Transitions in Zr, Hf, Ta, W, Re, Hg, Ac, and U ions with high sensitivity to variation of the fine-structure constant

J. C. Berengut, V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum

School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales 2052, Australia (Received 22 September 2011; published 21 November 2011)

We study transitions between ground and low-energy excited states of heavy ions corresponding to *s*-*d* single-electron transitions or s^2 - d^2 double-electron transitions. The large nuclear charge Z and significant change in angular momentum of electron orbitals make these transitions highly sensitive to a potential variation in the fine-structure constant α . The transitions may be considered as candidates for laboratory searches for space-time variation of α .

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevA.84.054501

PACS number(s): 31.30.J-, 32.30.Jc, 06.30.Ft, 31.15.am

I. INTRODUCTION

Theories unifying gravity with other interactions suggest that the fundamental constants of nature may vary over space and time (see, e.g., the review in Ref. [1]). Indications that the fine-structure constant $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c$ might change over cosmological scales have been found in quasar absorption spectra [2–7]. The most recent analysis of around 300 quasar absorption spectra taken from Keck and VLT telescopes is consistent with a smooth spatial gradient in the values of α along a particular direction in space [8]. This so-called Australian dipole reconciles all existing astrophysical and laboratory (null) measurements [9] (see also Ref. [10]).

Since the solar system (and the Earth within it) moves with respect to the frame of the gradient, the values of α on Earth should change as we move from regions of space with smaller α to regions with larger values. Thus the spatial variation of α may be studied using laboratory experiments that measure the change of α in time [11]. A number of such experiments have already been performed and reported (see, e.g. the review in Ref. [12]). The best current limit $\dot{\alpha}/\alpha = (-1.6 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-17} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ comes from a comparison of Hg⁺ and Al⁺ optical clocks over the course of a year [13]. This limit is better than that obtained from quasar absorption spectra if one assumes a linear time variation of α over ~10¹⁰-yr time scales. However, it needs to be further improved by two or three orders of magnitude to test the Australian dipole hypothesis [11]. One way of achieving this is to find an atomic system where the spectra are significantly more sensitive to the change of α than in the Hg⁺-Al⁺ system.

In our first paper on this subject [14] we suggested using *s*-*d* optical transitions in heavy atoms and ions. The sensitivity of these transitions to a variation of α is great. This is exactly what was used in the Hg⁺-Al⁺ experiment [13].

A number of other atomic transitions have been found where the sensitivity of the frequencies of the transitions to the variation of the fine-structure constant is even higher. These include close, long-lived states of different configurations [14–16], fine-structure anomalies [17], and optical transitions in highly charged ions [18,19]. The nearly degenerate excited states of dysprosium have already been used to place strong limits on terrestrial α variation [20–22]. In present Brief Report we further study the original idea of using the *s*-*d* and *s*-*f* transitions in heavy ions. We consider a number of ions and find many transitions that are as good as or even better than that used in Hg⁺. Results for ions with one valence electron above closed shells are presented in Sec. II A; these are Tm-like Ta⁴⁺, W⁵⁺, and Re⁶⁺ and Fr-like Ac²⁺ and U⁵⁺. In Sec. II B we study ions with two electrons above closed shells: Sr-like Zr²⁺, Yb-like Hf²⁺, and Ra-like Ac⁺. Finally, in Sec. II C we consider the Hg²⁺ and Hg³⁺ mercury ions, which have closed shells and single-hole electronic structures, respectively. In all cases we have chosen ions with relatively low-energy transitions so that they may be within the range of lasers—an important criterion for potential clocks.

II. CALCULATIONS

The dependence of atomic frequencies on the fine-structure constant appears due to relativistic corrections. In the vicinity of its present laboratory value $\alpha_0 \approx 1/137$ it is presented in the form

$$\omega(x) = \omega_0 + qx,\tag{1}$$

where ω_0 is the laboratory value of the frequency, $x = (\alpha/\alpha_0)^2 - 1$, and q is the sensitivity coefficient, which must be found from atomic calculations:

$$q = \frac{d\omega}{dx}\Big|_{x=0} \approx \frac{\omega(\delta x) - \omega(-\delta x)}{2\delta x}.$$
 (2)

Here δx must be small enough to exclude terms non-linear in $\delta(\alpha^2)$, yet should be large enough to ensure numerical stability. In the present calculations we use $\delta x = 0.01$.

For all atoms we start the calculations from the relativistic Hartree-Fock method. Techniques to include correlations depend on atomic structure and we will discuss them in the relevant sections.

It is worth noting that the Breit interaction is not an important contribution to the relativistic shift for the heavy atoms that we consider. As an example, we have calculated the effect of the Breit interaction on the $5d_{3/2}$ - $5d_{5/2}$ and $5d_{3/2}$ - $6s_{1/2}$ transitions in Ta⁴⁺: The *q* values change by 2% and 0.5%, respectively. This is consistent with previous work in light atoms ($Z \leq 30$) [23,24], where in all cases the effect of Breit interaction is found to contribute less than 10% (and usually much less than this). Extrapolating to heavy atoms, the

TABLE I. Energies and sensitivity coefficients q for the isoelectronic sequence Ta⁴⁺, W⁵⁺, and Re⁶⁺ (cm⁻¹).

Ion			Energy		
	Ζ	Level	Experiment	Theory	q
Ta ⁴⁺	73	$5d_{3/2}$	0	0	0
		$5d_{5/2}$	6608 ^a	5833	5161
		$6s_{1/2}$	47052 ^a	44812	-30931
W ⁵⁺	74	$5d_{3/2}$	0	0	0
		$5d_{5/2}$	8707 ^b	7981	7292
		$6s_{1/2}$	79433 ^b	77293	-38423
Re ⁶⁺	75	$5d_{3/2}$	0	0	0
		$5d_{5/2}$	10996 [°]	10410	9626
		$6s_{1/2}$	115066 ^c	112575	-46470

^aReference [27].

^bReference [28].

^cReference [29].

relativistic corrections scale as Z^2 , while the Breit interaction scales more like $\sim Z$. Therefore, the contribution of the Breit interaction to relativistic effects scales as $\sim 1/Z$ and it may be safely neglected in our calculations.

A. Ta v, W vi, Re vii, Ac iii, and U vi

These ions have one external electron above closed shells. We use the correlation potential method [25] in the V^{N-1} approximation to perform the calculations. The initial Hartree-Fock procedure is done for a closed-shell ion, with the external electron removed. States of the external electron are calculated in the field of the frozen core. Correlations are included with the use of the second-order correlation potential $\hat{\Sigma}$.

We use the *B*-spline technique [26] to generate a complete set of single-electron states that are needed for the calculation of $\hat{\Sigma}$. These states are the eigenstates of the relativistic Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 with the \hat{V}^{N-1} electron potential. We use 50 *B* splines of order 9 in a cavity of radius $40a_B$. Energies for the valence states ϵ_v are found by solving the Brueckner orbital equations for external electrons

$$(\hat{H}_0 + \hat{\Sigma} - \epsilon_v)\psi_v = 0.$$
(3)

TABLE II. Energy levels and sensitivity coefficients q for Ac^{2+} (cm⁻¹).

	Energ	у	
Level	Experiment ^a	Theory	q
$7s_{1/2}$	0	0	0
$6d_{3/2}$	801	1582	27297
$6d_{5/2}$	4204	5449	30230
$5 f_{5/2}$	23455	21698	56170
$5 f_{7/2}$	26080	24845	57324
$7p_{1/2}$	29466	30542	6861
$7p_{3/2}$	38063	39550	19118

^aReference [30].

TABLE III. Calculated energy levels and sensitivity coefficients q for U⁵⁺ (cm⁻¹).

Level	Energy	q
$5f_{5/2}$	0	0
$5 f_{7/2}$	6960	4687
$6d_{3/2}$	76173	-52900
$6d_{5/2}$	84683	-46300
$7s_{1/2}$	123368	-110355
$7p_{1/2}$	173761	
$7p_{3/2}$	195351	

The results for Yb⁺-like tantalum, tungsten, and rhenium and for Fr-like actinium and uranium are presented in Tables I, II, and III. All these ions have *s*-*d* or *s*-*f* transitions with large *q*-coefficients. Most of the states with large *q*-coefficients are metastable states. Large q-coefficients can be either positive or negative, which can be used to further improve the sensitivity of the frequency shift measurements to the time variation of α . One of the most interesting system is U⁵⁺, where the q coefficient for the frequency of the transition from the ground $5 f_{5/2}$ state to the metastable 7s state is very large ($q \sim -10^5$) and negative. The ratio of this frequency to the fine-structure interval in the ground state (where q is positive) is very sensitive to the variation of α . While such high energies are outside the range of normal optical lasers, they can potentially be reached using high-UV lasers such as those that employ high-harmonic generation [31]. Table III also shows calculated energies of the $7p_{1/2}$ and $7p_{3/2}$ states. It is useful to know their positions to make sure that the 6d and 7s states are metastable. To the best of our knowledge the experimental data on the energy levels of U^{5+} is absent.

B. Zr III, Hf III, and Ac II

These ions have two external electrons above closed shells. Energies of the *s* and *d* valence states are close to each other, which means that states of the s^2 and d^2 configurations should be close as well. Frequencies of the transitions between states of these configurations are expected to be more sensitive to the variation of α compared to the single-electron *s*-*d* transitions.

TABLE IV. Energy levels and sensitivity coefficients q for Zr^{2+} (cm⁻¹).

		Energ	q	
Level		Experiment ^a		Theory
$4d^2$	${}^{3}F_{2}$	0	0	0
4 <i>d</i> 5 <i>s</i>	${}^{3}D_{1}$	18399	18554	-6018
	${}^{3}D_{2}$	18803	18988	-5637
	${}^{3}D_{3}$	19533	19764	-4860
4d5s	${}^{1}D_{2}$	25066	26188	-4025
5 <i>s</i> ²	${}^{1}S_{0}$	48507	49297	-11000

^aReference [37].

TABLE V. Energy levels and sensitivity coefficients q for Hf^{2+} (cm⁻¹).

Leading configurations	Level	Energy	q
$\overline{5d^2}$	${}^{3}F_{2}$	0	0
	${}^{3}\bar{F_{3}}$	3558	5200
	${}^{3}F_{4}$	6652	7700
5d6s	${}^{3}D_{1}$	2652	-19600
	${}^{3}D_{2}$	3121	-14600
	${}^{3}D_{3}$	7112	-15500
55% 5d6s	${}^{1}D_{2}$	6124	-6700
$68\% 5d^2$, $30\% 6s^2$	${}^{3}P_{0}$	8775	-13500
$43\% 5d^2$, 55% $6s^2$	${}^{1}S_{0}$	11403	-19800
$5d^2$	${}^{3}P_{1}$	11345	5100
	${}^{3}P_{2}$	12995	4400
$5d^2$	${}^{1}G_{4}$	16151	6200
$79\% 5d^2$, 13% $6s^2$	$^{1}S_{0}$	33745	400

For calculations we use the configuration-interaction plus many-body perturbation theory method developed in our previous works [32–36]. Calculations are done in the V^{N-2} approximation with two valence electrons removed from the initial Hartree-Fock procedure. Basis states for valence electrons are calculated in the field of the frozen core. The configuration-interaction technique is used to construct two-electron states of valence electrons. Core-valence correlations are included by means of the many-body perturbation theory. The *B*-spline technique [26] is used to calculate basis states for valence electrons and to calculate the core-valence correlation operator $\hat{\Sigma}$.

The results are presented in Tables IV, V, and VI. The results for Zr^{2+} and Ac^+ show that the *q* coefficients for the d^2 - s^2 transition are indeed about two times larger than for the *d*-*s* transitions. It is natural to expect larger values of *q* for Hf²⁺ than for Zr²⁺ due to larger *Z*. It turns out, however, that Hf²⁺ has no states of pure $6s^2$ configuration: There is strong mixing between the $6s^2$ and $5d^2$ configurations and

TABLE VI. Energy levels and sensitivity coefficients q for Ac⁺ (cm⁻¹).

		Energ	q	
Level		Experiment ^a		Theory
$7s^2$	${}^{1}S_{0}$	0	0	0
6d7s	${}^{3}D_{1}$	4740	5460	22640
	${}^{3}D_{2}$	5267	6083	22989
	${}^{3}D_{3}$	7427	8514	24269
6d7s	${}^{1}D_{2}$	9087	10385	30346
$6d^2$	${}^{3}F_{2}$	13236	14639	44520
	${}^{3}F_{3}$	14949	16552	47073
	${}^{3}F_{4}$	16757	18646	48178
6 <i>d</i> ²	${}^{3}P_{0}$	17737	19204	44922
	${}^{3}P_{1}$	19015	20649	47038
	${}^{3}P_{2}$	22199	21132	45884

^aReference [30].

TABLE VII. Energy levels and sensitivity coefficients q for Hg^{2+} (cm⁻¹).

		Energy		
Level		Experiment ^a	Theory	q
$5d^{10}$	${}^{1}S_{0}$	0	0	0
$5d^{9}6s$	${}^{3}D_{3}$	42850	42191	-54800
	${}^{3}D_{2}$	46029	45920	-52900
	${}^{3}D_{1}^{-}$	58405	58500	-39600
5d ⁹ 6s	${}^{1}D_{2}$	61085	61835	-39900
$5d^86s^2$	${}^{3}F_{4}$	97893	97719	-114600

^aReference [30].

the weight of the $6s^2$ configuration does not exceed 55% (see Table V). This affects the values of q. They are not as large as they would be for the pure $6s^2$ case. Note also that there is no experimental data on the spectrum of Hf²⁺.

The largest *q*-coefficients among these three ions are for the Ac^+ (Table VI). This ion has excited metastable states of the $6d^2$ configuration while the ground state is practically pure $7s^2$ configuration.

C. Hg III and Hg IV

Finally, we consider the Hg^{2+} and Hg^{3+} ions. Here additional enhancement is expected due to excitations of the electrons from the (almost) filled 5*d* subshell. The effective nuclear charge for electrons in almost filled many-electron subshells is higher than for valence electrons outside the closed shells. Therefore, relativistic effects are larger and the *q* coefficients are larger too [19].

These ions have ten (Hg^{2+}) and nine (Hg^{3+}) external electrons. For the calculations we use the method especially developed for the many-electron cases in Refs. [38,39]. The results are presented in Tables VII and VIII. Here again we

TABLE VIII. Energy levels and sensitivity coefficients q for Hg³⁺ (cm⁻¹).

		Energy		q
Level		Experiment ^a	Theory	
$5d^{9}$	${}^{2}D_{5/2}$	0	0	0
	${}^{2}D_{3/2}$	15685	16140	14700
$5d^{8}6s$	${}^{4}F_{9/2}$	60138	59370	-63100
	${}^{4}F_{7/2}$	66109	66206	-58600
	${}^{4}F_{5/2}$	69942	71809	-60900
	${}^{4}F_{3/2}$	71763	73365	-58500
$5d^{8}6s$	${}^{2}F_{7/2}$	78854	79805	-47800
	${}^{2}F_{5/2}$	77675	78337	-48800
$5d^{8}6s$	$^{4}P_{5/2}$	86031	88669	-45700
	${}^{4}P_{3/2}$	83916	86568	-47600
	${}^{4}P_{1/2}$	82391	86501	-56100
$5d^{7}6s^{2}$	${}^{4}F_{5/2}$		145120	-130300

^aReferences [40,41].

see that the value of the q coefficient for double d-s transition is about two times larger than for single d-s transition. The value of q for these transitions is very large, $q \sim -10^5$, and the corresponding states are metastable.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council and the NCI National Facility.

- J.-P. Uzan, Rev. Mod. Phys. 75, 403 (2003); Living Rev. Relativity 14, 2 (2011).
- [2] J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, C. W. Churchill, M. J. Drinkwater, and J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 884 (1999).
- [3] J. K. Webb, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, V. A. Dzuba, J. D. Barrow, C. W. Churchill, J. X. Prochaska, and A. M. Wolfe, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 091301 (2001).
- [4] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, V. A. Dzuba, C. W. Churchill, J. X. Prochaska, J. D. Barrow, and A. M. Wolfe, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 327, 1208 (2001).
- [5] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, C. W. Churchill, and J. X. Prochaska, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 327, 1223 (2001).
- [6] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, C. W. Churchill, and J. X. Prochaska, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 327, 1237 (2001).
- [7] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, M. J. Drinkwater, F. Combes, and T. Wiklind, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 327, 1244 (2001).
- [8] J. K. Webb, J. A. King, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, R. F. Carswell, and M. B. Bainbridge, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 191101 (2011).
- [9] J. C. Berengut and V. V. Flambaum, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 264, 012010 (2011).
- [10] J. C. Berengut, V. V. Flambaum, J. A. King, S. J. Curran, and J. K. Webb, Phys. Rev. D 83, 123506 (2011).
- [11] J. C. Berengut and V. V. Flambaum, e-print arXiv:1008.3957 (2010).
- [12] V. V. Flambaum and V. A. Dzuba, Can. J. Phys. 87, 25 (2009).
- [13] T. Rosenband *et al.*, Science **319**, 1808 (2008).
- [14] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and J. K. Webb, Phys. Rev. Lett.
 82, 888 (1999); Phys. Rev. A 59, 230 (1999).
- [15] E. J. Angstmann, V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, A. Yu. Nevsky, and S. G. Karshenboim, J. Phys. B 39, 1937 (2006).
- [16] V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A 77, 012515 (2008).
- [17] V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A 72, 052514 (2005).
- [18] J. C. Berengut, V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 120801 (2010).
- [19] J. C. Berengut, V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and A. Ong, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 210802 (2011).
- [20] A.-T. Nguyen, D. Budker, S. K. Lamoreaux, and J. R. Torgerson, Phys. Rev. A 69, 022105 (2004).

- [21] A. Cingöz, A. Lapierre, A.-T. Nguyen, N. Leefer, D. Budker, S. K. Lamoreaux, and J. R. Torgerson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 040801 (2007).
- [22] S. J. Ferrell, A. Cingöz, A. Lapierre, A.-T. Nguyen, N. Leefer, D. Budker, V. V. Flambaum, S. K. Lamoreaux, and J. R. Torgerson, Phys. Rev. A 76, 062104 (2007).
- [23] I. M. Savukov and V. A. Dzuba, Phys. Rev. A 77, 042501 (2008).
- [24] S. G. Porsev, K. V. Koshelev, I. I. Tupitsyn, M. G. Kozlov, D. Reimers, and S. A. Levshakov, Phys. Rev. A 76, 052507 (2007).
- [25] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, P. G. Silvestrov, and O. P. Sushkov, J. Phys. B 20, 1399 (1987).
- [26] W. R. Johnson and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 1126 (1986).
- [27] F. G. Meijer and P. F. A. Klinkenberg, Physica 69, 111 (1973).
- [28] F. G. Meijer, Physica 74, 415 (1974).
- [29] F. G. Meijer, Physica 81C, 189 (1976).
- [30] C. E. Moore, *Atomic Energy Levels*, Natl. Bur. Stand. (US) Circ. No. 467 (US GPO, Washington, DC, 1958), Vol. III.
- [31] A. Cingöz, D. C. Yost, T. K. Allison, A. Ruehl, M. E. Fermann, I. Hartl, and J. Ye, e-print arXiv:1109.1871.
- [32] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and M. G. Kozlov, Phys. Rev. A 54, 3948 (1996).
- [33] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and M. G. Kozlov, JETP Lett. **63**, 882 (1996).
- [34] V. A. Dzuba and W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A 57, 2459 (1998).
- [35] V. A. Dzuba, Phys. Rev. A 71, 032512 (2005).
- [36] V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 052504 (2007).
- [37] Yu. Ralchenko, A. E. Kramida, J. Reader, and NIST ASD Team, NIST Atomic Spectra Database (version 4.0.1) http://physics.nist.gov/asd (National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, 2010).
- [38] V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A 77, 012514 (2008).
- [39] V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A 77, 012515 (2008).
- [40] Y. N. Joshi, A. J. J. Raassen, and B. Arcimowicz, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B 6, 534 (1989).
- [41] A. A. van der Valk, A. J. J. Raassen, and Y. N. Joshi, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B 7, 1182 (1990).