

## QED calculation of the $n=1$ and $n=2$ energy levels in He-like ions

A. N. Artemyev,<sup>1,2</sup> V. M. Shabaev,<sup>1,2</sup> V. A. Yerokhin,<sup>1,2,3</sup> G. Plunien,<sup>2</sup> and G.Soff<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, St. Petersburg State University,  
Oulianovskaya 1, Petrodvorets, St. Petersburg 198504, Russia*

<sup>2</sup>*Institut für Theoretische Physik, TU Dresden,  
Mommensenstraße 13, D-01062 Dresden, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*Center for Advanced Studies, St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University,  
Polytekhnicheskaya 29, St. Petersburg 195251, Russia*

### Abstract

We perform *ab initio* QED calculations of energy levels for the  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions with the nuclear charge in the range  $Z = 12-100$ . The complete set of two-electron QED corrections is evaluated to all orders in the parameter  $\alpha Z$ . Uncalculated contributions to energy levels come through orders  $\alpha^3(\alpha Z)^2$ ,  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^7$ , and higher. The calculation presented is the first treatment for excited states of He-like ions complete through order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ . A significant improvement in accuracy of theoretical predictions is achieved, especially in the high- $Z$  region.

PACS numbers: 12.20.Ds, 31.30.Jv, 31.10.+z

## Introduction

Helium and helium-like ions, being the simplest many-electron systems, traditionally serve as an important testing ground for investigations of many-body relativistic and QED effects. Calculations of QED effects in He-like ions have a long history. The expression for the Lamb shift complete through orders  $\alpha(\alpha Z)^4$  and  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$  was derived in pioneering studies by Araki [1] and Sucher [2]. Numerous posterior investigations of higher-order QED corrections in two-electron systems (see, e.g., review [3] and recent original studies [4, 5, 6]) were primarily aimed at helium, in which the experimental accuracy is by far better than in other two-electron systems. Recent progress in experimental spectroscopy of highly charged ions [7, 8, 9] opened new perspectives for probing higher-order QED effects in ions along the helium isoelectronic sequence up to He-like uranium. Investigations of QED effects in high- $Z$  ions are of particular importance since they can provide tests of quantum electrodynamics in the region of a very strong Coulomb field of the nucleus. Another factor that stimulates these investigations is the possibility to test the standard model by studying the effects of parity non-conservation (PNC) [10, 11, 12, 13]. Experimental identification of the PNC effects will require precise knowledge of the  $2^1S_0 - 2^3P_0$  interval in He-like ions with nuclear charge numbers near  $Z = 64$  (gadolinium) and  $Z = 90$  (thorium), which happens to be very small for these values of  $Z$  thus enhancing the PNC effects significantly.

Investigations of QED effects in heavy He-like ions differ significantly from those for the helium atom. First of all, the nuclear coupling parameter  $\alpha Z$  approaches unity and cannot be regarded as a good expansion parameter as in the case of helium. But on the other side, the electron-electron interaction in these systems is suppressed by a factor of  $1/Z$  with respect to the electron-nucleus interaction and, therefore, can be accounted for by a perturbation expansion in the parameter  $1/Z$ .

Until recently, the only QED effects calculated to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  were the one-electron self-energy and vacuum-polarization corrections [14, 15]. So, theoretical investigations of energy levels in heavy He-like ions mostly relied on these one-electron values, correcting them to account for the “screening” effect by various semi-empirical rules, notably, within Welton’s approximation, as in Ref. [16]. A more elaborate treatment of QED effects in He-like ions was presented by Drake [17]. His values for the QED correction included the complete contribution to order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$  derived in Refs. [1, 2] and parts of higher-order contributions obtained by employing the all-order results available for the one-electron QED corrections. The total energy values of Ref. [17] are

complete through order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$  and uncalculated terms start in orders  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$  and  $\alpha^3(\alpha Z)^2$ .

Later, Johnson and Sapirstein [18] applied relativistic many-body perturbation theory (MBPT) to the treatment of the electron correlation for  $n = 2$  triplet states of He-like ions. Combined with Drake's values for the QED and recoil corrections, their results yielded a better agreement with the experimental data than those of Ref. [17]. While the approach of Ref. [18] is still incomplete to order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ , it includes terms that were not accounted for in Ref. [17], namely the Breit-Breit interaction and some relativistic corrections to the second-order energy. Later, other evaluations of the electron-correlation part of the energies of He-like ions were performed by the relativistic configuration-interaction (CI) method [19] and by the relativistic all-order MBPT approach [20]. The studies [18, 19, 20] share the same main features: their treatment is based on the no-pair Hamiltonian and the electron correlation is taken into account within the Breit approximation. The results of these evaluations are in a very good agreement with each other.

A somewhat different approach was employed in Refs. [21, 22]. While the electron-correlation part was evaluated (as in the previous work by the same group [19]) by the CI method, the QED part was not taken from Ref. [17] but evaluated independently, by considering the one-loop QED corrections in a local screening potential. Due to different treatments of QED effects, there are certain deviations between the results of Refs. [21, 22] and those of Refs. [18, 19, 20].

In order to obtain reliable predictions for energy levels of high- $Z$  ions and to improve the theoretical accuracy in the low- and middle- $Z$  region, it is necessary to take into account two-electron QED effects without an expansion in  $\alpha Z$ . Such project has been recently accomplished (up to order  $\alpha^2$ ) for the two-electron part of the ground-state energy of He-like ions [23, 24, 25, 26, 27] and for the lowest-lying states of Li-like ions [28, 29, 30, 31]. To perform similar QED calculations for excited states of He-like ions is more difficult. One of the reasons is that, for the first time in QED calculations to all orders in  $\alpha Z$ , we encounter levels that are quasi-degenerate, namely  $2^3P_1$  and  $2^1P_1$ . To derive formal expressions for QED corrections in case of quasi-degenerate states is a serious problem that has been solved first within the two-time Green function (TTGF) method [32, 33, 34]. Different approaches to this problem have recently been addressed by other authors [35, 36].

Several QED corrections have been calculated to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  for excited states of He-like ions up to now. In our previous investigation [37], we evaluated the vacuum-polarization screening correction for all  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions. The two-photon exchange correction was calculated for excited states of He-like ions by Mohr and Sapirstein [38] ( $2^3S_1$  and  $2^3P_{0,2}$  states), by Andreev

*et al.* [39, 40] ( $2^1S_{0,1}$ ,  $2^3P_0$ ) and [36] ( $2^{1,3}P_1$ ), and by Åsen *et al.* [41] ( $2^1S_{0,1}$ ). In this paper we present an evaluation of the self-energy screening correction and an independent calculation of the two-photon exchange correction for all  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions. This completes the *ab initio* treatment of all *two-electron* QED corrections of order  $\alpha^2$  to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  and significantly improves the theoretical accuracy for the energy values, especially in the high- $Z$  region. Unlike all previous calculations, the results obtained are complete through order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ ; uncalculated terms enter through three-photon QED effects (to order  $\alpha^3(\alpha Z)^2$  and higher) and through two-loop one-electron QED corrections ( $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^7$  and higher).

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we describe the basic formalism and present general formulas for the two-electron QED corrections for the case of quasi-degenerate levels. In Section II, the numerical procedure is briefly discussed and numerical results are presented for the two-photon exchange correction and the screened self-energy correction. The total two-electron QED correction is then compiled, analyzed, and compared with the known terms of the  $\alpha Z$  expansion. In the last section, we present a compilation of all contributions available to the energy levels and compare results of different theoretical evaluations with existing experimental data. The relativistic units ( $\hbar = c = m = 1$ ) are used throughout the paper.

## I. FORMAL EXPRESSIONS

### A. Basic formalism

In this section we briefly formulate the basic equations of the TTGF method for quasi-degenerate states of a He-like ion. A detailed description of the method and, particularly, its implementation for the case of quasidegenerate states can be found in Refs. [33, 34, 42]. The derivation will be given for two particular quasidegenerate states,  $(1s2p_{1/2})_1$  and  $(1s2p_{3/2})_1$ , and can immediately be extended to a more general case. The unperturbed two-electron wave functions in the  $jj$  coupling are given by

$$u_1 = \sum_{m_a m_v} \langle j_a m_a j_v m_v | JM \rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_P (-1)^P |PaPv\rangle, \quad (1)$$

$$u_2 = \sum_{m_a m_w} \langle j_a m_a j_w m_w | JM \rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_P (-1)^P |PaPw\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where  $a$ ,  $v$  and  $w$  are taken to represent  $1s$ ,  $2p_{1/2}$  and  $2p_{3/2}$  orbitals, respectively;  $P$  is the permutation operator:

$$\sum_P (-1)^P |PaPv\rangle = |av\rangle - |va\rangle,$$

and  $|av\rangle \equiv |a\rangle|v\rangle$  is the product of the one-electron Dirac wave functions. The transition to the wave functions corresponding to the LS-coupling scheme within the non-relativistic approximation can be performed by

$$\begin{pmatrix} |2^3P_1\rangle \\ |2^1P_1\rangle \end{pmatrix} = R \begin{pmatrix} |(1s2p_{1/2})_1\rangle \\ |(1s2p_{3/2})_1\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

with

$$R = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & -1 \\ 1 & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

We mention that this choice of the matrix  $R$  implies that the one-electron  $2p_{1/2}$  and  $2p_{3/2}$  wave functions have the same sign in the non-relativistic limit.

The standard definition of the four-time two-electron Green function in the external field of the nucleus is

$$G(x'_1, x'_2; x_1, x_2) = \langle 0|T\psi(x'_1)\psi(x'_2)\bar{\psi}(x_1)\bar{\psi}(x_2)|0\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where  $\psi(x)$  is the electron-positron field operator in the Heisenberg representation,  $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger\gamma^0$ , and  $T$  denotes the time-ordered product operator. This Green function is constructed by perturbation theory after the transition to the interaction representation where it is given by (see, e.g., [43])

$$G(x'_1, x'_2; x_1, x_2) = \frac{\langle 0|T\psi_{\text{in}}(x'_1)\psi_{\text{in}}(x'_2)\bar{\psi}_{\text{in}}(x_2)\bar{\psi}_{\text{in}}(x_1) \exp[-i \int d^4z \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}(z)] |0\rangle}{\langle 0|T \exp[-i \int d^4z \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}(z)] |0\rangle}. \quad (6)$$

Here  $\psi_{\text{in}}(x)$  is the electron-positron field operator in the interaction representation and  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$  is the interaction Hamiltonian. Expression (6) allows one to construct  $G$  by using Wick's theorem.

In what follows, it is more convenient to work with the Green function in the mixed energy-coordinate representation, which is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} G(p_1^0, \mathbf{x}'_1, p_2^0, \mathbf{x}'_2; p_1^0, \mathbf{x}_1, p_2^0, \mathbf{x}_2) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx_1^0 dx_2^0 dx_1'^0 dx_2'^0 \\ &\times \exp(ip_1^0 x_1'^0 + ip_2^0 x_2'^0 - ip_1^0 x_1^0 - ip_2^0 x_2^0) G(x'_1, x'_2; x_1, x_2). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The Feynman rules for  $G(p_1^0, \mathbf{x}'_1, p_2^0, \mathbf{x}'_2; p_1^0, \mathbf{x}_1, p_2^0, \mathbf{x}_2)$  can be found in [34, 42]. We now introduce the Green function  $g(E)$  as

$$g(E) \delta(E - E') = \frac{\pi}{i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 dp_2^0 dp_1'^0 dp_2'^0 \delta(E - p_1^0 - p_2^0) \times \delta(E' - p_1'^0 - p_2'^0) P_0 G(p_1^0, p_2^0; p_1'^0, p_2'^0) \gamma_1^0 \gamma_2^0 P_0, \quad (8)$$

where  $P_0 = \sum_k u_k u_k^\dagger$  is the projector on the subspace of the unperturbed quasi-degenerate states under consideration [see Eqs. (1) and (2)]. It can easily be shown (see, e.g., Refs. [34, 42]) that the Green function  $g$  is the Fourier transform of the two-time Green function projected on the subspace of the unperturbed quasi-degenerate states.

It can be derived (see Ref. [34] for details) that the system under consideration can be described by a two-dimensional Schrödinger-like equation ( $k = 1, 2$ ),

$$H\psi_k = E_k\psi_k, \quad \psi_k^\dagger \psi_{k'} = \delta_{kk'}, \quad (9)$$

where

$$H = P^{-1/2} K P^{-1/2}, \quad (10)$$

$$K = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} dE E g(E), \quad (11)$$

$$P = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} dE g(E), \quad (12)$$

$\Gamma$  is a contour in the complex  $E$  plane that surrounds the levels under consideration but does not encircle other levels, and  $E_k$  are the exact energies of the states under consideration. It is assumed that the contour  $\Gamma$  is oriented anticlockwise. The operator  $H$ , which is a  $2 \times 2$  matrix, is constructed by perturbation theory in  $\alpha$ . Substituting

$$g(E) = g^{(0)}(E) + g^{(1)}(E) + g^{(2)}(E) + \dots, \quad (13)$$

$$P = P^{(0)} + P^{(1)} + P^{(2)} + \dots, \quad (14)$$

$$K = K^{(0)} + K^{(1)} + K^{(2)} + \dots, \quad (15)$$

where the superscript indicates the order in  $\alpha$ , we obtain [33]

$$H^{(0)} = K^{(0)}, \quad (16)$$

$$H^{(1)} = K^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} P^{(1)} K^{(0)} - \frac{1}{2} K^{(0)} P^{(1)}, \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H^{(2)} = & K^{(2)} - \frac{1}{2}P^{(2)}K^{(0)} - \frac{1}{2}K^{(0)}P^{(2)} - \frac{1}{2}P^{(1)}K^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2}K^{(1)}P^{(1)} \\
& + \frac{3}{8}P^{(1)}P^{(1)}K^{(0)} + \frac{3}{8}K^{(0)}P^{(1)}P^{(1)} + \frac{1}{4}P^{(1)}K^{(0)}P^{(1)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The solvability of Eq. (9) yields the basic equation for the calculation of the energy levels

$$\det(E - H) = 0. \tag{19}$$

As was noticed in Ref. [33], due to nonzero decay rates of excited states, the self-adjoint part of  $H$  should be understood in Eqs. (9) and (19),

$$H \equiv (1/2)(H + H^\dagger). \tag{20}$$

To zeroth order in  $\alpha$ , the Green function  $g(E)$  is

$$g^{(0)}(E) = \sum_{s=1}^2 \frac{|u_s\rangle\langle u_s|}{E - E_s^{(0)}}, \tag{21}$$

where  $E_1^{(0)}$  and  $E_2^{(0)}$  are the unperturbed energies of the  $(1s2p_{1/2})_1$  and  $(1s2p_{3/2})_1$  states, respectively, given by the sum of the one-electron Dirac-Coulomb energies:

$$E_1^{(0)} = \varepsilon_{1s} + \varepsilon_{2p_{1/2}}, \quad E_2^{(0)} = \varepsilon_{1s} + \varepsilon_{2p_{3/2}}.$$

Substituting Eq. (21) into the definitions of  $K$ ,  $P$ , and  $H$ , one gets

$$K_{ik}^{(0)} = E_i^{(0)} \delta_{ik}, \tag{22}$$

$$P_{ik}^{(0)} = \delta_{ik}, \tag{23}$$

$$H_{ik}^{(0)} = E_i^{(0)} \delta_{ik}. \tag{24}$$

Now we introduce a set of notations that will shorten the following expressions. The short-hand notation will be used for the summation over the Clebsh-Gordan coefficients in Eqs. (1), (2):

$$F_i |i_1 i_2\rangle \equiv \sum_{m_{i_1} m_{i_2}} \langle j_{i_1} m_{i_1} j_{i_2} m_{i_2} | JM \rangle |i_1 i_2\rangle. \tag{25}$$

where  $|i_1 i_2\rangle$  is either  $|av\rangle$  or  $|aw\rangle$ . It is convenient also to use the notation for the operator of the electron-electron interaction:

$$I(\omega) = e^2 \alpha_1^\mu \alpha_2^\nu D_{\mu\nu}(\omega), \tag{26}$$

where  $\alpha^\mu = \gamma^0 \gamma^\mu = (1, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$  and  $D_{\mu\nu}$  denotes the photon propagator. In the Feynman gauge, the propagator of a photon with the non-zero mass  $\mu$  is

$$D_{\mu\nu}(\omega, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = g_{\mu\nu} \frac{\exp(i\sqrt{\omega^2 - \mu^2 + i0} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)}{4\pi|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|}, \quad (27)$$

where it is assumed that  $\text{Im}\sqrt{\omega^2 - \mu^2 + i0} > 0$ . For the matrix elements of the operator  $I(\omega)$  we will use the short-hand notation

$$I_{ijkl}(\omega) = \langle ij | I(\omega) | kl \rangle. \quad (28)$$

## B. One-photon exchange diagram

In order to illustrate how the method works, below we present the detailed derivation of the correction to the quasidegenerate energy levels  $(1s2p_{1/2})_1$  and  $(1s2p_{3/2})_1$  due to the one-photon exchange diagram (Fig. 1). While the corresponding evaluation is much less cumbersome than those for the second-order two-electron corrections, it demonstrates most essential features that are encountered in these cases. For simplicity, in the derivation below we will assume that the unperturbed energy of the initial state  $i$  differs from that of the final state  $k$ :  $E_i^{(0)} \neq E_k^{(0)}$  (in the case under consideration it corresponds to  $i \neq k$ ). However, all the final formulas can be shown to be valid also for the case  $E_i^{(0)} = E_k^{(0)}$ .

According to the Feynman rules [34, 42] and the definition of  $g(E)$ , the contribution of the one-photon exchange diagram is

$$g_{ik}^{(1)}(E) = F_i F_k \left( \frac{i}{2\pi} \right)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 dp_1'^0 \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{1}{(p_1'^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_1}} + i0)(E - p_1'^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_2}} + i0)} \\ \times \frac{I_{P_{i_1} P_{i_2} k_1 k_2}(p_1'^0 - p_1^0)}{(p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1} + i0)(E - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_2} + i0)}. \quad (29)$$

Employing the identities

$$\frac{1}{(p_1'^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_1}} + i0)(E - p_1'^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_2}} + i0)} = \frac{1}{E - E_i^{(0)}} \left( \frac{1}{p_1'^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_1}} + i0} + \frac{1}{E - p_1'^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_2}} + i0} \right), \quad (30)$$

$$\frac{1}{(p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1} + i0)(E - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_2} + i0)} = \frac{1}{E - E_k^{(0)}} \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_2} + i0} \right), \quad (31)$$



we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{ik}^{(1)} &= F_i F_k \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} dE \frac{E}{(E - E_i^{(0)})(E - E_k^{(0)})} \left[ \left( \frac{i}{2\pi} \right)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 dp_1'^0 \sum_P (-1)^P \right. \\
&\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P i_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P i_2} + i0} \right) \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_2} + i0} \right) \\
&\quad \left. \times I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2} (p_1^0 - p_1^0) \right]. \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

The expression in the square brackets is an analytical function of  $E$  inside the contour  $\Gamma$ , if the photon mass  $\mu$  is chosen properly (see Refs. [33, 42]). Carrying out the  $E$  integration by Cauchy's theorem and taking into account that

$$\left( \frac{i}{2\pi} \right) \left( \frac{1}{x + i0} + \frac{1}{-x + i0} \right) = \delta(x), \tag{33}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{ik}^{(1)} &= F_i F_k \left\{ \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{E_i^{(0)} I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2} (\varepsilon_{P i_1} - p_1^0)}{E_i^{(0)} - E_k^{(0)}} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E_i^{(0)} - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_2} + i0} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{E_k^{(0)} I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2} (p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1})}{E_k^{(0)} - E_i^{(0)}} \\
&\quad \left. \times \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P i_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E_k^{(0)} - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P i_2} + i0} \right) \right\}. \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

In the same way we find

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{ik}^{(1)} &= F_i F_k \left\{ \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2} (\varepsilon_{P i_1} - p_1^0)}{E_i^{(0)} - E_k^{(0)}} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E_i^{(0)} - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_2} + i0} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2} (p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1})}{E_k^{(0)} - E_i^{(0)}} \\
&\quad \left. \times \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P i_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E_k^{(0)} - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P i_2} + i0} \right) \right\}. \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting Eqs. (34), (35) into Eq. (17), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{ik}^{(1)} = & F_i F_k \left\{ \frac{i}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 \sum_P (-1)^P I_{P_{i_1} P_{i_2} k_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{P_{i_1}} - p_1^0) \right. \\
& \times \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1} + i0} + \frac{1}{E_i^{(0)} - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_2} + i0} \right) \\
& + \frac{i}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp_1^0 \sum_P (-1)^P I_{P_{i_1} P_{i_2} k_1 k_2}(p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{k_1}) \\
& \left. \times \left( \frac{1}{p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_1}} + i0} + \frac{1}{E_k^{(0)} - p_1^0 - \varepsilon_{P_{i_2}} + i0} \right) \right\}. \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

Introducing the notations  $\Delta_1 = \varepsilon_{P_{i_1}} - \varepsilon_{k_1}$  and  $\Delta_2 = \varepsilon_{P_{i_2}} - \varepsilon_{k_2}$ , we can rewrite Eq. (36) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{ik}^{(1)} = & F_i F_k \frac{i}{8\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \sum_P (-1)^P I_{P_{i_1} P_{i_2} k_1 k_2}(\omega) \left( \frac{1}{\omega + \Delta_1 + i0} + \frac{1}{\Delta_2 - \omega + i0} \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{\omega + \Delta_2 + i0} + \frac{1}{\Delta_1 - \omega + i0} + \frac{1}{\omega - \Delta_1 + i0} + \frac{1}{-\Delta_2 - \omega + i0} \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{\omega - \Delta_2 + i0} + \frac{1}{-\Delta_1 - \omega + i0} \right) \\
= & F_i F_k \frac{1}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \sum_P (-1)^P I_{P_{i_1} P_{i_2} k_1 k_2}(\omega) \\
& \times \left[ \delta(\omega + \Delta_1) + \delta(\omega - \Delta_1) + \delta(\omega + \Delta_2) + \delta(\omega - \Delta_2) \right]. \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that  $I(z) = I(-z)$ , we finally obtain [33, 44]

$$H_{ik}^{(1)} = F_i F_k \frac{1}{2} \sum_P (-1)^P [I_{P_{i_1} P_{i_2} k_1 k_2}(\Delta_1) + I_{P_{i_1} P_{i_2} k_1 k_2}(\Delta_2)]. \tag{38}$$

### C. Two-photon exchange diagrams

The set of two-photon exchange diagrams is shown in Fig. 2. The first and the second graph are referred to as the ladder and the crossed diagram, respectively. The derivation of the general expressions for the two-photon exchange correction in the case of quasi-degenerate levels is rather lengthy. However, it greatly resembles the corresponding derivation for the one-photon exchange correction presented above, on one hand, and that for the two-photon exchange diagram in case of a single level described in detail in Ref. [45], on the other hand. We thus present only the final formulas for the two-photon exchange contributions to the matrix elements of the operator  $H^{(2)}$ .

### 1. The ladder diagram

The contribution of the two-photon ladder diagram is conveniently divided into the *irreducible* and the *reducible* part. The reducible contribution is defined as a part in which the total intermediate energy of the atom equals to  $E_1^{(0)}$  or  $E_2^{(0)}$  and the irreducible part is the remainder. The operator  $H^{(2)}$  is defined by Eq. (18). The first three terms in the right-hand side of this equation contribute both to the irreducible and to the reducible part. As to the others, it is natural to ascribe them to the reducible part.

The contribution of the irreducible part of  $H_{ik}^{(2)}$  is defined as the self-adjoint part of the following matrix

$$H_{ik}^{\text{lad,ir}} = [K^{(2,\text{ir})} - (1/2)P^{(2,\text{ir})}K^{(0)} - (1/2)K^{(0)}P^{(2,\text{ir})}]_{ik}. \quad (39)$$

The result is

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ik}^{\text{lad,ir}} = F_i F_k & \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \left[ S_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, 0) + S_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, \Delta) + S_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, 0, 0) + S_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, -\Delta, 0) \right] \right. \\ & + \frac{i}{4\pi} \text{v.p.} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{1}{x} \left[ S_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, x) - S_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, x + \Delta) \right. \\ & \left. \left. + S_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, x, 0) - S_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, x - \Delta, 0) \right] \right\}, \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta = E_i^{(0)} - E_k^{(0)}$  and the matrix elements  $S_{ik}$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ik}(E, x, y) = \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{i}{2\pi} \\ \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \sum_{n_1 n_2}^{E_n^{(0)} \neq E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)}} \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n_1 n_2}(\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \omega + x) I_{n_1 n_2 k_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{k_1} - \omega + y)}{[\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1}(1 - i0)][E - \omega - \varepsilon_{n_2}(1 - i0)]}. \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

The summation here runs over all  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  for which  $E_n^{(0)} \neq E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)}$ , where  $E_n^{(0)} \equiv \varepsilon_{n_1} + \varepsilon_{n_2}$  is the total intermediate energy of the atom. The sign "v.p." in front of the integral in Eq. (40) denotes that the principal value of the integral (over  $x$ ) must be taken.

We note that the part containing the integral over  $x$  in Eq. (40) vanishes identically in case of diagonal matrix elements ( $i = k$ ). It neither appears for single levels [45]. In case of off-diagonal matrix elements ( $i \neq k$ ), the contribution of this part is of order  $\alpha^2 \Delta$  and it vanishes when  $(E_i^{(0)} - E_k^{(0)}) \rightarrow 0$ . As shown in Ref. [34], such terms contribute to the next order of perturbation theory and can, therefore, be disregarded in the present consideration. Expression

(40) can be simplified even further by taking into account that

$$E_i^{(0)} = \overline{E}^{(0)} + O(\Delta), \quad E_k^{(0)} = \overline{E}^{(0)} + O(\Delta), \quad (42)$$

where  $\overline{E}^{(0)} = (E_i^{(0)} + E_k^{(0)})/2$ . We thus write  $H_{ik}^{\text{lad,ir}}$  simply as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ik}^{\text{lad,ir}} &= F_i F_k S_{ik}(\overline{E}^{(0)}, 0, 0) + O(\alpha^2 \Delta) \\ &= F_i F_k \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\substack{E_n^{(0)} \neq E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)} \\ n_1 n_2}} \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n_1 n_2}(\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \omega) I_{n_1 n_2 k_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{k_1} - \omega)}{[\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1}(1 - i0)][\overline{E}^{(0)} - \omega - \varepsilon_{n_2}(1 - i0)]} + O(\alpha^2 \Delta). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

The reducible contribution is induced by the self-adjoint part of the following operator

$$H^{\text{lad,red}} = H^{\text{lad,red,a}} + H^{\text{lad,red,b}}, \quad (44)$$

where

$$H^{\text{lad,red,a}} = K^{(2,\text{red})} - \frac{1}{2} P^{(2,\text{red})} K^{(0)} - \frac{1}{2} K^{(0)} P^{(2,\text{red})} \quad (45)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\text{lad,red,b}} &= -\frac{1}{2} P^{(1)} K^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} K^{(1)} P^{(1)} + \frac{3}{8} P^{(1)} P^{(1)} K^{(0)} \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{8} K^{(0)} P^{(1)} P^{(1)} + \frac{1}{4} P^{(1)} K^{(0)} P^{(1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The result for the first part reads

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ik}^{\text{lad,red,a}} &= F_i F_k \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} [A_{ik}(0) + A_{ik}(\Delta) + B_{ik}(0) + B_{ik}(-\Delta) + C_{ik}] \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} [D_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, 0) + D_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, \Delta) + D_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, 0, 0) + D_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, -\Delta, 0)] \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{4\pi} \text{v.p.} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{1}{x} [D_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, x) - D_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, x + \Delta) \\ &\quad \left. + D_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, x, 0) - D_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, x - \Delta, 0)] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ik}(x) &= \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{i}{2\pi} \sum_{\substack{E_n^{(0)} = E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)} \\ n_1 n_2}} \\ &\quad \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n_1 n_2}(\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1}) I_{n_1 n_2 k_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{k_1} - \varepsilon_{n_1})}{(\omega - \varepsilon_{P i_1} + E_i^{(0)} - E_n^{(0)} - i0)(\omega - \varepsilon_{P i_1} + x - i0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$B_{ik}(x) = \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{i}{2\pi} \sum_{n_1 n_2}^{E_n^{(0)}=E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)}} \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n_1 n_2}(\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \varepsilon_{n_1}) I_{n_1 n_2 k_1 k_2}(\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1})}{(\omega - \varepsilon_{k_1} + E_k^{(0)} - E_n^{(0)} - i0)(\omega - \varepsilon_{k_1} + x - i0)}, \quad (49)$$

$$C_{ik} = \sum_P (-1)^P \sum_{n_1 n_2}^{E_n^{(0)}=E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)}} (E_i^{(0)} + E_k^{(0)} - 2E_n^{(0)}) \times \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega' \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n_1 n_2}(\omega' - \varepsilon_{n_1})}{(\omega' - \varepsilon_{P i_1} - i0)(\omega' - \varepsilon_{P i_1} + E_i^{(0)} - E_n^{(0)} - i0)} \times \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{I_{n_1 n_2 k_1 k_2}(\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1})}{(\omega - \varepsilon_{k_1} - i0)(\omega - \varepsilon_{k_1} + E_k^{(0)} - E_n^{(0)} - i0)}, \quad (50)$$

$$D_{ik}(E, x, y) = \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{i}{2\pi} \sum_{n_1 n_2}^{E_n^{(0)}=E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)}} \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n_1 n_2}(\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \omega + x) I_{n_1 n_2 k_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{k_1} - \omega + y)}{(\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1} - i0)(\omega + \varepsilon_{n_2} - E - i0)}. \quad (51)$$

The part containing the integral over  $x$  in Eq. (47) represents a contribution of order  $\alpha^2 \Delta$ . Again, we regard this contribution as belonging to the next order of perturbation theory and disregard it in the present investigation.

The second part of the reducible contribution is given by the matrix element of the operator (46). The result is obtained by taking into account that

$$K_{ik}^{(0)} = E_i^{(0)} \delta_{ik}, \quad P_{ik}^{(0)} = \delta_{ik}, \quad (52)$$

$$K_{ik}^{(1)} = F_i F_k \sum_P (-1)^P \left\{ \frac{1}{2} [I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_1) + I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_2)] - \frac{(E_i^{(0)} + E_k^{(0)})}{2} \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\omega) \times \left[ \frac{1}{(\omega + \Delta_1 - i0)(\omega - \Delta_2 - i0)} + \frac{1}{(\omega + \Delta_2 - i0)(\omega - \Delta_1 - i0)} \right] \right\}, \quad (53)$$

and

$$P_{ik}^{(1)} = -F_i F_k \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\omega) \times \left[ \frac{1}{(\omega + \Delta_1 - i0)(\omega - \Delta_2 - i0)} + \frac{1}{(\omega + \Delta_2 - i0)(\omega - \Delta_1 - i0)} \right]. \quad (54)$$

The total result for the reducible part can be simplified by using Eq. (42) and disregarding terms that contribute to the next order of perturbation theory. One can show that in this case the  $A$ 's,  $B$ 's, and  $C$ 's in Eq. (47) are cancelled completely by the  $H^{\text{lad,red},b}$  term. The result is just

$$H_{ik}^{\text{lad,red}} = -F_i F_k D_{ik}(\overline{E}^{(0)}, 0, 0) + O(\alpha^2 \Delta) = -F_i F_k \sum_P (-1)^P \sum_{n_1 n_2}^{E_n^{(0)} = E_1^{(0)}, E_2^{(0)}} \times \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n_1 n_2}(\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \omega) I_{n_1 n_2 k_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{k_1} - \omega)}{(\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1} - i0)(\omega + \varepsilon_{n_2} - \overline{E}^{(0)} - i0)} + O(\alpha^2 \Delta). \quad (55)$$

## 2. The crossed diagram

The contribution of the crossed diagram is induced by the self-adjoint part of the following operator

$$H^{\text{cr}} = K^{(2)} - (1/2)P^{(2)}K^{(0)} - (1/2)K^{(0)}P^{(2)}. \quad (56)$$

The corresponding result reads

$$H_{ik}^{\text{cr}} = F_i F_k \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \left[ T_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, 0) + T_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, \Delta) + T_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, 0, 0) + T_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, -\Delta, 0) \right] + \frac{i}{4\pi} \text{v.p.} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{1}{x} \left[ T_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, x) - T_{ik}(E_i^{(0)}, 0, x + \Delta) + T_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, x, 0) - T_{ik}(E_k^{(0)}, x - \Delta, 0) \right] \right\}, \quad (57)$$

where

$$T_{ik}(E, x, y) = \sum_P (-1)^P \sum_{n_1 n_2} \frac{i}{2\pi} \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{I_{P i_1 n_2 n_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \omega + x) I_{n_1 P i_2 k_1 n_2}(\varepsilon_{k_1} - \omega + y)}{[\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1}(1 - i0)][E - \varepsilon_{P i_1} - \varepsilon_{k_1} - x - y + \omega - \varepsilon_{n_2}(1 - i0)]}. \quad (58)$$

The expression (57) can be simplified in the same way as the previous contributions, with the result

$$H_{ik}^{\text{cr}} = F_i F_k T_{ik}(\overline{E}^{(0)}, 0, 0) + O(\alpha^2 \Delta) = F_i F_k \sum_P (-1)^P \sum_{n_1 n_2} \frac{i}{2\pi} \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{I_{P i_1 n_2 n_1 k_2}(\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \omega) I_{n_1 P i_2 k_1 n_2}(\varepsilon_{k_1} - \omega)}{[\omega - \varepsilon_{n_1}(1 - i0)][\overline{E}^{(0)} - \varepsilon_{P i_1} - \varepsilon_{k_1} + \omega - \varepsilon_{n_2}(1 - i0)]} + O(\alpha^2 \Delta). \quad (59)$$

#### D. Screened self-energy correction

The set of Feynman diagrams representing the screened self-energy correction is shown in Fig. 3. Formal expressions for this correction in case of quasi-degenerate states were obtained previously in Ref. [46] by the TTGF method. Here we present only the final expressions for this correction.

The contribution of the vertex diagrams is given by

$$H_{ik}^{\text{ver}} = F_i F_k \sum_P (-1)^P \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \sum_{n_1 n_2} \left\{ \frac{I_{n_1 P i_2 n_2 k_2}(\Delta_1) I_{P i_1 n_2 n_1 k_1}(\omega)}{[\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \omega - \varepsilon_{n_1}(1 - i0)][\varepsilon_{k_1} - \omega - \varepsilon_{n_2}(1 - i0)]} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{I_{P i_1 n_1 k_1 n_2}(\Delta_2) I_{P i_2 n_2 n_1 k_2}(\omega)}{[\varepsilon_{P i_2} - \omega - \varepsilon_{n_1}(1 - i0)][\varepsilon_{k_2} - \omega - \varepsilon_{n_2}(1 - i0)]} \right\} + O(\alpha^2 \Delta), \quad (60)$$

where  $\Delta_1 = \varepsilon_{P i_1} - \varepsilon_{k_1}$  and  $\Delta_2 = \varepsilon_{P i_2} - \varepsilon_{k_2}$ .

The contribution of the remaining diagrams is conveniently separated into the irreducible and reducible parts. The irreducible contribution is given by

$$H_{ik}^{\text{se,ir}} = F_i F_k \sum_P (-1)^P \left\{ \sum_{n \neq k_1} \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 n k_2}(\Delta_1)}{\varepsilon_{k_1} - \varepsilon_n} \langle n | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{k_1}) | k_1 \rangle \right. \\ + \sum_{n \neq k_2} \frac{I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 n}(\Delta_2)}{\varepsilon_{k_2} - \varepsilon_n} \langle n | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{k_2}) | k_2 \rangle \\ + \sum_{n \neq P i_1} \langle P i_1 | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{P i_1}) | n \rangle \frac{I_{n P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_1)}{\varepsilon_{P i_1} - \varepsilon_n} \\ \left. + \sum_{n \neq P i_2} \langle P i_2 | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{P i_2}) | n \rangle \frac{I_{P i_1 n k_1 k_2}(\Delta_2)}{\varepsilon_{P i_2} - \varepsilon_n} \right\} + O(\alpha^2 \Delta), \quad (61)$$

where  $\Sigma(\varepsilon)$  is the self-energy operator defined by its matrix elements,

$$\langle a | \Sigma(\varepsilon) | b \rangle = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \sum_n \frac{\langle a n | I(\omega) | n b \rangle}{\varepsilon - \omega - \varepsilon_n(1 - i0)}. \quad (62)$$

The result for the reducible contribution reads

$$H_{ik}^{\text{se,red}} = F_i F_k \frac{1}{2} \sum_P (-1)^P \left\{ I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_1) \left[ \langle P i_1 | \Sigma'(\varepsilon_{P i_1}) | P i_1 \rangle + \langle k_1 | \Sigma'(\varepsilon_{k_1}) | k_1 \rangle \right] \right. \\ + I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_2) \left[ \langle P i_2 | \Sigma'(\varepsilon_{P i_2}) | P i_2 \rangle + \langle k_2 | \Sigma'(\varepsilon_{k_2}) | k_2 \rangle \right] \\ + I'_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_1) \left[ \langle P i_1 | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{P i_1}) | P i_1 \rangle - \langle k_1 | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{k_1}) | k_1 \rangle \right] \\ \left. + I'_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_2) \left[ \langle P i_2 | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{P i_2}) | P i_2 \rangle - \langle k_2 | \Sigma(\varepsilon_{k_2}) | k_2 \rangle \right] \right\} + O(\alpha^2 \Delta), \quad (63)$$

where  $I'(\omega) \equiv \partial I(\omega) / \partial \omega$ , and  $\Sigma'(\omega) \equiv \partial \Sigma(\omega) / \partial \omega$ .

### E. Screened vacuum-polarization correction

The derivation of formal expressions for the screened vacuum-polarization correction in case of quasi-degenerate states was described in our previous work [37]. For completeness, we present here the final expressions for this correction; the corresponding set of Feynman diagrams is shown in Fig. 3.

The expression for the contribution of the diagram with the vacuum-polarization loop inserted into the photon propagator can be obtained from the formula for the one-photon exchange (38) by replacing the operator of the electron-electron interaction  $I(\varepsilon)$  by the modified interaction,

$$U_{\text{VP}}^{\text{ph}}(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\alpha^2}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \int d\mathbf{z}_1 d\mathbf{z}_2 \frac{\alpha_\mu \exp(i|\varepsilon||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_1|)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_1|} \frac{\alpha_\nu \exp(i|\varepsilon||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}_2|)}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}_2|} \times \text{Tr} [\alpha^\mu G(\omega - \varepsilon/2, \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \alpha^\nu G(\omega + \varepsilon/2, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{z}_1)], \quad (64)$$

where  $G(\omega, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_n \psi_n(\mathbf{x})\psi_n^\dagger(\mathbf{y})/[\omega - \varepsilon_n(1 - i0)]$  is the Dirac-Coulomb Green function. The corresponding contribution to  $H_{ik}^{(2)}$  is

$$H_{ik}^{\text{vp,ph}} = F_i F_k \frac{1}{2} \sum_P (-1)^P \left[ \langle P i_1 P i_2 | U_{\text{VP}}^{\text{ph}}(\Delta_1) | k_1 k_2 \rangle + \langle P i_1 P i_2 | U_{\text{VP}}^{\text{ph}}(\Delta_2) | k_1 k_2 \rangle \right], \quad (65)$$

where  $\Delta_1 = \varepsilon_{P i_1} - \varepsilon_{k_1}$  and  $\Delta_2 = \varepsilon_{P i_2} - \varepsilon_{k_2}$ .

To the order under consideration, expressions for the remaining diagrams can be obtained from the one-photon exchange correction by perturbing the wave functions and the binding energies by an additional vacuum-polarization interaction. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ik}^{\text{vp,wf}} + H_{ik}^{\text{vp,be}} = & F_i F_k \frac{1}{2} \sum_P (-1)^P \left[ \langle \delta P i_1 P i_2 | [I(\Delta_1) + I(\Delta_2)] | k_1 k_2 \rangle \right. \\ & + \langle P i_1 \delta P i_2 | [I(\Delta_1) + I(\Delta_2)] | k_1 k_2 \rangle \\ & + \langle P i_1 P i_2 | [I(\Delta_1) + I(\Delta_2)] | \delta k_1 k_2 \rangle \\ & + \langle P i_1 P i_2 | [I(\Delta_1) + I(\Delta_2)] | k_1 \delta k_2 \rangle \\ & + (\delta \varepsilon_{P i_1} - \delta \varepsilon_{k_1}) \langle P i_1 P i_2 | I'(\Delta_1) | k_1 k_2 \rangle \\ & \left. + (\delta \varepsilon_{P i_2} - \delta \varepsilon_{k_2}) \langle P i_1 P i_2 | I'(\Delta_2) | k_1 k_2 \rangle \right]. \quad (66) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta i$  and  $\delta k$  refer to the first-order corrections to the corresponding wave function,

$$|\delta i\rangle = \sum_n^{\varepsilon_n \neq \varepsilon_i} \frac{|n\rangle \langle n | U_{\text{VP}} | i \rangle}{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_n}, \quad (67)$$



$\delta\varepsilon_i$  is the correction to the energy,  $\delta\varepsilon_i = \langle i|U_{\text{VP}}|i\rangle$ , and

$$U_{\text{VP}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \int d\mathbf{y} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \text{Tr} [G(\omega, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y})] \quad (68)$$

is the vacuum-polarization potential.

As discussed previously in Ref. [34], a direct derivation based on the TTGF method yields a result that differs from Eq. (66) by terms of order  $(\alpha^2\Delta)$ , which can be disregarded as long as we are not interested in higher orders of perturbation theory (see Ref. [34] for a detailed discussion).

## II. NUMERICAL EVALUATION AND RESULTS

An important difference of the present investigation from the previous studies of QED effects in high- $Z$  ions is that it involves QED corrections for *quasi-degenerate* configurations, namely  $(1s2p_{1/2})_1$  and  $(1s2p_{3/2})_1$ . While the derivation of basic expressions in this case is more difficult than for a single state, the final expressions for the diagonal matrix elements turn out to be very similar to those for the single-level case. We can, therefore, adopt a code developed for single-level calculations for the diagonal matrix elements of the operator  $H$ . For an evaluation of the off-diagonal matrix elements, a generalization of the code is needed.

The numerical procedure employed in the present calculation of the two-photon exchange correction is based on that presented in detail in our previous investigations for Li-like ions [30, 47]. Apart from the angular reduction that is performed by using the standard angular-momentum technique, the evaluation is rather similar to that for Li-like ions. The calculation was carried out employing the Fermi model for the nuclear-charge distribution, with the nuclear charge radii specified in Section III. The numerical uncertainty of the results is expected to be  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  eV in all cases except for the off-diagonal matrix element, for which the uncertainty is  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  eV for  $Z \leq 50$ ,  $2 \times 10^{-4}$  eV for  $Z \leq 80$ , and  $4 \times 10^{-4}$  eV otherwise. As a check of the numerical procedure, we performed the evaluation in two different gauges, the Feynman and the Coulomb ones. The two-photon exchange corrections (for mixing configurations, individual matrix elements) were found to be gauge invariant well within the uncertainty specified.

The results of our numerical calculation of the two-photon exchange correction for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions are presented in Table I. The values listed represent corrections to the energy in case of single levels and contributions to the matrix elements  $H_{ik}$  for the quasi-degenerate states. The energy levels for the  $(1s2p_{1/2})_1$  and  $(1s2p_{3/2})_1$  states are obtained

by diagonalizing the  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $H$  containing all relevant corrections. In Table I, we present also a comparison of our numerical values with the results of the previous calculations of this correction for various states of He-like ions [23, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41]. The comparison indicates that calculations by different groups are generally in agreement with each other. However, there exist also certain deviations between different calculations, notably with those by Andreev *et al.* [39, 40]. Regarding the comparison of the present results and the ones of Ref. [36] for the mixing states, we would like to stress that, generally speaking, results of different methods for individual matrix elements could be different, since the matrix  $H$  can differ by a unitary transformation. We observe, however, that in our case the results for the individual matrix elements agree with those of Ref. [36] approximately at the same level as for the single states.

The calculation of the screened self-energy correction for  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions resembles that for Li-like ions described in our previous work [29]. A more difficult angular structure of the initial-state wave functions for He-like ions makes final expressions more lengthy and their numerical evaluation more time consuming. Significant complications appear in performing angular integrations in momentum space for the vertex part with free-electron propagators. To handle them, we developed a generalization of the angular-integration procedure described in Ref. [29] to arbitrary states, using our experience in calculating similar angular integrals for the two-loop self-energy diagrams [48]. The actual calculation was carried out employing the spherical-shell model for the nuclear-charge distribution. Our numerical results for the screened self-energy correction for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions are presented in Table II in terms of the dimensionless function  $F(\alpha Z)$  defined as

$$\Delta E = \alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3 F(\alpha Z). \quad (69)$$

The values listed in the table represent corrections to the energy in case of single levels and contributions to the matrix elements  $H_{ik}$  for the quasi-degenerate states.

In case of the ground state of He-like ions, the self-energy correction was evaluated previously by Persson *et al.* [25], by us [27], and by Sunnergren [49]. In the present work, we recalculated this correction using the new code and found an excellent agreement with our previous results and with those by Sunnergren. A small deviation of the present result for  $Z = 90$  from the old one is due to a more recent value for the nuclear charge radius used in this work.

We note that the values presented in Table II for  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions can also be used for determining the screened self-energy correction due to the interaction of the valence electron and

the  $(1s)^2$  shell in *Li-like* ions. Indeed, by using elementary angular-summation rules, we obtain

$$(2j_v + 1) \Delta E_v^{\text{Li}} = \sum_J (2J + 1) \Delta E_{v,J}^{\text{He}}, \quad (70)$$

where  $\Delta E_v^{\text{Li}}$  denotes the screened self-energy correction in a Li-like ion due to the interaction of the electron in the state  $v$  and the  $(1s)^2$  shell,  $\Delta E_{v,J}^{\text{He}}$  is the screened self-energy correction in a He-like ion for the  $(1s v)_J$  configuration (in case of mixing configurations, a diagonal matrix element should be taken), and  $j_v$  is the total angular momentum of the  $v$  electron. By employing the identity (70), we check that our numerical results for He-like ions are in a very good agreement with our previous calculations for Li-like ions [29].

Our calculations of the screened self-energy and two-photon exchange corrections, combined with the results for the screened vacuum-polarization from Ref. [37] (with the off-diagonal matrix elements corrected in this paper, see below), complete the evaluation of the QED correction to first order in  $1/Z$  and to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  for  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions. As is known, the  $\alpha Z$  expansion of two-electron QED effects starts with  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$ . The two-photon exchange correction contains also contributions of previous orders in  $\alpha Z$  that can be derived from the Breit equation. We separate the “pure” QED part of the two-photon exchange contribution ( $\Delta E_{2\text{ph}}^{\text{QED}}$ ) as

$$\Delta E_{2\text{ph}} = \alpha^2[a_0 + (\alpha Z)^2 a_2] + \Delta E_{2\text{ph}}^{\text{QED}}, \quad (71)$$

where  $\Delta E_{2\text{ph}}$  is the total two-photon exchange correction and  $\Delta E_{2\text{ph}}^{\text{QED}}$  contributes to order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$  and higher. In order to extract numerical values for  $\Delta E_{2\text{ph}}^{\text{QED}}$  from our results for  $\Delta E_{2\text{ph}}$  without losses in accuracy, accurate values for the coefficients  $a_0$  and  $a_2$  are needed. We calculate them by fitting our results for the two-photon exchange correction obtained within many-body perturbation theory. A large number of fitting points and inclusion of fraction values for the nuclear charge number (up to  $Z = 0.1$ ) allowed us to achieve better accuracy than in previous calculations of similar coefficients (e.g., Refs. [17, 50, 51]). The numerical results for the coefficients  $a_0$  and  $a_2$  for all states under consideration are tabulated in the second and in the third column of Table III, respectively.

In Table IV we collect all two-electron QED contributions for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions. The screened self-energy and two-photon exchange corrections are calculated in the present work; in the table they are labeled as “Scr.SE” and “2-ph.exch.”, respectively. The screened vacuum-polarization correction was first evaluated in our previous investigation [37]. In the present work, we correct an error made in Ref. [37] for the off-diagonal matrix element and

extend our calculation to the region  $10 < Z < 20$ . Numerical values for the screened vacuum-polarization correction are listed in Table IV under entry ‘‘Scr.VP’’.

Our results for the two-electron QED correction calculated to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  can be compared with the results obtained within the  $\alpha Z$  expansion, which reads [1, 2]

$$\Delta E_{2\text{el}}^{\text{QED}} = \alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3 \left[ a_{31} \ln \alpha Z + a_{30} + (\alpha Z) G_{2\text{el}}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z) \right], \quad (72)$$

where the function  $G_{2\text{el}}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z)$  is the higher-order remainder that is not known analytically at present. We obtain numerical values for the coefficients  $a_{31}$  and  $a_{30}$  by using formulas from Ref. [1] and numerical results for the two-electron Bethe logarithms [52] and for the  $1/Z$ -expansion coefficients of expectation values of various operators [17, 53]. The only coefficient whose numerical value was not available in the literature was the anomalous-magnetic moment correction for the off-diagonal matrix element. This is the first-order  $1/Z$ -expansion term of the matrix element of the operator  $\alpha/\pi(H_3''' + H_5''')$  (see Eqs. (27) and (28) of Ref. [53]). The result of our calculation of this correction (denoted in Ref. [17] as  $\Delta E_{\text{anom}}$ ) for the off-diagonal term in the LS coupling reads

$$\Delta E_{\text{anom}}^{LS}(\text{offdiag}) = \alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3 0.010110. \quad (73)$$

Numerical values for the coefficients  $a_{31}$  and  $a_{30}$  for all states under consideration are listed in the third and in the fourth columns of Table III, respectively.

In Fig. 4, we plot our numerical results together with the contribution of the first two terms of the  $\alpha Z$  expansion (dashed line). In addition, we also plot the two-electron QED contribution, as evaluated by Drake [17] (dotted line). It was obtained according Eqs. (2)-(9) of Ref. [17], keeping the contribution of first order in  $1/Z$  only. (We note that Eq. (8) of Ref. [17] contains a misprint; its right-hand-side should be multiplied by  $Z$ .) Expressions obtained in this way are exact to the leading order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$ . They also contain some higher-order contributions, due to all-order results for the one-electron QED correction employed for the evaluation of the  $E_{L,1}$  term (Eq. (2) of Ref. [17]). We observe a good agreement of our results with the previously known contributions and conclude that Drake’s values fall much closer to our all-order results than the pure  $\alpha Z$ -expansion contribution.

For mixing states  $(1s2p_{1/2})_1$  and  $(1s2p_{3/2})_1$ , Fig. 4 presents a comparison for individual diagonal and off-diagonal matrix elements. It should be mentioned that, generally speaking, comparison of different methods should be performed for the physical energies obtained after the diagonalization of the total matrix and not for the individual matrix elements, since matrices with the same

eigenvalues can differ by a unitary transformation. We see from Fig. 4, however, that our results are in a good agreement with the  $\alpha Z$ -expansion contributions also for the individual matrix elements.

An agreement found with the leading term of the  $\alpha Z$  expansion offers us a possibility to obtain the next-to-leading contribution, which is not known analytically at present, and in this way to extend the results of our calculations to lower values of  $Z$ . We thus isolate the higher-order remainder  $G_{2\text{el}}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z)$  [see Eq. (72)] from our numerical data and fit it to the form

$$G_{2\text{el}}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z) = a_{41} \ln \alpha Z + a_{40} + (\alpha Z)(\dots). \quad (74)$$

Fitted values for the coefficients  $a_{41}$  and  $a_{40}$  are presented in the last two columns of Table III. It should be stressed that these coefficients were obtained in the  $jj$ -coupling scheme with the wave functions defined in case of mixing states by Eqs. (1), (2).

There is a way to check the self-consistency of the numerical results for individual matrix elements, which allows us to check each two-electron QED contribution separately. We note that, in the LS coupling, the only contribution to the off-diagonal matrix element to order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$  is that of the anomalous magnetic moment correction  $\Delta E_{\text{anom}}$ , Eq. (73). Therefore, for the two-photon exchange and screened vacuum-polarization corrections, the off-diagonal matrix element in the LS coupling is zero. In this case, the following identity is valid in the  $jj$ -coupling scheme (to the order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$ )

$$\sqrt{2}[\Delta E_{(1s2p_{1/2})_1} - \Delta E_{(1s2p_{3/2})_1}] = -\Delta E_{\text{offdiag}}^{jj}, \quad (75)$$

where  $\Delta E_i$  stand for the corresponding matrix elements. For the screened self-energy correction, the off-diagonal matrix element in the LS coupling ( $\Delta E_{\text{offdiag}}^{LS}$ ) is nonzero and the corresponding identity reads

$$\sqrt{2}[\Delta E_{(1s2p_{1/2})_1} - \Delta E_{(1s2p_{3/2})_1}] + \Delta E_{\text{offdiag}}^{jj} = 3\Delta E_{\text{offdiag}}^{LS}. \quad (76)$$

Fulfillment of these identities for individual two-electron QED contributions is checked in Table V. For the screened self-energy and vacuum-polarization correction, the fulfillment is obvious from the table. For the two-photon exchange correction, the difference between the right- and left-hand-side is very close to  $3(\alpha Z)^4$  eV in all cases listed and, therefore, should be ascribed to higher-order contributions, for which the identity is not valid anymore.

### III. ENERGIES OF $n = 1$ AND $n = 2$ STATES OF HE-LIKE IONS

In this section we collect all contributions available to the ionization energies of  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions. Individual corrections for selected ions are listed in Table VI. A description of contributions presented there is given below.

*Dirac energy.*  $\Delta E_{\text{Dirac}}$  is the Dirac value for the ionization energy of the valence electron including the finite-nuclear-size effect. The energy levels were calculated employing the two-parameter Fermi model for the nuclear-charge distribution. Parameters of the Fermi model were expressed in terms of the root-mean-square (rms) radius (see, e.g., Ref. [54]), whose actual values were taken from Refs. [55, 56, 57, 58]. For each value of  $Z$ , the nuclear parameters for the isotope with the largest abundance (with the longest life time) were chosen. An approximate formula from Ref. [59] was employed for calculating rms radii for ions with no experimental data available. In the table, we present also an estimation of the uncertainty of the nuclear-size effect. In all cases except  $Z = 80, 82, 83, 90,$  and  $92$ , this uncertainty was evaluated by taking the one-percent variation of the rms radius. For the above mentioned exceptions, the rms-radii are supposed to be known more precisely. In our calculation we employed the following values: 5.467(6) Fm for  $Z = 80$ , 5.504(25) Fm for  $Z = 82$ , 5.533(20) Fm for  $Z = 83$ , 5.802(4) Fm for  $Z = 90$ , and 5.860(2) Fm for  $Z = 92$ . The uncertainty of the nuclear-size effect in these cases was evaluated by adding quadratically two errors, one obtained by varying the rms radius within the error bars given and the other obtained by changing the model of the nuclear-charge distribution (the Fermi and the homogeneously-charged-sphere model were employed).

*Electron-electron interaction correction.*  $\Delta E_{\text{int}}$  incorporates corrections that can be derived from the Breit equation. It consists of 3 parts,

$$\Delta E_{\text{int}} = \Delta E_{1\text{ph}} + \Delta E_{2\text{ph}}^{\text{Breit}} + \Delta E_{\geq 3\text{ph}}^{\text{Breit}}, \quad (77)$$

which correspond to the one, two, and three and more photon exchange, respectively. In notations of Sec. I, the one-photon exchange correction is written as [33, 44]

$$\Delta E_{1\text{ph}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_P (-1)^P \left[ I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_1) + I_{P i_1 P i_2 k_1 k_2}(\Delta_2) \right], \quad (78)$$

where  $\Delta_1 = \varepsilon_{P i_1} - \varepsilon_{k_1}$  and  $\Delta_2 = \varepsilon_{P i_2} - \varepsilon_{k_2}$ . Its numerical evaluation was carried out employing the Fermi model for the nuclear-charge distribution; accurate numerical results for this correction can be found in Ref. [37].  $\Delta E_{2\text{ph}}^{\text{Breit}}$  represents the two-photon exchange correction within the

$\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^2$  approximation and is given by the first two terms in Eq. (71), with the coefficients  $a_0$  and  $a_2$  listed in Table III. The contribution due to the exchange by three and more photons was evaluated by summing terms of the  $1/Z$  expansion, with the corresponding coefficients taken from Refs. [50, 51] for the nonrelativistic energy and from Ref. [17] for the Breit-Pauli correction.

*One-electron QED correction.*  $\Delta E_{1\text{el}}^{\text{QED}}$  is the sum of the one-loop and two-loop one-electron QED corrections. The one-loop self-energy correction for  $1s$ ,  $2s$ , and  $2p_{1/2}$  states and  $Z \geq 26$  (including the nuclear-size effect) was tabulated in Ref. [60] by using the method developed by Mohr and co-workers [14, 61, 62]. For lower values of  $Z$  and for the  $2p_{3/2}$  state, we used a combination of our own calculation and an interpolation of the point-nucleus results from Ref. [63]. The Uehling part of the one-loop vacuum-polarization correction was calculated in this work for the Fermi nuclear model. The Wichmann-Kroll part of the vacuum-polarization correction was tabulated for  $Z \geq 30$  in Ref. [64]. For lower values of  $Z$ , it was calculated in this work by employing the asymptotic-expansion formulas for the Wichmann-Kroll potential [65].

The two-loop one-electron QED correction is calculated to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  only for the  $1s$  state up to now, see Ref. [48] and references therein. For excited states, one has to rely on the  $\alpha Z$  expansion, which reads (see review [66], references therein, and more recent studies [67, 68])

$$\Delta E_{1\text{el},2\text{lo}}^{\text{QED}} = \frac{\alpha^2 (\alpha Z)^4}{\pi^2 n^3} \left\{ B_{40} + (\alpha Z) B_{50} + (\alpha Z)^2 [L^3 B_{63} + L^2 B_{62} + L B_{61} + G_{2\text{lo}}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z)] \right\}, \quad (79)$$

where  $L = \ln[(\alpha Z)^{-2}]$ ,  $G_{2\text{lo}}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z) = B_{60} + (\alpha Z)(\dots)$  is the higher-order remainder, and the coefficients  $B_{ij}$  are

$$B_{40} = \left[ 2\pi^2 \ln 2 - \frac{49}{108}\pi^2 - \frac{6131}{1296} - 3\zeta(3) \right] \delta_{l0} + \left[ \frac{1}{2}\pi^2 \ln 2 - \frac{1}{12}\pi^2 - \frac{197}{144} - \frac{3}{4}\zeta(3) \right] \frac{1}{\kappa(2l+1)}, \quad (80)$$

$$B_{50} = -21.5561(31) \delta_{l0}, \quad (81)$$

$$B_{63} = -\frac{8}{27} \delta_{l0}, \quad (82)$$

$$B_{62}(ns) = \frac{16}{9} \left( \frac{71}{60} - \ln(2n) + \frac{1}{4n^2} - \frac{1}{n} + \psi(n) + C \right), \quad (83)$$

$$B_{62}(np) = \frac{4}{27} \frac{n^2 - 1}{n^2}, \quad (84)$$

$$B_{61}(1s) = 50.344005, \quad (85)$$

$$B_{61}(2s) = 42.447669, \quad (86)$$

$$B_{60}(1s) = -61.6(9), \quad (87)$$

$$B_{60}(2s) = -53.2(8), \quad (88)$$

where  $\zeta$  is the Riemann zeta function,  $\psi$  is the logarithmic derivative of the gamma function, and  $C = 0.577261\dots$  is the Euler constant. Great care should be taken employing the  $\alpha Z$  expansion for the estimation of the total correction for middle- and high- $Z$  ions, due to a very slow convergence of this expansion. In addition, it was found lately [69] that the numerical all-order results do not agree well with the analytical calculations to order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^6$ . A possible reason for this disagreement [70] can be an incompleteness of the analytical results (85), (86) for the  $B_{61}$  coefficient.

In order to extrapolate the all-order numerical results of Ref. [48] to the region  $Z=12-39$  for the  $1s$  state and to estimate the two-loop correction for excited states, we separate the  $1s$  higher-order remainder  $G_{21o}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z)$  from the numerical data of Ref. [48]. We observe that this function is smoothly behaving and can be reasonably approximated by a polynomial. We thus employ a linear (parabolic) fit to the function  $G_{21o}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z)$  in order to extrapolate the higher-order contribution to the region  $Z=12-39$ . For  $2s$  state, we employ the same values for the higher-order contribution and ascribe the uncertainty of 50% to them. For  $p$  states, no analytical calculations for the  $B_{61}$  coefficient exist up to now. We thus separate from the  $1s$  numerical results of Ref. [48] the function

$$\tilde{G}_{21o}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z) = L B_{61} + G_{21o}^{\text{h.o.}}(\alpha Z), \quad (89)$$

divide it by a factor of 8, and take the result as the uncertainty for the higher-order contribution for  $p$  states.

*Two-electron QED correction.*  $\Delta E_{2\text{el}}^{\text{QED}}$  is evaluated in Sec. II; the data are taken from Table IV.

*Higher-order QED correction.*  $\Delta E_{\text{h.o.}}^{\text{QED}}$  represents the contribution of QED effects of relative order  $1/Z^2$  and higher. This correction was evaluated by formulas presented in Ref. [17] suppressing terms that contribute to orders  $1/Z^0$  and  $1/Z$ . Its uncertainty was obtained by taking the relative deviation of the QED contribution to order  $1/Z$  calculated according to Ref. [17] from the



results of its exact evaluation presented in this work. (The corresponding comparison is presented in Fig. 4.)

*Relativistic recoil correction.*  $\Delta E_{\text{rec}}$  consists of the one-electron and the two-electron part. The one-electron relativistic recoil correction was evaluated to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  in a series of papers [71, 72, 73]. In our compilation, we employed the finite-nucleus results of Ref. [73] for the  $1s$  state, the point-nucleus results of Ref. [71] for the  $2s$  and  $2p_{1/2}$  states, and those of Ref. [72] for the  $2p_{3/2}$  state. The two-electron recoil contribution is given by the sum of the mass-polarization correction and the electron-electron interaction correction to the one-electron nuclear recoil. The nonrelativistic part of the mass-polarization correction was evaluated by summing the terms of the  $1/Z$  expansion of the matrix element  $\langle \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 \rangle$  taken from Ref. [17]. The known relativistic part of this correction of order  $(\alpha Z)^4 m/M$  [74] was also included. The electron-electron interaction correction to the one-electron nuclear recoil was taken into account in the nonrelativistic limit. It was estimated as  $(-m/M) \Delta E_{2\text{el}}$ , where  $\Delta E_{2\text{el}}$  is the total two-electron correction.

In the last column of Table VI we present the total values for the ionization energies, which are given by the sum of all corrections mentioned so far. For lead, thorium, and uranium, the total values include also the nuclear-polarization correction [75, 76]. Analyzing the main sources of uncertainties listed in the table, we conclude that in the low- $Z$  region the main error comes from the two-electron QED corrections, namely from the two-photon exchange contribution. In the high- $Z$  region, main sources of uncertainty are the one-electron two-loop QED correction (mostly, the two-loop self-energy correction) and the experimental values for the rms nuclear radii.

In Table VII, the total ionization energies of  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions with  $Z = 12 - 100$  are listed. We start our compilation with  $Z = 12$  since this is the point where the new terms accounted for in our calculation ( $\sim \alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ ) become comparable with omitted higher-order effects ( $\sim \alpha^3(\alpha Z)^2$ ).

In Fig. 5, our results are compared with the theoretical values obtained previously in calculations of different types [17, 20, 22]. Since our evaluation is the first one complete to the order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ , it is interesting to analyze the difference between various calculations in units of  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ . First of all, we note a significant deviation of our values from the recent results by Cheng and Chen [22], which arises from an incomplete treatment of QED corrections employed in that work. The authors evaluate the QED correction to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  at the one-loop level, employing a symmetric model potential in order to account for the electron-electron interaction. This approximation works reasonably well in the high- $Z$  region, but for ions with  $22 \leq Z \leq 36$

(as presented in the paper), the accuracy of this approximation turns out to be lower than that of Drake’s approach based on the exact  $\alpha Z$  expansion [17]. We mention that a previous investigation by these authors [19] employed the QED correction as evaluated by Drake. Its results agree well with those by Plante *et al.* [20] and thus are in a better agreement with our numerical values.

For the  $^1S_0$  and  $2^3P_{0,1}$  states, we observe also a distinct deviation of our ionization energies from the results by Drake [17]. A similar deviation was reported previously in the literature [18, 19, 20], where it was attributed to corrections of order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$  to the electron-electron interaction that were not accounted for by Drake’s unified method but can be (to a certain extent) included by methods based on the no-pair QED Hamiltonian [77]. Irregularities of the  $Z$ -dependence of the plotted difference, which can be observed for  $S$  states in the medium- and high- $Z$  region, is explained by more recent values for the rms nuclear radii employed in the present calculation.

As can be seen from Fig. 5, the best agreement is found with the calculation by Plante *et al.* [20]. It is to be noted that the results by Johnson and Sapirstein [18] and by Chen *et al.* [19] obtained by different methods but on the same level of sophistication are in a very good agreement with the ones by Plante and co-workers. Whereas all these results are incomplete to order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ , we conclude that the remaining contribution of this order is rather small for all  $n = 2$  states, which explains a good agreement of these results with the experimental data. Only for the  $1^1S_1$  state, we observe a significant new contribution of about  $0.5 \alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ . We mention, however, that despite of a good agreement observed for the  $n = 2$  states, the results by Plante *et al.* are well outside of the estimated error bars of the present theoretical values for most middle- and high- $Z$  ions.

In Table VIII, we list transition energies for which experimental results are available. Comparison is made with the MBPT calculation by Johnson and Sapirstein [18], with the CI calculations by Chen *et al.* [19], and with the all-order many-body treatment by Plante *et al.* [20]. These studies are, according to our analysis, the most complete ones among the previous calculations. We recall that in all these investigations QED corrections were taken as evaluated by Drake [17]. The difference between them, therefore, is related only to the part arising from the no-pair Hamiltonian, often referred to as the “structure” part.

We observe a generally good agreement of theoretical predictions with experimental data. Despite of the significant amount of available experimental information, the experimental uncertainty in the region of  $Z$  under consideration is generally larger than the difference between the calculations analyzed in Table VIII. Among few exceptions are the recent high-precision measurements of the  $2^3P_1 - 2^1S_0$  transition energy in silicon ( $Z = 14$ ) [90] and the  $2^3P_0 - 2^3P_1$  transition

energy in magnesium ( $Z = 12$ ) [91], whose accuracy is much higher than that of the theoretical predictions. However, at these relatively low values of  $Z$ , our treatment is basically equivalent to the previous studies, and the difference between the calculations can not be effectively probed in comparison with these measurements. When  $Z$  increases, deviation of our values from the results of the previous studies becomes more prominent, but the experimental uncertainty is much lower for higher  $Z$ . A compromise is found to be argon ( $Z = 18$ ), where the experimental determination of the  $2^3P_{0,2} - 2^3S_1$  transition energies by Kukla *et al.* [82] demonstrated a  $2\sigma$  deviation from the previous theoretical results. Our calculation brings the theoretical and experimental results in agreement for the  $2^3P_0 - 2^3S_1$  transition and reduces the discrepancy for the  $2^3P_2 - 2^3S_1$  transition to  $0.5\sigma$ .

An important feature of He-like ions is that they provide a possibility to study the effects of parity non-conservation [10, 11]. The  $2^1S_0 - 2^3P_0$  transition in He-like Eu ion ( $Z = 63$ ) is presently considered as the best candidate for future experiments [13]. The effect is enhanced by the fact that the  $2^1S_0$  and  $2^3P_0$  levels cross each other in a vicinity of  $Z = 63$ . Another crossing point of the levels occurs around  $Z = 90$  but it seems to be less promising for the experimental observation of the effect. In Table IX we list the results of different theoretical evaluations for the  $2^3P_0 - 2^1S_0$  transition energy in ions near the crossing points. A significant discrepancy is observed between different theoretical evaluations, which is due to the smallness of the energy difference for these ions. We mention a significant deviation of our values from the recent results by Andreev *et al.* [40]. In that work, the authors performed an *ab initio* calculation of the two-photon exchange correction, whose numerical values agree well with those obtained in this paper. However, evaluating the total transition energy, the authors used an estimation for the screened self-energy correction (that was not calculated at that moment), which is the main source of the disagreement observed.

Summarizing, in this investigation we performed *ab initio* QED calculations of the screened self-energy correction and the two-photon exchange correction for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions with  $Z \geq 12$ . This evaluation completes the rigorous treatment of all *two-electron* QED corrections of order  $\alpha^2$  to all orders in  $\alpha Z$  and significantly improves the theoretical accuracy for the energy values, especially in the high- $Z$  region. Unlike all previous calculations, the results obtained are complete through order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ ; uncalculated terms enter through three-photon-exchange QED effects ( $\sim \alpha^3(\alpha Z)^2$  and higher) and through higher-order one-electron two-loop QED corrections ( $\sim \alpha^2(\alpha Z)^7$  and higher).

## **Acknowledgements**

While finishing these investigations our friend and coauthor Gerhard Soff deceased. His great penchant to the fundamental aspects of the physics of strong fields and QED corrections in heavy atoms made him a significant and inspiring driving force in our collaboration, which can hardly be overestimated. We shall miss him a lot.

Stimulating discussions with P. Mohr, J. Sapirstein, and T. Stöhlker are gratefully acknowledged. This work was supported in part by RFBR (Grant No. 04-02-17574), by the Russian Ministry of Education (Grant No. E02-3.1-49), and by INTAS-GSI (grant No. 03-54-3604). The work of V.M.S. was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung. A.N.A. and V.A.Y. acknowledge the support by the "Dynasty" foundation. The work of A.N.A. was also supported by INTAS YS grant No. 03-55-960 and by Russian Ministry of Education and Administration of St. Petersburg (Grant No. PD02-1.2-79). G.P. and G.S. acknowledge financial support by the BMBF, DFG, and GSI.

TABLE I: The two-photon exchange correction for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions, in eV. For mixing configurations,  $(1s2p_{1/2})_1$  and  $(1s2p_{3/2})_1$  stand for the diagonal matrix elements of the operator  $H$  [see Eqs. (9), (10)], whereas "off-diag." labels the off-diagonal matrix elements.

$Z$	$(1s1s)_0$	$(1s2s)_0$	$(1s2s)_1$	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	off-diag.
12	-4.4186	-3.1741	-1.2991	-2.0506	-2.7789	-3.5332	-1.9964	-1.0711
14	-4.4645	-3.1952	-1.3024	-2.0741	-2.7899	-3.5413	-2.0000	-1.0686
		-3.19541 <sup>b</sup>	-1.30240 <sup>b</sup>					
16	-4.5173	-3.2196	-1.3062	-2.1015	-2.8027	-3.5507	-2.0041	-1.0658
18	-4.5770	-3.2473	-1.3106	-2.1328	-2.8173	-3.5613	-2.0088	-1.0626
		-3.24753 <sup>b</sup>	-1.31057 <sup>b</sup>		-2.8168 <sup>e</sup>	-3.5603 <sup>e</sup>		-1.0618 <sup>e</sup>
20	-4.6435	-3.2784	-1.3154	-2.1682	-2.8337	-3.5733	-2.0141	-1.0589
	-4.6447 <sup>a</sup>							
28	-4.9784	-3.4378	-1.3405	-2.3532	-2.9182	-3.6340	-2.0405	-1.0406
30	-5.0795	-3.4868	-1.3483	-2.4111	-2.9443	-3.6525	-2.0484	-1.0350
	-5.0812 <sup>a</sup>	-3.48716 <sup>b</sup>	-1.34827 <sup>b</sup>	-2.41112 <sup>d</sup>	-2.9439 <sup>e</sup>	-3.6506 <sup>e</sup>	-2.04834 <sup>d</sup>	-1.0350 <sup>e</sup>
		-3.473 <sup>c</sup>	-1.348 <sup>c</sup>					
			-1.34833 <sup>d</sup>					
32	-5.1877	-3.5396	-1.3566	-2.4741	-2.9725	-3.6724	-2.0568	-1.0291
40	-5.6924	-3.7919	-1.3961	-2.7817	-3.1072	-3.7658	-2.0956	-1.0015
	-5.6945 <sup>a</sup>		-1.39621 <sup>d</sup>	-2.78172 <sup>d</sup>	-3.1082 <sup>e</sup>	-3.7641 <sup>e</sup>	-2.09545 <sup>d</sup>	-1.0008 <sup>e</sup>
47	-6.2332	-4.0719	-1.4395	-3.1351	-3.2575	-3.8668	-2.1358	-0.9724
50	-6.4951	-4.2110	-1.4609	-3.3148	-3.3323	-3.9159	-2.1548	-0.9586
	-6.4975 <sup>a</sup>		-1.46120 <sup>d</sup>	-3.31489 <sup>d</sup>	-3.333 <sup>e</sup>	-3.915 <sup>e</sup>	-2.15465 <sup>d</sup>	-0.955 <sup>e</sup>
54	-6.8742	-4.4162	-1.4923	-3.5848	-3.4429	-3.9871	-2.1816	-0.9387
60	-7.5114	-4.7714	-1.5459	-4.0642	-3.6348	-4.1066	-2.2251	-0.9064
	-7.5142 <sup>a</sup>	-4.77215 <sup>b</sup>	-1.54587 <sup>b</sup>	-4.068 <sup>c</sup>	-3.635 <sup>e</sup>	-4.105 <sup>e</sup>	-2.22510 <sup>d</sup>	-0.893 <sup>e</sup>
		-4.781 <sup>c</sup>	-1.542 <sup>c</sup>	-4.06446 <sup>d</sup>				

				-1.54558 <sup>d</sup>					
66	-8.2393	-5.1924	-1.6082	-4.6505	-3.8632	-4.2426	-2.2724	-0.8708	
		-5.194 <sup>c</sup>	-1.605 <sup>c</sup>	-4.670 <sup>c</sup>					
70	-8.7812	-5.5159	-1.6552	-5.1131	-4.0394	-4.3430	-2.3060	-0.8453	
	-8.7847 <sup>a</sup>	-5.515 <sup>c</sup>	-1.648 <sup>c</sup>	-5.117 <sup>c</sup>	-4.038 <sup>e</sup>	-4.339 <sup>e</sup>	-2.30573 <sup>d</sup>	-0.801 <sup>e</sup>	
			-1.65478 <sup>d</sup>	-5.11403 <sup>d</sup>					
74	-9.3739	-5.8794	-1.7073	-5.6441	-4.2381	-4.4517	-2.3412	-0.8184	
79	-10.1957	-6.3996	-1.7803	-6.4220	-4.5238	-4.5999	-2.3877	-0.7826	
80	-10.3719	-6.5135	-1.7961	-6.5950	-4.5866	-4.6312	-2.3974	-0.7752	
	-10.375 <sup>a</sup>	-6.504 <sup>c</sup>	-1.789 <sup>c</sup>	-6.598 <sup>c</sup>	-4.585 <sup>e</sup>	-4.628 <sup>e</sup>	-2.39806 <sup>d</sup>	-0.771 <sup>e</sup>	
			-1.79562 <sup>d</sup>	-6.59593 <sup>d</sup>					
82	-10.7375	-6.7524	-1.8289	-6.9607	-4.7185	-4.6957	-2.4170	-0.7601	
83	-10.9271	-6.8776	-1.8460	-7.1540	-4.7877	-4.7288	-2.4270	-0.7524	
90	-12.3979	-7.8792	-1.9790	-8.7331	-5.3458	-4.9780	-2.5005	-0.6957	
	-12.403 <sup>a</sup>								
92	-12.8714	-8.2122	-2.0221	-9.2701	-5.5329	-5.0550	-2.5228	-0.6787	
		-8.21306 <sup>b</sup>	-2.02199 <sup>b</sup>	-9.274 <sup>c</sup>	-5.531 <sup>e</sup>	-5.053 <sup>e</sup>	-2.52228 <sup>d</sup>	-0.683 <sup>e</sup>	
		-8.184 <sup>c</sup>	-2.018 <sup>c</sup>	-9.27598 <sup>d</sup>					
			-2.02034 <sup>d</sup>						
100	-15.0772	-9.8239	-2.2223	-11.9330	-6.4484	-5.3900	-2.6191	-0.6058	
	-15.0805 <sup>a</sup>								

<sup>a</sup> Blundell *et al.* [23], <sup>b</sup> Åsen *et al.* [41], <sup>c</sup> Andreev *et al.* [39, 40], <sup>d</sup> Mohr and Sapirstein [38],  
<sup>e</sup> Andreev *et al.* [36].

TABLE IV: Two-electron QED correction for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions, in eV.

$Z$ State	Scr.SE	Scr.VP	2-ph.exch.	Total	$Z$ State	Scr.SE	Scr.VP	2-ph.exch.	Total
12 (1s) <sup>2</sup>	-0.0405	0.0021	0.0031(1)	-0.0353(1)	60 (1s) <sup>2</sup>	-2.4392(2)	0.3800(1)	0.0662(1)	-1.9930(2)
(1s2s) <sub>0</sub>	-0.0088	0.0004	0.0004(1)	-0.0080(1)	(1s2s) <sub>0</sub>	-0.6267(2)	0.0923	-0.1914(1)	-0.7258(2)
(1s2s) <sub>1</sub>	-0.0055	0.0003	-0.0001(1)	-0.0053(1)	(1s2s) <sub>1</sub>	-0.3377(2)	0.0484	-0.0327(1)	-0.3219(2)
(1s2p <sub>1/2</sub> ) <sub>0</sub>	-0.0017	0.0001	-0.0008(1)	-0.0024(1)	(1s2p <sub>1/2</sub> ) <sub>0</sub>	-0.1569(1)	0.0311	-0.4945(1)	-0.6203(1)
(1s2p <sub>1/2</sub> ) <sub>1</sub>	-0.0013	0.0001	-0.0002(1)	-0.0014(1)	(1s2p <sub>1/2</sub> ) <sub>1</sub>	-0.1227(1)	0.0190	-0.1330(1)	-0.2367(1)
(1s2p <sub>3/2</sub> ) <sub>1</sub>	-0.0010	0.0000	0.0000(1)	-0.0010(1)	(1s2p <sub>3/2</sub> ) <sub>1</sub>	-0.1063(2)	0.0046	-0.0349(1)	-0.1366(2)

TABLE II: Screened self-energy correction for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions, in units of  $F(\alpha Z)$ . In case of mixing configurations, contributions to the matrix elements  $H_{ik}$  are given; labeling is as in Table I.

$Z$	$(1s1s)_0$	$(1s2s)_0$	$(1s2s)_1$	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	off-diag.
12	-2.2139(8)	-0.4841(5)	-0.3031(5)	-0.0917(6)	-0.0691(6)	-0.0556(7)	-0.1350(7)	0.0533(2)
14	-2.0543(6)	-0.4519(4)	-0.2821(4)	-0.0845(5)	-0.0646(5)	-0.0537(6)	-0.1266(6)	0.0490(1)
16	-1.9217(3)	-0.4248(3)	-0.2646(3)	-0.0783(4)	-0.0605(4)	-0.0517(4)	-0.1197(4)	0.04559(5)
18	-1.8097(3)	-0.4021(3)	-0.2496(3)	-0.0733(2)	-0.0571(2)	-0.0501(2)	-0.1137(2)	0.04266(3)
20	-1.7137(3)	-0.3828(3)	-0.2368(3)	-0.0693(1)	-0.0544(1)	-0.0488(2)	-0.1086(2)	0.04013(3)
30	-1.3888(2)	-0.3194(2)	-0.1930(2)	-0.0581(1)	-0.0470(1)	-0.0452(2)	-0.0913(2)	0.03146(2)
40	-1.2112(1)	-0.2879(1)	-0.1685(1)	-0.05588(7)	-0.04542(7)	-0.0442(1)	-0.0817(1)	0.02639(2)
50	-1.1134(1)	-0.2746(1)	-0.1547(1)	-0.05963(8)	-0.04784(8)	-0.0449(1)	-0.0761(1)	0.02312(2)
60	-1.0679(1)	-0.2744(1)	-0.1478(1)	-0.06871(6)	-0.05371(6)	-0.0465(1)	-0.0729(1)	0.02087(1)
70	-1.06281(5)	-0.28559(5)	-0.14670(5)	-0.08394(5)	-0.06349(5)	-0.04896(7)	-0.07136(7)	0.019257(8)
80	-1.09510(3)	-0.30916(3)	-0.15096(3)	-0.10779(2)	-0.07864(2)	-0.05197(7)	-0.07091(7)	0.018047(6)
83	-1.11237(2)	-0.31903(2)	-0.15336(2)	-0.11728(2)	-0.08463(2)	-0.05294(7)	-0.07094(7)	0.017741(5)
90	-1.16760(2)	-0.34804(2)	-0.16122(2)	-0.14526(1)	-0.10222(1)	-0.05530(7)	-0.07130(7)	0.017104(3)
92	-1.18776(2)	-0.35814(2)	-0.16413(2)	-0.15515(1)	-0.10841(1)	-0.05600(7)	-0.07148(7)	0.016939(3)
100	-1.29293(2)	-0.40917(2)	-0.17942(2)	-0.20688(3)	-0.14073(3)	-0.05881(7)	-0.07250(7)	0.016343(3)

$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.0025	0.0001	-0.0001(1)	-0.0024(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.1666(2)	0.0159	0.0081(1)	-0.1426(2)
off-diag.	0.0010	-0.0001	0.0001(1)	0.0010(1)	off-diag.	0.0477	-0.0092	0.0053(2)	0.0437(2)
14 $(1s)^2$	-0.0596	0.0034	0.0046(1)	-0.0516(1)	70 $(1s)^2$	-3.8548(1)	0.7130(2)	-0.0164(1)	-3.1581(2)
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.0131	0.0007	0.0005(1)	-0.0119(1)	$(1s2s)_0$	-1.0358(1)	0.1819	-0.4071(1)	-1.2610(2)
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.0082	0.0005	-0.0002(1)	-0.0079(1)	$(1s2s)_1$	-0.5321(1)	0.0892	-0.0615(1)	-0.5043(2)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.0025	0.0002	-0.0015(1)	-0.0037(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.3044(1)	0.0667	-0.9717(1)	-1.2094(2)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.0019	0.0001	-0.0004(1)	-0.0021(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.2303(1)	0.0409	-0.2656(1)	-0.4550(2)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.0016	0.0001	0.0000(1)	-0.0015(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.1776(2)	0.0075	-0.0688(1)	-0.2388(2)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.0037	0.0002	-0.0001(1)	-0.0036(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.2588(2)	0.0266	0.0164(1)	-0.2158(2)
off-diag.	0.0014	-0.0001	0.0002(1)	0.0015(1)	off-diag.	0.0698	-0.0158	0.0063(2)	0.0603(2)
16 $(1s)^2$	-0.0832	0.0051	0.0066(1)	-0.0715(1)	80 $(1s)^2$	-5.9289(1)	1.2980(2)	-0.2374(1)	-4.8682(3)
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.0184	0.0011	0.0005(1)	-0.0168(1)	$(1s2s)_0$	-1.6738(1)	0.3520(1)	-0.7946(1)	-2.1164(2)
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.0115	0.0007	-0.0003(1)	-0.0110(1)	$(1s2s)_1$	-0.8173(1)	0.1615(1)	-0.1093(1)	-0.7652(2)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.0034	0.0003	-0.0025(1)	-0.0056(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.5836(1)	0.1429	-1.7938(1)	-2.2345(1)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.0026	0.0002	-0.0006(1)	-0.0030(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.4258(1)	0.0879	-0.4988(1)	-0.8367(1)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.0022	0.0001	0.0000(1)	-0.0022(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.2814(3)	0.0120	-0.1232(1)	-0.3926(3)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.0052	0.0003	-0.0002(1)	-0.0051(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.3839(3)	0.0428	0.0279(1)	-0.3132(3)
off-diag.	0.0020	-0.0002	0.0003(1)	0.0021(1)	off-diag.	0.0977	-0.0260	0.0072(2)	0.0789(2)
18 $(1s)^2$	-0.1116	0.0072	0.0091(1)	-0.0953(1)	83 $(1s)^2$	-6.7256(1)	1.5500(7)	-0.3460(1)	-5.5216(7)
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.0248	0.0015	0.0004(1)	-0.0228(1)	$(1s2s)_0$	-1.9289(1)	0.4286(2)	-0.9599(1)	-2.4602(2)
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.0154	0.0010	-0.0004(1)	-0.0148(1)	$(1s2s)_1$	-0.9273(1)	0.1927(2)	-0.1289(1)	-0.8635(2)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.0045	0.0004	-0.0039(1)	-0.0080(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.7091(1)	0.1799(1)	-2.1377(1)	-2.6669(1)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.0035	0.0003	-0.0010(1)	-0.0042(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.5117(1)	0.1109(1)	-0.5977(1)	-0.9985(1)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.0031	0.0001	-0.0001(1)	-0.0031(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.3201(4)	0.0136	-0.1446(1)	-0.4511(4)

TABLE III: Coefficients of the  $\alpha Z$  expansion of the second-order two-electron contribution to the energy levels of He-like ions. In case of mixing configurations, contributions to the matrix elements  $H_{ik}$  are given; labeling is as in Table I.

	$(\alpha Z)^0$	$(\alpha Z)^2$	$(\alpha Z)^3 \ln \alpha Z$	$(\alpha Z)^3$	$(\alpha Z)^4 \ln \alpha Z$	$(\alpha Z)^4$
$(1s1s)_0$	-0.157662	-0.6302	1.3191	1.6588	0.75(15)	-2.41(40)
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.114509	-0.2807	0.2755	0.3255	0.11(2)	-0.81(5)
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.047409	-0.0428	0.1795	0.1911	0.056(11)	-0.40(3)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.072999	-0.3035	0.0730	0.1063	0	-0.64(2)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.101008	-0.1444	0.0465	0.0578	0	-0.22(1)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.129018	-0.1075	0.0201	0.0058	0	-0.10
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.072999	-0.0473	0.0730	0.0595	0.01(1)	-0.14(2)
off-diag.	-0.039611	0.0319	-0.0374	-0.0432	-0.01(1)	0.08(4)

$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.0070	0.0004	-0.0002(1)	-0.0068(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.4289(4)	0.0489	0.0318(1)	-0.3482(4)
off-diag.	0.0026	-0.0002	0.0004(1)	0.0028(1)	off-diag.	0.1073	-0.0299	0.0074(4)	0.0848(4)
20 $(1s)^2$	-0.1450	0.0099	0.0119(1)	-0.1231(1)	90 $(1s)^2$	-9.0006(1)	2.338(1)	-0.7109(1)	-7.373(1)
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.0324	0.0021	0.0003(1)	-0.0300(1)	$(1s2s)_0$	-2.6829(1)	0.6810(2)	-1.4689(1)	-3.4708(3)
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.0200	0.0014	-0.0006(1)	-0.0192(1)	$(1s2s)_1$	-1.2428(1)	0.2921(2)	-0.1869(1)	-1.1376(2)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.0059	0.0006	-0.0059(1)	-0.0111(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-1.1197	0.3112(2)	-3.1842(1)	-3.9928(2)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.0046	0.0004	-0.0015(1)	-0.0057(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.7879	0.1929(1)	-0.9024(1)	-1.4974(1)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.0041	0.0001	-0.0002(1)	-0.0042(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.4263(5)	0.0176	-0.2051(1)	-0.6138(5)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.0092	0.0006	-0.0003(1)	-0.0089(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.5496(5)	0.0663	0.0413(1)	-0.4420(5)
off-diag.	0.0034	-0.0003	0.0005(1)	0.0036(1)	off-diag.	0.1318	-0.0410	0.0082(4)	0.0991(4)
30 $(1s)^2$	-0.3965	0.0348	0.0325(1)	-0.3292(1)	92 $(1s)^2$	-9.7800(1)	2.630(2)	-0.8520(1)	-8.002(2)
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.0912	0.0076	-0.0048(1)	-0.0884(1)	$(1s2s)_0$	-2.9489(1)	0.7770(4)	-1.6540(1)	-3.8259(4)
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.0551	0.0048	-0.0024(1)	-0.0527(1)	$(1s2s)_1$	-1.3514(1)	0.3287(2)	-0.2074(1)	-1.2301(3)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.0166	0.0022	-0.0289(1)	-0.0433(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-1.2775	0.3647(2)	-3.5612(1)	-4.4740(3)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.0134	0.0013	-0.0074(1)	-0.0195(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.8927	0.2262(2)	-1.0133(1)	-1.6798(2)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.0129	0.0005	-0.0016(1)	-0.0140(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.4611(5)	0.0188	-0.2254(1)	-0.6677(5)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.0261	0.0019	-0.0003(1)	-0.0245(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.5886(5)	0.0721	0.0440(1)	-0.4725(5)
off-diag.	0.0090	-0.0010	0.0013(1)	0.0093(1)	off-diag.	0.1395	-0.0448	0.0084(4)	0.1031(4)
40 $(1s)^2$	-0.8197	0.0887	0.0589(1)	-0.6721(1)	100 $(1s)^2$	-13.6716(1)	4.248(4)	-1.6551(1)	-11.079(4)
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.1948	0.0199	-0.0252(1)	-0.2002(1)	$(1s2s)_0$	-4.3266(1)	1.3404(8)	-2.6409(1)	-5.6271(8)
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.1141	0.0118	-0.0068(1)	-0.1091(1)	$(1s2s)_1$	-1.8972(1)	0.5366(5)	-0.3124(1)	-1.6730(5)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.0378	0.0060	-0.0916(1)	-0.1234(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-2.1876(3)	0.7067(5)	-5.5484(1)	-7.0293(6)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.0307	0.0036	-0.0239(1)	-0.0510(1)	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-1.4881(3)	0.4408(5)	-1.6074(1)	-2.6547(6)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.0299	0.0012	-0.0058(1)	-0.0345(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.6219(7)	0.0234	-0.3211(1)	-0.9195(7)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.0553	0.0044	0.0005(1)	-0.0503(1)	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.7666(7)	0.1009(1)	0.0529(1)	-0.6128(7)
off-diag.	0.0179	-0.0025	0.0025(1)	0.0179(1)	off-diag.	0.1728	-0.0630	0.0104(4)	0.1202(4)



TABLE V: Right-hand-side (r.h.s.) and left-hand-side (l.h.s.) of Eq. (76) (for the screened self-energy correction) and those of Eq. (75) (for the screened vacuum-polarization and two-photon exchange corrections), in eV. The comparison is valid to the leading order in  $\alpha Z$  only. The last column demonstrates that the difference (r.h.s.-l.h.s.) for the two-photon exchange correction arises predominantly from effects to order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^4$ .

$Z$	Scr.SE		Scr.VP		2-ph.exch.		(r.h.s.-l.h.s.)/ $(\alpha Z)^4$
	l.h.s.	r.h.s.	l.h.s.	r.h.s.	l.h.s.	r.h.s.	
12	0.0006	0.0006	0.0001	0.0001	-0.0003	-0.0001	3.
14	0.0010	0.0009	0.0001	0.0001	-0.0005	-0.0002	3.
16	0.0014	0.0013	0.0002	0.0002	-0.0008	-0.0003	3.0
18	0.0020	0.0019	0.0002	0.0002	-0.0012	-0.0004	3.0
20	0.0027	0.0026	0.0003	0.0003	-0.0018	-0.0005	3.0
30	0.0083	0.0087	0.0012	0.0010	-0.0083	-0.0013	3.0
40	0.0167	0.0205	0.0035	0.0025	-0.0256	-0.0025	3.18

50 $(1s)^2$	-1.4717(1)	0.1920	0.0781(1)	-1.2016(1)			
$(1s2s)_0$	-0.3630(1)	0.0446	-0.0783(1)	-0.3966(1)			
$(1s2s)_1$	-0.2044(1)	0.0250	-0.0159(1)	-0.1953(1)			
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-0.0788(1)	0.0141	-0.2289(1)	-0.2936(1)			
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-0.0632(1)	0.0086	-0.0606(1)	-0.1152(1)			
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-0.0593(1)	0.0025	-0.0156(1)	-0.0725(1)			
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-0.1006(1)	0.0088	0.0031(1)	-0.0887(1)			
off-diag.	0.0306	-0.0050	0.0039(1)	0.0294(1)			

TABLE VI: Individual contributions to the ionization energies of He-like ions (with the opposite sign), in eV. For mixing configurations, contributions to the matrix elements are listed.

$Z$ State	$\Delta E_{\text{Dirac}}$	$\Delta E_{\text{int}}$	$\Delta E_{1\text{el}}^{\text{QED}}$	$\Delta E_{2\text{el}}^{\text{QED}}$	$\Delta E_{\text{h.o.}}^{\text{QED}}$	$\Delta E_{\text{rec}}$	Total
12 $(1s)^2$	-1962.9887	200.8973	0.2801	-0.0353(1)	0.0008	0.0412	-1761.8045(1)
$(1s2s)_0$	-490.9832	72.9751	0.0371	-0.0080(1)	0.0005	0.0096	-417.9688(1)
$(1s2s)_1$	-490.9832	60.2485	0.0371	-0.0053(1)	0.0001	0.0099	-430.6928(1)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-490.9834	72.1736	-0.0010	-0.0024(1)	0.0002	0.0037	-418.8092(1)
$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-490.9834	74.9743	-0.0010	-0.0014(1)	0.0002	0.0075	-416.0038(1)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-490.0399	77.7699	0.0012	-0.0010(1)	0.0001	0.0113	-412.2584(1)
$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-490.0399	71.7742	0.0012	-0.0024(1)	0.0003	0.0036	-418.2630(1)
off-diag.	0	4.1676	0	0.0010(1)	-0.0001	0.0054	4.1739(1)

14	$(1s)^2$	-2673.7078	235.5743	0.4778	-0.0516(1)	0.0008	0.0487	-2437.6577(1)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-668.8650	85.8200	0.0637	-0.0119(1)	0.0006	0.0115	-582.9812(1)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-668.8650	70.5889	0.0637	-0.0079(1)	0.0002	0.0118	-598.2083(1)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-668.8654	84.7685	-0.0017	-0.0037(1)	0.0002(1)	0.0044	-584.0977(1)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-668.8654	88.0659	-0.0017	-0.0021(1)	0.0002	0.0090	-580.7941(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-667.1144	91.3604	0.0022	-0.0015(1)	0.0001	0.0135	-575.7397(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-667.1144	84.1211	0.0022	-0.0036(1)	0.0004	0.0043	-582.9899(1)
	off-diag.	0	5.0013	0	0.0015(1)	-0.0002	0.0065	5.0091(1)
16	$(1s)^2$	-3495.0043	270.4823	0.7562	-0.0715(1)	0.0009	0.0563	-3223.7801(1)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-874.5000	98.7466	0.1014	-0.0168(1)	0.0007	0.0134	-775.6547(1)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-874.5000	80.9665	0.1014	-0.0110(1)	0.0002	0.0137	-793.4291(1)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-874.5006	97.4677	-0.0028	-0.0056(1)	0.0003(2)	0.0051	-777.0359(2)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-874.5006	101.2216	-0.0028	-0.0030(1)	0.0003	0.0105	-773.2742(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-871.5074	104.9766	0.0038	-0.0022(1)	0.0001	0.0158	-766.5134(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-871.5074	96.4857	0.0038	-0.0051(1)	0.0005	0.0051	-775.0175(1)
	off-diag.	0	5.8246	0	0.0021(1)	-0.0002	0.0076	5.8341(1)
18	$(1s)^2$	-4427.4152(1)	305.6561	1.1310(1)	-0.0953(1)	0.0009	0.0575	-4120.6651(2)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-1108.0563	111.7675	0.1525	-0.0228(1)	0.0007(1)	0.0138	-996.1445(1)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-1108.0563	91.3873	0.1525	-0.0148(1)	0.0003	0.0141	-1016.5169(1)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-1108.0574	110.2884	-0.0043	-0.0080(1)	0.0003(3)	0.0053	-997.7757(3)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-1108.0574	114.4515	-0.0043	-0.0042(1)	0.0003	0.0108	-993.6035(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-1103.2520	118.6221	0.0062	-0.0031(1)	0.0001	0.0162	-984.6105(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-1103.2520	108.8712	0.0062	-0.0068(1)	0.0005	0.0052	-994.3756(1)
	off-diag.	0	6.6353	0	0.0028(1)	-0.0002	0.0078	6.6456(1)
20	$(1s)^2$	-5471.5558(2)	341.1317	1.6179(2)	-0.1231(1)	0.0008	0.0715	-5128.8570(3)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-1369.7265	124.8955	0.2195(1)	-0.0300(1)	0.0008(1)	0.0172	-1244.6235(2)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-1369.7265	101.8571	0.2195(1)	-0.0192(1)	0.0003	0.0175	-1267.6513(1)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-1369.7284	123.2478	-0.0063	-0.0111(1)	0.0004(4)	0.0066	-1246.4910(4)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-1369.7284	127.7658	-0.0063	-0.0057(1)	0.0003(1)	0.0135	-1241.9608(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-1362.3853	132.3004	0.0097	-0.0042(1)	0.0001	0.0203	-1230.0590(1)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-1362.3853	121.2809	0.0097	-0.0089(1)	0.0006	0.0065	-1241.0965(1)
	off-diag.	0	7.4312	0	0.0036(1)	-0.0003	0.0097	7.4442(1)
30	$(1s)^2$	-12395.3519(21)	524.3345	6.305(2)	-0.3292(1)	-0.0002	0.1036	-11864.9380(26)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-3108.3049(2)	192.6165	0.883(1)	-0.0884(1)	0.0010(4)	0.0254	-2914.8679(15)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-3108.3049(2)	155.1570	0.883(1)	-0.0527(1)	0.0005	0.0257	-2952.2919(14)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-3108.3193	190.7532	-0.0229(3)	-0.0433(1)	0.0006(15)	0.0099	-2917.6217(15)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-3108.3193	195.9801	-0.0229(3)	-0.0195(1)	0.0006(5)	0.0199	-2912.3612(6)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-3070.5057	201.3174	0.0546(3)	-0.0140(1)	0.0001	0.0295	-2869.1181(4)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-3070.5057	183.7941	0.0546(3)	-0.0245(1)	0.0012	0.0096	-2886.6708(4)
	off-diag.	0	11.1222	0	0.0093(1)	-0.0006	0.0140	11.1450(1)
40	$(1s)^2$	-22253.1573(98)	720.9169	16.315(5)	-0.6721(1)	-0.0030(12)	0.1354	-21516.466(11)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-5593.9685(13)	265.1796	2.365(7)	-0.2002(1)	0.0007(5)	0.0334	-5326.5902(69)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-5593.9685(13)	210.6536	2.365(7)	-0.1091(1)	0.0008	0.0338	-5381.0246(69)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-5594.0369	264.5843	-0.040(2)	-0.1234(1)	0.0008(37)	0.0134	-5329.6015(40)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-5594.0369	268.0222	-0.040(2)	-0.0510(1)	0.0007(12)	0.0260	-5326.0786(20)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-5471.5704	271.7376	0.193(2)	-0.0345(1)	0.0001	0.0378	-5199.6369(16)

	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-5471.5704	247.3427	0.193(2)	-0.0503(1)	0.0018	0.0125	-5224.0712(16)
	off-diag.	0	14.1717	0	0.0179(1)	-0.0010(1)	0.0178	14.2065(1)
50	$(1s)^2$	-35226.611(37)	936.5564	33.961(8)	-1.2016(1)	-0.0077(50)	0.1659	-34257.137(38)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-8884.0997(51)	344.7875	5.118(22)	-0.3966(1)	-0.0001	0.0412	-8534.550(22)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-8884.0997(51)	269.3108	5.118(22)	-0.1953(1)	0.0011(1)	0.0415	-8609.824(22)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-8884.3678(1)	347.6605	-0.006(5)	-0.2936(1)	0.0009(77)	0.0170	-8536.9893(91)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-8884.3678(1)	345.6503	-0.006(5)	-0.1152(1)	0.0009(26)	0.0315	-8538.8067(55)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-8575.5139	344.0793	0.523(5)	-0.0725(1)	-0.0002(2)	0.0447	-8230.9398(49)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-8575.5139	312.2766	0.523(5)	-0.0887(1)	0.0025(1)	0.0152	-8262.7855(49)
	off-diag.	0	16.3734	0	0.0294(1)	-0.0015(3)	0.0206	16.4220(3)
60	$(1s)^2$	-51577.89(11)	1178.1908	61.92(2)	-1.9930(2)	-0.014(15)	0.2152	-50339.58(12)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-13062.076(17)	434.2620	9.74(5)	-0.7258(2)	-0.0014(24)	0.0537	-12618.746(55)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-13062.076(17)	332.3354	9.74(5)	-0.3219(2)	0.0015(3)	0.0541	-12720.265(55)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-13062.9663(6)	443.7641	0.20(1)	-0.6203(1)	0.001(14)	0.0227	-12619.596(19)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-13062.9663(6)	431.1435	0.20(1)	-0.2367(1)	0.0010(46)	0.0400	-12631.816(13)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-12395.4629	418.8977	1.20(1)	-0.1366(2)	-0.0005(9)	0.0546	-11975.449(12)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-12395.4629	378.9465	1.20(1)	-0.1426(2)	0.0034(1)	0.0193	-12015.437(12)
	off-diag.	0	17.5341	0	0.0437(2)	-0.0021(5)	0.0246	17.6003(6)
70	$(1s)^2$	-71678.25(34)	1454.7177	103.45(5)	-3.1581(2)	-0.023(36)	0.2612	-70123.00(34)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-18247.262(53)	537.4108	17.07(10)	-1.2610(2)	-0.0033(84)	0.0658	-17693.98(11)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-18247.262(53)	401.3107	17.07(10)	-0.5043(2)	0.0019(5)	0.0662	-17829.31(11)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-18250.1817(30)	558.0871	0.84(3)	-1.2094(2)	0.001(25)	0.0283	-17692.431(37)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-18250.1817(30)	527.6354	0.84(3)	-0.4550(2)	0.0011(74)	0.0469	-17722.109(28)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-16948.0254	496.7905	2.44(3)	-0.2388(2)	-0.0010(24)	0.0608	-16448.971(27)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-16948.0254	447.7121	2.44(3)	-0.2158(2)	0.0043(1)	0.0225	-16498.059(27)
	off-diag.	0	17.4750	0	0.0603(2)	-0.0030(9)	0.0266	17.5590(9)
80	$(1s)^2$	-96061.17(14)	1778.3460	162.76(12)	-4.8682(3)	-0.035(78)	0.3326	-94124.63(20)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-24612.823(24)	659.7043	28.31(16)	-2.1164(2)	-0.006(21)	0.0853	-23926.84(16)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-24612.823(24)	478.4429	28.31(16)	-0.7652(2)	0.0023(9)	0.0858	-24106.74(16)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-24621.4092(19)	698.2096	2.41(5)	-2.2345(1)	0.001(41)	0.0369	-23922.985(66)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-24621.4092(19)	639.7159	2.41(5)	-0.8367(1)	0.001(11)	0.0570	-23980.061(53)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-22253.6733	578.4003	4.56(5)	-0.3926(3)	-0.0017(52)	0.0686	-21671.042(52)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-22253.6733	518.9620	4.56(5)	-0.3132(3)	0.0054(1)	0.0267	-21730.436(52)
	off-diag.	0	16.0290	0	0.0789(2)	-0.0040(15)	0.0289	16.133(2)
83	$(1s)^2$	-104318.14(45)	1887.0340	184.80(15)	-5.5216(7)	-0.038(96)	0.3620	-102251.50(48)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-26787.971(79)	701.2539	32.69(18)	-2.4602(2)	-0.007(27)	0.0938	-26056.40(20)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-26787.971(79)	503.6141	32.69(18)	-0.8635(2)	0.0025(10)	0.0943	-26252.43(20)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-26799.9095(69)	746.8793	3.18(6)	-2.6669(1)	0.001(47)	0.0404	-26052.473(79)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-26799.9095(69)	677.3537	3.18(6)	-0.9985(1)	0.001(12)	0.0611	-26120.309(64)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-23995.8077	603.7089	5.42(6)	-0.4511(4)	-0.0020(63)	0.0715	-23387.064(63)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-23995.8077	540.8844	5.42(6)	-0.3482(4)	0.0057	0.0283	-23449.822(62)
	off-diag.	0	15.3022	0	0.0848(4)	-0.0043(17)	0.0297	15.412(2)
90	$(1s)^2$	-125495.06(35)	2166.4366	245.28(27)	-7.373(1)	-0.05(16)	0.4338	-123090.46(47)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-32413.922(65)	809.3517	45.19(21)	-3.4708(3)	-0.009(45)	0.1168	-31562.77(23)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-32413.922(65)	566.9102	45.19(21)	-1.1376(2)	0.0029(14)	0.1174	-31802.86(22)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-32440.5502(70)	875.9130	5.82(9)	-3.9928(2)	0.002(66)	0.0496	-31562.76(11)

	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-32440.5502(70)	774.5561	5.82(9)	-1.4974(1)	0.001(16)	0.0707	-31661.599(95)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-28337.2409	664.4053	7.93(9)	-0.6138(5)	-0.0026(97)	0.0759	-27665.448(94)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-28337.2409	593.1280	7.93(9)	-0.4420(5)	0.0066	0.0314	-27736.589(93)
	off-diag.	0	13.0506	0	0.0991(4)	-0.0052(23)	0.0305	13.173(2)
92	$(1s)^2$	-132081.13(40)	2253.9270	265.16(33)	-8.002(2)	-0.05(18)	0.4600	-129569.84(55)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-34177.718(76)	843.6057	49.44(22)	-3.8259(4)	-0.009(51)	0.1260	-33288.42(24)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-34177.718(76)	586.3549	49.44(22)	-1.2301(3)	0.0030(16)	0.1266	-33543.06(23)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-34211.0649(86)	917.4965	6.86(10)	-4.4740(3)	0.002(73)	0.0531	-33291.13(13)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-34211.0649(86)	805.1933	6.86(10)	-1.6798(2)	0.001(17)	0.0743	-33400.62(11)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-29649.8340	682.1947	8.80(10)	-0.6677(5)	-0.003(11)	0.0774	-28959.44(10)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-29649.8340	608.3558	8.80(10)	-0.4725(5)	0.0068	0.0324	-29033.12(10)
	off-diag.	0	12.2592	0	0.1031(4)	-0.0054(25)	0.0308	12.383(3)
100	$(1s)^2$	-161165.5(6.0)	2646.5635	358.30(63)	-11.079(4)	-0.06(30)	0.6180	-158171.1(6.1)
	$(1s2s)_0$	-42048.7(1.2)	999.8620	70.19(20)	-5.6271(8)	-0.012(86)	0.1895	-40984.1(1.3)
	$(1s2s)_1$	-42048.7(1.2)	671.7243	70.19(20)	-1.6730(5)	0.0035(23)	0.1902	-41308.3(1.3)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_0$	-42127.25(19)	1111.1289	12.82(16)	-7.0293(6)	0.00(11)	0.0759	-41010.25(27)
	$(1s2p_{1/2})_1$	-42127.25(19)	944.3801	12.82(16)	-2.6547(6)	0.001(21)	0.0984	-41172.60(25)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_1$	-35228.5685	755.4926	13.05(16)	-0.9195(7)	-0.004(16)	0.0866	-34460.87(16)
	$(1s2p_{3/2})_2$	-35228.5685	670.7584	13.05(16)	-0.6128(7)	0.0079(2)	0.0382	-34545.33(16)
	off-diag.	0	8.4030	0	0.1202(4)	-0.0066(34)	0.0328	8.550(3)

TABLE VII: Total ionization energies (in eV) for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions.  
“RMS” denotes the root-mean-square radii expressed in Fermi.

Z	RMS	$1^1S_0$	$2^1S_0$	$2^3S_1$	$2^3P_0$	$2^3P_1$	$2^1P_1$	$2^3P_2$
12	3.057	1761.8045(1)	417.9688(1)	430.6928(1)	418.8092(1)	418.7058(1)	409.5564(1)	418.2630(1)
13	3.063	2085.9766(1)	497.0264(1)	510.9969(1)	498.0059(2)	497.8513(1)	487.6853(1)	497.2157(1)
14	3.123	2437.6577(1)	582.9812(1)	598.2083(1)	584.0977(2)	583.8774(1)	572.6564(1)	582.9899(1)
15	3.190	2816.9083(1)	675.8517(1)	692.3465(1)	677.1018(2)	676.8002(1)	664.4774(1)	675.5896(1)
16	3.263	3223.7801(2)	775.6547(1)	793.4291(1)	777.0359(2)	776.6364(1)	763.1511(1)	775.0175(1)
17	3.388	3658.3431(2)	882.4119(2)	901.4785(1)	883.9201(3)	883.4061(1)	868.6849(1)	881.2782(1)
18	3.427	4120.6651(3)	996.1445(2)	1016.5169(1)	997.7757(3)	997.1309(1)	981.0831(1)	994.3756(1)
19	3.435	4610.8065(3)	1116.8726(2)	1138.5651(2)	1118.6242(4)	1117.8332(2)	1100.3452(1)	1114.3132(1)
20	3.478	5128.8570(4)	1244.6235(2)	1267.6513(2)	1246.4910(4)	1245.5403(2)	1226.4795(1)	1241.0965(1)
21	3.546	5674.9027(5)	1379.4240(3)	1403.8033(2)	1381.4021(5)	1380.2810(2)	1359.4906(1)	1374.7310(1)
22	3.592	6249.0215(6)	1521.2993(3)	1547.0472(3)	1523.3840(6)	1522.0845(2)	1499.3776(1)	1515.2210(1)
23	3.600	6851.3098(7)	1670.2794(4)	1697.4139(3)	1672.4660(7)	1670.9837(2)	1646.1447(2)	1662.5723(1)
24	3.645	7481.8615(9)	1826.3943(5)	1854.9342(4)	1828.6783(8)	1827.0127(3)	1799.7935(2)	1816.7904(2)
25	3.706	8140.7858(11)	1989.6779(6)	2019.6431(5)	1992.0538(9)	1990.2085(3)	1960.3290(2)	1977.8820(2)
26	3.738	8828.1864(13)	2160.1629(7)	2191.5742(7)	2162.6259(10)	2160.6082(4)	2127.7522(2)	2145.8529(2)
27	3.788	9544.1817(15)	2337.8865(9)	2370.7658(8)	2340.4307(11)	2338.2522(4)	2302.0688(2)	2320.7104(3)
28	3.776	10288.8845(18)	2522.8843(11)	2557.2543(10)	2525.5046(12)	2523.1803(5)	2483.2797(3)	2502.4605(3)
29	3.883	11062.4295(22)	2715.1988(13)	2751.0833(12)	2717.8885(13)	2715.4371(5)	2671.3951(3)	2691.1119(3)
30	3.928	11864.9380(26)	2914.8679(15)	2952.2919(14)	2917.6217(15)	2915.0645(6)	2866.4147(4)	2886.6708(4)
31	3.996	12696.5555(31)	3121.9372(18)	3160.9268(17)	3124.7480(17)	3122.1099(7)	3068.3488(5)	3089.1461(5)
32	4.072	13557.4188(37)	3336.4503(21)	3377.0324(20)	3339.3118(19)	3336.6195(8)	3277.2016(5)	3298.5453(6)

33	4.096	14447.6761(44)	3558.4532(25)	3600.6561(24)	3561.3593(21)	3558.6415(9)	3492.9786(6)	3514.8764(6)
34	4.140	15367.4889(51)	3787.9973(29)	3831.8502(29)	3790.9401(23)	3788.2280(10)	3715.6912(7)	3738.1490(7)
35	4.163	16317.0085(59)	4025.1296(34)	4070.6630(34)	4028.1037(25)	4025.4293(12)	3945.3431(8)	3968.3710(9)
36	4.188	17296.4182(68)	4269.9080(39)	4317.1534(39)	4272.9045(28)	4270.3024(13)	4181.9484(10)	4205.5532(10)
37	4.204	18305.8805(77)	4522.3840(46)	4571.3742(45)	4525.3960(31)	4522.9014(14)	4425.5118(11)	4449.7039(11)
38	4.224	19345.5841(89)	4782.6167(53)	4833.3860(52)	4785.6363(34)	4783.2861(16)	4676.0457(13)	4700.8338(13)
39	4.243	20415.713(10)	5050.6647(61)	5103.2482(60)	5053.6841(37)	5051.5162(18)	4933.5581(14)	4958.9527(14)
40	4.270	21516.465(11)	5326.5902(69)	5381.0246(69)	5329.6015(40)	5327.6551(20)	5198.0604(15)	5224.0712(16)
41	4.324	22648.042(12)	5610.4573(79)	5666.7809(79)	5613.4525(44)	5611.7684(22)	5469.5642(18)	5496.2005(18)
42	4.407	23810.651(14)	5902.3327(90)	5960.5848(89)	5905.3040(48)	5903.9240(25)	5748.0806(20)	5775.3519(20)
43	4.424	25004.529(16)	6202.286(10)	6262.508(10)	6205.2242(52)	6204.1906(27)	6033.6179(22)	6061.5357(23)
44	4.481	26229.891(18)	6510.390(11)	6572.623(11)	6513.2861(56)	6512.6431(31)	6326.1919(25)	6354.7651(25)
45	4.494	27486.978(20)	6826.720(12)	6891.008(12)	6829.5632(61)	6829.3555(34)	6625.8116(28)	6655.0511(29)
46	4.532	28776.030(23)	7151.351(14)	7217.739(14)	7154.1334(66)	7154.4075(37)	6932.4916(32)	6962.4069(32)
47	4.544	30097.313(26)	7484.365(16)	7552.901(16)	7487.0762(72)	7487.8795(41)	7246.2430(35)	7276.8447(36)
48	4.610	31451.058(30)	7825.844(18)	7896.575(18)	7828.4758(78)	7829.8578(46)	7567.0820(40)	7598.3787(40)
49	4.614	32837.588(33)	8175.877(20)	8248.853(20)	8178.4166(84)	8180.4270(50)	7895.0172(44)	7927.0206(44)
50	4.655	34257.137(37)	8534.550(22)	8609.824(22)	8536.9893(91)	8539.6802(55)	8230.0663(49)	8262.7855(49)
51	4.681	35710.021(42)	8901.956(24)	8979.581(24)	8904.2848(98)	8907.7092(60)	8572.2401(54)	8605.6865(54)
52	4.742	37196.516(48)	9278.191(27)	9358.223(27)	9280.401(10)	9284.6147(66)	8921.5577(59)	8955.7395(59)
53	4.749	38716.991(53)	9663.359(29)	9745.855(29)	9665.435(11)	9670.4932(72)	9278.0263(65)	9312.9568(65)
54	4.787	40271.717(60)	10057.559(32)	10142.577(32)	10059.493(12)	10065.4542(79)	9641.6682(72)	9677.3560(72)
55	4.804	41861.068(67)	10460.900(35)	10548.504(35)	10462.681(13)	10469.6036(86)	10012.4945(79)	10048.9509(79)
56	4.839	43485.358(75)	10873.491(39)	10963.742(39)	10875.110(14)	10883.0560(94)	10390.5238(86)	10427.7586(86)
57	4.855	45144.988(83)	11295.452(42)	11388.416(42)	11296.894(15)	11305.926(10)	10775.7693(94)	10813.7940(94)
58	4.877	46840.299(93)	11726.896(46)	11822.641(46)	11728.153(16)	11738.337(11)	11168.248(10)	11207.074(10)
59	4.892	48571.70(10)	12167.953(50)	12266.549(50)	12169.011(17)	12180.414(12)	11567.978(11)	11607.616(11)
60	4.914	50339.57(11)	12618.745(54)	12720.265(54)	12619.596(18)	12632.287(13)	11974.976(12)	12015.437(12)
61	4.962	52144.28(12)	13079.399(59)	13183.917(59)	13080.041(20)	13094.093(14)	12389.261(13)	12430.554(13)
62	5.092	53986.08(14)	13550.028(64)	13657.622(64)	13550.484(21)	13565.970(15)	12810.849(14)	12852.988(14)
63	5.118	55865.89(16)	14030.843(69)	14141.593(69)	14031.069(23)	14048.066(16)	13239.757(15)	13282.753(15)
64	5.159	57783.89(18)	14521.952(74)	14635.942(74)	14521.947(24)	14540.533(17)	13676.007(17)	13719.870(16)
65	5.099	59740.95(19)	15023.567(79)	15140.883(79)	15023.271(26)	15043.528(19)	14119.614(18)	14164.358(18)
66	5.224	61736.53(22)	15535.693(86)	15656.421(86)	15535.200(28)	15557.210(20)	14570.601(19)	14616.237(19)
67	5.155	63772.63(24)	16058.718(91)	16182.954(91)	16057.906(30)	16081.757(22)	15028.984(21)	15075.525(21)
68	5.250	65848.23(27)	16592.583(98)	16720.419(98)	16591.556(32)	16617.336(24)	15494.786(23)	15542.244(23)
69	5.192	67965.42(29)	17137.69(10)	17269.23(10)	17136.338(34)	17164.141(25)	15968.027(24)	16016.414(24)
70	5.317	70122.99(34)	17693.97(11)	17829.31(11)	17692.430(36)	17722.351(27)	16448.728(26)	16498.058(26)
71	5.246	72323.72(36)	18261.94(12)	18401.19(12)	18260.039(38)	18292.178(29)	16936.909(28)	16987.195(28)
72	5.349	74565.87(41)	18841.44(13)	18984.70(12)	18839.354(41)	18873.814(32)	17432.594(30)	17483.849(30)
73	5.354	76851.98(45)	19432.97(13)	19580.37(13)	19430.599(44)	19467.486(34)	17935.803(33)	17988.041(32)
74	5.373	79181.87(50)	20036.62(14)	20188.27(14)	20033.990(46)	20073.413(36)	18446.561(35)	18499.794(35)
75	5.351	81556.77(54)	20652.69(15)	20808.72(15)	20649.760(49)	20691.835(39)	18964.889(37)	19019.131(37)
76	5.406	83976.26(60)	21281.25(16)	21441.78(16)	21278.139(52)	21322.982(41)	19490.812(40)	19546.078(40)
77	5.401	86442.47(66)	21922.76(18)	22087.92(18)	21919.389(56)	21967.123(44)	20024.352(43)	20080.656(42)
78	5.427	88955.17(73)	22577.32(19)	22747.25(19)	22573.761(59)	22624.513(47)	20565.534(46)	20622.892(45)

79	5.437	91515.78(80)	23245.28(20)	23420.12(20)	23241.533(63)	23295.435(51)	21114.385(49)	21172.810(48)
80	5.467	94124.62(20)	23926.84(16)	24106.74(16)	23922.985(66)	23980.173(53)	21670.929(52)	21730.436(52)
81	5.483	96783.07(98)	24622.37(23)	24807.48(23)	24618.417(71)	24679.035(58)	22235.191(55)	22295.795(55)
82	5.504	99491.78(52)	25332.13(19)	25522.62(19)	25328.139(74)	25392.333(60)	22807.199(59)	22868.915(58)
83	5.533	102251.50(48)	26056.40(19)	26252.43(19)	26052.472(78)	26120.396(64)	23386.977(62)	23449.821(62)
84	5.531	105064.1(1.3)	26795.67(29)	26997.42(29)	26791.770(85)	26863.584(70)	23974.554(66)	24038.542(66)
85	5.539	107930.0(1.4)	27550.15(31)	27757.80(31)	27546.379(90)	27622.249(75)	24569.959(70)	24635.105(70)
86	5.632	110847.9(1.6)	28319.82(34)	28533.55(34)	28316.644(96)	28396.741(80)	25173.222(75)	25239.543(74)
87	5.640	113823.5(1.7)	29105.83(37)	29325.84(37)	29103.01(10)	29187.523(86)	25784.366(79)	25851.878(79)
88	5.662	116855.4(1.9)	29908.12(40)	30134.62(40)	29905.87(10)	29994.978(92)	26403.424(84)	26472.143(83)
89	5.670	119945.7(2.1)	30727.27(44)	30960.47(44)	30725.66(11)	30819.562(99)	27030.425(88)	27100.367(88)
90	5.802	123090.45(46)	31562.76(22)	31802.86(22)	31562.75(11)	31661.642(94)	27665.405(93)	27736.589(93)
91	5.700	126304.7(2.5)	32417.55(52)	32664.83(52)	32417.86(13)	32521.96(11)	28308.381(99)	28380.818(98)
92	5.860	129569.84(54)	33288.42(23)	33543.06(22)	33291.13(12)	33400.65(10)	28959.40(10)	29033.11(10)
93	5.744	132910.9(3.1)	34180.25(63)	34442.58(63)	34183.54(15)	34298.73(13)	29618.48(11)	29693.48(10)
94	5.794	136309.1(3.4)	35089.75(70)	35359.99(69)	35095.26(16)	35216.35(14)	30285.67(11)	30361.97(11)
95	5.787	139776.9(3.7)	36019.54(76)	36297.99(76)	36027.09(17)	36154.35(15)	30960.99(12)	31038.62(12)
96	5.815	143310.9(4.1)	36969.20(84)	37256.14(84)	36979.56(19)	37113.25(16)	31644.49(12)	31723.45(12)
97	5.815	146916.8(4.5)	37940.10(93)	38235.85(92)	37953.42(20)	38093.82(18)	32336.18(13)	32416.50(13)
98	5.843	150592.5(5.0)	38932.1(1.0)	39236.9(1.0)	38949.28(22)	39096.68(20)	33036.12(14)	33117.80(14)
99	5.850	154343.8(5.5)	39946.6(1.1)	40261.0(1.1)	39967.97(24)	40122.68(22)	33744.33(15)	33827.40(14)
100	5.857	158171.1(6.0)	40984.1(1.2)	41308.2(1.2)	41010.25(26)	41172.61(24)	34460.85(15)	34545.32(15)

TABLE VIII: Comparison of theoretical and experimental transition energies. Units are  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  or eV as noted.

$Z$	This work	Plante <i>et al.</i> [20]	Chen <i>et al.</i> [19]	Johnson <i>et al.</i> [18]	Experiment	Reference
$2^3P_0 - 2^3S_1$ transition, in $\text{cm}^{-1}$ unless specified:						
12	95848(1)	95847	95848	95848	95851(7)	[78]
14	113809(2)	113809	113809	113809	113807(4)	[79]
					113815(4)	[80]
15	122956(2)	122955		122955	122953(9)	[79]
16	132220(2)	132219	132219	132219	132214(7)	[81]
					132198(10)	[80]
18	151158(3)	151155	151156	151155	151164(4)	[82]
					151204(9)	[83]
26	233484(10)	233469	233471		232558(550)	[84]
36	356892(39)	356822	356828	356823	357400(260)	[85]

92	251.93(26) eV	252.79	252.77		260.0(7.9)	[86]
----	---------------	--------	--------	--	------------	------

$2^3P_2 - 2^3S_1$  transition, in  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ :

12	100253(1)	100252	100253	100252	100263(6)	[78]
14	122744(1)	122743	122743	122743	122743(3)	[79]
					122746(3)	[80]
15	135154(1)	135151		135151	135150(5)	[79]
16	148499(1)	148496	148497	148496	148498(4)	[81]
					148493(5)	[80]
18	178582(1)	178576	178578	178576	178589(5)	[82]
					178591(31)	[83]
20	214179(2)	214170	214174	214170	214225(45)	[87]
22	256696(2)	256683	256688	256683	256746(46)	[88]
26	368767(6)	368742	368752	368742	368976(125)	[84]
28	441942(8)	441908	441920	441907	441950(80)	[89]
36	900116(33)	900009	900044	900008	900010(240)	[85]

$2^3P_1 - 2^3S_1$  transition, in  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ :

12	96682(1)	96680	96681		96683(6)	[78]
13	106026(1)	106025			106023(7)	[78]

$2^3P_1 - 2^1S_0$  transition, in  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ :

14	7229(1)	7231			7230.5(2)	[90]
----	---------	------	--	--	-----------	------

$2^3P_0 - 2^3P_1$  transition, in eV unless specified:

12	834(1) $\text{cm}^{-1}$	833	833		833.133(15)	[91]
28	2.324(1)	2.323	2.325		2.33(15)	[92]
47	0.803(8)	0.801	0.789		0.79(4)	[93]
64	18.586(31)	18.571	18.548		18.57(19)	[94]

$1^1S_0 - 2^1P_1$  transition, in eV:

16	2460.629	2460.628			2460.649(9)	[95]
18	3139.582	3139.580			3139.553(38)	[96]
19	3510.461	3510.459			3510.58(12)	[97]
21	4315.412	4315.409			4315.54(15)	[97]

TABLE IX: The  $2^3P_0 - 2^1S_0$  transition energy, in eV.

	$Z = 63$	$Z = 64$	$Z = 65$	$Z = 66$	$Z = 89$	$Z = 90$	$Z = 91$	$Z = 92$
This work	-0.226(73)	0.006(79)	0.296(84)	0.493(91)	1.61(46)	0.01(25)	-0.31(54)	-2.71(27)
Andreev <i>et al.</i> [40]	-0.591	-0.389	-0.153	0.016			-1.971	-4.511
Plante <i>et al.</i> [20]		-0.170		0.341		-0.095		-2.639
Drake [17]	-0.168	0.067	0.328	0.614	1.731	0.718	-0.209	-1.816
Maul <i>et al.</i> [12]								0.30

22	4749.644(1)	4749.639					4749.74(17)	[97]
23	5205.165(1)	5205.154					5205.27(21)	[97]
							5205.10(14)	[98]
24	5682.068(1)	5682.061					5682.32(40)	[97]
26	6700.434(1)	6700.423					6700.73(20)	[97]
							6700.90(25)	[99]
32	10280.217(4)	10280.185					10280.70(22)	[100]
36	13114.470(7)	13114.411					13115.31(30)	[101]
							13114.68(36)	[102]
54	30630.049(61)	30629.667					30629.1(3.5)	[103]
92	100610.44(56)	100613.924					100626(35)	[104]

$1^1S_0 - 2^3P_1$ , in eV:

18	3123.534	3123.532					3123.522(36)	[96]
23	5180.326(1)	5180.327					5180.22(17)	[98]
26	6667.578(1)	6667.564					6667.50(25)	[99]
32	10220.799(4)	10220.759					10221.80(35)	[100]
36	13026.116(7)	13026.044					13026.8(3)	[101]
54	30206.263(61)	30205.852					30209.6(3.5)	[103]
92	96169.19(56)	96172.427					96171(52)	[104]

$1^1S_0 - 2^3P_2$ , in eV:

23	5188.738(1)	5188.730					5189.12(21)	[98]
----	-------------	----------	--	--	--	--	-------------	------

$1^1S_0 - 2^3S_1$ , in eV:

23	5153.896(1)	5153.889					5153.82(14)	[98]
----	-------------	----------	--	--	--	--	-------------	------






FIG. 1: The diagram of the one-photon exchange.




FIG. 2: The diagrams of the two-photon exchange.

---

[1] H. Araki, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **17**, 619 (1957).

[2] J. Sucher, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1010 (1958).

[3] G. W. F. Drake, in *The Hydrogen Atom. Precision Physics of Simple Atomic Systems*, ed. by S. G.




FIG. 3: Self-energy screening and vacuum-polarization screening diagrams.




FIG. 4: Comparison of our all-order numerical results for the second-order two-electron QED correction (square dots, solid line) with values for this correction within the  $\alpha Z$  expansion (the contribution of order  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$ , dashed line) and with the related QED contribution by Drake [17] (dotted line), in units of  $\alpha^2(\alpha Z)^3$ .

Karshenboim *et al.*, p. 57, Berlin, 2001, Springer.

[4] K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4561 (2000).

[5] V. Korobov and A. Yelkhovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 193003 (2001).

[6] K. Pachucki, J. Phys. B **35**, 3087 (2002).

[7] R. E. Marrs, S. R. Elliott, and T. Stöhlker, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 3577 (1995).

[8] T. Stöhlker, S. R. Elliot, and R. E. Marrs, Hyperfine Interactions **99**, 217 (1996).

[9] A. Gumberidze, T. Stöhlker, D. Banas, K. Beckert, P. Beller, H. F. Beyer, F. Bosch, X. Cai, S. Hag-




FIG. 5: Comparison of different evaluations for the total ionization energy of  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  states of He-like ions. Plotted is the difference between the results obtained by us and by other authors, normalized by the factor  $\alpha^2 (\alpha Z)^4$ . Error bars refer to the estimation of the uncertainty of the present evaluation, open diamonds denote the results by Drake [17], filled circles stand for those by Plante *et al.* [20], and filled triangles indicate the values by Cheng and Chen [22].

mann, C. Kozhuharov, D. Liesen, F. Nolden, X. Ma, P. H. Mokler, A. Orsic-Muthig, M. Steck, D. Sierpowski, S. Tashenov, A. Warczak, and Y. Zou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 203004 (2004).

[10] A. Schäfer, G. Soff, P. Indelicato, B. Müller, and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 7362 (1989).

[11] V. Karasiev, L. Labzowsky, and A. Nefiodov, Phys. Lett. A **172**, 62 (1992).

[12] M. Maul, A. Schäfer, W. Greiner, and P. Indelicato, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 3915 (1996).

[13] L. N. Labzowsky, A. V. Nefiodov, G. Plunien, G. Soff, R. Marrus, and D. Liesen, Phys. Rev. A **63**,

054105 (2001).

- [14] P. J. Mohr, Ann. Phys. (New York) **88**, 26 (1974); **88**, 52 (1974).
- [15] G. Soff and P. J. Mohr, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 5066 (1988).
- [16] P. Indelicato, O. Gorceix, and J. Desclaux, J. Phys. B **20**, 651 (1987).
- [17] G. W. F. Drake, Can. J. Phys. **66**, 586 (1988).
- [18] W. R. Johnson and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **46**, R2197 (1992).
- [19] M. H. Chen, K. T. Cheng, and W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 3692 (1993).
- [20] D. R. Plante, W. R. Johnson, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 3519 (1994).
- [21] K. T. Cheng, M. H. Chen, W. R. Johnson, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 247 (1994).
- [22] K. T. Cheng and M. H. Chen, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 044503 (2000).
- [23] S. A. Blundell, P. J. Mohr, W. R. Johnson, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 2615 (1993).
- [24] I. Lindgren, H. Persson, and S. Salomonson, and L. Labzowsky, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 1167 (1995).
- [25] H. Persson, S. Salomonson, P. Sunnergren, and I. Lindgren, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 204 (1996).
- [26] A. N. Artemyev, V. M. Shabaev, and V. A. Yerokhin, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3529 (1997).
- [27] V. A. Yerokhin, A. N. Artemyev, and V. M. Shabaev, Phys. Lett. A **234**, 361 (1997).
- [28] A. N. Artemyev, T. Beier, G. Plunien, V. M. Shabaev, G. Soff, and V. A. Yerokhin, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 45 (1999).
- [29] V. A. Yerokhin, A. N. Artemyev, T. Beier, G. Plunien, V. M. Shabaev, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 3522 (1999).
- [30] V. A. Yerokhin, A. N. Artemyev, V. M. Shabaev, M. M. Sysak, O. M. Zherebtsov, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4699 (2000); Phys. Rev. A **64**, 032109 (2001).
- [31] J. Sapirstein and K. T. Cheng, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 022502 (2001).
- [32] V. M. Shabaev, Teor. Mat. Fiz. **82**, 83 (1990) [Theor. Math. Phys. **82**, 57 (1990)].
- [33] V. M. Shabaev, J. Phys. B **26**, 4703 (1993).
- [34] V. M. Shabaev, Physics Reports **356**, 119 (2002).
- [35] I. Lindgren, B. Åsen, S. Salomonson, and A.-M. Mårtensson-Pendrill, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062505 (2001).
- [36] O. Y. Andreev, L. N. Labzowsky, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 062505 (2004).
- [37] A. N. Artemyev, T. Beier, G. Plunien, V. M. Shabaev, G. Soff, and V. A. Yerokhin, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022116 (2000).
- [38] P. J. Mohr and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052501 (2000).

- [39] O. Y. Andreev, L. N. Labzowsky, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 042513 (2001).
- [40] O. Y. Andreev, L. N. Labzowsky, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 012503 (2003).
- [41] B. Åsen, S. Salomonson, and I. Lindgren, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032516 (2002).
- [42] V. M. Shabaev, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 4521 (1994).
- [43] C. Itzykson and J. B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980.
- [44] M. H. Mittleman, *Phys. Rev. A* **5**, 2395 (1972).
- [45] V. M. Shabaev and I. G. Fokeeva, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 4489 (1994).
- [46] E.-O. Le Bigot, P. Indelicato, and V. M. Shabaev, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 040501(R) (2001).
- [47] A. N. Artemyev, V. M. Shabaev, M. M. Sysak, V. A. Yerokhin, T. Beier, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 062506 (2003).
- [48] V. A. Yerokhin, P. Indelicato, and V. M. Shabaev, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **25**, 203 (2003).
- [49] P. Sunnergren, *Complete One-Loop QED Calculations for Few-Electron Ions*, Ph.D. thesis, Göteborg University and Chalmers University of Technology, unpublished.
- [50] F. C. Sanders and C. W. Scherr, *Phys. Rev.* **181**, 84 (1969).
- [51] K. Aashamar, G. Lyslo, and J. Midtdal, *J. Chem. Phys.* **52**, 3324 (1970).
- [52] S. P. Goldman and G. W. F. Drake, *J. Phys. B* **17**, L197 (1984).
- [53] G. W. F. Drake, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods B* **202**, 273 (1982).
- [54] V. M. Shabaev, *J. Phys. B* **26**, 1103 (1993).
- [55] G. Fricke, C. Bernhardt, K. Heilig, L. A. Schaller, L. Schellenberg, E. B. Schera, and C. W. de Jager, *At. Data Nucl. Data Tables* **60**, 177 (1995).
- [56] H. de Vries, C. W. de Jager, and C. de Vries, *At. Data Nucl. Data Tables* **36**, 495 (1987).
- [57] J. D. Zumbro, E. B. Shera, Y. Tanaka, C. E. Bemis, Jr., R. A. Naumann, M. V. Hoehn, W. Reuter, and R. M. Steffen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 1888 (1984).
- [58] J. D. Zumbro, R. A. Naumann, M. V. Hoehn, W. Reuter, E. B. Shera, C. E. Bemis, Jr., and Y. Tanaka, *Phys. Lett.* **167 B**, 383 (1986).
- [59] W. R. Johnson and G. Soff, *At. Data Nucl. Data Tables* **33**, 405 (1985).
- [60] T. Beier, P. J. Mohr, H. Persson, and G. Soff, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 954 (1998).
- [61] P. J. Mohr and Y.-K. Kim *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, 2727 (1992).
- [62] P. J. Mohr and G. Soff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 158 (1993).
- [63] P. J. Mohr, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 4421 (1992).
- [64] T. Beier, G. Plunien, M. Greiner, and G. Soff, *J. Phys. B* **30**, 2761 (1997).

- [65] A. G. Fainshtein, N. L. Manakov, and A. A. Nekipelov, *J. Phys. B* **24**, 559 (1991).
- [66] P. J. Mohr and B. N. Taylor, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **72**, 351 (2000).
- [67] K. Pachucki, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 042503 (2001).
- [68] K. Pachucki and U. D. Jentschura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 113005 (2003).
- [69] V. A. Yerokhin, P. Indelicato, and V. M. Shabaev, hep-ph/0411348 (2004) (<http://xxx.lanl.gov>).
- [70] K. Pachucki, Private communication, 2004.
- [71] A. N. Artemyev, V. M. Shabaev, and V. A. Yerokhin, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 1884 (1995).
- [72] A. N. Artemyev, V. M. Shabaev, and V. A. Yerokhin, *J. Phys. B* **28**, 5201 (1995).
- [73] V. M. Shabaev, A. N. Artemyev, T. Beier, G. Plunien, V. A. Yerokhin, and G. Soff, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 4235 (1998).
- [74] V. M. Shabaev and A. N. Artemyev, *J. Phys. B* **27**, 1307 (1994).
- [75] G. Plunien and G. Soff, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 1119 (1995); (E) **53**, 4614 (1996).
- [76] A. V. Nefiodov, L. N. Labzowsky, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, *Phys. Lett. A* **222**, 227 (1996).
- [77] J. Sucher, *Phys. Rev. A* **22**, 348 (1980).
- [78] H. A. Klein, F. Moscatelli, E. G. Myers, E. H. Pinnington, J. D. Silver, and, E. Träbert, *J. Phys. B* **18**, 1483 (1985).
- [79] D. J. H. Howie, W. A. Hallett, E. G. Myers, D. D. Dietrich, and J. D. Silver, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 4390 (1994); D. J. H. Howie, J. D. Silver, and E. G. Myers, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 1761 (1995).
- [80] R. DeSerio, H. G. Berry, R. L. Brooks, J. Hardis, A. E. Livingston, and S. J. Hinterlong, *Phys. Rev. A* **24**, 1872 (1981).
- [81] D. J. H. Howie, J. D. Silver, and E. G. Myers, *J. Phys. B* **29**, 927 (1996).
- [82] K. W. Kukla, A. E. Livingston, J. Suleiman, H. G. Berry, R. W. Dunford, D. S. Gemmell, E. P. Kanter, S. Cheng, and L. J. Curtis, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 1905 (1995).
- [83] H. F. Beyer, F. Folkmann, and K. H. Schartner, *Z. Phys. D* **1**, 65 (1986).
- [84] J. P. Buchet, M. C. Buchet-Poulizac, A. Denis, J. Desesquelles, M. Druetta, J. P. Grandin, and X. Husson, *Phys. Rev. A* **23**, R3354 (1981).
- [85] S. Martin, A. Denis, M. C. Buchet-Poulizac, J. P. Buchet, and J. Desesquelles, *Phys. Rev. A* **42**, 6570 (1990).
- [86] C. T. Munger and H. Gould, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 2927 (1986).
- [87] S. J. Hinterlong and A. E. Livingston, *Phys. Rev. A* **33**, 4378 (1986).
- [88] E. J. Galvez, A. E. Livingston, A. J. Mazure, H. G. Berry, L. Engström, J. E. Hardis, L. P. Somerville,

- and D. Zei, Phys. Rev. A **33**, 3667 (1986).
- [89] A. S. Zacarias, A. E. Livingston, Y. N. Lu, R. F. Ward, H. G. Berry, and R. W. Dunfords, Nucl. Instrum. Methods B **31**, 41 (1988).
- [90] M. Redshaw and E. G. Myers, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 023002 (2002).
- [91] E. G. Myers and M. R. Tarbutt, in *The Hydrogen Atom. Precision Physics of Simple Atomic Systems*, ed. by S. G. Karshenboim *et al.*, p. 679, Berlin, 2001, Springer.
- [92] R. W. Dunford, C. J. Liu, J. Last, N. Berrah-Mansour, R. Vondrasek, D. A. Church, and L. J. Curtis, Phys. Rev. A **44**, 764 (1991).
- [93] B. B. Birkett, J.-P. Briand, P. Charles, D. D. Dietrich, K. Finlayson, P. Indelicato, D. Liesen, R. Marrus, and A. Simionovici, Phys. Rev. A **47**, R2454 (1993); R. Marrus, A. Simionovici, P. Indelicato, D. D. Dietrich, P. Charles, J. P. Briand, K. Finlayson, F. Bosch, D. Liesen, and F. Parente, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 502 (1989).
- [94] P. Indelicato, B. B. Birkett, J.-P. Briand, P. Charles, D. D. Dietrich, R. Marrus, and A. Simionovici, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1307 (1992).
- [95] L. Schleinkofer, F. Bell, H.-D. Betz, G. Trollmann, and J. Rothermel, Phys. Scr. **25**, 917 (1982).
- [96] R. D. Deslattes, H. F. Beyer, and F. Folkmann, J. Phys. B **17**, L689 (1984).
- [97] P. Beiersdorfer, M. Bitter, S. vonGoeler, and K. W. Hill, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 150 (1989).
- [98] C. T. Chantler, D. Paterson, L. T. Hudson, F. G. Serpa, J. D. Gillaspay, and E. Takács, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 042501 (2000).
- [99] J. P. Briand, M. Tavernier, R. Marrus, and J. P. Desclaux, Phys. Rev. A **29**, 3143 (1984).
- [100] S. MacLaren, P. Beiersdorfer, D. A. Vogel, D. Knapp, R. E. Marrs, K. Wong, and R. Zasadzinski, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 329 (1992).
- [101] P. Indelicato, J. P. Briand, M. Tavernier, and D. Liesen, Z. Phys. D **2**, 249 (1986).
- [102] K. Widmann, P. Beiersdorfer, V. Decaux, and M. Bitter, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2200 (1996).
- [103] J. P. Briand, P. Indelicato, A. Simionovici, V. San Vicente, D. Liesen, and D. Dietrich, Europhys. Lett. **9**, 225 (1989).
- [104] J. P. Briand, P. Chevallier, P. Indelicato, K. P. Ziock, and D. D. Dietrich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2761 (1990).