

# HIGH-MAGNETIC-FIELD CORRECTIONS TO CESIUM HYPERFINE STRUCTURE \*

WAYNE M. ITANO

*Time and Frequency Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology,  
Boulder, Colorado 80303, USA*

Corrections to the Breit-Rabi formula for the ground state of  $^{133}\text{Cs}$  are calculated. For a recently proposed high-magnetic-field frequency standard, the corrections amount to a few parts in  $10^{12}$ .

De Marchi has proposed a cesium atomic-beam frequency standard based on the ( $M_F = -1$ ,  $\Delta M_F = 0$ ) transition, at the magnetic field ( $B \approx 82$  mT) where the derivative of the frequency with respect to  $B$  is zero,<sup>1</sup> and has carried out preliminary experiments.<sup>2</sup> In order for this to be a *primary* frequency standard, it is necessary to relate the measured frequency to that of the zero-field transition frequency  $\nu_0$ , which defines the SI unit of time. The Breit-Rabi formula predicts the frequency to be  $\sqrt{15/16}\nu_0 = 8\,900\,727\,438.257$  Hz.<sup>1</sup> For higher accuracy, additional terms must be taken into account.

Three corrections to the Breit-Rabi formula have been measured for the ground-state hyperfine structure of rubidium by Larson and coworkers.<sup>3-5</sup> These are the dipole diamagnetic shift, the quadrupole diamagnetic shift, and the hyperfine-assisted Zeeman shift. These terms have not yet been measured for cesium.

The dipole diamagnetic shift results from a cross term between the contact hyperfine interaction and the atomic diamagnetic interaction in second-order perturbation theory. This leads to a shift, proportional to  $B^2$ , in the dipole hyperfine constant  $A$ . I evaluated the perturbation sum over states, including the continuum, by solving an inhomogeneous differential equation for the perturbed wavefunction. I used an empirical potential for the valence electron derived by Klapisch.<sup>6</sup> The result is  $\delta A/A = 5.46 \times 10^{-10} B^2$ , where  $B$  is expressed in teslas. This leads to an increase in the ( $M_F = -1$ ) field-independent transition frequency of 33 mHz. Previous calculations have been reported by Bender<sup>7</sup> and by Ray *et al.*<sup>8</sup> In order to check the method, I used Klapisch's potential to calculate  $\delta A/A$  for rubidium. The result is 10% below the experimental value. I estimate an accuracy of around 20% for the present calculation in cesium.

The quadrupole diamagnetic shift results from a cross term between the nuclear quadrupole hyperfine interaction and the electronic diamagnetic interaction in second-order perturbation theory. The interaction is diagonal in  $M_I$  and  $M_J$ . The perturbation sum over states is the same one that appears in the calculation of the quadrupole shielding factor  $\gamma_\infty$ .<sup>4</sup> Using the value  $\gamma_\infty(\text{Cs}^+) = -86.8$ ,<sup>9</sup> I obtain the result

$$\langle M_I, M_J | H_{\text{QD}} | M_I, M_J \rangle = -4.6 \times 10^{-5} B^2 \frac{[3M_I^2 - I(I+1)]}{I(2I-1)}. \quad (1)$$

The result is in hertz if  $B$  is expressed in teslas. A similar calculation for rubidium yields a coefficient in good agreement with experiment.<sup>4</sup> For cesium, the estimate of the coefficient

---

\*Work of the US government. Not subject to US copyright.

for the shift is probably accurate within around 30%. However, for the special case of the ( $M_F = -1$ ) field-independent transition, the shift vanishes. The two states involved in the transition are  $(|-1/2, -1/2\rangle \pm |-3/2, 1/2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ , in the  $|M_I, M_J\rangle$  basis, where  $+$  refers to the higher-energy state and  $-$  to the lower-energy state. Hence, the states are shifted by the same amount, since they have the same  $M_I$ -content.

The hyperfine-assisted Zeeman shift was explained by Fortson as a third-order perturbation, in which the contact hyperfine interaction acts twice and the electronic Zeeman interaction acts once.<sup>10</sup> Fortson gave diagonal matrix elements in the  $|M_I, M_J\rangle$  basis. For the ( $M_F = -1$ ) field-independent transition, it is necessary to extend Fortson's calculation to include off-diagonal matrix elements. In the  $|(IJ)F, M_F\rangle$  basis, the nonzero matrix elements for  $^{133}\text{Cs}$  are

$$\langle 3, M_F | H_{\text{HAZ}} | 4, M_F \rangle = 4h\beta B \sqrt{16 - M_F^2}. \quad (2)$$

Fortson used quantum-defect theory to make a semi-empirical estimate for  $\beta$  in rubidium; it agreed with experiment within 10%. The same method, applied to cesium, yields  $\beta = 88$  mHz/T. For the ( $M_F = -1$ ) field-independent transition, the shift at  $B = 82$  mT is  $-2\sqrt{15}\beta B = -56$  mHz. This estimate of the shift is probably accurate within around 30%.

To achieve a theoretical error of  $10^{-14}$  in the total frequency, which is the projected accuracy of the high-field frequency standard,<sup>1</sup> the larger shifts must be known within less than 1%. This could possibly be done by *ab initio* calculations or by experiments carried out at much higher magnetic field, similar to those of Larson and coworkers in rubidium.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research and the Army Research Office.

## References

1. A. De Marchi, in *Proc. 7th European Frequency and Time Forum*, Neuchâtel, Switzerland, 1993, p. 541.
2. G. Costanzo, E. Rubiola, A. De Marchi, in *Proc. 9th European Frequency and Time Forum*, Besançon, France 1995 (in press).
3. N. P. Economou, S. J. Lipson, and D. J. Larson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1394 (1977).
4. S. J. Lipson, G. D. Fletcher, and D. J. Larson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 567 (1986).
5. G. D. Fletcher, S. J. Lipson, and D. J. Larson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 2535 (1987).
6. M. Klapisch, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **265**, 914 (1967).
7. P. L. Bender, in *Quantum Electronics, Proceedings of the Third International Congress, Paris*, ed. P. Grivet and N. Bloembergen (Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1964), p. 263.
8. S. N. Ray, M. Vajed-Samii, and T. P. Das, *Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* **24**, 477 (1979).
9. H. M. Foley, R. M. Sternheimer, and D. Tycko, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 734 (1954).
10. N. Fortson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 988 (1987).