arXiv:2407.14721v1 [physics.atom-ph] 20 Jul 2024

Laser Cooling of Radium-225 Ions

Roy A. Ready,^{1, *} Haoran Li,¹ Spencer Kofford,¹ Robert Kwapisz,¹ Huaxu Dan,¹ Akshay Sawhney,¹ Mingyu Fan,¹

Craig Holliman,¹ Xiaoyang Shi,¹ Luka Sever-Walter,¹ A. N. Gaiser,^{2,3} J. R. Griswold,⁴ and A. M. Jayich¹

¹Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

²Department of Chemistry, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA

³Facility for Rare Isotope Beams, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA

⁴Radioisotope Science and Technology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830, USA

(Dated: July 23, 2024)

Radium-225 (nuclear spin I = 1/2) ions possess electronic hyperfine transitions that are firstorder insensitive to magnetic field noise, which is advantageous for optical clocks and quantum information science. We report on laser cooling and trapping of radium-225 ions and hyperfine splitting measurements of the ion's 7s ${}^{2}S_{1/2}$, 7p ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$, and 6d ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ states. We measured the ground state hyperfine constant, $A({}^{2}S_{1/2}) = -27.684511056(9)$ GHz and the quadratic Zeeman coefficient, $C_{2} = 142.3(10)$ Hz G⁻², of the ${}^{2}S_{1/2}(F = 0, m_{F} = 0) \leftrightarrow {}^{2}S_{1/2}(F = 1, m_{F} = 0)$ transition. We also measured the hyperfine constants of the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ state, $A({}^{2}P_{1/2}) = -5.447(4)$ GHz, and the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ state, $A({}^{2}D_{3/2}) = -619.7(11)$ MHz.

Atoms with magnetic field-insensitive transitions are appealing for their use in quantum information science [1] (QIS) and precision measurement [2, 3]. For ions with a single valence electron and half-integer nuclear spin, there is a ground state qubit composed of two total spin projection $m_F = 0$ states separated by the hyperfine splitting. These states are first order-insensitive to magnetic field noise and are well-suited to laser driven gates [4, 5]. For laser-coolable ions with nuclear spin I = 1/2, the qubit is straightforward to initialize and control optically or with microwaves. This hyperfine qubit is a feature of ${}^{171}Yb^+$ [6, 7] and led to the development of the radioactive ${}^{133}Ba^+$ qubit [8]. The hyperfine qubit's features also benefit optical clocks based on 171 Yb⁺ [9, 10]. The radium-225 ion has nuclear spin 1/2, a low charge to mass ratio, and optical transitions at convenient wavelengths [11, 12], making it a good optical clock candidate [13]. The ion's large hyperfine splittings make it possible to run an optical clock with only two infrared wavelengths [14], which is amenable to integrated photonic devices.

Searches for time reversal symmetry violation are motivated by the observed baryon asymmetry of the universe and the strong CP problem [15]. Radium-225 has an octupole-deformed nucleus that enhances its sensitivity to hadronic sources of T-violation [16–18]. The sensitivity can be further enhanced by incorporating radium-225 into a molecule [19], which can be produced with laser-cooled ²²⁵Ra⁺ [20].

Radium is famous for its radioactivity and radium-225 is no exception with only a 15 d half-life. Despite this apparent obstacle we have worked with laser-cooled 225 Ra⁺ ions in a sealed vacuum system since June 6th, 2023. The key to seamless operation is the oven design based on Fan *et al.* [21], which continuously produces radium via the nuclear decay of thorium-229 (7800 yr half-life [22]).

To laser cool 225 Ra⁺ we drive optical transitions from

hyperfine levels of the ${}^{2}S_{1/2}$ and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ states to those of the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ state. The ${}^{2}S_{1/2}$ and ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ hyperfine splittings were first measured by laser spectroscopy of a hot atomic beam [23]. The ground state hyperfine splitting was remeasured [24], resulting in a 47 MHz (3.6σ) discrepancy with the previous result. With laser-cooled ${}^{225}\text{Ra}^{+}$ we measured the hyperfine structure of all three states used for laser cooling and state detection, improving the precision of the ${}^{2}S_{1/2}$ and ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ measurements and making the first measurement of the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ hyperfine structure. We also measured the quadratic Zeeman shift coefficient of the hyperfine qubit with microwave spectroscopy.

The ²²⁵Ra source is a molecular beam epitaxy oven with $8 \,\mu$ Ci of ²²⁹Th deposited in a titanium crucible. The oven is heated to between 350 °C and 400 °C to emit an effusive beam of radium atoms, see Fig. 1a. Radium ions are loaded into the trap with a two-stage process: neutral radium is driven to the ¹P₁ state with near-resonant 483 nm light and then ionized with 450 nm light. Radium ions are consistently trapped within 15 min of the oven reaching its target temperature.

The ions are held in a linear Paul trap with characteristic radial and axial dimensions $r_0 = 0.6 \text{ mm}$ and $z_0 = 2.5 \text{ mm}$, described previously in Ref. [20]. The radial electrodes are driven at 8.205 MHz and dc offsets of +200 mV and -100 mV are applied to opposite electrode pairs to break the degeneracy between radial motional modes. We can trap chains of ions, see Fig. 1a, though our spectroscopy was performed with single ions.

Ions are laser-cooled with four lasers to address all hyperfine levels in the ${}^{2}S_{1/2}$ ground and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ metastable states, see Fig. 1b. The frequency and power of each laser is independently controlled with an acousto-optic modulator set up in a double-pass configuration. Decays from the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ state populate both the ground state and the metastable state (638(10) ms lifetime [25]). The metastable state hyperfine levels are repumped with



FIG. 1: (a) Experimental apparatus. An oven emits radium atoms (pink arrow) which are photoionized by (PI) light at 483 nm and 450 nm. Trapped ions, such as the three shown, are detected and laser-cooled with light at 468 nm and 1079 nm. Permanent magnets define the quantization axis (\vec{B}) and hyperfine transitions are driven by a microwave (MW) horn. (b) Energy level diagram of the low-lying ²²⁵Ra⁺ hyperfine structure and ²S_{1/2} Zeeman sublevels, showing laser and microwave-driven transitions. State detection lasers drive transitions between the bright states (blue) and are offresonant from the dark states (black).

1079 nm light. Both 468 nm lasers and one repump laser are stabilized to an optical cavity, while the second repump laser is offset-locked [26] to its counterpart. We use the first-order sidebands of fiber electro-optic modulators (EOMs) to scan the 468 nm and 1079 nm light across the hyperfine states and also use the 468 nm EOM for state preparation, following Olmschenk *et al.* [27].

We drive magnetic dipole transitions between the ground state hyperfine levels with microwaves emitted from a horn positioned 10 cm from the trap center. The microwaves are generated by mixing a fixed tone at 27.3 GHz with a tunable rf source from a direct digital synthesizer, which is frequency doubled to near 385 MHz.

Each hyperfine splitting measurement consists of Doppler cooling the ion, preparing the target state, scanning the transition, and state detection. During state detection we drive the $S_{1/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 0)$ and $D_{3/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 0)$ transitions. The $^2S_{1/2}(F = 1)$ and $^2D_{3/2}(F = 1)$ states are referred to as the bright states, highlighted in blue in Fig. 1b. When the ion is in one of the dark states, ${}^{2}S_{1/2}(F=0)$ or ${}^{2}D_{3/2}(F=2)$, light is not scattered as the dark states do not decay and are far off resonance from the state detection lasers. Scattered 468 nm photons are focused onto a photomultiplier tube (PMT) and camera by an objective.

We characterize the hyperfine qubit by measuring the state preparation and measurement (SPAM) fidelity. After preparing the dark ground state, we transfer the population to the bright ground state with a 235 µs resonant microwave pulse and perform a state detection. This is compared to a state detection after only dark state preparation (no microwave pulse). From the SPAM measurement we find a 2.5 photon threshold to discriminate between bright events (11.6 photons on average) and dark events (0.04 photons on average) in a 1.7 ms detection time, see Fig. 2a. The threshold minimizes the average false detection fraction, given by $1/2(\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1)$ [28], where ϵ_0 (ϵ_1) is the fraction of dark (bright) events falsely identified as bright (dark) events, and is related to the fidelity by $\mathcal{F} = 1 - 1/2 (\epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1)$. We determine the fidelity of ²²⁵Ra⁺ in our system from an average of 13 separate measurements. Our measured average SPAM fidelity is $\mathcal{F} = 0.9951(9)$, with false identification fractions of $\epsilon_0 = 0.0035(8)$ and $\epsilon_1 = 0.007(2)$. Our result is limited by off-resonant scattering, PMT dark counts, and the 0.2241(11) % light collection efficiency.

The $S_{1/2}(F = 1, m_F = 0) \leftrightarrow S_{1/2}(F = 0, m_F = 0)$ hyperfine transition is sensitive to the second-order Zeeman shift $\Delta \nu_{\rm QZ} = C_2 B^2$, where C_2 is the quadratic Zeeman shift coefficient and B is the magnetic field magnitude. We measured $\Delta \nu_{\rm QZ}$ for a range of magnetic field strengths, as shown in Fig. 2b, and from the fit we extract the quadratic Zeeman shift coefficient, $C_2 = 142.3(10) \,\mathrm{Hz}\,\mathrm{G}^{-2}$, which is consistent with the calculated value of $141 \,\mathrm{Hz}\,\mathrm{G}^{-2}$ [29].

To measure the ground state hyperfine splitting, we prepare the ${}^{2}S_{1/2}(F = 0, m_{F} = 0)$ dark state and then scan a 10 ms microwave pulse across the π transition, $S_{1/2}(F = 0, m_{F} = 0) \leftrightarrow S_{1/2}(F = 1, m_{F} = 0)$, and perform state detection, see Fig. 2c. To obtain the unperturbed π transition frequency, $\Delta \nu_{\text{QZ}}(B = 3.0 \text{ G})$ is subtracted from the scanned frequency. We average 18 measurements, resulting in a ground state hyperfine constant of $A(S_{1/2}) = -27.684511056(9)$ GHz. The 0.9 Hz statistical uncertainty is negligible compared to the 9 Hz systematic uncertainty.

The dominant source of uncertainty of the ${}^{2}S_{1/2}$ hyperfine splitting comes from the second-order Zeeman shift, which shifts the frequency of the measured transition by $\Delta \nu_{\rm QZ}(B)$. To determine the magnetic field B at the ion, we perform Rabi spectroscopy on the σ transitions, $(F = 0, m_F = 0) \leftrightarrow (F = 1, m_F = \pm 1)$, and compute B from the Zeeman splitting. The average frequency of the σ transitions is subtracted from the π transition frequency to find $\Delta \nu_{\rm QZ}(B)$. The uncertainties for the



FIG. 2: (a) State preparation and measurement result for the ground state hyperfine transition. We measure an average of 0.04 photons in the dark state and 11.6 photons in the bright state. (b) The quadratic Zeeman shift for a range of magnetic field strengths, with studentized residuals (SR) from the quadratic fit used to extract C_2 , in the bottom panel. We determine the magnetic field magnitude at the ion by driving σ^- (orange) and σ^+ (red) transitions from the $m_F = \pm 1$ Zeeman levels, shown for the 1.5 G data point. (c) Spectroscopy of the $S_{1/2}(F = 1, m_F = 0) \leftrightarrow S_{1/2}(F = 0, m_F = 0)$ transition. A fixed scan time is determined from a Rabi flop, pink and inset, at the resonant frequency of the transition.

quadratic Zeeman shift data points are derived from fits to the transitions, and contribute 9 Hz to the measured ground state hyperfine splitting.

The second largest contribution to the systematic uncertainty is inaccuracy of the rf source, which is locked to a GPS-disciplined reference (SRS FS740). The short-term stability of this reference is 1×10^{-11} , and we assign an uncertainty of 0.3 Hz to this systematic.

We investigated frequency shifts due to the ac magnetic field of the rf trap drive by measuring the π transition frequency for a range of trap drive powers. We also tested for ac Stark shifts from probe laser light leakage. We did not observe any frequency shifts due to either of these effects.

We compare our result with previous measurements and a theoretical calculation of $A(S_{1/2})$, see Fig. 3. Of the two previous $A(S_{1/2})$ hyperfine constant measurements, our result agrees with the first measurement [23]. The contribution to hyperfine splittings due to the nuclear magnetization distribution is known as the Bohr-Weisskopf (BW) effect. For ²²⁵Ra⁺ the BW effect is relatively large but challenging to compute, and dominates the 380 MHz uncertainty for the calculated value of $A(S_{1/2})$ [30]. The BW effect can alternatively be extracted by combining atomic structure calculations with measured hyperfine splittings [31], and may be used to benchmark nuclear models.

The ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ and ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ hyperfine splittings are scanned with first-order sidebands from EOMs. The 468 nm EOM sideband drives the $S_{1/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 1)$ transition and the 1079 nm EOM sideband drives the $D_{3/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 1)$ transition. We reference the laser carrier frequency by performing spectroscopy on the $D_{3/2}(F = 2) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 1)$ and the $S_{1/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 0)$ transitions for the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ and ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ hyperfine splitting measurements, respectively.

To measure the hyperfine splitting of the $^2D_{3/2}$

state, we prepare the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}(F = 1)$ hyperfine level and scan the 1079 nm EOM sideband over the $D_{3/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 1)$ transition. We then measure the final dark state population, which is maximized when the EOM sideband frequency is resonant with the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ hyperfine splitting, see Fig. 4. The hyperfine splitting is determined from the difference of the $D_{3/2}(F = 2) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 1)$ and $D_{3/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 1)$ transition frequencies. The measured hyperfine splitting is 1239(2) MHz, which corresponds to a hyperfine constant of $A({}^{2}D_{3/2}) = -619.7(11)$ MHz. The statistical and systematic uncertainties are 100 kHz and 1.0 MHz.

To measure the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ hyperfine splitting, we prepare the ${}^{2}S_{1/2}(F = 1)$ bright state and scan the 468 nm EOM sideband over the $S_{1/2}(F = 1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}(F = 1)$ transition. We measure the dark state population, ${}^{2}S_{1/2}(F = 0)$ and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}(F = 2)$, which is maximized when the sideband frequency is resonant with the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ hyperfine splitting. The hyperfine splitting constant is $A({}^{2}P_{1/2}) = -5.447(4)$ GHz. The uncertainty is dominated by the 4.0 MHz systematic uncertainty, with a 120 kHz statistical uncertainty. Our result is consistent with the previous measurement [32] and improves the precision by a factor of 1.9.

The ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ hyperfine splitting measurements share the same sources of systematic uncertainty. The leading source of uncertainty for both the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ hyperfine measurements is drift of our laser stabilization cavities, which results in laser frequency drifts during measurements. We characterize the drift and assign uncertainties of 3.2 MHz to the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ and 0.7 MHz to the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ measurements.

The combination of Zeeman splitting with imperfect linear laser polarization or with an unequal population distribution in the Zeeman sublevels used for state preparation results in a systematic shift of the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$



FIG. 3: A comparison of our result with previous measurements [23, 24] (blue circles) and a calculation [30] (orange triangle) of the $A(^2S_{1/2})$ hyperfine constant. The plotted values are offset by $A_{\rm off.} = -27.704$ GHz.

hyperfine frequencies. For the corresponding systematic we assign an uncertainty that corresponds to the largest Zeeman splitting of each transition, measured at a magnetic field of 1.1 G. The resulting uncertainty is 1.6 MHz for the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ measurement, and 0.8 MHz for the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ measurement.

The hyperfine levels are frequency-shifted in the presence of laser light due to the ac Stark effect. We investigated frequency shifts of the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ states due to the probe lasers by varying the 468 nm laser power from $1.7 \,\mu\text{W}$ to $11.0 \,\mu\text{W}$ and varying the 1079 nm laser power from $5.0 \,\mu\text{W}$ to $15.0 \,\mu\text{W}$. We did not observe ac Stark shifts for either the ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ or ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ measurements, which is consistent with our calculated upper bound of $10 \,\text{kHz}$, well below the statistical uncertainty.

In summary, we have operated a radium-225 ion trap for over a year in a sealed vacuum system and measured the hyperfine splitting of the electronic states used for laser cooling and state detection. The demonstrated long-term source of short-lived ²²⁵Ra isotopes enables the development of a ²²⁵Ra⁺ ion optical clock, which has field-insensitive states that suppress magnetic field noise compared to a nuclear spin-zero ion optical clock [13], as well as experiments to test fundamental symmetries with radium-bearing molecules. Radium-225 ions are also a potential route to trapped actinium ions, as ²²⁵Ra β -decays to ²²⁵Ac, and therefore ²²⁵Ra⁺ decays could result in trapped ²²⁵Ac²⁺, which supports laser cooling and state detection in two independent manifolds.

We thank Wes Campbell, Christian Sanner, and Anthony Ransford for helpful discussions. H.L. was supported by ONR Grant No. N00014-21-1-2597 and M.F. was supported by DOE Award No. DE-SC0022034. R.A.R., R.K., A.S., H.D., C.A.H., X.S., L.S.W., and A.M.J. were supported by the Heising-Simons Foundation Award No. 2022-4066, the W.M. Keck Foundation, NIST Award No. 60NANB21D185, NSF NRT Award No. 2152201, the Eddleman Center, the Noyce Initiative, and NSF Award Nos. 2326810, 2146555, and 1912665. A.N.G. acknowledges the support of startup funds and Michigan State University. The isotope used in this re-



FIG. 4: The ${}^{2}S_{1/2}(F=0)$ and ${}^{2}D_{3/2}(F=2)$ dark state population as the EOM first-order sideband is scanned over the $D_{3/2}$ $(F=1) \leftrightarrow P_{1/2}$ (F=1) transition. A Lorentzian fit determines the ${}^{2}D_{3/2}$ hyperfine splitting.

search was supplied by the U.S. Department of Energy Isotope Program, managed by the Office of Isotope R&D and Production.

* roy.a.ready@gmail.com

- S. Crain, E. Mount, S. Baek, and J. Kim, Appl. Phys. Lett. 105, 181115 (2014).
- [2] N. C. Lewty, B. L. Chuah, R. Cazan, B. K. Sahoo, and M. D. Barrett, Opt. Express 20, 21379 (2012).
- [3] M. Pizzocaro, P. Thoumany, B. Rauf, F. Bregolin, G. Milani, C. Clivati, G. A. Costanzo, F. Levi, and D. Calonico, Metrologia 54, 102 (2017).
- [4] C. J. Ballance, T. P. Harty, N. M. Linke, M. A. Sepiol, and D. M. Lucas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 060504 (2016).
- [5] M. J. Boguslawski, Z. J. Wall, S. R. Vizvary, I. D. Moore, M. Bareian, D. T. C. Allcock, D. J. Wineland, E. R. Hudson, and W. C. Campbell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 131, 063001 (2023).
- [6] C. Balzer, A. Braun, T. Hannemann, C. Paape, M. Ettler, W. Neuhauser, and C. Wunderlich, Phys. Rev. A 73, 041407 (2006).
- [7] S. Ma, A. P. Burgers, G. Liu, J. Wilson, B. Zhang, and J. D. Thompson, Phys. Rev. X 12, 021028 (2022).
- [8] D. Hucul, J. E. Christensen, E. R. Hudson, and W. C. Campbell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 100501 (2017).
- [9] C. Tamm, N. Huntemann, B. Lipphardt, V. Gerginov, N. Nemitz, M. Kazda, S. Weyers, and E. Peik, Phys. Rev. A 89, 023820 (2014).
- [10] N. Huntemann, C. Sanner, B. Lipphardt, C. Tamm, and E. Peik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 063001 (2016).
- [11] M. Fan, C. A. Holliman, A. L. Wang, and A. M. Jayich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 223001 (2019).
- [12] G. N. West, W. Loh, D. Kharas, C. Sorace-Agaskar, K. K. Mehta, J. Sage, J. Chiaverini, and R. J. Ram, APL Photonics 4, 026101 (2019).
- [13] C. A. Holliman, M. Fan, A. Contractor, S. M. Brewer, and A. M. Jayich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 033202 (2022).
- [14] C. A. Holliman, M. Fan, and A. M. Jayich, in *Quantum Sensing*, Imaging, and Precision Metrology, Vol.

PC12447 (SPIE, 2023) p. PC124470C.

- [15] M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Ann. Phys. **318**, 119 (2005).
- [16] N. Auerbach, V. V. Flambaum, and V. Spevak, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4316 (1996).
- [17] J. Dobaczewski and J. Engel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 232502 (2005).
- [18] M. Bishof, R. H. Parker, K. G. Bailey, J. P. Greene, R. J. Holt, M. R. Kalita, W. Korsch, N. D. Lemke, Z.-T. Lu, P. Mueller, T. P. O'Connor, J. T. Singh, and M. R. Dietrich, Phys. Rev. C 94, 025501 (2016).
- [19] P. Yu and N. R. Hutzler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 126, 023003 (2021).
- [20] M. Fan, C. A. Holliman, X. Shi, H. Zhang, M. W. Straus, X. Li, S. W. Buechele, and A. M. Jayich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 126, 023002 (2021).
- [21] M. Fan, R. A. Ready, H. Li, S. Kofford, R. Kwapisz, C. A. Holliman, M. S. Ladabaum, A. N. Gaiser, J. R. Griswold, and A. M. Jayich, Phys. Rev. Research 5, 043201 (2023).
- [22] R. M. Essex, J. L. Mann, R. Collé, L. Laureano-Perez, M. E. Bennett, H. Dion, R. Fitzgerald, A. M. Gaffney, A. Gourgiotis, A. Hubert, K. G. W. Inn, W. S. Kinman, S. P. Lamont, R. Steiner, and R. W. Williams, Journal of Radioanalytical and Nuclear Chemistry **318**, 515 (2018).
- [23] S. A. Ahmad, W. Klempt, R. Neugart, E. W. Otten,

K. Wendt, and C. Ekström, Phys. Lett. B 133, 47 (1983).

- [24] W. Neu, R. Neugart, E. W. Otten, G. Passler, K. Wendt, B. Fricke, E. Arnold, H. J. Kluge, and G. Ulm, Zeitschrift für Physik D Atoms, Molecules and Clusters 11, 105 (1989).
- [25] R. Pal, D. Jiang, M. S. Safronova, and U. I. Safronova, Phys. Rev. A 79, 062505 (2009).
- [26] U. Schünemann, H. Engler, R. Grimm, M. Weidemüller, and M. Zielonkowski, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 70, 242 (1999).
- [27] S. Olmschenk, K. C. Younge, D. L. Moehring, D. N. Matsukevich, P. Maunz, and C. Monroe, Phys. Rev. A 76, 052314 (2007).
- [28] J. E. Christensen, D. Hucul, W. C. Campbell, and E. R. Hudson, npj Quantum Inf. 6, 35 (2020).
- [29] O. O. Versolato, L. W. Wansbeek, K. Jungmann, R. G. E. Timmermans, L. Willmann, and H. W. Wilschut, Phys. Rev. A 83, 043829 (2011).
- [30] J. S. M. Ginges, A. V. Volotka, and S. Fritzsche, Phys. Rev. A 96, 062502 (2017).
- [31] L. V. Skripnikov, J. Chem. Phys. 153, 114114 (2020).
- [32] K. Wendt, S. A. Ahmad, W. Klempt, R. Neugart, E. W. Otten, and H. H. Stroke, Zeitschrift für Physik D Atoms, Molecules and Clusters 4, 227 (1987).