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It is shown on a few examples of one-band materials with spheroidal Fermi surfaces and anisotropic order parameters that anisotropies \( \gamma_H \) of the upper critical field and \( \gamma_\lambda \) of the London penetration depth depend on temperature, the feature commonly attributed to multi-band superconductors. The parameters \( \gamma_H \) and \( \gamma_\lambda \) may have opposite temperature dependencies or may change in the same direction depending on Fermi surface shape and on character of the gap nodes. For two-band systems, the behavior of anisotropies is affected by the ratio of bands order parameters.

I. INTRODUCTION

In many superconductors anisotropy parameters of the upper critical field, \( \gamma_H = H_{c2,ab}/H_{c2,c} \), and of the London penetration depth, \( \gamma_\lambda = \lambda_c/\lambda_{ab} \), are not equal. Moreover, they may have different temperature dependencies. In conventional one-band s-wave materials, these parameters for a long time were considered the same and \( T \) independent. MgB\(_2\) is a good example of the current situation: \( \gamma_H(T) \) decreases on warming, whereas \( \gamma_\lambda \) increases \([1, 2]\). Up to date, the \( T \) dependence of the anisotropy parameters is considered by many as caused by a multi-band character of materials in question with the common reference to MgB\(_2\). In this work we develop an approximate method to evaluate \( \gamma(T) \) that can be applied with minor modifications to various situations of different order parameter symmetries and Fermi surfaces, two bands included. In particular, we show that even in the one-band case \( \gamma \)'s and their \( T \) dependencies may differ if the Fermi surface is not a sphere or the order parameter \( \Delta \) is not pure s-wave. Our conclusions challenge the common belief that temperature dependence of \( \gamma \) is always related to multi-band topology of Fermi surfaces.

We focus on the clean limit for two major reasons. Commonly after discovery of a new superconductor, an effort is made to obtain as clean single crystals as possible since those provide a better chance to study the underlying physics. A proper description of scattering in multi-band case would have lead to a multitude of scattering parameters which cannot be easily controlled or separately measured. Besides, in general, the scattering suppresses the anisotropy of \( H_{c2} \), the central quantity of interest in this work.

To begin, it is worth recalling that the problem of the 2nd order phase transition at the upper critical field \( H_{c2}(T) \) has little in common with the problem of a weak field penetration into superconductors, thus a priori one should not expect \( \gamma_H = \gamma_\lambda \). Still, at the critical temperature \( T_c \) the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) theory requires \( \gamma_H(T_c) = \gamma_\lambda(T_c) \) because both are described in terms of the same mass tensor.

At \( H_{c2}(T) \), the order parameter \( \Delta(r, T, \mathbf{k}_F) = \Psi(r, T) \Omega(\mathbf{k}_F) \to 0 \), and Eilenberger equations for weak coupling superconductors can be linearized. The factor \( \Omega(\mathbf{k}_F) \) here describes the \( \mathbf{k}_F \) dependence of \( \Delta \) and is normalized so that the average over the full Fermi surface \( \langle \Omega^2 \rangle = 1 \).

For clean materials, the basic self-consistency equation of the theory can be written as \([3]\):

\[
\Psi \ln t = \int_0^\infty dp \ln \tanh \frac{\pi T_p}{\hbar} \langle \Omega^2 v_\Pi e^{-\rho v_\Pi} \Psi \rangle. \tag{1}
\]

Here, \( v \) is the Fermi velocity, \( \Pi = \nabla + 2\pi i A/\phi_0, \) \( A \) is the vector potential, and \( \phi_0 \) is the flux quantum.

A. \( \gamma_H \) and \( \gamma_\lambda \) at \( T_c \)

In this domain, the gradients \( \Pi \sim \xi^{-1} \to 0 \) (\( \xi \) is the order of magnitude of the coherence length), and one can keep in the expansion of \( \exp(-\rho v\Pi) \) in the integrand (1) only the linear term to obtain:

\[
-\Psi \delta t = \frac{7\zeta(3)\hbar^2}{16\pi^2 T_c^2} \langle \Omega^2 (v \cdot \Pi)^2 \Psi \rangle, \quad \delta t = 1 - T/T_c. \tag{2}
\]

This is, in fact, the anisotropic version of linearized GL equation \(-\xi_{ik}^2 \Pi_i \Pi_k \Psi = \Psi \) with \([4]\)

\[
\xi_{ik}^2 = \frac{7\zeta(3)\hbar^2}{16\pi^2 T_c^2 \delta t} \langle \Omega^2 v_i v_k \rangle. \tag{3}
\]

The anisotropy parameter for uniaxial materials then readily follows:

\[
\gamma_H^2(T_c) = \left( \frac{H_{c2,a}}{H_{c2,c}} \right)^2 = \frac{\xi_{dd}^2}{\xi_{cc}^2} = \frac{\langle \Omega^2 v_d^2 \rangle}{\langle \Omega^2 v_c^2 \rangle}. \tag{4}
\]
As mentioned above, the anisotropy of the London penetration depth $\gamma_\lambda$ at $T_c$ is the same as that of $H_{c2}$:

$$\gamma_\lambda^2(T_c) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\sqrt{\gamma_{ab}}} = \gamma_\lambda^2 (T_c) = \frac{\langle \Omega^2 v_x^2 \rangle}{\langle \Omega^2 v_z^2 \rangle}. \quad (5)$$

This can be proven also directly using a general expression for the tensor $\lambda_{ik}^{-1}(T)$, see e.g. [5].

B. $\gamma_H$ and $\gamma_\lambda$ at $T = 0$

It is shown in Ref. [3] that for ellipsoidal Fermi surface and orbital $H_{c2}$, the self-consistency Eq. (1) gives for $\gamma_H(0)$:

$$\left\langle \Omega^2 \ln \frac{v_x^2 + \gamma^2 H(0) v_y^2}{v_x^2 + v_y^2} \right\rangle = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $z$ is the direction of the $c$-axis of a uniaxial crystal. One can solve this numerically for $\gamma_H(0)$ for various gap and Fermi surface anisotropies. It is remarkable that this relatively simple relation gives the anisotropy $\gamma_H(0)$ without employing actual values of $H_{c2,c}$ and $H_{c2,ab}$.

According to [5], the anisotropy of the penetration depth at $T = 0$ in the clean case is given by

$$\gamma_\lambda^2(0) = \frac{\langle v_a^2 \rangle}{\langle v_z^2 \rangle}. \quad (7)$$

Neither gap nor its anisotropy enter this result, i.e. $\gamma_\lambda(0)$ in the clean case depends only on the shape of the Fermi surface. The physical reason for this is the Galilean invariance of the superflow in the absence of scattering: looking at the superflow in the frame attached to a moving element, one sees all charged particles taking part in the supercurrent independently of their energy spectrum, the shape of the Fermi surface and orbital $H_{c2}$.

In the following we adopt Fermi surface as a spheroid with the symmetry axis $z$. The Fermi surface average of a function $A(\theta, \phi)$ is evaluated in the Appendix A:

$$\left\langle A(\theta, \phi) \right\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi A(\theta, \phi) \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi, \quad \Gamma = \sin^2 \theta + \epsilon \cos^2 \theta. \quad (8)$$

Here $\epsilon$ is the squared ratio of spheroid axes, $\theta$ and $\phi$ are the polar and azimuthal angles, respectively.

II. ONE-BAND ANISOTROPIES

A. $\Omega = 1$, isotropic s-wave.

We start with the simplest case of a constant gap on a Fermi spheroid. In this case $\gamma_\lambda^2 = \langle v_x^2 \rangle / \langle v_z^2 \rangle$ both at $T = 0$ and $T_c$. With the help of Appendix A, we find

$$\langle v_x^2 \rangle = v_{ab}^2 \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{3}, \quad \langle v_z^2 \rangle = \frac{v_{ab}^2}{3}. \quad (9)$$

Thus, $\gamma_\lambda = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ and it is $T$ independent. In particular, this means that $\gamma_H(T_c) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ as well.

To find $\gamma_H(0)$ we turn to Eq. (6) which in spherical coordinates $\theta, \phi$ takes the form:

$$0 = \left\langle \ln(\cos^2 \phi + \epsilon^2 \gamma_H^2 \cot^2 \theta) \right\rangle$$

Integrating first over $\phi$ and then over $\theta$ one can show that at $T = 0$:

$$\ln[(1 + \gamma_H \sqrt{\epsilon})/2] = 0,$$

i.e., $\gamma_H(0) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$. Thus, for isotropic s-wave, temperature independent anisotropies are $\gamma_\lambda = \gamma_H = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$.

B. $\Omega = \sqrt{2}e^{1/4} \cos 2\phi$, d-wave on Fermi spheroid

Since zero-$T$ anisotropy of $\lambda$ is independent of the order parameter symmetry, we have $\gamma_\lambda(0) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$, the same as for s-wave. At $T_c$, the calculation of $\langle \Omega^2 v_x^2 \rangle$ and $\langle \Omega^2 v_z^2 \rangle$ is straightforward and we obtain again $\gamma_\lambda(T_c) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$. Hence, $\lambda$-anisotropies of $s$- and $d$-waves are the same, that is somewhat surprising.

To find $\gamma_H(0)$ one solves Eq. (10) with an extra factor $\cos^2 2\phi$ in the integral. The result is shown in Fig. 1. Hence, whereas $\gamma_\lambda$ is $T$ independent, $\gamma_H$ is slightly de-

---

FIG. 1. (Color online) The d-wave anisotropy $\gamma_H$ at $T = 0$ vs ellipticity $\epsilon$. The blue curve is obtained by solving numerically Eq. (10) with an extra factor $\cos^2 2\phi$ in the integral. The red dashed curve is $\gamma_H(T_c) = \gamma_\lambda(T_c) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$. decreases on warming; this is also seen in Fig. 2 of Ref. [3].
C. $\Omega = \Omega_0 \cos \theta$, an equatorial line node

Again, at $T = 0$ one has $\gamma_\lambda(0) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$. At $T_c$:

$$\langle \Omega^2 v_x^2 \rangle = v_{ab}^2 \Omega_0^2 \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{4\pi} \int \frac{\sin^3 \theta \cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \varphi}{\Gamma^{5/2}} d\theta d\varphi,$$

$$\langle \Omega^2 v_y^2 \rangle = v_{ab}^2 \Omega_0^2 \frac{\epsilon^{5/2}}{4\pi} \int \frac{\sin \theta \cos^4 \theta}{\Gamma^{5/2}} d\theta d\varphi. \quad (12)$$

The integrals here are evaluated analytically, we omit cumbersome formulas and provide the result in Fig. 2 where $\gamma_\lambda(T_c)$ is a red solid curve and $\gamma_\lambda(0)$ is a blue dotted curve. Hence, $\gamma_\lambda$ decreases substantially on warming. $\gamma_H(0)$ is shown as a dashed-blue, so $\gamma_H$ increases on warming.

![FIG. 2. (Color online) The solid red curve: the anisotropy parameter $\gamma = \gamma_H$ at $T_c$ vs ellipticity $\epsilon$ for the order parameter with the equatorial line node. The upper dotted curve is $\gamma(0)$ and the lower dashed curve is $\gamma_H(0)$. Thus, $\gamma_\lambda(T)$ decreases on warming, whereas $\gamma_H(T)$ increases.](image)

D. $\Omega = \Omega_0 \sin \theta$, two polar point nodes

In this case the integrals (12) take the form:

$$\langle \Omega^2 v_x^2 \rangle = v_{ab}^2 \Omega_0^2 \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{4\pi} \int \frac{\sin^3 \theta \cos^2 \theta}{\Gamma^{5/2}} d\theta d\varphi,$$

$$\langle \Omega^2 v_y^2 \rangle = v_{ab}^2 \Omega_0^2 \frac{\epsilon^{5/2}}{4\pi} \int \frac{\sin \theta \cos^4 \theta}{\Gamma^{5/2}} d\theta d\varphi. \quad (13)$$

Anisotropy parameters evaluated numerically are shown in Fig. 3. Hence, $\gamma_\lambda(T)$ increases on warming, whereas $\gamma_H(T)$ decreases, the behavior opposite to that of $\Omega \propto \cos \theta$ of Fig. 2.

![FIG. 3. (Color online) The order parameter $\Omega \propto \sin \theta$. The red solid curve: $\gamma_\lambda = \gamma_H$ at $T_c$. The dotted blue curve is $\gamma_\lambda(0) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}$ and the blue dashed curve is $\gamma_H(0)$. Thus, in this case $\gamma_\lambda(T)$ increases on warming, whereas $\gamma_H(T)$ decreases, the behavior opposite to that of $\Omega \propto \cos \theta$, Fig. 2.](image)

This is because a given Fermi surface shape in fact determines nearly all other model parameters, so that one should be careful mapping real systems onto Procrustean bed of two spheroids. Still, mapping real multi-band systems on a two-band model is practically useful. Below we find out which model parameters can be considered independent, at least as far as temperature dependencies of anisotropies $\gamma_H$ and $\gamma_\lambda$ are concerned, the problem of interest to the experimental community.

Consider a model with the gap anisotropy given by

$$\Omega(k) = \Omega_{1,2}, \quad k \in F_{1,2}, \quad (14)$$

where $F_1, F_2$ are two sheets of the Fermi surface and $\Omega_{1,2}$ are constants. We denote the densities of states (DOS) on the two parts as $N_{1,2}$; assuming $X$ being constant at each sheet, we have:

$$\langle X \rangle = \langle X_1 N_1 + X_2 N_2 \rangle / N(0) = n_1 X_1 + n_2 X_2, \quad (15)$$

where $n_{1,2} = N_{1,2}/N(0)$ are normalized DOS'. Since the average over the full Fermi surface $\langle \Omega^2 \rangle = 1$, one has:

$$n_1 \Omega_{1}^2 + n_2 \Omega_{2}^2 = 1, \quad n_1 + n_2 = 1. \quad (16)$$

The simplicity of this model notwithstanding, when applied, e.g., to the problem of $T$-dependence of $\gamma_\lambda$ in MgB$_2$ [5], it generates $\gamma_\lambda(T)$ close to the measured [2].

Within this model we obtain:

$$\gamma_\lambda^2(T_c) = \frac{\langle \Omega^2 v_x^2 \rangle}{\langle \Omega^2 v_y^2 \rangle} = \frac{n_1 \Omega_{1}^2 \langle v_x^2 \rangle + n_2 \Omega_{2}^2 \langle v_x^2 \rangle}{n_1 \Omega_{1}^2 \langle v_y^2 \rangle + n_2 \Omega_{2}^2 \langle v_y^2 \rangle}, \quad (17)$$

$$\gamma_\lambda^2(0) = \frac{\langle v_x^2 \rangle}{\langle v_x^2 \rangle} = \frac{n_1 \langle v_x^2 \rangle + n_2 \langle v_x^2 \rangle}{n_1 \langle v_x^2 \rangle + n_2 \langle v_x^2 \rangle}. \quad (18)$$

To evaluate $\gamma_H(T_c) = \gamma_\lambda(T_c)$ we rearrange Eq. (17):

$$\gamma_\lambda^2(T_c) = \frac{\langle v_x^2 \rangle}{\langle v_x^2 \rangle} \left[ 1 + \frac{n_2 \Omega_{2}^2 \langle v_x^2 \rangle}{n_1 \Omega_{1}^2 \langle v_y^2 \rangle} \right]^{-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{n_2 \Omega_{2}^2 \langle v_x^2 \rangle}{n_1 \Omega_{1}^2 \langle v_y^2 \rangle} \right]. \quad (19)$$

III. TWO S-WAVE BANDS

Materials with $\pm s$ symmetry of the order parameter belong to this class, that makes this case relevant in particular. It is shown below that not every two-band system can be modeled consistently by two Fermi spheroids.
The ratios of average squared velocities are obtained using Appendix A and Eqs. (9):
\[
\frac{(v_x^2)}{e_1} = 1, \quad \frac{(v_y^2)}{e_2} = \frac{v_{ab,2}^2}{v_{ab,1}^2}, \quad \frac{(v_z^2)}{e_2} = \frac{v_{ab,2}^2 e_2}{v_{ab,1}^2 e_1}. \tag{20}
\]

Next, to find ratios of \(v_{ab}\) in two spherical bands, we turn to DOS', see Appendix A:
\[
n_\alpha = \frac{m_{ab,\alpha} v_{ab,\alpha}}{2\pi^2 h^4 N(0) \epsilon_{\alpha}}. \quad \alpha = 1,2. \tag{21}
\]

Besides, \(v_{ab,1}^2 = m_{ab,2} v_{ab,2}^2\) since the Fermi energy is the same on both bands. One obtains as a result
\[
\frac{v_{ab,2}^2}{v_{ab,1}^2} = \left(\frac{n_1 e_1}{n_2 e_2}\right)^{3/2}. \tag{22}
\]

Thus, ratios of velocities needed for \(\gamma(T_c)\) of Eq. (19) are expressed in terms of \(n_1\) and ellipticities \(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2\).

Similar manipulation yields for \(T = 0\):
\[
\gamma_1^2(0) = \frac{\langle v_x^2 \rangle_1}{\langle v_y^2 \rangle_1} \left[ 1 + \frac{n_2}{n_1} \langle v_x^2 \rangle_2 / \langle v_y^2 \rangle_2 \right]^{-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{n_2}{n_1} \langle v_x^2 \rangle_2 / \langle v_y^2 \rangle_2 \right]. \tag{23}
\]

Let us turn now to \(\gamma_H(0)\), which is found by solving the Eq. (6). For two bands we have:
\[
n_1 \Omega_1^2 \sqrt{\epsilon_1} J(\epsilon_1) + n_2 \Omega_2^2 \sqrt{\epsilon_2} J(\epsilon_2) = 0, \tag{24}
\]
\[
J(\gamma_H, \epsilon) = \int \sin \theta d\theta d\varphi \frac{d\varphi}{\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2}} \ln(\cos^2 \varphi + \epsilon^2 \gamma_H^2 \cot^2 \theta). \tag{25}
\]

As mentioned after Eqs. (10), the integral \(J\) can be done analytically:
\[
J(\gamma, \epsilon) = \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1 + \gamma \sqrt{\epsilon}}{2} \right). \tag{26}
\]

so that we obtain:
\[
(1 + \gamma_H \sqrt{\epsilon_1})^{n_1 \Omega_1^2} (1 + \gamma_H \sqrt{\epsilon_2})^{n_2 \Omega_2^2} = 2. \tag{27}
\]

Hence, given \(n, \Omega, \) and \(\epsilon\) for two s-wave bands, one can evaluate \(\gamma_H(0)\) as a root of this equation.

We note now, that since \(n_1 \Omega_1^2 + n_2 \Omega_2^2 = 1\), \(\Omega\)'s can be expressed in terms of DOS' and the ratio \(R = \Omega_2/\Omega_1\):
\[
n_1 \Omega_1^2 = \frac{1}{1 + R^2 n_2/n_1}, \quad n_2 \Omega_2^2 = \frac{n_2 R^2}{n_1(1 + R^2 n_2/n_1)}, \tag{28}
\]
or
\[
n_1 \Omega_1^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \beta}, \quad n_2 \Omega_2^2 = \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta}, \quad \beta = R^2 n_2/n_1. \tag{29}
\]

The ratio \(R\) of the order parameters can be different at \(T = 0\) and at \(T_c\) in two-band systems. To reflect this we use the notation \(\beta_0\) for \(T = 0\) and \(\beta_c\) for \(T_c\) in the following formulas for these systems. However, we argue in Appendix B that \(\beta_0 \approx \beta_c\) in materials with a strong inter-band coupling.

For the one-band case \(n_2 = 0\), \(\Omega_1 = 1\) and one obtains \(\gamma_H = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon}\) as one should. The form of Eq. (27) suggests a simple generalization to any number of spheroidal bands:
\[
\Pi_\alpha (1 + \gamma_H(0) \sqrt{\epsilon})^{n_\alpha \Omega_\alpha^2} = 2, \tag{30}
\]

where \(\alpha\) is a band number.

### A. Numerical procedure

One can summarize results of the previous section by system of three equations for \(\gamma\)'s:
\[
2 = (1 + \gamma_H(0) \sqrt{\epsilon_1})^{1/(1 + \beta_0)} (1 + \gamma_H(0) \sqrt{\epsilon_2})^{\beta_0/(1 + \beta_0)}, \tag{31}
\]
\[
\gamma_1^2(0) = \frac{1}{\epsilon_1} \left( 1 + \frac{(n_2/n_1)^{1/3}(\epsilon_1/\epsilon_2)^{1/3}}{1 + \frac{(n_2/n_1)^{1/3}(\epsilon_1/\epsilon_2)^{1/3}}{2/3}} \right), \tag{32}
\]
\[
\gamma_2^2(T_c) = \frac{1}{\epsilon_1} \left( 1 + \frac{\beta_c(n_1/n_2)^3(\epsilon_1/\epsilon_2)^{1/3}}{1 + \beta_c(n_1/n_2)^3(\epsilon_1/\epsilon_2)^{1/3}} \right). \tag{33}
\]

Thus, the three anisotropy parameters are expressed in terms of \(\beta_{0,c}, n_1\), and two ellipticities \(\epsilon_{1,2}\).

If \(\gamma_H(0), \gamma_\lambda(0)\), and \(\gamma(T_c)\) along with the order parameters ratios are measured for some material, one can consider Eqs. (31)–(33) as determining the DOS \(n_1\) and ellipticities \(\epsilon_{1,2}\) of the two-spheroids model for this material. Solving this system of three nonlinear equations can be done with an effective and fast routine FindRoot of Mathematica. This, however, not always works; solutions for some input parameters may turn out non-physical (e.g. a negative \(n_1\)). In other words, not every multiband material can be mapped onto two-band spherical model.

### B. Representative examples

To have a qualitative picture of \(\gamma\) behaviors, one can consider the case \(n_1 = n_2 = 0.5\) and oblate and strongly prolate spheroids with \(\epsilon_1 = 2\) and \(\epsilon_2 = 0.02\). In this case \(\beta = R^2 = \Delta_2^2/\Delta_1^2\). According to (32), \(\gamma_\lambda(0) = 1.642\). \(\gamma_\lambda(T_c)\) depends on the choice of \(\beta_c\); it is readily evaluated and shown in the upper panel of Fig. 5 along with \(\gamma_\lambda(0) = 1.642\). We conclude that \(\gamma_\lambda\) decreases on warming for \(\beta_c < 1\) and increases for \(\beta_c > 1\).

Unlike \(\lambda\), \(\gamma_H\) depends on both \(\beta_0\) and \(\beta_c\). Note, however, that the ratio \(\Delta_2^2/\Delta_1^2\) in MgB2, the “canonical” two-band material, increases altogether by about 15% on warming from 0 to \(T_c\), see Fig. 7 in [3]. One can show that \(\beta_c < \beta_0\) if the inter-band coupling is extremely weak and the condensates in two bands are nearly decoupled. As is argued in [6] and in Appendix B, such a situation is unlikely because the Coulomb inter-band interaction is always present and it is not weak. Then, within a qualitative argument, it makes sense to see how the anisotropy of \(H_{c2}\) varies by setting \(\beta_0 = \beta_c\), results are shown in the lower panel of Fig. 4.

Comparing the panels of Fig. 5, we see that for large \(\beta\) when \(\Delta_2\) dominates on the band with a small \(\epsilon_2\) (the Fermi spheroid is close to a cylinder), \(\gamma_\lambda\) increases on warming whereas \(\gamma_H\) decreases. If, however, the order parameter \(\Delta_1\) on the oblate part of the Fermi surface dominates and \(\beta = \Delta_2^2/\Delta_1^2 < 1\) the temperature behavior of \(\gamma\)'s flips: \(\gamma_\lambda\) decreases on warming whereas \(\gamma_H\) increases.

The above example (one band is close to being two-dimensional, whereas the other is “more three-
"dimensional" with $\epsilon = 2$) does not cover all relevant possibilities. Many multi-band compounds have all Fermi sheets as open corrugated cylinders. Having this in mind our next example is a two-bands system with both spheroids being nearly cylinders, we choose $\epsilon_1 = 0.1$ and $\epsilon_2 = 0.02$. Results are shown in Fig. 5. The upper panel shows that the anisotropy of $\lambda$ increases on warming if $\beta = \Delta_2^2/\Delta_1^2 > 1$, but if $\Delta_2 < \Delta_1$, $\gamma_\lambda$ decreases. The lower panel, however, shows that $\gamma_H$ decreases on warming for all gap ratios.

It is worth noting that For $\beta = 3$, $\gamma_H$ decreases from about 5.5 at $T = 0$ down to 1.2 at $T_c$, whereas $\gamma_\lambda$ increases from $\sim 1$ at $T = 0$ to 1.2 at $T_c$, a behavior reminiscent of MgB$_2$.

IV. SUMMARY

It is shown that the anisotropy parameters, $\gamma_H$ for the upper critical field and $\gamma_\lambda$ for the penetration depth, in general, depend on temperature even in one-band materials with anisotropic order parameters. The temperature behavior of $\gamma$’s depends, in particular, on the order parameter nodes and their distributions. We provide three examples: d-wave for which $\gamma_H$ only slightly decreases on warming, whereas $\gamma_\lambda$ is $T$ independent. If $\Delta$ has a line node on the equator of Fermi spheroid, $\gamma_\lambda(T)$ decreases on warming whereas $\gamma_H(T)$ increases. Point nodes at spheroid poles affect anisotropies in opposite way as demonstrated in Fig. 3.

Our results for Fermi ellipsoids are based on theory [3] which is a generalization of Helfand-Werthamer work [9] for the isotropic case. One of the features of this approach is that solutions of the linear equation $-\xi^2_k \Pi \Psi = \Psi$ at $H_{c2}$, belonging to the lowest Landau level, satisfy also the self-consistency equation for superconductivity. For general Fermi surfaces this is not the case, see e.g. [10]. At best, one can use our results for qualitative interpretations of data on anisotropy parameters.

Also, it is worth keeping in mind that we estimate the anisotropy of orbital $H_{c2}$ and disregard possibility of Pauli limiting effects. Of course, modeling many-band systems with two Fermi ellipsoids is far from being realistic, still it provides some straightforward inroads to a complicated interplay of anisotropies $\gamma_\lambda(T)$ and $\gamma_H(T)$.

Appendix A: Fermi spheroid

The Fermi surface as an ellipsoid of rotation is an interesting example in its own right and as a model for calculating $H_{c2}$ and $\lambda$ in uniaxial materials. Since both of these quantities are derived employing integrals over
the full Fermi surface, they are weakly sensitive to fine details of Fermi surfaces.

Although straightforward, the averaging over the Fermi spheroid of the main text should be done with care. Moreover, there are examples in literature where these averages were done incorrectly [3, 7]. We reproduce here this procedure to correct the error and to prevent it in future.

Consider an uniaxial superconductor with the electronic spectrum

\[ E(k) = \hbar^2 \left( \frac{k_x^2 + k_y^2}{2m_{ab}} + \frac{k_z^2}{2m_c} \right), \]

so that the Fermi surface is an ellipsoid of rotation with \( z \) as the symmetry axis. In spherical coordinates \( (k, \theta, \phi) \)

\[ E = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m_{ab}} \left( \sin^2 \theta + \frac{m_{ab}}{m_c} \cos^2 \theta \right) = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m_{ab}} \Gamma(\theta), \]

so that

\[ k^2_F(\theta) = \frac{2m_{ab}E_F}{\hbar^2 \Gamma(\theta)}. \]

The Fermi velocity is \( \mathbf{v}(k) = \nabla_k E(k)/\hbar \), with the derivatives taken at \( k = k_F \):

\[ v_x = \frac{v_{ab} \sin \theta \cos \phi}{\sqrt{\Gamma(\theta)}}, \quad v_y = \frac{v_{ab} \sin \theta \sin \phi}{\sqrt{\Gamma(\theta)}}, \]

\[ v_z = \frac{\epsilon v_{ab} \cos \theta}{\sqrt{\Gamma(\theta)}}, \quad \epsilon = \frac{m_{ab}}{m_c}, \quad v_{ab} = \frac{\sqrt{2E_F}}{m_{ab}}. \]

The value of the Fermi velocity, \( v = (v_x^2 + v_y^2 + v_z^2)^{1/2} \), is

\[ v = v_{ab} \sqrt{\frac{\sin^2 \theta + \epsilon^2 \cos^2 \theta}{\sin^2 \theta + \epsilon \cos^2 \theta}}. \]

The density of states \( N(0) \) is defined as an integral over the Fermi surface:

\[ N(0) = \int \frac{\hbar^2 d^2 k_F}{(2\pi \hbar)^3 v}. \]

An area element of the spheroid surface is

\[ d^2 k_F = k_F(\theta) \sqrt{k^2_F(\theta) + \left( \frac{d k_F}{d \theta} \right)^2} \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi, \]

and after simple algebra one obtains:

\[ \frac{d^2 k_{F,ab}}{v} = \frac{k_{F,ab} \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \]

where \( k_{F,ab}^2 = \frac{2m_{ab}E_F}{\hbar^2} \). This gives

\[ N(0) = \frac{m_{ab} v_{ab}}{2\pi^2 \hbar^3 \sqrt{\epsilon}}. \]

The normalized local density of states within solid angle \( \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi \) is

\[ \frac{\hbar^2 d^2 k_F}{(2\pi \hbar)^3 v N(0)} = \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon} \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi}{4\pi \Gamma^{3/2}}; \]

Eq. (A9) has been used here. Thus, the Fermi surface average of a function \( A(\theta, \phi) \) is:

\[ \langle A(\theta, \phi) \rangle = \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{4\pi} \int A(\theta, \phi) \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\phi. \]

If the Fermi surface consists of two spheroids, corresponding DOS' are

\[ N_\alpha = \frac{m_{ab,\alpha}^2 v_{ab,\alpha}}{2\pi^2 \hbar^3 \sqrt{\epsilon}_\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \]

and their ratio can be written as

\[ \frac{n_1}{n_2} = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1}} \left( \frac{m_{ab,1}}{m_{ab,2}} \right)^{3/2} = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1}} \left( \frac{v_{ab,1}}{v_{ab,2}} \right)^3. \]

The fact that Fermi energy is the same on both spheroids, \( m_{ab,1}v_{ab,1}^2 = m_{ab,2}v_{ab,2}^2 \), has been used here.

**Appendix B: On the gaps ratio**

![Fig. 6](image-url)

**FIG. 6.** The lower curve: the ratio of the bands order parameters \( |\Delta_2/\Delta_1| \) vs reduced temperature \( t = T/T_c \) for intra-band couplings given in the legend for \( n_1 = n_2 = 0.5 \) and a relatively strong inter-band coupling \( \lambda_{12} = -0.2 \) calculated according to [8]. The upper curve: the same for a weak inter-band coupling \( \lambda_{12} = -0.03 \). The increase of this ratio is due to a drop of \( \Delta_1 \) when the critical temperature of the bare first band of \( \sim 0.2 \) is approached.

The order parameters for a two-band system can be estimated using the microscopic theory which takes into account different intra- and inter-band couplings. It was shown that if the inter-band coupling \( \lambda_{12} \) is weak relative
to intra-band coupling matrix elements $\lambda_{11}$ and $\lambda_{22}$, the smaller gap $\Delta_1(T)$ drops precipitously if $T$ approaches the bare critical temperature of the first band, but survives up to the sample $T_c$ being very small. As a result the ratio $\Delta_2/\Delta_1$ becomes large on approach to $T_c$. However, as argued in Ref. [6], the inter-band coupling is unlikely to be exceedingly small because the Coulomb inter-band interaction is always present. Conservative estimate for MgB$_2$ gives the Coulomb part to be about 25% of the intra-band interaction.

For given couplings, the gaps ratio in two-band materials can be estimated within so-called “$\gamma$-model” developed in [8]. The results, shown in Fig. ??, clearly demonstrate that for a realistic inter-band coupling $\Delta_2/\Delta_1$ remains nearly constant at all temperatures.
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