

# Transition Temperatures of Superconductors estimated from Periodic Table Properties

O. P. Isikaku-Ironkwe<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Center for Superconductivity Technologies (TCST)  
Department of Physics,  
Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike (MOUUAU),  
Umuahia, Abia State, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>RTS Technologies, San Diego, CA 92122

## Abstract

Predicting the transition temperature,  $T_c$ , of a superconductor from Periodic Table normal state properties is regarded as one of the grand challenges of superconductivity. By studying the correlations of Periodic Table properties with known superconductors, it is possible to estimate their transition temperatures. Starting from the isotope effect and correlations of superconductivity with electronegativity ( $\mathcal{X}$ ), valence electron count per atom (Ne), atomic number ( $Z$ ) and formula weight (Fw), we derive an empirical formula for estimating  $T_c$  that includes an unknown parameter, ( $K_o$ ). With average values of  $\mathcal{X}$ , Ne and  $Z$ , we develop a material specific characterization dataset (MSCD) model of a superconductor that is quantitatively useful for characterizing and comparing superconductors. We show that for most superconductors,  $K_o$  correlates with  $Fw/Z$ , Ne,  $Z$ , number of atoms ( $A_n$ ) in the formula, number of elements ( $E_n$ ) and with  $T_c$ . We study some superconductor families and use the discovered correlations to predict similar and novel superconductors and also estimate their  $T_c$ s. Thus the material specific equations derived in this paper, the material specific characterization dataset (MSCD) system developed here and the discovered correlation between  $T_c$  and  $Fw/Z$ ,  $E_n$  and  $A_n$ , provide the building blocks for the analysis, design and search of potential novel high temperature superconductors with specific estimated  $T_c$ s.

**Keywords:** *estimating  $T_c$ , superconductivity by design, MSCD, combinatorial-computational search for superconductors, predicting superconductivity, similar superconductors,  $Fw/Z$ .*

## Introduction

The transition temperature  $T_c$ , of a superconductor is one of its most important properties. Predicting the  $T_c$  of superconductors from Periodic Table [1] normal state properties is regarded as one of the challenges in the design and search for novel high temperature superconductors [2]. This search has been described as *“the very heart of scientific research in superconductivity”* [2]. Achieving  $T_c$  prediction has also been tagged a “grand challenge” that should lead to a paradigm shift from discovery by serendipity to discovery by design. The *“Basic Research Needs for Superconductivity”* report of 2006 [2, 3, 4, 5] observed that *“despite our greater experience with many more superconductors of very different kinds, however, we still do not know how to predict the occurrence of superconductivity or design a material with given superconducting properties”*. The challenge of predicting superconducting properties of materials from the Periodic Table was first undertaken by B.T. Matthias [6, 7, 8, 9, 10] who observed a correlation of valence electron count per atom,  $N_v$ , with transition temperature,  $T_c$ . The isotope effect [11, 12] which pointed to a correlation between mass and  $T_c$ , became one of the building blocks of the BCS theory of superconductivity [13]. The BCS theory gave the first quantitative estimate of  $T_c$ . The BCS theory has however been criticized [14, 15] for not providing enough “material specific” parameters to search for and design superconductors. Villars and Phillips [16] had found three parameters (valence electrons, orbital radii and electronegativity) as “golden coordinates” that influence superconductivity and had high predictive power in their search for high- $T_c$  superconductors. Hirsch recognized the grand challenge [17] and attempted a statistical approach to its solution by studying thirteen key variables, normal state properties that correlate with superconductivity. He proposed that it should be possible to find “normal state properties” that tell whether a material will be a superconductor or not. He found the Hall coefficient,  $R_H$ , to have the highest correlation factor followed by work function, bulk modulus, melting temperature, and atomic volume. Next in his list were Debye temperature, effective  $U$ , ionic mass, ionization potential, magnetic susceptibility and electrical conductivity. Specific heat and thermal conductivity came last. Many studies have found significant correlations between superconductivity and electronegativity [16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23], valence electrons [6, 7, 8,

9, 10, 24, 25, 26, 27] and atomic number [17]. Theoretical efforts such as the density functional theory, DFT, of superconductivity [28, 29] have made some initial success in solving the challenge, particularly with simple metals and alloys. DFT has however yet to incorporate the successful “enlightened” empirical approach [15] and “material specific” chemistry [14] aspects of discovering superconductivity. Our research has been influenced by the superconductivity report [2] and “The Hirsch question” [17], namely: *“Is it possible to accurately predict the magnitude of the superconducting critical temperature,  $T_c$ , of a material from measurements of its normal state properties?”*

This paper attempts to answer the Hirsch question and to derive  $T_c$  as it relates to “material specific” Periodic Table properties such as electronegativity, valence electrons, atomic number, formula weight and other factors. These normal state properties are studied across many known families of superconductors and some correlations that may prove useful in designing and predicting the  $T_c$ s of novel families of superconductors are identified and quantified.

This paper is structured in three parts. Part I begins with the isotope effect. We then adopt the Gaussian distribution function to describe the maximum  $T_c$  to bound the variation of  $T_c$  with doping. We next extend it to correlations of the maximum  $T_c$  with Periodic Table properties such as electronegativity, valence electrons, formula weight and atomic number. For alloys and compounds we evaluate the average values of electronegativity, valence electron count and atomic number and the experimental parameter  $K_0$  at maximum  $T_c$ . In this work, the Pauling’s Electronegativity Scale [18] and Matthias valence electron convention in reference 10 are used in Table 1. In Part I we also introduce a material-specific characterization dataset (MSCD) system for describing and characterizing superconductors.

In Part II we use these insights to explore material specific properties of known superconductors, expressing  $K_0$  in material specific terms for the families of superconductors studied. We extend the discovered correlations of  $T_c$  with formula weight over atomic number,  $Fw/Z$ , number of atoms,  $A_n$ , number of elements,  $E_n$ , and  $K_0$  to estimate the material specific properties of novel superconductors up to 400K.

Part III discusses the implications of the material-specific paradigm introduced herein for the future analysis, design and search for potential high temperature superconductors (HTSCs). Guidelines for estimating superconductivity and  $T_c$  are enunciated, with examples.

### **Part I: Basic Theoretical Framework**

The Isotope effect [11, 12] provided the first evidence of a correlation between mass and transition temperature  $T_c$ , with  $T_c$  varying inversely as the square root of atomic mass ( $M$ ) for many elements. Introducing a proportionality parameter  $K$ ,  $T_c$  can be expressed as:

$$T_c \approx \frac{K}{\sqrt{M}} \quad (1)$$

Not long after the discovery of the isotope effect, Matthias et al. [6 - 10] and others [24 - 27] showed that  $T_c$  is correlated to valence electrons per atom,  $N_e$ , in elements and intermetallic compounds. Experimental data [6, 8, 9, 25, 26, 27] suggests that the applicability of this correlation can be improved with the addition of a Gaussian function [30] and  $T_c$  can be expressed approximately as:

$$T_c \approx N_e \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} \quad (2)$$

Where  $y = \frac{(x-X)}{\sigma}$ , in the Gaussian

$$G_x(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} \quad (3)$$

A similar Gaussian correlation also applies for variation of  $T_c$  with electronegativity,  $\chi$ , [16, 17, 18, 19, 20] expressed approximately as:

$$T_c \approx \chi \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} \quad (4)$$

For this paper, we propose to combine the dependencies in equations 1, 2 and 4 to give:

$$T_c = \chi \frac{N_e}{\sqrt{M}} K_1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} \quad (5)$$

where  $K_1$  is a modifying parameter to be determined by comparison with known superconductors. The atomic mass,  $M$ , is known to relate to its atomic number  $Z$ , by approximately:

$$M = K_2 Z \quad (6)$$

It can be shown that  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  can be combined and replaced by an appropriate parameter  $K_0$ , transforming equations (5) and (6) into:

$$T_c = \chi \frac{Ne}{\sqrt{Z}} K_0 e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} \quad (7)$$

Note that equations 5 and 7 are similar except that the parameters  $K_1$  and  $K_0$  have different values.  $K_1$  applies when we work with Mass and  $K_0$  when we work with Atomic number. For the rest of this work, we will use  $K_0$ .  $K_1$  and  $K_0$  can be regarded as  $T_c$  modifying parameters unique for each material family. For example,  $K_0$  varies from 2.0 for the elements to about 70 for best known mercury –based high temperature superconductor. The limits to this equation are determined by the value of  $e^{-1/2y^2}$  since the other factors, except  $T_c$ , cannot be zero. For maximum  $T_c$ ,

$$e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} = 1 \quad (8)$$

This occurs when  $y = 0$ . Equation 7 then reduces to:

$$T_c = \chi \frac{Ne}{\sqrt{Z}} K_0 \quad (9)$$

$T_c$  will be zero, when:

$$e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} = 0 \quad (10)$$

This occurs when  $y$  is infinite i.e.  $y = \infty$ . This value of  $y$  is determined by doping and crystal chemistry which we shall discuss in a future paper.

Though a Gaussian curve is assumed, the actual shape for any given superconductor will be determined by doping and yet to be determined chemical parameters that influence the value of  $y$ . The validity of the material specific equation 7 for  $T_c$  can be verified by studying

the combined effects on Tc of average values of electronegativity,  $\mathcal{X}$ , valence electrons, Ne, atomic number, Z, and the modifying parameter Ko. Next we derive the average values of these parameters.

### Average Values of $\mathcal{X}$ , Ne and Z

Most superconducting materials are alloys or chemical compounds. According to Sanderson [31] the effective electronegativity  $\mathcal{X}$  of a compound containing n elements is the average electronegativity of its constituent elements and atoms expressed as:

$$\mathcal{X} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{X}_i N_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n N_i} \quad (11)$$

where  $N_i$  is the number of atoms of element i, with electronegativity  $\mathcal{X}_i$ . The same logic can be extended to averages of valence electron count, Ne, and atomic number, Z. Thus for a compound with formula  $A_p B_q C_r D_s E_t$ , where p, q, r, s, t represent the numbers of atoms of elements A, B, C, D and E respectively. In this work, we use electronegativity  $\mathcal{X}$ , as defined by Pauling [18] and Valence electron count per atom Ne, as defined by Matthias [10] and others [25, 26, 27]. The average values of  $\mathcal{X}$ , Ne and Z for multi-element systems can then be calculated as:

$$\mathcal{X} = \frac{p\mathcal{X}_A + q\mathcal{X}_B + r\mathcal{X}_C + s\mathcal{X}_D + t\mathcal{X}_E}{p+q+r+s+t} \quad (12)$$

$$Ne = \frac{pNe_A + qNe_B + rNe_C + sNe_D + tNe_E}{p+q+r+s+t} \quad (13)$$

$$Z = \frac{pZ_A + qZ_B + rZ_C + sZ_D + tZ_E}{p+q+r+s+t} \quad (14)$$

The total formula weight, Fw, of  $A_p B_q C_r D_s E_t$  is expressed as:

$$Fw = pFw_A + qFw_B + rFw_C + sFw_D + tFw_E \quad (15)$$

The average values of electronegativity, valence electron count and atomic number will be used in computing the material specific characteristics of superconductors and other materials to be presented in this paper.

### Material-Specific Characterization Dataset (MSCD)

Using the Periodic Table[1] and Pauling's electronegativity scale (Table 1) we can compute from a material's formula,  $A_p B_q C_r D_s E_t$ , its electronegativity,  $\mathcal{X}$ , valence electron count, Ne, atomic number, Z, and formula weight Fw, from equations 9, 12, 13, 14 and 15. When the Tc

is known,  $K_0$  can be computed. We also compute the ratios:  $Ne/\sqrt{Z}$ ,  $Fw/Z$ ,  $Fw/Ne$  and  $Fw/\sqrt{Z}$  for cases where  $T_c$  is not previously known. We shall show in Part II, how to compute  $K_0$  from correlations of  $K_0$  with some of the above parameters. Here we define the material specific characterization dataset (MSCD) of a superconductor  $A_pB_qC_rD_sE_t$  as a set of parameters that chemically define the superconductor quantitatively.

$$A_pB_qC_rD_sE_t \equiv \langle \mathcal{X}, Ne, Z, Fw, T_c, Ne/\sqrt{Z}, K_0, Fw/Z, Fw/Ne, A_n, E_n, Fw/\sqrt{Z} \rangle \quad (16)$$

where  $A_n$  is the total number of atoms in the formula and  $E_n$  the total number of elements.

Besides been a powerful material specific computational characterization tool, the MSCD (16) is also useful for comparing superconductors. MSCD values computed using Table 1 and the Periodic Table of Elements [1] are displayed in Table 2 which represents the MSCD of many families of selected superconductors. MSCD may be seen as the “genome” of a superconductor in terms of the variables expressed therein. As we shall see in Part II of this paper, it can be used in the computational screening and combinatorial search for new superconductors.

## Part II: Analytical Observations of Superconductors

In this section we look for correlations of material specific properties that can be used for screening for superconductivity and also analyze the MSCD of families of superconductors and look for material-specific correlations of  $T_c$  with  $Fw/Z$ ,  $A_n$  and  $E_n$ .

### 2.1 Computational Material-Specific Screening for HTSC

We found that the value of  $Ne/\sqrt{Z}$  provides a quick computational screening for superconductivity or its absence in many materials.

We found from MSCD in Table 2, that for most high- $T_c$  superconductors,

$$0.8 < Ne/\sqrt{Z} < 1.0 \quad (17)$$

For the cuprates in particular, we observe that the electronegativity,  $\mathcal{X}$ , valence electron count,  $Ne$ , and atomic number,  $Z$ , lie within a narrow range specified as:  $2.4 < \mathcal{X} < 2.6$ ;  $3.8 < Ne < 4.4$  and  $20 < Z < 25$ .

### 2.2 Similar Superconductors

An interesting observation on superconductors with close enough  $T_c$ s is presented in the MSCD of Table 3 which lists five pairs of similar superconductors. We distinguish four possible cases:

(a)  $\langle \mathcal{X}, Ne \rangle$  the same

- (b)  $\langle \text{Ne}, Z \rangle$  the same
- (c)  $\langle \mathcal{X}, Z \rangle$  the same
- (d)  $\langle \mathcal{X}, \text{Ne}, Z \rangle$  the same.

We describe such superconductors as similar. We find the following empirical rule to apply within the range  $0.75 < \text{Ne}/\sqrt{Z} < 1.02$ .

1. Materials with exactly the same average electronegativity, valence electrons and atomic number have the same transition temperature.
2. If two or more materials have the same average valence electrons  $\text{Ne}$ , and atomic number  $Z$ , then their  $T_c$ s will be proportional to their electronegativities.
3. If two or more materials have the same average electronegativity  $\mathcal{X}$ , and valence electrons  $\text{Ne}$ , then their  $T_c$ s will be proportional to their average atomic numbers,  $Z$ .

### 2.3 Electronegativity

Electronegativity[18] has been shown [19, 20, 21, 22, 23] to correlate with superconductivity. A low electronegativity ( $\mathcal{X} < 1.6$ ) is usually associated with low  $T_c$ .  $T_c$  tends to go up as electronegativity increases peaking between 2.5 and 2.6. for high temperature superconductors. Asokamani et al. [19] showed that pressure generally correlates with electronegativity: an increase in pressure leads to an increase in electronegativity. Most materials with electronegativity above 2.6 are not superconductors. Table 4 showing the variation of  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $T_c$  for many superconductor families, indicates that electronegativity increases with  $T_c$  then at higher  $T_c$ s electronegativity tends to drop to around 2.46 (see figure 1).

### 2.4 General $T_c$ Correlations

From the MSCD of Table 2 we produce Table 5 which represents the MSCD for six families of superconductors with 1, 2, 4 and 5 elements. We study the correlations of  $T_c$  with:  $F_w/Z$ ,  $K_o$ , and  $E_n$ . These results are expressed as graphs in Figures 2, 3 and 4. Figure 2 shows that  $T_c$  increases with  $F_w/Z$ . Figure 3 also indicate that  $T_c$  increases with  $K_o$ . Fig. 4 shows that  $T_c$  increases with the number of elements.

### 2.5 Material Specific Map for Superconductor Families

Table 6 shows estimates for  $K_o$  in terms of  $F_w/Z$  for various families of superconductors, derived from Table 2 and references 25 and 26. Plugging these estimates into the formula for maximum  $T_c$  (equation 9), enables us to estimate the  $T_c$ s of families of superconductors indicated. We use these estimates in the next section to predict novel superconductors.

### 2.6 Predicting New Superconductors & Estimating their $T_c$ s

Using Table 6 and the rules in sections 2.1 and 2.2, we can predict novel superconductors as shown in Table 7 with 21 examples. We state their formulae and expected  $T_c$ s.



## 2.7 Tc variation in the Hg Cuprates

The Mercury-based cuprates produce the highest Tc of all known superconductors. The origin of this high Tc in cuprates is still uncertain though detailed studies [32, 33, 40] attribute this high-Tc phenomenon to layered homologous systems. Graph of Tc versus number of layers for the mercury cuprates [32, 33] produce a very unique graph (figure 6) where Tc peaks at layer 3 at 133K, falling off on both sides. We have been able to reproduce this graph by plotting Tc versus Fw/Z for the mercury cuprates (figure 5). This strongly suggests that Fw/Z plays the same role as number of layers.

## 2.8 High Fw/Z: Origin of HTSC?

The significance of Fw/Z in high-Tc superconductivity is probed further by examining three superconductors [43, 44, 45] shown in Table 8. Tc moves from 40 K to 93K and to 133K as Fw/Z increases from slightly over 16 to 29 and then to over 36. Even though the number of elements also increased, from 3 to 5, the largest increase is in Fw/Z. This suggests that Fw/Z may be the most significant parameter in increasing Tc.

## 2.9 Estimating Parameters for HTSC higher than 133K

Using  $\text{HgBa}_2\text{Ca}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_8$  as a design model we assume  $\frac{K_o}{Fw/z} = 1.9$ ,  $N_e = 3.85$ ,  $An/En = 3.2$ . With electronegativity  $\mathcal{X}$ , between 2.4 and 2.5 and  $N_e/\sqrt{Z}$  around 0.8 and  $K_o$  values up to 200 we use these values to compute Tc in the formula:  $T_c = \mathcal{X} \frac{N_e}{\sqrt{Z}} K_o$ . Six examples are given with Tc almost 400K in Table 10. The computations also yield the formula weight and average atomic number of the expected superconductors in addition to the number of elements and atoms in the materials.

## Part III: Discussion, Conclusions & Acknowledgements

### Discussion

Estimating Tcs in material specific terms have been a fundamental unsolved problem [3, 4, 5, 14, 17, 39] --- till now. Inability to estimate Tc has led to failure in predicting new families of superconductors. This inability arose from the problem of identifying the limiting parameter or “glue” to high Tc[40, 41]. Our studies have identified it as  $K_o$  which in material specific terms is a function of Fw/Z, number of atoms,  $An$ , and number of elements  $En$ . This can be confirmed if we examine the change in Fw/Z with Tc as we go from Nb to  $\text{MgB}_2$  to the Pnictides and cuprates (Table 2). There is a continuous large increase in Fw/Z, indicating a strong correlation with Tc as shown in Figure 2. Though the goal of this paper was not to delve into the mechanism of superconductivity, the data obtained showed that Fw/Z is the deciding parameter or “The Glue” to high temperature superconductivity. For each family of HTSC, Tc peaks at some value of Fw/Z which is not the highest value of Fw/Z for that family. The optimum Fw/Z for highest Tc is yet to be explained. We however found an empirical relation between maximum Tc and number of atoms  $An$  and elements  $En$ .  $An/En = 3.2$  for  $\text{HgBa}_2\text{Ca}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_8$ , our model design example. Tc definitely increases with Fw/Z, number of

elements and atoms then peaks and descends for each family of superconductors,(see figure 5 for Mercury cuprates).

In this study, we did not use the traditional tools of DFT and band structure calculations. Treating superconductivity as a material-specific chemistry problem, we rather explored chemical correlations and the power of the Periodic Table of elements [46]. Our predictions of 21 superconductors based on this novel approach, is the implicit proof of its correctness or not.

The techniques developed here have not directly taken into account structural features, phases, pressure and doping which really are embedded in electronegativity [19] and valence electrons [27] and atomic number. Nor have we delved into the theories of superconductivity to derive the equations used. We have used the minimal assumptions on the chemical foundations of superconductivity. We recognize the millions of possible permutations and combinations of the elements that could yield superconductivity [34]. However the methods introduced here present a novel computational combinatorial paradigm very different from previously proposed methods [36, 37]. It also considerably reduces the search space[34].

The magnetic features of superconductivity and the physics of heavy fermion superconductivity [51, 52] are outside the scope of this preliminary study focused on high temperature superconductors. They will be treated in a future paper.

Many general guidelines have been advanced for searching for high-Tc superconductors [15, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50]. The guidelines we have in this paper are unique in that they are material specific and actually estimate the Tcs you will get if you use them and the chemical formula of the superconductors that give the Tcs. We have achieved this with simple concepts of chemistry and physics using correlations of electronegativity, valence electron count, atomic number, formula weight over Z with superconductivity.

## **Conclusions**

The rational design of superconductors depends on obtaining a reasonable estimate for Tc which depends on identifying the parameters that influence Tc. In this paper we have identified the parameters as averages of electronegativity, valence electrons count per atom, formula weight over atomic number,  $Fw/Z$ , number of atoms,  $A_n$ , and number of elements  $E_n$ , in the material and a parameter  $Ko$ (equation 9). We have derived an empirical formula for Tc based on these parameters.

We found a material specific equivalent of  $Ko$  as a weighted value of formula weight divided by average atomic number of the constituent elements ( $Fw/Z$ ). The value of  $Fw/Z$  is a key determinant in the value of Tc. We showed that from the  $Fw/Z$  of a superconductor and the number of elements and atoms we can tell the limits of its Tc.

We also established material specific tests for HTSC over 90K ( $0.75 < Ne/\sqrt{Z} < 1.0$ );  $2.4 < X < 2.6$ ;  $3.8 < Ne < 4.4$ ;  $20 < Z < 25$ . We also proposed three empirical rules for detecting similar superconductors, namely:

1. Materials with exactly the same average electronegativity, valence electrons and atomic number have the same transition temperature.
2. If two or more materials have the same average valence electrons  $Ne$ , and atomic number  $Z$ , then their  $T_c$ s will be proportional to their electronegativities.
3. If two or more materials have the same average electronegativity and valence electrons, then their  $T_c$ s will be proportional to their average atomic numbers.

Using these rules and the material specific equations 9, 11 – 14, we predict 21 new superconductors and their  $T_c$ , displayed in Table 7.

We estimated in Table 10, material-specific parameters required to achieve room temperature superconductivity [15, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 45, 47]. Thus we can assert that we have successfully taken on the grand challenge and answered in the affirmative the Hirsch question: *“Is it possible to accurately predict the magnitude of the superconducting critical temperature,  $T_c$ , of a material from measurements of its normal state properties?”* Finally we propose that the methodology developed in this paper provide a novel set of building blocks for analysis, design and search for high temperature superconductors with  $T_c$  up to 400K.

## Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to acknowledge stimulating discussions with A.O.E. Animalu at University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Coming to UC San Diego in 2011, M.B. Maple, J.E. Hirsch, and J. Fortin asked critical questions that helped shape and focus the research. M. J. Schaffer, then at General Atomics, San Diego was always available to discuss, correct and suggest better ways to present the concepts and assumptions in the paper. J.R. O’Brien at Quantum Design provided me with much needed research resources in addition to stimulating discussions on chemistry aspects of superconductivity. This research was financially supported during this period by M. J. Schaffer.

## References

1. WebElements. “The Periodic Table on the Web”, [www.webelements.com](http://www.webelements.com)
2. DOE-BES, “Basic Research Needs for Superconductivity”: Report of the Basic Energy Sciences Workshop on Superconductivity 2006. pp 99, 100  
[http://science.energy.gov/~media/bes/pdf/reports/files/sc\\_rpt.pdf](http://science.energy.gov/~media/bes/pdf/reports/files/sc_rpt.pdf)
3. DOE-BES, “Basic Research Needs for Superconductivity”: Report of the Basic Energy Sciences Workshop on Superconductivity 2006. pp 1 -- 20

4. DOE-BES, "Basic Research Needs for Superconductivity": Report of the Basic Energy Sciences Workshop on Superconductivity 2006. pp 21—23.
5. DOE-BES; "Basic Research Needs for Superconductivity": Report of the Basic Energy Sciences Workshop on Superconductivity 2006. pp 200.
6. B.T. Matthias, "Empirical relation between superconductivity and the number of valence electrons per atom." *Phys. Rev.* 97 (1955), 74
7. B.T. Matthias, T.H. Geballe, S. Geller and E. Corenzwit, "Superconductivity". *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 35, 1 (1963).
8. B.T. Matthias, "The empirical Approach to superconductivity", *J. Adv. Cryogen. Engr.* 13, 1-8, (1968)
9. B.T. Matthias, "The Search for High-Temperature Superconductors", *Physics Today*, August 1971, 23-27
10. B.T. Matthias, "Systematics of Superconductivity", pp 227-293, in *SUPERCONDUCTIVITY: Vol. 1, Proceedings of the Advanced Summer Study Institute, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. Edited by P.R. Wallace; Gordon & Breach, Science Publishers (1969).*
11. E. Maxwell, "Isotope Effect in the Superconductivity of Mercury". *Phys. Rev* 78, 477 (1950).
12. C.A. Reynolds, B. Serin, W.H. Wright & L.B. Nesbitt, "Superconductivity of isotopes of Mercury". *Phys. Rev.* 78, 487 (1950).
13. J. Bardeen, L.N. Cooper & J.R. Schrieffer "Microscopic Theory of Superconductivity". *Phys. Rev.* 108, 1175 (1957).
14. Grochala W, Hoffmann R, Edwards P.P. "Chemistry of Vibronic Coupling. Part 5. Vibronic Coupling in Molecules and in Solids". *CHEM EUR J* 9 (2): 575-587, (2003).
15. C.W. Chu, "A Possible Path to RTS". *AAPPS Bulletin* August 2008, Vol. 18, No. 4
16. P. Villars and J.C. Phillips, "Quantum structural diagrams and high-Tc superconductivity". *Phys. Rev. B* 37, 2345 (1988)
17. J.E. Hirsch, "Correlations between normal state properties and superconductivity". *Phys. Rev. B* 55, 9007-9024 (1997).
18. Pauling, Linus (1960). *The Nature of the Chemical Bond*. Cornell University Press. pp. 88–107. ISBN 0801403332.
19. R. Asokamani and R. Manjula: "Correlation between electronegativity and superconductivity", *Phys. Rev B* 39 4217—4221, (1989).
20. D.A. Nepala and J.M. McKay, "Correlation of Electronegativity and transition temperature in high-Tc superconductors", *Physica C* 158 (1989) 65-68.
21. R. Jayaprakash and J. Shanker; "Correlation between electronegativity and high temperature superconductivity"; *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* Vol. 54, No. 3, pp 365-369, (1993).

22. C. Buzea and T. Yamashita, "Correlation between electronegativity and superconductivity", *Physica B* 281 & 282 (2000) 951-952.
23. L. long-Jian and Z. Zhuang-Jian, "Investigation of empirical laws for superconductivity of alloy and compound superconductors". *Chinese Physics* Vol. 10. No. 9, Sept. 2001.
24. M. Pop, Gh. Borodi, S. Simon; Correlation between valence electron concentration and high temperature superconductivity. *J. Phys. and Chem of Solids* 61 1939 – 1944 (2000).
25. C.P. Poole, Jr. and H.A. Farach , " Tabulations and correlations of transition temperatures of classical superconductors" *J. Supercond Inc. Novel Magnetism* Vol 13, No. 1, 47-60 (2000).
26. C.P. Poole, H.A. Farach, R. J. Creswick, R. Prozorov; *Superconductivity*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.(2007), Academic Press, San Diego, CA, USA
27. V. Vonsovsky, Yu. A. Izyumov, and E.Z. Kurmaev, "Superconductivity in Transition Metals", Springer, New York (1982).
28. M. Lüders, M.A.L. Marques, N.N. Lathiotakis, A. Floris, G. Profeta, L. Fast, A. Continenza, S. Massidda, E.K.U. Gross "Ab-initio theory of superconductivity - I: Density functional formalism and approximate functionals" *Phys. Rev. B* 72 024545 (2005).
29. M.A.L. Marques, M. Lüders, N.N. Lathiotakis, G. Profeta, A. Floris, L. Fast, A. Continenza, E.K.U. Gross, S. Massidda "Ab-initio theory of superconductivity II: Applications to elemental metals". *Phys. Rev. B* 72 024546 (2005).
30. J.W. Harris and H. Stocker, *Handbook of Mathematics and Computational Science* Springer (1988), pp. 240, 795
31. R.T. Sanderson, "Chemical Periodicity" Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1961) p 37
32. A.L. Kuzemsky and I.G. Kuzemskaya, "Structural sensitivity of superconducting properties of layered systems", *Physica C* 383 (2002) 140 -158
33. T.A. Zaleski and T.K. Kopec "Dependence of the superconducting critical temperature on the number of layers in homologous series of high-Tc Cuprates". *Phys. Rev. B* 71(2005) 014519
34. Francis J. DiSalvo "Challenges and opportunities in solid state chemistry", *Pure Appl. Chem.*, Vol. 72, No. 10, pp 1799 -1807, 2000
35. D.C. Johnston, "The Puzzle of high-Tc superconductivity in layered Iron Pnictides and Chalcogenides". Arxiv. 1005.4392 v2
36. Ichiro Takeuchi, Joshhen Lauterbach and Michael J. Fasolka, "Combinatorial Material Synthesis", *Materials Today*, October 2005, pp 18 –26.
37. Radislav A. Potyrailo and Ichiro Takeuchi, "Combinatorial and high throughput Materials Research". *Meas. Sci. Technol.* 16, (2005)
38. A. Mourachkine, "Route to room temperature superconductivity from a practical point of view" Arxiv: 0704.2188 v1 (2007)
39. W.E. Pickett, "High temperature superconductors at optimal doping" *Iranian Journal of Physics Research* Vol 6, No 3, 2006

40. DoE-BES "Basic Research Needs for Superconductivity": Report of the Basic Energy Sciences Workshop on Superconductivity 2006. pp 197, 200 -201  
[http://science.energy.gov/~media/bes/pdf/reports/files/sc\\_rpt.pdf](http://science.energy.gov/~media/bes/pdf/reports/files/sc_rpt.pdf)
41. DoE-BES "Basic Research Needs for Superconductivity": See pages 63 - 65 .
42. V.L. Ginzburg, "Nobel Lecture, Sec 3: On High-temperature and Room Temperature Superconductors", Rev. Mod. Phys. 76, 981 (2004)
43. J.G. Bednortz and K.A. Muller, "Possible high T<sub>c</sub> superconductivity in the Ba-La-Cu-O system," Z. Phys. B 64, 189 (1986); M.K. Wu et al "Superconductivity at 93 K in a new mixed-phase Y-Ba-Cu-O compound at ambient pressure," Phys Rev Lett. 58, 908 (1987)
44. Shilling, M. Cantoni, J.D. Guo and H.R. Ott, "Superconductivity above 130K in the Hg-Ba-Ca-Cu-O System", Nature 363, 56 – 58 (1993).
45. Terrell A. Vanderah, Chemistry of Superconductor Materials, (1992) Noyes Publications, Park Ridge, New Jersey, USA
46. T.H. Geballe, "The search for new materials", Physics C 341-348 (2000) 37-40
47. K.A. Muller, "The search for new high temperature superconductors", Supercond Sci. Technol. 19 (2006) S1 –S3
48. Horst Rogalla and Peter H. Kes; 100 years of Superconductivity (2011) CRC Press  
 "Overview of the experimental history, status and prospects of HTS", M.R. Beasley, pp 213 -- 222
49. Laura H. Greene, "Taming Serendipity", Physics World, 24, 41-43, 2011
50. Laura H. Greene, Hamoo Z. Arham, Cassandra R. Hunt and Wan Kyu Park. "Design of new superconducting materials, and point contact spectroscopy as a probe of strong electron correlations". ArXiv: 1110.4147 (2011)
51. M. Brian Maple, The Bernd T. Matthias Prize Lecture, "Three Decades of Progress on Superconductivity and Magnetism in Novel Materials," Wednesday, February 23, 2000 at the M2S-HTSC-VI Conference, held in Houston, Texas USA. Physica C, 341-348(2000) 47- 52.
52. Frank Steglich, The 2006 Bernd T. Matthias Prize Lecture "Superconductivity and Magnetism: From antagonism to mutual interplay"; Physica C 460-462 (2007) 7 - 12

## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

### List of Tables

**Data for the Tables are obtained from References 25, 26, 35 and 45. Computations**

**for  $K_0$  are done with equation (9) for maximum  $T_c$ :  $T_c = \mathcal{X} \frac{N_e}{\sqrt{Z}} K_0$**

Table 1: Pauling's Electronegativity Scale and Matthias's Valence Electron Count Convention

Table 2: Material Specific Characterization Dataset (MSCD) for 27 Superconductors with  $T_c$ s between 9K and 133K

Table 3: MSCD of similar superconductors with close  $T_c$ s

Table 4:  $T_c$  vs Electronegativity for 6 families of superconductors.

Table 5: MSCD for 6 Families of superconductors with  $E_n = 1, 2, 4$  and  $5$  at ambient pressure

Table 6: Material-specific estimates for  $K_0$  in terms of  $F_w$ ,  $N_e$ ,  $Z$ ,  $A_n$  and  $E_n$  for families of superconductors in the formula:  $T_c = \mathcal{X} \frac{N_e}{\sqrt{Z}} K_0$

Table 7: Some 21 predicted material specific superconductors and their  $T_c$ s based on equation (9) and the similarity rules proposed in section 2.2.

Table 8: Significance of  $F_w/Z$  in raising  $T_c$  from 40K to 93K and to 133K.  $F_w/Z$  may be "the glue" to achieving high- $T_c$  superconductivity.

Table 9: Hg-based Cuprate superconductors. Data from Ref. 26.

Table 10: Computations for possible ambient pressure high- $T_c$  Superconductors (HTSC-Ax) to over 390K.

### List of Figures

Figure 1:  $T_c$  vs  $\mathcal{X}$  for 6 families of superconductors

Figure 2:  $T_c$  vs  $F_w/Z$  for 6 families of superconductors

Figure 3:  $T_c$  vs  $K_0$  for 6 families of superconductors

Figure 4:  $T_c$  vs  $E_n$  for 6 families of superconductors

Figure 5:  $T_c$  vs  $F_w/Z$  for Mercury Cuprates

Figure 6:  $T_c$  vs No. of layers for Mercury Cuprates

Ne = 1		Ne = 2		Ne = 3		Ne = 4		Ne = 5		Ne = 6								
E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$							
H	2.1	Be	1.5	Sc	1.3	Ti	1.5	V	1.6	Cr	1.6							
Li	1.0	Mg	1.2	Y	1.2	Zr	1.4	Nb	1.6	Mo	1.8							
K	0.8	Ca	1.0	La	1.1	Hf	1.3	Ta	1.5	W	1.7							
Rb	0.8	Sr	1.0	B	2.0	C	2.5	N	3.0	O	3.5							
Cs	0.7	Ba	0.9	Al	1.5	Si	1.8	P	2.1	S	2.5							
Cu	1.9	Zn	1.6	Ga	1.6	Ge	1.8	As	2.0	Se	2.4							
Ag	1.9	Cd	1.7	In	1.7	Sn	1.8	Sb	1.9	Te	2.1							
		Hg	1.9	Tl	1.8	Pb	1.8	Bi	1.9									
Ne = 7		Ne = 8		Ne = 9		Ne = 10												
E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$	E	$\chi$	Nomenclature										
Mn	1.5	Fe	1.8	Co	1.8	Ni	1.8	$\chi$ = Electronegativity										
Tc	1.9	Ru	2.2	Rh	2.2	Pd	2.2	E = Element										
Re	1.9	Os	2.2	Ir	2.2	Pt	2.2	Ne = Valence Electron Count										
F	4.0	Ne = 3																
Cl	3.0	E	Ce	Pr	Nd	Pm	Eu	Tb	Yb	Lu	Sm	Gd	Ho	Er	Tm	Th	Pu	U
Br	2.8	$\chi$	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4
I	2.5																	

Table 1: Pauling's Electronegativity Scale and Matthias's Valence Electron Count Convention



Superconductor		$\chi$	Ne	Z	$Ne/\sqrt{Z}$	Fw	Fw/Z	Tc(K)	Ko	An	En
1	Nb	1.60	5.0	41	0.7809	92.91	2.27	9.2	7.14	1	1
2	NbN	2.30	5.0	24	1.0206	106.913	4.45	17	7.55	2	2
3	MoC	2.15	5.0	24	1.0206	107.951	4.5	14.3	6.79	2	2
4	Nb <sub>3</sub> Ge	1.65	4.75	38.75	0.7631	351.34	9.07	23.2	18.43	4	2
5	Y <sub>2</sub> C <sub>3</sub>	1.98	3.6	19.2	.8216	213.85	11.14	18	11.07	5	2
6	MgB <sub>2</sub>	1.7333	2.667	7.333	0.9847	45.93	6.263	39	22.85	3	2
7	Ba <sub>0.6</sub> K <sub>0.4</sub> BiO <sub>3</sub>	2.652	4.92	29.64	0.9037	355.02	11.98	30	12.52	5	3
8	La <sub>1.85</sub> Sr <sub>0.15</sub> CuO <sub>4</sub>	2.5836	4.4071	24.593	0.8905	397.68	16.17	40	17.39	7	3
9	Ba <sub>0.6</sub> K <sub>0.4</sub> Fe <sub>2</sub> As <sub>2</sub>	1.692	5.52	31.84	0.9783	359.58	11.293	38	22.96	5	3
10	Sr <sub>0.6</sub> K <sub>0.4</sub> Fe <sub>2</sub> As <sub>2</sub>	1.704	5.52	29.68	1.0132	329.752	11.110	37	21.43	5	3
11	Ba <sub>0.6</sub> K <sub>0.4</sub> PbO <sub>3</sub>	2.632	4.72	29.44	0.8699	353.24	11.999	30	13.10	5	3
12	SmFeAsO <sub>0.9</sub> F <sub>0.1</sub>	2.1375	5.525	32.275	0.9725	296.43	9.185	55	26.46	4	4
13	Gd <sub>0.8</sub> Th <sub>0.2</sub> FeAsO	2.11	5.5	34.05	0.9125	318.98	9.37	56.3	29.24	4	4
14	GdFeAsO <sub>0.85</sub>	2.0455	5.481	32.45	0.9621	301.62	9.295	53.5	27.19	4	4
15	YBa <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>7</sub>	2.5538	4.0	22.615	0.8411	666.22	29.46	93	43.3	13	4
16	YBa <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>4</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.5733	3.933	22.067	0.8373	745.77	33.80	80	37.13	15	4
17	Tl <sub>2</sub> Ba <sub>2</sub> CuO <sub>6</sub>	2.5727	4.273	31.909	0.7564	842.97	26.42	80	41.11	11	4
18	Tl <sub>2</sub> Ba <sub>2</sub> CaCu <sub>2</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.5467	4.133	27.733	0.7849	978.56	35.29	108	54.03	15	5
19	Tl <sub>2</sub> Ba <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>10</sub>	2.5316	4.053	25.316	0.8054	1114.23	44.01	125	61.30	20	5
20	Bi <sub>2</sub> Sr <sub>2</sub> CuO <sub>6</sub>	2.6091	4.636	29.0	0.8609	752.75	25.96	22	9.79	11	4
21	Bi <sub>2</sub> Sr <sub>2</sub> CaCu <sub>2</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.5733	4.4	25.6	0.8696	888.38	34.702	92	41.11	15	5
22	Bi <sub>2</sub> Sr <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>10</sub>	2.5526	4.263	23.632	0.8770	1024.01	43.332	110	49.12	19	5
23	TlBa <sub>2</sub> CuO <sub>5</sub>	2.5556	4.222	29.111	0.7825	622.59	21.39	52	26.00	9	4
24	Pb <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>3</sub> Cu <sub>2</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.56	4.267	23.007	0.8884	789.73	34.24	110	48.37	15	4
25	HgBa <sub>2</sub> CuO <sub>4</sub>	2.45	3.875	31.625	0.6891	602.80	19.06	95	56.27	8	4
26	HgBa <sub>2</sub> CaCu <sub>2</sub> O <sub>6</sub>	2.4583	3.833	26.50	0.7446	738.43	27.87	122	66.65	12	5
27	HgBa <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.4625	3.813	23.938	0.7792	874.044	36.51	133	69.32	16	5

Table 2: Material Specific Characterization Dataset (MSCD) for 27 Superconductors with Tcs between 9K and 133K

Superconductor		$\mathcal{X}$	Ne	Z	$Ne/\sqrt{Z}$	Fw	Fw/Z	Tc(K)	Ko	An	En
1	NbN	2.30	5.0	24	1.0206	106.913	4.45	17	7.55	2	2
	MoC	2.15	5.0	24	1.0206	107.951	4.50	14.3	6.79	2	2
2	CaAlSi	1.4333	3.0	15.667	.7579	95.15	6.07	7.8	7.18	3	3
	SrAlSi	1.4333	3.0	21.667	.6445	142.69	6.59	5.8	6.28	3	3
3	ZrN	2.2	4.5	23.5	.9283	105.231	4.478	10.7	5.24	2	2
	NbC	2.05	4.5	23.5	.9283	104.917	4.465	11.1	5.83	2	2
4	Nb <sub>3</sub> Sn	1.65	4.75	43.25	.7181	397.44	9.19	18	15.19	4	2
	Nb <sub>3</sub> Ge	1.65	4.75	38.75	.7631	351.34	9.07	23.2	18.43	4	2
5	BeB <sub>2</sub>	1.8333	2.6667	4.6667	1.2344	30.63	6.56	0	0	3	2
	LiBC	1.8333	2.6667	4.6667	1.2344	29.96	6.42	0	0	3	3

Table 3: MSCD of similar superconductors with close Tcs. Five pairs cases of similar superconductors with: (a)  $\langle \mathcal{X}, Ne \rangle$  the same: pairs 2, 4 and 5; (b)  $\langle Ne, Z \rangle$  the same: pairs 1, 3 and 5. (c)  $\langle \mathcal{X}, Ne, Z \rangle$  the same; pair 5. Note the closeness of their Tcs. In case 5 they have exactly the same Tc.

	$\mathcal{X}$	Tc (K)	Material
1	1.73	39	MgB <sub>2</sub>
2	2.11	56	Gd <sub>0.8</sub> Th <sub>0.2</sub> FeAsO
3	2.57	80	Tl <sub>2</sub> Ba <sub>2</sub> CuO <sub>6</sub>
4	2.56	110	Bi <sub>2</sub> Sr <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>10</sub>
5	2.53	125	Tl <sub>2</sub> Ba <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>10</sub>
6	2.46	133	HgBa <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub>

Table 4: Tc vs Electronegativity for 6 families of superconductors.

Example	$\mathcal{X}$	Ne	Z	$Ne/\sqrt{Z}$	Fw/Z	Ko	En	An	Tc (K)
Nb	1.6	5.0	41.0	0.781	2.27	7.14	1	1	9.2
NbN	2.3	5.0	24.0	1.0206	4.45	7.55	2	2	17
MgB <sub>2</sub>	1.73	2.667	7.333	0.985	6.26	22.85	2	3	39
Gd <sub>0.8</sub> Th <sub>0.2</sub> FeAsO	2.11	5.5	34.05	0.9125	9.37	29.24	4	4	56
Pb <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>3</sub> Cu <sub>2</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.56	4.267	23.01	0.888	34.24	48.37	4	15	110
HgBa <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.463	3.813	23.94	0.779	36.51	69.32	5	16	133

Table 5: MSCD for 6 Families of superconductors with En = 1, 2, 4 and 5 at ambient pressure

	Family	Ko Estimate	Comments
1	AB <sub>2</sub>	3.65(Fw/Z)	Applies to MgB <sub>2</sub> only
2	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>3</sub> , ABC <sub>3</sub> , AB <sub>4</sub>	Fw/Z	Applies to Y <sub>2</sub> C <sub>3</sub> , Ba <sub>0.6</sub> K <sub>0.4</sub> BiO <sub>3</sub> , and similar materials.
3	AB <sub>2</sub> C <sub>2</sub>	2(Fw/Z)	Applies to Pnictide 122 compounds
4	Pnictide 1-1-1-1	0.25(Fw/Ne + Fw/ $\sqrt{Z}$ )	Applies at Tc(max)
5	YBa <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>7</sub>	Fw/Z + An	An = number of atoms in formula
6	Pb <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>3</sub> Cu <sub>2</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	Fw/Z + An	An = number of atoms in formula
7	HgBa <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	1.9(Fw/Z)	Applies to Hg cuprates at highest Tc

Table 6: Material-specific estimates for Ko in terms of Fw, Ne, Z, An and En for families of superconductors in the formula:  $T_c = \mathcal{X} \frac{Ne}{\sqrt{Z}} K_o$

	Model	Predicted Materials		Predicted Tc Range
A	$\text{MgB}_2$ ( $T_c = 39\text{K}$ )	$\text{LiMgN}$	1	39K
		$\text{Li}_2\text{S}$	2	30K
		$\text{Mg}_2\text{C}$	3	31.5K
		$\text{MgBeC}$	4	39K
		$\text{KCN}$	5	20K
		$\text{NaBC}$	6	29K
		$\text{KB}_5$	7	39K
		$\text{NbSi}_2$	8	25 - 30K
		$\text{Li}_2\text{Mg}_2\text{CO}$	9	35.8K
		$\text{Na}_2\text{Be}_2\text{CO}$	10	35.8K
		$\text{Na}_2\text{Be}_2\text{CS}$	11	35.1K
B	$\text{NbN}$ ( $T_c = 17\text{K}$ ) $\text{MoC}$ ( $T_c = 14.3\text{K}$ )	$\text{GeS}$	12	14.3 - 17K
		$\text{SiSe}$	13	14.3 - 17K
C	$\text{LiBC}$ ( $T_c = 0\text{K}$ )	$\text{Be}_2\text{C}$	14	0K
		$\text{Na}_2\text{O}$	15	0K
D	$\text{CaBeSi}$ ( $T_c = 0.4\text{K}$ )	$\text{Na}_2\text{S}$	16	0.4K
E	$\text{Y}_2\text{C}_3$ ( $T_c = 18\text{K}$ )	$\text{Y}_2\text{S}_3$	17	20.6K
		$\text{In}_2\text{S}_3$	18	21.6K
		$\text{K}_2\text{S}_3$	19	17.8K
		$\text{Al}_2\text{Se}_3$	20	22K
		$\text{As}_2\text{Se}_3$	21	24.9K

Table 7: Some 21 predicted material specific superconductors and their Tcs based on equation (9), Table 6 and the similarity rules proposed in sections 2.1 and 2.2.

Superconductor	$\mathcal{X}$	Ne	Z	$Ne/\sqrt{Z}$	Fw	Fw/Z	Tc(K)	Ko	An	En	
1	$La_{1.85}Sr_{.15}CuO_4$	2.5836	4.4071	24.593	0.8905	397.68	16.17	40	17.39	7	3
2	$YBa_2Cu_3O_7$	2.5538	4.0	22.615	0.8411	666.22	29.46	93	43.3	13	4
3	$HgBa_2Ca_2Cu_3O_8$	2.4625	3.8125	23.938	0.7792	874.044	36.51	133	69.32	16	5

Table 8: Significance of Fw/Z in raising Tc from 40K to 93K and to 133K. Fw/Z may be “the glue” to achieving high-Tc superconductivity. Note too that the number of elements and atoms increased with Tc. The product  $\{\mathcal{X}, Ne/\sqrt{Z}\}$  did not change as significantly as Fw/Z.


	Superconductor	$\mathcal{X}$	Ne	Z	$Ne/\sqrt{Z}$	Fw	Fw/Z	Tc [K]	$K_0$	$\frac{K_0}{Fw/z}$	An	En
1	$HgBa_2CuO_4$	2.45	3.875	31.625	0.6891	602.8	19.06	97	57.45	3.02	8	4
2	$HgBa_2CaCu_2O_6$	2.4583	3.8333	26.5	0.7446	736.43	27.79	126	68.83	2.48	12	5
3	$HgBa_2Ca_2Cu_3O_8$	2.4625	3.8125	23.938	.7792	874.06	36.51	133	70.46	1.93	16	5
4	$HgBa_2Ca_3Cu_4O_{10}$	2.465	3.80	22.4	0.8029	1009.69	45.08	125	63.16	1.40	20	5
5	$HgBa_2Ca_4Cu_5O_{12}$	2.4667	3.7917	21.375	0.8201	1145.32	53.58	110	54.38	1.02	24	5
6	$HgBa_2Ca_5Cu_6O_{14}$	2.4679	3.7857	20.643	0.8332	1280.95	62.05	97	47.17	0.76	28	5
7	$HgBa_2Ca_6Cu_7O_{16}$	2.4688	3.7813	20.094	0.8435	1416.58	70.50	88	42.26	0.6	32	5

Table 9: Hg-based Cuprate superconductors. Data from Ref. 26.

	Superconductor	$\mathcal{X}$	$Ne/\sqrt{Z}$	$K_0$	Tc [K]	Fw/Z	$\frac{K_0}{Fw/z}$	Fw	Ne	Z	An	En
1	HgBa <sub>2</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> Cu <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub>	2.46	.7792	69.32	133	36.51	1.93	874.1	3.81	23.94	16	5
2	HTSC-A1	2.5	0.8	100	200	52.63	1.9	1218.96	3.85	23.16	23	7
3	HTSC-A2	2.45	0.8	120	235.2	63.16	1.9	1462.79	3.85	23.16	28	9
4	HTSC-A3	2.5	0.8	140	280	73.68	1.9	1706.43	3.85	23.16	33	10
5	HTSC-A4	2.45	0.79	160	309.7	82.21	1.9	1952.50	3.85	23.75	36	11
6	HTSC-A6	2.45	0.8	180	352.8	94.74	1.9	2194.19	3.85	23.16	42	13
7	HTSC-A6	2.55	0.78	200	397.8	105.26	1.9	2564.46	3.85	24.36	47	15


**Table 10:** Computations for possible ambient pressure high-Tc Superconductors (HTSC-Ax) to over 390K, assuming some initial values for  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $Ne/\sqrt{Z}$  and  $K_0$  in the formula:  $T_c = \mathcal{X} \frac{Ne}{\sqrt{Z}} K_0$ .

Assuming a  $\frac{K_0}{Fw/z} = 1.9$ , we compute Fw/Z for the proposed HTSC-Ax materials and also the Fw and Z, assuming Ne = 3.85. An =number of atoms and En =number of elements in the composition, assuming An/En =3.2 , like in HgBa<sub>2</sub>Ca<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> and YBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7</sub>



Tc(max) vs Electronegativity for En = 1, 2, 4 and 5

**Figure 1: Tc (max) vs Electronegativity for En = 1, 2, 4 and 5. We observe there is an electronegativity range between 1.73 and 2.4 which should have novel superconductors with Tc between 39K and 90K. So far only the Pnictides (Tc = 56K) have been discovered in this range. Between 2.4 and 2.5, Tc increases without much increase in electronegativity.**



Tc vs Fw/Z for 6 Families of Superconductors. The graph indicates that as Fw/Z increases, Tc increases too.

**Figure 2: Tc (max) vs Fw/Z for for 6 Families of superconductors with  $E_n = 1, 2, 4$  and 5 using data of Table 5. From the graph, we can see that there are yet to be discovered superconductor families with Tc between 60 and 100K and with Fw/Z between 10 and 30. The  $E_n$  may be 3 or 4.**






Fig. 2:  $T_c$  vs  $K_o$  for 6 Families of Superconductors. The graph indicates that as  $K_o$  increases,  $T_c$  increases too.

**Figure 3:  $T_c$  vs  $K_o$  for 6 Families of superconductors. The graph shows undiscovered superconductors with  $K_o$  between 30 and 42 and with  $T_c$  between 60K and 90K.**





Fig. 4: Tc vs En for 6 Families of Superconductors. The graph indicates that as En increases, Tc increases too.



Tc vs Fw/z for Mercury Cuprates

Figure 5: Tc vs Fw/Z for Mercury Cuprates




Figure 6:  $T_c$  vs Number of layers for Mercury Cuprates. The graph shows that after attaining an optimum layer and peaking, the  $T_c$  then decreases as the layers increase. This graph was first produced in references 32 and 33. Figure 5 bears a very close resemblance, suggesting a link between  $Fw/Z$  and layering in superconductivity.