due to its distinct chemical environments, detecting DO can be unambiguously linked to the presence of FEC decomposition products in the SEI. The presence of DO-type species in the C 1s spectra is correlated to the electrochemical performance: A higher retention in silicon activity was observed for the 20 and 50 vol % FEC-containing electrolytes, where FEC decomposition products (i.e., DO) were present even after 100 cycles. By contrast, when cycling in the 2FEC:98LP30 electrolyte, the silicon activity cannot be retained, and FEC decomposition products are barely detected after 100 cycles. We suggest that the presence of the −C−O, DO−, and −CO3Li-containing polymeric network positively influences the SEI during silicon volume changes. Additionally, we show that the interaction of FEC and LiPF6 plays an important role in the formation of SiO2F2 species.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In lithium-ion batteries, the stability of the solid–electrolyte interphase (SEI) is essential to a long cycle life. During lithiation, the electrolyte is repeatedly exposed to potentials outside its stability window (<1.3−0.8 V), resulting in its decomposition and deposition of solid products on the anode surface building the SEI. Especially in the first cycle, while the electrode surface is still bare, electrolyte decomposition occurs to a high degree. Many of these decomposition products are irreversibly formed and are depleting the lithium reservoir, which causes large capacity losses and low Coulombic efficiencies. However, once formed, the SEI ideally acts as a protective barrier, minimizing electrolyte reduction. Whether the SEI layer is operating as a protective barrier is mainly dependent on the nature of the formed electrolyte decomposition products as well as the electrode material. This is especially the case for materials such as silicon with high volume changes during lithiation and delithiation. As a result, silicon particles may pulverize, and the electrode material can delaminate from the current collector. Additionally, these volume changes cause high mechanical stress on the SEI, leading to cracks and re-exposure of silicon particles to the electrolyte. This leads to continuous SEI formation, thus depleting the lithium reservoir and electronically isolating silicon particles. Ultimately, these effects result in capacity fading and the cell’s end of life. Blending silicon with graphite can mitigate these effects. Graphite’s positive effects are (1) reduction of the stress on the electrode coating by providing a porous structure that accommodates the silicon volume change, (2) mitigation of
electronic contact losses, and a decrease of SEI formation. However, the overall electrochemical performance still heavily depends on the electrolyte used. Additive-free carbonate-based electrolytes such as LP30 (1 mol of LiPF6 in 1:1 ethylene carbonate:dimethyl carbonate) have been shown to form very unstable SEIs on silicon-containing anodes. For this type of electrolyte, both LiPF6 salt decomposition products such as LiF, LiPF6, and Li2PF5·O and solvent decomposition products like lithium carbonate (Li2CO3), lithium alkyl carbonates (LiOR), lithium ethylene dicarbonate (LED), and polyethylene oxide (PEO) are observed. In particular, LEDC and PEO are suspected of not being able to accommodate the volume changes of the silicon particles: solid-state NMR (ss-NMR) analyses of cycled electrolyte solution detected a high concentration of short-chain lithium alkyl carbonates and PEO-type oligomers, suggesting high solubility of these decomposition products.

Adding electrolyte additives such as fluoroethylene carbonate (FEC) greatly enhances the electrochemical performance of Si/Gr anodes. Several FEC decomposition mechanisms and associated stabilizing effects have been proposed to date. Many of them point to the formation of a cross-linked polymer that stabilizes the SEI during the electrode volume changes and effectively suppresses EC decomposition. Online electrochemical mass spectrometry (EEMS) studies indicate C–F and Si–F environments, the literature is divided. While XPS measurements indicate C–F and Si–F species, they could not be detected via ss-NMR. Along with its influence on SEI properties, FEC appears to affect the interaction between the SEI and the electrode. Its presence seems to promote the formation of organosiloxane (i.e., Si–C–) species and thereby influences the adhesion of the organic SEI to silicon surfaces.

FEC is not only used as an electrolyte additive but also as an electrolyte solvent to replace ethylene carbonate (EC). This approach is especially followed for electrolytes also used at high voltages. Substituting EC by fluorinated compounds such as FEC, P2EC, and fluorinated ether (F-EPE) has been shown to improve the cycling behavior of high-voltage cathodes. In this study, we investigate three electrolyte formulations and (3) a decrease of SEI formation, and the overall electrochemical performance still heavily depends on the electrolyte used. Additive-free carbonate-based electrolytes such as LP30 (1 mol of LiPF6 in 1:1 ethylene carbonate:dimethyl carbonate) have been shown to form very unstable SEIs on silicon-containing anodes. For this type of electrolyte, both LiPF6 salt decomposition products such as LiF, LiPF6, and Li2PF5·O and solvent decomposition products like lithium carbonate (Li2CO3), lithium alkyl carbonates (LiOR), lithium ethylene dicarbonate (LED), and polyethylene oxide (PEO) are observed. In particular, LEDC and PEO are suspected of not being able to accommodate the volume changes of the silicon particles: solid-state NMR (ss-NMR) analyses of cycled electrolyte solution detected a high concentration of short-chain lithium alkyl carbonates and PEO-type oligomers, suggesting high solubility of these decomposition products.

Adding electrolyte additives such as fluoroethylene carbonate (FEC) greatly enhances the electrochemical performance of Si/Gr anodes. Several FEC decomposition mechanisms and associated stabilizing effects have been proposed to date. Many of them point to the formation of a cross-linked polymer that stabilizes the SEI during the electrode volume changes and effectively suppresses EC decomposition. Online electrochemical mass spectrometry (EEMS) studies indicate C–F and Si–F environments, the literature is divided. While XPS measurements indicate C–F and Si–F species, they could not be detected via ss-NMR. Along with its influence on SEI properties, FEC appears to affect the interaction between the SEI and the electrode. Its presence seems to promote the formation of organosiloxane (i.e., Si–C–) species and thereby influences the adhesion of the organic SEI to silicon surfaces.

FEC is not only used as an electrolyte additive but also as an electrolyte solvent to replace ethylene carbonate (EC). This approach is especially followed for electrolytes also used at high voltages. Substituting EC by fluorinated compounds such as FEC, P2EC, and fluorinated ether (F-EPE) has been shown to improve the cycling behavior of high-voltage cathodes. In this study, we investigate three electrolyte formulations with FEC concentrations ranging from additive (i.e., 2 vol %) to cosolvent (i.e., 20 and 50 vol %), resulting in the following electrolyte mixtures: 2FEC:98LP30, 20FEC:80DMC, and 50FEC:50DMC. We analyze how the FEC content influences the SEI composition, thickness, and electrode morphology. SEI properties are studied by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS), and scanning electron microscopy (SEM) is used to study the electrode morphology. To achieve conclusive data evaluation, we present a general fitting model for FEC decomposition products. Finally, we demonstrate how the SEI, which depends on the FEC content in the electrolyte, influences the electrochemical performance of Si/Gr electrodes.

## 2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

### 2.1. Electrolyte Preparation

A battery-grade LP30 electrolyte (i.e., 1 M lithium hexafluorophosphate in a 1:1 mixture of ethylene carbonate:dimethyl carbonate), a hexafluorophosphate (LiPF6) salt, a dimethyl carbonate (DMC) solvent, and a fluoroethylene carbonate (FEC) electrolyte additive were purchased from Merck and used as received. The LiPF6 salt was dried under vacuum at 110 °C for 12 h. The FEC additive electrolyte was prepared by mixing 98 vol % LP30 with 2 vol % FEC. For both FEC cosolvent formulations, the respective volume fractions of DMC and FEC were mixed with 1 M LiPF6 salt. The water content of all three electrolytes was measured by Karl Fischer titration to be <10 ppm. All electrolytes were prepared in a glovebox.

### 2.2. Electrode Preparation

Electrodes were prepared using a slurry of 81 wt % graphite (SG64L, Imerys Graphite & Carbon, Switzerland), 9 wt % silicon nanopowder (Nanostructured & Amorphous Materials, Inc., 50–100 nm, purity of >99.9%), 5 wt % carbon nanofibers (Showa Denko), and 5 wt % lithium-polyacrylic acid binder solution. The binder solution was obtained by diluting a ready-made 45 wt % polyacrylic acid in a water solution (Sigma Aldrich) and subsequently adding lithium hydroxide (LiOH, Sigma Aldrich) until a pH of 6.5 was reached. The slurries were prepared in a two-step process. Premixing was done in a planetary mixer (Thinky ARV-310P). Hereby, silicon nanopowder (9 wt %) was mixed with carbon nanofibers (5 wt %) and graphite (81 wt %) in a water:ethanol mixture of 1:1.2. Subsequently, the mixture was dried and gradually transferred into a glass vial containing the binder solution. To break particle agglomerations, mixing was performed via ultrasonic dispersion with an ultrasonic homogenizer (Kinematica, Polytron PT 2500). The obtained slurry was coated on copper foil with a doctor blade (the wet thickness was set to 150 μm) and later dried at room temperature overnight. Individual electrodes were cut into discs of 12 mm diameter and dried under vacuum at 120 °C for 12 h. The resulting electrodes had a silicon-graphite mass loading of around 2.8–3.1 mg/cm².

### 2.3. Half-Cell Assembly and Cycling

The half-cells were assembled in an Ar-filled glovebox using a CR2025-type coin cell half-cell setup. The cells consisted of the Si/Gr working electrode, a microporous polypropylene separator (Celgard 2325), a glass fiber separator (VWR), and Li foil (thickness of 0.25 mm, purity of 99.9%, PI-KEM) as the counter electrode. The Celgard 2325 separator was applied directly on the electrode surface to protect the surface from glass fiber contaminations. The respective electrolyte solution (150 μL) used was Galvanostatic cycling with potential limitation (GCPL) was performed with a multichannel potentiostat (VMP3 & BCS, Bio-Logic) at 25 °C in a climate chamber (Binder). After one formation cycle at C/20 (Qform = 623 mAh g⁻¹), all cells were cycled at a lithiation rate of C/10 and a delithiation rate of C/3 between 1.5 and 0.01 V. All potentials are given in reference to Li/Li⁺. After every lithiation step, a constant-current–constant-voltage (CCCV) step was applied at C/5 for 30 min.

### 2.4. Postmortem Analysis (XPS and SEM)

All electrode samples were washed by a 1 min submersion in 1 mL of dimethyl carbonate (DMC) to remove excess electrolyte after cycling. After washing, all electrodes were dried and mounted on a sample holder using conductive copper tape. Sample preparation was carried out in an argon-filled glovebox (H₂O and O₂ < 1 ppm). Transfer to the XPS spectrometer or the SEM was done via a transfer module under inert atmosphere.
gas conditions. To ensure SEI stability in lithiated and delithiated states, the lithiation and delithiation endpoint potentials were held for 1 h after the electrochemical cycling.

2.4.1. X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS). XPS measurements were carried out with a K-alpha spectrometer from Thermo Fisher Scientific applying a microfocused, monochromated Al Kα X-ray source with a 400 μm spot size. A pass energy of 50 eV was used. Data acquisition and handling were done via Thermo Advantage software according to Parry et al.4 Spectra were fitted with one or more Voigt profiles, and Scofield sensitivity factors were applied for quantification. All spectra were referenced in binding energy to the hydrocarbon C 1s peak at 285 eV. For clarity of presentation, all spectra were normalized in intensity to the maximum intensity (i.e., the highest peak and background are normalized in intensity to [1,0]).

2.4.2. Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM). Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) measurements were conducted using a field emission scanning electron microscope (FESEM, Carl Zeiss SMT AG) equipped with energy-dispersive spectroscopy (EDS, Quantax 400 SDD, Bruker) at an acceleration voltage of 7 kV.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Electrochemistry. Galvanostatic cycling results of 9% Si/Gr half-cells cycled in the respective electrolytes 2FEC:98LP30 (blue), 20FEC:80DMC (black), and 50FEC:50DMC (green) are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. (a) Cycling stabilities (filled circles for lithiation and hollow circles for delithiation) and (b) Coulombic efficiencies of Si/Gr electrodes cycled in 2FEC:98LP30 (blue), 20FEC:80DMC (black), and 50FEC:50DMC (green) electrolytes.

All three cells display similar initial lithiation capacities of around 765 mA h g⁻¹, independent of the electrolyte. This value is much higher than the expected theoretical capacity of 623 mA h g⁻¹ due to extensive SEI formation during the first lithiation. Therefore, the resulting Coulombic efficiencies amount to only 80–83%. After the first delithiation, a capacity of around 620 mA h g⁻¹ is reached, which is close to the theoretical one. Upon cycling, the cell containing 2FEC:98LP30 exhibits the fastest capacity fade. After around 40 cycles, a linear decrease can be observed, which results in a capacity loss of 309 mA h g⁻¹ after 100 cycles and a retention of only 51%, when compared to the second cycle capacity. The loss in electrochemical activity at around 40 cycles can also be observed in the Coulombic efficiency plot, where efficiencies decrease to 98%. By contrast, when using the FEC cosolvent electrolytes, a more stable cycling behavior is achieved. Electrodes cycled in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC exhibit higher lithiation capacity retentions after 100 cycles when compared to the second cycle, amounting to 78 and 79%, respectively. Usually, capacity retentions of 75–80% declare the end of life of an LIB. However, the purpose of this study is to determine the effect of varying FEC concentrations on cycling stability rather than to optimize the battery cycle life. The drop in capacity can be attributed to the loss in silicon activity, as can be seen in the dQ/dE inset of Figure 51a. A positive effect of FEC on the electrochemical performance and more specifically on the retention of silicon activity has been demonstrated in several studies.20,22,23,35–38 Also, it has been shown by Jung et al.49 that FEC is consumed in every cycle, and when depleted, the cell performance drops dramatically.50,51 Hereby, the consumption of FEC is dependent on the relation of FEC concentration and the amount of active material in the electrode (i.e., μmolFEC/mgelectrode). In our case, all electrodes exhibited the same amount of silicon and a similar mass loading of around 2.8–3.1 mg cm⁻². FEC consumption on the lithium metal counter electrode has been observed in the literature; however, we can assume that these effects are very similar between our cells, as a similar cell setup with lithium counter electrodes was used. Therefore, the drop in capacity for the electrode cycled in the FEC additive electrolyte 2FEC:98LP30 shows the fastest capacity drop because FEC seems to be depleted earlier. With FEC as a cosolvent, a sufficient amount of FEC is still present in the electrolyte. In the following, we investigated how the FEC concentration in the electrolyte influences the SEI composition, thickness, and the electrode morphology.

3.2. SEI Analysis. 3.2.1. SEI Thickness on Graphite Particles. In this work, the SEI thickness is calculated by considering an average photoelectron inelastic mean free path, see Supporting Information page S3 for details. The calculation was conducted for Si/Gr anodes cycled to 0.8 and 0.01 V during the first lithiation as well as to 1.5 V after the 1st, 10th, and 100th delithiation. Obtained thicknesses are displayed in Figure 2. At 0.8 V, the SEI thickness is below 5 nm for all electrolyte formulations. Because carbonate-based solvents are known to decompose at around 1.2–0.9 V vs Li/Li⁺, the SEI is still thin at this early stage.52 In the fully lithiated state at 0 V, the thickness increases considerably for all three FEC contents. After the first delithiation at 1.5 V, a drop in SEI thickness is seen for all three electrolytes. This phenomenon of changes in SEI thickness from lithiated to delithiated states is known as SEI breathing and is a commonly observed process for silicon-containing electrodes.40,41 After 10 cycles, the thickness increases for each electrolyte. This increase is even
Decomposition products of FEC based on refs 17, 19, and 25. The measurement can be an indication for FEC defluorination, to 2:1 during fitting. The detection of DO in our XPS column in Figure 2 is therefore hatched. In contrast, when an SEI thickness above the information depth of XPS, and the 2FEC:98LP30, no graphite intensity was detected, indicating SEI layer on the graphite particles. In the case of stronger after 100 cycles, indicating the formation of a thick SEI layer on the graphite particles. In the case of 2FEC:98LP30, no graphite intensity was detected, indicating an SEI thickness above the information depth of XPS, and the column in Figure 2 is therefore hatched. In contrast, when cycled in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC, the SEI thickness is still below that critical threshold with values amounting to approximately 13 nm. Overall, a correlation in SEI thickness and FEC electrolyte concentration can be observed for the cycling stages at 0.01 V, 1, 10, and 100 cycles. The less FEC is present in the electrolyte, the thicker the SEI: 2FEC:98LP30 > 20FEC:80DMC > 50FEC:50DMC. Spectra for the cycling stages at 0.01 V, 1, 10, and 100 cycles. The resulting C 1s, F 1s, and Si 2p spectra are shown in the Supporting Information (Figure S2a). Alongside hydrocarbon products, and silicon oxyfluorides SiOFy. We further fixed the FWHM and the area ratio between C and C to 2:1 during fitting. The detection of DO in our XPS measurement can be an indication for FEC defluorination, yielding LiF and VC. VC can subsequently polymerize and form poly(VC). To check whether VC forms a similar SEI, we analyzed the decomposition products of an electrode cycled in pure VC. The C 1s spectrum in Figure S2b displays two peaks corresponding to C and C in poly(VC). Only little amounts of −C−O and −CO2 and no Li2CO3 are detected. In contrast, FEC leads to an SEI with high −C−O, C/C, and −CO2Li contents. This demonstrates that the SEIs formed by FEC and VC are very different. As proposed in the literature, it is very likely for DO or poly(VC), −C−O, and −CO2Li units to form a heterogeneous cross-linked polymer network. 17−19,63,44 For example, Jin et al. proposed a polymer consisting of cross-linked DO and PEO units. 19 The −C−O groups detected in our XPS analysis could correspond to PEO species. It is important to note that XPS cannot differentiate between poly(VC) and DO units as they display identical chemical environments at the same binding energies. It is also not possible to get information on the exact molecular structure of the polymer network with XPS due to the highly inhomogeneous nature of the SEI. A decomposition mechanism for FEC is proposed in Figure S3. The F 1s spectrum of Figure 3 shows a peak at 685.3 eV corresponding to LiF and a broad peak at 687.7 eV that is most likely a mixture of LiPF6 salt residues, LiPF5O2, LiPF4O, salt decomposition products, and silicon oxyfluorides SiOFy. 20 Both F−P and F−Si environments can be found in the corresponding P 2p (Figure S2a in the SI) and Si 2p spectra (Figure 3), respectively. LiF is a result of LiPF6 and FEC decomposition. Different silicon environments emerge in the Si 2p spectrum, namely, LiSi (98.2 eV), Li2SiO (101 eV), SiO2 (103 eV), and SiOF (105.3 eV). 23,24 To ensure consistent data evaluation, this fitting is used in all the following XPS analyses. Detailed information about the used fitting parameters can be found in Table S1.

3.2.3. SEI Composition. Figure 4 displays C 1s photoelectron spectra of Si/Gr electrodes cycled in 2FEC:98LP30, 20FEC:80DMC, and 50FEC:50DMC. Spectra for the following cycling states are shown: 0.8 and 0.01 V during the first lithiation as well as the 1st, 10th, and 100th cycle in

---

**Figure 3.** C 1s, F 1s, and Si 2p photoelectron spectra of an electrode after the first lithiation cycled in 1 M LiPF6 in an FEC electrolyte. Decomposition products of FEC based on refs 17, 19, and 25.
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delithiated states at 1.5 V. Derived atomic percentages of detected C 1s species are shown in Figure 5. Also displayed in Figure 5 are the atomic percentages of fluorine-containing decomposition products. F 1s, O 1s, and P 2p spectra can be found in the Supporting Information, see Figures S4−S6. An overview of all detected species with their atomic percentages is shown in Tables S2−S4 (SI). Assignment of different surface species has been done according to the fitting model previously described.

At 0.8 V, five peaks are observed for each electrolyte in the C 1s spectra of Figure 4: graphite (284.2 eV), hydrocarbons (285 eV), −C−O groups (286.7 eV), −CO$_2$Li species (289.2 eV), and −CO$_3$Li species (290.5 eV). Hydrocarbons can originate from surface contamination such as adventitious carbon as well as from −CH-containing SEI species. All −CO- containing compounds originate from starting electrolyte decomposition. A further voltage decrease to 0.01 V leads to thickening of the SEI, as can be seen by a drop in graphite intensity. As previously seen, the SEI thickness depends on the amount of FEC in the electrolyte and follows the trend 2FEC > 20FEC > 50FEC. A shift to lower binding energies of the graphite peak (i.e., to 282.5 eV) can be explained by the formation of an electrical potential gradient at the buried interface between the SEI and the electrode surface. 46,47 Additionally, two peaks emerge that can be ascribed to the two carbon environments in DO as has been previously discussed, namely, $C_a$ (287.9 eV) and $C_b$ (291.0 eV). The intensity ratio of $C_a$ and $C_b$ is close to 1:2, suggesting that the peaks mainly consist of DO units. Compared to the C 1s of the electrode cyclic in pure FEC (see Figure 3), the same carbon species are detected. While −CH, −C−O, −CO$_2$Li, and −CO$_3$Li were observed with pure FEC electrolytes, these species typically also emerge in SEIs formed by DMC- and EC-containing electrolytes, see Figure S7. Only $C_a$ and $C_b$ emerge in the presence of FEC. In the following discussion, these peaks are...
therefore used as an unambiguous indicator for the presence of FEC decomposition products in the SEI (the emergence of LiF also occurs for LiPF$_6$ and FEC, making it difficult to differentiate from which electrolyte component LiF is originating). After the first delithiation to 1.5 V, the graphite intensity increases for all three cases, indicating a thinner SEI. The SEI thinning results from the dissolution or detachment of certain species, such as LiF, which drops by 20 at. %, see Figure 5. A decrease in the relative peak area is observed for $-$C=O and $-$CO$_2$Li compounds, see Figure S7, while carbonate and DO species only change to a negligible extent. After 10 cycles, a decrease in atomic percentages and relative peak areas of carbonate species is observed for all three electrolytes, see Figure 5 and Figure S7. Electrodes cycled in 2FEC:98LP30 and 20FEC:80DMC display an increase in $-$C=O and DO abundance, while the detected LiF amount decreases. By contrast, the electrodes cycled in 50FEC:50DMC show no changes for $-$C=O and DO species but an increase in LiF. After 100 cycles, a large decrease of C$_a$ and C$_b$ is observed with 2FEC:98LP30, while $-$C=O and $-$CO$_3$ species increase in intensity and abundance, see Figures 4 and 5. In fact, the spectrum now looks very similar to a spectrum from an electrode cycled in a pure LP30 electrolyte, see Figure S8. By contrast, the electrodes cycled in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC still display intense C$_a$ and C$_b$ peaks in their C 1s spectrum. The decline of both peaks when cycling in the 2FEC:98LP30 formulation indicates decreasing FEC concentration in the electrolyte. Because FEC makes up only 2 vol % of the electrolyte, its depletion occurs much earlier than when it is used as a cosolvent. The increase in $-$C=O and $-$CO$_3$ species indicates an increase in EC and DMC decomposition. Previously observed DO components (i.e., C$_a$ and C$_b$) are now most likely buried under a new layer of these carbonate products. In contrast, when cycling in the FEC cosolvent electrolytes, namely, 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC, the FEC reservoir is much larger. Therefore, DO species are still present in the SEI even after prolonged cycling.

Another interesting feature is the influence of the EC cosolvent on the SEI composition of Si/Gr electrodes cycled in 2FEC:98LP30. The amount of detected $-$CO$_3$ is the highest for this electrolyte in all analyzed states (i.e., 0.1 V and 1, 10, and 100 cycles). The presence of EC seems to promote the formation of more carbonate-containing SEI species, suggesting that EC decomposition occurs, even in the presence of FEC. Jung et al. showed that the presence of FEC reduces the decomposition of EC to a bare minimum.$^{20}$ Similarly, Jin et al. found that in the presence of FEC, the formation of liquid decomposition products such as LEDC is suppressed.$^{17}$ That XPS still detects EC decomposition can be explained by its high chemical sensitivity. To evaluate the effect of EC in an FEC cosolvent electrolyte, electrodes were cycled in 20FEC:40EC:40DMC, with corresponding C 1s spectra displayed in Figure S9a. The C 1s spectra after the first lithiation (0.01 V) and the first delithiation (1 cyc) show the same surface species as the spectra in Figure 4. A comparison between atomic percentages of an electrode cycled in 20FEC:80DMC (black) and 20FEC:40EC:40DMC (pink) is given in Figure S9b. The presence of EC leads to an increase of all carbon–oxygen species (i.e., $-$C=O, C=O/C$_a$, $-$CO$_2$, $-$CO$_3$, and C$_b$). The intensified electrolyte decomposition in the presence of EC indicates that EC decomposition products negatively affect the SEI stability, promoting stronger electrolyte decomposition. The formation of alkyl dicarbonates such as LEDC upon EC decomposition are known to be highly reactive.$^{48,49}$ Additionally, the short-chain nature of LEDC leads to a poor ability to accommodate the silicon volume changes.$^{17}$

### 3.2.4. Effect of FEC on Silicon

To investigate the influence of FEC on silicon particles, Si 2p spectra are displayed in Figure 6. In general, some spectra show very noisy data, and

![Figure 6](https://doi.org/10.1021/acsaem.2c01454)
the peak fits are included only as a guide to the eyes. At 0.8 V, two silicon species are detected independent of the electrolyte formulation, namely, Si$_0$ (99 eV) and SiO$_2$ (∼103.3 eV). These signals are also found at the surface of silicon particles in pristine Si/Gr electrodes, see Figure S10. For electrodes cycled in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC electrolytes, an additional component is seen, which corresponds to SiO$_x$F$_y$ (∼106.3 eV). This species was also observed in the 100% FEC electrolyte previously discussed (see Figure 3). Upon lithiation to 0.01 V, the bulk silicon species, i.e., Si$_0$ and SiO$_2$, disappear in all three cases. By contrast, the SiO$_x$F$_y$ species is still observed for 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC. After the first delithiation, the electrode cycled in the 2FEC:98LP30 electrolyte displays peaks corresponding to lithiated silicon species such as Li$_x$Si (98.2 eV) and Li$_x$SiO$_y$ (101 eV). For this electrolyte, both species disappear after 10 cycles, but Li$_x$SiO$_y$ re-emerges after 100 cycles. Electrodes cycled in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC display Li$_x$Si and SiO$_x$F$_y$ species after the first delithiation. Additionally, Li$_x$SiO$_y$ is detected when using the 50FEC:50DMC electrolyte. After 10 and 100 cycles, only SiO$_x$F$_y$ species are observed, and no bulk silicon re-emerges for both FEC cosolvent formulations.

As is evident from the data, the FEC concentration in the electrolyte plays a role in the silicon species detected. Two main differences are observed: (1) The re-emergence of Li$_x$SiO$_y$ after 100 cycles for the 2FEC:98LP30 electrolyte is observed, while this is not the case with the two FEC cosolvent electrolytes. The re-emergence of the Li$_x$SiO$_y$ species could be due to cracks in the electrode coating, resulting from the low FEC content in the electrolyte after 100 cycles. This was seen in a previous work, in which cracks in the electrode coating could be observed in cross-sectional SEM micrographs after cycling in the absence of FEC. As seen in the analysis of the C 1s spectra, the SEI is predominantly made of EC and DMC decomposition products, which may lead to a less flexible SEI. (2) SiO$_x$F$_y$ is detected in the presence of 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC while not being observed at any time with 2FEC:98LP30. Interestingly, no correlation is seen between the FEC amount in the electrolyte and the amount of SiO$_x$F$_y$ detected. The most extensive reporting of this compound has been done by Philippe et al., who observed this species when cycling electrodes containing 80% silicon in a pure LP40 electrolyte (i.e., 1 M LiPF$_6$ in 1:1 EC:DEC), with LiPF$_6$ as the sole fluorine source. The authors demonstrated this species to form during cycling as well as when storing the electrode in the electrolyte over a long period. Hard X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (HAXPES) experiments showed SiO$_x$F$_y$ to be more present in upper layers and diminishing when deeper layers were probed. These results agree with our sputtering depth profiling experiment, see Figure S11a. Interestingly, no SiO$_x$F$_y$ species emerged after sputtering the electrode cycled in 2FEC:98LP30 for an extended amount of time, see Figure S11b. This is a strong indicator that this species is not formed if 9% Si/Gr anodes are cycled in the 2FEC:98LP30 electrolyte.

Furthermore, Philippe et al. analyzed electrodes cycled in 1 M LiFSI in 1:1 EC:DEC mixtures and could not detect any SiO$_x$F$_y$ species. They concluded LiPF$_6$ to play a major role in SiO$_x$F$_y$ formation. To verify this hypothesis, we replaced LiPF$_6$ with LiTFSI for the 20FEC:80DMC electrolyte, and indeed, Figure 7. SEM pictures of Si/Gr electrodes cycled in (a,b) 2FEC:98LP30, (c,d) 20FEC:80DMC, and (e,f) 50FEC:50DMC after 1 and 100 cycles in the delithiated state at 1.5 V. Insets of elemental distribution for 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC after 100 cycles.
no SiO$_2$F$_y$ was detected, see Figure S12. As a reminder, the SEI formed by the LiPF$_6$ 20FEC:80DMC formulation displays SiO$_2$F$_y$ species. This emphasized that LiPF$_6$ is crucial for the SiO$_2$F$_y$ formation. To verify whether EC influences the formation of this species, we cycled electrodes in a 1 M LiPF$_6$ 20FEC:40EC:40DMC electrolyte. Despite the presence of LiPF$_6$ and FEC, no SiO$_2$F$_y$ species was detected, see Figure S12. Based on all observations, the formation of SiO$_2$F$_y$ is correlated with the amount of silicon in the electrode and with the presence or absence of LiPF$_6$, FEC, and EC in the electrolyte. With high silicon loadings, SiO$_2$F$_y$ can still form even in the presence of EC and the absence of FEC; however, LiPF$_6$ should be the electrolyte salt. With a lower silicon loading (i.e., 9 wt%), SiO$_2$F$_y$ is not detected if EC is present in the electrolyte, even if LiPF$_6$ and FEC are being used. However, in the absence of EC but the presence of FEC and LiPF$_6$, SiO$_2$F$_y$ forms also at lower silicon contents. In the literature, the formation of SiO$_2$F$_y$ was hypothesized to be a result of the dissolution of silica by HF, see eqs 1 and 2: 

$$\text{HF} + \text{SiO}_2 \rightarrow \text{SiO}_2\text{F}_y + \text{H}_2\text{O}$$  

(1)

$$\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{LiPF}_6 \rightarrow x\text{HF} + \text{phosphates}$$  

(2)

HF is known to form through the reaction of LiPF$_6$ with trace amounts of water. The water content in all electrolytes was determined by Karl Fischer titration to be below 10 ppm. Therefore, the amount of hydrolyzed LiPF$_6$, i.e., the amount of HF formed, should be similar for 2FEC:98LP30, 20FEC:80DMC, and 50FEC:50DMC. However, FEC can act as a source of F$^-$ anions, which form during FEC decomposition by cleavage of the C–F bond. These F$^-$ anions can now either react with Li$^+$ ions to form LiF or with silicon oxide to form SiO$_2$F$_y$ compounds. However, in this case, SiO$_2$F$_y$ could also be formed when cycling in 20FEC:80DMC with LiTFSI salt. This suggests that the interaction of FEC and LiPF$_6$ may play an important role in the formation of SiO$_2$F$_y$. While no experimental results can be found in the literature, molecular dynamics calculations of FEC and LiPF$_6$ exist. They have shown that the presence of FEC leads to an increase in contact Li$^+$–PF$_6^-$ ion pairs. Contact ion pairs (CIP) are ions that are not separated by solvent molecules. This can increase the interaction between PF$_6^-$ and Li$^+$ and promote the formation of PF$_6$, Li$^+$, and fluoride, independent of the water content. In other words, the presence of FEC can increase the reactivity of the LiPF$_6$ salt. These CIPs may also affect the reactivity of FEC and LiPF$_6$ with respect to silicon. In the presence of EC or FEC decomposition products, this reactivity might be inhibited.

In summary, using an FEC cosolvent seems to lead to a more stable SEI because no bulk Li,Si or Li,SiO$_2$ species are re-emerging after cycling (which would indicate SEI dissolution or crack formation). Also, the presence of FEC and LiPF$_6$ and the absence of EC lead to the formation of SiO$_2$F$_y$ at low silicon contents.

3.2.5. SEI and Electrode Morphology. SEM micrographs of electrodes cycled in the respective electrolyte for 1 and 100 cycles are presented in Figure 7. After the first cycle, all three electrodes display graphite as large rectangular shaped particles. Silicon can be seen in agglomerations of bright, small, and round particles, while carbon nanofoils emerge as long wires. Also, small bright dots are seen on graphite and nanofoils. Whether they are also present on silicon particles is difficult to assess because both emerge as bright dots in the SEM images. After 100 cycles, substantial changes in the morphology can be observed for all three cases. The surface of the electrode cycled in 2FEC:98LP30 exhibits large areas with charging effects as can be seen from the extremely bright borders on the graphite particles and silicon agglomerations. This charging can result from the accumulation of insulating SEI species. Compared to the results obtained via XPS, this could be explained by a thicker SEI layer. When cycled in the FEC cosolvent electrolytes, the electrodes show fewer charging effects and an overall better resolved morphology. This could indicate a lower accumulation of insulating SEI species and, when correlated to the XPS measurements, could be explained by a thinner SEI layer.

The small dots observed on the graphite particles already present after 1 cycle have grown to larger roundly shaped particles. This is especially the case with 50FEC:50DMC. With the help of EDS, these areas can be assigned to fluorine-containing species (blue color), see the inset in Figure 7. Elemental distribution images measured via EDS in Figure S13 further show that these particles emerge especially in the fluorine map and much less in the maps of the other elements. Similar shapes have been observed in the literature and were suggested to be LiF. This assignment might also apply here because other fluorine-containing compounds such as P–F and Si–F are not seen as clearly in the respective phosphorus and silicon map, see Figure S13.

3.2.6. Correlating FEC Concentrations to SEI Properties and Electrochemical Performances. We investigated the electrochemical performance, SEI properties, and electrode morphologies of three FEC-containing electrolytes with 9% Si/Gr anodes. In this section, we bring together the different observations and findings. Similar electrochemical performances are seen for earlier cycles between 2FEC:98LP30, 20FEC:80DMC, and 50FEC:50DMC formulations. Significant differences emerge at later stages. After 100 cycles, Si/Gr anodes cycled in the 2FEC:98LP30 formulation display poor capacity retentions and a decrease in silicon and graphite activity. In contrast, the two FEC cosolvent formulations show much higher capacity retentions with higher silicon and graphite activities. SEI properties also display a dependence on the amount of FEC in the electrolyte. Compared to the FEC additive formulation, both FEC cosolvent electrolytes show a thinner SEI as determined from the XPS signal attenuation. While similar SEI compositions are observed in earlier cycling stages, differences emerge at later cycling numbers. SEM micrographs display a less charged electrode surface, and EDS shows the presence of large fluorine-containing particles, when Si/Gr anodes are cycled in both FEC cosolvent formulations.

Based on the XPS analysis, the variance in electrochemical performance can be attributed to differences in the SEI composition. The developed XPS fitting model shows FEC to decompose to –C–O–, DO–, and –CO$_2$Li-containing products. Most likely, these species are incorporated in a cross-linked polymeric network. The formation of a cross-linked polymeric network has been suggested in the literature many times. The peaks corresponding to DO species (C$_2$ and C$_3$ in this work) are an unambiguous indicator for the presence of FEC decomposition products in the SEI, as this species does not form with any other electrolyte component. DO environments are detected in the SEI when cycling in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC electrolytes even after 100 cycles. However, while being present in earlier cycling stages, the amount of detected DO drastically decreases after
longer cycling with 2FEC:98LP30. Instead, most of the observed peaks are related to $-\text{C-O}$ and $-\text{CO}_x\text{Li}$ environments, which correspond to EC decomposition products (i.e., Li$_x$CO$_y$, LEDC, and PEO). Therefore, the good initial electrochemical performance of the electrode cycled in 2FEC:98LP30 is explained by the presence FEC decomposition products in the SEI. The formed polymeric network increases the ability of the SEI to better accommodate the silicon volume changes. However, this network might not form a perfectly elastic SEI as it still cracks and leads to recurrent FEC reduction. In the case of 2FEC:98LP30, the continuous consumption of FEC eventually depletes the electrolyte of the additive. Simultaneously, an increase in EC reduction occurs, which ultimately leads to an SEI that is composed of short-chain LEDC and PEO components. These components are less fit to accommodate the silicon volume changes. Hence, the SEI fractures and the electrode material is re-exposed (see the Li$_x$SiO$_y$ peak for the 2FEC:98LP30 case). Consequently, a new SEI is formed on the re-exposed surfaces. This excessive SEI formation could ultimately lead to the isolation of silicon particles and reduced electrode integrity. The loss in graphite and silicon activity observed for the 2FEC:98LP30 electrolyte formulation could be explained by this phenomenon. In contrast, when cycling in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC, FEC decomposition products (indicated by DO environments) are present in the SEI for a longer period because the FEC reservoir in the electrolyte is larger. Also, since EC is not present in the electrolyte, its decomposition products are absent in the SEI. Consequently, the SEI is more stable, and less electrolyte is decomposed. The extended presence of the polymeric network buffers the silicon volume changes, reduces the amount of the SEI formed, and helps to maintain the electrode integrity for a longer time. This would explain the smaller decrease in silicon and graphite activity when cycling in the FEC cosolvent electrolytes. The presence of this polymer in the SEI seems therefore crucial for a good electrochemical performance.

A further interesting observation is the emergence of SiO$_x$F$_y$ species, which are detected when using the FEC cosolvent formulations but not the FEC additive electrolyte. Translating the findings from Philippe et al. with pure silicon to Si/Gr anodes, SiO$_x$F$_y$ may decrease the affinity between the binder and the surface of the active material. This would result in a poor electrochemical performance. However, the proposed negative impact of SiO$_x$F$_y$ does not seem to be detrimental to the performance because cells cycled in 20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC electrolytes show superior capacity retention. Therefore, the suggested negative impact of SiO$_x$F$_y$ most probably has an inferior impact on the SEI stability. Instead, the volume accommodating effect of the polymeric network seems to have a much higher influence on the electrochemical performance of Si/Gr electrodes.

In summary, FEC cosolvent electrolytes offer two advantages: (1) the positive effect of a polymeric network containing $-\text{C-O}$, DO, and $-\text{CO}_x\text{Li}$ species is preserved for much longer, and (2) no EC decomposition products are present in the SEI, which leads to a more stable surface layer and lower overall electrolyte consumption.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Our study examined how using FEC as a cosolvent influenced the electrochemical performance, SEI thickness, and composition, as well as the electrode morphology of Si/Gr composite electrodes. Two electrolyte formulations (20FEC:80DMC and 50FEC:50DMC) were compared to a reference electrolyte with FEC as an electrolyte additive (2FEC:98LP30). The developed XPS fitting model showed FEC to decompose to $-\text{C-O}$, DO, and $-\text{CO}_x\text{Li}$-containing products. Most likely, these species were incorporated in a cross-linked polymeric network. The two chemical environments in DO (C$_A$ and C$_B$) enabled us to unambiguously trace the presence of FEC decomposition products in the SEI. Compared to the additive concentration, both FEC cosolvent mixtures showed the following:

1. a thinner SEI as determined from XPS
2. a high amount of FEC decomposition products (as indicated by C$_A$ and C$_B$) present in the SEI even after longer cycling, while these species strongly decreased for the FEC additive electrolyte
3. reduced decomposition of DMC cosolvents (and the absence of EC decomposition products)
4. a lower amount of carbonate species
5. formation of SiO$_x$F$_y$ species, suggesting the presence of FEC and the absence of EC to promote the formation of this species

The improved electrochemical performance of the FEC cosolvent formulations originates from the presence of FEC decomposition products in the SEI even after 100 cycles, consisting of a polymeric network containing $-\text{C-O}$, DO, and $-\text{CO}_x\text{Li}$ units. The presence of this polymeric network species is crucial in stabilizing the SEI upon the silicon volume changes. Most probably, it increases the flexibility of the surface layer, which reduces the number of cracks in the SEI. In this way, less active material is re-exposed to the electrolyte, reducing the amount of the new SEI formed and thereby extending the lifetime of the cell. The prolonged presence of this polymeric species is especially essential when moving toward applications with higher silicon contents.
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