# Effects of Operating Conditions on LSM-Based SOFC Cathodes: EIS Analysis

Chenxin Deng, Madeleine McAllister, Mark R. De Guire & Arthur H. Heuer Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Case Western Reserve University

> prepared for the NETL SOFC Program 10 July, 2020



# Outline

- Background & objectives
  - Cell specifications; testing conditions
- New results since last PRM (Apr. 2019)
  - **1,000-h test** in air
  - Testing under *low po2*
  - **Aging** tests baseline for effects of T, t
- Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS
  - Equivalent circuit fitting
  - Distribution of relaxation times (DRT) analysis
- Conclusions



# **Background**

- What drives *microstructural change* in LSM\*-based SOFC cathodes during operation?
  - Temperature Current density ← DE-FE0023476
  - Cathode atmosphere

← current project (DE-FE0031189)

- Studying long-term performance loss in shorter time frames: Testing under *aggressive conditions*
  - Show effects of non-ideal operating conditions
  - Replicate effects of much longer conventional operation?
- What role does *Mn excess* play in these effects?

\*) LSM: lanthanum strontium manganite



# **Overall objectives**

- *Monitor changes* in performance and microstructure
- Seek correlations between
  - composition
    microstructure
  - performance operating conditions

and *obtain mechanistic understanding* of their interrelationships

• This presentation emphasizes progress in *electrochemical* 

characterization



## **Background**

- Measures of performance studied:
  - Change in area specific resistance (ASR) during extended testing
  - *I*–*V* curves (linear sweep voltammetry, LSV)
  - Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) analysis



*Equivalent circuit modeling* — Nova, Circle Fit



every

**Distribution of relaxation times** (DRT) — DRTtools



# **Cell specifications; testing conditions**

This study:

- Durability and aging tests
- Conventional or aggressive conditions
- LSV sweeps and EIS runs ⇒

current cycling every 24 h

Button cells:

- 8YSZ electrolyte Ni/8YSZ anode
- Cathodes: porous LSM / 8YSZ
  - (La<sub>0.85</sub> Sr<sub>0.15</sub>)<sub>0.90</sub> MnO<sub>3±δ</sub> (LSM 85-90) **11%** Mn excess
  - (La<sub>0.80</sub> Sr<sub>0.20</sub>)<sub>0.95</sub> MnO<sub>3±δ</sub> (LSM 80-95) 5% Mn excess
  - (La<sub>0.80</sub> Sr<sub>0.20</sub>)<sub>0.98</sub> MnO<sub>3±δ</sub> (LSM 80-98) 2% Mn excess



temperature [°C]	current density [mA cm <sup>-2</sup> ]	cathode p <sub>O2</sub>
900	380	0.2
	OCV (aging)	
1000	760	
	OCV (aging)	
900	380	0.1
	OCV (aging)	
1000	760	
	OCV (aging)	



## Test fixture for controlled cathode atmosphere





## New results: 1,000-h aggressive durability test in air, LSM 85-90

- 11% Mn excess (LSM 85-90), thin electrolyte, 1,000 °C, 760 mA cm<sup>-2</sup>
- 0-430 h: normal output; moderate degradation (37.7% per kh)
- 430 500 h: sharp, erratic drops, with periods of normal voltage
- 500 650 h: OCV (zero current)
- 650 1,008 h: resume load
  - Moderate degradation (23.5% per kh)
- Overall excellent performance:
  - 858 h at 760 mA cm<sup>-2</sup>
  - Initial total ASR 0.25 Ω cm<sup>2</sup> (~best in this project)
  - Final total ASR 0.30 Ω cm<sup>2</sup>
    comparable to best results of 500-h tests





#### New results: 1,000-h aggressive durability test in air, LSM 85-90



• *EIS*, 24 – 1,008 h, 1,000 °C, 0.76 A cm<sup>-2</sup>

- Gradual degradation across all aspects of cell performance
- Microstructural analysis underway



#### **New results:** 1,000-h test in air, LSM 85-90, 0.76 A cm<sup>-2</sup>

#### DRT analysis at 850 & 800 °C

after 0, 504, and 1,008 h testing at 1,000  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ 

- **As** t ↑ :
  - All major peaks ↑, more pronounced than at 1,000 °C
  - **Peak separation** in middle frequencies  $(10^{-3} < \tau < 10^{-2} \text{ s}, 10^{-1} < \tau < 10^2 \text{ s})$
- **As T**↓:
  - All major peaks ↑
  - Shift of oxygen exchange peak to longer  $\tau$
- In *low H<sub>2</sub>*, 800 °C, as *t* ↑:
  - Charge transfer losses ↓
  - Gas diffusion losses ↑ and shift to higher τ



#### **New results:** aging test, LSM 80-98, 900 °C, 10% O<sub>2</sub>, 0 A cm<sup>-2</sup>

0 – 19 h, 10% O<sub>2</sub>: ASR ↑ (data not shown)

 $\Rightarrow$  **Degradation** at low  $p_{O2}$ , zero load

- 19 187 h: *lab air,* 20 sccm
  - ASR ↓ for ~100 h
     *"repair"* of degradation?
  - … then ASR ↑
     "normal" thermal degradation?
- 187 500 h: 10% O<sub>2</sub>
  - $Z' \uparrow$  to 304 h, then  $\downarrow$
  - $Z' \uparrow$  remained higher than in air





#### **New results:** aging test, LSM 80-98, 900 °C, 10% O<sub>2</sub>, 0 A cm<sup>-2</sup>

- 0 19 h, *10% O₂*: ASR ↑
- 19 187 h: *lab air,* 20 sccm
  - ASR ↓ for ~100 h
  - ... then rose
- 187 500 h: *10% O<sub>2</sub>* 
  - overall: ASR ↑ , power ↓
- EIS fitting (equivalent circuit):
  - *R*, LSV agreed with total *RT*,EIS from EIS fitting
  - Series *RS*,EIS tracked total resistance *R*,LSV
  - Parallel *RP*,EIS unchanged





#### **New results:** aging test, LSM 80-98, 900 °C, 10% O<sub>2</sub>, 0 A cm<sup>-2</sup>



- All major peaks ↑
- Charge transfer shifts to shorter  $\tau$
- Oxygen exchange shifts to longer τ



CASE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING CASE WESTERN RESERVE



**As** *t* ↑ at 10% O<sub>2</sub>, 900 °C:

- Most major peaks ↑
- Charge transfer shifts to longer  $\tau$
- Complex effects in oxygen
  exchange and gas diffusion

# Equivalent circuit modeling



Fitting multiple arcs with overlapping semicircles



## *Effect of Mn excess:* 1,000 °C, 0.760 A cm<sup>-2</sup>, air



- ASR EIS is the sum of the gray, orange, and green, minus red curves.
- ASR EIS gave good agreement with ASR DC from durability testing:
  - $\pm 0.02 \ \Omega \ cm^2$  for 11% Mn xs  $\pm 0.03 \ \Omega \ cm^2$  for 5% Mn xs
  - $-0.06 \ \Omega \ cm^2$  for 2% Mn xs (effect of inductive component)
- ASR DC ↑ as t : from series resistance R<sub>s</sub>, not from R<sub>p</sub>
- $R_{p,Ca}$  was a minor component of total ASR EIS  $\leftarrow$  high T (1,000 °C)



#### *Effect of Mn excess:* 1,000 °C, 0.760 A cm<sup>-2</sup>, air



- LSM 85-90:
  - Thicker electrolyte  $\Rightarrow$  anomalously high  $R_{\rm S}$
  - Even when corrected to thinner electrolyte, these cells had highest ASR
  - On normal electrolyte, LSM 85-90 lasted 1 kh (earlier slides), lower ASR after 1 kh than LSM 80-95 and LSM 80-98 after 500 h
- LSM 80-95:
  - Distinct anode (high-f) and cathode (medium-f) parallel resistances
  - Moderate ASR overall
- LSM 80-98: lowest overall ASR in 500-h comparisons

## *Reproducibility:* LSM 85–90, 1,000 °C, 0.760 A cm<sup>-2</sup>, air



 ASR EIS gave good agreement with ASR DC (~ -0.04 Ω cm<sup>2</sup>). • ASR EIS gave excellent agreement with ASR DC  $(\pm 0.01 \ \Omega \ cm^2)$ .

~20% difference in total ASR (0.1  $\Omega$  cm<sup>2</sup>) between identical cells



# Aggressive vs. conventional: LSM 80–98 (2% Mn xs)



- All ASR components rose ~50% at 900 °C vs. 1,000 °C
- All ASR components *rose with t*, but more strongly at 900 °C
- High frequency: inductive component  $\Rightarrow$  lower ASR EIS vs. ASR DC
- ASR EIS and ASR DC still agree within 0.06  $\Omega cm^2$



## Conclusions (prior project): ASR, microstructure, EIS

- **EIS analysis:** a complement to durability testing
  - Equivalent circuit modeling
    - EIS ASR tracks DC ASR closely
    - Rise in  $R_s$  accounts for rise in ASR
    - Low-frequency R<sub>p</sub> (usu. assigned to cathode) was not the major source of ASR at 1,000 °C — expected at high T
  - Distribution of relaxation times (DRT modeling)
    - All major loss mechanisms  $\uparrow$  as time  $\uparrow$
    - All major loss mechanisms ↑ as temperature ↓
    - Enables resolution of mechanisms at different frequencies
    - In 10% H<sub>2</sub> (anode), charge transfer losses dropped, while gas diffusion losses rose and shifted to lower frequencies



# **Acknowledgments**

- Funding: DoE SOFC Program (DE-FE0023476, DE-FE0031189)
- Program managers:
  - Dr. Shailesh Vora
  - Dr. Patcharin Burke
  - Dr. Jason Montgomery
- Ted Ohrn, Special Power Sources
- Andrew Cai, Celeste Cooper, Mirko Antloga (CWRU)

<u>Disclaimer</u>: This research is based in part upon work supported by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

