Lithium amide (LiNH₂) is a promising material for reversible hydrogen storage,[10] yet the atomistic mechanisms behind the decomposition and dehydrogenation processes of LiNH₂ are unknown. It has been observed that the activation energy for LiNH₂ decomposition strongly varies with ball milling,[2–4] thus suggesting that the thermodynamics and kinetics of the decomposition depend on the particle size. The high surface-to-volume ratio of nanoparticles that result from the ball-milling process not only leads to an increase in the number of surface-active sites for reaction, but may also affect the actual reaction mechanisms. Based on results of ab initio calculations for native point defects and defect complexes in LiNH₂, we propose herein that the decomposition of LiNH₂ into lithium imide (Li₂NH) and ammonia (NH₃) occurs through two competing mechanisms, one that involves the formation of native defects in the interior of the material and the other at the surface. As a result, the prevailing mechanism and hence the activation energy depend on the surface-to-volume ratio, or the specific surface area (SSA), which changes with the particle size. We explain the observed variation of activation energy with ball milling, and address the role played by LiH in the dehydrogenation of (LiNH₂ + LiH) mixtures.

At temperatures below 300 °C, LiNH₂ reversibly stores approximately 6.5 wt% hydrogen during absorption under 20 bar followed by desorption under 0.04 bar, according to the following reaction [Eq. (1)]:[11]

$$\text{LiNH}_2 + \text{LiH} \rightarrow \text{Li}_2\text{NH} + \text{H}_2$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

It has been suggested that LiNH₂ reacts directly with LiH at the LiNH₂/LiH interface, with direct release of H₂.[10] Other reports, however, proposed that NH₃ necessarily evolves as a transient gas and the dehydrogenation of (LiNH₂ + LiH) mixtures involves an intermediate step [Eqs. (2) and (3)].[5,6]

$$2\text{LiNH}_2 \rightarrow \text{Li}_2\text{NH} + \text{NH}_3$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

The first reaction [Eq. (2)] was suggested to be diffusion-controlled,[2,7] that is, involving mass transport mediated by native defects; whereas in the second reaction [Eq. (3)], NH₃ was reported to be readily captured by LiH at very short contact times (ca. 25 ms).[3] After ball milling, LiNH₂ and (LiNH₂ + LiH) mixtures were found to have smaller particle size, increased specific surface area (SSA), and lower activation energy.[2–4]

LiNH₂ can be regarded as an ordered arrangement of Li⁺ and NH₃ units. Possible native point defects in the compound are vacancies, interstitials, and antisite defects associated with lithium, nitrogen, and hydrogen atoms. In insulating, large-band-gap materials such as LiNH₂, native point defects are expected to exist in charged states other than neutral, and charge neutrality requires that defects with opposite charge states coexist in equal concentrations. This requirement, and the fact that migration of charged defects has to maintain local and global charge neutrality, forms the basis of our analysis.

We carried out calculations for native defects in all possible charge states by using ab initio density functional theory. Defect complexes were also considered, with special attention to Frenkel pairs, that is, interstitial-vacancy pairs of the same species. The defects are characterized by their formation energies, which determine their concentrations, and migration barriers. The formation energy depends on the atomic chemical potentials, which can be chosen to represent the experimental conditions (see the technical details of the calculations and the theoretical approach in the Methods section). For charged defects, the formation energy also depends on the position of the Fermi level (i.e., the electron chemical potential). The slope in the formation-energy plots as a function of the Fermi level indicates the charge state. A positive slope indicates that the defect is positively charged, and a negative slope indicates the defect is negatively charged. We present the results only for selected defects that are most relevant to our present discussion. Detailed results for all possible native defects will be reported elsewhere.

Figure 1 shows the calculated formation energies for the negatively charged hydrogen vacancy ($V_{\text{H}^-}$), positively charged hydrogen interstitial (H⁺), negatively charged lithium vacancy ($V_{\text{Li}}^-$), and positively charged lithium interstitial (Li⁺). These defects have low formation energies and are, as discussed below, most relevant to the decomposition of LiNH₂. Li⁺ and $V_{\text{Li}}^-$ have the lowest formation energies.
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among all native point defects over the entire range of Fermi level values. \( V_{Li}^{-} \) corresponds to removing a \( Li^{+} \) ion from pristine \( LiNH_2 \), and \( Li^{+} \) corresponds to adding a \( Li^{+} \) ion in the space between two \( NH_2 \) units. We find that these defects lead to structural relaxations corresponding to slight displacements and rotations of the neighboring \( Li^{+} \) and \( NH_2^{-} \) units.

For the hydrogen-related defects, \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) corresponds to removing an \( H^{+} \) ion from pristine \( LiNH_2 \) to result in an \( NH_2^{-} \) unit. The formation of \( H^{+} \) ions leads to a neutral \( NH_3 \) unit, which is an \( NH_2^{-} \) unit with an extra \( H^{+} \) ion.

The activation energy of a process that involves native defects occurs in much lower concentrations than charged native defects, the Fermi level position is determined by oppositely charged defects with the lowest formation energies.\(^{[8,9]} \) According to Figure 1, these are \( Li^{+} \) and \( V_{Li}^{-} \), thus fixing the Fermi level at \( E_F = 2.49 \) eV. At this Fermi level value, the calculated formation energy of \( Li^{+} \) and \( V_{Li}^{-} \) is 0.51 eV, while the formation energies of \( H^{+} \) and \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) are 1.28 and 0.63 eV, respectively.

The activation energy of a process that involves native defects depends not only on the defect formation energies but also on the migration barriers. We find migration barriers of 0.61 and 0.71 eV for \( H^{+} \) and \( V_{Hi}^{+} \), respectively, by using the climbing-image elastic band method.\(^{[10]} \) For \( H^{+} \) in the \( NH_2 \) unit moves to the nearest \( NH_2^{-} \) unit; the saddle-point configuration consists of an \( H^{+} \) ion located midway between two \( NH_2^{-} \) units. Migration of \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) involves moving an \( H^{+} \) ion from a nearby \( NH_2^{-} \) unit to the vacancy, that is, the \( NH_2^{-} \) unit; the saddle-point configuration in this case consists of a \( H^{+} \) ion located midway between two \( NH_2^{-} \) units.

For the lithium-related defects, the migration of \( Li^{+} \) involves moving the \( Li^{+} \) ion from one ground-state interstitial site to another, with a migration barrier as low as 0.30 eV. For \( V_{Li}^{-} \), a \( Li^{+} \) ion moves from a nearby lattice site to the vacancy with a migration barrier of 0.20 eV. These values indicate that \( Li^{+} \) and \( V_{Li}^{-} \) are highly mobile even at temperatures below room temperature, thus implying that lithium-related defects readily achieve equilibrium concentrations at the temperatures of interest for decomposition.

We also investigated the formation of lithium and hydrogen Frenkel pairs. Figure 2 shows the structure of a \((H^{+}, V_{Hi}^{-})\) pair. The configurations of the individual defects are preserved in this complex; that is, \( H^{+} \) forms an \( NH_3 \) unit and \( V_{Hi}^{-} \) forms an adjacent \( NH_2^{-} \) unit. This hydrogen-related Frenkel pair has a formation energy of 1.54 eV and a binding energy of 0.38 eV (with respect to the isolated constituents). The distance between the two \( N \) ions in the pair is 3.37 Å, which is very close to the \( N-N \) distance in pristine \( LiNH_2 \) (3.38 Å). The lithium-related Frenkel pair \((Li^{+}, V_{Li}^{-})\) has a formation energy of 0.65 eV and a binding energy of 0.36 eV; the distance between \( Li^{+} \) and \( V_{Li}^{-} \) is 0.85 Å. Note that our calculated formation energy for \((Li^{+}, V_{Li}^{-})\) is lower than the value of 0.97 eV reported by Miceli et al.\(^{[11]} \) The formation energy is low (much lower than that of the hydrogen-related Frenkel pair), thus indicating that \( LiNH_2 \) is prone to Frenkel disorder on the \( Li \) sublattice.

The transformation of \( LiNH_2 \) into \( Li,NH \), such as in Equation (2), necessitates the breaking of \( N-H \) bonds, thus indicating that not only lithium-related but also hydrogen-related defects are required. In particular, \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) must be formed, either in the interior of the material or at the surface. The creation of \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) in the interior of \( LiNH_2 \) is necessarily accompanied by the creation of \( H^{+} \), so that mass and charge are conserved. In contrast, \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) can be created at the surface by the removal of an \( H^{+} \) ion from \( LiNH_2 \), with the resulting \( H^{+} \) accommodated as an adsorbed atom or reacting with nearby species. These two possibilities, namely formation of \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) in the interior of \( LiNH_2 \) or at the surface, can be regarded as two different mechanisms for the reaction. The mechanism that predominates will depend on the relative number of reaction sites available. Since one mechanism involves atoms in the bulk and the other involves atoms at the surface, the mechanism will depend on the surface-to-volume ratio. As discussed below, the two mechanisms have different activation energies, thus leading to the experimentally observed dependence of activation energies on the SSA. We now describe the mechanisms in more detail:

Mechanism 1: \((H^{+}, V_{Hi}^{-})\) Frenkel pairs are created in the interior of \( LiNH_2 \) by moving an \( H^{+} \) ion from a lattice site to an interstitial site (see Figure 2). Next, \( V_{Hi}^{+} \) and \( H^{+} \) are separated as \( H^{+} \) jumps from one \( NH_2^{-} \) unit to another. This process is
equivalent to displacing the NH$_2$ unit away from the NHF$^-$ unit, and leaves two Li$^+$ ions next to the NHF$^-$ unit; that is, a formula unit of Li$_i$NH is locally formed inside LiNH$_2$. The H$^+$ ion migrates to the surface and is released as NH$_3$. We assume that as the H$^+$ ion migrates from one NH$_2$ unit to the next, a corresponding Li$_i$ moves in the opposite direction (with a very low activation energy), thus maintaining local charge neutrality. The overall activation energy for this mechanism is 2.52 eV, which is equal to the formation energies of H$^+$ and V$_H^+$ plus the migration barrier of H$^+$. 

Mechanism 2: V$_H^+$ is created at the surface by removing an H$^+$ ion from LiNH$_2$. This H$^+$ ion can combine with a surface NH$_2$ unit to form NH$_3$, that is subsequently released. The rate-limiting step in this mechanism is not the formation of V$_H^+$ at the surface, but the hydrogen mass transport to the surface; that is, in order to maintain this reaction, H$^+$ ions have to be transported to the surface (equivalent to V$_H^+$ -diffusing into the interior). In this case, the activation energy is 1.34 eV for hydrogen self-diffusion mediated by V$_H^+$, that is, the sum of its formation energy and migration barrier. The Li$^+$ ion that is left after a surface NH$_2$ unit combines with an H$^+$ ion and is released in the form of NH$_3$, assists the self-diffusion of V$_H^+$, as required by the charge neutrality condition.

In LiNH$_2$ samples subjected to ball milling, the activation energy for decomposition decreases with milling time, from 2.53 eV (before ball milling, SSA: 3.72 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$) to 1.43 eV (after 3 h of milling, SSA: 46.65 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$). In samples composed of sufficiently large LiNH$_2$ particles, the surface-to-volume ratio is small and mechanism 1 (which depends on creation of defects in the bulk) prevails. Our calculated activation energy of 2.52 eV is in very good agreement with the experimental value of 2.53 eV for the activation energy for decomposition of LiNH$_2$ before ball milling. In samples composed of relatively small particles, on the other hand, the surface-to-volume ratio is large and mechanism 2 prevails. The calculated activation energy of 1.34 eV is again in good agreement with experimentally determined activation energies for the decomposition of ball-milled LiNH$_2$, which range from 1.33 to 1.43 eV.[2,12] As the milling time increases, the particle size decreases, and we expect the activation energy to decrease smoothly as the SSA decreases. Note that in both mechanisms, the highly mobile V$_{Li}$ and Li$_i$ defects, which also have low formation energies, serve to provide local charge neutrality and assist mass transport.

Our proposed mechanisms can also explain the dehydrogenation of (LiNH$_2$+LiH) mixtures (Eq. (1)). It is expected that LiNH$_2$ and LiH are in intimate contact if the reactants are carefully mixed. At the LiNH$_2$/LiH interface, LiH provides Li$^+$ and H$^+$ ions, for example, by forming Schottky defects in LiH. These species can diffuse into LiNH$_2$ and/or react with the corresponding units at the LiNH$_2$ surface. H$^+$ ions can combine with H$^+$ to form H$_2$ without releasing any NH$_3$. H$^+$ is either created in the bulk of LiNH$_2$ and transported to the LiNH$_2$/LiH interface by mechanism 1; or, alternatively, an H$^+$ ion is liberated from LiNH$_2$ when creating V$_H^+$ by mechanism 2. On the other hand, Li$^+$ ions can migrate across the LiNH$_2$/LiH interface and assist in forming Li$_i$NH. This behavior explains the formation of Li$_i$NH and H$_2$ in Equation (1). If LiNH$_2$ and LiH are not in intimate contact, NH$_3$ may be produced according to Equation (2) because the H$^+$ ions (from LiH) are not immediately available to combine with H$^+$ ions before the latter is released from LiNH$_2$ in the form of NH$_3$. In this case, the resulting NH$_3$ can be captured by LiH according to Equation (3) and/or released as one of the products.

It has been experimentally shown that the activation energy for the dehydrogenation of (LiNH$_2$+LiH) mixtures also decreases with increasing ball-milling time.[3-4] Shaw et al. reported activation energies of 1.70 eV (before ball milling, SSA: 4.65 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$), 1.36 eV (after 1.5 h, SSA: 47.36 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$), 1.18 eV (after 3 h, SSA: 51.32 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$), and 0.65 eV (after 24 h, SSA: 62.35 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$) for the dehydrogenation of (LiNH$_2$+LiH) mixtures.[3,4] Varin et al., on the other hand, reported a different set of activation energies: 2.46 eV (before ball milling, SSA: 16.5 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$), 0.98 eV (after 1 h, SSA: 26.4 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$), 0.88 eV (after 25 h, SSA: 59.6 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$), and 0.91 eV (after 100 h, SSA: 45.6 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$).[4] Both sets of data show similar trends: the activation energy is reduced significantly with ball milling and there is a correlation with the measured SSA.

The trend in the experimental activation energies is again consistent with our proposed explanation in terms of a bulk-versus surface-dominated mechanism for the decomposition of LiNH$_2$. For those samples that exhibit activation energies lower than that in mechanism 2 (1.34 eV), we suggest that the milling process may have created a high-energy state in the (LiNH$_2$+LiH) mixtures, in which defect concentrations are well above the equilibrium concentrations; the activation energy is then lowered because the energy cost of forming the rate-limiting defects no longer needs to be paid, thus leaving only the migration energy cost. In this case, the activation energy would be as low as 0.71 eV, that is, the migration barrier of V$_H^+$. In summary, we have proposed specific atomistic mechanisms for the decomposition of LiNH$_2$ that explain the particle-size dependence of the activation energy for decomposition. While our present study is devoted to understanding LiNH$_2$ decomposition, our approach is not limited to LiNH$_2$ but can be applied to other hydrogen storage systems.

Methods
Calculations were based on ab initio density functional theory within the generalized-gradient approximation[15] and the projector augmented wave method[16,17] as implemented in the VASP code.[18-20] For defect calculations in LiNH$_2$ (tetragonal: 32 atoms per unit cell),[21] we used a (2 x 2 x 1) supercell which contains 128 atoms, a 2 x 2 x 2 Monkhorst-Pack k-point mesh,[22] and plane-wave basis-set cutoff of 400 eV. Migration barriers were studied using the climbing-image nudged elastic band method.[23]

The formation energy of a defect X in charge state q is defined as[21]

\[ E(X^q) = E_{tot}(X^q) - E_{tot}(\text{bulk}) - \sum_j n_j \mu_j + q(E_F + \Delta V + q\phi), \]

where $E_{tot}(X^q)$ and $E_{tot}(\text{bulk})$ are the total energies of a supercell containing defect X and of a supercell of the perfect bulk material, respectively; $\mu_j$ is the atomic chemical potential of species $i$. 
(referenced to the standard state), and \( n_i \) denotes the number of atoms of species \( i \) that have been added \((n_i > 0)\) or removed \((n_i < 0)\) to form the defect. \( \epsilon_q \) is the electron chemical potential, that is, the Fermi level, referenced to the VBM in the bulk \((E_V)\). \( \Delta V \) is the “potential alignment” term, that is, the shift in the band positions that arises from the presence of the charged defect, obtained by aligning the average electrostatic potential in regions far away from the defect to the bulk value.\(^{[21]}\)

The chemical potentials \( \mu_{Li} \), \( \mu_{N} \), and \( \mu_{H} \) are variables and can be chosen to represent experimental conditions. Given the reported transformation between LiNH\(_2\) and Li\(_2\)NH,\(^{[7]}\) it is reasonable to assume that the two compounds are in contact. The temperature and pressure values at which the decomposition process occurs determine \( \mu_{H} \) through equilibrium with H\(_2\) gas. In this work, we employ a set of conditions used by David et al. for hydrogen desorption, namely 10\(^{-3}\) bar and 260\(^{\circ}\)C.\(^{[7]}\) A different set of chemical potentials corresponding to different experimental conditions can of course be chosen, and this may affect the relative defect formation energies. We have verified, however, that the details of this choice do not affect the physics of the mechanisms presented here.
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