

# Properties of the superconducting state in a two-band model

E. J. Nicol

Department of Physics, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1, Canada

J.P. Carbotte

Department of Physics and Astronomy, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4M1, Canada

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

Eliashberg theory is used to investigate the range of thermodynamic properties possible within a two-band model for s-wave superconductivity and to identify signatures of its two-band nature. We emphasize dimensionless BCS ratios (those for the energy gaps, the specific heat jump and the negative of its slope near  $T_c$ , the thermodynamic critical field  $H_c(0)$ , and the normalized slopes of the critical field and the penetration depth near  $T_c$ ), which are no longer universal even in weak coupling. We also give results for temperature-dependent quantities, such as the penetration depth and the energy gap. Results are presented both for microscopic parameters appropriate to  $MgB_2$  and for variations away from these. Strong coupling corrections are identified and found to be significant. Analytic formulas are provided which show the role played by the anisotropy in coupling in some special limits. Particular emphasis is placed on small interband coupling and on the opposite limit of no diagonal coupling. The effect of impurity scattering is considered, particularly for the interband case.

PACS numbers: 74.20.-z, 74.70.Ad, 74.25.Bt, 74.25.Nf

## I. INTRODUCTION

The properties of the superconducting state of conventional, single-band, electron-phonon superconductors differ markedly from BCS predictions.[1] However, they are well-described within isotropic Eliashberg theory with a single electron-phonon spectral density  $^2F(!)$  for the average interaction over the Fermi surface. This function is accurately known from inversion of tunneling data.[2] In many cases, the  $^2F(!)$  has also been calculated from first principle electronic band structure calculations extended to include the electron-phonon interaction, sometimes with the phonons taken directly from inelastic neutron scattering measurements. In many cases, such results agree very well with the corresponding tunneling data. While it is to be noted that, in principle, the electron-phonon spectral density for the various electrons on the Fermi surface is anisotropic leading to energy gap anisotropy[3, 4, 5, 6], this feature often does not play a prominent role because, in many instances, the electronic mean free path is much smaller than the coherence length. In such circumstances, a Fermi surface average of the electron-phonon spectral density can be used. Nevertheless, corrections due to gap anisotropy have been identified and studied in the past[7], often, but not always, in a separable anisotropic model.[8]

The history of two-band superconductivity[9, 10, 11, 12] and of  $MgB_2$  (with  $T_c \approx 39$  K [13]) in particular[14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22] is somewhat different. To our knowledge, as yet, there exists no inversion[23] of tunneling data from which the electron-phonon interaction is determined. In fact, it has been noted[24] that this may well never be possible in  $MgB_2$  because of its two-band nature which requires a microscopic description in terms of four separate electron-phonon spectral

functions  $^2_{ij}F(!)$ , where  $i =$  ; (or 1, 2), with the two-dimensional band having the largest electron-phonon coupling. The three-dimensional band on its own would have a smaller value of  $T_c$ , the critical temperature, although it has a higher value of the electron density of states at the Fermi energy.

In the absence of tunneling data giving reliable information on the fundamental kernels entering the two-band Eliashberg equations, first principle band structure calculations of  $^2_{ij}F(!)$  in  $MgB_2$  have been used to compute superconducting properties (for example, [16, 17, 18, 19]). To do this, it is also necessary to know the Coulomb pseudopotential repulsions  $_{ij}$  which are different for various indices ( $i; j$ ), but these have also been calculated. Good agreement with experiment is obtained in this way for the properties considered so far, more explicitly, the specific heat[16, 25], the penetration depth[17, 26], and the anisotropy in the two gaps, as well as their temperature dependence. For the penetration depth, impurity scattering can be important, and in and out of plane orientation of the magnetic field are different[17].

In this paper, we use the band theory information on  $^2_{ij}F(!)$  and  $_{ij}$  in  $MgB_2$  to calculate the critical temperature, the energy gap with its anisotropy and temperature dependence, and other thermodynamic properties, as well as the penetration depth, giving particular emphasis to strong coupling corrections. Further to our discussion of  $MgB_2$ , we provide a full listing of calculated dimensionless BCS ratios, now modified by both the anisotropy and the strong coupling effects in  $MgB_2$ , and make comparison with experiment. We also consider effects of variations in microscopic parameters away from those of  $MgB_2$ , as well as impurity scattering – intraband and interband. To this end, we reduce the

two-band Eliashberg equations, which fully account for retardation, in the two-square-well approximation (also called the  $\epsilon$  model). This leads to simple renormalized BCS (RBCS) forms which, when compared to our full numerical Eliashberg results, allow us to identify the strong coupling corrections which we find to be significant even for  $MgB_2$ .

When considering variations in microscopic parameters away from those of  $MgB_2$ , we place particular emphasis on two limiting cases: the limit of small interband coupling and the opposite case, when the intraband coupling is zero and the superconductivity is due to the interband coupling alone, a case discussed in the early work of Shul' et al. [9]. We also consider the special case when the intraband coupling in the second band is repulsive. The limit of small interband coupling is particularly interesting because it allows us to understand how the off-diagonal terms lead to the integration of otherwise two completely independent and non-communicating superconducting bands with separate transition temperatures  $T_{ci}$ . In this regard, we find that  $\gamma_{12}^2 F(\epsilon)$  and  $\gamma_{21}^2 F(\epsilon)$  behave very differently with  $2T$  the most effective variable at integrating the two systems and  $12$  the most effective at changing the critical temperature. The presence of the off-diagonal interactions rapidly smear out the features of the second transition at  $T_{c2}$ , i.e., the one with the smaller of the two  $T_{ci}$  values. More specifically, surprisingly small values of the mass renormalization parameter  $\gamma_{21}$ , as compared with  $\gamma_{11}$  and  $\gamma_{22}$ , have a large effect on the region of  $T_{c2}$ . We also find that relatively modest values of the interband impurity scattering rates lead to the significant integration of the two bands. Even when the bands are well-integrated, in the sense that little trace of a second sharp transition at  $T_{c2}$  remains, there still exist important modifications of the usual one-band BCS results because of the two distinct bands. As an example, the BCS dimensionless universal ratios now depend on the ratio of the electronic density of states at the Fermi energy of the two bands. Simple analytic expressions for these ratios are derived, which provide insight into the physics underlying two-band superconductivity and guidance as to how these results are to be interpreted.

In section II, we give the two-band Eliashberg equations and provide their reduction in the  $\epsilon$  approximation which is needed to identify strong coupling corrections to renormalized two-band BCS (RBCS). Section III deals with the dependence of  $T_c$  on microscopic parameters, i.e., on the electron-phonon interaction as well as on impurities. Intra- and interband quantities are both of interest. We consider the modifications of the dimensionless BCS ratios in the  $\epsilon$  model, as well as, the zero temperature value of the two gaps and their anisotropy.  $MgB_2$  is considered in section IV. The issue of strong coupling corrections in  $MgB_2$ , and more generally in other related systems, is discussed. The limit of small interband electron-phonon coupling is considered in section V. We study, in particular, how the two otherwise separate bands become integrated when this interaction is

switched on. The effect of interband impurity scattering is also considered in the same context as it exhibits analogous behaviour to the case of the off-diagonal electron-phonon coupling. In section VI, we deal briefly with the less realistic case of zero intraband electron-phonon coupling, where the superconductivity is due only to the interband piece. Conclusions are found in section VII.

Finally, in light of the recent developments in other areas of superconductivity and correlated electrons, we wish to emphasize that our use of the term "gap anisotropy" here is in reference to the difference in the magnitudes of the two gaps, each of which are isotropic s-wave in this work, and hence does not refer to a momentum-dependent order parameter. Likewise, "strong coupling" refers to the traditional meaning of strong electron-phonon coupling and is not an allusion to strong interband coupling.

## II. THEORY

The isotropic (within a band) Eliashberg equations generalized to two bands ( $i = 1, 2$ ) are written on the imaginary axis as [1, 3, 4, 12]:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i(i!_n) Z_i(i!_n) = & \frac{T}{\epsilon_n} \sum_m \sum_j \gamma_{ij}(i!_m, i!_n) \\ & \gamma_{ij}(i!_c) (i!_c - j!_m) \epsilon \frac{j(i!_m)}{i!_m^2 + j!_j^2(i!_m)} \\ & + \sum_j (t_{ij}^+ - t_{ij}) \epsilon \frac{j(i!_n)}{i!_n^2 + j!_j^2(i!_n)} \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i(i!_n) = & 1 + \frac{T}{\epsilon_n} \sum_m \sum_j \gamma_{ij}(i!_m, i!_n) \\ & \epsilon \frac{i!_m}{i!_m^2 + j!_j^2(i!_m)} \\ & + \sum_j (t_{ij}^+ + t_{ij}) \epsilon \frac{i!_n}{i!_n^2 + j!_j^2(i!_n)}; \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $t_{ij}^+ = 1/(2 - \gamma_{ij}^+)$  and  $t_{ij} = 1/(2 - \gamma_{ij})$  are the ordinary and paramagnetic impurity scattering rates, respectively, and

$$\gamma_{ij}(i!_m, i!_n) = \frac{2}{\epsilon_n} \int_0^{\epsilon_n} \frac{\gamma_{ij}^2 F(\epsilon)}{\epsilon^2 + (i!_n - \epsilon!)^2} d\epsilon; \quad (3)$$

Eq. (1) gives the gap  $\gamma_i(i!_n)$  and Eq. (2), the renormalization  $Z_i(i!_n)$  at the  $n$ 'th Matsubara frequency  $i!_n$ , with  $i!_n = (2n - 1)T$ . Here,  $T$  is temperature and  $n = 0; 1; 2; \dots$ . The electron-phonon kernels are  $\gamma_{ij}^2 F(\epsilon)$  as a function of phonon energy  $\epsilon$  and the Coulomb repulsions are  $\gamma_{ij}^+$ , with a high energy cutoff  $\epsilon_c$  needed for convergence and usually taken to be about

six to ten times the maximum phonon frequency. For the specific case of  $MgB_2$ , these may be found in [19]. The diagonal intraband elements of the electron-phonon interaction are largest, in the case of  $MgB_2$ , while the off-diagonal elements describing interband scattering are smaller, but still substantial.

In what is called the two-square-well approximation or model [11, 27, 28], we use in Eq. (1):

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ij}(i!_m, i!_n) &= g_{ij}; \text{ for both } j!_n \neq j!_m, j < ! \\ &= 0; \text{ otherwise;} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$g_{ij}(m = n) = g_{ij}(0) \quad g_{ij} = 2 \int_0^{\omega_D} \frac{\omega^2 F_{ij}(\omega)}{\omega^2} d\omega \quad (5)$$

Neglecting the gap in the denominator on the right-hand side of Eq. (2) for  $Z$ , we further approximate (see Ref. [28] for details)

$$Z_i(i!_n) = 1 + \sum_j g_{ij} \quad (6)$$

This result may now be used in Eq. (1) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} i(i!_n) &= i(\Gamma); j!_n \neq j!_m \\ &= 0; j!_n = j!_m \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where

$$i(\Gamma) = \frac{T}{Z_i} \sum_{m, j!_m \neq j!_n} \sum_j \frac{g_{ij}(\Gamma)}{\omega_m^2 + \omega_j^2} [g_{ij} - g_{ij}]; \quad (8)$$

where  $\omega_D$  represents either the Debye frequency or some other characteristic energy scale representing the phonons in the system, at most the maximum phonon energy. Detailed justification of using a single cutoff is found in Ref. [11]. These results are used to derive various quantities within the model, which we will call renormalized BCS or RBCS. We also solve the full Eliashberg equations for typical strong coupling parameters and for the case of  $MgB_2$ , and in order to connect to the language most appropriate for this purpose, the measure of the characteristic boson frequency,  $\omega_D$ , is defined to be:

$$\omega_D = \exp \left[ \frac{2}{\omega_D} \int_0^{\omega_D} \ln(\omega) \omega^2 F_{11}(\omega) d\omega \right] \quad (9)$$

This is reasonable for our case here as the  $\omega_D$  calculated for the different  $\omega^2 F_{ij}(\omega)$  spectra of  $MgB_2$  are almost the same and other spectra used in this paper will have the same frequency distribution in each channel only scaled in magnitude. In general, this definition should be reasonably robust as, unless  $\omega_{22}$ ,  $\omega_{12}$ , and  $\omega_{21}$  are large, the first channel  $\omega_{11}$  should dominate the strong coupling effects.

### III. BCS RATIOS: THE MODEL AND STRONG COUPLING

#### A. Critical Temperature: $T_c$

The critical temperature that results from the renormalized BCS equation (8) of the two-square-well approximation, takes the form

$$A = \ln \frac{1.13 \omega_D}{k_B T_c}; \quad (10)$$

or

$$k_B T_c = 1.13 \omega_D e^{-A}; \quad (11)$$

where

$$A = \frac{P}{2} \frac{(\omega_{11} + \omega_{22})^2 + 4 \omega_{12} \omega_{21}}{(\omega_{11} \omega_{22} + \omega_{12} \omega_{21})} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{11} &= \frac{\omega_{11} \omega_{11}}{1 + \omega_{11} + \omega_{12}}; & \omega_{12} &= \frac{\omega_{12} \omega_{12}}{1 + \omega_{11} + \omega_{12}}; \\ \omega_{22} &= \frac{\omega_{22} \omega_{22}}{1 + \omega_{22} + \omega_{21}}; & \omega_{21} &= \frac{\omega_{21} \omega_{21}}{1 + \omega_{22} + \omega_{21}} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

With no impurities and for one band ( $\omega_{12} = \omega_{21} = \omega_{22} = 0$ )

$$k_B T_c^{00} = 1.13 \omega_D e^{-1/\omega_{11}}; \quad (14)$$

Here we will be interested only in the ratio of  $T_c$  (Eq. (11)) to  $T_c^{00}$  (Eq. (14)) and so the cutoff  $\omega_D$  cancels, and the issue of the best choice for this quantity does not enter (see Allen and Dynes [27]). Results for  $T_c/T_c^{00}$  based on Eqs. (11-14) as a function of  $\omega_{21}$  for various values of  $\omega_{12}$  are shown in Fig. 1, where they are compared with results of complete numerical evaluation of the two-band Eliashberg equations (1) and (2). A Lorentzian model for the spectral densities  $\omega^2 F_{ij}(\omega)$  is used with zero Coulomb pseudopotential  $\mu_{ij}$  for simplicity. Specifically, we use a truncated Lorentzian spectral density, which is defined in Ref. [29], centered around 50 meV with width 5 meV, truncated by 50 meV to either side of the central point. The  $\omega_D$  for this spectrum is 44.6 meV. This spectral density is scaled in each of the four channels to give  $\omega_{11} = 1$ ,  $\omega_{22} = 0.5$ , and the range of values of  $\omega_{12}$  and  $\omega_{21}$  as required for the figure. The curves, which are labelled in the figure caption, are for the renormalized BCS calculations and the corresponding Eliashberg calculations are presented as points. We note that for small values of  $\omega_{21}$  agreement between the results and full Eliashberg is excellent. The agreement is somewhat less good around  $\omega_{21} = 0.5$  but still acceptable. An interesting point to note about this figure is that the effect on  $T_c$  of  $\omega_{21}$  and  $\omega_{12}$  are quite different. As  $\omega_{21}$  increases for fixed  $\omega_{12}$ ,  $T_c$  increases. On the other hand, for small but fixed  $\omega_{21}$ , increasing  $\omega_{12}$  decreases  $T_c$ ,



Results are given in Fig. 2. Except for the dotted lines, all curves were obtained from numerical solutions of the linearized version of the Eliashberg equations (1) and (2) using a Lorentzian model for  $\gamma_{ij}^2(\omega)$ . The curves come in sets of three for  $\gamma_{22} = 0.5$  (solid curve), 0.4 (dashed) and 0.3 (long-dashed). The other parameters are  $\gamma_{11} = 1$  and  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0.02$  (small interband coupling). The lower set are for  $t_{21}^+ = 0$  with  $t_{12}^+$  varying while the upper set have  $t_{12}^+ = 2$ . The middle set have  $t_{12}^+ = t_{21}^+$ . Note that in showing the results when  $t_{12}^+$  or  $t_{21}^+$  are varied separately, we are violating a requirement that they must be linked together by the density of states in the two bands. That is, as required for the  $\gamma_{ij}$ 's, likewise the impurity scattering rates must obey  $t_{12}^+ = t_{21}^+ = N_2/N_1$ . Our middle set of curves obey this constraint, but we have ignored it for the other curves in order to illustrate the general behaviour of each individual type of scattering separately. As found for the  $\gamma_{ij}$ 's, the effect of  $t_{12}^+$  and that of  $t_{21}^+$  on  $T_c$  are quite different. The quantity  $t_{12}^+$  represents scattering from band 1 to band 2 and leads to pairbreaking much like paramagnetic impurities in the one-band case. We can see this analytically in the simple case of  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0$  for which the two bands are decoupled and the critical temperature is a property of the first band alone. In this case, Eqs. (16-18) reduce to [33]

$$\frac{T_c}{T_{c0}} = \frac{2}{4 - \gamma_{12}^2} \quad (19)$$

for both normal or paramagnetic impurities in the linear approximation for the impurity scattering rate. The initial linear decrease in  $T_c$  with increasing  $t_{12}^+$  is seen in the lower set of three curves of Fig. 2. As  $t_{12}^+$  is increased further, higher order corrections start to be important and the curves show saturation to a value which is larger, the greater the value of  $\gamma_{22}$ . Also note that formula (19) shows that  $T_c$  is independent of  $\gamma_{21}$ . This expectation is confirmed in the upper set of three curves of Fig. 2, where  $T_c$  has increased by no more than 3% for  $t_{21}^+ = T_{c0} = 1.5$ . This small increase is due to the small  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  used for the figure, while in Eq. (19), we have  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0$ . The middle set of curves, which apply for  $t_{12}^+ = t_{21}^+$  and therefore satisfy the constraint imposed by having chosen  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0.02$ , exhibits, by comparison to the other two cases, only a very small region which is linear in impurity scattering and these curves are intermediate to the other two sets, as expected. They also saturate at higher values of  $T_c$  and we find that  $T_c$  decreases by only 20-30% for this case, similar to the observation by Mitrovic who was considering specially the case of MgB<sub>2</sub> [34]. Finally, we comment on the dotted curves which are based on Eqs. (16) to (18) valid in the model and first order in  $t_{ij}^+$ . The lowest curve applies to the  $t_{21}^+ = 0$  case and the upper one to  $t_{12}^+ = 0$ . The slopes are in good agreement with the full Eliashberg results over a significant range of interband impurity scattering  $t_{ij}^+$ . For the middle set of curves the linear behaviour applies only comparatively to a rather small region. In all cases there still is some difference between our results and Eliashberg

because of strong coupling corrections. As previously stated, interband impurity scattering in two-band superconductivity works like paramagnetic impurities in the ordinary one-band case. For this latter case, Schachinger, Dams, and Carbotte [35] have found for the specific case of Pb, the classic strong coupling material, that the model overestimates the initial slope of the drop in  $T_c$  value, with increasing impurity scattering. The physics is simple. For strong coupling,  $2 = k_B T_c$  is larger than its BCS value i.e., the gap is bigger than expected on the basis of its  $T_c$ . This is because as  $T$  is increased, that part of the inelastic scattering which corresponds to the real (as opposed to virtual) processes, which are pairbreaking, increases and  $T_c$  is reduced below the value it would be without. As a result, the initial drop in  $T_c$  value with increasing impurity content is not as large in strong as in weak coupling because the system has a larger gap which is more robust against impurities. The same applies to interband scattering in a two-band superconductor. The initial slope of the drop is faster in the model than in Eliashberg, as most recently shown by Mitrovic [34], who has commented on prior work by Golubov and Mazin [33], where only unrenormalized BCS results were given and the drop in  $T_c$  was even faster. Mitrovic also presents functional derivatives for ordinary impurities [34] and his findings complement our calculations here. In addition, as low frequency phonons act like ordinary impurities, the previous work by Mitrovic on functional derivatives [32] for the electron-phonon spectral functions also confirms our impurity results by comparison with the behaviour of the low frequency part of the functional derivatives for  $\gamma_{12}$  versus  $\gamma_{21}$ .

Finally, it has been of some interest amongst experimentalists, looking at novel superconductors, to know the outcome of having a repulsive interaction in the second band (i.e.  $\gamma_{22} < 0$ ). As will be seen in the next section, a second energy gap is still induced in this case due to the interband coupling, however, a signature of this repulsive band would exist in the case of impurity scattering, as strong interband scattering of sufficient strength could drive the  $T_c$  to zero [30].

## B. Energy Gaps and Gap Ratios

We turn next to the consideration of the energy gaps. The transcendental equation for  $u_{\pm} = \pm 1$  at  $T = 0$  in the model is:

$$12u_{\pm} \frac{21}{u_{\pm}} + (\gamma_{11}\gamma_{22} - \gamma_{12}\gamma_{21}) \ln u_{\pm} = \gamma_{22} - \gamma_{11}; \quad (20)$$

from which the gap ratio for the larger gap  $\gamma_1$  may be found:

$$\ln \frac{1.13}{2k_B T_c} = A \frac{1 + \gamma_{12} u_{\pm} \ln u_{\pm}}{\gamma_{11} + \gamma_{12} u_{\pm}}; \quad (21)$$

The solution for the gap ratio  $2\gamma_1 = k_B T_c$  can be corrected for strong coupling effects by multiplying by a factor

in the denominator of the logarithm of Eq. (21) with [36]:

$$= 1 + 12.5 \frac{T_c^2}{T_c} \ln \frac{T_c}{2T_c} : \quad (22)$$

As long as  $\lambda_{11}$  is large and  $\lambda_{22}$ ,  $\lambda_{12}$ , and  $\lambda_{21}$  are small, one needs only to correct the first channel for strong coupling effects. Otherwise additional corrections for the other channels may exist but there would be no merit in such complexity of including these corrections over doing the full numerical calculations with the Eliashberg equations. It is expected that in real systems,  $\lambda_{11}$  is large relative to the other parameters and hence dominates the strong coupling aspect of the result. However, when the off-diagonal couplings are significant, the strong coupling corrections of the first channel can affect the second.




FIG. 3: Gap ratios for the upper ( $2\Delta_1/k_B T_c$ ) and lower gap ( $2\Delta_2/k_B T_c$ ) as a function of  $\lambda_{12}$  for varying  $\lambda_{22}$ : 0.5 (solid), 0.1 (dotted), -0.5 (short-dashed), and -1 (long-dashed). Here,  $\lambda_{11} = 1$ ,  $\lambda_{21} = 0.3$ . These calculations are done using the RBCS formulas (20-21) in the text, the solid dots show Eliashberg calculations for the same set of parameters with  $\lambda_{22} = 0.1$  (for comparison with the dotted curve). Strong coupling corrections are significant and the rest of the curves in this figure would also be modified by strong coupling, much of this can be captured by the strong coupling correction formula given in the text. (Note that as  $\lambda_{22}$  and  $\lambda_{21}$  are finite, the points for  $\lambda_{12} = 0$  are not physically realizable.)

Our first set of results for the two energy gaps is given in Fig. 3. The lines are based on the simpler equations (20) and (21), and the solid dots are for the results of full Eliashberg solutions on the imaginary axis and analytically continued with Padé approximants [1] to the real axis, where the gap is determined by  $\omega_0 = (\omega_0^2 - \Delta_0^2)^{1/2}$  [1]. For clarity in the figure, only one such set of results is shown for the case of  $\lambda_{22} = 0.1$ . While magnitudes differ considerably between the renormalized BCS and strong coupling (comparing solid dots with the dotted curves), the general trends are the same. Specially in Fig. 3,  $\lambda_{12}$

is varied with  $\lambda_{11} = 1$ ,  $\lambda_{21} = 0.3$ , and  $\lambda_{22}$  fixed to various values in turn. The upper curve applies to  $\Delta_1$  and the lower curve of the same line type, to  $\Delta_2$ . While in all cases  $\Delta_1$  increases with increasing  $\lambda_{12}$ , in one case (solid curve), the lower gap decreases slightly. More importantly, the value of the upper gap ratio increases above its BCS ratio 3.53 and can reach 4.6 in renormalized BCS, a feature which comes from the two-band nature of the system. Comparing the dotted curves to the solid circles for  $\Delta_1$ , we note that Eliashberg results are always above their counterpart, reflecting well-known strong coupling corrections to the gap. This applies as well to  $\Delta_2$ , the lower gap. We now comment specially on the other curves. To increase the anisotropy between  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  for the parameter set considered here, we need to decrease the value of  $\lambda_{22}$ . Note, however, that even when we assume a repulsion in the second band, equal in size to the attraction  $\lambda_{11} = 1$  in the first band (long-dashed curve), a substantial gap is nevertheless induced in the second channel even for  $\lambda_{12} = 0$ . It is the finite value of  $\lambda_{21}$  which produces this gap. Recall that  $\lambda_{21}$  describes the effect of band 1 on band 2 due to interband electron-phonon coupling. Turning on, as well, some  $\lambda_{12}$  increases the second gap further but not by much. Finally, we mention that as  $\lambda_{21}$  increases (not shown here),  $\Delta_1$  decreases while  $\Delta_2$  increases, i.e. the ratio of  $\Delta_2/\Delta_1$  goes up towards one and the anisotropy is reduced.




FIG. 4: Gap ratio  $2\Delta_1/k_B T_c$  as a function of  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21}$ , for  $\lambda_{11} = 1.3$  and  $\lambda_{22} = 0.5$ . These curves provide a comparison between the Eliashberg calculation (solid curve) and the RBCS calculation (dashed curve), along with the result from using the RBCS expression with the strong coupling correction formula given in the text (dot-dashed curve).

In Fig. 3, the ratio  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = N_2/N_1$  is varying, while in Fig. 4, we keep  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21}$  and illustrate more clearly the effect of strong coupling Eliashberg in comparison with the RBCS calculation, and also provide a comparison with the RBCS calculation corrected with the strong

coupling formula of Eq. (22). One finds that the gap in Eliashberg is quite enhanced over the RBCS result, even exhibiting a different qualitative behaviour with the Eliashberg gap (solid curve) increasing with increasing  $\lambda_{12}$  while the RBCS counterpart (dashed curve) is decreasing. However, when the strong coupling correction formula is applied to the RBCS result, the resulting curve (dot-dashed) is now in reasonable agreement with the Eliashberg calculation and follows the evolution with increasing  $\lambda_{12}$  very well.

It is of interest to experimentalists [37], looking at novel materials suspected of harbouring multiband superconductivity, whether there may be a range of parameters that could produce a very large upper gap ratio with a large anisotropy in magnitude between the upper and lower gaps. It is possible that it could occur in a regime where  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = 1$ , as suggested by the trend in our Fig. 3, while in the opposite regime we will show that all results return to standard weak coupling BCS values. As previously mentioned, this ratio of  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21}$  is equivalent to the ratio of density of states in the two bands, sometimes denoted as  $\gamma$  in the literature, i.e.

$\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = N_2/N_1$ . We have gone to  $\gamma = 20$  within the renormalized BCS formalism and were not able to produce gap ratios bigger than about 5 or so, for the parameters examined, and at the same time, the lower gap ratio was about 3. We conclude, therefore, that even with added strong coupling effects, very large gap ratios tending towards 10 to 20 are difficult to obtain in conjunction with a large anisotropy in the two gaps. Repulsive potentials in the second band can give a large anisotropy, but they also lower the value of the upper gap ratio. Later in Section VI, we will return to this issue of trying to obtain large gap ratios and large gap anisotropy, when we examine another extreme limit first considered by Suhl et al. [9].

To conclude this subsection, we examine an approximate formula for the gap ratio in two-band superconductivity, which has been given and used by experimentalists [38], to determine its range of validity in the face of more exact calculations. The formula is an unrenormalized BCS formula and we have already seen that renormalization and strong coupling effects can be substantial. For  $\lambda_{22}; \lambda_{12}; \lambda_{21} = \lambda_{11}$ , we can derive the primary (or large) gap ratio as:

$$\frac{2\Delta_1}{k_B T_c} \approx 3.53 \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda_{12}}{\lambda_{21}} \right)^2 \ln u$$

$$= 3.53 \left( 1 - \frac{N_2}{N_1} \right)^2 \ln \frac{2}{1}; \quad (23)$$

which is the same equation as given in Iavarone et al. [38], where their use of the indices 1 and 2 are reversed with respect to ours. In our formula (23) given here, the  $u$  and  $v$ 's are coupled through Eq. (20), but in the case of Ref. [38] the ratio of the density of states and the ratio of the gaps are treated as independent parameters with the only constraint being that  $u > 1$ .




FIG. 5: Gap ratios for the upper ( $2\Delta_1/k_B T_c$ ) and lower gap ( $2\Delta_2/k_B T_c$ ) as a function of  $\lambda_{12}$  for  $\lambda_{11} = 1.0$ ,  $\lambda_{22} = 0.5$ ,  $\lambda_{21} = 0.2$ . The solid curve is the exact BCS result, whereas, the dashed curve illustrates the approximate formula of Iavarone et al. [38].

In Fig. 5, we compare this approximate BCS formula with that of our exact renormalized BCS formula for typical  $\lambda_{ij}$  values used in the literature. The  $\lambda_{ij}$  are set to zero as there is no such feature in the Iavarone et al. formula and the  $\lambda$ 's in that case would simply serve to change the effective value of  $\lambda$ 's. We find that the approximate formula (dashed curve of Fig 5) compares well with the renormalized BCS result in the limit of small  $\lambda_{12}; \lambda_{21}; \lambda_{22}$ , as required by the constraint of the approximation, and breaks down for  $\lambda_{12} > 0.5$ , where the approximate formula tends to overestimate quite significantly the value of the two gaps. Strong coupling effects would produce very significant deviations in addition. Not shown is the case where  $\lambda_{12}; \lambda_{21}; \lambda_{22}$  were all taken to be very small and then in that case, as expected, there was excellent agreement between the exact renormalized BCS calculation and the approximate form. The fact that Iavarone et al. [38] obtained excellent estimates of the two energy gaps for MgB<sub>2</sub> is maybe fortuitous in some sense, because it will be seen in the next section, where we discuss MgB<sub>2</sub> in detail, that the renormalized BCS formula underestimates the correct gap values of MgB<sub>2</sub> and strong coupling corrections of about 7-10% are needed to obtain good agreement between the data and full Eliashberg calculations. We conclude that their simple formula is helpful, but that it should be used with caution when considering systems where the parameters are no longer small as then this formula will fail.

### C. Specific Heat Jump

The specific heat is calculated from the free energy. The difference in free energy  $F = F_S - F_N$  between the superconducting state and the normal state is given by [1]:

$$F = T \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_i \left[ \frac{1}{N_i(0)} \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{1 + \frac{1}{N_i(0)}}{1 - \frac{1}{N_i(0)}} \right) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \right] ; \quad (24)$$

where  $S$  and  $N$  refer to the superconducting and normal state, respectively, and  $i$  indexes the number of bands. From this, the difference in the specific heat is obtained:

$$C = T \frac{d^2 F}{dT^2} ; \quad (25)$$

and the negative of the slope of the difference in specific heat near  $T_c$  is given as

$$g = \frac{dC(T)}{dT} \bigg|_{T_c} = \frac{1}{T_c} ; \quad (26)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the Sommerfeld constant for the two-band case.

In the model, the gap near  $T_c$ , for  $t = T/T_c$ , can be written as

$$\Delta_1(t) = \frac{8(T_c)^2}{7(3)} \frac{c}{1} (1-t); \quad (27)$$

$$\Delta_2(t) = \frac{8(T_c)^2}{7(3)} \frac{1}{2} (1-t); \quad (28)$$

where  $(3)' = 1.202$ . Here,

$$1 = \frac{(1 - A_{22})_{11} + (1 - A_{21})_{12} [1 + A_{21}^2 (1 - A_{22})^3]}{(1 - A_{22})_{11} + (1 - A_{21})_{12} [2A + A_{22}^2 (1 - A_{22})]} \quad (29)$$

and

$$2 = \frac{(1 - A_{11})_{22} + (1 - A_{12})_{21} [1 + A_{12}^2 (1 - A_{11})^3]}{(1 - A_{11})_{22} + (1 - A_{12})_{21} [2A + A_{11}^2 (1 - A_{11})]} ; \quad (30)$$

and the strong coupling correction is introduced through [39]:

$$c = 1 + 53 \frac{T_c}{\ln} \ln \frac{1}{3T_c} ; \quad (31)$$

The specific heat jump at  $T_c$  is:

$$\frac{C}{T_c} = 1.43 \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}) \frac{c}{1} + (1 + \frac{1}{N_2} + \frac{1}{N_1}) \frac{1}{2}}{(1 + \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}) + (1 + \frac{1}{N_2} + \frac{1}{N_1})} ; \quad (32)$$

We end with this expression that anisotropy (ie.,  $\frac{1}{N_1} \neq \frac{1}{N_2}$ ) reduces the jump ratio but increasing  $\frac{1}{N_2}$  or  $\frac{1}{N_1}$  increases the ratio, and the maximum obtainable is 1.43. Other work along the same line is given in Refs. [30, 31] where they do not consider full renormalized BCS or strong coupling theories, as we have done here.

When  $\frac{1}{N_2}; \frac{1}{N_1} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $1 = \frac{1}{N_1} + 0 (\frac{1}{N_2})$  and  $1 = \frac{1}{N_2} + 0 (\frac{1}{N_1})$ . This is assuming  $\frac{1}{N_1} \gg \frac{1}{N_2}$  and  $\frac{1}{N_2}$  remain significant as compared with the value of the off diagonal elements. In this case,

$$\frac{C}{T_c} = 1.43 \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2})}{(1 + \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}) + (1 + \frac{1}{N_2} + \frac{1}{N_1})} ; \quad (33)$$

The physics of this formula is that, in this limit, the specific heat jump at  $T_c$  itself is determined only by the superconductivity of the dominant band, but it is normalized with the normal state specific heat belonging to the sum of both bands. This has the effect of making  $C(T_c)/T_c$  always less than the BCS value by a factor of  $1/(1 + \gamma)$ , where  $\gamma = (1 + \frac{1}{N_2} + \frac{1}{N_1})/(1 + \frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2})$ . For  $MgB_2$ , we expect  $\gamma > 1$  which means that in this case the normalized jump is reduced to about half its BCS value. If we had included in (33) the strong coupling correction  $c$ , this would have the effect of increasing the factor 1.43 to a larger value characteristic of strong coupling but the additional anisotropy parameters would still work to reduce the jump. Thus, in a two-band superconductor, the jump will be smaller than for one band with the same strong coupling index.

### D. Thermodynamic Critical Magnetic Field

The thermodynamic critical magnetic field is calculated from the free energy difference:

$$H_c(T) = \frac{1}{8} \frac{F}{F} ; \quad (34)$$

As the temperature dependence of this quantity, normalized to its zero temperature value, follows very closely a nearly quadratic behaviour, the deviation function  $D(t)$  is often plotted:

$$D(t) = \frac{H_c(T)}{H_c(0)} (1 - t^2); \quad (35)$$

where  $t = T/T_c$ .

At  $T = 0$

$$H_c^2(0) = 4 N_1 \frac{1}{2} (1 + u^2); \quad (36)$$

where  $u = N_2/N_1$  and

$$N_i = N_i(0) (1 + \frac{1}{N_{ii}} + \frac{1}{N_{ij}}); \quad (37)$$

The zero temperature critical magnetic field is modified through the second term in (36) which increases with increasing  $u$  and with the square of the anisotropy ratio  $u$ , which in this case is just the ratio of the independent



gap values for the two separate bands. Further, the dimensionless ratio is

$$\frac{T_c^2}{H_c^2(0)} = \frac{(k_B T_c)^2 [1 + \frac{1}{u^2}]}{6 [1 + \frac{1}{u^2}]}; \quad (38)$$

For almost decoupled bands, Eq. (38) becomes

$$\frac{T_c^2}{H_c^2(0)} = 0.168 \frac{1 + \frac{1}{u^2}}{1 + \frac{1}{u^2}}; \quad (39)$$

where the second factor on the right-hand side modifies the usual single-band BCS value of 0.168 for the presence of the second band. Again, both  $\gamma$  and  $u$  enter the correction. If there is no anisotropy,  $u = 1$ , and therefore the bands must be the same, we recover the one-band limiting value. For large anisotropy where  $u \rightarrow 0$ , and if  $\gamma$  is of order one, the ratio in Eq. (39) is of order twice its one-band value because the second band contributes very little to the zero temperature condensation energy, but is still as equally important as the first band in its contribution to  $T_c$ , the normal state specific heat. Near  $T_c$

$$H_c(t) = \frac{32}{7} \frac{1}{(3)} (k_B T_c) (1 - t) \left[ \frac{N_1}{2} + \frac{N_2}{2} \right]^{1/2}; \quad (40)$$

which then gives the dimensionless ratio

$$h_c(0) = \frac{H_c(0)}{H_c^0(T_c) T_c} = \frac{2}{k_B T_c} \frac{1}{7} \frac{1}{(3)} \frac{1 + \frac{1}{u^2}}{1 + \frac{1}{u^2}}; \quad (41)$$

Strong coupling factors could be introduced in (36), (38), and (40). They are not given explicitly here as they are less important than for the specific heat jump and the slope of the penetration depth at  $T_c$  (see Table I). The limit of nearly decoupled bands ( $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ ;  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ ;  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ ) gives for this quantity:

$$h_c(0) = 0.576 \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{u^2}}; \quad (42)$$

The square root, which accounts for two-band effects contains a correction proportional to  $\frac{1}{u^2}$ . It can be understood as follows. The slope at  $T_c$  found from formula (40) depends only on band 1 but  $H_c(0)$  involves both and hence this correction comes solely from  $H_c(0)$  as seen in Eq. (36). If the anisotropy between the two bands is large  $u \rightarrow 0$ , there is no correction factor in (42) because the second band is eliminated from  $H_c(0)$ . If, on the other hand,  $u$  is near 1, the two bands have nearly equal gap value but still it is only band 1 which contributes to the slope at  $T_c$  and the dimensionless ratio (42) can now be larger than its BCS value.

## E. Penetration Depth

The London penetration depth  $\lambda_L(T)$  is evaluated from [1]:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(T)} = \frac{T}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_i \frac{1}{Z_i(i!n)} \frac{1}{[1 + \frac{1}{u^2} (i!n)]^{3/2}}; \quad (43)$$

where in three dimensions

$$\frac{1}{Z_{ooi}} = \frac{4 n_i e^2}{m_i c^2} = \frac{8 e^2}{3 c^2} N_i v_{Fi}^2; \quad (44)$$

and  $v_{Fi}$  is the Fermi velocity in the band labelled by the index  $i$ . This last equation would be multiplied by a factor of 3/2 in two dimensions.

For the penetration depth  $\lambda_L(T)$  at  $T = 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(0)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(0)} \frac{1}{Z_{oo1} (1 + \frac{1}{u^2} (1!n))} + \frac{1}{Z_{oo2} (1 + \frac{1}{u^2} (2!n))}; \quad (45)$$

and near  $T_c$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(t)} = 2(1 - t) \frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(T_c) Z_{oo1} (1 + \frac{1}{u^2} (1!n))} + \frac{1}{Z_{oo2} (1 + \frac{1}{u^2} (2!n))}; \quad (46)$$

where

$$\lambda_L(0) = \frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(0)} = \frac{1}{1 + 1/3} \frac{T_c}{\lambda_L^2(T_c)} \ln \frac{1}{13 T_c}; \quad (47)$$

$$\lambda_L(T_c) = \frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(T_c)} = \frac{1}{1 + 1/6} \frac{T_c}{\lambda_L^2(T_c)} \ln \frac{1}{3.5 T_c}; \quad (48)$$

Hence, defining  $y_L(T) = 1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_L^2(T)}$ , we write the dimensionless BCS penetration depth ratio as

$$y = \frac{y_L(0)}{y_L^0(T_c) T_c} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \frac{1}{u^2}) \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{u^2}}; \quad (49)$$

where  $\frac{1}{u^2} = v_{F2}^2 (1 + \frac{1}{u^2} (1!n)) = v_{F1}^2 (1 + \frac{1}{u^2} (2!n))$ . It is expected to be of order 1 unless there is a great disparity in the two Fermi velocities. For  $MgB_2$ , we use the values of  $v_{F1} = 4.40 \times 10^6$  m/s and  $v_{F2} = 5.35 \times 10^6$  m/s reported in Ref. [18] and for our other model calculations, we take them to be equivalent, for simplicity. For the nearly decoupled case

$$\frac{y_L(0)}{y_L^0(T_c) T_c} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \frac{1}{u^2}); \quad (50)$$

For  $\gamma$  and  $u$  equal to one, we see that the normalized slope of the penetration depth is twice its one-band BCS value of 1/2. Should  $\gamma$ ,  $u$ , or both be much larger than 1, then the slope can be even larger, which reflects the fact that only the dominant band determines the slope  $y_L^0$  but both bands contribute to  $y_L(0)$ . Information on the  $v_{Fi}$  and the  $N_i(0)$  is contained in the slope.




FIG. 6: Upper frame: Electronic specific heat for  $\text{MgB}_2$  in the superconducting state normalized to the normal state as a function of  $T/T_c$ . The points are the experimental results of Wang et al.[25] and the solid curve is the result for the Eliashberg calculation using the parameters given in the literature[32]. The dashed curve illustrates the case where the  $_{12}$  and  $_{21}$  parameters, used for the solid curve, have been halved. The jump due to the lower gap begins to appear in this case. Middle frame:  $[\lambda(0)/\lambda(T)]^2$  versus  $T/T_c$ . Curves are those resulting from the same set of parameters as discussed for the upper frame, with the  $v_{F1}$  taken from Ref. [8]. The data, shown for comparison, have been taken from Ref. [17]. No impurity scattering has been used to obtain a better fit. Lower frame: The deviation function  $D(t)$  for the thermodynamic critical field. Line labels are as above and the data (open and solid circles) are formed from the  $H_c(T)$  data given by Wang et al.[25] and Bouquet et al.[40], respectively.

#### IV. $\text{MgB}_2$ : INTEGRATED BANDS AND STRONG COUPLING

We now continue on beyond renormalized BCS formulas to evaluate quantities based on the full two-band Eliashberg formalism and we begin with the specific case of  $\text{MgB}_2$  and strong coupling effects. Eqs. (1) and (2) were solved for electron-phonon spectral densities  $_{ij}^2 F(!)$ , read from graphs in Ref. [32], which were originally presented in Ref. [19]. The Coulomb repulsion parameters  $_{ij}$  and  $_{ij}$ , taken from [19], were:  $_{11} = 1.017$ ,  $_{12} = 0.448$ ,  $_{21} = 0.213$ ,  $_{22} = 0.155$ ,  $_{13} = 0.210$ ,  $_{23} = 0.172$ ,  $_{33} = 0.095$ , and  $_{31} = 0.069$ , with  $!_c = 750$  meV. From these parameters,  $T_c$  was found to be 39.5 K. As discussed in our theory introduction, we

used  $!_{11} = 66.4$  meV, calculated from the  $_{11}^2 F(!)$  spectrum, to form our strong coupling index  $T_c = !_{11}$ . The other three channels had  $!_{11} < 62$  meV, which is not so different, although as argued previously, the main strong coupling effects will come from the 11 channel, and hence the choice of 66.4 meV for this parameter. From the solution of the Eliashberg equations, we can evaluate Eq. (24) for the free energy difference between the superconducting and normal state, and evaluate the superfluid density or the inverse square of the penetration depth from Eq. (43). In Fig. 6, which has three frames: the top is the specific heat, middle, the penetration depth, and bottom, the critical magnetic field deviation function of formula (35), we compare Eliashberg results (solid curve) with experimental results (solid and open circles, triangles, and squares).

In all cases, the agreement with experiment is very good and certainly as good as is obtained in conventional one-band cases[1]. In each case, we also present a second set of theoretical results (dashed curve) for which all microscopic parameters remain those of  $\text{MgB}_2$  except that we have half the value of the off-diagonal spectral functions  $_{12}^2 F(!)$  and  $_{21}^2 F(!)$ , which changes the  $T_c$  only by about one degree. It is clear that doing this reduces greatly the quality of the fit one obtains with the experimental data. This can be taken as evidence that the electronic structure, first-principle calculations of electron-phonon spectral functions are accurate. It also shows that variation of parameters by a factor of two or so away from the computed ones can lead to significant changes in superconducting properties and, in this instance, features of the second transition, due to the lower gap, begin to appear. The specific heat curve was computed before in Refs. [15, 16] and the penetration depth in Refs. [17, 26]. In these cases, our calculations (solid curves) confirm previous ones and demonstrate that our calculational procedure is working correctly. For the penetration depth we did not introduce impurity scattering. Impurities can affect the penetration depth and were included in Ref. [17]. The three sets of penetration depth data are for clean (solid circles[50] and triangles[49]) and dirty samples (solid squares[51]) as discussed in [17]. To our knowledge, the deviation function has not been computed and compared with experiment before and it is presented for the first time here. The data is from Refs. [25] (open circles) and [40] (solid circles) and again agreement with calculation, with no free parameters, is very good. The minimum in the deviation function for the Eliashberg calculation occurs at  $T/T_c = 0.6$  and has a value of -0.054. In the experimental data, the minima occur at about  $T/T_c = 0.6$  and 0.65, with values of about -0.05 and -0.045, respectively. For reference, the one-band BCS value is -0.037 and strong coupling makes this value even smaller and can even push it to a positive value, hence anisotropy is compensating for the strong coupling effects and is making this value larger and more negative.[1]

In Fig. 7, we present the temperature dependence of




FIG. 7: Gap ratios for the upper ( $\Delta_1 = k_B T_c$ ) and lower gap ( $\Delta_2 = k_B T_c$ ) as a function of  $T/T_c$ . Shown as the solid curves are the predictions for the gap ratios given by our full Eliashberg calculations for  $MgB_2$ , the dashed curves are the Eliashberg calculations for the case of reducing the diagonal coupling by half and the dotted curves show the classic BCS temperature dependences to illustrate the deviation of the temperature dependence of the Eliashberg two-band calculation for  $MgB_2$ . The open circles are the data from Iavarone et al.[38], where we have used a  $T_c = 38.3K$  to obtain their quoted upper gap ratio value of 4.3. The solid dots are the data of Gonnelli et al.[41].

the two gap ratios for  $MgB_2$ . Once again the solid curve is the full Eliashberg calculation using the parameters given for  $MgB_2$  with no adjustments. The ratio  $\Delta_1/\Delta_2$  increases from 2.7 at  $T = 0$  to about 3.5 at  $T_c$ . The temperature-dependent behaviour shown here was also found by Choi et al.[16], Brinkman et al.[18], and Golubov et al.[19]. A comparison with some of the more recent experiments is given by the open and closed circles, with the data taken from Iavarone et al.[38] and Gonnelli et al.[41], respectively. Similar data is found in other references[42, 44, 45]. In the case of the data by Iavarone et al., the statement of  $T_c$  was ambiguous and so we used their quoted value of the upper gap ratio of 4.3 along with their quoted value of the upper gap being 7.1 meV to determine a  $T_c = 38.3K$  used for the scaling of the data for the plot presented here. The Gonnelli et al. data is presented based on the  $T_c$  of 38.2K given in their paper. There is a very reasonable agreement of the data with the calculation, once again, along with Fig. 6, this shows a consistency of a number of sets of data from several different types of experiments with the one set of parameters fixed from band structure for  $MgB_2$ . Thus overall, the agreement between theory and experiment is excellent and validates the two-band nature of superconductivity in this material. The dotted curves in Fig. 7 are presented to show that the two-band calculations do show deviation from a classic BCS temperature depen-

dence (which was used in the original presentations of the data[38, 41]). In particular, Gonnelli et al. argued that the deviation of their lower gap data at temperatures above 25K (or  $T/T_c = 0.65$ , here) from the BCS temperature dependence is an additional signature of the two-band nature of the material. However, we find no such dramatic suppression in the two-band calculations at this temperature and only with the dashed curve, where we have taken the diagonal electron-phonon coupling to be half of the usual value for  $MgB_2$  do we find an inflection point around 0.35. We were not able to induce a suppression of the lower gap in the vicinity of  $T_c$  by varying the  $MgB_2$  parameters slightly about their accepted values. However, such behaviour can be found in other regimes of the parameter space not relevant to  $MgB_2$  and this feature and the issue raised by Gonnelli et al. will be discussed further in the next section. To end, note that an inflection point is also seen in the penetration depth at about  $T/T_c = 0.35$ , as described first by Golubov et al.[17] and also found here (solid curve of middle frame of Fig. 6).

More results from our calculations as well as comparison with data are presented in Table I. In the first column, we include, for comparison, the one-band BCS values for the various dimensionless ratios. The strong coupling index is first, followed by the major gap to critical temperature ratio, the minor gap ratio, the anisotropy  $\Delta_1/\Delta_2 = 1$ , the normalized specific heat jump and the negative of its slope at  $T_c$ ,  $T_c^2 = H_c^2(0)$ , and the inverse of the normalized slope at  $T_c$  for the critical magnetic field and for the penetration depth. Included in the second column, also for comparison, are the same indices for Pb, the prototype, single-band, strong coupler. We remind the reader that, in many conventional superconductors, strong coupling corrections are large and that the data cannot be understood without introducing them, and these are to be differentiated from those corrections due to anisotropy. The third column gives the results of our two-band calculations for  $MgB_2$ . This is followed by a column giving experimental values. It is clear that the agreement between theory and experiment is good. Note that we have not attempted to make a complete survey of all experiments, but have tried to present as many as reasonable, with no judgement about the quality of the data or samples, which might have improved over time. In addition, for the quantities related to slopes, i.e.,  $g$ ,  $h_c(0)$ , and  $\gamma$ , we have tried to estimate these ourselves from the graphs in papers and so this should be viewed as rough estimates as the values might change with a more rigorous analysis of the original data. Also shown are the results when our renormalized BCS formulas of the previous section are implemented using  $MgB_2$  parameters[52], which allows us to define a measure of strong coupling corrections, entered in column 6 as percentages. It is seen that  $MgB_2$  is an intermediate coupling case. The next column shows the results when the analytical expressions for strong coupling corrections to renormalized BCS, given in the text, are applied. This

TABLE I: Universal dimensionless BCS ratios and their modification for strong coupling (SC) and two-band superconductivity. RBCS stands for Renormalized BCS formula given in text. The percentage difference between the full Eliashberg (Eliash.) calculation and RBCS, used to measure the amount of strong coupling correction, is given as % SC and defined as  $j(\text{Eliash.: RBCS}) = \text{Eliash.:j}$ .

Ratio	BCS one-band	Pb one-band	MgB <sub>2</sub> Eliash.	MgB <sub>2</sub> Expt.	MgB <sub>2</sub> RBCS	MgB <sub>2</sub> % SC	MgB <sub>2</sub> RBCS+SC	Lor Eliash.	Lor RBCS	Lor % SC	Lor RBCS+SC
$T_c = T_{c1}$	0.0	0.128	0.051	0.076 <sup>a</sup>	0.0		0.052	0.15	0.0		0.15
$2\gamma_1 = k_B T_c$	3.53	4.49	4.17	3.6-4.6 <sup>b</sup>	3.86	7.4%	4.15	4.97	3.84	23%	5.14
$2\gamma_2 = k_B T_c$	3.53	4.49	1.55	1.0-1.9 <sup>b</sup>	1.40	9.7%		2.66	2.27	15%	
$\gamma_2 = \gamma_1$	1.00	1.00	0.37	0.30-0.42 <sup>b</sup>	0.36	2.7%		0.535	0.593	11%	
$C = T_c$	1.43	2.79	1.04	0.82-1.32 <sup>c</sup>	0.817	21%	1.02	2.08	1.07	49%	1.97
$g$	-3.77	-12.68	-3.28	-(2.37-4.31) <sup>d</sup>				-8.32			
$T_c^2 = H_c^2(0)$	0.168	0.132	0.225	0.183 <sup>e</sup>	0.247	9.8%		0.153	0.193	26%	
$h_c(0)$	0.576	0.465	0.581	0.518-0.667 <sup>f</sup>	0.629	8.3%		0.500	0.621	24%	
$\gamma$	0.5	0.311	1.25	1.22 <sup>g</sup> , 0.547 <sup>h</sup>	1.50	20%	1.32	0.536	0.861	61%	0.569

<sup>a</sup>Ref. [25]

<sup>b</sup>Refs. [38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46]

<sup>c</sup>Refs. [25, 40, 43, 47]

<sup>d</sup>Estimated from Refs. [25, 40, 43]

<sup>e</sup>Ref. [40]

<sup>f</sup>Estimated from Refs. [25, 40, 48]

<sup>g</sup>Estimated from data of Ref. [50] as presented in [17]

<sup>h</sup>Estimated from Ref. [49]

improves the agreement with the full Eliashberg results as compared to RBCS. Some discrepancies remain due in part to additional modifications introduced by the coupling of a strong coupling band with a weak coupling one through the off-diagonal  $\gamma_j$ 's. The next four columns were obtained for our Lorentzian spectral density model with  $\gamma_{11} = 1.3$ ,  $\gamma_{22} = 0.5$ ,  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0.2$ , and  $\gamma_{ij} = 0$ . This was devised to have a strong coupling index  $T_c = T_{c1} = 0.15$  which is slightly larger than Pb and well within the range of realistic values for electron-phonon superconductors. It is clear that strong coupling corrections are now even more significant and cannot be ignored in a complete theory.

More information on strong coupling effects as well as on two-band anisotropy is given in Fig. 8, where we show the same BCS ratios as considered in Table I. In all eight frames, we have used our model Lorentzian  $\gamma_{ij}^2 F(|\epsilon|)$  spectra. The solid curves are results of full Eliashberg calculations as a function of  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$ , with  $\gamma_{11}$  fixed at 1.3 and  $\gamma_{22}$  at 0.5. The dashed curves are for comparison and are based on our formulas, i.e., give renormalized BCS results without use of the strong coupling correction formulas. They, of course, can differ very significantly from one-band universal BCS values because of the two-band anisotropy. We see that these effects can be large and that on comparison between the solid and dashed curves, the strong coupling effects can also be significant. As  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  is increased from zero, with  $\gamma_{11}$  and  $\gamma_{22}$  remaining fixed, the  $T_c$  increases and this leads to the increase in  $T_c = T_{c1}$  from about 0.15 at  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0$  to over 0.2 at  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 1$ . For all the indices considered here, we note that their values at  $T_c = T_{c1} = 0.2$  are close to the values that they would have in a one-band

case [1], and the remaining anisotropy in the  $\gamma_j$ 's play only a minor role. (Of course, this is a qualitative statement since it is well known that the shape of  $\gamma^2 F(|\epsilon|)$  for fixed  $T_c = T_{c1}$  can also affect somewhat the value of BCS ratios [1].) This is expected since in this case the fluctuation of the average of any  $\gamma_{ij}$  is becoming smaller. For RBCS all ratios have returned to the one-band case at  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 1$  except for  $\gamma$  which remains 6% larger. We now comment on select indices separately. The normalized specific heat jump at  $T_c$  in the model is given by formula (32) with  $\gamma_c = 1$ . For  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  small,  $\gamma_1 \approx 1 + O(\gamma_{12}^2)$  and  $\gamma_2 \approx 0 + O(\gamma_{12}^4)$ . These conditions mean that  $C = T_c$  rises slightly as  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  increases, and eventually reaches 1.43. By contrast, the solid curve includes, in addition, strong coupling effects which increase the value of the jump ratio rather rapidly. For  $2\gamma_{1,2} = k_B T_c$ , the lower gaps have the same value for  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0$  as it is determined only by  $\gamma_{22}$ . This is not so for the upper gaps. The dashed curve takes on its BCS value of 3.53, but the solid curve (an Eliashberg calculation) has strong coupling effects as described in Fig. 4. (This means that  $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1$  is smaller for the solid curve as compared to the dashed one in the lower left-hand frame.) As  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  increases, the long-dashed and lower short-dashed curves begin to deviate because the former starts to acquire strong coupling corrections of its own through the off-diagonal  $\gamma_j$ 's. While the solid curve also increases, the anisotropy between 1 and 2 decreases. The short-dashed curves show different behaviour. The ratio  $2\gamma_1 = k_B T_c$  starts at 3.53, rises slightly towards 4 before tending towards 3.53 again. Now, the anisotropy between  $\gamma_2$  and  $\gamma_1$  decreases mainly because  $\gamma_2$  itself rises towards 3.53. The behaviour of  $T_c^2 = H_c^2(0)$  (dashed




FIG. 8: Various BCS ratios as discussed in the text, shown as a function of  $\lambda_{12}$ , where  $\lambda_{21} = \lambda_{12}$  (i.e.  $\lambda = 1$ ),  $\lambda_{11} = 1/3$ , and  $\lambda_{22} = 0.5$ . The solid curves are those for the full Eliashberg calculation for a Lorentzian model of  $^2F_{ij}(\omega)$  spectra and the short-dashed curves are for the renormalized BCS formulas developed from the model and given in the text. For the frame with the gap ratios, the upper gap is given by the solid curve and the lower gap is given by the long-dashed curve, the upper and lower short-dashed curves are for the upper and lower gaps, respectively, in RBCS. The first frame gives the effective  $T_c = T_{c1}$  for the Eliashberg spectrum based on the definition given in the text.

curve) can be understood from Eq. (38). While  $T_{c1} = T_c$ , as we have seen, does change somewhat with  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21}$ , a more important change is the  $u^2$  factor in the denominator of (38) which rapidly decreases this ratio towards its BCS value of 0.168 as  $u$  increases towards 1. The behaviour of  $h_c(0)$  given by Eq. (41) is more complex. The numerator in the square root goes towards  $1 + u^2$ , as  $u^2 \rightarrow 1$ , more rapidly than the denominator which involves the  $\lambda$ 's. Here, the numerator and denominator compete and consequently  $h_c(0)$  first increases before showing a slow decrease to its BCS value. Finally,  $y$  in formula (49) decreases with increasing off-diagonal because of the square bracket in the denominator. It is clear from these comparisons between Eliashberg and RBCS that, in general, both strong coupling and anisotropy effects play a significant role in the dimensionless ratios, and both need to be accounted for.




FIG. 9: Upper frame: Specific heat in the superconducting state normalized to the normal state,  $C_s(T) = T$ , versus  $T = T_{c0}$ , where  $T_{c0}$  is the  $T_c$  for only the  $\lambda_{11}$  channel, with all others zero. Shown are curves for various off-diagonal  $\lambda$ 's with  $\lambda_{11} = 1$  and  $\lambda_{22} = 0.5$ . Three curves are for  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21}$  equal to: 0.0001 (solid), 0.01 (short-dashed) and 0.1 (long-dashed). Also shown are:  $\lambda_{12} = 0.1$  and  $\lambda_{21} = 0.01$  (i.e.,  $\lambda = 10$ ) (dot-dashed) and  $\lambda_{12} = 0.01$  and  $\lambda_{21} = 0.1$  (i.e.,  $\lambda = 0.1$ ) (dotted). Middle frame: The superfluid density  $[\lambda(0) = \lambda(T)]^2$  versus  $T = T_{c0}$  for the same parameters. Lower frame: The deviation function  $D(t)$  plotted versus  $T = T_{c0}$ . The dot-dashed curve has been divided by 10 from its original value in order to display it on the same scale as the other curves.

## V. THE LIMIT OF NEARLY SEPARATE BANDS

When  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = 0$ , there exist two transition temperatures  $T_{c1}$  and  $T_{c2}$  associated with  $\lambda_{11}$  and  $\lambda_{22}$ , separately, and for several properties, but not all, the superconducting state is the straight sum of the two bands as they would be in isolation. Here, we wish to study how the integration of the two bands proceeds as  $\lambda_{12}$  and/or  $\lambda_{21}$  is switched on. Our first results related to this issue are shown in Fig. 9, which has three frames. The top frame deals with the normalized specific heat  $C_s(T) = T$  as a function of temperature, the middle, the normalized inverse square of the penetration depth  $[\lambda_L(0) = \lambda_L(T)]^2$  and the bottom gives the critical field deviation function  $D(t)$  of Eq. (35). In all cases, we have used our Lorentzian model for the spectral densities  $^2F_{ij}(\omega)$  with  $\lambda_{11} = 1$  and  $\lambda_{22} = 0.5$  fixed for all curves. The solid curves are for  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = 0.0001$ , short-dashed for 0.01, and long-dashed for 0.1. In the top two frames,

the two separate transitions are easily identified in the curves with solid line type. Because of the very small value of  $\rho_{12} = \rho_{21}$ , the composite curve is obviously the summation of two subsystems, which are almost completely decoupled. However, already for  $\rho_{12} = \rho_{21} = 0.01$  which remains very small as compared with the value of  $\rho_{11}$  and even  $\rho_{22}$ , the second transition (short-dashed curve) becomes significantly smeared. The two subsystems have undergone considerable integration. In particular, the second specific heat jump is rounded, becoming more knee-like. Also, the sharp edge or kink in the solid curve for the superfluid density is gone in the short-dashed curve. Thus, to observe clearly two distinct systems, the off-diagonal  $\rho$ 's need to be very small. Once  $\rho_{12} = \rho_{21} = 0.1$  (long-dashed curve), the integration of the two subsystems is very considerable if not complete. This does not mean, however, that superconducting properties become identical to those for an equivalent one-band system. As long as the  $\rho_{ij}^2 F(i)$  are not all the same, there will be anisotropy and this will change properties as compared with isotropic Eliashberg one-band results. Note that in the solid Eliashberg curve of Fig. 6, a point of inflection remains, as commented on by Golubov et al.[17]. In the case of the deviation function (lower frame), the solid curve shows a sharp cusp which is related to the lower transition temperature of the decoupled bands but not quite at that value as this function is composed from subtracting  $1 - (T/T_c)^2$  from  $H_c(T) = H_c(0)$ . However, two distinct pieces of the curve exist and notably near  $T_c$  the curve has a very different curvature from what is normally encountered. In particular, the temperature dependence of the solid curve is concave down at high temperature in contrast to the usual case of concave up. As the bands are coupled through larger and larger interband  $\rho$ 's, the curve moves to a shape more consistent with one-band behaviour. However, the curve remains negative due to the anisotropy, while usually strong coupling would drive the curve positive with an overall concave-down curvature[1], which is illustrated by the dotted curve for which the first band dominates, as we describe below.

The other curves in these figures, dot-dashed and dotted, are for  $\rho = 10$  with  $\rho_{12} = 0.1$  and  $\rho_{21} = 0.01$ , and  $\rho = 0.1$  with  $\rho_{12} = 0.01$  and  $\rho_{21} = 0.1$ , respectively. For  $\rho = 10$ , the second band with the smaller of the two diagonal values of  $\rho$  has ten times the density of states as compared to band 1 with the larger  $\rho$  value. This large disparity in density of states can have drastic effects on superconducting properties, and furthermore modify both the observed temperature dependence and the value of the BCS ratios. The second specific heat jump in the dash-dotted curve, although smeared, is quite large as compared with that in the solid or even the dashed curve. Also, it is to be noted that beyond the temperature of the lower maximum in  $C_S(T) = T$ , the curve shows only a very modest increase, reflecting the low value of the electronic density of states in band 1, and the ratio of the jump at  $T_c$  to the normal state is now quite reduced.

The low density of states in band 1 is also reflected in the low value of the penetration depth curve (middle frame, dash-dotted curve) in the temperature region above  $T_{c2}$ . Finally, we note that while we have chosen a large value of  $\rho$  for illustration here, MgB<sub>2</sub> has an  $\rho = 1.37$  which, by the above arguments, would tend to accentuate the features due to the second band.




FIG. 10: Upper frame: Individual contributions from each band to the superfluid density  $[\lambda(0) = \lambda_{1,2}(T)]^2$  as a function of  $T/T_{c0}$ , where  $T_{c0}$  is the  $T_c$  for the  $\rho_{11}$  channel alone, with all others zero. Shown are curves for various off-diagonal  $\rho_{21}$  with  $\rho_{11} = 1$ ,  $\rho_{22} = 0.5$ , and  $\rho_{12} = 0.0001$ . The three pairs of curves are for  $\rho_{21}$  equal to: 0.0001 (solid), 0.01 (short-dashed), and 0.1 (long-dashed). The curves which go to zero at a lower temperature correspond to  $[\lambda(0) = \lambda_2(T)]^2$  while those which go to zero close to 1 are for  $[\lambda(0) = \lambda_1(T)]^2$ . Lower frame: Now the  $\rho_{21}$  is held fixed at 0.0001 and the  $\rho_{12}$  is varied. The three pairs of curves are for  $\rho_{12}$  equal to: 0.0001 (solid), 0.1 (short-dashed), and 0.2 (long-dashed). Here, the ratio of the density of states  $\rho$  has been taken to be 1 for convenience of illustrating the curves on the same scale.

A very different behaviour is obtained when  $\rho = 0.1$  for which case the electronic density of states in the second band is reduced by a factor of ten as compared to the first band. In this case, the dotted curve applies and looks much more like a standard one-band case with very significant strong coupling effects  $C(T_c) = T_c / 2.4$ . The influence of band 2 has been greatly reduced. Finally, we note that the introduction of the off-diagonal elements can change  $T_c$ . In particular, the dot-dashed curve ends at a considerably reduced value of critical temperature as compared with the other curves. This is consistent with Fig. 1 where we saw that increasing  $\rho_{12}$  for small values

of  $\gamma_{21}$  decreases  $T_c$ . On the other hand, for the dotted curve for which values of  $\gamma_{12}$  and  $\gamma_{21}$  are interchanged as compared to the dash-dotted curve,  $T_c$  is hardly affected because  $\gamma_{12}$  is small and it is this parameter which affects  $T_c$  more. The two parameters  $\gamma_{12}$  and  $\gamma_{21}$  do not play the same role in  $T_c$  or for that matter in the integration process of the two bands. This is made clear in Fig. 10 which deals only with the penetration depth. What is shown are the separate contributions to the superfluid density coming from the two bands. In all cases,  $\gamma_{11} = 1$  and  $\gamma_{22} = 0.5$ . In the top frame,  $\gamma_{12} = 0.0001$  and  $\gamma_{21}$  is varied. It is clear that as  $\gamma_{21}$  is increased, the superfluid density associated with the second band remains significant even above the second transition temperature  $T_{c2}$  which is well defined in the solid curve. This is the opposite behaviour of what is seen in the lower frame where  $\gamma_{21}$  remains at 0.0001 and  $\gamma_{12}$  is increased. In this case,  $T_c$  changes significantly but the superfluid density associated with the second band remains negligible above  $T_{c2}$ . Note finally that the relative size of the superfluid density in each band will vary with  $\gamma_{11}$  and  $v_{F1}$ , neither of which have been properly accounted for in this figure, as we wished to illustrate solely the effect of  $\gamma_{12}$  and  $\gamma_{21}$  on the issue of integration of the bands and modification of  $T_c$ .

The changes, with the off-diagonal elements  $\gamma_{12}$  and  $\gamma_{21}$ , in the temperature dependence of the upper and lower gaps are closely correlated with those just described for the superfluid density. This is documented in Fig. 11 which has two frames. In all cases  $\gamma_{11} = 1$  and  $\gamma_{22} = 0.5$ . In the top frame,  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  equal to 0.0001 (solid), 0.01 (short-dashed), and 0.1 (long-dashed). The various pairs of curves apply to the upper and lower gap ratios. Note the long tails in the short-dashed curve (lower gap), still small but extending to  $T = T_c$ . For the long-dashed curve, the lower and upper gaps now have very similar temperature dependences, but these are not yet identical to BCS. We have already seen in Fig. 7, for the specific case of  $MgB_2$ , that the lower gap falls below BCS at temperatures above  $T = T_c \approx 0.7$ , which is expected when it is viewed as an evolution out of two separate gaps, with two  $T_c$  values, due to increasing the off-diagonal coupling. In the lower frame, we show results for  $\gamma_{12} = 0.1$  (dot-dashed) and  $\gamma_{21} = 0.1$  (dotted). Again, as expected, the two dash-dotted curves show distinct temperature dependences while for the dotted they are very similar.

A very similar story emerges when interband impurity scattering is considered. Results are given in Fig. 12 and Fig. 13. Fig. 12 has three frames. Here,  $\gamma_{11} = 1$ ,  $\gamma_{22} = 0.5$ , and  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = 0.0001$ , with our Lorentzian electron-phonon spectral functions  $\gamma_{ij}^2 F(\omega)$  described previously. The top frame deals with the temperature dependence of the normalized superconducting state electronic specific heat  $C_s(T) = T$ . The middle frame gives the gap ratios of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  and thus the curves come in pairs, with  $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2$ . And the bottom frame shows the deviation function  $D(t)$  for the thermodynamic critical magnetic field. What is varied in the various curves is




FIG. 11: Upper frame: Upper and lower gap ratios,  $2\Delta_{1,2}(T)/k_B T_{c0}$ , versus  $T/T_{c0}$ , where  $T_{c0}$  is the  $T_c$  for the  $\gamma_{11}$  channel alone, with all  $\gamma$ 's zero. Shown are curves for various off-diagonal  $\gamma$ 's with  $\gamma_{11} = 1$  and  $\gamma_{22} = 0.5$ . Three pairs of curves are for  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  equal to: 0.0001 (solid), 0.01 (short-dashed) and 0.1 (long-dashed). Lower frame: Same as for upper frame except now are shown:  $\gamma_{12} = 0.1$  and  $\gamma_{21} = 0.01$  (i.e.,  $\gamma_{12} = 10$ ) (dot-dashed) and  $\gamma_{12} = 0.01$  and  $\gamma_{21} = 0.1$  (i.e.,  $\gamma_{21} = 10$ ) (dotted).

the interband impurity scattering rate  $t_{12}^+ = t_{21}^+$  (taken to be equal in value, i.e.,  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$ ). The solid curve, which clearly shows two transitions, is for  $t_{12}^+ = 0$ . It is to be noted first, that in all cases, off-diagonal impurity scattering changes the value of the critical temperature, reducing it to less than 0.8 of its pure value in the case of the dot-dashed curve. This decrease in  $T_c$  does not translate, however, into a steady decrease in the specific heat jump at  $T_c$ . We see that while the jump initially decreases with increasing  $t_{12}^+ = t_{21}^+$ , eventually it increases and is largest for the dot-dashed curve. Both Watanabe and Kita [30] and Mishonov et al. [31], using only an unrenormalized BCS model, find an increase with impurity scattering and no initial decrease as is found in the full Eliashberg calculation. This is a clear illustration that, at minimum, a renormalized BCS formula needs to be used to capture the qualitative trend and full Eliashberg theory is required if one wishes to be quantitative. It is also clear that as interband impurity scattering increases, the jump in the specific heat at the second transition, seen in the solid curve, is rapidly washed out and little remains of this anomaly in the dot-dashed curve. Even the long-dashed curve shows little structure in this re-




FIG. 12: Top frame: Specific heat in the superconducting state normalized to the normal state,  $C_s(T) = T$ , versus  $T = T_{c0}$ , where  $T_{c0}$  is the  $T_c$  for the pure case. Here,  $t_{11} = 1$ ,  $t_{22} = 0.5$ , and  $t_{12} = t_{21} = 0.0001$ . Shown are curves for varying  $t_{12}^+ = t_{21}^+$  equal to: 0.0 (solid), 0.01 (short-dashed), 0.2 (long-dashed), and 0.5 (dot-dashed) in units of  $T_{c0}$ . Notice that the value of the jump at  $T_c$  first dips and then rises with impurity scattering. Middle frame:  $2\Delta_{1,2}(T)/k_B T_{c0}$  versus  $T = T_{c0}$ . The upper three curves correspond to  $2\Delta_1/k_B T_{c0}$  and the lower three to  $2\Delta_2/k_B T_{c0}$ , with the curves labelled the same way as in the upper frame. Only the first three impurity cases are shown for clarity. The other progresses in the same manner with the  $T_c$  reducing further and the gaps moving closer to a common value. Bottom frame: The deviation function  $D(t)$  versus  $T = T_{c0}$ , again with the curves labelled the same way as in the top frame.

gion, in analogy to what we found to hold for the case of increasing the off-diagonal electron-phonon elements. Note, however, there remains a point of inflection which has moved to higher temperature. Such a shift of the inflection point can also be brought about by increasing the off-diagonal  $\tau$ 's as seen in Fig. 9.

The temperature dependence of the gap ratios (middle frame of Fig. 12) also mirror what we found in Fig. 11. The dashed curves exhibit quite distinct temperature dependences between  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  while this is no longer the case for the pair of long-dashed curves. Note that, as compared to the solid curve, the anisotropy in the gaps for the long-dashed curve has been reduced considerably. The upper gap has decreased and the lower increased even more. The washing out of the gap anisotropy by off-diagonal impurity scattering is expected and has been studied theoretically [33, 53] and experimentally [54]. For

carbon doping, the gaps are seen to merge at about 13% for which  $T_c$  has been reduced to about 20 K with the large gap reducing to its BCS value and the smaller gap moving upwards only very little in contrast to our model calculations for which the lower gap changes relatively more and isotropy is reached at about a 30% reduction in  $T_c$ . Of course, as one dopes, the electronic density of states and the electron-phonon parameters also change [55], and one needs to include these in addition to any interband scattering.

Finally, the effect of interband ordinary impurity scattering on the deviation function, shows a behaviour similar to that found for paramagnetic impurities in one-band superconductors [35]. Initially, as in the other properties, the impurities smear the structure related to the second transition temperature (in this case the cusp feature in the solid curve) and once the two bands are fairly well integrated, then like paramagnetic impurities, the effect here is to keep the minimum at the same temperature but change its value. A key difference though is that, in the case of paramagnetic impurities in one-band, the extremum in the curve moves from positive (and strong coupling) to negative (and weak coupling) because the gap is being reduced towards zero. Here, with the two bands, the impurities do not reduce  $T_c$ , and hence the gap, to zero, but rather to a finite value related to the washing out of the anisotropy between the two bands, and hence the extremum in this case will move from negative (where it is positioned due to large anisotropy) to smaller values, reflecting this.

Next we turn to the results given in Fig. 13, which shows the temperature dependence of the superfluid density for various values of impurity parameters. Again,  $t_{11} = 1$ ,  $t_{22} = 0.5$ , and  $t_{12} = t_{21} = 0.0001$  with the Lorentzian spectra. What is illustrated in these four frames is how very different the effect of  $t_{11}^+$ ,  $t_{22}^+$ ,  $t_{12}^+$ , and  $t_{21}^+$  are. The solid curve is for reference and is the pure case. Once again, for the case of varying  $t_{12}^+$  and  $t_{21}^+$ , we have violated the constraint that their ratio must be fixed by the ratio of the density of states. This we can do theoretically to decouple and, therefore, illustrate the effects of these different scattering channels, but in real systems, they would be constrained and the net result would be a combination of the effects from both channels. The top left frame shows the effect on the superfluid density of increasing the impurity scattering in the first band (intraband scattering). Such impurities reduce the superfluid density in band 1 while leaving band 2 unaltered. In the lower right-hand frame it is the superfluid density in the second band that is reduced, leaving the first unchanged.  $T_c$  is unaffected by intraband impurity scattering in isotropic s-wave superconductors due to Anderson's theorem. The top right-hand frame shows that increasing  $t_{12}^+$  reduces the critical temperature as well as reduces the superfluid density in band one without, however, having much effect on the second band. The kink associated with the rise of the second band is hardly changed as  $t_{12}^+$  is not the integrating variable, rather it






FIG. 13: Effect of impurity scattering on the superfluid density  $[\lambda_0(0)/\lambda(T)]^2$ , plotted versus  $T/T_{c0}$ , where  $T_{c0}$  and  $\lambda_0(0)$  are for the pure case. Each frame shows the effect of the different type of impurity scattering keeping all other impurity terms equal to zero. The spectrum parameters are:  $\lambda_{11} = 1$ ,  $\lambda_{22} = 0.5$ , and  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = 0.0001$ . The solid curve in all cases is for the pure case of  $t_{ij}^+ = 0$ . In the upper left frame:  $t_{11}^+ = T_{c0} = 0.2$  (short-dashed) and  $2.0$  (long-dashed). In the upper right frame:  $t_{12}^+ = T_{c0} = 0.2$  (short-dashed) and  $0.4$  (long-dashed). In the lower left frame:  $t_{21}^+ = T_{c0} = 0.02$  (short-dashed) and  $0.1$  (long-dashed). In the lower right frame:  $t_{22}^+ = T_{c0} = 0.2$  (short-dashed) and  $2.0$  (long-dashed).

is  $t_{21}^+$  which integrates rapidly the bands as seen in the lower left-hand frame. However, in this case, the critical temperature is hardly changed and there is little change to the curve above  $T = T_{c0} \approx 0.7$ .

#### VI. THE LIMIT OF PURE OFFDIAGONAL COUPLING

While the two-band nature in  $MgB_2$ , driven by the electron-phonon interaction, is well-established, there have been many reports of possible two-band superconductivity in other systems, including the conventional A15 compound  $Nb_3Sn$  [56]. With a  $T_c = 18$  K and a main gap  $2\Delta_M \approx 4.9T_c$ , there is specific heat evidence for a second gap at  $0.8T_c$ . Other systems are  $NbSe_2$  [57],  $Y_2C_3$  and  $La_2C_3$  [58] and possibly a second nonsuperconducting band in  $CeCoIn_5$  [59]. In the triplet spin state superconductor  $Sr_2RuO_4$  [60], a small gap is induced in the second band. A two-band superconductivity is likely to be a widespread phenomenon, not confined to electron-phonon systems, it seems appropriate to investigate further an extended range of parameter space for the  $t_{ij}$ 's and in particular the possibility that the off-diagonal elements are the dominant mechanism for superconductivity.

In the limit of pure off-diagonal coupling, where  $\lambda_{11} =$




FIG. 14: Upper frame: Gap ratios for the upper ( $2\Delta_1 = k_B T_c$ ) and lower gap ( $2\Delta_2 = k_B T_c$ ) as a function of  $\lambda_{12}$  for varying  $\lambda_{21}$ : 0.01 (solid), 0.1 (dotted), and 0.3 (dashed). Here,  $\lambda_{11} = 0$ ,  $\lambda_{22} = 0$ . This is for comparison with Suhlet al.[9]. Lower frame: Gap anisotropy,  $u = \Delta_2/\Delta_1$ , versus  $\lambda_{12}$  for the same parameters and curve labels as the upper frame. Note that  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21}$  is plotted. With  $\lambda_{12} < \lambda_{21}$ , the roles are simply reversed with  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  would become the large gap, etc.

$\lambda_{22} = 0$ , Eq. (12) for the coupling  $A$ , which determines  $T_c$  from Eq. (11), simplifies to:

$$A = \frac{1}{\lambda_{12} \lambda_{21}}; \quad (51)$$

and the ratio of the gap to  $T_c$  given in Eq. (21) becomes

$$\frac{2\Delta_1}{k_B T_c} = 3.54 \exp A \frac{u}{\lambda_{21}}; \quad (52)$$

The ratio  $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = 1$  can be taken and Eq. (20) for the gap anisotropy  $u = \Delta_2/\Delta_1$  written as:

$$u^2 - 1 = \frac{p}{A} u \ln u; \quad (53)$$

This equation gives  $u$  in terms of  $p$  and  $A$ . Since by its definition  $0 < u < 1$ ,  $u \ln u$  is negative so a condition on obtaining a solution of (53) is that

$$u^2 - 1 < 0 \text{ or } \frac{1}{u^2}; \quad (54)$$

For a trial solution of  $u = 0.1$ , this would give  $1 < \frac{1}{u^2} < 100$ . For  $p = 60$ , as an example,  $A = 4.46$  and

$2\gamma_1 = k_B T_c \approx 9.7$ , which is very large. This occurs for  $T_c = \ln 10^2$ , using  $\ln(1.13 \ln T_c) = A$ , which is in the weak coupling regime. However, to achieve an upper gap ratio value greater than 11 or so, will correspond an unrealistically small value of  $T_c = \ln$  (of order  $10^{-10}$ , for example). In Fig. 14, we show results in the upper frame for  $2\gamma_{1,2} = k_B T_c$  versus  $\gamma_{12}$  for various  $\gamma_{21}$  values. In the lower frame, we show  $u$  versus  $\gamma_{12}$ . The difference between Fig. 14 and Fig. 3 shows that large values of  $2\gamma_1 = k_B T_c$  are more naturally obtained in the pure off-diagonal regime and are associated as well with small values of  $u$  and the weak coupling regime. This latter feature implies that there will be no further strong coupling corrections to an already large gap ratio. We have also calculated the thermodynamics and superfluid density in this regime, for a range of parameters, but have found these properties to show quite ordinary behaviour and have discovered no new physics. For the sake of brevity, we present none of these results but instead note that in this limit the  $\gamma$ 's are

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_{21}}{\gamma_{12}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\gamma_{12}} \right); \quad (55)$$

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_{12}}{\gamma_{21}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \gamma_{12}); \quad (56)$$

with  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$ , and hence, the various dimensionless ratios are:

$$\frac{C}{T_c} = 1.43 \frac{4}{(1 + \gamma_{12})^2} \quad (57)$$

and

$$h_c(0) = \frac{1}{T_c} \frac{1}{\gamma_{12}} \frac{7}{32} (3) (1 + \gamma_{12}) \frac{1 + \gamma_{12}^2}{\gamma_{12}^2} \quad (58)$$

and

$$\frac{Y_L(0)}{Y_L^0(T_c) T_c} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{(1 + \gamma_{12})(1 + \gamma_{21})}{\gamma_{12} \gamma_{21}}; \quad (59)$$

where  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_F^2 (1 + \gamma_{12}) = \gamma_F^2 (1 + \gamma_{21})$ . The ratio for the zero temperature critical field of Eq. (38) does not change its form and so is not repeated here. These ratios behave, qualitatively, no differently from what we found in section III. A difference worth noting is the following. In linear order, the effect of interband impurity scattering on  $T_c$  takes the form (16-18):

$$\frac{T_c}{T_{c0}} = 1 - \frac{\gamma_{12}^2}{8} \frac{1}{\gamma_{12}} \frac{\gamma_{21}}{\gamma_{12}} \quad (60)$$

which is always negative and larger for paramagnetic than for normal impurities. It can also be very large for  $\gamma_{12} \gg 1$ . This is another distinction between pure off-diagonal coupling and MgB<sub>2</sub>, for example. In obtaining (60), we have used the fact that  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} = \gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21}$  and  $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{21} > 1$ .

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have calculated thermodynamics, gap anisotropy and penetration depth for a two-band Eliashberg superconductor. For the parameters appropriate to MgB<sub>2</sub> which are obtained from first principle band structure calculations of the electron-phonon spectral functions, we find good agreement with the existing experimental data. We reduce the Eliashberg equations to a renormalized BCS form by application of the two-square-well approximation. Comparison of these results with those from the full Eliashberg equations allow us to determine strong coupling corrections, which we find to be significant in MgB<sub>2</sub>. When the parameters for the electron-phonon interaction are moved away from those specific to MgB<sub>2</sub>, the strong coupling corrections can become much larger, and superconducting properties reflect this fact, as well as the change in anisotropy between the bands. Within the two-band approximation, we derive simple analytic expressions for the various dimensionless BCS ratios which would be universal in the one-band case, but are not in the two-band one. They depend on the anisotropy and particularly on the ratio of the electronic density of states in the two bands. The anisotropy in the ratio of the two gaps at zero temperature is investigated and is found to increase as  $\gamma_{22}$  is reduced and made repulsive, in which case the existence of superconductivity in the first band, and the off-diagonal coupling to it, induces a gap in a band which would, on its own, not be superconducting.

We have paid particular attention to the limit of nearly decoupled bands, i.e., small interband coupling, with the superconductivity originating from  $\gamma_{11}$  and  $\gamma_{22}$  in the first and second band, respectively. When  $\gamma_{12}; \gamma_{21} \rightarrow 0$ , there are two transitions at  $T_{c1}$  and  $T_{c2}$  and two specific heat jumps. As the interband coupling is turned on, the two bands become integrated and the second transition smears. We have found that the two parameters,  $\gamma_{12}$  and  $\gamma_{21}$ , have very different effects on the smearing of the second transition and on  $T_c$ .  $\gamma_{12}$  largely modifies  $T_c$ , reducing it, whereas,  $\gamma_{21}$  alters the lower temperature region around the second transition. Only very small values of  $\gamma_{21}$ , as compared with  $\gamma_{11}$  and  $\gamma_{22}$ , are needed to cause large changes in the region around  $T_{c2}$ . It was found that a small amount of interband impurity scattering can also significantly smear the second transition, and so reduce the distinction between the two bands. However, even when the two bands are well-integrated and a sharp second transition is no longer easily discernible, this does not imply that the superconducting properties become those of a one-band superconductor. Anisotropy remains and this affects properties.

In view of the possible widespread occurrence of two-band superconductivity, even for systems with exotic mechanism not necessarily due to the electron-phonon interaction, we deemed it of interest to consider the case of zero intraband coupling,  $\gamma_{11} = \gamma_{22} = 0$ , with superconductivity due only to the interband  $\gamma_{12}$  and  $\gamma_{21}$ , which need not have the same value. When these are very different

ent, the resulting gaps are quite different from each other and the ratio of  $\Delta_1$  to  $T_c$  can become large particularly in the weak coupling limit. This is a distinguishing feature of pure  $d$ -diagonal coupling. Another distinguishing feature is the possibility of a rapid reduction of  $T_c$  towards zero by interband impurity scattering, as compared with the case for which the diagonal elements play the leading role.

#### Acknowledgments

EJN acknowledges funding from NSERC, the Government of Ontario (Premier's Research Excellence Award), and the University of Guelph. JPC acknowledges support from NSERC and the CIAR. In addition, we thank E. Schachinger and J. Wei for helpful discussions.

- 
- [1] J.P. Carbotte, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 62, 1027 (1990).  
 [2] The  $Pb-^{235}F$  (!) is given by W.L.M. McMullan and J.M. Rowell, in *Superconductivity*, edited by R.D. Parks (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1969), Vol. 1, p. 601.  
 [3] F. Marsiglio and J.P. Carbotte in *The Physics of Conventional and Unconventional Superconductors* edited by K.H. Bennemann and J.B. Ketterson (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2003), Vol. 1, p. 233.  
 [4] J.M. Damasceno and J.P. Carbotte, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* 43, 263 (1981).  
 [5] P. Tomlinson and J.P. Carbotte, *Phys. Rev. B* 13, 4738 (1976).  
 [6] H.K. Leung, J.P. Carbotte, and C.R. Leavens, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* 24, 25 (1976).  
 [7] See the book *Anisotropy Effects in Superconductors* edited by H. Weber (Plenum Press, New York, 1977).  
 [8] H.G. Zarate and J.P. Carbotte, *Phys. Rev. B* 27, 194 (1983).  
 [9] H. Suhl, B.T. Matthias, and L.R. Walker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 3, 552 (1959).  
 [10] Some further examples of two-band work from the past are: T. Soda and Y. Wada, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 36, 1111 (1996); C.C. Sung and V.K. Wong, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* 28, 1933 (1967); W.S. Chow, *Phys. Rev.* 172, 467 (1968); R.H. Burkland and W.S. Chow, *Phys. Rev. B* 3, 779 (1971); V.A. Moskalenko, A.M. Ursu, and N.I. Botoshan, *Phys. Lett.* 44A, 183 (1973); N. Schopohl and K. Schamberg, *Solid State Commun.* 22, 371 (1977).  
 [11] P. Entel and D. Rainer, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* 23, 511 (1976).  
 [12] P. Entel, *Z. Phys. B* 24, 263 (1976); *ibid.* 23, 321 (1976).  
 [13] J. Nagamatsu, N. Nakagawa, T. Muranaka, Y. Zenitani, and J. Akimitsu, *Nature* 410, 63 (2001).  
 [14] A.Y. Liu, I.I. Mazin, and J. Kortus, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 087005 (2001).  
 [15] H.J. Choi, D. Roundy, H. Sun, M.L. Cohen, and S.G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. B* 66, 020513 (2002).  
 [16] H.J. Choi, D. Roundy, H. Sun, M.L. Cohen, and S.G. Louie, *Nature (London)* 418, 758 (2002).  
 [17] A.A. Golubov, A. Brinkman, O.V. Dolgov, J. Kortus, and O. Jepsen, *Phys. Rev. B* 66, 054524 (2002).  
 [18] A. Brinkman, A.A. Golubov, H. Rogalla, O.V. Dolgov, J. Kortus, Y. Kong, O. Jepsen, and O.K. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. B* 65, 180517(R) (2002).  
 [19] A.A. Golubov, J. Kortus, O.V. Dolgov, O. Jepsen, Y. Kong, O.K. Andersen, B.J. Gibson, K. Ahn, and R.K. Kramers, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 14, 1353 (2002).  
 [20] J.M. An and W.E. Pickett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 4366 (2001).  
 [21] I.I. Mazin, O.K. Andersen, O. Jepsen, O.V. Dolgov, J. Kortus, A.A. Golubov, A.B. Kuz'menko, and D. van der Marel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 107002 (2002).  
 [22] I.I. Mazin and V.P. Antropov, *Physica C* 385, 49 (2003).  
 [23] I.K. Yanson, *cond-mat/0405246*  
 [24] O.V. Dolgov, R.S. Gonnelli, G.A. Ummarino, A.A. Golubov, S.V. Shulga, and J. Kortus, *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 132503 (2003).  
 [25] Y. Wang, T. P. Lackowski, and A. Junod, *Physica C* 355, 179 (2001); A. Junod, Y. Wang, F. Bouquet, and P. Toulemonde, in *Studies of High Temperature Superconductors*, edited by A.V. Narlikar, (Nova Publishers, Commack, NY, 2002) Vol. 38, p. 179.  
 [26] C.P. Moca, *Phys. Rev. B* 65, 132509 (2002).  
 [27] P.B. Allen and R.C. Dynes, *Phys. Rev. B* 12, 905 (1975).  
 [28] P.B. Allen and B. Mitrovic, in *Solid State Physics*, edited by H. Ehrenreich, F. Seitz, and D. Turnbull (Academic, New York, 1982) Vol. 37, p. 1.  
 [29] E.J. Nicol, J.P. Carbotte, and T. Timusk, *Phys. Rev. B* 43, 473 (1991).  
 [30] K. Watanabe and T. Kita, *cond-mat/0401410*  
 [31] T.M. Mishonov, E.S. Penev, J.O. Indekeu, and V.L. Pokrovsky, *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 104517 (2003).  
 [32] B. Mitrovic, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 38, 451 (2004).  
 [33] A.A. Golubov and I.I. Mazin, *Phys. Rev. B* 55, 15146 (1997).  
 [34] B. Mitrovic, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 16, 9013 (2004).  
 [35] E. Schachinger, J.M. Damasceno, and J.P. Carbotte, *Phys. Rev. B* 22, 3194 (1980).  
 [36] B. Mitrovic, H.G. Zarate, and J.P. Carbotte, *Phys. Rev. B* 29, 184 (1984).  
 [37] J. Wei, private communication.  
 [38] M. Iavarone, G. Karapetrov, A.E. Koshelev, W.K. Kwok, G.W. Crabtree, D.G. Hinks, W.N. Kang, Eun-Mi Choi, Hyun Jung Kim, Hyeon-Jin Kim, and S.I. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 187002 (2002).  
 [39] F. Marsiglio and J.P. Carbotte, *Phys. Rev. B* 33, 6141 (1986).  
 [40] F. Bouquet, R.A. Fisher, N.E. Phillips, D.G. Hinks, and J.D. Jorgensen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 047001 (2001).  
 [41] R.S. Gonnelli, D. Daghero, G.A. Ummarino, V.A. Stepanov, J. Jun, S.M. Kazakov, and J. Karpinski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 247004 (2002).  
 [42] P. Szabo, P. Samuely, J. Kacmarcik, T. Klein, J. Marcus, D. Fruchart, S.M. Iraglia, C. Marcat, and A.G.M. Jansen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 137005 (2001).  
 [43] M. Putti, M. Aronste, P. Manfrinetti, and A. Palenzona, *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 094514 (2003).  
 [44] F. Giubileo, D. Rodichev, W. Sacks, R. Lam, D.X. Thanh, J. Klein, S.M. Iraglia, D. Fruchart, J. Marcus, Ph. Monod, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 177008 (2001).  
 [45] H. Schmidt, J.F. Zasadzinski, K.E. Gray, and D.G. Hinks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 127002 (2002).

- [46] F. Bouquet, Y. Wang, R.A. Fischer, D.G. Hinks, J.D. Jorgensen, A. Junod, and N.E. Phillips, *Europhys. Lett.* **56**, 856 (2001).
- [47] H.D. Yang, J.-Y. Lin, H.H. Li, F.H. Hsu, C.J. Liu, S.-C. Li, R.-C. Yu, and C.-Q. Jin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 167003 (2001).
- [48] B. Kang, H.-J. Kim, M.-S. Park, K.-H. Kim, and S.-I. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 144514 (2004).
- [49] F. Manzano, A. Carrington, N.E. Hussey, S. Lee, A. Yamamoto, and S. Tajima, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 047002 (2002).
- [50] B.B. Jin, N. Klein, W.N. Kang, H.-J. Kim, E.-M. Choi, S.-I. Lee, T. Dahm, and K. Maki, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 104521 (2002).
- [51] Ch. Niedermayer, C. Bernhard, T. Holden, R.K. Krenner, and K. Ahn, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 094512 (2002).
- [52] Note that in implementing the model with a finite  $\omega_{ij}$ , in principle, one cannot use the same  $\omega_{ij}$  as those used in the Eliashberg calculation as the Eliashberg  $\omega_{ij}$  depend on the high frequency cutoff  $\omega_c$ , which is 750 meV in our calculations. The model is based on modeling the frequency dependent gap function by a constant up to some cutoff which is on the scale of the phonon energies. Typically, an appropriate cutoff might be the maximum phonon frequency or the frequency beyond which the phonon spectrum suddenly drops to small values, as this will be reflected in the gap function by a sudden drop with the gap function going negative. Thus, to maximize the effectiveness of this approximation to mimic the behaviour of the gap function, one might use  $\omega_c = 75 \text{ meV}$  (as has Mitrovic[34]) as a major peak in the phonon spectra occurs at this energy, after which it drops to small values. The new  $\omega_{ij}(\omega_c)$  for the RBCS calculations would then be found from the matrix equation:  $\omega_{ij}(\omega_c) = [\omega_{ij} + \omega_{ij}(\omega_c) \ln(\omega_{ij}/\omega_c)]^{-1} \omega_{ij}(\omega_c)$  [34]. For simplicity, we have used the Eliashberg  $\omega_{ij}$ 's in our calculations for Table I, as we have found that for varying  $\omega_c$ , the values do not change very much and hardly at all in some cases, and our goal is only to provide a rough estimate of the strong coupling corrections in relation to RBCS.
- [53] S.C. Erwin and I.I. Mazin, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 132505 (2003).
- [54] R.S. Gonnelli, D. Daghero, G.A. Ummarino, A. Calzolari, Valeria Dellaroca, V.A. Stepanov, S.M. Kazakov, J. Jun and J. Karpinski, *cond-mat/0407267*; *ibid cond-mat/0407265*
- [55] G.A. Ummarino, R.S. Gonnelli, S. Massidda, and A. Bianconi, *Physica C* **407**, 121 (2004).
- [56] V. Guritanu, W. Goldacker, F. Bouquet, Y. Wang, R. Lortz, G. Doll, and A. Junod, *cond-mat/0403590*
- [57] E. Boaknin, M.A. Tanatar, J. Paglione, D.G. Hawthorn, R.W. Hill, F. Ronning, M. Sutherland, L. Taillefer, J. Sonier, S.M. Hayden, and J.W. Brill, *cond-mat/0304499*
- [58] I.A. Sergienko, *cond-mat/0406527*
- [59] M.A. Tanatar et al, private communication
- [60] A.P. Mackenzie and Y. Maeno, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 657 (2003).