

# Enormous variation in homogeneity and other anomalous features of room temperature superconductor samples: a Comment on Nature 615, 244 (2023)

J. E. Hirsch

Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0319

The resistive transition width of a recently discovered room temperature near-ambient-pressure hydride superconductor [1] changes by more than three orders of magnitude between different samples, with the transition temperature nearly unchanged. For the narrowest transitions, the transition width relative to  $T_c$  is only 0.014%. The voltage-current characteristics indicate vanishing critical current, and the normal state resistance is unusually small. These anomalous behaviors and other issues indicate that this system is not a superconductor. Implications for other hydrides are discussed.

Room temperature at near ambient pressure has recently been claimed for a Lu-H-N compound [1]. In this paper we question the validity of that claim on the basis of analysis of some of the reported measurement results that show anomalous features, and discuss the implications of this analysis.

In Extended Data (hereafter ED) Fig. 15 of Ref. [1], the authors show resistance versus temperature in the absence and presence of a magnetic field. The relative width of the resistive transition  $\Delta T/T_c$  shown in the inset of the figure is 0.13 for zero field. The authors explain the considerable width by stating “*The large transition width at zero field indicates sample inhomogeneities, which is typical for high-pressure experiments.*”, which is not implausible.

However, in the data for resistance versus temperature in ED Fig. 13a of Ref. [1], shown here in Fig. 1, the width of the resistive transitions is only 0.04K, so the relative width is  $\Delta T/T_c = 0.00014$ , at comparable pressures (10 kbar vs 15 kbar respectively). For the resistance curves shown in Fig. 2 of Ref. [1], at pressures 10 kbar and 16 kbar, the relative width is in-between those two




FIG. 1: Resistance versus temperature for N-doped lutetium hydride at pressure  $\sim 10$  kbar, as reported in Ref. [1] ED Fig. 13a and associated reported raw data. The blue and red curves were measured under cool down and warm up conditions respectively [1].




FIG. 2: Resistance versus temperature for N-doped lutetium hydride at pressure 15kbar. Left panel: with background subtraction, as reported in Ref. [1] ED Fig. 15. Right panel: same without background subtraction, obtained from the raw data given in Ref. [1]. The black, blue and red curves are for applied magnetic fields 0T, 1T, 3T respectively [1].

extremes,  $\Delta T/T_c \sim 0.008$ , 60 times larger than for ED Fig. 13a, 16 times smaller than for ED Fig. 15.

Following the logic of the authors, the sample used for ED Fig. 13a is 1,000 times more homogeneous than the sample used for ED Fig. 15, the samples used for their Fig. 2 are in-between. The protocol used in preparing these samples was presumably similar, as described in the “Methods” section of Ref. [1]. It is not understandable why superconducting samples prepared similarly would exhibit a degree of inhomogeneity that differs by three orders of magnitude. The fact that the transitions shown in Fig. 1 show hysteresis is also in conflict with what is expected for a superconductor and is not explained in the paper.

It should also be noted that the authors say “In some cases, small residual resistance from the instrument offsets was subtracted from the measured voltage.”, but don’t specify whether “some cases” include the resistance data shown in their Fig. 2 and ED Fig.13a. For ED Fig. 15 it is explicitly stated that a background resistance is




FIG. 3: Top panel: voltage versus current from source data for Fig. 2b of Ref. [1]. Bottom panel: voltage versus current data for a known superconductor, from Ref. [7].

subtracted out [1]. When plotting the raw data without background subtraction, the curves shown in Fig. 2 right panel result [4]. There is no hint of a superconducting transition in Fig. 2 right panel.

In addition, the width of the transitions shown in Fig. 1 is unreasonably small. No other known superconductor exhibits such sharp transitions even at ambient pressure, and under pressure additional broadening of the transition results from pressure gradients. In ref. [2], we pointed out that the narrow width of the transitions reported in Ref. [3] for another room temperature superconductor under pressure, CSH, was unreasonably small,  $\Delta T/T_c = 0.005$ , and that was 35 times *larger* than the width seen in Fig. 1. Other anomalies in the resistance curves of Ref. [3] were noted in Ref. [5]. Ref. [3], which has six coauthors in common with Ref. [1], was recently retracted [6].

Furthermore, the voltage-current characteristic shown in Fig. 2b of Ref. [1], reproduced here in Fig. 3 top panel, is not consistent with what is expected for a superconductor at temperature well below its critical temperature. There is no evidence of any region of zero resistance in Fig. 3 top panel, in contrast with the typical behavior shown in Fig. 3 bottom panel for a known supercon-




FIG. 4: Voltage versus current for Lu-H-N. Left panel: Fig. 2b of Ref. [1]. Right panel: another example reported by R. P. Dias, Ref. [12].

ductor [7], showing zero voltage up to a critical current that increases as the temperature decreases. Other such measurements for known superconductors showing how this behavior varies with temperature and magnetic field are shown in Refs. [8–11]. If one nevertheless insisted to infer a non-zero critical current from Fig. 3 top panel, it would be certainly smaller than  $0.5\text{mA}$ , at temperature  $T/T_c \sim 0.1$ . According to the authors, “On average, sample sizes are on the order of  $70\text{-}100\ \mu\text{m}$  in diameter and  $10\text{-}20\ \mu\text{m}$  thick”. Assuming the smallest cross-sectional area in that range,  $A \sim 10\ \mu\text{m} \times 70\ \mu\text{m}$ , yields a critical current density  $J_c < 72\text{A}/\text{cm}^2$  (or smaller if larger dimensions are assumed). That would be five orders of magnitude smaller than critical current densities reported for  $\text{LaH}_{10}$  and  $\text{H}_3\text{S}$  at temperature  $T/T_c \sim 0.5$  [13], and inconsistent with the magnetization measurements shown in Fig. 3 of Ref. [1].

Furthermore, the values of the normal state resistance at room temperature inferred from Fig. 2b of Ref. [1], and for another example of voltage current-characteristics presented by the lead author of Ref. [1] in Ref. [12], shown on the left and right panels of Fig. 4, are anomalously small:  $R \sim 1.12\text{m}\Omega$  for the left panel,  $R \sim 0.05\text{m}\Omega$  for the right panel. From the van der Pauw formula  $\rho \sim \pi dR/\ln(2)$  ( $d$ =thickness,  $R$ =resistance), assuming the largest  $d = 20\ \mu\text{m}$  yields  $\rho \sim 10\ \mu\Omega - \text{cm}$  for the left panel of Fig. 4 and  $\rho \sim 0.4\ \mu\Omega - \text{cm}$  for the right panel. These values are six times and 130 times smaller than the room temperature resistivity of lutetium metal. These discrepancies point to the behavior reported [1, 12] as voltage versus current for Lu-H-N both at room temperature and at low temperatures being due to experimental artifacts rather than superconductivity. It is notable that for other samples that showed a resistance drop from much larger room temperature resistance values (Fig. 2a and ED Fig. 13 a of Ref. [1]), consistent with what could be expected, no voltage-current characteristics were shown in Refs. [1, 12].

We also point out that the ac susceptibility data shown




FIG. 5: Three holy grails. The top three panels show resistance versus temperature for three different compounds at pressure ranges  $\sim 200\text{GPa}$  (Refs. [3, 15, 16]),  $\sim 20\text{GPa}$  (Ref. [14]) and  $\sim 2\text{GPa}$  (Ref. [1]) respectively, all showing room temperature superconductivity. The bottom three panels show  $T_c$  versus pressure for the three different compounds as reported in Refs. [3], [14], [1]. Note that even though Ref. [3] was retracted [6], all the authors disagreed with the retraction.

in ED Fig. 5 of Ref. [1] before background subtraction show a background dependence on temperature that has positive slope, negative slope, and zero slope, for the same or comparable pressures. The background ac susceptibility is expected to reflect the physical properties of the environment of the sample, which should not drastically change for different measurements.

We also point out that the lead author of Ref. [1] R. P. Dias and some of its coauthors have previously reported room temperature superconductivity in other compounds, at pressures one [14] and two [3, 15, 16] orders of magnitude larger than reported in Ref. [1], as shown in Fig. 5. In the 112 years since superconductivity was discovered, no room temperature superconductivity has been conclusively established by other researchers in any compound at any pressure despite intensive searches. The probability that the same research group would hit this holy grail three separate times is insignificant.

Finally, we point out that experimental attempts to reproduce the results reported in Ref. [1] have shown no indication of superconductivity in samples prepared by following the sample preparation method described in Ref. [1] [17–22], and theoretical attempts to calculate  $T_c$  in this system within the conventional theory of

superconductivity have found values of  $T_c$  two orders of magnitude smaller [23–26] than reported in Ref. [1].

In conclusion, the extreme sharpness of the resistive transition curves shown in Fig. 1, the fact that the width of the resistive transition changes by three orders of magnitude between different samples, the fact that resistance data versus temperature plotted without background subtraction show no hint of superconductivity, the fact that voltage-current characteristics do not show evidence for a finite critical current, the fact that normal state resistances measured are anomalously small, the fact that the background ac susceptibility changes drastically in different measurements, and the fact that several experimental and theoretical studies have not been able to reproduce the results reported in Ref. [1], indicate that the behavior observed reported in Ref. [1] is not due to superconductivity.

If the resistance drops seen in Fig. 5 and other figs. of Refs. [1, 3, 15, 16] are not due to superconductivity they must be due to other reasons unrelated to superconductivity, either physical phenomena or/and experimental artifacts associated with performing resistance measurements on very small hydrogen-rich samples under high pressure in diamond-anvil cells, with




FIG. 6: Resistance versus temperature for various hydrides under pressure claimed to be high temperature superconductors. The name of the last author in the reference is shown in each panel. From upper left to lower right: *LuHN* [1], *CSH* [3], *YH<sub>9</sub>* [29], *LaH<sub>10</sub>* [30], *LaH<sub>10</sub>* [31], *YH<sub>6</sub>* [32], *CeH* [33], *H<sub>3</sub>S* [34], *CaH<sub>6</sub>* [35].

the expectation grounded in the conventional theory of superconductivity that superconductivity will be found [28]. The resistance versus temperature curves shown in Fig. 5 above and in other figs. of Refs. [1, 3, 15, 16] look similar to resistance versus temperature curves for other hydrides under high pressure that have been claimed to be high temperature superconductors in recent years [27], as shown in Fig. 6. This raises the possibility that those same other reasons unrelated to superconductivity that may account for the resistance drops in Refs. [1, 3, 15, 16] reported by Dias and coworkers could account for the resistance drops seen in all hydrides under high pressure claimed to be high temperature superconductors [27], in contradiction with the predictions of Ref. [28] and in agreement with other theoretical predictions [36]. Magnetic evidence claimed to support high temperature superconductivity in sulfur and lanthanum hydrides under pressure has been called into question elsewhere [37–39].

## Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to multiple colleagues for discussions on these issues, and in particular to Erik van Heumen for stimulating discussions on transport measurements. Some of the anomalies reported here were also noted in comments to Ref. [1] submitted by readers that are posted at the website of Ref. [1], at pubpeer.com [40], in the blog post “nanoscale views” [41], and in various postings in reddit.com [42].

**Competing interests:** the author declares no competing interests.

**Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available from the author upon reasonable request.

- [1] Nathan Dasenbrock-Gammon, Elliot Snider, Raymond McBride, Hiranya Pasan, Dylan Durkee, Nugzari Khalvashi-Sutter, Sasanka Munasinghe, Sachith E. Dissanayake, Keith V. Lawler, Ashkan Salamat and Ranga P. Dias, “Evidence of near-ambient superconductivity in a N-doped lutetium hydride”, *Nature* **615**, 244 (2023).
- [2] J. E. Hirsch and F. Marsiglio, “Unusual width of the superconducting transition in a hydride”, *Nature* **596**, E9 (2021).
- [3] Elliot Snider, Nathan Dasenbrock-Gammon, Raymond McBride, Mathew Debessai, Hiranya Vindana, Kevin Vencatasamy, Keith V. Lawler, Ashkan Salamat and Ranga P. Dias, “Room-temperature superconductivity in a carbonaceous sulfur hydride”, *Nature* **586**, 373 (2020).
- [4] See also comment by Bartolomeo Oszan at website of Ref. [1].
- [5] J. J. Hamlin, [arXiv:2210.10766](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.10766) (2022).
- [6] E. Snider et al, “Retraction Note: Room-temperature superconductivity in a carbonaceous sulfur hydride”, *Nature* **610**, 804 (2022).
- [7] T. Freltoft, H. J. Jensen and P. Minnhagen, “Evidence for intrinsic critical current density in high  $T_c$  superconductors”, *Solid State Communications* **78**, Issue 7, 635 (1991).
- [8] J. Lopez and P. Mune, “Anomalous inversion of voltage versus current curves in ZFC and FC conditions in BSCCO ceramic superconductors”, *Physica C* **261**, 173 (1996).
- [9] L. Qiao et al, “Dynamical instability of the electric transport in superconductors”, *Scientific Reports* **8**, 14104 (2018).
- [10] G. C. Han, *J. Phys: Condens. Matter* **7**, 8175 (1995).
- [11] J. W. Ekin et al, “Evidence for weak link and anisotropy limitations on the transport critical current in bulk polycrystalline  $Y_1Ba_2Cu_3O_x$ ”, *Journal of Applied Physics* **62**, 4821 (1987).
- [12] R. P. Dias, talk presented at APS March Meeting, 2023, “Observation of Room Temperature Superconductivity in Hydride at Near Ambient Pressure”, [Session K20, K20.00002](https://www.aps.org/programs/meetings/march-meeting/2023/session/K20), 3:00 PM–5:48 PM, Tuesday, March 7, 2023. See [youtube.com/watch?v=XhhvOMuLF94](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XhhvOMuLF94), 9:03/13:43 or <https://jorge.physics.ucsd.edu/K20Dias.mov>.
- [13] V. Minkov, et al, “Magnetic field screening in hydrogen-rich high-temperature superconductors”, *Nat Commun* **13**, 3194 (2022).
- [14] R. P. Dias, reported at colloquium given at University of California San Diego, April 22, 2021. Same data were presented by R. P. Dias at the 10th Asian Conference on High Pressure Research (ACHPR), November 21-26, 2021, and at [CDRTS 2022, L’Aquila, Italy](https://www.cdrts2022.org/), July 26-29, 2022.
- [15] G. Alexander Smith, Ines E. Collings, Elliot Snider, Dean Smith, Sylvain Petitgirard, Jesse S. Smith, Melanie White, Elyse Jones, Paul Ellison, Keith V. Lawler, Ranga P. Dias and Ashkan Salamat, “Carbon content drives high temperature superconductivity in a carbonaceous sulfur hydride below 100 GPa”, *Chem. Commun.* **58**, 9064 (2022).
- [16] Hiranya Pasan, Elliot Snider, Sasanka Munasinghe, Sachith E. Dissanayake, Nilesh P. Salke, Muhtar Ahart, Nugzari Khalvashi-Sutter, Nathan Dasenbrock-Gammon, Raymond McBride, G. Alexander Smith, Faraz Mostafaeipour, Dean Smith, Sergio Villa Cortés, Yuming Xiao, Curtis Kenney-Benson, Changyong Park, Vitali Prakapenka, Stella Chariton, Keith V. Lawler, Maddury Somayazulu, Zhenxian Liu, Russell J. Hemley, Ashkan Salamat and Ranga P. Dias, “Observation of Conventional Near Room Temperature Superconductivity in Carbonaceous Sulfur Hydride”, [arXiv:2302.08622](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.08622) (2023).
- [17] X. Ming et al, “Absence of near-ambient superconductivity in  $LuH_{2\pm x}N_y$ ”, [arXiv:2303.08759](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08759) (2023).
- [18] P. Shan et al, “Pressure-induced color change in the lutetium dihydride LuH2”, [arXiv:2303.06718](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.06718) (2023).
- [19] X. Xing et al, “Observation of non-superconducting phase changes in  $LuH_{\pm x}N_y$ ”, [arXiv:2303.17587](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17587) (2023).
- [20] S. Cai et al, “No evidence of superconductivity in the compressed sample prepared from the lutetium foil and H2/N2 gas mixture”, [arXiv:2304.03100](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03100) (2023).
- [21] N. Wang et al, “Percolation-induced resistivity drop in cold-pressed LuH2”, [arXiv:2304.00558](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.00558) (2023).
- [22] Ying-Jie Zhang et al, “Pressure induced color change and evolution of metallic behavior in nitrogen-doped lutetium hydride”, [arXiv:2303.17453](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17453) (2023).
- [23] K. P. Hilleke et al, “Structure, Stability and Superconductivity of N-doped Lutetium Hydrides at kbar Pressures”, [arXiv:2303.15622](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.15622) (2023).
- [24] Y. Sun et al, “Effect of nitrogen doping and pressure on the stability of cubic  $LuH_3$ ”, [arXiv:2303.14034](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.14034) (2023).
- [25] Z. Huo et al, “First-principles study on the superconductivity of N-doped fcc-LuH3”, [arXiv:2303.12575](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.12575) (2023).
- [26] P. P. Ferreira et al, “Search for ambient superconductivity in the Lu-N-H system”, [arXiv:2304.04447](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.04447) (2023).
- [27] I. A. Troyan et al, “High-temperature superconductivity in hydrides”, and references therein.
- [28] W. E. Pickett, “Room temperature superconductivity: The roles of theory and materials design”, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **95**, 021001 (2023) and references therein.
- [29] E. Snider et al, “Synthesis of Yttrium Superhydride Superconductor with a Transition Temperature up to 262 K by Catalytic Hydrogenation at High Pressures”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 117003 (2021).
- [30] M. Somayazulu et al, “Evidence for Superconductivity above 260 K in Lanthanum Superhydride at Megabar Pressures”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 027001 (2019).
- [31] A. P. Drozdov et al, “Superconductivity at 250 K in lanthanum hydride under high pressures”, *Nature* **569**, 528 (2019).
- [32]
- [33] W. Chen et al, “High-Temperature Superconducting Phases in Cerium Superhydride with a  $T_c$  up to 115 K below a Pressure of 1 Megabar”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 117001 (2021).
- [34] S. Mozaffari et al, “Superconducting phase diagram of  $H_3S$  under high magnetic fields”, *Nature Comm.* **10**, 2522 (2019) .
- [35] L. Ma et al, “High-Temperature Superconducting Phase in Clathrate Calcium Hydride  $CaH_6$  up to 215 K at a Pressure of 172 GPa”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 167001 (2022).
- [36] J. E. Hirsch, “Hole superconductivity xOr hot hydride superconductivity”, *J. Appl. Phys.* **130**, 181102 (2021)

and references therein.

- [37] J. E. Hirsch and F. Marsiglio, “On magnetic field screening and expulsion in hydride superconductors”, [arXiv:2207.01541 \(2023\)](#).
- [38] J. E. Hirsch and F. Marsiglio, “Clear evidence against superconductivity in hydrides under high pressure”, [Matter and Radiation at Extremes 7, 058401 \(2022\)](#).
- [39] J. E. Hirsch, “Faulty evidence for superconductivity in ac magnetic susceptibility of sulfur hydride under pressure”, [National Science Review, 9, nwac086 \(2022\)](#).
- [40] [pubpeer \(2023\)](#).
- [41] [nanoscale views \(2023\)](#)
- [42] [reddit.com \(2023\)](#).