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The energy density presents the core competitiveness of lithium (Li)-ion batteries. In conventional Li-ion batteries, the utilization of the gravimetric/volumetric energy density at the electrode level is unsatisfactory (<84 wt% and <62 vol%, respectively) due to the existence of non-electrochemical active parts among the 3D porous electrodes, including electrolytes, binders, and carbon additives. These are regarded as indispensable and irreducible components of the electronic and ionic transport network. Here, a dense “all-electrochem-active” (AEA) electrode for all-solid-state Li batteries is proposed, which is entirely constructed from a family of superior mixed electronic–ionic-conducting active materials.

1. Introduction

The pursuit of high energy density and a safe working process remains a topic of interest in the field of energy storage devices. Following a lengthy competition, lithium (Li)-ion batteries have come to dominate almost all the critical applications, including consumer electronic devices, electric transportation, and electric grid energy storage.[1,2] Compared with the early Li-ion batteries produced by Sony in the 1990s (80 W h kg⁻¹, 200 W h L⁻¹ [LiCoO₂/C]),[3] the energy densities of the state-of-the-art Li-ion batteries have increased more than threefold (~300 W h kg⁻¹ [NCM811/Si–C], ~700 W h L⁻¹ [LiCoO₂/C]).[4,5] However, it is alarming that the energy density of the current type Li-ion batteries is very close to the limit.[6] The energy density at the electrode level is not only determined by the theoretical energy density of the electrochemical couples (energy density = average voltage × specific capacity) but is also highly sensitive to the weight fraction of the inactive components.[7,8] In addition, the binder and any conductive additives, especially the filling electrolyte, not only limit the energy density but also involve various security issues. As such, a number of research studies and technologies have been aimed at reducing the fraction of the inactive mass or volume; however, the attendant strategy is, at best, borderline.

In fact, only one case overcomes this barrier, that is, the Li metal anode. The absence of inactive additives and the high energy density (Li⁰ → Li⁺ + e⁻, 3860 mA h g⁻¹, 2061 mA h L⁻¹) ensure it is a prominent representative electrode.[9,10] In fact, the Li metal anode can be regarded as an “all-electrochem-active” (AEA) anode. However, on the cathode side, the realization of an AEA is primarily limited by its insufficient electronic conductivity (10⁻⁴–10⁻¹⁰ S cm⁻¹), which is over five orders of magnitude lower than the conductive carbon black (=10 S cm⁻¹).[11,12] and its sluggish Li-ion diffusion coefficient (D_Li) (10⁻¹⁰–10⁻¹⁵ cm² s⁻¹) that is much smaller than the liquid 1 M LiPF₆ in dimethyl carbonate–ethylene carbonate electrolytes (≈2 × 10⁻⁶ cm² s⁻¹).[13] To guarantee a well interconnected electronic–ionic network, the porous 3D electrode structure of the traditional Li-ion cathode must be uniformly filled with the conductive additive (carbon black), the polymer binder, and the liquid electrolytes, the total weight and volume fractions of which are >10 wt% and >30 vol%, respectively[15–17] (see the detailed information in Tables S1 and S2, Supporting Information).

The equivalent specific capacity (ESC = C/mₑlec, C is the capacity of the cathode and mₑlec = mₑlec + m_binder + m_binder + m_electrolyte)
$m_{\text{electrolyte-in-the-electrode}} + m_{\text{conductive-additive}}$ is defined to assess the capacity of the electrode, accounting for the overall impacts of the active cathode and the non-active parts, including the binder, carbon black, and electrolyte filling in the electrode. Based on the ESC, we can obtain the energy density of the electrode ($EG_{\text{electrode}} = ESC \times V$, where $V$ is the discharge voltage). This indicates that the above compromises dilute the electrode-level energy density by at least 16%. Compared with the liquid-electrolyte-based electrode, the solid-state electrolyte (SSE)-based electrodes perform better in terms of security; however, perhaps unsurprisingly, they exhibit a lower $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ due to their higher densities (oxide-based electrolyte: 2.93–5.07 g cm$^{-3}$, sulfide (S)-based electrolytes: 1.87–1.97 g cm$^{-3}$, PEO-based: 1.2–1.25 g cm$^{-3}$) and far more SSEs are required to ensure physical contact. According to the existing data, the weight fraction of cathode materials in all-solid-state Li batteries (ASSLBs) is less than 80 wt% (Figure 1d,e, see the detailed information in Tables S1–S3, Supporting Information), which results in low $ESC_{\text{electrode}}$ (0.8 × specific capacity) for this type of battery. In ASSLBs, it is theoretically possible to achieve an AEA electrode if the Li-containing cathode has high enough ionic and electronic conductivity, where the electrode is 100% occupied by active cathode materials and the Li-ion and electron transportation is self-actuating (Figure 1c).

2. The Concept of AEA Electrodes

In conventional Li-ion cathodes, the Li-ions reach the cathode through the electrolyte and electrons from the external circuit to the cathode and react at the three-phase interface (carbon/electrolyte/electroactive mass). However, it is significant that the Li-ion and electron transportation self-relies on the all-in-one active electrode in our proposed AEA electrodes, the weight and volume percentages of which can increase to 100% and 89% (porosity 11%), respectively, in the electrode. To realize our idea, the ideal AEA candidates should have fast Li-ion transportability (alternative to electrolyte), high electronic conductivity (alternative to the conductive additive), and abundant Li storage sites (electrochemical active capacity). Furthermore, the ideal candidate would have a stable fixing structure with a low fluctuation of ionic and electronic conductivity that varies according to Li-ion concentration.

Following careful screening, a series of conductive transition metal sulfides caught our attention. In previous works, pure amorphous transition metal sulfide cathodes were used as the electrode ASSLBs. However, their electronic conductivity ($\approx 10^{-3}$ S cm$^{-1}$) is four orders of magnitude lower than carbon ($\approx 10$ S cm$^{-1}$), and their ionic conductivity is not particularly stable during the charge-discharge process. In our work, we selected crystal transition metal sulfides,
namely, layer-structured TiS$_2$ and chevrel-phase Mo$_6$S$_8$, which not only have a very stable host structure but also high electronic conductivity.\cite{33} Mo$_6$S$_8$ and TiS$_2$ have a high electronic conductivity, which is over 3–6 orders of magnitude higher than that of the typical cathode materials (NMC532 and carbon-coated LiFePO$_4$), and comparable to the commercial conductive carbon (Super P) (Figure 2a, see the detailed information in Table S4, Supporting Information). These superhigh electronically conducting TiS$_2$ and Mo$_6$S$_8$ materials allow for eliminating the conductive carbon in the electrode. In addition, Mo$_6$S$_8$ and TiS$_2$ have a high Li-ion diffusion coefficient of 1.8–9.8 $\times$ $10^{-8}$ and 8 $\times$ $10^{-9}$ to 9 $\times$ $10^{-10}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$ (see the detailed information in Figure S1, Supporting Information),\cite{25,34,35} which is comparable to that of SSEs (Li$_{10}$GeP$_2$S$_{12}$, 8.8–9 $\times$ $10^{-8}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$, Li$_{10}$SiP$_2$S$_{12}$, 7–7.2 $\times$ $10^{-8}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$, Li$_{6.25}$Al$_{0.25}$La$_3$Zr$_2$O$_{12}$, 1–1.1 $\times$ $10^{-8}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$), and far higher than that of the conventional commercial cathodes (LiFePO$_4$: 6.8 $\times$ $10^{-16}$ to 1.8 $\times$ $10^{-15}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$, NMC: 2.8–8 $\times$ $10^{-11}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$, LiCoO$_2$: 10$^{-11}$ to 10$^{-12}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$) (Figure 2b, see the detailed information in Table S5, Supporting Information).\cite{36–45} As such, they can serve as solid-state electrolytes rather than filling electrolytes in the electrodes. Meanwhile, the intercalation compounds of Mo$_6$S$_8$ and TiS$_2$ enable Li-ion storage in their host with the high stability of the host framework structure and the low fluctuation of ionic and electronic conductivity. Based on the above merits of the physicochemical properties, we decided to use full

Figure 2. The proof-of-concept of the AEA-ASSLBs: a) Electronic conductivities of our AEA materials in comparison with the available conductive carbon additives and traditional cathodes, obtained via the 4-electrode powder electronic conductivity test. b) Li-ion diffusion coefficients of our AEA materials obtained via the potentiostatic intermittent titration technique method in comparison with the available traditional cathodes and typical SSEs. c,d) The galvanostatic discharge–charge profiles of the Li$_{0.1}$TiS$_2$- and LiMo$_6$S$_8$-based AEA cathodes. e) Their corresponding cycling stabilities at 0.1C/70°C.
3. Demonstration of AEA All-Solid-State Li-Batteries

To provide a proof-of-concept, AEA-ASSLBs were constructed using a configuration of AEA cathode (100% TiS$_2$ or Mo$_6$S$_8$)/SSEs (Li$_{10}$GeP$_2$S$_{12}$–Li$_3$PS$_4$)/AEA anode (100% Li metal anode). As shown in Figure 2c,d, the TiS$_2$-based AEA-ASSLBs had an initial discharge capacity of 213 mA h g$^{-1}$ at 70 °C, with the characteristic smooth slope in the voltage profile demonstrating the solid-solution reaction. Meanwhile, the Mo$_6$S$_8$-based AEA-ASSLBs delivered a capacity of 130 mA h g$^{-1}$, with two characteristic well-defined plateaus in the voltage profile corresponding with the two-phase reaction (2.3 V, Li$_x$Mo$_6$S$_8$ $\rightarrow$ Li$_{x-1}$Mo$_6$S$_8$, and 2.05 V, Li$_{x-1}$Mo$_6$S$_8$ $\rightarrow$ Li$_3$Mo$_6$S$_8$/Li$_4$Mo$_6$S$_8$) (Figure 2d). Since both pristine TiS$_2$ and Mo$_6$S$_8$ are Li-free, a partial pre-lithiation was required to provide the function of a Li-ion conductor on the initial discharge. Specifically, the observed capacity gap between the first and second discharge roughly correlates with the Li consumption of the pre-lithiation process corresponding with Li$_0$TiS$_2$ (LTS) (25 mA h g$^{-1}$) and LiMo$_6$S$_8$ (LMS) (35 mA h g$^{-1}$). Starting with these very partially pre-lithiated materials (LTS and LMS), the batteries had a reversible capacity of more than 180 mA h g$^{-1}$ for LTS and 90 mA h g$^{-1}$ for LMS, demonstrating that our AEA-ASSLBs can work well based on both solid-solution (LTS) and two-phase reaction (LMS) mechanisms. In sharp contrast, the AEA electrode constructed using the typical LiFePO$_4$ and Li$_4$Ti$_5$O$_12$ materials failed (see the detailed information in Figure S2, Supporting Information). Compared with the LTS, the LMS exhibited better cycling stability with a high capacity retention of 89% after 50 cycles (compared with the 2nd cycle).

The aforementioned distinctions could be attributed to the materials’ intrinsic physicochemical properties, crystal structure, and different Li storage mechanisms. LTS presents a solid-solution reaction involving Li-vacancy disorder, the Li-ion diffusion coefficient of which largely depends on the vacancy concentration and is susceptible to the Li concentration. Upon cycling, any trapping Li for the irreversible capacity loss could potentially gradually lower the kinetic of the LTS–AEA electrode, resulting in capacity fade (Figure 2e). In contrast, LMS maintains a high $D_{Li}$ with a very low fluctuation from $1.8 \times 10^{-8}$ to $1.7 \times 10^{-7}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$ (Figure 3a). The C-rate performance also

![Figure 3. a, b) The electrochemical mechanism of the LMS-based AEA cathode: a) Li-ion diffusion coefficients and energy bandgap of Li$_x$Mo$_6$S$_8$ ($x = 0$, 1, 3, 4), b) the porosity of the AEA Mo$_6$S$_8$ electrode as a function of the applied pressure. The red circles represent the value test with pressure and the blue ones represents the value test releasing the pressure. c) In situ XRD analysis of the LMS-based AEA cathode (left). The normalized intensity of the peak at 33.9° (Li$_i$), 33.7° (Li$_0$), and 32.7° (Li$_{-3-4}$) in different stages (middle) and the phase transition process accompanying the charge–discharge profiles (right).]
verified the fast kinetic of Li-ion transportation, and the LMS–AEA electrode with a high cathode mass loading of 13.91 mg cm\(^{-2}\) (compacting density is 4.5 g cm\(^{-3}\)) and the thickness of electrode is 30.9 \(\mu\)m eliminates the possibility that the capacity only originates from the interfacial electrochemical reaction between the LMS and the SSE (see the detailed information in Figures S3 and S4, Supporting Information). Furthermore, our LMS–AEA electrode exhibited superior plasticity, which enabled elastic recovery after releasing the pressure. As the apparent gap in porosity marked by the shadowed area in Figure 3b indicates, the porosity of Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) decreased to 11% under 360 MPa (the applied pressure of ASSLBs in real operating conditions) and rebounded to 24% after the pressure was released (see the detailed information in Tables S6 and S7, Supporting Information). The excellent deformability of the LMS–AEA electrode is not only favorable in terms of achieving a dense electrode and good physical solid–solid interfacial contact but is also helpful for buffering the volume expansion of cathode materials during cycling. Thus, in the following section, LMS is selected as our priority material.

To verify the phase transformation during charging, in situ X-ray diffraction (XRD) was performed for a tailor-made ASSLB (Figure 3c). The pristine electrode belongs to the Li\(_0\) phase (Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\)) ([JCPDC: 89–5114]) with three major peaks at 30.7° (12\(\bar{7}\)), 33.9° (21\(\bar{2}\)), and 34.8° (104). At the initial stage of the discharge, a new Li\(_1\) phase (LiMo\(_6\)S\(_8\)) ([JCPDC: 81–0858, 30.4° (12\(\bar{7}\)), 33.7° (21\(\bar{2}\)), and 35.0° (104)]) was generated along with a decrease in the intensity of the Li\(_0\), indicating the two-phase transformation between Li\(_0\) and Li\(_1\). Subsequently, along with a second discharge plateau (2.05 V), the Li\(_1\) phase further transformed into a Li\(_3\) phase ([JCPDS81-0859, 32.7° (21\(\bar{2}\)), 35.5° (104), and 36.8° (220)] and finally converted into Li\(_4\)Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) (L\(_4\) phase) ([JCPDS: 81–0860, 32.6° (21\(\bar{2}\)), 35.4° (104), and 36.7° (220)]). To further quantify the relative content of the different phases in the two-phase coexistence region, the normalized intensity based on the (21\(\bar{2}\)) peak was obtained, as shown in Figure 3d (middle). This revealed clear multiple two-phase coexistences that were consistent with the charge–discharge profiles (Figure 2d). The final discharge product of Li\(_4\) can only be reversibly converted into Li\(_3\) with a trace of Li\(_0\) phase remaining that corresponds with the very short plateau at 2.45 V at the end of the charge stage (circled in Figure 3c, right). The LMS–AEA electrode processes a step-wise electrochemical reaction with the multiple phase transformations in the first cycle, which can be divided into four stages in the order of stage I, stage II, stage III, and stage IV (Figure 3c, middle). During stages I and II, the increase in Li concentration promotes Li-ion transportation in the AEA electrode due to the formation of Li\(_x\)Mo\(_y\)S\(_8\) (\(x = 1, 3, 4\)) with a high diffusion coefficient \(D_{L1}\). The high Li concentration phases gradually transformed into low phases during delithiation (stage III) (Li\(_4\)–Li\(_3\)–Li\(_1\)). At the end of stage IV, an ionically blocking interphase layer mainly consisting of Li\(_0\) formed since this is a Li-free and ionic-isolating phase, and its formation on the interface of the electrode–electrolyte shut down the further phase transformation from Li\(_1\) to Li\(_0\) in the bulk electrode, much like a specific “ionic switch.” At this time, the delithiation process is blocked and Li\(_0\) is retained to a large extent. These results confirmed our hypothesis that the LMS–AEA electrode requires an initial partial pre-lithiation such that its Li-ionic and electronic conductivities are qualified.

Based on the above results and discussion, we have successfully demonstrated the proof-of-concept of the AEA electrode in ASSLBs. This AEA electrode can also work at room temperature (see the detailed information in Figures S5, Supporting Information). However, compared with conventional Li-ion batteries, the ESC electrode of the LMS–AEA cathode was only 90 mA h g\(^{-1}\), which means that it had not yet realized its full potential in terms of energy density. To further display the advantages of the AEA electrode, a hybrid S\(_8–\)Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) (S–LMS)-based AEA cathode was attempted, since an S cathode has a high theoretical capacity of 1,675 mA h g\(^{-1}\), with redox potentials ideally below the “ionic switch” of 2.45 V\(^{[48–51]}\). Given that a S\(_8\) cathode is electronically insulating, the conductive LMS served as an efficient electronically and ionically conducting network within the AEA electrode, with the weight percentages of S\(_8\) and Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) 32.5 and 67.5 wt%, respectively. The transmission electron microscopy (TEM) image of the hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode (Figure 4a) revealed the coexistence of amorphous S\(_8\) (marked by the yellow-block) and crystalline Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) (marked by the green lines), the electron diffraction patterns are shown in Figure S6, Supporting Information, and the XRD patterns are shown in Figure S7, Supporting Information. Inside the electrode, the small Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) nanosheets were mutually interconnected and thus constructed a conductive network for transport of electrons/ions. Furthermore, the amorphous S\(_8\) was homogenously dispersed, which was reflected by the 10–30 nm nanoscale domain in the Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) framework that guarantees the desired electrons/ions transport in the insulating S\(_8\). Unlike conventional all-solid-state Li–S cathodes with three single-function materials (carbon/SSE/S) for forming three-phase reaction interfaces, our hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode had an all-in-one ionically/electronically transporting two-phase reaction interface (LMS/S), which allows for avoiding the unbalanced transport between the electron (by carbon) and Li-ion (by the SSEs).

Figure 4b shows the cross-sectional images and the elemental mapping of the hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode and the Li\(_{10}\)Ge\(_5\)P\(_8\)S\(_{12}\) SSE. The local element distribution of the phosphorus (P) indicated a pure AEA cathode electrode without any SSE component (see the detailed information in Figures S8–S10, Supporting Information), which was confirmed by the obtained energy-dispersive spectrum, as shown in Figure 4c. Furthermore, the volumetric density at the electrode level is highly dependent on the porosity, which can be reduced by applying pressure in ASSLBs. It is significant that our S–LMS–AEA electrode had a very high compacted filling rate of 91.8% at 360 MPa, which was due to the creep of the soft Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) and S\(_8\) (Figures 3b and 4d, see the detailed information in Tables S6 and S8, Supporting Information), the 8.2% residual porosity of which allowed for accommodating the volume expansion. Combining the advantages of AEA electrodes in terms of ESC, the theoretical volumetric density of the S–LMS–AEA electrode was estimated to be above 3565.3 W h L\(^{-1}\) (in terms of the volume of the Mo\(_6\)S\(_8\) and S\(_8\)), which is more than double that of the conventional S–C-LGPS (32.5 wt%, 17.5 wt%, 50 wt%) electrode with the same fraction of sulfur.
Figure 4. The structure and electrochemical mechanism of the hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode (32.5%S8–67.5%Mo6S8). a) TEM image of the S–LMS–AEA cathode. b) The cross-sectional SEM images of the AEA cathode/Li10GeP2S12 interface with the energy dispersive spectrometer (EDS) mapping of the P and S elements. c) EDS point analysis of the P and S elements in the AEA cathode (Point 1) and the Li10GeP2S12 (Point 2). The black scale in (a) is 20 nm, and the white scales in (b) and (c) are 50 µm. d,e) Comparison of the electronic conductivities, theoretical volumetric energy density, and porosity of the S–LMS–AEA cathode and those of a typical S–C–LGPS cathode (32.5 wt%, 17.5 wt%, 50 wt%, see the detailed information in Figure S11, Supporting Information). f) The electrochemical redox mechanism of the S–LMS–AEA cathode.
As Figure 4f illustrates, we proposed a possible electrochemical mechanism for a hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode. Below 2.45 V, the AEA Mo6S8 electrode was first pre-lithiated into LMS before it was reversibly transformed into the following Li-rich phases (Li1 ↔ Li4). Moreover, simultaneously, the S8 cathode underwent a conversion of S ↔ Li2S, delivering a specific capacity of 1,290 mA h g⁻¹ (by the initial electrode mass, before discharge without Li). The ESC electrode was used instead of the specific capacity for the cathode to evaluate the energy density at the electrode level. In terms of the hybrid S–Mo6S8–AEA cathode with the Li metal, a high ESC electrode of 483 mA h g⁻¹ (0.8 mA h cm⁻², the theoretical value is 630 mA h g⁻¹, supplementary material) was achieved after three cycles, with gravimetric and volumetric energy densities of 905.5 W h kg⁻¹ and 2778 W h L⁻¹, respectively, at the electrode level, which was close to the theoretical energy density of 1260 W h kg⁻¹ and 3865 W h L⁻¹ (Figure 5a, see the detailed information in the Supplementary calculation model). Meanwhile, in terms of the discharge products, Li2S and Li4Mo6S8, the values were 777 W h kg⁻¹ and 1945 W h L⁻¹, which is still higher than those of the commercial high-density LiCoO2 electrode (476 W h kg⁻¹, 1698 W h L⁻¹, by the electrode mass) (see the detailed information in Table S8, Supporting Information). Furthermore, to demonstrate the cycling stability of our hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode, a Li–In AEA anode was applied to stabilize the interface between the Li metal anode and the SSE. This demonstrated that our AEA ASSLBs had excellent cycling stability with a capacity retention of 76% after 120 cycles (compared to the 30th cycle with the highest energy density, Figure 5c,d).

Our hybrid S–LMS–AEA cathode exhibited the following significant advantages: 1) The electrodes were constructed using 100% electrochemically active substances without any inactive materials, thereby maximizing the cathode capacities at the electrode level. 2) The all-in-one electronic/ionic conductive network of the LMS cathode is favorable in terms of enhancing the electrode kinetic through avoiding the unbalance and inhomogeneous reaction at the three-phase reacting interfaces (carbon/electrolyte/S). 3) Both the AEA cathode and the SSEs belong to the sulfur family, which allows for excellent mutual compatibility through their high affinity. 4) The elastic nature of the AEA cathode alleviates the volume expansion of the S8/Li2S during cycling. In principle, the LMS–AEA cathode has strong universality, combined with other active materials with a redox potential of less than 2.45 V possible. For example, another type of hybrid AEA cathode with 40% Li4Ti5O12 and 60% Mo6S8 (LTO–LMS) exhibited superior cycling stability, with an ESC electrode of 130 mA h g⁻¹ at the electrode level (Figure 5b–d).

4. Conclusion

We have proposed a new concept of AEA all-SSE with a superior electronic/ionic mixing conductor as an alternative to carbon black and the electrolyte in the electrode. With consideration of our AEA principle and the screening criteria, the LTS-
LMS-based AEA electrodes were selected due to their high electronic conductivity, high ionic diffusion coefficient, and stable Li-storage performance. In these AEA electrodes, the energy density gap at the electrode level between the accessible and the theoretical value is bridged and minimized as far as possible. More significantly, due to the ionically/electronically conductive network self-supported by the AEA cathode material, it can be combined with a high-capacity sulfur cathode to construct a hybrid S–LMS-based AEA cathode with high energy densities of over 770 Wh kg$^{-1}$ and 1900 Wh L$^{-1}$ at the electrode level. In the future, we believe that AEA electrodes will provide a new means of increasing the energy densities of batteries, regardless of the discovery of new materials. Furthermore, there is the possibility of increasing the energy density by exploring new AEA material candidates with a higher capacity and high voltage that effectively match the 4 V transition metal-oxide cathodes.

5. Experimental Section

**Preparation of AEA Cathode:** Mo$_6$S$_8$ was synthesized by methods previously reported. Ti$_2$ (99.9%), S$_8$ (99.95%, Innochem), Li$_2$Ti$_3$O$_12$ (99%), Li$_4$GeP$_2$S$_12$ (2–5 µm, Kejing star), Li$_3$PS$_4$ (2–5 µm, Kejing star), Li (99.95%, 80 µm, CEL), and In (99.999%, 30 µm) foils were obtained commercially. For LMS and LTS-based AEA cathode, the Mo$_6$S$_8$ and Ti$_2$S$_2$ were used as the AEA electrode without further treatment. For hybrid S–LMS and LTO–LMS-based AEA cathode, S$_8$/Mo$_6$S$_8$ and Li$_4$Ti$_3$O$_12$/Mo$_6$S$_8$ were mixed in 32.5:67.5 by weight (162.5 mg, 337.5 mg) and 40:60 by weight (200 mg, 300 mg). Then put them in an agate mortar for the ball-milling with 300 r, 12 h, and 300 r, 4 h to prepare the hybrid AEA cathode, respectively.

**Batteries Assembly:** The AEA-ASSLBs batteries were assembled by the configuration of AEA cathode/LGPS/Li$_3$PS$_4$/Li(In). A mass of 100 mg LGPS and 50 mg Li$_3$PS$_4$ SSE was uniaxially compressed at ~216 MPa. Then the AEA cathode was added on top of the SSE and distributed homogeneously and compressed at 360 MPa. A thickness of 80 µm Li foil was added (accompanying a 30 µm In foil, depending on the experimental designing.) The photography and schematic plot are shown in Figure S12, Supporting Information.

**Characterization:** The morphologies of the samples were investigated by SEM and TEM. The in situ XRD patterns of the all-solid-state battery were measured using Cu Kα radiation on an X-ray diffractometer from 29.8° to 37.5° (2θ), under 70 °C. The electrochemistry was conducted on a LAND battery test station at 70 °C. The electronic conductivities of the powder materials were measured by the 4-probe method at room temperature and atmosphere, and the Li-ion diffusion coefficient was measured by potentiostatic intermittent titration technique. More details of the materials and characterizations are provided in the Supporting Information.
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