Nick Clark · Published April 25, 2026 · PDF

Skeleton Technologies supercapacitors vs the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell: pairing high power with bulk energy storage

Skeleton Technologies builds carbon supercapacitors and its SuperBattery for applications that demand very high power and very long cycle life, where a conventional battery would wear out or overheat. The domain problem is the standing gap between power-dense devices that hold little energy and energy-dense devices that cannot burst hard. This article positions that product family against a distinct architecture built on the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell, disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649, which discloses a single sealed cell that stores bulk energy and supplies a transient peak-power reservoir from the same physical volume.

What Skeleton Technologies (supercapacitors) Does

Skeleton Technologies is an energy storage company that designs and manufactures supercapacitors (also called ultracapacitors) and a related product it markets as the SuperBattery. Its cells are built around a proprietary carbon electrode material the company describes as curved graphene. Like supercapacitors generally, the products store charge primarily in the electric double layer at a high-surface-area electrode rather than through a bulk chemical conversion, which is the structural reason the category delivers its characteristic strengths.

Those strengths are real and worth stating plainly. Supercapacitors of this class charge and discharge extremely quickly, deliver very high power density, tolerate a very large number of charge and discharge cycles, and operate reliably across a wide temperature range. Skeleton markets these devices into applications where that behavior is the deciding factor: grid frequency regulation, transport and automotive power buffering, engine and equipment starting, regenerative energy capture, and backup power. The SuperBattery is positioned as a fast-charging, high-power device that narrows some of the energy gap while keeping the power and cycle-life advantages of the underlying material. For workloads dominated by short, intense power demands and enormous cycle counts, a supercapacitor is frequently the correct engineering choice, and it is a well-established, mass-produced technology.

The trade-off inherent to the double-layer mechanism is also well known: energy stored per unit mass is far lower than in a chemical battery, so a supercapacitor holds relatively little total energy for its size and weight. This is a property of the storage mechanism, not a defect in any particular product, and Skeleton engineers around it deliberately by targeting power-first applications.

The Architectural Axis

The axis this comparison addresses is the structural separation between where a system holds bulk energy and where it sources transient peak power. In most deployed systems these are two different jobs handled by two different devices or by one device oversized to cover both. A battery holds the energy; a supercapacitor covers the power burst. Each is good at one end of the curve.

The disclosed invention addresses that same axis from the opposite direction. Rather than being a better device for one end of the power-versus-energy curve, it discloses a single cell architecture intended to hold bulk energy and also to source a bounded transient burst from the same physical volume. The point of the comparison is not that a supercapacitor is deficient at storing energy. It is that the two technologies occupy structurally different positions: one is a shipping, power-optimized component, and the other is an architecture-level disclosure of a cell that internalizes both roles.

How the Disclosed Approach Differs

The disclosed cell, per the specification, is a sealed hermetic enclosure holding a continuous dual-domain proton-conducting carbon gel with a dispersed population of metal nanoflakes, and no internal separator or membrane between its two carbon current collectors. Its primary storage mechanism is chemical, not double-layer: energy is held as electron-stabilized metal-hydrogen surface bonds formed at the nanoflake surfaces by proton-coupled electron transfer. Because storage is chemical and surface-bonded, the disclosed energy figures cited in the specification are far higher per unit mass than the double-layer regime, though these are calculated and projected values for a provisional architecture rather than measured results.

On the power axis, the specification discloses a peak power operating mode that is structurally distinct from the primary chemistry. Under transient current draw well above the cell's sustained rating, the mechanism draws in parallel on the primary hydrogen-metal chemistry, on dynamic flake expansion, and on controlled local failure of the boron-doped carbon framework at strained sites, which releases bonding electrons into the gel's conduction band to supply additional current. The specification states this yields a peak capacity in the range of roughly 5 to 15 percent of nominal capacity per event, for durations of fractions of a second up to tens of seconds, and describes the strained regions as being subsequently healed by migration of a mobile carbon reservoir back to the failed sites. Notably, the specification itself frames this feature by contrast with the conventional approach of pairing a battery with a separate supercapacitor sized for peak demand, and describes the disclosed cell as supplying peak power from the same physical cell without a separate auxiliary device.

A second structural difference sits on the retention axis. The disclosed cell holds charge by bulk-equipotential saturation of a conductive medium rather than by insulation across a separator, and the specification projects calendar self-discharge well below one percent per year in a long-term storage mode. Supercapacitors, by the nature of the double layer, characteristically self-discharge relatively quickly and are generally not chosen for long standing storage. These are different design centers, and the specification is explicit that its retention and peak-power numbers are projections for an unbuilt architecture.

Where They Fit Together

Honestly framed, these are more complementary than adversarial, and today only one of them exists as a product you can buy. A Skeleton supercapacitor or SuperBattery is a shipping, validated component with measured power density, measured cycle life, and a manufacturing base behind it. The Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell is a provisional disclosure of an architecture. Nothing in it has been built or benchmarked.

Where they meet conceptually is the pairing pattern. A common system design places a supercapacitor alongside a battery so the capacitor absorbs and delivers the fast transients while the battery carries the bulk energy. Skeleton products are engineered for exactly that role and do it well. The disclosed architecture proposes to fold both roles into one cell, but that proposal is unproven. A designer choosing a component today, on measured specifications and supply availability, would reach for the shipping supercapacitor. The disclosed cell is relevant as an architectural alternative to the two-device pattern, not as a substitute for a supercapacitor in a system that needs one now.

It is also fair to note the axes where a supercapacitor is likely to remain preferable regardless. For the very highest instantaneous power, the fastest possible charge acceptance, and the largest raw cycle counts across a wide temperature envelope, the double-layer mechanism has intrinsic advantages that a chemical-bond storage mechanism does not obviously match, and the disclosed cell does not claim to.

Boundary Conditions

The materials science underlying the disclosed cell is pre-existing. Metal-hydrogen surface chemisorption, proton-conducting carbon gels, boron doping of carbon, MXene additives, and electrochemically driven nanoparticle restructuring are all described in prior published research, and the specification says so directly. The novelty asserted is the combination and architecture, meaning the integration of separator-free bulk-equipotential retention, surface-bonded hydrogen storage, asymmetric kinetic gating, dynamic flake expansion, and a bonding-electron peak-power reservoir into one sealed cell, not any newly discovered basic science.

The status asymmetry is the governing boundary condition of this comparison. Skeleton ships mass-produced hardware with published, measured performance. The disclosed cell is an early-stage provisional disclosure whose energy density, peak-power fraction, self-discharge rate, round-trip efficiency, and cycle life are calculated projections stated as ranges, which the specification repeatedly flags as to be determined empirically through prototype testing. Every quantitative claim on the disclosed side should be read as a projection from a described mechanism, not as demonstrated performance. The peak-power mode in particular relies on controlled, healable carbon-framework failure, whose reversibility and durability across many events are exactly the kind of behavior only prototype testing can confirm.

Disclosure Scope

This article discusses subject matter disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application No. 64/055,649. The description of Skeleton Technologies, its supercapacitor and SuperBattery products, and the surrounding market and application context is provided as external background to locate the disclosed architecture on the power-versus-energy axis; it is not part of the filing and is not a claim of the application. Nothing here asserts any defect, failure, or shortcoming in any Skeleton Technologies product, and the characteristics attributed to supercapacitors are stated as ordinary, widely-understood properties of the double-layer storage category, offered neutrally. The comparison is intended only to explain how the disclosed cell architecture is structurally different, and where it is instead complementary. The scope of any patent protection is defined solely by the claims that may issue from the application and its progeny, not by the descriptive or comparative statements in this article.

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)
- Fast-Response Frequency Regulation and Power Quality Without a Separate Power Bank (/articles/h-al-battery/frequency-regulation-power-quality)

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)
- EnerVenue nickel-hydrogen stationary cells vs a hydrogen-aluminum equipotential cell: two ways to store hydrogen in a battery (/articles/h-al-battery/enervenue)
- **Skeleton Technologies supercapacitors vs the Hydrogen-Aluminum Energy Cell: pairing high power with bulk energy storage (/articles/h-al-battery/skeleton-technologies)**

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