

Blackbody Radiation Shifts in Optical Atomic Clocks

Marianna S. Safronova, Mikhail G. Kozlov, and Charles W. Clark

Abstract—A review of recent theoretical calculations of blackbody radiation (BBR) shifts in optical atomic clocks is presented. We summarize previous results for monovalent ions that were obtained by a relativistic all-order single-double method, where all single and double excitations of the Dirac-Fock wave function are included to all orders of perturbation theory. A recently developed method for accurate calculations of BBR shifts in divalent atoms is then presented. This approach combines the relativistic all-order method and the configuration interaction method, which provides for accurate treatment of correlation corrections in atoms with two valence electrons. Calculations of the BBR shifts in B^+ , Al^+ , and In^+ have enabled us to reduce the present fractional uncertainties in the frequencies of their clock transitions as measured at room temperature: to 4×10^{-19} for Al^+ and 10^{-18} for B^+ and In^+ . These uncertainties approach recent estimates of the limits of precision of currently proposed optical atomic clocks. We discuss directions of future theoretical developments for reducing clock uncertainties resulting from blackbody radiation shifts.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE International System of Units (SI) defines the unit of time, the second, as “the duration of 9 192 631 770 periods of the radiation corresponding to the transition between the two hyperfine levels of the ground state of the cesium 133 atom,” meaning, to be precise, “a cesium atom at rest at a temperature of 0 K” [1]. However, in light of recent advances in optical measurements, the SI governance body has recommended several radiation sources for secondary realizations of the SI second, notably certain optical transitions of trapped cold atoms and ions such as Sr^+ , Hg^+ , Yb^+ , and Sr [1]–[3]. In 2010, the $^{27}Al^+ 3s^2 1S_0-3s3p 3P_0$ transition was used to construct a quantum-logic optical clock with an estimated fractional frequency uncertainty of 8.6×10^{-18} [4]. Development of such precise frequency standards opens the way to applications such as precise measurements of time variation of the fundamental constants, testing of physics postulates,

geodesy, inertial navigation, magnetometry, and tracking of deep-space probes [5], and potentially to a more precise definition of the second.

Any definition of the second should be based on a clock decoupled from its particular environment. Thermal fluctuations of the electromagnetic field—blackbody radiation (BBR)—are pervasive and can only be suppressed by cooling the clock. Through the ac Stark effect, the BBR at any nonzero temperature induces small shifts in atomic energy levels. At room temperature, the differential BBR shift of the two levels of a clock transition makes one of the largest irreducible contributions to the uncertainty budget of optical atomic clocks. Thus, measured clock transition frequencies must be corrected in practice for the effect of the BBR shift, which is quite difficult to measure directly.

In this paper, we review the current status of the theoretical calculations of BBR shifts in optical frequency standards. We consider the most recent developments in improving the accuracy of BBR shifts in Ca^+ and Al^+ . In the latter case, our recent calculations reduce the fractional frequency uncertainty to 4×10^{-19} , which is close to the fundamental limits of cooled ion frequency standards because of effects such as micromotion in the trap [6], [7]. We present new calculations of BBR shifts for B^+ and In^+ , which are candidates for quantum-logic spectroscopy as used with Al^+ [8]. We also discuss future possibilities for improvement of theoretical calculations of BBR shifts in various systems.

The overall BBR shift of the clock frequency is the difference between BBR shifts of the initial and final levels involved in the transition. It is related to the difference of the static electric-dipole polarizabilities between the clock states, $\Delta\alpha_0$, by [9]

$$\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}} = -\frac{1}{2}(831.9 \text{ V/m})^2 \left(\frac{T(\text{K})}{300}\right)^4 \Delta\alpha_0(1 + \eta), \quad (1)$$

where η is a small dynamic correction resulting from the frequency distribution of the BBR field. Evaluation of η requires knowledge of the electric-dipole matrix elements of the transitions that make the dominant contributions to the polarizabilities. Higher multipolar contributions to the BBR shift are suppressed by powers of the fine structure constant, α , and are insignificant in present uncertainty budgets. For example, magnetic-dipole (M1) contributions are suppressed by a factor of α^2 [9]; we estimate the M1 contribution to the Al^+ BBR shift to be less than 10^{-5} Hz, which is negligible at the present level of accuracy [10].

For optical versus microwave transitions, the polarizabilities of the two clock states are, in principle, com-

Manuscript received July 29, 2011; accepted October 4, 2011. This research was performed under the sponsorship of the US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, and was supported by the National Science Foundation under Physics Frontiers Center Grant PHY-0822671. The work of M. G. Kozlov was supported in part by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research grant number 11-02-00943.

M. S. Safronova is with the Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Delaware, Newark, DE (e-mail: msafro@udel.edu).

M. G. Kozlov is with the Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Neutron Research Division, Gatchina, Russian Federation.

C. W. Clark is with the Joint Quantum Institute, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Electron and Optical Physics Division, Gaithersburg, MD.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TUFFC.2012.2213>

TABLE I. SUMMARY OF THE FRACTIONAL BBR SHIFTS $\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}/\nu_0$ AND THEIR UNCERTAINTIES AT $T = 300\text{K}$ IN VARIOUS FREQUENCY STANDARDS.

Atom	Clock transition	ν_0 (Hz)	$\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}/\nu_0$	Uncertainty in $\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}/\nu_0$	Reference
Rb	$5s (F = 2 - F = 1)$	8.34×10^9	-1.25×10^{-14}	4×10^{-17}	Safronova <i>et al.</i> 2010 [11]
Cs	$6s (F = 4 - F = 3)$	9.19×10^9	-1.7×10^{-14}	3×10^{-17}	Simon <i>et al.</i> 1998 [12]
Ca ⁺	$4s-3d_{5/2}$	4.11×10^{14}	9.2×10^{-16}	1×10^{-17}	Safronova <i>et al.</i> 2011 [13]
Sr ⁺	$5s-4d_{5/2}$	4.45×10^{14}	5.6×10^{-16}	2×10^{-17}	Jiang <i>et al.</i> 2009 [14]
Mg	$3s^2 1S_0-3s3p 3P_0$	6.55×10^{14}	-3.9×10^{-16}	1×10^{-17}	Porsev <i>et al.</i> 2006 [9]
Ca	$4s^2 1S_0-4s4p 3P_0$	4.54×10^{14}	-2.6×10^{-16}	4×10^{-17}	Porsev <i>et al.</i> 2006 [9]
Sr	$5s^2 1S_0-5s5p 3P_0$	4.29×10^{14}	-5.5×10^{-15}	7×10^{-17}	Porsev <i>et al.</i> 2006 [9]
Yb	$6s^2 1S_0-6s6p 3P_0$	5.18×10^{14}	-2.6×10^{-15}	3×10^{-16}	Porsev <i>et al.</i> 2006 [9]
Hg	$6s^2 1S_0-6s6p 3P_0$	1.13×10^{15}	-1.6×10^{-16}		Hachisu <i>et al.</i> 2008 [15]
B ⁺	$2s^2 1S_0-2s2p 3P_0$	1.12×10^{15}	1.42×10^{-17}	1×10^{-18}	Safronova <i>et al.</i> 2011 [10]
Al ⁺	$3s^2 1S_0-3s3p 3P_0$	1.12×10^{15}	-3.8×10^{-18}	4×10^{-19}	Safronova <i>et al.</i> 2011 [10]
In ⁺	$5s^2 1S_0-5s5p 3P_0$	1.27×10^{15}	-1.36×10^{-17}	1×10^{-18}	Safronova <i>et al.</i> 2011 [10]
Yb ⁺	$6s-5d 2D_{3/2}$	6.88×10^{14}	-5.1×10^{-16}	1×10^{-16}	Tamm <i>et al.</i> 2009 [16]
Yb ⁺	$6s-4f^3 6s^2 2F_{7/2}$	6.42×10^{14}	-2.5×10^{-16}	1×10^{-16}	Hosaka <i>et al.</i> 2009 [17]

ν_0 is the absolute transition frequency.

pletely independent. Theoretical evaluation of the BBR shift requires accurate calculation of the polarizabilities of the individual states. Only the scalar part of the polarizability contributes to the BBR shift, because any tensor component of the polarizability averages out as a result of the isotropy of blackbody radiation.

A useful figure of merit for the frequency standard is the fractional BBR shift, $\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}/\nu_0$, where ν_0 is the absolute transition frequency. A summary of the fractional BBR shifts and their uncertainties at $T = 300\text{K}$ is given in Table I for various atomic transitions [9]–[17]. We also give the fractional BBR shifts in Rb and Cs microwave frequency standards [11], [12] to demonstrate their size relative to the BBR shifts in optical frequency standards. To the best of our knowledge, the values with the smallest uncertainty of the BBR shift at $T = 300\text{K}$ are listed for each frequency standard. This uncertainty does not include uncertainty resulting from imperfect temperature control. With the exception of the Cs value [12], all data are results of the theoretical calculations.

From the theoretical standpoint, the number of the valence electrons (and the presence of core holes) defines the most accurate theoretical approach that can be used. For example, calculations of the BBR shift in Ca⁺ and Sr⁺ have the same degree of complexity, but the treatment of Sr is considerably more involved than that of Sr⁺. The main sources of uncertainties in these cases also differ. Most of the present optical clock proposals involve either monovalent or divalent systems, with Yb⁺, Hg⁺, and Ag being notable exceptions because of low-lying excitation energies of their subvalence electrons. We discuss monovalent and divalent systems separately, and outline possible approaches for treating other systems.

II. MONOVALENT IONS: CA⁺ AND SR⁺

Both Ca⁺ and Sr⁺ ions are monovalent systems with atomic structure similar to that of their alkali neighbors, K and Rb. However, in the ions, the lowest nd states lie

below the lowest np state, leading to the possibility of using these low-lying metastable nd states for the development of optical frequency standards.

The overall BBR shift of the Ca⁺ $4s-3d_{5/2}$ and Sr⁺ $5s-4d_{5/2}$ clock transition frequencies is calculated as the difference between the BBR shifts of the individual levels involved in the transition. For example, in the case of Ca⁺, the BBR shift is given by

$$\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}(4s - 3d_{5/2}) = -\frac{1}{2}[\alpha_0(3d_{5/2}) - \alpha_0(4s)] \times (831.9 \text{ V/m})^2 \left(\frac{T(\text{K})}{300}\right)^4. \quad (2)$$

The polarizability difference, $\Delta\alpha_0$, is negative when the upper state polarizability is smaller than the lower state polarizability. A negative polarizability difference means the frequency shift is positive. Both Ca⁺ and Sr⁺ polarizabilities can be obtained using the same approaches as for the alkali-metal atoms, because of their similar electronic structure. The most accurate calculations of the relevant ns and $nd_{5/2}$ polarizabilities in these systems have been recently carried out using the relativistic all-order method [13], [14].

The relativistic all-order method including single-, double-, and partial-valence triple excitations has been applied to accurate calculations of energies, transition amplitudes, hyperfine constants, static and dynamic electric-dipole polarizabilities, quadrupole and octupole polarizabilities, magic wavelengths, atomic quadrupole moments, C_3 and C_6 coefficients, isotope shifts, and other properties of a large number of monovalent atoms and ions as well as the calculation of parity-violating amplitudes and electric-dipole moment (EDM) enhancement factors. We refer the reader to the review [18] and references therein for a detailed description of this method, its applications, and extensions. The accuracy of this approach is well understood, which enables accurate estimation of the uncertainties in calculations of the clock state polarizabilities and the resulting BBR shifts.

The valence scalar $\alpha_0(v)$ polarizability of Ca^+ or Sr^+ in an excited state v is given by [in atomic units (a.u.)]

$$\alpha_0(v) = \frac{2}{3(2j_v + 1)} \sum_{nlj} \frac{|\langle v || D || nlj \rangle|^2}{E_{nlj} - E_v}. \quad (3)$$

Unless stated otherwise, we use a.u. for all matrix elements and polarizabilities throughout this paper. We note that atomic units for α are converted to SI units via $\alpha/h[\text{Hz}/(\text{V}/\text{m})^2] = 2.48832 \times 10^{-8} \alpha$ [a.u.], where the conversion coefficient is $4\pi\epsilon_0 a_0^3/h$ and the Planck constant, h , is factored out.

The ionic core polarizability must be added to the valence term given by (3) and corrected for the presence of the respective valence electron (term VC). This core correction VC term is small and is calculated in the random phase approximation (RPA). This partitioning of the core and valence polarizability contributions is discussed in detail in [19].

Although the sum over the excited states in (3) converges rapidly for the lower state, this is not the case for the upper $nd_{5/2}$ state, where the contribution of highly-excited $nf_{7/2}$ states is large and must be treated accurately. This problem has been recently resolved in [13] by performing the all-order calculation for n up to $n = 26$, resulting in factor of 3 improvement in the accuracy of $3d_{5/2}$ polarizability over previous calculations (see [20] and references therein). In previous work, contributions from highly-excited states were calculated in the Dirac-Hartree-Fock (DHF) approximation and adjusted for missing correlation using a semi-empirical procedure resulting in the larger uncertainty [20]. We refer the reader to [13] for further details of the most recent polarizability calculations.

We list contributions to the Ca^+ $3d_{5/2}$ polarizability (in a.u.) [13] in Table II. The final result is compared with other calculations [20]–[22].

Substituting the values for the $4s$ and $3d_{5/2}$ static polarizabilities, 76.1(5) a.u. and 31.8(3) a.u., respectively, into Eq. (2) yields 0.3815(44) Hz [13] for the BBR shift. (Uncertainties are given in parentheses.) The dynamic corrections were evaluated in [13] to be $\eta = 0.0012$ and $\eta = 0.0044$ for the $4s$ and $3d_{5/2}$ states, respectively, following [9]. The resulting dynamic correction to the BBR shift is only 0.1%, -0.0004 Hz.

Mitroy and Zhang [21] used non-relativistic configuration interaction with a semi-empirical core potential (CICP) approach. The CICP values are in good agreement with our results, taking into account the accuracy of both calculations. The comparison with coupled-cluster calculations of [22] is discussed in detail in [13]. In summary, the present value of the BBR shift, 0.3811(44) Hz, is consistent with other calculations, 0.380(14) Hz [20], 0.37(1) Hz [22], and 0.368 Hz [21], but is three times more accurate.

The all-order calculation of the BBR shift of the Sr^+ $4s$ – $3d_{5/2}$ clock transition is similar to that for Ca^+ . The dynamic contribution is more significant in Sr^+ , where it

TABLE II. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE $3d_{5/2}$ SCALAR POLARIZABILITY OF Ca^+ IN a_0^3 .

Contribution	α_0
$4p_{3/2}$	22.78(25)
$np_{3/2}$	0.03
$4f_{5/2}$	0.12
$nf_{5/2}$	0.17
$4f_{7/2}$	2.39(5)
$5f_{7/2}$	0.77(1)
$6f_{7/2}$	0.35(1)
$7f_{7/2}$	0.19(1)
$(8\text{--}12)f_{7/2}$	0.31(1)
$(13\text{--}26)f_{7/2}$	1.39(4)
$nf_{7/2}$	0.27(15)
Core	3.26(3)
VC	−0.23(1)
Total	31.8(3)
Ref. [20]	32.0(1.1)
Ref. [21]	32.73
Ref. [22]	29.5(1.0)

Uncertainties are given in parentheses. The final results are compared with other theory [20]–[22].

contributes nearly 1% (-0.002 Hz) to the BBR shift of 0.250(9) Hz.

In comparison with Ca^+ , the lower accuracy of the calculated Sr^+ BBR shift is due to greater cancelation between polarizabilities of the upper and lower clock states. The individual uncertainties in the Sr^+ $5s$ and $4d_{5/2}$ static polarizabilities, 91.3(9) a.u. and 62.0(5) a.u., respectively, are about 1%, which is similar to that of the corresponding states in Ca^+ .

Further reduction of the theoretical uncertainty would be very difficult because it would require predicting several E1 matrix elements to significantly better than 0.5%. On the other hand, experimental measurement of the dc Stark shift of the clock transition would be essentially equivalent to the measurement of the BBR shift, particularly for Ca^+ , where dynamic correction contributes only 0.1%. Very accurate measurements of the ground-state static polarizabilities would also lead to the improvement of the BBR shift values.

III. DIVALENT SYSTEMS

A. Mg, Ca, Sr, Hg, and Yb

Although the all-order approach produced accurate results for BBR shifts for optical clocks based on the monovalent ions, such as Ca^+ and Sr^+ , it cannot be straightforwardly extended to the BBR calculations in divalent systems such as Sr or Al^+ . The main difficulties of such an extension are outlined in [23]. The correlation corrections associated with the interaction of valence electrons are very large and are described poorly by perturbative treatments. On the other hand, the configuration interaction (CI) method is well suited for the accurate treatment of valence-valence correlations as long as number of the valence electrons is small. However, core excitations are

neglected or only a small number of them are included, leading to a significant loss of accuracy for heavy atoms. Therefore, an approach that combines configuration interaction with many-body perturbation theory (MBPT) was developed in [24]. The CI+MBPT approach allows one to incorporate core excitations in the CI method by constructing an effective Hamiltonian that incorporates certain perturbation theory terms. The CI method is then applied to the H^{eff} to obtain improved energies and wave functions. The CI+MBPT method was used in [9] and [15] to calculate BBR shifts in $ns^2\ ^1S_0$ – $nsnp\ ^3P_0$ clock transitions in Mg, Ca, Sr, Yb, and Hg. Where available, experimental data was used for the dipole matrix element associated with dominant contributions. The Sr BBR shift was later investigated in more detail in [25] using the same approach. Table I lists the results of these calculations.

The CI+MBPT approach includes only a limited number of the core-valence excitation terms (mostly to second order) and it deteriorates in accuracy for heavier, more complicated systems. Moreover, the BBR shifts are particularly large in Sr and Yb, requiring higher precision of the calculation (or measurements) to achieve the same ultimate clock uncertainty.

CI+all-order method developed in [23], [26] includes higher-order correlations beyond second order in a systematic way, resulting in higher accuracy of the resulting atomic properties. We have applied this method to the calculation of the BBR shifts in B^+ , Al^+ , and In^+ . This calculation is described in Section III-B. The same approach may be also used to calculate BBR shifts in all other divalent systems.

The Sr case requires very high accuracy of the BBR calculations (see [25] for detailed analysis of the Sr case) because fractional BBR shift in this system is the largest among all optical cases listed in Table I. Therefore, more all-order corrections, such as triple excitations [18] and all-order corrections to the effective dipole operation may have to be included to significantly reduce the uncertainty.

Until recently, attempts to apply CI+all-order approach to treat Yb resulted in the failure of the convergence procedure used in the all-order part of the method. Specifically, we found that the iteration procedure in the all-order method fails to converge for the Yb^{2+} core equations because of extremely large contributions from the $4f$ shell. This all-order core calculation is necessary for the future use in the CI+all-order Yb calculation. Recently, this problem was resolved by using the reduced linear equation (RLE) stabilizer procedure [27]. Therefore, the Yb BBR shift value may be improved with the use of the CI+all-order method described in the next section.

B. Al^+ , B^+ , and In^+

Although the BBR shift in Al^+ frequency standards is anomalously small, its contribution becomes significant at the current level of precision. As noted previously, the

BBR frequency shift of the clock transition can be related to the difference of the static electric-dipole polarizabilities between the final and initial clock states. Because of severe (98%) cancellation between the static polarizabilities of the two clock states in this frequency standard, accurate calculation of the BBR shift in Al^+ is very difficult and required development of new all-order methodology. We developed a theoretical method within the framework of relativistic many-body theory to accurately treat correlation corrections in atoms with a few valence electrons [23]. This method combines the all-order approach currently used in precision calculations of properties of monovalent atoms with the configuration-interaction (CI) approach that is applicable for many-electron systems. In this work, we have extended this method to accurate calculation of the ground and excited state polarizabilities of divalent ions. The resulting polarizabilities are used to evaluate the BBR shifts at 300K in the ns^2 – $nsnp\ ^3P_0$ clock transitions in Al^+ , B^+ , and In^+ . Frequency-dependent corrections are also evaluated and found to be negligible in all three cases.

In the combined CI+all-order approach used in this work, core excitations are incorporated in the CI method by constructing an effective Hamiltonian using fully converged all-order method mentioned in Section III-A. This approach is described in detail in [23]. Its application to the polarizability calculations is described in [10]. The valence part of the polarizability is determined by solving the inhomogeneous equation of perturbation theory in the valence space [28]. The ionic core contribution to the polarizability is calculated separately in the random-phase approximation (RPA). The small valence-core (VC) term that corrects the ionic core polarizability for the presence of the valence electrons is also calculated in the RPA. DHF calculations are also carried out for both of these contributions to evaluate their uncertainties.

We note that, in our approach, the ionic core contribution is the same for both clock states and so it does not contribute to the BBR shift. On the other hand, the VC contribution differs between the two clock states. It is negligible for B^+ . It is the largest for the 3P_0 polarizability of In^+ , to which it contributes only 0.5%. However, its contribution to the BBR shift is much larger, 1.8% and 5% in Al^+ and In^+ , respectively, because of the large degree of cancellation between 1S_0 and 3P_0 polarizabilities. Our estimate of the dominant uncertainty in this term is the difference of the DHF and RPA values; we assume that all other uncertainties do not exceed this dominant uncertainty. Adding these uncertainties in quadrature, we estimate that the VC term leads to 0.6% and 2% uncertainties in the BBR shifts for Al^+ and In^+ , respectively.

To establish the accuracy of our approach to the calculation of valence polarizability, we also perform CI and CI+MBPT [24] calculations carried out with the same parameters (configuration space, basis set, number of partial waves, etc.). No core excitations are added in the pure divalent CI approach. Comparison of the CI, CI+MBPT, and CI+all-order values allows us to evaluate the im-

TABLE III. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CALCULATED ENERGY LEVELS OF THE B⁺ AND Al⁺ IONS.

Ion	Term	E_{expt} (cm ⁻¹)	CI (%)	CI+MBPT (%)	CI+All (%)
B ⁺	2s ² 1S ₀	508818	0.2	0.007	-0.001
	2p ² 3P ₀	98911	-1.0	-0.114	-0.005
	2p ² 3P ₁	98920	-1.0	-0.116	-0.007
	2p ² 3P ₂	98933	-1.1	-0.124	-0.015
	2p ² 1D ₂	102363	-0.8	-0.188	-0.113
	2p ² 1S ₀	127661	-0.5	-0.264	-0.223
	2s3s 3S ₁	129774	0.2	0.010	0.014
	2s3s 1S ₀	137622	-0.2	-0.116	-0.093
	2s3d 3D ₁	150650	0.2	-0.005	-0.004
	2s3d 3D ₂	150650	0.2	-0.006	-0.004
	2s3d 3D ₃	150650	0.2	-0.006	-0.005
	2s2p 3P ₀	37336	-0.7	-0.028	0.043
	2s2p 3P ₁	37342	-0.7	-0.040	0.037
	2s2p 3P ₂	37358	-0.8	-0.054	0.020
	2s2p 1P ₁	73397	-1.3	-0.395	-0.272
	2s3p 3P ₀	143989	0.1	0.004	0.009
	2s3p 3P ₂	143990	0.1	0.003	0.008
	2s3p 3P ₁	143993	0.1	0.002	0.008
	2s3p 1P ₁	144103	0.04	-0.016	-0.004
	Al ⁺	3s ² 1S ₀	381308	1.2	0.043
3p ² 1D ₂		85481	2.3	0.071	-0.022
3s4s 3S ₁		91275	1.4	0.068	0.015
3p ² 3P ₀		94085	1.6	0.036	0.008
3p ² 3P ₁		94147	1.6	0.032	0.004
3p ² 3P ₂		94269	1.6	0.024	-0.004
3s4s 1S ₀		95351	1.4	0.053	0.003
3s3d 3D ₃		95549	1.4	-0.002	-0.026
3s3d 3D ₂		95551	1.4	-0.002	-0.026
3s3d 3D ₁		95551	1.4	-0.001	-0.025
3s3p 3P ₀		37393	3.1	0.151	0.007
3s3p 3P ₁		37454	3.1	0.140	0.008
3s3p 3P ₂		37578	3.1	0.120	-0.017
3s3p 1P ₁		59852	0.4	-0.175	-0.141
3s4p 3P ₀		105428	1.4	0.068	0.020
3s4p 3P ₁		105442	1.4	0.067	0.020
3s4p 3P ₂		105471	1.4	0.065	0.018
3s4p 1P ₁		106921	1.3	0.046	0.007

The two-electron binding energies are listed in the first row for each ion; all other levels are measured from the ground state. The three rightmost columns are results of the different methods labeled in the text: configuration interaction (CI), configuration interaction with many-body perturbation theory (CI+MBPT), and configuration interaction plus all-order method (CI+All).

portance of the various correlation corrections, thereby establishing the upper bound on the uncertainty of our calculations.

Tables III and IV present the comparison of the experimental energies of Al⁺, B⁺, and In⁺ with those calculated in the CI, CI+MBPT, and CI+all-order approximations. The first and second column give state identification and the term value taken from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) critically evaluated experimental data [29]. Percentage differences between experimental and calculated energy levels,

$$\varepsilon = \frac{E_{\text{expt}} - E_{\text{th}}}{E_{\text{expt}}},$$

are given in the last three columns. Experimental term values, E_{expt} , are given in cm⁻¹. Theoretical values calcu-

lated in the CI, CI+MBPT, and CI+all-order approximations are listed in the respectively labeled columns. Two-electron binding energies are given in the first row for each ion; all other levels are counted from the ground state, as in [29]. Significant improvement of the energy values is observed for Al⁺ and In⁺ with the CI+all-order method, as expected because of the more complete inclusion of the correlation corrections in comparison with the CI and CI+MBPT approaches. The CI+all-order energies are within a few inverse centimeters (cm⁻¹) of the experimental values for B⁺ and Al⁺ for most of the levels. The accuracy of the In⁺ energy levels is sufficient for the purposes of the present work, i.e., replacing our theoretical energies by the experimental values in the dominant polarizability contributions leads to only a 1% change in the value of the BBR shift. The accuracy of the CI+MBPT method for B⁺ is already at the level of our numerical precision for most of the transitions.

TABLE IV. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CALCULATED ENERGY LEVELS OF THE In^+ ION.

Ion	Term	E_{expt} (cm^{-1})	CI (%)	CI+MBPT (%)	CI+All (%)
In^+	$5s^2\ ^1S_0$	378299	5.8	-1.1	-0.25
	$5s6s\ ^3S_1$	93923	8.8	-1.5	-0.42
	$5s6s\ ^1S_0$	97030	8.1	-1.5	-0.48
	$5p^2\ ^1D_2$	97628	10.5	-2.3	-0.66
	$5p^2\ ^3P_0$	101608	7.0	-1.8	-0.42
	$5s5d\ ^3D_1$	102088	8.6	-1.4	-0.30
	$5s5d\ ^3D_2$	102174	8.6	-1.4	-0.30
	$5s5d\ ^3D_3$	102308	8.6	-1.4	-0.31
	$5p^2\ ^3P_1$	103249	7.2	-1.9	-0.44
	$5p^2\ ^3P_2$	105565	7.3	-1.9	-0.45
	$5s5p\ ^3P_0$	42276	13.2	-3.7	-1.08
	$5s5p\ ^3P_1$	43351	13.0	-3.6	-0.97
	$5s5p\ ^3P_2$	45830	13.0	-3.6	-1.06
	$5s5p\ ^1P_1$	63038	4.2	-0.4	-0.09
	$5s6p\ ^3P_0$	107662	8.1	-1.4	-0.34
	$5s6p\ ^3P_1$	107842	8.0	-1.4	-0.34
	$5s6p\ ^3P_2$	108430	8.0	-1.4	-0.35
	$5s6p\ ^1P_1$	109780	7.4	-1.3	-0.35

The two-electron binding energy is listed in the first row; all other levels are measured from the ground state. The three rightmost columns are results of the different methods labeled in the text: configuration interaction (CI), configuration interaction with many-body perturbation theory (CI+MBPT), and configuration interaction plus all-order method (CI+All).

The breakdown of the contributions to the $ns^2\ ^1S_0$ and $nsnp\ ^3P_0$ polarizabilities α_0 of B^+ ($n = 2$), Al^+ ($n = 3$), and In^+ ($n = 5$) is given in Table V. Absolute values of the corresponding reduced electric-dipole matrix elements are listed in column labeled D in units of a_0e . The ionic core polarizability and the VC term that corrects it for the presence of the valence electrons are listed in rows labeled Core and VC. The final polarizability values are listed in rows labeled Total. We subtract the values of the terms listed separately in Table V from our total valence polarizability values to obtain the remaining contributions that are listed in the rows labeled Other. Our dominant contributions for Al^+ are in excellent agreement with CI calculations with a semi-empirical core potential (CICP) of Mitroy *et al.* [30]. Note that Al^+ is anomalous in this table for the near equality (within 2%) of the polarizabilities of its upper and lower states, especially because the polarizability of the lower state is completely dominated by the contribution from a single transition, whereas the upper state has substantial contributions from three different configurations.

We note that the oscillator strengths f_{gn} can be obtained from the reduced matrix elements to compare with standard tabulations by using

$$f_{gn} = \frac{2D_{gn}^2 \Delta E_{ng}}{3(2J_g + 1)}, \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta E_{ng} = E_n - E_g$ and $J_g = 0$ for the present clock states [19].

We investigate the uncertainty resulting from the inclusion of the core excitations by comparing the difference $\Delta\alpha_0$ calculated in the CI, CI+MBPT, CI+all-order approximations. These results are summarized in Table V. We find that the entire contribution of core excitations to the BBR shift, estimated as the difference of the CI+all-

order and CI values $\Delta\alpha_0$ is only 3%, 5%, and 16% for B^+ , Al^+ , and In^+ , respectively. The difference between CI+MBPT and CI+all-order values is 0.4% for B^+ and Al^+ , and 1.7% for In^+ . Therefore, we place an upper bound on the uncertainty of our BBR values at 10% for all three cases.

Our final results are summarized in Table VI [10], where we list the polarizability difference $\Delta\alpha_0$, BBR shift at $T = 300\text{K}$, relative BBR shift $\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}/\nu_0$, and the uncertainty in the relative BBR shift for B^+ , Al^+ , and In^+ . We find that dynamic corrections are very small for both states and nearly equal for both states. Their contributions to BBR shift are thus negligible for all three ions. Our BBR shift value in Al^+ $\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}} = -0.00426(43)$ Hz is in agreement with CICP value of Mitroy *et al.* [30] and recent coupled-cluster calculation [31]. It is also consistent with the experimental measurement $\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}} = -0.008(3)$ Hz from [32]. The values of η for Al^+ are in agreement with those of [30].

IV. OTHER SYSTEMS

Although the ground state of Yb^+ is a single-particle configuration, $4f^{14}6s\ ^2S_{1/2}$, the first excited configuration in this system is a one-hole two-particle state, i.e., $4f^{13}6s^2\ ^2F_{7/2}$. Both this configuration and the next excited configuration, $4f^{14}5d\ ^2D$, are metastable, as electric-dipole transitions to the ground state are forbidden. Therefore, Yb^+ is particularly well suited for the development of optical-frequency standards because two different types of transitions (quadrupole and octupole) may be used [2], [16], [17].

Although the single-particle states of Yb^+ such as the ground and the $4f^{14}5d\ ^2D$ configurations can be treated with the all-order approach, the results may not be as accurate as for monovalent systems, such as Cs or even

TABLE V. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE $ns^2\ ^1S_0$ AND $nsnp\ ^3P_0$ POLARIZABILITIES α_0 OF B^+ , Al^+ , AND In^+ IN a_3^0 .

Ion	State	Contribution	D	α_0	
B^+	$2s^2\ ^1S_0$	$2s^2\ ^1S_0-2s2p\ ^1P_1$	2.118	8.918	
		$2s^2\ ^1S_0-2s3p\ ^1P_1$	0.320	0.104	
		Other		0.582	
		Core		0.020	
		VC		0.000	
		Total			9.624
B^+	$2s2p\ ^3P_0$	$2s2p\ ^3P_0-2p^2\ ^3P_1$	1.354	3.216	
		$2s2p\ ^3P_0-2s3s\ ^3S_1$	0.476	0.754	
		$2s2p\ ^3P_0-2s3d\ ^3D_1$	1.175	1.517	
		Other		2.267	
		Core		0.020	
		VC		-0.001	
		Total			7.772
		Total			24.048
Al^+	$3s^2\ ^1S_0$	$3s^2\ ^1S_0-3s3p\ ^1P_1$	3.113	23.661	
		$3s^2\ ^1S_0-3s4p\ ^1P_1$	0.045	0.003	
		Other		0.138	
		Core		0.265	
		VC		-0.019	
		Total			24.048
Al^+	$3s3p\ ^3P_0$	$3s3p\ ^3P_0-3s4s\ ^3S_1$	0.900	2.197	
		$3s3p\ ^3P_0-3p^2\ ^3P_0$	1.836	8.687	
		$3s3p\ ^3P_0-3s3d\ ^3D_1$	2.236	12.568	
		Other		0.836	
		Core		0.265	
		VC		-0.010	
		Total			24.543
		Total			24.543
In^+	$5s^2\ ^1S_0$	$5s^2\ ^1S_0-5s5p\ ^1P_1$	2.977	20.554	
		$5s^2\ ^1S_0-5s6p\ ^1P_1$	0.123	0.020	
		Other		0.261	
		Core		3.220	
		VC		-0.041	
		Total			24.014
In^+	$5s5p\ ^3P_0$	$5s5p\ ^3P_0-5s6d\ ^3S_1$	1.015	2.921	
		$5s5p\ ^3P_0-5s5d\ ^3D_1$	2.189	11.755	
		$5s5p\ ^3P_0-5p^2\ ^3P_1$	1.664	6.649	
		Other		1.645	
		Core		3.220	
		VC		-0.170	
		Total			26.019
		Total			26.019

Absolute values of the corresponding reduced electric-dipole matrix elements are listed in the column labeled D in a_0e . Final polarizability values are listed in rows labeled Total.

TABLE VI. BBR SHIFTS AT $T = 300K$ IN B^+ , Al^+ , AND In^+ .

Ion	$\Delta\alpha_0(a_3^0)$	$\Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}$ (Hz)	$ \Delta\nu_{\text{BBR}}/\nu_0 $	Uncertainty
B^+	-1.851	0.0159(16)	1.42×10^{-17}	1×10^{-18}
Al^+	0.495	-0.00426(43)	3.8×10^{-18}	4×10^{-19}
In^+	2.01	-0.0173(17)	1.36×10^{-17}	1×10^{-18}

heavier Ra^+ owing to very large correlation corrections and mixing of the one-hole two-particle configuration. However, accuracy of the BBR shift for the quadropole transition may be improved with the all-order approach such as described above for Ca^+ . Such calculations have not yet yet been performed owing to the convergence issue in the Yb^{2+} core equations described in Section III-A that was resolved only recently [27].

At the present time, there is no approach that can produce accurate predictions of the properties of actual

one-hole two-particle configurations such as $4f^{43}6s^2\ ^2F_{7/2}$ in Yb^+ . The best possible theoretical approach may be to develop a CI+MBPT method that can treat one-hole two-particle configurations. The particle-hole formalism provides more efficient treatment of the states with more-than-half filled shells. It is particularly useful for almost-filled shells with no more than one hole. Generalization of the CI+MBPT approach to systems with holes requires significant modifications. The main problem here is avoiding double counting of the correlation corrections.

The Hg^+ case is similar to that of Yb^+ , but because the Hg^+ trap is operated at cryogenic temperatures [7], the BBR shift is negligible.

V. CONCLUSION

In summary, we have reviewed the present status of BBR shift calculations for several optical frequency standards. Recent calculations of BBR shifts in Ca^+ , B^+ , Al^+ , and In^+ were described in more detail. Our calculations of the BBR shifts in B^+ , Al^+ , and In^+ reduced the ultimate uncertainties resulting from this effect at room temperature to the 10^{-18} level for B^+ and In^+ and to 4×10^{-19} for Al^+ . These uncertainties approach recent estimates of the feasible precision of currently proposed optical atomic clocks. Possible theoretical approaches that may reduce uncertainties resulting from BBR shifts in other systems were discussed.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. N. Taylor and A. Thompson, Eds. "The international system of units (SI)," National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, NIST Special Publication vol. 330, 2008, pp. 79–81.
- [2] T. J. Quinn, "Practical realization of the definition of the metre, including recommended radiations of other optical frequency standards (2001)," *Metrologia*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 103–133, 2003.
- [3] A. Wallard, "News from the BIPM-2003," *Metrologia*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 99–108, 2004.
- [4] C. W. Chou, D. B. Hume, J. C. J. Koelemeij, D. J. Wineland, and T. Rosenband, "Frequency comparison of two high-accuracy Al^+ optical clocks," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 104, no. 7, art. no. 070802, 2010.
- [5] H. Katori, "Optical lattice clocks and quantum metrology," *Nat. Photonics*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 203–210, 2011.
- [6] D. J. Wineland, W. M. Itano, J. C. Bergquist, and R. G. Hulet, "Laser-cooling limits and single-ion spectroscopy," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 2220–2232, 1987.
- [7] T. Rosenband, D. B. Hume, P. O. Schmidt, C. W. Chou, A. Brusch, L. Lorini, W. H. Oskay, R. E. Drullinger, T. M. Fortier, J. E. Stalnaker, S. A. Diddams, W. C. Swann, N. R. Newbury, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, and J. C. Bergquist, "Frequency ratio of Al^+ and Hg^+ single-ion optical clocks; Metrology at the 17th decimal place," *Science*, vol. 319, no. 5871, pp. 1808–1812, 2008.
- [8] D. J. Wineland, J. C. Bergquist, J. J. Bollinger, R. E. Drullinger and W. M. Itano, "Quantum computers and atomic clocks," in *Proc. 6th Symp. Frequency Standards and Metrology*, 2002, pp. 361–368.
- [9] S. G. Porsev and A. Derevianko, "Multipolar theory of blackbody radiation shift of atomic energy levels and its implications for optical lattice clocks," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 74, no. 2, art. no. 020502(R), 2006.
- [10] M. S. Safronova, M. G. Kozlov, and C. W. Clark, "Precision calculation of blackbody radiation shifts for metrology," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 107, art. no. 143006, 2011.
- [11] M. S. Safronova, D. Jiang, and U. I. Safronova, "Blackbody radiation shift in ^{87}Rb frequency standard," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 82, no. 2, art. no. 022510, 2010.
- [12] E. Simon, P. Laurent, and A. Clairon, "Measurement of the Stark shift of the Cs hyperfine splitting in an atomic fountain," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 436–439, 1998.
- [13] M. S. Safronova and U. I. Safronova, "Blackbody radiation shift, multipole polarizabilities, oscillator strengths, lifetimes, hyperfine constants, and excitation energies in Ca^+ ," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 83, art. no. 012503, 2011.
- [14] D. Jiang, B. Arora, M. S. Safronova, and C. W. Clark, "Blackbody-radiation shift in a $^{88}\text{Sr}^+$ ion optical frequency standard," *J. Phys. B*, vol. 42, no. 15, art. no. 154020, 2009.
- [15] H. Hachisu, K. Miyagishi, S. G. Porsev, A. Derevianko, V. D. Ovsinnikov, V. G. Pal'chikov, M. Takamoto, and H. Katori, "Trapping of neutral mercury atoms and prospects for optical lattice clocks," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 100, no. 5, art. no. 053001, 2008.
- [16] C. Tamm, S. Weyers, B. Lipphardt, and E. Peik, "Stray-field-induced quadrupole shift and absolute frequency of the 688-THz $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ single-ion optical frequency standard," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 80, no. 4, art. no. 043403, 2009.
- [17] K. Hosaka, S. A. Webster, A. Stannard, B. R. Walton, H. S. Margolis, and P. Gill, "Frequency measurement of the $^2\text{S}^{1/2}$ - $^2\text{F}^{7/2}$ electric octupole transition in a single $^{171}\text{Yb}^+$ ion," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 79, no. 3, art. no. 033403, 2009.
- [18] M. S. Safronova and W. R. Johnson, "All-order methods for relativistic atomic structure calculations," *Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys.*, vol. 55, pp. 191–233, Oct. 2007.
- [19] J. Mitroy, M. S. Safronova, and W. C. Clark, "Theory and applications of atomic and ionic polarizabilities," *J. Phys. B*, vol. 43, no. 20, art. no. 202001, 2010.
- [20] B. Arora, M. S. Safronova, and C. W. Clark, "Blackbody radiation shift in a $^{43}\text{Ca}^+$ ion optical frequency standard," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 76, no. 6, art. no. 064501, 2007.
- [21] J. Mitroy and J. Y. Zhang, "Long range interactions of the Mg^+ and Ca^+ ions," *Eur. Phys. J. D*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 415–424, 2008.
- [22] B. K. Sahoo, B. P. Das, and D. Mukherjee, "Relativistic coupled-cluster studies of ionization potentials, lifetimes, and polarizabilities in singly ionized calcium," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 79, no. 5, art. no. 052511, 2009.
- [23] M. S. Safronova, M. G. Kozlov, W. R. Johnson, and D. Jiang, "Development of the configuration-interaction plus all-order method for atomic calculations," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 80, no. 1, art. no. 012516, 2009.
- [24] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and M. G. Kozlov, "Combination of the many-body perturbation theory with the configuration-interaction method," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 3948–3959, 1996.
- [25] S. G. Porsev, D. A. Ludlow, M. M. Boyd, and J. Ye, "Accurate calculations of Sr properties for a high-accuracy optical clock," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 78, no. 3, art. no. 032508, 2008.
- [26] M. G. Kozlov, "Precision calculations of atoms with few valence electrons," *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, vol. 100, no. 4, pp. 336–342, 2004.
- [27] H. Gharibnejad, E. Eliav, M. S. Safronova, and A. Derevianko, "Resolving all-order method convergence problems for atomic physics applications," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 83, no. 5, art. no. 052502, 2011.
- [28] M. G. Kozlov and S. G. Porsev, "Polarizabilities and hyperfine structure constants of the low-lying levels of barium," *Eur. Phys. J. D*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 59–63, 1999.
- [29] Yu. Ralchenko, A. E. Kramida, J. Reader, and NIST ASD Team (2010, Feb. 1). NIST Atomic Spectra Database (version 4.0), National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD. [Online]. Available: <http://physics.nist.gov/asd>
- [30] J. Mitroy, J. Y. Zhang, M. W. J. Bromley, and K. G. Rollin, "Blackbody radiation shift of the Al^+ clock transition," *Eur. Phys. J. D*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 15–19, 2009.
- [31] M. Kállay, H. S. Nataraj, B. K. Sahoo, B. P. Das, and L. Visscher, "Relativistic general-order coupled-cluster method for high-precision calculations: Application to the Al^+ atomic clock," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 83, no. 3, art. no. 030503(R), 2011.
- [32] T. Rosenband, W. M. Itano, P. O. Schmidt, D. B. Hume, J. C. J. Koelemeij, J. C. Bergquist, and D. J. Wineland, "Blackbody radiation shift of the $^{27}\text{Al}^+ \ ^1\text{S}_0$ - $^3\text{P}_0$ transition," in *Proc. EFTF Conf.*, 2006, pp. 289–291.



Marianna Safronova is an Associate Professor in the Department of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Delaware, working in the field of theoretical atomic physics. She received her Ph.D. degree from the Physics Department of the University of Notre Dame in 2001. Her theoretical atomic physics group focuses on the development of methodologies for high-precision atomic calculations and their applications. Her research involves both the study of the fundamental physics problems (fundamental symmetries) and applications of atomic physics to future technological developments (such as quantum computing and optical atomic clocks).



of atoms and molecules, space-time variation of fundamental constants, and quantum chaos.

Mikhail G. Kozlov is a leading scientific collaborator at the Molecular Beam Laboratory, Neutron Research Division, Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Russia. He is also a member of the Foundational Questions Institute (FQXi). Dr. Kozlov received his Ph.D. degree from the Department of Physics of the Leningrad State University, Russia, in 1982. His research interests include development of new methods in atomic and molecular theory, parity nonconservation, time-reversal violation, and permanent electric dipole moments



Singapore. His research interests include dynamics of ultracold atoms, physical implementation of quantum information processing, far-ultraviolet radiometry with synchrotron radiation sources, quantitative tomographic imaging, and neutron optics and detection.

Charles W. Clark is an NIST Fellow at the National Institute of Standards and Technology in Gaithersburg, MD, and is Co-Director of the Joint Quantum Institute of NIST and the University of Maryland (UMD). He received his Ph.D. in physics from the University of Chicago in 1979. He is also an Affiliate Professor at the Institute for Physical Science and Technology (UMD), Program Manager for Atomic, Molecular and Quantum Physics at the Office of Naval Research, and Visiting Professor at the National University of