

# Enormous variation in homogeneity 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 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%. This anomalous behavior and other issues indicate that this system is not a superconductor.

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

Following the logic of the authors, the sample used for ED Fig. 13 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




FIG. 1: Resistance versus temperature for N-doped lutetium hydride at pressure  $\sim 10$ kbar, as reported in Ref. [1] ED Fig. 15 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].

why superconducting samples prepared similarly would exhibit a degree of inhomogeneity that differs by three orders of magnitude.

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.13. For ED Fig. 15 it is explicitly stated that a background resistance is 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




FIG. 3: Three holy grails. The top three panels show resistance versus temperature for three different compounds at pressure ranges  $\sim 200\text{GPa}$  (Refs. [3, 13, 14]),  $\sim 20\text{GPa}$  (Ref. [12]) 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], [12], [1]. Note that even though Ref. [3] was retracted [5], all the authors disagreed with the retraction.

width seen in Fig. 1. Ref. [3] was recently retracted [5].

The fact that the transitions shown in Fig. 1 show hysteresis is also in conflict with what is expected for a superconductor. However, this could potentially originate in the spatial separation of the thermometer and the sample and temperature gradients originating in a fast rate of temperature change, about which the paper gives no information.

We also point out that the ac susceptibility data shown 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 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] [6–8], 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 [9–11] than reported in Ref. [1].

Finally, we point out that a subset of the authors of Ref. [1] have previously reported room temperature superconductivity in other compounds, at pressures one [12] and two [3, 13] orders of magnitude larger than reported in Ref. [1], as shown in Fig. 3. 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.

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, that the background ac susceptibility changes drastically in different measurements, and that several experimental and theoretical studies have not been able to reproduce the results reported in Ref. [1], suggest that the behaviour observed reported in Ref. [1] is due to experimental artifacts and not due to superconductivity.

### Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to multiple colleagues for discussions on these issues. 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 [15], in the blog post “nanoscale views” [16], and in various postings in reddit.com [17].

**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. Disnayake, 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 Osanza at website of Ref. [1], 25 days ago.
- [5] E. Snider et al, “Retraction Note: Room-temperature superconductivity in a carbonaceous sulfur hydride”, *Nature* 610, 804 (2022).
- [6] X. Ming et al, “Absence of near-ambient superconductivity in  $\text{LuH}_{2\pm x}\text{N}_y$ ”, *arXiv:2303.08759* (2023).
- [7] P. Shan et al, “Pressure-induced color change in the

- lutetium dihydride LuH<sub>2</sub>”, [arXiv:2303.06718 \(2023\)](#).
- [8] X. Xing et al, “Observation of non-superconducting phase changes in  $LuH_{\pm x}N_y$ ”, [arXiv:2303.17587 \(2023\)](#).
- [9] K. P. Hilleke et al, “Structure, Stability and Superconductivity of N-doped Lutetium Hydrides at kbar Pressures”, [arXiv:2303.15622 \(2023\)](#).
- [10] Y. Sun et al, “Effect of nitrogen doping and pressure on the stability of cubic  $LuH_3$ ”, [arXiv:2303.14034 \(2023\)](#).
- [11] Z. Huo et al, “First-principles study on the superconductivity of N-doped fcc-LuH<sub>3</sub>”, [arXiv:2303.12575 \(2023\)](#).
- [12] 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 Iowa State University Condensed Matter seminar, May 5, 2022.
- [13] 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).
- [14] 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 \(2023\)](#).
- [15] [pubpeer \(2023\)](#).
- [16] [nanoscale views \(2023\)](#)
- [17] [reddit.com \(2023\)](#).