Journal Name

# **Supporting Information**

# Novel Cu(Zn)-Ge-P compounds as advanced anode materials for Li-ion batteries

Wenwu Li,\*<sup>a,b</sup> Pengfei Shen,<sup>b</sup> Lufeng Yang,<sup>c</sup> Anjie Chen,<sup>d</sup> Jeng-Han Wang,<sup>d</sup> Yunyong Li<sup>b</sup>, Hailong Chen,<sup>c</sup> and Meilin Liu\*<sup>a</sup>

- a. School of Materials Science & Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332, USA
- b. School of Materials and Energy, Guangdong University of Technology, Guangzhou 510006, PR China.
- c. The Woodruff school of Mechanical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, 771 Ferst Drive, Atlanta, GA, 30332, USA
- d. Department of Chemistry, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, 11677, Taiwan.

ARTICLE

Journal Name

Table S1. Key processing and refinement parameters of CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> sample.

Compound	CuGe <sub>2</sub> P <sub>3</sub>
Crystal System	Cubic
Space Group	F-43m
Point Group	CF6
a Å	5.354425
V Å <sup>3</sup>	153.511
20-interval °	5-130
Z	1
Rwp%	1.64
Rp%	1.28
2	1.594

Table S2. Fractional atomic coordinates and isotropic displacement parameters (Å<sup>2</sup>) of CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>.

	х	у	Z	U <sub>iso</sub>	Occ
Cu	0	0	0	0.25128	0.333
Ge	0	0	0	0.25128	0.667
Р	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.00689	1

Table S3. Synchrotron radiation angle information of the CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>.

CuGe <sub>2</sub> P <sub>3</sub> Powder									
20	4.435°	5.03°	7.258°	7.616°	8.506°	10.266°	11.187°	12.576°	13.344°
Relative intensity	100	10.46	54.3	6.97	29.17	8.07	11.82	12.25	7.24



Fig. S1. Morphology characterizations of CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> compound at low magnification: a) The FESEM image; b) the TEM image.



Fig. S2. HRTEM image of as-synthesized cubic  $CuGe_2P_3$ .



Fig. S3. Raman spectroscopy of the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound.



**Fig. S4**. a) Initial three CV curves and b) initial three discharge-charge profiles of the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound; c) voltage profiles of different cycling conditions of  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound at 100 mA h g<sup>-1</sup>.



Fig. S5. Typical discharge-charge curves and cycle performance of the cation-disordered CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> compound without any conductive agents.



**Fig. S6**. The crystal structure of Li<sub>3</sub>CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>, which derived from the Li-insertion voids within the crystal structure of the cation-disordered CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> compound.



Fig. S7. Binding energies of cation-disordered CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> with various Li atom number inserted in the voids by first-principles calculations.

4 | J. Name., 2020, 00, 1-3



Fig. S8. The corresponding supercell models in Fig. S7.



Fig. S9. The enlarged XRD patterns at the state of discharging to 0.4 V and charging to 0.85 V.



**Fig. S10**. High-resolution XPS spectra of the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound electrodes after initial cycling, the discharge state of 5 mV, pristine  $CuGe_2P_3$  sample and raw materials of Ge, P and Cu.



Fig. S11. The ex-situ high-resolution synchrotron X-ray diffraction patterns of CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> anodes at different potentials.

#### Journal Name

#### ARTICLE



Fig. S12. Ex-situ HRTEM images of the cation-disordered CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> compound anodes at different potentials.



Fig. S13. Simulation models utilized for first-principles calculations of the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  and Ge.



Fig. S14. Band structures of the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$ .



Fig. S15. Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy of the cell with a) ball milled Cu+2Ge+3P samples and, b) ball milled Ge powder.

**Table S4**. The tested electronic conductivity of the  $CuGe_2P_3$ -based electrode ( $CuGe_2P_3$ : carbon black: binder = 7: 2: 1),  $CuGe_2P_3$  powder, Ge powder, the mixed Cu+2Ge+3P powder and red P powder under the mild pressure and room temperature.

Materials	Conductivity (S m <sup>-1</sup> )
CuGe <sub>2</sub> P <sub>3</sub> electrode	331
CuGe <sub>2</sub> P <sub>3</sub>	68
Ge	0.089
mixed Cu+2Ge+3P	0.03
red P	less than 10 <sup>-5</sup>



Fig. S16. Typical Li-ion migration paths of the cation-disordered CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> and Ge.



**Fig. S17**. a), d) and g) Galvanostatic intermittent titration technique (GITT) profiles during first-cycle discharge-charge of LIBs utilizing the ball milled Cu+2Ge+3P samples; b), e) and h) typical schemes for single-step of GITT experiments of LIBs utilizing the ball milled Cu+2Ge+3P samples; c), f) and l) dE/dt<sup>(1/2)</sup> curves from b), e) and h) of LIBs the ball milled Cu+2Ge+3P samples.



**Fig. S18**. a) Galvanostatic intermittent titration technique (GITT) profiles during pristine discharge and charge of LIBs utilizing milled Ge as electrodes; b) the typical schemes for single-step of GITT experiments of LIBs utilizing milled Ge as electrodes; c) dE/dt<sup>(1/2)</sup> curves from b) of LIBs utilizing milled Ge as electrodes.



**Fig. S19**. SEM images of the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound and milled Ge electrodes: a) milled Ge electrodes before cycling, b) milled Ge electrodes after 20 cycles at 100 mA g<sup>-1</sup>, c) cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound electrodes before cycling, d) the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound electrodes after 20 cycles at 100 mA g<sup>-1</sup>.



**Fig. S20**. a) XRD pattern and b) HRTEM image of the amorphous carbon-coated the cation-disordered  $CuGe_2P_3$  compound. The broadened XRD diffraction peaks and the low intensity, along with the disappearance of graphite indicate that the particle size of the as-synthesized  $CuGe_2P_3$  was significantly decreased and embedded into the amorphous carbon.



Fig. S21. a-b) TGA curves of CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>/C@Graphene and b) the CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> compound; c) XRD pattern of CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> under 400°C in air for 3h.

Note that the carbon content is calculated as follows:

Carbon content in the composite is x and  $\text{CuGe}_2\text{P}_3$  is y.

x + y =1 (Equation 1);

1.19y = 0.92 (Equation 2).

According to the above equations, the carbon content (x) can be obtained to be 22.69 %, which is close to the feed ratio of the two components.



Fig. S22. Low magnification TEM image and elemental mappings of CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>/C@Graphene.



Fig. S23. Voltage profiles of different cycling conditions of  $CuGe_2P_3/C@Graphene$  at 200 mA h g<sup>-1</sup>.



Fig. S24. BET curves of a) CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>/C@Graphene and b) Cation-disordered CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub> compound.



**Fig. S25**. The LiFePO<sub>4</sub>//CuGe<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>/C@Graphene full cell: a) a schematic sketch of the full cell; b) the first five discharge-charge profiles; c) cycle performance.

**Table S5**. Performances comparisons of  $CuGe_2P_3/C@Graphene$  with recently reported Ge-based anodes in terms of initial Coulombic efficiency and long cycling stability.

Materials	Cycle performance	Initial Coulombic efficiency	References
CuGe <sub>2</sub> P <sub>3</sub> /C@Graphene	0.02 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 600 cycles, 1312 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	91%	This work
Li <sub>2</sub> GeO <sub>3</sub>	0.05 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 300 cycles, 725 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	56%	[49]
$Ge_{0.90}Ga_{0.10}$	0.32 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 150 cycles, 1146 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	85%	[50]
GeP <sub>3</sub> /C	0.1 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 130 cycles, 1109 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	73.8%	[51]
GeSn	0.2 C, 25 cycles, 1040 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	83%	[52]
Ge <sub>0.85</sub> Te <sub>0.15</sub>	1 C, 500 cycles, 1002 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	70.4%	[53]
GeS	0.16 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 100 cycles, 1150 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	78%	[54]
3D-pGe	1.147 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 250 cycles, 770 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	92.3%	[55]
Si-Ge hNWs	1 C, 400 cycles, 300 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	74.7%	[56]
$Ge_3N_4@C$	0.69 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 300 cycles, 660 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	78%	[57]
NPGeNFs	3 C, 500 cycles, 678 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	81.8%	[58]
$Ge_2Sb_2Se_5$	0.5 C, 100 cycles, 626 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	68%	[59]
Ge-HS/GNs	0.8 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 500 cycles, 1182 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	83.6%	[60]
rGO/Ge/rGO	1.6 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 500 cycles, 1085 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	69.6%	[61]
Ge (ZnRR)	0.08 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 300 cycles, 1030 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	81%	[62]
Li <sub>2</sub> TiGeO <sub>5</sub>	1 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 600 cycles, 406 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	68%	[63]
Ge@MoS <sub>2</sub>	7 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 100 cycles, 594 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	79.6%	[64]
Ge-S-C	0.1 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 100 cycles, 1114 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	77.7%	[65]
Fe-GeO <sub>2</sub>	1 A g <sup>-1</sup> , 100 cycles, 1114 mA h g <sup>-1</sup>	58.76%	[66]



Fig. S26. Evolved XRD patterns of the Cu(Zn)-Ge-P samples of Cu(Zn)+2Ge+3P, Cu(Zn)+3Ge+4P, and Cu(Zn)+4Ge+5P samples.



Fig. S27. Initial three discharge-charge curves of the cation-disordered Cu(Zn)-Ge-P compounds (Cu(Zn)Ge<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>  $\rightarrow$  Cu(Zn)Ge<sub>3</sub>P<sub>4</sub>  $\rightarrow$  Cu(Zn)Ge<sub>4</sub>P<sub>5</sub>.



**Fig. S28**. Typical discharge profiles of the cation-disordered Cu-Ge-P compounds ( $CuGe_2P_3 \rightarrow CuGe_3P_4 \rightarrow CuGe_4P_5$ ), commercial Ge and P/C electrodes.