

Discovery of superconductivity in technetium-borides at moderate pressures

Xiangru Tao,^{1,*} Aiqin Yang,^{1,*} Yundi Quan,¹ Biao Wan,² Shuxiang Yang,^{3,†} and Peng Zhang^{1,‡}

¹MOE Key Laboratory for Non-equilibrium Synthesis and Modulation of Condensed Matter, Shaanxi Province Key Laboratory of Advanced Functional Materials and Mesoscopic Physics, School of Physics, Xi'an Jiaotong University, 710049, Xi'an, Shaanxi, P.R.China

²Key Laboratory of Material Physics of Ministry of Education, School of Physics and Microelectronics, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450052, Henan, P.R.China

³Zhejiang laboratory, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, P.R.China

(Dated: March 25, 2024)

Advances in theoretical calculations boosted the searches for high temperature superconductors, such as sulfur hydrides and rare-earth polyhydrides. However, the required extremely high pressures for stabilizing these superconductors handicapped further implementations. Based upon thorough structural searches, we identified series of unprecedented superconducting technetium-borides at moderate pressures, including TcB (P6₃/mmc) with superconducting transition temperature $T_c = 20.2$ K at ambient pressure and TcB₂ (P6/mmm) with $T_c = 23.1$ K at 20 GPa. Superconductivity in these technetium-borides mainly originates from the coupling between the low frequency vibrations of technetium-atoms and the dominant technetium-4d electrons at the Fermi level. Our works therefore present a fresh group in the family of superconducting borides, whose diversified crystal structures suggest rich possibilities in discovery of other superconducting transition-metal-borides.

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of superconductivity in mercury¹ motivated a centurial race for superconductors of higher temperatures. Owing to the progress in theoretical calculations,²⁻⁵ numerous high-temperature superconducting hydrides have been discovered in the past decade, including H₃S ($T_c \approx 191 - 204$ K at 200 GPa)^{6,7} and LaH₁₀ ($T_c \approx 274 - 286$ K at 210 GPa) of record high superconducting transition temperature.⁸⁻¹¹ However, stable presence of these superconducting hydrides requests very high pressures, which largely limits their potential implementations.

Among all BCS-superconductors, borides represent a unique category with superconductivity at relatively low pressures. MgB₂ has the highest superconducting transition temperature, $T_c=39$ K, among all BCS-type superconductors at ambient pressure.¹² Up to today, discovered bulk superconducting borides of the same stoichiometry as MgB₂ include CaB₂ ($T_c \sim 50$ K¹³ or 9.4 - 28.6 K¹⁴ at ambient pressure, theory), NbB₂ ($T_c \sim 9.2$ K at ambient pressure, experiment¹⁵⁻¹⁷), OsB₂ ($T_c=2.1$ K at ambient pressure, experiment¹⁸), RuB₂ ($T_c=1.6$ K at ambient pressure, experiment¹⁸), ScB₂ ($T_c=1.5$ K at ambient pressure, experiment¹⁹), WB₂ (maximum $T_c=15$ K at 100 GPa, experiment²⁰), ZrB₂ ($T_c=5.5$ K at ambient pressure, experiment²¹). Superconducting borides of other stoichiometry include X₇B₃ (X=Re and Ru with $T_c=3.3$ and 2.58 K respectively at ambient pressure, experiment^{22,23}), Re₃B ($T_c=4.8$ K at ambient pressure, experiment²³), X₂B (X=Mo, Re, Ta and W with $T_c=5.07, 2.8, 3.12$ and 3.22 K respectively at ambient pressure, experiment²²), XB (X=Hf, Nb, Mo, Ta and Zr with $T_c=3.1, 8.25, 0.5, 4.0$ and 2.8-3.4 K respectively at ambient pressure, experiment²²), FeB₄ ($T_c=2.9$ K at ambient pressure, theory and experiment^{24,25}), XB₅ (X=Na, K, Rb, Ca, Sr, Ba, Sc and Y with $T_c=17.5, 14.7, 18.6, 6.6, 6.8, 16.3, 14.2$ and 12.3 K respectively at ambient

pressure, theory²⁶), BeB₆ ($T_c=24$ K at 4 GPa, theory²⁷), CB₆ ($T_c=12.5$ K at ambient pressure, theory²⁸), MgB₆ ($T_c=9.5$ K at 32.6 GPa, theory²⁹), XB₆ (X=Nb, La, Th and Y with $T_c=3.0, 5.7, 0.74$ and 7.1 K respectively at ambient pressure, experiment²²), XB₇ (X=Li, Na, K, Mg, Ca and Sr with $T_c=21.56, 18.33, 26.20, 29.31, 7.68$ and 12.67 K respectively at ambient pressure, theory³⁰), RbB₆ and RbB₈ ($T_c=7.3 - 11.6$ K and 4.8 - 7.5 K at ambient pressure respectively, theory³¹), YB₆ ($T_c=7.2$ K at ambient pressure, experiment³²), LaB₈ ($T_c=14$ K³³ or 20 K³⁴ at ambient pressure, theory), XB₁₂ (X=Nb, La, Th and Y with $T_c=3.0, 5.7, 0.74$ and 7.1 K respectively at ambient pressure, experiment^{22,35,36}), or even ternary borides like SrB₃C₃ ($T_c=22$ K at 23 GPa, theory and experiment³⁷). Especially, the recent experimental discovery of superconducting MoB₂ with $T_c=32$ K at 100 GPa ignites further enthusiasm in looking for superconducting transition-metal-borides at ambient pressure or at least relatively lower pressures.³⁸

The potential superhardness of metal-borides further merits their values. Among the superconducting metal-borides listed above, several are superhard due to the strong covalent bonding between the metal-boron and the boron-boron atoms in crystals. Superconducting FeB₄ has nanoindentation hardness of 62±5 GPa.²⁵ Other superconducting metal-borides with superhardness includes OsB₂ (≥ 2000 kg/mm²,³⁹) YB₆ (Vickers hardness of 37.0 GPa⁴⁰), RbB₆ (Vickers hardness of 19.7 GPa³¹), RbB₈ (Vickers hardness of 36.9 GPa³¹), XB₇ (X=Li, Na, K, Mg, Ca, Sr with Vickers hardness of 12.0, 21.3, 22.5, 5.6, 20.4 and 25.1 GPa³⁰) and ZrB₁₂ (Vickers hardness of 40 GPa⁴¹).

After the discovery of MgB₂ with $T_c=39$ K, there have been extensive efforts in searching for similar metal-borides superconductors. Unfortunately, the outcomes are discouraging. T_c of most metal-borides are below 10 K as presented above, except the recently discovered isostructure MoB₂ with $T_c=32$ K at 100 GPa. The su-




FIG. 1. (a) Formation enthalpy of predicted structures in technetium-boron binary system at 0 GPa, 90 GPa and 180 GPa. Thermodynamically stable structures are marked by red-filled dots on convex hull (black solid line); thermodynamically metastable structures are marked by blue 'x'. Composition ratio is defined by $N_B/(N_{Tc} + N_B)$, where N_B and N_{Tc} represent the number of atoms in the formula unit. (b) Composition-pressure phase diagram of thermodynamically stable structures in technetium-boron binary system.

perconducting mechanism of MoB_2 is suggested being very different from MgB_2 . In MgB_2 the B-p electrons play dominant role for its superconductivity,^{42,43} while in MoB_2 its Mo-4d electrons contribute majorly.³⁸ This raises two essential questions, (1) can we find other superconductors of different structures than MgB_2 , with transition temperatures at least above 10 K and at not very high pressures? (2) whether the superconducting mechanism of MoB_2 applies to other superconducting transition metal-borides?

Technetium-borides have been extensively investigated because of their outstanding mechanical properties.^{44–64} Three technetium-borides have long been synthesized by experiment at ambient pressure, Tc_3B (Cmcm) of the orthorhombic structure, Tc_7B_3 (P6₃/mmc) and TcB_2 (P6₃/mmc, Vickers hardness 38.4 GPa⁶⁴ or 39.4 GPa⁶³) of the hexagonal structure. Later theoretical calculations also proposed three stoichiometry of TcB, TcB₃ and TcB₄.^{50,58–63} First-principle DFT calculations by Li *et al.*⁵⁰ suggest that hexagonal TcB (P6m2) could be energetically stable. Structural searches by Wu *et al.*⁵⁹ found a thermodynamically stable TcB (Cmcm) structure above 8 GPa. Later structural searches by Zhang *et al.*⁶⁰ argues that TcB (P3m1, Vickers hardness 30.3 GPa) could be energetically more stable than the above two structures. Structural predictions by Van Der Geest *et al.*⁵⁸ suggest there are two thermodynamically stable structures, TcB (Pnma) and TcB₄ (P6₃/mmc), at 30 GPa. First-principle DFT calculations by Miao *et al.*⁶² reported thermodynamically stable TcB₃ (P6m2, Vickers hardness 29 GPa) structure at above 4 GPa. Structural searches by Ying *et al.*^{61,63} suggested two struc-

tures, TcB₃ (P6m2, Vickers hardness 30.7 GPa) and TcB₄ (P6₃/mmc, Vickers hardness 32.4 GPa), are thermodynamically stable at 0 and 100 GPa respectively.

Although technetium is rare in nature, the technetium-based compounds are under investigations by multiple disciplines in the past. Perovskites ATcO₃ (A = Ca, Sr, Ba) attracted extensive interests due to their extremely high antiferromagnetic Neel temperatures (750–1200 K).^{65–68} Recently, technetium hydrides were theoretically predicted and then experimentally synthesized under high pressure.^{69,70}

Previous works on technetium-borides are concentrated on the high hardness and the high incompressibility of technetium-borides, while the explorations for superconductivity are absent. Considering the fact that series of transition-metal-borides have been found superconducting at relatively low pressures, there is no reason to rule out the possible presence of superconductivity in technetium-borides. Besides, current results about the thermodynamically stable phases of technetium-borides are highly diversified. Therefore, we choose to search the technetium-boron binary system for new superconductors at low or even ambient pressures. A comprehensive phase diagram of all thermodynamically stable technetium-borides up to 180 GPa has been derived. We also found five new superconducting technetium-borides of metastable states, including TcB (P6₃/mmc), TcB₂ (P6/mmm), Tc₂B (I4/mcm), Tc₃B (P4/mmm) and TcB (Cmcm), which remain dynamically stable at relatively low pressures. The mechanical properties of these superconducting technetium-borides have been investigated as well.

II. METHODS

The structure prediction for technetium-boron binary crystals is performed by CALYPSO package⁷¹. The electronic structures and the phonon properties are calculated using QUANTUM-ESPRESSO (QE) package⁷². The plane-wave kinetic-energy cutoff and the charge density energy cutoff are 100 Ry and 400 Ry, respectively. Optimized norm-conserving pseudopotential with valence electron configurations of Tc-4p⁶4d⁵5s² and B-2s²2p¹ and Methfessel-Paxton smearing⁷³ width of 0.02 Ry are used. Since technetium is radioactive without stable isotopes, we adopted the average mass of technetium and boron at 97.907 and 10.811 atomic mass units throughout our calculations. The dynamic matrix and the electron-phonon coupling (EPC) constant λ are calculated using the density-functional perturbation theory⁷⁴. Superconducting transition temperature is estimated following the Allen-Dynes modified McMillan equation⁷⁵,

$$T_c = \frac{\omega_{\log}}{1.2} \exp \left[-\frac{1.04(1 + \lambda)}{\lambda - \mu^* (1 + 0.62\lambda)} \right], \quad (1)$$

in which λ is the average EPC parameter, ω_{\log} is the logarithmic average frequency, and the Coulomb pseudopotential⁷⁶ $\mu^* = 0.12$. Mechanical properties including Vickers hardness are estimated following models by Chen *et al.* and Tian *et al.*^{77,78}. Calculation details are referenced to the supplementary information⁷⁹.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Convex hull and phase diagram

We have done variable-composition and fixed-composition structure searches in the Tc-B system at pressures of 0, 90 and 180 GPa. Thermodynamically stable structures and the derived composition-pressure phase diagram are presented in Fig. 1. Three existing technetium-borides at ambient pressure, Tc₃B (Cmcm), Tc₇B₃ (P6₃/mmc) and TcB₂ (P6₃/mmc), have been successfully identified. Tc₃B (Cmcm) is thermodynamically stable up to 180 GPa in our study. In contrast, Tc₇B₃ (P6₃/mmc) and TcB₂ (P6₃/mmc) stop being energetically favorable above 60 GPa and 139 GPa respectively, and a new TcB₂ (I4₁/amd) thermodynamically stable phase shows up above 170 GPa. Two previously predicted structures, TcB₃ (P6̄m2)^{61,62} and TcB₄ (P6₃/mmc)^{58,63}, also have been found in our calculations, which are thermodynamically stable above 2 and 35 GPa, respectively. We found TcB (P2₁) structure being thermodynamically stable above 24 GPa, then transfers into Pmn2₁ structure at 63 GPa, and finally into the previously predicted Pnma structure⁵⁸ at 160 GPa. We also discovered technetium-borides of two new stoichiometries, Tc₃B₄ and Tc₂B. Tc₃B₄ (C2/m) is thermodynamically stable above 151 GPa. Tc₂B (C2/m) structure is thermodynamically stable above 23 GPa, then transfers

TABLE I. Total electronic DOS at Fermi level $N(E_F)$, EPC parameter λ , logarithmic average frequency ω_{\log} , and superconducting transition temperature T_c of the superconducting technetium-borides at their lowest dynamically stable pressures.

Formula	Space group	P (GPa)	$N(E_F)$ (states/eV/f.u.)	λ	ω_{\log} (cm ⁻¹)	T_c (K)
TcB ₂	P6/mmm	20	1.41	1.85	125.1	23.1
TcB	P6 ₃ /mmc	0	1.63	1.56	126.1	20.2
Tc ₂ B	I4/mcm	0	1.75	0.85	165.1	10.9
Tc ₃ B	P4/mmm	0	2.85	0.92	162.9	12.9
TcB	Cmcm	30	1.05	0.96	135.5	11.5

into Fddd structure at 60 GPa. The crystal structure information of all thermodynamically stable phases are presented in Table IV of supplementary information⁷⁹.

B. Superconductivity of thermodynamically metastable technetium-borides

We also examined potential superconductors in technetium-borides, including all thermodynamically stable structures and the thermodynamically metastable structures within range of 300 meV above the convex hull. Totally five thermodynamically metastable technetium-borides have been found superconducting at 180 GPa, including TcB₂ (P6/mmm, 42 meV/atom above the hull), TcB (P6₃/mmc, 255 meV/atom above the hull), Tc₂B (I4/mcm, 2 meV/atom above the hull), Tc₃B (P4/mmm, 248 meV/atom above the hull) and TcB (Cmcm, 25 meV/atom above the hull). These five superconducting technetium-borides stay dynamically stable at decreased pressures. The minimum dynamical stable pressures of TcB₂ (P6/mmm) and TcB (Cmcm) are 20 and 30 GPa respectively, while TcB (P6₃/mmc), Tc₂B (I4/mcm) and Tc₃B (P4/mmm) are dynamically stable even at ambient pressure.

The superconducting transition temperatures of all five technetium-borides increase at decreased pressure in Fig. 2. We also summarize the superconducting transition temperature of the five technetium-borides at their lowest dynamically stable pressures, together with their total electronic DOS at the Fermi level $N(E_F)$, the EPC parameter λ and the logarithmic average frequency ω_{\log} in Table I. TcB₂ (P6/mmm) has the highest superconducting transition temperature of 23.1 K at 20 GPa, which comes from its largest EPC parameter $\lambda=1.85$. In contrast, TcB (Cmcm) has much lower superconducting transition temperature of 11.5 K at 30 GPa due to its small EPC parameter $\lambda=0.96$. Superconducting transition temperature of TcB (P6₃/mmc), Tc₂B (I4/mcm) and Tc₃B (P4/mmm) at 0 GPa are 20.2, 10.9, and 12.9 K, respectively. Although the EPC parameters λ of these metastable technetium-borides are not small, their logarithmic average frequency ω_{\log} are rather low at maximumly 165.1 cm⁻¹, which limited their superconducting




FIG. 2. Superconducting transition temperature of TcB₂ (P6/mmm), TcB (P6₃/mmc), Tc₂B (I4/mcm), Tc₃B (P4/mmm) and TcB (Cmc) as a function of pressure.




FIG. 3. Crystal structures of superconducting technetium-borides. (a) TcB₂ (P6/mmm) (b) TcB (P6₃/mmc) (c) Tc₂B (I4/mcm) (d) Tc₃B (P4/mmm) and (e) TcB (Cmc). The technetium and the boron atoms are represented by spheres of coral and green colors, respectively.

transition temperature. This is in sharp contrast with MgB₂, which has smaller $\lambda = 0.87$ but much larger $\omega_{log} = 504 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and the highest BCS-type superconducting transition temperature of 39 K at ambient pressure.⁸⁰

The thermodynamically metastable nature of the discovered superconducting technetium-borides doesn't necessarily exclude their experimental synthesis. Metastable materials have long been synthesized and implemented,⁸¹ typically like fullerene C₆₀. As to superconductor, DFT calculations predict NdH₉ (P6₃/mmc) is 35 meV/atom

above the convex hull at 150 GPa, yet being successfully synthesized with $T_c \approx 4.5 \text{ K}$.⁸² Especially, several metastable borides have been predicted superconducting in recent structural searches. Xia *et al.* discovered thermodynamically metastable CB₆ with superconducting transition temperature of 12.5 K at ambient pressure.²⁸ Zhang *et al.* also found thermodynamically metastable RbB₆ (Pm-3m) and RbB₈ (Immm) with superconducting transition temperatures of 7.3–11.6 and 4.8–7.5 K at ambient pressure, respectively.³¹ These works further

validate the importance and necessity of our discoveries of superconducting technetium-borides.

C. Crystal structures

The crystal structures of five superconducting technetium-borides in our study are presented in Fig.3. TcB_2 (P6/mmm) shares exactly the same crystal structure with MgB_2 and MoB_2 . TcB (P6₃/mmc) has TiAs-type structure, in which the rhombus Tc-layers are AB-stacking along the c-axis and the rhombus B-layers are sandwiched between the neighbouring Tc-layers. Tc_3B (P4/mmm) has square Tc-layers stacking in ABB-pattern along the c-axis, and the square B-layers locate between the two Tc-layers of BB-pattern. Tc_2B (I4/mcm) consists of square Tc-layers AB-stacking along the c-axis, where the neighbouring Tc-layers are twisted by 37.2 degrees. The B-layers in Tc_2B (I4/mcm) are sandwiched between the neighbouring Tc-layers as well. In TcB (Cmcm), the square Tc-layers stack in ABCD-pattern along the b-axis, and the B-atoms form zig-zag chains along the c-axis between the AB and CD Tc-layers. The angle of the zig-zag chain of B-atoms is around 108.8 degree. Crystal structure information of the superconducting technetium-borides are referenced to Table III in the supplementary information.⁷⁹

D. Electronic structures

The electronic DOS of superconducting technetium-borides at their lowest stabilizing pressure are presented in the left columns of Fig.4. The electronic DOS of all technetium-borides share certain features. The total DOS at the Fermi level are dominated by the states of Tc-4d bands. Although the B-2p DOS have considerable weight away the Fermi level, its contribution is minor at the Fermi level, if not being zero. The B-2s DOS almost vanish around the Fermi level, which makes B-2s bands almost irrelevant for electronic conduction. Our DOS results of technetium-borides are in close resemblance to another transition-metal-boride MoB_2 ³⁸, while in obvious contrast with the alkali-earth-metal boride MgB_2 ^{42,43} or alkali-metal boride RbB_6 .³¹ In either MgB_2 ^{42,43} or RbB_6 ³¹, the major DOS at the Fermi level are contributed by the B-p bands. But in either the superconducting technetium-borides of our study or MoB_2 ,³⁸ the 4d electronic states play dominant roles around the Fermi level.

The electronic band structure and the Fermi surface of superconducting technetium-borides are presented in Fig. S1 of supplementary information⁷⁹. For all five superconducting technetium-borides, either their band structure or their Fermi surface show obvious electronic dispersion in three dimensions. Typically for example TcB_2 , which shares the same crystal structure as MgB_2 and MoB_2 , has three dimensional Fermi surface

like MoB_2 ^{38,83} while being distinct from the quasi-two-dimensional Fermi surface of MgB_2 .^{43,84}

E. Dynamical stability and electron-phonon coupling

The phonon spectrum, the PHDOS, the Eliashberg functional $\alpha^2F(\omega)$ and the corresponding integrated EPC constant λ of superconducting technetium-borides at their lowest dynamically stable pressures are presented in the right columns of Fig.4. There is no sign of imaginary frequency in the phonon spectrum of all five superconducting technetium-borides, which proves the dynamical stability of these structures at the corresponding pressures. The distribution of the PHDOS and the Eliashberg spectral functional $\alpha^2F(\omega)$ of superconducting technetium-borides show clear separation between the low frequency phonon modes of the heavier Tc-atoms and the high frequency phonon modes of the lighter B-atoms. This enables us to separate the integrated EPC constant λ into two parts, the EPC from Tc-atoms λ_{Tc} , and the EPC from B-atoms λ_B . The ratio of EPC from oscillation of Tc-atoms relative to the total EPC, λ_{Tc}/λ , are 0.883, 0.910, 0.873, 0.907 and 0.911 for TcB_2 (P6/mmm), TcB (P6₃/mmc), Tc_2B (I4/mcm), Tc_3B (P4/mmm) and TcB (Cmcm), respectively. It indicates superconductivity in these five technetium-borides mainly originates from the coupling between the Tc-4d electrons and the low frequency phonon modes of Tc-atoms. At least three isotopes of technetium have reasonably long half lives (Tc-97, Tc-98 and Tc-99 at 4.2×10^6 , 6.6×10^6 and 2.13×10^5 years, respectively). Therefore, we suggest experiments on the isotope effects of technetium to examine our prediction.

The superconducting mechanism of our predicted technetium-borides is similar to that in transition-metal-borides MoB_2 , whose superconductivity mainly originates from the coupling between the Mo-4d electrons and the low frequency Mo-phonon modes.³⁸ However, the superconducting scenarios in alkali-earth-metal boride MgB_2 ^{42,43} and alkali-metal boride RbB_6 ³¹ are very different in that the couplings between B-2p electrons and the high frequency B-phonon modes play dominant roles.

The presence of BCS superconductivity or not in transition metal borides such as Mn-B, Mo-B, Tc-B, Re-B and Ru-B are likely being related to the magnitude of correlations of d-electrons in the transition metal. In MnB_2 , Mn-3d electrons are localized due to their strong correlations, which leads to magnetism and the suppression of BCS-superconductivity. In contrast, the superconductivity in MoB_2 , technetium-borides, Ru_7B_3 and Re_7B_3 are preserved where the correlations of d-electrons in Mo, Tc, Ru and Re are relatively smaller.

Observations in phonon spectrum, PHDOS and EPC of superconducting technetium-borides are consistent with their relatively smaller logarithmic average frequency ω_{log} as listed in Table I, since Tc-atoms are much heavier than B-atoms. The enhanced λ plus small




FIG. 4. Total and partial electronic DOS, phonon dispersion relation, phonon density of states (PHDOS), Eliashberg functional $\alpha^2F(\omega)$ and integrated EPC parameter $\lambda(\omega)$ of superconducting technetium-borides at their lowest dynamically stable pressures. From top to bottom, (a) TcB_2 (P6/mmm, 20 GPa), (b) TcB (P6₃/mmc, 0 GPa), (c) Tc_2B (I4/mcm, 0 GPa), (d) Tc_3B (P4/mmm, 0 GPa) and (e) TcB (Cmcm, 30 GPa).

TABLE II. Vickers hardness of superconducting technetium-borides at their lowest dynamically stable pressures.

Formula	Space Group	P (GPa)	$H_{v,Chen}$ ⁷⁷ (GPa)	$H_{v,Tian}$ ⁷⁸ (GPa)
TcB ₂	P6/mmm	20	10.6	12.0
TcB	P6 ₃ /mmc	0	2.8	4.8
Tc ₂ B	I4/mmm	0	11.8	13.0
Tc ₃ B	P4/mmm	0	10.0	11.3
TcB	Cmcm	30	12.2	13.7

ω_{log} characters of TcB₂ have also been seen in isostructural superconductor TlBi₂ of heavy atomic mass,⁸⁵ with $\lambda=1.4$, $\omega_{log}=37\text{ cm}^{-1}$ and rather low $T_c=5.5\text{ K}$. Recent work suggests introduction of hydrogen atoms into non-superconducting transition-metal boride Ti₂B₂ will result in superconducting Ti₂B₂H₄ ($T_c=48.6\text{ K}$ at ambient pressure), through expansion of the frequency range of phonon spectrum and consequently enlarged electron-phonon coupling⁸⁶. Similar hydrogenation probably helps in elevating the superconducting transition temperatures of technetium-borides by enlarging ω_{log} .

Another interesting observation on the discovered superconducting technetium-borides is that the Fermi levels of TcB₂ and TcB fall closely above the very peak positions of their DOS, as shown in Fig. 4. Since the EPC in technetium-borides is controlled by the coupling between the Tc-4d electrons and the oscillation of Tc-atoms, slight hole-doping could lower the Fermi level, thus enhances the effective number of electrons participating into the superconducting pairing and therefore enlarges the superconducting transition temperatures.

F. Hardness

We also calculated the Vickers hardness of discovered superconducting technetium-borides as presented in Table II, including . At ambient pressure, TcB (P6₃/mmc), Tc₂B (I4/mmm) and Tc₃B (P4/mmm) have Vickers hardness values of 2.8-4.8, 11.8-13.0 and 10.0-11.3 GPa, respectively. The Vickers hardness of TcB₂ (P6/mmm) and TcB (Cmcm) are 9.8-11.3 GPa and 12.2-13.7 GPa at pressures of 20 and 30 GPa, respectively. The superconducting technetium-borides in our study have relatively lower hardness values than previously stated superconducting borides of superhardness, for example RbB₆ (Pm-3m, Vickers hardness of 19.7 GPa at the ambient pressure) and RbB₈ (Immm, Vickers hardness of 36.9 GPa at the ambient pressure).³¹ Other mechanical parameters including elastic constants C_{ij} , bulk modulus

B, and shear modulus G at their lowest dynamically stable pressures are also calculated. Mechanical stability criteria⁸⁷ related to the elastic constants of these superconducting technetium-borides are fulfilled as presented in supplementary information⁷⁹.

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have conducted thorough structural searches in the technetium-boron binary system. An updated composition-pressure phase diagram of technetium-borides up to 180 GPa have been derived, including two new stoichiometries as Tc₃B₄ and Tc₂B. More importantly, we also found five unprecedented superconducting technetium-borides which remain dynamically stable at moderate or even ambient pressures. Among these thermodynamically metastable superconducting technetium-borides, TcB₂ (P6/mmm) has the highest superconducting transition temperature of 23.1 K at 20 GPa, and TcB (P6₃/mmc) has the highest superconducting transition temperature of 20.2 K at ambient pressure. The superconductivity in these technetium-borides mainly originate from the coupling between the dominant presence of Tc-4d electronic states around the Fermi level and the low frequency vibration modes of the technetium-atoms, which is closely analogous to another transition-metal-boride MoB₂. Our calculations not only identified superconducting TcB₂ (P6/mmm) of the same crystal structure as MgB₂ and MoB₂, but also discovered series of superconducting technetium-borides with diversified crystal structures. This work proves the rich structures and stoichiometries in superconducting technetium-borides at high pressures, thus sheds lights on the necessity of extended researches in discovery of new superconducting transition-metal borides.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

P. Z., Y.D. Q. and S.X. Y. designed the project; X.R. T. conducted the structure searches; P. Z. and A.Q. Y. calculated the electronic structure, the phonon spectra and the superconducting transition temperatures; all authors prepared the manuscript together. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 11604255 and the Natural Science Basic Research Program of Shaanxi No. 2021JM-001. Shuxiang Yang is supported by the Key Research Projects of Zhejiang Lab (Grants No. 2021PB0AC02). The computations are performed at the TianHe-2 national supercomputing center in Guangzhou and the HPC platform of Xi'an Jiaotong University.

* These authors contributed equally to this work

† yang_shuxiang@zhejianglab.com

‡ zpantz@mail.xjtu.edu.cn

- ¹ H. K. Onnes, in *Proceedings Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Vol. 13 (1911) pp. 1274–1276.
- ² C. J. Pickard and R. Needs, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **23**, 053201 (2011).
- ³ Y. Wang, J. Lv, L. Zhu, and Y. Ma, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183**, 2063 (2012).
- ⁴ A. R. Oganov and C. W. Glass, *J. Chem. Phys.* **124**, 244704 (2006).
- ⁵ F. Giustino, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 015003 (2017).
- ⁶ D. Duan, Y. Liu, F. Tian, D. Li, X. Huang, Z. Zhao, H. Yu, B. Liu, W. Tian, and T. Cui, *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 6968 (2014).
- ⁷ A. Drozdov, M. Erements, I. Troyan, V. Ksenofontov, and S. I. Shylin, *Nature* **525**, 73 (2015).
- ⁸ H. Liu, I. I. Naumov, R. Hoffmann, N. Ashcroft, and R. J. Hemley, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **114**, 6990 (2017).
- ⁹ Z. M. Geballe, H. Liu, A. K. Mishra, M. Ahart, M. Somayazulu, Y. Meng, M. Baldini, and R. J. Hemley, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **57**, 688 (2018).
- ¹⁰ M. Somayazulu, M. Ahart, A. K. Mishra, Z. M. Geballe, M. Baldini, Y. Meng, V. V. Struzhkin, and R. J. Hemley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 027001 (2019).
- ¹¹ A. Drozdov, P. Kong, V. Minkov, S. Besedin, M. Kuzovnikov, S. Mozaffari, L. Balicas, F. Balakirev, D. Graf, and V. Prakapenka, *Nature* **569**, 528 (2019).
- ¹² J. Nagamatsu, N. Nakagawa, T. Muranaka, Y. Zenitani, and J. Akimitsu, *Nature* **410**, 63 (2001).
- ¹³ H. J. Choi, S. G. Louie, and M. L. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 064503 (2009).
- ¹⁴ Z. Yu, T. Bo, B. Liu, Z. Fu, H. Wang, S. Xu, T. Xia, S. Li, S. Meng, and M. Liu, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 214517 (2022).
- ¹⁵ J. Schirber, D. Overmyer, B. Morosin, E. Venturini, R. Baughman, D. Emin, H. Klesnar, and T. Aselage, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 10787 (1992).
- ¹⁶ A. Yamamoto, C. Takao, T. Masui, M. Izumi, and S. Tajima, *Physica C Supercond.* **383**, 197 (2002).
- ¹⁷ H. Takeya, K. Togano, Y. S. Sung, T. Mochiku, and K. Hirata, *Physica C Supercond.* **408**, 144 (2004).
- ¹⁸ Y. Singh, A. Niazi, M. D. Vannette, R. Prozorov, and D. C. Johnston, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 214510 (2007).
- ¹⁹ G. V. Samsonov, *Handbook of Refractory Compounds* (Springer, New York, 1980).
- ²⁰ C. Pei, J. Zhang, C. Gong, Q. Wang, L. Gao, Y. Zhao, S. Tian, W. Cao, C. Li, Z.-Y. Lu, H. Lei, K. Liu, and Y. Qi, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **65**, 287412 (2022).
- ²¹ L. Leyarovska and E. Leyarovski, *J. Less-Common Met.* **67**, 249 (1979).
- ²² C. Buzea and T. Yamashita, *Supercond. Sci. Technol.* **14**, R115 (2001).
- ²³ A. Kawano, Y. Mizuta, H. Takagiwa, T. Muranaka, and J. Akimitsu, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **72**, 1724 (2003).
- ²⁴ A. N. Kolmogorov, S. Shah, E. R. Margine, A. F. Bialon, T. Hammerschmidt, and R. Drautz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 217003 (2010).
- ²⁵ H. Gou, N. Dubrovinskaia, E. Bykova, A. A. Tsirlin, D. Kasinathan, W. Schnelle, A. Richter, M. Merlini, M. Hanfland, A. M. Abakumov, D. Batuk, G. Van Tendeloo, Y. Nakajima, A. N. Kolmogorov, and L. Dubrovinsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 157002 (2013).
- ²⁶ H. Xie, H. Wang, F. Qin, W. Han, S. Wang, Y. Wang, F. Tian, and D. Duan, *Matter Radiat. at Extremes* **8**, 058404 (2023).
- ²⁷ L. Wu, B. Wan, H. Liu, H. Gou, Y. Yao, Z. Li, J. Zhang, F. Gao, and H.-k. Mao, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **7**, 4898–4904 (2016).
- ²⁸ K. Xia, M. Ma, C. Liu, H. Gao, Q. Chen, J. He, J. Sun, H.-T. Wang, Y. Tian, and D. Xing, *Mater. Today Phys.* **3**, 76 (2017).
- ²⁹ L. Duan, J. Su, N. Gong, B. Wan, P. Chen, P. Zhou, Z. Wang, Z. Li, and L. Wu, *Dalton Trans.* **48**, 14299 (2019).
- ³⁰ S. Han, L. Yu, Y. Liu, B. Zhao, C. Wang, X. Chen, Y. Zhang, R. Yu, and X. Liu, *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **33**, 2213377 (2023).
- ³¹ P. Zhang, Y. Tian, Y. Yang, H. Liu, and G. Liu, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 013130 (2023).
- ³² R. Lortz, Y. Wang, U. Tutsch, S. Abe, C. Meingast, P. Popovich, W. Knafo, N. Shitsevalova, Y. B. Paderno, and A. Junod, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 024512 (2006).
- ³³ L. Ma, X. Yang, G. Liu, H. Liu, G. Yang, H. Wang, J. Cai, M. Zhou, and H. Wang, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 174112 (2021).
- ³⁴ Y. Liang, M. Xu, S. Lin, X. Yuan, Z. Qu, J. Hao, and Y. Li, *J. Mater. Chem. C* **9**, 13782 (2021).
- ³⁵ G. Akopov, W. H. Mak, D. Koumoulis, H. Yin, B. Owens-Baird, M. T. Yeung, M. H. Muni, S. Lee, I. Roh, Z. C. Sobell, P. L. Diaconescu, R. Mohammadi, K. Kovnir, and R. B. Kaner, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **141**, 9047 (2019).
- ³⁶ J. Teyssier, A. B. Kuzmenko, D. van der Marel, F. Margiglio, A. B. Liashchenko, N. Shitsevalova, and V. Filipov, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 134503 (2007).
- ³⁷ L. Zhu, H. Liu, M. Somayazulu, Y. Meng, P. A. Guñka, T. B. Shiell, C. Kenney-Benson, S. Chariton, V. B. Prakapenka, H. Yoon, J. A. Horn, J. Paglione, R. Hoffmann, R. E. Cohen, and T. A. Strobel, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 013012 (2023).
- ³⁸ C. Pei, J. Zhang, Q. Wang, Y. Zhao, L. Gao, C. Gong, S. Tian, R. Luo, M. Li, W. Yang, Z.-Y. Lu, H. Lei, K. Liu, and Y. Qi, *Natl. Sci. Rev.* **10**, nwad034 (2023).
- ³⁹ M. B. W. R. W. Cumberland, S. M. J. J. Gilman, and R. B. K. S. H. Tolbert, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **127**, 7264 (2005).
- ⁴⁰ Y. H. T. L.-P. Ding, Y. T. P. Shao, and H. L. Z.-L. Zhao, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **12**, 5423 (2021).
- ⁴¹ T. Ma, H. Li, X. Zheng, S. Wang, X. Wang, H. Zhao, S. Han, J. Liu, R. Zhang, and P. Z. et al., *Adv. Mater.* **29**, 1604003 (2017).
- ⁴² J. M. An and W. E. Pickett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4366 (2001).
- ⁴³ J. Kortus, I. I. Mazin, K. D. Belashchenko, V. P. Antropov, and L. L. Boyer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4656 (2001).
- ⁴⁴ W. Trzebiatowski and J. Rudzinski, *J. Less-Common Met.* **6**, 244 (1964).
- ⁴⁵ D. Armstrong, *J. Less-Common Met.* **67**, 191 (1979).
- ⁴⁶ A. Pallas and K. Larsson, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **110**, 5367 (2006).
- ⁴⁷ Y. Wang, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **91**, 101904 (2007).
- ⁴⁸ M. Wang, Y. Li, T. Cui, Y. Ma, and G. Zou, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **93**, 101905 (2008).
- ⁴⁹ S. Aydin and M. Simsek, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 134107 (2009).
- ⁵⁰ J. Li, X. Wang, K. Liu, Y. Sun, L. Chen, and H. Yang, *Physica B-condensed Matter* **405**, 4659 (2010).
- ⁵¹ W. Chen and J. Jiang, *Solid State Commun.* **150**, 2093 (2010).
- ⁵² W. jie Zhao and B. Xu, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **65**, 372 (2012).
- ⁵³ E. Deligoz, K. Çolakoglu, H. B. Ozisik, and Y. O. Ciftci, *Solid State Sci.* **14**, 794 (2012).
- ⁵⁴ M. Zhong, X. yu Kuang, Z.-H. Wang, P. Shao, L.-P. Ding, and X.-F. Huang, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **117**, 10643 (2013).

- ⁵⁵ M. Zhang, H. Yan, Q. Wei, and H. Wang, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **68**, 371 (2013).
- ⁵⁶ C. Ying, E. Zhao, L. Lin, and Q. Hou, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* **28**, 1450213 (2014).
- ⁵⁷ F.-G. Kuang, X.-Y. Kuang, S.-Y. Kang, and X.-F. Huang, *Curr. Inorg. Chem.* **5**, 143 (2015).
- ⁵⁸ A. Van Der Geest and A. Kolmogorov, *Calphad* **46**, 184 (2014).
- ⁵⁹ J. Wu and G. Yang, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **82**, 86 (2014).
- ⁶⁰ G. Zhang, T. Bai, H. Yan, and Y.-R. Zhao, *Chin. Phys. B* **24**, 106104 (2015).
- ⁶¹ C. Ying, X. Bai, Y. Du, E. Zhao, L. Lin, and Q. Hou, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **30**, 1650131 (2016).
- ⁶² X. Miao, W. Xing, F. Meng, and R. Yu, *Solid State Commun.* **252**, 40 (2017).
- ⁶³ C. Ying, T. Liu, L. Lin, E. Zhao, and Q. Hou, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **144**, 154 (2018).
- ⁶⁴ H. Wu, Y. X. Wang, Z. xin Yan, W. Liu, Z. Q. Wang, and J. B. Gu, *Appl. Phys. A* **129**, 175 (2023).
- ⁶⁵ M. Avdeev, G. J. Thorogood, M. L. Carter, B. J. Kennedy, J. Ting, D. J. Singh, and K. S. Wallwork, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **133**, 1654 (2011), pMID: 21268576, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja109431t>.
- ⁶⁶ C. Franchini, T. Archer, J. He, X.-Q. Chen, A. Filippetti, and S. Sanvito, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 220402 (2011).
- ⁶⁷ E. E. Rodriguez, F. Poineau, A. Llobet, B. J. Kennedy, M. Avdeev, G. J. Thorogood, M. L. Carter, R. Seshadri, D. J. Singh, and A. K. Cheetham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 067201 (2011).
- ⁶⁸ J. Mravlje, M. Aichhorn, and A. Georges, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 197202 (2012).
- ⁶⁹ X. Li, H. Liu, and F. Peng, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **18**, 28791 (2016).
- ⁷⁰ D. Zhou, D. V. Semenok, M. A. Volkov, I. A. Troyan, A. Y. Seregin, I. V. Chepkasov, D. A. Sannikov, P. G. Lagoudakis, A. R. Oganov, and K. E. German, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 064102 (2023).
- ⁷¹ Y. Wang, J. Lv, L. Zhu, and Y. Ma, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183**, 2063 (2012).
- ⁷² P. Giannozzi, S. Baroni, N. Bonini, M. Calandra, R. Car, C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, G. L. Chiarotti, M. Cococcioni, and I. Dabo, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **21**, 395502 (2009).
- ⁷³ M. Methfessel and A. Paxton, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 3616 (1989).
- ⁷⁴ S. Baroni, S. De Gironcoli, A. Dal Corso, and P. Giannozzi, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 515 (2001).
- ⁷⁵ P. B. Allen and R. C. Dynes, *Phys. Rev. B* **12**, 905 (1975).
- ⁷⁶ P. Morel and P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **125**, 1263 (1962).
- ⁷⁷ X.-Q. Chen, H. Niu, D. Li, and Y. Li, *Intermetallics* **19**, 1275 (2011).
- ⁷⁸ Y. Tian, B. Xu, and Z. Zhao, *Int. J. Refract. Hard Met.* **33**, 93 (2012).
- ⁷⁹ “The online supplemental material are provided at xxx,”.
- ⁸⁰ Y. Kong, O. V. Dolgov, O. Jepsen, and O. K. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 020501 (2001).
- ⁸¹ M. Aykol, S. S. Dwaraknath, W. Sun, and K. A. Persson, *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaaq0148 (2018).
- ⁸² D. Zhou, D. V. Semenok, H. Xie, X. Huang, D. Duan, A. Aperis, P. M. Oppeneer, M. Galasso, A. I. Kartsev, A. G. Kvashnin, A. R. Oganov, and T. Cui, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **142**, 2803 (2020).
- ⁸³ Y. Quan, K.-W. Lee, and W. E. Pickett, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 224504 (2021).
- ⁸⁴ H. J. Choi, D. Roundy, H. Sun, M. L. Cohen, and S. G. Louie, *Nature* **418**, 758–760 (2002).
- ⁸⁵ A. Yang, X. Tao, Y. Quan, and P. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 075203 (2023).
- ⁸⁶ Y.-L. Han, Y.-P. Li, L. Yang, H.-D. Liu, N. Jiao, B.-T. Wang, H.-Y. Lu, and P. Zhang, *Mater. Today Phys.* **30**, 100954 (2023).
- ⁸⁷ F. Mouhat and F. Coudert, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 224104 (2014).