

A Simulation Study of the Lithium Ion Transport Mechanism in Ternary Polymer Electrolytes – The Critical Role of the Segmental Mobility

Diddo Diddens^{1,2,*} and Andreas Heuer^{1,2}

¹*Institut für physikalische Chemie, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität
Münster, Corrensstrasse 28/30, 48149 Münster, Germany*

²*NRW Graduate School of Chemistry, Corrensstrasse 36, 48149 Münster, Germany
(Dated: December 3, 2024)*

The lithium transport mechanism in ternary polymer electrolytes, consisting of poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO), lithium-bis(trifluoromethane)sulfonimide (LiTFSI) and the ionic liquid *N*-methyl-*N*-propylpyrrolidinium bis(trifluoromethane)sulfonimide (PYR₁₃TFSI) is analyzed via molecular dynamics (MD) simulations. Starting from the classical, binary electrolyte PEO₂₀LiTFSI, we focus on two different strategies by which the ternary electrolytes can be devised, namely by (a) *adding* the ionic liquid to the binary system, and (b) *substituting* the PEO chains in PEO₂₀LiTFSI by the ionic liquid. In order to elucidate in how far the microscopic lithium transport differs between these two electrolyte classes, we employ an analytical, Rouse-based cation transport model¹, which has originally been devised for the binary systems. Within this framework, the cation transport is characterized via three different mechanisms, each quantified by an individual time scale. Our analysis demonstrates that this model is also applicable to the ternary electrolytes, allowing us to express the effect of the ionic liquid in terms of the time scales of the transport model. Whereas the addition of the ionic liquid to PEO₂₀LiTFSI plasticizes the polymer network and thus also increases the lithium ion mobility, no significant effect can be observed when substituting the PEO chains by the ionic liquid. This is due to the fact that in the latter case the amount of free, mobile ether oxygens reduces, since more lithium ions coordinate to the PEO backbone, which compensates with the plasticizing effect. Thus, the segmental mobility displays a decisive role in polymer electrolytes. In total, our findings are in agreement with recent experimental observations².

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Polymer electrolytes – typically consisting of an amorphous polymer matrix and a salt dissolved in it – are promising candidates for many technological devices such as batteries or fuel cells. They were first discovered by Wrigth in 1973³, who investigated salt-doped poly(ethylene oxide) (PEO) melts. Some years later their potential for electrochemical applications was discovered by Armand⁴, since they combine many properties of conventional liquid and ceramic electrolytes due to their inherently stable but flexible nature^{5,6}. However, at ambient temperatures the conductivity of many of these materials is still too low for an efficient technological use.

Several attempts have been made in the past to overcome this deficiency. Common modifications of the classical polymer-salt systems are the addition of nanoparticles⁷ or organic solvent molecules^{8–10}. However, in case of the latter, the resulting electrolytes suffer from the high volatility and thus flammability of the solvent as well as its reaction with lithium metal electrodes¹⁰. Here, Passerini *et al.*^{2,11–13} demonstrated that the use of an ionic liquid instead of a conventional solvent has several advantages: The ionic liquids are non-volatile, non-flammable¹⁴ and exhibit a wide electrochemical stability window¹⁵. In this way, improved polymer electrolytes can be designed, which show an increased conductivity combined with inherent stability^{2,11} and are thus ideal to create light-weighted but powerful batteries^{12,13}.

However, it is not yet fully understood in how far the lithium transport mechanism in these materials changes relative to the conventional polymer electrolytes. For instance, it was speculated¹¹ that the lithium ions become progressively coordinated by the anions from the ionic liquid and are thus decoupled from the rather slow PEO chains. Alternatively, one might also expect that the IL enhances the PEO dynamics and serves as a plasticizer in this way, which is a common observation when adding low-molecular solvents to PEO-salt systems^{8–10}. In this contribution, we utilize molecular dynamics (MD) simulations to address these issues, and interpret the changes in the microscopic lithium transport mechanism within the framework of an analytical model^{1,16}, which has originally been devised for binary polymer electrolytes.

With few exceptions^{17–20}, the archetypal PEO-based electrolytes have been most intensely studied via MD simulations^{1,16,21–26}. Here, essentially three different cation transport mechanisms have been observed: diffusion of the cation along the polymer chain, cooperative motion of the cation with the polymer chain and cationic transfer between different polymer chains. While all of these mechanisms have already been observed in early studies^{22,24}, only relatively recent work has resulted in a quantitative characterization of the individual contributions to the overall cationic diffusion^{1,16,26}. This is due to the fact that several ten to hundred nanoseconds are required in order to fully quantify the relevant microscopic transport processes. Moreover, an appropriate force field is important in order to gain reliable results. Here, espe-




Figure 1: Sketch depicting the three different cation transport mechanisms in PEO-salt electrolytes. Each mechanism is characterized by a specific time scale.

cially the incorporation of polarization promises a significant improvement in the description of the ion dynamics^{18,27–29}.

Based on insights from simulations of a PEO/LiTFSI electrolyte²⁶, Borodin *et al.* have proposed a transport model based on the three mechanisms that was consistent with the numerical MD data. Moreover, the model was able to predict the experimentally observed lithium diffusion coefficient. To this purpose, the diffusion coefficient for the motion of the ion along the polymer chain, the intersegmental jump rate (i.e. the rate of hopping processes between segments of two different PEO chains or between two remote segments of one PEO chain) as well as the characteristic form of the segmental MSD between two jumps, i.e. $\text{MSD}(t) = a(c, T)t^{0.6}$ (with a being a function of the salt concentration c and the temperature T), were extracted from the simulations. These three ingredients were combined in a microscopic model similar in spirit to the Dynamic Bond Percolation (DBP) model of Ratner³⁰. By utilizing a Monte-Carlo scheme for the motion along the chain and the intersegmental hopping process, the lithium diffusion coefficient was obtained numerically from this model.

Motivated by the success of this model, Maitra and Heuer developed an analytical framework to describe the cation transport in a PEO/LiBF₄ electrolyte¹, which is based on both the Rouse model³¹ as well as the DBP model³⁰. Here, the purely empirical description of the segmental dynamics, $\text{MSD}(t) = a(c, T)t^{0.6}$, as well as the numerical evaluation of the diffusion along the chain and the intersegmental hopping were replaced by analytical expressions. Each of the three transport mechanisms was characterized by a specific time scale (see also sketch in Figure 1): 1. Diffusion along the PEO chain, which can be interpreted as an effective one-dimensional random walk along the curvilinear path of the polymer chain. The time scale the ion needs to explore the entire PEO chain is denoted by τ_1 . 2. Segmental motion of the PEO chain, which can be separated into the center-of-mass motion and the internal dynamics. The internal dynamics can be described by the Rouse model with an effective Rouse time τ_2 characterizing the motion of the bound PEO segments. 3. Intersegmental transfer of the cation from one PEO chain to another takes place. This

motion can be quantified by the average residence time τ_3 at a given chain. It was shown¹ that this mechanism can be viewed as a renewal process within the framework of the DBP model³⁰, since the dynamics of a given lithium ion becomes independent of its past after being transferred to another PEO chain. Therefore, this contribution is also vital to the long-range cation transport and a significant conductivity on the macroscopic scale.

Since the diffusion along the chain is also expressed within the framework of the Rouse model, correlations with the polymer dynamics are implicitly contained in this model, which have been neglected by Borodin *et al.*²⁶. Another advantage is that the lithium diffusion coefficient can easily be calculated as a function of the polymer chain length N , which immediately follows from the N -dependence of the three underlying time scales.

Of course, as motivated above, the situation is expected to change when other, more complex electrolytes than the binary PEO-salt mixtures are investigated. In this work, we aim to generalize the transport model to ternary polymer electrolytes consisting of PEO/LiTFSI and the ionic liquid *N*-methyl-*N*-propylpyrrolidinium bis(trifluoromethane)sulfonimide (PYR₁₃TFSI, in the following also abbreviated as IL) in order to unravel the microscopic origin of the experimental observations by Passerini *et al.*^{2,11}. In particular, we focus on PEO₂₀LiTFSI, to which a variable amount x of PYR₁₃TFSI is added. However, it is a priori unclear if the lithium transport mechanism changes only quantitatively – characterized by different values for τ_1 , τ_2 and τ_3 – or if it even changes on a qualitative level. Certainly, the transport mechanism will be altered at some point when PEO is successively substituted by PYR₁₃TFSI molecules. In order to investigate such a crossover, additional simulations with constant lithium volume concentration were performed, in which the PEO chains were successively substituted by PYR₁₃TFSI molecules under the constraint of a constant volume of the simulation box. Figure 2 shows snapshots from the simulations for the two different scenarios. Since the transport mechanism in the binary PEO₂₀LiTFSI electrolyte has already been thoroughly explored^{16,26}, this system serves as a reference substance.

In what follows, the experimentally investigated electrolytes¹¹ with a constant ratio of EOs to lithium ions, namely EO : Li = 20 : 1, and a variable amount x of PYR₁₃TFSI relative to LiTFSI will be denoted as PEO₂₀LiTFSI · x PYR₁₃TFSI. The theoretically motivated systems to study the transition between binary PEO/LiTFSI and PYR₁₃TFSI/LiTFSI electrolytes will be abbreviated as PEO_{20- αx} LiTFSI · x PYR₁₃TFSI. Here, α is the ratio of the respective partial molar volumes of PEO and PYR₁₃TFSI and will be determined subsequently.

For reasons of simplicity, we also abbreviate PEO as ‘P’ (i.e. polymer or PEO) and LiTFSI as ‘S’ (i.e. salt) in the following, leading to the short-hand notations P₂₀S · x IL and P_{20- αx} S · x IL for the two distinct classes of ternary




Figure 2: Snapshots from the simulation showing (a) the *addition* of IL to the binary polymer electrolyte $\text{PEO}_{20}\text{LiTFSI}$ and (b) the *substitution* of PEO chains by IL molecules from the same electrolyte. PEO chains are shown in red, lithium ions in green, whereas all other ions (PYR_{13}^{+} and TFSI^{-}) are invisible.

electrolytes.

II. MD SIMULATION METHODOLOGY

The MD simulations were performed with a modified version of the AMBER Molecular Dynamics Program Package³², allowing us to employ a specifically designed force field for PEO/LiTFSI ^{28,29} and $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ ³³.

The initial configurations were created by randomly placing the individual molecules on a simple cubic lattice with a lattice constant of 36 Å irrespective of their type, mixing the system in this way. In case of PEO, the chains already had coiled conformations as under melt conditions, thereby circumventing an expensive equilibration over several Rouse times.

The binary PEO/LiTFSI electrolyte contained 10 PEO chains with $N = 54$ monomers each as well as 27 LiTFSI molecules. In case of the addition of IL, i.e. $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$, the simulation cell also contained 18 ($x = 0.66$) or 87 ($x = 3.24$) $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ molecules (the latter is shown in Figure 2(a)). In case of the substitution of PEO ($\text{P}_{20-\alpha}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$) and thus a constant lithium volume concentration, the partial molar volumes of PEO and $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ must be known. Through several short equilibration runs of the binary PEO/LiTFSI and $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}/\text{LiTFSI}$ electrolytes, we found that both the molar volumes of PEO and $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ are independent of the lithium mole fraction (at least for the investigated concentration range), and that approximately $\alpha = 7.14$ PEO monomers occupy the same volume as one $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ ion pair. Based on these values, we created the following systems: 8 PEO chains with 15 $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ molecules ($\text{P}_{16}\text{S} \cdot 0.556 \text{ IL}$), 6 PEO

chains with 30 $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ molecules ($\text{P}_{12}\text{S} \cdot 1.111 \text{ IL}$) and 4 PEO chains with 45 $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ molecules ($\text{P}_8\text{S} \cdot 1.667 \text{ IL}$, see Figure 2(b)), all of them containing, as above, 27 LiTFSI ion pairs. Neat PEO (16 chains with $N = 54$) and the pure $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}/\text{LiTFSI}$ electrolyte (76 $\text{PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ as well as 27 LiTFSI ion pairs) serve as reference within this context.

The systems were equilibrated in the NpT ensemble for 70 – 80 ns using the PME technique³⁴. Afterwards, production runs with a total length of 200 ns were performed in the NVT ensemble. A time step of 1 fs was used in all simulations to propagate the systems. The temperature was maintained by the Berendsen thermostat³⁵ to a reference temperature of $T_0 = 423 \text{ K}$. All bonds involving hydrogen were constrained by the SHAKE algorithm³⁶. The inducible point dipoles were integrated by the Car-Parrinello-like scheme³⁷, and the charge-dipole interactions between atoms separated by three bonds (1-4 interactions) were scaled by a factor of 0.2. For all other nonbonded contributions, the full 1-4 interaction was taken into account. Dipole-dipole interactions were damped using the Thole screening with $a_T = 0.4$ ³⁸.

One indeed observes from Table I that the equilibrium values for the box lengths are nearly the same for all $\text{P}_{20-\alpha}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$ systems. Slight deviations for $\text{LiTFSI} \cdot 2.815 \text{ PYR}_{13}\text{TFSI}$ may result from rounded molecule numbers in the simulation.

III. STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES

In order to quantify the local structure around the lithium ions, radial distribution functions (denoted as $g(r)$ in the following) have been computed for the atom

system	L_{box} [Å]	1 PEO [%]	2 PEO [%]	b_0^2 [Å ²]	$\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle$ [Å ²]	$\langle \mathbf{R}_g^2 \rangle$ [Å ²]
PEO	40.11	-	-	10.39	1904 ± 43	306 ± 35
P ₂₀ S	35.96	47.2	52.7	9.71	1573 ± 112	260 ± 42
P ₂₀ S · x IL						
P ₂₀ S · 0.66 IL	38.27	53.0	47.0	9.66	1654 ± 121	272 ± 38
P ₂₀ S · 3.24 IL	45.29	75.8	24.0	9.58	1498 ± 57	249 ± 37
P _{20-αx} S · x IL						
P ₁₆ S · 0.556 IL	35.93	55.4	44.5	9.54	1767 ± 271	267 ± 50
P ₁₂ S · 1.111 IL	35.96	64.2	35.4	9.34	1349 ± 150	227 ± 43
P ₈ S · 1.667 IL	36.00	83.7	13.8	9.09	1840 ± 430	280 ± 80
P ₀ S · 2.815 IL	36.33	-	-	-	-	-

Table I: Length of the simulation box and ratio of lithium ions coordinating to one or two PEO chains. Mean squared chemical bond length b_0^2 , mean squared end-to-end vector $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle$ and mean squared radius of gyration $\langle \mathbf{R}_g^2 \rangle$ of the PEO chains.

pairs $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{PEO}}$ as well as $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{TFSI}}$ (see supporting information). Both coordination types exhibit a sharp peak around 2 Å corresponding to the first coordination shell, which is in good agreement with neutron diffraction experiments³⁹ and quantum chemistry calculations^{40,41}. For $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{PEO}}$, the first coordination sphere directly crosses over into a second small peak around 3.3 Å. At larger distances no significant structural arrangement can be found. For the coordination of $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{TFSI}}$, peaks become noticeable also at larger distances around 6 Å and 8 Å, thus demonstrating that long-ranged correlations are present as also observed for a PEO₂₀LiI electrolyte⁴². The same observation can be made for the PEO-free electrolyte P₀S · 2.815 IL, as also reported in previous MD studies⁴³. The pair correlation function of the PYR₁₃ cations and TFSI anions (i.e. $N_{\text{PYR}_{13}} - \text{O}_{\text{TFSI}}$) exhibits only a weak first coordination peak between 3.6 and 5.0 Å.

When successively adding the IL, one observes that the peak positions of both $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{PEO}}$ and $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{TFSI}}$ remain the same for all electrolytes. For P₂₀S · x IL, the EO coordination numbers extracted from the integral over the first shell increase slightly, partly as a result of the lower fraction of lithium ions coordinating to two PEO chains (see discussion below), for which the EO coordination number is lower due to steric effects. In P_{20- αx} S · x IL, the absolute EO coordination number (as determined from the integral over $g(r)$) decreases with increasing IL content. This trend can be explained by the decreasing number of possible coordination sites, since the PEO concentration reduces. Naturally, the coordination number of the TFSI oxygens increases with increasing IL content in both types of electrolytes.

Since the positions of the peaks do not change with composition, the same criterion to define temporary lithium bonds will be used for the subsequent analysis. We consider a EO and a Li^+ as bound if their distance is not larger than 3.0 Å. In analogy, we consider a Li^+ and a TFSI oxygen as bound if their distance is not larger than 2.7 Å.

Figure 3 shows the probability distribution functions

$p(n)$ to find a lithium ion with n EOs or TFSI oxygens in its first coordination shell. One observes that the coordination numbers are very similar in all systems and only change slightly with the IL concentration. The predominant lithium coordination consists of 4 – 5 EOs, which is in good agreement with experimental data³⁹ and quantum chemistry calculations^{40,41}. In those complexes where the 4–5 EOs originate from a single PEO molecule, the polymer chain wraps helically around the cation. For complexes involving two PEO chains, typically 2 – 3 EOs from each chain coordinate to the ion. Coordinations by TFSI oxygens are rather rare, and in most cases the anion coordinates only briefly to the lithium ion (see also snapshots in Figure 2, where all ions are in the vicinity of a PEO chain). The only exceptions are P₈S · 1.667 IL and, though less pronounced, P₁₂S · 1.111 IL, for which also an EO coordination number of $n = 2$ becomes noticeable. Simultaneously, the lithium ions more likely coordinate to 1 – 2 TFSI oxygens, while some are even coordinated to TFSI only (0.4 % for P₁₂S · 1.111 IL and 2.5 % for P₈S · 1.667 IL). As in pure IL/LiTFSI, the prevalent coordination number in the latter scenario is about 3 – 4, originating mostly from different anions. This specific coordination has also been observed previously in MD simulations⁴³, although experimental work emphasizes that also the $\text{Li}(\text{TFSI})_2$ complex is important⁴⁴.

Table I summarizes the percentages of lithium ions coordinating to one or two PEO chains. Coordinations to three PEO chains were rarely observed and had a very brief life time of a few picoseconds only. Therefore, these events were neglected for the subsequent analysis. For the pure polymer electrolyte, the fractions of complexes involving one and two chains are nearly equal. Similar binding energies for both coordination types have also been found in quantum chemistry calculations⁴¹. The fraction of lithium ions coordinating to one PEO molecule increases with the IL content for both types of electrolytes. This is a consequence of the reduced PEO concentration, as it becomes less likely that a lithium ion encounters a second chain in the semidilute case.

Interestingly, in P₂₀S · x IL, the fraction of both Li^+




Figure 3: Probability $p(n)$ to find a certain coordination number n of EOs (irrespective if the ion is tied to one or two PEO chains) or TFSI oxygens in (a) $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL and (b) $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL.

coordinating to TFSI and Li^+ coordinating to one PEO chain increases linearly with the IL amount x , thus indicating that the changes in the coordination sphere are purely statistical. For $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL however, these trends are stronger than linear, which can be attributed to the fact that the PEO chains are successively removed from the system, and the remaining PEO chains become more crowded in this way. Thus, the different coordination shell can not solely be explained as a simple dilution effect.

Due to the helical coordination structure of the PEO backbone, the local polymer structure changes, and the conformational phase space of the chain is reduced. Moreover, in case of the ternary electrolytes, the additional IL molecules dilute the PEO molecules, thus inducing a crossover from a polymer melt to a semidilute solution, which may also alter the equilibrium conformation of the polymer chains⁴⁵. Table I summarizes the mean squared distance b_0^2 between two chemical monomers and the mean squared end-to-end vector $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle$. Due to the crown-ether-like coordination of the PEO backbone, b_0^2 is smaller in all lithium-containing systems. For $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL, this trend becomes more pronounced with increasing IL concentration. A contraction of the polymer chain can also be observed for $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL from $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle$, which also decreases, whereas for $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL no clear predictions can be made within the error bars. When determining the ratio of $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle$ and the radius of gyration $\langle \mathbf{R}_g^2 \rangle$, one finds values close to the ideal ratio of six for a Gaussian chain⁴⁵ for all electrolytes, again indicating that Gaussian chain properties are fulfilled to a good approximation on a global scale. Also for the scaling of the Rouse mode amplitudes $\langle \mathbf{X}_p^2 \rangle$, we observe only slight deviations from the respective curve for pure PEO (see supporting information). In the limit of low mode numbers p , we find the expected Rousean scaling $\langle \mathbf{X}_p^2 \rangle \propto p^{-2}$,

again demonstrating that the chain structure remains relatively ideal upon the addition of IL. Thus, no significant swelling of the chains can be observed, and the structural properties are similar as in neat PEO. On a local scale however, the PEO chains become rather contracted due to the helical coordination sphere of the lithium ions.

IV. DYNAMICAL PROPERTIES

The MSDs of the lithium ions in the individual electrolytes are shown in Figure 4. For $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL, one indeed observes an increase of the lithium mobility upon the addition of IL (Figure 4(a)). In particular, this increase becomes visible at 1 – 10 ns, whereas the onset to diffusive behavior occurs on the same time scale for all systems. Nevertheless, the MSD is much smaller than for pure $P_0S \cdot 2.815$ IL, and the crossover to diffusion occurs much later. This is a first indication that most likely the lithium transport mechanism does not change too drastically, which is consistent with the observation that nearly all cations coordinate to the PEO chains (Figure 3). Interestingly, for $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL, no significant difference in the lithium MSD can be found (Figure 4(b)).

Figure 5 shows the distribution of the life times $p(\tau)$ of complexes between Li^+ and distinct EOs, PEO chains and TFSI anions. One observes that both the complexes between lithium ions and EOs as well as TFSI molecules reach a maximum life-span of about 1 ns. It may seem surprising that a significant fraction of the TFSI anions is coordinated to Li^+ for a few hundred picoseconds, especially when keeping in mind that TFSI is a weakly coordinating anion and also Figure 3 suggests that this coordination is rather rare. One additionally finds that the MSDs of Li^+ and TFSI have a similar magnitude on this time scale, indicating correlated motion of both




Figure 4: MSDs of the lithium ions in the (a) $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL and (b) $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL electrolytes. The curve for the pure IL-salt solution $P_0S \cdot 2.815$ IL is also shown for comparison.




Figure 5: Distributions $p(\tau)$ of life times τ for complexes between Li^+ and EOs, TFSI anions, or PEO chains for (a) $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL and (b) $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL.

species. However, a previous analysis on a PEO/LiI electrolyte⁴² showed that in this case the anion-cation coordinations lasted up to several ten nanoseconds, and also the respective MSDs had similar values during this time interval. Thus, the overall tendency towards Li^+ -TFSI complex formation can still be considered as weak in case of TFSI-based electrolytes.

For the EO coordinations, small τ -values of a few picoseconds are most probable, and $p_{EO}(\tau)$ decreases monotonously for larger life times (Figure 5). This trend arises from both the diffusion along the chain and the interchain transfer. However, a more detailed analysis related to the first mechanism reveals that many EOs reenter the first coordination sphere after a few picoseconds. Therefore, the PEO segments will be affected by the presence of the ions for a longer period. This is also reflected by the long-term decay of $p_{EO}(\tau)$ (i. e. $\tau \geq 10$ ps), which can be described by a significantly stretched exponential ($\beta = 0.58$ with an average relaxation time of 23 ps).

Due to the breaking and reformation of $EO-Li^+$ bonds, the overall decay becomes slower than according to an ideal exponential decay.

The life times of complexes between Li^+ and PEO chains show a very wide distribution spreading over several orders of magnitude. In some cases, a PEO chain coordinates to a lithium ion only briefly with one or two EOs, whereas in other cases the cation remains attached to one particular chain for the entire simulation length of 200 ns.

Finally, one notices that all these characteristics hardly depend on the IL concentration. In combination with the structural observations, this emphasizes that the typical coordinations and the associated exchange processes roughly remain the same as compared to the binary electrolyte $P_{20}S$. As a result, one might speculate that also the lithium transport mechanism does not change significantly when incorporating ILs into PEO-based polymer electrolytes, at least on a qualitative level.

V. EXTRACTION OF THE TIME SCALES

In the following, we will extract the time scales τ_1 , τ_2 and τ_3 as defined by the transport model, and interpret the observed differences in the lithium MSD (Figure 4) via these parameters.

A. Diffusion along the Chain

As already discussed in several simulation studies^{1,21,22,26}, the cations move along the PEO backbone, thereby performing a quasi-one-dimensional random walk. Figure 6 shows the mean squared change $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ of the average EO index n . Within this context, a distinction was made between cations that were bound to one specific chain (irrespective of possible other coordinations) and cations bound to two chains during the whole observation time t .

Starting from about 100 ps, the dynamics crosses over to a regime that is only slightly subdiffusive with an exponent of $\alpha \approx 0.8$. Qualitatively, this behavior is found for all IL concentrations. For sufficiently long chains and a significant amount of PEO-Li⁺ complexes that exist throughout the entire observation time, $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ will show diffusive behavior on longer time scales. Naturally, in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$, one would expect a crossover to a plateau for finite chain lengths. From Figure 6, neither of these two effects can be found, indicating that most life times of the PEO-Li⁺ complexes are too short (see also Figure 5). Moreover, the lithium ions move on average 7–8 monomers only during 10 ns. Keeping in mind that the lithium ions are typically bound to 4–5 monomers (Figure 3), these findings imply that the ions have barely left their own coordination sphere during the accessible time scale. This is also consistent with the fact that the same α -value is observed when calculating $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ depending on the starting position of the lithium ion, i. e. in the center or at the end of the chain (not shown). Therefore, finite size effects of the PEO chains are irrelevant in the present case.

For P₂₀S · x IL, no significant change of $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ can be observed when varying the IL concentration, indicating that the motion along the chain is basically determined by the characteristic motion of the PEO backbone, and that the surrounding molecules (i. e. PEO chains or IL molecules) have virtually no influence on this mechanism. Interestingly, the magnitude of $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ is essentially the same for lithium ions bound to one or to two PEO chains (not shown).

Switching to P_{20- α} S · x IL, one observes that the motion along the chain becomes slower with increasing IL concentration, especially for P₁₂S · 1.111 IL and P₈S · 1.667 IL (Figure 6(b)), which can be attributed to the lower amount of free EOs in the system, as the PEO molecules are successively substituted by IL. As a result, each PEO chain coordinates to more cations, and one might expect that the attached cations repulse each

other. Interestingly, the value for α remains basically the same in this case, and only the magnitude of the functional form $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle \propto t^\alpha$ becomes slightly lower. Thus, this decrease is obviously related to a reduced mobility of the PEO backbone, since one would observe an earlier crossover to a plateau for $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ and thus a lower α -value in case of the correlated motion of several cations bound to a single chain.

Although the motion along the chain is still slightly subdiffusive for large time scales, approximate diffusion coefficients $D_1(t^*)$ were extracted from Figure 6 in order to determine τ_1 . The D_1 were obtained from $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ from the Einstein relation

$$D_1(t^*) = \frac{\langle \Delta n^2(t^*) \rangle}{2t^*}, \quad (1)$$

where t^* represents the time where the D_1 were determined. Ideally, one would choose $t^* = \tau_3$ (determined below) in order to estimate the net effect of this mechanism. Unfortunately, the statistics of $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ are too bad on these time scales. Therefore, $D_1(\tau_3)$ was determined from Figure 6 by extrapolation. The time scale τ_1 was then calculated according to the formalism of the transport model¹:

$$\tau_1 = \frac{(N-1)^2}{\pi^2 D_1} \quad (2)$$

Table II summarizes the resulting τ_1 -values. For the P_{20- α} S · x IL electrolytes, one clearly observes an increase of τ_1 with increasing IL concentration, since more and more EOs become involved in complexes with lithium, and the PEO backbone becomes less mobile. Contrarily, for the P₂₀S · x IL electrolytes, τ_1 decreases only slightly, and the motion along the chain basically remains unaltered by the presence of the IL. However, one should bear in mind that the τ_1 -values implicitly depend on τ_3 , and it is not clear if the extrapolation with $\alpha \approx 0.8$ underestimates τ_1 , as $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ might cross over to a diffusive type of motion on larger time scales. Nevertheless, one can conclude that the experimentally^{2,11} and numerically (Figure 4) observed increase of the lithium diffusivity for P₂₀S · x IL must arise from an enhancement of at least one of the other mechanisms.

B. Segmental Motion

In order to quantify the segmental polymer motion, the MSDs $\langle \Delta R^2(t) \rangle$ of the EOs relative to the center of mass of the PEO chain have been calculated (Figure 7). This quantity has been computed for all EOs (i. e. irrespective of the presence of an ion), for EOs bound to a lithium ion and for the respective attached ions. The criterion to consider a cation or EO as bound was that the average EO index of the ion did not change more than one, i. e. $|\Delta n(t)| \leq 1$ for all time frames during t . For the bound EOs, no further distinction between additional coordinations of the lithium ion to e. g. another PEO chain or a




Figure 6: Mean square change of the average EO index $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ for (a) $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL and (b) $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL.

system	τ_1 [ns]	$\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$ [$\text{\AA}^2$]	τ_R [ns]	τ_2 [ns]	C_R [$\text{\AA}^2 \text{ ns}^{-1/2}$]	C_2 [$\text{\AA}^2 \text{ ns}^{-1/2}$]
PEO	-	1979	22	-	151.5	-
P ₂₀ S	147	1662	45	167	89.0	46.2
$P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL						
P ₂₀ S · 0.66 IL	140	1570	37	89	92.7	59.8
P ₂₀ S · 3.24 IL	127	1571	24	68	115.2	68.4
$P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL						
P ₁₆ S · 0.556 IL	181	1479	43	145	81.0	44.1
P ₁₂ S · 1.111 IL	208	1359	35	145	82.5	40.5
P ₈ S · 1.667 IL	301	1151	28	104	78.1	40.5

Table II: Parameters characterizing the two intramolecular transport mechanisms (see text for further explanation). The values for pure PEO are also shown for comparison.




Figure 7: MSDs of the average EOs (circles), bound EOs (diamonds), lithium ions bound to these EOs ($|\Delta n(t)| \leq 1$, solid lines in the inset). All MSDs have been computed in the center-of-mass frame of the PEO chain. The dashed and the dotted lines show the respective Rouse fits.

TFSI molecule was made. Thus, these effects are already implicitly contained in the curves in Figure 7.

The average EOs (circles) show typical Rouse-like motion with the characteristic relaxation time τ_R . The dynamics of the bound EOs (diamonds) is qualitatively the same but protracted. Therefore, it is possible to characterize the intramolecular dynamics of the bound EOs by using a larger, effective Rouse time τ_2 . The lithium ions attached to these EOs (inset, solid lines) closely follow the bound EOs, which gives evidence for their cooperative motion. On short time scales, the MSD of the EOs is larger than the lithium MSD due to the additional internal degrees of freedom of the PEO backbone, but the MSD of the bound cations catches up on longer time scales (approximately 1 ns). Due to the collective motion, τ_2 characterizes the dynamics of the attached lithium ions as well.

Figure 7 also shows the Rouse fits

$$\langle \Delta \mathbf{R}^2(t) \rangle = \frac{2\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle}{\pi^2} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{[1 - \exp(-\frac{tp^2}{\tau_R})]}{p^2} \quad (3)$$

for the average (dashed lines) and the bound EOs (dotted lines). It is important to mention that the precise value of τ_2 obtained from these fits also depends on the value of $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle$ entering the prefactor of Eq. 3. In order to obtain a fit consistent with the plateau value at large t , the MSDs of the average EOs were fitted using two parameters, i.e. τ_R and $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$. In this way, the values in Table I are replaced by an effective mean squared end-to-end vector $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$, characterizing the maximum accessible intramolecular distance for the cations. Once $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$ was determined from the MSDs of the average EOs, the MSDs of the bound EOs were fitted using this value in combination with a single fit parameter τ_2 only. The fitting parameters $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$, τ_R and τ_2 are summarized in Table II.

In case of $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$, $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$ decreases only slightly when IL is added. Compared to pure PEO, the $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$ are about 16–20 % lower in these systems and show good agreement with the respective values in Table I. This demonstrates that the PEO chains in these electrolytes behave relatively ideal, thus additionally validating our analysis in terms of the Rouse model. Both τ_R and τ_2 decrease significantly, clearly indicating that the dynamics of the PEO segments becomes faster with increasing IL concentration. Therefore, the IL can be regarded as plasticizer in present case. Due to the enhanced polymer mobility, the lithium ions also move faster while they are coordinated to a specific chain, and the overall lithium MSD increases as observed in Figure 4. A similar observation has been made experimentally for other plasticizers like ethylene/propylene carbonate^{9,10} or short PEO chains embedded in a high-molecular weight matrix^{8,10}. Naturally, this effect has also been observed for ILs in the experiments² that motivated the present work.

For $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$, $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$ clearly decreases when the PEO chains are successively substituted by IL molecules.

Consequently, more and more lithium ions coordinate to a specific PEO chain, making the backbone more rigid and thus diminishing the maximum displacement accessible via the segmental motions. In combination with the decline of $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$, the values for τ_R and τ_2 also decrease when the IL concentration is raised (Table II). However, it must be pointed out that the τ_R - and the τ_2 -values of different electrolytes can only be quantitatively compared in conjunction with the precise value of $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$. Therefore, a direct comparison of τ_R and τ_2 is only valid for similar $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$, as in the case of $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$. This is also highlighted by the observations from Figure 7(b), where the EOs (both types) rather become slower with the IL fraction. Therefore, it is convenient to express the effect of both $\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}}$ and τ_R or τ_2 within a single meaningful number. To this purpose, the prefactor of the characteristic Rouse-like motion for intermediate time scales (i.e. $\tau_R/N^2 \ll t \ll \tau_R$), $\langle \Delta \mathbf{R}^2(t) \rangle = (2\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle / \pi^{3/2}) \sqrt{t/\tau_R}$, can be calculated, making it possible to directly measure the magnitude of the MSDs. Table II displays the constants $C_R = 2\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}} / (\pi^3 \tau_R)^{1/2}$ and $C_2 = 2\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}} / (\pi^3 \tau_2)^{1/2}$ for the individual systems, thereby quantifying the mobilities of the average and the bound EOs, respectively. Here, one indeed observes the same trends as from the direct comparison of the MSDs: For $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$, the segmental mobility expressed by C_R and C_2 clearly increases with the IL concentration, whereas it slightly decreases in case of the $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$ electrolytes. For these reasons, also the lithium dynamics decreases in $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$ in contrast to $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$. This behavior can again be explained by the reduced flexibility of the PEO backbone, since the fraction of bound EOs increases when the PEO chains are gradually substituted by IL. This effect counteracts the plasticizing influence of the IL,

In both investigated types of electrolytes, the center-of-mass dynamics of the PEO chains becomes faster with increasing IL concentration. This is not too surprising, since the motion of the individual chains is less hindered by other chains when the PEO concentration is reduced.

Within the analysis above, the detailed coordination of the lithium ions is not specified further. Of course, it is questionable if cations bound to two PEO chains show the same dynamical behavior as ions bound to one chain only, since the former complexes could be regarded as transient crosslinks, which would significantly impede the polymer dynamics. A more detailed analysis (see supporting information) indeed revealed that there is a fundamental difference between these two coordination types. While for lithium ions coordinated to a single PEO chain ions that diffuse along the backbone are significantly faster than those that remain bound to the same monomers, no difference between these two ion categories could be found for cations attached to two PEO chains. This implies that the cations bound to two PEO chains experience no effective transport due to the diffusion along the chain. Rather, the PEO chain moves reptation-like along its own contour past the cation, which results in a non-zero $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$ (Figure 6), but does not contribute

to the lithium transport. However, this feature can be easily implemented by weighting the effect of τ_1 according to the ratio of ions bound to one PEO chain only (see discussion in the supporting information).

C. Interchain Transfer

When only considering the diffusion along the chain and the PEO dynamics as possible transport mechanisms, the ion remains confined to a finite volume characterized by the radius of gyration of the PEO chains. Moreover, the diffusion of the center of mass of the polymer chain becomes irrelevant in the long-chain limit. Therefore, the transfer of the cation between different PEO chains is necessary for the long-range cation transport and thus any macroscopically measurable conductivity. Here, previous MD simulations have shown that the dynamics of the lithium ion is independent from its past after such a transfer processes¹, leading to Markovian behavior for time scales larger than τ_3 , and that these processes can thus be regarded as renewal events in the spirit of the Dynamic Bond Percolation (DBP) model by Ratner *et al.*³⁰.

1. Transfer Mechanism

We start with the investigation of the detailed mechanism of the cation transfer process. During most transfers, the ion is coordinated to two PEO chains simultaneously (i. e. the leaving chain and the entering chain, see also Table I) as a transition state. In some events, the cation is also temporarily coordinated by TFSI anions only and migrates to another PEO chain in this way, which will be discussed below.

Figure 8 shows a histogram of the life times τ of the intermediate in which a Li^+ is coordinated by two PEO chains (solid lines). One clearly observes that the resulting distribution is very broad. Whereas most complexes exist only briefly (i. e. a few picoseconds), some exist over nearly the whole simulation length of 200 ns. For all electrolytes, no significant difference can be found for $p(\tau)$, suggesting a rather universal mechanism. This is also reasonable when keeping in mind that the lithium coordination sphere containing two PEO chains is relatively compact, and that the surrounding molecules thus hardly affect the transfer process once the complex has formed. Of course, it is questionable if also the brief coordinations in Figure 8 can result in a successful cation transfer, since the separation of the leaving chain and the simultaneous formation of a new, stable coordination sphere on the entering chain will need a certain time. For this purpose, Figure 8 also shows $p(\tau)$ for complexes which resulted in a transfer where the ion remained detached from the old chain for at least 100 ps. This time scale is motivated by a more detailed analysis (not shown), in which we found that brief transfers followed by immediate back-

jumps to the previous polymer chain occur up to 100 ps. Of course, these events cannot be regarded a renewal process in the strict sense, since the lithium dynamics will not become uncorrelated to its past after such an event. Thus, we used this criterion throughout our analysis to identify real renewal processes. From Figure 8 one indeed observes that the probability of such a successful transfer is lower for short τ . These curves indicate that it takes on average approximately 50 ps to form an intermediate capable to provide a successful transfer. Once such an intermediate complex has formed, its decay obviously is rather spontaneous as indicated by the roughly exponential shape of $p(\tau)$ for $\tau \geq 50$ ps. Again, the curves are nearly identical for all electrolytes.

In order to study the transfer mechanism in more detail, we monitored the progress of the cation transfer as follows: When a second PEO chain enters the coordination sphere of a cation that is already coordinated to a PEO molecule, the EO coordination number n at the first chain naturally decreases. For brief coordinations of the second chain, the crown-ether-like structure of the first chain will hardly be perturbed. On the other hand, for longer times, one would expect a rather symmetric coordination by both PEO chains, leading to smaller n . In case of a successful cation transfer, the EO coordination number decreases even further to zero. The minimum coordination number $n_{\min}$ that is reached during τ can therefore be used to monitor the progress and the success of the cation transfer. Figure 9 shows the probability $p(n_{\min})$ to find a specific minimum coordination number $n_{\min}$ as well as the probability to find any coordination number n on the first PEO chain during τ . One clearly observes that on average 2 – 3 EOs of each chain coordinate to the Li^+ (solid lines). This coordination is independent from the IL concentration as expected from the dense packing of the coordination sphere. For $p(n_{\min})$, one notices that the brief coordinations corresponding to $n_{\min} = 4 - 5$ become less likely with increasing IL concentration for $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$. As a consequence, the relative probability that a complex with $n_{\min} = 2$ is formed increases. For $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$, no such effect can be observed, and $p(n_{\min})$ remains basically unaltered by the presence of the IL. This indicates that the increased probability of $n_{\min} = 2$ for $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$ is not related to a concentration effect, which would also be present for $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$. Here, rather the lower fraction of free EOs, the electrostatic repulsion of the coordinating lithium ions and the resulting rigidity of the PEO backbone impeding the formation of the helical structure with $n = 4 - 5$ leads to a larger value for $p(n_{\min} = 2)$. In total, a complete cation transfer with $n_{\min} = 0$ has the same relative probability of about 10 % for all IL concentrations and EO : Li ratios.

It is worth noting that, in contrast to earlier findings from MD simulations of a PEO/ LiBF_4 electrolyte¹, no significant influence of the anion on the PEO-to-PEO transfer could be observed. Here, it was found that the BF_4^- anion assisted the transfer by stabilizing the inter-




Figure 8: Histogram of the life times τ of the intermediate complexes involving two PEO chains which facilitate the cationic transfer. Solid: all events, dashed: successful events only (see text). (a) $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL and (b) $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL.




Figure 9: Probability $p(n)$ to find a specific EO coordination number n for a cation coordinated to two PEO chains (solid) as well as the probability $p(n_{\min})$ to find a minimum EO coordination number $n_{\min}$ on the first PEO chain during the life time of the complex (dashed).

mediate complex. Within the present analysis, no influence of the IL and thus a higher TFSI concentration on the mechanistic details of the transfer could be observed. Most likely, the minor importance of the TFSI anions for the transfer arises from the suppressed tendency to form ion pairs or higher-order ionic clusters as compared to BF_4^- .

2. Renewal Time

In order to determine τ_3 , we counted the number of transfer processes N_{tr} from the simulations. As above, brief transfers and successive backjumps after less than

100 ps were excluded, while on the other hand transfer processes via the anions were also counted, since they serve as a renewal process in the same way. Subsequently, the τ_3 -values were determined according to $\tau_3 = t_{\max} N_{Li^+} / N_{tr}$, where $t_{\max} = 200$ ns is the simulation length and $N_{Li^+} = 27$ is the number of lithium ions in the simulation box.

The individual values for τ_3 are summarized in Table III. One observes for both the $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL and the $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL electrolytes that τ_3 increases with increasing IL concentration. Since the PEO molecules become more and more diluted, this can at least partly be explained as a concentration effect. In order to study this effect in more detail, Table III also shows the partial volume of the

simulation box occupied by IL relative to the total volume filled with PEO and IL, $V_{\text{IL,rel}} = V_{\text{IL}}/(V_{\text{IL}} + V_{\text{PEO}})$, since both species are in principle able to serve as a solvent. When comparing electrolytes with similar $V_{\text{IL,rel}}$, e. g. $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot 0.66$ IL with $\text{P}_{16}\text{S} \cdot 0.556$ IL or $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot 3.24$ IL with $\text{P}_8\text{S} \cdot 1.667$ IL, it is obvious that τ_3 is larger for the $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x$ IL electrolytes. This indicates that not only the reduced PEO concentration expressed via $V_{\text{IL,rel}}$ leads to an increase of τ_3 , but also the reduced number of free EOs, which are necessary for a successful transfer.

Table III also shows the probability p_{IL} that a TFSI-supported transfer takes place as well as the average squared distance $\langle \Delta \mathbf{R}_{\text{Li}}^2 \rangle_{\text{IL}}$ the lithium ion covers while it is connected to TFSI only. For high IL concentrations, it becomes more likely for a lithium ion to migrate through the IL-rich regions of the electrolyte. Since this scenario is less likely for $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x$ IL, one can conclude that the transfer via TFSI in $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x$ IL is mainly caused by the crowded PEO chains and the lower fraction of free EOs. However, from the percentages to find a lithium ion solely coordinated by anions at any time, i. e. 0.4 % for $\text{P}_{12}\text{S} \cdot 1.111$ IL and 2.5 % for $\text{P}_8\text{S} \cdot 1.667$ IL, it is clear that the residence time in the IL-rich regions is rather short. Nevertheless, the value of $\langle \Delta \mathbf{R}_{\text{Li}}^2 \rangle_{\text{IL}}$ indicates that the PEO-TFSI-PEO transitions may substantially contribute to the overall lithium MSD if p_{IL} is large enough.

In total, it was observed that the transfer process is similar in all investigated electrolytes, and that a universal mechanism holds for the PEO-to-PEO transition. Therefore, the critical step is the encounter of a second PEO chain, or, more precisely, a free PEO segment. Once the complex has formed, it decays according to a universal distribution of life times (Figure 8), and the probability that the cation is completely detached from the old chain ($n_{\text{min}} = 0$ in Figure 9) is identical for all systems. Nevertheless, in the limit of high IL concentrations, the a change of the overall lithium transport mechanism becomes visible, since the transfer processes facilitated by TFSI become more important, especially for $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x$ IL. However, as long as the displacement the ion covers in the IL-rich region is sufficiently small, these transfers are also captured by the formalism of the transport model.

D. Comparison with Experiments

Finally, we compare the predictions of the lithium transport model to the experimental data taken from ref. 2. Of course, a direct comparison of D_{Li} as extracted from Figure 4 is impossible, since the motion of the short PEO chains ($N = 54$) in our simulations significantly contributes to the lithium diffusion, whereas most experimental studies focus on the long-chain limit (e. g. $M_w = 4.000.000$ g/mol in ref. 2). However, due the explicit N -dependence of the three time scales¹, i. e. $\tau_1 \propto N^2$, $\tau_2 \propto N^2$ and $\tau_3 \propto N^0$, and using the fact that the center-of-mass motion vanishes for $N \rightarrow \infty$, this

problem can be easily circumvented.

For the scaling of τ_2 , entanglement effects may become relevant, which would manifest itself by a steeper dependence of the polymer relaxation time for chain lengths larger than the entanglement length N_e . However, if $\tau_3 < \tau_e$, meaning that the lithium ion leaves the chain before the latter begins to reptate or the constraints imposed by the crosslinks become important, the dynamical contribution to the lithium ions is still Rousean⁴⁵. In the case of PEO, experiments revealed that the entanglement regime sets in from about $N \approx 75$ ^{46,47}. Based on these observations, one can estimate τ_e according to $\tau_e = \tau_R(N = 75) = \tau_R(75/54)^2$. For P_{20}S , this leads to $\tau_e \approx 87$ ns, which is substantially larger than τ_3 . Also in case of the highly plasticized $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot 3.24$ IL one finds $\tau_e \approx 46$ ns $> \tau_3$. Therefore, the lithium ion leaves the PEO chain before the tube constraints become noticeable, and the transport model can also be applied in the limit of long chains.

Due to the renewal events (i. e. the interchain transfer), D_{Li} can be expressed as

$$D_{\text{Li}}(N) = \frac{\langle g_{12}(N, \tau_3) \rangle_{\text{M3}}}{6\tau_3} + D_{\text{PEO}}(N), \quad (4)$$

where $\langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{\text{M3}}$ corresponds to an averaged, elementary step length between two successive renewal events (abbreviated as M3), and is characterized by the intramolecular transport mechanisms (i. e. M1 and M2). The center-of-mass motion of the PEO chains with length N is characterized by the diffusion coefficient D_{PEO} . As shown in earlier work¹, g_{12} can be described by a Rouse-like expression

$$g_{12}(t) = \frac{2\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle}{\pi^2} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{[1 - \exp(-\frac{tp^2}{\tau_{12}})]}{p^2}, \quad (5)$$

where $1/\tau_{12} = 1/\tau_1 + 1/\tau_2$ is a combined relaxation rate due to both mechanisms. Assuming exponentially distributed residence times at the distinct PEO chains, one can write down an analytical expression for the average MSD at a given chain:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{\text{M3}} &= \frac{1}{\tau_3} \int_0^{\infty} dt \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_3}\right) g_{12}(t) \\ &= \frac{2\langle \mathbf{R}_e^2 \rangle}{\pi^2} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{p^2 \frac{\tau_3}{\tau_{12}} + 1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Solving this expression numerically, values for D_{Li} were obtained for $N = 54$ ($D_{\text{Li}}^{N=54}$) and for $N \rightarrow \infty$ ($D_{\text{Li}}^{N \rightarrow \infty}$), which are summarized in Table IV. For $D_{\text{Li}}^{N=54}$, we observe that the values obtained from Eq. 6 are in reasonable agreement with the respective diffusion coefficients $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{MSD}}$ directly determined from Figure 4, showing that the predictions of our model are consistent with the numerical data. For $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x$ IL, the deviations of $D_{\text{Li}}^{N=54}$ from $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{MSD}}$ can be attributed to the large uncertainties of D_{PEO} , since the PEO chains are removed in this case.

system	τ_3 [ns]	p_{IL} [%]	$\langle \Delta \mathbf{R}_{\text{Li}}^2 \rangle_{\text{IL}}$ [$\text{\AA}^2$]	$V_{\text{IL,rel}}$
P ₂₀ S	17.1 ± 1.3	2.5	31.2 ± 8.5	0.00
P ₂₀ S · x IL				
P ₂₀ S · 0.66 IL	18.4 ± 1.4	1.0	34.2 ± 12.6	0.19
P ₂₀ S · 3.24 IL	24.1 ± 1.3	8.5	101.6 ± 25.6	0.54
P _{20-αx} S · x IL				
P ₁₆ S · 0.556 IL	25.0 ± 2.0	4.6	33.6 ± 10.6	0.20
P ₁₂ S · 1.111 IL	28.4 ± 2.2	13.7	79.3 ± 17.0	0.40
P ₈ S · 1.667 IL	32.7 ± 2.5	38.2	225.7 ± 51.0	0.60

Table III: Average residence times τ_3 (the leaving PEO chain had to remain detached for at least 100 ps as a criterion for a successful transfer process). Here, p_{IL} is the probability that the lithium ion is transferred by the TFSI anions, whereas $\langle \Delta \mathbf{R}_{\text{Li}}^2 \rangle_{\text{IL}}$ corresponds to the average squared distance the ion covers while it is connected to TFSI only. Also shown is the fraction $V_{\text{IL,rel}}$ of the molar volume occupied by IL.

system	$D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{MSD}}$	$D_{\text{Li}}^{N=54}$	$D_{\text{Li}}^{N \rightarrow \infty}$
P ₂₀ S	3.133	2.932	1.947
P ₂₀ S · x IL			
P ₂₀ S · 0.66 IL	3.698	3.649	2.309
P ₂₀ S · 3.24 IL	4.744	4.313	2.392
P _{20-αx} S · x IL			
P ₁₆ S · 0.556 IL	3.396	(2.633)	1.511
P ₁₂ S · 1.111 IL	3.124	(2.613)	1.311
P ₈ S · 1.667 IL	2.803	(2.808)	1.166

Table IV: Lithium diffusion coefficient D_{Li} (in $\text{\AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$) calculated by the lithium transport model (in particular equations 4 and 6). The values in parentheses have large uncertainties arising from the bad statistics in the diffusive regime PEO center-of-mass diffusion (since the PEO chains are removed), and do not properly reflect same trends as $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{MSD}}$.

In the following, we will compare our results with the experimental data ($D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}}$) at $T = 323$ K taken from ref. 2. Despite the temperature gap between simulation and experiment, we observe identical trends: For a similar dilution series, in which the IL is *added* to P₂₀S, $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}}$ also increases significantly with increasing IL content (i. e. $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}} = 0.052 \text{ \AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$ for P₂₀S · 1.0 IL, $0.118 \text{ \AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$ for P₂₀S · 2.0 IL and $0.126 \text{ \AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$ for P₂₀S · 4.0 IL). In contrast to this, $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}}$ rather decreases when the PEO chains are *substituted* by IL, and, consequently, the EO : Li ratio decreases ($D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}} = 0.070 \text{ \AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$ for P₁₀S · 0.0 IL, $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}} = 0.051 \text{ \AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$ for P₁₀S · 1.0 IL, $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}} = 0.063 \text{ \AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$ for P₁₀S · 2.0 IL and $D_{\text{Li}}^{\text{exp}} = 0.046 \text{ \AA}^2\text{ns}^{-1}$ for P₅S · 1.0 IL).

As discussed above, these observations can be understood as follows: In case of P₂₀S · x IL, the IL acts as a plasticizer, and the enhanced polymer dynamics leads to a faster lithium ion dynamics. On the other hand, when the EO : Li ratio simultaneously decreases as for P_{20- αx} S · x IL, the remaining PEO chains become more and more rigid, which approximately cancels the plasticizing effect of the IL.

Thus, two opposing trends related to the segmental

mobility can be found in ternary polymer electrolyte-ionic liquid mixtures: the slowdown of the polymer motion with decreasing EO : Li ratio (also encountered in the binary systems) and the plasticizing due to the IL, leading to an enhancement of the polymer dynamics. Naturally, for the technologically relevant long-chain limit, the enhancement of the center-of-mass motion of the PEO chains is irrelevant. For these reasons, one should keep in mind that the polymer chains remain mobile enough when designing new electrolyte materials.

Of course, the value of D_{Li} consists of essentially three contributions (Eq. 4): the intrachain distance $\langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{\text{M3}}$ the ion covers while connected to the same chain, the center-of-mass motion of the PEO molecules characterized by D_{PEO} and the renewal events measured by τ_3 , which facilitate the diffusive motion of the ions in the long-time limit for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, these trends may also oppose each other as in case of P₂₀S · x IL. For these reasons, it is desirable to quantify in how far the modified intrachain transport and the altered renewal rates contribute to the overall change of D_{Li} relative to the pure polymer electrolyte P₂₀S.

Table V shows the percentage by which the intramolecular contributions ($\langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{\text{M3}}$), the center-of-mass motion of the PEO chains (D_{PEO}) and the renewal rates (τ_3^{-1}) as well as the overall D_{Li} -values change relative to the pure polymer electrolyte P₂₀S for $N = 54$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For P₂₀S · x IL one clearly observes that the intramolecular contribution increases with the IL concentration, mainly as a result of the increased segmental mobility. For finite PEO chains, the enhanced D_{PEO} -value additionally increases the lithium motion. In contrast to this, the contribution of the renewal processes decreases for these electrolytes. However, the plasticizing effect overcompensates this decrease, and D_{Li} increases for both $N = 54$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Remarkably, the relative intramolecular contribution also increases for P_{20- αx} S · x IL, although the enhancement is weaker than for P₂₀S · x IL. At first glance, this may contradict the findings presented above, where it was

system	$N = 54$				$N \rightarrow \infty$		
	M12 [%]	M3 [%]	c.o.m. [%]	tot. [%]	M12 [%]	M3 [%]	tot. [%]
P ₂₀ S	±0.0	±0.0	±0.0	±0.0	±0.0	±0.0	±0.0
P ₂₀ S · x IL							
P ₂₀ S · 0.66 IL	+21.7	−7.1	+39.9	+24.5	+27.6	−7.1	+18.6
P ₂₀ S · 3.24 IL	+53.9	−29.0	+98.7	+47.1	+73.1	−29.0	+22.9
P _{20−αx} S · x IL							
P ₁₆ S · 0.556 IL	+9.3	−31.6	+10.2	−10.2	+13.5	−31.6	−22.4
P ₁₂ S · 1.111 IL	+6.4	−39.8	+23.1	−10.9	+11.8	−39.8	−32.7
P ₈ S · 1.667 IL	+4.7	−47.7	+51.6	−4.2	+14.5	−47.7	−40.1

Table V: Changes of the intramolecular contribution $\langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{M3}$, the renewal times τ_3 , the center-of-mass motion D_{PEO} and the resulting D_{Li} -value relative to P₂₀S for $N = 54$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$.

observed that both the diffusion along the PEO chain and the segmental motion become slower when IL is added to the system. However, this mismatch can easily be resolved by the following considerations: First, the fraction of lithium ions coordinating to one PEO chain only increases when going from P₂₀S to P₈S · 1.667 IL (Table I). As discussed above (see also supporting information), the diffusion along the PEO backbone becomes more efficient in this way, since lithium ions coordinated to two polymer chains experience no effective transport via this mechanism. The second, more important effect leading to the observations from Table V is the fact that $\langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{M3}$ is evaluated for different τ_3 (Eq. 6). Thus, with increasing τ_3 also the distance $\langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{M3}$ increases, although this dependence is weaker than linear, and the overall D_{Li} diminishes in this case. Consistently, calculating the individual values for $\langle g_{12}(\tau_3) \rangle_{M3}$ with a constant value of $\tau_3 = 17.1$ ns as observed for P₂₀S, the intramolecular contribution indeed decreases for P_{20- αx} S · x IL. The only contribution which displays a clear increase is D_{PEO} . Thus, for $N = 54$, D_{Li} diminishes only slightly, whereas a significant decrease can be found in case of $N \rightarrow \infty$.

So far, we focused only on the high-temperature limit which we can address in our simulations. Although simulations at low temperature would be too costly, we are nevertheless able to make some statements about this regime.

For the scenario of the addition of IL, it was reported that the glass-transition temperature T_g significantly decreases with increasing IL concentration², which is an indication that the enhanced polymer dynamics also plays a crucial role at low temperatures. Thus, one would expect that the plasticizing effect and thus the increase of D_{Li} becomes even more pronounced. Indeed, at 323 K, D_{Li} increases by a factor of 2.4 when going from P₂₀S to P₂₀S · 4.0 IL², whereas at 423 K, the relative increase of $D_{Li}^{N \rightarrow \infty}$ between P₂₀S and P₂₀S · 3.24 IL is only half as large (Table V).

In contrast to this, the decrease of T_g is significantly weaker between P₂₀S and P₁₀S · 1.0 IL (which slightly resembles the case of IL substitution), and D_{Li}^{exp} approximately remains constant at 323 K². In contrast to this,

one observes from Table V that $D_{Li}^{N \rightarrow \infty}$ significantly decreases when going from P₂₀S to P₈S · 1.667 IL. However, one has to keep in mind that these values do not contain the contribution of the migration through the IL-rich regions, which are relevant for the case of substitution (Table III). Thus, the motion of the ions is partially decoupled from the polymer chains, and one cannot solely argue on the basis of the T_g -values. This issue might be addressed in future work.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we applied a previously developed cation transport model¹ to MD simulation data of two classes of ternary mixtures of PEO/LiTFSI and an ionic liquid. Motivated by experimental observations^{2,11}, electrolytes of the type P₂₀S · x IL were studied, i. e. in which an ionic liquid has been *added* to the binary polymer electrolyte P₂₀S. Furthermore, we focused on the theoretically interesting P_{20- αx} S · x IL electrolytes, in which the PEO chains are *substituted* by the ionic liquid, in order to explore the crossover from the binary polymer electrolytes to lithium-salt-containing ionic liquids.

From a structural point of view, the PEO chains themselves were only locally distorted by the crown ether-like coordination structure, and no imprint of swelling or collapsed chains due to the presence of the ionic liquid could be found.

For all electrolytes, it turned out that the lithium dynamics mainly took place at the PEO chains. A transport mechanisms in which the lithium ions are decoupled from the PEO dynamics due to the progressive coordination of TFSI anion becomes relevant only for P₁₂S · 1.111 IL and P₈S · 1.667 IL, in which the EO : Li ratio was relatively low, resulting in a lack of free ether oxygens capable to bind the lithium ions.

The application of the transport model revealed that the increased lithium diffusivity in P₂₀S · x IL can be attributed to the enhanced PEO dynamics, and that the ionic liquid thus serves as a plasticizer. As a result, also the lithium ions coordinating to the PEO chains be-

come faster, which is in agreement with experimentally observed diffusion coefficients².

For $P_{20-\alpha x}S \cdot x$ IL, no significant increase of the lithium diffusivity could be observed, since the plasticizing effect of the ionic liquid was superimposed with a slowdown due to the reduced flexibility of the PEO backbone caused by crowding effects. Moreover, the same crowding also leads to an additional increase of τ_3 beyond the simple dilution as also observed for $P_{20}S \cdot x$ IL. Thus, the lithium diffusion coefficient in fact rather reduces with the mole fraction of ionic liquid.

In summary, one faces the situation that the segmental mobility of the PEO chains plays a decisive role in ternary polymer electrolytes: Whereas the lithium ions

slow down the PEO chains, the ionic liquid accelerates the polymer motion. Thus, for the design of new battery materials, one should attempt to render the latter effect the dominating one.

Acknowledgments

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

* Electronic address: d.diddens@uni-muenster.de

- ¹ A. Maitra and A. Heuer, *Physical Review Letters* **98**(22), 227802 (2007).
- ² M. Joost, M. Kunze, S. Jeong, M. Schönhoff, M. Winter, and S. Passerini, *Electrochimica Acta* **in press**(2), 861 (????).
- ³ D. E. Fenton, J. M. Parker, and P. V. Wright, *Polymer* **14**(11), 589 (1973).
- ⁴ M. B. Armand, *Ann. Rev. Mater. Sci.* **16**, 245 (1986).
- ⁵ F. M. Gray, *Solid Polymer Electrolytes* (Wiley-VCH, New York, 1991).
- ⁶ P. G. Bruce and C. A. Vincent, *Journal of the Chemical Society, Faraday Transactions* **89**(17), 3187 (1993).
- ⁷ W. Gang, J. Roos, D. Brinkmann, F. Capuano, F. Croce, and B. Scrosati, *Solid State Ionics* **53**(Part 2), 1102 (1992).
- ⁸ M. C. Borghini, M. Mastragostino, and A. Zanelli, *Electrochimica Acta* **41**(15), 2369 (1996).
- ⁹ L. R. A. K. Bandara, M. A. K. L. Dissanayake, and B. E. Mellander, *Electrochimica Acta* **43**(10-11), 1447 (1998).
- ¹⁰ Y. T. Kim and E. S. Smotkin, *Solid State Ionics* **149**(1-2), 29 (2002).
- ¹¹ J. H. Shin, W. A. Henderson, and S. Passerini, *Electrochemistry Communications* **5**(12), 1016 (2003).
- ¹² J. H. Shin, W. A. Henderson, G. B. Appetecchi, E. Alessandrini, and S. Passerini, *Electrochimica Acta* **50**(19), 3859 (2005).
- ¹³ J. H. Shin, W. A. Henderson, S. Scaccia, P. P. Prosini, and S. Passerini, *Journal of Power Sources* **156**(2), 560 (2006).
- ¹⁴ D. Adam, *Nature* **407**(6807), 938 (2000).
- ¹⁵ D. R. MacFarlane, J. H. Huang, and M. Forsyth, *Nature* **402**(6763), 792 (1999).
- ¹⁶ D. Diddens, A. Heuer, and O. Borodin, *Macromolecules* **43**(4), 2028 (2010).
- ¹⁷ O. Borodin, G. D. Smith, R. Bandyopadhyaya, P. Redfern, and L. A. Curtiss, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering* **12**(3), S73 (2004).
- ¹⁸ O. Borodin, G. D. Smith, O. Geiculescu, S. E. Creager, B. Hallac, and D. DesMarteau, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **110**(47), 24266 (2006).
- ¹⁹ O. Borodin and G. D. Smith, *Macromolecules* **40**(4), 1252 (2007).
- ²⁰ K.-J. Lin and J. K. Maranas, *Macromolecules* **45**(15), 6230 (2012).
- ²¹ F. Müller-Plathe, *Acta Polymer.* **45**, 259 (1994).
- ²² F. Müller-Plathe and W. F. van Gunsteren, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **103**(11), 4745 (1995).
- ²³ S. Neyertz and D. Brown, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **104**(10), 3797 (1996).
- ²⁴ O. Borodin and G. D. Smith, *Macromolecules* **33**(6), 2273 (2000).
- ²⁵ L. J. A. Siqueira and M. C. C. Ribeiro, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **122**(19), 194911 (2005).
- ²⁶ O. Borodin and G. D. Smith, *Macromolecules* **39**(4), 1620 (2006).
- ²⁷ O. Borodin, G. D. Smith, and R. Douglas, *J. Chem. Phys. B* **107**(28), 6824 (2003).
- ²⁸ O. Borodin and G. D. Smith, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **110**(12), 6279 (2006).
- ²⁹ O. Borodin and G. D. Smith, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **110**(12), 6293 (2006).
- ³⁰ A. Nitzan and M. A. Ratner, *J. Phys. Chem.* **98**(7), 1765 (1994).
- ³¹ P. E. Rouse, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **21**(7), 1272 (1953).
- ³² D. A. Case, T. A. Darden, T. E. Cheatham, C. L. Simmerling, J. Wang, R. E. Duke, R. Luo, M. Crowley, R. C. Walker, W. Zhang, K. M. Merz, B. Wang, *et al.*, *Amber 10* (University of California, San Francisco, 2008), URL <http://amber.scripps.edu/#Amber10>.
- ³³ O. Borodin and G. D. Smith, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **110**(23), 11481 (2006).
- ³⁴ A. Toukmaji, C. Sagui, J. Board, and T. Darden, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **113**(24), 10913 (2000).
- ³⁵ H. J. C. Berendsen, J. P. M. Postma, W. F. van Gunsteren, A. DiNola, and J. R. Haak, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **81**(8), 3684 (1984).
- ³⁶ J. P. Ryckaert, G. Ciccotti, and H. J. C. Berendsen, *Journal of Computational Physics* **23**(3), 327 (1977).
- ³⁷ D. van Belle, M. Froeyen, G. Lippens, and S. J. Wodak, *Molecular Physics* **77**(2), 239 (1992).
- ³⁸ B. T. Thole, *Chemical Physics* **59**(3), 341 (1981).
- ³⁹ G. Mao, M.-L. Saboungi, D. L. Price, M. B. Armand, and W. S. Howells, *Physical Review Letters* **84**(24), 5536 (2000).
- ⁴⁰ P. Johansson, J. Tegenfeld, and J. Lindgren, *Polymer* **40**, 4399 (1999).
- ⁴¹ A. G. Baboul, P. C. Redfern, A. Sutjianto, and L. A. Curtiss, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **121**(31),

- 7220 (1999).
- ⁴² A. Maitra and A. Heuer, Journal of Physical Chemistry B **112**(32), 9641 (2008).
- ⁴³ O. Borodin, G. D. Smith, and W. Henderson, Journal of Physical Chemistry B **110**(34), 16879 (2006).
- ⁴⁴ J.-C. Lassegues, J. Grondin, and D. Talaga, Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics **8**(48), 5629 (2006).
- ⁴⁵ M. Doi and S. F. Edwards, *The Theory of Polymer Dynamics* (Oxford Science Publications, Clarendon, Oxford, 2003).
- ⁴⁶ M. Appel and G. Fleischer, Macromolecules **26**(20), 5520 (1993).
- ⁴⁷ J. Shi and C. A. Vincent, Solid State Ionics **60**, 11 (1993).

VII. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

A. Radial Distribution Functions

B. Static Rouse Mode Amplitudes

C. Influence of the Lithium Ion Coordination Sphere on the Segmental Dynamics

Within the analysis from Figure 7, the detailed coordination of the lithium ions is not specified further. One would expect that the rather brief coordinations of the TFSI anions do not change the mechanistic details of the polymer-supported lithium transport, and that this effect is implicitly contained in τ_2 . On the other hand, it is questionable if cations bound to two PEO chains even *qualitatively* show the same behavior as ions bound to one chain only, since the former complexes could be regarded as transient crosslinks. A more detailed analysis indeed reveals that there is a fundamental difference between these two coordination types. This can be seen in Figure 12, which shows the lithium MSD of lithium ions bound to one and to two PEO chains for P₂₀S. A second distinction was made if the ions diffused along the PEO chain (both intramolecular mechanisms) or remained bound to the same EOs (polymer dynamics only, here, the same criterion as above, $|\Delta n(t)| \leq 1$, has been applied). In case of cations bound to one PEO chain only (Figure 12(a)), ions undergoing both types of intramolecular transport are clearly faster than those remaining close to the initial position on the PEO chain. For lithium ions connected to two PEO chains, no significant difference between these two categories can be observed in the MSD (Figure 12(b)). This implies that the cations bound to two PEO chains experience no effective transport due to the diffusion along the chain. Rather, the PEO chain moves reptation-like along its own contour past the cation, which results in a non-zero $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$, but does not contribute to the overall lithium transport. This can also be seen from the MSD of the EOs that are initially bound to the respective lithium ions, which is also shown in Figure 12(b). Here, these EOs are significantly faster than the lithium ions during the entire observation range. Contrarily, in case of complexes involving a single PEO chain only, the MSD of the cations which move along the chain becomes equally large as the MSD of the initially bound EOs at about 1 ns. Seemingly,

the lithium ions become even more mobile for larger t in accordance with the predictions of the transport model, however, one cannot make clear predictions within the error bars. From Figure 12(a) one also observes that for short times the slipping motion of the polymer chain is dominant even for ions bound to one PEO molecule, as the MSD of the attached EOs is substantially larger. Thus, the libration of the PEO backbone on microscopic time scales also leads to slight contributions to $\langle \Delta n^2(t) \rangle$, which naturally results in a displacement of the EOs instead of the attached lithium ions. For all other investigated electrolytes, the observations from Figure 12 are qualitatively the same.

With respect to the transport model, in particular Eq. 5, this effect can be easily captured. Here, the only additionally required parameter is the ratio of lithium ions coordinated to one or two PEO chains (Table I):

$$\tilde{g}_{12}(t) = r_{1\text{PEO}} g_{12}(t) + (1 - r_{1\text{PEO}}) g_2(t) \quad (7)$$

For the fraction $r_{1\text{PEO}}$ of cations bound to one PEO chain, Eq. 5 remains valid, whereas for ions bound to two chains with $\tau_{1,2\text{PEO}} \rightarrow \infty$ only τ_2 is important. Within this approximation, the average dynamics of the lithium ions (i.e. averaged over ions bound to one or two PEO chains while simultaneously allowing the intermediate exchange between these two coordination states) is estimated from the structural property $r_{1\text{PEO}}$ only. Figure 13 shows that this simplistic picture is indeed valid to a good approximation. Here, Figure 13(a) displays the MSD of ions bound to one or two PEO molecules in P₂₀S as extracted from the simulations. These curves have in turn been used to calculate an approximate average MSD according to Eq. 7, which is also shown in Figure 13(a). In fact, the agreement of $\tilde{g}_{12}(t)$ with the average MSD (i.e. a lithium ion that remained on the same chain irrespective of other coordinations) is nearly quantitative. Deviations for larger time scales are due to bad statistics. In the same spirit, Figure 13(b) shows the ratio between the approximate $\tilde{g}_{12}(t)$ and the average MSD directly calculated from the simulations for all systems. As for P₂₀S, this ratio is close to unity for all other electrolytes. These observations highlight that, since the crosslinks are temporary and an exchange between both coordination types takes place, the long-time behavior of the intramolecular dynamics may be estimated by the average in Eq. 7, as nicely demonstrated in Figure 13.




Figure 10: Upper: radial distribution functions in $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$ for the atom pairs (a) $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{PEO}}$ and (b) $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{TFSI}}$. Lower: radial distribution functions in $\text{P}_{20-\alpha}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$ for the atom pairs (c) $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{PEO}}$ and (d) $\text{Li}^+ - \text{O}_{\text{TFSI}}$.




Figure 11: Rouse mode amplitudes $\langle \mathbf{X}_p^2 \rangle$ in dependence of the mode number p for the two electrolyte classes (a) $\text{P}_{20}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$ and (b) $\text{P}_{20-\alpha x}\text{S} \cdot x \text{ IL}$. The $\mathbf{X}_p$ have been calculated from the expression of the discrete Rouse model, i.e. $\mathbf{X}_p(t) = (1/N) \sum_{n=1}^N \cos((p\pi(n-1/2)/N)) \mathbf{R}_n(t)$.




Figure 12: MSDs of the lithium ions bound to (a) one or (b) two PEO chains in P_{20}S . A second distinction was made between cations that diffused along the PEO chain (M1 and M2) and ions that remained bound to the same EOs (M2 only). The MSDs of the average EOs and the EOs that are initially bound to the respective lithium ions are also shown. All curves have been computed in the center-of-mass frame. For the other electrolytes, the scenario is qualitatively the same.




Figure 13: (a) MSD of lithium ions bound to one or two PEO chains as well as the MSD of cations which are bound to the same PEO molecule during t (irrespective of further coordinations) for P₂₀S. The MSDs of ions bound to one and to two chains have been used to compute an approximate average $\tilde{g}_{12}(t)$ according to Eq. 7. (b) Ratio of $\tilde{g}_{12}(t)$ relative to the real average MSD as extracted from the simulations for the P₂₀S · x IL (top) and the P_{20- α x}S · x IL electrolytes (bottom).

This figure "EO_Li_msd_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "EO_Li_msd_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "IL_addition.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "IL_substitution.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "PILbin_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "PILbin_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "Px_minusx_ratios.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "Xp2_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "Xp2_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "approx_1PEO_vs_2PEO_P20.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "coord_n_chainlogtaubin_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "coord_n_chainlogtaubin_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "delta_n_msd_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "delta_n_msd_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "gofr_PEO_O-Li_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "gofr_PEO_O-Li_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "gofr_TFSI_O-Li_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "gofr_TFSI_O-Li_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "jumps.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "logtaubin_ind_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "logtaubin_ind_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "msd_Li_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "msd_Li_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "onePEO.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "p_n_p_n_min_add.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "p_n_p_n_min_sub.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>

This figure "twoPEO.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1211.3413v1>