

Parity nonconservation in Fr-like actinide and Cs-like rare-earth ions

B. M. Roberts,* V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum

School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

(Dated: November 20, 2018)

Parity nonconservation amplitudes are calculated for the $7s-6d_{3/2}$ transitions of the francium isoelectronic sequence (Fr, Ra^+ , Ac^{2+} , Th^{3+} , Pa^{4+} , U^{5+} and Np^{6+}) and for the $6s-5d_{3/2}$ transitions of the cesium isoelectronic sequence (Cs, Ba^+ , La^{2+} , Ce^{3+} and Pr^{4+}). We show in particular that isotopes of La^{2+} , Ac^{2+} and Th^{3+} ions have strong potential in the search for new physics beyond the standard model – the PNC amplitudes are large, the calculations are accurate and the nuclei are practically stable. In addition, $^{232}Th^{3+}$ ions have recently been trapped and cooled [C. J. Campbell *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 233004 (2009)]. We also extend previous works by calculating the $s-s$ PNC transitions in Ra^+ and Ba^+ , and provide new calculations of several energy levels, and electric dipole and quadrupole transition amplitudes for the Fr-like actinide ions.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 31.15.A-, 31.30.jg

I. INTRODUCTION

The parity nonconservation (PNC) amplitude of the $6s-7s$ transition in cesium is presently the most precise low-energy test of the electroweak theory. This precision is a result of highly accurate measurements [1] and the almost equally accurate atomic calculations used for their interpretation [2–5]. This interpretation shows that the value of the weak nuclear charge for ^{133}Cs , coming from the PNC measurements, differs from the prediction of the standard model by 1.6σ [2, 6]. Although this cannot be regarded as disagreement, it indicates that further improvements to the accuracy of the measurements and interpretation may lead to new important results.

Additionally, the need for new measurements is motivated by the requirement to check the existing results. It is very important that an independent test of the existing experimental results [1] is performed. These are very important results and must be checked even if the accuracy is not improved. Moreover, there is a good chance for both theoretical and experimental improvement since the PNC amplitudes of these systems are up to 50 times larger than in Cs.

It is natural to expect a higher accuracy in measurements of systems where the PNC effect is larger. On the other hand, for high accuracy of the calculations it is important to have systems with a simple electron structure. The $s-d$ transitions in the Fr-like ions considered in this paper seem to be very promising in this regard. The PNC amplitude is larger for atoms or ions with higher nuclear charge Z [7]. It is also larger for the $s-d$ transitions [8] than for the $s-s$ transitions like the one used in cesium [2]. The accuracy of these calculations is also expected to be high since the ions have simple electron structure with one valence electron above closed shells similar to that of cesium.

There are several additional factors which promise potentially better theoretical accuracy for these ions than for Cs:

- The main source of theoretical uncertainty is electron correlations. The relative value of the correlation correction is smaller for ions than for neutral atoms.
- There are no strong cancellations between different correlation corrections for $s-d$ PNC amplitudes [8] in contrast to very strong cancellation for the $6s-7s$ PNC amplitude in Cs.
- The $s-d$ PNC amplitude is strongly dominated by the term with the $d-p$ electric dipole transition amplitude and $s-p$ weak matrix element. This term can be checked and/or corrected if an accurate experimental value for the $d-p$ amplitude is known. A similar approach in Cs works with limited accuracy due to strong cancellation between $6s-np$ and $7s-np$ contributions.

PNC measurements have been considered for the Ba^+ ion [9] and are in progress for the Ra^+ ion [10]. The FrPNC collaboration has begun the construction of a laser cooling and trapping apparatus with the purpose of measuring atomic parity nonconservation in microwave and optical transitions of francium [11]. With a PNC amplitude in the $7s-8s$ optical transition expected to be around 15 times larger than that of cesium, and its relatively simple electronic configuration, francium is a very good candidate atom for precision measurements and calculations of PNC [8, 12, 13].

With the aim of motivating experiment in this important area, we present calculations of $s-s$ and $s-d$ PNC amplitudes for several Cs- and Fr-like ions. Simple estimates show that the size of the PNC effect should scale as $E_{PNC} \sim Z^3 R(Z\alpha) / Z_a$, where R is a relativistic factor, Z is nuclear charge and Z_a is the effective charge defined as $E_n = -Z_a^2 / 2n^2$ atomic units [14]. Here, E_n is the energy of valence electron, n the principal quantum

* b.roberts@unsw.edu.au

number ($n = 7$ for Fr-like ions). Therefore PNC effects in these ions are only slightly smaller than in neutral atoms.

Of particular interest are the optical s - d PNC transitions of $^{232}\text{Th}^{3+}$ and $^{139}\text{La}^{2+}$, and the IR transition in $^{227}\text{Ac}^{2+}$. ^{232}Th has a half-life of 1.5×10^{10} years and ^{227}Ac of 21.8 years, much more stable than Fr with its most stable isotope (^{223}Fr) having a half-life of just 22 minutes. $^{139}\text{La}^{2+}$ is stable. Importantly, the $^{232}\text{Th}^{3+}$ ion has been trapped and cooled by Campbell *et al.* [15]. This was the first reported laser cooling of a multiply charged ion.

The experiment needed to measure the $7s$ - $6d_{3/2}$ PNC amplitude in Th^{3+} is somewhat different to the conventional PNC experiments. Neither of the states of interest are the ground state and the PNC amplitude must be reached by first populating the metastable $7s$ state. This is explored in more detail in the later sections. Ac^{2+} maintains a $7s$ ground state, and has a very long lived $6d_{3/2}$ state, which is highly beneficial for PNC measurements [9].

^{227}Ac and the odd-nucleon isotope ^{229}Th (with a half-life of 7340 years) will also be of interest for measurements of nuclear-spin-dependent PNC in optical or hyperfine transitions, including the extraction of the nuclear anapole moment and the strength of the PNC nuclear forces (see, e.g. [16]).

II. CALCULATIONS

The PNC amplitude of a transition between states a and b of the same parity can be expressed via the sum over opposite parity states n ,

$$E_{\text{PNC}} = \sum_n \left[\frac{\langle b | \hat{d}_{E1} | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{h}_W | a \rangle}{E_a - E_n} + \frac{\langle b | \hat{h}_W | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{d}_{E1} | a \rangle}{E_b - E_n} \right], \quad (1)$$

where a , b , and n are many-electron wave functions of the atom, \hat{d}_{E1} is the electric dipole transition operator and $\hat{h}_W = \frac{G_F}{2\sqrt{2}} Q_W \rho(r) \gamma_5$ is the nuclear-spin-independent PNC interaction (G_F the Fermi constant, Q_W is the nuclear weak charge, ρ the nucleon density and the Dirac matrix $\gamma_5 = i\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$).

The exact expression (1) can be reduced to an approximate one which looks very similar but contains single-electron matrix elements and energies. This serves as a base for the *sum-over-states* calculations. Many-body effects are included in this approach by modifying single-electron orbitals and the external field operators. We use this approach for tests only. The actual calculations are done using a different approach based on solving differential equations. This approach has many important advantages which will be discussed below.

We start from the mean-field Dirac-Fock approximation with a V^{N-1} potential, which is particularly convenient for the single valence electron ions studied here, and then include dominating electron correlation effects. Core-valence correlation corrections to the valence elec-

tron wavefunction are included via the correlation potential method [17]. The correlation potential, $\hat{\Sigma}$, including summation of the series of dominating diagrams, is calculated in all orders of perturbation theory using relativistic Green functions and the Feynman diagram technique [18]. The correlation potential $\hat{\Sigma}$ is then used to construct the so-called *Brueckner orbitals* (BOs) for the valence electron. The BOs are found by solving the relativistic Hartree-Fock-like equations with the extra operator $\hat{\Sigma}$: $(\hat{H}_0 + \hat{\Sigma} - E_n)\psi_n^{(\text{BO})} = 0$, where \hat{H}_0 is the relativistic Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian and the index n denotes valence states. The BO $\psi_n^{(\text{BO})}$ and energy E_n include correlations.

The weak and electric dipole interactions and the electron core polarization effects are included via the time-dependent Hartree-Fock approximation [17, 18], which is equivalent to the well-known random phase approximation (RPA). The single-electron wavefunction in an external weak and $E1$ field is expressed in the RPA method as $\psi = \psi_0 + \delta\psi + Xe^{-i\omega t} + Ye^{i\omega t} + \delta Xe^{-i\omega t} + \delta Y e^{i\omega t}$, where ψ_0 is the unperturbed state, $\delta\psi$ is the correction due to weak interaction acting alone, X and Y are corrections due to the photon field acting alone, δX and δY are corrections due to both fields acting simultaneously, and ω is the frequency of the PNC transition. Where possible, ω should be taken from the experimental energy of the transition. The corrections are found by solving the system of RPA equations self-consistently for the core:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{H}_0 - E_c)\delta\psi_c &= -(\hat{h}_W + \delta\hat{V}_W)\psi_{0c}, \\ (\hat{H}_0 - E_c - \omega)X_c &= -(\hat{d}_{E1} + \delta\hat{V}_{E1})\psi_{0c}, \\ (\hat{H}_0 - E_c + \omega)Y_c &= -(\hat{d}_{E1}^\dagger + \delta\hat{V}_{E1}^\dagger)\psi_{0c}, \\ (\hat{H}_0 - E_c - \omega)\delta X_c &= -\delta\hat{V}_{E1}\delta\psi_c - \delta\hat{V}_W X_c - \delta\hat{V}_{E1W}\psi_{0c}, \\ (\hat{H}_0 - E_c + \omega)\delta Y_c &= -\delta\hat{V}_{E1}^\dagger\delta\psi_c - \delta\hat{V}_W Y_c - \delta\hat{V}_{E1W}^\dagger\psi_{0c}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the index c denotes core states, $\delta\hat{V}_W$ and $\delta\hat{V}_{E1}$ are corrections to the core potential arising from the weak and $E1$ interactions respectively and $\delta\hat{V}_{E1W}$ is the correction to the core potential arising from the simultaneous perturbation of the weak field and the electric field of the laser light.

The PNC amplitude between valence states a and b in the RPA approximation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\text{PNC}} &= \langle \psi_b | \hat{d}_{E1} + \delta\hat{V}_{E1} | \delta\psi_a \rangle + \langle \psi_b | \hat{h}_W + \delta\hat{V}_W | X_a \rangle \\ &+ \langle \psi_b | \delta\hat{V}_{E1W} | \psi_a \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_b | \hat{d}_{E1} + \delta\hat{V}_{E1} | \delta\psi_a \rangle + \langle \delta\psi_b | \hat{d}_{E1} + \delta\hat{V}_{E1} | \psi_a \rangle \\ &+ \langle \psi_b | \delta\hat{V}_{E1W} | \psi_a \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

By using BOs for the valence states ψ_a and ψ_b in (3) we can include correlations in the calculation of the PNC amplitude. The corrections $\delta\psi_a$ and $\delta\psi_b$ to the BOs ψ_a and ψ_b are also found with the use of the correlation potential $\hat{\Sigma}$:

$$(\hat{H}_0 - E_a + \hat{\Sigma})\delta\psi_a = -(\hat{h}_W + \delta\hat{V})\psi_{0a}. \quad (4)$$

TABLE I. Comparison of calculated energy levels (BO) and experimental values (Ref. [19]) for Cs, Ba⁺, Fr and Ra⁺. (cm⁻¹)

Level	Cs		Ba ⁺		Fr		Ra ⁺				
	BO	Exp.	BO	Exp.	BO	Exp.	BO	Exp.			
6s _{1/2}	0	0	6s _{1/2}	0	0	7s _{1/2}	0	0	7s _{1/2}	0	0
6p _{1/2}	11168	11178	5d _{3/2}	4280	4874	7p _{1/2}	12218	12237	6d _{3/2}	11741	12084
6p _{3/2}	11736	11732	5d _{5/2}	5128	5675	7p _{3/2}	13954	13924	6d _{5/2}	13471	13743
5d _{3/2}	14310	14499	6p _{1/2}	20234	20262	6d _{3/2}	16200	16230	7p _{1/2}	21291	21351
5d _{5/2}	14426	14597	6p _{3/2}	21960	21952	6d _{5/2}	16412	16430	7p _{3/2}	26259	26209
7s _{1/2}	18631	18536	7s _{1/2}	42647	42355	8s _{1/2}	19862	19740	8s _{1/2}	43757	43405
7p _{1/2}	21818	21765	6d _{3/2}	46234	45949	8p _{1/2}	23190	23113	7d _{3/2}	49082	48744
7p _{3/2}	22000	21946	6d _{5/2}	46438	46155	8p _{3/2}	23737	23658	5f _{5/2}	49254	48988
6d _{3/2}	22611	22589	4f _{5/2}	47829	48259	7d _{3/2}	24311	24244	7d _{5/2}	49485	49240
6d _{5/2}	22656	22632	4f _{7/2}	48219	48483	7d _{5/2}	24402	24333	5f _{7/2}	49569	49272
8s _{1/2}	24391	24317	7p _{1/2}	49595	49390	9s _{1/2}	25773	25671	8p _{1/2}	50864	50606
4f _{7/2}	24528	24472	7p _{3/2}	50213	50011	5f _{7/2}	25970	—	8p _{3/2}	52635	52392
4f _{5/2}	24528	24472	8s _{1/2}	58258	58025	5f _{5/2}	25971	—	9s _{1/2}	59448	59165
Lim.: ^a	31458	31406		80838	80686		32925	32849		82035	81842

^a Ionization energy of the ground-state valence electronTABLE II. Calculated energy levels (BO) for the francium-like actinide ions and available experimental data [20]. (cm⁻¹)

Level	Ac ²⁺		Th ³⁺		Pa ⁴⁺	U ⁵⁺		Np ⁶⁺		
	BO	Exp.	BO	Exp.	BO	BO	Exp.	BO		
7s _{1/2}	0	0	5f _{5/2}	0	0	5f _{5/2}	0	0	5f _{5/2}	0
6d _{3/2}	435	801	5f _{7/2}	4393	4325	5f _{7/2}	6061	7784	5f _{7/2}	9470
6d _{5/2}	3926	4204	6d _{3/2}	8681	9193	6d _{3/2}	48302	90713	6d _{3/2}	139415
5f _{5/2}	23467	23455	6d _{5/2}	14084	14486	6d _{5/2}	55753	100369	6d _{5/2}	151486
5f _{7/2}	26112	26080	7s _{1/2}	22948	23131	7s _{1/2}	79208	141157	7s _{1/2}	211402
7p _{1/2}	29375	29466	7p _{1/2}	59957	60239	7p _{1/2}	123396	193744	7p _{1/2}	273437
7p _{3/2}	38136	38063	7p _{3/2}	72995	73056	7p _{3/2}	141201	216937	7p _{3/2}	301680
8s _{1/2}	69660		8s _{1/2}	120357	119622	7d _{3/2}	201271	283289	6f _{5/2}	365542
7d _{3/2}	73543		7d _{3/2}	120907	119685	7d _{5/2}	203789	284244	6f _{7/2}	366832
7d _{5/2}	74579		7d _{5/2}	122622	121427	6f _{5/2}	203997	288691	7d _{3/2}	382067
8p _{1/2}	80612		8p _{1/2}	135196	134517	6f _{7/2}	204665	292124	7d _{5/2}	386532
6f _{5/2}	83166		8p _{3/2}	140536	139871	8s _{1/2}	205653	299566	8s _{1/2}	400640
6f _{7/2}	83513		9s _{1/2}	161461	160728	8p _{1/2}	224369	322245	8p _{1/2}	428393
Lim.:	141221	140590 ^a		232015	231065 ^a		363394	509109	500000 ^a	667359

^a Theoretical values: 140590(160), 231065(200), 500000(13000) [19]

TABLE III. Percentage difference between calculations and experiment for the most important energy intervals for PNC.

Energy Interval	Fr	Ra ⁺	Ac ²⁺	Th ³⁺
7s _{1/2} - 7p _{1/2}	-0.2%	-0.3%	-0.3%	-0.3%
7s _{1/2} - 8p _{1/2}	0.3%	0.5%	—	0.8%

Note that the last term in (3) gives an important contribution that is usually not included in sum-over-states calculations. It represents the *double core-polarization* by simultaneous action of two external fields; the electric field of laser light and weak electron-nucleus interaction.

This term is negligible for the 6s-7s PNC transition in Cs by chance only, and is very different for other atoms and transitions. It is 2% for the 6s-5d PNC transition of Cs, 5% for the 7s-6d transition in Ra⁺ and 40% for the 6p_{1/2}-6p_{3/2} transition in Tl. The last applies to the case when thallium is treated as a one-valence-electron

TABLE IV. Calculated ionisation energies (cm⁻¹) including ladder diagrams for La²⁺ and comparison with experiment.

Level	BO	Ladder	Sum	Exp. [19]	% Diff.
6s _{1/2}	141301	-204	141097	141084	0.01%
6p _{1/2}	112930	-189	112741	112660	0.07%
6p _{3/2}	109780	-174	109606	109564	0.04%
5d _{3/2}	155565	-1005	154561	154675	-0.07%
5d _{5/2}	153902	-1025	152877	153072	-0.13%

TABLE V. Calculated reduced matrix elements of transitions of interest to s-d PNC calculations. RPA equations solved at the energy of each PNC transition. (a.u.)

Transition	Ra ⁺	Ac ²⁺	Th ³⁺
7s _{1/2} - 7p _{3/2}	4.485	3.775	3.326
7s _{1/2} - 8p _{3/2}	0.3729	0.1755	0.0770
6d _{3/2} - 7p _{1/2}	3.533	2.569	2.100
6d _{3/2} - 8p _{1/2}	0.0440	0.2047	0.2275

TABLE VI. Calculations of reduced E1 and E2 matrix elements $\langle \psi_f || \tilde{d}_{E_k} || \psi_i \rangle$ for the Fr-like actinide ions, including Brueckner correlations and core polarization (a.u.).

Note that the reduced matrix elements observe the symmetry property $\langle a || \tilde{d} || b \rangle = (-1)^{J_a - J_b} \langle b || \tilde{d} || a \rangle$.

E1		Fr	Ra ⁺	Ac ²⁺	Th ³⁺	Pa ⁴⁺	U ⁵⁺	Np ⁶⁺
<i>i</i>	<i>f</i>							
7 <i>s</i> _{1/2}	7 <i>p</i> _{1/2}	4.287	3.228	2.707	2.377	2.147	1.969	1.830
	7 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	5.906	4.482	3.771	3.316	2.995	2.745	2.546
	8 <i>p</i> _{1/2}	0.287	-0.071	-0.196	-0.261	-0.306	-0.342	-0.370
	8 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	0.890	0.360	0.148	0.026	-0.060	-0.131	—
8 <i>s</i> _{1/2}	7 <i>p</i> _{1/2}	-4.195	-2.497	-1.887	-1.554	-1.340	-1.188	-1.101
	7 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	-7.425	-4.621	-3.563	-2.974	-2.595	-2.329	-2.162
	8 <i>p</i> _{1/2}	10.150	7.006	5.599	4.758	4.186	3.762	3.426
	8 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	13.442	9.386	7.547	6.437	5.676	5.107	4.643
6 <i>d</i> _{3/2}	7 <i>p</i> _{1/2}	7.174	3.533	2.571	2.096	1.803	1.587	1.433
	7 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	-3.301	-1.496	-1.050	-0.837	-0.708	-0.614	-0.549
	8 <i>p</i> _{1/2}	-2.489	0.041	0.189	0.185	0.13	—	—
	8 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	0.764	-0.137	-0.156	-0.138	—	—	—
6 <i>d</i> _{5/2}	5 <i>f</i> _{7/2}	-9.117	-5.666	-2.819	-1.930	-1.498	-1.217	-0.996
	7 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	10.156	4.795	3.417	2.749	2.344	2.044	1.835
	8 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	-2.499	0.379	0.487	0.453	0.366	—	—
5 <i>f</i> _{5/2}	6 <i>d</i> _{3/2}	7.318	4.441	2.173	1.510	1.184	0.968	0.795
	6 <i>d</i> _{5/2}	-2.037	-1.257	-0.604	-0.417	-0.327	-0.271	-0.229

E2		Fr	Ra ⁺	Ac ²⁺	Th ³⁺	Pa ⁴⁺	U ⁵⁺	Np ⁶⁺
<i>i</i>	<i>f</i>							
7 <i>s</i> _{1/2}	6 <i>d</i> _{3/2}	-33.367	-14.676	-9.529	-7.065	-5.612	-4.591	—
	6 <i>d</i> _{5/2}	-41.568	-18.868	-12.373	-9.225	-7.359	-6.049	-3.9
5 <i>f</i> _{5/2}	7 <i>p</i> _{1/2}	69.761	33.569	6.711	3.086	1.97	1.35	—
	7 <i>p</i> _{3/2}	-47.191	-20.289	-3.408	-1.438	—	—	—

system, so that the 6*s* electrons remain in the core. The reason why it is not usually included in sum-over-states calculations is that it cannot be represented as a product of single-electron matrix elements involving valence states. The problem of double core polarization will be considered in more detail elsewhere [21].

Table I presents our calculated energy levels for Cs, Ba⁺, Fr and Ra⁺ against experimental values. The BO calculations are accurate to around 0.1-0.5% for most levels, which is typical for this type of calculation. Table II presents our calculated energy levels for the francium-like actinide ions, and Table III shows the percentage difference between our calculations and experimental values for the most important energy intervals for PNC in Fr, Ra⁺, Ac²⁺ and Th³⁺.

Note that the accuracy can be further improved by including the contributions of the so-called *ladder diagrams* [22]. We illustrate this using the La²⁺ ion as an example. Table IV presents calculations of La²⁺ ionisation energies including ladder diagrams. The experimental energies are reproduced to an extraordinary accuracy, even for the notoriously difficult *d* levels. A full inclusion of the ladder diagrams for all ions will be saved for a later work, and currently our method only allows inclusion of ladder diagrams in the energy levels but not PNC. Here we demonstrate that by including the ladder diagrams the accuracy is significantly improved, and that the accuracy in all of these ions is very good.

We also calculate several reduced E1 matrix elements that are of interest to PNC transitions, which are presented in Table V, and in Table VI we present calculations of several of the reduced matrix elements of the considered Fr-like actinide ions.

In francium, the 7*s* state is the ground state. However, in charged ions this is not necessarily the case. For the ions after actinium the 5*f* state is pushed below 7*s*, forming a new ground state (see Table II). Also, after actinium the 6*d*_{3/2} state is pushed below the 7*s* state. The ions after Np⁶⁺ no longer have closed *p*-shells and are not considered here. A similar crossing of configurations also occurs in the cesium isoelectronic sequence; Cs and Ba⁺ have 6*s* ground-states, La²⁺ has 5*d*_{3/2}, and Ce³⁺ and Pr⁴⁺ have 4*f* ground-states (see Tables I and IV).

For a 7*s*-6*d*_{3/2} interval to be a viable transition for the measurement of PNC, one of these states (7*s* or 6*d*_{3/2}) should be either the ground state or a metastable state that can first be populated and then the PNC transition observed.

Also, it was shown in the pivotal work of N Fortson [9] that to ensure accurate PNC measurements of a single trapped ion both the upper and lower levels of the transition should be long lived. In Table VII we present calculations of the lifetimes of the relevant levels for Ba⁺, La²⁺, Ra⁺, Ac²⁺ and Th³⁺. We show that this condition is met in all of these ions except for Th³⁺, which has a long-lived upper level but a lower level that quickly

TABLE VII. Lifetimes (s) of upper and lower states of the s - d PNC transitions for main ions of interest, where n is the principal quantum number: $n = 6$ for Ba^+ and La^{2+} , $n = 7$ for Ra^+ , Ac^{2+} and Th^{3+} . (∞ means ground state).

Level	Ba^+	La^{2+}	Ra^+	Ac^{2+}	Th^{3+}
$(n-1)d_{3/2}$	84.5	∞	0.642	1.19×10^6	0.58
$ns_{1/2}$	∞	0.347	∞	∞	1.12×10^{-6}

decays via E1 transitions.

Note in particular the very long-lived upper ($6d_{3/2}$) state of Ac^{2+} . This state is practically stable, the E2 transition back to the $7s$ ground state (the only lower state - see Table II) is highly suppressed due to the very small energy gap of this state, 801 cm^{-1} . This is very beneficial for the measurement of PNC in single-trapped ions [9].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The final calculations of the s - d and (near) optical s - s PNC amplitudes for the francium-like ions are presented in Table VIII with some previous calculations for comparison. The amplitudes calculated here include core-polarization (RPA) and all-order Brueckner correlations.

For comparison and completeness, these calculations were also performed for Cs, Ba^+ and the first few Cs-like lanthanide ions. These much lighter ions have correspondingly smaller PNC amplitudes. The results are presented in Table IX. We have not presented a result for the $6s$ - $7s$ transition in cesium since this has been investigated thoroughly in our recent work [2].

The PNC amplitudes calculated here agree very well with previous determinations for Cs, Ba^+ , Fr and Ra^+ . For Ra^+ our result is within 1% of the result calculated in Ref. [8] using the same ‘solving equations’ method used here [23]. Our Ra^+ value is also, however, 4-5% smaller than the amplitudes calculated in that same work as well as in Ref. [24], which used a different ‘sum-over-states’ approach. The difference is most likely due to the *double core-polarization* (last term of (3), discussed above), which we calculate to contribute -4.7% to this amplitude, and is not included in the sum-over-states calculations. Note that double core-polarization was also not included in our recent calculations for Ba^+ , Yb^+ , and Ra^+ [27]. This is because in that paper we were focused on the nuclear spin-dependent PNC amplitudes, where high accuracy of the analysis is less important.

The sd PNC transitions tend to have a single dominating term which contributes $\sim 90\%$ to the total amplitude [8]. In Th^{3+} , for example, this term with the $7s$ - $7p_{1/2}$ energy interval contributes approximately 96%. The energy interval for this term agrees with experiment to 0.3% (see Table III). Based on comparison with experimental energies and previous calculations, we expect our amplitudes to be accurate to around 1%. This accuracy

TABLE VIII. Calculated $7s$ - $6d_{3/2}$ and $7s$ - $8s$ PNC amplitudes for the Fr-like actinide ions, in units $i(-Q_W/N) \times 10^{-11}$ a.u. Also shown are the ground-state levels, experimental wavelengths of the transitions, and several previous PNC calculations for comparison.

Ion	ground -state	λ (nm)	E_{PNC}	
			This work	Others
^{223}Fr	$7s_{1/2}$	sd 616	57.99	57.1(23) [8]
		ss 507	15.38	15.56(17) ^a [13]
$^{226}\text{Ra}^+$	$7s_{1/2}$	sd 827	44.35	15.69(16) ^b [25]
				43.9(17) ^c [8]
		ss 230	10.89	46.4 [10]
				46.47 ^a [24]
$^{227}\text{Ac}^{2+}$	$7s_{1/2}$	sd 12484	42.81	
$^{232}\text{Th}^{3+}$	$5f_{5/2}$	sd 717	43.59	
$^{231}\text{Pa}^{4+}$	$5f_{5/2}$	sd 324 ^d	43.49	
$^{238}\text{U}^{5+}$	$5f_{5/2}$	sd 198	45.94	
$^{237}\text{Np}^{6+}$	$5f_{5/2}$	sd 139 ^d	44.07	

^a Contribution of Breit interaction is removed for the convenience of comparison. The final result of [13] is -15.41, and of [24] is 45.89

^b Breit and QED corrections removed for comparison. The final result of [25] is 15.49

^c Rescaled from ^{223}Ra [23]


^d Calculated (BO) wavelength

TABLE IX. Calculations of the PNC amplitudes for the Cs-like actinide ions and several previous PNC calculations for comparison. In units $i(-Q_W/N) \times 10^{-11}$ a.u.

Ion	ground -state	λ (nm)	E_{PNC}	
			This work	Others
^{133}Cs	$6s_{1/2}$	sd 690	3.703	3.62(14) [8]
$^{137}\text{Ba}^+$	$6s_{1/2}$	sd 2051	2.197	2.17(9) [8]
		ss 236	0.6582	2.46(2) [26]
$^{139}\text{La}^{2+}$	$5d_{3/2}$	sd 736	2.135	
$^{140}\text{Ce}^{3+}$	$4f_{5/2}$	sd 721	2.076	
$^{141}\text{Pr}^{4+}$	$4f_{5/2}$	sd 156	2.102	

can be improved by including the Breit [28], neutron-skin [29] and QED [30] corrections, missed high-order correlations such as ladder diagrams [22] (see Table IV) and structural radiation [18], and with the use of experimental p - d E1 amplitudes. With these corrections the theoretical accuracy can be expected to surpass that of cesium.

The experimental accuracy can be expected to be high due to stable nuclei and large PNC signals. Additionally, in the case of Ac^{2+} where both upper and lower levels are extremely long-lived, the experimental accuracy has the potential to be very high.

FIG. 1. Level scheme for Th^{3+} 

IV. ACCESSING THE PNC TRANSITION.

In order to observe the $7s$ - $6d_{3/2}$ PNC transitions in the actinide ions with the $5f_{5/2}$ ground states, the $7s$ state must first be populated. In these ions the $5d_{3/2}$ state lies below the $7s$ state, however it is unstable as it will decay very quickly via an E1 transition to the $5f_{5/2}$ ground state. Population of the $7s$ state can be achieved via optical excitation to the $7p_{1/2}$ or $7p_{3/2}$ levels by a series of E1 transitions (e.g. $5f$ - $6d$ - $7p$) or an E2 transition, then $7p_{1/2,3/2}$ will spontaneously decay to the $7s$ state via an E1 transition – see Fig. 1.

For this method to be viable we need to meet several criteria. First, we need the $7s$ state to be metastable and have an appropriate lifetime. Second, we should also have that the pumping transition frequencies (to populate $7s$) are in the range of laser spectroscopy. Also, it is necessary that the de-excitation from the p to s -level is relatively probable compared to transitions to other levels. If this last condition is not met it is possible to enforce it using stimulated emission, which should not be a problem since these transitions are optical.

Table X shows the probabilities and per-second transition rates for these transitions in Th^{3+} . Our calculations

are in very good agreement with existing calculations of Safronova *et al.* [31, 32]. The $7s$ state should be relatively stable, since there are no allowed E1 transitions to lower states. The only significant contributions to its decay are from E2 transitions to the $6d_{3/2}$ and $6d_{5/2}$ states. We calculate a long lifetime of 0.58 s, in excellent agreement with the recent calculation of M. S. and U. I. Safronova of 0.570(8) s [32].

TABLE X. Energies (ω), probabilities (Γ) and per-second transition rates (A_r) of transitions in Th^{3+} .

Transition		ω (a.u.)	Γ (a.u.)	A_r (s^{-1})
$5f_{5/2} - 6d_{3/2}$	E1	0.042	1.46×10^{-11}	6.07×10^5
$6d_{3/2} - 7p_{1/2}$	E1	0.233	7.21×10^{-9}	2.99×10^8
$5f_{5/2} - 7p_{1/2}$	E2	0.274	3.41×10^{-15}	142
$7p_{1/2} - 7s_{1/2}$	E1	0.169	7.07×10^{-9}	2.92×10^8
$7p_{1/2} - 6d_{3/2}$	E1	0.233	1.45×10^{-8}	5.97×10^8
$5f_{5/2} - 7p_{3/2}$	E2	0.333	1.96×10^{-15}	81.4
$7p_{3/2} - 7s_{1/2}$	E1	0.227	1.66×10^{-8}	6.90×10^8
$7p_{3/2} - 6d_{3/2}$	E1	0.291	2.24×10^{-9}	9.28×10^7
$7p_{3/2} - 6d_{5/2}$	E1	0.267	1.87×10^{-8}	7.30×10^8
$7s_{1/2} - 6d_{3/2}$	E2	0.064	3.57×10^{-17}	1.48
$7s_{1/2} - 6d_{5/2}$	E2	0.039	5.57×10^{-18}	0.23

V. CONCLUSION

We have provided calculations of parity nonconservation, energy levels, matrix elements and lifetimes of several Cs-like rare-earth and Fr-like actinide ions.

We demonstrate that these systems provide a very high theoretical accuracy. With the inclusion of other effects (such as Breit, QED, ladder operators etc.) this could lead to better precision in the calculations than has been achieved in cesium.

With very large PNC amplitudes, these ions can be expected also to have a very high accuracy in the measurements, with the added benefits of (near)-stable nuclei in Ba^+ , La^{2+} , Ac^{2+} and Th^{2+} , and long-lived upper and lower states for Ba^+ , La^{2+} , Ra^+ and particularly Ac^{2+} .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council.

- [1] C. S. Wood, S. C. Bennett, D. Cho, B. P. Masterson, J. L. Roberts, C. E. Tanner and C. E. Wieman, *Science* **275**, 1759 (1997); S. C. Bennett and C. E. Wieman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2484 (1999); **82**, 4153(E) (1999); **83**, 889(E) (1999).
- [2] V. A. Dzuba, J. C. Berengut, V. V. Flambaum and B. Roberts, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 203003 (2012).

- [3] S. G. Porsev, K. Beloy and A. Derevianko, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 181601 (2009); *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 036008 (2010).
- [4] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and O. P. Sushkov, *Phys. Lett. A* **141**, 147 (1989); V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and J. S. M. Ginges, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 076013 (2002).

- [5] S. A. Blundell, W. R. Johnson and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1411 (1990); S. A. Blundell, J. Sapirstein and W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 1602 (1992); M. G. Kozlov, S. G. Porsev and I. I. Tupitsyn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3260 (2001).
- [6] P. G. Blunden, W. Melnitchouk and A. W. Thomas Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 262301 (2012).
- [7] I. B. Khriplovich, *Parity nonconservation in atomic phenomena* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1991).
- [8] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and J. S. M. Ginges, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 062101 (2001).
- [9] N. Fortson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2383 (1993).
- [10] L. W. Wansbeek, B. K. Sahoo, R. G. E. Timmermans, K. Jungmann, B. P. Das and D. Mukherjee, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 050501 (2008).
- [11] E. Gomez, L. A. Orozco and G. D. Sprouse, Rep. Prog. Phys. **69**, 79 (2006); D. Sheng, J. Zhang and L. A. Orozco, Rev. Scient. Instr. **83**, 043106 (2012); S. Aubin, J. A. Behr, G. Chen, R. Collister, V. V. Flambaum *et al.*, AIP Conf. Proc. **1525**, 530 (2013).
- [12] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and O. P. Sushkov, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 3454 (1995).
- [13] M. S. Safronova and W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022112 (2000).
- [14] J. C. Berengut, V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and A. Ong, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 022517 (2012).
- [15] C. J. Campbell, A. V. Steele, L. R. Churchill, M. V. DePalatis, D. E. Naylor, D. N. Matsukevich, A. Kuzmich and M. S. Chapman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 233004 (2009).
- [16] J. S. M. Ginges and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rep. **397**, 63 (2004).
- [17] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, P. G. Silvestrov and O. P. Sushkov, J. Phys. B **20**, 1399 (1987);
- [18] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and O. P. Sushkov, Phys. Lett. A **140**, 493 (1989). V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and O. P. Sushkov, Phys. Lett. A **141**, 147 (1989); V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, A. Y. Krafnakher and O. P. Sushkov, Phys. Lett. A **142**, 373 (1989).
- [19] A. Kramida, Yu. Ralchenko, J. Reader and NIST ASD Team. NIST Atomic Spectra Database (2012). Online: <http://physics.nist.gov/asd>
- [20] J. Blaise and J.-F. Wyart, International Tables of Selected Constants (1992). Online: <http://www.lac-upsud.fr/Database>
- [21] B. M. Roberts, V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, to be published.
- [22] V. A. Dzuba, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 042502 (2008).
- [23] The information about isotope numbers is missed in our old paper [8]. It is most likely ^{223}Ra in the mixed states calculations and ^{226}Ra in the sum-over-states calculations.
- [24] R. Pal, D. Jiang, M. S. Safronova and U. I. Safronova, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 062505 (2009).
- [25] V. M. Shabaev, I. I. Tupitsyn, K. Pachucki, G. Plunien and V. A. Yerokhin, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 062105 (2005).
- [26] B. K. Sahoo, B. P. Das, R. K. Chaudhuri and D. Mukherjee, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032507 (2007).
- [27] V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 052513 (2011).
- [28] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum and M. S. Safronova, Phys. Rev. A, **73** 022112 (2006).
- [29] A. Derevianko, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012106 (2001).
- [30] B. M. Roberts, V. A. Dzuba and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 054502 (2013).
- [31] U. I. Safronova, W. R. Johnson and M. S. Safronova, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 042511 (2006).
- [32] M. S. Safronova and U. I. Safronova, arXiv:1304.0158 (2013).