

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

LBL Publications

Title

Performance and Durability of Proton Exchange Membrane Vapor-Fed Unitized Regenerative Fuel Cells

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2wk5t9pj>

Journal

Journal of The Electrochemical Society, 169(5)

ISSN

0013-4651

Authors

Fornaciari, Julie C
Garg, Samay
Peng, Xiong
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2022-05-01

DOI

10.1149/1945-7111/ac6c51

Peer reviewed

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

Performance and Durability of Proton Exchange Membrane Vapor-Fed Unitized Regenerative Fuel Cells

To cite this article before publication: Julie C Fornaciari *et al* 2022 *J. Electrochem. Soc.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1149/1945-7111/ac6c51>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2022 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd..

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be/has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC 4.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under the applicable CC licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the applicable licence referred to in the article – either <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Performance and Durability of Proton Exchange Membrane Vapor-Fed Unitized Regenerative Fuel Cells

Journal:	<i>Journal of The Electrochemical Society</i>
Manuscript ID	JES-107224.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Apr-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Fornaciari, Julie; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Energy Technologies Area; University of California Berkeley, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering Garg, Samay; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Energy Technologies Area ; University of California Berkeley, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering Peng, Xiong; Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Energy Technology Area Regmi, Yagya; Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester Fuel Cell Innovation Centre Weber, Adam; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Energy Technologies Area Danilovic, Nemanja; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Energy Technologies Area
Keywords:	Unitized Regenerative Fuel Cells, Energy Storage, water management, Hydrogen Battery, Energy Conversion, Fuel Cells - PEM

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Performance and Durability of Proton-Exchange Membrane Vapor-Fed Unitized Regenerative Fuel Cells

Julie C. Fornaciari^{1,2,*,z} Samay Garg^{1,2,=,a} Xiong Peng,¹ Yagya N. Regmi,³ Adam Z. Weber,^{1,**} and Nemanja Danilovic¹

¹Energy Storage and Distributed Resources Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United States

²Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, United States

³Manchester Fuel Cell Innovation Centre, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M1 5GD, England, United Kingdom

=These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Electrochemical Society Student Member.

**Electrochemical Society Fellow.

^aPresent address: Department of Chemical Engineering, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, United States.

^zE-mail: jfornaciari@lbl.gov

Abstract

With a growing demand on electricity, clean hydrogen production and usage can be an asset not only to mitigate emissions, but for long-term energy storage as well. Hydrogen gas, a high-density energy carrier, can be made through electrolysis in charging mode and generate electricity via a fuel cell in discharging mode in a unitized regenerative fuel cell (URFC). While URFCs reduce cost by combining the charging and discharging modes into a singular device, switching between modes becomes burdensome, and water management is a major challenge. One way to mitigate these issues is to operate the entire system in the vapor phase. Vapor-phase operation simplifies the physics of the system, but will introduce losses within the system, primarily ohmic and mass transport during the charging mode. In this study, we explore the performance of a Proton-Exchange-Membrane (PEM)-URFC under vapor-phase conditions and the impact of different PEMs, feed gases, and relative humidity has on the performance and durability. By tailoring operating conditions and membrane, the vapor-URFC achieves a roundtrip efficiency of 42% and a lifetime of 50,000 accelerated stress test cycles for fully humidified feeds. Discussion of vapor-URFC for energy storage and extensions to look at various applications shows the promise of this technology.



Introduction

The prevalence of distributed renewable energy sources, primarily wind and solar, is growing rapidly, and so is the need for energy storage of these inherently intermittent resources. These energy-storage systems are a necessity to provide reliable, on-demand electricity, even

1
2
3 seasonally, where solar energy can be stored from the summer to winter months.^{1,2} Typical
4
5 batteries, such as lithium ion, are well-suited for short-term energy storage on the scale of hours,
6
7 but to scale them up for long-term energy storage is cost prohibitive.³ Electrochemical generation
8
9 of hydrogen gas is an attractive medium for long-duration energy storage due to high energy and
10
11 power densities, and excellent long-term stability.¹ Using hydrogen gas as an energy carrier also
12
13 decouples energy storage from the energy-conversion device, which is especially advantageous
14
15 for large-scale energy storage due to the lower costs.^{1,2,4-7} Affording the flexibility to make
16
17 hydrogen gas when surplus renewable electricity is available at lower price and be able to deploy
18
19 it at a moment's notice is the advantage to these systems. Potentially, the most cost-effective route
20
21 to utilize hydrogen gas as the renewable energy carrier is by using a low-temperature unitized
22
23 regenerative fuel cell (URFC).^{4-6,8-14} Specifically, exploring vapor-fed URFCs can provide insight
24
25 into the feasibility of these hydrogen batteries as to solve energy resiliency issues in off-grid and
26
27 water-scarce applications.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 In a reversible fuel cell (RFC), a fuel cell (FC) and water electrolyzer (WE) can be
35
36 combined to form a hydrogen battery system.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ A unitized regenerative fuel cell (URFC)
37
38 combines the FC and WE functionality into a single device, which significantly reduces capital
39
40 expenses (capex).¹⁵ URFCs can operate in two configurations,⁵ constant gas (CG) and constant
41
42 electrode (CE). The CE configuration illustrated in Figure S1 has been studied more in recent
43
44 years,^{5,8,18,19} and is capable of higher efficiency than CG, but at the expense of lower lifetimes
45
46 since the electrodes are exposed to a larger range of potentials leading to the electrodes degrading
47
48 rapidly over time.¹⁸ The CG configuration, while sacrificing efficiency, is capable of longer
49
50 lifetimes and much faster switching times. In this paper, we focus on the CG configuration,
51
52
53

illustrated in Figure 1, where both oxygen reactions (eqs. 1 and 2): reduction (ORR) and evolution (OER), occur at one electrode, and both hydrogen reactions (eqs. 3 and 4): oxidation (HOR) and evolution (HER), occur at the opposite electrode.



As a result of this configuration, the device itself does not have a fixed anode and cathode; rather, the O₂ electrode acts as the cathode during FC operation and the anode during WE operation, while the H₂ electrode acts as the anode during FC operation and the cathode during WE operation. Operating in this configuration minimizes the switchover time between FC and WE operation and minimizes combustion risk by completely isolating H₂ and O₂.

As shown in Figure 1b, a PEM-URFC consists of a membrane-electrode assembly (MEA), including two electrodes separated by a proton-conducting membrane which acts as a solid polymer electrolyte. PEM devices typically employ perfluorinated sulfonic-acid membranes (PFSA) comprised of an inert polymer backbone and side chains terminated with sulfonic acid groups which absorb water, thereby creating channels through which protons can be shuttled between the two electrodes. At each electrode there is a transport layer, either carbon gas-diffusion layer (GDL) or titanium porous-transport layer (PTL), to facilitate the transport of gaseous species to and from the catalyst layers where the electrochemical reactions take place. The catalyst layers

1
2
3 for the hydrogen and oxygen electrodes are comprised of catalysts, ionomer, and open pores. The
4 oxygen-electrode catalyst layer must have two catalysts, one for OER and one for ORR. In
5 contrast, the hydrogen-electrode catalyst uses one catalyst, Pt/C, which catalyzes both HOR and
6 HER. Thus far, research in the URFC field has been generally aimed at developing catalysts and
7 tuning their structures,^{20–22} integrated catalyst-layer structure,^{16,19,23,24} porous-transport layers,^{25–27}
8 and membrane chemistry.²⁸ These factors also contribute to the overall cell efficiency and
9 performance.^{23,27}

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 The conventional URFC uses a liquid feed, which provides enough water for optimal
21 proton conduction through the membrane and assures there is enough water for the reaction and
22 hydration in WE operation. Using water vapor as a feed in place of liquid water eliminates the
23 need for ultra-high purity deionized water, thereby simplifying operation and reducing operating
24 and capital costs (opex and capex, respectively) at the expense for higher ohmic and transport
25 losses through the membrane and cell. Removing the need of ultra-pure water also eliminates the
26 need of ion exchange resins for water purification and pumps.^{29,30} Additionally, bubble formation
27 in liquid-water fed WE complicates transport within the system by introducing multiphase flow.
28 Vapor-fed operation eliminates these complexities and also removes the need for liquid water to
29 be purged from the system when switching from WE to FC operation. While vapor-fed WE
30 generates higher mass-transport overpotentials than liquid-fed,³¹ the FC operation would be at an
31 advantage as water management would be better controlled and pore-flooding at the start of
32 operation would be avoided.^{32–37} Water management is important for these technologies and will
33 be complicated by differential pressurization and need to be optimized, especially as electrolysis
34 and fuel cell mode have divergent criteria. While vapor operation can simplify to a certain extent,
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3 there are other materials solutions such as including amphiphilic diffusion layers and actively
4 removing water from the feed. Additionally, humid ambient air can be used as a feed in both
5
6 operating modes, supplying oxygen during FC operation and water vapor during WE operation.
7
8 This operation eliminates the need for water purification and minimizes the switch-over time
9
10 between operating modes, which brings the vapor-URFC on par with a typical battery for the
11
12 balance of plant. The only storage needed is for the hydrogen gas.
13
14
15
16
17

18 This simplified operation makes the vapor URFC an attractive device in scenarios where
19
20 small-scale, high-density, long-term energy storage is necessary. The advantages in such scenarios
21
22 may outweigh the performance penalty incurred by using water vapor as a feed due to greater
23
24 ohmic losses within the MEA. Namely, this device shows exceptional promise for off-grid energy
25
26 storage in humid environments, as well as for energy storage on spacecraft and extraterrestrial
27
28 habitats.
29
30
31

32 Currently there is a gap in the literature for investigating vapor-fed URFCs, their operating
33
34 capabilities, and their applications. In this study, we baseline the performance of a vapor-fed URFC
35
36 and explore how different membrane ion-exchange capacities and feed relative humidities enhance
37
38 or inhibit the cell performance, specifically the roundtrip efficiency. Additionally, we apply
39
40 durability protocols to assess the lifetime of such a cell. Additionally, exploring two such
41
42 applications, off-grid and extraterrestrial, we demonstrate this device's feasibility for operation
43
44 and identify additional optimization parameters.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Methods

Catalyst-Coated-Membrane Fabrication

Catalyst inks are comprised of catalyst particles, solvent, and ionomer. The catalyst inks for each electrode are detailed in Table 1. The H₂ electrode inks contain Pt/C (46.2 wt% Pt on HSC, Tanaka, Japan), with a 1:1 n-propanol (200 proof, Koptec, Pennsylvania, USA) to deionized (DI) water (18.2 MΩ, Milli-Q, EMD Millipore, Massachusetts, USA) mixture, by volume. The ionomer used was a 5 wt% Nafion™ dispersion (D521, Chemours, Delaware, USA) with an ionomer to carbon ratio of 0.6. The O₂ electrode inks contain a mixture of iridium black (SA=100, Tanaka, Japan) and platinum black (Tanaka, Japan) and used a 2:1:1 n-propanol:water:ethanol solvent mixture. The same ionomer was used in the O₂ electrode ink as the H₂ electrode ink, but the ionomer to catalyst ratio was 0.116.²⁴ For the H₂ electrode ink, the vial was manually shaken before sonicating in a bath sonicator (M1800, Branson, Connecticut, USA) equipped with a chiller (Grant) for 30 min at 10°C. For the O₂ electrode ink, the vial was manually shaken and sonicated using a probe-tip sonicator (CPX500, Cole-Parmer, Illinois, USA) with the vial submerged in an ice bath and covered with parafilm to prevent solvent evaporation during sonication.

The Nafion™ (NR-212, Chemours, Delaware USA) and Aquivion® (E87-05S; E98-05S, Solvay, Belgium) PFSA membranes were conditioned by boiling in DI water at 100°C for one hour before being allowed to cool to room temperature and stored in DI water.

To prepare a 5 cm² catalyst-coated membrane (CCM), the membrane is placed on a protective fiberglass sheet and heated on the hotplate of the ultrasonic spray-coater (Sono-Tek

Exacta Coater, New York, USA) under a Teflon-coated fiberglass mask and a rubber gasket. The membrane was dried at 80°C under vacuum prior to spraying the catalyst ink. For the H₂ electrode, 10 mL of ink was sprayed at a deposition rate of 0.3 mL/min to achieve a catalyst loading of 0.3 mg/cm². For the O₂ electrode, 30 mL of ink was sprayed at a deposition rate of 0.35 mL/min to achieve a total catalyst loading of 1 mg/cm².

Cell Assembly

Carbon-paper gas-diffusion layers (GDLs) with a microporous layer (MPL) (Sigracet 29BC, Fuel Cell Store, Texas, USA) were used for the H₂ electrode, and titanium porous-transport layers (Ti-PTL) (NEL Hydrogen, Connecticut) were used for the O₂ electrode. The Ti-PTLs were soaked in a dilute Teflon solution and dried on a vacuum hot plate at 100°C to deposit the desired amount of PTFE, 5 wt%, onto the PTL. The PTLs were then baked in a tube furnace at 400°C in Argon to crystallize the PTFE. PTFE gaskets (McMaster-Carr, Illinois, USA) were used on both sides, the PTFE gasket is thickness matched to the Ti-PTL, and 20% compression of the carbon GDL. Electrochemical cells from Fuel Cell Technologies (FCT, New Mexico, USA) equipped with graphite serpentine flow fields and gold-plated copper current collectors were used for testing. Graphite serpentine flow fields were used to assure no leaks are occurring in the system and when tested and compared to titanium flow fields, there was no change in performance. Graphite flow fields showed minimal oxidation under the testing conditions and duration on both the H₂ and O₂ sides.³¹

Cell Testing

A potentiostat (Biologic, France) with electrochemical-impedance-spectroscopy capabilities and a 20 A booster was used for all electrochemical tests, and a fuel-cell test stand (FCT) was used to regulate cell operating conditions and feed gases. The cell was heated with FCT rod heaters, and a thermocouple in the endplate of the cell was used to maintain the cell at 80°C throughout testing. The gas feed lines were maintained at 85°C throughout testing, and DI water was used to humidify the gases before being fed to the cell. To note, these tests are ran to assure better membrane hydrogen on the cathode and the humidity remains at 100% RH. However, in actual operation, running the system with high humidity on the hydrogen side would require an extra step of drying the system and could lead to lower overall system efficiency.

Prior to FC testing, the cell was conditioned by running chronoamperometry (CA) at 100 mV cell potential for 16 to 20 hr until the current stabilizes with air flowing at 700 mL/min at the O₂ electrode and H₂ flowing at 300 mL/min at the H₂ electrode, and no applied backpressure. The flow rates were then increased to 1000 and 450 mL/min at the oxygen and hydrogen electrodes, respectively, and the backpressure at both electrodes was set to 21 psi. High stoichiometric feeds were used to test the system to maintain differential conditions. For example, the stoichiometric feed was 5 for hydrogen and 10 for air at 1 A/cm². However, it is important to note that these are not practical operating conditions. To assess FC performance, a series of constant current holds were carried out: 1 min current holds were used for current densities below 0.2 A/cm², and 3 min current holds were used for current densities at or above 0.2 A/cm². The current was ramped up in steps of 20 mA/cm² or 200 mA/cm², within the kinetic or ohmic regimes, respectively. The cell

1
2
3 potential was averaged across the last 30 s of each step and across the ramp-up and ramp-down
4 holds to generate a polarization curve. Electrochemical impedance was measured at every current
5 density to generate a Nyquist plot, where the intercept with the real axis is the measured high
6 frequency resistance (HFR) of the cell
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 For WE testing, the flow rates were set to 450 mL/min of N₂ (corresponding to a
14 stoichiometric feed of 10 at 1 A/cm²) at the O₂ electrode and 100 mL/min of H₂ at the H₂ electrode.
15 Flowing H₂ during electrolysis operation helps establish a stable reference electrode. Performance
16 was assessed in a similar manner as FC mode, with the current increased stepwise from 5 mA/cm²
17 until the cell potential reaches 2.1 V before ramping back down, as shown in Figure S2.
18 Polarization curves were generated using the same method as FC polarization curves. The data
19 analysis was performed using a Python code to generate the polarization curve, high-frequency
20 resistance (HFR), and Tafel slope.³⁸
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Accelerated stress tests (ASTs) were performed on the down-selected MEA to assess the durability
33 and stability of the vapor URFCs.^{39,40} A sawtooth cycling profile was used, with the potential limits
34 set to 0.55 V and 1.55 V and a scan rate of 300 mV/sec.¹⁵ These limits were chosen as they
35 correspond to current densities of approximately -1 and 1 A/cm², respectively. At regular and
36 convenient intervals, the cycling was stopped, and FC and WE performance were assessed using
37 the methods described above. The cycling continued until the cell no longer achieved a current
38 density of 1 A/cm² in either FC or WE mode, which was designated as end of life (EOL).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Results and Discussion

Liquid-Water vs. Water-Vapor Performance

To compare URFC performance with a liquid-water feed to that with a water-vapor feed for WE operation, CCMs were prepared with a Nafion™ 1100 membrane. Since the FC operation is usually operated with highly humidified gases, we initially compare the WE performance. As illustrated in Figure 2, the performance using a water-vapor feed is significantly reduced compared to that using liquid water. The vapor-fed URFC requires 1.78 V at 1.0 A/cm² where the liquid-fed URFC reached the same current density at 1.54 V. One major difference between the two feeds is the HFR. The HFR increases with increasing current density for the vapor-fed cell, indicating larger ohmic losses at elevated current densities. The HFR for the liquid-fed cell remains low and constant (0.09 Ω cm²). Vapor electrolysis shows higher ohmic losses due to membrane dehydration and localized mass-transport limitations in the catalyst layer.³¹ Regardless, the vapor-fed URFC achieved 42% roundtrip efficiency (RTE, calculations are in the SI) at 1 A/cm². The liquid-fed cell can achieve >50% for the RTE at 1 A/cm², although engenders a more complicated balance of plant and switching time between operation modes. A table comparing the different RTEs achieved in literature is in the SI.

Membrane comparison (1100 vs. 980 vs. 870)

While maintaining a constant membrane thickness (50 μm), we explore the effects of equivalent weight (EW) on URFC performance and efficiency using 3 membranes (Figure 3). A membrane's EW is equal to the moles of water per ionic group, which is inversely proportional to

1
2
3 the ion-exchange capacity.²⁸ Lower EW membranes were expected to improve device performance
4 because the higher fraction of ionic groups should lead to high water uptake and thereby improve
5 membrane hydration.²⁸ Better membrane hydration reduces ohmic losses across the membrane,
6 resulting in lower overpotential; however, as shown in Figure 3, Nafion™ 1100 exhibited the best
7 performance of the three membranes tested, achieving $42\% \pm 2\%$ RTE at 1 A/cm^2 . Every RTE is
8 shown in Figure 3b, in order to compare at various current densities for different operations. The
9 trend continues in the direction of lower EW leading to higher overpotentials. The HFR for
10 Aquivion® 870 was significantly higher than that for both Nafion™ 1100 and Aquivion® 980,
11 suggesting that higher ohmic losses can account for the majority of the poor performance of this
12 membrane. However, the HFRs for Aquivion® 980 and Nafion™ 1100 were similar for FC
13 operation, differing some in WE operation. While the HFR differs in WE operation, other factors
14 may result in the poorer performance of Aquivion® 980. Those factors may include different mass
15 transport within the MEA or membrane swelling impacting the amount of electrochemically active
16 catalyst in the layer, as the lower the EW results in higher swelling.^{41,42} Additionally, using the
17 Nafion ionomer in the catalyst layer with Aquivion membranes could lead to a mass transport loss
18 due to the ionomer/membrane interface.

41 Relative-Humidity Experiments

42
43
44 Regardless of whether the performance loss associated with the Aquivion® membranes
45 can be attributed to membrane swelling or an interfacial loss, reducing the amount of water
46 available as reactant should result in performance loss for a system. Ideally, real-life applications
47 would result in the cells operating at less than 100% relative humidity (RH). Quantifying the loss
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3 due to the reduction in water availability can provide a guide for lower-humidity applications.
4
5 Therefore, all three membranes were tested at RHs ranging from 52% to 122% RH at 80°C to gain
6
7 insight into the importance of the rate of water fed into the vapor-fed URFC and the comparison
8
9 to the liquid electrolyzer, highlighted in Figure 4. As discussed earlier, decreasing membrane
10
11 hydration increases ohmic overpotentials and in vapor-fed system is dependent on the vapor
12
13 pressure. As shown in Figure 4, the difference in potential were minimal at higher RHs, including
14
15 the oversaturated case at 122%. The oversaturated test did not result in performance enhancement
16
17 approaching the liquid electrolysis. Instead, oversaturated feed resembles the 100% RH vapor
18
19 electrolysis, which indicates that although there is more water available to react, the system is still
20
21 limited by other factors. The higher RH could lead to some condensing in the channels of the cell
22
23 and the local RH at the MEA may be lower, something to explore in future work and is out of the
24
25 scope of this paper.
26
27
28
29

30
31 As expected, the largest loss in performance is observed for the 52% RH test, showing a
32
33 non-monotonic increase in potential with current density. Decreasing the RH reduces the amount
34
35 of water available for the oxygen-evolution reaction and membrane hydration. This decrease in
36
37 water content manifests in the decrease in RTE from 42% at 100% RH to 37% RTE at 52% RH.
38
39 Across the full range of RHs, Nafion™ 1100 exhibited the best performance relative to either
40
41 Aquivion® membrane, regardless of the RH. Nafion™ 1100 exhibited an RTE of 37% at 52%
42
43 RH, while Aquivion® 870 had an RTE of 33% at 122% RH. The difference between these tests is
44
45 revealed when comparing the EW and the respective HFR at 100% RH, as shown in Figure 3,
46
47 revealing that for higher EW membranes, less water is available to react in the vapor phase even
48
49 at high RHs.
50
51
52
53

Durability

ASTs were used to assess device durability and to mimic start-up/shut-down of these systems at both 100% RH and 75% RH to observe two different durability cases, shown in Figure 5. Although beginning-of-life (BOL) performance is similar for the 100% and 75% case (42% and 38% RTE, respectively), degradation occurs more rapidly at 75% RH as the lower humidity is a stressor in FC and WE operation. Shown in Figure 5a and, at 100% RH, the cell retained 78% of BOL performance after 7,000 charge/discharge cycles and 52% of BOL performance after 20,000 cycles, with EOL after 50,000 cycles. EOL is defined here as the point at which the cell could no longer sustain a current density of 1 A/cm². In Figure 5b, at 75% RH, the cell retained 76% of BOL performance after 1,000 charge/discharge cycles and 37% of BOL performance after 7,000 cycles, with EOL after 20,000 cycles. Converting these cycle lifetimes into temporal lifetimes depends on the duty cycle in operation. For example, assuming a daily duty cycle resulting from load-shifting solar power in off-grid applications, the 100% RH and 75% RH cells would retain approximately 75% of BOL performance after 19 years and 3 years, respectively.

In both cases, WE performance remained constant for the duration of the AST, indicating that a loss of FC performance drives efficiency loss.¹⁵ Figure S3 illustrates the detailed evolution of device performance over the course of the AST at 100% RH. As shown in Figure S4, the voltage-loss breakdown for the FC performance indicates the kinetic and mass-transport loss is a large fraction of the voltage loss seen at EOL (Figure S5 shows the WE operation applied-voltage breakdown). We acknowledge that the AST protocol may not account for all degradation mechanisms that would occur during a realistic 24-hour charge/discharge cycle; however, these

1
2
3 results are promising and suggest that this type of device could be used for the applications
4
5 discussed in this paper.
6

7 8 Impact of oxygen carrier gas 9

10
11 The vapor-URFC is most desirable for off-grid or extraterrestrial applications as the
12 balance of plant is minimized and can provide on-demand hydrogen and electricity. For off-grid
13 applications, operating at ambient humidity is necessary since the air would not be humidified
14 further before feeding it to the URFC. However, as shown in Figure 4, the limitation on the
15 electrolyzer performance is already drastic at 52% RH. These losses seen at 52% RH could be
16 mitigated by controlling water management within the cell and better utilization of the catalyst
17 layer.³¹ Further optimization of the MEA and techno-economic analysis is required for fully
18 understanding how this technology can be used as an off-grid long-term energy storage system.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 When evaluating different applications, such as extraterrestrial, the feed gas at the oxygen
32 electrode is another consideration. Humidifying air or carbon dioxide as a carrier gas could be
33 other opportunities to utilize different ambient feeds. As shown in Figure 6, at both 100% and 75%
34 RH, there was no significant change in RTE when air was used during WE operation in place of
35 N₂, indicating that it is not necessary to switch from air to an inert gas at the O₂ electrode when
36 switching from FC to WE operation. Shown in Figure 6a, the electrolyzer polarization curves
37 increases by 55 mV at 1 A/cm² when using air versus nitrogen, which can be accounted for the
38 slight change in diffusivity.³¹ By maintaining constant gas flows at both electrodes, the device will
39 be much simpler and more reliable for off-grid energy storage
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3 For applications in spacecraft and extraterrestrial habitats, it would be desirable to use
4 humid CO₂ as a carrier gas during WE. Air would be a precious resource and repurposing captured
5 CO₂ from human respiration would eliminate the need for carrying a source of nitrogen and all of
6 the requisite supporting equipment (tanks, *etc.*). Additionally, operating at lower RH is better since
7 water is also a limited resource. Figure 6a shows at both 100% RH (Figure 6b shows the
8 performance for 75% RH), there was no significant change in RTE when CO₂ was used during
9 WE operation in place of N₂, indicating that CO₂ is a viable carrier gas for water vapor during WE
10 operation. A disadvantage to using CO₂ as the feed gas is when this URFC is ran at high pressures,
11 hydrogen could potentially interact with CO₂ and lead to catalyst poisoning. Further testing with
12 CO₂ as the pressurized feed gas is required to assure catalyst poisoning does not happen.
13 Additionally, it may be desirable to use either air or pure O₂ during FC operation depending on the
14 availability of gases and/or to improve device performance.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Summary

32
33
34
35
36 In this study, we presented a parametric study of vapor-URFC components and operating
37 conditions, focusing on membrane EW, the feed RH, and the oxygen-electrode carrier gas. We
38 found that a higher equivalent weight membrane correlates with improved device performance,
39 most likely as a result of better water transport and less swelling of the membranes during
40 operation. When operating at 100% RH, the vapor-URFC achieved an RTE of 42% ± 2%, which
41 is comparable to state-of-the-art for vapor-URFC to date. The device still achieved 37% RTE at
42 52% RH, indicating that the device is robust over a wide range of RHs. The vapor-URFC exhibited
43 excellent long-term stability and sustained 1 A/cm² for 50,000 and 20,000 AST cycles at 100%
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3 and 75% RH, respectively. The device performance was also agnostic to the oxygen electrode
4 carrier gas, which emphasizes the flexibility of this device to fit niche markets. Specifically, proof-
5 of-concept results using air and CO₂ as carrier gases demonstrate the viability of the vapor-URFC
6 for off-grid and terrestrial applications.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Acknowledgements

14
15
16
17 The authors acknowledge the Department of Energy – Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable
18 Energy – Fuel Cell Technologies Office (DOE-EERE-FCTO) and program managers Greg Kleen
19 and Dimitrios Papageorgopoulos for funding under Contract Number DE-AC02-05CH11231. JCF
20 and SG thank the National Science Foundation (grant DGE 1106400 and grant 2021322071,
21 respectively) for support. The authors thank Proton OnSite/NEL Hydrogen for Ti PTLs. JCF,
22 YNR, XP, and ND designed and created the idea of the work. JCF and SG conducted experiments.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 JCF, SG, and ND composed the manuscript, and all authors edited the written work.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

References

1. O. Krishan and S. Suhag, *Int J Energy Res*, **43**, 6171–6210 (2019).
2. T. M. Gür, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, **11**, 2696–2767 (2018).
3. A. R. Dehghani-Sanij, E. Tharumalingam, M. B. Dusseault, and R. Fraser, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **104**, 192–208 (2019).
4. M. Gabbasa, K. Sopian, A. Fudholi, and N. Asim, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **39**, 17765–17778 (2014).
5. B. Paul and J. Andrews, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **79**, 585–599 (2017).
6. Y. Wang, D. Y. C. Leung, J. Xuan, and H. Wang, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **65**, 961–977 (2016).
7. Y. Wang, D. Y. C. Leung, J. Xuan, and H. Wang, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, **75**, 775–795 (2017).
8. S. A. Grigoriev, P. Millet, V. I. Poremsky, and V. N. Fateev, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **36**, 4164–4168 (2011).
9. T. Sadhasivam K. Dhanabalan, S.H. Roh, T. H. Kim, K.W. Park, S. Jung, M. D. Kurkuri, H. Y. Jung, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **42**, 4415–4433 (2017).

- 1
2
3 10. P. Millet, R. Ngameni, S. A. Grigoriev, and V. N. Fateev, *International Journal of Hydrogen*
4 *Energy*, **36**, 4156–4163 (2011).
5
6
7
8
9 11. H. Ito, N. Miyazaki, M. Ishida, and A. Nakano, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **41**,
10 5803–5815 (2016).
11
12
13
14 12. T. Yoshida and K. Kojima, *Interface magazine*, **24**, 45–49 (2015).
15
16
17
18 13. M. Hunsom, D. Kaewsai, and A. M. Kannan, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **43**,
19 21478–21501 (2018).
20
21
22
23 14. S. Choi, T. C. Davenport, and S. M. Haile, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, **12**, 206–215 (2019).
24
25
26
27 15. Y. N. Regmi, X. Peng, J. C. Fornaciari, M. Wei, D. J. Myers, A. Z. Weber, N. Danilovic,
28 *Energy Environ. Sci.*, **13**, 2096–2105 (2020).
29
30
31
32 16. X. Peng, Z. Taie, J. Liu, Y. Zhang, X. Peng, Y.N. Regmi, J. C. Fornaciari, C. Capuano, D.
33 Binny, N. N. Kariuki, D. J. Myers, M. C. Scott, A. Z. Weber, N. Danilovic, *Energy Environ. Sci.*,
34 **13**, 4872–4881 (2020).
35
36
37
38
39
40 17. C. Duan, R. Kee, H. Zhu, N. Sullivan, L. Zhu, L. Bian, D. Jennings, R. O'Hayre, *Nat Energy*,
41 **4**, 230–240 (2019).
42
43
44
45
46 18. J. Ahn and R. Holze, *J Appl Electrochem*, **22**, 1167–1174 (1992).
47
48
49 19. S. A. Grigoriev, P. Millet, K.A. Dzhus, H. Middleton, T.O. Saetre, V. N. Fateev, *International*
50 *Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **35**, 5070–5076 (2010).
51
52
53

- 1
2
3 20. T. Sadhasivam, G. Palanisamy, S.H. Roh, M. D. Kurkuri, S. C. Kim, H.Y. Jung, *International*
4 *Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **43**, 18169–18184 (2018).
5
6
7
8
9 21. G. Chen, S. R. Bare, and T. E. Mallouk, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, **149**, A1092–A1099 (2002).
10
11
12 22. Y.-J. Wang, B. Fang, X. Wang, A. Ignaszak, Y. Liu, A. Li, L. Zhang, J. Zhang, *Progress in*
13 *Materials Science*, **98**, 108–167 (2018).
14
15
16
17 23. G. C. da Silva, K. J. J. Mayrhofer, E. A. Ticianelli, and S. Cherevko, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, **165**,
18 F1376–F1384 (2018).
19
20
21
22
23 24. M. Bernt and H. A. Gasteiger, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, **163**, F3179–F3189 (2016).
24
25
26
27 25. R. Omrani and B. Shabani, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **44**, 3834–3860 (2019).
28
29
30 26. H. Ito, K. Abe, M. Ishida, C. M. Hwang, and A. Nakano, *International Journal of Hydrogen*
31 *Energy*, **40**, 16556–16565 (2015).
32
33
34
35 27. G. Bender, M. Carmo, T. Smolinka, A. Gago, N. Danilovic, M. Mueller, F. Ganci, A. Fallisch,
36 P Lettenmeier, K.A. Friedrich, K. Ayers, B. Pivovar, J. Mergel, D. Stolten, *International Journal*
37 *of Hydrogen Energy*, **44**, 9174–9187 (2019).
38
39
40
41
42
43 28. A. Kusoglu and A. Z. Weber, *Chem. Rev.*, **117**, 987–1104 (2017).
44
45
46
47 29. C. Xiang, K. M. Papadantonakis, and N. S. Lewis, *Mater. Horiz.*, **3**, 169–173 (2016).
48
49
50 30. A. Ursua, L. M. Gandia, and P. Sanchis, *Proc. IEEE*, **100**, 410–426 (2012).
51
52
53

- 1
2
3 31. J. C. Fornaciari, M. R. Gerhardt, J. Zhou, Y. N. Regmi, N. Danilovic, A. T. Bell, A. Z. Weber,
4
5 *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, **167**, 104508 (2020).
6
7
8
9 32. M. Grimm, M. Hellmann, H. Kemmer, and S. Kabelac, *Fuel Cells*, **20**, 477–486 (2020).
10
11
12 33. S. G. Kandlikar, *Heat Transfer Engineering*, **29**, 575–587 (2008).
13
14
15 34. P. Berg, K. Promislow, J. St. Pierre, J. Stumper, and B. Wetton, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, **151**,
16
17 A341 (2004).
18
19
20 35. T. V. Nguyen and M. W. Knobbe, *Journal of Power Sources*, 10 (2003).
21
22
23
24 36. C. Zhang, W. Zhou, L. Zhang, S. H. Chan, and Y. Wang, *International Journal of Hydrogen*
25
26 *Energy*, **40**, 4666–4672 (2015).
27
28
29 37. M. Kim, N. Jung, K. Eom, S.J. Yoo, J. Y. Kim, J. H. Jang, H. Kim, B. K. Hong, E. Cho, *Journal*
30
31 *of Power Sources*, **266**, 332–340 (2014).
32
33
34
35 38. S. Garg, J. Fornaciari, A. Weber, and N. Danilovic, *JOSS*, **6**, 2940 (2021).
36
37
38
39 39. C. Lim, L. Ghassemzadeh, F. V. Hove, M. Lauritzen, J. Kolodziej, G.G. Wang, S. Holdcroft,
40
41 E. Kjeang., *Journal of Power Sources*, **257**, 102–110 (2014).
42
43
44 40. M. P. Rodgers, L. J. Bonville, H. R. Kunz, D. K. Slattery, and J. M. Fenton, *Chem. Rev.*, **112**,
45
46 6075–6103 (2012).
47
48
49 41. A. Kusoglu, B. L. Kienitz, and A. Z. Weber, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, **158**, B1504 (2011).
50
51
52
53

1
2
3 42. C. Arthurs and A. Kusoglu, *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, **4**, 3249–3254 (2021).
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Figure 1: (a) Vapor-URFC schematic for constant-gas mode. (b) A cross section of the MEA used
4 in the vapor-URFC. The water shown entering in the oxygen electrode is vapor phase and a
5 hydrogen inlet is not needed for HER but could be fed in.
6
7
8
9

10 Figure 2: Vapor WE performance is compromised relative to the liquid WE due to greater ohmic
11 losses. The left axis corresponds to WE performance, and the right axis shows the WE HFR.
12
13
14
15


16 Figure 3: (a) Polarization curves during both FC (solid) and WE (dashed) operation for MEAs
17 using the three membranes tested. (b) RTE (dash-dot) and HFR during FC operation (dotted) for
18 MEAs using the three membranes tested.
19
20
21
22
23

24 Figure 4: (a) Nafion™ 1100 WE performance between 81 to 122% RH, with a significant drop off
25 at 52% RH. (b) RTE for Nafion™ 1100 at the different RH feeds. (c) Aquivion™ 870 WE
26 performance between 52 to 122% RH. (d) RTE for Aquivion™ 870 at the different RH feeds. (e)
27 Aquivion™ 980 WE performance between 52 to 122% RH. (f) RTE for Aquivion™ 980 at the
28 different RH feeds.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Figure 5: AST cycles and performance compared to beginning of life (BOL) for the vapor-URFC
37 at (a) 100% RH and (b) 75% RH.
38
39
40
41

42 Figure 6: The electrolyzer polarization curve and RTEs for vapor-URFCs using nitrogen, air, and
43 carbon dioxide at the oxygen electrode at (a) 100% RH and (b) 75% RH.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3 Table 1: The catalyst recipe for the hydrogen electrode and oxygen electrode.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Component	H ₂ Electrode Ink	O ₂ Electrode Ink
Pt/C (46.2 wt% Pt)	65.22 mg	n/a
Pt Black	n/a	25.00 mg
Ir Black	n/a	25.00 mg
H ₂ O	17.60 g	10.00 g
<i>n</i> -PrOH	16.08 g	14.09 g
EtOH	n/a	7.89 g
Nafion™ D521	422.61 mg	116 mg

