An integrated reduced order model considering degradation effects for LiFePO4/graphite cells
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Abstract

A reduced order model (ROM) considering degradation effects is proposed and validated against experiments for both fresh and cycled lithium iron phosphate (LFP)/graphite cells. The ion behaviors in the LFP particles such as two-phase transition and path dependence are modeled using a shrinking core with a moving interface between a lithium-rich and a lithium-deficient phase. The model errors are further minimized by employing the Extended Kalman Filter (EKF) to achieve a more accurate state-of-charge (SoC) estimation. The average error of SoC and voltage estimation is kept within 4% and 2%, respectively. Side reaction is regarded as the predominant cause of degradation, which can be accelerated by elevated temperatures, high SoC levels and large SoC cycling limits. The effects of operating conditions on degradation are described by a modified Butler-Volmer equation that is incorporated into the developed ROM. The integrated model facilitates to represent the degradation effects of side reaction, including loss of ions, loss of active material, growth of solid electrolyte interphase and deposit layer, and electrolyte decomposition. The model is capable of estimating capacity and power with an accuracy of 2% and 3% up to 1000 cycles, respectively.

© 2018 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

1. Introduction

Lithium iron phosphate (LFP), firstly introduced by Padhi [1] et al., is a potential cathode material undergone remarkable developments in the commercial market of lithium ion batteries (LiBs), due to the characteristics of good electrochemical and thermal stability [2]. Compared with the electrodes embedded by Ni, Mn, Co, LFP based electrodes have the characteristics of two-phase transition and path dependence in both charge and discharge cycles. Srinivasan and Newman [3], Wang et al. [4] and Kavasajjula et al. [5] successively proposed a full order model (FOM) based on the concept of a shrinking core to simulate the discharge behaviors of both half and full cells with consideration of phase transformation rate, two-phase interface mobility and diffusion coefficients in both lithium-rich (Li1-xFePO4) and lithium-deficient phase (LiFePO4). The electrochemical behaviors of charge profiles were validated by incorporating Laudau transformation to generate a moving boundary [6]. In spite of high accuracy, complexity of the parameters and high computational efforts limit the real-time application of FOM. Plenty of reduction methods have been applied to reduce the execution time with accuracy maintained, such as single particle model (SPM) [7], enhanced SPM [8,9], state-variable model [10], reformulated model [11], proper orthogonal decomposition (POD) [12] model and volume averaging model [13]. However, the lack of predictive capability of end-of-life (EoL) performance impedes its use in the battery management system (BMS).

The degradation of LiBs corresponding to calendar life [14,15] and cycle life [16–19] is as the results of exposing to the ambient environment and cycling usage, respectively. The capacity and power fade are not caused by a single reason, but from large varieties. The inter-dependency of various degradation causes makes the comprehension of degradation mechanism more difficult. Schematic diagram of potential degradation mechanism taking place at composite electrodes, separator and current collectors is depicted in Fig. 1.

Degradation phenomena occurring at positive and negative electrode are significantly different. Researchers have identified the side reaction taking place at the interface between electrode and electrolyte at anode as the predominant cause of degradation for LiBs [20–30]. The main reaction is the intercalation/de-
The intercalation of lithium ions to/from the electrode solid matrix during cycling. The side reaction takes place between the lithium ions and the electrolyte solvents, which leads to the formation of the unsolvable byproducts that are the main components of the solid electrolyte interphase (SEI) layer. The side reaction is described in Eqs. (1) and (2).

$$2\text{Li}^+ + 2\text{e}^- + \text{EC} \rightarrow \text{CH}_2 = \text{CH}_2 \uparrow + \text{Li}_2\text{CO}_3 \downarrow$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)
2Li$^+ + 2e^- + 2EC → CH_2 = CH_2 \uparrow + (CH_2OCO_2Li)_2 \downarrow \quad (2)

Other byproducts of the side reaction, such as LiOH, Li_2O, and ROLi etc., are neglected as minor components. The major compositions of the SEI after the reduction of ethylene carbonate (EC) based electrolyte are lithium carbonate (Li_2CO_3) and lithium ethylene dicarbonate (CH_2OCO_2Li)_2. The SEI is prone to form at initial cycles, especially in charging protocol, which is used to protect the electrode from possible corrosion and prevent electrolyte from being decomposed. The SEI is permeable to lithium ions and electrolyte solvents, but impermeable to electrons, which can be treated as a natural barrier of the main reaction on the covered surface of anode. The schematic diagram of SEI formation at anode is shown in Fig. 2. The new SEI is formed at the interface between the pre-formed SEI and graphite particles. In addition, the SEI grows over time, clogs pores and isolates graphite particles that cause a decrease of the accessible area for lithium ions to participate in the reduction reactions, which provokes loss of active anode material. When the graphite particle is fully covered by the SEI, the isolation of electrons makes it impossible to participate in the chemical reaction anymore, which is treated as one source of the loss of recyclable lithium ions. The continuous consumption of lithium ions is the other source of loss of ions, which could result in capacity fade during prolonged cycles.

Previous study shows that the byproducts of side reaction are not only accumulated on the surface of graphite particles, but also on the interface between the composite anode and separator, which is defined as the deposit layer (DL) [31]. As the increasing thickness of the SEI and DL, the ionic conductivity decreases, which causes power fade. The continuous electrolyte decomposition and its attribute to side reaction leads to the impedance rise of electrolyte, which induces power fade as well. Thereby, loss of recyclable lithium ions and loss of active material (AM) of graphite electrode mainly result in capacity fade, while the impedance rise induced from the growth of SEI and DL and electrolyte decomposition are the main causes for power fade.

To degradation effects of LFP cathode, researchers [32–34] have identified iron deposition on the surface of graphite electrode by various characterization techniques, such as transmission electron microscopy (TEM) and Raman spectroscopy. It was also proposed that the iron dissolution from LFP electrode surface was caused by the chemical reaction between acidic species in the electrolyte and Fe$^{3+}$ impurities [35]. In a failure case, the deposited irons on the surface of graphite electrode could grow as dendrites to cause internal short circuit. However, Liu et al. [36] revealed that the iron dissolution from LFP electrode was only a minor effect of degradation compared with those taking place on anode.

The various causes, impact factors and inter-dependencies of degradation mechanism make it extremely challenging to describe the degradation effects of LiBs mathematically. The models to predict the degradation phenomena can be divided into two groups, empirical/semi-empirical models [17,37–40] and physics-based electrochemical thermal models [41,42]. The models in the first group were developed by fitting the experimental data to obtain the empirical equations or extract degradation parameters to predict the capacity fade or impedance rise for both calendar life and cycle life. Even though it has the strengths of high accuracy, it is still limited by its high dependence on experimental data and empirical coefficients. In addition, the accuracy cannot be maintained if operating conditions are out of the experimental ranges. Conversely, the physics-based degradation models consider the side reaction whose rate was quantified by the reformulated Butler-Volmer (BV) equation based on the concept provided by Newman [43]. Considering the phase change phenomenon of LFP based cells, M. Safari and C. Delacourt [44,45] proposed a FOM incorporating side reaction based on the resistive-reactant perspective. The physical boundary between two phases was replaced by the concentration-dependent diffusion coefficients. P. Gambhire et al. [41] developed a ROM by volume averaging methods with concentration-dependent diffusivities and then incorporated SEI formation by side reaction. No capacity or power fade could be estimated in the abovementioned model.

In this paper, a physics-based ROM considering degradation effects were developed to estimate both beginning-of-life (BoL) and end-of-life (EoL) behaviors in real time. The integrated model was validated against experiments conducted by large-format pouch-type LFP/graphite cells. Due to the existence of the voltage plateau caused by two-phase transition on LFP electrode, the accuracy of SoC estimation was enhanced by incorporating a hybrid method combing both Extended Kalman Filter (EKF) and Coulomb counting. The degradation effects of side reaction, including ion loss, AM loss, SEI and DL growth, and electrolyte decomposition, were estimated. The capacity loss and power fade as a function of cycling time were also estimated by the model. The details of tests, including single cycles, multiple cycles for BoL and cycling tests for EoL are summarized in Section 2. The principles and equations of the electrochemical models are discussed in Section 3. Section 4 introduces the results of model validation against both fresh and cycled LFP/graphite cells. Section 5 is the conclusion.

2. Experiments

Cells used for experiments are the large-format pouch-type LiFePO_4/graphite cells provided by Top Battery, whose specifications are shown in Table 1. The LiBs are tested in a thermal chamber with three K-type thermocouples adhesive to the cell surface to measure temperatures. A programmable power supply and an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Cathode</th>
<th>LFP</th>
<th>Electrolyte</th>
<th>Confidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End-of-charge (EoC) voltage 3.6 V
End-of-discharge (EoD) voltage 2.0 V
Nominal capacity 20Ah

Fig. 2. Schematic diagram of SEI formation at anode.
electric and discharge current profiles. Impedance spectra are measured by electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) equipment, GAMRY, and the parameters are extracted by fitting the equivalent circuit model (ECM).

The experiments of fresh cells include measurement of the open-circuit voltage (OCV), application of the charge/discharge profiles in the single cycles and multiple cycles. The OCV is measured at the ambient temperature of 25 °C using a very small current of 0.05C-rate (1A) in order to allow the terminal voltage and OCV to be equal in the maximum likelihood. The charge/discharge protocols in the single and multiple cycles are as follows: 1) Pre-tests: 5 initial cycles at constant current (CC) of 1C-rate (20A) with 30 min’ rest between each consecutive charge/discharge cycle; 2) Single-cycle tests: ¯ Charge the cell using CC until end-of-charge (EOC) voltage (3.6 V); ¯ Rest for 30 min; ¯ Discharge the cell using CC until end-of-discharge (EoD) voltage (2 V). The CC applied at charging and discharging varies among 1C-rate, 2C-rate and 4C-rate at different ambient temperatures (25/40/55 °C, respectively). 3) Multiple-cycle tests: Discharge the cell to 2 V and then charge it to 3.6 V continuously without resting using CC at 1/2/4C-rate; 4) Post-tests: EIS and capacity measurements.

The test matrix of accelerated cycling tests is shown in Table 2. At every 30 or 60 cycles, the capacity and impedance are measured at 25 °C in the following steps. Capacity measurement: 1) Charge the cell using CC protocol (CC: 1C-rate) to 3.6 V; 2) Rest for 30 min; 3) Discharge the cell with 1C-rate CC to 2 V. EIS measurement: 1) Charge the cell to 50% SoC by 1C-rate CC; 2) Rest for 3 h; 3) Conduct EIS test at the frequency from 10 mHz to 1 kHz.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T(°C)</th>
<th>Cha. Current</th>
<th>Dis. Current</th>
<th>J50°C</th>
<th>25–95%</th>
<th>5–75%</th>
<th>45–55%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4C-rate (80A)</td>
<td>4C-rate (80A)</td>
<td>1080 cycles</td>
<td>3500 cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>900 cycles</td>
<td>900 cycles</td>
<td>3000 cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>870 cycles</td>
<td>870 cycles</td>
<td>540 cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS test</td>
<td>Frequency range: 10 mHz to 1 kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Model development

#### 3.1. ROM

The single LFP/graphite cell is composed of multiple sandwich-structured microcells with three basic layers, composite anode, separator and composite cathode. The composite electrode is mainly fabricated by electrode particles, electrolyte and binder. When the cells are discharged, reduction and oxidation reactions take place at the anode and cathode, respectively. The lithium ions de-intercalated from the anode particles transport through the electrolyte to the cathode while the electrons transport through the external circuit. Likewise, the reverse reaction takes place at charging. The electrochemical behaviors, including intercalation/de-intercalation of lithium ions to/from the electrode, kinetics of chemical reaction taking place at the interface between electrode and electrolyte, ion transportation and diffusion through electrode particles and electrolyte, are described by the coupled partial differential equations (PDEs) which are solved by the finite difference method (FDM) in the FOM.

The mass transfer and charge conservation are governed by Fick’s law and Ohm’s law, respectively. The electrochemical kinetics are governed by the BV equation under consideration of both anodic and cathodic reactions. Due to the time-consuming demerits of the FOM, it is still necessary to simplify the governing equations in the FOM with decent accuracy maintained. The polynomial approach, state space approach and linearization are applied to reduce the order of the equations of ion concentration of electrode phase, ion concentration of electrolyte phase and current density, respectively. The ion behaviors of the two-phase transition and the existence of path dependence are considered by two set of parameters and number of layers coexisting in the LFP particles, respectively. The moving interfaces of the coexisting layers dependent upon the usage history has induced a moving boundary problem, or Stephen problem that describes the location of the boundary as a function of time and space, which can be solved by the variable space grid method. The governing equations and their corresponding boundary conditions of both FOM and ROM and the applied reduction methods are summarized in Table 3. The simplified governing equations of ion concentration in the solid particles are shown in Table 4.

#### 3.2. ROM with EKF

ROM can be used to estimate SoC calculated from the average ion concentration in the particles. However, the accuracy of SoC estimation is limited by the errors induced by the inaccuracy of the ROM, sensors and initial values of integration of the ion concentrations, which can be further minimized by using the EKF. The applied current and SoC are regarded as the input and output, respectively, where the average volume ion concentration of anode is regarded as a state and the terminal voltage is the measuring output. The principles of the EKF is summarized in Table 5.

When a current is applied to the battery, the difference between the measured and simulated terminal voltage is calculated at each time step and corrected by the optimized Kalman gain. Then the corrected error is feed-backed to update the state and the error covariance matrix (P). Finally, SoC is calculated using the average ion concentration of anode by Eq. (19). The process is carried out recursively and repetitively. The formulations of the EKF using ROM is shown in Table 6.

Since the SoC-OCV curve of LFP cells has a relatively flat region due to the characteristics of two-phase transition, the terminal voltage error is very small and might cause the EKF to stop updating and the Kalman gain to be zero, which is inevitable regardless of any controls. Therefore, a hybrid method of combining EKF and coulomb counting has been used. When the battery enters the stage of voltage plateau area, the SoC estimation algorithm switches from the EKF to coulomb counting. A tolerance is set to be the criteria of determining the SoC estimation mode. When the error of terminal voltage between the measured and estimated state is less than the tolerance, the algorithm used to do SoC estimation is coulomb counting and vice versa.

#### 3.3. Physics-based degradation model

#### 3.3.1. Model principles

In order to develop a physics-based degradation model, several assumptions have been made:

1. The byproducts of side reaction are only the mixture of Li2CO3 and (CH2OCO2Li)2 based on Eq. (1) and Eq. (2).
2. The reduction reaction rate of side reaction is much higher than the oxidation reaction rate, which implies that the side reaction is an irreversible process.
3. Degradation effects on cathode, such as iron dissolution, are neglected.
4. No overcharge or undercharge process is considered.
Table 3
Governing equations of the FOM and ROM [46].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOM</th>
<th>Reduction method</th>
<th>ROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ion concentration in electrode</td>
<td>Polynomial approach</td>
<td>See Table 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial t} - \frac{D_{s_L}}{L} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} - \frac{D_{i_L}}{L} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} = \frac{-j^i}{\sigma</em>{\text{eff}} A} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (c_{s_L} - c_{i_L}) \frac{dr}{\partial t} \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} - D</em>{i_L} \frac{\partial c_{i_L}}{\partial x} \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} = D</em>{s_L} \frac{\partial c_{s_L}}{\partial x} \bigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion concentration in electrolyte</td>
<td>State space approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\delta (v_x c_s)}{\delta t} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial (v_x c_s)}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} = \frac{1 - \frac{\sigma</em>{\text{eff}}}{\sigma_A}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right)} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial t} \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 - \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x} \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} = \frac{1}{\sigma</em>{\text{eff}} A} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohm's law in electrode</td>
<td>Finite difference method (FDM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} = \frac{1}{\sigma</em>{\text{eff}} A} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohm's law in electrolyte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td>_{x=L} = 0 - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} = \frac{1}{\sigma</em>{\text{eff}} A} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrochemical kinetics</td>
<td>Ge has no influence on reaction current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( j^i = a_i q_0 \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\alpha_i F}{RT} \eta \right) - \exp \left( - \frac{\alpha_i F}{RT} \right) \right] )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta = \phi_3 - \phi_2 - U_{\text{equ}} )</td>
<td>Linearization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{\partial c_s}{\partial x} \right) \bigg</td>
<td><em>{x=L} = \frac{1}{\sigma</em>{\text{eff}} A} \left( \frac{1}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{\partial x} \right) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( j^i = a_i q_0 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \left( \phi_3 - U \right) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Principles of EKF.

Prediction (Time update)
State prediction: \( \dot{x}_k = A_k x_{k-1} + B_k u_{k-1} \)
Error covariance prediction: \( P_k = A_k P_{k-1} A_k^T + B_k Q_{k-1} B_k^T \)
Kalman gain: \( K_k = P_k A_k^T (A_k P_{k-1} A_k^T + B_k Q_{k-1} B_k^T)^{-1} \)
State correction: \( \dot{x}_k = (I - K_k A_k) x_{k-1} + K_k z_k \)
Error covariance correction: \( P_k = (I - K_k A_k) P_{k-1} \)

Note
\[ A = \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{k-1}} \right] \]
\[ W = \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_{k-1}} \right] \]
\[ H = \left[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_{k-1}} \right] \]
\[ V = \left[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial u_{k-1}} \right] \]

Table 6
Formulations of EKF using ROM.

State and measurement
\[ x = \begin{bmatrix} c_{ave}^1 \\ \vdots \\ c_{ave}^n \\ V \end{bmatrix} \]

System
\[ \begin{align*}
\dot{c}_{ave}^i &= \frac{3f^{i+1}}{R_k a_i M_k} \\
V_i &= U^{i+1}(y) - U^{i}(x) - \eta
\end{align*} \]

Jacians
\[ A = I \]
\[ H = \frac{\partial W}{\partial c_{ave}^i} = \frac{\partial x_{ave}^i}{\partial x_{ave}^i} \]

SoC estimation
\[ \text{SoC} = \frac{\int_0^L \left( \frac{c_{ave}^i - c_{ave}^{i,\text{max},0}}{c_{ave}^{i,\text{max},0} - c_{ave}^{i,\text{min},0}} \right) \ dx}{100} \]

5. No mechanical failure, such as graphite exfoliation, electrode volume change and particle cracks, is considered.

In the former developed ROM with EKF, the BV equation of Eq. (7) only describes the kinetics of main reaction. Considering side reaction, the BV equation is reformulated to describe the total reaction rate which is the sum of the reaction rate of the main and side reaction. Based on the assumptions above, the side reaction rate only considers the reduction reaction. The corresponding equations about degradation are summarized in Table 7. Compared to the over-potential of Eq. (7), the potential drop caused by SEI formation has been added in the model.

The equilibrium potential of main reaction, \( U_{\text{equ}} \), is a function of the stoichiometric number and ion concentration in electrolyte according to the Nernst equation where \( U_{\text{equ}}^0 \) and \( U_{\text{equ}}^0 \) are the standard equilibrium potential of anode and cathode when \( c_e = c_{e0} \), respectively. The equilibrium potential of cathode, \( U_{\text{equ}} \), is estimated by an empirical equation derived from Ref. [2]. Then the equilibrium potential of anode, \( U_{\text{equ}} \), can be calculated by the difference between measured OCV and \( U_{\text{equ}} \). However, the standard equilibrium potential of the side reaction, \( U_{\text{equ,side}}^0 \), is no longer
Table 7
Equations for physics-based degradation model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction rate</th>
<th>Side reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mu^i_j = \frac{q_{Li}^j}{d_{Li}^j} \frac{(x_0 + q_{Li}^a)}{RT} \eta$</td>
<td>$\mu^i_{side} = - \frac{q_{Li,side}^j}{d_{Li,side}^j} \exp \left( - \frac{\alpha_{Li,side} \eta_{side}}{RT} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-potential</td>
<td>$\eta = \eta_{0} - U_{eq} - \frac{R_{Li,j}}{d_{Li}^j}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equilibrium potential</td>
<td>$U_{eq} = \frac{RT}{NT} \ln \left( \frac{C_{0}}{C_{e}} \right) - \frac{RT}{NT} \ln \left( \frac{C_{x}}{C_{e}} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reaction rate</td>
<td>$U_{eq, side} = - \frac{RT}{NT} \ln \left( \frac{C_{x}}{C_{e}} \right)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes [2]

**Fig. 3.** Schematic diagram of degradation mechanism at anode of a microcell.

a function of the stoichiometric number, but depends on the material composition of the electrolyte. Various recommendation values of $U_{eq, side}$ are provided by Ref. [24], such as 2 V, 1.7 V, 0.8 V and 0.4 V. The specific value of $U_{eq, side}$ in this model is obtained by fitting experimental data of terminal voltage at various operating conditions.

3.3.2. Analysis of the effects of side reaction

The degradation effects of LiBs are inextricably linked to the side reaction. The schematic diagram of degradation mechanism is depicted in Fig. 3. Loss of recyclable lithium ions, loss of AM, growth of SEI and DL and electrolyte decomposition pertaining to main degradation effects are considered in the physics-based degradation model. The yellow shade in Fig. 3 denotes the byproducts of the side reaction. The side reaction occurs at the interface between graphite particles and the anode and the separator. The LiBs are composed of the byproducts that are totally isolated electrode particles which cannot be involved in any further chemical reaction.

The degradation effects resulting from the side reaction can be discussed from two aspects, the consumption of the reactants and the aggregation of the products. With regard to the analysis of the reactants, the amount of consumed lithium ions in the side reaction can be calculated by integrating the side reaction rate over time and volume of the composite anode.

$$d_{Li, side}(t) = \int_{0}^{t} \int_{0}^{\delta_{a}} \frac{\mu_{side}}{\delta_{a}} A dx$$

where $d_{Li, side}$ is the amount of consumed lithium ions with a unit of Ah. $\delta_{a}$ is the thickness of the composite anode. $A$ denotes the cross section area of the LiB.

The consumption of the electrolyte solvent is analyzed by the change of the volume fraction of electrolyte, given by Eq. (21).

$$\frac{d\eta_{v}}{dt} = \frac{\alpha V_{e}}{\delta_{a}} \int_{0}^{\delta} \frac{\mu_{side}}{\delta_{a}} dx$$

where $\eta_{v}$ is the volume fraction of electrolyte solvent. $V_{e}$ is the molar volume of the electrolyte. $\alpha$ is a dimensionless coefficient indicating how many moles of the electrolyte solvents are involved in the side reaction when one mole of the lithium ions is consumed.

Provided that the byproducts of the side reaction are only Li$_2$CO$_3$ and (CH$_2$OCO$_2$Li)$_2$, the consumed molar of the electrolyte solvent are 0.5 and 1, respectively. Under the assumption of the same reaction rate for Eq. (1) and Eq. (2), $\alpha$ equals to 0.75. Correspondingly, the decrease of the volume fraction of the electrolyte solvents leads to a decrease of the effective diffusion coefficient in the electrolyte.

$$D_{e}^{eff} = D_{e} \cdot \eta_{v}$$

The increasing rate of the SEI thickness is proportional to the reaction rate of the side reaction, given in Eq. (23).

$$\frac{d\delta_{SEI}}{dt} = \frac{\tilde{V}_{SEI}}{2\tilde{a}_{Li}} \frac{\mu_{side}}{\delta_{a}}$$

where $\delta_{SEI}$ and $\tilde{V}_{SEI}$ are the thickness and molar volume of the SEI layer, respectively.

The resistance increase of the SEI layer is given in Eq. (24).

$$\Delta R_{SEI} = \frac{\delta_{SEI}}{\kappa_{SEI}}$$

where $\kappa_{SEI}$ is the ion conductivity of the SEI.
Table 8
Model parameters for BoL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Negative electrode</th>
<th>Separator</th>
<th>Positive electrode</th>
<th>unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geometry and volume fractions</td>
<td>Thickness, $\delta$</td>
<td>$72 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$20 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$108 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Particle radius, $R_i$</td>
<td>$3.72 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$0.475 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>$m$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active material volume fraction, $\epsilon_s$</td>
<td>$0.5814$</td>
<td>$0.5589$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polymer phase volume fraction, $\epsilon_p$</td>
<td>$0.0369$</td>
<td>$0.5464$</td>
<td>$0.0243$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conductive filler volume fraction, $\epsilon_f$</td>
<td>$0.0869$</td>
<td>$0.0243$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porosity, $\epsilon$</td>
<td>$0.3749$</td>
<td>$0.4536$</td>
<td>$0.3925$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li$^+$ concentrations</td>
<td>Stoichiometry at 0% SOC: $X_{soe, bds}$</td>
<td>$0.02$</td>
<td>$0.84$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoichiometry at 100% SOC: $X_{100oC_bds}$</td>
<td>$0.94$</td>
<td>$0.16$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average electrolyte concentration, $\epsilon_{eq}$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>mol m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange current density coefficient, $i_0$</td>
<td>$13.2 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$6.79 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$A m^{-2}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange diffusion coefficient of side reaction, $D_{side}$</td>
<td>$0.5$, $0.5$</td>
<td>$0.5$, $0.5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrolyte phase Li$^+$ diffusion coefficient, $D_{el}$</td>
<td>$100$</td>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$5 m^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruggeman’s porosity exponent, $p$</td>
<td>$1.5$</td>
<td>$1.5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrolyte phase ionic conductivity, $\kappa_{eq}$</td>
<td>$0.363$</td>
<td>$0.363$</td>
<td>$0.363$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equilibrium potential of LFP</td>
<td>$U_{eq}(x)$</td>
<td>$-3.4323 + 0.8428 \exp(-80.2493 x^{5.3098})$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Model parameters for EoL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange current density of side reaction, $i_{0, side}$ (A m$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>$2.28 \times 10^{-2}$ at 25°C $2.62 \times 10^{-2}$ at 40°C $2.73 \times 10^{-2}$ at 55°C</td>
<td>Optimized by comparing simulation to the self-discharge data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard equilibrium potential of side reaction, $U_{eq, side}$ (V)</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>Optimized by comparing simulation to the experimental data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molar volume of SEI, $V_{SEI}$ (mol m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{9}$</td>
<td>Obtained by assuming the initial thickness of SEI is 2 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionic conductivity of SEI, $\kappa_{SEI}$ (S m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>$4 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>Optimized by comparing simulation to the terminal voltage under cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation rate of active anode materials due to SEI, $k_i$</td>
<td>$15$</td>
<td>Optimized by comparing simulation to measured capacity fade Used from literature [33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molar volume of DL, $V_{DL}$ (mol m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>$7.56 \times 10^{9}$</td>
<td>Optimized by comparing simulation to the terminal voltage under cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionic conductivity of DL, $\kappa_{DL}$ (S m$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>$0.1$</td>
<td>Optimized by comparing simulation to the terminal voltage under cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molar volume of electrolyte, $V_{el}$ (mol m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>$3.25 \times 10^{8}$</td>
<td>Optimized by comparing simulation to the terminal voltage under cycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Delta \epsilon_s = -k_i n_0 \Delta \epsilon_{SEI}$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

where $\epsilon_s$ is the volume fraction of the active electrode material, and $k_i$ is a dimensionless coefficient.

The increasing rate of the thickness and impedance of the DL are described in Eq. (26) and Eq. (27).

$\frac{\partial \delta_{DL}}{\partial t} = \frac{R_s V_{DL} \delta_{DL}}{2F} \sigma_{side} x \Delta \delta$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$\Delta R_{DL} = \Delta \delta_{DL} / \kappa_{DL}$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

Where $\Delta \delta_{DL}$, $V_{DL}$, and $\kappa_{DL}$ are the thickness, molar volume and ion conductivity of the DL, respectively.

4. Results and discussion

Some of geometric and morphologic parameters of the cells, such as thickness, particle radius, active material volume fraction etc., are provided by the manufacturer, while the others, such as stoichiometric number and diffusion coefficients of solid and electrolyte phase etc., are used from literatures and then optimized based on the validated results. The list of the parameters for BoL and EoL can be found in Tables 8 and 9, respectively. The parameters except for some temperature-dependent ones, such as diffusion coefficients and exchange current density of side reaction, are the same in the development of the integrated electrochemical model. The temperature-dependent parameters are optimized by the means of the Arrhenius equation.

4.1. Validation for beginning-of-life (BoL)

In order to verify the accuracy of the ROM with EKF, the experimental data and their corresponding simulation results with different discharge/charge currents applied are compared at different operating temperatures. The comparison of the discharge profile between the simplified ROM and the ROM with EKF is depicted in Fig. 4(a). The constant discharging current of 1C-rate with resting is applied to a fresh LFP/graphite cell at the operating temperature of 25°C. The markers, the pink solid line and the blue solid line represent the results of experiments, ROM and ROM with EKF, respectively. For the constant discharging, the terminal voltage of both the ROM and the ROM with EKF shows a good match with the experimental data. However, the ROM could not reach the EoD cutoff voltage. Furthermore, the prediction of voltage recovery during resting is underestimated by the ROM, but in an excellent match with the ROM with EKF. Therefore, the incorporation of the EKF into the developed ROM achieves a high accuracy of the estimation of the terminal voltage and SoC.
experimental data and simulation results of the ROM with EKF at different discharge and charge currents (1/2/4C-rate) applied at 25 °C are plotted in Fig. 4(b) and (c), respectively. Since constant currents are applied to the cells, the slope of the SoC should be a constant. The markers and the solid lines represent the experiments and simulations, respectively. The responses of terminal voltages and SoCs have a good match with experiments of different discharge and charge profiles at 25 °C. The error between the experimental measurements and the estimated results obtained from the ROM with EKF are summarized and depicted in Fig. 4.
Fig. 4(d). The estimated errors of terminal voltage and SoC under different discharging and charging conditions are within 2% and 4%, respectively.

Some parameters of the ROM are highly sensitive to the temperatures, such as the diffusion coefficients of solid and electrolyte phase. According to the analysis of parameter sensitivity, the diffusion coefficient of solid phase has affected the capacity, while that of the electrolyte phase has affected the over-potential. Thus, dependency of the diffusion coefficients of solid and electrolyte phase on temperature are reflected using the Arrhenius equation. Different discharging currents (1/2/4C) are applied to the cells at 40 °C and 55 °C. The comparison results of terminal voltage and SoC are plotted in Fig. 4(e). The upper two subplots in Fig. 4(e) are the comparisons of terminal voltage and SoC at 40 °C from left to right, while the lower two subplots are those at 55 °C, respectively. Both terminal voltage and SoC estimations are in a good match.

Besides the validation of the static response of the integrated ROM with EKF, such as constant discharging and constant charging, the transient response of the model is validated against multiple cycles. The upper subplot in Fig. 4(f) depicts the load current profiles to the cells. The positive and negative sign of the current is defined as the discharging and charging current, respectively. The middle subplot is the response of terminal voltage at multiple cycles at 25 °C. The bottom subplot is then the SoC comparison between experiments and simulations at 25 °C. The makers, ‘X’, and solid line represent the experimental measurements and simulation results, respectively. Furthermore, the simulation results show a great match with experimental measurements.

4.2. Analysis of degradation effects

Since the LFP/graphite cells discussed in the paper is difficult to get aged, the degradation effects of side reaction rate and other corresponding parameters, such as volume fraction of electrode and electrolyte, resistance of the SEI and DL, ion loss and AM loss, can be analyzed by the validation results at 55 °C. The change of degradation related parameters over time are calculated by the equations in section 3.3.2. The distribution of side reaction rate along the direction of anode thickness as a function of cycle number is depicted in Fig. 5(a). The x-axis and y-axis denote the dimensionless anode thickness and side reaction rate, respectively. The dimensionless anode thickness, $\delta = 0$ and $\delta = 1$, illustrates the location of the interface between copper current collector and the composite anode and that between the composite anode and separator, respectively. The analysis has shown that side reaction rate at the interface between the composite anode and the separator is higher due to the higher ion concentration. The lithium ions are accumulated at the interface of the separator in a charging period, which promotes the side reaction and results in the formation of the DL. In addition, as the number of cycles increases, the

![Fig. 5. Analysis of degradation parameters during side reaction. (a) Side reaction rate; (b) Ion loss and AM loss; (c) Change of SEI resistance and volume fraction of anode; (d) Change of electrolyte volume fraction and resistance of DL.](image_url)
side reaction rate increases as well, which induces the growth of SEI.

The side reaction consumes recyclable lithium ions \( q_{Li}^{\text{side}} \), which causes loss of ions. The growth of SEI layer can clog pores and isolate particles so that the accessible area gets reduced, which is accelerated by increasing number of cycles as shown in Fig. 5(b). The variation of SEI resistance and electrode volume fraction over time along the anode thickness direction is plotted in Fig. 5(c), while that of electrolyte volume fraction and resistance of the DL as a function of cycle number is plotted in Fig. 5(d). Accordingly, the resistance of SEI \( R_{SEI} \) increases, while the electrode volume fraction \( \varepsilon_s \) decreases over time.

According to the side reaction describing by Eqs. (1) and (2), the electrolyte, as one of the reactants, is consumed continuously, which leads to the decrease of electrolyte volume fraction \( \varepsilon_e \). The thickness of the DL increases over time, so that the resistance of DL \( R_{DL} \) increases with the increasing cycle number. The analysis of the degradation effects of side reaction based on the variation of the electrochemical parameters can be summarized in Table 10.

### 4.3. Validation of end-of-life (EoL)

Compared with the effects of temperature, those of SoC cycling limit, SoC level and charging C-rate have less influence on the degradation of LFP/graphite cells [31]. Thus, temperature, as the key factor of accelerating degradation, will be investigated in more details. The comparison of discharge terminal voltage with 1C-rate discharge current applied between simulation results obtained by the physics-based degradation model and experimental data at different operating temperatures are plotted from Fig. 6(a) to Fig. 6(c). As the cells are aged with the increase of number of cycles, the time to reach EoD voltage has been reduced. The prediction of terminal voltage during discharge is estimated up to 1080, 900 and 870 cycles at 25 °C, 40 °C and 55 °C, respectively.

Capacity fade is one of the most significant criteria to evaluate performance of degraded LiBs, which is mainly caused by ion loss and AM loss. The comparison of simulated capacity and the Ah-based measured capacity as the function of cycle number is shown in the upper subplot of Fig. 7. Furthermore, the corresponding error between measurements and simulation results is plotted in the lower subplot. In order to display the capacity variations comparably, the dimensionless capacity retention is defined as the capacity ratio of the aged cell over the fresh cell in Eq. (28). The relative capacity error is calculated by Eq. (29).

\[
Q_{\text{max - dimensionless}} = \left( \frac{Q_{\text{aged,cell}}}{Q_{\text{fresh,cell}}} \right) \times 100\% \tag{28}
\]

\[
Q_{\text{error - dimensionless}} = \left( \frac{Q_{\text{exp}} - Q_{\text{sim}}}{Q_{\text{exp}}} \right) \times 100\% \tag{29}
\]

The color of purple and red, orange and yellow, and cyan and blue in the upper subplot of Fig. 7 denotes the capacity retention calculated based on experimental data and simulation results at 25 °C, 40 °C and 55 °C, respectively. The error shown in the lower

### Table 10 Degradation effects and parameters of side reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Degradation parameters</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Side reaction rate ( \dot{q}_{\text{side}} )↑</td>
<td>Loss of recyclable lithium ions</td>
<td>( q_{Li}^{\text{side}}(t) )↑</td>
<td>Capacity fade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of active anode material</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_s )↓</td>
<td>Clearance increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth of SEI</td>
<td>( R_{SEI} )↑</td>
<td>Impedance rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth of DL</td>
<td>( R_{DL} )↑</td>
<td>Impedance rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrolyte decomposition</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_e )↓</td>
<td>Impedance rise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Validation of discharge behaviors by 1C-rate current at 25/40/55 °C. (a) 25 °C; (b) 40 °C; (c) 55 °C.
The other major consequence of degradation is the rise of impedances that leads to power fade. The ion-consuming SEI and DL growth and the dryness of electrolyte due to side reaction result in the power fade. In order to obtain the SEI resistance, the impedance spectra of cells cycled at 25°C and 55°C are plotted in Fig. 8(a) and (b), respectively. As the increase of cycle number, the radius of the first semi-circle on behalf of SEI resistance is increased, especially at the elevated temperature. The SEI resistance extracted from the ECM based on the EIS experimental data is compared with the simulated results obtained from the integrated degradation model at different operating temperatures, which is shown in Fig. 8(c). The markers of cross and circle represent experimental data and simulation results, respectively. The growth of SEI resistance matches well with each other. The comparison manifests that elevated operating temperature accelerates the degradation of LFP/graphite cells. Power fade is predicted at different operating temperatures as shown in Fig. 9. The upper subplot displays the comparison of power between measurements and simulations at different operating temperatures. The lower subplot presents the corresponding error of power at 25°C and 55°C, respectively. With consideration of the change of ionic conductivity of SEI and DL, the
power decreases as the increase of cycle number. The overall error of power estimation is within 3%.

5. Conclusion

An integrated ROM that includes EKF for enhancing estimation accuracy of terminal voltage and SoC for BoL as well as a life model that facilitates capacity and power fade for EoL is developed. The model is validated against both fresh and cycled pouch-type large-format LFP/graphite cells, whose nominal capacity is 20Ah. The unique characteristics of ion behaviors in the cathode particles including two-phase transition and path dependence are described using a shrinking core model. The EKF is incorporated into the developed ROM to achieve a higher accuracy of terminal voltage and SoC estimation. With different discharging and charging profiles applied to the cells, including both single cycles and multiple cycles, the electrochemical behaviors of the cells are explored at different working temperatures. The temperature dependent parameters, such as diffusion coefficients of solid and electrolyte phase, are formulated using the Arrhenius equation. The average error of terminal voltage and SoC estimation is within 2% and 4%, respectively.

According to the experimental studies on degradation mechanism, the side reaction has been identified as the predominant cause for both calendar and cycle life, which is accelerated by the elevated operating temperatures, high SoC levels and large SoC cycling limits. These phenomena are formulated by modifying BV equation that is incorporated into the ROM with EKF. The capacity fade is caused by loss of recyclable lithium ions and loss of AM, while the power fade is the growth of SEI and DL and electrolyte decomposition. The ROM with EKF and life model is validated by the accelerated cycling tests conducted at various operating conditions, including working temperatures, SoC cycling limits and SoC levels, which match well with experimental data with respect to terminal voltage, capacity fade and power fade. The estimation error of capacity and power as the function of cycle number at different temperatures have been remained within 2% and 3%, respectively.

Future work will include the development of a subzero temperature electrochemical model that considers the effects of lithium plating/stripping at different working conditions.
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