

Reply to “Comment on ‘Nonstandard superconductivity or no superconductivity in hydrides under high pressure’ ”

J. E. Hirsch^a and F. Marsiglio^b

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

^b*Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E1*

In Ref. [1] we surveyed the known hydride superconductors, and compared their resistive behavior to that of typical known superconductors, including conventional (e.g. NbN and MgB₂) and unconventional (e.g. YBCO) superconductors, and concluded that the behavior of the hydrides was indicative of nonstandard or no superconductivity. In the preceding comment, Talantsev, Minkov, Balakirev and Eremets [2] (arXiv:2311.07865) claim that we presented a “*flawed analysis and a selective and inaccurate report of published data.*” Here we show that this claim is wrong.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

In their Comment, Talantsev, Minkov, Balakirev and Eremets [2] claim (first sentence in their abstract, and elsewhere in the Comment) that in our paper [1] we “*assert that hydrogen-rich compounds do not exhibit superconductivity*”. That claim is non-factual: our paper claimed instead that “*Our results indicate that either these materials are unconventional superconductors of a novel kind, which we term “nonstandard superconductors,” or alternatively, that they are not superconductors,*” and that “*If the second is the case, which we believe is more likely, we suggest that the signals interpreted as superconductivity are either experimental artifacts or they signal other interesting physics but not superconductivity.*” We will assume in what follows that their statement that our claim “*relies on a flawed analysis and a selective and inaccurate report of published data*” refers to our true claim, not an imagined one. To refute that claim, we follow the sequence of their sections II-VI, their titles given in italics in the listing below, and discuss their figures which purport to support their claim.

II. DETAILED ANALYSIS

1) *The transition width definition.*

Our observation of nonstandard behavior in the hydrides compared to that in known superconductors is based on observation of *qualitative* trends. That such an approach is required is exemplified by the myriad examples of resistivity vs. temperature curves with knees, tails, kinks, non-monotonic behavior, etc, for which an arbitrary rigid definition of width such as given in Eq. (1) of the Comment is not appropriate. That is, choosing $\Delta T_{0.1-0.9}$ as in Eq. (1) of the Comment, versus $\Delta T_{0.15-0.85}$ or $\Delta T_{0.05-0.95}$, would yield qualitatively different answers. For all the examples discussed in our paper [1], both standard superconductors and hydride

materials, the curves of resistance versus temperature for varying magnetic fields from which we extracted the widths shown in our Fig. 11 are shown in our paper also, enabling readers to easily perform their own analysis with their favorite definition of transition width such as Eq. (1) in the Comment, and compare with our estimates given in Fig. 11 of [1]. Surprisingly, this was not done in the Comment.

2) *Type I superconductors.*

We do not believe that the hydrides are type I superconductors, nor does anyone else as far as we know, so we consider this discussion in the Comment to be irrelevant. Note that if these hydrides really were type I superconductors with such high T_c 's, that don't expel magnetic fields and trap magnetic fields according to what is reported by the authors of the Comment in other publications [3, 4], then indeed they would be *very* nonstandard superconductors.

3) *Type II superconductors (non-hydrides)*

Various examples of resistivity widths for non-hydride type II superconductors have been provided in the Comment. Shown in their Fig. (3a) are results for 2.9 nm thin films of MgB₂, with fields applied both perpendicular and parallel to the plane of the thin film, reported in Ref. [5]. There is an initial decrease of transition width as a function of applied field, followed by the standard increase with magnetic field. These films have thickness of only a few unit cells, smaller than the superconducting coherence length and much smaller than the London penetration depth. Clearly the anomalous initial decrease of transition width with magnetic field highlighted in the Comment is a property connected to ultrathin films. The hydride samples have thicknesses that are larger by three orders of magnitude and surely resemble the polycrystalline samples used in the study referred to in our paper and many other such studies more than they resemble highly oriented ultrathin films.

Fig. (3b) in the Comment are results reported in Ref.

[6] for polycrystalline MgB_2 samples doped by SiC, that also show an upturn for low fields. The authors of Ref. [6] discuss this anomalous feature of their data in great detail, and conclude that “*the origin of the low field ΔT upturn is due to multiple superconducting transitions resulting from the replacement of B and/or Mg atoms by other elements.*” We cannot rule out that multiple transitions in the hydrides could also conceivably give rise to such an upturn. We are not aware however of such upturns in the hydrides, instead our paper Ref. [1] highlighted the fact that in many cases the transition widths are approximately constant as function of field.

In Fig. (3c) in the Comment, a figure is presented for a pnictide, $\text{NaFe}_{1-x}\text{Co}_x\text{As}$. In this case, referring to the Comment’s Ref. 27, which we cite as Ref. [7], the authors “cherry-picked” one composition ($x = 0.01$) for an applied field parallel to the c -axis, from Fig. (4a) of Ref. [7]. However, as subsequent panels in that same Fig. 4 of Ref. [7] show, reproduced here in Fig. (1), all higher compositions ($x = 0.03$ and $x = 0.07$) clearly show the normal broadening as a function of applied field. This compound at this stoichiometry is a poor choice, because, as the authors of [7] indicate, the compound with $x = 0.01$ is actually also antiferromagnetic, with a Néel temperature of 33 K, not too far above the superconducting transition temperature. The authors also point out that the superconducting transition at $x = 0.01$ is extremely broad for this reason (compare with panels (c) and (e) in Fig. (1)), so one can imagine that a reduction in the width with applied field could well reflect the impact of that field on the underlying antiferromagnetic state. Since no antiferromagnetic transitions are expected in the hydride materials this is hardly a suitable choice of material with which to critique our results, especially leaving out the higher dopant values.

In Fig. (3d) in the Comment, an example of a cuprate material, $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_8$, with applied pressure of 9 GPa is given, using data obtained from the Comment’s Ref. (28), cited here as Ref. [8]. Again, this is a poor choice of material with which to critique our work, as it was used by the authors of Ref. [8] to observe “a pressure-induced crossover from two- to three-dimensional (2D to 2D) superconducting states,” resulting in “Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless-like behavior”. Therefore a significant amount of nonstandard physics is occurring in this material, that also exhibits multiple transitions. We show Fig. (1) from that paper here as Fig. (2). The displayed resistance versus temperature curves clearly indicate abnormal behavior at low applied fields, along with the expected broadening with field at higher magnetic fields, where the resistivity curves lack the abnormality present at lower fields.

4) Highly compressed scandium.

These measurements are at high pressure, and only under the highest pressure measured (262 GPa) is there an indication from Fig. (4) in the Comment that the




FIG. 1: Fig. 4 from Ref. [7]. Note the variation of the temperature scales for panels (a) and (b) ($x = 0.01$), compared to (c) and (d) ($x = 0.03$) and to (e) and (f) ($x = 0.07$). At $x = 0.01$ the material has entered an antiferromagnetic state, so application of a magnetic field also affects the underlying magnetic state.

width decreases with increasing fields at very low fields. But this is precisely where a significant knee occurs (see Fig. 8d in the supplementary material of the Comment), and so concerns about the interpretation of this initial decrease echo those above.

5) Hydride superconductors.

Figure 5 of the Comment shows resistance width versus applied field constructed by the authors based on their Eq. (1), but applied to very complicated resistance versus temperature measurements. It is not clear what the purpose of this Figure is. In Fig. 3 we show a number of resistance versus temperature profiles used by the authors of the Comment in their Fig. 5. The upper left panel shows the data from Mozaffari et al. [9] on H_3S for a variety of applied magnetic fields whose width is shown in Fig. 5a of the Comment. It is evident that there are difficulties with interpretation, as a significant kink exists in the low field (including zero field) data. Mozaffari et al. [9] attribute this to inhomogeneities, but do not have an explanation for why application of a sufficiently high magnetic field seemingly removes these inhomogeneities,




FIG. 2: Fig. 1 from Ref. [8]. It is a strikingly poor material with which to conclude anything about transition widths, particularly at low applied field where a pronounced knee is present in the resistivity data (panels (b) and (d)). Note the clear indication of two transitions at 9 GPa (in panel (a)) so the comments from sintered MgB_2 paper (Wang et al. [6]) about the “abnormal” decrease in transition width could well apply.

or why there was a time dependence for these resistance measurements. Whatever the explanation, at the very least, their resistance versus temperature measurements constitute strong evidence for nonstandard superconductivity and, in our opinion, it is imprudent to try to analyze the transition width as a function of applied magnetic field for such data.

To construct the result in their Fig. (5b), Talantsev et al. use resistance versus temperature data from Troyan et al. [10] for YH_6 . We show this data in the upper right panel of Fig. (3); this figure clearly shows anomalous characteristics. So once again, if we cannot qualitatively understand the resistance versus temperature measurements, it seems ill-advised to apply a formula such as the Comment’s Eq. (1) to analyse their widths.

In panel (c) of Fig. 5 of the Comment, a number of compounds are included. The $(\text{La,Ce})\text{H}_9$ data (red diamonds) are very similar to the ones we presented for LaH_{10} (black squares) and therefore support our claim of very little or decreasing broadening with applied field. The plotted results for SnH_4 are again misleading as a perusal of the resistance versus temperature data indi-




FIG. 3: Some of the resistance versus temperature profiles used in Fig. 5 of the Comment, and one additional figure (lower right panel). A detailed description is given in the text. Briefly, all of these results show anomalous behavior over some temperature and/or magnetic field range, and determining a transition width using Eq. (1) of Ref. [2] is clearly problematic. In the lower left panel we have included (red) *parallel* lines to indicate that the widths of these transitions are not changing at low applied magnetic field. In the lower right panel we show recent results for LaH_{23} from Ref. [12].

cate. These data, from Troyan et al. [11], are included in the lower left panel of our Fig. 3, together with four *parallel* red lines that represent the slopes of the resistance drops for the three lowest magnetic fields quite well. The fact that they are *parallel* indicates that the width is not changing at all with increasing field, contrary to the claim made in the Comment, where an increasing slope is indicated as a function of magnetic field. As the field increases further the resistance drops begin to broaden, but largely because of an increasing tail at the low temperature end. This is most apparent for very high applied fields, where the normal state resistance takes a semiconductor-like upward turn and eventually the near-zero resistance limit is never achieved. To attribute this abnormal behavior simply to transition width broadening is very misleading. Finally, the HfH_x results shown in panel (c) of Fig. 5 of the Comment show both a very small width for zero field and a very small increase as a function of applied magnetic field, for fields as large as $B_{\text{appl}}/B_{c2} = 0.3$. This is qualitatively different from the broadenings seen in standard superconductors shown in Fig. 11a of our paper Ref. [1], hence we consider these results to be consistent with the message in our paper.

To conclude, we show in the lower right panel of Fig. 3 recent results for La_4H_{23} from Ref. [12], showing anomalous narrowing of the resistance drop with increasing field. The authors of Ref. [12] comment that “The

sample demonstrates the absence (and even negative value) of broadening of superconducting transitions in a magnetic field, as previously observed for yttrium (YH_6) and lanthanum-yttrium ($(La, Y)H_{10}$) hydrides”, confirming the theme of our paper Ref. [1] that the anomalous behavior in resistance width that we pointed out is common in so-called hydride superconductors.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

To conclude this Reply, we address each point of the “Detailed explanation of the primary message of the Comment” in its Sect. I, where the authors claim to “demonstrate the following”:

“1. There is no universal in-field transition width dependence that can serve as the criterion for determining the existence of the superconductivity in any given material”

There is a near-universal broadening of the resistive transition versus field in standard type II superconductors, whose origin is well understood [1, 13]. As shown in this Reply, for all examples of “anomalous” behavior for standard superconductors presented in the Comment we have shown that there are clear reasons for the anomalous behavior that are not expected to be present in the hydrides. Absence of such broadening in many hydride materials suggests that the resistance drops seen in hydrides are not due to superconductivity but due to other reasons [14–17].

“2. Hydrides at high pressures exhibit a similar in-field transition width dependence to other superconductors, such as MgB_2 ”

The typical behavior of MgB_2 samples is very standard, the few samples that show anomalous behavior do it for reasons that don’t apply to the hydrides.

“3. The authors employed undisclosed definitions/methods for extracting: the transition temperature and the transition width from raw experimental resistance data”

We showed figures for the resistance curves for all cases discussed in our paper, the qualitative behavior that we highlighted is very clear from those figures. The authors of the Comment have not shown that their criteria for transition width gives qualitatively different behavior than what we showed in Fig. 11 of our paper Ref. [1].

“4. The authors[1] selectively presented datasets that support their claims while excluding datasets that contradict them”

We presented a representative set of examples available at that time. Since then other materials have been measured, and several of them show nonstandard behavior as discussed in the previous section.

“5. The authors[1] misinterpreted the magnetic phase diagrams of superconductors by overlooking the existence of the intermediate state in type-I superconductors.”

The intermediate state in type-I superconductors is irrelevant to the hydrides claimed to be high temperature type II superconductors with strong pinning centers [4].

In conclusion, we argue that the Comment [2] has no merit. The points that we made in our paper Ref. [1] are valid and important, an early warning that the resistance drops observed for hydrides under pressure may not be due to superconductivity. Since we wrote Ref. [1], substantial additional evidence has emerged that the hydrides are either “nonstandard superconductors” or, more likely, not superconductors [18–20]. In addition, we point out that two papers [21, 22] claiming high temperature superconductivity in hydrides that showed anomalous behavior in the resistance data [14, 16] have been retracted [23, 24] and a third one [25] is under investigation, and other claims [26–28] have not been reproduced.

Acknowledgments

FM was supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

-
- [1] J. E. Hirsch and F. Marsiglio, “Nonstandard superconductivity or no superconductivity in hydrides under high pressure”, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 134505 (2021).
- [2] E.F. Talantsev, V.S Minkov, F.F. Balakirev and M.I. Erements, “Comment on ‘Nonstandard Superconductivity or No Superconductivity in Hydrides under High Pressure.’” preceding comment, [arXiv:2311.07865](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07865) (2023).
- [3] V. S. Minkov, S. L. Budko, F. F. Balakirev, V. B. Prakapenka, S. Chariton, R. J. Husband, H. P. Liermann and M. I. Erements, “Magnetic field screening in hydrogen-rich high-temperature superconductors”, *Nat Commun* **13**, 3194 (2022).
- [4] V. S. Minkov, V. Ksenofontov, S. L. Bud’ko, E. F. Talantsev and M. I. Erements, “Magnetic flux trapping in hydrogen-rich high-temperature superconductors”, *Nat. Phys.* (2023).
- [5] N. Acharya, M. A. Wolak, T. Tan, N. Lee, A. C. Lang, M. Taheri, D. Cunnane, B. S. Karasik, and X. X. Xi, “ MgB_2 ultrathin films fabricated by hybrid physical chemical vapor deposition and ion milling”, *APL Mater.* **4**, 086114 (2016).
- [6] C.C. Wang, R. Zeng, X. Xu, S.X. Dou, “Superconducting transition width under magnetic field in MgB_2 polycrystalline samples” *J. Appl. Phys* **108**, 093907 (2010).
- [7] W. J. Choi, Y. I. Seo, D. Ahmad and Yong Seung Kwon, “Thermal activation energy of 3D vortex matter in $NaFe_{1-x}Co_xAs$ ($x = 0.01, 0.03$ and 0.07) single crystals” *Scientific Reports* **7**, 10900 (2017).
- [8] Jing Guo, Yazhou Zhou, Cheng Huang, Shu Cai, Yutao Sheng, Genda Gu, Chongli Yang, Gongchang Lin,

- Ke Yang, Aiguo Li, Qi Wu, Tao Xiang and Liling Sun, “Crossover from two-dimensional to three-dimensional superconducting states in bismuth-based cuprate superconductor,” *Nature Physics* **16**, 295 (2020).
- [9] Shirin Mozaffari, Dan Sun, Vasily S. Minkov, Alexander P. Drozdov, Dmitry Knyazev, Jonathan B. Betts, Mari Einaga, Katsuya Shimizu, Mikhail I. Erements, Luis Balicas and Fedor F. Balakirev, “Superconducting phase diagram of H_3S under high magnetic fields,” *Nature Communications* **10**, 2522 (2019).
- [10] Ivan A. Troyan, Dmitrii V. Semenov, Alexander G. Kvashnin, Andrey V. Sadakov, Oleg A. Sobolevskiy, Vladimir M. Pudalov, Anna G. Ivanova, Vitali B. Prakapenka, Eran Greenberg, Alexander G. Gavriliuk, Igor S. Lyubutin, Viktor V. Struzhkin, Aitor Bergara, Ion Errea, Raffaello Bianco, Matteo Calandra, Francesco Mauri, Lorenzo Monacelli, Ryosuke Akashi, Artem R. Oganov, “Anomalous High-Temperature Superconductivity in YH_6 ,” *Advanced Materials* **33**, 2006832 (2021).
- [11] Ivan A. Troyan, Dmitrii V. Semenov, Anna G. Ivanova, Andrey V. Sadakov, Di Zhou, Alexander G. Kvashnin, Ivan A. Kruglov, Oleg A. Sobolevskiy, Marianna V. Lyubutina, Dmitry S. Perekalin, Toni Helm, Stanley W. Tozer, Maxim Bykov, Alexander F. Goncharov, Vladimir M. Pudalov, and Igor S. Lyubutin, “Non-Fermi-Liquid Behavior of Superconducting SnH_4 ,” *Advanced Science* **10**, 2303622 (2023).
- [12] Jianning Guo, Dmitrii Semenov, Grigoriy Shutov, Di Zhou, Su Chen, Yulong Wang, Kexin Zhang, Xinyue Wu, Sven Luther, Toni Helm, Xiaoli Huang, Tian Cui, “Unusual metallic state in superconducting A15 -type La4H_{23} ,” *National Science Review*, nwa149 (2024).
- [13] G. Blatter, M. V. Feigel'man, V. B. Geshkenbein, A. I. Larkin, and V. M. Vinokur, “Vortices in high-temperature superconductors,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 1125 (1994).
- [14] J. E. Hirsch and F. Marsiglio, “Unusual width of the superconducting transition in a hydride,” *Nature* **596**, E9 (2021).
- [15] M. Dogan and M. L. Cohen, “Anomalous behavior in high-pressure carbonaceous sulfur hydride,” *Physica C* **583**, 1353851 (2021).
- [16] J. E. Hirsch, “Enormous variation in homogeneity and other anomalous features of room temperature superconductor samples,” *J Supercond Nov Magn* **36**, 1489 (2023).
- [17] J. E. Hirsch, “Electrical resistance of hydrides under high pressure: evidence of superconductivity or confirmation bias?,” *J Supercond Nov Magn* **36**, 1495 (2023).
- [18] J. E. Hirsch, “Are hydrides under high-pressure-high-temperature superconductors?,” *National Science Review*, nwad174 (2023 and references therein).
- [19] J. E. Hirsch, “Hysteresis loops in measurements of the magnetic moment of hydrides under high pressure: Implications for superconductivity,” *Physica C* **617**, 1354449 (2024).
- [20] J. E. Hirsch and F. Marsiglio, “Further analysis of flux trapping experiments on hydrides under high pressure,” *Physica C* **620**, 1 1354500 (2024).
- [21] 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).
- [22] Nathan Dasenbrock-Gammon, Elliot Snider, Raymond McBride, Hiranya Pasan, Dylan Durkee, Nugzari Khalvashi-Sutter, Sasanka Munasinghe, Sachith E. Dissanayake, Keith V. Lawler, Ashkan Salamat and Ranga P. Dias, “Evidence of near-ambient superconductivity in a N-doped lutetium hydride”, *Nature* **615**, 244 (2023).
- [23] Elliot Snider, Nathan Dasenbrock-Gammon, Raymond McBride, Mathew Debessai, Hiranya Vindana, Kevin Vencatasamy, Keith V. Lawler, Ashkan Salamat and Ranga P. Dias “Retraction Note: Room-temperature superconductivity in a carbonaceous sulfur hydride”, *Nature* **610**, 804 (2022).
- [24] Nathan Dasenbrock-Gammon, Elliot Snider, Raymond McBride, Hiranya Pasan, Dylan Durkee, Nugzari Khalvashi-Sutter, Sasanka Munasinghe, Sachith E. Dissanayake, Keith V. Lawler, Ashkan Salamat and Ranga P. Dias, “Retraction Note: Evidence of near-ambient superconductivity in a N-doped lutetium hydride”, *Nature* **624**, 460 (2023).
- [25] Elliot Snider, Nathan Dasenbrock-Gammon, Raymond McBride, Xiaoyu Wang, Noah Meyers, Keith V. Lawler, Eva Zurek, Ashkan Salamat, and Ranga P. Dias, “Synthesis of Yttrium Superhydride Superconductor with a Transition Temperature up to 262 K by Catalytic Hydrogenation at High Pressures”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 117003 (2021).
- [26] 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, Ranga P. Dias, “Observation of Conventional Near Room Temperature Superconductivity in Carbonaceous Sulfur Hydride”, [arXiv:2302.08622](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.08622) (2022).
- [27] Nilesh P. Salke, Alexander C. Mark, Muhtar Ahart and Russell J. Hemley, “Evidence for Near Ambient Superconductivity in the Lu-N-H System”, [arXiv:2306.06301](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.06301) (2023).
- [28] A. D. Grockowiak, M. Ahart, T. Helm, W. A. Coniglio, R. Kumar, K. Glazyrin, G. Garbarino, Y. Meng, M. Oliff, V. Williams, N. W. Ashcroft, R. J. Hemley, M. Somayazulu and S. W. Tozer, “Hot Hydride Superconductivity Above 550 K”, *Front. Electron. Mater*, **Sec. Superconducting Materials Volume 2 - 2022** — <https://doi.org/10.3389/femat.2022.837651>.