

Supplementary Information for “Differentiable Modeling and Optimization of Battery Electrolyte Mixtures Using Geometric Deep Learning”

Shang Zhu,[†] Bharath Ramsundar,[‡] Emil Annevelink,[†] Hongyi Lin,[†] Adarsh Dave,[†] Pin-Wen Guan^{a,†}, Kevin Gering,[¶] and Venkatasubramanian Viswanathan^{*,†}

[†]*Department of Mechanical Engineering,*

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA

[‡]*Deep Forest Sciences, Palo Alto, California 94306, USA*

[¶]*Energy Storage & Technology, Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415, USA*

E-mail: venkvis@cmu.edu

^aCurrent affiliation: Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California 94550, USA

S1: Baseline Model with Morgan Fingerprints

We further design a purely data-driven baseline model, **MixECFP**, by removing the mixture physics model and replacing the GNNs with Morgan fingerprints.¹ **MixECFP** simply concatenates the fingerprints, compositions, and environment conditions, so it does not include a mixture pooling operator and does not preserve the permutation invariance. Overall, the results of three model variants are shown in Table S 1, **DiffMix**, **GNN-only** and **Mix-**

ECFP. In **MixECFP**, by permuting the sequences of mixture components, the testing MAE increases significantly for all three tasks, preventing its use in real-world applications. Further, **DiffMix** and **GNN-only** outperform **MixECFP** on the model accuracy even without permuting.

Table S 1: Model Performance on Thermodynamic Properties and Ionic Conductivities^a

Task	DiffMix test	GNN-only test	MixECFP test	MixECFP permuted ^c
V_m^E (cm ³ /mol)	0.033±0.009^b	0.090±0.106	0.034±0.008	0.462±0.114
H_m^E (J/mol)	5.10±0.32^b	9.88±2.21	16.97 ± 2.19	365.26 ± 44.53
κ (mS/cm)	0.044±0.005	0.045±0.006	0.105 ± 0.007	22.70 ± 6.62

a. Results are reported by regression mean-absolute-errors (MAEs) (Mean ± Standard Deviation) after running an ensemble of 5 models. *b.* The polynomial order N is 4 in Equation (2) in Main Text. *c.* Permuted loss is generated by permuting input component sequences.

S2: Data Efficiency of DiffMix

The amount and diversity of the data may highly influence the performance of data-driven models. To evaluate the model performances on the datasets of varying sizes, we randomly sampled 10%, 20%, 50%, and 100% of the original thermodynamic datasets and reran the training processes in order to obtain a curve of testing losses against the amount of sampled data. The curve is visualized in Figure S 1 (a) and (b), indicating the deteriorated model accuracy when fewer data were provided. From Figure S 1 (a) and (b), we found that **DiffMix** is more accurate than the **GNN-only** baseline, except for the two most data-limited points in Figure S 1 (a) on excess molar volumes. This may be attributed to the high variances of the model performances.

S3: Physics Capacity Analysis on DiffMix

To further interpret the trained **DiffMix** model on thermodynamic data in this work, we visualize the magnitudes of R-K coefficients $\{C_{RK,ij}^k\}$ varied by the polynomial order number




Figure S 1: (a-b) The testing regression MAEs as a function of the number of training data for (a) excess molar volumes (V_m^E), and (b) excess molar enthalpies (H_m^E). These curves are generated after running an ensemble of 5 models, where the solid lines and shaded areas display the mean values standard deviations of results, respectively.

k , as shown in Figure S 2. Both the results in Figure S 2 (a) and (b) indicate an overall decreasing trend of the R-K coefficients with some fluctuations, where the zeroth order ($k=0$) term plays the most dominant role in the following R-K polynomials.

$$P_m = \sum_{i < j} [x_i x_j \sum_{k=0}^N C_{RK,ij}^k (x_i - x_j)^k] + \sum_i x_i P^i \quad (1)$$

This is consistent with the plateauing pattern of the model performance when increasing the number of polynomials involved (N), where adding higher-order terms does not help improve the model accuracy, as discussed in the main text.




Figure S 2: Magnitudes of R-K Coefficients $\{C_{RK,ij}^k\}$ Varied by the Order Number k , on the Task of (a) Excess Molar Volumes (V_m^E), and (b) Excess Molar Enthalpies (H_m^E). The coefficients are extracted by averaging the values from all data points, including training, validation and testing, as well as from all five models in the ensemble of the model training process (R-K order numbers of these models (N) are set as 15 during training). For the binary systems evaluated in this work, only one series of interaction coefficients $\{C_{RK,12}^k\}$ exists, i.e. between chemical species 1 and chemical species 2.

S4: Differentiable Optimization Results with Fixed Solvent Concentrations

Across Figure 4 (a)-(d) in the main text, we focus on varying solvent composition space while fixing lithium mole fractions. Figure S 3 (a) and (b) further introduce the optimization scenario of fixed solvent compositions and varying salt concentrations. Figure S 3 (a) is created given the DMC:EC ratio of 0.7:0.3, close to the bottom ending point of Figure 4 (c) in the main text, indicating that the optimal lithium mole fraction is around 0.08, agreeing with the value we select in Figure 4 (c) in the main text. **Clio**² further validated the **DiffMix** simulation results in Figure S 3 (b).




Figure S 3: (a) Ionic conductivities (κ , red curve) and their gradients ($\Delta\kappa$, blue curve) with varying lithium concentrations and fixed solvent composition (DMC:EC, 0.7:0.3 mole fraction). (b) Optimization Curve of ionic conductivities with fixed solvent compositions (four initial points Figure 4 (c) in the Main Text), where we include both **DiffMix** results and the robotic experimentation results generated by **Clío**.

Differentiable Optimization Data

In Table S 2, we present the data generated from differentiable optimization and compare the results from both **DiffMix** and **Clío**. These data correspond to Figure 4 (c-d) in the main text. Note that the lithium-ion mole fraction is fixed as 0.08 and the temperature we run **DiffMix** optimization is 30 °C, while the temperature of robotic experimentation is slightly off.

References

- (1) Rogers, D.; Hahn, M. Extended-Connectivity Fingerprints. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* **2010**, *50*, 742–754, PMID: 20426451.
- (2) Dave, A.; Mitchell, J.; Burke, S.; Lin, H.; Whitacre, J.; Viswanathan, V. Autonomous optimization of nonaqueous battery electrolytes via robotic experimentation and machine learning. 2021; <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.14786>.

Table S 2: Differentiable Optimization History^a

batch	step	PC _{mol}	DMC _{mol}	EC _{mol}	κ_{ML} (mS/cm)	κ_{Cllo} (mS/cm)	T_{Cllo} (°C)
1	0	0.8	0.1	0.1	7.33	7.63±0.02	27.16±0
1	1	0.73	0.26	0	9.17	9.41±0.09	27.06±0.02
1	2	0.65	0.35	0	10.37	10.39±0.22	27±0.01
1	3	0.54	0.46	0	11.58	11.65±0.16	26.94±0
1	4	0.4	0.6	0	12.93	12.49±0.01	26.88±0.01
1	5	0.27	0.71	0.03	13.74	12.65±0.05	26.94±0.03
1	6	0.19	0.71	0.1	13.87	13.4±0	27.06±0
1	7	0.13	0.71	0.15	14.06	13.41±0.08	27.13±0.02
1	8	0.06	0.75	0.19	14.14	13.62±0.01	26.99±0.01
1	9	0.06	0.75	0.19	14.14	13.62±0.01	26.99±0.01
2	0	0.1	0.9	0	10.76	11.05±0	26.89±0
2	1	0.06	0.74	0.19	14.16	13.62±0.01	26.99±0.01
2	2	0.06	0.74	0.2	14.16	13.62±0.01	26.99±0.01
2	3	0.06	0.74	0.2	14.16	13.62±0.01	26.99±0.01
2	4	0.06	0.75	0.2	14.16	13.62±0.01	26.99±0.01
2	5	0.06	0.75	0.2	14.16	13.62±0.01	26.99±0.01
3	0	0.3	0.4	0.3	11.65	11.52±0.05	27.42±0.03
3	1	0.26	0.59	0.15	13.25	13.22±0.12	27.53±0.02
3	2	0.2	0.71	0.09	13.86	13.4±0	27.06±0
3	3	0.14	0.71	0.15	14.05	13.41±0.08	27.13±0.02
3	4	0.07	0.71	0.22	14.2	13.69±0.08	27.2±0.01
3	5	0.06	0.71	0.23	14.21	13.69±0.08	27.2±0.01
4	0	0.1	0.4	0.5	12.1	11.62±0.08	26.86±0.02
4	1	0	0.57	0.43	13.88	13.75±0.02	27.01±0.04
4	2	0	0.7	0.3	14.39^b	13.71±0.14	27.2±0.03
4	3	0	0.74	0.26	14.24	13.82±0.04	27.2±0.02
4	4	0	0.73	0.27	14.3	13.82±0.04	27.2±0.02
4	5	0	0.73	0.27	14.33	13.82±0.04	27.2±0.02

a. Results are reported for four trajectories corresponding to Figure 4 (c-d) in the main text. The lithium mole fraction is fixed at 0.08. κ_{ML} is **DiffMix** output with temperature set at 30 °C. *b.* Highest κ_{ML} from **DiffMix** optimization, with **AEM**³ verification of 14.2 (mS/cm) at the optimal lithium mole fraction of 0.082 to 0.085 with the given PC:DMC:EC ratio.

- (3) Gering, K. L. Prediction of Electrolyte Conductivity: Results from a Generalized Molecular Model Based on Ion Solvation and a Chemical Physics Framework. *Electrochimica Acta* **2017**, *225*, 175–189.