

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

HYPERFINE STRUCTURE OF THE STABLE LITHIUM ISOTOPES. II

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4785s1xn>

Author

McColm, Douglas.

Publication Date

1965-05-27

University of California
Ernest O. Lawrence
Radiation Laboratory

HYPERFINE STRUCTURE OF THE STABLE LITHIUM ISOTOPES. II.

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

*This is a Library Circulating Copy
which may be borrowed for two weeks.
For a personal retention copy, call
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 5545*

Berkeley, California

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California

AEC Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

HYPERFINE STRUCTURE OF THE STABLE LITHIUM ISOTOPES. II.

Douglas McColm

May 27, 1965

HYPERFINE STRUCTURE OF THE STABLE LITHIUM ISOTOPES. II*

Douglas McColm

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California

May 27, 1965

ABSTRACT

A theoretical treatment of the hfs anomaly between Li^6 and Li^7 is given, and the result compared to that reported in the preceding paper. The distribution of nuclear charge and magnetism, the polarization of the electron wave function by the nuclear electric-quadrupole moment, and the specific mass correction are treated. Agreement with experiment is obtained with a value for the p-nucleon radial parameter not inconsistent with that obtained from electron-scattering experiments.

I. INTRODUCTION

The hyperfine structure (hfs) anomaly between two isotopes is known to be a consequence of the details of their nuclear structure, thanks to the work of Bohr and Weisskopf,¹ and though it has been studied intensively in the isotopes of hydrogen, it has not come into the same widespread use in nuclear physics as have the nuclear moments, even though its study yields valuable information about the outermost shell of nucleons. This is in part because of the complexity of hfs anomaly calculations and in part because relatively few have been measured so far. Much basic work has been done² which makes possible the interpretation of hfs anomaly measurements for many isotopes; but these treatments cannot be used for the lithium isotopes, and so an interpretation of the measurements reported in the preceding paper³ is given here.

A number of effects are present in the lithium case: (a) The electron radial wave function is modified inside the nucleus by the distribution of nuclear charge, i. e., the Breit-Rosenthal (BR) effect;⁴ (b), the electron distribution interacts with the nuclear magnetism over a finite volume, i. e., the Bohr-Weisskopf (BW) effect;⁴ (c) the nuclear motion polarizes the electron distribution in its vicinity, i. e., the Bohr (B) effect;⁵ (d) the center of mass of the atom is not at the same place as the center of mass of the nucleus, i. e., the specific mass correction.

Effects arising from nondiagonal matrix elements of the magnetic-dipole and electric-quadrupole operators are neglected. Furthermore, the treatment is nonrelativistic. We obtain an expression for the hfs anomaly Δ_{67} , which contains a number of nuclear parameters, by employing as a nuclear model a spherical α -particle core surrounded by nucleons in p orbital. The radial functions for both the core orbitals and the p orbitals

are taken as harmonic-oscillator functions, but with different radii, R_S and R_P , respectively.

The nuclear parameters are then evaluated with an L-S coupled model of the nuclei, a not unreasonable approximation in the light of the calculations done by Karath.⁶ Evaluation of these parameters in intermediate coupling will be the subject of a later article.

II. HAMILTONIAN

The Hamiltonian employed can be split up as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_N + \mathcal{H}_E + \mathcal{V}_c + \mathcal{V}_{\text{hfs}} \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{H}_N is the nuclear Hamiltonian, \mathcal{H}_E is the electron Hamiltonian including an interaction with a nuclear point charge but exclusive of other electric or magnetic effects, \mathcal{V}_c is the correction to the Coulomb potential arising from the finite nuclear size, and \mathcal{V}_{hfs} is the hyperfine-structure operator.

The Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_N is not solved; harmonic-oscillator radial functions are employed instead.

Throughout, distances are measured in units of $a_0 = \hbar^2/me^2$ and energies in units of mc^2 . Thus

$$\mathcal{V}_c = -a^2 \sum_{en} \frac{1}{r_{en}} \chi_P(n) + a^2 \sum_e \frac{Z}{r_e} \quad (2)$$

where a is the fine-structure constant, r_e is the distance between the e th electron and the nucleon center of mass, r_{en} is the distance between the e th electron and the n th nucleon, and χ_P is a proton-projection operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_P(n) &\equiv \frac{1}{2} - T_z(n) \\ \chi_N(n) &\equiv \frac{1}{2} + T_z(n) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where T_z is the z-component of the isospin operator. And \mathcal{V}_c can be expanded:

$$\mathcal{V}_c = -a^2 \sum_{en} \sum_k w_k \underline{C}^{(k)}(e) \cdot \underline{C}^{(k)}(n) \chi_P(n) + a^2 \sum_e (Z/r_e) \quad (4)$$

where

$$w_k = \begin{cases} r_e^k / r_n^{k+1}, & r_e < r_n \\ r_n^k / r_e^{k+1}, & r_e > r_n \end{cases}$$

Here $\underline{C}^{(k)}$ is a spherical harmonic normalized to $4\pi/2k+1$.⁷

In Eq. (4) the term in the first sum with $k=0$, $r_e > r_n$, is the usual Coulomb potential, and is cancelled by the second sum. Of the remaining terms in the first sum, the one with $k=0$, $r_e < r_n$, produces the BR effect, and those with $k \neq 0$ produce the B effect. The wave function associated with this total potential \mathcal{V}_c can then be used to evaluate the hfs.

Because of singularities in the nonrelativistic hfs operator, it is convenient for us to calculate relativistically and then perform a nonrelativistic reduction. Therefore, take

$$\mathcal{V}_{hfs} = a \sum_{en} \underline{a}(e) \cdot \underline{A}(n) \quad (5)$$

where $\underline{a}(e)$ (the Dirac α matrix) equals $2\rho_1 \underline{S}(e)$, with $\rho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$; and $\underline{A}(n)$ is the vector potential arising from the presence of the n th nucleon.

$$\underline{A}(n) = \nabla(e) \times \frac{\underline{\mu}_S(n)}{r_{en}} + [(a^2/m_n) g'_L(n) \underline{P}(n)] / r_{en}$$

$$\underline{\mu}_S(n) = (a^2/2m_n) g'_S(n) \underline{S}(n)$$

$$g'_S(n) = g_N \chi_N(n) + g_P \chi_P(n) \quad (6)$$

$$g'_L(n) = (1 - \frac{m_n}{M}) \chi_P(n)$$

Here m_n is the mass of the n th nucleon measured in units of the electron mass, μ_S is the spin magnetic-moment operator, g_N and g_P are the neutron and proton g factors, respectively, \underline{S} and \underline{L} are the total spin and orbital angular-momentum operators; and $(1 - m_n/M)$ is the reduced-mass correction to the nuclear orbital g factor.⁸ Other specific mass corrections are discussed in Appendix II. Now \mathcal{V}_{hfs} can be re-expressed in tensor-operator form as follows:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{hfs}} = \sum_{K, k, a} \phi_{Kka}(e, n) U_{\underline{ka}}^{(K)}(n) \cdot \left\{ C_{\underline{m}}^{(k)}(e) \underline{S}(e) \right\}^{(K)} \quad (7)$$

where the $U_{\underline{ka}}^{(K)}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\underline{k1}}^{(K)} &= \left\{ C_{\underline{m}}^{(k-1)}(n) \underline{S}(n) \right\}^{(K)} \\ U_{\underline{k2}}^{(K)} &= \left\{ C_{\underline{m}}^{(k-1)}(n) \underline{L}(n) \right\}^{(K)} \\ U_{\underline{k3}}^{(K)} &= C_{\underline{m}}^{(K)}(n) \\ U_{\underline{k4}}^{(K)} &= \left\{ C_{\underline{m}}^{(k+1)}(n) \underline{S}(n) \right\}^{(K)} \\ U_{\underline{k5}}^{(K)} &= \left\{ C_{\underline{m}}^{(k+1)}(n) \underline{L}(n) \right\}^{(K)} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{kK1} &= \begin{cases} [(ia^3/m_n) b_{k-1, K} g'_S(n) w_k(e, n)] / r_n, & r_e > r_n \\ 0, & r_e < r_n \end{cases} \\ \phi_{kK2} &= [2(ia^3/m_n) (-1)^{K+1} b_{k-1, K} g'_L(n) w_k(e, n)] / (2k+1) r_n \\ \phi_{kK3} &= \left(\frac{ia^3}{m_n} \right) c_{kK} g'_L(n) \left[\frac{w_k(e, n)}{r_n} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial r_n} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\phi_{kK4} = \begin{cases} 0 & , r_e > r_n \\ [(ia^3/m_n)b_{kK}g'_S(n)w_k(e,n)]/r_n & , r_e < r_n \end{cases}$$

$$\phi_{kK5} = [2(ia^3/m_n)b_{kK}g'_L(n)w_k(e,n)]/(2k+1)r_n$$

Here

$$b_{kk} = (-1)^{k+1}[k(2k+3)]^{1/2}, \quad k \geq 0$$

$$b_{k,k+1} = (-1)^{k+1}[k+2)(2k+1)]^{1/2}, \quad k \geq 0$$

$$b_{kK} = 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$c_{k,k+1} = -[(k+1)/(2k+1)]^{1/2}$$

$$c_{k,k-1} = +[k/(2k+1)]^{1/2}$$

$$c_{kK} = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

(10)

This is consistent with the usual result,¹ provided the identity

$$\{C_{\underline{L}}^{(2)}\}_{\underline{L}}^{(1)} = \underline{L}/(40)^{1/2} \text{ is employed.}$$

The one-electron Dirac wave function used is

$$|jm_j\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} |^{\ell}_L Sjm_j\rangle \\ |^{\ell}_S Sjm_j\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where the radial dependence is made explicit by

$$\begin{aligned} |^{\ell}_L Sjm_j\rangle &= g_j(r) |^{\ell}_L Sjm_j\rangle \\ |^{\ell}_S Sjm_j\rangle &= f_j(r) |^{\ell}_S Sjm_j\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now ℓ_L , the orbital quantum number for the large component, must be $j \pm 1/2$ for which $\ell_S = j \mp 1/2$.

The total wave function is then

$$|FM_F\rangle = \sum_{j, M_I, M_j} q_j (IM_I j m_j | FM_F) |IM_I\rangle |j m_j\rangle. \quad (13)$$

Here $(IM_I j m_j | FM_F)$ is a vector-coupling coefficient, and q_j is an expansion coefficient to include states of different j (arising from the Bohr effect), and $q_{1/2} \equiv 1$. The single-electron case, calculated first, is based on the assumption that the total hfs arises from the outermost 2s electron; and so J is set equal to j . This assumption is known to be false,⁹ and so a complete treatment is done also (Appendix I).

In the single-electron case, the first-order perturbation theory yields

$$\langle FM_F | \mathcal{V}_{hfs} | FM_F \rangle = (-1)^{I+j_0+F} \sum_K \left\{ \begin{matrix} I & j_0 & F \\ j_0 & I & K \end{matrix} \right\} V_{j_0 j_0 K} + 2 \sum_j q_j \left\{ \begin{matrix} I & j_0 & F \\ j & I & K \end{matrix} \right\} V_{j j_0 K} \quad (14)$$

where $j_0 = 1/2$ and where

$$V_{j j' K} = \sum_{k, a, n} (I || U_{ka}^{(K)} || I) \langle M_{j j' K k a} \rangle. \quad (15)$$

Here $M_{j j' K k a}$ is the average over nuclear radial coordinates of the function

$$M_{j j' K k a} = \phi_{k K a}(en) [v_1(j j' k K) + v_2(j j' k K)], \quad (16)$$

where

$$v_1(j j' k K) = (-1)^{j-j'} (\ell_L S j || \{ \underline{C}^{(k)}(e) \underline{S}(e) \}^{(K)} || \ell'_L S' j') - (\ell'_L S' j' || \{ \underline{C}^{(k)}(e) \underline{S}(e) \}^{(K)} || \ell_L S j) \quad (17)$$

$$v_2(j j' k K) = (-1)^{j-j'} (\ell_S S j || \{ \underline{C}^{(k)}(e) \underline{S}(e) \}^{(K)} || \ell'_L S' j') - (\ell'_L S' j' || \{ \underline{C}^{(k)}(e) \underline{S}(e) \}^{(K)} || \ell_S S j).$$

In the nonrelativistic limit

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_{jj'Kka} = & \left(\frac{ia}{4} \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} [v_1(jj'kK) - v_2(jj'kK)] \int r_e^2 \phi_{kKa} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_e} [g_j(r_e)g_{j'}(r_e)] dr_e \right. \\
 & + \frac{1}{2} [v_1(jj'kK) + v_2(jj'kK)] \int r_e^2 \phi_{kKa} [g_j(r_e) \frac{\partial}{\partial r_e} g_{j'}(r_e) - g_{j'}(r_e) \frac{\partial}{\partial r_e} g_j(r_e)] dr_e \\
 & \left. + [\kappa'v_1(jj'kK) - \kappa v_2(jj'kK)] \int r_e \phi_{kKa} g_j(r_e)g_{j'}(r_e) dr_e \right\}, \quad (18)
 \end{aligned}$$

and the presence of the first term ensures the survival of surface terms for values of K greater than 1, all of which correspond to delta-function singularities in a strictly nonrelativistic treatment. The quantity κ equals $-j + 1/2$ for $\ell_L = j - 1/2$ and equals $j + 3/2$ for $\ell_L = j + 1/2$.

III. ONE-ELECTRON ELECTRONIC WAVE FUNCTION--B AND BR EFFECTS

We first treat the case in which the hfs is presumed to arise from a single electron in an s orbital, the object being to compute a wave function containing the terms that contribute to the hfs anomaly. In this calculation V_{hfs} is omitted, and the perturbations treated arise from V_c .

Ordinary perturbation theory cannot be used because the corrections of interest are appreciable only in the vicinity of the nucleus, and a very large number of excited atomic states would be needed to approximate the correction to the wave function.

What is done is to develop a differential equation in the radial coordinates, which can be easily solved because distances of the order of the nuclear dimension are very small compared to unity in atomic units. To remove all angular dependences from the wave equation, write the nonrelativistic radial function explicitly:

$$|jm_j\rangle = g_j(r) |jm_j\rangle, \quad (19)$$

i. e., $|jm_j\rangle$ contains radial dependence, $|jm_j\rangle$ does not. Then introduce an analogue of (13)

$$|IjFM_j\rangle = \sum_{M_I M_j} (IM_I j m_j | FM_F) |IM_I\rangle |jm_j\rangle, \quad (20)$$

which depends on the nuclear radial coordinates but not on the electron radial coordinates. Thus $\langle jm_j | \mathcal{H}_E | jm_j \rangle$ is a radial operator that is called \mathcal{H}_j and operates on $g_j(r)$.

$$\mathcal{H}_j = -\frac{\alpha^2}{2} [\Lambda_\ell(r) + \mathcal{V}_P + \mathcal{V}_{EE}], \quad (21)$$

where $\Lambda_\ell(r) = (\partial^2/\partial r^2) + (2/r)(\partial/\partial r) - [\ell(\ell+1)/r^2]$ and where ℓ is the orbital quantum number associated with j , $\mathcal{V}_P = Z/r$, and \mathcal{V}_{EE} is the electron-electron interaction potential, which can be neglected in the region close to the nucleus. We then evaluate

$$\langle IjFM_F | \mathcal{H}_E + \mathcal{H}_N + \mathcal{V}_C - \mathcal{E} | FM_F \rangle = 0$$

and obtain

$$q_j (\mathcal{H}_j - \mathcal{E}_E) g_j(r) + (-1)^{I+F+j} \sum_k \begin{Bmatrix} I & j_0 & F \\ j & I & k \end{Bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{jj_0 k I} g_{j_0}(r) = 0 \quad (22)$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}_{jj_0 k I} = -\alpha^2 \sum_n (j \| C_{\underline{m}}^{(k)}(e) \| j_0) \langle I \| w_k C_{\underline{m}}^{(k)}(n) \chi_{P(n)} \| I \rangle, \quad k \neq 0$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{j_0 j_0 0 I} = -\alpha^2 \sum_n \sqrt{2} \langle I \| (w_0 - \frac{1}{r_e}) \chi_{P(n)} \| I \rangle,$$

the $1/r_e$ arising from the subtraction of the point-nucleus Coulomb potential.

Terms involving matrix elements not connecting the ground state have been omitted in (18). Since the product of q_j and R_j appears, one of these can be chosen at our convenience. As $q_{1/2} = 1$, let

$$a_j = \left[\begin{array}{cc} I - \frac{1}{2} & I + \frac{1}{2} \\ j & I - \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right]^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \| \underline{C}^{(2)} \| j \right), \quad j \neq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (23)$$

Define the BR correction ϵ_{BR} by

$$g_{1/2} = (1 + \epsilon_{BR})g_0, \quad (24)$$

where g_0 is the eigenfunction of $\mathcal{H}_{1/2}$, and define the B correction ϵ_B by

$$g_j = \epsilon_B g_0. \quad (25)$$

The energy shift (isotope shift) associated with the perturbation is not important in this problem, since it does not contribute to the hfs. So set \mathcal{E}_E equal to the eigenvalue of $\mathcal{H}_{1/2}$. Neglecting second-order terms $\epsilon_B \epsilon_{BR}$ and omitting the term $(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} g_0)(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \epsilon)$, which has a negligible effect on the result, we obtain finally

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_0 \epsilon_{BR} + \frac{2}{R_P} V_P(x_P) + \frac{4}{R_S} V_S(x_S) &= 0, \quad \text{Li}^6 \text{ and Li}^7 \\ \epsilon_B &= 0, \quad \text{Li}^6 \\ \Lambda_2 \epsilon_B + \frac{2(5)^{1/2}}{R_P} Q_7 V_2(x_P) &= 0, \quad \text{Li}^7 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $x_P = r_e/R_P$, $x_S = r_e/R_S$, and Q_7 is the nuclear-electric-quadrupole moment divided by R_P^2 .

$$\begin{aligned} V_P(x) &= -(1/x) + \Phi_2(x) - (1/3) \Phi_3(x) \\ V_S(x) &= -(1/x) + \Phi_2(x) \\ V_2(x) &= \Phi_3(x) - (2/3) \Phi_1(x) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $\Phi_1(x) = (2/\pi)^{1/2} e^{-x^2}$, $\Phi_2(x) = (1/x) \int_0^x \Phi_1(t) dt$, $\Phi_3(x) = (1/x^2)(\Phi_2 - \Phi_1)$.

Equations (27) have the exact solution

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{BR} = & 2 R_P [(x_P/2) - (x_P^2/2)\Phi_2(x_P) - (5/12)\Phi_2(x_P) - (1/4)\Phi_1(x_P)] \\ & + 4 R_S [(x_S/2) - (x_S^2/2)\Phi_2(x_S) - (1/4)\Phi_2(x_S) - (1/4)\Phi_1(x_S)] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\epsilon_B = 0, \quad \text{Li}^6$$

$$\epsilon_B = (5^{1/2}/3)Q_7 R_P [\Phi_2(x_P) - (3/2)\Phi_3(x_P)], \quad \text{Li}^7$$

IV. CONCLUSION

The result of the one-electron problem done above is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{67} = & [- (C_{S1} + 2C_{S0} - 2)(0.778 + 0.0940 \Gamma) \\ & + (0.0177)(C_{S1} + 2C_{S0} - 12)Q_7 - (0.198)C_{S3}Q_7 + (0.055)C_{L3}Q_7] R_P \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where

$$\Gamma = 2r_m (r_m^2 + 2)(r^2 - 2) - 3r_m^5 (r + 1) - 3r^3 (r - r_m^2) \quad (30)$$

for $r = R_S/R_P$, and $r_m = R_S R_P / (R_S^2 + R_P^2)^{1/2}$. The quantities C are parameters of the Li^7 nucleus:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{S0} &= (I \| g'_S \underline{\underline{S}} \| I) / (I \| g'_S \underline{\underline{S}} + g'_L \underline{\underline{L}} \| I) \\ C_{S1} &= 10^{1/2} (I \| g'_S \{ \underline{\underline{C}}^{(2)}_{\underline{\underline{S}}} \}^{(1)} \| I) / (I \| g'_S \underline{\underline{S}} + g'_L \underline{\underline{L}} \| I) \\ C_{S3} &= [6/5(7^{1/2})] (I \| g'_S \{ \underline{\underline{C}}^{(2)}_{\underline{\underline{S}}} \}^{(3)} \| I) / (I \| g'_S \underline{\underline{S}} + g'_L \underline{\underline{L}} \| I) \\ C_{L3} &= [6/5(7^{1/2})] (I \| g'_L \{ \underline{\underline{C}}^{(2)}_{\underline{\underline{L}}} \}^{(3)} \| I) / (I \| g'_S \underline{\underline{S}} + g'_L \underline{\underline{L}} \| I). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The C parameters were evaluated by means of an L-S coupled model of the Li^7 nucleus having $T = 1/2$ and symmetrized with respect to all nucleons, $L = 1$, $S = 1/2$, $I = 3/2$, with the result $C_{S1} = - (8/3)Q_7 C_{S0}$, $C_{S3} = 1.14 Q_7 C_{S0}$, $C_{L3} = 0$, and $C_{S0} = 0.907$.

If we employ the values of R_S and R_P obtained by Burleson and Hofstader⁹ on the basis of their electron-scattering experiments, $R_S = 0.50 \times 10^{-4}$, $R_P = 0.20 \times 10^{-4}$ (in units of a_0): i. e., $R_P < R_S$ so that the p nucleons move inside the α -particle core. Their data yield $r = 2.48$, $\Gamma = 64.6$. The term Q_7 , calculated for the L-S coupled model, is $Q_7 = -[3/5(5)^{1/2}] = -0.268$ so that $\Delta_{67} = +0.5 \times 10^{-4}$, i. e., about one half the experimental result. However, the uncertainty is very large, because if r is raised from 2.48 to 3, while at the same time maintaining a constant average nucleon radius (corresponding to a change in R_P from 0.20×10^{-4} to 0.17×10^{-4}), agreement with experiment is obtained. This occurs because Γ is very sensitive to R_P , and so current measurements of R_P are insufficient for one to compute Δ_{67} accurately. In fact, if intermediate coupling values of the C parameters were employed, the experimental value for Δ_{67} could be used to determine a good value for R_P .

However, if we use the value of Q_7 given above together with the value of R_P from Burleson and Hofstader to calculate the nuclear electric quadrupole moment, we obtain a value an order of magnitude smaller than that obtained by applying the result of the Nesbet and Kahalas¹⁰ calculation to the data of Wharton et al.¹¹ If we use a value of R_P consistent with this quadrupole moment, however, Δ_{67} changes sign. One effect which might resolve this difficulty has been neglected, that is, the polarization of the α -particle nuclear core by the nucleon p orbitals.

Inclusion of the 1s electrons in the hfs problem does not alter the result, as is shown in Appendix I; and so the electron part of the problem can be regarded as properly solved, exclusive of relativistic corrections. The specific mass effect produces a change in the magnetic moment μ only, as is shown in Appendix II, and so does not influence the above.

In conclusion, it is possible to say that the major effects in the Li^6 - Li^7 hfs anomaly are accounted for, and agreement with experiment is obtained with a value of R_p not inconsistent with that given by Burleson and Hofstader.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author acknowledges much help and encouragement from Professors William A. Nierenberg and Richard Marrus, and many fruitful discussions with Dr. Brian Judd. He also thanks Professor Melba Phillips for calling the mass correction to his attention.

APPENDICES

I. Effect of the 1s Orbitals

We show here that the inclusion of the 1s orbitals does not affect the hfs anomaly result, a fact one would anticipate since the anomaly does not depend on the details of the unperturbed electron radial function.

Call the three electron radial functions $R_{1+}(e)$, $R_{1-}(e)$, and $R_{2+}(e)$ (assuming $M = 1/2$). Form

$$X_{\alpha}(ij) = 1/\sqrt{2} [R_{\beta}(i)R_{\gamma}(j) + R_{\beta}(j)R_{\gamma}(i)] \quad (I-1)$$

where $\alpha\beta\gamma$ are a permutation of 1+, 1-, 2+. Let

$$R(k) = R_{2+}(k)X_{2+}(ij), \quad i \neq j \neq k. \quad (I-2)$$

The $J = 1/2$ function $|00S_0M\rangle$ is then

$$|00S_0M\rangle = N^{-1/2} \begin{vmatrix} 1 & \sigma_M(1) & R(1) \\ 1 & \sigma_M(2) & R(2) \\ 1 & \sigma_M(3) & R(3) \end{vmatrix}, \quad (I-3)$$

or in compressed notation, $|J_0M\rangle = N^{-1/2} \det \{1, \sigma_M(j), R(k)\}$. Here N is a normalizing factor, and $\sigma_{1/2}(k)$ is defined by

$$\sigma_{1/2}(k) = 6^{-1/2} [2\beta(k)\alpha(i)\alpha(j) - \alpha(k)\beta(i)\alpha(j) - \alpha(k)\alpha(i)\beta(j)] \quad (I-4)$$

where $\alpha(e)$ is a spin function with $M = +1/2$; β is a spin function with $M = -1/2$; and $\sigma_{-1/2}(e)$ is obtained by interchanging α and β .

For the perturbations produced by the Bohr effect, introduce the combination

$$R'_{\alpha}(k) = \frac{1}{3} \{ R'_{2+}(k) C_{M_L}^{(2)}(k) X_{2+}(ij) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} R_{2+}(k) [R'_{1+}(i) C_{M_L}^{(2)}(i) R_{1-}(j) + R'_{1+}(j) C_{M_L}^{(2)}(j) R_{1-}(i)] \\ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} R_{2+}(k) [R_{1+}(i) R'_{1-}(j) C_{M_L}^{(2)}(j) + R_{1+}(j) R'_{1-}(i) C_{M_L}^{(2)}(i)] \}, \quad (I-5)$$

which has the symmetry needed in order to express the perturbed part of the wave function by

$$|L'M_L S_0 M_S\rangle = (N^{-1/2}) \det\{1, \sigma_{M_S}(j), R'(k)\} \quad (I-6)$$

where $L' = 2, S_0 = 1/2$.

The total wave function is again

$$|FM_F\rangle = \sum_J q_j |IJFM_F\rangle \quad (I-7)$$

where

$$|IJFM_F\rangle = \sum_{M_I M_L M_S} (IM_I J M_J | FM_F) (LM_L S M_S | JM_J) |IM_I\rangle |LM_L S M_S\rangle \quad (I-8)$$

Now the projection functions needed to produce a differential equation in the radial coordinates are $(k, S_0 M_S |$ and $(L' M_L S_0 M_S |$. Define

$$(1, S_0 M_S | = \sigma_{M_S}(3) - \sigma_{M_S}(2); (2, S_0 M_S | = \sigma_{M_S}(1) - \sigma_{M_S}(3);$$

$$(3, S_0 M_S | = \sigma_{M_S}(2) - \sigma_{M_S}(1). \text{ Also let } (L' M_L S_0 M_S | = \det\{1, \sigma_{M_S}(j), C_{M_L}^{(2)}(k)\}.$$

Then the equation

$$(\mathcal{H}_E + \mathcal{H}_N - \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{V}_c) |FM_F\rangle = 0, \quad (I-9)$$

when operated on from the left by $\sum_{M_I M_J} (IM_I S_0 M_J | FM_F) \langle IM_I | \langle k, S_0 M_J |$,

becomes the first part of Eq. (26), provided we define

$$R_a(k) = [1 + \epsilon_{BR}(k)] R_{a0}(k). \quad (I-10)$$

Here $R_{a0}(k)$ is the eigenfunction of $\mathcal{H}_E(k)$ and ϵ_{BW} does not depend on a ; i.e., it is the same function of r_k for all the orbitals present.

Similarly if we operate on (I-9) with

$\sum_{M_I M_L M_S} (IM_I J M_J | FM_F) (L' M_L S_0 M_S | JM_J) \langle IM_I | (L' M_L S_0 M_S |$, we obtain the

second part of Eq. (26), provided $R'_a(k) = \epsilon_B(k)R_{a0}(K)$. Again $\epsilon_B(k)$ does not depend on a .

Since the hfs operator is a one-particle operator, the contribution to the total Li^7 hfs from each electron will contain a factor $1 + \Delta_{67}$, and so the result will be the same as that obtained above for a single electron.

II. The Specific Mass Correction

The specific mass correction is calculated nonrelativistically. The vector potential arising from the n th nucleon at electron e is given by

$$A(e, n) = \frac{a^2}{m_n} \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{2} g'_S \nabla(e) \times \underline{S}(n) \right] / R_{en} + \left[\chi_{P(n)} \underline{P}(n) \right] / R_{en} \right\}, \quad (II-1)$$

and the interaction Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}' is then

$$\mathcal{H}' = a^2 \sum_{en} \left\{ \underline{P}(e) \cdot \underline{A}(e, n) + \frac{1}{2} g_e \underline{S}(e) \cdot \nabla(e) \times \underline{A}(e, n) \right\} \quad (II-2)$$

where the coordinates R_e, R_n are taken in an arbitrary inertial framework; g'_S is defined in Eq. (6) and g_e is the electron-spin g -value; all masses are measured in units of the electron mass.

Introducing a coordinate system centered at the center-of-mass (c.m.) of the nucleus (not the atom), which is taken to be at the position R ; and labeling the coordinates in this c.m. frame by r_e and r_n ; we find that $R_{en} = r_{en}$, that

$$\nabla(e) = \nabla'(e) + \frac{1}{M} \nabla \quad (II-3)$$

and that

$$\underline{P}(n) = \left(1 - \frac{m_n}{M}\right) \underline{p}(n) - \sum_{n'} \frac{1}{M_N} \underline{p}(n') - \sum_e \frac{m_n}{M_N} \underline{p}(e) + \frac{m_n}{M_N} \underline{P}, \quad n' \neq n \text{ or } n_0. \quad (II-4)$$

Here $\nabla'(e), \underline{p}(e)$, and $\underline{p}(n)$ refer to the center-of-mass frame, whereas ∇ and \underline{P} refer to the c.m. motion in the inertial frame. The mass of the

nucleus is M_N , and the total mass of the atom is M ; n_0 is the nucleon whose coordinates were eliminated by the introduction of \underline{R} .

Substitution of $P(e)$ and $P(n)$ into \mathcal{H}' gives

$$\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}'_1 + \mathcal{H}'_2 + \mathcal{H}'_3, \quad (\text{II-5})$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}'_1 = \sum_{en} \left(\frac{a^4}{m_n}\right) \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{2} g_e \chi_{P(n)} \left(1 - \frac{m_n}{M_N}\right) \underline{S}(e) \cdot \underline{L}(n) \right] / r_{en}^3 + \left[\frac{1}{2} g_n \underline{L}(e) \cdot \underline{S}(n) \right] / r_{en}^3 + \left[\frac{1}{4} g_e g_n \underline{S}(e) \cdot \underline{\nabla}'(e) \times \left[\underline{\nabla}'(e) \times \underline{S}(n) \right] \right] / r_{en} \right\} \quad (\text{II-6})$$

$$\mathcal{H}'_2 = \sum_{en} \left(\frac{a^4}{m_n}\right) \left\{ \left[-\frac{1}{2} g_e \chi_{P(n)} \sum_{n'} \frac{m_n}{M_N} (\underline{r}_n \times \underline{p}(n') \cdot \underline{S}(e)) \right] / r_{en}^3 - \left[\chi_{P(n)} \sum_{e'} \left(\frac{m_n}{M_N}\right) \underline{p}(e) \cdot \underline{p}(e') \right] / r_{en} + \left[\frac{1}{2} g_e \chi_{P(n)} \sum_{e'} \left(\frac{m_n}{M_N}\right) \underline{r}_e \times \underline{p}(e') \cdot \underline{S}(e) \right] / r_{en}^3 \right\}, \quad n' \neq n \text{ or } n_0 \quad (\text{II-7})$$

and \mathcal{H}'_3 consists of terms containing \underline{R} or $\underline{\nabla}$ or \underline{P} , and terms such as $\underline{p}(e) \cdot \underline{p}(n)$ whose diagonal terms vanish for wave functions having a definite parity for both the electronic and nuclear parts separately.

Here \mathcal{H}' is the expected Hamiltonian, and \mathcal{H}'_2 is the mass correction. The first term of \mathcal{H}'_2 has vanishing diagonal elements for nucleons having a definite ℓ , and the third has vanishing diagonal elements for electrons having definite ℓ . The second term has vanishing diagonal elements for $e \neq e'$, but for $e = e'$ a term proportional to $\frac{1}{M} p^2 / r$ survives. This term gives no hfs energy shift directly, because both hfs levels will be shifted the same way, but it will affect the wave function, producing a correction similar to the reduced mass correction times $\langle 1/r \rangle$. But the reduced mass correction to the hfs anomaly, $(m_6/m_7)^3$, is about $(1-3 \times 10^{-5})^3$ so that corrections of the form

$\frac{1}{M} p^2/r$ would be negligible. This argument is used also to justify the neglect of nondiagonal elements of \mathcal{H}'_2 .

Finally, we must consider the Hughes-Eckhart correction.¹² The kinetic-energy operator in the c. m. system, \mathcal{T}_E , is

$$\mathcal{T}_E = -\frac{\alpha^2}{2} \sum_e \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{1}{M_N}\right) \nabla_e'^2 + \frac{1}{M_N} \sum_{ef} \nabla_e' \cdot \nabla_f' \right\}, \quad e \neq f \quad (\text{II-8})$$

and the $\nabla_e' \cdot \nabla_f'$ term, although its energy shift would not affect the hfs, would alter the wave function. But again, diagonal terms vanish and non-diagonal ones would be negligible.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

- * Work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.
1. A. Bohr and V. F. Weisskopf, Phys. Rev. 77, 94 (1950).
 2. H. H. Stroke, R. J. Blin-Stoyle, V. Jaccarino, Phys. Rev. 123, 1326 (1961); A. S. Reiner, Nucl. Phys. 5, 544 (1958).
 3. Richard Schlecht and Douglas McColm, Part I, companion paper, Hyperfine Structure of the Stable Lithium Isotopes. I, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Report UCRL-11773 (unpublished), submitted to Phys. Rev.
 4. J. E. Rosenthal and G. Breit, Phys. Rev. 41, 459 (1932).
 5. A. Bohr, Phys. Rev. 81, 134 and 331 (1951).
 6. D. Karath, Phys. Rev. 101, 216 (1956).
 7. The phase of $C_{\underline{m}}^{(K)}$ is the same as that used by Condon and Shortley, Theory of Atomic Spectra (Cambridge, 1935). See for example, A. R. Edmonds, Angular Momentum in Quantum Mechanics (Princeton, 1957), p. 21.
 8. M. Phillips, Phys. Rev. 76, 1803 (1949).
 9. George R. Burleson and R. Hofstader, Phys. Rev. 112, 1282 (1958).
 10. S. L. Kahalas and R. K. Nesbet, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 549 (1961) and J. Chem. Phys. 39, 529 (1963).
 11. L. Wharton, L. P. Gold, and W. Klemperer, J. Chem. Phys. 37, 2149 (1962) and Phys. Rev. 133, B270 (1964).
 12. D. S. Hughes and C. Eckhart, Phys. Rev. 36, 694 (1930).

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud. The document outlines the various types of records that should be maintained, including receipts, invoices, and bank statements, and provides detailed instructions on how to properly document each type of transaction. It also discusses the importance of regular audits and the role of internal controls in ensuring the accuracy of the records.

2. The second part of the document focuses on the importance of transparency and accountability in financial reporting. It discusses the various methods used to calculate and report financial performance, including the use of accrual accounting and the importance of disclosing all relevant information. The document also discusses the role of external auditors in providing an independent opinion on the accuracy of the financial statements and the importance of maintaining a high level of ethical standards in the reporting process.

3. The third part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud. The document outlines the various types of records that should be maintained, including receipts, invoices, and bank statements, and provides detailed instructions on how to properly document each type of transaction. It also discusses the importance of regular audits and the role of internal controls in ensuring the accuracy of the records.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud. The document outlines the various types of records that should be maintained, including receipts, invoices, and bank statements, and provides detailed instructions on how to properly document each type of transaction. It also discusses the importance of regular audits and the role of internal controls in ensuring the accuracy of the records.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud. The document outlines the various types of records that should be maintained, including receipts, invoices, and bank statements, and provides detailed instructions on how to properly document each type of transaction. It also discusses the importance of regular audits and the role of internal controls in ensuring the accuracy of the records.

