Nick Clark · Published April 25, 2026 · PDF

Eos Energy Enterprises Znyth zinc long-duration storage vs a hydrogen-aluminum equipotential cell: an abundant-materials architecture comparison

Eos Energy Enterprises ships Znyth zinc-based aqueous batteries as a lithium-free option for multi-hour and long-duration grid storage. Both Eos and the approach described here start from the same premise, that grid storage should not depend on scarce or flammable chemistry, but they answer it with different cell architectures. The alternative discussed below is built on the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649.

What Eos Energy Enterprises, maker of zinc-based (Znyth) long-duration storage systems Does

Eos Energy Enterprises is a U.S. manufacturer of stationary energy storage systems built on its Znyth zinc-based battery. The design uses a zinc chemistry with an aqueous, non-flammable electrolyte, and Eos positions it as a lithium-free option for multi-hour and long-duration grid applications. Rather than sell bare cells, Eos delivers integrated systems built up from its Z3 modules into larger enclosures intended for utility, commercial, and industrial deployment, with the electronics, balance of plant, and enclosure engineered around the battery.

This is a genuine and well-established approach, and it does several things well. The aqueous electrolyte removes the flammable organic solvents that dominate lithium-ion fire risk, which is a real safety advantage for stationary installations. The chemistry relies on zinc rather than lithium, cobalt, or nickel, which reduces exposure to constrained and geographically concentrated supply chains. And, importantly, Eos ships product: the systems are manufactured, deployed, and operating in the field, backed by warranties, standards testing, and a real service organization. Any comparison has to begin by acknowledging that asymmetry honestly. Eos has a shipping, mass-produced system. The subject of this article is an architecture disclosed in a provisional patent application, not a built or benchmarked product.

The Architectural Axis

The axis worth examining is not "zinc versus something else" as a materials contest. Both approaches deliberately choose abundant, non-flammable-leaning materials over scarce or fire-prone ones, so on that dimension they are allies more than rivals. The interesting difference is structural: how the cell holds charge and how it ages.

Conventional rechargeable cells, including aqueous zinc designs, are organized around a defined anode and cathode separated by an ion-conducting, electron-insulating barrier. Charge is retained because that separator prevents electrons from flowing directly between two electrodes held at different potentials. This is the standard and well-proven way to build a battery, and it is not a defect. It does, however, carry structural consequences that are inherent to the separated-electrode arrangement: the separator is a load-bearing component for charge retention, and the electrodes undergo use-driven and rest-driven change over their service life.

The provisional application approaches charge retention from a different structural starting point. That difference, not any claimed shortcoming of Eos, is the axis this article addresses.

How the Disclosed Approach Differs

The Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell, as disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649, describes a sealed cell with two carbon current collectors and, between them, a single continuous volume of a proton-conducting carbon gel with metal nanoflakes, described in preferred embodiments as aluminum, dispersed through it. There is no internal separator or membrane. The gel is itself both electronically and ionically conductive.

The disclosure calls the resulting retention principle bulk-equipotential storage. In the charged state with no load connected, the specification describes substantially all of the metal nanoflakes sitting at the same electrochemical potential, so no internal potential gradient exists to drive self-discharge. As the specification frames it, the cell holds charge not by being insulated against internal current but by being internally saturated to the point that there is no driving force for current to flow. A potential gradient, and therefore discharge, appears only when an external circuit is closed between the terminals. This is a structurally different answer to the same problem a separator solves in a conventional cell.

Energy is stored in the disclosed architecture as electron-stabilized hydrogen bonded to the surfaces of the metal nanoflakes, formed by proton-coupled electron transfer during charging and reversed by electron withdrawal during discharge. The specification distinguishes this surface-bonded storage from bulk metal-hydride formation and from intercalation chemistry, and describes it as a kinetically trapped bond state that does not spontaneously decompose at rest. The specification also describes mechanisms intended to be use-positive over cycling, including mechanochemical healing in which mobile carbon migrates to strained sites, and a field-serviceable gel-replacement pathway in certain embodiments, framed as extending operational life relative to single-fill operation. On the abundant-materials axis the disclosure leans on aluminum and a carbon gel derived, in the disclosed synthesis route, from biomass feedstock.

Two safety behaviors in the specification are worth noting because they bear on the same stationary-storage concerns Eos addresses. The disclosure describes a heat-triggered discharge stall, in which rising temperature increases internal resistance and stalls discharge, framed as a reversible interlock against thermal runaway. It also describes a mechanical-breach response in which oxygen ingress drives rapid oxidation to benign products, described as non-flammable water vapor, aluminum oxide particulates, and carbon dioxide. These are disclosed mechanisms of an architecture, not measured results.

Where They Fit Together

For anyone evaluating storage today, these are not interchangeable, and the honest framing is compose-and-choose rather than head-to-head. Eos is a deployable system a buyer can specify, permit, and commission now, with the operational track record, standards compliance, and support structure that a real product carries. If the requirement is a lithium-free multi-hour or long-duration system that has to be installed this year, that is a decision about shipping hardware, and a provisional disclosure does not compete in that decision.

The disclosed architecture occupies a different slot: it is a design-space contribution about how a separator-free, equipotential, surface-bonded-hydrogen cell might be built, aimed at the same broad goals of abundant materials and non-flammable-leaning safety that Eos pursues. Where they genuinely align is direction: both reject the assumption that grid storage must be built on scarce or flammable chemistry. Where they differ is maturity and structure. One is a fielded zinc product; the other is an early-stage architectural disclosure exploring a different retention principle.

Boundary Conditions

The most important boundary condition is candor about the two sides. On the Eos side, everything above is stated at the architecture level, from widely known facts about aqueous zinc systems and Eos's product positioning, and none of it asserts a defect in their technology. Where a detail would require specific figures, incident data, or non-public design particulars, this article intentionally does not go, to avoid overstating what can be verified.

On the disclosed side, the boundary is that the underlying materials science is pre-existing. Hydrogen chemisorption on metal surfaces, proton-conducting carbon gels, turbostratic graphene, and electrochemical nanoparticle restructuring are all established in the published literature, and the specification says so directly. The novelty asserted in the provisional lies in the combination and architecture, the integration of separator-free equipotential retention, surface-bonded hydrogen storage, electrostatic flake isolation, and the associated healing and service methods into one sealed cell, not in any newly discovered basic science.

Equally important, the provisional is a disclosure of an architecture, not a built, validated, or benchmarked product. The specification is explicit that its energy-density, efficiency, calendar-life, and cycle-life figures are projected or prophetic values based on the disclosed mechanisms and on published data for the underlying materials, and that actual performance, including long-duration storage behavior, is to be determined empirically through prototype and long-duration testing. No performance claim here should be read as measured. The comparison is therefore between a shipping system and an architectural proposal, and that difference in maturity is the governing boundary condition.

Disclosure Scope

The invention described here is disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649, and the scope of what is disclosed is defined by that application, not by this article. All statements in this article about the disclosed cell trace to that specification, including its own characterization of projected and prophetic figures as unvalidated pending empirical testing. References to Eos Energy Enterprises and its Znyth zinc-based long-duration storage systems, and to the broader grid-storage market, are provided solely as external context to locate the disclosed architecture on a comparison axis a reader might search for. That framing is not part of the patent filing and is not a claim of the filing. Nothing in this article asserts, or should be read as asserting, any defect, deficiency, or infringement on the part of Eos Energy Enterprises or its products, which are described here fairly and at the architecture level; the comparison is offered only to explain how the disclosed approach differs structurally in its charge-retention principle and materials architecture.

Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell (/h-al-battery)

All 40 steps → (/inventive-steps)

Sealed electrochemical cell storing energy as reversible covalent hydrogen bonds on carbon electrodes.

Provisional application

PRIMARY TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

- A Hydrogen-Aluminum Surface-Bond Storage Cell with Bulk-Equipotential Charge Retention (/articles/a-hydrogen-aluminum-surface-bond-storage-cell-with-bulk-equipotential-charge-retention)

SECONDARY TECHNICAL

- Charge Retention by Bulk-Equipotential Saturation Without an Internal Separator (/articles/h-al-battery/bulk-equipotential-charge-retention)

- Storing Energy as Electron-Stabilized Metal-Hydrogen Surface Bonds Formed by Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer (/articles/h-al-battery/hydrogen-metal-surface-bond-storage)
- Electron-Mediated Bond Stability: The Kinetically Trapped Idle State Behind Indefinite Calendar Life (/articles/h-al-battery/electron-mediated-bond-stability)
- Hot-Proton Charging Versus Cold-Proton Discharge: The Bias-Gated Asymmetry That Blocks Self-Charge and Self-Discharge (/articles/h-al-battery/hot-cold-proton-asymmetry)
- Asymmetric Dual-Domain Proton Paths: Separate Ingress and Egress Routes in a Hydrogen-Aluminum Storage Gel (/articles/h-al-battery/asymmetric-dual-domain-paths)
- Hydrophobic Gating: Rejecting Neutral and Molecular Hydrogen While Admitting Only Biased Protons (/articles/h-al-battery/hydrophobic-gating)
- The Storage Gel as a Polarized Electrochemical Switch: Coherent Alignment, Equipotential Locking, and Load-Proportional Discharge (/articles/h-al-battery/gel-polarized-switch)
- Flake-Flake Electrostatic Isolation: DLVO Repulsion as a Self-Discharge Barrier in a Separator-Free Hydrogen-Aluminum Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/flake-electrostatic-isolation)
- Dynamic Flake Expansion: Carbon-Intercalation Wedging to Expose Buried Metal Surface Under Bias (/articles/h-al-battery/dynamic-flake-expansion)
- Hydrogen-Locked Expanded State: Surface-Energy Inversion as a Positive-Feedback Capacity Mechanism (/articles/h-al-battery/hydrogen-locked-expanded-state)
- Secondary Carbon-Hydrogen Storage on Transmuted Intercalated Carbon (/articles/h-al-battery/secondary-carbon-hydrogen-storage)
- Mechanochemical Strain Self-Healing and Use-Positive Aging in a Bulk-Equipotential Hydrogen-Aluminum Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/mechanochemical-self-healing)
- Boron Doping of the Carbon Framework as a Multi-Function Precision Multiplier (/articles/h-al-battery/boron-doping-precision-multiplier)
- The Floating Aluminum Equipotential Extension Layer: A Multifunctional Inner Case for the Bulk-Equipotential Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/aluminum-equipotential-extension-layer)

APPLICATIONS · GENERAL

- Grid-Scale and Renewable-Firming Storage with the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/grid-scale-storage)
- Building-Integrated and Behind-the-Meter Storage: Putting Energy Cells Inside the Structure With the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/building-integrated-storage)
- Stationary Backup and UPS Reserve Power for Data Centers, Hospitals, and Telecom (/articles/h-al-battery/backup-and-ups)
- Storage for Microgrids, Islands, and Off-Grid Sites: A Stationary Cell Built From Abundant Materials (/articles/h-al-battery/microgrid-and-off-grid)

- Electric Mobility and Transport: How a Hydrogen-Aluminum Cell Architecture Maps to Vehicle Constraints, and Where It Does Not (/articles/h-al-battery/ev-and-mobility)
- Marine and Rail Energy Storage: A Bulk-Equipotential Hydrogen-Aluminum Cell for Mass-Tolerant Heavy Transport (/articles/h-al-battery/marine-and-rail)
- Supply-Chain-Resilient Field Power: An Abundant-Material Energy Cell for Defense and Expeditionary Operations (/articles/h-al-battery/defense-and-field-power)

APPLICATIONS · SPECIFIC

- CATL (Contemporary Amperex Technology Co. Limited) alternative: a hydrogen-aluminum cell architecture vs LFP, NMC, and sodium-ion at the chemistry-category and materials-sourcing level (/articles/h-al-battery/catl)
- LG Energy Solution NCM/NCMA lithium-ion cells vs the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell: an architectural comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/lg-energy-solution)
- Form Energy iron-air multi-day grid storage vs a sealed bulk-equipotential hydrogen-aluminum cell: an architectural comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/form-energy)
- ESS Inc, maker of long-duration iron flow batteries vs a sealed solid-state cell: comparing the flow architecture to the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell (/articles/h-al-battery/ess-inc)
- Ambri liquid-metal battery vs a solid-state hydrogen-aluminum energy cell: architectural comparison for stationary storage (/articles/h-al-battery/ambri)
- QuantumScape solid-state lithium-metal battery vs a bulk-equipotential hydrogen-aluminum surface-bond cell: an architecture comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/quantumscape)
- Natron Energy sodium-ion (Prussian-blue-electrode) batteries vs a hydrogen-aluminum surface-bond cell: an abundant-materials architecture comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/natron-energy)
- **Eos Energy Enterprises Znyth zinc long-duration storage vs a hydrogen-aluminum equipotential cell: an abundant-materials architecture comparison (/articles/h-al-battery/eos-energy)**

Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell overview → (/h-al-battery)