

Calculation of energy levels and transition amplitudes for barium and radium

V A Dzuba¹, and V V Flambaum^{1,2}

¹School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia

² Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439-4843, USA

E-mail: V.A.Dzuba@unsw.edu.au

Abstract.

The radium atom is a promising system for studying parity and time invariance violating weak interactions. However, available experimental spectroscopic data for radium is insufficient for designing an optimal experimental setup. We calculate the energy levels and transition amplitudes for radium states of significant interest. Forty states corresponding to all possible configurations consisting of the $7s$, $7p$ and $6d$ single-electron states as well as the states of the $7s8s$, $7s8p$ and $7s7d$ configurations have been calculated. The energies of ten of these states corresponding to the $6d^2$, $7s8s$, $7p^2$, and $6d7p$ configurations are not known from experiment. Calculations for barium are used to control the accuracy.

PACS numbers: 31.25.Eb,31.25.Jf,32.70.Cs

1. Introduction

Studying parity (P) and time (T) invariance violating effects in atoms is a way of searching for new physics beyond the standard model (see, e.g. [1]). These effects are strongly enhanced in radium atom due to high value of the nuclear charge Z , and specific features of the nuclear and electron structure [2, 3, 4]. The atomic electric dipole moment induced by the T,P-violating nuclear forces and P-violating effects produced by the nuclear anapole moment are enhanced 3 orders of magnitude in comparison with previous experiments (the detailed comparison and complete list of references may be found e.g. in the review [1]). Preparations for the measurements are currently in progress at Argonne [5] and Groningen [6, 7].

Detailed knowledge of the positions of the lowest states of an atom as well as transition probabilities between them is important for the design of cooling and trapping schemes and for estimation of the enhancement of the P and T -odd effects. Energy spectrum of Ra was first measured by Rasmussen [8] in 1934. Interpretation of his data was corrected by Russell [9] also in 1934. Compilation by Moore [10] based on these two works contains about forty energy levels of radium. There were few more experimental works on radiums studying Rydberg states [11], hyperfine structure and isotope shift [12, 13], nuclear magnetic moments [14], etc. In the most recent work by Sielzo *et al* the lifetime and position of the $^3P_1^o$ state of Ra has been measured. The result for the energy is in excellent agreement with early data by Russell [9] and Rasmussen [8].

There were some doubts inspired by theoretical work of Bieroń *et al*[16] among experimentalists working with radium on whether the data presented by Rasmussen [8] and Russell [9] were reliable and accurate. This disagreement between theory and experiment motivated our previous calculations [17]. The calculations strongly favored experimental data. However, the strongest evidence of the correctness of the experimental data came from recent success in trapping of radium atoms at Argonne. Corresponding paper which would include among other things new data on experimental resolution to the D-state location is to be submitted soon [18].

Excellent agreement between theory and experiment for radium and its lighter analog barium[17] allows us to address next problem - gaps in experimental data for radium. In particular, it is important to know the positions of the states corresponding to the $6d^2$ configuration. The locations of these levels are important when considering the possibility of laser-cooling and trapping Ba or Ra in the metastable $6s5d\ ^3D_3$ or $7s6d\ ^3D_3$ state, respectively. This would be a useful alternative to the relatively slow and leaky transitions available from the ground 1S_0 state. In particular, the $6s5d\ ^3D_3 - 5d6p\ ^3F_4$ transition in barium and the $7s6d\ ^3D_3 - 6d7p\ ^3F_4$ transition in radium could provide a fast and closed cycling transition. However, the data for barium [19] indicates that the energies of the $5d^2$ configuration lie very low, between the $6s6p$ and the $5d6p$ configuration, and therefore provide an undesirable leak channel. It is reasonable to expect that the energies of the $6d^2$ configuration of radium also lie pretty low. This would

limit the cooling and trapping schemes for radium causing leaking of some transitions into the states of the $6d^2$ configuration [18].

The main task of our previous paper [17] was to prove that the experimental data was correct. Therefore we calculated only energy levels known from experiment. In present paper we extend the calculations to include all states of the lowest configurations of radium. We calculate energy levels and lifetimes of forty states of the $7s^2$, $7s7p$, $7s6d$, $7s8s$, $6d7p$, $6d^2$, $7s8p$, $7p^2$ and $7s7d$ configurations. For 19 lowest states we also present detailed data on electric dipole transition amplitudes. Similar calculations for barium are used to control the accuracy of the calculations.

2. Method of calculations and results for barium

The method of calculations has been described in detail in our previous works [20, 21, 22, 17]. Here we repeat its main points most relevant to present calculations.

The calculations are done in the V^{N-2} approximation [21] which means that initial Hartree-Fock procedure is done for a double ionized ion, with two valence electrons removed. This approach has many advantages. It simplifies the inclusion of the core-valence correlations by avoiding the so called *subtraction* diagrams[20, 21]. This in turn allows one to go beyond second-order of the many-body perturbation theory (MBPT) in treating core-valence correlations. Inclusion of the higher-order core-valence correlations significantly improves the accuracy of the results [21, 22]. Also, using V^{N-2} approximation makes calculations for a positive ion and for a neutral atom very similar providing more opportunities for the control of the accuracy. One more advantage is that atomic core is independent on the state of valence electrons. Ground and excited states are treated equally which is important for calculating energy intervals.

Single-electron Hamiltonian for a valence electron has the form

$$\hat{h}_1 = h_0 + \hat{\Sigma}_1, \tag{1}$$

where h_0 is the relativistic Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{h}_0 = c\alpha\mathbf{p} + (\beta - 1)mc^2 - \frac{Ze^2}{r} + V^{N-2}, \tag{2}$$

and $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is the correlation potential operator which represents correlation interaction of a valence electron with the core. Calculations for a positive ion are done by solving the equation

$$(\hat{h}_1 - \epsilon_v)\psi_v = 0, \tag{3}$$

where ϵ_v and ψ_v are the energy and wave function of a valence electron. Both ϵ_v and ψ_v include the effect of core-valence correlations and the wave functions ψ_v are often called *Brueckner orbitals* to distinguish them from Hartree-Fock orbitals which do not include correlations.

The effective Hamiltonian for a neutral two-electron atom is the sum of two single-electron Hamiltonians plus an operator representing interaction between valence electrons:

$$\hat{H}^{\text{eff}} = \hat{h}_1(r_1) + \hat{h}_1(r_2) + \hat{h}_2(r_1, r_2). \quad (4)$$

Interaction between valence electrons is the sum of Coulomb interaction and correlation correction operator $\hat{\Sigma}_2$:

$$\hat{h}_2 = \frac{e^2}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|} + \hat{\Sigma}_2(r_1, r_2), \quad (5)$$

$\hat{\Sigma}_2$ represents screening of Coulomb interaction between valence electrons by core electrons.

We use standard configuration interaction (CI) technique to solve the Schrödinger equation for two-electron valence states. Two-electron wave function for the valence electrons Ψ has a form of expansion over single-determinant wave functions

$$\Psi = \sum_i c_i \Phi_i(r_1, r_2). \quad (6)$$

Φ_i are constructed from the single-electron valence basis states calculated in the V^{N-2} potential

$$\Phi_i(r_1, r_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_a(r_1)\psi_b(r_2) - \psi_b(r_1)\psi_a(r_2)). \quad (7)$$

Coefficients c_i as well as two-electron energies are found by solving matrix eigenvalue problem

$$(H_{ij}^{\text{eff}} - E)X = 0, \quad (8)$$

where $H_{ij}^{\text{eff}} = \langle \Phi_i | \hat{H}^{\text{eff}} | \Phi_j \rangle$ and $X = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$.

The most complicated part of the calculations is calculation of the correlation correction operators $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_2$. We use MBPT and Feynman diagram technique to do the calculations. MBPT expansion for $\hat{\Sigma}$ starts from second order. Inclusion of the second order operators $\hat{\Sigma}_1^{(2)}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_2^{(2)}$ into effective Hamiltonian (4) accounts for most of the core-valence correlations. However, further improvement is still possible if higher-order correlations are included into $\hat{\Sigma}_1$. We do this the same way as for a single valence electron atoms [23]. Two dominating classes of the higher-order diagrams are included into $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ by applying Feynman diagram technique to the part of $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ which corresponds to direct Coulomb interaction. These two classes are (a) screening of Coulomb interaction between valence and core electrons by other core electrons, and (b) interaction between an electron excited from the core and the hole in the core created by this excitation [23]. The effect of screening of Coulomb interaction in exchange diagrams is imitated by introducing screening factors f_k into each Coulomb line. We assume that screening factors f_k depend only on the multipolarity of the Coulomb interaction k . It turns out that the values of f_k vary very little from atom to atom and the same values can be used for all atoms of the first and second columns of the periodic table:

$$f_0 = 0.72, f_1 = 0.62, f_2 = 0.83, f_3 = 0.89, f_4 = 0.94, f_5 = 1.0, \dots$$

Calculations show that for atoms like Ba and Ra accurate treatment of $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is more important than that of $\hat{\Sigma}_2$. Therefore we calculate $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ in second order of MBPT only.

One needs a complete set of single-electron states to calculate $\hat{\Sigma}$ and for construction of two-electron basis states (7) for the CI calculations. We use the same basis in both cases. It is constructed using *B*-spline technique [24, 25]. We use 50 *B*-splines of order 7 in a cavity of radius $R_{max} = 40a_B$, where a_b is Bohr radius. Single-electron basis orbitals in each partial wave are constructed as linear combination of 50 *B*-splines

$$\psi_a(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{50} b_i^a B_i(r). \quad (9)$$

Coefficients b_i^a are found from the condition that ψ_a is an eigenstate of the Hartree-Fork Hamiltonian h_0 (2).

The effect of inclusion of second and higher-order $\hat{\Sigma}$ into effective Hamiltonian for two-electron valence states of Ba and Ra was studied in detail in our previous paper [17]. It was also suggested there that the best results can be obtained if fitting parameters are introduced before $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ for each partial wave. The values of these parameters for Ba found from fitting experimental energies of the $6s^2$, $6s6p$ and $6s5d$ configurations are $\lambda_s = 1.0032, \lambda_p = 1.0046$ and $\lambda_d = 0.9164$. Note that we keep the same fitting parameters for $\hat{\Sigma}_{p_{1/2}}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{p_{3/2}}$ as well as for $\hat{\Sigma}_{d_{3/2}}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{d_{5/2}}$. We do this to avoid false contribution to the fine structure. Fitting of the energies imitate the effects of higher-order correlations, incompleteness of the basis set, Breit and QED corrections.

Final results for Ba are presented in Table 1. The results for twelve states of the $6s^2$, $6s5d$, $6s6p$ and $5d6p$ configurations are the same as in our previous work. However we present now 27 more states, including states of very important $5d^2$ configuration. Note that corresponding energies absent in Moore book [10] and we use recent compilation by Curry [19] instead. Parameter Δ in the Table is the difference between experimental and theoretical energies ($\Delta = E_{expt} - E_{calc}$). The agreement between theory and experiment is extremely good in most of cases. The largest difference is for the $5d^2 \ ^1S_0$ state. It is 723 cm^{-1} or 2.7%. Note however that experimental value for this state came from a different source than all other data and has the largest uncertainty (see [19] for details). There is a chance that the experimental value is incorrect. The only other large difference is for the $5d^2 \ ^1D_2$ state. It is 409 cm^{-1} or 1.8%. For other states of the $5d^2$ configuration the difference between theory and experiment is about 1% or smaller. For most of other states the difference is just small fraction of a per cent.

Energy levels of barium where calculated by many authors before [26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31]. The scope of the present work does not allow us to cite all these results. Comprehensive review of previous calculations for Ba is a big task while our present consideration serves very specific and limited purpose. We just want to demonstrate that our method work very well for Ba, therefore we can expect the results of similar quality for Ra which has similar electron structure.

In Table 1 we also present the values of observed and calculated *g*-factors. Non-

Table 1. Energies and lifetimes of lower states of barium

Config.	Term	J	Energies (cm^{-1})			g -factors			Lifetime
			Expt[19]	Calc	Δ	Obs[19]	NR	Calc	
$6s^2$	1S	0	0.000	0	0		0.00	0.00	-
$6s5d$	3D	1	9033.966	9039	-5	0.53	0.50	0.50	-
	3D	2	9215.501	9216	0	1.18	1.17	1.16	-
	3D	3	9596.533	9581	-14	1.38	1.33	1.33	-
$6s6p$	1D	2	11395.350	11626	-231	1.00	1.00	1.00	-
	$^3P^o$	0	12266.024	12269	-3		0.00	0.00	2.6 μs
	$^3P^o$	1	12636.623	12637	0	1.45	1.50	1.50	1.2 μs
	$^3P^o$	2	13514.745	13517	-2	1.52	1.50	1.50	1.4 μs
$5d^2$	$^1P^o$	1	18060.261	17833	227	1.02	1.00	1.00	8.2 ns
	3F	2	20934.035	21145	-211		0.67	0.67	190 μs
	3F	3	21250.195	21457	-207		1.08	1.08	2.9 ms
	3F	4	21623.773	21831	-207		1.25	1.25	-
	1D	2	23062.051	23471	-409		1.00	1.15	470 ns
	3P	0	23209.048	23369	-160		0.00	0.00	160 ns
	3P	1	23479.976	23640	-160		1.50	1.50	170 ns
$5d6p$	3P	2	23918.915	24160	-241		1.50	1.34	270 ns
	1S	0	26757.3	26034	723		0.00	0.00	1.3 μs
	$^3F^o$	2	22064.645	22040	25		0.67	0.76	33 ns
	$^3F^o$	3	22947.423	22926	21		1.08	1.08	30 ns
	$^1D^o$	2	23074.387	23078	-4		1.00	0.92	26 ns
	$^3F^o$	4	23757.049	23745	12		1.25	1.25	27 ns
	$^3D^o$	1	24192.033	24149	43	0.54	0.50	0.51	18 ns
	$^3D^o$	2	24531.513	24494	38	1.16	1.17	1.17	18 ns
	$^3D^o$	3	24979.834	24952	28	1.32	1.33	1.32	18 ns
	$^3P^o$	0	25642.126	25705	-63		0.00	0.00	13 ns
	$^3P^o$	1	25704.110	25765	-61	1.52	1.50	1.49	13 ns
	$^3P^o$	2	25956.519	26022	-65	1.52	1.50	1.49	14 ns
	$^1F^o$	3	26816.266	26881	-65	1.09	1.00	1.00	47 ns
	$^1P^o$	1	28554.221	28604	-50	1.02	1.00	1.00	14 ns
$6s7s$	3S	1	26160.293	26074	86		2.00	2.00	16 ns
$6s6d$	1S	0	28230.231	28361	-131		0.00	0.00	29 ns
	1D	2	30236.826	30230	7		1.00	1.00	38 ns
	3D	1	30695.617	30622	73		0.50	0.50	14 ns
	3D	2	30750.672	30672	79	1.11	1.17	1.16	14 ns
$6s7p$	3D	3	30818.115	30731	87	1.32	1.33	1.33	14 ns
	$^3P^o$	0	30743.490	30616	127		0.00	0.00	110 ns
	$^3P^o$	1	30815.512	30686	130		1.50	1.50	100 ns
	$^3P^o$	2	30987.240	30856	131		1.50	1.50	94 ns
	$^1P^o$	1	32547.033	32433	114	1.07	1.00	1.00	12 ns

Table 2. Experimental and theoretical transition probabilities for barium

$\lambda_{\text{air}}/\text{\AA}$	$\Delta E/\text{cm}^{-1}$	Lower	Upper	Transition probability (s^{-1})	
		level	level	Expt.[19]	Calc.
5535.481	18060.261	$6s^2\ ^1S_0$	$6s6p\ ^1P_1$	1.19×10^8	1.21×10^8
5826.274	17158.872	$6s5d\ ^1D_2$	$5d6p\ ^1P_1$	4.50×10^7	4.14×10^7
6527.311	15316.012	$6s5d\ ^3D_2$	$5d6p\ ^3D_2$	3.30×10^7	3.08×10^7
6595.325	15158.068	$6s5d\ ^3D_1$	$5d6p\ ^3D_1$	3.80×10^7	3.64×10^7
6675.270	14976.532	$6s5d\ ^3D_2$	$5d6p\ ^3D_1$	1.89×10^7	1.67×10^7
6693.842	14934.980	$6s5d\ ^3D_3$	$5d6p\ ^3D_2$	1.46×10^7	1.26×10^7

relativistic (NR) values are given by

$$g_{NR} = 1 + \frac{J(J+1) - L(L+1) + S(S+1)}{2J(J+1)}, \quad (10)$$

where J is total momentum of the atom, L is angular momentum and S is spin. Comparing calculated values of g -factors with observed and non-relativistic values is useful for identification of the states.

In Table 1 we also present calculated values of lifetimes of all considered states. Only electric dipole (E1) transitions were included in the calculations. Therefore, we don't present lifetimes of the long living states which can only decay via magnetic dipole (M1) or electric quadrupole (E2) transitions.

We calculate E1 transition amplitudes between states Ψ_a and Ψ_b using the expression

$$A(E1)_{ab} = \sum_{i,j} c_i^a c_j^b \langle \Phi_i || d_z + \delta \hat{V}^{N-2} || \Phi_j \rangle, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{d} = -e\mathbf{r}$ is the electric dipole operator, $\delta \hat{V}^{N-2}$ is the correction to the self-consistent potential of the atomic core due to the electric field of the photon. The term with $\delta \hat{V}^{N-2}$ accounts for the so called RPA (random-phase approximation) or core polarization correction. The functions Ψ_i are two-electron basis states (7) and c_i are expansion coefficients for states Ψ_a and Ψ_b over basis states Φ_i as in (6).

Expression (11) is approximate. It includes dominating contributions to the E1 amplitudes but doesn't take into account some small corrections. A detailed discussion of different contributions into matrix elements between many-electron wave functions can be found e.g. in Ref. [32]. In terms of that paper expression (11) corresponds to the leading contribution to the effective amplitude (A_{RPA} , see Eq. (22) of Ref. [32]). It accounts for configuration interaction, core-valence correlations and core polarization effects. Next, the so called *subtraction* contribution (A_{SBT}) does not exist in present calculations since we use the V^{N-2} approximation. Subtraction terms appear only if Hartree-Fock procedure includes valence electrons. They account for the difference between Hartree-Fock potential and potential of the core in the CI Hamiltonian. In the

V^{N-2} approximation for a two valence electrons atom these two potentials are identical. The terms not included into (11) are: the two-particle correction (A_{TP}), the self-energy correction (A_σ), structure radiation and normalization corrections (see [32] for details).

Using expression (11) gives satisfactory accuracy for most of the cases. However neglecting other contributions for small amplitudes may lead to some instability of the results. This is especially true for small amplitudes which vanish in the non-relativistic limit ($\Delta S > 0, \Delta L > 1$). Present calculations give only rough estimation of the values of these amplitudes. However, it doesn't have much effect on lifetimes since lifetimes dominate by strong transitions with large amplitudes.

Typical accuracy of the calculations for strong transitions is illustrated by the data in Table 2. Here we compare some calculated transition probabilities for Ba with the most accurate experimental data. The probability of the E1 transition from state i to a lower state j is (atomic units)

$$T_{ij} = \frac{4}{3}(\alpha\omega_{ij})^3 \frac{A_{ij}^2}{2J_i + 1}. \quad (12)$$

3. Results for radium

The results of calculations for energies, g -factors and lifetimes of forty lowest states of radium are presented in Table 3. Energies are compared with available experimental data. Calculations follow the same procedure as for barium. The only difference is in values of rescaling parameters for correlation potential $\hat{\Sigma}$. Fitting of the experimental energies of the $7s^2$, $7s7p$ and $7s6d$ configurations leads to the following values of the rescaling parameters: $\lambda_s = 1.0021, \lambda_p = 1.0053$ and $\lambda_d = 0.9327$. These values are very close to similar values for barium (see above). The Coulomb integrals and correlation corrections in electronic analogues (e.g. Ba and Ra) usually have approximately the same values. This fact may be used to extract unaccounted higher correlation corrections from Ba and improve our predictions for unknown energy levels in Ra. Indeed, the differences between theory and experiment for similar states of radium and barium are very close at least for lower states. This is in spite of different order of levels, about 2.5 times difference in fine structure intervals (spin-orbit interaction increases $\sim Z^2$) and some difference in fitting parameters for the correlation potential. This means that the difference between theory and experiment for barium can be used to improve the predicted positions of those states of radium for which experimental data is absent. Column *Extrap.* in Table 3 presents energies of radium corrected using the difference between theory and experiment for barium. States where experimental data is available illustrate that the procedure leads to systematic improvement of the agreement between theory and experiment for lower states of radium. For states where there is no experimental data extrapolated values give better prediction of the energies than just *ab initio* calculations.

Note that this procedure doesn't work for higher states. This is because saturation of the basis in the CI calculations rapidly deteriorates with the increase of the excitation

Table 3. Energies and lifetimes of lower states of radium

Config.	Term	J	Energies (cm^{-1})				g -factors		Lifetime	
			Expt[19]	Calc	Δ	Extrap.	Δ	NR		Calc
$7s^2$	1S	0	0.00	0		0		0.00	0.00	-
$7s7p$	$^3P^o$	0	13078.44	13102	-24	13099	-21	0.00	0.00	-
	$^3P^o$	1	13999.38	14001	-2	14002	-2	1.50	1.47	360 ns
	$^3P^o$	2	16688.54	16698	-9	16696	-7	1.50	1.50	5.4 μs
$7s6d$	3D	1	13715.85	13742	-26	13737	-21	0.50	0.50	640 μs
	3D	2	13993.97	13994	0	13994	0	1.17	1.16	-
	3D	3	14707.35	14655	52	14641	66	1.33	1.33	-
$7s6d$	1D	2	17081.45	17343	-262	17112	-31	1.00	1.01	710 μs
$7s7p$	$^1P^o$	1	20715.71	20433	283	20660	56	1.00	1.02	5.5 ns
$7s8s$	3S	1	26754.05	26665	89	26751	3	2.00	2.00	18 ns
$7s8s$	1S	0		27768		27637		0.00	0.00	80 ns
$6d7p$	$^3F^o$	2	28038.05	27991	47	28016	22	0.67	0.74	33 ns
	$^3F^o$	3	30117.78	30067	51	30088	30	1.08	1.09	28 ns
	$^3F^o$	4	32367.78	32363	5	32375	-7	1.25	1.25	23 ns
$6d7p$	$^1D^o$	2	30918.14	30894	24	30890	28	1.00	1.07	19 ns
$6d^2$	3F	2		29731		29520		0.67	0.71	1.6 μs
	3F	3		30464		30257		1.08	1.08	34 μs
	3F	4		31172		30965		1.25	1.25	3 s
$6d^2$	1D	2		30982		30573		1.00	1.05	150 ns
$7s8p$	$^3P^o$	0	31085.88	31008	78	31135	49	0.00	0.00	76 ns
	$^3P^o$	1	31563.29	30695	868			1.50	1.07	20 ns
	$^3P^o$	2	31874.44	31778	96	31909	35	1.50	1.44	57 ns
$7p^2$	3P	0		29840						21 ns
	3P	1	31248.61	31365	-116			1.50	1.49	26 ns
	3P	2	32941.13	33180	-239			1.50	1.21	42 ns
$7s7d$	3D	1	32000.82	31895	106	31968	33	0.50	0.51	18 ns
	3D	2	31993.41	31902	91	31981	12	1.17	1.16	19 ns
	3D	3	32197.28	32068	129	32155	42	1.33	1.33	21 ns
$7p^2$	1D	2	32214.84	32205	10			1.00	1.20	29 ns
$6d7p$	$^3D^o$	1	32229.97	32090	140			0.50	0.84	21 ns
	$^3D^o$	2	32506.59	32436	71			1.17	1.17	13 ns
	$^3D^o$	3	33197.46	33169	28			1.33	1.17	21 ns
$7s8p$	$^1P^o$	1	32857.68	31446	1412			1.00	1.16	34 ns
$6d7p$	$^3P^o$	0	33782.41	33809	-27			0.00	0.00	10 ns
	$^3P^o$	1	33823.70	33837	-13			1.50	1.40	10 ns
	$^3P^o$	2	34382.91	34421	-38			1.50	1.42	11 ns
$6d^2$	1S	0		33961				0.00	0.00	150 ns
$6d7p$	$^1F^o$	3		34332				1.00	1.14	25 ns
$6d^2$	1S	0		35408				0.00	0.00	30 ns
$6d7p$	$^1P^o$	1		36043				1.00	1.03	38 ns

Table 4. E1-transition amplitudes for 19 lowest states of radium

Even state	Odd state	Amplitude	Even state	Odd state	Amplitude
$7s^2$	1S_0	$7s7p$ $^3P_1^o$	$7s6d$	1D_2	$6d7p$ $^1D_2^o$
		1.218			$6d7p$ $^3F_3^o$
$7s8s$	1S_0	$7s7p$ $^1P_1^o$	$6d^2$	3F_2	$7s7p$ $^3P_1^o$
		5.504			0.542
$7s6d$	3D_1	$7s7p$ $^3P_1^o$	$7s7p$	$^1P_1^o$	0.442
		0.057			0.266
$7s6d$	3D_1	$7s7p$ $^3P_0^o$	$7s7p$	$^3P_2^o$	2.995
		2.574			4.644
$7s6d$	3D_1	$7s7p$ $^1P_1^o$	$6d^2$	1D_2	1.208
		0.437			1.274
$7s6d$	3D_1	$7s7p$ $^3P_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^3P_1^o$	1.786
		0.688			1.023
$7s6d$	3D_1	$6d7p$ $^3F_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^3P_2^o$	1.274
		3.729			1.535
$7s6d$	3D_1	$6d7p$ $^1D_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^1P_1^o$	1.023
		1.394			3.259
$7s8s$	3S_1	$7s7p$ $^3P_0^o$	$7s6d$	3D_3	$7s7p$ $^3P_2^o$
		2.214			6.340
$7s6d$	3D_2	$7s7p$ $^3P_1^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_2^o$	0.290
		3.890			0.107
$7s6d$	3D_2	$7s7p$ $^1P_1^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_3^o$	3.259
		1.476			2.911
$7s6d$	3D_2	$7s7p$ $^3P_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_4^o$	0.595
		6.075			3.064
$7s6d$	3D_2	$6d7p$ $^3F_2^o$	$6d^2$	3F_3	6.340
		0.266			0.190
$7s6d$	3D_2	$6d7p$ $^1D_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^3P_2^o$	0.190
		3.584			0.702
$7s6d$	3D_2	$7s7p$ $^3P_1^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_2^o$	0.702
		4.382			0.566
$7s6d$	3D_2	$7s7p$ $^1P_1^o$	$6d^2$	3F_4	0.566
		0.813			0.037
$7s6d$	3D_2	$7s7p$ $^3P_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_3^o$	1.597
		2.605			6.343
$7s6d$	3D_2	$6d7p$ $^3F_2^o$	$6d^2$	3F_4	0.037
		2.946			6.343
$7s6d$	3D_2	$6d7p$ $^1D_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_3^o$	0.566
		0.168			5.672
$7s6d$	3D_2	$6d7p$ $^3F_3^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_4^o$	1.597
		4.568			0.037
$7s6d$	1D_2	$7s7p$ $^3P_1^o$	$6d^2$	3F_4	0.037
		0.344			6.343
$7s6d$	1D_2	$7s7p$ $^1P_1^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_3^o$	1.597
		3.189			6.343
$7s6d$	1D_2	$7s7p$ $^3P_2^o$	$6d^2$	3F_4	0.037
		0.510			6.343
$7s6d$	1D_2	$6d7p$ $^3F_2^o$	$7s7p$	$^3F_4^o$	6.343
		2.856			6.343

energy. Since the energies of similar excited configurations of Ba and Ra are significantly different the effect of incompleteness of the basis is different too.

Experimental data for g -factors of radium is not available. However, comparing calculated and non-relativistic values of g -factors indicates that the $L - S$ scheme still works very well for the most of the lower states of Ra and can be unambiguously used to name the states. The $L - S$ scheme breaks higher in the spectrum due to the combination of relativistic effects and configuration mixing. For example, as can be seen from Table 3 states $7s8p$ $^3P_1^o$, $6d7p$ $^3D_1^o$ and $7s8p$ $^1P_1^o$ are strongly mixed. The calculated g -factors of each of these states deviate significantly from the non-relativistic values. This makes it difficult to identify the states. Also, strong configuration mixing is probably the reason for poor agreement between theory and experiment for the energies of these states.

Lifetimes of the states presented in Table 3 were calculated using Eqs. (11) and (12) for all possible electric dipole transitions from a given state to lower states. This involves 270 E1-transition amplitudes. It is impractical to present all of them in a table. However, for considering different trapping and cooling schemes it is important to know transition probabilities between different pairs of states rather than just lifetimes. Therefore we present in Table 4 52 amplitudes between 19 lowest states of radium. This data should be sufficient in most of cases. More data is available from authors on request. Note that the values of small amplitudes which vanish in non-relativistic limit ($\Delta S > 0, \Delta L > 1$) should be considered as rough estimation only (see discussion in previous section).

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Jeffrey Guest and Zheng-Tian Lu for many stimulating discussions. This work was supported by the Australian Research Council. One of us (VF) appreciates support from Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Physics, Contract No. W-31-109-ENG-38.

- [1] Ginges J S M and Flambaum V V, 2004 *Physics Reports* **397** 63
- [2] Auerbach N, Flambaum V V and Spevak V 1996 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76** 4316
Spevak V, Auerbach N and Flambaum V V 1997 *Phys. Rev. C* **56** 1357
- [3] Flambaum V V 1999 *Phys. Rev. A* **60** R2611
- [4] Dzuba V A, Flambaum V V and Ginges J S M 2000 *Phys. Rev. A* **61** 062509
- [5] Ahmad I, Bailey K, Guest J R, Holt R J, Lu Z-T, O'Connor T P, Potterveld D H, Schulte E C and Scielzo N D, <http://www-mep.phy.anl.gov/atta/research/radiumedm.html>.
- [6] Jungmann K 2002 *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **33** 2049
- [7] Jungmann K, Berg G P, Damalapati U, Dendooven P, Dermois O, Harakeh M N, Hoekstra R, Morgenstern R, Rogachevskiy A, Sanchez-Vega M, Timmermans R, Traykov E, Willmann L and Wilschut H W 2003 *Phys. Scripta* **T104** 178
- [8] Rasmussen E 1934 *Zeit. Phys.* **87** 607
- [9] Russell H N 1934 *Phys. Rev.* **46** 989
- [10] Moore C E 1958 *Atomic Energy Levels* vol 3 Natl. Bur. Stand. (U.S.), Circ. No. 467 (U.S. GPO, Washington, D. C.)
- [11] Armstrong J A, Wynne J J and Tomkins F S 1980 *J. Phys. B* **13** L113
- [12] Ahmad S A, Klempt W, Neugart R, Otten E W, Wendt K and Ekström C 1983 *Phys. Lett. B* **133** 47
- [13] Wendt K, Ahmad S A, Klempt W, Neugart R, Otten E W and Stroke H H 1987 *Z. Phys. D* **4** 227
- [14] Arnold E, Borchers W, Carre M, Duong H T, Juncar P, Lerme J, Liberman S, Neu W, Neugart R, Otten E W, Pellarin M, Pinard J, Ulm G, Vialle J L and Wendt K 1987 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59** 771
- [15] N D. Scielzo N D, Guest J R, Schulte E C, Ahmad I, Bailey K, Bowers D L, Holt R J, Lu Z-T, O'Connor T P and Potterveld D H 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* **73** 010501(R)
- [16] Bieroń J, Froese Fischer C, Fritzsche S and Pachucki K 2004 *J. Phys. B* **37** L305
- [17] Dzuba V A and Ginges J S M 2006 *Phys. Rev. A* **73** 032503
- [18] Guest J R 2006 private communication
- [19] Curry J J 2004 *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data*, **33** 725
- [20] Dzuba V A, Flambaum V V and Kozlov M G 1996 *Phys. Rev. A* **54** 3948
- [21] Dzuba V A 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* **71** 032512
- [22] Dzuba V A 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* **71** 062501

- [23] Dzuba V A, Flambaum V V and Sushkov O P 1989 *Phys. Lett. A* **140** 493
- [24] Johnson W R and Sapirstein J 1986 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** 1126
- [25] Johnson W R, Blundell S A and Sapirstein J 1988 *Phys. Rev. A* **37** 307
- [26] Rose S G, Pyper N C and Grant I P 1978 *J. Phys. B*, **11** 755
- [27] Migdalek J and Baylis W E 1987 *Phys. Rev. A*, **35** 3227; 1990 **42** 6897
- [28] Eliav E, Kaldor U and Ishikawa Y 1996 *Phys. Rev. A* **53** 3050
- [29] Kozlov M G and Porsev S G, 1997 *JETP* **84** 461
- [30] Dzuba V A and Johnson W R 1998 *Phys. Rev. A* **57** 2459
- [31] Kozlov M G and Porsev S G 1999 *Eur. Phys. J. D* **5** 59
- [32] Dzuba V A, Flambaum V V, Kozlov M G and Porsev S G 1998 *JETP* **87** 885