

# Electric dipole moment of the electron in YbF molecule.

N. S. Mosyagin, M. G. Kozlov, and A. V. Titov  
*Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute,*  
*Gatchina, St.-Petersburg district, 188350, RUSSIA*  
(August 28, 2018)

## Abstract

*Ab initio* calculation of the hyperfine,  $P$ -odd, and  $P, T$ -odd constants for the YbF molecule was performed with the help of the recently developed technique, which allows to take into account correlations and polarization in the outercore region. The ground state ( $^2\Sigma_{1/2}$ ) electronic wave function of the YbF molecule is found with the help of the Relativistic Effective Core Potential method followed by the restoration of molecular four-component spinors in the core region of ytterbium in the framework of a non-variational procedure. Core polarization effects are included with the help of the atomic Many Body Perturbation Theory for Yb atom. For the isotropic hyperfine constant  $A$ , accuracy of our calculation is about 3% as compared to the experimental datum. The dipole constant  $A_d$  (which is much smaller in magnitude), though better than in all previous calculations, is still underestimated by almost 23%. Being corrected within a semiempirical approach for a perturbation of  $4f$ -shell in the core of Yb due to the bond making, this error is reduced to 8%. Our value for the effective electric field on the unpaired electron is 4.9 a.u. =  $2.5 \times 10^{10}$  V cm $^{-1}$ .

31.25.Nj, 31.90.+s, 32.80.Ys, 33.15.Pw

*a. Introduction.* A number of papers [1–5] were devoted to the calculations of the  $P, T$ -odd interaction constants in the ground state  $^2\Sigma_{1/2}$  of YbF molecule. These calculations are necessary for the interpretation of the ongoing experimental search for the Electric Dipole Moment (EDM) of the electron  $d_e$  [6]. It is expected that in this experiment it will be possible to put a more stringent bound on the EDM of the electron. However, in order to link experimentally measured  $P, T$ -odd frequency shift with  $d_e$ , one needs to know an effective electric field on the uncoupled electron, which is characterized by a constant  $W_d$ . So, reliable calculations of this quantity are essential. The cited above calculations predict the values of this constant in the interval  $(-0.62 \div -1.5) \times 10^{25} \text{ Hz e}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .

It is known, that parameter  $W_d$  is sensitive to the spin density in the vicinity of the heavy nucleus (see, for example, [7]). The same, of course, can be said about magnetic hyperfine constants. So, comparison of the calculated constants of the hyperfine structure on the  $^{171}\text{Yb}$  nucleus with the experiment provides an important test of the quality of the  $W_d$  calculation. In previous calculations [2,4] hyperfine constants were significantly underestimated. In [2], it was concluded that the spin-correlation effects of the unpaired electron with the outermost core  $5s$ - and  $5p$ -shells of ytterbium should be taken into account in order to perform more accurate calculations of the hyperfine and  $P, T$ -odd constants. After that it was shown that  $4f$ -shell can also contribute to the dipole part of the spin density [3]. In unrestricted Dirac-Fock (DF) calculations by Parpia [5], the values for  $W_d$  are in a reasonable (mutually consistent) agreement with our previous Relativistic Effective Core Potential (RECP)-based [2] and semiempirical [1,3] calculations. Recently a new technique to account for the most important types of the core-valence correlations and the core polarization effects with the help of the atomic Many Body Perturbation Theory (MBPT) was developed and proved to be very efficient for the calculations of the hyperfine structure and  $P, T$ -odd effects for the BaF molecule [8]. Below we report the results of the application of this method to calculation of the YbF molecule. The deviation of the calculated  $A_d$  from the experimental value is analyzed and the final  $A_d$  magnitude is corrected with the help of the semiempirical procedure [3].

*b. Spin-rotational Hamiltonian.* For the  $^{171}\text{Yb}$  isotope, which has nuclear spin  $I = \frac{1}{2}$ , the molecular spin-rotational degrees of freedom are described by the following spin-rotational Hamiltonian (see [7]):

$$H_{\text{sr}} = B\mathbf{N}^2 + \gamma\mathbf{S}\mathbf{N} - D_e\mathbf{n}\mathbf{E} + \hat{\mathbf{S}}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{I} + W_A k_A \mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{I} + (W_S k_S + W_d d_e)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{n}. \quad (1)$$

In this expression  $\mathbf{N}$  is the rotational angular momentum,  $B$  is the rotational constant,  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $\mathbf{I}$  are the spins of the electron and the Yb nucleus,  $\mathbf{n}$  is the unit vector directed along the molecular axis from Yb to F. The spin-doubling constant  $\gamma$  characterizes the spin-rotational interaction.  $D_e$  and  $\mathbf{E}$  are the molecular dipole moment and the external electric field. The axial tensor  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$  describes magnetic hyperfine structure on the Yb nucleus. It can be determined by two parameters:  $A = (A_{\parallel} + 2A_{\perp})/3$  and  $A_d = (A_{\parallel} - A_{\perp})/3$ . The smaller hyperfine structure associated with the  $^{19}\text{F}$  nucleus is neglected. The last three terms in (1) account for the  $P$ - and  $P, T$ -odd effects. First of them describes interaction of the electron spin with the anapole moment of the nucleus  $k_A$  [9]. The second one corresponds to the scalar  $P, T$ -odd electron-nucleus interaction with the dimensionless constant  $k_S$ . The third one describes interaction of the electron EDM  $d_e$  with the internal molecular field  $\mathbf{E}^{\text{mol}}$ .

$$H_d = 2d_e \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{\text{mol}}, \quad (2)$$

$$W_d d_e = 2 \langle {}^2\Sigma_{1/2} | H_d | {}^2\Sigma_{1/2} \rangle. \quad (3)$$

These equations show that the constant  $\frac{1}{2}W_d$  characterizes an effective electric field on the unpaired electron. Similar to the  $W_d$ , the other  $P$ - and  $P, T$ -odd constants  $W_i$  depend on the electron spin-density in a vicinity of the heavy nucleus and reliability of their calculation can be also tested by comparison of the calculated and experimental hyperfine constants.

*c. Calculation scheme.* The Generalized RECP or GRECP (see [10] and references) calculation of the ground state  ${}^2\Sigma$  of YbF molecule was performed by analogy with [2]. The main difference of the present calculation is that the pseudospinors corresponding to the  $5s$ - and  $5p$ -shells were frozen from the calculation of the  $\text{Yb}^{2+}$  ion with the help of the level-shift technique (which is also known as Huzinaga-type ECP, see e.g. [11]). It was necessary to freeze these pseudospinors, because polarization of the corresponding shells was taken into account by means of the Effective Operator (EO) technique (see [8] for details). RASSCF [12] calculations with 5284 configurations were performed for 11 electrons distributed in RAS-1=(2,0,0,0), RAS-2=(2,1,1,0), and RAS-3=(6,4,4,2) subspaces. The described above procedure follows the same lines as the one used in our previous calculation of BaF molecule [8].

The molecular relativistic spinor for the unpaired electron was constructed from the molecular pseudoorbital  $\tilde{\varphi}_u^M$

$$\tilde{\varphi}_u^M = \sum_i C_i^s \tilde{\varphi}_i^s + \sum_i C_i^p \tilde{\varphi}_i^{p, m_l=0} + \dots, \quad (4)$$

so that the atomic  $s$ - and  $p$ -pseudoorbitals of ytterbium in (4) were replaced by the unsmoothed four-component DF spinors derived for the same atomic configurations which were used in generation of basis  $s$ - and  $p$ -pseudoorbitals. The MO LCAO coefficients were preserved after the RECP calculations. As the spin-orbit interaction for the unpaired electron is small, the “spin-averaged” valence atomic  $p$ -pseudoorbital was replaced by the linear combination of the corresponding spinors with  $j = l \pm 1/2$  (see [2] for details).

EOs for the magnetic hyperfine interaction, for the EDM interaction (2) and for the anapole moment interaction were constructed by means of the atomic MBPT. The EOs include two most important correlation corrections, which involve all the core electrons. The first correction corresponds to the Random Phase Approximation (RPA), and the second one corresponds to the substitution of the valence DF orbitals by the Brueckner orbitals. The latter are found by solving the one-particle equations with the self-energy operator  $\sigma(\varepsilon)$  added to the Dirac-Fock operator  $h_{\text{DF}}$ :

$$(h_{\text{DF}} + \sigma(\varepsilon_n)) \phi_n = \varepsilon_n \phi_n. \quad (5)$$

For the operator  $\sigma(\varepsilon)$  we used diagrammatic technique developed in [13]. In our calculations of this operator we have neglected excitations from the shells  $1s \cdots 3d$ . Opposite to that, in RPA equations it was important to include all the core electrons. Both RPA equations and Brueckner equations were solved for a finite four-component basis set in the  $V^{N-2}$  approximation (which means that SCF corresponds to  $\text{Yb}^{2+}$ ), and matrix elements of the

EOs were calculated. The basis set included DF orbitals for  $1s \dots 6s, 6p, 5d$  shells. In addition  $7 - 18s, 7 - 18p, 6 - 17d, 5 - 17f$  and  $5 - 14g$  orbitals were formed by analogy with the basis set N2 of [13]. Molecular orbitals were reexpanded in this basis set to find matrix elements of EOs for the molecular wave function.

The main advantage of this method is that there is no need to extend the active (valence) space in order to include core electrons. It is of particular importance when one is interested in such molecular properties as hyperfine,  $P$ -odd, and  $P, T$ -odd constants. Corresponding electronic operators are singular at the nucleus. For this reason, it is necessary to include all the core electrons in RPA equations. Corresponding extension of the active space would be extremely expensive. Another approach which allows core electrons to contribute to the spin density is the unrestricted DF molecular calculation (where polarization is taken into account [5]).

*d. Results.* Explicit expression for the parameter  $W_d$  is given in (2) and (3). Other electronic matrix elements, which correspond to the parameters  $A$ ,  $A_d$  and  $W_i$  of operator (1) can be found in [7]. All the radial integrals and atomic four-component spinors were calculated for the finite nucleus  $^{171}\text{Yb}$  in a model of uniformly charged ball. It is well known, that atomic matrix elements of operator (2) are proportional to  $Z^3$ . The same scaling is applicable to the constant  $W_S$ , while the matrix elements which contribute to the constants  $W_A$  are proportional to  $Z^2$ . As far as the nuclear charge of the fluorine is 8 times smaller than that of the ytterbium, we have neglected contributions to the  $W_i$  parameters from the vicinity of the fluorine nucleus. The additional argument which justifies this approximation is that the unpaired electron in the YbF molecule is mainly that of the Yb atom, and thus the spin density is localized near the Yb atom. At present we do not have RPA program for the scalar  $P, T$ -odd interaction, so we have focused here on the calculation of the constants  $W_d$  and  $W_A$ .

Results for the parameters of the spin-rotational Hamiltonian are given in table I. Comparison of the results of the GRECP/RASSCF calculation [2] with the results of the present GRECP/RASSCF/EO calculation confirms our previous conclusion that correlations (including spin polarization) with the core give a significant contribution to the hyperfine structure and to the  $P$ -odd and  $P, T$ -odd constants.

Our final value for the hyperfine structure constant  $A$  differs by less than 3% from the experimental value [14]. That means that the symmetrical part of the spin density in the vicinity of the Yb nucleus in our calculation is probably rather good. However, it is also very important to reproduce the asymmetrical part of the spin density, which accounts for the dipole constant  $A_d$ . Our value for  $A_d$  is in a slightly better agreement with the experiment than the value from [4], but is still underestimated by almost 23%. About a half of this difference can be explained by the fact that in our molecular calculation  $4f$ -shell of the Yb atom was frozen. It was first pointed out by Khriplovich that in the YbF molecule excitations from the  $f$ -shell can be important. In particular, they can explain the small value of the spin-doubling constant  $\gamma$  [15]. It was shown recently that contribution of the  $f$ -shell excitations to the spin density can give significant correction to the constant  $A_d$  [3]. Using equations (19) and (31) from the paper [3] we obtain the following estimates for the  $f$ -shell excitation contributions to  $A$  and  $A_d$ :

$$\delta A \approx -3 \text{ MHz}, \quad \delta A_d \approx 15 \text{ MHz}. \quad (6)$$

Note that these corrections arise from the admixture to the molecular wave function of the configuration with the hole in the  $4f$  shell. The weight of this configuration was estimated in [3] to be of the order of 4%. Such an admixture is a purely molecular effect and is not accounted for by the EO technique. So, we can conclude that  $\delta A_d$  can be added to our value for  $A_d$ , resulting in  $A_d \approx 94$  MHz, that is in a much better agreement with the experimental value 102 MHz.

It is important that similar contribution of the  $4f$ -shell excitations to the constant  $W_d$  is strongly suppressed. Indeed, operator (2) mixes  $f$ - and  $d$ -waves. For Yb atom,  $4d$ -shell is very deep and its mixture with the  $4f$ -orbitals by the molecular field is very small, while  $5d$ -shell is weakly bound and does not penetrate into the core region. Similar contributions to other constants  $W_i$  are negligible due to the contact character of the corresponding interactions.

One can see that the values of the  $W_d$  constant from the unrestricted DF calculation [5], the most recent semiempirical calculation [3] and the present GRECP/RASSCF/EO calculation are in a very close agreement now. It is also important that the valence electron contribution to the  $W_d$  in [5] is in 7.4% agreement with the corresponding RECP-based calculation [2] (see table I). Another recent DF calculation [4] gives the value, which is two times smaller.

*Acknowledgments.* This work was implemented under the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (N. M. and A. T.: grants N 96-03-33036 and 96-03-00069g; M. K.: grant N 98-02-17663).

## REFERENCES

- [1] M.G.Kozlov, V.F.Ezhov, Phys.Rev.**A**, **49**, 4502 (1994).
- [2] A.V.Titov, N.S.Mosyagin, V.F.Ezhov, Phys.Rev.Lett., **77**, 5346 (1996).
- [3] M.G.Kozlov, J.Phys.**B**, **30**, L607 (1997).
- [4] H.M.Quiney, H.Skaane, I.P.Grant, J.Phys.**B**, **31**, L85 (1998).
- [5] F.A.Parpia, J.Phys.**B**, **31**, 1409 (1998).
- [6] B.E.Sauer, S.K.Peck, G.Redgrave, E.Hinds, Phys.Scr., **T70**, 34 (1997).
- [7] M.G.Kozlov, L.N.Labzowsky, J.Phys.**B**, **28**, 1933 (1995).
- [8] M.G.Kozlov, A.V.Titov, N.S.Mosyagin, P.V.Souchko, Phys.Rev.**A**, **56**, R3326 (1997).
- [9] V.V.Flambaum, I.B.Khriplovich, Phys.Lett., **110A**, 12 (1985).
- [10] N. S. Mosyagin, A. V. Titov, and Z. Latajka, Int. J. Quant. Chem. **63**, 1107 (1997);  
A. V. Titov and N. S. Mosyagin, Preprint PNPI No. **2182** (Petersburg Nuclear Physics  
Institute, Gatchina, St.-Petersburg district, 1997), 81 p., submitted for publication.
- [11] V.Bonifacic, S.Huzinaga, J.Chem.Phys., **60**, 2779 (1974).
- [12] J.Olsen, B.O.Roos, J.Chem.Phys., **89**, 2185 (1988); K. Andersson, M. R. A. Blomberg,  
M. P. Fülscher, V. Kellö, R. Lindh, P.-Aa. Malmqvist, J. Noga, J. Olsen, B. O. Roos,  
A. J. Sadlej, P. E. M. Siegbahn, M. Urban, P.-O. Widmark, MOLCAS, Version 2,  
University of Lund, Sweden 1991.
- [13] V.A.Dzuba, V.V.Flambaum, M.G.Kozlov, JETP Lett., **63**, 882 (1996); Phys.Rev.**A**,  
**54**, 3948 (1996).
- [14] L. B. Knight, Jr. and W. Weltner, Jr., J. of Chem. Phys. **53**, 4111 (1970).
- [15] B.E.Sauer, J.Wang, E.A.Hinds, Phys.Rev.Lett., **74**, 1554 (1995).

TABLES

TABLE I. Parameters of the spin-rotational Hamiltonian for  $^{171}\text{YbF}$ .

Method	$A$ (MHz)	$A_d$ (MHz)	$W_d$ ( $10^{25} \frac{\text{Hz}}{\text{e}\cdot\text{cm}}$ )	$W_A$ (Hz)	$W_S$ (kHz)
Exper. [14]	7617	102			
Semiemp. [1]			-1.5	730	-48
GRECP/SCF [2]	4932	59	-0.91	484	-33
GRECP/RASSCF [2]	4854	60	-0.91	486	-33
Semiemp. [3]			-1.26		-43
DHF [4]	5918	35	-0.31	163	-11
DHF+CP [4]	7865	60	-0.60	310	-21
DHF (rescaled) [4]			-0.62	326	-22
DF (unpaired electron contribution) [5]			-0.962		
Unrestricted DF [5]			-1.203		-22
GRECP/RASSCF/EO (this work)	7842	79	-1.206	634	
GRECP/RASSCF/EO (with $4f$ -hole correction)	7839	94	-1.206	634	