IV.A.4i First-Principles Modeling of Hydrogen Storage in Metal Hydride Systems

J. Karl Johnson Department of Chemical Engineering University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15261 Phone: (412) 624-5644; Fax: (412) 624-9639 E-mail: karlj@pitt.edu

David S. Sholl Department of Chemical Engineering Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Phone: (412) 268-4207; Fax: (412) 268-7139 E-mail: sholl@andrew.cmu.edu

DOE Technology Development Manager: Carole Read

Phone: (202) 586-3152; Fax: (202) 586-9811 E-mail: Carole.Read@ee.doe.gov

DOE Project Officer: Paul Bakke Phone: (303) 275-4916; Fax: (303) 275-4753 E-mail: Paul.Bakke@go.doe.gov

Contract Number: DE-FC36-05GO15066

Start Date: October 1, 2004 Projected End Date: September 30, 2009

Introduction

Researchers at the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University are computing thermodynamic properties of metal hydride alloys, including the heat of reaction (ΔH) for known reactions to test the accuracy of the approach and ΔH for new reactions to identify promising destabilized compounds. The heat of reaction is a key indicator of the potential performance of a hydride. If ΔH is too large then the temperature required to release hydrogen will be unacceptably high. If ΔH is too low, then the hydride will likely not be reversible.

Interfacial properties of hydrides are also computed in this project. Hydrogenation of destabilized hydrides and other systems is studied to assess reversibility, identify common hydrogenation pathways that might be applicable to other materials, and assess the role of interfacial transport. The overall goal of our work is to screen as many possible destabilized hydride systems as possible in order to identify potential candidate systems for experimental exploration.

Approach

Plane wave density functional theory (DFT) calculations are performed with the Vienna Ab-initio Simulation Package (VASP) [1,2]. The calculations examine a spatially infinite material using periodic boundary conditions in all the principal directions. We use both ultrasoft pseudopotentials (USPP) and the projector augmented wave (PAW) method [3] for prediction of reaction enthalpies. Electron exchange and correlation effects are described using the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) with the Perdew-Wang 91 (PW91) functional [4]. We have performed test calculations with the USPP revised Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof [5] and PAW Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof [6] functionals, but these resulted in ΔH values that were much lower than experimental or PW91 values. The bond energy of H_{a} is key to the accuracy of all the ΔH calculations. We have therefore computed the bond energy of H₂ from USPP-PW91 and PAW-PW91; both methods give 4.56 eV, which is in good agreement with the experimental value of 4.52 eV [7]. We use a Monkhorst-Pack mesh with a sufficient number of k-points to converge the energies. Geometry optimizations for bulk structures are performed by allowing all atomic positions and all cell parameters to vary.

The enthalpy of the reaction at 0 K was calculated using,

$$\Delta H = \sum_{\text{products}} E - \sum_{\text{reactants}} E$$
(1)

where E is the total energy of one of the bulk structures of interest as calculated by DFT. We have not accounted for zero point corrections in any of the total energies. The accuracy of our approach has been assessed by comparing our calculated values with experimental values for a number of different hydride materials. The results are shown in Figure 1.

Calculation of vapor pressures requires the free energies, in addition to the enthalpies. The entropies (and hence the free energies) can be computed by calculation of the phonon density of states for the solids, as well as including the free energy of the gas phase H_2 . Calculation of the phonon density of states and the resulting vibrational contributions to the free energy were performed using the PHONON code developed by Parlinski. These calculations used the same exchangecorrelation functional and energy cutoff as listed above for our total energy calculations. Force constants were computed using displacements of individual atoms of 0.03-0.07 Å. In order to avoid interaction between



FIGURE 1. Comparison of data from experiments or thermodynamic tables for hydride decomposition enthalpies with plane wave DFT predictions. All ΔH values are in kJ/mol H₂. The results shown with black squares are from Wolverton et al. [12] (Comparison of experimental and theoretical ΔH values)

images of the displaced atom when defining the phonon density of states, it is necessary to use a relatively large supercell. In most cases we chose a supercell in such a way that it approximates a spherical shape.

Results

We have computed ΔH for many different possible destabilized hydrides and have plotted ΔH vs. the wt% hydrogen uptake in Figure 2. We identify promising candidate reaction schemes by considering each of the reactions shown in Figure 1 that have $15 \le \Delta H \le 75$ kJ/mol H₂ and that yield > 6.5 wt% H storage. We have chosen the value of 6.5 wt% because it is slightly larger than the interim 2010 DOE targets [8]. The range of enthalpies is chosen so that after accounting for the uncertainty associated with our DFT calculations we will capture essentially all reactions that can satisfy the experimental bounds of $30 \le \Delta H \le 60$ kJ/mol H₂. That is, we identify candidate reactions in an inclusive manner, consistent with our goal of motivating detailed experimental studies of potential candidates.

Our inclusive criterion for identifying interesting reaction schemes yields seven reactions. One is the reaction already studied experimentally by Vajo et al. [9]

$$2 \operatorname{LiBH}_{4} + \operatorname{MgH}_{2} \rightarrow \operatorname{MgB}_{2} + 2 \operatorname{LiH} + 4 \operatorname{H}_{2}$$
(2)

This reaction can yield a maximum of 11.56 wt% H at completion, and has been demonstrated experimentally to yield > 9 wt% H reversibly. A second reaction is the one suggested recently by Pinkerton et al. [10] and also by Aoki et al. [11]:

J. Karl Johnson



FIGURE 2. USPP-DFT predictions of ΔH for 129 new destabilized reactions along with 4 known ones. The region of interest includes reactions which have >6.5 wt% H, and reaction enthalpy between 30 -60 kJ/mol H₂. (Predicted ΔH for destabilized reactions)

$$\text{LiBH}_4 + 2 \text{ LiNH}_2 \rightarrow \text{Li}_3 \text{BN}_2 + 4 \text{ H}_2 \tag{3}$$

This reaction yields 11.9 wt% H at completion, and is predicted by DFT to have $\Delta H = 22$ (24) kJ/mol H₂ using the USPP (PAW) approach and the orthorhombic form of LiBH₄.

Crucially, our approach also identifies five interesting reactions that have not previously been proposed or examined. One example is

$$3 \operatorname{LiNH}_{2} + 2 \operatorname{LiH} + \operatorname{Si} \rightarrow \operatorname{Li}_{5} \operatorname{N}_{3} \operatorname{Si} + 4 \operatorname{H}_{2}$$

$$\tag{4}$$

This reaction yields 7.16 wt% H on completion. Our DFT calculations predict that the reaction enthalpy is 19-30 (23-34) kJ/mol H₂ using the USPP (PAW) approach. The range of values for this reaction reflects the variants in the Li_5N_3Si crystal structure that were employed in our calculations. A related reaction involves a mixture of LiNH₂ and MgH₂:

$$LiNH_2 + MgH_2 \rightarrow LiMgN + 2H_2$$
(5)

This reaction releases 8.19 wt% H on completion, with a DFT-predicted reaction enthalpy of 29.7 (31.9) kJ/mol H₂ using the USPP (PAW) approach. Two other examples identified by our calculations are variants of (2):

$$4 \operatorname{LiBH}_{4} + \operatorname{MgH}_{2} \rightarrow \operatorname{MgB}_{4} + 4 \operatorname{LiH} + 7 \operatorname{H}_{2}$$
(6)

$$7 \operatorname{LiBH}_{4} + \operatorname{MgH}_{2} \rightarrow \operatorname{MgB}_{7} + 7 \operatorname{LiH} + 11.5 \operatorname{H}_{2}$$
(7)

These schemes differ from reaction 2 by including larger amounts of LiBH₄ as a reactant, forming MgB₄ or MgB₇ as a product rather than MgB₂. Reactions 6 and 7 release 12.5 and 13 wt% H on completion. Our USPP-

DFT calculations predict a reaction enthalpy of 66.8 (69.2-73.1) kJ/mol H₂ using the orthorhombic form of LiBH₄ for the reaction forming MgB₄ (MgB₇). The range of enthalpies for the latter reaction is due to the different structures of MgB₇ used to account for the vacancies in the crystal structure. The fifth example involves CaH₂:

$$CaH_2 + 6 LiBH_4 \rightarrow CaB_6 + 6 LiH + 10 H_2$$
(8)

Upon completion, this reaction releases 11.7 wt% H and the DFT-predicted reaction enthalpy is 60 (63) with USPP (PAW).

We have computed the vapor pressures for a select number of reactions from the phonon density of states method. As an example, we show in Figure 3 the vapor pressure curve computed from our DFT calculations compared with the vapor pressure computed from thermodynamic tables from the NIST database. The agreement is remarkably good for this system. However, the agreement for other test systems is not expected to be that good because the accuracy of DFT methods are not good enough to give quantitative agreement with experiments.

Conclusions and Future Directions

We have demonstrated the utility of using first principles density functional theory to screen candidate reaction schemes for hydrogen storage. We can predict the enthalpy of reaction to within reasonable accuracy to justify further experimental investigations for the most promising candidate materials. Perhaps more importantly, we can quickly discount reaction schemes that have ΔH values that are either much too high or



FIGURE 3. Vapor pressure of $2MgH_2 + Si = Mg_2Si + 2H_2$ calculated from density functional theory and compared with thermodynamic data from the NIST database. (Calculated vapor pressure curve for the MgH_2+Si system)

much too low. This is of critical importance because of the challenge posed to experimental groups to synthesize and characterize a large number of different alloys from both a time and financial resources view-point.

We have provided a proof-in-principle that we are able to compute vapor pressures (van't Hoff plots) for hydride reactions, including destabilized hydrides. This should prove useful for estimating the potential usefulness of a given reaction scheme, beyond the simple reaction enthalpy approach.

We are currently investigating kinetics of hydrogenation reactions and the effect of oxide formation. We are working closely with experimental groups and providing information on interfacial energies in order to estimate finite-size effects on the thermodynamics of hydrogen storage for nanoparticles. Future work also includes the following planned activities:

- Contribute data to the UIUC toolbox data base
- Collaborate with Ursula Kattner, NIST by computing thermodynamic properties of LiB4 and other materials
- Continue work on computing P-T diagrams for metal hydrides
- Continue work on interfacial energies
- Continue work on destabilized hydride reversibility
- Investigate new reaction schemes for destabilized hydrides including other light elements

Special Recognitions & Awards/Patents Issued

1. Invited talk at the International Symposium on Materials Issues in Hydrogen Production and Storage, Santa Barbara, CA, August 20-25, 2006.

2. Invited talk at the Fall MRS meeting, special session on hydrogen storage.

FY 2006 Publications/Presentations

1. Sudhakar V. Alapati, J. Karl Johnson, and David S. Sholl "Identification of Destabilized Metal Hydrides for Hydrogen Storage Using First Principles Calculations", *Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, **110**, 8769-8776 (2006).

Invited Talks

1. J. Karl Johnson, Sudhakar V. Alapati, Bing Dai, David S. Sholl "Computational Study of Metal Hydride Destabilization" *American Physical Society March Meeting*, Baltimore, MD, 13-17 March, 2006.

2. J. Karl Johnson, "Atomistic Simulations of Novel Hydrogen Storage Materials", *Pittsburgh-Cleveland Catalysis Society*, Pittsburgh, PA, 9 December, 2005.

3. J. Karl Johnson, "Atomistic Simulations of Novel Hydrogen Storage Materials", *Department of Chemical Engineering, Brigham Young University*, Provo, Utah, 1 December, 2005.

4. J. Karl Johnson, Sudhakar V. Alapati, Bing Dai, Giovanni Garberglio, David S. Sholl, "Computational Studies of Hydrogen Storage: Metal Organic Frameworks and Destabilized Metal Hydrides", *W. E. Heraeus Seminar on Hydrogen Storage with Novel Nanomaterials*, Bad Honnef, Germany, 23-27 October, 2005.

Contributed Talks

1. Giovanni Garberoglio, Anastasios Skoulidas, Karl Johnson, "Mechanisms of Hydrogen Adsorption in Metal Organic Frameworks", *AIChE Annual Meeting*, Cincinnati, Ohio, 31 October to 4 November, 2005.

2. Karl Johnson, Giovanni Garberoglio "Hydrogen Storage in Metal Organic Frameworks: Predictions from Computer Simulations", *Symposium on Materials for the Hydrogen Economy, Materials Science & Technology 2005* Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, September 25-28, 2005.

3. Sudhakar V. Alapati, David S. Sholl and J. Karl. Johnson, "Screening Destabilized Alloys for Hydrogen Storage Applications and Prediction of Thermodynamic Properties using First Principles", 2006 Midwest Thermodynamics and Statistical Mechanics Conference, Akron, OH, May 25-26, 2006.

4. Bing Dai, David S. Sholl and J. Karl. Johnson, "First Principles Investigation of Adsorption and Dissociation of Hydrogen on the Mg2Si Surface", *2006 Midwest Thermodynamics and Statistical Mechanics Conference*, Akron, OH, May 25-26, 2006.

5. Bing Dai, Sudhakar V. Alapati, David S. Sholl and J. Karl. Johnson, "First Principles Investigation of Adsorption and Dissociation of Hydrogen on the Mg₂Si Surface" 231st *American Chemical Society National Meeting*, Atlanta, Georgia, 26-30 March 2006.

6. Sudhakar V. Alapati, Bing Dai, J. Karl. Johnson and David S. Sholl, "First Principles Calculations of Destabilized Alloys for Hydrogen Storage Applications" *2006 TMS Annual Meeting*, San Antonio, TX, 12-16 March, 2006.

References

1. Kresse, G. & Hafner, J. Ab initio molecular dynamics for liquid metals. *Phys. Rev. B* 47, 558 (1993).

2. Kresse, G. & Furthmüller, J. Efficient iterative schemes for ab initio total-energy calculations using a plane-wave basis set. *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 11169 (1996).

3. Kresse, G. & Joubert, D. From ultrasoft pseudopotentials to the projector augmented-wave method. *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1758 (1999).

4. Perdew, J. P. et al. Atoms, molecules, solids, and surfaces: Applications of the generalized gradient approximation for exchange and correlation. *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 6671 (1992).

5. Hammer, B., Hansen, L. B. & Nørskov, J. K. Improved adsorption energetics within density-functional theory using revised Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof functionals. *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 7413 (1999).

6. Perdew, J. P., Burke, K. & Ernzerhof, M. Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple. *Phys. Rev. Lett* **77**, 3865 (1996).

7. Lide, D. R. (ed.) *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics* (CRC Press, New York, 2002).

8. DOE Hydrogen Storage Targets. *DOE Hydrogen Storage Targets http://www.eere.energy.gov/hydrogenandfuelcells/mypp/pdfs/storage.pdf*.

9. Vajo, J. J., Skeith, S. L. & Meters, F. Reversible Storage of Hydrogen in Destabillized LiBH₄. *J. Phys.Chem B* **109**, 3719 (2005).

10. Pinkerton, F. E., Meisner, G. P., Meyer, M. S., Balogh, M. P. & Kundrat, M. D. Hydrogen Desorption Exceeding ten weight percent from the new quarternary hydride $Li_3BN_2H_e$. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **109**, 6 (2005).

11. Aoki, M. et al. Destabilization of LiBH4 by mixing with LiNH2. *Appl. Phys. A* **80**, 1409 (2005).

12. Wolverton, C., Ozolinš, V. & Asta, M. Hydrogen in aluminum: First-principles calculations of structure and thermodynamics. *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 144109 (2004).