

# Atomistic modeling of bulk and grain boundary diffusion in solid electrolyte $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ using machine-learning interatomic potentials

Yongliang Ou,<sup>1,\*</sup> Yuji Ikeda,<sup>1</sup> Lena Scholz,<sup>2</sup> Sergiy Divinski,<sup>3</sup> Felix Fritzen,<sup>2</sup> and Blazej Grabowski<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute for Materials Science, University of Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 55, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Applied Mechanics, University of Stuttgart, Universitätsstr. 32, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute of Materials Physics, University of Münster, Wilhelm-Klemm-Str. 10, 48149 Münster, Germany*

(Dated: July 8, 2024)

$\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  is a promising candidate for the solid electrolyte in all-solid-state Li-ion batteries due to its high ionic conductivity. In applications, this material is in a polycrystalline state with grain boundaries (GBs) that can affect ionic conductivity. While atomistic modeling provides valuable information on the impact of GBs on Li diffusion, such studies face either high computational cost (when using *ab initio* methods) or accuracy limitations (when using classical potentials) as challenges. Here, we develop a quality-level-based active learning scheme for efficient and systematic development of *ab initio*-based machine-learning interatomic potentials, specifically moment tensor potentials (MTPs), for large-scale, long-time, and high-accuracy simulations of complex atomic structures and diffusion mechanisms as encountered in solid electrolytes. Based on this scheme, we obtain MTPs for  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  and investigate two tilt GBs,  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$ ,  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$ , and one twist GB,  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ . All three GBs exhibit low formation energies of less than  $20 \text{ meV}/\text{\AA}^2$ , indicating their high stability in polycrystalline  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . Using the MTPs, diffusion coefficients of the anion-ordered and anion-disordered bulk, as well as the three GBs, are obtained from molecular dynamics simulations of atomistic models with more than 16 000 atoms for 5 ns. At 300 K, the GB diffusion coefficients fall between the ones of the anion-ordered bulk structure ( $0.012 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ , corresponding ionic conductivity about  $0.2 \text{ mS}/\text{cm}$ ) and the anion-disordered bulk structure (50% Cl/S-anion disorder;  $2.203 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ , about  $29.8 \text{ mS}/\text{cm}$ ) of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . Experimental data fall between the Arrhenius-extrapolated diffusion coefficients of the investigated atomic structures, supporting our quantitative *in silico* predictions.

## I. INTRODUCTION

All-solid-state Li-ion batteries have attracted attention for their improved safety compared to conventional Li-ion batteries by virtue of their solid instead of a flammable liquid electrolyte [1]. However, finding a suitable material for the solid electrolyte is not trivial [2]. In 2008, the argyrodite-type  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  was first reported, featuring an unusually high Li-ion mobility [3]. Later, intensive experimental investigations [4–6] affirmed the superior ionic conductivity, and ever since  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  is considered a candidate for the solid electrolyte.

Diffusion of Li ions in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  was measured using nuclear magnetic resonance [7, 8]. The room-temperature diffusion coefficients reported in the two studies are of the same order of magnitude ( $3.87 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$  [7] vs.  $2.5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$  [8]), and the derived activation energies differ by about 20%, ( $0.35 \pm 0.01 \text{ eV}$  [7] vs.  $(0.28 \pm 0.01) \text{ eV}$  [8]). Differences in the activation energies can come from the relatively narrow temperature intervals of the diffusion measurements and difficulties in reproducibly synthesizing such materials. Depending on the synthesis conditions, polycrystalline materials with Cl/S-anion disorder [9] and potentially different grain boundary (GB) distributions [10, 11] are obtained. Further, the contributions of crystalline bulk

and GBs to the Li diffusion can hardly be separated in experiments [10], which might affect the measured coefficients.

Atomistic simulations provide an important complementary tool for an improved understanding of diffusion mechanisms and the impact of GBs. Table I summarizes molecular dynamics (MD) simulations for Li self-diffusion in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . The diffusion coefficient for the anion-ordered bulk structure was computed in several previous studies [12–15], all of which gave values that are orders of magnitude smaller than those in experiments. Further investigations (both simulations [16, 17] and experiments [9]) showed that the origin of superionic Li diffusion is most likely related to the Cl/S-anion disorder in the bulk structure of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . This anion disorder triggers Li inter-cage diffusion. Recently, quantitative investigations of Li diffusivity in the anion-disordered structure were also performed by *ab initio* MD simulations [15, 18, 19]. With 50% Cl/S-anion disorder in the bulk structure, the Arrhenius-extrapolated Li diffusion coefficients at room temperature are consistent with experiments [15, 18]. The simulated activation energies of Li diffusion are lower ( $0.20$  to  $0.26 \text{ eV}$  [18] and  $0.25 \text{ eV}$  [15]) than the above-listed experimental data. Due to the typical high computational requirements of *ab initio* MD simulations, the sampling time was relatively short in these previous studies, and defects (e.g., GBs) were often neglected.

Interatomic potentials can be utilized instead of *ab ini-*

\* [yongliang.ou@imw.uni-stuttgart.de](mailto:yongliang.ou@imw.uni-stuttgart.de)

TABLE I. Theoretical studies which provided calculated diffusion coefficients for Li self-diffusion in solid electrolyte  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . A closely related  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Br}$  study [19] with grain boundaries (GBs) is also listed. Previous studies used *ab initio* molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, while in the present work, a machine-learning interatomic potential (MLIP), specifically moment tensor potential (MTP), fitted to *ab initio* data is used to accelerate MD. The number of atoms in the simulation cell is denoted by  $N_{\text{at}}$ . “Yes” or “no” means that the corresponding structures have or have not been considered in the corresponding study.

Year	Sampling	Size ( $N_{\text{at}}$ )	Time (ns)	Anion-ordered bulk	Anion-disordered bulk	GBs	Reference
2017	<i>ab initio</i> MD	52	0.1	yes	no	no	[12]
2019	<i>ab initio</i> MD	52	0.3	yes	partially <sup>a</sup>	no	[13]
2022	<i>ab initio</i> MD	52	0.12	yes	no	no	[14]
2022	<i>ab initio</i> MD	52	0.15	yes	yes	no	[18]
2022	classical force field	416	20	no	yes	no	[20]
2023 <sup>b</sup>	<i>ab initio</i> MD	312	0.04	yes	yes	yes	[19]
2024	<i>ab initio</i> MD	52	0.3	yes	yes	no	[15]
2024	<i>ab initio</i> $\rightarrow$ MLIP MD	>16 000	5	yes	yes	yes	this work

<sup>a</sup> Only one configuration with a Cl/S antisite defect was considered in Ref. [13].

<sup>b</sup> A structurally similar material,  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Br}$ , was investigated in Ref. [19].

*tio* simulations to reduce the computational cost. This enables large-scale and long-time MD simulations, equipping us with tools for a statistically reliable prediction of diffusion properties. For example, classical force fields parameterized by *ab initio* data were utilized for simulating solid electrolytes [20–22]. Due to the complex structure of these materials and the limited number of fitting parameters in the force fields, simulation results with lower accuracy have to be expected. A good alternative is given by machine-learning interatomic potentials calibrated to *ab initio* data, which have recently emerged as a powerful tool to accelerate MD simulations while preserving near *ab initio* accuracy [23, 24]. Machine-learning interatomic potentials were shown to accurately describe diffusion [25, 26] and work well even for complex electrolytes [27]. Li diffusion in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  has not been investigated systematically with a machine-learning interatomic potential to our knowledge.

The present study investigates the impact of three GBs with different structural characteristics ( $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$ ,  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$ , and  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ ) on Li diffusion in the solid electrolyte  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ , aiming to provide accurate GB diffusion coefficients and thereby enhance the understanding of experimentally measured data. To this end, we propose and apply an active learning scheme that systematically exploits the quality levels of machine-learning interatomic potentials, specifically of moment tensor potentials (MTPs) [28]. Based on the scheme, we fit machine-learning potentials to *ab initio* data and systematically analyze their performance using the target quantity, i.e., the diffusion coefficient, as a measure. Accelerated by the thus obtained and validated machine-learning interatomic potentials, large-scale and long-time MD simulations are performed to optimize the GB structures and analyze the difference in GB diffusion mechanisms compared to the bulk. From these simulations, we extract the diffusion coefficients for the GBs as well as for the anion-ordered and anion-disordered bulk structures. The results provide a theoretically admissible range of Li diffusivity in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ .

## II. METHODOLOGY

### A. Grain boundary construction

$\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  exhibits an argyrodite-type structure and belongs to the cubic crystal system with the space group  $F\bar{4}3m$  (No. 216) [3, 29]. Figure 1(a) shows the conventional unit cell of the bulk structure, which contains four formula units (52 atoms). The shown bulk structure is anion-ordered, i.e., the Wyckoff sites  $4a$  [the sites symmetrically equivalent to  $(0, 0, 0)$ ] and  $4c$  [equivalent to  $(0.25, 0.25, 0.25)$ ] are fully occupied by Cl and S atoms, respectively. Further,  $\text{PS}_4$  tetrahedral units are present with the P and S atoms located at  $4b$  [equivalent to  $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ ] and  $16e$  sites, respectively. The Cl and the P atoms each form a face-centered cubic sublattice. These relatively heavy anions (Cl, P, and S) comprise a three-dimensional backbone that provides multiple interstitial sites to accommodate the lightweight Li atoms. The Li atoms are positioned at  $24g$  sites in the ideal model with high symmetry. As highlighted in Fig. 1(a), six Li atoms octahedrally coordinate an S atom at a  $4c$  Wyckoff site, forming a so-called Li cage. It was reported both experimentally [29, 30] and theoretically [31–33] that the high-symmetry structure is not the most stable phase at low temperatures and that neighboring interstitial sites, e.g.,  $48h$  Wyckoff sites, offer lower-energy states for the Li atoms. This results in symmetry-breaking displacements of the Li atoms, referred to as tilting of cages. The dynamic stabilization of the Li atoms at the high-symmetry positions (phase transition) with increasing temperature was investigated in Ref. [30]. Such a temperature-induced phase transition is also observed in many other materials. For example, the high-symmetry structure of  $\text{BaFeO}_3$  perovskite is dynamically unstable at lower temperatures and is dynamically stabilized at elevated temperatures [34].

Based on the cubic symmetry of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  and the coincidence-site lattice theory, periodic and commensu-




FIG. 1. (a) Conventional unit cell of anion-ordered bulk  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  with 52 atoms (four formula units). One octahedral cage consisting of six Li atoms is highlighted in blue. (b) Coincidence-site lattice (CSL) unit cell with 78 atoms (six formula units). The planes for constructing the two  $\Sigma 3$  GBs are highlighted in blue. (c) CSL unit cell with 130 atoms (ten formula units). The plane for constructing the  $\Sigma 5$  GB is highlighted in blue. The CSL unit cells are used to construct the GB simulation models (Table II). Atomistic models are visualized using VESTA [35].

rate GB structures can be generated [36]. Considering the complexity of the bulk structure, three relatively simple GBs, yet featuring different geometrical arrangements, namely  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$ ,  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}1)[110]$ , and  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ , were chosen for the present study. Table II lists information about the simulation models for the GBs and also the bulk.  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$  and  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}1)[110]$  are tilt GBs symmetric for the Cl and P atoms with misorientation angles of  $70.53^\circ$  and  $109.47^\circ$ , respectively. [110] is the tilt axis, and  $(1\bar{1}2)$  and  $(\bar{1}\bar{1}1)$  are the GB planes.  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  is a twist GB with a rotational axis of [001] and a misorientation angle of  $36.87^\circ$ . The GB plane (001) is perpendicular to the rotational axis.

To obtain the three GB supercells, two coincidence-site lattice unit cells [Fig. 1(b) for the two  $\Sigma 3$  GBs, and Fig. 1(c) for the  $\Sigma 5$  GB] were constructed by coordinate transformations of the conventional unit cell [Fig. 1(a)]. The GB planes used for constructing the GBs are highlighted in blue. For  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$ , the GB plane cuts through some  $\text{PS}_4$  units and some Li cages. For  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}1)[110]$ , in contrast, the integrity of all Li cages and  $\text{PS}_4$  units is preserved by setting the GB plane to the position of the Cl atomic layers. The integrity of all Li cages is also preserved for  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ , but some  $\text{PS}_4$  units are cut through by the GB plane. With these distinct structural features of the GBs, different diffusion behaviors of Li can be expected.

The GB simulation models were constructed as periodic bicrystals, where two grains of different crystallographic orientations are stacked in the  $z$  direction. A thin vacuum layer was used to separate the two grains to ensure that the smallest atomic distance in the GB simulation cells is larger than  $1.5 \text{ \AA}$ . In each GB simu-

lation cell,  $x$  and  $y$  lie within the GB plane ( $\parallel$ ), and  $z$  is perpendicular ( $\perp$ ) to the GB plane. The tilt axis of the  $\Sigma 3$  GBs is in the  $y$  direction, and the rotational axis of the  $\Sigma 5$  GB is in the  $z$  direction. There are two GBs per simulation cell of the same type but with inverted orientations due to the coincidence-site lattice construction. To avoid the interaction between these GBs, supercells were made so that the distances between the GBs in the direction perpendicular to the GB planes ( $z$ ) are larger than  $65 \text{ \AA}$ . Table II lists the total number of atoms for each GB simulation cell. All simulation cells maintain the stoichiometry of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ , ensuring the formal charge neutrality.

## B. Anion disorder in bulk structure

Anion disorder in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  refers to the mixing of Cl and S atoms at the  $4a$  and the  $4c$  Wyckoff sites of the bulk structure, as observed in experiments [3, 29]. In the present study, 50% site-exchange of Cl and S was considered. The atomistic model of the anion-disordered bulk structure was constructed based on the supercell of the anion-ordered bulk structure detailed in Table II. In each model, half of the Cl atoms at the  $4a$  sites and half of the S atoms at the  $4c$  sites were randomly selected and exchanged.

TABLE II. Data on the anion-ordered bulk and the constructed GB models. The  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$  entrees give the relation of the Cartesian axes of each model with the crystallographic directions of the conventional unit cell of the bulk structure [Fig. 1(a)]. For all GB simulation cells,  $x$  and  $y$  are parallel ( $\parallel$ ) and  $z$  is perpendicular ( $\perp$ ) to the GB plane. The tilt axis of the  $\Sigma 3$  tilt GBs is along the  $y$  direction, and the rotational axis of the  $\Sigma 5$  twist GB is along the  $z$  direction. The total number of atoms is denoted by  $N_{\text{at}}$ . The dimensions of the optimized structures, the GB formation energy [ $\gamma$ , Eq. (8)] calculated at 0 K are shown (cf. Sec. III B). The GB width ( $\delta$ ) and the fraction of atomic sites within the GB ( $f$ ) are evaluated at 500 K (cf. Sec. III D).

Models	$x$ ( $\parallel$ )	$y$ ( $\parallel$ )	$z$ ( $\perp$ )	$N_{\text{at}}$	Dimension ( $\text{\AA}$ )	$\gamma$ (meV/ $\text{\AA}^2$ )	$\delta$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	$f$ (%)
anion-ordered bulk	[100]	[010]	[001]	17 836	$70 \times 70 \times 70$			
GB $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}2)[110]$ tilt $70.53^\circ$	$[\bar{1}11]$	[110]	$[\bar{1}\bar{1}2]$	19 656	$53 \times 51 \times 148$	10.44	8.36	11.3
GB $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}1)[110]$ tilt $109.47^\circ$	$[\bar{1}\bar{1}2]$	[110]	$[\bar{1}\bar{1}1]$	17 472	$50 \times 51 \times 133$	7.12	5.52	8.3
GB $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ twist $36.87^\circ$	[130]	$[3\bar{1}0]$	[001]	16 380	$49 \times 49 \times 139$	18.78	7.44	10.7

### C. Self-diffusion coefficient calculation

The self-diffusion coefficients were computed from the mean square displacements (MSDs) of Li atoms in MD simulations. The MSD at simulation time  $t$  and temperature  $T$  reads

$$\text{MSD}(t, T) = \langle |\mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{r}_0|^2 \rangle_T, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}(t)$  is the position vector of a Li atom at time  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{r}_0$  is its position vector at the reference time  $t = 0$ , and  $\langle \dots \rangle_T$  denotes the average at  $T$  over all Li atoms in the simulation cell. Generally, the MSD can be expressed analytically as a function of the simulation time  $t$  by [37]

$$\text{MSD}(t, T) \propto t^\alpha, \quad (2)$$

where the parameter  $\alpha$  captures the type of diffusion regime. For  $\alpha \neq 1$ , diffusion is considered to be anomalous. Specifically, one refers to the  $\alpha < 1$  regime as subdiffusion and the  $\alpha > 1$  regime as superdiffusion [37]. For  $\alpha = 1$ , i.e., when the MSD depends linearly on  $t$ , a normal diffusion process is identified, and the diffusion coefficient  $D$  can be calculated by the Einstein equation [38],

$$D(T) = \frac{1}{2n} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \text{MSD}(t, T) \right), \quad (3)$$

where  $n$  is the number of dimensions. Further, within the normal diffusion regime, the diffusion coefficient typically follows an Arrhenius-type relation

$$D(T) = D_0 \exp \left( -\frac{E_a}{k_B T} \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $D_0$  is a constant,  $E_a$  is the activation energy for diffusion, and  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant.

In simulations, the  $t \rightarrow \infty$  limit in Eq. (3) cannot be reached and has to be replaced by a finite time frame. In the present work, the MSD from the simulation time interval 3 to 5 ns was used to fit Eq. (2) and to determine thereby  $\alpha$  and  $K_\alpha$ . Normal diffusion was assumed when  $\alpha = 1 \pm 0.1$ .

To obtain self-diffusion coefficients of GBs, previous studies extracted GB diffusion data by considering the

MSD only within the rather small GB region (typical widths of about  $10 \text{\AA}$ ) [39–41]. The limited number of jumping events captured in the corresponding MD simulations can lead to significant uncertainties in the calculated GB diffusion coefficients. To improve the accuracy of the GB diffusion coefficients, we followed here a different approach. Specifically, we first computed the *effective* diffusion coefficient  $D^{\text{eff}}$  for a bicrystal supercell made of two symmetrically equivalent GBs and the bulk separating them (Sec. II A). To extract from  $D^{\text{eff}}$  the GB diffusion coefficient,  $D^{\text{GB}}$ , we assumed that  $D^{\text{eff}}$  is linearly composed from  $D^{\text{GB}}$  and a bulk diffusion contribution,  $D^{\text{bulk}}$ . The procedure was applied separately to the GB diffusion component perpendicular to the GB plane,  $D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}}$ , and the component within the GB plane,  $D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}}$ . To separate  $D^{\text{GB}}$  into  $D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}}$  and  $D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}}$ , the vectors  $\mathbf{r}$  entering Eq. (1) were projected onto the  $z$  direction or the  $x$ - $y$  plane, yielding the respective projected diffusion coefficients (subscripts  $\perp$  and  $\parallel$ , respectively). For the diffusion direction within the GB plane, the so-called Hart equation [42, 43],

$$D_{\parallel}^{\text{eff}}(T) = (1 - \tau) D_{\parallel}^{\text{bulk}}(T) + \tau D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}}(T), \quad n = 2, \quad (5)$$

where  $\tau$  is the fraction of time spent by the diffusing atoms at the GB sites [44] and  $n$  indicates the dimension as used in Eq. (3), manifests the linear decomposition of the effective bicrystal diffusion coefficient. For the diffusion direction perpendicular to the GB plane, long-range diffusion of Li atoms crossing the bulk and the GB area may become relevant. However, the present MD simulations indicate that most Li atoms diffuse around a local area, i.e., there is no significant long-range mass transport of Li (Sec. III C). Thus, approximately, the Hart equation can also be used to extract the perpendicular GB diffusion coefficient,

$$D_{\perp}^{\text{eff}}(T) \approx (1 - \tau) D_{\perp}^{\text{bulk}}(T) + \tau D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}}(T), \quad n = 1. \quad (6)$$

For consistency, the projected diffusion coefficients for the bulk,  $D_{\parallel}^{\text{bulk}}(T)$  and  $D_{\perp}^{\text{bulk}}(T)$ , were computed in a supercell similar in orientation to the corresponding GB model (Table II). The linear mixing parameter  $\tau$  was approximated by

$$\tau \approx f \approx \frac{\delta}{l}, \quad (7)$$

where  $f$  is the volume fraction of GB sites,  $\delta$  is the GB width, and  $l$  is the distance between the GBs. Equation (7) applies in steady state with negligible segregation (Sec. III B) and when only parallel and periodic GBs are included in the simulation model (Sec. II A). The GB width  $\delta$  was determined based on the GB profiles and GB trajectories (Sec. III D).

To obtain  $D^{\text{GB}}(T)$  from Eqs. (5) and (6), the bulk and the GB diffusion coefficients were assumed to obey the Arrhenius relation [Eq. (4)]. For the bulk structure, stable MD simulations can be performed over a wide temperature range (up to 800 K), and the obtained results confirm that  $D^{\text{bulk}}(T)$  closely adheres to an Arrhenius-like behavior (Sec. III D). Eq. (4) was fitted to the  $D^{\text{bulk}}(T)$  data and the corresponding fitting parameters ( $D_0$  and  $E_a$ ) have small variance. The MD simulations of the GB models (Table II) for  $D^{\text{eff}}(T)$  are less stable at higher temperatures, and the resulting fitting parameters have larger uncertainty, consequently also for  $D^{\text{GB}}$  (Sec. III D).

#### D. Computational details

*Ab initio* simulations were carried out under the density-functional theory (DFT) framework using the projector augmented wave method [45] and the generalized gradient approximation in the PBE parametrization [46], as implemented in VASP [47–49]. The  $1s^22s^1$ ,  $3s^23p^3$ ,  $3s^23p^4$ , and  $3s^23p^5$  electrons were treated as valence electrons for Li, P, S, and Cl, respectively. The plane-wave cutoff was set to 500 eV. For calculations of the conventional unit cell [Fig. 1(a)], the reciprocal space was sampled using the tetrahedron method with Blöchl corrections [50] and a  $\Gamma$ -centered  $2 \times 2 \times 2$   $k$ -point mesh (416  $k$ -point). For calculations of the GB structures, the reciprocal space was sampled at the  $\Gamma$ -point using the Gaussian smearing with a width of 0.03 eV. For structural optimization, the energy and the maximum residual force were converged to better than  $10^{-5}$  eV per simulation cell and  $10^{-2}$  eV  $\text{\AA}^{-1}$ , respectively.

Large-scale MD simulations were performed using the validated MTP within LAMMPS [51] for the models listed in Table II. The MD time step was set to 2 fs. To fully relax the structures, the annealing-and-quenching approach (a+q) was employed, i.e., the structures were first equilibrated at 600 K for 0.2 ns and then slowly cooled to 1 K within 1 ns. Thermal vibrations at the annealing stage enable Li diffusion, and the slow quenching stage ensures that the system is maintained at a thermodynamically favorable state. The a+q approach was performed in the *NPT* ensemble. Lastly, geometry optimization was performed using the conjugate gradient algorithm implemented in LAMMPS. Only the lattice variation along the  $z$  direction was allowed during relaxation. The GB formation energy  $\gamma$  at 0 K was calculated by

$$\gamma = \frac{E_{\text{GB}} - E_{\text{bulk}}}{A_{\text{tot}}}, \quad (8)$$

where  $E_{\text{GB}}$  is the total energy of the respective GB model (Table II) after relaxation, and  $E_{\text{bulk}}$  is the total energy of the reference anion-ordered bulk model. Further,  $A_{\text{tot}}$  is the total GB area in the simulation cell, which is twice as large as the  $x$ - $y$  cross-sectional area because of two GB planes in the present simulation cell. For consistency, anion-ordered bulk models with a supercell geometry corresponding to the GB models were used in Eq. (8). For diffusion investigation, the structures were first relaxed and equilibrated using the Nosé–Hoover thermostat for 0.2 ns at a targeting temperature. The *NPT* ensemble with a temperature rescaling every 100 time steps at the intended temperature and at zero pressure was used. Next, to avoid any spurious effects of the thermostat on diffusion, a microcanonical (*NVE*) ensemble was used, and the system was sampled for 5 ns. The GB profiles were created by binning Li atoms into slices of a width of about 5  $\text{\AA}$  in the  $z$  direction of the simulation cell and averaging from the entire *NVE* MD sampling period.

### III. RESULTS

#### A. Training scheme and validation of MTP

A special training and active learning scheme for the MTP, as summarized in Fig. 2 and outlined in the following, is proposed in the present study. The initialization involves *ab initio* MD simulations for the anion-ordered bulk structure. The trajectories obtained from these initial runs are used as the basis for the training set. Next, the first pre-training and active learning cycle is performed for the target training structure (e.g., a GB structure) for an MTP of level 4. The “level” indicates the quality, i.e., the number of fitting parameters, in the MTP [52]. The new configurations obtained during standard active learning [53] are labeled by DFT calculations (i.e., energy, forces, and stresses are computed) and then added to and accumulated in the training set. In the following steps, MTPs of higher levels (6, 8, 10, and so on) are subsequently used for pre-training and standard active learning. Configurations obtained after each pre-training or standard active learning cycle are labeled and added to the training set. The accuracy of the trained MTPs at different levels is estimated by the fitting errors with respect to DFT. Finally, when a high-accuracy MTP is obtained (as quantified below), the active-learning scheme finishes. Further details on the proposed scheme are given in Appendix A.

In the first few cycles of the proposed active learning scheme, a relatively large number of new configurations are being sampled and added to the training set. The corresponding information (energies, forces, stresses) is required to provide a larger-scale estimate of the potential energy surface of the target structure. Consequently, multiple iterations within each standard active learning cycle of the initial MTPs are required. It is, therefore, beneficial to use low-level MTPs at the beginning of the




FIG. 2. Proposed quality-level-based active learning scheme for the MTP. After initialization, pre-training and standard active learning are performed iteratively for MTPs with increasing levels, and the generated configurations are accumulated in the training set. When the targeted level  $M$  is reached, the final MTP with high accuracy is outputted for subsequent simulations.

active learning scheme since they can be generally constructed within a smaller number of iterations than high-level MTPs due to their fewer fitting parameters. The low-level MTPs are also more robust in phase space extrapolation, requiring less computational cost for refitting. Starting the whole active learning scheme with low-level MTPs thus generates, in a computationally efficient manner, an ample training set for the high-level MTPs at the later stages of the active learning scheme. In this way, the number of standard active learning iterations is kept small for the computationally expensive high-level MTPs. Overall, the proposed training and active learning scheme systematizes and accelerates the construction of precise MTPs for chemically and structurally complex materials.

In the present study, various MTPs were fitted from level 4 up to level 20 for the anion-ordered and the anion-disordered bulk structures. Based on the results for the bulk, single MTPs were fitted for each GB from level 4 up to level 18. Figures 3(a) and (b) show the validation root-mean-square errors (RMSEs) in energies and forces for the anion-ordered and anion-disordered bulk, respectively. Additionally, Fig. 3(c) shows the dependence of the target quantity, i.e., the diffusion coefficient, on the MTP level. For the anion-ordered bulk structure, the RMSE in energy is less than 10 meV/atom for MTPs




FIG. 3. Validation root-mean-square error (RMSE) in (a) energy and (b) force of the MTPs obtained for the anion-ordered and the anion-disordered bulk structures with the proposed scheme (from level 4 to 20, Fig. 2). (c) Calculated diffusion coefficients  $D$  at 600 K with the obtained MTPs. Each line represents the result of an MTP fitted independently. Multiple MTPs were fitted for each structure to show statistics.

from level 14 on. The RMSE in force slowly decreases with the MTP level and reaches a small final value of about  $0.05 \text{ eV}/\text{\AA}$  for level 20. Larger RMSEs in both energy and force are observed for the anion-disordered bulk structure, likely due to its complex anionic arrangement. With MTPs from level 10 on, the calculated diffusion coefficients for the ordered and the disordered bulk structures converge to final values of about  $20 \times 10^{-7}$  and  $180 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ , respectively. The ordered bulk structure also shows less variation among multiple MTPs for both the RMSEs and the diffusion coefficients.

Variation in the calculated diffusion coefficients may originate from the following sources: 1. Limited diffusion sampling time; 2. Different local minima within the MTP parameter space; 3. Different accumulated training sets. To systematically investigate these sources, the diffusion coefficients of the anion-ordered bulk structure were calculated at 600 K for three different sets of simulations:

- A. The complete active learning scheme was run once, thereby generating one MTP at each level (from 4

to 20). For each MTP, five independent runs for 5 ns were performed, and the corresponding standard deviation for the diffusion coefficient was determined. The standard deviation for set A represents the contribution to the variation due to the finite sampling time of the diffusion coefficient.

- B. The final training set obtained after the active learning in A was used to fit ten MTPs for each level. Different MTPs (in terms of the basis set coefficients) can be obtained even for the same training set and for the same MTP level because of multiple local minima in the MTP parameter space visited due to randomized initial starting conditions. At each level, the 10 MTPs were used to run diffusion coefficient simulations for 5 ns. The corresponding standard deviation in the diffusion coefficient was determined for each level. The standard deviation for set B contains the contribution from the finite sampling time (set A) and additionally the variation from the different MTP parameters.

- C. The whole active learning scheme was run ten times, thereby generating 10 different MTPs at each level. These MTPs vary not only in the MTP parameters but, importantly, also in the training set used for the fitting. Thus, set C includes, in addition to the previous variation contributions (as for set B), the variation due to different training sets.

The standard deviations of the diffusion coefficients obtained for these three sets of simulations are shown in Fig. 4(a). The results allow us to draw a very important conclusion. All curves decrease with increasing MTP levels and reach very small values for the highest investigated levels. This means that the final diffusion-coefficient values for the highest MTP levels do not depend (beyond the remaining statistical variation) on the initial starting conditions of the active learning scheme. Thus, it is possible to systematically increase the precision in the predicted diffusion coefficient values of the MTPs. However, one should be aware of the accompanying strongly increasing computational cost with MTP level as shown in Fig. 4(b). To balance the accuracy and simulation cost, MTPs of level 18 with 807 fitting parameters were used in the present study.

Table III lists the information on the final MTPs trained for different target structures. Larger training RMSEs in both energies and forces are observed for the GBs compared to the bulk structures (more than 1 meV/atom in energy). Despite applying a different anion disorder in constructing the validation set for the MTP of the disordered bulk structure, the validation RMSE remains consistent with the training RMSE. Details of the construction of the validation set are given in Appendix A.

Figure 5 shows the radial distribution functions of the ordered bulk structure in the conventional unit cell




FIG. 4. (a) Standard deviation of the diffusion coefficients  $D$  of the anion-ordered bulk structure at 600 K for three different sets of simulations. As a reference, the diffusion coefficient of the anion-ordered bulk structure calculated with a level 20 MTP at 600 K is about  $20 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$  [Fig. 3(c)]. In set A, only one MTP was utilized at each level for  $D$  calculations, so the variation comes from finite time. In set B, different MTPs fitted to the identical training set were utilized. The variation comes from both finite time and MTP parameter space. In set C, MTPs were independently trained following the proposed scheme (Fig. 2). The variation comes from finite time, MTP parameter space, and different training sets. (b) CPU time required to calculate  $D$  for the ordered bulk structure. An exponential function was fitted to show the CPU time and the MTP level relation.

[Fig. 1(a)] and the  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  GB obtained from MD simulations at 600 K with 4000 and 2000 steps, respectively. The accuracy of the MTP is validated by the small difference in the radial distribution functions from those obtained by DFT.

## B. Structures and energies

Table IV shows structural and energetic information on the anion-ordered bulk  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  at 0 K as obtained with various optimization approaches. For the optimization with symmetry constraint (i.e., preserving the space group  $F\bar{4}3m$ ), DFT and MTP show similar lattice constants of about  $10.25 \text{ \AA}$ . The symmetry-constrained structure is dynamically unstable at 0 K as confirmed by additional phonon calculations. The related double-well potentials of two imaginary modes were analyzed previously in Ref. [33]. The dynamical instability is also consistent with previous experimental [29, 30] and computational [31, 32] studies reporting that the high symme-

TABLE III. Information of the final MTPs. The number of atoms in the simulation cell of the training structures is denoted by  $N_{\text{at}}$ , and the number of configurations in the final accumulated training set is denoted by  $N_{\text{conf}}$ . Different MTPs were independently trained to different structures according to the proposed scheme up to level 18 (i.e.,  $M = 18$  in Fig. 2) with 807 fitting parameters. Training and validation root-mean-square error (RMSE) is shown for the bulk structures, and training RMSE is shown for the GB structures.

Training structure	$N_{\text{at}}$	$N_{\text{conf}}$	Training RMSE		Validation RMSE	
			Energy (meV/atom)	Force (eV/Å)	Energy (meV/atom)	Force (eV/Å)
anion-ordered bulk	104	2219	4.7	0.132	3.1	0.056
anion-disordered bulk	208	2210	5.1	0.153	6.0	0.095
GB $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$	312	2350	6.6	0.164	n/a	n/a
GB $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$	156	2293	6.9	0.157	n/a	n/a
GB $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$	260	2241	6.1	0.157	n/a	n/a




FIG. 5. Comparison of radial distribution functions obtained by DFT and MTP MD at 600 K for the anion-ordered bulk and the  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  GB averaged over 4000 and 2000 MD steps, respectively. Analysis was performed using OVITO [54].

try  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  structure [Fig. 1(a)] is not the most stable phase at low temperatures and 0 K, respectively.

Due to the complicated potential energy surface of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  with multiple local minima, it is difficult to find the fully optimized structure based on direct optimization methods (e.g., the conjugate gradient algorithm). To enhance the search for the global energy minimum, an MD-based annealing+quenching (a+q) optimization scheme with volume relaxation was carried out with the MTP (cf. Sec. IID). The MTP-optimized structure was further relaxed with DFT utilizing the conjugate gradient algorithm to validate the MTP result. The resulting structure has an energy of  $-58.9$  meV/atom with respect to the  $F\bar{4}3m$  high-symmetry state, which is energetically more favorable than the structure obtained previously based on optimization with DFT and the USPEX method ( $-50.0$  meV/atom) [31]. The corresponding MTP energy of our optimized structure is  $-55.3$  meV/atom and thus in agreement with the corresponding DFT value with an error of  $+3.6$  meV/atom, consistent with the vali-

ation RMSE in energy [Fig. 3(a) and Table III]. For a larger simulation cell with 17836 atoms (the anion-ordered bulk model shown in Table II), the optimization with the MTP yields an energy that is further reduced by 2.4 meV/atom. This result indicates that there are favorable arrangements of the Li atoms that cannot be represented with the small simulation cell.

For the GB models, an additional step, the so-called  $\gamma$ -surface search [57], should be considered to optimize the interface between the two grains before using the a+q approach. Specifically, in the  $\gamma$ -surface search, different rigid shifts of the two grains in directions parallel to the GB plane ( $x$ - $y$ ) are investigated in order to probe different initial GB structures for further optimization. For each GB model, we investigated a mesh of  $20 \times 20$  points on the respective  $\gamma$ -surface, by performing direct optimization for each such point. The structure of the lowest-energy point in the  $\gamma$ -surface was selected for further relaxation with the a+q approach. Additionally, the original GB structures without a shift were also used for relaxation with the a+q approach. Full relaxation of the structures with or without the  $\gamma$ -surface search leads to similar final optimized structures. This finding indicates that the shifting of two grains is implicitly included in the a+q optimization process, at least for the three GBs considered in the present study.

The atomic structures of the three GB models after optimization are shown in Fig. 6. To better emphasize the characteristic features, Li atoms are not visualized, and only the atoms close to the GB plane are shown. The dimensions of the optimized structures, and GB energies [ $\gamma$ , Eq. (8)] calculated at 0 K are shown in Table II. For  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$  [Figs. 6(a) and (b)], voids (as large as 6 Å in diameter) form at the GB plane. The formation of these voids requires the reordering of a range of atoms, which in turn requires enough thermal energy that is available through the a+q process. In contrast, direct optimization could not reproduce the voids, emphasizing again the importance of the a+q process. For the  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  GB [Figs. 6(c) and (d)], for which the cage structure is preserved during the GB construction, only a small change of the cage arrangement is visible at the GB plane after optimization. In particular, no void formation



TABLE IV. Structural and energetic data for the anion-ordered  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  bulk at 0 K based on different methods.<sup>a</sup> The total number of atoms in the simulation cell is denoted by  $N_{\text{at}}$ . The structure before optimization [Fig. 1(a)] has a cubic symmetry with the space group  $F\bar{4}3m$ . The cubic shape of the simulation cell is constrained during the a+q optimization, and  $a$  refers to the cubic lattice constant. The energy  $\Delta E$  is the energy of the optimized structure referenced with respect to the symmetry-constrained structure.

Source	$N_{\text{at}}$	Method	$a$ (Å)	Space group	Stability <sup>b</sup>	$\Delta E$ (meV/atom)	Reference
DFT	52	CG <sup>c</sup> with sym. constraint	10.246	$F\bar{4}3m$	unstable	0.0	this work
MTP	52	BFGS <sup>d</sup> with sym. constraint	10.264	$F\bar{4}3m$	unstable	0.0	this work
MTP	52	a+q <sup>e</sup>	9.950	$P1$	stable	-55.3	this work
DFT	52	MTP a+q $\rightarrow$ DFT CG <sup>f</sup>	9.940 <sup>g</sup>	$P1$	n/a	-58.9	this work
DFT	13	USPEX <sup>h</sup>	10.209 <sup>g</sup>	$P1$	stable	-50.0	[31]
MTP	17 836	a+q	9.954	$P1$	n/a	-57.7	this work

<sup>a</sup> A lattice constant of 9.818 Å was obtained in experiments at 150 K and 1 atm for a sample with about 56.2% of Cl/S-anion disorder showing the space group  $F\bar{4}3m$  [9]. Note that this experimental value is not directly comparable with the simulation results given in the table because of the differences with respect to the space group, temperature, and anion ordering.

<sup>b</sup> The Stability column indicates the dynamical stability as determined by the presence or absence of imaginary phonons at 0 K.

<sup>c</sup> The conjugate gradient (CG) algorithm implemented in VASP was used.

<sup>d</sup> The Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) algorithm implemented in ASE [55] was used.

<sup>e</sup> The annealing-and-quenching (a+q) approach described in Sec. II D was used.

<sup>f</sup> The optimized structure with MTP using the a+q<sup>d</sup> method was further optimized with DFT using the CG<sup>b</sup> method.

<sup>g</sup> The cubic cell shape was changed after this optimization, so the effective cubic lattice constant is shown.

<sup>h</sup> The universal structure predictor: evolutionary xtallography (USPEX) described in Refs. [31, 56] was used.

is observed. Correspondingly,  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  shows a GB energy of only 7.12 meV/Å<sup>2</sup>, which is the smallest among the three investigated GBs. Such a small value indicates that the GB structure does not differ much from the bulk structure. For the  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  GB [Figs. 6(e) and (f)], with which the cage structure is preserved and the GB plane is densely filled with atoms, other distinct results are observed than that of the two  $\Sigma 3$  GBs. For the  $\Sigma 5$  GB, optimization leads to an amorphous-like area at and near the GB plane. The amorphous area extends from the Cl atoms at the GB plane to the next layer of the Cl atoms away from the GB plane. The atoms inside the affected area appear to be structurally disordered. Since the bonds at the GB plane are severely modified compared to the bulk, the largest GB energy (18.78 meV/Å<sup>2</sup>) is found for the  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  GB.

Figure 7 shows the energy and the number profiles of Li atoms for the three GB models. To emphasize the impact of the GBs, the values are referenced with respect to their bulk counterparts. According to the energy profiles (Fig. 7, upper panel), the atomic energy of the Li atoms decreases at the GB plane for the  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}2)[110]$  (about -0.6 meV/atom) and the  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  (about -1.1 meV/atom) GBs. For the  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  GB, the change in atomic energy of Li at the GB plane is smaller and mostly positive (about +0.2 meV/atom). For all three GBs, the impact of the GB plane on Li energy is slightly reduced as temperature increases. As regards the number-of-atoms profiles (Fig. 7, lower panel), we observe layers with an increased and decreased number of Li atoms around the GB plane as compared to the bulk. Especially for  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ , Li atoms tend to segregate from the edge to the center of the amorphous-like GB area. Due to the comparably large statistical error indicated by the error bars in the number-of-atoms pro-

files, a clear temperature dependence cannot be deduced. The overall small values in the number-of-atoms profiles (lower panel in Fig. 7; note the small  $\Delta N$  values on the  $y$ -axis) indicate the absence of Li segregation from the bulk region to the GB region, i.e., the averaged Li concentration in the GB region is comparable to the bulk region, supporting the approximation in Eq. (7). Li segregation in the present simulations may be hindered by the restriction of all simulation cells to the stoichiometric composition of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  (Sec. II A).

The energy profiles were utilized to determine the GB widths as needed for GB diffusion coefficient calculations (cf. Sec. III D). For the  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}12)[110]$  and  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  GBs, the distinct peaks in the Li energy help to identify the GBs and their widths. Specifically, a Gaussian function was fitted to these peaks, and the full-width-at-half-maximum was used to extract the GB widths (a similar approach was used in Ref. [58]). Since the temperature dependence is very small, the GB widths obtained from the 500 K profiles were used throughout the GB diffusion coefficient calculations. The Gaussian-fitting approach was not applied to the  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  GB due to the rather complex fluctuation of the energy profile around the GB plane [Fig. 7(b)]. Instead, we analyzed the arrangement of the cages traced by the Li trajectories [Fig. 9(c), in the orientation parallel to  $y$ ] and declared the GB width as the gap between the cages positioned on the left and right of the GB plane. Since 12 columns of the cages are included in each grain, the grain boundary fraction  $f$  was estimated to be about 8.3%. The corresponding GB width for the  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  was calculated based on the length of the simulation cell in the  $z$ -direction (perpendicular to the GB plane) averaged from MD simulations at 500 K. The estimated GB widths (cf. Table II) are similar between  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}2)[110]$  and  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  and smaller




FIG. 6. Atomic structures of the three GB models after optimization (cf. Table II). Each GB model is visualized in two views (top and bottom row), with the GB normal lying in the paper plane for both views. The GB plane is indicated by the vertical black line in the middle of each structure. For visibility, Li atoms and cages are not visualized, and only the atoms close to the GB plane (within about  $\pm 1$  nm) are shown. The smallest repeating GB structural units are highlighted for the  $\Sigma 3$  GBs.

for  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$ , consistent with visual inspection of the Li diffusion trajectories (cf. Sec. III C).

### C. Bulk and GB diffusion

Trajectories of all Li atoms obtained from 5 ns MD runs at 300 and 600 K for the anion-ordered bulk structure are shown in Figs. 8(a) and (b), respectively. The trajectories of a few selected Li atoms are highlighted in blue. At 300 K, the Li trajectories are mostly localized within the cages, and only very few inter-cage jumps occur during the simulation time. At 600 K, the Li trajectories are distributed much more homogeneously in the simulation cell due to the enhanced inter-cage (long-range) diffusion. Clearly, temperature strongly affects Li diffusion, especially inter-cage diffusion. It is worth emphasizing that the macroscopic conductivity measured on the experimental scale mainly results from inter-cage diffusion.

Figures 8(c) and (d) are zoom-ins of the trajectories of a single Li atom at 300 and 600 K, respectively. At 300 K, the selected Li atom shows frequent *intra*-cage diffusion visiting multiple interstitial sites of the same cage within the 5 ns of simulation time but no *inter*-cage diffusion. At 600 K, in contrast, significant intra- and inter-cage diffusion is observed for the selected Li atom. After jumping to a neighboring cage, the Li atom typically resides in the new cage for some time, during which various interstitial sites are visited via intra-cage diffusion. Occasionally, the residence time is shorter, and the Li atom diffuses quickly to another cage. Short residence times in the cages are more frequently observed at higher temperatures, and they further enhance long-range diffusion and conductivity.

To quantify the frequency of inter-cage jumps, Fig. 8(e) shows the inter-cage jump rates in  $(\text{Li atom} \cdot \text{ns})^{-1}$  as a function of temperature. At the lowest investigated temperature (200 K), almost no inter-cage jumps are observed within the 5 ns simulation time. The average inter-cage jumping rate increases strongly with increasing temperature. Consequently, the macroscopic conductivity likewise increases strongly with temperature.

In the anion-ordered bulk structure, each cage consists of six Li atoms around one S atom. When inter-cage jumps of Li occur, it can be anticipated that there will be an imbalanced distribution of Li in the cages, i.e., single cages may show a Li occupancy of more or less than six. Figure 8(f) shows the cage occupancy averaged over the entire MD simulation time at different temperatures. The color mapping in the plot indicates the percentage of the cages in the simulation cell that exhibit the corresponding occupancy. As expected, when very few inter-cage jumps are observed, e.g., at 200 K, almost all cages are occupied by six Li atoms, i.e., neutral occupation. With increasing temperature and more inter-cage jumps [Fig. 8(e)], the cage occupancy distribution broadens, i.e., cages with more or less than six Li atoms are observed. Taking the highest investigated temperature

of 800 K, about 13% of cages have an imbalance of  $\pm 1$  Li atoms (i.e., cages with five or seven Li atoms). The majority (73%) of the cages are still occupied with six Li atoms.

Figure 9 shows an analysis of Li diffusion for the three GB models, with a focus on 300 K. Similar to the bulk analysis [Figs. 8(a) and (b)], trajectories of all Li atoms obtained from 5 ns MD simulations for the three GB models are shown in Figs. 9(a)–(c). Trajectories far from the GB regions are similar to the bulk results discussed above. In the GB regions, differences can be seen depending on the GB type. For  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$  [Fig. 9(a)], broken cages are connected by Li trajectories across the GB plane, leading to multiple complex diffusion paths. Additionally, small voids (regions not covered by Li trajectories) in diameter of about 5 Å are found at the GB plane. These voids result from the intersection of rows of cages from the two grains, oriented with a rotational angle of  $70.53^\circ$  (the tilt angle). The impact on Li diffusion is substantially different when the GB planes do not break any cages: For  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  [Fig. 9(b)], the GB plane is located between two rows of cages from each grain. Most Li atoms show only intra-cage diffusion, even in the GB region. Only a few trajectories cross the GB planes. For  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  [Fig. 9(d)], the analysis of the Li trajectories is complicated by the projection plane. Nevertheless, one can clearly distinguish different trajectories within the GB region. The trajectories appear homogeneously distributed with no clear voids being visible.

The trajectories of the 0.1% of the Li atoms that have displaced furthest are colored and highlighted in Figs. 9(a), (b), and (c). Most of the long trajectories are located close to the GB planes. This indicates that the GB structure increases the probability of long-range diffusion compared to the anion-ordered bulk. For  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$ , the long-range trajectories connect the broken cages at the GB plane. Trajectories combined with both intra- and inter-cage jumps are observed for the  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  GB. Similar trajectories are also found for the anion-ordered bulk but at a higher temperature, e.g., 600 K [Figs. 8(c) and (d)]. For  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ , trajectories reveal straighter diffusion paths for Li crossing the GB plane, suggesting a weaker trapping effect of the cages for Li. Trajectories within the GB plane [right column of Figs. 9(a)–(c)] suggest negligible in-plane anisotropy in GB diffusion for the three GBs.

In Fig. 9(d), distributions of Li according to displacements from the GB simulations are compared to those derived from simulations of the anion-ordered bulk structure. For the bulk structure, most Li atoms show displacements up to about 6 Å. Considering that the maximum atomic distance within one cage at 0 K is about 4.6 Å, it can be concluded that most Li atoms at 300 K are restricted to intra-cage diffusion, consistent with the previous analysis (Fig. 8). At the same temperature and with the same simulation time, longer Li displacements and a higher probability of long-distance displacements are observed for the GB models compared to the bulk.




FIG. 7. Temperature-dependent GB profiles of the three GB models (Table II) averaged from 5 ns of MD simulations. For each GB, the atomic energy of Li atoms and the number of Li atoms related to the bulk are shown in the upper and lower rows, respectively. Error bars show the standard error from three repeating MD simulations with different random seeds.

Importantly, a different impact on Li mobility is observed for the different GB types. A strong enhancement in Li diffusion is shown for  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$  and  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  GBs. A relatively small enhancement in Li diffusion is seen for  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$ , which mainly results from a higher probability of Li atoms that show displacements between 6 and up to 12 Å.

#### D. Diffusion coefficients

Diffusion coefficients were calculated from the MSDs according to Eq. (3) if normal diffusion was observed. Figure 10(a) shows the MSDs of the Li atoms in the anion-ordered bulk as a function of time and for different temperatures at intervals of 50 K as a representative example. Note that a double-logarithmic scale is used to reveal the diffusion type. At low temperatures (up to 300 K), a plateau in the MSD is visible after a certain simulation time. The plateau indicates that most Li atoms in the simulation cell exhibit only intra-cage (short-range) diffusion within the simulation time, i.e., Li atoms are trapped in the cages. This is fully consistent with the above analysis of the Li trajectories [Figs. 8(a) and (b)]. At elevated temperatures (300 to 600 K), the MSD curves show a characteristic increase-plateau-increase shape. This shape indicates a combina-

tion of intra- and inter-cage jumps (short- and long-range diffusion) of Li atoms in the simulation cell, as also implied by the increased inter-cage jump rates at higher temperatures in Fig. 8(e). At temperatures exceeding 600 K, the plateau in the MSD disappears because the long-range diffusion of Li sets in already in the initial stages of the simulation. Similar MSD curves are found for the anion-disordered bulk and the three GB models.

A linear dependence of the MSD with a slope of  $\alpha = 1$  [cf. Eq. (2)] identifies normal diffusion, while the respective offset corresponds to the diffusion-coefficient value. The dotted line in Fig. 10(a) indicates a slope of one as a guide to the eye. According to the MSDs, sub-diffusion ( $\alpha < 1$ ) is found for simulations at low temperatures in the whole simulation time frame up to 5 ns. At high temperatures, sub-diffusion is also observed for short observation times as evidenced by the initial slope below one (e.g., at 800 K in the time interval up to 10 ps). During these short observation times there is not enough inter-cage jumps in the simulation to trigger long-range diffusion. These results emphasize the importance of carefully checking the slope of the MSD curve to ensure a correct application of the Einstein equation [Eq. (3)]. Figure 10(b) shows the  $\alpha$  values as a function of temperature obtained by fitting the MSD within the simulation time interval of 3 to 5 ns according to Eq. (2). We define normal diffusion by the criterion  $\alpha = 1 \pm 0.1$  (Sec. II C).







FIG. 8. Trajectories of all Li atoms in the ordered bulk structure (Table II) at (a) 300 K and (b) 600 K after 5 ns of MD simulations. The trajectories of a few selected Li atoms are highlighted in blue, and the trajectories of the other Li atoms are shown in gray. (c) and (d) zoom in the one of the highlighted Li trajectories at 300 K and 600 K, respectively, relative to the initial position. The color mapping indicates the probability density smoothed by kernel-density estimation. The elapsed time of every two continuous snapshots is 1 ps. (e) Inter-cage jumping rate and (f) cage occupancy of Li under different temperatures. The color mapping indicates the percentage of Li atoms that exhibit the corresponding jumping rate or cage occupancy. The result of each temperature is averaged from 5 ns of simulation. Trajectories in (a) and (b) are visualized by OVITO [54].

(a)  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$ (b)  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$ (c)  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$ 

(d)




FIG. 9. Analysis of Li diffusion for the three GB models (Table II) at 300 K and after 5 ns MD simulations. (a), (b), and (c) Trajectories of all Li in the simulation cells. Trajectories of the 0.1% Li atoms that have displaced furthest are highlighted with different colors. For each GB model, trajectories are visualized in two views. GB planes are located in the middle and at the edge of the GB simulation cells in the  $z$ -direction. (d) Distribution of Li according to displacement.




FIG. 10. (a) Mean square displacements (MSD) of all Li atoms in MD simulations of the anion-ordered bulk models (Table II) as a function of simulation time up to 5 ns. The color of the MSD curves indicates the simulation temperature. The slope corresponding to  $\alpha = 1$  [Eq. (2), normal diffusion] is shown by dashed black lines for reference. (b)  $\alpha$  values as a function of temperature obtained by fitting the MSD within the simulation time interval 3 to 5 ns according to Eq. (2). The normal diffusion regime, defined by the criterion  $\alpha = 1 \pm 0.1$  (Sec. II C), is indicated. Note that the MSDs from the anion-disordered bulk and the GB models are not shown here, and the GB models include both the bulk and the GB regions (Sec. II A).

Based on this definition, normal diffusion occurs for the anion-ordered bulk at temperatures higher than 500 K. For the GBs that enhance Li diffusion, normal diffusion is already observed at lower temperatures. The anion-disordered bulk structure with 50% anion disorder of Cl and S atoms shows normal diffusion at the lowest temperatures, i.e., from 350 K on. Diffusion coefficients were calculated within the defined normal-diffusion regime.

The calculated diffusion coefficients and the resulting Arrhenius fits are shown in Fig. 11 (open symbols and black lines) for the anion-ordered and anion-disordered bulk structures. For the three GBs, only the Arrhenius fits are shown, separated into diffusion coefficients perpendicular to and within the GB plane. The corresponding Arrhenius fitting parameters are listed in Table V. Clear linear Arrhenius relations are observed for the diffusion coefficients of both the anion-ordered and the anion-disordered bulk structures with respect to the inverse temperature. The ordered bulk structure shows a high diffusion activation energy of 384 meV, which is lowered to 216 meV by the random 50% anion disorder of the Cl and S anions. This is in good agreement with previous experiments [17] and simulations [9] focusing on the effect of anion disorder. For comparison, Fig. 11 includes results from anion-ordered [12–14] and anion-disordered [15, 18] bulk structures obtained by *ab initio* MD simulations from previous studies, all of which show significant deviations compared to the values obtained in the present work. This is likely due to smaller simulation cells {52 atoms [12–15, 18] vs. more than 16 000 atoms in the present work (Table I)} and shorter simulation times {up to 300 ps [12–15, 18, 19] vs. 5 ns in the present work (Table I)} caused by the expensive *ab initio* MD simula-

tions utilized in previous studies.

Enhanced diffusion is observed for all three GBs as compared to the anion-ordered bulk ( $0.038 \times 10^{-7}$  to  $1.641 \times 10^{-7}$  cm<sup>2</sup>/s for GBs vs.  $0.012 \times 10^{-7}$  cm<sup>2</sup>/s for the anion-ordered bulk at 300 K). The enhancement is sensitive to the GB width (details in Sec. IV). Based on the current width estimates [Figs. 7(a) and (c), Fig. 9(c), and Table II], varying increases are shown at 300 K: from  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  (about three to five times) to  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}2)[110]$  or  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  (more than one hundred times). For all GBs, higher diffusivity is shown for Li diffusing along rather than across the GB plane at 300 K, i.e.  $D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}} > D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}}$ . The calculated GB diffusion coefficients are within the interval set by the anion-ordered and anion-disordered bulk diffusion coefficients for temperatures below 700 K. Table V also shows that the diffusion activation energies of GBs  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  and  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  are also within the activation energy range of the ordered and disordered bulk structures (216 to 384 meV). The diffusion activation energy of GB  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}\bar{1}2)[110]$  is comparable to that of the disordered bulk structure.

Experimental data obtained by nuclear magnetic resonance measurements from Refs. [7, 8, 59] and obtained by polarization measurements from Ref. [30] are shown in Fig. 11 and Table V for comparison. For reference, ionic conductivities,  $\sigma$ , which are converted from the calculated diffusion coefficients from atomistic simulations (Appendix B), are also shown in Table V. The available experimental data, including all the activation energies, the diffusion coefficients, and the conductivities, fall between the computed and Arrhenius-extrapolated values of the investigated atomic structures.




FIG. 11. Arrhenius diagram for diffusion coefficients  $D^{\text{bulk}}$ ,  $D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}}$ , and  $D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}}$  obtained by atomistic simulations. Anion-ordered and anion-disordered (50% Cl/S-anion disorder) bulk results are included. The fitted Arrhenius lines for the three GBs and directions parallel ( $\parallel$ , solid lines) and perpendicular ( $\perp$ , dashed lines) to the GB plane are shown. For comparison, bulk diffusion coefficients obtained by *ab initio* MD [shorter sampling, up to 300 ps vs. 5 ns in the present work (Table I)] from Refs. [12–15] (ordered) and [15, 18] (disordered, 50% Cl/S-anion disorder) are shown. The experimental data marked by + (Adeli *et al.* [7]),  $\times$  (Schlenker *et al.* [8]), and  $\star$  (Hanghofer *et al.* [59]) are based on nuclear magnetic resonance measurements, while  $\ast$  (Deiseroth *et al.* [30]) are based on polarization measurements. The samples corresponding to + and  $\times$  showed 61.5% (Adeli *et al.* [7]) and 53.8% (Schlenker *et al.* [8]) Cl/S-anion disorder, respectively.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

We have proposed an active learning scheme based on MTPs of progressively increasing quality. A systematic validation for the thus-obtained MTPs has also been conducted. Our results demonstrate that the proposed active learning scheme is able to automatically and efficiently sample configurations for constructing the training set of complex atomic structures in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ , including GBs, starting from *ab initio* MD simulations of the anion-ordered bulk structure. Importantly, diffusion coefficients obtained from the final high-level MTPs show small variations with respect to the training set and MTP parameter space, guaranteeing the reproducibility of atomistic simulations using machine-learning interatomic potentials. We note that active learning ideas

akin to our current scheme were investigated recently for structurally and chemically simpler systems, i.e., a unary metallic system (Zr) with defects [60] and a defect-free ternary system ( $\text{Ti}_{0.5}\text{Al}_{0.5}\text{N}$ ) [61]. With the verified applicability to a structurally and chemically complex material system,  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ , the present work brings active learning to the next development stage.

The high-level MTPs trained with the proposed scheme show energy RMSEs from 6 to 7 meV/atom, which are higher than that found for metallic systems, either with defects (up to 4 meV/atom) [62–64] or without defects (1 to 3 meV/atom) [65–69]. This comparison indicates the inherent complexity of the electronic interactions in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . Since the computational time grows quickly for high MTP levels (e.g., level 20) without substantial reduction of the RMSEs, a further increase of the MTP level does not seem to be a viable option. In



TABLE V. Fitted Arrhenius parameters for the diffusion coefficients [ $D_0$ ,  $E_a$ , cf. Eq. (4)] and self-diffusion coefficients at 300 K of bulk and pure GBs, i.e.,  $D^{\text{bulk}}$ ,  $D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}}$ , and  $D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}}$  obtained in the present work. Note that  $D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}}$  and  $D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}}$  in Eqs. (5) and (6), respectively, are evaluated with the GB widths estimated in Table II. The experimental results obtained by nuclear magnetic resonance measurements in previous studies [7, 8] are shown for comparison. The ionic conductivities,  $\sigma$ , are converted from the calculated diffusion coefficients,  $D$  (Appendix B).

Structures	Direction	$D_0$ ( $10^{-7}$ cm <sup>2</sup> /s)	$E_a$ (meV)	$D$ at 300 K ( $10^{-7}$ cm <sup>2</sup> /s)	$\sigma$ at 300 K (mS/cm)
anion-ordered bulk	all	$3.331 \times 10^4$	384	0.012	0.2
anion-disordered bulk <sup>a</sup>	all	$9.367 \times 10^3$	216	2.203	29.8
GB $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$	$\parallel$	$6.091 \times 10^3$	214	1.548	20.9
	$\perp$	$5.100 \times 10^3$	211	1.455	19.7
GB $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$	$\parallel$	$4.352 \times 10^4$	348	0.062	0.8
	$\perp$	$4.289 \times 10^4$	360	0.038	0.5
GB $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$	$\parallel$	$1.154 \times 10^4$	229	1.641	22.2
	$\perp$	$1.110 \times 10^4$	236	1.204	16.3
polycrystal from exp. <sup>b</sup>	n/a	n/a	$350 \pm 10$	0.387	2.5
polycrystal from exp. <sup>c</sup>	n/a	n/a	$280 \pm 10$	0.25	3.4

<sup>a</sup> The structure has 50 % of Cl/S-anion disorder.

<sup>b</sup> The sample showed 61.5 % of Cl/S-anion disorder [7].

<sup>c</sup> The sample showed 53.8 % of Cl/S-anion disorder [8].

the future, the proposed active learning scheme could be coupled with other recent machine-learning potentials, e.g., NequIP [70] or MACE [71], to further optimize the balance of accuracy and efficiency.

The GB energies obtained with the MTPs and the annealing-and-quenching (a+q) method for three structurally distinct GBs in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  are within 7 to 19 meV/Å<sup>2</sup> which translates to 0.1 to 0.3 J/m<sup>2</sup>. These values are consistent with the value of 0.26 J/m<sup>2</sup> reported in Ref. [19] for  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Br}$ , a similar material system. The present GB energies are mostly lower than those for other recently explored solid electrolytes, e.g.,  $\text{Li}_3\text{PS}_4$  (0.2 to 1.2 J/m<sup>2</sup>) [41],  $\text{Li}_{0.16}\text{La}_{0.62}\text{TiO}_3$  (0.3 to 1.3 J/m<sup>2</sup>) [72] or  $\text{Li}_3\text{OCl}$  (0.3 to 1.1 J/m<sup>2</sup>) [39, 73].

Calculations of GB diffusion coefficients are sensitive to the utilized GB width. If GBs enhance Li diffusion compared to the anion-ordered bulk (as for  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ ), smaller estimates of GB widths result in larger GB diffusion coefficients and vice versa. Based on the GB energy profiles and the Li trajectories, the three GBs investigated in the present work have widths within 5 to 9 Å. These values are similar to those estimated for other solid electrolytes in previous computational studies, e.g.,  $\beta\text{-Li}_3\text{PS}_4$  (7 to 10 Å) [39] or  $\text{Li}_{0.375}\text{Sr}_{0.4375}\text{Ta}_{0.75}\text{Zr}_{0.25}\text{O}_3$  (5 to 10 Å) [74].

Our simulations show that all three GBs enhance the Li self-diffusion in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  compared to the anion-ordered bulk, which is consistent with a previous study for  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Br}$  [19]. The effect of GBs on Li diffusion depends on the characteristic atomic arrangements induced by the GBs. The  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$  GB breaks the Li-coordinated cages and thus enhances Li diffusion, which we refer to as the ‘‘cage-opening effect’’. A similar enhancement of Li diffusion was found due to the effect of anion disorder [9, 17]. For  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$ , fewer structural changes (distortions) are seen in the GB regions, and correspondingly, less long-range Li diffusion is observed

in the MD simulations compared to  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$ . The amorphous-like structures forming at the  $\Sigma 5(001)[001]$  GB increase the Li diffusion. Our findings are in line with the Li-diffusion enhancement due to amorphization reported for another sulfide-type solid electrolyte, i.e.,  $\text{Li}_3\text{PS}_4$  [41, 75].

At temperatures below 700 K, the calculated GB diffusion coefficients fall within the interval set by the Arrhenius fits for the diffusion coefficients of the anion-ordered and anion-disordered bulk structures. Similar phenomena were also seen for other solid electrolytes: For  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Br}$  the MSDs of Li atoms in the GB regions are in between those for the anion-ordered and the anion-disordered structures [19], and for  $\beta\text{-Li}_3\text{PS}_4$  GB diffusion coefficients are in between those for the bulk and the amorphous structures [41]. We expect that Li diffusion coefficients of other (high-angle) GBs in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  will also fall into the here-established Arrhenius interval. For the anion-disordered structures of argyrodites  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{X}$  ( $\text{X} \in \{\text{Cl}, \text{Br}, \text{I}\}$ ), both experiments [5, 76] and simulations [17, 19] indicate that maximum diffusivity is likely achieved at about 50 % X/S-anion disorder. Therefore, we expect that the Li diffusion coefficient of the bulk structure with a different anion-disorder ratio may also fall into the obtained order-disorder interval.

The Borisov relation [77, 78] and its derivatives [79] are often applied to establish correlations between GB energy and diffusivity for metallic materials [79–82]. For  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ , the 0 K GB energy of  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$  is larger than that of  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$ . The diffusion coefficient of  $\Sigma 3(1\bar{1}2)[110]$  is also larger than that of  $\Sigma 3(\bar{1}11)[110]$  over a wide temperature range. These results indicate that the Borisov relation may be applied for  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ , but further research on more GBs is required to validate the hypothesis.

Since the available experimental diffusivity data for  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  correspond to polycrystalline samples [7, 8, 30,

59], it is meaningful to analyze the diffusion coefficients of polycrystalline  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . Figure 12 shows an extrapolation of the diffusion coefficients obtained from the atomistic simulations at 300 K to the macro-scale based on the Wiener bounds [83, 84] (Appendix C). The color-shaded regions in Fig. 12(a) indicate the spread of the effective macroscopic diffusion coefficient  $D_{\text{macro}}$  for a polycrystalline microstructure with GBs, assuming either the anion-ordered or anion-disordered bulk structure. Both color-shaded regions narrow down with increasing grain size, and the impact of GBs becomes nearly negligible above a grain diameter of 1000 nm. This finding is consistent with experiments that reported a minor influence of GBs on Li transport [8, 59] for grain sizes of about 1500 nm [8]. To analyze a joint contribution of the anion-ordered and the anion-disordered bulk regions in a macroscopic sample, Fig. 12(b) shows the Wiener bounds [83, 84] (Appendix C) for a mixture of the anion-ordered and anion-disordered regions (without an additional GB impact). Compared with experimental data, a significant interval of possible  $D_{\text{macro}}$  values is observed over a large volume fraction range of the two regions (about 10 to 95%). To systematically examine the experimental and simulation results and to investigate the combined effect of different bulk structures and GBs, continuum simulations with explicit consideration of the microstructure are needed [85], which is planned for a subsequent study. Additionally, the impact of other defects, e.g., dislocation [86] or micro-pores [87], may also be considered.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Diffusion in solid electrolytes is a complex, multiscale phenomenon influenced by microstructure and chemistry, particularly grain boundaries (GBs) and anion disorder. This multiscale challenge pushes simulations to their limits as classical force fields lack accuracy and large-scale *ab initio* methods are computationally out of reach.

We have tackled this challenge and developed a quality-level-based active learning scheme to efficiently and systematically train accurate machine-learning interatomic potentials for complex atomic structures. These potentials enable, for example, the acquisition of diffusivity data for GBs and anion-disordered structures in solid electrolytes through accelerated atomistic simulations with near *ab initio* accuracy.

Utilizing the proposed scheme, we have investigated Li-ion diffusion for three structurally distinct GBs in  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . These GBs exhibit low formation energies, indicating their high stability in polycrystalline  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . The GBs enhance Li-ion diffusion compared to the anion-ordered bulk structure, with the degree of enhancement varying according to the specific GB structure. The underlying reason for the enhancement is traced back to the Li-cage opening effect in the GB region. GBs may, thus, generally affect the macroscopic diffusivity of

polycrystalline  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . Based on the present data, the limiting case for diffusion enhancement is the 50% anion-disordered bulk. Experimental diffusion data for  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  around room temperature fall into the wide Arrhenius-extrapolated interval of diffusion coefficients for the investigated atomic structures.

The proposed scheme facilitates the computation of energies and diffusivities for various complex atomic structures in solid electrolytes. These data can, for example, be subsequently integrated into continuum simulations to model large-scale microstructures comprising multiple complex atomic structures. Consequently, high-precision simulations of macroscale diffusion in solid electrolytes are within reach, with potential applications in microstructure engineering.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project is funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy – EXC 2075 – 390740016. We acknowledge the support by the Stuttgart Center for Simulation Science (SimTech), the state of Baden-Württemberg through bwHPC, and the German Research Foundation (DFG) through grant no. INST 40/575-1 FUGG (JUSTUS 2 cluster) – 405998092. Blazej Grabowski is funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Program (grant agreement no. 865855). Yuji Ikeda is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – 519607530. Felix Fritzen is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) in the Heisenberg program – FR2702/10 – 517847245. Sergiy Divinski thanks the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) for a partial support via grant DI 1419/18-1.

### Appendix A: Details on training and validation of MTP

A detailed flowchart of the proposed quality-level-based active learning scheme is shown in Fig. 13. This scheme consists of three core parts: Initialization, pre-training, and standard active learning.

In the initialization, *ab initio* MD simulations are performed for the ordered bulk structure of the material to provide the basis for the training set. To reduce the size of the training set (which enables faster MTP fitting at the initial stage), a small number of (several hundred) uncorrected configurations are extracted (so-called “sub-sample”) from the obtained *ab initio* MD trajectories. These configurations, together with the DFT-computed energies, forces, and stresses, are then added to the training set.




FIG. 12. Extension of diffusion coefficients at 300 K from atomistic (Fig. 11 and Table V) to macro-scale based on the Wiener bounds [83, 84] [Eq. (C1) for the upper bound and Eq. (C2) for the lower bound]. (a) Grain size ( $d$ ) effect for a polycrystal with anion-ordered or anion-disordered (with 50%-anion disorder) bulk structures. The shaded areas are the intervals set by the Wiener bounds. (b) Effect of mixing the ordered and the disordered bulk structures for a single crystal without GBs. The range covering diffusion coefficients measured in experiments at 300 K [7, 8] is shown for comparison. It was evidenced from experiments that the sample had a grain size of less than 1500 nm [8].

Next, an untrained MTP of level 4 ( $m = 4, i = 1$ ), which is the lowest level set for this quality-level-based active learning scheme, is utilized. To ensure that the training set includes sufficient configurations obtained by the *ab initio* MD simulations during initialization, a pre-training process is performed when an MTP with a higher level is used for the first time. The untrained MTP is first trained using the training set in this process. Then the trained MTP is used to select configurations (so-called “select-add”) with large grades (based on the D-optimality criterion [88, 89]) from the *ab initio* trajectories. The selected configurations are then added to the training set, and the MTP is retrained.

The standard active learning process is set after the pre-training process. At the beginning of the standard active learning, the training atomic structure intended for training (e.g., a structure with a defect) must be provided. MTP is used for the training structure to perform MD simulations, where configurations with large grades are selected (so-called “sample”). Further, the energies, forces, and stresses of the sampled configurations are obtained by DFT calculations and added to the training set. The MTP is then retrained using the training set with the sampled configurations. The active learning for one training structure is finished when no more configurations are sampled. In case the MTP is required to train with multiple training structures (e.g., different anion-disordered structures of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ ), the active learning is repeated for each training structure with the MTP of the same level ( $i$  increases which  $m$  is unchanged).

After pre-training and standard active learning, the trained MTP at level 4 ( $m = 4$ ) is outputted, and the accuracy of the MTP is evaluated according to the fitting RMSEs in energy and force. If higher accuracy is required, an untrained MTP of the next level (level 6,

$m = 6$ ) is utilized for another training round ( $i$  reset to 1) with the pre-training and standard active learning processes. The new configurations generated during each process are added to and accumulated in the training set. The level of MTP in pre-training and standard active learning can continue to increase in this way until the accuracy requirement of the MTP is satisfied. After that, the highest level of the utilized MTPs is denoted by  $M$ , and the whole active learning scheme finishes by outputting the finally-trained level  $M$ -MTP. With this quality-level-based scheme, the configuration space of the training structures is explored efficiently and systematically. It is important to note that the computational cost of high-level MTPs increases rapidly, necessitating a balance between accuracy and efficiency (Sec. III A).

In the present study, conventional unit cells of the ordered bulk structure of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$  [Fig. 1(a)] at three volumes (17.73, 20.68 and 23.94  $\text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$ ) were used in the initialization process. *Ab initio* MD simulations were performed at 1500 K for 8 ps with the Nosé–Hoover thermostat and the canonical ( $NVT$ ) ensemble implemented in VASP. A time step of 2 fs and a Nosé mass of  $3 \text{ u \AA}^2$  were utilized. At each ionic step, the energy was converged within  $10^{-3}$  eV per simulation cell. The MD trajectories were “sub-sampled” every 1 ps. A set of untrained MTPs configured at different levels [52] and with 8 radial basis functions was utilized. The minimum and maximum cutoffs were set to 1.5 and 5  $\text{\AA}$ , respectively. The fitting weights for the energies, the atomic forces, and the stresses were set to 1, 0.1  $\text{\AA}^2$ , and 0.001  $\text{\AA}^6$ , respectively. In the standard active learning process, “sample” was performed by MD simulations with LAMMPS at a temperature of 1000 K and for a maximum of 0.4 ns. The  $NPT$  ensemble with the same parameters described in Sec. IID was used. The grades of selecting and break-




FIG. 13. Detailed quality-level-based active learning scheme proposed and utilized in the present study. “Sub-sample” and “select-add” are commands in the MLIP package [52]. The level of MTP [52] is denoted by  $m$ , and  $i$  is the index of different MTPs at the same level. When the desired accuracy of MTP is reached, the active learning scheme finishes. The finally trained MTP with the level denoted by  $M$  is used for subsequent atomistic simulations. The present study obtained and tested MTP levels of up to 20 ( $M = 20$ ).

ing thresholds were chosen to be 2 and 5, as suggested in Ref. [53].

Training structures were constructed for the anion-ordered and anion-disordered bulk, as well as the three GBs of  $\text{Li}_6\text{PS}_5\text{Cl}$ . A  $1 \times 1 \times 2$  supercell was used for the ordered bulk structure. The disordered bulk structure was constructed based on a  $1 \times 2 \times 2$  supercell of the bulk structures (Sec. II B). Three different disordered structures with random anion disorder were used to train MTPs at each level. In total, 2210 configurations were accumulated in the training set up to level 18 (Table III). GB training structures were constructed following Sec. II A and with supercells of the coincidence-site lattice unit cell. The validation sets were constructed separately for the anion-ordered and the anion-disordered bulk structures. For each training structure, the final MTP trained up to level 20 was used to perform an MD simulation at 600 K. The validation set of each structure contains 500 configurations “sub-sampled” every 1 ps from the MD simulation. The energies, forces, and stresses of those configurations were calculated with DFT. Note that for the anion-disordered bulk structure, the anion disorder of the configurations in the validation set is different from that of the configurations in the training set.

### Appendix B: Conversion of self-diffusion coefficients to ionic conductivities

Based on the Nernst–Einstein equation [90, 91], a relation between ionic conductivity,  $\sigma$ , and the self-diffusion coefficient,  $D$ , at temperature,  $T$ , can be written as

$$\sigma(T) = \Lambda \frac{D(T)e^2}{k_B T}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $e$  is the elementary charge. The coefficient  $\Lambda$  is related to the concentration of mobile ions, i.e., the Li-ions in the present case, and to the Haven ratio [90, 91]. Table VI lists the experimentally measured values for  $\sigma$  and  $D$  at about 300 K from different studies, and the resulting  $\Lambda$ ’s [Eq. (B1)]. As reflected by the strong scatter in the  $\Lambda$  values from the different studies, the determination of  $\Lambda$  is not trivial [7, 92]. We utilized  $\Lambda = 21.808 \times 10^{-3} \text{ Li}/\text{\AA}^3$  from the most recent experimental study [8] to convert the calculated self-diffusion coefficients to ionic conductivity (Table V).

### Appendix C: Extension from atomistic to macro-scale

Diffusion coefficients at the macro-scale ( $D_{\text{macro}}$ ) are evaluated based on the calculated atomistic diffusion coefficients (Table V) at an exemplary temperature of 300 K. Historically, models with different geometrical assumptions of grains have been used to obtain effective diffusion coefficients of polycrystals, e.g., the Maxwell–Garnet model [93] and its modification [94], the Belowa–

TABLE VI. Comparison of experimentally measured ionic conductivity  $\sigma$ , self-diffusion coefficient  $D$  at about 300 K.  $\Lambda$  is calculated based on the measured values and according to Eq. (B1).

Year	$T$ (K)	$\sigma$ (mS/cm)	$D$ ( $10^{-7} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ )	$\Lambda$ ( $10^{-3} \text{ Li}/\text{\AA}^3$ )	Ref.
2011	313	0.0013	0.77	0.003	[30]
2019	313	9	0.67	22.625	[59]
2019	298	2.5	0.387	10.359	[7]
2020	298	3.4	0.25	21.808	[8]

Murch [43] model, or the Chen–Schuh [95] model. In continuum mechanics, the Voigt–Reuss bounds [96–98] are commonly used to give an admissible range of effective properties rather than a geometry-dependent guess. They are equivalent to the Wiener bounds [83] used for permittivity.

For a polycrystal with a set of components  $I$ , e.g., the ordered bulk, the disordered bulk, and the GBs, etc., Chen et al. [84] have shown that, in the absence of segregation, if diffusivity ratios of any two components are less than  $10^2$  (low-contrast system), the Wiener bounds remain valid for evaluating the effective diffusion coefficients. Specifically, the upper and lower bounds of the diffusion coefficients of the polycrystal are given by the weighted arithmetic mean

$$D_{\text{macro}}^{\text{upper}} = \sum_{i \in I} f^i D^i \quad (\text{C1})$$

and the weighted harmonic mean

$$D_{\text{macro}}^{\text{lower}} = \left( \sum_{i \in I} \frac{f^i}{D^i} \right)^{-1}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

respectively. Here,  $f^i$  is the volume fraction of the structure  $s$  in the polycrystal which satisfies

$$\sum_{i \in I} f^i = 1. \quad (\text{C3})$$

Eqs. (C1) and (C2) are equivalent to the equations of the Hart [42, 43] and the one-dimensional Maxwell–Garnet models [93], respectively. As was validated in Ref. [99], effective diffusion coefficients of a polycrystal calculated from the above-mentioned classical models fall within the Wiener bounds [Eqs. (C1) and (C2)].

For simplicity, we assume an isotropic distribution of GB surface orientations. Therefore, the averaged GB diffusion coefficients can be estimated as an arithmetic mean of the diffusion coefficients at the atomistic scale in three dimensions (Fig. 11 and Table V),

$$D^{\text{GB}_j} \approx \frac{2D_{\parallel}^{\text{GB}_j} + D_{\perp}^{\text{GB}_j}}{3}, \quad (\text{C4})$$

where  $j$  indicates the GB type. With an average grain size of  $G$ , the volume fraction  $f^{\text{GB}_j}$  of the type- $j$  GB can

be approximated [95, 100],

$$f^{\text{GB}_j} \approx p^{\text{GB}_j} H_{\text{GB}} \frac{\delta^{\text{GB}_j}}{d}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

where  $\delta^{\text{GB}_j}$  is the width of the type- $j$  GB (Table II).  $H_{\text{GB}}$  is a dimensionless numerical factor accounting for the shape and size distribution of the grains in a polycrystal. Here,  $H_{\text{GB}} = 2.9105$  was used, corresponding to the grain shape of Voronoi polyhedra and a nearly log-normal grain-size distribution [95, 100]. The formation probability of the type- $j$  GB is reflected by  $p^{\text{GB}_j}$ . For simplicity, we assume all GB types to appear with equal probability, i.e., for every  $j$ ,  $p^{\text{GB}_j} \approx 1/n^{\text{GB}}$ , where  $n^{\text{GB}}$  is the total number of GB types. The analysis has to be modified if Li ions are not equipartitionally distributed

between different components, i.e., in the case of segregation [101].

We note that the above considerations refer to equilibrium conditions. Considering kinetics, the analysis corresponds to the so-called A-type kinetic regime of GB diffusion [102], which holds if the specific diffusion lengths,  $\sqrt{D_i t}$ , in all microstructure elements in question  $i$  exceed the characteristic size of those elements,  $d_i$  [103] (in the absence of segregation, the relation  $\sqrt{D_i t} > 3d_i$  is required). Otherwise, one has to deal with diffusion in a complex microstructure with a hierarchy of the kinetic properties of the constituting elements (e.g., GBs of different types, phases, particles, dislocations, pores, etc. and their specific geometrical arrangement) that results in a hierarchy of the diffusion regimes and challenges the analysis [104, 105].

- 
- [1] T. Famprakis, P. Canepa, J. A. Dawson, M. S. Islam, and C. Masquelier, *Nat. Mater.* **18**, 1278 (2019).
- [2] Q. Zhao, S. Stalin, C.-Z. Zhao, and L. A. Archer, *Nat. Rev. Mater.* **5**, 229 (2020).
- [3] H.-J. Deiseroth, S.-T. Kong, H. Eckert, J. Vannahme, C. Reiner, T. Zaiß, and M. Schlosser, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **47**, 755 (2008).
- [4] S. Boulineau, J.-M. Tarascon, J.-B. Leriche, and V. Viallet, *Solid State Ion.* **242**, 45 (2013).
- [5] M. A. Kraft, S. P. Culver, M. Calderon, F. Böcher, T. Krauskopf, A. Senyshyn, C. Dietrich, A. Zevalkink, J. Janek, and W. G. Zeier, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **139**, 10909 (2017).
- [6] J. Ruhl, L. M. Riegger, M. Ghidui, and W. G. Zeier, *Adv. Energy Sustain. Res.* **2**, 2000077 (2021).
- [7] P. Adeli, J. D. Bazak, K. H. Park, I. Kochetkov, A. Huq, G. R. Goward, and L. F. Nazar, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **58**, 8681 (2019).
- [8] R. Schlenker, A.-L. Hansen, A. Senyshyn, T. Zinkevich, M. Knapp, T. Hupfer, H. Ehrenberg, and S. Indris, *Chem. Mater.* **32**, 8420 (2020).
- [9] N. Minafra, M. A. Kraft, T. Bernges, C. Li, R. Schlem, B. J. Morgan, and W. G. Zeier, *Inorg. Chem.* **59**, 11009 (2020).
- [10] S. Ganapathy, C. Yu, E. R. H. van Eck, and M. Wagemaker, *ACS Energy Lett.* **4**, 1092 (2019).
- [11] E. Milan and M. Pasta, *Mater. Futures* **2**, 013501 (2022).
- [12] Z. Deng, Z. Zhu, I.-H. Chu, and S. P. Ong, *Chem. Mater.* **29**, 281 (2017).
- [13] A. R. Stamminger, B. Ziebarth, M. Mrovec, T. Hammerschmidt, and R. Drautz, *Chem. Mater.* **31**, 8673 (2019).
- [14] M. Jiang, Z.-W. Chen, A. Rao, L.-X. Chen, X.-T. Zu, and C. V. Singh, *J. Mater. Chem. C* **10**, 18294 (2022).
- [15] T. Jeon, G. H. Cha, and S. C. Jung, *J. Mater. Chem. A* **12**, 993 (2024).
- [16] N. J. J. de Klerk, I. Rosłoń, and M. Wagemaker, *Chem. Mater.* **28**, 7955 (2016).
- [17] B. J. Morgan, *Chem. Mater.* **33**, 2004 (2021).
- [18] B. D. Lee, J.-W. Lee, J. Park, M. Y. Cho, W. B. Park, and K.-S. Sohn, *RSC Adv.* **12**, 31156 (2022).
- [19] M. Sadowski, *Properties of Sulfide Solid Electrolytes Studied by Electronic Structure Calculations*, Ph.D. thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt (2023).
- [20] T. Das, B. V. Merinov, M. Y. Yang, and W. A. G. Iii, *J. Mater. Chem. A* **10**, 16319 (2022).
- [21] S. Stegmaier, R. Schierholz, I. Povstugar, J. Barthel, S. P. Rittmeyer, S. Yu, S. Wengert, S. Rostami, H. Kungl, K. Reuter, R.-A. Eichel, and C. Scheurer, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **11**, 2100707 (2021).
- [22] S. Stegmaier, K. Reuter, and C. Scheurer, *Nanomater.* **12**, 2912 (2022).
- [23] K. Gubaev, V. Zaverkin, P. Srinivasan, A. I. Duff, J. Kästner, and B. Grabowski, *Npj Comput. Mater.* **9**, 1 (2023).
- [24] L. C. Erhard, J. Rohrer, K. Albe, and V. L. Deringer, *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 1927 (2024).
- [25] I. I. Novoselov, A. V. Yanilkin, A. V. Shapeev, and E. V. Podryabinkin, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **164**, 46 (2019).
- [26] G. Winter and R. Gómez-Bombarelli, *J. Phys. Energy* **5**, 024004 (2023).
- [27] A. Musaelian, S. Batzner, A. Johansson, L. Sun, C. J. Owen, M. Kornbluth, and B. Kozinsky, *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 579 (2023).
- [28] A. V. Shapeev, *Multiscale Model. Simul.* **14**, 1153 (2016).
- [29] S.-T. Kong, H.-J. Deiseroth, C. Reiner, Ö. Gün, E. Neumann, C. Ritter, and D. Zahn, *Chem. Eur. J.* **16**, 2198 (2010).
- [30] H.-J. Deiseroth, J. Maier, K. Weichert, V. Nickel, S.-T. Kong, and C. Reiner, *Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem.* **637**, 1287 (2011).
- [31] Z. Wang and G. Shao, *J. Mater. Chem. A* **5**, 21846 (2017).
- [32] A. Golov and J. Carrasco, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* **13**, 43734 (2021).
- [33] M. D'Amore, L. E. Daga, R. Rocca, M. F. Sgroi, N. L. Marana, S. M. Casassa, L. Maschio, and A. M. Ferrari, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **24**, 22978 (2022).
- [34] Y. Ou, Y. Ikeda, O. Clemens, and B. Grabowski, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 064308 (2022).
- [35] K. Momma and F. Izumi, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **44**, 1272

- (2011).
- [36] J. Cheng, J. Luo, and K. Yang, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **155**, 92 (2018).
- [37] R. Metzler and J. Klafter, *Phys. Rep.* **339**, 1 (2000).
- [38] A. Einstein, *Ann. Phys.* **322**, 549 (1905).
- [39] J. A. Dawson, P. Canepa, T. Famprikis, C. Masquelier, and M. S. Islam, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **140**, 362 (2018).
- [40] T. Lee, J. Qi, C. A. Gadre, H. Huyan, S.-T. Ko, Y. Zuo, C. Du, J. Li, T. Aoki, R. Wu, J. Luo, S. P. Ong, and X. Pan, *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 1940 (2023).
- [41] R. Jalem, M. L. H. Chandrappa, J. Qi, Y. Tateyama, and S. P. Ong, *Energy Adv.* **2**, 2029 (2023).
- [42] E. W. Hart, *Acta Metall.* **5**, 597 (1957).
- [43] I. V. Belova and G. E. Murch, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **64**, 873 (2003).
- [44] I. Kaur, Y. Mishin, and W. Gust, *Fundamentals of Grain and Interface Boundary Diffusion* (Wiley & Sons LTD, 1995).
- [45] P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 17953 (1994).
- [46] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- [47] G. Kresse, *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* **192-193**, 222 (1995).
- [48] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 11169 (1996).
- [49] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1758 (1999).
- [50] P. E. Blöchl, O. Jepsen, and O. K. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 16223 (1994).
- [51] A. P. Thompson, H. M. Aktulga, R. Berger, D. S. Bolinteanu, W. M. Brown, P. S. Crozier, P. J. in 't Veld, A. Kohlmeyer, S. G. Moore, T. D. Nguyen, R. Shan, M. J. Stevens, J. Tranchida, C. Trott, and S. J. Plimpton, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **271**, 108171 (2022).
- [52] I. S. Novikov, K. Gubaev, E. V. Podryabinkin, and A. V. Shapeev, *Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol.* **2**, 025002 (2020).
- [53] K. Gubaev, Y. Ikeda, F. Tasnádi, J. Neugebauer, A. V. Shapeev, B. Grabowski, and F. Körmann, *Phys. Rev. Mater.* **5**, 073801 (2021).
- [54] A. Stukowski, *Model. Simul. Mater. Sci. Eng.* **18**, 015012 (2009).
- [55] A. H. Larsen, J. J. Mortensen, J. Blomqvist, I. E. Castelli, R. Christensen, M. Dułak, J. Friis, M. N. Groves, B. Hammer, C. Hargus, E. D. Hermes, P. C. Jennings, P. B. Jensen, J. Kermode, J. R. Kitchin, E. L. Kolsbjerg, J. Kubal, K. Kaasbjerg, S. Lysgaard, J. B. Maronsson, T. Maxson, T. Olsen, L. Pastewka, A. Peterson, C. Rostgaard, J. Schiøtz, O. Schütt, M. Strange, K. S. Thygesen, T. Vegge, L. Vilhelmsen, M. Walter, Z. Zeng, and K. W. Jacobsen, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter.* **29**, 273002 (2017).
- [56] C. W. Glass, A. R. Oganov, and N. Hansen, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **175**, 713 (2006).
- [57] Y. Guo, Q. Wang, and W. A. Saidi, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **121**, 1715 (2017).
- [58] R. K. Koju and Y. Mishin, *Phys. Rev. Mater.* **4**, 073403 (2020).
- [59] I. Hanghofer, M. Brinek, S. L. Eisbacher, B. Bitschnau, M. Volck, V. Hennige, I. Hanzu, D. Rettenwander, and H. M. R. Wilkening, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **21**, 8489 (2019).
- [60] Y. Luo, J. A. Meziere, G. D. Samolyuk, G. L. W. Hart, M. R. Daymond, and L. K. Béland, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **19**, 6848 (2023).
- [61] F. Bock, F. Tasnádi, and I. A. Abrikosov, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A* **42**, 013412 (2024).
- [62] X. Xu, X. Zhang, A. Ruban, S. Schmauder, and B. Grabowski, *Acta Mater.* **255**, 118986 (2023).
- [63] X. Xu, X. Zhang, A. Ruban, S. Schmauder, and B. Grabowski, *Scr. Mater.* **242**, 115934 (2024).
- [64] N. Zotov, K. Gubaev, J. Wörner, and B. Grabowski, *Model. Simul. Mat. Sci. Eng.* **32**, 035032 (2024).
- [65] B. Grabowski, Y. Ikeda, P. Srinivasan, F. Körmann, C. Freysoldt, A. I. Duff, A. Shapeev, and J. Neugebauer, *Npj Comput. Mater.* **5**, 1 (2019).
- [66] J. H. Jung, P. Srinivasan, A. Forslund, and B. Grabowski, *Npj Comput. Mater.* **9**, 1 (2023).
- [67] J. H. Jung, A. Forslund, P. Srinivasan, and B. Grabowski, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 184107 (2023).
- [68] A. Forslund, J. H. Jung, P. Srinivasan, and B. Grabowski, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 174309 (2023).
- [69] Y. Zhou, P. Srinivasan, F. Körmann, B. Grabowski, R. Smith, P. Goddard, and A. I. Duff, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 214302 (2022).
- [70] S. Batzner, A. Musaelian, L. Sun, M. Geiger, J. P. Mailoa, M. Kornbluth, N. Molinari, T. E. Smidt, and B. Kozinsky, *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 2453 (2022).
- [71] I. Batatia, D. P. Kovacs, G. Simm, C. Ortner, and G. Csanyi, in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process Syst.*, Vol. 35, edited by S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Curran Associates, Inc., 2022) pp. 11423–11436.
- [72] A. R. Symington, M. Molinari, J. A. Dawson, J. M. Statham, J. Purton, P. Canepa, and S. C. Parker, *J. Mater. Chem. A* **9**, 6487 (2021).
- [73] J. A. Quirk and J. A. Dawson, *Adv. Energy Mater.* **13**, 2301114 (2023).
- [74] T. Lee, J. Qi, C. A. Gadre, H. Huyan, S.-T. Ko, Y. Zuo, C. Du, J. Li, T. Aoki, R. Wu, J. Luo, S. P. Ong, and X. Pan, *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 1940 (2023).
- [75] K. Hayamizu, Y. Aihara, T. Watanabe, T. Yamada, S. Ito, and N. Machida, *Solid State Ion.* **285**, 51 (2016).
- [76] L. Zhou, N. Minafra, W. G. Zeier, and L. F. Nazar, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **54**, 2717 (2021).
- [77] V. Borisov, V. Golikov, and G. Scherbedinskiy, *Phys. Met. Metall.* **17**, 881 (1964).
- [78] J. Pelleg, *Philos. Mag.: J. Theor. Exp. Appl. Phys.* **14**, 595 (1966).
- [79] D. E. Page, K. F. Varela, O. K. Johnson, D. T. Fullwood, and E. R. Homer, *Acta Mater.* **212**, 116882 (2021).
- [80] S. V. Divinski, G. Reglitz, and G. Wilde, *Acta Mater.* **58**, 386 (2010).
- [81] D. Prokoshkina, V. A. Esin, G. Wilde, and S. V. Divinski, *Acta Mater.* **61**, 5188 (2013).
- [82] C. Li, S. Lu, S. Divinski, and L. Vitos, *Acta Mater.* **255**, 119074 (2023).
- [83] K. Karkkainen, A. Sihvola, and K. Nikoskinen, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.* **38**, 1303 (2000).
- [84] Y. Chen and C. A. Schuh, *Acta Mater.* **54**, 4709 (2006).
- [85] T. W. Heo, A. Grieder, B. Wang, M. Wood, T. Hsu, S. A. Akhade, L. F. Wan, L.-Q. Chen, N. Adelman, and B. C. Wood, *Npj Comput. Mater.* **7**, 1 (2021).
- [86] V. Faka, M. T. Agne, M. A. Lange, D. Daisenberger, B. Wankmiller, S. Schwarzmüller, H. Huppertz, O. Maus, B. Helm, T. Böger, J. Hartel, J. M. Gerdes, J. J. Molaison, G. Kieslich, M. R. Hansen, and W. G. Zeier, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **146**, 1710 (2024).
- [87] J. Janek and W. G. Zeier, *Nat. Energy* **8**, 230 (2023).
- [88] E. V. Podryabinkin and A. V. Shapeev, *Comput. Mater.*

- Sci. **140**, 171 (2017).
- [89] K. Gubaev, E. V. Podryabinkin, and A. V. Shapeev, *J. Chem. Phys.* **148**, 241727 (2018).
- [90] M. Uitz, V. Epp, P. Bottke, and M. Wilkening, *J. Electroceram.* **38**, 142 (2017).
- [91] M. Kizilyalli, J. Corish, and R. Metselaar, *Pure Appl. Chem.* **71**, 1307 (1999).
- [92] A. Marcolongo and N. Marzari, *Phys. Rev. Mater.* **1**, 025402 (2017).
- [93] J. C. M. Garnett and J. Larmor, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A* **203**, 385 (1997).
- [94] J. R. Kalnin, E. A. Kotomin, and J. Maier, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **63**, 449 (2002).
- [95] Y. Chen and C. A. Schuh, *J. Appl. Phys.* **101**, 063524 (2007).
- [96] W. Voigt, *Ann. Phys.* **274**, 573 (1889).
- [97] A. Reuss, *J. Appl. Math. Mech.* **9**, 49 (1929).
- [98] R. Hill, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **11**, 357 (1963).
- [99] J. S. Yoon, H. Sulaimon, and D. J. Siegel, *J. Mater. Chem. A* **11**, 23288 (2023).
- [100] A. Thorvaldsen, *Acta Mater.* **45**, 587 (1997).
- [101] Y. Zhang and L. Liu, *Am. J. Sci.* **312**, 1028 (2012).
- [102] L. G. Harrison, *Trans. Faraday Soc.* **57**, 1191 (1961).
- [103] A. Paul, T. Laurila, V. Vuorinen, and S. V. Divinski, *Thermodynamics, diffusion and the Kirkendall effect in solids* (Springer International Publishing, Switzerland, 2014).
- [104] S. V. Divinski, J. S. Lee, and C. Herzig, *J. Metastable Nanocryst. Mater.* **19**, 55 (2004).
- [105] S. Divinski, F. Hisker, Y.-S. Kang, J.-S. Lee, and C. Herzig, *Acta Mater.* **52**, 631 (2004).