Demonstrating Correlation Trends in the Electric Dipole Polarizabilities of Many Low-lying States in Cesium (Cs I) through First-principle Calculations

A. Chakraborty \textcircled{o}^* and B. K. Sahoo \textcircled{o}^\dagger

Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics Division, Physical Research Laboratory, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380009, India

(Dated: April 3, 2025)

Electron correlation and higher-order relativistic effects are probed in the evaluation of scalar and tensor static electric dipole (E1) polarizabilities (α_d) of several even- and odd-parity states in cesium (Cs) using the Dirac-Hartree-Fock (DHF) method, second-order perturbation theory (MBPT(2)), third-order perturbation theory (MBPT(3)), random phase approximation (RPA), and singles and doubles approximated relativistic coupled-cluster (RCCSD) method. To account for perturbation due to odd-parity E1 operator on the atomic orbitals, calculations are carried out in the linear response approach. Our final α_d values, with the estimated uncertainties, show reasonably good agreement with the previous calculations and available experimental results. Differences among the DHF, MBPT(2), MBPT(3) and RPA results indicate pair-correlation (PC) effects play major roles than the core-polarization (CP) effects in the determination of α_d values in Cs. From the differences among the MBPT(3) and RCC results, we find correlations among the PC and CP effects and double CP effects together are also significant in these calculations. Contributions from the Breit interactions are found to be quite large in the high-lying states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Precise estimations of electric dipole (E1) polarizabilities (α_d) are essential to estimate systematic effects due to light shifts in the high-precision measurements using atomic systems [1, 2]. Particularly, their accurate values are useful in the atom trapping, atomic clocks, quantum computing and testing fundamental physics experiments [3–7]. Alkali atoms are usually preferred to be undertaken to conduct various studies involving high-precision measurements owing to their simple electronic structures and well-characterized properties [8, 9]. Particularly, the cesium (Cs) atom is preferred in the experiments which is the heaviest non-radioactive alkali atom. ¹³³Cs based atomic clocks help defining the SI second and support metrology, including space missions where precise timekeeping is crucial [10-12]. This is also the only atomic system in which parity violation (PV) amplitude has been measured within 0.5% accuracy [13] and help constraining physics beyond the Standard Model of particle physics and extracting nuclear anapole moment [14–16].

Given its importance in both applied and fundamental research, Cs has been the subject of extensive theoretical and experimental studies. Over the past five decades, numerous investigations have been conducted to determine the α_d values of both the ground and excited states of Cs [17–34]. Despite the vast body of work, persistent discrepancies exist among various theoretical predictions and experimental results, leading to unresolved controversies in the field [17, 25–29]. One of the most enduring and debated issues is related to the polarizabilities of the $6P_{1/2}$ and $6P_{3/2}$ states [17, 35]. Polarizabilities of these states show significant inconsistencies among the theoretical and experimental values and among different measurements carried out independently [17, 25–27]. Notably, two independent measurements of polarizabilities of the $6P_{1/2}$ and $6P_{3/2}$ states report values differing by approximately 3% and 1.5%, respectively [25–27]. A similar situation arises in the case of the 7S state, where experimental findings have introduced further debates on these studies. In a recent study, Quirk et al. [29] reported a polarizability value of 6207.9 atomic units (a.u.) for the 7S state. However, this result deviates significantly from previously established theoretical predictions and an earlier experimental value reported to be approximately 6238 a.u. [20, 22, 28]. This level of disagreement underscores the need for employing more accurate theories or carrying out further high-precision measurements of α_d in the low-lying states to reconcile these inconsistencies and refine our understanding of Cs atomic structure.

The earlier calculations were carried out by employing basically linearized version of a relativistic coupledcluster (RCC) method [18, 20, 21] or Dirac-Hartree-Fock (DHF) method with core-polarization (CP) potential approach [22]. The high-precision α_d values reported from these calculations are mostly obtained using the sumover-states approach. In this approach, the dominant valence correlation contributions are evaluated by combining the high-precision E1 matrix elements from either calculations or measurements with the experimental energies. The remaining contributions from the valence correlations due to E1 matrix elements involving high-lying states are estimated using either mean-field calculations at the DHF method or lower-order many-body perturbation theory (MBPT). Moreover, contributions from the occupied orbitals, that cannot be estimated accurately in the sum-over-states approach, were considered through ab initio calculations using MBPT or random phase ap-

^{*} arupc794@gmail.com

[†] bijaya@prl.res.in

proximation (RPA). Such mixed approaches to determine α_d values have many shortcomings from the interest of theoretical studies – (i) this approach does not treat all the correlation contributions on equal footing, (ii) it cannot take into account correlations among contributions that are evaluated separately, (iii) propagation of correlation effects from lower- to higher-order methods cannot be probed in different states explicitly, and (iv) it cannot account for contributions from double-core-polarization (DCP) effects that involve intermediate states with double excitations. This calls for employing first-principle approaches to calculate the α_d values systematically; particularly in Cs in view of the aforementioned debates on some of its reported results.

Among all the many-body methods commonly employed to carry out atomic calculations, the RCC theory is considered to be more powerful. This method not only takes into account electron correlations more rigorously it also obeys size-consistent behavior. However, this method cannot be directly employed to determine α_d values of atomic systems in the spherical coordinate system. Thus, we considered linear response (LR) approach in the RCC theory framework in which atomic orbitals are perturbed explicitly due to the odd-parity E1 operator as discussed in our previous works [36-39]. In this approach, core, core-valence and valence correlation effects are treated on equal footing. It also accounts CP, pair-correlation (PC), DCP and their correlations to allorders. In order to understand propagation of correlation effects in the evaluation of α_d values, we present results at the DHF, second-order MBPT (MBPT(2)) method, third-order MBPT (MBPT(3)) method, RPA, and singles and doubles approximated RCC (RCCSD) method. In the LR approach, the MBPT(2) method contains the lowest-order CP contributions while RPA includes CP contributions to all-orders. Similarly, the MBPT(3)method contains the lowest-order PC effects and the RCCSD method contains all-order PC effects. Moreover, the RCCSD method contains correlations among the CP and PC effects as well as DCP contributions. Therefore, it is possible to understand importance of CP, PC and DCP effects by analyzing trends of α_d values in different states of Cs through the above mentioned methods.

The paper is organized as follows: Sec. II introduces the scalar and tensor components of α_d and Sec. III outlines many-body methods employed in the LR approach to compute α_d of different states of Cs. The next section presents and discusses results by comparing them with the earlier studies and highlight roles of important correlation effects in the accurate evaluation of α_d following the conclusion of the work. Unless specified otherwise, all results are reported in a.u..

II. THEORY

For an isolated atom, parity is a good quantum number. However, when an atom is placed in an external electric field, it loses its spherical symmetry leading to shifts in its energy levels. For an atomic state $|J_n M_n\rangle$, where *n* is the principal quantum number, the dominant energy shift due to a static electric field $\vec{\mathbb{E}} = \mathbb{E}_0 \hat{\epsilon}$ arises from the second-order effect, given by

$$\Delta E^{(2)}(J_n, M_n) = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_d(J_n, M_n)\mathbb{E}_0^2,$$
(1)

where $\alpha_d(J_n, M_n)$ is the static electric dipole polarizability of the corresponding atomic state. As can be seen from the above equation, $\alpha_d(J_n, M_n)$ depends on J_n and M_n . Using the M_n -dependent factors, it yields [40, 41]

$$\alpha_d(J_n, M_n) = \alpha_d^S(J_n) + \frac{3M_n^2 - J_n(J_n + 1)}{J_n(2J_n - 1)} \alpha_d^T(J_n).$$
(2)

Here $\alpha_d^S(J_n)$ and $\alpha_d^T(J_n)$ are called as the scalar and tensor polarizabilities, respectively. These M_n independent quantities can be written in terms of reduced matrix elements as

$$\alpha_d^S(J_n) = C_0 \sum_k \frac{|\langle J_n || D || J_k \rangle|^2}{E_{J_n}^{(0)} - E_{J_k}^{(0)}}$$
(3)

and

$$\alpha_{d}^{T}(J_{n}) = \sqrt{\frac{40J_{n}(2J_{n}-1)}{3(J_{n}+1)(2J_{n}+3)(2J_{n}+1)}} \sum_{k} (-1)^{J_{n}+J_{k}+1} \\
\times \left\{ J_{n} \ 2 \ J_{n} \\
1 \ J_{k} \ 1 \right\} (-1)^{J_{n}-J_{k}} \frac{|\langle J_{n}||D||J_{k}\rangle|^{2}}{E_{J_{n}}^{(0)} - E_{J_{k}}^{(0)}} \\
= \sum_{k} C_{k} \frac{|\langle J_{n}||D||J_{k}\rangle|^{2}}{E_{J_{n}}^{(0)} - E_{J_{k}}^{(0)}},$$
(4)

where $C_0 = -\frac{2}{3(2J_n+1)}$, $C_k = \sqrt{\frac{40J_n(2J_n-1)}{3(J_n+1)(2J_n+3)(2J_n+1)}} \times (-1)^{J_n+J_k+1} \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} J_n & 2 & J_n \\ 1 & J_k & 1 \end{array} \right\}$ with the curly bracket symbol denoting the 6j coefficient and $D = \sum_q d_q$ is the E1 operator. From the angular momentum selection rules, it can be shown that $\alpha_d^T(J_n)$ will be non-zero only for the states $J_n > 1/2$.

By dividing electrons into core and valence electrons, correlation contributions to $\alpha_d^{S/T}$ can be divided into [42, 43]

$$\alpha_d^{S/T} = \alpha_c^{S/T} + \alpha_{cv}^{S/T} + \alpha_v^{S/T}, \tag{5}$$

where terms with subscripts c, cv, and v denote contributions from core, core-valence, and valence correlation, respectively. Due to appearance of the 6j coefficient in C_k , the core contribution to α_d^T will be zero, as for the core sector, J = 0.

III. METHODOLOGY

It is relatively easier to evaluate the α_v^S and α_v^T values of atomic states in the sum-over-states approach using



FIG. 1. Breakdown of the RCC term $(\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)})_c$ to the MBPT terms through Goldstone diagram representation. Here, single arrows going down and up mean occupied and virtual orbitals, respectively. The single curly line represents the E1 operator D, whereas the double curly line corresponds to the effective E1 operator \tilde{D} . The dotted line corresponds to residual V_{res} interaction from the atomic Hamiltonian.

formulas given by Eqs. (3) and (4) with the knowledge of reduced matrix elements $\langle J_n || D || J_k \rangle$ and excitation energies of dominantly contributing low-lying transitions. Since $\langle J_n || D || J_k \rangle$ amplitudes and their excitation energies involving occupied or continuum orbitals cannot be evaluated explicitly using many-body methods, a sumover-states approach cannot be used to determine $\alpha_c^{S/T}$, $\alpha_{cv}^{S/T}$ and continuum contributions to $\alpha_v^{S/T}$. Thus, they are estimated often using lower-level methods like DHF method or RPA; particularly in Cs. For comprehensive and accurate estimations of these contributions to $\alpha_d^{S/T}$, we express their expressions in the LR approach as [39]

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_d^{S/T} &= \langle \Psi_n^{(0)} | \tilde{D}^{S/T} | \Psi_n^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \Psi_n^{(1)} | \tilde{D}^{S/T} | \Psi_n^{(0)} \rangle \\ &= 2 \langle \Psi_n^{(0)} | \tilde{D}^{S/T} | \Psi_n^{(1)} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$
(6)

where $|\Psi_n^{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\Psi_n^{(1)}\rangle$ denote the unperturbed and firstorder perturbed wave functions of the system, respectively. These wave functions are solutions to the atomic Hamiltonian (H_{at}) and the perturbative corrections due to the E1 interaction. The term $\tilde{D}^{S/T}$ refers to the effective dipole operators for scalar and tensor components, given by $\tilde{D}^S = C_0 D$ and $\tilde{D}^T = \sum_k C_k D$.

The first-order perturbed wave function $|\Psi_n^{(1)}\rangle$ can be obtained by solving the following inhomogeneous equation

$$(H_{at} - E_n^{(0)})|\Psi_n^{(1)}\rangle = -D|\Psi_n^{(0)}\rangle.$$
 (7)

Solution of this equation using a given method would



FIG. 2. Breakdown of the Goldstone diagram corresponding to $(\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)})_{cv}$ in terms of MBPT diagrams. Here, the double arrow represents the valence orbital while other symbols are same as described in Fig. 1.

ensure that all the correlation contributions to $\alpha_d^{S/T}$ are treated equally. However, accurate determination of these contributions depend on the choice of atomic Hamiltonian and many-body method. To demonstrate dependency of results with choice of a method, we present results from the DHF, MBPT(2), MBPT(3), RPA and RCCSD methods. These methods are discussed briefly below, while details of these methods can be found elsewhere [36, 39, 44–46].

To begin with, we consider H_{at} at the Dirac-Coulomb approximation, given by (in a.u.)

$$H_{at} \equiv \sum_{i} \left[c \vec{\alpha}_{i}^{D} \cdot \vec{p}_{i} + (\beta_{i}^{D} - 1)c^{2} + V_{n}(r_{i}) \right] + \sum_{i,j>i} \frac{1}{r_{ij}}.$$

Here, α^D and β^D are the Dirac matrices, \vec{p} is the singleparticle momentum operator, $V_n(r)$ represents the nuclear potential felt by an electron, and $\frac{1}{r_{ij}}$ represents the Coulomb repulsion between two electrons. We also estimate corrections due to the Breit interaction and lowestorder Quantum Electrodynamics (QED) effects. The QED effects include the lowest-order vacuum polarization effect, described through the Uehling potential and Wichmann-Kroll potential, as well as the self-energy effect described by the magnetic and electric form factors [35, 47].

Since all the considered atomic states of Cs have the closed-core $[5p^6]$ and a valence orbital with different parity and angular momentum, we consider the V^{N_e-1} potential formalism, with $N_e = 55$ being the number of electrons, to produce the initial wave function, $|\Phi_0\rangle$, using the DHF Hamiltonian, H_{DHF} . To connect results from different methods, we express the final (unperturbed) wave function of the closed-core, $|\Psi_0^{(0)}\rangle$, due to H_{at} by

$$|\Psi_0^{(0)}\rangle = \Omega_0^{(0)} |\Phi_0\rangle, \tag{8}$$

where $\Omega_0^{(0)}$ is referred to as the wave operator. Obviously, $\Omega_0^{(0)} = 1$ in the DHF method while it accounts for the electron correlation effects arising from the residual interaction $V_{res} = H_{at} - H_{DHF}$ in a many-body method.

In order to obtain the desired wave function of an intended state of Cs, we append the required valence orbital, v, to the closed-core configuration in the next step by defining the modified DHF wave function as $|\Phi_v\rangle = a_v^{\dagger}|\Phi_0\rangle$. This follows the final unperturbed wave function in the wave operator formalism

$$|\Psi_{v}^{(0)}\rangle = (\Omega_{0}^{(0)} + \Omega_{v}^{(0)})|\Phi_{v}\rangle, \qquad (9)$$

where $\Omega_v^{(0)}$ is responsible for accounting the correlation effects involving the electron from the valence orbital v. Similarly, the corresponding first-order perturbed wave functions can be expressed as

$$|\Psi_0^{(1)}\rangle = \Omega_0^{(1)} |\Phi_0\rangle \tag{10}$$

and

$$|\Psi_{v}^{(0)}\rangle = (\Omega_{0}^{(1)} + \Omega_{v}^{(1)})|\Phi_{v}\rangle,$$
 (11)

where superscript (1) on wave operators stands for the first-order perturbation.

In the DHF method, like the $\Omega_0^{(0)}$ operator $\Omega_v^{(0)} = 1$ but $\Omega_0^{(1)} = \sum_{ap} \frac{\langle \Phi_a^p | D | \Phi_0 \rangle}{\epsilon_p - \epsilon_a} a_p^\dagger a_a = \sum_{ap,k} \frac{\langle \phi_p | d_k | \phi_a \rangle}{\epsilon_p - \epsilon_a} a_p^\dagger a_a$ and $\Omega_v^{(1)} = \sum_p \frac{\langle \Phi_p^v | D | \Phi_v \rangle}{\epsilon_p - \epsilon_v} a_p^\dagger a_v = \sum_{p,k} \frac{\langle \phi_p | d_k | \phi_v \rangle}{\epsilon_p - \epsilon_v} a_p^\dagger a_v$ with $|\phi_i\rangle$ and ϵ_i are the single particle DHF wave function and energy of the the *i*th orbital, respectively. Here, a, b denote for core orbitals, p, q denote for virtual orbitals and $|\Phi_{ab\cdots}^{pq\cdots}\rangle = a_p^\dagger a_q^\dagger \cdots a_b a_a |\Phi_0\rangle$.

Using the above DHF wave operators as the initial guess, the unperturbed perturbed wave operators in the MBPT method can be derived using the Bloch equation [48]

$$\left[\Omega_0^{(0)}, H_{DHF}\right] = \left(V_{res}\Omega_0^{(0)} - \Omega_0^{(0)}[V_{res}\Omega_0^{(0)}]\right)_l$$

and

$$\left[\Omega_v^{(0)}, H_{DHF} \right] = \left(V_{res} (\Omega_0^{(0)} + \Omega_v^{(0)}) - \Omega_v^{(0)} [V_{res} (\Omega_0^{(0)} + \Omega_v^{(0)}] \right)_l,$$
 (12)

where 'l' means that only the linked diagrams will contribute to the wave operator. In the MBPT(n = 2, 3) approximations, $\Omega_{0/v}^{(0)}$ contains up to n - 1 number of V_{res} .

Similarly, the first-order perturbed wave operators in the MBPT method can be derived by extending the Bloch equation [44, 45] as

$$[\Omega_0^{(1)}, H_{DHF}] = (D\Omega_0^{(0)} + V_{res}\Omega_0^{(1)})_l$$



FIG. 3. Breakdown of the RCC term $\tilde{D}S_{1v}^{(1)}$ to the MBPT terms through Goldstone diagrams. All the symbols used here represent the same operators as those in the previous figures.

and

$$[\Omega_v^{(1)}, H_{DHF}] = (D(\Omega_0^{(0)} + \Omega_v^{(0)}) + V_{res}(\Omega_0^{(1)} + \Omega_v^{(1)}))_l -\Omega_v^{(1)}(V_{res}(\Omega_0^{(0)} + \Omega_v^{(0)}).$$

It can be followed that $\Omega_{0/v}^{(1)}$ contains up to n-2 number of V_{res} and one order of D in the MBPT(n = 2, 3) approximations.

In the RPA, $\Omega_{0/v}^{(0)}$ are equivalent to the DHF method and the first-order perturbed wave operators are obtained by

$$(H_{DHF} - \mathcal{E}_0)\Omega_0^{(1)}|\Phi_0\rangle = -D|\Phi_0\rangle - U_0^{RPA}|\Phi_0\rangle$$

and

$$(H_{DHF} - \mathcal{E}_v)\Omega_v^{(1)}|\Phi_v\rangle = -D|\Phi_v\rangle - U_v^{RPA}|\Phi_v\rangle, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_0 = \langle \Phi_0 | H_{DHF} | \Phi_0 \rangle$, $\mathcal{E}_v = \langle \Phi_v | H_{DHF} | \Phi_v \rangle$ and the RPA potentials are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} U_0^{RPA} |\Phi_0\rangle &= \sum_{a,b} \left[\langle b | V_{res} \Omega_0^{(1)} | b \rangle | a \rangle - \langle b | V_{res} \Omega_0^{(1)} | a \rangle | b \rangle \right. \\ &+ \langle b | \Omega_0^{(1)\dagger} V_{res} | b \rangle | a \rangle - \langle b | \Omega_0^{(1)\dagger} V_{res} | a \rangle | b \rangle \end{aligned}$$



FIG. 4. Demonstration of breakdown of Goldstone diagram of the RCC term $\tilde{D}S_{2v}^{(1)}$ as lower-order diagrams. All symbols used here stand for the same operators as in the previous figures.

and

$$\begin{split} U_v^{RPA} |\Phi_v\rangle &= \sum_b \left[\langle b | V_{res} \Omega_0^{(1)} | b \rangle | v \rangle - \langle b | V_{res} \Omega_v^{(1)} | v \rangle | b \rangle \right. \\ &+ \langle b | \Omega_0^{(1)\dagger} V_{res} | b \rangle | v \rangle - \langle b | \Omega_0^{(1)\dagger} V_{res} | v \rangle | b \rangle \right]. \end{split}$$

In the RCC theory *ansatz*, the unperturbed wave operators are defined as [48-50]

$$\Omega_0^{(0)} = e^{T^{(0)}} \tag{14}$$

and

$$\Omega_v^{(0)} = e^{T^{(0)}} S_v^{(0)}. \tag{15}$$

Extending these definitions to the first-order perturbed wave functions, we can define the corresponding wave operators as

$$\Omega_0^{(1)} = e^{T^{(0)}} T^{(1)} \tag{16}$$

and

$$\Omega_v^{(1)} = e^{T^{(0)}} \left(S_v^{(1)} + S_v^{(0)} T^{(1)} \right).$$
(17)

In the RCCSD method approximation, we define

$$T^{(0)} = T_1^{(0)} + T_2^{(0)}$$
 and $T^{(1)} = T_1^{(1)} + T_2^{(1)}$ (18)

and

$$S_v^{(0)} = S_{1v}^{(0)} + S_{2v}^{(0)}$$
 and $S_v^{(1)} = S_{1v}^{(1)} + S_{2v}^{(1)}$, (19)

where subscripts 1 and 2 denote single and double excitations, respectively. It yields

$$\alpha_d^S = 2 \frac{\langle \Phi_v | \{1 + S_v^{(0)}\}^{\dagger} \bar{\tilde{D}}^S \{T^{(1)}(1 + S_v^{(0)}) + S_v^{(1)}\} | \Phi_v \rangle}{\langle \Phi_v | \{S_v^{(0)\dagger} + 1\} \bar{N} \{1 + S_v^{(0)}\} | \Phi_v \rangle} + 2 \langle \Phi_0 | \bar{\tilde{D}}^S T^{(1)} | \Phi_0 \rangle$$
(20)

and

$$\alpha_d^T = 2 \frac{\langle \Phi_v | \{1 + S_v^{(0)}\}^{\dagger} \tilde{D}^T \{T^{(1)}(1 + S_v^{(0)}) + S_v^{(1)}\} | \Phi_v \rangle}{\langle \Phi_v | \{S_v^{(0)\dagger} + 1\} \bar{N} \{1 + S_v^{(0)}\} | \Phi_v \rangle},$$
(21)

where $\overline{\tilde{D}}^{S/T} = e^{T^{(0)\dagger}} \overline{\tilde{D}}^{S/T} e^{T^{(0)}}$ and $\overline{N} = e^{T^{(0)\dagger}} e^{T^{(0)}}$. In Eq. (20), the closed RCC term $\overline{\tilde{D}}^{S}T^{(1)}$ with respect to $|\Phi_0\rangle$ contribute to α_c^S while the open part of RCC terms $\overline{\tilde{D}}^{S/T}T^{(1)}$ contribute to $\alpha_{cv}^{S/T}$.

In order to corroborate our earlier statements that the RCC method, even at the RCCSD approximation, includes CP, PC, DCP and their correlations to all-orders, we demonstrate this by expressing the RCC terms in Goldstone diagrams and their break-downs into MBPT diagrams. In Fig. 1, we show core contributing Goldstone diagram for $(\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)})_c$ and its breakdown in terms of MBPT diagrams. We have also shown the open diagrams from the term $(\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)})_{cv}$ contributing to core-valence sector of the the $\alpha_d^{S/T}$ values in Fig. 2. We have also classified these diagrams under DHF, RPA types corresponding to CP contributions and non-RPA types corresponding to PC contributions. This demonstrates that the core and core-valence contributing RCC terms take into account CP, PC and their correlations to all-orders. It can be shown that contributions from $\tilde{D}T_2^{(1)}$ corresponds to DCP and other non-CP and non-PC effects. Similarly, it is evident from Fig. 3 that the Goldstone diagram representing the RCC term $\tilde{\tilde{D}}S_{1v}^{(1)}$ that takes into account contributions from the single excitations to $\alpha_n^{S/T}$ also contains the CP, PC and their correlations involving the valence electron to all-orders. The Goldstone diagram shown in Fig. 4 for $\tilde{D}S_{2v}^{(1)}$ represents for the double excitation contributions to $\alpha_v^{S/T}$. Its breakdown in terms of MBPT diagrams show that it includes contributions from DCP and many non-CP and non-PC effects that cannot be taken into account in the sum-over-states approach. Since amplitude solving equations for the single and double excitation operators in the RCC method are coupled, all these terms are correlated through the LR approach in the determination of the $\alpha_d^{S/T}$ values. Moreover, core and valence correlation contributions are also coupled in the LR approach of the RCC method.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION IV.

For accurate calculations of wave functions of all the considered states of Cs, we have employed an extensive size basis set of primitive Gaussian-type orbitals (GTOs), specifically tailored to capture the electronic correlations more effectively. The basis set consisted of 40, 39, 38, 37, 36, 35, and 34 GTOs for the s, p, d, f, g, h, and i symmetries, respectively. This large basis set is expected to ensure that the calculations are both comprehensive and accurate, accounting for a wide range of radial part

	$lpha_d^S$					$lpha_d^T$				
State	DHF	MBPT(2)	RPA	MBPT(3)	RCCSD	DHF	MBPT(2)	RPA	MBPT(3)	RCCSD
$6S_{1/2}$	664.6	571.3	625.2	544.2	405.0					
$6P_{1/2}$	1379.7	1305.5	1348.2	1732.5	1330.9					
$6P_{3/2}$	1620.1	1536.3	1584.3	2053.4	1638.5	-215.8	-234.5	-224.5	-422.9	-261.4
$5D_{3/2}$	151.5	187.3	169.3	78.4	-342.5	257.8	212.6	237.7	85.4	360.7
$5D_{5/2}$	43.7	82.6	62.7	64.1	-443.1	513.1	444.7	482.8	163.5	677.1
$7S_{1/2}$	8084.5	7891.4	8008.2	7983.7	6197.7					
$7P_{1/2}$	21644.8	21394.0	21543.7	36205.3	29470.1					
$7P_{3/2}$	25808.2	25527.5	25694.0	43307.6	36888.3	-3038.8	-3067.1	-3052.9	-6359.7	-4385.1
$8S_{1/2}$	47192.9	46849.8	47063.0	49332.3	38020.8					
$8P_{1/2}$	147930.1	147402.8	147732.8	266682.6	219973.3					
$8P_{3/2}$	177595.6	177004.4	177372.0	322044.1	278993.8	-19460.6	-19497.1	-19481.6	-42552.2	-30381.1
$9S_{1/2}$	187510.5	186960.9	187311.5	202567.0	153252.1					
$9P_{1/2}$	647919.8	646990.2	647600.9	1217278.5	1004191.9					
$9P_{3/2}$	781171.4	780127.8	780809.3	1478366.3	1282853.7	-80007.7	-80048.7	-80037.0	-184328.1	-132655.0

TABLE I. Calculated static scalar and tensor polarizability values of the ground and excited states of Cs atom using the DHF and many-body methods. All values are in a.u..

in the atomic wave function. As mentioned earlier, we have employed the DHF, MBPT(2), MBPT(3), RPA and RCCSD methods to calculate values for α_d^S and α_d^T of the Cs atom. The results are presented in Table I. As shown in this table, the differences between the DHF and MBPT(2) values of $\alpha_d^{S/T}$ are small, indicating contributions from the lowest-order CP effects are minimal. Now, comparing the results from the MBPT(2) and RPA methods, we again find a very small difference in the polarizability values. However, the RPA results are much more closer to the DHF values than those from the MBPT(2) method. As the RPA approach includes CP effects to allorders, this small difference indicates that there are cancellations among the lowest-order and higher-order CP effects in the evaluation of the $\alpha_d^{S/T}$ values. Now we compare the α_d^S results from the MBPT(2)

Now we compare the α_d^S results from the MBPT(2) and RPA methods with MBPT(3) values. Other than $S_{1/2}$ states, we see very large differences in the polarizability values; especially for the $D_{3/2}$ and $D_{5/2}$ states. This shows that the polarizability values are very much sensitive to the PC correlation effects than the CP effects. The dominance of PC over CP effects are much more prominent in the RCCSD method. In the 5D states, the all-order PC effects flip the sign of the scalar polarizability values. A similarly large difference can be observed between MBPT(2) and MBPT(3) values for α_d^T . However, it is interesting to note that the RCCSD values are closer to the MBPT(2) or RPA results than the MBPT(3) method, suggesting that there are huge cancellations among the lowest-order PC effects and all-order PC effects.

To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the

contributions from different many-body methods in estimating the α_d^S and α_d^T of different states in Cs, we present ratios of these values from each method to the corresponding DHF values. Fig. 5 illustrates the trends in the scalar polarizability values, while Fig. 6 provides the corresponding trends for tensor polarizabilities. The primary factors influencing these calculations are the non-RPA effects, which dominate the correlation trends. To explore this further, we analyzed the correlation trends among the atomic states belonging to the same angular momentum symmetry for the scalar polarizability values $\alpha_d^S.$ As shown in Fig. 5, the correlation trends from different $S_{1/2}$ states are not the same. This implies that states with the same angular momentum are not necessarily influenced by the correlation effects in the similar manner. For the ground state, the cancellation between lowest-order and all-order CP effects is particularly strong. The PC effects further decrease the polarizability value in the MBPT(3) and RCCSD methods. However, for other $S_{1/2}$ states, α_d^S is relatively insensitive to the CP effects. Notably, the lowest-order non-RPA effects from the MBPT(3) method do not contribute to α_d^S of the $7S_{1/2}$ state, however, for the $8S_{1/2}$ and $9S_{1/2}$ states, these effects increase the polarizability values. Once again, the all-order RCCSD calculations decrease the values.

For the $nP_{1/2}$ and $nP_{3/2}$ states, similar trends are observed in the correlation plots. Unlike the $S_{1/2}$ states, where non-RPA effects decrease the values of α_d^S , the non-RPA effects in the $P_{1/2}$ and $P_{3/2}$ states actually increase the overall values of α_d^S . However, as can be seen in the plots, for the $6P_{1/2}$ and $6P_{3/2}$ states, the polarizability values are more sensitive to the CP effects than



FIG. 5. Ratios of scalar polarizability values from different many-body methods and their DHF values. These plots demonstrate the amount of electron correlation effects captured in the many-body methods in the determination of α_d^S of different states in the Cs atom.

the other $P_{1/2,3/2}$ states. Another interesting thing to note is that the PC effects are less dominating in the 6Pstates compared to other nP states. In all the $P_{1/2,3/2}$ states, the lowest-order non-RPA effects increase the polarizabilities at the MBPT(3) level. Subsequently, the all-order RCCSD contributions reduce the polarizability values again. This trend highlights the complex roles of non-RPA effects and their importance in accurately capturing the behavior of the correlation effects in the excited states. The effects of the non-RPA corrections are significantly pronounced in the $5D_{3/2,5/2}$ states. In these states, changes in the polarizability values from the DHF method to the MBPT(3) method is small. However, allorder PC effects from the RCCSD method are very dominating, decreasing the polarizability values and even flipping their signs. The differences between the MBPT(3)and RCCSD values for the scalar polarizabilities of the 5D states exceeds 100%, emphasizing the critical roles played by the all-order effects captured in the RCCSD method. These substantial deviations underscore the importance of including higher-order corrections, as they significantly alter the polarizability values compared to the lower-order perturbative methods, highlighting the necessity of better all-order treatments of correlation effects in the accurate predictions of polarizability values; particularly in Cs.

Next, we focus on the correlation trends of the tensor polarizability values for the $P_{3/2}$ and $D_{3/2,5/2}$ states. As shown in Fig. 6, all the $nP_{3/2}$ states exhibit a similar correlation trend, where the non-RPA effects increase the magnitudes of the polarizability values. Like in the case of α_d^S , here also correlations in the $6P_{3/2}$ state is more sensitive to the CP effects than the other $nP_{3/2}$ states. A particularly interesting trend is observed for the 5D states. In these states, the MBPT(3) contributions reduce the tensor polarizabilities compared to the RPA level. However, the all-order contributions from the RCCSD method reverse the effect and increase the results again. The differences between the MBPT(3) and RCCSD values exceed 70%, highlighting the importance of the higher-order effects in the α_d^T values that can only be captured by the RCCSD method.

To explore contributions of different correlation effects to the values of α_d^S and α_d^T through different RCC terms,



FIG. 6. Ratios of tensor polarizability values from different many-body methods and their DHF values. The figures highlight how effectively electron correlation effects are captured by various many-body approaches in the computation of the α_d^T values for different states of the Cs atom.

we present results from these terms in Table II. As it was mentioned earlier, the closed part of $\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)}$ and its complex conjugate (c.c.) term, $T_1^{(1)\dagger}\tilde{D}$, correspond to the core correlations, while their open parts contribute to the core-valence correlations. In the table, these contributions are listed separately under the terms $(\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)} + c.c.)_c$ for core correlations and $(\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)} + c.c.)_{cv}$ for core-valence correlations. The terms involving $S_v^{(0)}/S_v^{(1)}$ represent the valence correlations. It is evident from this table that the dominant contributions to both α_d^S and α_d^T arise from the $\tilde{D}S_{1v}^{(1)}$ and its c.c. terms. The core correlations originating from $\tilde{D}T_1^{(1)}$ and c.c. terms encompass contributions from both the singly and doubly excited configurations. These terms account not only for the core contributions in the RPA method but also for the PC contributions to the core correlations in the MBPT(3) method to allorders as shown in the figures of the previous section.

Similarly, the valence correlation contributions from the RPA are captured by the $\tilde{D}S_{1v}^{(1)} + S_{1v}^{(1)\dagger}\tilde{D}$ terms in the RCCSD method, which include contributions from the PC correlations and higher-order effects involving the valence electron [36, 37]. Another significant RCCSD term is $\tilde{D}S_{2v}^{(1)} + c.c.$, whose contributions cannot be neglected for accurate determination of the polarizabilities. For example, in the case of the ground state of the Cs atom, these terms contribute up to 3% of the total value. Additionally, we present corrections to the polarizability values due to wave function normalization, labeled as 'Norm'. As the table indicates, contributions from 'Norm' cover 1-2% of the polarizability values, highlighting their significance. The correlation contributions to α_d^{T} and α_d^{T} arising from the other RCCSD terms, such as $\tilde{D}T_{1/2}^{(1)}S_{1/2v}^{(0)}$, $T_{1/2}^{(1)\dagger}\tilde{D}S_{1/2v}^{(0)}$, $S_{1/2v}^{(0)\dagger}\tilde{D}S_{1/2v}^{(1)}$ and $S_{1/2v}^{(1)\dagger}\tilde{D}S_{1/2v}^{(0)}$ are also non-negligible. These are basically contributions from the non-RPA effects, many of which cannot be considered as a part of the PC correlations. We present the contributions from these nonlinear terms under the label 'Others' in the table above. Inclusion of these contributions is also important and can contribute up to 10-15% of the total values for scalar polarizabilities of the $S_{1/2}$ and $D_{3/2}$ states. For the $P_{1/2,3/2}$ states, these terms also contribute about 1-7% of their total values. Similar trends are observed in the tensor polarizability calculations as well. In the above table, we present contributions from corrections arising from the Breit interaction and QED effects. As can be seen in the table, the Breit contributions substantially influence the polarizability values. These contributions are particularly prominent in the $5D_{3/2,5/2}$ states, where they account for about 2% of the total values. For other states, the Breit contributions are about 1% and cannot be neglected. In contrast, the QED contributions are only about 0.1% of the total values, making their impact less on the polarizability estimations. It is worth noting at this stage that we only make ballpark estimation of QED contributions by using model potentials for the lowest-order vacuumpolarization and self-energy correction terms through the atomic Hamiltonian. However, these estimations can have 100% uncertainties.

The recommended values for α_d^S and α_d^T are given as the values obtained from the RCCSD method along with other corrections. These values are presented in Table III, along with the estimated uncertainties, which are derived from the leading order triple excitations and estimated QED effects. In the table, we compare our results with other recent high-precision relativistic calculations and experimental data [17–34]. As observed in the table, our recommended value for the $6S_{1/2}$ state is in good agreement with the experimental value when the error bar is taken into account. It is worth noting that this value can be further refined and the uncertainty minimized by including full triple excitations in the RCC

TABLE II. Contributions from different RCC terms to the polarizability values of α_d^S and α_d^T for the considered states of the Cs atom. Terms with subscripts 'c' and 'cv' correspond to core and core-valence contributions, respectively. Contributions given under 'Norm' represent corrections to the results due to normalization factors of the wave functions. Contributions from other non-linear terms of the RCCSD method are given together under "Others".

Polarizability	State	Contributions							
		$(\bar{\tilde{D}}T_1^{(1)} + c.c.)_c$	$(\bar{\tilde{D}}T_1^{(1)} + c.c.)_{cv}$	$\bar{\tilde{D}}S_{1v}^{(1)} + c.c.$	$\bar{\tilde{D}}S_{2v}^{(1)} + c.c.$	Norm	Others	Breit	QED
α_d^S	$6S_{1/2}$	15.42	-0.62	456.29	-11.46	-9.22	-45.76	-0.10	0.45
	$6P_{1/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	1442.78	-20.34	-18.79	-95.57	7.83	-0.41
	$6P_{3/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	1761.39	-24.23	-20.12	-101.70	7.62	0.08
	$5D_{3/2}$	15.42	-0.30	-356.99	9.87	27.44	-31.74	-6.01	-0.20
	$5D_{5/2}$	15.42	-0.38	-485.69	10.71	31.92	-7.94	-6.81	-0.35
	$7S_{1/2}$	15.42	-0.11	7035.08	-29.44	-145.45	-682.49	-2.56	7.25
	$7P_{1/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	30358.97	-66.18	-476.06	-615.94	254.77	-0.90
	$7P_{3/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	37804.60	-79.86	-514.28	-658.92	308.60	12.71
	$8S_{1/2}$	15.42	-0.04	43885.92	-55.17	-850.31	-5002.73	-24.51	52.18
	$8P_{1/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	225282.56	-124.65	-3265.82	-4048.54	2103.06	11.28
	$8P_{3/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	283288.74	-148.97	-3558.05	-3414.08	2688.23	122.47
	$9S_{1/2}$	15.42	-0.02	180432.14	-88.40	-3358.39	-23880.17	-127.63	259.12
	$9P_{1/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	1026237.23	-200.67	-14822.14	-16682.67	9516.60	128.11
	$9P_{3/2}$	15.42	~ 0.0	1299488.89	-241.43	-16107.75	-13211.79	12309.27	601.09
α_d^T	$6P_{3/2}$	0.0	~ 0.0	-303.50	-0.97	3.16	40.57	-0.92	0.28
u	$5D_{3/2}$	0.0	0.18	411.54	-4.20	-27.84	-22.33	3.33	-0.02
	$5D_{5/2}$	0.0	0.38	794.58	-6.77	-47.45	-68.96	5.01	0.26
	$7P_{3/2}$	0.0	~ 0.0	-4929.15	-0.21	61.27	513.68	-34.10	3.37
	$8P_{3/2}$	0.0	~ 0.0	-33599.38	0.52	393.31	3097.86	-292.81	19.37
	$9P_{3/2}$	0.0	~ 0.0	-145747.83	2.20	1685.04	12659.50	-1315.23	61.34
	0,2								

calculation, which would improve the precision of the results. A preliminary investigation shows triple excitations help bring this value very close to the experimental result. For the $6P_{1/2,3/2}$ states, our recommended values for α_d^S are more accurate compared to other theoretical estimates. Moreover, our results for the $6P_{1/2}$ and $6P_{3/2}$ states align more closely with the experimental values from Refs. [26] and [27], respectively. This improvement represents a significant step forward in achieving more accurate and reliable values for α_d in the heavier atomic systems. Our recommended value for α_d^T of the $6P_{3/2}$ state is also in good agreement with the experimental value reported in Ref. [27]. This agreement reinforces the reliability of our method for accurate calculations of α_d in the LR approach.

For the $5D_{3/2}$ and $5D_{5/2}$ states, no experimental values are currently available, so we have turned to comparisons with theoretical results from other recent works [20–22]. Notably, our results for both the scalar and tensor polarizabilities of these states are in excellent agreement with the values obtained using the sum-over-states approach. Our recommended result for the $7S_{1/2}$ state is closer to the experimental value reported in Ref. [29] than the value from Ref. [28]. For the $7P_{1/2}$ and $7P_{3/2}$ states, our estimated values are also well within the experimental uncertainties. For the $8S_{1/2}$ state, our reported value for the scalar polarizability is in better agreement with the most precise experimental value available from Ref. [34]. In the case of the $8P_{1/2}$ and $8P_{3/2}$ states, no experimental values are currently available. Therefore, we once again compare our results with the sum-over-states results from other theoretical studies. As shown in the table, our results are about 1-2% smaller than those reported in Refs. [20, 21]. For the $9S_{1/2}$ state, our result is much closer to the experimental value reported in Ref. [32] than to the other theoretical estimations. In contrast, for the scalar and tensor polarizabilities of the $9P_{1/2}$ and $9P_{3/2}$ states, we observe similar deviations between our results and those from Refs. [20, 21] that we observed for the $8P_{1/2}$ and $8P_{3/2}$ states. It is important to note that in these calculations, mixture of many-body methods were employed to estimate the polarizabilities in which experimental energies were used to minimize the uncertainties.

State		$lpha_d^S$		α_d^T				
	This work	Theory	Experiment	This work	Theory	Experiment		
$6S_{1/2}$	405(5)	$\begin{array}{c} 399.8 \ [18] \\ 401.0(6) \ [19] \\ 406(8) \ [20] \\ 398.4(7) \ [21] \\ 396.32 \ [22] \end{array}$	401.00(6) [24]					
$6P_{1/2}$	1331(18)	$\begin{array}{c} 1339(43) \ [20] \\ 1338(54) \ [21] \\ 1332.2 \ [22] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1371(9) \ [25] \\ 1328.35(12) \ [26] \end{array}$					
$6P_{3/2}$	1638(20)	$\begin{array}{c} 1651(46) \ [20] \\ 1648(58) \ [21] \\ 1644.7 \ [22] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1665(13) \ [25] \\ 1640(2) \ [27] \end{array}$	-261.4(4.8)	$\begin{array}{c} -260(11) \ [20] \\ -261(13) \ [21] \\ -262.95 \ [22] \end{array}$	-262.4(1.5) [27]		
$5D_{3/2}$	-343(20)	$\begin{array}{c} -335(38) \ [20] \\ -352(69) \ [21] \\ -346.30 \ [22] \end{array}$		360.7(6.9)	$\begin{array}{c} 357(25) \ [20] \\ 370(28) \ [21] \\ 359.26 \ [22] \end{array}$			
$5D_{5/2}$	-443(23)	$\begin{array}{c} -439(42) \ [20] \\ -453(70) \ [21] \\ -450.30 \ [22] \end{array}$		677(13)	$\begin{array}{c} 677(34) \ [20] \\ 691(40) \ [21] \\ 680.47 \ [22] \end{array}$			
$7S_{1/2}$	6198(41)	$\begin{array}{c} 6237(42) \ [20] \\ 6238(41) \ [21] \\ 6242.5 \ [22] \\ 6208 \ [23] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6238(6) \ [28] \\ 6207.9(2.4) \ [29] \end{array}$					
$7P_{1/2}$	29470(350)	29880(160) [20] 29890(700) [21] 30138 [22]	$\begin{array}{c} 29660(50) \ [30] \\ 29500(600) \ [31] \end{array}$					
$7P_{3/2}$	36888(432)	37510(170) [20] 37500(800) [21] 37867 [22]	$\begin{array}{c} 37280(70) \ [30] \\ 37800(800) \ [31] \end{array}$	-4385(69)	$\begin{array}{c} -4408(50) \ [20] \\ -4410(170) \ [21] \\ -4431.9 \ [22] \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -4413(29) \ [30] \\ -4420(120) \ [31] \end{array}$		
$8S_{1/2}$	38021(235)	$\begin{array}{c} 38270(260) \ [20] \\ 38270(280) \ [21] \end{array}$	38370(380) [32] 38260(290) [33] 38110(50) [34]					
$8P_{1/2}$	219973(2488)	$\begin{array}{c} 223300(1400) \ [20] \\ 223000(2000) \ [21] \end{array}$						
$8P_{3/2}$	278994(3180)	$\begin{array}{c} 284500(1700) \ [20] \\ 284000(3000) \ [21] \end{array}$		-30381(438)	$\begin{array}{c} -30570(410) \ [20] \\ -30600(600) \ [21] \end{array}$			
$9S_{1/2}$	153252(1152)	$\begin{array}{c} 153700(1000) \ [20] \\ 153700(1700) \ [21] \end{array}$	150700(1500) [32]					
$9P_{1/2}$	1004192(9781)	$\begin{array}{l} 1021400(5600) \ [20] \\ 1021000(7000) \ [21] \end{array}$						
$9P_{3/2}$	1282854(12283)	$\begin{array}{c} 1312900(7000) \ [20] \\ 1312000(7000) \ [21] \end{array}$		-132655(1367)	$\begin{array}{c} -134700(1700) \ [20] \\ -135000(2000) \ [21] \end{array}$			

TABLE III. List of recommended values for α_d^S and α_d^T (in a.u.) from our calculations. We also compare our results with the other theoretical and available experimental values.

V. SUMMARY

We have used linear response coupled-cluster theory in the relativistic framework to calculate the scalar and tensor polarizabilities for the ground and excited states of the Cs atom. Calculations are carried out at the singlesand doubles-excitation approximations and their uncertainties are estimated from the dominantly contributing triple contributions in the perturbative approach and QED effects. We also present results from random phase approximation and finite-order many-body perturbation theory to analyze propagation of the correlation effects in the evaluation of electric dipole polarizabilities. Our findings show that core polarization effects contribute dominantly over the pair-correlation contributions in the determination of electric dipole polarizabilities in Cs. Also, our finding shows that contributions from the Breit interactions are significant for precise estimations of the polarizabilities in the high-lying states in this atom. From the comparison between our results with the experimen-

- V G Pal'chikov, Yu S Domnin and A V Novoselov, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. 5, S131 (2003).
- [2] V. I. Yudin, A. V. Taichenachev, M. V. Okhapkin, and S. N. Bagayev, Chr. Tamm, E. Peik, N. Huntemann, T. E. Mehlstäubler, and F. Riehle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 030801 (2011).
- [3] N. Schlosser, G. Reymond, I. Protsenko, and P. Grangier, Nature, 411, 1024 (2001).
- [4] C. P. Williams and S. H. Clearwater, *Explorations in Quantum Computing* (Springer-Verlag), New York, 1997).
- [5] D. P. DiVincenzo, Fortschr. Phys. 48, 771 (2000).
- [6] A. Negretti, P. Treutlein, and T. Calarco, Quantum Inf. Process. 10, 721 (2011).
- [7] M. G. Kozlov, M.S. Safronova, J.R. Crespo Lopez-Urrutia, and P.O. Schmidt, Rev. Mod. Phys. 90, 045005 (2018).
- [8] L. Liew; S. Knappe; J. Moreland; H. Robinson; L. Hollberg; J. Kitching, Appl. Phys. Lett. 84, 2694–2696 (2004).
- [9] M. Saffman, T. G. Walker and K. Molmer, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 2313 (2010).
- [10] C. Lammerzahl, G. Ahlers, N. Ashby, M. Barmatz, P. L. Biermann, H. Dittus, V. Dohm, R. Duncan, K. Gibble, J. Lipa, N. Lockerbie, N. Mulders and C. Salomon, General Relativity and Gravitation **36** (2004).
- [11] The International System of Units (SI), edited by B. N. Taylor (U.S. GPO, Gaithersburg, MD, 2001).
- [12] A. W. Carr and M. Saffman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 150801 (2016).
- [13] C. S. Wood, S. C. Bennett, D. Cho, B. P. Masterson, J. L. Roberts, C. E. Tanner, and C. E. Wieman, Science 275, 1759 (1997).
- [14] M.-A. Bouchiat and C. Bouchiat, Rep. Prog. Phys. 60, 1351 (1997).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by ANRF with grant no. CRG/2023/002558 and Department of Space, Government of India. All calculations reported in this work were performed on the ParamVikram-1000 HPC cluster at the Physical Research Laboratory (PRL), Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that supports the findings of this study are available within the article.

- [15] J. S. M. Ginges and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rep. 397, 63 (2004).
- [16] A. Chakraborty and B. K. Sahoo, Phys. Rev. A 110, 022812 (2024).
- [17] M. S. Safronova and C. W. Clark, Phys. Rev. A 69, 040501(R) (2004).
- [18] M. S. Safronova, W. R. Johnson, and A. Derevianko, Phys. Rev. A 60, 4476 (1999).
- [19] A. Chakraborty and B. K. Sahoo, Phys. Rev. A 108, 042818 (2023).
- [20] M. S. Safronova, U. I. Safronova, and Charles W. Clark, Phys. Rev. A 94, 012505 (2016).
- [21] E. Iskrenova-Tchoukova, M. S. Safronova, and U. I. Safronova, J. Comput. Methods Sciences and Eng. 7, 521 (2007).
- [22] Tang Yong-Bo, Li Cheng-Bin and Qiao Hao-Xue, Chin. Phys. B 23, 063101 (2014).
- [23] C. Bouchiat, C. Piketty, and D. Pignon, Nucl. Phys. B 221, 68 (1983).
- [24] J. M. Amini and H. Gould, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 153001 (2003).
- [25] L. R. Hunter, D. Krause Jr., S. Murthy, and T. W. Sung, Phys. Rev. A 37, 3283 (1988).
- [26] L. R. Hunter, D. Krause Jr., K. E. Miller, D. J. Berkeland, M. G. Boshier, Opt. Commun. 94, 210 (1992).
- [27] C. E. Tanner and C. Wieman, Phys. Rev. A 38, 162 (1988).
- [28] S. C. Bennett, J. L. Roberts, and C. E. Wieman, Phys. Rev. A 59, R16(R) (1999).
- [29] J. A. Quirk, A. Jacobsen, A. Damitz, C. E. Tanner and D. S. Elliott, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 233201 (2024).
- [30] George Toh, D. Antypas, and D. S. Elliott, Phys. Rev. A 89, 042512 (2014).
- [31] V. G. Domelunksen, Optica Spektrosk. 54, 950 (1983),
 [Opt. and Spectrosc. 54, 565 (1983)].

- [32] H. Weaver and A. Kortyna, Phys. Rev. A 86, 042511 (2012).
- [33] M. Gunawardena, D. S. Elliott, M. S. Safronova, and U. Safronova, Phys. Rev. A 75, 022507 (2007).
- [34] D. Antypas and D. S. Elliott, Phys. Rev. A 83, 062511 (2011).
- [35] B. K. Sahoo, Phys. Rev. A 93, 022503 (2016).
- [36] B. K. Sahoo, Chem. Phys. Lett. 448, 144 (2007).
- [37] B. K. Sahoo and B. P. Das, and D. Mukherjee, Phys. Rev. A 79, 052511 (2009).
- [38] A. Chakraborty, S. K. Rithvik and B. K. Sahoo Phys. Rev. A 105, 062815 (2022).
- [39] A. Chakraborty and B. K. Sahoo, arXiv:2502.10312 (Accepted in Phys. Rev. A).
- [40] N. L. Manakov and V. D. Ovsiannikov and L. P. Rapoport, Phys. Rep. 141, 320 (1986).
- [41] J. E. Stalnaker, D. Budker, S. J. Freedman, J. S. Guzman, S. M. Rochester, and V. V. Yashchuk, Phys. Rev. A 73, 043416 (2006).

- [42] B. Arora, D. K. Nandy, and B. K. Sahoo, Phys. Rev. A 85, 012506 (2012).
- [43] J. Kaur, D. K. Nandy, B. Arora, and B. K. Sahoo, Phys. Rev. A 91, 012705 (2015).
- [44] Y. Singh, B. K. Sahoo, and B. P. Das, Phys. Rev. A 89, 030502(R) (2014).
- [45] A. Chakraborty and B. K. Sahoo, J. Phys. Chem. A 127, 7518 (2023).
- [46] B. K. Sahoo, Y. Singh, Phys. Rev. A 95, 062514 (2017).
- [47] V. V. Flambaum and J. S. M. Ginges, Phys. Rev. A 2, 052115 (2005).
- [48] I. Lindgren and J. Morrison, in *Atomic Many-Body Theory*, edited by G. Ecker, P. Lambropoulos, and H. Walther (SpringerVerlag, Berlin, 1985).
- [49] J. Cizek, J. Chem. Phys. 45, 4256 (1966); Adv. Chem. Phys. 14, 35 (1969).
- [50] D. Mukherjee, Pramana **12**, 203 (1979).