in multiply connected specimens. Whereas a simply connected voidless specimen can serve to realize only a single Hall effect on the bar's exterior boundary, many voids with interior boundary contacts, or anti-Hall bars, can be placed within a multiply connected specimen. By injecting a current through the interior boundary of each anti-Hall bar, we showed that it is possible to obtain multiple simultaneous Hall effects in a single specimen, one from each anti-Hall bar. Thus the sign of the Hall effect in the multiply connected specimen is not a direct indicator of the sign of the Hall coefficient, as is the case in the simply connected Hall-bar geometry.

The relation between Hall-effect measurements made on a standard Hall bar and on an anti-Hall bar can be understood as follows. Imagine that a standard Hall bar, with contacts on the exterior boundary, has a single void in the interior. The sample can be transformed into a single anti-Hall bar via an inversion transformation—that is, by turning the sample inside out. The transformation shifts the exterior boundary and contacts to the sample's interior while moving the boundary of the hole to the exterior.

Suppose the direction of the magnetic field is fixed. If the exterior Hall voltage is positive for positive current in the Hall bar with a void, turning the sample inside out to obtain the anti-Hall bar produces a negative Hall voltage on the interior boundary. That's because the sample's orientation becomes flipped with respect to the magnetic field. A characteristic of the Hall effect is that the sign of the Hall voltage reverses when the direction of the magnetic field reverses. Consequently, the inversion transformation reverses the sign of the Hall effect on the interior (anti-Hall bar) boundary with respect to the Hall effect on the exterior (Hall bar) boundary.

The repeating unit in the metamaterial shown on the February cover is a torus with contacts either on the inner or outer boundaries. The reported sign reversal is therefore the effect that I and my colleague discovered more than 23 years ago.

References

1. C. Kern, M. Kadic, M. Wegener, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 016601 (2017).
2. R. G. Mani, K. von Klitzing, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **64**, 1262 (1994); "Null (net) current Hall effect device for reducing resistive offsets," German Patent DE 43 08 375 C2 (23 July 1998); "Hall-effect device with current and Hall-voltage connections," US Patent 5,646,527 (8 July 1997); "Hall-effect device with current and Hall-voltage connection points," European Patent 0689723 B1 (4 June 1997).

Ramesh G. Mani
(rmani@gsu.edu)
Georgia State University
Atlanta

Sulfur hydride and superconductivity theory

In his comments in "Unmasking the record-setting sulfur hydride superconductor" (PHYSICS TODAY, July 2016, page 21) Sung Chang quotes Mari Einaga, who explains that the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) theory "was largely abandoned because of the discovery of cuprates and other unconventional superconductors." We believe that is true, and it has curtailed development of the BCS theory. Indeed, Jorge Hirsch, in a dramatic review,[1] has called the whole theory into question.

Hirsch listed metallic hydrogen and metal hydrides as examples of the failure of the BCS theory's predictive power: The predicted high transition temperature, T_c, in those two cases has not materialized.[1] However, in an ironic twist, Mikhail Eremets and colleagues have recently found $T_c = 203$ K in sulfur hydride.[2] Their finding appears to vindicate the BCS theory because Tian Cui and his team had used the theory[3] to predict the record-breaking high T_c before the experiment by Eremets and colleagues, and Ion Errea and coworkers later verified Cui and coworkers' results theoretically.[4] Both groups used the McMillan formula (derived from a generalized version of BCS theory), which relates T_c to the electron–phonon coupling strength and the Coulomb pseudopotential, a measure of the Coulomb repulsion between electrons.

Despite that twist, Hirsch does have other points that need serious consideration. He argues that in the BCS theory, the Coulomb pseudopotential acts as a wild card that can be freely adjusted to fit the theory with any experimental result.[1] The Coulomb pseudopotential, 0.16 from a private communication with Errea, is unusually large compared with its typical value of approximately 0.12. The discrepancy needs to be explained.

We note, too, that the electrical resistivity of sulfur hydride under pressure in the normal state is experimentally measured in reference 2 but is not theoretically evaluated in references 3 and 4. The theoretical evaluation should be consistent with the experimental measurement because, according to BCS theory, both resistivity and superconductivity arise from the same electron–phonon interaction. Historically, a considerable number of researchers attempted but were unable to find consistent resistivity and superconductivity theoretically, even in simple metals.[5] The significance of those failures should not be underestimated. A similar evaluation should be made on sulfur hydride, and an understanding sought of the unusually large Coulomb pseudopotential there.

In his article, Chang states that "the BCS theory has a deceptively simple recipe for achieving high T_c: Create a high density of conduction-electron states and couple the conduction electrons to high-frequency phonons." But he voices caution. Perhaps understanding normal-state electrical resistivity and Coulomb pseudopotential in sulfur hydride can be of some help in getting to the bottom of the problem.

References

1. J. E. Hirsch, *Phys. Scr.* **80**, 035702 (2009).
2. A. P. Drozdov et al., *Nature* **525**, 73 (2015).
3. D. Duan et al., *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 6968 (2014).
4. I. Errea et al., *Nature* **532**, 81 (2016).
5. X. H. Zheng, D. G. Walmsley, *Solid State Commun.* **237–238**, 42 (2016) and references therein.

D. George Walmsley
(dg.walmsley@qub.ac.uk)
Xue-Heng Zheng
(xhz@qub.ac.uk)
Queens University Belfast
Belfast, UK