Role of hydrophobic anode MPL in controlling water crossover in DMFC
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A B S T R A C T

The importance of reducing water crossover from anode to cathode in a direct methanol fuel cell (DMFC) has been well documented, especially if highly concentrated methanol fuel is to be used. A low-α membrane electrode assembly (MEA) with thin membrane is key to achieving this goal. The low water crossover from anode to cathode for these types of MEAs has traditionally been attributed to the use of a hydrophobic cathode micro-porous layer (MPL). However, it has recently been discovered that a hydrophobic anode MPL also reduces the water crossover, possibly even more significantly than a hydrophobic cathode MPL. In this work, we develop and use a 1D, two-phase transport model that accounts for capillary-induced liquid flow in porous media to explain how a hydrophobic anode MPL controls the water crossover from anode to cathode. We further show that a lower water crossover can lead to a lower methanol crossover via dilution of methanol in the anode catalyst layer. Finally, we perform a parametric study and show that a thicker anode MPL with greater hydrophobicity and lower permeability is more effective in reducing the water crossover.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In recent years, direct methanol fuel cells (DMFCs) have become a leading contender to replace the lithium-ion (Li-ion) battery as the workhorse power source for mobile devices. Primary reasons for the great attention to DMFC technology include the potential for higher energy density than Li-ion batteries (the theoretical energy density of methanol (MeOH) is ~4800 Wh l−1 compared with ~1000–1500 Wh l−1 for Li-ion batteries [1]), simple fuel storage, no need for fuel reforming or cell humidification, and simple cell design [2–4]. However, in order to become a viable contender with Li-ion batteries, DMFC designs must first increase their practical energy density in Wh l−1. A key to accomplishing this task is the use of highly concentrated methanol fuel.

The basic half-cell and overall reactions for a DMFC are given by Eq. (1). In the methanol oxidation reaction (MOR), Eq. (1a), 1 mole of H2O reacts with 1 mole of CH3OH. In the cathode catalyst layer (cCL), H2O is produced both via the oxygen reduction reaction (ORR), Eq. (1b), and by crossed-over CH3OH via the overall reaction, Eq. (1c).

CH3OH + H2O → 6H+ + 6e− + CO2 (anode)  (1a)

6H+ + 6e− + (3/2)O2 ↔ 3H2O (cathode)  (1b)

CH3OH + (3/2)O2 → 2H2O + CO2 (overall)  (1c)

The fact that H2O and CH3OH react stoichiometrically 1:1 in the anode catalyst layer (aCL) is the reason that water management in DMFCs is critically important in order to use high concentration methanol fuel. In order to operate in steady-state, a high concentration methanol fuel cell (HC-MFC) must have a back-flux of water from cathode to anode, as fully elucidated by Wang and co-workers [5–7].

Defining a net water transport coefficient, α, as the net H2O flux across the membrane (from anode to cathode) normalized by the protonic flux provides a convenient way to characterize the water transport in DMFCs.

α = H2O − F
Mem
(7)

Blum et al. [8] proposed a DMFC operating at a water-neutral state, whereby all water needed for the anode MOR is supplied by back-flux from the cathode. In such a design, α = −1/6, and theoretically such a cell could operate on neat methanol fuel. Wang and co-workers [5–7] further showed that in order to use even 3 M methanol fuel, a maximum of α ≈ 3 is allowed; any higher and the cell will run short of water before methanol. This is a startling finding in light of the fact that the 3 M fuel is only roughly 10% methanol by volume, and that it is very common for DMFCs not using low-α MEAs to have α ≈ 3. The point of low water crossover being critical to the use of highly concentrated MeOH fuel is clearly evident.

Abbreviations: DMFC, direct methanol fuel cell; EOD, electro-osmotic drag; HC-MFC, high concentration methanol fuel cell; Li-ion, lithium-ion; MCO, methanol crossover ratio; MEA, membrane electrode assembly; MOR, methanol oxidation reaction; ORR, oxygen reduction reaction.
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from Fig. 1, which gives the maximum MeOH fuel concentration as a function of the net water transport coefficient required for steady-state operation. This plot, an extension of the table presented by Liu et al. [6] based on a mass balance analysis on the anode, illustrates that as $\alpha$ becomes smaller, an equivalent reduction in $\alpha$ becomes more effective. This is evident by the steeper slope of the curves as $\alpha \rightarrow -1/6$. In this figure, the methanol crossover ratio (MCO) is used to quantify the crossover to the cathode:

$$\text{MCO} = \frac{I_{\text{xover}}}{I + I_{\text{xover}}} = 1 - n_{\text{fuel}}$$

Fig. 1. Maximum methanol fuel concentration vs. net water transport coefficient ($\alpha$) for steady-state operation.

Lu et al. [5] and Liu et al. [6] further demonstrated that by using a thin Nafion® 112 membrane along with hydrophobic anode and cathode micro-porous layers (MPLs), they could reduce water crossover to $\alpha \sim 0.6$–0.8 at 60°C while still maintaining a high fuel efficiency ($\sim 80$–90%), cell voltage ($\sim 0.4$V), and power density ($\sim 60$ mW cm$^{-2}$). This type of membrane electrode assembly (MEA) design was first proposed by Lim and Wang [9] and is now commonly referred to as a “low-$\alpha$ MEA”. Low-$\alpha$ MEAs have been implemented in various forms by a number of researchers [5–7,9–17].

Within the low-$\alpha$ MEA literature, it has been traditionally believed that a hydrophobic cathode micro-porous layer (cMPL) is the most effective way by which to reduce $\alpha$ via increasing the liquid pressure in the cCL, thereby forcing a back-flow of water to the anode [5–7,9,10,12–15]. However, Liu [16,17] discovered experimentally that a hydrophobic aMPL also plays a significant role in reducing $\alpha$; using two otherwise identical Nafion® 112-based MEAs with and without hydrophobic aMPL, Liu [16,17] showed $\alpha \sim 0.3$ and $\alpha \sim 1.2$, respectively. Park et al. [11] confirmed this finding by demonstrating a drop in $\alpha$ from $\sim 3.5$ to $\sim 1.1$ by simply including a hydrophobic aMPL in their Nafion® 1135-based MEA design. It is worth mentioning that many of the conclusions drawn from the modeling results presented in this work are in agreement with the experimental work of Liu [16,17].

The primary purpose of this work is to put forth a theoretical framework of how a hydrophobic anode MPL helps to reduce the water crossover through a low-$\alpha$ MEA with, e.g. thin Nafion® 112 membrane. In doing so we develop and use a 1D, two-phase transport model for the MEA sandwich that accounts for capillary-induced liquid flow in porous media. We further unveil that a lower $\alpha$ can lead to lower methanol crossover due to a dilution effect in the aCL. Finally, through a parametric study we illustrate how a thicker aMPL with greater hydrophobicity and lower permeability can be tailored to further reduce $\alpha$.

2. Model

The model presented in the following sections is an extension of a 1D model previously presented by Liu [18]. Major expansions beyond the work [18] include: (1) incorporation of a saturation jump model; (2) incorporation of a cathode mixed potential electrochemistry model; (3) explicit treatment of CLs as zones of finite thickness rather than infinitely thin interfaces; (4) incorporation of an MPL model; (5) the ability to model the transition between a single- and a two-phase region. The addition of the saturation jump model and explicit treatment of the MPLs and CLs are critically important in allowing us to explain the hydrophobic aMPL effect on water crossover, as will be discussed in the sections that follow.

2.1. Basic model setup and assumptions

In a two-phase region on the anode side of the cell, the species fluxes in the anode regions to the current density by simply utilizing the MOR given by Eq. (1a). The resultant species fluxes are given in Table 1. On the cathode side of the cell, the species fluxes are coupled with the cathode potential based on the detailed reac-

Fig. 2. Geometry of 1D DMFC model.
Table 1
Species fluxes for 1D DMFC model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Species fluxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aBL, aMPL</td>
<td>$N^{\text{MeOH}}<em>0(x) = N^{\text{MeOH}}</em>{\text{Mem}} + \frac{i}{F} + N^{\text{H}_2\text{O}}_0(x) = N^{\text{H}<em>2\text{O}}</em>{\text{Mem}} + \frac{i}{F}$; $N^{\text{O}_2}(x) = \frac{i}{F}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aCL</td>
<td>$N^{\text{MeOH}}<em>0(x) = N^{\text{MeOH}}</em>{\text{Mem}} + \frac{i}{F} + N^{\text{H}_2\text{O}}_0(x) = N^{\text{H}<em>2\text{O}}</em>{\text{Mem}} + \frac{i}{F}$; $N^{\text{O}_2}(x) = \frac{i}{F}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cCL</td>
<td>$N^{\text{MeOH}}<em>0(x) = \left[ N^{\text{MeOH}}</em>{\text{Mem}} + \frac{\partial \text{MeOH}}{\partial x} \right]<em>x - \text{MeOH}</em>{aCL;k,MeOH} + \frac{\partial \text{MeOH}}{\partial x} \left( x - \text{MeOH}_{aCL;k,MeOH} \right)$; $N^{\text{H}_2\text{O}}_0(x) = \left[ N^{\text{H}<em>2\text{O}}</em>{\text{Mem}} + \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{O}}{\partial x} \right]_x - \text{H}<em>2\text{O}</em>{aCL;k,H_2O} + \frac{\partial \text{H}_2\text{O}}{\partial x} \left( x - \text{H}<em>2\text{O}</em>{aCL;k,H_2O} \right)$; $N^{\text{O}_2}(x) = \frac{i}{F}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cMPL, cBL</td>
<td>$N^{\text{MeOH}}_0(x) = 0$; $N^{\text{H}_2\text{O}}_0(x) = N^{\text{H}<em>2\text{O}}</em>{\text{cMPL,cBL};k,H_2O}; N^{\text{O}_2}(x) = N^{\text{O}<em>2}</em>{\text{cMPL,cBL};k,O_2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
We take a similar approach to vapor-phase MeOH in the cCL where MeOH is present from membrane crossover. We model the liquid-phase transport again using the Stefan–Maxwell equation, resulting in the following expression which is solved for liquid MeOH concentration.

\[
\frac{c_{\text{MeOH}} \cdot V_{\text{H}_2 \text{O}}}{c_{\text{MeOH}} - c_{\text{MeOH}, \text{H}_2 \text{O}}} \left( \frac{d c_{\text{MeOH}}}{d x} \right) = -\frac{D_{\text{MeOH}}}{k_f} \frac{d c_{\text{MeOH}}}{d x}
\]

\[= N_{\text{MeOH}}(x) \quad (11)\]

### 2.5. Liquid flow model

In the porous media of the fuel cell anode and cathode, there exists liquid flow driven by capillary forces. In this work we follow the theory presented in detail by Pasaogullari and Wang [19,20], and Nam and Kaviany [21], where Darcy’s law is used to model the liquid flow through the porous media. In Darcy’s law, the liquid flux is proportional to the negative of the gradient in liquid pressure; defining the capillary pressure as \( p_c \) and noting that we assume the gas phase pressure to be uniform over the porous media, we end up with an expression yielding the liquid flux proportional to the gradient in capillary pressure. Further, using the Leverett function to relate the capillary pressure to the liquid saturation, we end up with the following 1D expression:

\[ \frac{\partial N_l}{\partial x} \cdot (K_r) \left( \sigma \cos \theta \right) \frac{d \sigma}{d x} = N_l(x) \quad (12) \]

In the 1D model, we solve Eq. (12) for the liquid saturation. Note that wherever liquid MeOH is present, the liquid flux is equal to the sum of the liquid MeOH and \( H_2 O \) fluxes.

At the interface of two distinct porous layers (e.g. aBL and aMPL), the capillary pressure remains uniform across the interface [20,21]. As a result, a saturation jump model is implemented at those interfaces (given here for two generic adjacent layers A and B):

\[ p_{c,A} = p_{c,B} \quad (13a) \]

\[ \sigma \cos(\theta_A) \left( \frac{E_A}{K_A} \right)^{1/2} f(\rho_{\text{int},A}) = \sigma \cos(\theta_B) \left( \frac{E_B}{K_B} \right)^{1/2} f(\rho_{\text{int},B}) \quad (13b) \]

### 2.6. Electrochemistry model

In our model the transport equations are coupled to the cathode electrochemistry model via the flux terms, as given in Table 1. The cathode electrochemistry model is based on the detailed reaction mechanism given by Liu and Wang [12] which accounts for the mixed potential in the cCL caused by the crossed-over MeOH. In order to implement this in the 1D model, we split the cCL into two regions: where MeOH is still present from crossover \( x < x_o \) and where MeOH is not present \( x > x_o \). The average volumetric reaction current densities for MOR and ORR, \( j_{\text{MOR}} \) and \( j_{\text{ORR}} \), and the average volumetric chemical reaction rate, \( r_{\text{chem}} \), are defined in the region \( x < x_o \). As part of this model, we calculate \( \eta_o, j_{\text{MOR}}, j_{\text{ORR}}, \) and \( r_{\text{chem}} \) from the following expressions, with all quantities...
defined by their average values in the cCL:

\[ n_c = \frac{RT}{\alpha F} \ln \left( \frac{j_{\text{ORR}}^{\text{ref}} c_{\text{MeOH}}^{\text{G,ref}}}{j_{\text{ORR}}^{\text{ref}} c_{\text{MeOH}}^{\text{G}}} \frac{1}{1 - s} \right) \]  

(14)

\[ j_{\text{ORR}} = 6aFk_4 \exp \left( \frac{(1 - \beta_4)FCV}{RT} \right) \beta CO_{\text{MeOH}} \]  

(15)

\[ j_{\text{MOR}} = \frac{i}{\delta_{\text{CCL}}} + j_{\text{ORR}} \]  

(16)

\[ \rho_{\text{chem}} = aK_{\text{MeOH}} \exp \left( \frac{1}{c_{\text{O}_2}} \right) \]  

(17)

We take the equations for the CO and OH surface coverages directly from Ref. [12]:

\[ \theta_{\text{CO}} = \frac{b}{k_2} \exp [a_2 F CV_{\text{f}} / RT] \]  

(18)

\[ \theta_{\text{OH}} = \frac{k_1 \exp (-\beta F CV_{\text{f}} / RT)}{\delta / \delta_{\text{CCL}}} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{1 - \beta_1 F CV_{\text{f}} / RT}{k_1 \exp (-\beta F CV_{\text{f}} / RT)} \right] \right] \]  

(19)

\[ \rho = \frac{b}{(k_1 \exp (-\beta F CV_{\text{f}} / RT))} \exp \left( \frac{1 - \beta_1 F CV_{\text{f}} / RT}{k_1 \exp (-\beta F CV_{\text{f}} / RT)} \right) \]  

(20)

Note that in these expressions, \( \psi_c \) is the average cathode potential in the cCL, which can be expressed as

\[ \psi_c = n_c + U_{\text{ORR}}^{\text{ref}} \]  

(21)

As illustrated in Table 1 the species flux terms in the cCL (which are essentially the source terms in the transport equations) are obviously functions of the reaction rates given by Eqs. (15)–(17). The reaction rates given by Eqs. (15)–(17) (and complimentary Eqs. (14) and (18)–(20)) are likewise functions of the cCL species concentrations. Hence, the cathode electrochemistry and transport models are coupled, and must be solved simultaneously. It is worth noting that while our cathode electrochemistry model is based on that of Liu and Wang [12], the way we implement it in our model is somewhat different. The anode electrochemistry and transport models are not coupled because we assume a uniform reaction rate in the anode and calculate the anode overpotential after the transport problem has been solved. Hence, we end up with \( i \) (current density) in the anode flux terms (see Table 1), which is an input to the model. Because we only present results from the transport model in this work, further details of the anode electrochemistry model are not needed.

2.7. Boundary conditions

The MeOH and O2 concentration boundary conditions (at the BL/flow channel interface) are estimated based on a simple 1D mass balance analysis of the flow channel:

\[ c_{\text{MeOH}}^{\text{G}} |_{\text{anode boundary}} = c_{\text{MeOH}}^{\text{G,0}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2 \xi_{\text{a}} (\text{ref} / \text{a})} \right] \]  

(22)

\[ c_{\text{O}_2}^{\text{G}} |_{\text{cathode boundary}} = c_{\text{O}_2}^{\text{G,b}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2 \xi (\text{ref} / \text{c})} \right] \]  

(23)

The anode and cathode liquid saturation boundary conditions are assumed as

\[ s_{\text{anode}} = 0.8 \]  

(24)

\[ s_{\text{cathode boundary}} = \begin{cases} 0.1 & i < 1000 \text{A/m}^2 \\ 0.1 \left( \frac{i}{1000 \text{A/m}^2} \right)^{1.5} & i > 1000 \text{A/m}^2 \end{cases} \]  

(25)

2.8. Numerical implementation and solution

In the 1D model, the anode and cathode are coupled by the membrane model. Further, due to the detailed cathode mixed potential model, the transport, liquid flow, and cathode electrochemistry models are coupled. In the solution procedure, all differential equations are differenced using a backwards-differencing scheme. Further, we implement an iterative scheme which calculates the required membrane fluxes and coupled reaction rates using a hybrid secant/bi-section method. Based on the iterative values of these parameters, we solve the transport and liquid saturation problem utilizing a Gauss–Seidel iteration method. The entire system is iterated until converged; strict error tolerances are used for each variable individually, and residuals are checked to ensure convergence.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Hydrophobic anode MPL effect

Table 3 gives the baseline DMFC parameters used in this study. Fig. 3(a) illustrates the net water transport coefficient versus cell current density, and Fig. 3(b) gives the EOD, diffusion, and hydraulic-permeation components for each variable individually, and residuals are checked to ensure convergence.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_{\text{aMPL}} ) (( \mu \text{m} ))</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_{\text{aBL}} ) (( \mu \text{m} ))</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_{\text{aCL}} ) (( \mu \text{m} ))</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_{\text{aMPL}} ) (( \mu \text{m} ))</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_{\text{aBL}} ) (( \mu \text{m} ))</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilon_{\text{aMPL}} )</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilon_{\text{aBL}} )</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \epsilon_{\text{aCL}} )</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa_{\text{aMPL}} ) (\text{m}^2)</td>
<td>1.0 \times 10^{-14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa_{\text{aBL}} ) (\text{m}^2)</td>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-15}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa_{\text{aCL}} ) (\text{m}^2)</td>
<td>3.6 \times 10^{-16}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa_{\text{aMPL}} ) (\text{m}^2)</td>
<td>4.0 \times 10^{-20}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_{\text{aMPL}} )</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_{\text{aBL}} )</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_{\text{aCL}} )</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T (\text{K}) )</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho (\text{Pa}) )</td>
<td>101,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho_{\text{H}_2} (\text{M}) )</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \psi_{\text{c}} ) (\text{A/cm}^2)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \psi_{\text{c}} ) (\text{A/cm}^2)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

gradient of liquid pressure across the membrane. The liquid saturation profiles given in Fig. 4 for various current densities help to explain physically how the hydrophobic aMPL causes this considerable reduction in α. At each of the three current densities, the liquid saturation level is lower in the aCL with the hydrophobic aMPL present. This reduction in aCL saturation acts to both reduce the EOD coefficient and increase the difference in water content across the membrane, thereby increasing back diffusion from cathode to anode.

Note that the lower liquid saturation level in the aCL is caused by the hydrophobic nature of the aMPL in the following manner. The saturation level in the aMPL is far lower than in the aBL due to the saturation jump. At a lower saturation level, the liquid-phase relative permeability is much lower in Darcy’s law, Eq. (12) (see Table 2, in this work, we have assumed $k_r = s^4$); this ultimately causes a significantly larger drop in saturation over the aMPL thickness when compared with an equivalent length aBL section. This large drop in liquid saturation over the thickness of the aMPL ultimately leads to
a significantly different capillary pressure, \( p_c \), at the aCL interface, as compared with only aBL present. As per Eqs. (13a) and (13b), this different capillary pressure leads to a reduced saturation level in the aCL. It is therefore the saturation jump at the aBL/aMPL interface coupled with the low liquid-phase permeability at low saturation (in the aMPL) that lead to the low aCL saturation, and the reduction in \( \alpha \) as described.

From Fig. 5 we see that in addition to reducing the water crossover, a hydrophobic aMPL also slightly reduces the methanol crossover to the cathode. At any given current density, it is evident from Fig. 5 that the MCO is lower with hydrophobic aMPL present, i.e. the fuel efficiency is higher. This is a direct consequence of the dilution effect a lower \( \alpha \) has on the methanol concentration in the aCL, as further illustrated by Fig. 6, which shows the methanol and H\(_2\)O liquid concentration profiles in the anode with and without hydrophobic aMPL at \( i = 150 \text{ mA cm}^{-2} \). Here we see that with the hydrophobic aMPL present, the methanol concentration is less than, and the H\(_2\)O concentration is greater than without aMPL. From Eq. (6) we see that the EOD and diffusion components of MeOH crossover are both increasing functions of the methanol concentration in the aCL, and hence it is clear that the dilution effect causes a lower MCO.

It is further important to note from Fig. 6 that even though the liquid H\(_2\)O concentration profile increases towards the membrane, it does not imply that there is a net flux of H\(_2\)O towards the anode flow channel. Indeed, there is a diffusion flux towards the anode flow channel (negative \( x \)-direction). However, due to the capillary-induced liquid flow, there is an advection of liquid towards the aCL, and hence net H\(_2\)O transport is still towards the aCL (positive \( x \)-direction). Obviously, due to the binary nature of the liquid methanol/water mixture, where the concentration of H\(_2\)O is greater, the concentration of methanol must necessarily be less.

### 3.2. Parametric study—effect of anode MPL properties

#### 3.2.1. Contact angle

Fig. 7 shows the \( \alpha \) versus current density curves for a cell with baseline parameters except with varying aMPL contact angle. It is evident that a higher contact angle (i.e. more hydrophobic to methanol–water solutions) yields a lower water crossover, with \( \alpha \) ranging from \( \sim 1.3 \)–1.6 for \( \theta_{\text{aMPL}} = 110^\circ \) to \( \sim 0.1 \)–0.2 for \( \theta_{\text{aMPL}} = 125^\circ \) in the current density range of \( i = 150–200 \text{ mA cm}^{-2} \). Fig. 8 illustrates that the greater hydrophobicity acts to increase the saturation jump at the aBL/aMPL interface, thereby reducing the saturation level in the aMPL. As described in the previous section, this lower aMPL saturation level ultimately acts to reduce the liquid saturation level in the aCL, thereby reducing \( \alpha \).

It is worth noting in Eq. (12) that a larger contact angle directly acts to reduce the gradient in saturation for a given liquid flux, which would theoretically lead to a higher aCL saturation level.
Fig. 9. Net water transport coefficient ($\alpha$) vs. cell current density for anode micro-porous layer (aMPL) permeabilities $k_{aMPL} = 1.5 \times 10^{-15}, 2.0 \times 10^{-15}, 2.5 \times 10^{-15},$ and $3.0 \times 10^{-15}$ m$^2$.

Fig. 10. Liquid saturation profiles for anode micro-porous layer (aMPL) permeabilities $k_{aMPL} = 1.5 \times 10^{-15}, 2.0 \times 10^{-15}, 2.5 \times 10^{-15},$ and $3.0 \times 10^{-15}$ m$^2$; $i = 150$ mA cm$^{-2}$.

However, as evidenced by Figs. 7 and 8, this effect is secondary to the contact angle effect on saturation jump at the aBL/aMPL interface, and the mechanism for lower aCL saturation as described in Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Permeability

Fig. 9 shows the $\alpha$ versus current density profile for baseline cell parameters, except for variable aMPL permeability. This plot shows that a lower permeability leads to a reduction in $\alpha$, which is seen to be $\sim 1-1.25$ for $k_{aMPL} = 3.0 \times 10^{-15}$ m$^2$, and $0.025-0.04$ for $k_{aMPL} = 1.5 \times 10^{-15}$ m$^2$ for $i = 150-200$ mA cm$^{-2}$. Fig. 10 shows that the greatest effect of smaller aMPL permeability is in reducing the saturation level in the aMPL and a corresponding reduction in the aCL. Note from Eq. (12) that a reduced aMPL permeability also acts to increase the saturation gradient in the aMPL, which ultimately reduces the saturation in the aCL. However, once again this effect is secondary to the influence of lower permeability on saturation level in the aMPL via interfacial saturation jump, and hence lower liquid-phase relative permeability.

3.2.3. Thickness

Finally, Figs. 11 and 12 show the $\alpha$ versus current density and saturation profile plots for MEAs with baseline parameters, but with different aMPL thicknesses. From Fig. 11 we see that a thicker aMPL acts to reduce $\alpha$, being $\sim 0.4-0.52$ for aMPL thickness of 15 $\mu$m, and $\sim 0.12-0.2$ for aMPL thickness of 30 $\mu$m, again for $i = 150-200$ mA cm$^{-2}$. As shown in Fig. 12, the aMPL thickness obviously does not affect the saturation jump at the aBL/aMPL interface, but it does reduce the saturation level in the aCL simply due to the fact that it creates a longer distance over which the liquid must be transported.

4. Conclusions

We have used a 1D, two-phase transport model that accounts for capillary-induced liquid flow in porous media to study the water transport characteristics of a Nafion® 112-based low-$\alpha$ MEA for DMFCs. Specifically, we have physically described how a hydrophobic aMPL acts to reduce the water crossover to the cathode. Our model shows that this is accomplished primarily by lower electroosmotic drag and enhanced back diffusion, both due to lower liquid saturation in the aCL. Further, it is shown that via dilution of methanol in the aCL, the lower $\alpha$ caused by hydrophobic aMPL reduces the MCO (i.e. increases the fuel efficiency). Finally, a detailed parametric study has demonstrated that an aMPL with higher hydrophobicity, lower permeability, and greater thickness acts to reduce the amount of water crossover to the cathode. The lowered water crossover will in turn enable the direct use of higher concentration methanol fuel in the DMFC anode, as demonstrated in Refs. [7,15].
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Appendix A. Nomenclature

- $a$: specific reaction area
- $\alpha$: net water transport coefficient
- $\alpha_e$: ORR cathodic charge transfer coefficient
- $\beta$: kinetic parameter for chemical reaction
- $\beta_4$: kinetic rate parameter for MOR
- $c_{\psi}^q$: molar concentration of species $\psi$ in phase $q$
- $c_{\psi,a}^q$: molar concentration of species $\psi$ at inlet of flow channel
- $c_{H_2O}^{\text{sat}}$: saturated gas-phase molar concentration of H$_2$O
- $c_q^\delta$: total molar concentration of phase $q$
- $D_{\psi_1,\psi_2}^q$: diffusivity of species $\psi_1$ and $\psi_2$ in phase $q$
- $D_{\psi}^{\text{Mem}}$: diffusivity for species $\psi$ in the membrane
- $\delta$: thickness
- $\eta$: Faraday's constant
- $\gamma$: kinetic parameter for chemical reaction
- $\eta$: efficiency; overpotential
- $i$: current density
- $j_{\text{ORR}}$: volumetric ORR rate in cathode catalyst layer
- $j_{\text{MOR}}$: volumetric MOR rate in cathode catalyst layer
- $J$: Leverett function
- $k_H$: Henry constant
- $k_l$: liquid-phase relative permeability
- $k_4$: kinetic rate parameter for MOR
- $K$: rate coefficient for MOR
- $K_e$: chemical reaction rate coefficient
- $k$: permeability
- $\lambda$: water content
- $M$: molecular weight
- $\mu$: viscosity
- $n_d^\psi$: electro-osmotic drag coefficient for species $\psi$
- $N_{\psi}^D$: superficial flux of species $\psi$ in all phases
- $N_{\psi}^{\phi}$: superficial flux of species $\psi$ in phases $q$
- $N_{\psi}^{\text{Mem}}$: superficial flux of species $\psi$ across the membrane
- $p$: pressure
- $\theta$: contact angle; surface coverage
- $r_{\text{chem}}$: volumetric chemical reaction rate in cathode CL
- $R$: universal gas constant
- $\rho$: density
- $s$: liquid saturation (i.e. volume fraction of liquid in the pore space)
- $\sigma$: surface tension
- $T$: temperature
- $U_{\text{ORR}}^a$: equilibrium potential of oxygen reduction reaction
- $V_c$: cathode potential

Superscript

- $\text{Mem}$: membrane

Subscripts

- $a$: anode
- $c$: cathode; capillary
diff: diffusion
eff: effective
- $f$: fuel
- $g$: gas
- $HP$: hydraulic pressure
- $l$: liquid
- Mem: membrane
- ref: reference
- $t$: total
- $x$: coordinate
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