CC/NUMBER 12 MARCH 25, 1985

This Week's Citation Classic "

Pekeris C L. Ground state of two-electron atoms. Phys. Rev. 112:1649-58, 1958. [Department of Applied Mathematics, Weizmann Institute, Rehovot, Israel]

In this paper, a new method is developed for solving the Schrödinger wave equation for two-electron atoms and is applied to atoms with nuclear charges Z ranging from 1 to 10. In addition to the nonrelativistic energy eigenvalues, the mass-polarization and relativistic corrections are also evaluated. From this and the experimental ionization potential, the Lamb shift is deduced. [The SCI® indicates that this paper has been cited in over 440 publications since 1958.]

> Chaim L. Pekeris Department of Applied Mathematics Weizmann Institute Rehovot 76100 Israel

> > lanuary 24, 1985

By the use of perimetric coordinates (a name I coined), it was possible to represent the solution of the Schrödinger wave equation for two-electron atoms by a series in orthogonal functions of three variables, each ranging independently from 0 to ∞. The coefficients in this series were found (directly from the wave equation) to obey a 33-term recursion relation. The vanishing of the determinant of these equations yielded the energy eigenvalue and the coefficients. E.B. Wilson wrote, "No integrals were evaluated, all the elements of his secular equation were integers (and most were zeros) and he achieved eight place accuracy. (Incidentally, he also calculated error limits.)"1 The new method was applied in subsequent papers to evaluate the Lamb shift, term-values of excited S and P states, lower bounds to the energy, fineand hyperfine-structure, and oscillator strengths (f-values) in He.

Chandrasekhar commented on the paper as follows: "Until 1953² all physicists firmly believed that with 8 parameters Hylleraas³ had achieved an accuracy better than what you now have with 214 parameters."⁴ "...There is no basis for supposing that this oft quoted result of Hylleraas is valid."2

The paper and those that followed it brought forth enthusiastic letters: "monumental" (Herzberg), "will become a 'classic'" (Coulson), "final definitive" (Chandrasekhar), "ingenious" and (Salpeter), "beautiful piece of work" (Goudsmit), "my appreciation and admiration for your number D(0) is at least of order 715" (V. Hughes).

D(0), the electron charge density at the nucleus. enters in the theory of the hyperfine splitting of He³, which was measured by V. Hughes and coworkers⁵ to an accuracy of two parts in 10⁷, and we determined D(0) by solving a determinant of order 715, to be followed by one of order 1078, which yielded an accuracy for D(0) of five parts in 108

In the case of the ground state of He, Herzberg achieved an experimental accuracy of 0.15 cm⁻⁻⁻ for the ionization potential,6 while our accuracy ranged from 0.01 cm⁻¹ to 0.0001 cm⁻¹. Similar agreement was achieved for the 21S, 23S states of He as well as for the 1¹S and 2³S states of Li⁺.

It therefore came as a shock to find, on July 31. 1961, that our theoretical value for the ionization potential of the 2¹S state of Li⁺ came out 118,699.430 cm⁻¹, as against Herzberg and Moore's⁷ experimental value of 120,008.30 cm⁻¹. Herzberg and Moore refined a previous measurement by Series and Willis⁸ of the 8517Å line, achieving an accuracy of 0.10 cm⁻¹. The discrepancy of 1300 cm⁻¹ meant that the 2¹S-2¹P transition in Li+ is not the 8517Å line, but one at 9584Å. As I was about to write to Herzberg asking him to send his "source" to Rank at Pennsylvania State University, who agreed to search for the 9584Å line, a letter arrived from Aage Bohr (August 15, 1961) stating, "In order to assist in your detective work, we are sending you the library copy of Werner's thesis from 1927." In his thesis Werner retracted his identification of the 8517Å line, which he had published in Nature in 1926.9 and on which Series and Willis based their identification. On June 8, 1962, a preprint of a paper by Edlén and Toresson arrived, reporting an accurate measurement of the 9854Å line, which they found to be "in perfect agreement with the value calculated by Pekeris."¹⁰

I am indebted to my former assistant Yigal Accad, to whom every word stored in our homemade computer, WEIZAC, was at any moment as distinct as the fingers on his hand.

Wilson E B, Jr. Some remarks on quantum chemistry. (Rich A & Davidson N, eds.) Structural chemistry and molecular biology. San Francisco: Freeman, 1968, p. 753-60.
 Chandrasekhar S, Elbert D & Herzberg G. Shift of the 1thS state of helium. Phys. Rev. 91:1172-3, 1953.
 Hyllemas E A. Uber den Grundterm der Zweiclektronenprobleme von H⁻, He, Li⁺, Be⁺ + usw. Z. Phys. 65:209-25, 1930. (Cited 295 times since 1955.)

Chandrasekhar S. Personal communication. 5 September 1958.
 White J A. Chow L Y. Drake C. Hugbes V W. Hyperfine structure of the metastatic triplet state of helium three. Phys. Rev. Lett. 3:428-9, 1959.

<sup>rnys. kev. Lett. 3:428-9, 1959.
6. Herzberg G. Ionization potentials and Lamb shift of the ground state of ⁴He and ³He. Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A 248:309-32, 1958. (Cited 80 times.)
7. Herzberg G & Moore H. The spectrum of Li⁺. Can. J. Phys. 37:1293-313, 1959. (Cited 95 times.)
8. Serles G W & Willis K. Note on the Li II spectrum. Proc. Phys. Soc. 71:274, 1958.
9. Werner S. The spark spectrum of lithum. Nature 118:154-5, 1926.
10. Toresson Y G & Edlén B. The 1s2s¹S level of Li⁺. Archiv Phys. 23:117-18, 1962.</sup>