

Brief Reports

Brief Reports are accounts of completed research which do not warrant regular articles or the priority handling given to Rapid Communications; however, the same standards of scientific quality apply. (Addenda are included in Brief Reports.) A Brief Report may be no longer than 3½ printed pages and must be accompanied by an abstract. The same publication schedule as for regular articles is followed, and page proofs are sent to authors.

QED based on self-energy: The relativistic $2S_{1/2} \rightarrow 1S_{1/2} + 1\gamma$ decay rates of hydrogenlike atoms

A. O. Barut* and Y. I. Salamin†

International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy

(Received 9 February 1990; revised manuscript received 22 October 1990)

Within the framework of the recently advanced formulation of QED based on self-energy, we calculate the relativistic rates of the $2S_{1/2} \rightarrow 1S_{1/2} + 1\gamma$ transition in the hydrogen isoelectronic sequence for values of Z ranging between 1 and 92. We compare our results with those of Johnson [Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 1123 (1972)] and Parpia and Johnson [Phys. Rev. A **26**, 1142 (1982)], analytically and numerically. Although the two approaches are quite different, the formulas for decay rates are shown to be equivalent.

I. INTRODUCTION

There has been renewed interest¹ lately in the study, both theoretically and experimentally, of the decay of the metastable states in hydrogenlike atoms and ions, stimulated mainly by the development of state-of-the-art experimental techniques.² The decay of the $2S \rightarrow 1S$ metastable states has been theoretically investigated by many authors³ working within the framework of the standard theory of quantum electrodynamics (QED). The transition has been shown to proceed via two competing processes. Those are the single-photon magnetic dipole ($M1$) transition (dominant at high values of the atomic number Z) and the double-photon electric ($2E1$) transition (dominant at low values of Z). In this work we are interested in the single-photon process, or its equivalent, in the formulation of QED based on self-energy.

According to the standard theory, contribution of the single-photon transition to the decay rates of the metastable $2S$ states of low- Z hydrogenic ions is small in comparison with the two-photon transition. Moreover, in 1974 Lin and Feinberg⁴ and later in 1978 Barbieri and Sucher⁵ have shown that, to lowest order in $Z\alpha$, where α is the fine-structure constant, the radiative corrections have no effect on the $M1$ transition matrix element.

A calculation of the single-photon decay rates of the $2S$ states in the hydrogen isoelectronic sequence was performed in 1972 by Johnson⁶ using an analytical closed-form expression. This calculation was improved in 1982 by Parpia and Johnson⁷ by incorporating the finite-nuclear-size corrections.

On the experimental side, though, no precise measurements of the single-photon $M1$ decay rates have yet been reported, but their effect has clearly been identified.^{8(b)}

There is, however, a measurement of the $M1$ decay amplitude.^{8(a)}

The standard treatment, however, is not the only approach. We have recently developed a fully relativistic theory for the decay rates of spontaneous emission based upon the idea that the process is triggered by the electron's self-energy.⁹ Our approach has been applied to single-photon atomic transitions in hydrogen and has been found to successfully reproduce the experimentally well-established results of the standard theory.

Moreover, the formulation of QED based on self-energy has recently been used by Barut and his co-workers¹⁰ to calculate, among other things, such effects as the electron's $g-2$, the Casimir effect, the Unruh effect, and the Lamb shift.

In this paper we employ the closed-form expression we arrived at fully analytically from our entirely relativistic approach in performing a calculation similar to Parpia and Johnson's.⁷ Work is also currently in progress¹¹ to calculate the $2E1$ rates of decay, all within the context of the self-energy approach.

In Sec. II we give our expression for the $2S \rightarrow 1S$ decay rates, and in Sec. III an analytic proof of the equivalence of the standard QED and self-field QED calculations for decay rates is given. Section IV deals with discussion and conclusions.

II. THE DECAY RATES

Apart from a slight change in notation, the aim of which is primarily to facilitate the comparison with Johnson's expression, the $2S \rightarrow 1S$ transition rate in a hydrogenlike atom is given in Ref. 9 by

$$\Gamma_{2S \rightarrow 1S} = -2\alpha\omega[(R_1 + R_2)^2 - 3(R_3 + R_4)^2 + 4R_3R_4], \quad (1)$$

where

$$R_1 = \left[\frac{(2\gamma+1)(1+\epsilon_1)(1+\epsilon_2)}{2(N+1)^3} \right]^{1/2} \times \left[\frac{2}{N+1} \right]^{2\gamma} \frac{N^\gamma}{(1+\eta^2)^{2\gamma}} \left[NF_1 - \frac{2}{1+\eta^2} F_2 \right], \quad (2a)$$

$$R_2 = \left[\frac{(2\gamma+1)(1-\epsilon_1)(1-\epsilon_2)}{2(N+1)^3} \right]^{1/2} \times \left[\frac{2}{N+1} \right]^{2\gamma} \frac{N^\gamma}{(1+\eta^2)^{2\gamma}} \times \left[(N+2)F_1 - \frac{2}{1+\eta^2} F_2 \right], \quad (2b)$$

$$R_3 = \left[\frac{(2\gamma+1)^3(1+\epsilon_1)(1-\epsilon_2)}{32(N+1)} \right]^{1/2} \times \left[\frac{\omega}{3\lambda} \right] \left[\frac{2}{N+1} \right]^{2\gamma+2} \frac{N^{\gamma+1}}{(1+\eta^2)^{2\gamma}} \times \left[NF_3 - \frac{4(\gamma+1)}{(2\gamma+1)(1+\eta^2)} F_4 \right], \quad (2c)$$

$$R_4 = \left[\frac{(2\gamma+1)^3(1-\epsilon_1)(1+\epsilon_2)}{32(N+1)} \right]^{1/2} \times \left[\frac{\omega}{3\lambda} \right] \left[\frac{2}{N+1} \right]^{2\gamma+2} \frac{N^{\gamma+1}}{(1+\eta^2)^{2\gamma}} \times \left[(N+2)F_3 - \frac{4(\gamma+1)}{(2\gamma+1)(1+\eta^2)} F_4 \right], \quad (2d)$$

and where

$$F_1 = {}_2F_1\left(-\gamma + \frac{1}{2}, -\gamma + 1, \frac{3}{2}; -\eta^2\right), \quad (3a)$$

$$F_2 = {}_2F_1\left(-\gamma, -\gamma + \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}; -\eta^2\right), \quad (3b)$$

$$F_3 = {}_2F_1\left(-\gamma + 1, -\gamma + \frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}; -\eta^2\right), \quad (3c)$$

$$F_4 = {}_2F_1\left(-\gamma + \frac{1}{2}, -\gamma + 1, \frac{5}{2}; -\eta^2\right), \quad (3d)$$

and finally

$$\gamma = \sqrt{1 - (Z\alpha)^2}, \quad N = \sqrt{2\gamma + 2}, \quad \lambda = Z\alpha m,$$

$$\eta = \frac{\omega N}{\lambda(N+1)}, \quad \epsilon_1 = \left[\frac{\gamma+1}{2} \right]^{1/2}, \quad \epsilon_2 = \gamma,$$

$$\omega = m(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2), \quad m = \frac{m_e}{1 + \xi}, \quad \xi = \frac{m_e}{M},$$

$$M = M_{\text{atom}} - Zm_e.$$

Parpia and Johnson,^{6,7} on the other hand, have used the following expression:

$$\Gamma(M1) = \frac{4}{9}\alpha\omega^3 |\mathcal{M}(\omega)|^2, \quad (4)$$

with

$$\mathcal{M}(\omega) = -\frac{(Z\alpha)^2}{m} \left[\frac{2(N-1)}{N+2} \right]^{1/2} \left[\frac{2}{N+1} \right]^{2\gamma+1} N^{\gamma-1} \times [{}_2F_1(\gamma + \frac{1}{2}, \gamma + 1, \frac{5}{2}; -\eta^2) + \frac{2}{5}N\eta^2 {}_2F_1(\gamma + \frac{3}{2}, \gamma + 2, \frac{7}{2}; -\eta^2)]. \quad (5)$$

The numerical results reported by Parpia and Johnson⁷ are based on a modified version of Eqs. (4) and (5). The modification has been brought about by replacing the Coulomb potential due to a point nuclear charge by the potential produced by a Fermi-Dirac charge distribution.

III. ANALYTIC PROOF OF EQUIVALENCE OF QED AND SELF-FIELD QED FORMULAS

The theoretical bases of self-field electrodynamics and standard QED are quite different. And at first the resulting formulas for the decay rates of spontaneous emission look quite different. In the former case one calculates directly the decay rate, in the latter case the absolute value squared of a decay amplitude. Nevertheless, one can show analytically the equivalence of the two formulas, Eq. (1) and Eqs. (4)–(5).

Because only two hypergeometric functions occur in Eq. (5), one can express the four functions occurring in Eqs. (2), F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 , in terms of these two functions F_A and F_B :

$$F_1 = (1 + \eta^2)^{2\gamma} \left[F_A - \frac{1}{15} \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] N^2(N^2-1)F_B \right],$$

$$F_2 = \frac{(1 + \eta^2)^{2\gamma}}{(2+N)} \left[\frac{1}{3}[N^3 - 2N^2 + 12]F_A - \frac{2N^2}{15}(N^3 - 2N + 2) \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] F_B \right],$$

$$F_3 = (1 + \eta^2)^{2\gamma} \left[F_A - \frac{N^2}{5} \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] F_B \right],$$

$$F_4 = (1 + \eta^2)^{2\gamma} \left[F_A - \frac{4}{5} \left[\frac{N^2}{2} - 1 \right] \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] F_B \right].$$

The functions R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4 in Eq. (1) are linear combinations of the F 's, hence of F_A and F_B :

$$R_1 = C(2-N) \left[\frac{1}{6}(N^2-6)F_A + \frac{N^2}{15} \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] F_B \right],$$

$$R_2 = C(2-N) \left[-\frac{1}{6}[N^2 - 2N - 6]F_A - \frac{N}{15} \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] (2N^2 + N - 4)F_B \right],$$

$$R_3 = \frac{C}{3} \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] \left[\frac{(2+N)}{2}(N^2 - 2N - 2)F_A + \frac{N}{5}(2-N)(2N^2 - N - 4)F_B \right],$$

$$R_4 = \frac{C}{3} \left[\frac{2-N}{2+N} \right] \left[\frac{(2+N)}{2}(N^2 - 2)F_A - \frac{N^2}{5}(2-N)F_B \right],$$

where

$$F_A = {}_2F_1\left(\gamma + \frac{1}{2}, \gamma + 1, \frac{5}{2}; -\eta^2\right),$$

$$F_B = {}_2F_1\left(\gamma + \frac{3}{2}, \gamma + 2, \frac{7}{2}; -\eta^2\right),$$

and

$$C = \left[\frac{(2\gamma + 1)(1 + \epsilon_1)(1 + \epsilon_2)}{2(N + 1)} \right]^{1/2} \frac{2^{2\gamma} N^\gamma}{(N + 1)^{2\gamma + 1}}.$$

Substituting the R 's into Eq. (1), one obtains

$$\Gamma = \frac{4}{9} \alpha \omega^3 (Z\alpha)^4 \frac{8(N - 1)}{N^2(N + 2)} \left[\frac{2^{2\gamma} N^\gamma}{(N + 1)^{2\gamma + 1}} \right]^2 \\ \times (F_A^2 + \frac{4}{5} N \eta^2 F_A F_B + \frac{4}{25} N^2 \eta^4 F_B^2),$$

which is exactly Eq. (4).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Our calculation differs from that of Parpia and Johnson⁷ in two respects. They do not include the reduced-mass corrections in their results but merely show, albeit partly correctly, towards the end of their paper how to incorporate them. In our calculation, however, we use the electron's reduced-mass m everywhere instead of m_e . On the other hand, Parpia and Johnson use the potential of a Fermi-Dirac charge distribution in place of the Coulomb potential of the point nucleus and then use the numerically generated counterparts of the Dirac-Coulomb wave functions to calculate the matrix

TABLE I. Rates of the $2S_{1/2} \rightarrow 1S_{1/2} + 1\gamma$ transition in hydrogenlike atoms. The rates $\Gamma(M1)$ are given in s^{-1} . Z is the atomic number and $a[b]$ in the last column is to be read as $a \times 10^b$.

Z	Point nucleus ^a	$10^6 Z^{-10} \Gamma(M1)$		$\Gamma(M1)$
		Finite nucleus ^b	This calculation	
1	2.4959	2.4958	2.4945	2.4945[−6]
2	2.4964	2.4963	2.4960	2.5559[−3]
3	2.4971	2.4970	2.4968	1.4743[−1]
4	2.4981	2.4980	2.4979	2.6192[00]
5	2.4993	2.4993	2.4992	2.4406[01]
6	2.5009	2.5009	2.5008	1.5121[02]
7	2.5028	2.5027	2.5026	7.0693[02]
8	2.5049	2.5049	2.5048	2.6895[03]
9	2.5073	2.5073	2.5072	8.7422[03]
10	2.5100	2.5100	2.5100	2.5100[04]
12	2.5164	2.5163	2.5163	1.5580[05]
14	2.5239	2.5238	2.5238	7.3002[05]
16	2.5326	2.5325	2.5325	2.7845[06]
18	2.5425	2.5424	2.5424	9.0776[06]
20	2.5537	2.5536	2.5536	2.6149[07]
22	2.5661	2.5660	2.5660	6.8154[07]
24	2.5798	2.5797	2.5798	1.6357[08]
26	2.5949	2.5948	2.5949	3.6631[08]
28	2.6114	2.6112	2.6113	7.7346[08]
30	2.6292	2.6290	2.6292	1.5525[09]
34	2.6694	2.6691	2.6693	5.5105[09]
38	2.7158	2.7154	2.7158	1.7050[10]
40	2.7415	2.7415	2.7415	2.8747[10]
42	2.7690	2.7684	2.7690	4.7294[10]
46	2.8296	2.8287	2.8295	1.2003[11]
50	2.8983	2.8969	2.8982	2.8303[11]
54	2.9759	2.9740	2.9759	6.2741[11]
58	3.0635	3.0609	3.0635	1.3198[12]
60	3.1114	3.1114	3.1114	1.8813[12]
62	3.1623	3.1586	3.1623	2.6541[12]
66	3.2738	3.2687	3.2738	5.1344[12]
70	3.3999	3.3926	3.3998	9.6036[12]
74	3.5425	3.5324	3.5425	1.7443[13]
78	3.7046	3.6903	3.7046	3.0880[13]
80	3.7939	3.7939	3.7939	4.0737[13]
82	3.8894	3.8690	3.8894	5.3459[13]
86	4.1012	4.0719	4.1012	9.0759[13]
90	4.3454	4.3033	4.3453	1.5151[14]
92	4.4817	4.4310	4.4817	1.9468[14]

^a Reference 6.

^b Reference 7.

elements. In our calculation, the nucleus is taken as pointlike and exact Dirac-Coulomb wave functions are employed in arriving at the analytic expressions (1) and (2).

Our numerical results are displayed in Table I. In the second column, we show Johnson's earlier results⁶ for $10^6 Z^{-10}$ times the $M1$ decay rates of the metastable $2S \rightarrow 1S$ states of the hydrogenic atoms, for $Z = 1$ to $Z = 92$. In his calculation, Johnson does not take the finite nucleus effects into consideration. The third column contains the results of Parpia and Johnson's 1982 calculation incorporating the corrections due to a nucleus of finite extension. Our results for the same quantity are shown in the fourth column while the last column contains the values in s^{-1} of the decay rates as $a[b]$. In the fifth column $a[b]$ means $a \times 10^b$.

Finally, we remark that, in our calculation, we have used the most recently reported¹² values for the electron mass m_e , the fine-structure constant α , Planck's constant \hbar , the atomic masses M , and the atomic mass unit u .

The direct measured $M1$ amplitude

$$\langle 1S_{1/2,1/2} | M1 | 2S_{1/2,1/2} \rangle = -(0.2725 \pm 0.0313) \alpha^2 (e\hbar/mc)$$

agrees with the theoretical value $-0.2794\alpha^2(e\hbar/mc)$.

We note that the agreement between the results of our

calculation and those of Johnson's for the point nucleus case (compare the second and fourth columns in Table I) is almost complete. As in our calculation, the reduced-mass corrections have been included in Johnson's paper.⁶

A comparison of the third and fourth columns, on the other hand, shows quite clearly that the use, by Parpia and Johnson, of numerically generated Dirac-Coulomb wave functions, suitable for a finite nucleus potential, amounts only to a decrease in the $M1$ rates that grows with Z to reach the level of 1.1% for $Z = 92$.

The slight difference between the numerical results using two different formulas for low- Z values is due to the fact that Eq. (1) involves the difference of two very large numbers (which vanishes in the nonrelativistic limit) and hence is sensitive to cancellations. Equation (4) seems to be numerically simpler.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Professor Abdus Salam, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and UNESCO for hospitality at the International Center for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy. They would also like to acknowledge the help of G. W. F. Drake for suggesting and carrying out an analytic proof of the equivalence of the two approaches, and also for pointing out Ref. 8(a).

*Permanent address: Physics Department, University of Colorado, Campus Box 390, Boulder, CO 80309.

†Permanent address: Physics Department, Birzeit University, P.O. Box 14, Birzeit, West Bank of Jordan.

¹X. Mu and B. Craseman, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 4585 (1988); A. van Wijngaarden, J. Patel, and G. W. F. Drake, *ibid.* **33**, 312 (1986); G. W. Drake, *ibid.* **34**, 2871 (1986).

²K. Ilakovic, J. Tudoric-Ghemo, B. Busic, and V. Hovart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2469 (1986).

³See, for example, Y. Lin and J. Li, J. Phys. B **21**, 1509 (1988); H. G. Gould, in *Atomic Theory Workshop on Relativistic and QED Effects in Heavy Atoms (National Bureau of Standards, Gaithersburg, MD)*, Proceedings of the Atomic Theory Workshop on Relativistic and QED Effects in Heavy Atoms, AIP Conf. Proc. No. 136, edited by Hugh Pikelly and Yong-Ki Kim (AIP, New York, 1985), p. 66 and references therein.

⁴D. L. Lin and G. Feinberg, Phys. Rev. A **10**, 1425 (1974).

⁵R. Barbieri and J. Sucher, Nucl. Phys. B **134**, 155 (1978).

⁶W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 1123 (1972).

⁷F. A. Parpia and W. R. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **26**, 1142 (1982).

⁸(a) A. van Wijngaarden, J. Patel, and G. W. F. Drake, Phys. Rev. A **33**, 312 (1986); (b) H. Gould and R. Marrus, *ibid.* **28**, 2001 (1983).

⁹A. O. Barut and Y. I. Salamin, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 2284 (1988); Z. Phys. D (to be published).

¹⁰A. O. Barut, J. P. Dowling, and J. F. van Huele, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 4405 (1988); A. O. Barut and J. P. Dowling, *ibid.* **36**, 649 (1987); **30**, 2550 (1987); **39**, 2796 (1989); **41**, 2227 (1990); **41**, 2284 (1990); Z. F. Naturforsch **44A**, 1051 (1989); A. O. Barut, in *The Electron 1990*, edited by A. Weingartshofen *et al.* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991).

¹¹A. O. Barut and Y. I. Salamin (unpublished).

¹²G. P. Yost *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **204B**, 14 (1988); **204B**, 51 (1988); **204B**, 56 (1988).