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Abstract

Thermodynamic data of the LiBH₄ compound are reviewed and critically assessed. On the basis of literature data of heat capacity, heat of formation, temperature and enthalpy of phase transitions, a CALPHAD optimized Gibbs energy function is derived for the condensed phases i.e. orthorhombic and hexagonal solid phases and the liquid phase. Considering hydrogen as an ideal gas phase, the thermodynamics of decomposition reactions of LiBH₄ is calculated, showing good agreement with existing experimental data.

1. Introduction

Lithium borohydride (LiBH₄) is an attractive candidate for energy storage, due to its high gravimetric (18.5 wt%) and volumetric (121 kg H₂/m³) hydrogen density. Hydrogen desorption temperature of LiBH₄ is too high for practical applications [1] and, as similar chemical-hydride-based energy carriers, it is difficult to re-hydrogenate [2]. For these reasons, several attempts have been recently carried out in order to promote hydrogen desorption and absorption processes. Because electronic structure calculations indicate that a charge transfer from the metal cations M⁺ to the [BH₄]⁻ anions is a key feature determining the thermodynamic stability of M(BH₄)ₙ, cation and anion substitutions in LiBH₄ have been investigated [3–7]. Moreover, a destabilization of LiBH₄ via reaction with a second hydride system has been suggested, in order to reduce the Gibbs Free Energy (GFE) difference between hydrogenated and de-hydrogenated species [2,8]. As an example, LiBH₄-MgH₂ reactive hydride composite has been deeply studied [5,9]. Even if the mechanisms of dehydrogenation reactions have not been clarified yet, the addition of a small amount of a promoter (e.g. SiO₂, Mg, Al, TiCl₃) has been demonstrated to accelerate the desorption reactions [2,5]. More recently, the confinement of LiBH₄ in nanosized scaffolds has been shown to be a suitable approach to reduce the desorption temperature [10]. Finally, the synthesis of nanosized LiBH₄ particles allowed the decreasing of the desorption temperature to values close to room temperature [11].

In complex hydrides the challenge is to identify stable dehy-drogenation products and possible intermediate compounds. Thermodynamic modeling [12] is a modern tool that allows the prediction of equilibrium behavior of multicomponent systems, decreasing the extent of expensive or difficult experimental studies. It is based on the availability of thermodynamic data-bases describing the GFE for each phase of a system as a function of temperature, pressure and composition. So, a good description of the GFE for each stable phase of LiBH₄ is very important to understand the dehydrogenation behavior of several systems containing this compound [13].

LiBH₄ shows three condensed phases: an orthorhombic structure from room temperature to 383 K, a hexagonal structure from 383 K to 551 K and a liquid phase at higher temperatures [1,2].

Thermodynamic properties of LiBH₄ have been widely investigat-ed with several experimental and theoretical methods [14–19], as summarized in Table 1. GFE functions for LiBH₄ are available in commercial and open databases [20,21] and they should be used to estimate the thermodynamics of hydrogen desorption. However, despite the huge availability of data, ther-modynamic functions used in current databases [20,21] are out of date. In fact, they are still based on data reported in JANAF tables [22], which contain values estimated by comparison with NaBH₄. Moreover, data related to polymorphous transformation and melting of this compound are not reported in JANAF tables.

In the present work, thermodynamic properties for LiBH₄ have been collected from the literature considering also ab-initio calculations, widely applied in recent years in order to estimate structural and thermodynamic properties [23–28]. Literature data, together with calorimetric measurements of molar heat capacity C p,m of LiBH₄ reported recently by present authors [19].
These values are due to big discrepancies with respect to the other data, to an unclear connection to experiments or because data have been reported referring to other publications (in this case only the original data have been considered).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors [Ref.], (year)</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>T range (K)</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Sample purity (wt%)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis et al. [14], (1949)</td>
<td>Dissolution in hydrochloric acid and drop calorimetry</td>
<td>273–298.15</td>
<td>Ni crucible under dry N₂</td>
<td>Purified up to 98.72</td>
<td>Instability of the stored compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallett and Johnston [15], (1953)</td>
<td>Nernst vacuum calorimetry</td>
<td>15–303</td>
<td>Sample filled in the calorimeter container and sealed under He pressure</td>
<td>Purified under N₂ up to 99.7</td>
<td>Purification process according to Ref. [14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedneva et al. [35], (1964)</td>
<td>Differential thermal analysis (DTA)</td>
<td>298.15–873</td>
<td>Under dry H₂ at 0.05 K s⁻¹ flow rate (1 bar)</td>
<td>97–98</td>
<td>Synthesized from LiH and BF₃ ether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stassinovich and Egorenko [16], (1968)</td>
<td>DTA</td>
<td>300–983</td>
<td>Under various H₂ pressures/ p₁ (1.0133–10.133 bar)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Four endothermic events were observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semenenko et al. [40], (1971)</td>
<td>Thermal analysis/ XRD</td>
<td>300–620</td>
<td>Samples in sealed ampoules under vacuum (0.2 10⁻⁵ bar/ p₁);</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>Annealed mixtures (LiBH₄-NaBH₄) at varying compositions: eutectic observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistorius [36], (1974)</td>
<td>Phase diagram determination</td>
<td>298.15–823</td>
<td>Under high pressure piston in dry box up to 5 GPa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thermodynamic parameters deduced by extrapolation to zero pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbanov et al. [17], (1984)</td>
<td>Adiabatic and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)</td>
<td>10–450</td>
<td>Under vacuum and measurements referred to C₅₇ of Al₂O₃</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>DSC data were 5% higher than those obtained by adiabatic measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orimo et al. [56], (2005)</td>
<td>DSC/Thermal desorption (TD) / Raman spectroscopy/ powder-XRD</td>
<td>300–800</td>
<td>DSC under 0.1 MPa of H₂ heating rate 10 K min⁻¹</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orimo et al. [46], (2006)</td>
<td>Thermogravimetry (TG), DTA/ Mass spectrometry (MS)</td>
<td>300–900</td>
<td>TG-DTA a 150 ml min⁻¹ H₂ flow</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zattel et al. [1], (2007)</td>
<td>TD/ MS</td>
<td>298.15–773</td>
<td>Heating rate 0.5 K min⁻¹</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>For low T equilibrium conditions not fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauron et al. [44], (2008)</td>
<td>TD/ Dynamic PCT</td>
<td>650–800</td>
<td>Extrapolation of the equilibrium pressure for H₂ flow equal to 0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Sample frozen using cryogenic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filinchuk et al. [42], (2009)</td>
<td>HR-XRD</td>
<td>80–500</td>
<td>Sample in thin glass capillaries under protective oil</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price et al. [41], (2009)</td>
<td>DSC/DSC</td>
<td>298.15–873</td>
<td>Under Ar at 0.00334 K s⁻¹ rate in Al hermetically sealed pans</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendolino et al. [37], (2009)</td>
<td>DSC/TGA</td>
<td>298.15–873</td>
<td>Under H₂ pressure at 0.1834 K s⁻¹ rate in Al hermetically sealed pans</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Variable heating rates for activation energy estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Kharbachi [19], (2011)</td>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>298–553K</td>
<td>Under Ar in Al hermetically sealed pans</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>2 scanning methods: “linear temperature ramp method” and “the enthalpy method”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors [Ref.], (year)</th>
<th>Polymorphous transition</th>
<th>Melting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tₑₑ (K)</td>
<td>ΔHₑₑ (kJ mol⁻¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlesinger [39], (1940)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedneva [35], (1964)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stassinovich [16], (1968)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semenenko [40], (1971)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistorius [36], (1974)</td>
<td>381.570.5</td>
<td>6.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbanov [17], (1984)</td>
<td>385.6</td>
<td>6.22970.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zattel [43], (2003)</td>
<td>(378)</td>
<td>(578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavrichev [59], (2003)</td>
<td>384.6</td>
<td>(578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zattel [60], (2004)</td>
<td>(381)</td>
<td>(578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orimo [56], (2005)</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zattel [1], (2007)</td>
<td>(391)</td>
<td>(4.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarkovic [38], (2008)</td>
<td>(381)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filinchuk [42], (2008)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>(553)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price [41], (2009)</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendolino [37], (2009)</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Kharbachi [19], (2011)</td>
<td>386.671</td>
<td>5.06970.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang [81], (2012)</td>
<td>384.5</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work (linear extrapolation from Pistorius [36])</td>
<td>(381)</td>
<td>(578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>382.75</td>
<td>5.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. deviation</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected value</td>
<td>38372</td>
<td>5.370.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated entropy (D5S/ΔDH/T) Dₛₜₑₑ (kJ mol⁻¹) Dₛₜₑₑ (kJ mol⁻¹)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author</th>
<th>DS ( \text{J K}^{-1} \text{mol}_1^{-1} )</th>
<th>DH ( \text{kJ mol}_1^{-1} )</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis [14], (1949)</td>
<td>92.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heat of reaction of LiBH(_4) with dihine HC(_3) measured in a bomb calorimeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis [14], (1949)</td>
<td>93.305</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation. Enthalpy of formation of the compound involved in the experiment of Davis [14] updated with more recent values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagman [31], (1964)</td>
<td>97.155</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation. Enthalpy of formation of the compound involved in the experiment of Davis [14] updated with more recent values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith [29], (1963)</td>
<td>97.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recalculated from Davis [14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffes [32], (1964)</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review about hydrides. DG reported as 194.3 ( \pm ) 219.2 T( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) and based on data of Wagman [31] and Hallett [15], assuming a melting behavior similar to other hydrides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagman [63], (1982)</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation. Enthalpy of formation of the compound involved in the experiment of Davis [14] updated with more recent values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST-JANAF [22], (1998)</td>
<td>95.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation. Enthalpy of formation of the compound involved in the experiment of Davis [14] updated with more recent values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zutel [43], (2003)</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value based on decomposition temperature obtained for various hydrogen pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miwa [23], (2004)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT-PBE calculations including ZPE. DH ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) if zero-point energies is not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zutel [1], (2007)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value reported without references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zutel [1], (2007)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation based on the work of Nakamori [33] that correlate the enthalpy of formation of the borohydrides with the Pauling electronegativities of cations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegel [24], (2007)</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT calculations at 300 K. DS estimated assuming DS ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) and DS(^{10}) calculated equal to 15.3 J K(^{-1} ) mol(^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caputo [25], (2010)</td>
<td>35.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>DG at 298 K is reported to be 269.306 kJ mol(^{-1} ) ( \pm ) 1. The calculation of DH is reported at T=k=0 K, after correction for ZPE. The entropy of reaction has been calculated as DS(^{10}) (DH(0 K)–DG(298 K))/T(298 K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee [26], (2010)</td>
<td>97.924</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only electronic energy used. 177.187 kJ mol(^{-1} ) given for the formation of hexagonal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed [54], (2011)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>No reference given. Probably refers to another reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith [29], (1963)</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deducted from free energy of formation of LiBH(_4) and LiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miwa [23], (2004)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT-PBE calculations for o-LiBH(_4) including ZPE. DH(^{10}) ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) if ZPE is not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankcombe [65], (2005)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value calculated for o-LiBH(_4) with a PW91 functional, including the ZPE correction calculated by Miwa [23] using a PBE functional. 85.5 ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) was obtained using LDA functional with ZPE calculated by Miwa [23]. 106.95 ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) using PW91 functional without ZPE. 114.15 ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) using LDA functional without ZPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajo [8], (2005)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study of LiBH(_4) ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) as PCT. Data for LiBH(_4) decomposition are estimated using Outokumpu HSC Chemistry for Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankcombe [27], (2006)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value calculated for o-LiBH(_4) with PW91 functional including the ZPE at T(=)298 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohba [28], (2006)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT calculations for o-LiBH(_4) without ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegel [24], (2007)</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT calculations at 300 K. DS estimated assuming DS ( \text{kJ mol}^{-1} ) and DS(^{10}) calculated equal to 27.1 J K(^{-1} ) mol(^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauron [44], (2008)</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT calculations for o-LiBH(_4) without ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauron [44], (2008)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT calculations for o-LiBH(_4) without ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price [41], (2009)</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>DFT at 0 K without ZPE corrections. DH of reaction for o-LiBH(_4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price [41], (2009)</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>The authors measured by DSC the enthalpy of transition and melting of LiBH(_4) and then used the data reported in JANAF [22] and CRC handbook of chemistry [66] to calculate the reaction enthalpy for o-LiBH(_4) at 298 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozolins [45], (2009)</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The authors measured by DSC the enthalpy of transition and melting of LiBH(_4) and then used the data reported in JANAF [22] and CRC handbook of chemistry [66] to calculate the reaction enthalpy for liquid-LiBH(_4) at 298 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozolins [45], (2009)</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value calculated at T=298 K with a PW functional including the ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohba [28], (2006)</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value calculated at T=298 K with a PW functional including the ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caputo [25], (2010)</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value calculated at T=4(\times)300 K with a PW functional including the ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caputo [25], (2010)</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value calculated at T=4(\times)300 K with a PW functional including the ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caputo [25], (2010)</td>
<td>56.139</td>
<td></td>
<td>DH of reaction for h-LiBH(_4). DFT at 0 K without ZPE correction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
have been considered. According to the CALPHAD method, the GFE functions for orthorhombic, hexagonal and liquid phases of LiBH₄ have been obtained. Finally, from the calculated GFE, possible decomposition reaction paths have been estimated in order to describe hydrogen absorption and desorption processes.

2. Review of LiBH₄ thermodynamic properties

Table 2 summarizes experimental results of the polymorphous phase transition (orthorhombic-to-hexagonal) and melting of LiBH₄. Table 3 gives experimental and calculated enthalpy and entropy values for different decomposition reactions of LiBH₄. For sake of comparison, data are reported per mol of H₂. In the following, experimental techniques and theoretical methods used to obtain various data will be described in details.

2.1. LiBH₄ solid state

2.1.1. Standard molar heat capacity and entropy

In 1949, Davis et al. [14] measured the enthalpy increment in LiBH₄ between T=273.15 K and T=298.15 K using drop calorimetry. Starting from their data, the value of the molar heat capacity can be inferred at an average temperature of 285.6 K as C_p,m(285.6 K) = 670.9 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹. At lower temperatures (i.e. 15–303 K), Hallet and Johnston [15] measured the heat capacity of LiBH₄ by adiabatic calorimetry and proposed, for the standard molar heat capacity and entropy at 298.15 K, values of C_p,m(298.15 K) = 80.46 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹ and S(298.15 K) = 73.7 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹, respectively. Using literature values for the absolute entropy of elements, Smith and Bass [29] recalculated S(298.15 K) equal to 75.85 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹. Gorbunov et al. [17] measured the heat capacity of the compound between 10 K and 450 K, using both adiabatic and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) under vacuum. Up to 250 K, their results agree with previous measurements of Hallett and Johnston [15] but their values were lower of about 2.5% at 298.15 K, giving C_p,m(298.15 K) = 80.92 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹.

The values reported in JANAF tables [22] for the C_p,m (298.15 K) and S(298.15 K) are 82.539 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹ and 75.815 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹, respectively. The National Institute of Standard and Technology (NIST) chemistry WebBook [21] also based on the JANAF compilation) gives C_p,m (298.15 K) = 82.67 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹ and S(298.15 K) = 75.88 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹. The slight difference is likely due to the different equation used to fit experimental C_p,m data. It is worth noting that data of molar heat capacity reported in JANAF tables [22] below 300 K are based on experimental values reported by Hallet and Johnston [15], but at higher temperatures they are estimated by comparison with C_p,m values of NaBH₄ and, therefore, are not supported by experimental data. A comparison of experimental data with various functions for molar heat capacity provided by the abovementioned authors is reported in Figure A1 in Appendix: Supplementary data.

On the basis of the review of the whole set of available data (as described below in the Thermodynamic modeling section) the values for C_p,m (298.15 K) and S(298.15 K) assessed in the present work are 80.92 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹ and 74.97 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹, respectively.

2.1.2. Standard enthalpy of formation

The heat of formation of LiBH₄ was determined in 1949 by Davis et al. [14] measuring in a bomb calorimeter the heat of dissolution in hydrochloric acid at 298.15 K, according to

\[ \text{LiBH}_4 + 2\text{HCl} \rightarrow \text{LiCl} + 2\text{H}_2 + 2\text{H}_2 \text{O} \]

The total heat effects were measured with a precision of 0.35%. In order to calculate the dissolution enthalpy at 298.15 K, the authors measured the heat capacity of the reactants and products using drop calorimetry [14]. The enthalpy of reaction (1) was determined to be 301.54 kJ mol⁻¹, so that a value of the standard heat of formation, D_Hf(298.15 K)/14 184.7271 kJ mol⁻¹ was given for orthorhombic LiBH₄. Because D_Hf for H₂O and NH₂O was calculated from D_Hf of B₂O₃, known within 1% (i.e. 712 kJ mol⁻¹), the authors reported an accuracy of the obtained value related to that of the heat of formation of H₂O. The uncertainty on the heat of formation of this acid was rather large, as D_Hf of B₂O₃ contributes by half of it. In addition, the reference state of boron was chosen as amorphous boron. From this experimental measurement, many revisions of the standard heat of formation of LiBH₄ were reported in the literature. Different dissolution calorimetry experiments, either coming from literature or performed by the authors, provided the heat contribution of each compound in reaction (1) during mixing. Table A1 in Appendix: Supplementary data summarizes the
heat of formation of the whole set of compounds involved in the calorimetric determinations of Davis et al. [14], as used in the compilations reported thereafter by many authors. It is clear that the main difference in the results comes from the heat of formation of boracic acid, H$_2$BO$_3$, i.e. during its dissolution in water or indirectly from its basic products B$_2$O$_3$ and elemental boron. The compilation given by Wagman [31], adopted by NIST, suggested a standard heat of formation of LiBH$_4$ as DfH(298.15 K)=$\pm$194.317 0.21 kJ mol$^{-1}$. This value has been maintained by Jeffes and McKerrell [32] in their thermodynamic tables. Using literature values, Smith and Bass [29] recalculated for LiBH$_4$ a value of DfH(298.15 K)=$\pm$194.01 kJ mol$^{-1}$. The experimental data of Davis et al. [14] have been also reviewed in JANAF tables [22], where a value of DfH(298.15 K)=$\pm$190.4670.21 kJ mol$^{-1}$ is reported. The reference state of boron in JANAF tables [22] is crystalline, whereas there is no information in the report made by Wagman [31]. The heat of transformation of amorphous boron from its crystalline counterpart is reported as 4.4 kJ mol$^{-1}$ [31]. Thus, it can be argued that the main reason of the difference between the two reported values, JANAF [22] and Wagman [31], is likely due to a different selection of reference state for boron.

First principle methods were used to calculate the ‘‘cohesion’’ energy of LiBH$_4$ at 0 K. Miwa et al. [23] calculated the heat of formation to be equal to DfH (0 K)=$\pm$194 kJ mol$^{-1}$. and, when zero-point energies were included, it was given as DfH (0 K)=$\pm$160 kJ mol$^{-1}$. Nakamori et al. [33] studied theoretically the stability of metal-borohydrides and found a correlation between the heat of formation and the Pauling electronegativity of the cation. The value reported for LiBH$_4$ was DfH (0 K)=$\pm$146 kJ mol$^{-1}$. Zuttel et al. [1] provided a value of DfH (0 K)=$\pm$194.15 kJ mol$^{-1}$, obtained from calculations of formation reaction, LiH$_2$B$_3$/2H$_2$4dLiBH$_4$. Siegel et al. [24], using the VASP ab-initio calculations package, provided a value of 179.4 kJ mol$^{-1}$ for the heat of decomposition of LiBH$_4$ to the parent elements (B, Li, 2H$_2$) at 300 K.

In the present assessment, the value reported by the JANAF compilation [22], DfH(298.15 K)=$\pm$190.4670.21 kJ mol$^{-1}$, was selected. In fact, it is based on the single experimental measure-ment of enthalpy of formation [14] and updated with the most recent values for the formation enthalpy of the compounds involved in the calorimetric measurement.

2.2. LiBH$_4$ polymorphous transition

2.2.1. Transition temperature

It is well established that the LiBH$_4$ has a polymorphous transformation from orthorhombic to hexagonal structure [34]. The values of the phase transition temperature (T$_{tr}$) reported in the literature are collected in Table 2. Fedneva et al. [35] detected by DSC the presence of the polymorphous transition in the temperature range from 381 K to 385 K. The 4 K range may be related to uncertainties in the baseline of the DSC peak, due to the effect of an unusual increase of the molar heat capacity, as discussed in details in Ref. [19]. Stasinevich and Egorenko [16] observed the phase transformation by Differential Thermal Analysis (DTA) at different hydrogen pressures, from 1.0133 bar to 10.133 bar. The polymorphous phase transition was reported to be independent on the hydrogen pressure and it was given at an average temperature T$_{tr}$=383.373 K. The temperature of the polymorphous transition was also observed with DTA by Pistorius [36], who gives a value, averaged from 16 measurements, equal to T$_{tr}$=381.570.5 K. In the same paper, the transition temperature was measured at various pressures by means of piston rotation technique. From these data, the orthorhombic-to-hexagonal tran-sition temperature may be calculated by linear extrapolation to 0.0001 GPa pressure as T$_{tr}$=381.670.5 K, as shown in Figure A2: Supplementary data. A value of T$_{tr}$=383 K was obtained for the polymorphous transformation temperature by Pendolino et al. [37] using DSC. From a selection of collected data (see Table 2), an average selected value of T$_{tr}$=383.72 K has been considered for the assessment.

2.2.2. Polymorphous transition enthalpy and entropy

From the analysis of the high pressure phase diagram by Pistorius [36], a slope dT/dP=24 K GPa$^{-1}$ for the orthorhombic-to-hexagonal transition was obtained. The volume change was deduced to be ΔV=0.4 cm$^3$ mol$^{-1}$. The author deduced a value of entropy of transition Ds$_{tr}$S=16.5 J K$^{-1}$ mol$^{-1}$. With the assumption that Ds$_{tr}$S is approximately constant along the transition line, the author found (ΔV/p=0.36 cm$^3$ mol$^{-1}$, a value the author said “in fair agreement” with the value given by Zuttel et al. [1]. Stasinevich and Egorenko [16] observed the phase transition by Differential Thermal Analysis (DTA) at different hydrogen pressures, from 1.0133 bar to 10.133 bar. The polymorphous phase transition was reported to be independent on the hydrogen pressure and it was given at an average temperature T$_{tr}$=383.373 K. The temperature of the polymorphous transition was also observed with DTA by Pistorius [36], who gives a value, averaged from 16 measurements, equal to T$_{tr}$=381.570.5 K. In the same paper, the transition temperature was measured at various pressures by means of piston rotation technique. From these data, the orthorhombic-to-hexagonal tran-sition temperature may be calculated by linear extrapolation to 0.0001 GPa pressure as T$_{tr}$=381.670.5 K, as shown in Figure A2: Supplementary data. A value of T$_{tr}$=383 K was obtained for the polymorphous transformation temperature by Pendolino et al. [37] using DSC. From a selection of collected data (see Table 2), an average selected value of T$_{tr}$=383.72 K has been considered for the assessment.

2.2.2. Polymorphous transition enthalpy and entropy

From the analysis of the high pressure phase diagram by Pistorius [36], a slope dT/dP=24 K GPa$^{-1}$ for the orthorhombic-to-hexagonal transition was obtained. The volume change was deduced to be ΔV=0.4 cm$^3$ mol$^{-1}$. The author deduced a value of entropy of transition Ds$_{tr}$S=16.5 J K$^{-1}$ mol$^{-1}$. With the assumption that Ds$_{tr}$S is approximately constant along the transition line, the author found (ΔV/p=0.36 cm$^3$ mol$^{-1}$, a value the author said “in fair agreement” with the value given by Zuttel et al. [1]. Stasinevich and Egorenko [16] observed the phase transition by Differential Thermal Analysis (DTA) at different hydrogen pressures, from 1.0133 bar to 10.133 bar. The polymorphous phase transition was reported to be independent on the hydrogen pressure and it was given at an average temperature T$_{tr}$=383.373 K. The temperature of the polymorphous transition was also observed with DTA by Pistorius [36], who gives a value, averaged from 16 measurements, equal to T$_{tr}$=381.570.5 K. In the same paper, the transition temperature was measured at various pressures by means of piston rotation technique. From these data, the orthorhombic-to-hexagonal tran-sition temperature may be calculated by linear extrapolation to 0.0001 GPa pressure as T$_{tr}$=381.670.5 K, as shown in Figure A2: Supplementary data. A value of T$_{tr}$=383 K was obtained for the polymorphous transformation temperature by Pendolino et al. [37] using DSC. From a selection of collected data (see Table 2), an average selected value of T$_{tr}$=383.72 K has been considered for the assessment.

2.3. LiBH$_4$ liquid state

2.3.1. Melting temperature

Schlesinger and Brown in 1940, when preparing LiBH$_4$ from diborane and ethyl-lithium, identified the melting temperature (Tm) under static vacuum in the range 548–553 K, accompanied with a slight H$_2$ release [39]. Fedneva et al. [35] reported DTA measurements on LiBH$_4$ under hydrogen flow. They observed the melting of the compound in the 541–559 K temperature range, the variation being probably related to a H$_2$
evolution. Pistorius [36] obtained $T_m$ \( \frac{1}{4} \)588 K by extrapolation of data from high pressure down to atmospheric pressure. Due to the high pressure used in the experiments, he did not report any hydrogen release at melting. Stasinevich and Egorenko [16] found $T_m$ slightly increasing in the 551–555 K temperature range as a function of hydrogen pressure, being this range comparable to the measurement uncertainty. The reported average value was $T_m$ \( \frac{1}{4} \)5537 2 K. Semenko et al. [40], studying LiBH\(_4\)-NaBH\(_4\) system by the method of heating curves, gave $T_m$ \( \frac{1}{4} \)5555 K. From DSC measurements, Price et al. [41] obtained $T_m$ \( \frac{1}{4} \)552 K and the present authors [19] obtained $T_m$ \( \frac{1}{4} \)553 K. In JANAF tables [22], the melting temperature for LiBH\(_4\) was estimated as $T_m$ \( \frac{1}{4} \)750 K by comparison with that of NaBH\(_4\).

The melting temperature of LiBH\(_4\) selected for the assessment, $T_m$ \( \frac{1}{4} \)55175 K, is the average of values given in the literature (see Table 2), neglecting data given by Pistorius et al. [36] and by JANAF tables [22], which have not been obtained by experimental measurements.

### 2.3.2. Enthalpy of melting

Due to the high reactivity of the compound, few data have been reported in literature for the enthalpy of melting ($D_m$H) of LiBH\(_4\). In Ref. [41], a value of $D_m$H\(=\)48.03 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) has been obtained by thermal analysis. Zarkevich et al. [38], using an ab-initio molecular dynamics approach, calculated $D_m$H\(=\)66.3 kJ mol\(^{-1}\). In Ref. [1], a value of $D_m$H\(=\)74.56 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) has been reported, without a clear reference to the experimental or calculation technique used for the determination. The enthalpy of melting selected for the assessment was taken as the average of available values, corresponding to $D_m$H\(=\)72 kJ mol\(^{-1}\).

### 2.3.3. Density

The slope of\(dT/dP\) at the melting in the diagram given by Pistorius [36] could be used to calculate the volume change at melting. By using the Clausius–Clapeyron equation and the selected value for the enthalpy of melting, the value ($D_m$V\(_p\) \(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}\))\(_{0,0,870.4 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1}}\) has been calculated. Using the volume of the unit cell of the hexagonal phase given by Filinchuk et al. [42] at 535 K, the density of the liquid phase near the melting temperature can be estimated as \(\rho_{\text{liq}}\) \(\approx\)0.60370.007 g cm\(^{-3}\).

### 2.4. LiBH\(_4\) thermal decomposition

The compound synthesized by Schlesinger and Brown [39] had the chemical formula Li\(_{0.99}\)B\(_1.02\)H\(_{1.8}\). When the sample was main-tained at 553 K for 10 h under primary vacuum, a release of 62.5% of H\(_2\) available in the compound was observed. The assumed decomposition reaction was at that time

\[
\text{LiBH}_4(l) = \text{LiBH}_4(s) + \text{H}_2(g)
\]

Stasinevich and Egorenko [16] observed the thermal decomposition of LiBH\(_4\) by DTA at different hydrogen pressures (from 1.0133 bar to 10.133 bar). The decomposition temperature was observed to be dependent on hydrogen pressure, but a clear indication of decom-position products was not provided. The authors compared experimental results with a decomposition reaction according to

\[
\text{LiBH}_4(l) = \text{LiBH}_4(s) + \text{H}_2(g)
\]

where (l) and (s) stands for liquid and solid phases, respectively. The GFE of reaction (4) was given as 103.4 0.150 T kJ mol\(^{-1}\), whereas the GFE for the decomposition reaction into the pure components was reported as 194.1 0.219 T kJ mol\(^{-1}\). On the basis of experimental results, a thermal decomposition of LiBH\(_4\) via reaction (4) was claimed by the authors.

DTA analysis of thermal decomposition of LiBH\(_4\) was reported in Ref. [43], where a small release of hydrogen (0.3 wt%) in the 373–473 K temperature range was evidenced. No desorption of hydrogen was observed at melting, but a significant hydrogen delivery was detected starting at 593 K. On the basis of the amount of delivered hydrogen, the formation of a product with nominal composition LiB\(_2\)H\(_2\) was claimed. When catalyzed with SiO\(_2\), LiBH\(_4\) was reported to transform into LiH and B, with further hydrogen delivery.

A careful analysis of thermal decomposition of LiBH\(_4\) has been carried out by Mauzon et al. [44] using dynamic Pressure–Composition–Temperature (PCT) and Thermal-Programmed-Desorption (TPD) measurements. LiH was observed as a decom-position product, whereas LiBH\(_4\) was supposed to decompose following reaction (4). According to the Van’t Hoff equation, thermodynamic quantities were determined for the hydrogen desorption and values equal to 111 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) and 172 J K\(^{-1}\) mol\(^{-1}\) were given for the enthalpy and entropy of reaction, respectively. Even if the points obtained at high temperatures were well-located on a straight line in the Van’t Hoff plot, the authors observed that it cannot be excluded that the
equilibrium was not fully reached during the experiments. In fact, at the lowest temperature (686 K), the experimental point appeared out of the fitting line.

Price et al. [41], on the basis of a study on the decomposition pathways of LiBD₂-MgD₂ multicomponent systems investigated by in-situ neutron diffraction, calculated an enthalpy and entropy of reaction (4) equal to 87.9 kJ mol⁻¹ and 120.1 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹, respectively.

The heat of decomposition reaction of orthorhombic LiBH₄ into LiHpB₃/2H₂ at 0 K was estimated by Miwa et al. [23] by ab-initio calculations. A value of 112 kJ mol⁻¹ was reported, which turns into 150 kJ mol⁻¹ if Zero Point Energy (ZPE) is not included. In the frame of a large analysis of possible thermal decomposition products, Ohba et al. [28] calculated by ab-initio methods the heat of the same reaction as 112.5 kJ mol⁻¹ whereas, more recently, Ozolins et al. [45] calculated a value of 129 kJ mol⁻¹. Using a similar approach, Frankcombe and Kroes [27], calculated a value of 93.7 kJ mol⁻¹ at room temperature.

The presence of Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ phase in the products of thermal decomposition of LiBH₄ has been claimed on the basis of ab-initio calculations [28,46] and it has been confirmed experimentally by Raman spectroscopy [46] and NMR [47]. This intermediate compound also occurs during dehydrogenation of LiBH₄ nanocomposed in the aerogel [10]. A very low hydrogen desorption temperature (i.e. 305 K) has been recently observed in nanostructured LiBH₄ [11]. In this case, the formation of Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ was observed at 538 K, and even lower temperatures. From the analysis of dehydrogenation process of the LiBH₄/MgH₂ system, it has been suggested that the formation of Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ phase as a product is hindered at pressures higher than 2.0 MPa [48]. The formation of B₂H₆ during dehydrogenation of LiBH₄ has been also suggested [49,50], causing a loss of boron. The Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ formation in the desorption of LiBH₄ has been explained as a result of reaction of diborane with LiBH₄ [49].

Experimental thermodynamic data of reactions involving Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ phase are not available. Ab-initio calculations have been performed for the following decomposition reaction:

\[
\text{LiBH}_4 \rightarrow \text{LiBH}_2 \text{B}_2 \text{H}_6, \quad \Delta H = 112 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}
\]

Ohba et al. [28] suggested a decomposition process of LiBH₄ via reaction (5), giving an enthalpy equal to 60.7 kJ mol⁻¹.

Ozolins et al. [45] calculated at 300 K an enthalpy and entropy of reaction (5) equal to 48.1 kJ mol⁻¹ and 105.5 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹, respectively. More recently, Caputo and Zuttel [25] calculated a value of the enthalpy of reaction at 0 K equal to 60.7 kJ mol⁻¹, when LiBH₄ is in the hexagonal structure.

Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ has been also reported as a possible product of the thermal decomposition reaction [28,49], but experimental thermodynamic data about this compound are lacking. A value of enthalpy equal to 348 kJ mol⁻¹ was calculated for the 2LiH ± 10B±4H₂-Li₂B₁₀H₁₀ reaction by ab-initio methods [28], neglecting ZPE corrections.

3. Thermodynamic modeling

Thermodynamic modeling is based on a parametric description of the GFE, as a function of temperature and pressure, for LiBH₄ compound and for possible decomposition products. All phases have been considered as stoichiometric compounds, i.e. with a fixed composition. The GFE functions for all phases have been defined in a wide temperature range, even in domains beyond the phase stability. No pressure dependence of the GFE has been considered for the condensed phases. For LiBH₄, parameters have been determined for orthorhombic, hexagonal and liquid phases. For the products of thermal decomposition, parameters have been taken from available databases [20]. For Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ and Li₂B₁₀H₁₀ phases, parameters were not available, so they have been determined as described below. Hydrogen has been described as an ideal gas phase, according to Ref. [20]. The Parrot module of the ThermoCalc software [51,52] was used for the assessment.

3.1. Assessment of Gibbs Free Energy functions

In order to evaluate the temperature dependence of the GFE of condensed phases, the pure elements in their stable structure at 298.15 K under a pressure of 1 bar were chosen as a reference state (SER, Standard Element Reference) as recommended by SGTE (Scientific Group Thermodata Europe) [53].

The temperature dependence of the GFE of a compound (COMP) has been described with the following polynomial expression [12]:

\[
C_1^{1/4} \Delta_{b} T | _{i}^{| CTn T |} |D_{n}^{1/2} | |E_{T}^{3} | |F_{T}^{1} | \mid G_{o} D_{f} T | ^{| n} | X | 6 \Phi
\]

where \( j \) represents the phase and the parameters \( A-G_{o} \) are optimized on the basis of the available experimental or computed data. If necessary, different set of parameters have been used to describe the same phase in different temperature ranges. When thermodynamic data are available at low temperatures, a more complex expression of GFE, based on the Einstein model for the molar heat capacity [54], has been used.

The calculation of the enthalpy (H), entropy (S) and free energy (G) functions is based on the integration of the molar heat capacity, according to the following equations:

\[
H_{T} = Z_{T} C_{p} \ln \frac{mT}{S_{T}} \quad S_{T} = \frac{Z_{T} C_{p}-k}{dT} \quad G_{T} = H_{T} - T S_{T}
\]

The calculation of the enthalpy (H), entropy (S) and free energy (G) functions is based on the integration of the molar heat capacity, according to the following equations:

\[
H_{T} = Z_{T} C_{p} \ln \frac{mT}{S_{T}} \quad S_{T} = \frac{Z_{T} C_{p}-k}{dT} \quad G_{T} = H_{T} - T S_{T}
\]
Starting from selected values for the standard heat of forma-tion (\(D_f^\text{H}^{298.1}\)) and standard entropy (\(S^\text{298.1}\)) of the orthorhombic phase at 298.15 K, \(H\) and \(S\) of each phase are deduced as a function of temperature, knowing the enthalpy and entropy of the phase transformations, according to

\[ H^\text{298.1}_n = \sum Z^\text{tr} \int_{T^\text{tr1}}^{T^\text{tr2}} H^{\text{f}} \frac{dT}{T} + \int_{T^\text{tr2}}^{T} H^{\text{p,m}} \frac{dT}{T} \]

\[ S^\text{298.1}_n = \sum Z^\text{tr} \int_{T^\text{tr1}}^{T^\text{tr2}} S^{\text{f}} \frac{dT}{T} + \int_{T^\text{tr2}}^{T} C_P^{\text{p,m}} \frac{dT}{T} \]

where \(D_f^\text{H}^{298.1}, H, D_f^\text{S}^{298.1}, S\) and \(T^\text{tr}\) are the enthalpy, entropy and temperature for the phase transition \(n\), respectively. The quan-tities used for the calculation of GFE functions for LiBH\(_4\) phases are taken from selected values collected in Table A2 in Appendix: Supplementary data.

For each phase, different parameters for GFE were evaluated for different temperature ranges identified according to transition temperatures. The GFE parameters for each phase were assessed so that, outside the temperature range of stability, the molar heat capacity approaches that of the stable phase [55]. It should be noticed that this approach, suggested by SGTE [53], is not based on physical models, but it guarantees that extrapolations outside the phase stability range yield a reasonable description of GFE. According to this approach, an unreasonable step in the \(C_P^{\text{p,m}}\) function of each phase at the equilibrium transition temperature is avoided. However, in order to allow a smooth change of the \(C_P^{\text{p,m}}\) at the transition temperature high order terms (\(T^9\) and \(T^7\)) have been introduced in the GFE expression for the temperature ranges where each phase is not stable. The contributions of the high order terms to the polynomial expression of GFE are rather lower than those related to low order terms.

3.1.1. Orthorhombic phase

For this phase, \(C_P^{\text{p,m}}\) data [15,17,19] are available from low temperature up to the phase transition. So, two temperature ranges from 0 K to 383 K and above 383 K were identified. In the first temperature range, the Einstein model [54] was used to describe the GFE. In the high temperature range, where the orthorhombic phase is not stable, the GFE is described so that the constant molar heat capacity of the liquid (see below) is approached gradually according to

\[ \text{LiBH}_4^{\text{Ortho}} \frac{dT}{T} T^{4383 \text{ K}} \frac{1}{4} \text{LiBH}_4^{\text{Liquid}} \frac{\partial H^{\text{f}}}{\partial T} |_{\text{CT}^9} \frac{\partial T}{T} \]

\[ \partial H^{\text{p,m}}/\partial T |_{\text{CT}^9} \]

where the parameters A, B and C have been evaluated in order to have the continuity of the enthalpy, entropy and molar heat capacity of the orthorhombic phase at 383 K. The term \(\text{CT}^9\) brings gradually the \(C_P^{\text{p,m}}\) of the orthorhombic phase to that of the liquid phase.

3.1.2. Hexagonal phase

Three temperature ranges were identified for the hexagonal phase: 0–383K, 383–551 K and above 551 K. In the 383–551 K temperature range, where the hexagonal phase is stable, the GFE function has been described with Eq. (6) on the basis of available \(C_P^{\text{p,m}}\) data for this phase [19], of selected values for the enthalpy and entropy of transition and of the thermodynamic function of the orthorhombic phase, as described above in Eqs. (8) and (9).

In the low temperature range (0–383 K), where the hexagonal phase is not stable, the GFE function has been described so that the molar heat capacity of the hexagonal phase reaches gradually that of the orthorhombic phase, according to the equation

\[ \text{LiBH}_4^{\text{Hexa}} \frac{dT}{T} T^{4383 \text{ K}} \frac{1}{4} \text{LiBH}_4^{\text{Ortho}} \frac{\partial H^{\text{f}}}{\partial T} |_{\text{CT}^7} \frac{\partial T}{T} \]

Even in this case, A, B and C parameters have been evaluated in order to have the continuity of the enthalpy, entropy and molar heat capacity of the hexagonal phase at 383 K.

For the high temperature range, above melting temperature (T4551 K), the same approach described before has been fol-lowed, so that the same polynomial expression of Eq. (10) has been adopted for the description of GFE.

3.1.3. Liquid phase

The GFE for the liquid phase has been described with two set of parameters, valid in the low temperature range of liquid undercooling (0–551 K) and above the melting temperature (551 K), where the liquid phase is stable. For the latter tempera-ture range, due to the absence of data, a constant molar heat capacity was considered, so that the GFE has been described with the following function:

\[ \text{LiBH}_4^{\text{Liquid}} \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial H^{\text{f}}}{\partial T} |_{\text{CT}^0} \frac{\partial T}{T} \]

where the selected values for the enthalpy and entropy of melting were used to determine the parameters A and B of this equation and the C parameter has been set on the basis of the estimated molar heat capacity of the liquid phase [19].
The GFE of the liquid phase in the low temperature range (0–551 K) has been described with an equation similar to Eq. (11), once again driving the molar heat capacity of the liquid phase toward that of the orthorhombic phase at low temperatures and checking the continuity of the enthalpy, entropy and molar heat capacity of the liquid phase at the melting temperature (551 K).

3.1.4. Li$_2$B$_2$H$_2$ and Li$_2$B$_4$H$_{10}$ phases

Because Li$_2$B$_2$H$_2$ compound has been reported as a product of the thermal decomposition reaction [28,46,47] but parameters for the description of its GFE are not available, a specific assessment of thermodynamic properties of this phase has been carried out. This phase has been treated as a stoichiometric phase, so that GFE has been described as

$$
\text{Gibbs Free Energy functions of the LiBH}_4
$$

The parameter A has been evaluated on the basis of the ab-initio calculated enthalpy and entropy reported in Ref. [45] for the following reactions at 300 K: Li$_2$B$_2$H$_2$ $\rightarrow$2LiH$_2$B$_2$H$_2$ and 12LiBH$_4$ $\rightarrow$Li$_2$B$_2$H$_2$ [10LiH$_2$B$_2$H$_2$].

Similarly, for the Li$_2$B$_4$H$_{10}$ compound, the GFE has been described as:

$$
\text{Gibbs Free Energy functions of the LiBH}_4
$$

The parameter A has been evaluated on the basis of the ab-initio calculations at 0 K reported in Ref. [28] and the para-meter B has been fixed on the basis of the entropy change from gaseous hydrogen state to solid hydride (i.e. 130 J K$^{-1}$ mol$^{-1}$).

GFE functions for $\text{Gibbs Free Energy functions of the LiBH}_4$ have been taken from Ref. [20].

3.1.5. Assessment procedure

In a preliminary assessment procedure, experimental data on thermal decomposition of liquid LiBH$_4$ at different H$_2$ pressures [16,44] were considered to evaluate the GFE of the liquid phase, assuming a full decomposition into LiH[LiB]$_3$/2H$_2$ or 1/12Li$_2$B$_2$H$_2$ [13/12LiH]$_3$/12H$_2$. Actually, a full decomposition into these products turned out to be not coherent with selected values for enthalpy end entropy of melting. This result suggests that the decomposition mechanism of liquid LiH$_4$ observed experimentally might be more complex than that described by reactions mentioned above. In fact, the DSC signal of Ref. [56] as well as the differential curve of the thermal desorption spectra reported in Ref. [1] show several peaks. So, thermal decomposit-ion data have not been considered for the assessment because equilibrium conditions were not guaranteed. Table 4 shows, for each phase and within the temperature range of validity, the assessed parameters for the GFE functions that have been deter-mined and used for the following calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>Gibbs Free Energy functions/ J (mol of f.u)</th>
<th>T range (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GORTHEIN</td>
<td>5791.9044818 8197394(T/K)/j 5496556 10$^7$(T/K)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GORTHEIN</td>
<td>6297972548 16.81555245(T/K)/j 32864983 10$^7$(T/K)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GLIBH4HEX</td>
<td>8229.40031 14.7390106(T/K)/j 7.833 10$^7$(T/K)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GLIBH4</td>
<td>8229.40031 14.7390106(T/K)/j 7.833 10$^7$(T/K)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GLIBH4HEX</td>
<td>8229.40031 14.7390106(T/K)/j 7.833 10$^7$(T/K)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GLIBH4</td>
<td>8229.40031 14.7390106(T/K)/j 7.833 10$^7$(T/K)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GORTHEIN</td>
<td>2.0643880 10$^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GORTHEIN</td>
<td>2.0643880 10$^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GORTHEIN</td>
<td>2.0643880 10$^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH$_4$</td>
<td>GORTHEIN</td>
<td>2.0643880 10$^7$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Assessed Gibbs Free Energy functions of the LiBH$_4$ condensated phases, Li$_2$B$_2$H$_2$ and Li$_2$B$_4$H$_{10}$, with their T range of validity.
Fig. 1. Calculated molar heat capacity, $C_{p,m}$, for LiBH$_4$: orthorhombic (continuous line ——), hexagonal (dashed line ———)— and liquid (dotted line ) at different temperatures compared to experimental values from Ref. [17] (filled squares for the orthorhombic phase, & open squares for the hexagonal phase) and Ref. [19] (K filled circles for the orthorhombic phase, & open circles for the hexagonal phase).

Fig. 2. Enthalpy ($H$) as a function of temperature for the different phases of LiBH$_4$ in the respective ranges of stability. Continuous line (——) shows the results of calculation. Experimental molar heat capacity values from Ref. [19] have been integrated with respect to temperature and are shown as open circles ( ). Experimental enthalpies of phase transformations from Refs. [1], [17], [36] m, [41] & have been added for comparison to the values calculated at the temperature of phase transformations (horizontal dotted lines).

4. Consistency of results and discussion

The calculated molar heat capacity of the various phases of LiBH$_4$ compared to experimental data [17,19] are reported in Fig. 1. The agreement between experimental and calculated values for the solid phases is rather good in the whole temperature range. At low temperatures (0–383 K), where the orthorhombic phase is stable, the Einstein model appears suitable for the description of experimental data. In the 383–551 K temperature range, where the hexagonal phase is stable, the molar heat capacity values are well described by the equation selected for this phase. Above the melting temperature (551 K), no experimental data are available, so a constant value of molar heat capacity is considered for the liquid phase, as estimated in Ref. [19]. It is worth noting that, outside the temperature range of stability, the molar heat capacity of metastable phases are merging the values of the stable phase, as described above. A comparison of obtained results with data available in the literature is reported in Figure A1 in Appendix: Supplementary data.

The enthalpy function of LiBH$_4$ is presented in Fig. 2 as a function of temperature, taking into account the stable phase in various temperature ranges. The plot starts at 298.15 K at 190.46 kJ mol$^{-1}$, corresponding to the selected value for the enthalpy of formation of LiBH$_4$. Experimental molar heat capacity values taken from Ref. [19] have been integrated with respect to temperature and corresponding enthalpy values are shown as open circles. They fit well with the calculated enthalpy of LiBH$_4$ at different temperatures. For comparison, existing experimental data of enthalpies of transformations (polymorphous transition and melting) have been reported in the figure at the corresponding temperatures of transformations, by referring to the enthalpy of the stable phase at the same temperature (horizontal dotted lines). The calculated enthalpy variation at the phase transitions of LiBH$_4$ are within error uncertainty of measurements, indicating a fairly good agreement between calculated and experimental values.

Fig. 3. Calculated LiBH$_4$ phase diagram considering Li$_2$B$_{12}$H$_{12}$ and Li$_2$B$_{10}$H$_{10}$ compounds (dashed line ——) or without considering Li$_2$B$_{12}$H$_{12}$ and Li$_2$B$_{10}$H$_{10}$ in the calculations (continuous line ——). Experimental values of phase transitions from Refs. [16]’, [44], [35] B, [19] m, [36] K, [18] & and [41] p are shown for comparison.
Fig. 3 shows the calculated phases stability for LiBH$_4$ as a function of H$_2$ pressure and temperature. Vertical lines represent phase transitions involving only condensed phases, so that there is no pressure dependence for the temperature of transformation. On the contrary, phase transformations related to H$_2$ evolution are represented as sloped curves, because of the pressure-dependence of the temperature of transformation. In order to check the reliability of calculated phase diagram, experimental data on phase transformations are added to the plot. A rather good agreement can be observed for polymorphous transformation and melting.

Concerning thermal decomposition reactions, the comparison between calculated and experimental results is strongly related to a clear description of reaction products. In order to consider different thermal decomposition reactions of LiBH$_4$, stable and metastable phase diagrams have been calculated. In particular, dashed lines in Fig. 3 consider the stable reaction products, i.e. 1/12 Li$_2$B$_{12}$H$_{12}$+$\frac{5}{6}$LiH$\cdot$13/12H$_2$. In this case, Li$_2$B$_{12}$H$_{12}$ is found to be stable in a wide range of temperature and pressures. If the formation of Li$_2$B$_{12}$H$_{12}$ and Li$_2$B$_{10}$H$_{10}$ phases is considered kinetically hindered, they can be rejected from the calculations (continuous lines in Fig. 3), so that the products of the decomposition reaction become LiH$\cdot$B$\cdot$3/2H$_2$. In order to understand the behavior of real systems during thermal decomposition experiments, the following reactions have been studied.

$$\text{LiBH}_4\rightarrow\text{Li}_2\text{B}_{12}\text{H}_{12}\quad\delta 15\beta$$
$$\text{LiBH}_4\rightarrow\text{Li}_2\text{B}_{10}\text{H}_{10}\quad\delta 16\beta$$
$$\text{LiBH}_4\rightarrow\text{LiH}\cdot\text{B}\cdot\text{3}\cdot\text{2H}_2\quad\delta 17\beta$$
$$\text{LiBH}_4\rightarrow\text{Li}^+\text{B}^+\cdot\text{2H}_2\quad\delta 18\beta$$

The Van’t Hoff plot for these decomposition reactions has been calculated and the results are shown in Fig. 4, together with available experimental data. At ambient pressure, the results of Fedneva et al. [35] and of Stasinievich and Egoroennko [16] lie far away from the calculated line for reaction (15). They fairly agree with the calculated metastable decomposition to LiH (reaction (17)), but, when the pressure and temperature are increased, the agreement becomes scarce. This result suggests that during these experiments, as also reported by the authors [16], equilibrium conditions were not fulfilled. Moreover, the experimental results obtained by Mauron et al. [44] show a limited agreement with calculations, approaching the stable decomposition reaction (15) at the highest pressure (about $10^5$ Pa) and temperature, but tend to metastable reaction (17) at ambient pressure and lower temperatures. In fact, in a recently published paper from the

![Graph showing calculated phases stability for LiBH$_4$ as a function of H$_2$ pressure and temperature. Vertical lines represent phase transitions involving only condensed phases.](image-url)
Fig. 3. Calculated reaction enthalpy for possible LiBH₄ decomposition reactions: LiBH₄→Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ [8/6 LiH+13/12H₂ (dashed line ———); LiBH₄→Li₂B₁₂H₁₀ [4/5 LiH+11/12H₂ (dotted line —); LiBH₄→LiH+B₃/2H₂ (con-tinuous line ——); LiBH₄→LiBH₂H₂ (dashed dotted line ——)].

The same group [57], it is suggested that decomposition according to reaction (17) seems kinetically favoured, whereas reaction (15) is kinetically hindered. In fact, in order to promote reaction (15) and overcome the kinetic barrier, the temperature has to be significantly increased. So, even if some uncertainties are related to the thermodynamic stability of Li₂B₁₂H₁₂, because assessed parameters are based only on ab-initio calculations [45], it appears that its formation, even if thermodynamically favoured, must be kinetically hindered.

Since the calculated Van’t Hoff plots for various decomposition reactions lie away from the experimental results [16,35,44], it is unlikely that single decomposition reactions take place during experiments. In fact, even if traces of Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ have been detected in the decomposition products according to reaction (15) [28,46,47], the metastable decomposition reaction (17) is also present [44]. The decomposition reaction (16), leading to Li₂B₁₀H₁₀, is less favoured than reaction (15), but it is close to reaction (17). As a result, as shown in Figure A4 of Appendix: Supplementary data, if the formation of Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ is kinetically hindered, Li₂B₁₀H₁₀ should be the decomposition product at low temperatures, but when the temperature is increased it should be replaced by LiH.

According to the stable phase diagram (Fig. 3), at 1 bar H₂ pressure, Li₂B₁₂H₁₂ should be stable above 500 K and a driving force for reaction (15) should be present above that temperature. This driving force could explain the hydrogen transport detected in LiBH₄ below the melting temperature[58], as well as the small hydrogen release detected during melting [35,39,46]. In fact, at these temperatures, there should be no driving force for the decomposition into LiH according to reaction (17) pathway, so that release of H₂ should not be observed.

Table 3 summarizes the enthalpy and entropy values collected from the literature for selected decomposition reactions. For comparison, Fig. 5 shows the enthalpy of decomposition reactions, calculated as a function of temperature at 1 bar H₂. Discontinuities are due to phase transitions of compounds involved in the reactions. As a general trend, the enthalpy of reactions initially decreases when increasing the temperature, because of the polymorphous transition and melting of the reactant (LiBH₄). The increase in enthalpy observed at 961 K is due to melting of LiH, one of the products of reactions (15, 16 and 17). The value of the enthalpy of reaction (18) at 298 K correctly reproduces the value given in JANAF tables [22]. On the other hand, around 700 K, the enthalpy calculated for reaction (17) is quite different from the value reported in Ref. [44]. It is worth noting that a wide discrepancy is reported for the enthalpy of this reaction: as summarized in Table 3, considering both experimental and calculated values, it varies from 52 to 75 kJ mol⁻¹H₂. In fact, even if several papers attributed the thermal decomposition of LiBH₄ to this reaction pathway, a clear determination of decomposition products is often missing.

Fig. 6 shows the calculated entropy at 1 bar H₂ as a function of temperature for various decomposition reactions. Similarly to the enthalpy behavior reported in Fig. 5, the effect of phase transitions of the compounds involved in the reactions turns out as a decrease in the entropy of dehydrogenation reaction when LiBH₄ undergoes a phase transition or as an increase in the case of a phase transformation of products. Close to room temperature, an

whereas lower values, between 90 and 100 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹H₂, have been obtained for other decomposition reactions. This result can be explained considering the high entropy of dehydrogenation for products of these decomposition reactions.

5. Conclusions
A new assessment of thermodynamic properties of LiBH₄ has been performed after a critical evaluation of available thermodynamic data. This work is an update of JANAF thermochemical tables for LiBH₄, which were not reviewed since 1998. A selection of values for thermodynamic properties of condensed phases (orthorhombic, hexagonal, and liquid) of LiBH₄ have been collected. In particular, literature data for the heat of formation of the compound have been reviewed and the value of 190.4670.21 kJ mol⁻¹ given in JANAF tables [22] has been confirmed. New analytical functions for the Gibbs Free Energy of the condensed phases have been obtained, also in the temperature range outside their stability, and a pressure–temperature phase diagram has been calculated. Possible thermal decomposition reactions of LiBH₄ have been analyzed, evidencing that the direct decomposition into LiH and boron seems kinetically favoured, whereas the stable decomposition reaction via Li₂B₂H₆ is kinetically hindered. The new thermo-dynamic functions may provide relevant insights into the study of LiBH₄ for hydrogen storage purposes. In particular, the developed thermodynamic database for LiBH₄ allows to display phase transitions in working conditions (i.e. pressure and temperature) and to show thermodynamically favoured decomposition products, enabling to distinguish between thermodynamically or kinetically driven reactions.
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