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It was recently pointed out that so-called “superhydrides”, hydrogen-rich materials that appear to become superconducting at high temperatures and pressures, exhibit physical properties that are different from both conventional and unconventional standard type I and type II superconductors [1, 2]. Here we consider magnetic field expulsion in the first material in this class discovered in 2015, sulfur hydride [3]. A nuclear resonant scattering experiment has been interpreted as demonstration that the Meissner effect takes place in this material [4, 5]. However, here we point out that the observed effect implies a Meissner pressure [6] in this material that is much larger than that of standard superconductors. This provides strong evidence that hydride superconductors are qualitatively different from the known standard superconductors if they are superconductors.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

The 2015 discovery of high temperature superconductivity in pressurized sulfur hydride [3] (H\textsubscript{3}S) with critical temperature up to 203K was the first of several metal hydrides recently reported to be superconducting at high temperatures and pressures between 100GPa and 250GPa. These include phosphorous hydride at above 100K [8], lanthanum hydride at 250K [9], above 260K [10] and above 550K [11], yttrium hydride at 243K [12–14], thorium hydride at 161K [15], lanthanum-yttrium ternary hydrides at 253K [16], carbonaceous sulfur hydride at room temperature [17] and cerium hydride above 110K [18]. For all these materials, resistance versus temperature curves exhibit sharp drops at temperatures that have been interpreted as superconducting transition temperatures, and application of large magnetic fields shifts these transition temperatures to lower values. These materials have been characterized as strongly type II superconductors, with upper critical fields in the range 60T-150T [19].

However, in recent work we [1] and others [2] have argued that features of the resistive transition in a magnetic field appear to be in conflict with the behaviour seen in standard superconductors, explained by the conventional theory of superconductivity [20], hence that these materials, if they are superconductors, are ‘nonstandard superconductors’ [1].

To establish that superconductivity exists in these materials it would be important to show that they expel magnetic fields, i.e. the Meissner effect. Alternatively even if somewhat less compelling, that they do not allow penetration of magnetic fields, i.e. magnetic field exclusion. In Refs. [4, 5], it has been claimed that magnetic field exclusion in sulfur hydride has been detected through a novel nuclear resonance scattering experiment, and hence that the existence of superconductivity has been unequivocally confirmed. Here we challenge this interpretation. We show that a standard superconductor, whether conventional or unconventional, would not show this behavior. We conclude that this observation provides further evidence that sulfur hydride, and by inference other hydride superconductors, are either nonstandard superconductors, or they are not superconductors.

II. THE NRS EXPERIMENT

In Ref. [4], a 2.6 – \textmu m thick foil of tin was immersed into the H\textsubscript{3}S specimen [21]. The tin was enriched to 95\% with the \textsuperscript{119}Sn isotope to serve as the sensor. The sensor monitors the magnetic field via the magnetic interaction at the \textsuperscript{119}Sn nucleus as detected by nuclear resonant scattering (NRS) of synchrotron radiation. The presence of magnetic field at tin nuclei was identified by quantum beats in the time spectra of NRS [22].

As a control, the measurements were conducted simultaneously with two diamond anvil cells (DACs). One contained the H\textsubscript{3}S sample, the other contained only H\textsubscript{2}. Both had identical \textsuperscript{119}Sn-enriched foils, and were in the same applied magnetic field and temperature. It was found that the spectra measured were similar for both samples above 100K, but differed markedly for temperatures below 50K. While the control sample response was consistent with having a magnetic field in its interior equal to the applied magnetic field, \(H_{ext} \sim 0.68T\), the response of the H\textsubscript{3}S sample indicated that the magnetic field in the interior of the sample dropped to zero for temperatures 50K and below when the magnetic field was applied perpendicular to the sample, and to about a third of the applied field when the magnetic field was applied parallel to the sample.

The experiment did not attempt to detect the Meissner effect, i.e. magnetic field expulsion, but rather magnetic field exclusion [7]. The sample was first cooled in the absence of a magnetic field and subsequently the magnetic field was applied. The authors concluded that the experiment showed that the magnetic field was excluded from the interior of the sample at low temperatures due to the Meissner effect, therefore the sample had to be in the superconducting state at low temperatures.

In the following sections we show that a standard su-
perpendicular would not have excluded the magnetic field in the conditions of the experiment as described. We cannot conceive of any physical effect occurring in the sample other than superconductivity that would shield the applied magnetic field to the extent indicated by the results presented in this paper. Therefore we have to conclude that either this is a nonstandard superconductor with properties markedly different from those of standard superconductors, or that the experiment was faulty and hence it did not provide supporting evidence to the claim of superconductivity in \( H_3S \).

III. MAGNETIC FIELD EXCLUSION

Let us first consider the geometry where the applied magnetic field is perpendicular to the \( Sn \) foil, because it is in this geometry where the largest deviation from the expected behavior of standard superconductors occurs.

Figure 1 shows the geometry, also shown in Ref. [4] figure S6. The external magnetic field had magnitude \( H_{\text{ext}} = 0.68T \). The figure shows the assumed exclusion of the magnetic field from the sample interior. It is immediately obvious that the magnetic field at the edges of the sample is much larger than the applied field, due to demagnetization. For a cylindrical geometry with aspect ratio \( \text{height/radius} = 0.333 \), as shown in Fig. 1, the demagnetizing factor is approximately \( N_2 = 0.727 \) [23]. This indicates that the magnetic field at the edges of the sample is a factor \( 1/(1-N_2) = 3.7 \) times larger than the applied field. So the magnetic field at the edge of the sample is

\[
H_{\text{edge}} = 2.5T.
\]

If this is a type I superconductor, it would imply that the thermodynamic critical field \( H_c \) is larger than 2.5T. This in itself would be unprecedented. The largest known critical fields for standard type I superconductors are of order 0.05T, i.e. 50 times smaller. If this is a type II superconductor, which is generally assumed, it would imply that the lower critical field \( H_{c1} \) is larger than 2.5T. This is even more unprecedented, since \( H_{c1} < H_c \) within the standard theory of superconductivity.

In Ref. [3], the upper critical field \( H_{c2} \) was estimated to be between 60 and 80T. Let us assume \( H_{c2} = 68T \), corresponding to a zero temperature coherence length \( \xi = 2.20nm \). From magnetization measurements, it was concluded in Ref. [3] that the lower critical field is approximately \( H_{c1} \sim 0.03T \). The applied field is then 1/100 of \( H_{c2} \) and much larger than \( H_{c1} \). From this, the London penetration depth was estimated to be \( \lambda_{L} = 125nm \) [3]. Alternatively, Tsalaansev estimated a value \( \lambda_{L} = 189nm \) from self-field critical current data [24]. We will use the value of \( \lambda_{L} \) of Ref. [3] for definiteness; note that our conclusions would not change using a larger \( \lambda_{L} \) value.

It is clear that if this was a standard superconductor the applied field which is much larger than \( H_c \) would penetrate throughout the superconductor, no matter what the geometry, in particular in the two configurations used in [4], magnetic field perpendicular to the \( Sn \) foil (Fig.1) and parallel to it, and the sample would be in the mixed state [20]. For a sample of cross-sectional area \( A \) perpendicular to the magnetic field, the number of vortices \( N_v \) is determined by the equation

\[
H_{\text{ext}}A = N_v \phi_0.
\]

The upper critical field is given by

\[
H_{c2} = \frac{\phi_0}{2\pi \xi^2}
\]

so the area per vortex is

\[
a_v = \frac{A}{N_v} = 2\pi \xi^2 \frac{H_{c2}}{H_{\text{ext}}}
\]

so for \( H_{\text{ext}}/H_{c2} = 0.01 \),

\[
a_v = \pi(\sqrt{200}\xi)^2
\]

so the distance between vortex cores is approximately

\[
d_v = 2\sqrt{200}\xi = 62nm
\]

which is half the estimated London penetration depth. This indicates that the magnetic field is nearly uniform in the mixed state of this superconductor, with magnitude in the range

\[
e^{-d_v/(2\lambda_L)}H_{\text{ext}} < H < H_{\text{ext}}
\]

or

\[
0.78H_{\text{ext}} < H < H_{\text{ext}}.
\]

So using the parameters for this superconductor inferred by the authors of Ref. [3] and assuming standard superconductivity, we conclude that in both geometries used in Ref. [4], applied magnetic field perpendicular and
parallel to the Sn film, the magnetic field would be uniform or nearly uniform inside the sample and inside the Sn film when the sample is in the superconducting state at all temperatures. However this is inconsistent with the experimental results presented in Fig. 4 of Ref. [4], that indicate that the magnetic field drops to zero in one geometry and to one third of the applied value in the other geometry, for temperatures below 50K, as is shown in Fig. 2.

But let us assume that for some unknown reason the magnetic field is indeed zero in the interior of the sample. What would be the current necessary so that the field does not penetrate? A lower bound to that current would be a current circulating near the surface that generates a magnetic field $H_{edge} = 0.68T$ at the center of the sample. For a circular loop of current of radius $a$ with current $I$ circulating, the magnetic field at the center is

$$ B = \frac{2\pi I}{ca} \quad (9) $$

which for $B = 0.68T$ and $a = 15\mu m$ as shown in Fig. 1 yields $I = 16$ Amp. Assuming the current circulates within the London penetration depth $\lambda_L = 125nm$ of the surface and sample thickness $5\mu m$ as shown in Fig. 1 yields for the current density

$$ J = 2.6 \times 10^9 \frac{Amp}{cm^2}. \quad (10) $$

Therefore, the critical current density would have to be larger than the value Eq. (10). Critical current densities for all known standard superconductors are about 2 orders of magnitude lower than that value. This then strongly suggests that if $H_3S$ is a superconductor it is a nonstandard superconductor, as defined in Ref. [1]. Note that we also found in Ref. [1], based on analysis of the resistive transition in a magnetic field, that the critical current densities of nonstandard superconductors are much higher than those of standard superconductors.

## IV. NONSTANDARD SUPERCONDUCTIVITY IN $H_3S$

To firmly establish that if $H_3S$ is a superconductor it is a nonstandard superconductor, let us ignore the values of $\lambda_L$ reported in Refs. [3, 24] mentioned above and instead infer its value using the standard theory of superconductivity. As discussed in the previous section, the total magnetic field at the edge of the sample would be $2.5T$ if the field doesn’t penetrate. Within the standard theory of superconductivity this implies that the lower critical field $H_{c1}$ is larger than $2.5T$ even at temperatures around 100K where the magnetic field starts to be excluded. Let us explore the implications of this. For simplicity we will assume $H_{c1} = 2.5T$ at $T = 0$, although in reality it would have to be even larger if it is $2.5T$ at $\sim 100K$.

Using the expression for the lower critical field [20, 25]

$$ H_{c1}(0) = \frac{\phi_0}{4\pi \lambda_L(0)^2} \ln\left(\frac{\lambda_L(0)}{\xi(0)}\right) \quad (11) $$

we have for the London penetration depth at zero temperature

$$ \lambda_L(0) = \xi(0) \frac{H_{c2}(0)}{2H_{c1}(0)} \ln\left(\frac{\lambda_L(0)}{\xi(0)}\right) \quad (12) $$

and with $H_{c2}(0) = 68T$, $H_{c1}(0) = 2.5T$

$$ \frac{\lambda_L(0)}{\xi(0)} = 3.69 \ln\left(\frac{\lambda_L(0)}{\xi(0)}\right) \quad (13) $$

and we obtain $\lambda_L(0) = 4.54\xi(0) = 10.0nm$. So the material would have to be a weakly type II superconductor, with $\kappa = \lambda_L(0)/\xi(0) = 4.5$, to exclude the applied magnetic field as found in the NRS experiment, instead of $\kappa > 50$ as inferred in Refs. [3, 24].

This would be contrary to all expectations for this material based on the standard theory of superconductivity [3, 19, 24]. In addition, it would imply that the thermodynamic critical field, given by

$$ H_c(T) = \frac{\phi_0}{2\sqrt{2}\pi \lambda_L(T)\xi(T)} \quad (14) $$

has the value

$$ H_c(0) = 10.6T \quad (15) $$

which is more than an order of magnitude larger than is found for any standard superconductor, and implies an enormous condensation energy. This in turn exerts an enormous ‘Meissner pressure’ $H_c^2/(8\pi)$ [6] which is necessary to account for the experimental results seen in Fig. 2 in the configuration of Fig. 1.

Within the standard theory of superconductivity the thermodynamic critical field obeys the relation

$$ \frac{H_c^2(0)}{8\pi} = \frac{1}{2} g(\epsilon_F) \Delta^2(0) \quad (16) $$

![Fig. 2: Comparison of experimental results from the NRS experiment of Ref. [4] with what would be expected if sulfur hydride is a standard superconductor, for applied magnetic field perpendicular and parallel to the Sn film. The blue triangles and red dots show the values of the magnetic field at the Sn film inferred from the experimental data for the $H_3S$ sample and the control $H_2$ sample respectively in Ref. [4]. The grey strips indicate the range of magnetic fields where the blue triangles should be located if $H_3S$ was a standard superconductor according to Eq. (8).](image-url)
where $\Delta(0)$ is the energy gap at zero temperature and $g(\varepsilon_F)$ is the density of states per spin at the Fermi energy. So we would have to assume that this relation which holds for standard superconductors fails for the superhydrides for unknown reasons. Alternatively, this value of $H_c(0)$ would imply that either the density of states or the energy gap are much larger than in standard superconductors. Assuming the standard BCS relation between energy gap and critical temperature, the density of states that would be implied by the value Eq. (16) for the critical field is

$$g(\varepsilon_F) = \frac{0.586 \text{ states}}{\text{spin} - eV/A^3}. \quad (17)$$

This is an enormous density of states. For comparison, using the standard theory the density of states of sulfur hydride was estimated to be $0.019 \text{ states}/(\text{spin} - eV/A^3)$ [19], 30 times smaller.

Assuming the density of states is given by the free electron expression with effective mass $m^*$ we have

$$g(\varepsilon_F) = \frac{0.0206 \ m^*}{\text{spin} - eV A^2 \ m_e n^{1/3}} \quad (18)$$

with $n$ the number density. For the density of states given by Eq. (17) this yields for the Wigner Seitz radius

$$r_s = 0.022 \frac{m^*}{m_e} A. \quad (19)$$

The $H - H$ distance in sulfur hydride at pressures above 150 GPa is approximately 1.4Å. Assuming $r_s = 0.7 A$ yields

$$\frac{m^*}{m} \approx 32. \quad (20)$$

However, the effective mass enhancement resulting from electron-phonon interaction is expected to be only around a factor of 3. The theoretical calculations that claim to explain the observed values of $T_c$ in $H_3S$ [26–32] are not compatible with an effective mass enhancement as given by Eq. (20).

Note also that if the London penetration depth is $\lambda_L \sim 10.0nm$ as given by this analysis rather than 125nm, the critical current would have to be larger than $3.2 \times 10^{10} \text{Amp/cm}^2$, even more anomalous than the lower bound given by Eq. (10).

We conclude that if the experimental results reported in Ref. [4] are valid, $H_3S$ cannot be explained by the standard theory of superconductivity. Therefore, $H_3S$ is a novel nonstandard superconductor that excludes magnetic fields that are two orders of magnitude larger than what the standard theory predicts it can exclude. Presumably this is also true for all the other nonstandard superconductors [1], i.e. all other hydrogen-rich materials that superconduct at high temperatures under high pressures.

V. DISCUSSION

The paper where the nuclear resonance experiment was reported [4] has been cited 97 times according to Google Scholar (Jan. 5, 2021), and none of the papers citing it question its validity. So the assertion that sulfur hydride expels magnetic fields is generally accepted by the scientific community to be a fact proven by this experiment. However in this paper we have called the validity of this understanding into question.

If sulfur hydride truly excludes magnetic fields of the magnitude claimed in the geometries used in this experiment, it implies that its superconductivity is very nonstandard. It has a “Meissner effect on steroids”. This new property of nonstandard superconductors unveiled by the NRS experiment [4] is consistent with what was found in Ref. [1], that nonstandard superconductors should have critical currents that are orders of magnitude higher than those of standard superconductors. A new theory of the electrodynamics of these materials is required to describe their very unusual properties. These properties would lend them very useful for practical applications such as levitating trains.

However, if these materials are so different from standard superconductors we also have to ask: why is it that standard BCS-Eliashberg theory is able to accurately predict their transition temperatures as claimed in the literature [26–38]? We suggest that ‘superflexibility’ [39] may have something to do with it, whether or not these materials are superconductors.

Alternatively, and more likely in our view, we have to conclude that the experiment reported in Ref. [4] is flawed for some reason. If so, it does not provide any supporting evidence to the claim that sulfur hydride under pressure is a high temperature superconductor [3, 19], contrary to what is generally assumed [40] (see however [41]). This casts further doubt on the claim that superhydrides are high temperature superconductors, adding to the arguments given in [1, 2, 42].
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[7] The abstract of the paper mistakenly claims that the results demonstrate that the magnetic field “is expelled from the volume” of the sensor.


[21] At the time of the experiment, it was believed that superconducting hydrogen sulfide was H2S; presently it is generally agreed it is H3S [19] that has the higher transition temperature.


[25] This is an approximate relation, but will suffice for our purposes.


[40] Ref. [3] reporting the discovery of sulfur hydride as a 200K superconductor has been cited 1,367 times in the scientific literature according to Google Scholar, Jan. 5, 2021.
