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HIGHLIGHTS

- High-accuracy calculations for the 12 $^2S$ Rydberg states of Li.
- Finite-nuclear-mass approach is used.
- Isotope shifts of the transition energies are calculated.
- All-electron explicitly correlated Gaussian functions are used.
- The non-linear parameters of the Gaussians are optimized.
- Analytical energy gradient is used in the optimization.
- For the 10s, 11s, 12s, and 13s states the present calculations are the first ever.

ABSTRACT

In this work we report very accurate variational calculations of the twelve lowest $^2S$ Rydberg states of the lithium atom performed with the finite-nuclear-mass (FNM) approach and with all-electron explicitly correlated Gaussian functions. The FNM non-relativistic variational energies of the states are augmented with the leading relativistic and QED corrections. The calculated transition energies are compared with the previous works (only eight states of the series were calculated before) and with the available experimental results. Density distributions of the electrons and the nucleus in the center-of-mass frame are also shown.

1. Introduction

One of the major challenges of the quantum theory of atoms is to determine the energy levels corresponding to bound ground and excited states and the frequencies of the transitions between these levels with the spectroscopic accuracy (i.e. below 1 cm$^{-1}$). As such determination involves the calculation of the corresponding wave functions representing the computed states, various properties of the states can also be determined. That involves, for example, the transition intensities, the average distances of the electrons to the nucleus and between the electrons, etc. As the amount of computations required grows very rapidly with the number of electrons (this growth is proportional to the factorial of the number of electrons) even for atoms with a few electrons this becomes a computationally very demanding task. Thus, in undertaking such calculations the accuracy one aims to achieve needs to be balanced with the computational resources the calculations are expected to use.

One of the many challenges involved in atomic calculations is to target not only a few lowest lying states but to extend the calculations to a wider spectrum of states. For the lithium atom calculations exist where excited-state energies and the corresponding wave functions were determined with high accuracy using various approaches such as: multi-reference self-consistent-field, full configuration interaction, Hylleraas-configuration-interaction, etc. [1–8]. Particularly relevant to the present work are the most recent calculations performed by Drake and Yan, Wang et al., and Puchalski et al. [2,7,8]. For the beryllium atoms only the lowest five $^2S$ states [9] and one $^2P$ state [10] were calculated. Recently, very accurate calculations were also performed for the lowest four $^2S$ states of the boron atom [11]. Capabilities now exist to extend the calculations of Rydberg states of small atoms to ten states and beyond. In this work such calculations are reported for two isotopologues of the lithium atom ($^6$Li and $^7$Li). The $^2S$ Rydberg series is expected to use.
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being considered.

Very accurate calculations of atomic spectra, especially when highly excited Rydberg states are being considered, is a challenging undertaking. Electron correlation, the effect originating from strong Coulombic interaction between the electrons, needs to be very accurately described. Moreover, there are some subtle effects due to relativism, QED, and finite nuclear mass and size that need to be also accounted for in the calculation. The most accurate description of the correlated motion of the electrons can be achieved if the basis functions used for expanding the spatial part of the wave function explicitly depends on the distances between the electrons (the so-called explicitly correlated basis functions). The explicitly correlated Gaussian functions (ECG) used in the present calculations are such functions. They were introduced to the field of atomic and molecular quantum-mechanical calculations by Boys [12]. An example of ECG atomic calculations is the work on the determination of the $3S \rightarrow 2S$ transition energy of the beryllium atom [13] where the calculated value agreed with the experimental results of Johansson [14,15] within the experimental error bar. ECGs were also used to calculate the lowest $S \rightarrow P$ transitions of beryllium [10].

The standard approach to calculate atomic spectra involves in the first step a calculation of the total non-relativistic energies of the considered states of the system with an infinite nuclear mass (INM). Subsequently, in the following steps the perturbation theory is used to account for energy corrections (adiabatic and non-adiabatic) due to the finite nuclear mass (FNW), as well as for relativistic and quantum-electrodynamics (QED) effects and effects due to the finite size of the nucleus. The leading corrections are calculated as expectation values of the corresponding quantum mechanical operators representing the effects. In the present work the non-relativistic calculations in the first step are performed using the FNW approach. Thus, the resulting energies and the corresponding wave functions depend on the nuclear mass of the considered isotopologue. Most of the adiabatic and non-adiabatic effects are already explicitly included at this stage of the calculation. In the approach used, the Hamiltonian representing the atom is first written in terms of Cartesian laboratory coordinates and then it is transformed to a new Cartesian coordinate system, whose first three coordinates are the laboratory-frame coordinates of the center of mass and the remaining coordinates are internal coordinates. In calculating the energy corrections due to relativistic and QED effects, the quantum mechanical operators representing these effects are also first transformed from the laboratory coordinate system to the new coordinate system and then they are used to calculate the corrections. As the leading corrections are expectation values of the operators calculated using the FNW wave functions, they are also specific to the particular isotopologues. This means that the so-called recoil effects are explicitly included in the corrections and do not need to be calculated using an approach based on the double perturbation theory.

Various types of ECG basis functions have been used by our research group in high-accuracy atomic and molecular calculations performed with an approach where the Born-Oppenheimer (BO) approximation has not been assumed and an approach based on the BO approximation [16,18,19]. High accuracy in those calculations have been achieved by performing extensive optimization of the non-linear parameters of the Gaussians by the variational minimization of the total energy of the system. To expedite the optimization, we have developed and implemented algorithms for calculating analytical derivatives of the total energy with respect to the non-linear parameters of the ECGs (i.e. the energy gradient) [16,17]. The implementation of the energy gradient, which is supplied to the optimization procedure to guide the process of changing the values of the non-linear parameters to lower the energy, has been key to generate very accurate results in the calculations. Thus, even though the Gaussians less accurately describe the cusps and the long-range behavior of the wave function in comparison with, for example, explicitly-correlated Slater functions, this deficiency can be effectively remediated with the use of sufficiently large ECG basis sets and by optimizing them with a gradient-based optimization procedure.

If a FNM approach is employed in an atomic calculation, it is expected that the internal motion of the electrons and the nucleus occurs around the center of mass. When the electrons are excited to higher electronic states the motion of the particles forming the atom becomes more complex. In this work we use plots of the electronic and nuclear densities to describe this motion. The densities are calculated with respect to the center of mass of the atom. In Rydberg states, which are subject of the present study, when one of the electrons moves away from the nucleus as it occupies states with a higher energy and with a larger average radius, the nucleus also starts to orbit around the center of mass with a larger radius. Also, in the process of Rydberg excitation, the electronic wave function acquires more radial nodes which the electronic density plot should reveal. Corresponding nodes should also appear in the nuclear density. A part of the present work is devoted to the analysis of the electronic and nuclear densities of the two major isotopologues, $^7\text{Li}$ and $^7\text{Li}$, of lithium.

As mentioned, the lowest eight $2S$ Rydberg states of lithium were subject of previous high accuracy calculations (i.e. states $2s, 3s, \ldots, 9s$). Apart from recalculating these eight states, in the calculations perform in this work, we also consider four more states (i.e. states $10s, 11s, 12s$, and $13s$) and transitions involving these states.

2. Method used in the calculations

The total non-relativistic Hamiltonian of an $n$-electron atom is first expressed in terms of laboratory Cartesian coordinates $\{\mathbf{R}_i\}$. The BO approximation is not assumed and, thus, the Hamiltonian describes a $(n + 1)$-particle system consisting of a nucleus and $n$ electrons. It depends on $3(n + 1)$ coordinates, $R_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n + 1$. Next separation of the motion of the center of mass (18) is performed. It effectively reduces the $(n + 1)$-particle problem to an $n$-particle problem. To perform the separation a new Cartesian coordinate system is introduced whose first three coordinates are the laboratory coordinates of the center of mass, $R_{\text{cm}}$, and the remaining $3n$ coordinates are internal coordinates. The internal coordinates are the position coordinates of the electrons relative to the position of the nucleus. The vector with length $3n$ of the internal coordinate is denoted by $\mathbf{r}$. It consists of single-electron position vectors $\mathbf{r}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. When the total Hamiltonian is transformed from the laboratory coordinate system to the new system of coordinates, it separates into the Hamiltonian representing the kinetic energy of the center-of-mass motion (dependent only on the center-of-mass coordinates) and the so-called internal Hamiltonian (dependent only on the internal coordinates). The separation is rigorous. The internal Hamiltonian, $H_{\text{int}}$, has the following form (in a.u.):

$$\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{\mu_i} \mathbf{V}_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i = 1}^{n} \frac{1}{m_i} \mathbf{V}_{ii}^2 + \sum_{i = 1}^{n} q_i \mathbf{E}_{\text{elec}}^q + \sum_{i = 1}^{n} q_i \mathbf{E}_{\text{qed}}^q,$$

(1)

where $q_i$ is the nuclear charge, $q_i = -1$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, are charges of the electrons, $m_o$ is the mass of the nucleus (10961.89865m_u for $^7\text{Li}$ and 12786.39228m_u for $^7\text{Li}$, where $m_o$ is the electron mass), $m_i = m_o + m_\mu$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ are the electron masses, and $\mu_i = m_o m_i/(m_o + m_\mu)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, are the reduced masses of the electrons. $\mathbf{T}$" denotes the transposition. The finite-nuclear-mass effects are represented by the mass-polarization term, $\sum_{i = 1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{m_\mu} \mathbf{V}_{ij}^2 \mathbf{V}_{ij}$, and by the reduced masses, $\mu_i$.

The standard procedure to account for the leading relativistic and QED effects is to expand the total energy in powers of the fine structure constant [20, 21]:

$$E_{\text{tot}} = E_{\text{rel}}^{(0)} + \alpha^2 E_{\text{rel}}^{(2)} + \alpha^4 E_{\text{rel}}^{(4)} + \alpha^6 E_{\text{rel}}^{(6)} + \ldots,$$

(2)

where $E_{\text{rel}}^{(0)}$ is an eigenvalue of the nonrelativistic Hamiltonian (1), $E_{\text{rel}}^{(2)}$ is...
represents the leading relativistic corrections, \( E_{\text{QED}}^{(3)} \) represents the leading QED corrections, and \( E_{\text{QED}}^{(4)} \) represents higher-order QED corrections. \( \alpha \) is the fine structure parameter; \( \alpha = 7.297352698 \times 10^{-3} \) [22]. In the tables, where the results of the present calculations are reported, term “rel” denotes \( E_{\text{rel}}^{(3)} \), term "QED" denotes \( E_{\text{QED}}^{(3)} \), and term "HQED" denotes \( E_{\text{QED}}^{(4)} \).

As mentioned the \( E_{\text{QED}}^{(2)} \) corrections are evaluated in this work in the framework of the perturbation theory using the non-BO non-relativistic wave function corresponding to zero-order energy \( E_{\text{0}} \). These corrections are expectation values of the respective effective Dirac–Breit
in the k−states according to the Eq. (11) in Ref. [8] that has the following form:

\[ \hat{H}_{\text{rel}} = \hat{H}_{\text{relMV}} + \hat{H}_{\text{D}} + \hat{H}_{\text{GOO}} + \hat{H}_{\text{G}}. \]  

(3)

The terms represent the mass–velocity (MV), Darwin (D), orbit-orbit (OO), and spin–spin (SS) interactions (the spin-orbit interaction does not appear as it is zero for S states). The explicit form of the effective Dirac–Breit operators in the internal coordinates can be found in Ref. [18].

\[ E^{(3)}_{\text{spf}} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left[ \frac{15}{32} + \ln(\alpha^{-2}) - \ln k_0 \right] \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle \hat{S}^i(r_i) \rangle \]

\[ + \left[ \frac{164}{32} + \frac{14}{\pi^2\ln\alpha} \right] \sum_{i < j} \langle \hat{S}^i(r_i) \hat{S}^j(r_j) \rangle \]

\[ - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\langle \hat{S}^2 \left( \frac{1}{r_i} \right) \right\rangle, \]

(4)

where \( \ln k_0 \) is the so-called Bethe logarithm [8] and \( \left\langle \hat{S}^2 \left( \frac{1}{r} \right) \right\rangle \) is the Araki-Sucher term [8]. \( \langle \hat{S}^i(r_i) \rangle \) and \( \langle \hat{S}^i(r_i) \hat{S}^j(r_j) \rangle \) are expectation values of the one-electron and two-electron three-dimensional Dirac delta functions. In our calculations, we do not include the term proportional to Bethe logarithm, \( \ln k_0 \).

The spatial parts of the wave functions of the twelve lowest \( ^2S \) states of lithium considered in this work are expanded in terms of following ECGs:

\[ \phi = \exp[-r^2A_{\text{G}}r], \]

(5)

where \( A_{\text{G}} \) is \( 3n \times 3n \) symmetric matrix. Basis functions (5) need to be square integrable in order to be used in expanding wave functions of bound states. This only happens if the \( A_{\text{G}} \) matrix is positive definite. To make \( A_{\text{G}} \) positive definite it is represented in the Cholesky-factored form as \( A_{\text{G}} = (L_k L_k^T) \otimes I_3 \), where \( L_k \) is a \( n \times n \) lower triangular matrix, \( I_3 \) is a 3 unit matrix, and \( \otimes \) denotes the Kronecker product. With the \( L_k \) matrix elements being any real numbers, \( A_{\text{G}} \) is positive definite. In the variational optimization performed in this work for the ECG basis set of each considered state the matrix elements of \( L_k \) are the variational parameters. Due to the above mentioned property of the Cholesky factorization they can be varied without any restrictions in the range form \( -\infty \) to \( +\infty \).

The spin-free formalism [25,26] is used to enforce the proper permutational symmetry of the wave function. In this formalism, a projector, which introduces the desired symmetry properties, is constructed using the standard procedure involving Young operators [27]. For the \( ^2S \) states of the lithium atom the symmetry projector can be chosen as: \( Y = (1 + P_{12})(1-P_{23}) \), where \( P_{ij} \) permutes the labels of the spatial coordinates of the i-th and j-th electrons. In the calculations of the Hamiltonian and overlap matrix elements, as well as in the operators representing the relativistic corrections, the projector \( Y \) is moved from the "bra" to the "ket" and appears as \( P = Y \Phi \) in the "ket" part of the integrals (\( \langle \Phi | \hat{\rho} | \Phi \rangle \)).

In the approach used in this work the variational calculation for each state is performed separately and independently from other states. For each state a different basis set is generated by the minimization of the total energy of that state with respect to the \( L_k \) matrix elements. The linear expansion coefficients, \( c_k \), of the wave function in terms of basis functions are obtained in the standard way by solving the secular equation.

The variational minimization of the second or a higher root of the nonrelativistic Hamiltonian requires the corresponding eigenfunction to be kept orthogonal to the eigenfunctions of the lower roots (MacDonald-Hylleraas-Undheim theorem). Even though the optimization of the ECG basis set and the generation of the wave function for each state is carried out in a separate calculation, the procedure used makes the calculated wave function orthogonal to the wave functions of all lower states expressed in terms of the basis set used in the calculation. Thus, all total energies obtained in this work are strict upper bounds to the corresponding exact energy values. However, the final wave functions obtained for different states are not, strictly speaking, exactly orthogonal to each other, as they are obtained in different basis sets. They would be exactly orthogonal if the basis sets are complete. As the total energies of the twelve considered states are uniformly very well converged, the deviation from the exact orthogonality of the final wave functions should be very small.

Growing the basis set is a multistep process. It involves choosing a small starting set of ECGs (for the lowest state this set is generated using an orbital guess obtained using a standard AO basis set; for a higher...
Table 3
Computed $n_s \rightarrow 2s$, $n = 2, ..., 9$, transition frequencies (in cm$^{-1}$) for the lithium atom in comparison with the previously calculate values (Theo) and experimental results (Exp). The subscripts (nr, rel, rel + QED, and rel + HQED) indicate the inclusion of relativistic and QED corrections in the calculations. The $^7$Li results are obtained using a simple polynomial-based extrapolation procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Isotope</th>
<th>Basis Size</th>
<th>$\Delta E_{nr}$</th>
<th>$\Delta E_{rel}$</th>
<th>$\Delta E_{rel+QED}$</th>
<th>$\Delta E_{rel+QED+HQED}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3s \rightarrow 2s$</td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>39985.113916</td>
<td>39987.8464</td>
<td>39987.3767</td>
<td>39987.3693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>39985.113903</td>
<td>39987.8464</td>
<td>39987.3767</td>
<td>39987.3693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [7]</td>
<td></td>
<td>39987.91791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Exp [28]</td>
<td></td>
<td>39987.912189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 11000</td>
<td>27203.815137</td>
<td>27205.904152</td>
<td>27205.535891</td>
<td>27205.716661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [7]</td>
<td></td>
<td>27205.7120086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4s \rightarrow 2s$</td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>9500</td>
<td>35009.734652</td>
<td>35012.26234</td>
<td>35011.82389</td>
<td>35011.81709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>35009.7346510</td>
<td>35012.26235</td>
<td>35011.82390</td>
<td>35011.81709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 11500</td>
<td>35009.7346500</td>
<td>35012.26238</td>
<td>35011.82392</td>
<td>35011.81711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>35011.82392(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Exp [29]</td>
<td></td>
<td>35011.82392(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 11500</td>
<td>35009.2456218</td>
<td>35011.77335</td>
<td>35011.33490</td>
<td>35011.32810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>35011.33490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5s \rightarrow 2s$</td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>38297.036272</td>
<td>38299.708715</td>
<td>38299.24767</td>
<td>38299.24061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>38297.036283</td>
<td>38299.708750</td>
<td>38299.24767</td>
<td>38299.24061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>38299.24767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Exp [30]</td>
<td></td>
<td>38299.2406(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 12000</td>
<td>38296.502755</td>
<td>38299.17498</td>
<td>38298.71434</td>
<td>38298.70719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>38298.70719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6s \rightarrow 2s$</td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>39985.113916</td>
<td>39987.8464</td>
<td>39987.3767</td>
<td>39987.3694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>11500</td>
<td>39985.113903</td>
<td>39987.8464</td>
<td>39987.3767</td>
<td>39987.3694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 12500</td>
<td>39985.113895</td>
<td>39987.8464</td>
<td>39987.3767</td>
<td>39987.3694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>39987.3767(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Exp [30]</td>
<td></td>
<td>39987.3695(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 12500</td>
<td>39984.557690</td>
<td>39987.2902</td>
<td>39986.8205</td>
<td>39986.8132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>39986.8132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7s \rightarrow 2s$</td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>40965.480437</td>
<td>40968.2409</td>
<td>40967.7671</td>
<td>40967.7598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>40965.480373</td>
<td>40968.2412</td>
<td>40967.7674</td>
<td>40967.7600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>40965.480335</td>
<td>40968.2421</td>
<td>40967.7681</td>
<td>40967.7607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>40967.7681(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Exp [30]</td>
<td></td>
<td>40967.7624(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 13000</td>
<td>40964.911029</td>
<td>40967.6726</td>
<td>40967.1986</td>
<td>40967.1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>40967.1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8s \rightarrow 2s$</td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>11500</td>
<td>41584.88651</td>
<td>41587.6630</td>
<td>41587.1869</td>
<td>41587.1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>41584.88561</td>
<td>41587.6623</td>
<td>41587.1861</td>
<td>41587.1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>13500</td>
<td>41584.88531</td>
<td>41587.6622</td>
<td>41587.1860</td>
<td>41587.1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>41587.1860(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Exp [30]</td>
<td></td>
<td>41587.1792(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 13500</td>
<td>41584.30776</td>
<td>41587.0847</td>
<td>41586.6086</td>
<td>41586.6012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>41586.6012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9s \rightarrow 2s$</td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>42001.03151</td>
<td>42003.8159</td>
<td>42003.3386</td>
<td>42003.3312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>42001.03088</td>
<td>42003.8176</td>
<td>42003.3400</td>
<td>42003.3326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>42003.3400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 14000</td>
<td>42001.03053</td>
<td>42003.8178</td>
<td>42003.3401</td>
<td>42003.3327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>42003.3401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li 14000</td>
<td>42000.44745</td>
<td>42003.2349</td>
<td>42002.7572</td>
<td>42002.7498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^7$Li Theo [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>42002.7498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next small groups of functions are added to the basis set and, after each group is optimized, the whole basis set is reoptimized. The reoptimization involves cycling over all functions, one by one, several times and reoptimizing their nonlinear parameters. All optimizations are carried out using this one-function-at-the-time approach. The initial guess for an added function is generated by selecting a set of most contributing functions already included in the basis set, randomly perturbing their non-linear parameters, and choosing the functions which lower the energy the most. The use of the analytic gradient is crucial in making the optimization efficient. The above described strategy is found efficient and numerically
stable. It allows at all stages of the basis growing and optimizing process to control and, if necessary, eliminate any linear dependency that may occur between the basis functions. As such dependencies may lead to numerical inaccuracies and may destabilize the calculation, they have to be eliminated.

In this work the variational optimization of the non-linear parameters of the Gaussians is carried out using the FNM approach and performed only for the $^7\text{Li}$ isotopologue. The $^7\text{Li}$ basis sets for all considered states are used in the calculations for the $^6\text{Li}$ isotopologue, as well as the INM energy calculations (for $^7\text{Li}$) without reoptimization of the ECG non-linear parameters. As our previous calculations of atomic isotopologues have shown [19], no reoptimization of the nonlinear variational parameters is needed when states of different isotopes are calculated. The adjustment of the linear coefficients, $c_i$, through re-diagonalization of the Hamiltonian matrix suffices to describe relatively small changes in the wave function and the energy caused by a change of the nuclear mass.

As mentioned in the introduction, the FNM approach used in the present calculations allows to describe the coupled motion of both electrons and the nuclei using nuclear and electron density plots. The electron density, $\rho_e$, at point $\xi$ relative to the center of mass of the atom, $R_{CM}$, is evaluated as the expectation value of the following 3D Dirac delta function:

$$\rho_e(\xi) = \langle \delta(R_e - R_{CM} - \xi) \rangle,$$

where $R_e$ is the position vector of one of the electrons in the laboratory coordinate system. As the FNM ECG wave function is used in the expectation value calculation, slightly different densities are obtained for $^6\text{Li}$ and $^7\text{Li}$. The nuclear density, $\rho_n$, at point $\xi$, is evaluated in a similar way as the expectation value of the following delta function:

$$\rho_n(\xi) = \langle \delta(R_n - R_e - \xi) \rangle,$$

where $R_n$ is the position vector of nucleus in the laboratory coordinate system. Electronic and nuclear density plots for some selected states of $^6\text{Li}$ and $^7\text{Li}$ are compared in the result section.

3. Results

The ECG atomic code for $S$ states written in Fortran90 and employing the MPI (message passing interface) is used in the present calculations. The considered twelve Rydberg $S$ states of lithium are divided into two groups. The first group comprising eight lowest states, $2s$, $3s$, $4s$, ... , and $9s$ was calculated with high accuracy before [8]. The second group comprising states $10s$, $11s$, $12s$, and $13s$ has not been calculated yet by others. The purpose of the calculations performed for the first group of states is to determine the accuracy of the calculations using ECGs with more accurate calculations performed with products of Slater-type orbitals multiplied by powers of the distances between the three electrons and the nucleus, $r_1$, $r_2$, and $r_3$, and by powers of inter-electron distances, $r_{12}$, $r_{13}$, and $r_{23}$. The results for states 2s-10s are collected in Table 1. The results for states 11s-13s are shown in Table 2. Both sets of results include the non-relativistic energies, $E_{\text{NR}}$, the mass-density and orbit-orbit relativistic corrections, $\langle \mathcal{H}_{\text{BMV}} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{H}_{\text{OOO}} \rangle$, the expectation values of the one-electron and two electron Dirac delta functions, $\langle \delta(r_i) \rangle$ and $\langle \delta^2(r_i) \rangle$, and the Araki-Sucher QED term, $\langle \psi^2(1/r_i) \rangle$. The convergence is only shown for the $^7\text{Li}$ isotopologue. The results for the $^6\text{Li}$ isotopologue and for $^7\text{Li}$ are only given for the best basis sets. The $^7\text{Li}$ results are obtained by setting the mass of the nucleus to infinity in the calculations (in practice, setting it to a large number).

The number of the basis functions used in the calculations varies from state to state. It increases with the excitation level of the atom. This is necessary because, as the excitation level increases, the wave functions become more oscillatory and this requires more basis functions to be used in the wave-function expansion. For the ground $2s$ state, the largest number of the ECGs used is 10500 and the results obtained with 8500, 9500, and 10,500 ECGs are shown in Table 1. For state $9s$ we show the results obtained with 12,000, 13,000, and 14,000 ECGs. For state $10s$ the largest basis set used comprises 14500 ECGs and for states 10s, 11s, 12s, and 13s the largest set consists of 16000 ECGs. To assess the quality of the present results, one can compare, for example, the $^7\text{Li}$ non-relativistic energies for the lowest two states with the recent values of Wang et al. [7] obtained with Hylleraas-type functions. Their energies of $^7\text{Li}$ are $-7.47860622991050(5)$ and $-7.35409842144436(7)$ hartree are lower than our energies obtained with ECGs in the 13-th decimal digit by 6 and 7, respectively.

The data from Table 1 and Table 2 are used to calculate the $ns \rightarrow 2s$ de-excitation transition frequencies for all twelve states considered in this work. The calculations are performed for both $^6\text{Li}$ and $^7\text{Li}$ isotopologues. The results are shown in Table 3 and Table 4. The results
are compared with the previous calculations [2,7,8] and with experimental results [28–30].

In general, our results agree well with the results of the previous calculations [8]. The agreement is slightly worse for lower states than for the higher states. We attribute this to not including in the present calculations some higher order effects, which the previous calculations accounted for. The novelty of the present work are the predictions of the transition frequencies involving states $s_{10}$, $s_{11}$, $s_{12}$, and $s_{13}$. We estimate the reliability of these predictions to be by about one order of magnitude lower than for states $s_8$, $s_9$, and $s_{10}$.

As predicted by Lorenzen and Niemax [31], the value of the quantum defect effect should be approximately constant for a series of excitations of a valence electron to Rydberg states with a particular angular momentum quantum number. For the states considered in this work, the $ns$ states, quantum defect effect is indeed almost constant and ranges from 0.41146 for the $2s$ state to 0.39831 for the $1s$ state. The quantum defect effect for the $S$ Rydberg series was analyzed by Bubin and Adamowicz [32] and two models were tested for more accurate prediction of the transition energies of the states in the series with respect to the ground $2s^2$ state using QDE-like formulas fitted to the experimental transitions. For states $s_{10}$, $s_{11}$, $s_{12}$, and $s_{13}$, the more sophisticated of the two models (Model 2) predicted the transition

---

Fig. 1. Radial nuclear densities of Rydberg states 2s, 6s, and 11s of $^7$Li (plots a, c, and e), and the corresponding radial electron densities (plots b, d, and f). Both sets of densities shown with solid lines. Dash lines show densities of a hydrogen-like atom whose nuclear mass is equal to the nuclear mass of $^7$Li and the nuclear charge is +1. The hydrogen-like densities are included to show the Rydberg character of the $^7$Li densities. The densities are calculated using Eqs. (7) and (6). They are multiplied by $4\pi r^2$ to make them be radial densities, as the considered states are spherically symmetric.
energies to be $42295.82, 42509.73, 42670.72,$ and $42794.93$ cm$^{-1}$, respectively, for $^6$Li, and $42296.41, 42510.32, 42671.32,$ and $42795.52$ cm$^{-1}$, respectively, for $^7$Li. These values are in good agreement with the transition frequencies calculated in the present work of $42295.522, 42509.59, 42670.76,$ and $42795.26$ cm$^{-1}$ for $^6$Li, and $42296.109, 42510.18, 42671.35,$ and $42795.85$ cm$^{-1}$ for $^7$Li.

The $2s \rightarrow 2s$ deexcitation transition frequencies calculated for $^7$Li and $^6$Li enable calculation of the isotope shifts of the corresponding transitions. As these shifts can be measured experimentally, their theoretical prediction may provide valuable information for such measurements. In moving from the $^7$Li to $^6$Li transitions, a down-shift of the transitions is predicted. The shift is equal to $-0.38$ cm$^{-1}$ for the $3s \rightarrow 2s$ transition, to $-0.49$ cm$^{-1}$ for the $4s \rightarrow 2s$, and to $-0.53, -0.56, -0.57, -0.58, -0.58, -0.59, -0.59, -0.59, -0.58$, and $-0.60$ cm$^{-1}$ for the $ns \rightarrow 2s, n = 5, ..., 13$, transitions, respectively.

To illustrate the nature of the twelve $2s$ Rydberg states calculated in this work with the FNM approach we show plots of the nuclear and electronic densities for some selected states (states $2s, 6s,$ and $11s$). The density plots are shown in Fig. 1. The densities are calculated with the approach described in the methodology section. As mentioned, the plots provide a representation of the coupled motion of the electrons and the nucleus around the center of mass of the atom. This should be manifested by the number and the character of the maxima of the electronic densities matching the maxima in the nuclear densities. Naturally, as the mass of the nucleus is much larger than the electronic mass, the radius of the motion of the nucleus around the center of mass and, consequently, the distances of the maxima from the center of mass in the nuclear density should be much smaller than those in the electronic density (the distance of the maxima in the two densities should scale as the ratio of the nuclear and electronic masses). Upon analysis of the plots, this is indeed what one observes. It is also interesting to compare the densities obtained for the $^6$Li and $^7$Li isotopologues. One may expect that the electronic densities of the two isotopologues for a particular state should be almost identical. However, the peaks in the nuclear densities of $^7$Li should be shifted closer by about 20% to the center of mass in comparison to the peaks in the $^6$Li density (the masses of the two isotopologues differ by about 20%). Indeed, one can notice such as a shift in the nuclear-density plots for state $13s$ shown in Fig. 2. Also, as one can notice, as the electronic density becomes increasingly more diffuse with the increasing level of the excitation, the nuclear density also diffuses in space. This is a reflection of the average distances of both the electrons and the nucleus from the center of mass of the atom increasing with the excitation level.

4. Summary

In summary, explicitly correlate all-electron Gaussian functions are used to calculate the lowest twelve $2s$ Rydberg states of the lithium atom. While for states $2s, 3s, ...,$ and $9s$ high-accuracy calculations have been done before [8], the calculations of states $10s, 11s, 12s,$ and $13s$ presented in this work are done for the first time. The total energies of the twelve states include the leading relativistic and QED corrections. These energies are used to calculate transition frequencies corresponding to de-exciting the atom from each of the states to the $2s$ ground state. These frequencies are compared with the results of the previous calculations [8] and with the high-resolution experimental results [28–30]. The comparison shows that the present results are consistent with the previous results. This lends credence to the predicted transitions involving states $10s, 11s, 12s$, and $13s$. These predictions can be used to experimentally measure these frequencies. As the method employed in the present calculations uses the finite-nuclear-mass approach, slightly different sets of transitions are obtained for $^6$Li and $^7$Li. The isotope shifts, which can be derived from the present results, are also measurable quantities that can be determined experimentally.

The finite-nuclear-mass approach used in the present work enables an analysis of the coupling to the motions of the electrons and the nucleus around the center of mass of the atom. In this work the analysis is performed using the electronic and nuclear densities. These densities are determined relative to the center of mass of the atom and plotted as functions of the distance from this center. As expected, as the level of the Rydberg excitation increases the electronic density becomes increasingly more oscillatory and diffuse. Due to the coupling of the electronic and nuclear motions similar oscillations appear in the nuclear density. For each maximum in the electronic density there is a matching maximum in the nuclear density. The relative heights of the maxima in the electronic density are similar to the maxima heights in the nuclear density. However, the two densities differ in terms of their radial extent, with the extent of the nuclear density being much more compressed towards the center of mass than the electronic density. The compression ratio is equal to the electron/nucleus mass ratio.
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