Effects of Composition and Operating Conditions on the Microstructure and Performance of LSM-Based SOFC Cathodes

Naima Hilli,¹ Celeste E. Cooper,¹ Chenxin Deng,¹ Andrew Cai,¹ Zhien Liu,² Richard Goettler,² Arthur Heuer,¹ & Mark De Guire¹ ¹⁾ Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Case Western Reserve University ²⁾ LG Fuel Cell Systems

U.S. Department of Energy Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program 2018 Annual Merit Review and Peer Evaluation Meeting Washington, DC • 13–15 June 2018



Outline

- $(La_{1-x}Sr_x)_{1-y}MnO_{3\pm\delta}$ (lanthanum strontium manganite, LSM) — effect of *Mn excess* (A-site deficiency) on long-term performance
 - Durability testing \Rightarrow **ASR** (area specific resistance) vs. time
 - Cathode *microstructural* changes
 - **TEM/EDXS** (transmission electron microscopy / energydispersive x-ray spectroscopy)
 - *3DR* (3D reconstruction)
- New observations and questions
 - Comparison: long-term conventional testing vs. accelerated testing
 - Mn distribution and its evolution with time a clue to degradation?



Cell specifications; testing procedures

- Button cells fabricated at LGFCS
 - 8YSZ electrolyte
 NiO / 8YSZ anode
 - Cathodes: LSM / 8YSZ
 - $(La_{0.85} Sr_{0.15})_{0.90} MnO_{3\pm\delta} (LSM 85-90) 11\% Mn excess$
 - (La_{0.80} Sr_{0.20})_{0.95} MnO_{3±δ} (LSM 80-95) 5% Mn excess
 - (La_{0.80} Sr_{0.20})_{0.98} MnO_{3±δ} (LSM 80-98) 2% Mn excess
- Cell testing
 - Anode: humidified H_2 , 50 sccm
 - Cathode: ambient air
 - Accelerated tests: 1000 °C, 0.760 A cm⁻²
 - Conventional tests: 900 °C, 0.380 A cm⁻²
 - I–V and EIS scans every ~24 or ~48 h





Electrode * ASR (accelerated testing)



*) total cell DC ASR, minus estimated ASR for 8YSZ substrate @ nominal thickness & DC conductivity



•

Microstructural change after 500 h accelerated testing

LSM 85-90 (11% Mn xs)



LSM 80-95 (5% Mn xs)



LSM 80-98 (2% Mn xs)



500 h, accel'd

as received







- Coarsening of pores & LSM
- Densification of CCC*
- *) cathode current collector

 Highest overall microstructural stability

- Coarsening of pores & LSM
- Densification of CCC*

ASR and TPB density: role of Mn excess (accel'd testing)

- As Mn excess ↑,
 ASR↓
- As test time ↑:
 - Active TPB ↓
 - Total ASR ↑
- Effects on ASR diminish as Mn excess ↓





Prior work, normal conditions: TEM/EDXS cells tested at 800 °C



At cathode-electrolyte interface* after extended testing:1

 Reduced porosity
 Accumulation of Mn₂O₃ or Mn₃O₄²

H.-J. Wang et al., 14th SECA Workshop, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, July 2013.
 H.-J. Wang et al., *Metall. Mater. Transactions E: Materials for Energy Systems* 1 [3] 263-271 (2014).



Prior work, normal conditions: 3DR



- Cathode densification near cathode-electrolyte interface
- Evident after 16 kh/860 °C, but not after 8 kh/860 °C

Ref.: H.-J. Wang et al., 14th SECA Workshop, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, July 2013



Phase profiles across cathodes



LSM 80-95: phase profiles, 0-624 h accel'd testing

5% Mn excess:

- Develops porosity gradient during operation, ...
- ... denser at cathode/ electrolyte interface
- Not localized at e'lyte



Distance from the electrolyte interface (um)



Microstructural evolution during operation

Normal conditions, 8,000–16,000 h:

- Loss of porosity at cathode/electrolyte interface
- Mn oxides:
 - localized at cathode/ electrolyte interface
 - increasing with time

Accelerated conditions, ≤ 624 h:

 Porosity gradient, lowest at cathode/electrolyte interface



11% Mn excess: TEM w/EDXS, 0-493 h accel'd testing

- As received (0 h)
 - MnO_x observed sparingly across entire cathode
- 493 h accelerated testing
 - MnO_x near cathode/ e'lyte interface and in LSM cathode current collector (CCC)







5% Mn excess: TEM w/EDXS, 0–624 h accel'd testing



as received

500 h

MnO_x:

- Rarely seen in cathode
- Seen in CCC



624 h

Not seen at 5% Mn xs:

Densification and MnO_x *localized* at cathode/ electrolyte interface



Microstructural evolution during operation

Normal conditions, 8,000–16,000 h:

- Loss of porosity at cathode/electrolyte interface
- Mn oxides:
 - localized at cathode/ electrolyte interface,
 - increasing with time

Accelerated conditions, ≤ 624 h:

- Porosity gradient, lowest at cathode/electrolyte interface
- Mn oxides:
 - localized at cathode/ electrolyte interface,
 - for Mn excess ≥11%



11% Mn xs: LSM EDXS profiles, 0-493 h accel'd testing



5% Mn excess: LSM EDXS profiles, 0-624 h accel'd testing





cation %	as received	500 h	624 h
Mn	48	50	52
La	40	38	36
Sr	11	11	11

11% Mn excess, 8YSZ EDXS profiles, 0-493 h accel'd testing



- Uniform YSZ composition
 across cathodes
- Little change after 493 h

cation %	as received	493 h
Zr-K	79.0	77.0
Y	13.5	14.1
Mn	5.2	4.4



5% Mn excess, 8YSZ EDXS profiles, 0-624 h accel'd testing





200-µm electrolyte





100–µm electrolyte

Distance from electrolyte cathode interface (µm)

Porosity still *lower than* other cathodes

200-μm electrolyte: larger MnO_x particles



100-μm electrolyte: more MnO_x particles



ERN RESERVE





Summary: cathode microstructures, as received (3DR)

as received		LSM 85-90 (100-µm e'lyte)	LSM 80-95	LSM 80-98	Cathode D
sample volume (µm ³)		5,400	6,300	4,100	6,840
	porosity	23	29	28	31
fraction (%)	YSZ	35	33	37	34
fraction (70)	LSM	41	38	35	35
Total TPB (µm ⁻²)		20.6	14	22	18.4
Active TPB	(µm ⁻²)	19.4	13	20	17

Testing of LSM 85-90 cathodes on 100-µm electrolytes: *in progress* porosity is low; TPB density is relatively high; many small Mn oxide particles; Net effect on ASR: *TBD*

Summary

- ASR decreases with Mn excess (A-site deficiency) from 11% to 2% why?
- *Mn oxides: not predictive* of ASR or degradation rate
 - A local probe of p_{O_2} ? A reservoir for Mn?
- Effects of densification at cathode/CCC interface?
- *Mn distribution* and its evolution with time a clue to degradation?
- Analysis of EIS results in progress
- Role of p₀₂ focus of new project



Acknowledgments

- Funding: DoE SOFC Core Technology Program (DE-FE0023476)
- Program managers: Dr. Shailesh Vora, Dr. Patcharin Burke (NETL)
- 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.



- For 2018, prior results not previously presented:
 - Conventional test results
 - Trends in R_p , R_s , R_{tot} (EIS vs. durability testing)
 - R_p , R_s , R_{tot} vs. time (CeCe's thesis) compare to ASR from durability testing?
 - Does higher R_{electrolyte} (thicker; same material) have more effect on ASR and degradation rate than just the higher resistance itself?



- 10 mm electrolyte cathode

200–µm electrolyte lower porosity, smaller pores **100–µm electrolyte** more & larger pores





LSM 80-98 (C)

mų Or

LSM 80-95 (B)



Cathode D





Vol%	LSM 85-90 (thin)	LSM 80-95 (B)	LSM 80-98 (C)	Cathode D
porosity	23	29	28	31
YSZ	35	33	37	34
LSM	41	38	35	35

Phase profiles, as received (3DR)

All cells showed uniform phase profiles as received





Vol%	LSM 85-90	LSM 80-95	LSM 80-98	Cathode D
porosity	17	29	28	31
YSZ	41	33	37	34
LSM	41	38	35	35

Phase profiles across cathode after 500 h accel'd testing (3DR)





All three cathodes developed slight porosity gradients after 500 h of accelerated testing, with lowest porosity at cathode-electrolyte interface

3D calculation: comparison Gen A, B and C

		G	en A	Gen B			Gen C	
		As reduced	493 h accel test	As received	500h Accel test	624 hrs Accel test	As received	500h Accel test
sample volume (μm³)		4350	4525	6300	5096	4550	4100	5012
	porosity	17	18	29	25	25	28	25
volume fraction (%)	YSZ	41	43	33	35	37	37	37
. ,	LSM	41	38	38	40	38	35	38
	porosity	0.2	0.42	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4
particle diameter (µm)	YSZ	0.5	0.46	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.5
	LSM	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.7
	porosity	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.4	1.7	1.7
tortuosity	YSZ	1.5	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.8
	LSM	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.6
normalized	porosity	26	14	16	13	13	21	14
surface area (um ⁻¹)	YSZ	12	13	13	12	11	18	13
(F)	LSM	10	9.9	9	8	8	13	8
Total TPB (µ	ım⁻²)	17	5.9	14	15	11	22	11
Active TPB (µm⁻²)	10	5.1	13	13	10	20	10

LSM 80-98 & 8YSZ EDXS profiles, 500 h accel'd testing



Likewise at 2% Mn excess:

- Mn level in LSM matches nominal composition after 500 h accel'd testing
- If Mn is "going back into the LSM" during operation, it is not leaving the YSZ

Cathode D, as rec'd: microstructure near e'lyte

- Uniform microstructure across cathode
 - No gradients in phase fractions
 - LSM matches nominal composition
 - YSZ contains 4–5 cat% Mn (typical)
- No MnO_x observed near electrolyte nor inside cathode

EDS Layered Image 1





EDS Layered Image 2

Cathode D, as rec'd: microstructure near CCC

- MnO_x not seen inside the cathode nor near CCC interface
- MnO_x is observed inside the CCC (red arrows)

EDS Layered Image 5



2.5µm

A – B – C – D comparison: Electrode * ASR (accel'd testing)



*) total cell DC ASR, minus estimated ASR for 8YSZ substrate @ nominal thickness & DC conductivity



Cathode A: LSM85-90



Cathode C: LSM80-98



Cathode B: LSM80-95



LSM 85-90 / 8YSZ (A) — as received

LSM 85–90 (A), as rec'd	200–µm electrolyte	100–µm electrolyte
sample volu	ıme (µm³)	4,350	5,400
	porosity	17	23
	YSZ	41	35
(70)	LSM	'd 200-μm electrolyte 100-μm 4,350 5, 17 1 41 1 41 1 0.2 0 0.5 0 0.6 0 1.3 1 1.3 1 12 10 17 2	41
particle diameter	porosity	0.2	0.3
oarticle diameter	YSZ	0.5	0.4
(pm)	LSM	LSM 0.6	0.6
	porosity	2.0	1.6
tortuosity	YSZ	1.5	1.6
	LSM	1.3	1.4
normalized	porosity	26	21
surface area	YSZ	12	10
(µm ⁻¹)	LSM	10	9.5
total TPB	8 (μm ⁻²)	17.1	20.6
active TP	B (μm ⁻²)	10.3	19.4



Summary: cathode microstructures, as received (3DR)

as rece	ived	LSM 85-90 (A) (200-µm e'lyte)	LSM 80-95 (B)	LSM 80-98 (C)	Cathode D
sample volun	ne (µm³)	4,350	6,300	4,100	6,840
	porosity	17	29	28	31
fraction (%)	YSZ	41	33	37	34
	LSM	41 38 35 0.2 0.4 0.3	35	35	
n extists	porosity	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4
diameter (um)	YSZ	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3
diameter (µm)	LSM	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6
	porosity	2.0	1.5	1.7	1.5
tortuosity	YSZ	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.7
	LSM	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.4
normalized	porosity	26	16	21	16
surface area	YSZ	12	13	18	17
(µm ^{−1})	LSM	10	9	13	9
Total TPB	(µm⁻²)	17	14	22	18.4
Active TPB	(µm ⁻²)	10	13	20	17



CASE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

CASE WESTERN RESERVE

Bulk LSM particle composition profile



• Uniform LSM composition across the cathode composition A Thin electrolyte (as received)

Bulk 8YSZ particle composition profile



distance from electrolyte um

Uniform 8YSZ composition across the cathode composition C
~4.5 cat% Mn dissolved in 8YSZ

TEM w/EDXS of bulk 8YSZ composition

72 h





- Uniform YSZ composition across cathodes
- 4 5 cat% Mn

Bulk 8YSZ particle composition profile

niminal composition



~4.4 cation % Mn is found to dissolve in the 8YSZ

LSM 80-95 (B) durability testing: reproducibility





Reproducibility of 3D reconstruction data

LSM 80-98 (C) as received, two specimens



Phase profiles at cathode/CCC interface (3DR)



A – B – C comparison: cathode-CCC interface (500 h accel'd testing)



Densification (bottom plot)

A – B – C comparison: porosity and TPB density

	LSM 85-90; 11% Mn xs		L	LSM 80-95; 5% Mn xs			LSM 80-98; 2% Mn xs	
	as rec'd	493h accel	as rec'd	500h accel	624h accel	as rec'd	500h accel	
sample volume, µm³	4350	4525	6300	5096	4550	4100	5012	
porosity, volume %	17	18	29	25	25	28	25	
pore diameter, µm	0.23	0.42	0.38	0.5	0.46	0.28	0.44	
pore surface area, μm^{-1}	26	14	16	13	13	21	14	
total TPB, μm ⁻²	17.1	5.9	14.5	14.8	11	21.7	11.1	
active TPB, μm^{-2}	10.3	5.1	13.0	12.5	10	20.0	10.2	

Vs. LSM 85-90 (A) and 80-98 (C), LSM 80-95 (B) shows:

- Less pore coarsening and loss of pore area
- **Stabler TPB** (total and active)



Procedures: button cell specifications

- Fabricated at LGFCS
- Cell details:
 - 8YSZ electrolyte, 32 mm dia.
 - NiO-8YSZ anode (60:40 wt%)
 - Cathodes: A-site deficient LSM + 8YSZ (50:50 wt%)
 - <u>Comp'n A</u>: (La_{0.85} Sr_{0.15})_{0.90} MnO_{3±δ}
 (LSM 85-90)



- <u>Comp'n B</u>: (La_{0.80} Sr_{0.15})_{0.95} MnO_{3±δ} (LSM 80-95)
- <u>Comp'n C: (La_{0.80} Sr_{0.15}) 98 MnO_{3±δ} (LSM 80-98)</u>
- Electrodes: screen printed, 9.5 mm dia., fired separately



Our observed trend in electrode ASR vs. A/B ratio is opposite of electrical conductivity predicted by defect chemistry modeling.



Fig. 8. Variation of total conductivity of 10% Sr doped LSM, small polaron model. Same equilibrium constants as in Fig. 7. The conductivity, predicted from Eqs. (20) and (21), based on simplifications, are shown for comparison.

F.W. Poulsen, Solid State Ionics 129 (2000) pp. 145-162

Pre-test protocol: temperature parametric study



Representative V-I & P-I sweeps, 0–624 h





Representative Bode plots, 0–624 h





Representative Nyquist plots, 24–400 h







Cathode B: 500-hr Conventional Test



Frequency (Hz)

Cathode B: 500-hr Conventional Test



Ζ'

57

Reproducibility of 3DR (cathode C, as received)

		specimen 1	specimen 2			
Sample Vo	olume (µm³)	4350 4100		Use Δ instead		
Cathode o	composition	C (LSM80-	98 / 8YSZ)	of std. de	of std. dev.?	
Test c	ondition	As rec	eived	Average	Std. dev'n	% dev'n
_	Porosity	27.3	27.9	27.6	0.37	1.4%
Volume Fraction (%)	YSZ	36.1	36.8	36.5	0.52	1.4%
11466011 (70)	LSM	36.6	35.3	35.9	0.90	2.5%
Particle	Porosity	0.26	0.28	0.27	0.01	5.2%
Diameter	YSZ	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.00	0.00%
(μm)	LSM	0.49	0.46	0.48	0.02	4.5%
	Porosity	1.66	1.77	1.72	0.08	4.5%
Tortuosity	YSZ	1.93	1.86	1.90	0.05	2.6%
	LSM	1.73	1.64	1.69	0.06	3.8%
Normalized	Porosity	23.0	21.3	22.1	1.21	5.5%
Surface Area	YSZ	18.6	18.5	18.6	0.08	0.46%
(µm⁻¹)	LSM	12.3	13.1	12.7	0.54	4.2%
Total TPB (µm⁻²)		27.4	21.7	24.6	4.0	16%
Active 1	⁻²) ΓΡΒ (μm ⁻²)	24.2	20.0	22.1	3.0	14%
Active TPB (%)		88.3	92.1	90.0	2.6	3.0%

Average microstructural parameters: *std. dev'ns <5%* TPB (total & active): *std. dev'ns ≤ 4 μm², ~15%*

		Gen A				
		as received	200 h	493 h		
sample volume (µm³)		≈ 4350	≈ 4620	≈ 4525		
	porosity	17	17	18.4		
volume fraction (%)	YSZ	42	41	43.2		
	LSM	41	42	38.4		
narticle diameter	porosity	0.2	0.34	0.42		
	YSZ	0.5	0.6	0.46		
(µm)	LSM	0.6	0.7	0.6		
	porosity	2	1.7	1.6		
tortuosity	YSZ	1.5	1.43	1.3		
	LSM	1.3	1.35	1.4		
normalized surface	porosity	26	17.4	14.2		
area	YSZ	12	10	13		
(µm ⁻¹)	LSM	10	7.6	9.88		
Total TPB (µm ⁻²)		17.1	9.6	5.86		
Active TPB (µm ⁻²)		10.3	8.2	5.13		

A – B comparison: 3DR

		LSM 85-	90 (compo	sition A)	LSM 80-95 (composition B)		
		as received	500 h conv test	493 h accel. test	as received	500 h conv test	500 h accel'd test
sample volume (µm ³)		4350	3700	4525	6300	5000	5096
.1	porosity	17	21.9	18.4	29	26	26
fraction (%)	YSZ	42	42.6	43.2	33	35.5	35
	LSM	41	35.5	38.4	38	38.5	39
particle	porosity	0.2	0.4	0.42	0.46	0.45	0.38
	YSZ	0.5	0.5	0.46	0.47	0.42	0.51
	LSM	0.6	0.65	0.6	0.67	0.65	0.7
	porosity	2.0	1.65	1.6	1.34	1.4	1.67
tortuosity	YSZ	1.5	1.47	1.3	1.32	1.65	1.66
	LSM	1.3	1.45	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.44
normalized	porosity	26	15.7	14.2	13	13.3	15.9
surface area	YSZ	12	11.5	13	13	14	11.9
(μm^{-1})	LSM	10	8.9	9.9	8.9	9.3	8.5
Total TPB (µm ⁻²)		17.1	11	5.9	14.5	14.2	14.8
Active TPB (µm ⁻²)		10.3	9.5	5.1	13.0	13	12.5

In contrast to LSM 85-90 (A), LSM 80-95 (B) shows:

- Pore refinement (!?) and increasing area and tortuosity
- **Stabler TPB** (total and active)

A – B – C comparison: 3DR

		Gen A		Gen B			Gen C	
		As received	493h Accel test	As received	500h Accel test	624 hrs Accel test	As received	500h Accel test
sample volume (μm³)		4350	4525	6300	5096	4550	4100	5012
volume fraction (%)	porosity	17	18	29	25	25	28	25
	YSZ	41	43	33	35	37	37	37
	LSM	41	38	38	40	38	35	38
particle diameter (μm)	porosity	0.23	0.42	0.38	0.5	0.46	0.28	0.44
	YSZ	0.52	0.46	0.45	0.5	0.51	0.32	0.46
	LSM	0.59	0.61	0.65	0.7	0.72	0.26	0.71
normalized surface area (µm ⁻¹)	porosity	26	14	16	13	13	21	14
	YSZ	12	13	13	12	11	18	13
	LSM	10	10	9	8	8	13	8
Total TPB (μm ⁻²)		17.1	5.9	14.5	14.8	11	21.7	11.1
Active TPB (μm ⁻²)		10.3	5.1	13.0	12.5	10	20.0	10.2

Vs. LSM 85-90 (A) and 80-98 (C), LSM 80-95 (B) shows:

- Less pore coarsening and loss of pore area
- **Stabler TPB** (total and active)

A – B – C comparison: ASR and TPB density

- As Mn excess ↓,
 ASR ↓
 (A → B → C)
- As test *t* **↑**:
 - Active TPB 🐓
 - Total ASR 乔
 - Effects

 diminish as Mn
 excess ↓
 (A → B → C)



 $\label{eq:active_reproducibility} \begin{array}{l} \underline{ASR} \left[\ \Omega \ cm^2 \ \right], \ 0 \ h: \ \pm 0.08 \ (A); \ \pm 0.03 \ (B) \\ \underline{active \ TPB \ density} \ \left[\ \mu m^{-2} \ \right], \ 0 \ h: \ \pm 3.0 \ (C) \end{array}$

