

Nanomaterials Design for Lithium-Sulfur Batteries

A thesis presented for the award of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

From

University of Technology Sydney

By

Yi Chen, B.Eng., M.Eng.

June, 2020

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Yi Chen declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Faculty of Science at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:

Signature: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 25/02/2020

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family. Appreciate their love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to offer my heartfelt appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Guoxiu Wang, for his invaluable instruction and guidance. Professor Wang has full passion for scientific research, which largely affects and inspires me during my PhD period.

I would also like to thank my co-supervisor, Dr. Dawei Su, for his selfless help, patient guidance and constant support during my PhD period.

Special thanks are expressed to my colleagues in the Centre for Clean Energy Technology at UTS, for their kind help and cooperation during the past years. I would like to specially thank the lab manger, Dr. Jane Yao, for her professional management on the lab, which can make us fully devote our time into research.

In addition, I would like to thank the administrative and technical support from I received from Ronald Shimmon, Katie McBean, Herbert Yuan, Mark Lockrey, Alexander Angeloski, Linda Xiao, Mark Berkahn. I also take this chance to thank the financial support from Australian Renewable Energy Agency and Australian Research Council.

Last but not least, I would like to express my deeply grateful to my parents for their selfless love and fully support over the past years. Thank you, Dad and Mom!

PUBLICATIONS

- (1) **Y. Chen**, D. Su, Q. Zhang, G. Wang, 60 Years of Lithium-Sulfur Batteries: From Academic Research to Commercial Viability, *Adv. Mater.*, Submitted.
- (2) **Y. Chen**, S. Choi, D. Su, X. Gao, G. Wang, Self-standing sulfur cathodes enabled by 3D hierarchically porous titanium monoxide-graphene composite film for high-performance lithium-sulfur batteries, *Nano Energy*, 2018, 47, 331-339. (IF=15.548)
- (3) **Y. Chen**, W. Zhang, D. Zhou, H. Tian, D. Su, C. Wang, D. Stockdale, F. Kang, B. Li, G. Wang, Co-Fe Mixed Metal Phosphide Nanocubes with Highly Interconnected-Pore Architecture as an Efficient Polysulfide Mediator for Lithium-Sulfur Batteries, *ACS Nano*, 2019, 13, 4731-4741. (IF=13.903)
- (4) D. Zhou, **Y. Chen**, B. Li, H. Fan, F. Cheng, D. Shanmukaraj, T. Rojo, M. Armand, G. Wang, A Stable Quasi-Solid-State Sodium-Sulfur Battery, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2018, 57, 10168-10172. (IF=12.102)
- (5) H. Tian, X. Yu, H. Shao, L. Dong, **Y. Chen**, X. Fang, C. Wang, W. Han, G. Wang, Unlocking Few-Layered Ternary Chalcogenides for High-Performance Potassium-Ion Storage, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2019, 9, 1901560. (IF=24.884)
- (6) H. Tian, H. Shao, **Y. Chen**, X. Fang, P. Xiong, B. Sun, P. H. Notten, G. Wang, Ultra-stable sodium metal-iodine batteries enabled by an in-situ solid electrolyte interphase, *Nano Energy*, 2019, 57, 692-702. (IF=15.548)
- (7) X. Gao, D. Zhou, **Y. Chen**, W. Wu, D. Su, B. Li, G. Wang, Strong charge polarization effect enabled by surface oxidized titanium nitride for lithium-sulfur batteries, *Commun. Chem.*, 2019, 2, 1-10.
- (8) J. Song, X. Guo, J. Zhang, **Y. Chen**, C. Zhang, L. Luo, F. Wang, G. Wang, Rational design of free-standing 3D porous MXene/rGO hybrid aerogels as polysulfide reservoirs for high-energy lithium-sulfur batteries, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, 7, 6507-6513. (IF=10.733)
- (9) J. Xu, W. Zhang, **Y. Chen**, H. Fan, D. Su, G. Wang, MOF-derived porous N-Co₃O₄@N-C nanododecahedra wrapped with reduced graphene oxide as a high capacity cathode for lithium-sulfur batteries, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2018, 6, 2797-2807. (IF=10.733)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP	I
DEDICATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
PUBLICATIONS	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
LIST OF TABLES	VIII
LIST OF FIGURES	IX
ABSTRACT	XX
INTRODUCTION	XXII
Chapter 1 Literature Review	1
1.1 Principles and challenges of Li-S batteries	1
1.2 Sulfur cathode host design	4
1.2.1 Carbon materials as host	5
1.2.2 Organic materials as host	16
1.2.3 Metal oxides as host	25
1.2.4 Metal organic frameworks as host	37
1.2.5 Metal hydroxides as host	42
1.2.6 Metal sulfides as host	45
1.2.7 Metal nitrides as host	56
1.2.8 Metal carbides as host	62
1.2.9 Metal phosphides as host	70
1.2.10 Metal borides as host	74
1.2.11 Other emerging metal compounds as host	77
1.2.12 Using metal to mediate polysulfide redox	80
1.3 Separator modification and interlayer engineering	84
1.4 Binder improvement	98
1.4.1. Mechanical strength	99
1.4.2. Polysulfide regulation	101
1.4.3 Conductivity	104
1.5 Electrolyte optimization	105
1.5.1 Liquid electrolytes	105
1.5.2 Solid-state electrolytes	112
1.5.3 Gel polymer electrolytes	115
1.6 Lithium metal anode protection in Li-S batteries	117
1.6.1 Lithium metal interface design	118
1.6.2 Lithium metal host design	124
Chapter 2 General Experimental Methods and Characterizations	133
2.1 Overview	133

2.2 Materials preparation	135
2.2.1 Solution reaction	135
2.2.2 Solid state reaction	135
2.3 Materials characterizations	136
2.3.1 X-ray Diffraction.....	136
2.3.2 Thermogravimetric analysis.....	136
2.3.3 Scanning electron microscopy	136
2.3.4 Transmission electron microscopy.....	137
2.3.5 X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy	137
2.3.6 Raman spectroscopy	138
2.3.7 N ₂ adsorption/desorption	138
2.3.8 Ultraviolet-visible spectroscopy	138
2.4 Electrochemical measurements.....	139
2.4.1 Cell assemble	139
2.4.2 Galanostatic charge and discharge.....	139
2.4.3 Cyclic voltammetry.....	140
2.4.4 Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy.....	140
Chapter 3 Self-standing Sulfur Cathodes Enabled by 3D Hierarchically Porous Titanium Monoxide-Graphene Composite Film for High-Performance Lithium-Sulfur Batteries.....	142
3.1 Introduction.....	142
3.2 Experimental section.....	146
3.2.1 Synthesis of polystyrene (PS) sphere templates.....	146
3.2.2 Preparation of TiO ₂ nanotubes	146
3.2.3 Preparation of 3D porous TiO-G film and other control host materials.....	147
3.2.4 Preparation of porous TiO-G/S electrode and other control electrodes	147
3.2.5 Preparation of Li ₂ S ₆ solution.....	148
3.2.6 Structure characterization	148
3.2.7 Electrochemical measurements.....	149
3.3 Results and discussion	150
3.3.1 Materials synthesis and characterization.....	150
3.3.2 Electrochemical performances	161
3.4 Conclusions.....	171
Chapter 4 Co-Fe Mixed Metal Phosphide Nanocubes with Highly Interconnected-Pore Architecture as an Efficient Polysulfide Mediator for Lithium-Sulfur Batteries.....	172
4.1 Introduction.....	172
4.2 Experimental section.....	175
4.2.1 Preparation of Fe _{0.667} Co(CN) ₄ (H ₂ O) ₄ nanocubes.....	175
4.2.2 Preparation of Co-Fe-P nanocubes and Co-Fe particles	175
4.2.3 Preparation of S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe.....	176
4.2.4 Preparation of Li ₂ S ₆ solution and adsorption test.....	176
4.2.5 Symmetric cell assembly and measurements.....	176
4.2.6 Materials characterization	177
4.2.7 Electrochemical measurements.....	178
4.2.8 Computational methods	179

4.3 Results and discussion	180
4.4 Conclusions.....	215
Chapter 5 Summary and Future Perspective.....	216
5.1 Summary.....	216
5.2 Future perspective.....	217
5.2.1 Sulfur content in the cathode	218
5.2.2 Areal sulfur loading.....	218
5.2.3 Lean electrolyte condition.....	219
5.2.4 All solid-state Li-S batteries.....	219
5.2.5 Prototype Li-S pouch cells.....	219
5.2.6 Safety	220
5.2.7 Cost.....	220
APPENDIX: NOMENCLATURE.....	221
REFERENCES	223

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Chemicals/materials used in the thesis	134
Table 3.1 The weight percentage of different components of a typical cathode for different types of Li-S batteries.....	144
Table 4.1 Parameters identified by modeling the impedance spectra in Figure 4.18	197
Table 4.2 Comparison of the cycling performance of this work with other previously reported metal compounds as sulfur host materials for Li-S batteries.	200
Table 4.3 Parameters identified by modeling the impedance spectra of Li_2S_6 symmetric cells in Figure 4.34	213

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1** (a) Schematic of the electrochemistry for Li-S batteries. Reproduced from reference¹⁷. Copyright 2016 Royal Society of Chemistry. (b) A typical charge-discharge voltage profile of Li-S batteries in ether-based electrolyte. Reproduced from reference⁵⁴. Copyright 2017, Wiley-VCH.2
- Figure 1.2** (a) Schematic illustration of sulfur confined in CMK-3. (b) TEM image of sulfur-loaded CMK-3. The inset indicates the pristine CMK-3 with same magnification. (c) Cycling performances of CMK-3/S (red) and CMK-3/S-PEG (black) at current density of 168 mA g⁻¹. (a-c) Reproduced from reference³¹. Copyright 2009, Nature Publishing Group. (d) TEM image of porous hollow carbon@sulfur spheres. (e) Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiency of porous hollow carbon@sulfur composite at 0.5C. Reproduced from reference³⁷. Copyright 2011, Wiley-VCH. SEM images of graphene-wrapped sulfur particles at (f) low and (g) high magnifications. Reproduced from reference³⁶. Copyright 2011, American Chemical Society. (h) Schematic, (i) SEM and (j) TEM images of hollow carbon nanofiber-encapsulated sulfur. The green line in Figure j represents counts of sulfur signal along the dashed orange line. Reproduced from reference⁷⁰. Copyright 2011, American Chemical Society.7
- Figure 1.3** (a,b) TEM images of microporous carbon spheres at different magnifications. (c) Voltage profiles of sulfur-microporous carbon sphere composite with 42% sulfur content at current density of 400 mA g⁻¹ in carbonate-based electrolyte. (d) Cycling performances of sulfur-carbon sphere composites at current density of 40 mA g⁻¹ with 42 wt% and 51 wt% sulfur contents, respectively. (a-d) Reproduced from reference⁷⁸. Copyright 2010, Royal Society of Chemistry. (e) TEM image of a CNT@microporous carbon nanocable. (f) HR-TEM image shows the carbon channels in the coating layer. (g) Charge-discharge voltage curves of S/CNT@microporous carbon at 0.1C in carbonate-based electrolyte. (h) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of S/CNT@microporous carbon and S/CB at 0.1C. (e-h) Reproduced from reference⁷⁹. Copyright 2012, American Chemical Society. 11
- Figure 1.4** (a) Schematic of the synthetic process for nitrogen-doped aligned CNT/graphene (N-ACNT/G) hybrid. (b) SEM and (c) TEM images of N-ACNT/G hybrids. (a-c) Reproduced from reference⁸². Copyright 2014, Wiley-VCH. (d) SEM image of N-doped hollow porous carbon bowls (N-HPCB). (e) Cycling performances of S/N-HPCB, S/N-HPCS, S/N-HCS and S/HCS at 0.2C. (f) Schematic of the confinement effect of polysulfides by HCS and N-HPCB. (d-f) Reproduced from reference⁸³. Copyright 2016, Wiley-VCH. (g) Photograph of a dandelion supported N,S-codoped graphene sponge. (h) Schematic of the fabrication process for N,S-codoped graphene electrodes and Li-polysulfide batteries. (i) SEM image of the N,S-co-doped graphene sponge. (j) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of N,S-codoped graphene, N-doped graphene, S-doped graphene and rGO. (g-j) Reproduced from reference⁸⁴. Copyright 2015, Nature Publishing Group. 14
- Figure 1.5** (a) SEM and (b) TEM images of PANI nanotubes. (c) SEM and (d) TEM images of SPANI composite. (a-d) Reproduced from reference⁹⁶. Copyright 2012, Wiley-VCH. (e) Schematic illustration of the synthesis process of sulfur-PANI yolk-shell nanostructure. (f) TEM image of sulfur-PANI core-shell spheres. (g) TEM image of yolk-shell structured sulfur-PANI spheres. (e-g) Reproduced from reference⁹⁷. Copyright 2013, American Chemical Society. 17
- Figure 1.6** Schematic of the synthetic process of conductive polymer-coated hollow sulfur nanospheres. (b) SEM and (c) TEM images of hollow sulfur nanospheres without polymer coating. (d) SEM and (e) TEM images of PPY-coated hollow sulfur nanospheres. (f) PEDOT-coated and (g) PANI-coated hollow sulfur nanospheres. (a-g) Reproduced from reference⁹⁹. Copyright 2013, American Chemical Society. (h)

Schematic illustration of the synthetic process for poly(S-r-DIB) copolymer. (i) Photograph of molten sulfur at 185 °C. (j) Photograph of poly(S-r-DIB) solid with 30 wt% DIB. (h-j) Reproduced from reference¹⁰¹. Copyright 2013, Nature Publishing Group. k) Schematic of the synthesis process of porphyrin organic framework hollow spheres. (l) TEM image of porphyrin organic framework hollow spheres. (k-l) Reproduced from reference¹⁰². Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH.20

Figure 1.7 (a) Schematic of the synthetic process for SPAN/CNT electrodes. SEM images of b) PAN/CNT film and (c) SPAN/CNT film. The insets show the corresponding enlarged images. (d) Cross-sectional SEM image of SPAN/CNT electrode. (e) The proposed electrochemical conversion mechanism of SPAN cathode during discharge-charge process. Reproduced from reference¹¹³. Copyright 2019, Wiley-VCH....24

Figure 1.8 (a) Schematic of the synthesis process for sulfur-TiO₂ yolk-shell nanostructure. (b) SEM and (c) TEM images of yolk-shell structured sulfur-TiO₂ spheres. (d) Cycling performance of sulfur-TiO₂ yolk-shell sphere cathode at 0.5C for 1000 cycles. (a-d) Reproduced from reference¹¹⁵. Copyright 2013, Nature Publishing Group. (e) XPS of S/MnO₂ nanosheets electrodes after discharge to certain states: from top to bottom: discharged to 2.15 V, discharged to 2.15 V and then aged in the cell for 20h, discharged to 800 mA h g⁻¹, and discharged to 1.8 V. Reproduced from reference¹²¹. Copyright 2015, Nature Publishing Group. (f) Schematic of synthesis process of MnO₂@HCF/S. TEM images of g) MnO₂@SiO₂@C, (h) MnO₂@HCF and i) MnO₂@HCF/S. (j) Illustration of polysulfide trapping by MnO₂@HCF. (k) Cycling performances of MnO₂@HCF/S and HCF/S at 0.2C. f-k) Reproduced from reference¹²². Copyright 2015, Wiley-VCH.27

Figure 1.9 (a) Schematic of the interaction between Li₂S₄ and Ti₄O₇. (b) Photographs of Li₂S₄/THF solution before (top) and after (bottom) contact with nothing (1), graphite (2), VC carbon (3) and Ti₄O₇ (4). (c) High-resolution XPS S 2p spectra of Li₂S₄, Li₂S₄/Ti₄O₇ and Li₂S₄/VC, respectively. (d) Distribution of sulfur species upon discharge determined by operando XANES. The solid and dashed lines represent Ti₄O₇/S-6 and VC/S-6, respectively. (e) Illustration of surface-mediated reduction of S₈ on Ti₄O₇. (a-e) Reproduced from reference¹²⁸. Copyright 2014, Nature Publishing Group. XRD patterns of (f) rutile TiO₂, (i) Magnéli phase Ti₆O₁₁ and (l) Ti₄O₇, respectively. The insets are the corresponding stackings of the oxygen octahedral. TEM images of g) TiO₂, (j) Ti₆O₁₁ and (m) Ti₄O₇, respectively. The insets are the corresponding digital photos. HR-TEM images of (h) TiO₂, (k) Ti₆O₁₁ and (n) Ti₄O₇, respectively. The insets show the corresponding fast Fourier transform (FFT) diffraction patterns. (f-n) Reproduced from reference¹²⁹. Copyright 2014, American Chemical Society.31

Figure 1.10 (a) Schematic of the synthetic process for mesoporous Ti₄O₇ microspheres. SEM images of (b) mesoporous TiO₂ microspheres and (c) mesoporous Ti₄O₇ microspheres. a-c) Reproduced from reference¹³⁰. Copyright 2016, Wiley-VCH. (d) Schematic of the synthetic procedure for Ti₄O₇ nanoparticles with interconnected-pore architecture. TEM images of (e) porous PS-P2VP particles, (f) TiO₂@PS-P2VP particles and (g) porous Ti₄O₇ particles. (d-g) Reproduced from reference¹³¹. Copyright 2017, Wiley-VCH.33

Figure 1.11 (a) Schematic of synthetic process for TiO@C-HS/S spheres. TEM images of (b) PS, (c) PS@TiO₂@PDA, (d) TiO@C-HC and (e) TiO@C-HS/S spheres, respectively. (f) Cycling performances of TiO@C-HS/S cathodes at 0.2 and 0.5C. (a-f) Reproduced from reference¹³⁴. Copyright 2016, Nature Publishing Group. (g) Schematic of synthesis procedure of 3D hierarchically porous TiO-G/S film. Digital photos of (b) PS-TiO₂-GO sponge and (i) TiO-G film electrodes. (j) Cross-sectional backscattered electron image of sulfur-loaded TiO-graphene film. k) Illustration of the interactions between TiO and sulfur species. (g-k) Reproduced from reference¹³⁵. Copyright 2018, Elsevier.35

Figure 1.12 (a) Cycling performances of S@MIL-100(Cr), S@SBA-15 and S@mesoporous carbon. The

insets illustrate the corresponding microstructures. Reproduced from reference¹⁷⁸. Copyright 2011, American Chemical Society. (b) Crystal structure of Ni-MOF containing two different types of pores. (c) Cycling performances of Ni-MOF/S at 0.1, 0.2 and 0.5C. The inset illustrates the interactions between polysulfides and paddle-wheel unit in Ni-MOF. (b,c) Reproduced from reference¹⁷⁹. Copyright 2014, American Chemical Society. (d) Comparison of cycling performances of S/MIL-53, S/NH₂-MIL-53, S/HKUST-1 and S/ZIF-8 at 0.5C. (e) Schematic of the largest apertures of the four different MOFs. (f) Cycling performances of S/ZIF-8 with different particle sizes. The inset shows the SEM images of ZIF-8 with particle sizes of 150 nm, 1 μm and 3 μm (from left to right), respectively. (d-f) Reproduced from reference¹⁸⁰. Copyright 2014, Royal Society of Chemistry. Crystal structures of (g) PCN-224, (h) MIL-53, (i) MIL-101, respectively, and illustrations of corresponding ion diffusion pathways in their pores. (g-i) Reproduced from reference¹⁸¹. Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH.38

Figure 1.13 SEM images of (a) MHNs/CNT and (b) MOFs/CNT. The inset in b shows the photograph of the self-standing MOFs/CNT thin film. (c) Crystal structures of three different kinds of MOFs. (d) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of S@HKUST-1/CNT, S@MOF-5/CNT and S@ZIF-8/CNT. (e) Cycling performances of soft-package Li-S cells using S@HKUST-1/CNT cathodes at different sulfur loadings. Reproduced from reference¹⁸². Copyright 2017, Nature Publishing Group.41

Figure 1.14 (a) Cycling performance of S@Na₂Fe[Fe(CN)₆]@PEDOT at 5C. (b) The atomic model configurations of Li₂S_x (x=8, 6, 4 and 2) in Na₂Fe[Fe(CN)₆]. (c) The optimized interaction of PEDOT with sulfur species. (d) Illustration of the S@Na₂Fe[Fe(CN)₆]@PEDOT system in the early stage of the discharge process. Reproduced from reference¹⁸³. Copyright 2017, Wiley-VCH.42

Figure 1.15 (a) Schematic of the synthesis process for S@CB hybrids@thin Ni(OH)₂ layers. SEM images of (b) CB powder, (c) S₈@CB and (d) S₈@CB@Ni(OH)₂ hybrids. (e) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of S₈@CB and S₈@CB@Ni(OH)₂ at 0.2C for 500 cycles. The inset shows the sulfur utilization efficiency. (a-e) Reproduced from reference¹⁸⁵. Copyright 2015, Nature Publishing Group. (f) Schematic illustration of the synthesis process for Co(OH)₂@LDH/S. TEM images of (g) ZIF-67, (h) single-shelled ZIF-67@LDH, (i) doubled-shelled Co(OH)₂@LDH nanocages, and (j) Co(OH)₂@LDH/S. (k) Cycling performance of Co(OH)₂@LDH/S and C/S at 0.1C. (f-k) Reproduced from reference¹⁸⁸. Copyright 2016, Wiley-VCH.44

Figure 1.16 (a) Schematic of the synthetic process for Li₂S@TiS₂ core-shell nanostructures. (b) SEM image of Li₂S@TiS₂ core-shell nanostructures. (c) Cycling performances of Li₂S@TiS₂ and bare Li₂S cathodes at 0.2C (1C=1166 mA g⁻¹Li₂S). (a-c) Reproduced from reference¹⁹⁶. Copyright 2014, Nature Publishing Group. (d) Illustration of CoS₂ promoted polysulfide redox reaction. (e) CV curves of symmetrical Li₂S₆ cells with different electrodes. (f) Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiency of CoS₂ (15%) + G-based sulfur cathode at 2C for 2000 cycles, followed by 10 cycles at 0.2C. (d-f) Reproduced from reference¹⁹⁹. Copyright 2016, American Chemical Society. (g) Schematic of the synthetic process for S@CNTs/Co₃S₄ nanoboxes. (h) Schematic diagram of the three-dimensional interlaced carbon nanotubes threaded hollow Co₃S₄ nanoboxes. (i) TEM image of CNTs/Co₃S₄ nanoboxes. (j) TEM image of S@CNTs/Co₃S₄ nanoboxes. Cycling performances of different electrodes at 0.2C under (k) ambient conditions and (l) 50 °C. (g-l) Reproduced from reference²⁰⁰. Copyright 2017, American Chemical Society. (m) Schematic illustration of the fabrication process of honeycomb-like spherical S@Co₉S₈ nanostructures. (n,o) SEM images of honeycomb-like Co₉S₈ nanostructures. (p) TEM image of the Co₉S₈ nanostructures. (q) Cycling performance of S@Co₉S₈ cathode at 1C for 600 cycles. (m-q) Reproduced from reference²⁰¹. Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH.48

Figure 1.17 (a) Schematic illustration of i) the synthesis process of MoS₂-encapsulated hollow sulfur

sphere, and ii) effective lithium polysulfides entrapment and structural integrity of MoS₂-encapsulated hollow sulfur sphere upon lithiation/delithiation. (b-d) *In-situ* TEM images of MoS₂-encapsulated hollow sulfur spheres upon continuous lithiation and delithiation process. (a-d) Reproduced from reference²⁰⁹. Copyright 2017, American Chemical Society. (e) Schematic of the synthesis process of MoS_{2-x}/rGO composite and the conversion of sulfur species on its surface. (f) HR-TEM image of MoS_{2-x}/rGO composite. (g) Comparison of the cycling performances of rGO/S, MoS₂/rGO/S and MoS_{2-x}/rGO/S cathodes at 0.5C. (e-g) Reproduced from reference²¹⁰. Copyright 2017, Royal Society of Chemistry. (h) SEM and (i) TEM images of ZnS nanospheres. (j) CVs of Li₂S₆ and Li₂S₆-free symmetrical cells with ZnS-CB as working electrodes. (k) Illustration of the promoted redox reaction of polysulfide conversion by the catalyzing of ZnS nanospheres during discharge. (l) Comparison of the cycling performances of ZnS-CB/S and CB/S cathodes at 0.2C. (h-l) Reproduced from reference²¹¹. Copyright 2018, Elsevier. (m) Digital images of Li₂S₆ solution after interaction with carbon and different kinds of metal sulfides. Atomic geometries and binding energies of Li₂S₆ adsorption on (n) Ni₃S₂, (o) SnS₂, (p) FeS, (q) CoS₂, (r) VS₂ and (s) TiS₂, respectively. (m-s) Reproduced from reference²¹². Copyright 2017, National Academy of Sciences.

.....51

Figure 1.18 (a) In situ XRD measurements of a Li|Mo₆S₈/S₈ cell. (b) Illustration of the discharge process of intercalation-conversion hybrid cathodes of Mo₆S₈/S₈. (c) Cycling performance of the hybrid cathodes with 6.2 mg cm⁻² S₈ loading and 6.1 mg cm⁻² Mo₆S₈ loading. (d) The pouch-cell configuration constructed by the Mo₆S₈/S₈ cathode with an ultralow electrolyte/active material ratio of ~1.2 μL mg⁻¹ and ~2×Li excess (100 μm for one side). (a-d) Reproduced from reference²¹³. Copyright 2019, Nature Publishing Group. (e) XRD pattern of the MoS₃. The inset shows the schematic structure of the 1D chain-like MoS₃. (f) TEM image of MoS₃/CNT composite. (g) Charge-discharge curves of MoS₃ cathodes in carbonate based electrolyte. (h) Cycling performance of the MoS₃ cathode. (e-h) Reproduced from reference²¹⁴. Copyright 2017, National Academy of Sciences.55

Figure 1.19 (a) SEM image of mesoporous TiN. Reproduced from reference²⁴¹. Copyright 2016, Wiley-VCH. (b) Schematic of the mesoporous TiN-O-OMC. (c) TEM and (d) HR-TEM images of mesoporous TiN-O-OMC. (b-d) Reproduced from reference²⁴⁴. Copyright 2019, Nature Publishing Group. (e) SEM image of Co₄N nanosheets assembled mesoporous sphere. (f) Optical images of Li₂S₆ solutions after adding equal amounts of super P, Co₃O₄ and Co₄N, respectively. (g) Co 2p_{3/2} XPS spectra of CoN₄ phase and Co₄N/Li₂S₆, respectively. (h) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of Co₄N/S cathodes at 2C and 5C, respectively. (e-h) Reproduced from reference²⁴⁶. Copyright 2017, American Chemical Society. (i) Optical image of VN/G composite foams. (j) TEM image of VN/G composite. (i,j) Reproduced from reference²⁴⁷. Copyright 2017, Nature Publishing Group. (k) Schematic of sulfur loaded-VN nanobubble. (l) TEM image of a single VN nanobubble. (k,l) Reproduced from reference²⁴⁸. Copyright 2017, American Chemical Society.59

Figure 1.20 (a) EIS and (b) CV of Li₂S₆ symmetric cells with different working electrodes. (c) Potentiostatic discharge curves of a Li₂S₈/tetraglyme solution at 2.05 V on different substrates. The lighter and darker colors represent the precipitation of Li₂S and reduction of Li₂S₈/Li₂S₆, respectively. (d-f) SEM images of the precipitated Li₂S on different substrates as indicated in c. (g) Cycling performances of TiC@G/S and TiO₂@G/S electrodes at 0.2C. (a-g) Reproduced from reference²⁵⁰. Copyright 2016, Wiley-VCH. TEM images of (h) W₂C NPs-CNFs, (i) Mo₂C NPs-CNFs and (j) TiC NPs-CNFs, respectively (scale bars=200 nm). (k) Photographs of the Li₂S₆ adsorption by different powders in DOL/DME (1:1, v/v) solution. Optimized geometries of Li₂S₆ adsorbed on (001) planes of (l) W₂C, (m) Mo₂C and (n) TiC, respectively. (o) CV curves of Li₂S₆ symmetric cells using W₂C NPs-CNFs, Mo₂C

NPs-CNFs, TiC NPs-CNFs and CNFs as electrodes. (h-o) Reproduced from reference²⁵¹. Copyright 2018, American Chemical Society.....64

Figure 1.21 (a) Schematic structure of B₄C@CNF. (b,c) SEM images of B₄C@CNF. Electrochemical performances of coin-cells: (d) Cycling performances of B₄C@CNF/S and CNF/S cathodes at 1C over 500 cycles, (e) Cycling performances of B₄C@CNF/S cathodes at 0.2C with higher sulfur loadings. Electrochemical performances of pouch-cells: (f) EIS spectra of B₄C@CNF/S and CNF/S cathodes before and after cycling, (g) Cycling performances of B₄C@CNF/S and CNF/S electrodes with sulfur mass of 40 mg per cathode at 0.1C, (h) Discharge capacities of B₄C@CNF/S with sulfur mass of 200 mg per cathode. (a-h) Reproduced from reference²⁵⁶. Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH. (i) Schematic of the synthesis process for TSC/NbC composite. (j,k) SEM and (l) TEM images of TSC/NbC composite. The insets in l show the SAED pattern and enlarged TEM image. (m) Cycling performances of TSC/NbC-S and TSC-S at 0.1C for 500 cycles. The inset demonstrates the LEDs powered by the battery. (i-m) Reproduced from reference²⁵⁷. Copyright 2019, Wiley-VCH.....67

Figure 1.22 (a) SEM image of MXene phase Ti₂C. (b) Illustration of the interactions between MXene and sulfur species. (c) Ti 2p XPS spectra of i) Ti₂C and ii) S/Ti₂C, iii) Li₂S₄-Ti₂C and iv) S/Ti₂C electrode after discharged to 1.8 V at C/20, respectively. (d) S 2p XPS spectra of i) S, ii) S/Ti₂C, and iii) S/Ti₂C electrode after discharged to 1.8 V at C/20, respectively. (a-d) Reproduced from reference²⁶³. Copyright 2015, Wiley-VCH. (e) Schematic of the synthesis process for N-Ti₃C₂T_x/S composite. SEM images of crumpled porous N-Ti₃C₂T_x nanosheets (f,g) before and (h,i) after sulfur loading. (e-i) Reproduced from reference²⁶⁵. Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH.....69

Figure 1.23 (a,b) Co 2p_{3/2}, (c,d) P 2p, and (e) S 2p XPS spectra of (a,c) CoP and (b,d) CoP-R nanoparticles before and after interacting with Li₂S₆. (f) Proposed binding mechanism of lithium polysulfides on CoP and CoP-R surfaces. (a-f) Reproduced from reference²⁷². Copyright 2018, American Chemical Society. (g) Schematic illustration of the synthesis process for S@Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (h) TEM image of Fe_{0.667}Co(CN)₄(H₂O)₄ nanocubes. (i) SEM and (j) TEM image of porous Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (k) XRD pattern of Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (m) Cycling performances of S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe electrodes at 0.2C. (n) Cycling performances of S@Co-Fe-P cathodes at 0.2C with higher areal sulfur loadings. g-n) Reproduced from reference²⁷⁴. Copyright 2019, American Chemical Society.....73

Figure 1.24 (a) Schematic of TiB₂ (001) surface. (b) TEM and (c) HRTEM images of TiB₂ nanoparticles. (d) TEM image of TiB₂/S composite. (e) Scanning TEM image of a single TiB₂/S nanoparticle and corresponding EDX mapping. (f) Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiencies of TiB₂/S cathode at 0.2C for 150 cycles. (a-f) Reproduced from reference²⁷⁸. Copyright 2018, American Chemical Society. (g) Schematic of the synthesis strategy for MgB₂. (h) XRD pattern of MgB₂. The inset shows the SAED pattern. (i) SEM image of MgB₂ nanoparticles. (j) SEM image of MgB₂-graphene composite. (k) Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiencies of MgB₂-graphene/S cathode with a high sulfur loading of 9.3 mg cm⁻² at 0.2C. The first cycle was at 0.05C. (g-k) Reproduced from reference²⁸⁰. Copyright 2019, Cell Press.76

Figure 1.25 (a) SEM and (b) TEM images of CoOOH sheets. (c) TEM image and (d-f) corresponding EDX mappings of S@CoOOH sheets. (a-f) Reproduced from reference²⁸². Copyright 2019, Wiley-VCH. (g) Schematic illustration of the synthesis process of HNb₃O₈@S. (h) SEM and (i,j) TEM images of HNb₃O₈ nanobelts. (k) HRTEM image of HNb₃O₈ nanobelts. The inset shows the SAED pattern. (m) AFM image of HNb₃O₈ nanobelts. (n) Scanning TEM image of HNb₃O₈@S nanobelts and corresponding EDX mappings. (g-n) Reproduced from reference²⁸⁴. Copyright 2019, Wiley-VCH.....79

Figure 1.26 (a) TEM and (b) HAADF-STEM images of single Co atoms on nitrogen-doped graphene

(Co-N/G). (c) CVs of Li_2S_6 symmetric cells with different electrodes. (d) Discharge and (e) charge profiles of S@Co-N/G, S@N/G, S@Co/G, and S@rGO electrodes showing the overpotentials for conversion between soluble lithium polysulfides and insoluble $\text{Li}_2\text{S}_2/\text{Li}_2\text{S}$. (f) Atomic structures of N/G and Co-N/G used in the first-principle calculations. (g) Gibbs free energy profiles for the reduction of lithium polysulfides on N/G and Co-N/G substrates, respectively. The insets show the optimized adsorption geometries of intermediate sulfur species on N/G and Co-N/G substrates, respectively. Energy profiles of Li_2S decomposition on (h) N/G and (i) Co-N/G. The insets show the initial, transition, and final structures. The black, pink, dark blue, green and yellow balls represent C, N, Co, Li and S atoms, respectively. Reproduced from reference²⁸⁸. Copyright 2019, American Chemical Society.82

Figure 1.27 (a) Schematic configuration of a Li-S battery with an additional carbon interlayer. b) SEM image of the microporous carbon paper. (a,b) Reproduced from reference⁴¹. Copyright 2012, Nature Publishing Group. (c) Schematic of four different electrode configurations. Schematics of Li-S batteries with (d) electrode configuration I and (e) electrode configuration IV. Photographs of (f) large-area graphene current collector strip and (g) G-separator. (c-g) Reproduced from reference²⁸⁹. Copyright 2014, Wiley-VCH. (h,i) Schematic illustrations of two hypothetical functions of carbon interlayer in Li-S batteries. (j) Schematic illustrations of four different battery configurations. (k) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of Li-S batteries with four different battery configurations. (h-k) Reproduced from reference²⁹⁰. Copyright 2018, The Electrochemical Society.85

Figure 1.28 Schematic of the fabrication process of sulfur-graphene-PP separator integrated electrode and the corresponding battery assembly. Reproduced from reference²⁹¹. Copyright 2015, Wiley-VCH.87

Figure 1.29 (a) Schematic and photograph of PP separator covered with 2-layer CVD-graphene with an areal of $5 \times 60 \text{ cm}^2$. SEM images of the surface of PP separator (b) with and (c) without 2-layer CVD-graphene. (d) Cross-sectional TEM image of PP separator coated with 2-layer CVD-graphene. (e) Raman spectra of bare-PP and 2G-PP. Reproduced from reference²⁹². Copyright 2017, American Chemical Society.89

Figure 1.30 Schematic illustrations of Li-S battery configurations using (a) routine membrane and (b) ion selective membrane. (c) Enlarged microstructure of the ion selective membrane. SEM images of (d) routine PP/PE/PP membrane and (e) ion selective Nafion-PP/PE/PP membrane. (f) Cycling performances of Li-S batteries with routine membrane and ion selective membrane at 1C, respectively. (a-f) Reproduced from reference²⁹³. Copyright 2014, Royal Society of Chemistry. Schematics of (g) a hydro-phobic interface and (h) a polysulfide-phobic interface. (i) Top-view and (j) side-view of VOPO_4/PP membrane. The inset in i shows the photograph of VOPO_4/PP membrane. (k) Schematic illustration of suppressing polysulfide shuttle by using a $\text{S}_6^{2-}\text{-VOPO}_4/\text{PP}$ separator. (l) Cycling performances of Li-S cells with different separators. (m) Long-cycling performance of the Li-S battery with $\text{S}_6^{2-}\text{-VOPO}_4/\text{PP}$ separator at 3C for 2000 cycles. The inset shows the voltage profiles at selective cycles. (g-m) Reproduced from reference²⁹⁶. Copyright 2019, Wiley-VCH.91

Figure 1.31 (a) Schematic of the fabrication process for artificial MOF@GO separator. (b) Schematic of MOF@GO separator acting as ionic sieve towards polysulfides. The enlarged image illustrates the pore size of the HKUST-1 (about 0.9 nm) is much smaller than that of polysulfides. (c) Cross-sectional SEM image of the MOF@GO separator. The inset shows a photograph along the MOF side. Reproduced from reference²⁹⁷. Copyright 2016, Nature Publishing Group.92

Figure 1.32 (a) Schematic of the fabrication process for MOF@PVDF-HFP membrane. (b) Digital photos of the flexible MOF@PVDF-HFP separator. (c) TOP-view SEM image of the MOF@PVDF-HFP separator and the corresponding elemental mappings of Cu and F. (d) Side-view of the MOF@PVDF-HFP

separator. (e) Digital photos of visible H-type Li-S cells with different separators during a discharging process. Reproduced from reference ²⁹⁸ . Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH.	94
Figure 1.33 (a) Schematic of the in-situ growth of Co ₉ S ₈ arrays on Celgard separator. Surface SEM images of (b) MOF-Celgard and (c) Co ₉ S ₈ -Celgard separators. The insets show the corresponding digital photos. (d) Cross-sectional SEM image of Co ₉ S ₈ -Celgard separator. (e) Photographs of glass cells with Li ₂ S ₆ in DOL/DME solution and pure DOL/DME solvent in the left and right chambers, respectively, separated by Celgard (top panel) and the Co ₉ S ₈ -Celgard separator (bottom panel) and the improvement mechanism of the Co ₉ S ₈ -Celgard separator during the charge/discharge processes. Reproduced from reference ²⁹⁹ . Copyright 2018, Royal Society of Chemistry.	96
Figure 1.34 (a) Schematic of the cross-linking of CMC binder with CA as linker. SEM images of the surface of thick sulfur cathodes with high sulfur loading of 5.2 mg cm ⁻² using (b) PVDF binder and (c) cross-linked CMC-CA binder. (a-c) Reproduced from reference ³⁵⁸ . Copyright 2016, Wiley-VCH. (d) Cycling performance of the sulfur cathode using poly(AETMAC-co-EGDA) as binder. The insets show the SEM image of sulfur@porous hollow carbon sphere cathode, the illustration of S@carbon spheres linked by the poly(AETMAC-co-EGDA) binder and the structure of the binder. SEM images of the surface of sulfur cathodes after 100 cycles fabricated with (e) PVDF binder, (f) poly(DADMAC-co-EGDA) binder and (g) poly(AETMAC-co-EGDA) binder. (d-g) Reproduced from reference ³⁵⁹ . Copyright 2019, American Chemical Society.	100
Figure 1.35 The optimized binding geometries of Li ₂ S and LiS species on (a) PVP and (b) PVDF binders. Optical microscopy images of electrode slurries of (c) Li ₂ S/Carbon/PVP and (d) Li ₂ S/Carbon/PVDF in NMP (60:35:5 by weight in both cases). The insets show the corresponding digital images. (a-d) Reproduced from reference ³⁶⁰ . Copyright 2013, Royal Society of Chemistry. (e) Schematic of electrode construction using (e) traditional PVDF binder and f) polar polymer with abundant amino and amide groups. (g) The reducible molecular structure PPA binder. (e-g) Reproduced from reference ⁴⁸ . Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH.	103
Figure 1.36 (a) Molecule structures of four different binders. (b) Cycling performances at 0.1C and self-discharge tests of cathodes with different binders. Reproduced from reference ³⁶⁵ . Copyright 2015, Elsevier.	104
Figure 1.37 (a) Voltage profiles and (b) cycling performances of Li-S batteries at different sulfur/electrolyte ratios. Reproduced from reference ³⁸⁶ . Copyright 2013, The Electrochemical Society.	107
Figure 1.38 (a) Schematic for in situ wrapping a TPS layer on the cathode. TEM images of (b) CMK-3/S, (c) CMK-3/S@PANS and (d) CMK-3/S@PANS@TPS. The scale bars are all 10 nm. Digital photos of glass cells with (e) CMK-3/S, (f) CMK-3/S@PANS and (g) CMK-3/S@PANS@TPS cathodes after 20 cycles at 0.1C. Reproduced from reference ³⁹⁰ . Copyright 2017, Nature Publishing Group.	109
Figure 1.39 (a) Ab initio calculations of the two electrolyte systems with different electrolyte/lithium salt ratios. The purple, cyan, grey, gold and blue color represent Li ⁺ cations, free diethylene glycol dimethyl ether (G2) molecules, coordinated G2 molecules, contact-ion-pair of TFSI anions and aggregates of TFSI anions, respectively. The cubic box represents the supercell for the calculated system. (b) Discharge profiles and (c) cycling performance of Li-S cells using G2:LiTFSI electrolytes with different molar ratios. (d) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of Li-S cells using an low E/S ratio of 5 μL/mg at 0.2C with different G2:LiTFSI electrolytes. Reproduced from reference ³⁹¹ . Copyright 2018, Nature Publishing Group.	110
Figure 1.40 Schematic of the garnet bilayer solid-state electrolyte. Reproduced from reference ⁴⁵³ . Copyright 2017, Royal Society of Chemistry.	115

Figure 1.41 (a) SEM image of the PETEA-based gel polymer electrolyte. The inset shows the photographs of the gel electrolyte and its precursor solution. (b) Illustration of the formation of a passivation layer on the sulfur cathode surface. (c) Cycling performances of Li-S cells with PETEA-based gel polymer electrolyte and liquid electrolyte. (a-c) Reproduced from reference⁴⁹¹. Copyright 2016, Elsevier. 116

Figure 1.42 (a) Schematic of tween polymer-grafted lithium metal. (b) Schematic of lithium plating and stripping process on bare lithium metal and tween polymer-grafted lithium metal. Reproduced from reference⁵⁰². Copyright 2018, American Chemical Society. 121

Figure 1.43 (a) Schematic of the fabrication process of MoS₂-coated Li metal anode via the sputtering and subsequent lithiation. (b) Side and (c) top view SEM images of as-deposited MoS₂ on lithium metal. The inset in c shows the enlarged image. (d) Top-view SEM image of lithiated MoS₂ on lithium metal surface. (e) Cycling performance of a Li-S battery with MoS₂-coated Li metal as anode and CNT-sulfur as cathode for 1200 cycles at 0.5C. The inset illustrates the configurations of the as-assembled battery. Reproduced from reference⁵⁰⁴. Copyright 2018, Nature Publishing Group..... 123

Figure 1.44 (a) Schematic of the fabrication process for layered Li-rGO film. (b) Digital photos of (b) GO film, (c) sparked rGO film and (d) layered Li-rGO film. (a-d) Reproduced from reference⁵⁰⁷. Copyright 2016 Nature Publishing Group. (e) Schematic of the lithium metal coated by a thin layer of LiF. (f) Cycling performances of Li-S prototype cells with Li foil, Li-rGO and LiF-coated Li-rGO as anodes. (e,f) Reproduced from reference⁵⁰⁸. Copyright 2017, American Chemical Society. 125

Figure 1.45 (a) Schematic of the microstructure of Li_xM/graphene film. (b) Schematic of the fabrication process for Li_xM/graphene film. Reproduced from reference⁵⁰⁹. Copyright 2017, Nature Publishing Group. 126

Figure 1.46 Schematic of an all-in-one solid-state Li-S battery based on trilayer garnet electrolyte. Reproduced from reference⁵¹⁰. Copyright 2018, Elsevier..... 127

Figure 1.47 (a) Schematic of the fabrication process for 3D NPC@S/3D NPC@Li full cell. Reproduced from reference⁵¹². Copyright 2018, Wiley-VCH. (b) Schematic for the fabrication of dendrite-free lithium anode by designing NPCN-wrapped 3D metal foam as the current collector. (c) Cycling performances of Li/Cu foil|C/S, Li/Cu foam|C/S, and Li/Cu@NPCN|C/S full cells at 1C. (d) Cycling performance of Li/Cu@NPCN|C/S full cell at 2C. (b-d) Reproduced from reference⁵¹⁵. Copyright 2019, American Chemical Society. (e) Schematic of the synthesis process MCS and CMCS. SEM images of (f) MCS and (g) CMCS. (h) Schematic of lithium deposition on Cu foil directly and through MCS. (i) Schematic of the Li-S full cell with S@CMCS as cathode and Li@MCS as anode. (j) Cycling performances of S@CMCS cathodes coupled with Li@MCS and Li@Cu anodes respectively at 1C. e-j) Reproduced from reference⁵¹⁴. Copyright 2019, Wiley-VCH. 129

Figure 1.48 (a) Schematic of the fabrication process for Cu-coated and Ni-coated carbon fabrics as hosts for lithium and sulfur, respectively. (b) Photograph of the inner configuration of a Li-S full battery. (c) Cycling performance of Li-S fabric full cells under non-bending and bending conditions. Reproduced from reference⁵¹⁶. Copyright 2018, Nature Publishing Group. 131

Figure 2.1 Framework of the experiments 133

Figure 3.1 Schematic illustration of the synthesis procedure of 3D hierarchically porous TiO-G/S film. The grey and blue spheres represent the PS spheres and TiO nanoparticles, respectively..... 150

Figure 3.2 (a) SEM image of PS spheres. (b) TEM image of TiO₂ nanotube. (c) SEM image of the surface of PS-TiO₂-GO aerogel. Optical images of (d) PS-TiO₂-GO aerogel and (e) TiO-G film. (f) SEM image of the surface of porous TiO-G film. (g) TEM and (h) high-resolution TEM images of porous TiO-G

composite. Cross-sectional (i) SEM image, (j) backscattered electron image and the corresponding (k, l) elemental mappings of the porous TiO-G/S film.	151
Figure 3.3 Size distribution of PS spheres.	152
Figure 3.4 TEM image of graphene oxide.	153
Figure 3.5 (a) XRD pattern of the porous TiO-G composite. (b) Nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherm of the porous TiO-G composite. Inset shows the pore size distribution obtained using the BJH method. (c) Raman spectra of the porous TiO-G, TiO ₂ -G and graphene. (d) TGA curves of the porous TiO-G/S, TiO ₂ -G/S and G/S in N ₂ atmosphere with a heating rate of 10 °C /min.	154
Figure 3.6 Magnified SEM image of the surface of porous TiO-G film.	155
Figure 3.7 SEM image of the nonporous TiO-G without the use of PS sphere template.	155
Figure 3.8 (a) Cross-sectional SEM image of the porous TiO-G film, and (b,c,d) the corresponding C-, O- and Ti-elemental mappings.	157
Figure 3.9 XRD pattern of TiO ₂ -G composite.	158
Figure 3.10 (a) TEM and (b) high-resolution TEM images of TiO ₂ -G composite.	159
Figure 3.11 XRD pattern of the graphene film.	160
Figure 3.12 (a) Nyquist plots of the porous TiO-G/S, TiO ₂ -G/S and G/S cathodes before cycling from 0.01 Hz-100 kHz. (b) The 1 st to 6 th CV profiles of the porous TiO-G/S cathode at a scan rate of 0.1 mV s ⁻¹ in the voltage range of 1.7-2.8 V. (c) The first-cycle galvanostatic charge-discharge voltage profiles of the porous TiO-G/S, TiO ₂ -G/S and G/S cathodes at 0.1 C in the potential window from 1.7 to 2.8 V. (d) Galvanostatic charge-discharge voltage profiles of the porous TiO-G/S cathode at various current densities from 0.1 to 2 C. (e) Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiency of the porous TiO-G/S cathode at 2 C for 200 cycles.	163
Figure 3.13 Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiencies of the porous TiO-G/S, TiO ₂ -G/S and G/S cathodes at 0.5 C for 50 cycles.	164
Figure 3.14 Rate performance of the porous TiO-G/S cathode at different current densities.	166
Figure 3.15 Cross-sectional (a) SEM image and (b) elemental mappings of C, O, Ti and S of the thicker TiO-G/S electrode.	167
Figure 3.16 (a) Cycling stability and Coulombic efficiency of porous TiO-G/S cathode at 0.2 C for 300 cycles with high areal sulfur loading of about 5.2 mg cm ⁻² . (b) Comparison of the electrochemical performance of this work with some recent publications. (c) Optical images of a Li ₂ S ₆ solution before and after the addition of TiO-G powder. (d) High-resolution S 2p spectra of TiO-G/Li ₂ S ₆ . (e) Demonstration of the chemical interaction between TiO and sulfur species. The Ref. in Figure b refer to: [7] <i>Energy Environ. Sci.</i> 2017, 10, 1694-1703; [22] <i>Adv. Energy Mater.</i> , 2017, 7, 1602014; [33] <i>Nano Energy</i> , 2017, 38, 239-248; [34] <i>Nano Energy</i> , 2017, 37, 7-14; [39] <i>Nat. Commun.</i> , 2017, 8, 14627; [43] <i>ACS Nano</i> , 2017, 11, 4694-4702; [44] <i>Nat. Commun.</i> , 2013, 4, 1331; [45] <i>Adv. Funct. Mater.</i> , 2017, 27, 1701176; [46] <i>Adv. Mater.</i> , 2017, 29, 1702707; [47] <i>ACS Nano</i> , 2017, 11, 7274-7283; [48] <i>Adv. Energy Mater.</i> , 2017, 7, 1602543; [49] <i>Nat. Commun.</i> , 2017, 8, 482; [50] <i>Adv. Mater.</i> , 2017, 29, 1603835; [51] <i>Adv. Mater.</i> , 2016, 28, 3167-3172; [52] <i>Adv. Funct. Mater.</i> , 2016, 26, 1225-1232.	169
Figure 4.1 (a) Schematic illustration of the synthesis process for S@Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (b) SEM and (c) TEM images of Fe _{0.667} Co(CN) ₄ (H ₂ O) ₄ nanocubes. (d) The SAED pattern of a single Fe _{0.667} Co(CN) ₄ (H ₂ O) ₄ nanocube. (e) XRD pattern of Fe _{0.667} Co(CN) ₄ (H ₂ O) ₄ nanocubes. (f-h) SEM images of Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (i) XRD pattern of Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (j) TEM and (k) HR-TEM images of Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (l) SEM and (m) TEM images of S@Co-Fe-P nanocubes. (n) STEM and corresponding elemental mappings (Co, Fe, C, P, O and S elements) of a single S@Co-Fe-P nanocube.	180

Figure 4.2 (a) Low resolution SEM image and (b) corresponding size distribution of $\text{Fe}_{0.667}\text{Co}(\text{CN})_4(\text{H}_2\text{O})_4$ nanocubes.	181
Figure 4.3 TEM image of a single $\text{Fe}_{0.667}\text{Co}(\text{CN})_4(\text{H}_2\text{O})_4$ nanocube.	182
Figure 4.4 (a) Low resolution SEM image and (b) corresponding size distribution of Co-Fe-P nanocubes.	183
Figure 4.5 XPS survey spectrum of Co-Fe-P nanocubes.	184
Figure 4.6 HR-TEM image of Co-Fe-P nanocubes. The lattice fringe is attributed to the (101) plane of FeP_2	185
Figure 4.7 Nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherm of the Co-Fe-P nanocubes. The inset shows the pore size distribution acquired using the BJH method.	186
Figure 4.8 SEM images of Co-Fe nanoparticles.	187
Figure 4.9 XRD pattern of Co-Fe nanoparticles.	188
Figure 4.10 Nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherm of the Co-Fe nanoparticles. The inset shows the pore size distribution obtained using the BJH method.	188
Figure 4.11 SEM images of Co-Fe-P nanoparticles synthesized at 500 °C.	189
Figure 4.12 SEM images of Co-Fe-P nanoparticles synthesized at 650 °C.	190
Figure 4.13 SEM images of Co-Fe-P nanoparticles synthesized at 700 °C.	191
Figure 4.14 (a) SEM image and the (b) corresponding elemental mappings of the S@Co-Fe particles. ..	192
Figure 4.15 TGA curves of S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe nanocubes at a heating rate of 10 °C/min under Ar atmosphere.	193
Figure 4.16 (a) The 2 nd cycle CV curves of the S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe cathodes at 0.1 mV s ⁻¹ . (b) The 1 st cycle charge-discharge voltage profiles of S@Co-Fe-P cathodes at current rates of 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1 and 2 C. (c) Rate performances of S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe cathodes. (d) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe cathodes at 0.2 C. (e) Long cycling performance and Coulombic efficiency of the S@Co-Fe-P cathode at 1 C. The areal sulfur loading is about 1 mg cm ⁻²	194
Figure 4.17 The galvanostatic charge-discharge voltage profiles of S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe cathodes at 0.1C.	196
Figure 4.18 Nyquist plots of S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe electrodes before cycling. The inset shows equivalent circuit.	197
Figure 4.19 Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of S@Co-Fe-P-600, S@Co-Fe-P-500, S@Co-Fe-P-700 and S@Co-Fe cathodes.	198
Figure 4.20 Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiency of the S@Co-Fe cathode at 1 C.	199
Figure 4.21 TGA curve of S@Co-Fe-P nanocubes with a higher sulfur content of about 82%.	199
Figure 4.22 Cycling performance and Coulombic efficiency of S@Co-Fe-P cathode at 1C with a higher sulfur content of 82%. The areal sulfur loading is about 3 mg cm ⁻²	200
Figure 4.23 Digital photographs of the separators paired with S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe cathodes after 500 cycles at 1 C, respectively.	202
Figure 4.24 (a) SEM image of the lithium metal anode before cycling process. (b) SEM image and (c) corresponding sulfur mapping image of lithium metal anode paired with S@Co-Fe-P cathode after 500 cycles at 1 C. (d) SEM image and (e) corresponding sulfur mapping image of lithium metal anode paired with S@Co-Fe cathode after 500 cycles at 1 C. (f) The sulfur contents on the lithium metal anodes obtained from EDX analysis paired with S@Co-Fe-P and S@Co-Fe cathodes after 500 cycles at 1C, respectively.	202
Figure 4.25 EDX spectrum of the lithium metal anode paired with the S@Co-Fe cathode after 500 cycles	

at 1 C. The inset shows the elemental contents and the carbon come from the nearby conducting substrate.	203
Figure 4.26 EDX spectrum of the lithium metal anode paired with the S@Co-Fe-P cathode after 500 cycles at 1 C. The inset shows the elemental contents.....	204
Figure 4.27 (a) Cycling performances and Coulombic efficiencies of S@Co-Fe-P cathodes at 0.2 C with high areal sulfur loadings of about 3.7 and 5.5 mg cm ⁻² , respectively. (b) Schematic diagram of the soft-package Li-S battery based on a S@Co-Fe-P cathode. (c) Photographs of a LED lighted by a S@Co-Fe-P based soft-package Li-S battery upon bending-unbending operations. Logo used with permission from University of Technology Sydney (UTS). (d) The first-cycle charge-discharge voltage profiles of S@Co-Fe-P based Li-S pouch-cell at 0.2 C. (e) Cycling performance of S@Co-Fe-P based Li-S pouch-cell at 0.5 C. The areal sulfur loading for the pouch-cell is about 1 mg cm ⁻²	205
Figure 4.28 Comparison of the areal capacity of this work with other reported metal compounds as sulfur host materials for Li-S batteries. The Ref.1 to Ref.19 in the figure refer to: [1] <i>Nat. Commun.</i> 2013, 4, 1331; [2] <i>Nat. Commun.</i> 2016, 7, 13065; [3] <i>Adv. Funct. Mater.</i> 2017, 27, 1701176; [4] <i>ACS Nano</i> 2016, 10, 4192-4198; [5] <i>ACS Nano</i> 2017, 11, 6031-6039; [6] <i>Nano Energy</i> 2017, 38, 239-248; [7] <i>J. Am. Chem. Soc.</i> 2017, 139, 12710-12715; [8] <i>Nano Energy</i> 2017, 37, 7-14; [9] <i>Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.</i> 2018, 57, 16703-16707; [10] <i>Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.</i> 2015, 54, 3907-3911; [11] <i>Energy Storage Mater.</i> 2019, 16, 228-235; [12] <i>Nano Energy</i> 2018, 53, 432-439; [13] <i>Nano Lett.</i> 2018, 18, 1035-1043; [14] <i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2016, 28, 6926-6931; [15] <i>Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.</i> 2018, 57, 10944-10948; [16] <i>Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.</i> 2019, 58, 3779-3783; [17] <i>Adv. Funct. Mater.</i> 2019, 29, 1806724; [18] <i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2019, 1900009; [19] <i>Nano Energy</i> 2019, 59, 636-643.....	206
Figure 4.29 (a) Ultraviolet/visible adsorption spectra of a Li ₂ S ₆ solution before and after the addition of Co-Fe or Co-Fe-P powder. The inset shows the digital photo of Li ₂ S ₆ solution before and after the addition Co-Fe or Co-Fe-P powder. (b) Co 2p _{3/2} , (c) Fe 2p _{3/2} and (d) P 2p XPS spectra of Co-Fe-P nanocubes before and after interacting with Li ₂ S ₆ . (e) Side (f) top view of a Li ₂ S ₆ molecule adsorbed on the (-111) plane of CoP ₂ using DFT calculations. (g) Side and (h) top view of a Li ₂ S ₆ molecule adsorbed on the (101) plane of FeP ₂ using DFT calculations. (i) Side view of a Li ₂ S ₆ molecule adsorbed on the (111) plane of Fe _{0.25} Co _{0.75} using DFT calculations. The pink, red, blue, yellow and light blue balls represent Co, Fe, P, S and Li atoms, respectively.	209
Figure 4.30 Top view of a Li ₂ S ₆ molecule adsorbed on the (-111) plane of CoP ₂ using DFT calculations. The pink, blue, yellow and light blue balls represent Co, P, S and Li atoms, respectively.	210
Figure 4.31 Top view of a Li ₂ S ₆ molecule adsorbed on the (101) plane of FeP ₂ using DFT calculations. The red, blue, yellow and light blue balls represent Fe, P, S and Li atoms, respectively.....	211
Figure 4.32 Side view a Li ₂ S ₆ molecule adsorbed on the (110) plane of Fe _{0.25} Co _{0.75} using DFT calculations. The binding energy is calculated to be -1.11 eV. The pink, red, yellow and light blue balls represent Co, Fe, S and Li atoms, respectively.	212
Figure 4.33 The calculated binding energies between Li ₂ S ₆ and CoP ₂ , FeP ₂ and Fe _{0.25} Co _{0.75} (111).	212
Figure 4.34 (a) CV curves of Li ₂ S ₆ and Li ₂ S ₆ -free symmetric cells. (b) EIS spectra of symmetric Li ₂ S ₆ cells. The inset in Figure b shows equivalent circuit.	213

ABSTRACT

Lithium-sulfur (Li-S) batteries, which rely on the redox reactions, show great promise for next-generation energy storage owing to their high theoretical energy density, environmental benignity and low cost of sulfur. However, the practical application of Li-S batteries has been largely impeded by the low conductivity of sulfur and the shuttle effect of polysulfides. One of the most effective strategies to overcome these problems is to disperse insulating sulfur active material within other conductive matrixes that are capable of physically adsorbing and/or chemically binding sulfur and its intermediate polysulfides. In this thesis, we designed two types of host materials that can be used to improve the electrochemical performance of Li-S batteries.

A new self-standing host enabled by a 3D hierarchically-porous titanium monoxide-graphene composite film was designed to overcome the main challenges of Li-S batteries. The hierarchically porous graphene scaffold can not only facilitate rapid lithium ion and electron transport, but also provide sufficient spaces to accommodate sulfur species. In addition, the ultrafine and polar titanium monoxide nanoparticles embedded in the three-dimensional graphene networks show strong chemical anchoring for polysulfides, and their inherent metallic conductivity accelerates the redox reaction kinetics. Benefiting from this attractive architecture, the freestanding titanium monoxide-graphene/sulfur cathode demonstrated superior electrochemical performance for Li-S batteries.

Uniform Co-Fe mixed metal phosphide (Co-Fe-P) nanocubes with highly interconnected-pore architecture were synthesized as sulfur host for Li-S batteries. With the

highly interconnected-pore architecture, inherently metallic conductivity and polar characteristic, the Co-Fe-P nanocubes not only offer sufficient electrical contact to the insulating sulfur for high sulfur utilization and fast redox reaction kinetics, but also provide abundant adsorption sites for trapping and catalyzing the conversion of lithium polysulfides to suppress the shuttle effect. As a result, the sulfur-loaded Co-Fe-P (S@Co-Fe-P) nanocubes exhibited superior electrochemical performances both in coin cells and pouch cells.