

Dense All-Electrochem-Active Electrodes for All-Solid-State Lithium Batteries

Meiying Li, Tao Liu, Zhe Shi, Weijiang Xue, Yong-sheng Hu, Hong Li, Xuejie Huang, Ju Li,* Liumin Suo,* and Liquan Chen

The energy density presents the core competitiveness of lithium (Li)-ion batteries. In conventional Li-ion batteries, the utilization of the gravimetric/volumetric energy density at the electrode level is unsatisfactory (<84 wt% and <62 vol%, respectively) due to the existence of non-electrochemical active parts among the 3D porous electrodes, including electrolytes, binders, and carbon additives. These are regarded as indispensable and irreducible components of the electronic and ionic transport network. Here, a dense “all-electrochem-active” (AEA) electrode for all-solid-state Li batteries is proposed, which is entirely constructed from a family of superior mixed electronic–ionic-conducting cathodes, to minimize the energy density gap between the accessible and theoretical energy density at the electrode level. Furthermore, with the ionic–electronic-conductive network self-supported from the AEA cathode, the dense hybrid sulfur (S)-based AEA electrode exhibits a high compacted filling rate of 91.8%, which indicates a high energy density of 777 W h kg⁻¹ and 1945 W h L⁻¹ at the electrode level based on the total cathodes and anodes when at 70 °C.

devices. Following a lengthy competition, lithium (Li)-ion batteries have come to dominate almost all the critical applications, including consumer electronic devices, electric transportation, and electric grid energy storage.^[1,2] Compared with the early Li-ion batteries produced by Sony in the 1990s (80 W h kg⁻¹, 200 W h L⁻¹ [LiCoO₂/C]),^[3] the energy densities of the state-of-the-art Li-ion batteries have increased more than three-fold (≈300 W h kg⁻¹ [NCM811/Si-C], ≈700 W h L⁻¹ [LiCoO₂/C]).^[4,5] However, it is alarming that the energy density of the current type Li-ion batteries is very close to the limit.^[6] The energy density at the electrode level is not only determined by the theoretical energy density of the electrochemical couples (energy density = average voltage × specific capacity) but is

also highly sensitive to the weight fraction of the inactive components.^[7,8] In addition, the binder and any conductive additives, especially the filling electrolyte, not only limit the energy density but also involve various security issues. As such, a number of research studies and technologies have been aimed at reducing the fraction of the inactive mass or volume; however, the attendant strategy is, at best, borderline.

In fact, only one case overcomes this barrier, that is, the Li metal anode. The absence of inactive additives and the high energy density (Li⁰ → Li⁺ + e⁻, 3860 mA h g⁻¹, 2061 mA h L⁻¹) ensure it is a prominent representative electrode.^[9,10] In fact, the Li metal anode can be regarded as an “all-electrochem-active” (AEA) anode. However, on the cathode side, the realization of an AEA is primarily limited by its insufficient electronic conductivity (10⁻⁴–10⁻¹⁰ S cm⁻¹), which is over five orders of magnitude lower than the conductive carbon black (≈10 S cm⁻¹),^[11,12] and its sluggish Li-ion diffusion coefficient (*D*_{Li}) (10⁻¹⁰–10⁻¹⁵ cm² s⁻¹) that is much smaller than the liquid 1 M LiPF₆ in dimethyl carbonate–ethylene carbonate electrolytes (≈2 × 10⁻⁶ cm² s⁻¹).^[13,14] To guarantee a well interconnected electronic–ionic network, the porous 3D electrode structure of the traditional Li-ion cathode must be uniformly filled with the conductive additive (carbon black), the polymer binder, and the liquid electrolytes, the total weight and volume fractions of which are >10 wt% and >30 vol%, respectively^[15–17] (see the detailed information in Tables S1 and S2, Supporting Information).

The equivalent specific capacity ($ESC = C/m_{\text{electrode}}$, *C* is the capacity of the cathode and $m_{\text{electrode}} = m_{\text{cathode}} + m_{\text{binder}} +$

1. Introduction

The pursuit of high energy density and a safe working process remains a topic of interest in the field of energy storage

Dr. M. Li, Dr. T. Liu, Prof. Y.-s. Hu, Prof. H. Li, Prof. X. Huang, Prof. L. Suo, Prof. L. Chen
Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Materials Genome Engineering
Key Laboratory for Renewable Energy
Beijing Key Laboratory for New Energy Material and Devices
Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics
Institute of Physics
Chinese Academy of Science
Beijing 100190, China
E-mail: suoliumin@iphy.ac.cn

Dr. M. Li, Prof. L. Suo
Center of Materials Science and Optoelectronics Engineering
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing 100049, China

Dr. Z. Shi, Dr. W. Xue, Prof. J. Li
Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering and
Department of Materials Science and Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
E-mail: liju@mit.edu

Prof. L. Suo
Yangtze River Delta Physics Research Center Co. Ltd
Liyang 213300, China

 The ORCID identification number(s) for the author(s) of this article can be found under <https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.202008723>.

DOI: 10.1002/adma.202008723

$m_{\text{electrolyte-in-the-electrode}} + m_{\text{conductive-additive}}$) is defined to assess the capacity of the electrode, accounting for the overall impacts of the active cathode and the non-active parts, including the binder, carbon black, and electrolyte filling in the electrode. Based on the ESC, we can obtain the energy density of the electrode ($EG_{\text{electrode}} = ESC \times V$, where V is the discharge voltage). This indicates that the above compromises dilute the electrode-level energy density by at least 16%. Compared with the liquid-electrolyte-based electrode, the solid-state electrolyte (SSE)-based electrodes perform better in terms of security; however, perhaps unsurprisingly, they exhibit a lower $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ due to their higher densities (oxide-based electrolyte: 2.93–5.07 g cm⁻³, sulfide (S)-based electrolytes: 1.87–1.97 g cm⁻³, PEO-based: 1.2–1.25 g cm⁻³) and far more SSEs are required to ensure physical contact.^[18,19] According to the existing data,^[20–22] the weight fraction of cathode materials in all-solid-state Li batteries (ASSLBs) is less than 80 wt% (Figure 1d,e, see the detailed information in Tables S1–S3, Supporting Information), which results in low $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ ($0.8 \times$ specific capacity) for this type of battery. In ASSLBs, it is theoretically possible to achieve an AEA electrode if the Li-containing cathode has high enough ionic and electronic conductivity, where the electrode is 100% occupied by active cathode materials and the Li-ion and electron transportation is self-actuating (Figure 1c).

2. The Concept of AEA Electrodes

In conventional Li-ion cathodes, the Li-ions reach the cathode through the electrolyte and electrons from the external circuit to the cathode and react at the three-phase interface (carbon/electrolyte/electroactive mass).^[23,24] However, it is significant that the Li-ion and electron transportation self-relies on the all-in-one active electrode in our proposed AEA electrodes, the weight and volume percentages of which can increase to 100% and 89% (porosity 11%), respectively, in the electrode. To realize our idea, the ideal AEA candidates should have fast Li-ion transportability (alternative to electrolyte), high electronic conductivity (alternative to the conductive additive), and abundant Li storage sites (electrochemical active capacity). Furthermore, the ideal candidate would have a stable fixing structure with a low fluctuation of ionic and electronic conductivity that varies according to Li-ion concentration.

Following careful screening, a series of conductive transition metal sulfides caught our attention.^[25–28] In previous works, pure amorphous transition metal sulfide cathodes were used as the electrode ASSLBs.^[29–31] However, their electronic conductivity ($\approx 10^{-3}$ S cm⁻¹) is four orders of magnitude lower than carbon (≈ 10 S cm⁻¹),^[32] and their ionic conductivity is not particularly stable during the charge–discharge process. In our work, we selected crystal transition metal sulfides,




Figure 1. a–c) The concept of AEA electrodes: a) Commercial liquid Li-ion batteries (74.6–83.6 wt% cathode, anode: graphite); b) conventional ASSLBs (80 wt% cathode, anode: Li metal); c) the proposed AEA-ASSLBs (100 wt% AEA cathode, anode: Li metal). d, e) Summaries of the weight and volume percentages of various components.




Figure 2. The proof-of-concept of the AEA-ASSLBs: a) Electronic conductivities of our AEA materials in comparison with the available conductive carbon additives and traditional cathodes, obtained via the 4-electrode powder electronic conductivity test. b) Li-ion diffusion coefficients of our AEA materials obtained via the potentiostatic intermittent titration technique method in comparison with the available traditional cathodes and typical SSEs. c,d) The galvanostatic discharge–charge profiles of the $\text{Li}_{0.1}\text{TiS}_2$ - and LiMo_6S_8 -based AEA cathodes. e) Their corresponding cycling stabilities at 0.1C/70 °C.

namely, layer-structured TiS_2 and chevre-phase Mo_6S_8 , which not only have a very stable host structure but also high electronic conductivity.^[33] Mo_6S_8 and TiS_2 have a high electronic conductivity, which is over 3–6 orders of magnitude higher than that of the typical cathode materials (NMC532 and carbon-coated LiFePO_4), and comparable to the commercial conductive carbon (Super P) (Figure 2a, see the detailed information in Table S4, Supporting Information). These superhigh electronically conducting TiS_2 and Mo_6S_8 materials allow for eliminating the conductive carbon in the electrode. In addition, Mo_6S_8 and TiS_2 have a high Li-ion diffusion coefficient of $1.8\text{--}9.8 \times 10^{-8}$ and 8×10^{-9} to $9 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (see the detailed information in Figure S1, Supporting Information),^[25,34,35]

which is comparable to that of SSEs ($\text{Li}_{10}\text{GeP}_2\text{S}_{12}$, $8.8\text{--}9 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, $\text{Li}_{10}\text{SiP}_2\text{S}_{12}$, $7\text{--}7.2 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, $\text{Li}_{6.25}\text{Al}_{0.25}\text{La}_3\text{Zr}_2\text{O}_{12}$, $1\text{--}1.1 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$), and far higher than that of the conventional commercial cathodes (LiFePO_4 : 6.8×10^{-16} to $1.8 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, NMC: $2.8\text{--}8 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, LiCoO_2 : 10^{-11} to $10^{-12} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$) (Figure 2b, see the detailed information in Table S5, Supporting Information).^[36–45] As such, they can serve as solid-state electrolytes rather than filling electrolytes in the electrodes. Meanwhile, the intercalation compounds of Mo_6S_8 and TiS_2 enable Li-ion storage in their host with the high stability of the host framework structure and the low fluctuation of ionic and electronic conductivity. Based on the above merits of the physicochemical properties, we decided to use full

electrochemical active electrodes (100% Mo_6S_8 or TiS_2 cathode and Li metal anode) to construct an ASSLB.

3. Demonstration of AEA All-Solid-State Li-Batteries

To provide a proof-of-concept, AEA-ASSLBs were constructed using a configuration of AEA cathode (100% TiS_2 or Mo_6S_8)/SSEs ($\text{Li}_{10}\text{GeP}_2\text{S}_{12}$ - Li_3PS_4)/AEA anode (100% Li metal anode).^[46] As shown in Figure 2c,d, the TiS_2 -based AEA-ASSLBs had an initial discharge capacity of 213 mA h g^{-1} at 70°C , with the characteristic smooth slope in the voltage profile demonstrating the solid-solution reaction. Meanwhile, the Mo_6S_8 -based AEA-ASSLBs delivered a capacity of 130 mA h g^{-1} , with two characteristic well-defined plateaus in the voltage profile corresponding with the two-phase reaction (2.3 V , $\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8 \rightarrow \text{LiMo}_6\text{S}_8$, and 2.05 V , $\text{LiMo}_6\text{S}_8 \rightarrow \text{Li}_3\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8/\text{Li}_4\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8$) (Figure 2d). Since both pristine TiS_2 and Mo_6S_8 are Li-free, a partial pre-lithiation was required to provide the function of a Li-ion conductor on the initial discharge. Specifically, the observed capacity gap between the first and second discharge roughly correlates with the Li consumption of the pre-lithiation process corresponding with

$\text{Li}_{0.1}\text{TiS}_2$ (LTS) (25 mA h g^{-1}) and LiMo_6S_8 (LMS) (35 mA h g^{-1}). Starting with these very partially pre-lithiated materials (LTS and LMS), the batteries had a reversible capacity of more than 180 mA h g^{-1} for LTS and 90 mA h g^{-1} for LMS, demonstrating that our AEA-ASSLBs can work well based on both solid-solution (LTS) and two-phase reaction (LMS) mechanisms. In sharp contrast, the AEA electrode constructed using the typical LiFePO_4 and $\text{Li}_4\text{Ti}_5\text{O}_{12}$ materials failed (see the detailed information in Figure S2, Supporting Information). Compared with the LTS, the LMS exhibited better cycling stability with a high capacity retention of 89% after 50 cycles (compared with the 2nd cycle).

The aforementioned distinctions could be attributed to the materials' intrinsic physicochemical properties, crystal structure, and different Li storage mechanisms. LTS presents a solid-solution reaction involving Li-vacancy disorder, the Li-ion diffusion coefficient of which largely depends on the vacancy concentration and is susceptible to the Li concentration.^[47] Upon cycling, any trapping Li for the irreversible capacity loss could potentially gradually lower the kinetic of the LTS-AEA electrode, resulting in capacity fade (Figure 2e). In contrast, LMS maintains a high D_{Li} with a very low fluctuation from 1.8×10^{-8} to $1.7 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Figure 3a). The C-rate performance also




Figure 3. a,b) The electrochemical mechanism of the LMS-based AEA cathode: a) Li-ion diffusion coefficients and energy bandgap of $\text{Li}_x\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8$ ($x = 0, 1, 3, 4$), b) the porosity of the AEA Mo_6S_8 electrode as a function of the applied pressure. The red circles represent the value test with pressure and the blue ones represents the value test releasing the pressure. c) In situ XRD analysis of the LMS-based AEA cathode (left). The normalized intensity of the peak at 33.9° (Li_0), 33.7° (Li_1), and 32.7° (Li_{3-4}) in different stages (middle) and the phase transition process accompanying the charge–discharge profiles (right).

verified the fast kinetic of Li-ion transportation, and the LMS–AEA electrode with a high cathode mass loading of 13.91 mg cm^{-2} (compacting density is 4.5 g cm^{-3} and the thickness of electrode is $30.9 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$) eliminates the possibility that the capacity only originates from the interfacial electrochemical reaction between the LMS and the SSE (see the detailed information in Figures S3 and S4, Supporting Information). Furthermore, our LMS–AEA electrode exhibited superior plasticity, which enabled elastic recovery after releasing the pressure. As the apparent gap in porosity marked by the shadowed area in Figure 3b indicates, the porosity of Mo_6S_8 decreased to 11% under 360 MPa (the applied pressure of ASSLBs in real operating conditions) and rebounded to 24% after the pressure was released (see the detailed information in Tables S6 and S7, Supporting Information). The excellent deformability of the LMS–AEA electrode is not only favorable in terms of achieving a dense electrode and good physical solid–solid interfacial contact but is also helpful for buffering the volume expansion of cathode materials during cycling. Thus, in the following section, LMS is selected as our priority material.

To verify the phase transformation during charging, in situ X-ray diffraction (XRD) was performed for a tailor-made ASSLB (Figure 3c). The pristine electrode belongs to the Li_0 phase (Mo_6S_8) [JCPDC: 89–5114] with three major peaks at 30.7° ($12\bar{1}$), 33.9° ($21\bar{2}$), and 34.8° (104). At the initial stage of the discharge, a new Li_1 phase (LiMo_6S_8) [JCPDC: 81–0858, 30.4° ($12\bar{1}$), 33.7° ($21\bar{2}$), and 35.0° (104)] was generated along with a decrease in the intensity of the Li_0 , indicating the two-phase transformation between Li_0 and Li_1 . Subsequently, along with a second discharge plateau (2.05 V), the Li_1 phase further transformed into a Li_3 phase [JCPDS81-0859, 32.7° ($21\bar{2}$), 35.5° (104), and 36.8° (220)] and finally converted into $\text{Li}_4\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8$ (L_4 phase) [JCPDS: 81–0860, 32.6° ($21\bar{2}$), 35.4° (104), and 36.7° (220)]. To further quantify the relative content of the different phases in the two-phase coexistence region, the normalized intensity based on the ($21\bar{2}$) peak was obtained, as shown in Figure 3d (middle). This revealed clear multiple two-phase coexistences that were consistent with the charge–discharge profiles (Figure 2d). The final discharge product of Li_4 can only be reversibly converted into Li_1 with a trace of Li_0 phase remaining that corresponds with the very short plateau at 2.45 V at the end of the charge stage (circled in Figure 3c, right). The LMS–AEA electrode processes a step-wise electrochemical reaction with the multiple phase transformations in the first cycle, which can be divided into four stages in the order of stage I, stage II, stage III, and stage IV (Figure 3c, middle). During stages I and II, the increase in Li concentration promotes Li-ion transportation in the AEA electrode due to the formation of $\text{Li}_x\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8$ ($x = 1, 3, 4$) with a high diffusion coefficient D_{Li} . The high Li concentration phases gradually transformed into low phases during delithiation (stage III) ($\text{Li}_4\text{–Li}_3\text{–Li}_1$). At the end of stage IV, an ionically blocking interphase layer mainly consisting of Li_0 formed since this is a Li-free and ionic-isolating phase, and its formation on the interface of the electrode–electrolyte shut down the further phase transformation from Li_1 to Li_0 in the bulk electrode, much like a specific “ionic switch.” At this time, the delithiation process is blocked and Li_1 is retained to a large extent. These results confirmed our hypothesis that the LMS–AEA

electrode requires an initial partial pre-lithiation such that its Li ionic and electronic conductivities are qualified.

Based on the above results and discussion, we have successfully demonstrated the proof-of-concept of the AEA electrode in ASSLBs. This AEA electrode can also work at room temperature (see the detailed information in Figures S5, Supporting Information). However, compared with conventional Li-ion batteries, the $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ of the LMS–AEA cathode was only 90 mA h g^{-1} , which means that it had not yet realized its full potential in terms of energy density. To further display the advantages of the AEA electrode, a hybrid $\text{S}_8\text{–Mo}_6\text{S}_8$ (S–LMS)-based AEA cathode was attempted, since an S cathode has a high theoretical capacity of $1,675 \text{ mA h g}^{-1}$, with redox potentials ideally below the “ionic switch” of 2.45 V.^[48–51] Given that a S_8 cathode is electronically insulating, the conductive LMS served as an efficient electronically and ionically conducting network within the AEA electrode, with the weight percentages of S_8 and Mo_6S_8 32.5 and 67.5 wt%, respectively. The transmission electron microscopy (TEM) image of the hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode (Figure 4a) revealed the coexistence of amorphous S_8 (marked by the yellow-block) and crystalline Mo_6S_8 (marked by the green lines), the electron diffraction patterns are shown in Figure S6, Supporting Information, and the XRD patterns are shown in Figure S7, Supporting Information. Inside the electrode, the small Mo_6S_8 nanosheets were mutually interconnected and thus constructed a conductive network for transport of electrons/ions. Furthermore, the amorphous S_8 was homogeneously dispersed, which was reflected by the 10–30 nm nanodomain distributed in the Mo_6S_8 framework that guarantees the desired electrons/ions transport in the insulating S_8 . Unlike conventional all-solid-state Li–S cathodes with three single-function materials (carbon/SSE/S) for forming three-phase reaction interfaces, our hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode had an all-in-one ionically/electronically transporting two-phase reaction interface (LMS/S), which allows for avoiding the unbalanced transport between the electron (by carbon) and Li-ion (by the SSEs).

Figure 4b shows the cross-sectional images and the elemental mapping of the hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode and the $\text{Li}_{10}\text{GeP}_2\text{S}_{12}$ SSE. The local element distribution of the phosphorus (P) indicated a pure AEA cathode electrode without any SSE component (see the detailed information in Figures S8–S10, Supporting Information), which was confirmed by the obtained energy-dispersive spectrum, as shown in Figure 4c. Furthermore, the volumetric density at the electrode level is highly dependent on the porosity, which can be reduced by applying pressure in ASSLBs. It is significant that our S–LMS–AEA electrode had a very high compacted filling rate of 91.8% at 360 MPa, which was due to the creep of the soft Mo_6S_8 and S_8 (Figures 3b and 4d, see the detailed information in Tables S6 and S8, Supporting Information), the 8.2% residual porosity of which allowed for accommodating the volume expansion. Combining the advantages of AEA electrodes in terms of ESC, the theoretical volumetric density of the S–LMS–AEA electrode was estimated to be above $3565.3 \text{ W h L}^{-1}$ (in terms of the volume of the Mo_6S_8 and S_8), which is more than double that of the conventional S–C–LGPS (32.5 wt%, 17.5 wt%, 50 wt%) electrode with the same fraction of sulfur.




Figure 4. The structure and electrochemical mechanism of the hybrid S-LMS-AEA cathode (32.5% S_8 -67.5% Mo_6S_8). a) TEM image of the S-LMS-AEA cathode. b) The cross-sectional SEM images of the AEA cathode/ $Li_{10}GeP_2S_{12}$ interface with the energy dispersive spectrometer (EDS) mapping of the P and S elements. c) EDS point analysis of the P and S elements in the AEA cathode (Point 1) and the $Li_{10}GeP_2S_{12}$ (Point 2). The black scale in (a) is 20 nm, and the white scales in (b) and (c) are 50 μm . d,e) Comparison of the electronic conductivities, theoretical volumetric energy density, and porosity of the S-LMS-AEA cathode and those of a typical S-C-LGPS cathode (32.5 wt%, 17.5 wt%, 50 wt%, see the detailed information in Figure S11, Supporting Information). f) The electrochemical redox mechanism of the S-LMS-AEA cathode.




Figure 5. The strategies for high energy density AEA-ASSLBs. a–c) Typical charge–discharge profiles of ASSLBs with hybrid S–LMS (32.5% S₈–67.5% Mo₆S₈) versus Li, LTO–LMS (40% Li₄Ti₅O₁₂–60% Mo₆S₈) versus Li, and S–LMS versus Li–In alloy anode. d) Cycling stabilities of the AEA battery with the S–LMS cathode. The capacity was calculated based on the $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$.

As Figure 4f illustrates, we proposed a possible electrochemical mechanism for a hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode. Below 2.45 V, the AEA Mo₆S₈ electrode was first pre-lithiated into LMS before it was reversibly transformed into the following Li-rich phases (Li₁ ↔ Li₄). Moreover, simultaneously, the S₈ cathode underwent a conversion of S ↔ Li₂S, delivering a specific capacity of 1,290 mA h g⁻¹ (by the initial electrode mass, before discharge without Li). The $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ was used instead of the specific capacity for the cathode to evaluate the energy density at the electrode level. In terms of the hybrid S–Mo₆S₈–AEA cathode with the Li metal, a high $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ of 483 mA h g⁻¹ (0.8 mA h cm⁻², the theoretical value is 630 mA h g⁻¹, supplementary material) was achieved after three cycles, with gravimetric and volumetric energy densities of 905.5 W h kg⁻¹ and 2778 W h L⁻¹, respectively, at the electrode level, which was close to the theoretical energy density of 1260 W h kg⁻¹ and 3865 W h L⁻¹ (Figure 5a, see the detailed information in the Supplementary calculation model). Meanwhile, in terms of the discharge products, Li₂S and Li₄Mo₆S₈, the values were 777 W h kg⁻¹ and 1945 W h L⁻¹, which is still higher than those of the commercial high-density LiCoO₂ electrode (476 W h kg⁻¹, 1698 W h L⁻¹, by the electrode mass) (see the detailed information in Table S8, Supporting Information). Furthermore, to demonstrate the cycling stability of our hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode, a Li–In AEA anode was applied to stabilize the interface between the Li metal anode and the SSE. This demonstrated that our AEA ASSLBs had excellent cycling stability with a capacity retention of 76% after 120 cycles

(compared to the 30th cycle with the highest energy density, Figure 5c,d).

Our hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode exhibited the following significant advantages: 1) The electrodes were constructed using 100% electrochemically active substances without any inactive materials, thereby maximizing the cathode capacities at the electrode level. 2) The all-in-one electronic/ionic conductive network of the LMS cathode is favorable in terms of enhancing the electrode kinetic through avoiding the unbalance and inhomogeneous reaction at the three-phase reacting interfaces (carbon/electrolyte/S). 3) Both the AEA cathode and the SSEs belong to the sulfur family, which allows for excellent mutual compatibility through their high affinity. 4) The elastic nature of the AEA cathode alleviates the volume expansion of the S₈/Li₂S during cycling. In principle, the LMS–AEA cathode has strong universality, combined with other active materials with a redox potential of less than 2.45 V possible. For example, another type of hybrid AEA cathode with 40% Li₄Ti₅O₁₂ and 60% Mo₆S₈ (LTO–LMS) exhibited superior cycling stability, with an $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ of 130 mA h g⁻¹ at the electrode level (Figure 5b–d).

4. Conclusion

We have proposed a new concept of AEA all-SSE with a superior electronic/ionic mixing conductor as an alternative to carbon black and the electrolyte in the electrode. With consideration of our AEA principle and the screening criteria, the LTS- and

LMS-based AEA electrodes were selected due to their high electronic conductivity, high ionic diffusion coefficient, and stable Li-storage performance. In these AEA electrodes, the energy density gap at the electrode level between the accessible and the theoretical value is bridged and minimized as far as possible. More significantly, due to the ionically/electronically conductive network self-supported by the AEA cathode material, it can be combined with a high-capacity sulfur cathode to construct a hybrid S–LMS-based AEA cathode with high energy densities of over 770 W h kg⁻¹ and 1900 W h L⁻¹ at the electrode level. In the future, we believe that AEA electrodes will provide a new means of increasing the energy densities of batteries, regardless of the discovery of new materials. Furthermore, there is the possibility of increasing the energy density by exploring new AEA material candidates with a higher capacity and high voltage that effectively match the 4 V transition metal-oxide cathodes.

5. Experimental Section

Preparation of AEA Cathode: Mo₆S₈ was synthesized by methods previously reported. TiS₂ (99.9%), S₈ (99.95%, Innochem), Li₄Ti₅O₁₂ (99%), Li₁₀GeP₂S₁₂ (2–5 μm, Kejing star), Li₃PS₄ (2–5 μm, Kejing star), Li (99.95%, 80 μm, CEL), and In (99.999%, 30 μm) foils were obtained commercially. For LMS and LTS-based AEA cathode, the Mo₆S₈ and TiS₂ were used as the AEA electrode without further treatment. For hybrid S–LMS and LTO–LMS-based AEA cathode, S₈/Mo₆S₈ and Li₄Ti₅O₁₂/Mo₆S₈ were mixed in 32.5:67.5 by weight (162.5 mg, 337.5 mg,) and 40:60 by weight (200 mg, 300 mg). Then put them in an agate mortar for the ball-milling with 300 r, 12 h, and 300 r, 4 h to prepare the hybrid AEA cathode, respectively.

Batteries Assembly: The AEA-ASSLBs batteries were assembled by the configuration of AEA cathode/LGPS/Li₃PS₄/Li(In). A mass of 100 mg LGPS and 50 mg Li₃PS₄ SSE was uniaxially compressed at ≈216 MPa. Then the AEA cathode was added on top of the SSE and distributed homogeneously and compressed at 360 MPa. A thickness of 80 μm Li foil was added (accompanying a 30 μm In foil, depending on the experimental designing.) The photography and schematic plot are shown in Figure S12, Supporting Information.

Characterization: The morphologies of the samples were investigated by SEM and TEM. The in situ XRD patterns of the all-solid-state battery were measured using Cu Kα radiation on an X-ray diffractometer from 29.8° to 37.5° (2θ), under 70 °C. The electrochemistry was conducted on a LAND battery test station at 70 °C. The electronic conductivities of the powder materials were measured by the 4-probe method at room temperature and atmosphere, and the Li-ion diffusion coefficient was measured by potentiostatic intermittent titration technique. More details of the materials and characterizations are provided in the Supporting Information.

Supporting Information

Supporting Information is available from the Wiley Online Library or from the author.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Center for Clean Energy.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

Research data are not shared.

Keywords

“all-electrochem-active” electrodes, all-solid-state batteries, conductive networks, energy density

Received: December 25, 2020

Revised: March 15, 2021

Published online: May 17, 2021

- [1] J. M. Tarascon, M. Armand, *Nature* **2001**, 414, 359.
- [2] J. B. Goodenough, Y. Kim, *Chem. Mater.* **2010**, 22, 587.
- [3] T. T. Nagaura, *Prog. Batteries Sol. Cells* **1990**, 9, 209.
- [4] H. Li, *Joule* **2019**, 3, 911.
- [5] X. Wang, Y. L. Ding, Y. P. Deng, Z. Chen, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2020**, 10, 1903864.
- [6] J. Janek, W. G. Zeier, *Nat. Energy* **2016**, 1, 16141.
- [7] B. J. Landi, M. J. Ganter, C. D. Cress, R. A. DiLeo, R. P. Raffaele, *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2009**, 2, 638.
- [8] H. Zheng, R. Yang, G. Liu, X. Song, V. S. Battaglia, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2012**, 116, 4875.
- [9] W. Xu, J. Wang, F. Ding, X. Chen, E. Nasybulin, Y. Zhang, J. Zhang, *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2014**, 7, 513.
- [10] X. Shen, H. Liu, X. B. Cheng, C. Yan, J. Q. Huang, *Energy Storage Mater.* **2018**, 12, 161.
- [11] B. Caglar, P. Fischer, P. Kauranen, M. Karttunen, P. Elsner, *J. Power Sources* **2014**, 256, 88.
- [12] J. Ni, Y. Li, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2016**, 6, 1600278.
- [13] S. Indris, R. Heinzmann, M. Schulz, A. Hofmann, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2014**, 161, A2036.
- [14] S. G. Stewart, J. Newman, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2008**, 155, F13.
- [15] W. Bauer, D. Nötzel, V. Wenzel, H. Nirschl, *J. Power Sources* **2015**, 288, 359.
- [16] N. Besnard, A. Etienne, T. Douillard, O. Dubrunfaut, P. T. Van, L. Gautier, S. Franger, J. C. Badot, E. Maire, B. Lestriez, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2017**, 7, 1602239.
- [17] E. J. Berg, C. Villevieille, D. Streich, S. Trabesinger, P. Novák, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2015**, 162, A2468.
- [18] S. Skaarup, K. West, B. Z. Christiansen, *Solid State Ionics* **1988**, 28, 975.
- [19] L. Liu, J. Xu, S. Wang, F. Wu, H. Li, L. Chen, *eTransportation* **2019**, 1, 100010.
- [20] R. Xu, J. Yue, S. Liu, J. Tu, F. Han, P. Liu, *ACS Energy Lett.* **2019**, 4, 1073.
- [21] Y. G. Lee, S. Fujiki, C. Jung, N. Suzuki, N. Yashiro, R. Omoda, D. S. Ko, T. Shiratsuchi, T. Sugimoto, S. Ryu, J. H. Ku, T. Watanabe, Y. Park, Y. Aihara, D. I. T. Han, *Nat. Energy* **2020**, 5, 299.
- [22] Z. Wan, D. Lei, W. Yang, C. Liu, K. Shi, X. Hao, L. Shen, W. Lv, B. Li, Q. H. Yang, F. Kang, Y. B. He, *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **2019**, 29, 1805301.
- [23] H. Bockholt, M. Indrikova, A. Netz, F. Golks, A. Kwade, *J. Power Sources* **2016**, 325, 140.
- [24] Y. H. Chen, C. W. Wang, X. Zhang, A. M. Sastry, *J. Power Sources* **2010**, 195, 2851.
- [25] A. J. Vaccaro, T. Palanisamy, R. L. Kerr, J. T. Maloy, *Solid State Ionics* **1981**, 2, 337.
- [26] M. Pan, T. Hakari, A. Sakuda, A. Hayashi, Y. Suganaka, S. Mori, M. Tatsumisago, *Electrochemistry* **2018**, 86, 175.
- [27] M. Mao, Z. Lin, Y. Tong, J. Yue, C. Zhao, J. Lu, Q. Zhang, L. Gu, L. Suo, Y. Hu, H. Li, X. Huang, L. Chen, *ACS Nano* **2020**, 14, 1102.

- [28] T. Yamada, S. Ito, R. Omoda, T. Watanabe, Y. Aihara, M. Agostini, U. Ulissi, J. Hassoun, B. Scrosatic, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2015**, *162*, A646.
- [29] T. Matsuyama, A. Hayashi, C. J. Hart, L. F. Nazar, M. Tatsumisago, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2016**, *163*, A1730.
- [30] A. L. Santhosha, N. Nazer, R. Koerver, S. Randau, F. H. Richter, D. A. Weber, J. Kulisch, T. Adermann, J. Janek, P. Adelhelm, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2020**, *10*, 2002394.
- [31] T. Matsuyama, M. Deguchi, K. Mitsuhara, T. Oht, T. Mori, Y. Orikasa, Y. Uchimoto, Y. Kowada, A. Hayashi, M. Tatsumisago, *J. Power Sources* **2016**, *313*, 104.
- [32] A. Sakuda, N. Taguchi, T. Takeuchi, K. Tatsumi, Z. Ogumi, *Solid State Ionics* **2014**, *262*, 143.
- [33] M. Nagao, H. Kitaura, A. Hayashi, M. Tatsumisago, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2013**, *160*, A819.
- [34] S. R. Narayanan, D. H. Shen, S. Surampudi, A. I. Attia, G. Halpert, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **1993**, *140*, 1854.
- [35] W. Xue, Z. Shi, L. Suo, C. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Wang, K. P. So, A. Maurano, D. Yu, Y. Chen, L. Qie, Z. Zhu, G. Xu, J. Kong, J. Li, *Nat. Energy* **2019**, *4*, 374.
- [36] Y. Zhu, Y. Xu, Y. Liu, C. Luo, C. Wang, *Nanoscale* **2013**, *5*, 780.
- [37] S. Wenzel, S. Randau, T. Leichtwei, D. A. Weber, J. Sann, W. G. Zeier, J. Janek, *Chem. Mater.* **2016**, *28*, 2400.
- [38] J. Mao, K. Dai, M. Xuan, G. Shao, R. Qiao, W. Yang, V. S. Battaglia, G. Liu, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* **2016**, *8*, 9116.
- [39] D.-K. Kim, H.-M. Park, S.-J. Jung, Y. U. Jeong, J.-H. Lee, J.-J. Kim, *J. Power Sources* **2006**, *159*, 237.
- [40] S. R. Das, S. B. Majumder, R. S. Katiyar, *J. Power Sources* **2005**, *139*, 261.
- [41] S. Y. Luchkin, K. Romanyuk, M. Ivanov, A. L. Kholkin, *J. Appl. Phys.* **2015**, *118*, 072016.
- [42] R. Fallahzadeh, N. Farhadian, *Solid State Ionics* **2015**, *280*, 10.
- [43] Z. Zhang, Y. Shao, B. Lotsch, Y. Hu, H. Li, J. Janek, L. F. Nazar, C. Nan, J. Maier, M. Armand, L. Chen, *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2018**, *11*, 1945.
- [44] S. Cui, Y. Wei, T. Liu, W. Deng, Z. Hu, Y. Su, H. Li, M. Li, H. Guo, Y. Duan, W. Wang, M. Rao, J. Zheng, X. Wang, F. Pan, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2016**, *6*, 1501309.
- [45] W. Li, K. Wang, S. Cheng, K. Jiang, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2019**, *9*, 1900993.
- [46] X. Yao, N. Huang, F. Han, Q. Zhang, H. Wan, J. P. Mwiszerwa, C. Wang, X. Xu, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2017**, *7*, 1602923.
- [47] A. Van der Ven, J. Bhattacharya, A. A. Belak, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2013**, *46*, 1216.
- [48] H. Huo, J. Liang, N. Zhao, X. Li, X. Lin, Y. Zhao, K. Adair, R. Li, X. Guo, X. Sun, *ACS Energy Lett.* **2020**, *5*, 2156.
- [49] P. G. Bruce, S. A. Freunberger, L. J. Hardwick, J. M. Tarascon, *Nat. Mater.* **2012**, *11*, 19.
- [50] H. Qu, J. Zhang, A. Du, B. Chen, J. Chai, N. Xue, L. Wang, L. Qiao, C. Wang, X. Zang, J. Yang, X. Wang, G. Cui, *Adv. Sci.* **2018**, *5*, 1700503.
- [51] Y. Liu, P. He, H. Zhou, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2018**, *8*, 1701602.

ADVANCED MATERIALS

Supporting Information

for *Adv. Mater.*, DOI: 10.1002/adma.202008723

Dense All-Electrochem-Active Electrodes for All-Solid-State Lithium Batteries

Meiying Li, Tao Liu, Zhe Shi, Weijiang Xue, Yong-sheng Hu, Hong Li, Xuejie Huang, Ju Li, Liumin Suo,* and Liqun Chen*

Supporting Information

Dense All-Electrochem-Active Electrodes for All-Solid-State Lithium Batteries

Meiying Li^{1,2}, Tao Liu¹, Zhe Shi³, Weijiang Xue³, Yong-sheng Hu¹, Hong Li¹, Xuejie Huang¹, Ju Li^{3}, Liumin Suo^{1,2,4*}, Liquan Chen¹*

Materials and methods:

Materials: The Mo₆S₈ was synthesized by methods previously reported. The TiS₂ (99.9%), S₈ (99.95%, Innochem), Li₄Ti₅O₁₂ (99%), Li₁₀GeP₂S₁₂ (2-5μm, Kejing star), Li₃PS₄ (2-5μm, Kejing star), Li (99.95%, 80μm, CEL) and In (99.999%, 30 μm) foils were obtained commercially. For LMS and LTS-based AEA cathode, the Mo₆S₈ and TiS₂ are using as the AEA electrode without further treatment. For hybrid S-LMS and LTO-LMS based AEA cathode, the S₈/ Mo₆S₈ and Li₄Ti₅O₁₂/ Mo₆S₈ were mixed in 67.5:32.5 (wt%) and 40:60 (wt%) ratio and then put in an agate mortar for the ball-milling with 300r, 12h, and 300 r, 4 h to prepare the hybrid AEA cathode, respectively.

Electronic conductivity measurements: The electronic conductivities of the powder materials were measured by the 4-probe method at room temperature and atmosphere, using a Powder electronic conductivity meter (MCP PD51, Mitsubishi Chemical). The sample was poured into an insulating tube (diameter 20 mm) and pressed into a pellet (thickness 2-4 mm) with four conducting probes remain in contact with the sample. The conductivities were measured under various pressure from 6.37 MPa to 50.93 MPa.

Ionic diffusion coefficient measurements: Since the ionic conductivity measurement of the mixed ionic and electronic conductor is difficult, here, the Li-ion diffusion coefficient was measurement by potentiostatic intermittent titration technique (PITT).

The potential step is 20 mV, and each step lasts 15 minutes. After charge/discharge, the standing time is 15 minutes. The test voltage range is 1.7 V-2.8V.

Porosity measurements: With pressure: The sectional area of the mold is 0.785 cm^2 . The inner height of the mold (D_{im}) is measured by the inner screw micrometer. Then 200mg Mo_6S_8 is poured into the mold, and the inside diameter of the mold becomes D_{im+S} . The volume of the sample under current pressure is $0.785 \times (D_{im+S} - D_{im})$. Each pressure lasts 3 minutes. Without pressure: The sectional area of the mold is 0.785 cm^2 . Vernier caliper measures the external height of the mold (D_{em}). Then 200mg Mo_6S_8 is poured into the mold, and each pressure lasts 3 minutes. After that, the external diameter of the mold becomes D_{em+S} , and the volume of the sample without pressure is $0.785 \times (D_{em+S} - D_{em})$.

Electrochemical Characterization: The AEA-ASSLBs batteries are assembled by the configuration of AEA cathode/LGPS/ Li_3PS_4 /Li(In). A mass of 100 mg LGPS and 50mg Li_3PS_4 solid-state electrolyte (SSE) was uniaxially compressed at about 216 MPa. Then the AEA cathode was added on top of the SSE and distributed homogenously and compressed at 360 MPa. The cathode loading is 1.5 mg cm^{-2} . After that, a thickness of $80 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ Li foil was added (accompanying a $30 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ In foil, depending on the experimental designing.) and compressed at 216 MPa. The photography and schematic plot are shown in Figure S11. The all-solid-state battery is sealed at a desiccator.

Characterization: The morphologies of the samples were investigated by SEM (Hitachi S-4800) with energy-disperse X-ray analysis. TEM image and selected area electron diffraction patterns were acquired using a transmission electron microscope (JEM-2100 plus, FEI Tecna F20). The *in situ* XRD patterns of the solid-state battery were measured using $\text{Cu K}\alpha$ radiation on an X-ray diffractometer from 29.8° to $37.5^\circ(2\theta)$. The electrochemistry was conducted on a LAND battery test station (BT2000, China) with a voltage cutoff of 1.8-2.8V for LMS-battery and 1-3V for LTS-battery and composite AEA-ASSLBs, at 70°C .

The energy density calculation model:

(1) The weight and volume fraction of cathode in the electrode:

The calculation model referred to the literature, and some data also collected from it²⁸. The three types of batteries, including All-Electrochem-Active all solid-state battery (AEA -ASSLBs), the commercial Liquid Li-ion batteries (Liquid LIBs), and All solid-state lithium metal battery (ASSLBs) are compared with each other whose detailed calculation information shows in Table S1, Table S2 and Table S3. The AEA electrode of AEA -ASSLBs is calculated based on 100 % Mo₆S₈, whose porosity is 11 vol. % under 360 MPa (Table S6). The electrode of Liquid LIBs is comprised of the active material, the carbon additive, the binder whose porosity is in the range of 30-40%. Assuming all the porosity is filled by the liquid electrolyte. The electrode of ASSLBs is comprised of the active material with an average active material (AM) density of 4 g cm⁻³, the carbon additive, the binder, and the sulfide-based solid-state electrolyte (1.87 ~ 1.97 g cm⁻³). The mass fraction of the active material is ~ 80%, representing the highest level in All-solid-state as the previous reports, whose porosity is assumed to the same as AEA ASSLBs (11 vol.%).

(2) The energy density of the cathode and electrode:

To better represent our advantage, we used a new expression of equivalent specific capacity (*ESC*) to assess the energy density in the electrode level where the electrode weight is used instead of the weight of the cathode. Where *C* is the capacity of the cathode, $m_{electrode} = m_{cathode} + m_{binder} + m_{electrolyte \text{ absorbed in the electrode}} + m_{conductive \text{ additive}}$.

$$SC = \frac{C}{m_{electrode}} \quad (1)$$

The energy density is calculated by:

$$EG = \int_{V_{charge}}^{V_{discharge}} ESC \, dV = ESC \cdot V_{average} \quad (2)$$

However, as for the traditional calculation, the energy density is calculated by:

$$SC = \frac{C}{m_{cathode}} \quad (3)$$

$$EG = \frac{SC \cdot V_{\text{average}}}{m_{\text{cathode}} + m_{\text{binder}} + m_{\text{electrolyte absorbed}} + m_{\text{conductive additive}}} \quad (4)$$

Thus, the value calculated by the *ESC* method is the same as the *SC* method. Also, it considers the inactive material, makes the evaluation of capacity in electrode more concise and comprehensive.

The energy density calculation:

The materials of our S-based AEA electrode is the composite of S₈ and Mo₆S₈ ($C_{S_8}=1675 \text{ mA h g}^{-1}$, $C_{Mo_6S_8}=128 \text{ mA h g}^{-1}$, $\rho_{S_8}=1.96 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{Mo_6S_8}=5.06 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$). The fraction of these two materials is 32.5% and 67.5%.

a. The theoretical capacity and energy density of the S₈-Mo₆S₈ AEA electrode:

$$C_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = 0.325TC_{S_8} + 0.675TC_{Mo_6S_8} = 630 \text{ mAh/g}$$

$$EG_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = C \cdot 2V = 1260 \text{ Wh/kg} \quad (\text{by weight})$$

$$\rho_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = \frac{1}{\frac{0.325}{\rho_{S_8}} + \frac{0.675}{\rho_{Mo_6S_8}}} = 3.34 \text{ g/cm}^3$$

$$EG_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = \rho_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} \cdot C \cdot 2V \cdot (1 - \text{porosity}) = 3865 \text{ Wh/L} \quad (\text{by volume})$$

b. The theoretical capacity and energy density of the Li₂S-Li₄Mo₆S₈ AEA electrode:

When converted to Li₂S and Li₄Mo₆S₈, $\rho_{Li_2S}=1.66 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{Li_4Mo_6S_8}=4.78 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$.

$$m_{S_8}:m_{Mo_6S_8} = 0.325:0.675$$

$$m_{Li_2S}:m_{Li_4Mo_6S_8} = 0.325 \cdot \frac{8M_{Li_2S}}{M_{S_8}} : 0.675 \cdot \frac{M_{Li_4Mo_6S_8}}{M_{Mo_6S_8}} = 0.40:0.60,$$

$$8M_{Li_2S} = 368, M_{S_8} = 256, M_{Li_4Mo_6S_8} = 860, M_{Mo_6S_8} = 832$$

$$C_{Li_2S-Li_4Mo_6S_8} = C_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} \frac{1}{0.325 \frac{8M_{Li_2S}M_{S_8}}{M_{S_8}} + 0.675 \frac{M_{Li_4Mo_6S_8}}{M_{Mo_6S_8}}}$$

$$= 541 \text{ mAh/g}$$

$$EG_{S-LMS} = C \cdot 2V = 1082 \text{ Wh/kg} \quad (\text{by weight})$$

$$\rho_{Li_2S-Li_4Mo_6S_8} = \frac{1}{\frac{0.40}{\rho_{Li_2S}} + \frac{0.60}{\rho_{Li_4Mo_6S_8}}} = 2.7257 \text{ g/cm}^3$$

$$EG_{Li_2S-Li_4Mo_6S_8} = \rho_{Li_2S-Li_4Mo_6S_8} \cdot C \cdot 2V \cdot (1 - \text{porosity})$$

$$= 2708 \text{ Wh/L} \quad (\text{by volume})$$

c. The practical ESC and energy density of the S₈-Mo₆S₈ AEA electrode:

The fraction of active material in our AEA electrode is 100 wt%, so the weight energy density of the material is equal to the electrode. The porosity of the cathode electrode is 8.15%, the practical discharge capacity of the half-cell is 0.6289 mA h (0.8 mA h cm⁻²), and the hole electrode weight is 1.3 mg.

$$ESC_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = C_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = \frac{0.6289 \text{ mAh}}{1.3 \text{ mg}} = 483.8 \text{ mAh/g}$$

$$EG_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = \int_{2.8}^1 ESC(V) dV = 905.5 \text{ Wh/kg} \quad (\text{by weight})$$

$$EG_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} = \rho_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} \cdot (1 - \text{porosity}) \cdot ESC \cdot V_{\text{average}}$$

$$= 2778 \text{ Wh/L} \quad (\text{by volume})$$

d. The practical ESC and energy density of the Li₂S-Li₄Mo₆S₈ AEA electrode:

When converted to Li₂S and Li₄Mo₆S₈, $\rho_{Li_2S}=1.66 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ and $\rho_{Li_4Mo_6S_8}=4.78 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$.

$$EG_{Li_2S-Li_4Mo_6S_8} = EG_{S_8-Mo_6S_8} \frac{1}{0.325 \frac{8M_{Li_2S}M_{S_8}}{M_{S_8}} + 0.675 \frac{M_{Li_4Mo_6S_8}}{M_{Mo_6S_8}}}$$

$$= 905.5/1.1649 = 777 \text{ Wh/kg} \quad (\text{by weight})$$

$$EG_{Li_2S-Li_4Mo_6S_8} = \rho_{Li_2S-Li_4Mo_6S_8} \cdot (1 - \text{porosity}) \cdot ESC \cdot V_{\text{average}}$$

$$= 1945 \text{ Wh/L} \quad (\text{by volume})$$

1. Supplementary calculation results:

Table. S1. The percentage of every part in real battery cathode by weight.

| | Liquid LIBs | ASSLBs | AEA -ASSLBs |
|-----------------|--------------|--------|-------------|
| Active material | 50-83.60% | 80% | 100% |
| Electrolyte | 10.10-32.22% | 15% | 0 |
| Carbon/binder | 5.62-16.38% | 5% | 0 |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------|-----|
| carbon density [g cm ⁻³] | 2.26 | | |
| binder density [g cm ⁻³] | 1.8 | | |
| 1M electrolyte [g cm ⁻³] | 1.2 | | |
| solid-state electrolyte density [g cm ⁻³] | 1.92 | | |
| | Liquid LIBs cathode | ASSLBs | AEA |

Table. S2. The percentage of every part in real battery cathode by volume.

| | | | | | | cathode | cathode |
|--|--------------------|--------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|--|
| AM | LiFeO ₄ | NMC | Li ₂ MnO ₄ | LiCoO ₂ | Li ₂ S | (average) | Li ₄ Mo ₆ S ₈ |
| AM density [g cm ⁻³] | 3.4 | 3.7 | 4.05 | 5.05 | 1.66 | 4 | 4.78 |
| Carbon/solid electrode by weight | | 4% | | | 24% | 5% | 0 |
| Binder/solid electrode by weight | | 3% | | | 8% | 0 | 0 |
| AM/solid electrode by weight | | 93% | | | 68% | 80% | 100% |
| composite solid density [g cm ⁻³] | 3.25 | 3.50 | 3.79 | 4.58 | 2.19 | 3.33 | 4.78 |
| porosity | 40% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 35.15% | 11% | 11% |
| total electrode density [g cm ⁻³] | 2.43 | 2.81 | 3.01 | 3.56 | 1.84 | 2.96 | 4.25 |
| AM density in total electrode [g cm ⁻³] | 1.81 | 2.28 | 2.47 | 2.98 | 0.97 | 2.37 | 4.25 |
| carbon and binder density in total electrode [g cm ⁻³] | 0.14 | 0.17 | 0.19 | 0.22 | 0.45 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| electrolyte density in total electrode [g cm ⁻³] | 0.48 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.00 |
| AM/total electrode by weight | 74.62% | 81.09% | 81.88% | 83.60% | 50% | 80% | 100.00% |
| Electrolyte/total electrode by weight | 19.76% | 12.81% | 11.95% | 10.10% | 32.22% | 15% | 0.00% |
| carbon and binder/total electrode by weight | 5.62% | 6.10% | 6.16% | 6.29% | 17.7% | 5% | 0.00% |
| AM/total electrode by volumn | 53.30% | 61.58% | 60.89% | 58.99% | 48.37% | 59.28% | 89.00% |
| Electrolyte/total electrode by volumn | 40.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 35.15% | 23.16% | 0.00% |
| carbon and binder/total electrode by volumn | 6.70% | 8.42% | 9.11% | 11.01% | 16.38% | 6.56% | 0.00% |

Table. S3. The calculation of *ESC* and *EG* about Liquid LIBs cathode, ASSLBs cathode, and AEA cathode.

| | Liquid LIBs | ASSLBs | AEA -ASSLBs |
|-----------------|--------------|--------|-------------|
| Active material | 48.37-61.58% | 59.28% | 89% |
| Electrolyte | 30-40% | 23.16% | 0 |

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------|-----|
| Carbon/binder | 6.70-16.38% | 6.56% | 0 |
| Porosity | (Full of electrolyte) | 11% | 11% |

Note: the calculation model is according to the reference, and some data also collected from it. Reference: E. J. Berg, C. Villeville, D. Streich, S. Trabesinger, P. Novák, Rechargeable Batteries: Grasping for the Limits of Chemistry. *Journal of The Electrochemical Society* **162**, A2468-A2475 (2015).

2. Supplementary Tables and Figures:**Table. S4.** The Electronic conductivity and the porosity of some energy storage materials.

| Porosity | MS | Porosity | TS | Porosity | SuperP | Porosity | NCM | Porosity | C-LFPO |
|----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| | [S cm ⁻¹] | | [S cm ⁻¹] | | [S cm ⁻¹] | | [S cm ⁻¹] | | [S cm ⁻¹] |
| 0.56482 | 10.8 | 0.33261 | 10.36 | 0.74279 | 10.15 | 0.13447 | 1.649×10 ⁵ | 0.405 | 0.00251 |
| 0.50494 | 22.96 | 0.27919 | 21.43 | 0.6919 | 15.48 | 0.115 | 2.741×10 ⁵ | 0.36971 | 0.00353 |
| 0.47826 | 34.03 | 0.24286 | 31.81 | 0.65204 | 20.52 | 0.09974 | 3.645×10 ⁵ | 0.34882 | 0.00417 |
| 0.46028 | 44.17 | 0.21646 | 41.31 | 0.63181 | 23.45 | 0.08658 | 4.516×10 ⁵ | 0.33676 | 0.00457 |
| 0.44605 | 54.15 | 0.19255 | 50.3 | 0.60912 | 26.79 | 0.07026 | 5.309×10 ⁵ | 0.32265 | 0.00502 |
| 0.43103 | 64.18 | 0.17329 | 58.97 | 0.5873 | 30.05 | 0.05632 | 6.052×10 ⁵ | 0.31 | 0.00541 |
| 0.42312 | 73.14 | 0.15559 | 67.03 | 0.56925 | 32.98 | 0.04184 | 6.771×10 ⁵ | 0.30029 | 0.00575 |
| 0.40968 | 83.08 | 0.13944 | 74.42 | 0.55177 | 35.83 | 0.02711 | 7.477×10 ⁵ | 0.28882 | 0.00608 |

Table. S5. The literature about the Li-ion diffusion coefficient.

| Cathode | Lower limit [$\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$] | Upper limit [$\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$] |
|------------------|---|---|
| LCO | 1.00×10^{-12} | 1.00×10^{-11} |
| LFPO | 6.77×10^{-16} | 1.80×10^{-14} |
| LMO | 4.67×10^{-13} | 7.00×10^{-11} |
| LNMO | 5.00×10^{-12} | 6.00×10^{-10} |
| NMC111 | 2.80×10^{-11} | 4.00×10^{-11} |
| NMC532 | 3.00×10^{-11} | 4.20×10^{-11} |
| NMC622 | 7.00×10^{-11} | 8.00×10^{-11} |
| TiS ₂ | 5.00×10^{-10} | 8.00×10^{-9} |
| MS | 1.00×10^{-8} | 2.00×10^{-8} |
| LGPS | 8.80×10^{-8} | 9.00×10^{-8} |
| LSPS | 7.00×10^{-8} | 7.20×10^{-8} |
| LALZO | 1.00×10^{-8} | 1.10×10^{-8} |

Table. S6. The measurement of porosity with pressure.

| Pressure [MPa] | Mould height [D_{im} , mm] | Mould and Sample [D_{im+S} , mm] | Sample height [$D_{im+S}-D_{im}$, mm] | Sample volume [cm ³] | Density [g cm ⁻³] | Porosity % |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| 36 | 46.96 | 47.94 | 0.98 | 0.7697 | 2.59845 | 48.647 |
| 72 | 46.97 | 47.87 | 0.9 | 0.7069 | 2.82942 | 44.083 |
| 108 | 46.98 | 47.79 | 0.81 | 0.6362 | 3.1438 | 37.87 |
| 144 | 46.95 | 47.69 | 0.74 | 0.5812 | 3.44119 | 31.992 |
| 180 | 46.94 | 47.66 | 0.72 | 0.5655 | 3.53678 | 30.103 |
| 216 | 46.94 | 47.63 | 0.69 | 0.5419 | 3.69055 | 27.064 |
| 252 | 46.95 | 47.61 | 0.66 | 0.5184 | 3.8583 | 23.749 |
| 288 | 46.94 | 47.57 | 0.63 | 0.4948 | 4.04203 | 20.118 |
| 324 | 46.96 | 47.55 | 0.59 | 0.4634 | 4.31607 | 14.702 |
| 360 | 46.96 | 47.53 | 0.57 | 0.4477 | 4.46751 | 11.709 |

Table. S7. The measurement of porosity after releasing pressure.

| Pressure [Mpa] | Mould height [D_{em} , mm] | Mould and sample [D_{em+S} , mm] | Sample height [$D_{em+S}-D_{em}$, mm] | Sample volume [cm ³] | Density [g cm ⁻³] | Porosity % |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| 36 | 71.14 | 72.16 | 1.02 | 0.8011 | 2.49655 | 50.661 |
| 72 | 71.14 | 72.12 | 0.98 | 0.7697 | 2.59845 | 48.647 |
| 108 | 71.14 | 72.04 | 0.9 | 0.7069 | 2.82942 | 44.083 |
| 144 | 71.14 | 72.02 | 0.88 | 0.6912 | 2.89373 | 42.812 |
| 180 | 71.14 | 71.96 | 0.82 | 0.644 | 3.10546 | 38.627 |
| 216 | 71.14 | 71.94 | 0.8 | 0.6283 | 3.1831 | 37.093 |
| 252 | 71.14 | 71.88 | 0.74 | 0.5812 | 3.44119 | 31.992 |
| 288 | 71.14 | 71.84 | 0.7 | 0.5498 | 3.63783 | 28.106 |
| 324 | 71.14 | 71.8 | 0.66 | 0.5184 | 3.8583 | 23.749 |
| 360 | 71.14 | 71.8 | 0.66 | 0.5184 | 3.8583 | 23.749 |

Porosity was calculated by $1 - \frac{\text{compact density}}{\text{real density}}$

Density under different pressure conditions is reduced by measuring its volume. The sample is 200mg Mo_6S_8 (real density: 5.06 g cm^{-3}). The sectional area of the mould is 0.785cm^2 .

Note:

Lee, S. G. Jeon, D. H., Effect of electrode compression on the wettability of lithium-ion batteries. *Journal of Power Sources* **265**, 363-369 (2014).

Table S8. The porosity and theoretical volume energy density of S-LMS and typical solid-state cathode.

| Pressure [MPa] | S-LMS Porosity [%] | S-LMS energy density [W h L ⁻¹] | S-C/LGPS Porosity [%] | S-C/LGPS energy density [W h L ⁻¹] |
|----------------|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| 36 | 48.5 | 1999.5 | 47.2 | 1090.4 |
| 72 | 39.5 | 2348.6 | 44.7 | 1142.1 |
| 108 | 36.5 | 2466.0 | 38.0 | 1280.0 |
| 144 | 33.7 | 2573.2 | 36.8 | 1305.3 |
| 180 | 31.9 | 2642.2 | 33.5 | 1372.9 |
| 216 | 28.8 | 2765.6 | 32.1 | 1401.9 |
| 25 | 27.4 | 2818.3 | 31.4 | 1416.9 |
| 288 | 25.3 | 2901.2 | 31.4 | 1419.9 |
| 324 | 20.6 | 3082.5 | 24.1 | 1567.8 |
| 360 | 8.2 | 3565.3 | 16.7 | 1720.6 |

The porosity is measured by volume-pressure conversion and all of the porosities were measured under pressure. The cathode volume is based on S₈ and Mo₆S₈, whose reversible specific capacity is 1600 mA h g⁻¹ and 90 mA h g⁻¹, respectively. The average voltage of active material is calculated in terms of 2 V.

Table. S9. The estimated energy density based on the electrode level.

| AM | LiFeO ₄ | NMC | LiMnO ₄ | LiCoO ₂ | Li ₂ S | Mo ₆ S ₈ | TiS ₂ | Li ₂ S-LMS |
|--|--------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| AM density [g cm ⁻³] | 3.4 | 3.7 | 4.05 | 5.05 | 1.66 | 4.78 | 3.09 | 2.73 |
| total electrode density [g cm ⁻³] | 2.43 | 2.81 | 3.01 | 3.56 | 1.58 | 4.26 | 2.75 | 2.5 |
| Porosity | 40% | 30% | 30% | 0.30 | 11% | 11.00% | 11% | 8.15% |
| AM density in electrode [g cm ⁻³] | 1.81 | 2.28 | 2.47 | 2.98 | 0.95 | 4.26 | 2.75 | 2.5 |
| specific capacity [SC, mAh g ⁻¹] | 160 | 170 | 130 | 150.00 | 912 | 91.20 | 198 | 415 |
| AM/total electrode by weight | 74.62% | 81.09% | 81.88% | 83.60% | 60% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| electrode specific capacity [ESC, mAh g ⁻¹] | 119.39 | 137.85 | 106.45 | 125.41 | 547.2 | 91.20 | 198 | 415 |
| average voltage [V] | 3.3(C) | 3.6(C) | 4(C) | 3.80 (Li) | 1.8 (Li) | 2.05(Li) | 2.07 (Li) | 1.96(Li) |
| electrode energy density [EG, Wh kg ⁻¹] | 393.99 | 496.24 | 425.79 | 476.54 | 985 | 185.70 | 410 | 777 |
| electrode energy density [EG, Wh L ⁻¹] | 956.90 | 1394.43 | 1282.30 | 1698.07 | 1560 | 794.7 | 1128 | 1945 |

Note:

Some parameter of the calculation is according to the reference 1, and the value of 1.92 is an average of Sulphur solid-state electrolyte (1.87~1.97) according to reference 2.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| SSE density [g cm ⁻³] | 1.92 |
| carbon density [g cm ⁻³] | 2.26 |
| cathode density [g cm ⁻³] | LiCoO ₂ (5.05) LNMO (4.4) S (1.96) |
| porosity | 11% |




Figure. S1. li-ion diffusion coefficient of $\text{Li}_1\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8$ (2.1V, $1.8 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$), $\text{Li}_3\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8$ (1.9V, $9.8 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$) and $\text{Li}_4\text{Mo}_6\text{S}_8$ (1.8V, $8.8 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$).




Figure. S2. The battery based on pure LiFePO_4 (loading: 4.8 mg cm^{-2} , $12.7 \mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$) and pure LTO (loading: 5.5 mg cm^{-2} , $30 \mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$) are all tested under 70°C .




Figure. S3. C-rate of Mo_6S_8 all solid-state battery. The loading of AEA is 1 mg cm^{-2} .




Figure. S4. High loading LMS-AEA cathode (13.91 mg cm^{-2}) at 70°C .




Figure. S5. The charge/discharge and cycle performance of LMS-AEA cathode at room temperature.




Figure. S6. The high-resolution TEM (a, b) and electron diffraction (c, d) of AEA S-LMS cathode.




Figure. S7. The XRD patterns of the AEA S-LMS cathode. The crystalline phase of Mo₆S₈ is remained after ball-milling.




Figure. S8. Low-magnification SEM image of AEA materials. (a) Mo₆S₈ (b) S₈ (c) 40% Li₄Ti₅O₁₂-60% Mo₆S₈ (d) 32.5% S₈-67.5% Mo₆S₈.




Figure. S9. Low-magnification SEM cross-section image of all solid-state battery before charge and after. (a) Mo_6S_8 battery uncharged. (b) 32.5% S_8 -67.5% Mo_6S_8 battery uncharged. (c) 32.5% S_8 -67.5% Mo_6S_8 battery after 30 cycles. (d) Solid-state electrolyte of LGPS in the all solid-state battery. (e) High-magnification SEM of 32.5% S -67.5% Mo_6S_8 cathode in the battery. (f) The interface of AEA and LGPS in the battery.




Figure. S10. EDS spectra of 32.5% S -67.5% Mo_6S_8 AEA battery. (a) The spectra of AEA. (b) The spectra of LGPS. In the EDS.




Figure. S11. Electronic conductivities of 32.5% S₈-67.5% Mo₆S₈ cathode under different pressures.




Figure. S12. The photography and chematic plot AEA all-solid-state battery.