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The lithium transport mechanism in ternary polymer electrolytes, consisting of PEO$_{20}$LiTFSI and various fractions of the ionic liquid PYR$_{13}$TFSI, is investigated by means of MD simulations. This is motivated by recent experimental findings, which demonstrated that these materials display an enhanced lithium mobility relative to their binary counterpart PEO$_{20}$LiTFSI. In order to grasp the underlying microscopic scenario giving rise to these observations, we employ an analytical, Rouse-based cation transport model, which has originally been devised for conventional polymer electrolytes. This model describes the cation transport via three different mechanisms, each characterized by an individual time scale. It turns out that also in the ternary electrolytes essentially all lithium ions are coordinated by PEO chains, thus ruling out a transport mechanism facilitated by the ionic-liquid molecules only. Rather, the reason for the enhanced lithium mobility can be found in the plasticizing effect of the ionic liquid, which enhances the dynamics of the PEO chains and thus also the motion of the attached ions. Additional focus is laid on the prediction of lithium diffusion coefficients from the simulation data for various chain lengths and the comparison with experimental data, thus demonstrating the broad applicability of our approach.

PACS numbers:

I. MOTIVATION

Solid polymer electrolytes (SPEs) are promising candidates for lithium ion batteries, as they are ideal to create small and light-weighted but powerful energy storages. The classical SPEs consist of an amorphous polymer matrix, e.g. poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO), and a lithium salt dissolved in it. By using lithium salts with large anions such as lithium-bis(trifluoromethane)sulfonimide (LiTFSI), the crystallization or salting-out, which is a common problem for inorganic salts, can be suppressed as the negative charge is delocalized over the whole anion. However, at ambient temperatures, the conductivity of most SPEs is still too low for an efficient technological use. Among several other remedies that have been proposed to overcome this deficiency, the incorporation of a room temperature ionic liquid (IL) seems to be a very promising approach, as the resulting ternary electrolytes show both an increased conductivity and inherent stability. Further benefits directly stem from the advantages of the ILs themselves: They are non-volatile, non-flammable and exhibit a wide electrochemical stability window.

However, it is not yet fully understood in how far the lithium transport mechanism in these materials changes relative to the conventional polymer electrolytes. For instance, it was speculated that the lithium ions become progressively coordinated by the anions from the IL and are thus decoupled from the rather slow PEO chains. Alternatively, one might also expect that the IL enhances the PEO dynamics and serves as a plasticizer in this way, which is a common observation when adding low-molecular solvents to PEO-salt systems. In this work, we utilize molecular dynamics (MD) simulations to unravel which scenario is responsible for the experimental observations. In order to quantify the lithium motion, we employ an analytical cation transport model, which has originally been devised for binary polymer electrolytes.

In the following, we will briefly review this model. Our description is based on both the Rouse model as well as the Dynamic Bond Percolation model, and distinguishes three different microscopic lithium ion transport mechanisms (see also sketch in Figure 1): 1. The ions diffuse along the PEO backbone to which they are attached. This motion can be characterized by the time scale $\tau_1$. The ions need to explore the entire PEO chain. 2. For ambient temperatures, i.e. $T \gg T_g$, the PEO chains are naturally also subject to thermal motion, carrying the attached ions in this way. In case of Rousean motion, the polymer dynamics and thus motion of the attached ions can be quantified by an effective Rouse time $\tau_2$. 3. Finally, an ion bound to a specific PEO chain can be transferred to another chain. The mean residence time at a given chain is denoted as $\tau_3$ in the following. As demonstrated by earlier MD studies, the last mechanism can also be viewed as a renewal process within the framework of the DBP model, since the dynamics of a given lithium becomes independent of its past after being transferred to another PEO chain. In the limit of long chains, this mechanism therefore also allows the ions to cover macroscopic distances.

Of course, switching to the ternary electrolytes, it is a priori unclear if this scenario changes only quantitatively – reflected by different values for $\tau_1$, $\tau_2$ and $\tau_3$ – or if the lithium ion transport mechanism also...
changes on a qualitative level. In particular, we focus on two ternary polymer electrolytes with a slightly different IL cation than in the experiments, i.e. N-methyl-N-propylpyrrolidinium (PYR$_{13}$TFSI), with a stoichiometry of PEO$_{20}$LiTFSI · 0.66 PYR$_{13}$TFSI and PEO$_{20}$LiTFSI · 3.24 PYR$_{13}$TFSI, respectively. The binary polymer electrolyte, PEO$_{20}$LiTFSI, serves as a reference substance. For convenience, PEO will be abbreviated as ‘P’ (i.e. polymer or PEO) and LiTFSI as ‘S’ (i.e. salt) in the following, leading to the short-hand notation P$_x$S · x IL with $x = 0$, $x = 0.66$ and $x = 3.24$.

II. SIMULATION DETAILS

The simulations were performed with the AMBER 10 Program Package. Here, the sander module was modified, allowing us to use a many-body polarizable force field specifically designed for PEO/LiTFSI and PYR$_{13}$TFSI. The simulation box contained 10 PEO chains with $N = 54$ monomers each as well as 27 LiTFSI ion pairs, yielding a concentration of ether oxygens (EOs) to lithium ions of EO : Li = 20 : 1. Additionally, the two ternary systems contained 18 or 87 PYR$_{13}$TFSI molecules, corresponding to $x = 0.66$ and $x = 3.24$. After equilibration runs of 70–80 ns in the NpT ensemble, production runs with a length of 200 ns have been performed in the NVT ensemble, collecting data every picosecond. An elementary integration step of 1 fs was used, while the systems were coupled to a Berendsen thermostat with a reference temperature of 423 K. All bonds involving hydrogen were constrained by the SHAKE algorithm. The induceable point dipoles were integrated by a Car-Parrinello-like scheme.

III. STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES

We find for all electrolytes that virtually all lithium ions are coordinated to one or two PEO chains, thereby giving a first hint that also for the ternary systems the cation transport entirely takes place at the PEO chains. The percentages of lithium ions coordinating to two PEO chains are 53 % for P$_{20}$S, 47 % for P$_{20}$S·0.66 IL and 24 % for P$_{20}$S·3.24 IL, thus indicating a dilution effect which reduces the probability for an ion to encounter a second PEO molecule. This is also supported by the observation that the amount of Li$^+$ coordinating two PEO chains decreases linearly with $x$.

The predominant lithium coordination consists of 4–5 EOs, which is in good agreement with experimental data and quantum chemistry calculations (see Figure S5 in the supporting information). In those complexes where the 4–5 EOs originate from a single PEO molecule, the polymer chain wraps helically around the cation. For complexes involving two PEO chains, typically 2–3 EOs from each chain coordinate to the ion. Additional coordinations by TFSI oxygens are rather rare (about 12–20 %, see Figure S5), and in most cases the anion coordinates only briefly to the lithium ion. Again, the amount of Li$^+$ coordinating to TFSI increases linearly with $x$, thus indicating that this effect is purely statistical.

For the conformational properties of the PEO molecules, we naturally observe a contraction of the chains due to the crown-ether-like coordination sphere of the lithium ions. This manifests itself by a decrease of the mean squared end-to-end vector $\langle R^2 \rangle$ for the electrolytes ($\langle R^2 \rangle = 1662 \, \text{Å}^2$, $1570 \, \text{Å}^2$ and $1571 \, \text{Å}^2$ for $x = 0$, 0.66 and 3.24, respectively) as compared to the pure PEO melt ($\langle R^2 \rangle = 1979 \, \text{Å}^2$). In case of the ternary electrolytes, one might expect that the PEO chains are swollen on a global scale, since the addition of IL would induce a crossover from a polymer melt to a semidilute solution. However, from both $\langle R^2 \rangle$ and the scaling of the Rouse-mode amplitudes, we observe no such feature.

IV. DYNAMICS OF THE LITHIUM IONS

Although from a structural point of view no significant differences between the individual electrolytes emerge, we observe a clear increase of the overall lithium mean...
square displacement (MSD), especially for the subdiffusive regime at $t = 1 - 10$ ns (crosses in Figure 2), whereas the onset to diffusion essentially occurs on a similar time scale, i.e. $t = 20 - 50$ ns. A similar increase can be found for the MSD of the entire PEO chains (inset in Figure 2). Although the larger center-of-mass motion of the PEO chains contributes to the effective transport of the lithium ions due to their cooperative diffusion, the differences in the inset of Figure 2 can only partly explain the increase of the lithium MSD. Thus, at least one of the three transport mechanisms must become faster due to the presence of the IL, which we will investigate in the following.

A. Motion Along the PEO Backbone

First, we start with the evaluation of the diffusion along the PEO backbone. In order to quantify this mechanism, it is convenient to successively number all monomers at a given PEO chain in order to express the lithium position by the average EO index $n$, and to calculate an effective MSD $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ along this coordinate (Figure 3).

Starting from approximately 100 ps, the dynamics is slightly subdiffusive, characterized by an exponent of $\alpha \approx 0.8$. Qualitatively, this behavior is found for all IL concentrations as well as for both coordination types of the lithium ions (i.e. bound to one or to two PEO chains). For sufficiently long chains as well as a significant amount of PEO–Li$^+$ complexes that exist throughout the entire observation time, $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ will show diffusive behavior on longer time scales. Naturally, in the limit $t \to \infty$, one would expect a crossover to a plateau for finite chain lengths. From Figure 3, neither of these two effects can be found, indicating that most life times of the PEO–Li$^+$ complexes are too short. Rather, the lithium ions only move on average 7–8 monomers during 10 ns. Keeping in mind that the lithium ions are typically bound to 4–5 monomers, these findings imply that the ions have barely left their own coordination sphere during the accessible time scale. Therefore, finite size effects of the PEO chains are irrelevant in the present case.

In total, no significant dependence of $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ on the IL concentration can be observed, indicating that the surrounding molecules (i.e. PEO chains or IL) have virtually no influence on this mechanism. It is interesting to note that the magnitude of $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ is essentially the same for lithium ions bound to one or to two PEO chains (not shown).

Although the motion along the chain is still slightly subdiffusive, approximate diffusion coefficients $D_1(t^*)$ were extracted from Figure 3 in order to determine an estimate for $\tau_1$. The $D_1$ were obtained from $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ from the Einstein relation, $D_1(t^*) = \langle \Delta n^2(t^*) \rangle/(2t^*)$, where $t^*$ represents a specific time scale. Ideally, one would choose $t^* = \tau_1$ (determined below) in order to estimate the net effect of this mechanism. Unfortunately, the statistics of $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ are too bad on these time scales. Therefore, $D_1(\tau_3)$ was determined from Figure 3 by extrapolation, and the $\tau_1$-values in turn were calculated according to $\tau_1 = (N-1)^2/(\pi^2 D_1)$ (Table I). One observes that $\tau_1$ slightly decreases with increasing IL concentration. However, these values also implicitly depend on $\tau_3$, which to a large extend explains the weak dependence on the IL content (cf. Figure 3).

B. Polymer Motion

Next, we focus on the polymer dynamics itself. Figure 4 shows the MSD of the EOs relative to the center of mass of the PEO chain. This quantity has been computed for all EOs (i.e. irrespective of the presence of an ion), for EOs bound to a lithium ion as well as for the re-
spective attached ions. The criterion to consider a cation or EO as bound was that the average EO index of the ion did not change more than one, i.e., $|\Delta n(t)| \leq 1$ for all time frames during $t$. For the bound EOs, no further distinction between additional coordinations of the lithium ion to another PEO chain or a TFSI molecule was made. Thus, these effects are already implicitly contained in the curves in Figure 4.

The average EOs (circles) show typical Rouse-like motion with the characteristic relaxation time $\tau_R$. The dynamics of the bound EOs (crosses) is qualitatively the same but protracted. Therefore, it is possible to characterize the intramolecular dynamics of the bound EOs by a larger, effective Rouse time $\tau_2$. The lithium ions attached to these EOs (inset, solid lines) closely follow the bound EOs, which gives clear evidence for their cooperative motion. On short time scales, the MSD of the EOs is larger than the lithium MSD due to the additional internal degrees of freedom of the PEO backbone, but the MSD of the bound cations catches up on longer time scales (approximately 1 ns). Thus, $\tau_2$ characterizes both the dynamics of the bound PEO segments as well as the attached lithium ions. For the ternary systems, the respective curves are qualitatively the same as in the inset of Figure 4.

Figure 4 also shows the Rouse fits, i.e., $g_R(t) = \left(2R^2_2\right)\pi^{-2}\sum_{p=1}^{\infty}\left[1 - \exp \left(-tp^2/\tau_R\right)\right]p^{-2}$ for the average (dashed lines) and $g_2(t) = \left(2R^2_2\right)\pi^{-2}\sum_{p=1}^{\infty}\left[1 - \exp \left(-tp^2/\tau_2\right)\right]p^{-2}$ for the bound EOs (dotted lines). Of course, the precise value of $\tau_R$ and $\tau_2$ obtained from these fits also depends on the value of ($R^2_2$) in the prefactor. In order to obtain a fit consistent with the plateau value at large $t$, the MSDs of the average EOs were fitted using two parameters, i.e., $\tau_R$ and ($R^2_2$). Subsequently, the MSDs of the bound EOs were fitted using this value in combination with a single fit parameter $\tau_2$ only. The resulting values for ($R^2_2$) are, as already discussed above, approximately constant for all electrolytes. The respective $\tau_R$- and $\tau_2$-values are summarized in Table I (deviations from our previous study on $P_{20S}$ arise from the shorter simulation length of about 27 ns as well as the modified fitting procedure).

Both $\tau_R$ and $\tau_2$ decrease significantly, clearly indicating that the dynamics of the PEO segments becomes faster with increasing IL concentration. Therefore, the IL can be regarded as plasticizer. For the average segments, the dynamics for $P_{20S}$·0.66 IL is nearly the same as for pure PEO ($\tau_R = 22$ ns), showing that the plasticizing approximately cancels with the slowing-down caused by the coordinating lithium ions as found for $P_{20S}$. The presence of the IL also enhances the motion of the bound segments, and, as a result, the dynamics of the respective attached lithium ions, leading to an increase of the overall lithium MSD. Here, experimental studies reported similar findings for other plasticizers like ethylene/proplylene carbonate or short PEO chains embedded in a high-molecular weight matrix.

Finally, the center-of-mass dynamics of the PEO chains becomes also faster with increasing IL concentration (inset of Figure 2). Thus, for finite chain lengths, the plasticizing effect is twofold since both the internal, segmental PEO dynamics and the center-of-mass motion is accelerated, which both contributes to the lithium diffusivity (see discussion below).

It should be pointed out that it is questionable if cations bound to two PEO chains show the same dynamical behavior as ions bound to one chain only, since the former complexes could be regarded as transient crosslinks, which would significantly impede the polymer dynamics. A more detailed analysis (see supporting information) indeed revealed that there is a fundamental difference between these two coordination types. While for lithium ions coordinated to a single PEO chain ions that diffuse along the backbone are significantly faster than those that remain bound to the same monomers, no difference between these two categories could be found for cations attached to two PEO chains. This implies that the cations bound to two PEO chains experience no effective transport due to the diffusion along the chain. Rather, the PEO chain moves reptation-like along its own contour past the cation, which results in a non-zero $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ (Figure 3), but does not contribute to the lithium transport. However, this feature can be easily implemented by weighting the effect of $\tau_1$ according to the ratio of ions bound to one PEO chain only (see discussion in the supporting information).

### C. Interchain Transfer

Next, we will determine the renewal time for the individual electrolytes. The number of transfer processes $N_{Li}$ was counted from the simulations, and the $\tau_3$-values were determined according to $\tau_3 = t_{max}N_{Li}/N_{tr}$, where $t_{max} = 200$ ns is the simulation length and $N_{Li}$ is the number of lithium ions in the simulation box. Of course, it is questionable if brief transfers followed by successive backjumps to the previous polymer chain serve...
as a renewal process in the strict sense, since the lithium dynamics will not become uncorrelated to its past after such an event. A more detailed analysis (not shown) revealed that these non-Markovian, short-time backjumps occurred up to 100 ps, which we used subsequently as a criterion to define real renewal events. In cases where the transfer was mediated by TFSI anions only (probability $p_{\text{PT}}$ in Table I), we found that the displacement the ion covers in the IL-rich region was sufficiently small, so that the contribution of these transfers to the lithium MSD is negligible.

The individual values for $\tau_3$ are summarized in Table I. One observes that $\tau_3$ increases with increasing IL concentration. Since the PEO molecules become more and more diluted, this can mainly be explained as a concentration effect. Obviously, the critical step for a transfer process is the encounter of a another PEO segment.

V. APPLICATION OF THE TRANSPORT MODEL

As a first consistency check of our description, we employ the underlying physical picture of the transport model to reproduce the lithium MSD in Figure 2. During the residence time $\tilde{t}$ at a given PEO chain, the MSD $g_{12}$ of the lithium ion is given by a Rouse-like expression:

$$g_{12}(\tilde{t}) = \frac{2(R_0^2)}{\pi^2} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\tilde{t}}{2\tau_p}\right)}{\tilde{t}^p},$$

(1)

where $\tau_{12}^{-1} = \tau_1^{-1} + \tau_2^{-1}$ is a combined relaxation rate due to both intramolecular mechanisms. After a renewal process (i.e., an interchain transfer), the ion dynamics becomes uncorrelated to its past, and the motion at the new chain is again characterized by Eq. (1). Thus, it is possible to interpret the overall lithium dynamics as a random walk, in which the elementary step length is given by Eq. (1) and the direction of motion for the successive step changes randomly after each renewal event. In the following, we assumed that the number of ion transfer processes during time interval $t$ is given by a Poisson distribution with mean $t/\tau_3$, leading to exponentially distributed $\tilde{t}$ at the individual PEO chains. For a given observation time $t$, the lithium MSD due to the three transport mechanisms was then obtained from the numerical average over a large number of Poisson processes. The third ingredient required for the total lithium MSD as depicted in Figure 2 is the center-of-mass motion of the PEO chains, which was directly extracted from the simulations (inset of Figure 2) and added to the model curve. The resulting predictions are shown as solid lines in the main panel of Figure 2.

For P$_{20}$S, one observes a nearly perfect agreement throughout the entire observation time, starting from the Rouse regime to the diffusive long-time limit. This demonstrates that the simplistic picture of our model indeed captures the underlying, much more complex microscopic scenario. Interestingly, essentially the same model curve is obtained when uniformly distributed $\tilde{t}$ are used. Apparently, a renewal event is unlikely on short time scales, and the MSD reduces to Eq. (1) whereas for large time scales only the average residence time $\tau_3$ is important.

In case of P$_{20}$S · 0.66 IL and P$_{20}$S · 3.24 IL, the model curves agree with the empirical lithium MSD for time scales larger than about 1 – 2 ns. Slight deviations can be attributed to the large uncertainties of the MSD of the PEO chains. However, the model prediction systematically overestimates the MSDs of P$_{20}$S · 0.66 IL and P$_{20}$S · 3.24 IL for short time scales. Here, a more detailed analysis (to be published under separate cover) revealed that these deviations are caused by hydrodynamic interactions arising from the presence of the IL. However, on longer length and time scales, these hydrodynamic interactions are screened, which has also been reported for other semidilute polymer solutions. Thus, both the Rouse-like behavior on intermediate time scales and the diffusive regime are correctly reproduced, which clearly demonstrates the applicability of our model to the experimentally relevant long-time limit.

Motivated by these findings, we finally use the transport model to compute the total lithium diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{Li}}$. One of the main benefits of our model is the fact that due to its analytical nature $D_{\text{Li}}$ can be calculated for all chain lengths $N$, which immediately follows from the scaling laws of the three time scales, i.e., $\tau_1 \propto N^2$, $\tau_2 \propto N^2$ and $\tau_3 \propto N^0$.

Of course, for the scaling of $\tau_2$, entanglement effects may become relevant, which would slow down the segmental dynamics. However, if $\tau_3 < \tau_e$, meaning that the lithium ion leaves the PEO chain before the latter begins to reptate (the onset of this regime being characterized by the entanglement time $\tau_e$), the overall dynamics is still Rousean. For such a scenario, our model can still be used to calculate $D_{\text{Li}}$. In the case of PEO, experiments revealed that the entanglement regime sets in from about $N \approx 75$ to 87 ns. Based on these observations, one can estimate $\tau_e$ according to $\tau_e = \tau_R(N = 75) = \tau_R(75/54)^2$. For P$_{20}$S, this leads to $\tau_e \approx 87$ ns, which is substantially larger than $\tau_3$. Also in case of the highly plasticized P$_{20}$S · 3.24 IL one finds $\tau_e \approx 46$ ns > $\tau_3$. Therefore, the lithium ion leaves the PEO chain before the tube constraints become noticeable, and the formalism of the transport model can thus also be applied in the limit of long chains.

As an alternative to the numerical evaluation of the Poisson process (model curves in Figure 2), it is also possible to derive an analytical expression for the diffusive long-time limit, characterized by $D_{\text{Li}}$. From the distribution of the residence times $\tilde{t}$ at the individual PEO chains, i.e., $p(\tilde{t}) = \tau_3^{-1} \exp(-\tilde{t}/\tau_3)$, the mean elementary step length $\langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_N \tau_3$, averaged over all possible $\tilde{t}$,
can be obtained:
\[
\langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_{M3} = \frac{1}{\tau_3} \int_0^\infty dt \exp \left( -\frac{t}{\tau_3} \right) g_{12}(t) = \frac{2(R_3^2)}{\pi^2} \sum_{p=1}^\infty \frac{1}{p^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{p^2 \frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2} + 1} \right] (2)
\]

Since \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) depend on the chain length, the averaged MSD between two successive renewal events, \( \langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_{M3} \), is also a function of \( N \). Moreover, one has to take into account the additive contribution due to the center-of-mass diffusion of the PEO chains. By making use of the renewal property, the overall lithium diffusion coefficient can thus be expressed as

\[
D_{Li}(N) = \frac{\langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_{M3}}{6\tau_3} + D_{PEO}(N),
\]

where \( D_{PEO}(N) \) is the diffusion coefficient of the PEO chains with length \( N \). By solving Eq. (2) numerically and inserting the result into Eq. (3) values for \( D_{Li} \) were obtained for \( N = 54 \) (\( D_{Li}^{N=54} \)) and \( N \rightarrow \infty \) (\( D_{Li}^{N=\infty} \)), which are summarized in Table I.

For \( D_{Li}^{N=54} \), we observe that the values obtained from Eq. (3) are in reasonable agreement with the respective diffusion coefficients \( D_{Li}^{MSD} \) directly determined from Figure 2, again showing that the predictions of our model are consistent with the numerical data. When comparing \( D_{Li}^{N=\infty} \) with the PFG-NMR data, \( D_{Li}^{exp} = 0.052 A^2 ns^{-1} \) for \( P_{20S} \cdot 1.0 IL \), \( 0.118 A^2 ns^{-1} \) for \( P_{20S} \cdot 2.0 IL \) and \( 0.126 A^2 ns^{-1} \) for \( P_{20S} \cdot 4.0 IL \) at \( T = 323 K \), one observes identical trends as in Table I, namely a significant increase of \( D_{Li} \) with increasing IL amount. As discussed above, these findings can be attributed to the plasticizing effect of the IL.

It is illuminating to look at these values in more detail, since the segmental motion entering \( \langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_{M3} \), the renewal time \( \tau_3 \) and the center-of-mass motion, measured by \( D_{PEO} \), alters the value of \( D_{Li} \) (Eq. (3)). For these reasons, it is desirable to quantify how far these three trends contribute to the overall change of \( D_{Li} \). In case of \( N \rightarrow \infty \), the intramolecular contribution \( \langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_{M3} \) increases by about 28 % for \( P_{20S} \cdot 0.66 IL \) and 73 % for \( P_{20S} \cdot 3.24 IL \), mainly as a result of the increased segmental mobility (Figure 4). In contrast to this, the contribution of the renewal processes decreases by about 7 % and 29 %, respectively. Nevertheless, the enhancement of \( \langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_{M3} \) overcompensates this effect, and the overall lithium diffusivity increases by about 19 % for \( x = 0.66 \) and 23 % for \( x = 3.24 \). On the contrary, the changes in \( \tau_3 \) dominate in the short-chain limit, since the differences in \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) for the individual electrolytes disappear for \( N \rightarrow 0 \). Of course, this does not imply that also the differences in \( D_{Li} \) disappear, as the center-of-mass diffusion of the PEO chains becomes faster with decreasing \( N \) and with increasing IL concentration (Figure 2). Thus, the stronger increase of \( D_{Li}^{N=54} \) with \( x \) (20 % for \( x = 0.66 \) and 45 % for \( x = 3.24 \), Table I) as opposed to \( D_{Li}^{N=\infty} \) arises to a substantial degree from the contribution of \( D_{PEO} \). In fact, for \( N = 54 \), \( \langle g_{12}(\tau_3, N) \rangle_{M3}/(6\tau_3) \) increases only by 13 % for \( P_{20S} \cdot 0.66 IL \) and by 9 % for \( P_{20S} \cdot 3.24 IL \), whereas \( D_{PEO} \) becomes faster by about 30 % and 92 %, respectively.

So far, we focused on the high-temperature limit which we can address in our simulations. Interestingly, it was observed that in the low-temperature regime the relative increase of \( D_{Li}^{exp} \) upon the addition of IL becomes even more pronounced (i.e. \( D_{Li}^{exp} \) increases by a factor of 2.4 when going from \( P_{20S} \) to \( P_{20S} \cdot 4.0 IL \) at 323 K), whereas the relative increase of \( D_{Li}^{N=\infty} \) between \( P_{20S} \) and \( P_{20S} \cdot 3.24 IL \) is only half as large (Table I). Although simulations at low temperatures would be too costly, one would nevertheless expect that the plasticizing effect at least partly accounts for the larger relative increase of \( D_{Li} \) in this regime. This is also indicated by DSC measurements, which revealed that the glass-transition temperature \( T_g \) decreases significantly (up to 35 K) with the IL fraction. Thus, it is likely that the enhanced polymer dynamics, apart from other, possibly related effects, plays a crucial role at low temperatures.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, we have examined the microscopic lithium ion transport mechanism in ternary polymer electrolytes consisting of PEO_{20}LiTFSI and PYR_{13}TFSI. In particular, we addressed the question in how far the microscopic scenario of the ion transport changes upon the addition of IL, and how the experimentally observed increase in the lithium ion diffusion coefficient [1] can be understood in terms of the individual transport mechanisms. To this purpose, an analytical cation transport model [2] was successfully applied. It turned out that virtually all lithium ions were coordinated to the PEO chains, thus ruling out a transport mechanism in which the lithium transportation is decoupled from the polymer chains. Rather, the main reason for the increase of the lithium diffusion coefficient is the plasticizing effect of the IL, which enhances the segmental motion of the PEO chains, and, consequently, the dynamics of the respective attached ions. Another minor counteracting effect was the successive dilution of the electrolyte due to the IL, which slightly decreases the rate of interchain transfers. In the sum however, the plasticizing is dominant, and the overall lithium diffusivity increases. For the design of novel battery materials, our findings therefore imply that a polymer electrolyte which is both highly plasticized and exhibits a high transfer rate, e.g. facilitated by a more coordinating IL, would yield optimal results.
Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Oleg Borodin, Nicolaas A. Stolwijk, Stefano Passerini and Mario Joost for helpful discussions and for providing the experimental data. Financial support from the NRW Graduate School of Chemistry is also greatly appreciated.

Figure 5: Probability $p(n)$ to find a certain coordination number $n$ of EOs (irrespective if the ion is tied to one or two PEO chains) or TFSI oxygens in its first coordination shell.

Figure 6: MSDs of the lithium ions bound to one or two PEO chains in PEO$_{20}$LiTFSI. A second distinction was made between cations that diffused along the PEO chain (M1 and M2) and ions that remained bound to the same EOs (M2 only). All curves have been computed in the center-of-mass frame. For the other electrolytes, the scenario is qualitatively the same.

VII. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

A. Coordination Environment

Figure 5 shows the probability distribution functions $p(n)$ to find a lithium ion with $n$ EOs or TFSI oxygens in its first coordination shell.

B. Influence of the Lithium Ion Coordination on the Segmental Motion

In order to elucidate in how far the lithium ions coordinated to two PEO chains act as temporary crosslinks,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>system</th>
<th>1 PEO [%]</th>
<th>2 PEO [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P$_{20}$S</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P$_{20}$S · 0.66 IL</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P$_{20}$S · 3.24 IL</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: Ratio of lithium ions coordinating to one or two PEO chains.

Figure 6 shows the lithium MSD of lithium ions bound to one and to two PEO chains for P$_{20}$S. A second distinction was made if the ions diffused along the PEO chain (both intramolecular mechanisms) or remained bound to the same EOs (polymer dynamics only, here, the same criterion as for Figure 4, $|\Delta n(t)| \leq 1$, has been applied). In case of cations bound to one PEO chain only (Figure 6), ions undergoing both types of intramolecular transport are clearly faster than those remaining close to the initial position on the PEO chain. For lithium ions connected to two PEO chains, no significant difference between these two categories can be observed in the MSD (Figure 6). This implies that the cations bound to two PEO chains experience no effective transport due to the diffusion along the chain. Rather, the PEO chain moves reptation-like along its own contour past the cation, which results in a non-zero $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$, but does not contribute to the overall lithium transport. For all other investigated electrolytes, the observations from Figure 6 are qualitatively the same.

With respect to the transport model, in particular Eq. 1, this effect can be easily captured. Here, the only additionally required parameter is the ratio of lithium ions coordinated to one or two PEO chains (Table II):

$$g_{12}(t) = r_{1\text{ PEO}} g_{12}(t) + (1 - r_{1\text{ PEO}}) g_2(t)$$ (4)

For the fraction $r_{1\text{ PEO}}$ of cations bound to one PEO chain, Eq. 1 remains valid, whereas for ions bound to two chains with $r_{1\text{ PEO}} \rightarrow \infty$ only $r_2$ is important. Within this approximation, the average dynamics of the lithium ions (i.e. averaged over ions bound to one or two PEO chains while simultaneously allowing the intermediate exchange between these two coordination states) is estimated from the structural property $r_{1\text{ PEO}}$ only.

Figure 6 shows that this rather simplistic picture is indeed valid to a good approximation. Here, Figure 6 displays the MSD of ions bound to one or two PEO molecules in P$_{20}$S as extracted from the simulations. These curves have in turn been used to calculate an approximate average MSD according to Eq. 1 which is also shown in Figure 6. In fact, the agreement of $\tilde{g}_{12}(t)$ with the average MSD (i.e. a lithium ion that remained on the same chain irrespective of other coordinations) is nearly quantitative. Deviations for larger time scales are due to bad statistics. In the same spirit, the inset of Figure 6 shows the ratio between the approximate $\tilde{g}_{12}(t)$ and the average MSD directly calculated from the simulations for all systems. As for P$_{20}$S, this ratio is close to unity for all other electrolytes. These observations high-
light that, since the crosslinks are temporary and an exchange between both coordination types takes place, the long-time behavior of the intramolecular dynamics may be estimated by the average in Eq. 4, as nicely demonstrated in Figure 7.