First-Principles Determination of the Ground-State Structure of LiBH₄

Adem Tekin,^{1,*} Riccarda Caputo,² and Andreas Züttel²

¹*Informatics Institute, Istanbul Technical University, 34469 Maslak, Istanbul, Turkey*

²*EMPA, Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Science and Technology, Überlandstrasse, 129 CH-8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland*
(Received 15 December 2009; published 24 May 2010)

The potential energy surface of LiBH₄ is investigated by a ground-state search method based on simulated annealing and first-principles density functional theory calculations. A new stable orthogonal structure with *Pnma* symmetry is found, which is 9.66 kJ/mol lower in energy than the proposed *Pnma* structure by Soulié *et al.* [*J. Alloys Compd.* **346**, 200 (2002)]. For the high-temperature structure, we suggest a new monoclinic *P2/c* structure, which is 21.26 kJ/mol over the ground-state energy and shows no lattice instability.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.215501

PACS numbers: 61.66.Fn, 71.15.Mb, 71.15.Nc

Lithium borohydride (LiBH₄) has been extensively studied since the early 1940s, when Schlesinger and coworkers started a systematic synthesis of metal borohydrides [1]. Although a considerable number of papers have been published on LiBH₄, a clear theoretical structure determination from first principles seems to suffer from a lack of methodological approach. On the experimental side, already Harris *et al.* [2] reported an orthorhombic structure (space group *Pcmm*) with cell dimensions $a = 6.81$ Å, $b = 4.43$ Å, and $c = 7.17$ Å. In the last decade, because LiBH₄ has been proposed [3] as a promising material for technological applications of hydrogen as clean fuel, thanks to its high gravimetric (18.5 wt % H) and volumetric (121 kg H/m³) hydrogen density, the interest in the entire class of metal tetrahydroborohydrides has been rewound. Soulié *et al.* [4] reported an orthorhombic structure [space group *Pnma* (IT 62), $a = 7.17858$ Å, $b = 4.43686$ Å, and $c = 6.80321$ Å] by synchrotron x-ray diffraction at room temperature. In this structure, each [BH₄]^{δ−} anion was surrounded by four Li^{δ+} cations and each Li^{δ+} by four [BH₄]^{δ−} both in tetrahedral configuration. The [BH₄]^{δ−} ions were strongly distorted from the ideal tetrahedral geometry. The same *Pnma* structure was also reported by Züttel *et al.* [5]. Furthermore, Soulié *et al.* [4] observed that *Pnma* structure transforms into a hexagonal phase (space group *P6₃mc*, $a = 4.27631$ Å, and $c = 6.94844$ Å) at 408 K. However, this structure was found to have imaginary normal modes of vibration in the theoretical calculations performed a few years later [6] and therein a monoclinic structure with symmetry group *Cc* was proposed for the high-temperature phase of LiBH₄. Recently, a single crystal synchrotron diffraction study was conducted by Filinchuk *et al.* [7] aiming to find the more accurate low- and high-temperature crystal structures of LiBH₄. Correspondingly, they [7] confirmed the *Pnma* with a nearly ideal tetrahedral [BH₄]^{δ−} ions for the low temperature structure and the *P6₃mc* structure for the high-temperature phase. In contrast to Soulié *et al.* [4], they predicted the phase transition occurring at 381 K.

Moreover, at room temperature, a new phase with *Ama2* symmetry [8] has been reported by an x-ray diffraction study. It has also been found that pressure-induced phase transition is possible in LiBH₄: at room temperature and a pressure of 1.2–10 GPa a transition from *Pnma* to *Ama2* phase occurs and above 10 GPa a cubic (*Fm $\bar{3}$ m*) NaBH₄-type structure is preferred. In *Ama2* structure, Li^{δ+} ions prefer a tetrahedral coordination with the [BH₄]^{δ−} anions and each [BH₄]^{δ−} group is surrounded by a square-planar coordination of four Li^{δ+} atoms. Differently, in *Fm $\bar{3}$ m* structure, each of the Li^{δ+} and [BH₄]^{δ−} ions are octahedrally coordinated. It is clear that despite the enormous efforts and the large amount of work devoted to the study of such an interesting compound, a clear determination of the ground-state structure has not yet been unambiguously defined. We report in the present Letter the first-principles structure determination of LiBH₄, following the same procedure already applied for the ground-state determination of Mg(BH₄)₂ [9] and Mg(NH₃)_nCl₂ [10] with $n = 6, 2, 1$.

As discussed in [9] for Mg(BH₄)₂, the number of bonds between the metal atom and hydrogen stabilizes the crystal structure. The crystal structures of LiBH₄ were constructed by maximizing the number of Li—H bonds within a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ supercell, using only several bond length constraints, and 1, 2, and 4 formula units (f.u.) of LiBH₄. A model with 2 f.u. of LiBH₄ used in simulated annealing (SA) search [11] is shown in Fig. 1, where (i) one of the Li atom was set to the origin, (ii) a fixed tetrahedral coordinate system was used for [BH₄]^{δ−} with 1.24 Å B—H distances, (iii) the positions of the Li atom and [BH₄]^{δ−} groups were determined using three spherical coordinates (the center of mass distance, Θ and Φ), (iv) three Euler angle parameters (α , β , and γ) were used to rotate each [BH₄]^{δ−} group, (v) the lattice vectors were used as parameters, and (vi) the resulting 24 parameters (15 and 42 for 1 and 4 f.u., respectively) were globally optimized to maximize the number of Li—H bonds in LiBH₄. In addition to this model, in the SA search, the type of crystal system, e.g., triclinic and mono-

FIG. 1 (color online). The model system used in SA optimizations. (See details in the text.)

clinic, was also applied as a constraint to be able to reduce the parameter search space. Since our SA optimization approach is based only on the geometrical features of the studied system [neither empirical potentials nor density functional theory (DFT) energies are used], bond length constraints must be carefully introduced into the models discussed above to avoid results leading to unphysical crystal structure. More specifically, we adopted the cutoff criterion that if the Li—B, Li—Li, B—B, and H—H distances in the $2 \times 2 \times 2$ supercell were longer than 2.55, 3.75, 3.78, and 2.3 Å, respectively, then the corresponding crystal structures were accepted in these model systems. The fitness criteria in the SA optimizations, namely, the total number of Li—H bonds in the cut-through lattice, were determined by simply counting the number of Li—H bonds, for the Li—H bond in the ranges (2.00, 2.50) Å or (1.84, 2.50) Å. All of these constraints

were adjusted with the help of data reported in the literature. The best promising structures were further optimized by the subsequent periodic lattice calculations.

We employed DFT based methods, in particular, CASTEP [12], as implemented in MATERIALS STUDIO 4.4 to optimize ionic positions and lattice parameters of α -boron [13], lithium (bcc), and all the structures reported in the present Letter. Norm-conserving pseudopotentials were utilized for all atoms together with a fine mesh of k points, with the energy conversion threshold of 0.01 meV/atom, maximum displacement of 0.001 Å and maximum force of 0.03 eV/Å, yielding a high accuracy for the energy and atomic displacements. For lithium and boron atoms the valence region was modeled using the $2s^1$ and $2s^2 2p^1$ electrons, respectively. The Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof 96 and the generalized gradient form (GGA-PBE) of the exchange-correlation functional were applied. Density functional perturbation theory (DFPT) as implemented in CASTEP [14] was used for phonon calculations. In addition, the fully optimized structures calculated by CASTEP were further considered in the phonon calculations performed by plane-wave self-consistent field (PWSCF) which is a computer code for electronic-structure calculations within DFT and density functional perturbation theory, using pseudopotentials and a plane-wave basis set [15].

The SA search successfully predicted many distinct structures for LiBH₄, with different molecular configurations, e.g., bidentate and tridentate, 25 of them were selected for the periodic DFT calculations. In addition to those structures, we considered the two most important experimentally determined structures, namely, orthorhombic and hexagonal [3,4,16] (and references therein), in the periodic lattice calculations. In Table I, we reported the structure data and thermodynamic results of selected structures whose lattice stability was confirmed by the phonon

TABLE I. Thermodynamic and structural data of selected structures, which were fully optimized by using CASTEP. The quantities reported are the enthalpy of formation (kJ/mol) at $T = 0$ K, $\Delta_f H$, the symmetry group that best fitted the optimized structures, within brackets the international crystallographic number (IT), the corresponding lattice parameters (Å) and in brackets the maximum deviation of the atomic coordinates from the crystallographic positions corresponding to the specific group of symmetry. The first seven structures showed all the normal modes of vibration real. The last three structures were optimized starting from the reference structures, of which only the orthorhombic structure showed lattice stability. The cubic structure $F\bar{4}3m$, which was modeled in comparison to the cubic NaBH₄ structure [17], showed imaginary modes.

$\Delta_f H$	Symmetry group (IT)	Lattice parameters (max deviation)	Remarks
−239.988	<i>Pnma</i> (62)	8.484, 4.348, 5.750 (0.02)	Orthorhombic
−218.724	<i>P2/c</i> (13)	11.343, 6.993, 8.780 (0.004)	Monoclinic
−234.854	<i>C2</i> (5)	10.550, 10.016, 6.732 (0.004)	Monoclinic
−233.122	<i>R3</i> (146)	9.90, 9.90, 11.28 (0.02)	Hexagonal
−234.516	<i>Cc</i> (9)	13.13, 6.08, 6.93 (0.03)	Monoclinic
−235.079	<i>P2₁/c</i> (14)	4.15, 7.01, 7.81 (0.02)	Monoclinic
−233.248	<i>P2₁3</i> (198)	6.22, 6.22, 6.22 (0.02)	Cubic
−188.976	<i>F43m</i> (216)	5.741, 5.741, 5.741 (0.01)	Cubic
−230.330	<i>Pnma</i> (62)	7.248, 4.367, 6.559 (0.001)	Orthorhombic [4]
−212.511	<i>P6₃mc</i> (186)	4.221, 4.221, 7.612 (0.001)	Hexagonal [4]
−218.889	<i>Ama2</i> (40)	6.293, 5.626, 5.901 (0.001)	C-centered orthorhombic [8]

TABLE III. DFT coordinates of the high-temperature $P2/c$ structure of LiBH_4 .

Ion type	Wyckoff position	x	y	z
Li1	4g	0.1305	0.4976	0.7484
B2	4g	0.8075	0.5522	0.0622
H3	4g	0.9254	0.6570	-0.0010
H4	4g	0.8718	0.3988	0.9578
H5	4g	0.6938	0.5165	0.2688
H6	4g	0.7339	0.6374	0.0310

ground-state orthorhombic structure. The Cc symmetry structure [6], proposed as a candidate for the high-temperature phase, found 5.74 kJ/mol higher than the ground-state structure and instable showing the first two normal modes with imaginary frequencies, -70.43 cm^{-1} and -10.97 cm^{-1} . Conversely, one of our stable and higher energy structure, the monoclinic structure with symmetry $P2/c$, resulted in 21.264 kJ/mol above the ground-state structure, and showed lattice stability by phonon analysis with all real normal modes [18]. The relaxed DFT ionic coordinates of this structure are given in Table III. Furthermore, we modeled a face-centered cubic (fcc) structure with $F\bar{4}3m$ symmetry, in which $\text{Li}^{\delta+}$ and $[\text{BH}_4]^{\delta-}$ ions are octahedrally coordinated, in analogy to NaBH_4 [17]. Compared to the quasicubic structure with $R\bar{3}$ symmetry, the unitcell volume of the fcc structure was quite compact: $319.100 \text{ \AA}^3$ versus $189.214 \text{ \AA}^3$. As reported in Table I, the hexa-coordination of Li to borohydride groups in the $F\bar{4}3m$ symmetry was energetically unfavoured, being 51.012 kJ/mol above the ground-state structure. In addition, the phonon analysis revealed a lattice instability, showing clearly that the hexa-coordination of $\text{Li}^{\delta+}$ to $[\text{BH}_4]^{\delta-}$ groups was dynamically unfavored. Compared to the analogous structure of NaBH_4 , the LiBH_4 —fcc showed a shorter cubic lattice parameter and hence a reduced molar volume by 20.56% than of NaBH_4 , a fact that can be attributed mainly to steric effects, being the ionic radius of Li smaller than of Na. Clearly, what differentiated the structures and governed both the lattice symmetry and the lattice stability was the local coordination of lithium atoms to $[\text{BH}_4]^{\delta-}$ groups.

In conclusion, the potential energy surface of LiBH_4 was investigated by a ground-state search method based on SA and first-principles DFT calculations. Six structures were found lower in energy than the reported orthorhombic structure. Even if the symmetry group of the lowest energy structure was the same, $Pnma$, the lattice parameters were different, leading to a slight difference in the cell volume [18]. For the high energy structure, we suggested a new monoclinic $P2/c$ over the hexagonal $P6_3mc$, because of the lattice stability, being all the phonon frequencies posi-

tive for the former, while the latter showed two double degenerate imaginary modes, with frequencies -55.70 and -41.44 cm^{-1} . Based on the hypothesis that a direct transition from the orthorhombic ground state to the monoclinic structure occurred, the transition temperature was estimated to be 408.8 K. The first-principles structure determination approach that we used in the present work revealed a powerful tool for modeling and predicting stable structures.

*adem.tekin@be.itu.edu.tr

- [1] H. I. Schlesinger and H. C. Brown, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **62**, 3429 (1940).
- [2] P. M. Harris and E. P. Meibohm, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **69**, 1231 (1947).
- [3] A. Züttel, P. Wenger, S. Rentsch, P. Sudan, Ph. Mauron, and Ch. Emmenegger, *J. Power Sources* **118**, 1 (2003).
- [4] J-Ph. Soulie', G. Renaudin, R. Cerny, and K. Yvon, *J. Alloys Compd.* **346**, 200 (2002).
- [5] A. Züttel, S. Rentsch, P. Fischer, P. Wenger, P. Sudan, Ph. Mauron, and Ch. Emmenegger, *J. Alloys Compd.* **356–357**, 515 (2003).
- [6] Z. Łodziana and T. Vegge, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 145501 (2004).
- [7] Y. Filinchuk, D. Chernyshov, and R. Cerny, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **112**, 10579 (2008).
- [8] Y. Filinchuk, D. Chernyshov, A. Nevidomskyy, and V. Dmitriev, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **47**, 529 (2008).
- [9] R. Caputo, A. Tekin, W. Sikora, and A. Züttel, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **480**, 203 (2009).
- [10] A. Tekin, J. S. Hummelshøj, H. S. Jacobsen, D. Sveinbjörnsson, D. Blanchard, J. K. Nørskov, and T. Vegge, *Energ. Environ. Sci.* **3**, 448 (2010).
- [11] A. Corona, M. Marchesi, C. Martini, and S. Ridella, *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* **13**, 262 (1987).
- [12] S. J. Clark, M. D. Segall, C. J. Pickard, P. J. Haspin, M. J. Probert, K. Refson, and M. C. Payne, *Z. Kristallogr.* **220**, 567 (2005).
- [13] R. Caputo and A. Züttel, *Mol. Phys.* **107**, 1831 (2009).
- [14] K. Refson, S. J. Clark, and P. R. Tulip, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 155114 (2006).
- [15] P. Giannozzi *et al.*, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **21**, 395502 (2009).
- [16] M. R. Hartman, J. J. Rush, T. J. Udovic, R. C. Bowman, Jr., and S. J. Hwang, *J. Solid State Chem.* **180**, 1298 (2007).
- [17] P. Martelli, R. Caputo, A. Remhof, P. Mauron, A. Borgschulte, and A. Züttel, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **114**, 7173 (2010).
- [18] See supplementary material at <http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.215501> for the figures containing simulated x-ray diffraction patterns, density of states, electron density distributions, and high-temperature structure.