

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

2

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No 0704-0188

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS DTIC FILE COPY	
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT This document has been approved for public release and sale in accordance with the provisions of the DTIC	
2b DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Dept. of Chemistry Cornell University	6b OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)	7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research		
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Dept. of Chemistry Cornell University Ithaca, NY 14853		7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy Street Alexandria, VA 22217		
8a NAME OF FUNDING SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research	8b OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy St. Alexandria, VA 22217		10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO	TASK NO
				WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) Powerful Oxidizing Agents for the Oxidative Deintercalation of Lithium from Transition Metal Oxides				
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Abigal R. Wizansky, Paul E. Rauch, and Francis J. DiSalvo				
13a TYPE OF REPORT Technical Report	13b TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year Month Day) 1989-8-16		15 PAGE COUNT
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION				
17 COSATI CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP		
			Oxidizing Agents, Lithium Oxides Deintercalation	
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) NO₂⁺ and MoF₆ are shown to be powerful oxidizing agents for the deintercalation of lithium from LiCoO₂ and Li₂CuO₂. The oxidations, which usually were accompanied by some side reaction, yielded materials of composition Li_xMO₂ with x~0 for M=Co and x~1.5 for M=Cu. Both starting materials are insulating (ρ > 10³ Ω cm), but the deintercalated products are much more conducting (by at least four orders of magnitude).				
20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. Mark Roff			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 202-696-4409	22c OFFICE SYMBOL

DD Form 1473, JUN 86

Previous editions are obsolete

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

S/N 0102-LF-014-6603

4

AD-A212 116

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Grant or Contract N00014-88-K-0139

R&T Code 4131035

Technical Report No. 1

Powerful Oxidizing Agents for the Oxidative
Deintercalation of Lithium from Transition Metal Oxides

by

Abigail R. Wizansky, Paul E. Rauch,
and Francis J. DiSalvo

Prepared for Publication

in the

Journal of Solid State Chemistry

Cornell University
Department of Chemistry
Ithaca, NY 14853

August 16, 1989

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose
of the United States Government

This document has been approved for public release
and sale; its distribution is unlimited



In Revised Form
4-5-89

Manuscript
H015

POWERFUL OXIDIZING AGENTS FOR THE OXIDATIVE DEINTERCALATION
OF LITHIUM FROM TRANSITION METAL OXIDES

Abigail R. Wizansky, Paul E. Rauch,
and Francis J. DiSalvo, Jr.*


Department of Chemistry
Cornell University

* Author to whom correspondence
should be addressed.

Abstract. NO_2^+ and MoF_6 are shown to be powerful oxidizing agents for the deintercalation of lithium from LiCoO_2 and Li_2CuO_2 . The oxidations, which usually were accompanied by some side reaction, yielded materials of composition Li_xMO_2 with $x \sim 0$ for $\text{M}=\text{Co}$ and $x \sim 1.5$ for $\text{M}=\text{Cu}$. Both starting materials are insulating ($\rho > 10^3 \Omega\text{cm}$), but the deintercalated products are much more conducting (by at least four orders of magnitude).

INTRODUCTION

Previous studies of the intercalation chemistry of many transition metal chalcogenide systems have established that I_2 and Br_2 are effective reagents for the oxidative deintercalation of lithium from sulfide and selenide compounds(1). A familiar example of such a deintercalation is the reaction of iodine with $LiTiS_2$,



in which titanium is oxidized from 3+ to 4+. We have been interested in developing lithium deintercalation chemistry as a synthetic route to highly-oxidized transition metal oxides. There are only a few reports in the literature of lithium deintercalation from oxides; these include both chemical oxidation (of $LiVO_2$ (2), $LiNbO_2$ (3), and $LiCoO_2$ (4), using bromine or iodine as oxidizing agent) and also electrochemical oxidation (of $LiCoO_2$ (5) and $LiNiO_2$ (6)). In the reported chemical oxidations with bromine, the removal of lithium did not usually proceed to completion, and we expect that some oxides will require more powerful oxidants than bromine for any reaction to occur at all; thus we have been searching for such oxidants capable of deintercalating lithium from oxides.



Three potentially useful oxidizing agents are NO^+ , NO_2^+ , and MoF_6 . Figure 1 shows the estimated redox potentials of the

couples NO^+/NO (7), $\text{NO}_2^+/\text{NO}_2$ (8) and $\text{MoF}_6/\text{MoF}_6^-$ (7) in acetonitrile solution, as well as an estimated value for $\text{PtF}_6/\text{PtF}_6^-$ (9) for comparison. All are at substantially higher potentials than the commonly-used agents I_2 and Br_2 . (Note that the $\text{PtF}_6/\text{PtF}_6^-$ potential is well beyond the oxidative decomposition limit of acetonitrile, which is at approximately +3 volts versus NHE.) Our work has focused around two oxides, LiCoO_2 and Li_2CuO_2 . LiCoO_2 , which has an ordered rocksalt structure with alternating layers of lithium and cobalt, was chosen to allow comparison with previous deintercalation studies using Br_2 as the oxidant (4). The main structural feature of Li_2CuO_2 (10) is a one-dimensional chain of edge-sharing CuO_4 square-planar units, with lithium positioned in tetrahedral sites between the chains (see Figure 2). In this previously unexamined case, removal of lithium would formally oxidize the copper from $2+$ to $3+$, possibly changing the insulating Cu^{2+} phase into a metal or even a superconductor. While the square-planar CuO_4 units in Li_2CuO_2 are edge-sharing rather than corner-sharing to form chains or sheets as in the recently discovered high- T_c superconductors, the connection between structure and superconductivity in copper oxides has still not been elucidated and it may be useful to search for superconductivity in mixed $\text{Cu}^{2+}/\text{Cu}^{3+}$ oxides with various structural features.

EXPERIMENTAL


LiCoO_2 was prepared as a black powder by heating Li_2CO_3 and cobalt metal in air to 900C for 2d. Li_2CuO_2 was prepared as a red-brown powder from Li_2O_2 and CuO in a platinum crucible under flowing oxygen at 500C for 5d.

The oxidations were carried out in acetonitrile under an argon atmosphere. The source of NO_2^+ was a soluble hexafluorophosphate salt, NO_2PF_6 (Morton Thiokol Alfa). The salt was heated to 100C under vacuum to remove volatile impurities and was then reacted with the oxides:



(The LiPF_6 is soluble in acetonitrile, while the oxide product remains behind as the only solid phase.) The NO_2^+ oxidation of Li_2CuO_2 was especially vigorous.

Reactions with MoF_6 were carried out by condensing gaseous MoF_6 into acetonitrile containing the oxide:



After filtration and drying in vacuo, the oxide powders were

characterized by X-ray powder diffraction and atomic emission (Li) or absorption (Cu) spectroscopy.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Mizushima et al (5) have examined the X-ray diffraction pattern of $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{CoO}_2$ as a function of lithium content. For $x < .5$ they were able to index all peaks on the hexagonal cell of LiCoO_2 and to observe gradual changes in the c lattice parameter by following the position of the (003) line in the diffraction pattern. (The (003) d -spacing gives the spacing between CoO_2 layers.) They noted that for $x > .67$ diffraction peaks became few and broad. Consistent with their results, we observe from X-ray diffraction that the product $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{CoO}_2$ with x near 1 is highly disordered. When LiCoO_2 is treated with half an equivalent of NO_2^+ , the (003) and (104) peaks remain from the powder pattern of the starting material, with slightly shifted d -spacings; after reaction with a full equivalent of NO_2^+ , only one peak is visible, in the approximate position of the (003) line of the starting material. Because this peak is consistently observed as the lithium content in $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{CoO}_2$ is gradually varied, it seems reasonable to conclude from its presence that the CoO_2 layer structure is retained and to interpret its position as representing the spacing between CoO_2 layers. Note that since only a single line is visible in the diffraction pattern of

$\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{CoO}_2$ for x near 1, the disorder in the structure cannot be just a simple stacking disorder (11), but must also involve irregular spacing of the CoO_2 layers along the c axis.

X-ray diffraction results for the copper compound indicate that the material of nominal composition $\text{Li}_{2-x}\text{CuO}_2$ ($0 < x < 1$) is actually a mixture of two phases: stoichiometric Li_2CuO_2 and a new second phase (of approximate composition $\text{Li}_{1.5}\text{CuO}_2$) characterized by 7 broad diffraction peaks (see Table I).

Both the cobalt and copper products are unstable at high temperatures, decomposing as follows:



The oxidation of LiCoO_2 with MoF_6 appears to be close to 100% efficient. However, the oxidations with NO_2^+ of both LiCoO_2 and Li_2CuO_2 involve significant side reaction. During the reaction of NO_2^+ with Li_2CuO_2 , 10% of the Li_2CuO_2 decomposes into solution, according to an atomic absorption measurement of the Cu concentration in the acetonitrile reaction solution. Also, elemental analysis of the product $\text{Li}_{2-x}\text{CuO}_2$ reveals a large

difference between the nominal composition (based on the amount of NO_2^+ used) and the actual composition:

<u>nominal x in $\text{Li}_{2-x}\text{CuO}_2$</u>	<u>actual value</u>
.50	.25
.75	.42
1.00	.49

Similarly, in the reaction of NO_2^+ with LiCoO_2 , some cobalt ends up in solution, as evidenced by the cobalt oxide precipitate which forms on addition of aqueous base to the reaction solution; as with the copper compound, significantly less than one Li is removed for each NO_2^+ used. Unfortunately, direct elemental analysis of the product $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{CoO}_2$ was not possible due to its poor solubility. Also, analysis of the reaction solution for lithium would not give a reliable estimate of the degree of deintercalation since some of the lithium in solution would be due to a destructive side reaction of LiCoO_2 rather than to deintercalation. In the absence of a direct chemical method for determining the lithium content of the deintercalated samples, we have attempted to monitor the degree of deintercalation with X-ray diffraction by correlating the observed interlayer spacings with the amount of oxidizing agent used. This correlation is summarized in Figure 3, a plot of interlayer spacing versus amount of oxidant used; here the "interlayer spacing" is an average value as measured by the position of the one visible diffraction peak. Data from electrochemical deintercalations by

Mizushima et al (5) have been included on the figure. Since NO_2^+ is not completely efficient at deintercalation, the NO_2^+ data points do not overlap the electrochemical or MoF_6 data; that is, two equivalents of NO_2^+ are required to achieve maximal deintercalation. The observed increase in the interlayer spacing with decreasing lithium content is somewhat unusual in that such spacings usually decrease on deintercalation. A similar increase was observed by Mendiboure et al (4) in an electrochemical deintercalation of LiCoO_2 .

Two-point resistance measurements were obtained on pressed powders in an argon-filled glove box. Calculated resistivities for the cobalt compounds are $5.4 \times 10^3 \Omega\text{cm}$ for LiCoO_2 and $.6 \Omega\text{cm}$ after reaction with one equivalent of NO_2^+ ; in the copper system, the resistivity is greater than $10^6 \Omega\text{cm}$ for Li_2CuO_2 but drops to $71 \Omega\text{cm}$ upon reaction with one equivalent of NO_2^+ . Both compounds show a drop in resistivity of four or more orders of magnitude upon oxidation. While such measurements cannot be trusted for quantitative comparison due to the importance of interparticle contact resistance, the large decrease in resistivity clearly indicates that the products are more conducting than the reactant solids. Dc magnetic susceptibility measurements show that the product oxides are not superconducting down to 4K.

In summary, we report here the use of the powerful oxidizing agents NO_2^+ and MoF_6 to deintercalate lithium from transition metal oxides. Although with some oxides side reaction can be significant, these and similar chemical oxidants may provide an

effective low temperature route to the synthesis of highly-oxidized transition metal oxides.

Acknowledgements. We thank J. M. Shreeve of the University of Idaho for her generous donation of the MoF_6 . Support for this work through the Office of Naval Research is gratefully acknowledged. Also, ARW has been supported in this work by a National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship.

REFERENCES


1. See, for example, D.W. Murphy and P.A. Christian, *Science* 205(4407), 651 (1979).
2. K. Vidyasagar and J. Gopalakrishnan, *J. Solid State Chem.* 42, 217 (1982).
3. N. Kumada, S. Muramatu, F. Muto, N. Kinomura, S. Kikkawa and M. Koizumi, *J. Solid State Chem.* 73, 33 (1988).
4. A. Mendiboure, C. Delmas and P. Hagenmuller, *Mater. Res. Bull.* 19, 1383 (1984).
5. K. Mizushima, P.C. Jones, P.J. Wiseman and J.B. Goodenough, *Mater. Res. Bull.* 15, 783 (1980).
6. J.B. Goodenough, K. Mizushima and T. Takeda, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* 19 Supplement 19-3, 305 (1980).
7. G.M. Anderson, J. Iqbal, D.W.A. Sharp, J.M. Winfield, J.H. Cameron and A.G. McLeod, *J. Fluorine Chem.* 24, 303 (1984).
8. Estimated from the value for NO^+/NO given in reference 7 together with the ionization enthalpies for NO and NO_2 given by F.A. Cotton and G. Wilkinson in "Advanced Inorganic Chemistry" 4th edition, pp. 424-426, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1980).
9. Estimated from the values for MoF_6 and WF_6 given in reference 7 together with the estimated difference in electron affinities of WF_6 and PtF_6 given by N. Bartlett in *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* 7(6), 433 (1968).
10. R. Hoppe and H. Rieck, *Z. anorg. allg. Chemie* 379, 157 (1970).
11. See, for example, A. Guinier, "X-ray Diffraction in Crystals, Imperfect Crystals, and Amorphous Bodies" Section 7.2, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco (1963).


Table I. X-ray powder data for the product of the reaction of Li_2CuO_2 with one equivalent of NO_2PF_6 .


<u>d (Å)</u>	<u>estimated intensity</u>
4.84	100
3.58	30
2.87	50
2.78	25
2.47	25
2.13	40
1.95	50

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Figure 1. Estimated redox potentials in acetonitrile. After a similar figure from reference (1).
- Figure 2. Li_2CuO_2 unit cell. Shows one-dimensional chains of edge-sharing CuO_4 units; Li_2CuO_2 crystallizes in the orthorhombic space group Immm with $Z=2$, $a=3.66$, $b=2.86$, and $c=9.39$ (crystallographic data is from reference (10)).
- Figure 3. X-ray diffraction results for $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{CoO}_2$: intersheet distance versus amount of oxidant used. x = electrochemical deintercalation data from reference (5);
● = NO_2^+ data; ○ = MoF_6 data.







TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GENERAL

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research Chemistry Division, Code 1113 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000	3	Dr. Ronald L. Atkins Chemistry Division (Code 385) Naval Weapons Center China Lake, CA 93555-6001	1
Commanding Officer Naval Weapons Support Center Attn: Dr. Bernard E. Douda Crane, IN 47522-5050	1	Chief of Naval Research Special Assistant for Marine Corps Matters Code 00MC 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000	1
Dr. Richard W. Drisko Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Code L52 Port Hueneme, California 93043	1	Dr. Bernadette Eichinger Naval Ship Systems Engineering Station Code 053 Philadelphia Naval Base Philadelphia, PA 19112	1
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2 <u>high</u> <u>quality</u>	Dr. Sachio Yamamoto Naval Ocean Systems Center Code 52 San Diego, CA 92152-5000	1
David Taylor Research Center Dr. Eugene C. Fischer Annapolis, MD 21402-5067	1	David Taylor Research Center Dr. Harold H. Singerman Annapolis, MD 21402-5067 ATTN: Code 283	1
Dr. James S. Murday Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375-5000	1		