

its regime of validity to fortify claims that 30 K would be the upper limit for electron–phonon coupling.”

The above comment may not be entirely fair if its subject is the analysis McMillan made in a 1968 article,¹ in which he doesn't mention 30 K as a possible maximum value of T_c but does list 9.2, 22, 28, and 40 K as possible maximums. None of those temperatures are the upper limit of electron–phonon coupling in general. Rather, they are upper limits of T_c in classes of materials represented by lead, niobium, and niobium–tin and vanadium–silicon alloys, and they have not exceeded the regime of validity of the McMillan equation. In particular, McMillan does not exclude higher T_c in other classes, provided that λ does not exceed 2 in his equation.

Specifically, McMillan realizes that T_c from his equation declines when, on average, the phonon frequency becomes either too large or too small and searching for maximum T_c leads to $\lambda = 2$. Since in 1968 it was believed that $T_c = 7.2$ K and $\lambda = 1.3$ in Pb, McMillan concludes that T_c may reach 9.2 K in a Pb alloy when $\lambda = 2.8$. In that case, T_c was found numerically and therefore was not subject to the $\lambda < 2$ limit. Had, say, McMillan found $T_c = 203$ K with $\lambda = 1.3$ from a material in his day, he likely would have concluded that T_c could be higher still in a similar material with $\lambda = 2.8$.

In recent work,² we extended the McMillan equation for $0.6 < \lambda < 2.67$. We found that the original McMillan equation is indeed highly accurate if $\lambda < 2$. We also predicted that T_c can reach ~44 K in a beryllium–lead alloy, when the Be to Pb ratio is 0.58 to 0.42 ($\lambda = 1$ and Debye temperature is 871 K). Our result may be useful to experimenters because it not only shows that T_c may be high in a class of alloys, but it also gives the exact compo-

sition of the alloy, hopefully without extreme pressure.

References

1. W. L. McMillan, *Phys. Rev.* **167**, 331 (1968).
2. X. H. Zheng, J. X. Zheng, D. G. Walmsley, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.01367v2>.

X. H. Zheng

(xhz@qub.ac.uk)

Queen's University Belfast
Belfast, UK

J. X. Zheng

(jxz12@ic.ac.uk)

Imperial College London
London, UK



The article by Warren Pickett and Mikhail Eremets on room-temperature superconductivity in hydrides had me thinking about the role of specific heat in superconductivity research.

Heike Kamerlingh Onnes and Gilles Holst reported in 1914 that “with respect to the specific heat, nothing peculiar happens” at mercury's superconducting transition,¹ which Kamerlingh Onnes had discovered three years earlier. Twenty years later, after technical advances in cryogenics and thermometry, Kamerlingh Onnes's former student, Willem Keesom, and J. A. Kok discovered a specific heat jump at the critical temperature T_c , without latent heat.¹ It was misinterpreted as a sudden drop in Debye temperature, which assumes phonons are the predominant contributor to specific heat, even though the free electronic model for electronic specific heat ($C_e = \gamma T$) had been proposed before then. It took almost another 20 years for the superconducting-state electronic specific heat (C_{es}) to be identified, but still erroneously concluded as having a T^3 dependence. Eventually, experimental data covering a wider (T_c/T) range confirmed the exponential-temperature dependence of its electronic origin.²

In their 1957 article, John Bardeen, Leon Cooper, and J. Robert Schrieffer opened with the statement, “The main facts which a theory of superconductivity must explain are (1) a second-order phase transition at the critical temperature, T_c , (2) an electronic specific heat varying as $\exp(-T_0/T)$ near $T = 0$ K and other evidence for an energy gap.”³ The rest is now history.

In my opinion, superconducting hydrides may provide opportunities for

studying C_{es} in detail over an exceptionally broad (T_c/T) range. Intuitively, the near-room-temperature transition would make it impossible to delineate the electronic and the lattice contributions from total specific heat ($C = C_e + C_l$) being obtained calorimetrically. That appears to be a valid concern for cuprate superconductors with T_c near or above 90 K. In contrast, for metallic hydrogen with an exceedingly high Debye temperature⁴ of approximately 3500 K, the lattice specific heat C_l at 280 K can be estimated to be approximately 1 J/mol K. The same amount of normal-state $C_e = \gamma T$ would also prevail at 280 K if the coefficient $\gamma = 3.6$ mJ/mol K², which is comparable to that of many conventional superconductors.

The difficulty rests with the high-pressure aspect in calorimetric measurements. A standard pressure-cell approach was successfully employed on superconducting uranium some 50 years ago,⁵ but only at 10 kbar. Researchers are designing and developing diamond anvil cells, but they face challenges regarding pressure limits and heat leak. However, as we look back, after 1911 it took more than 40 years of improving cryogenics and low-temperature calorimetry to finally reveal exponential-temperature dependence of C_{es} , which was important to the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer theory. We now need to overcome another technical hurdle—in pressure instead of temperature.

References

1. H. Kamerlingh Onnes, G. Holst, *Commun. Phys. Lab. Univ. Leiden*, no. 142c (1914); W. H. Keesom, J. A. Kok, *Physica* **1**, 770 (1934).
2. W. S. Corak, C. B. Satterthwaite, *Phys. Rev.* **102**, 662 (1956).
3. J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper, J. R. Schrieffer, *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 1175 (1957).
4. N. W. Ashcroft, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 1748 (1968).
5. J. C. Ho, N. E. Phillips, T. F. Smith, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **17**, 694 (1966).

James C. Ho

(james.ho@shockers.wichita.edu)

Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas

► **Pickett and Eremets reply:** X. H. Zheng and J. X. Zheng focus on McMillan's classic 1968 paper to address the decades-studied but unresolved question of maximum T_c . The last short section of his paper was on issues of maximum T_c . Though he carefully stated that his equation for T_c “was derived for $\lambda \leq 1$,” he nevertheless extrapolated

CONTACT PHYSICS TODAY

Letters and commentary are encouraged and should be sent by email to ptletters@aip.org (using your surname as the Subject line), or by standard mail to Letters, PHYSICS TODAY, American Center for Physics, One Physics

Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740-3842. Please include your name, work affiliation, mailing address, email address, and daytime phone number on your letter and attachments. You can also contact us online at <http://contact.physicstoday.org>. We reserve the right to edit submissions.