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#### Abstract

The ground-state ionization potential of the $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ atom is found to be 5945204223 (42) MHz. Along with lower-order contributions, this result includes all effects of relative order $\alpha^{4}, \alpha^{3} m_{e} / m_{\alpha}$, and $\alpha^{5} \ln ^{2} \alpha$. Effective operators derived in dimensionally regularized nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics are employed. The average values of these operators are evaluated using a high-accuracy variational wave function constructed in an exponential basis.
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In contrast to the theoretical description of electromagnetically bound two-body systems such as hydrogen, positronium, or muonium, where considerable progress has been achieved (for the recent reviews, see, e.g., [1]), high-precision calculations in more complex atoms have been worked out to a lesser degree. The central problem with an extension of the methods developed for the two-body problem to few-electron atoms is that those methods usually strongly rely on the solution of the Schrödinger equation for a single particle in the Coulomb field. Having a simple analytic form, such a solution is a perfect reference point for the quantum-mechanical perturbation theory, and various observables can be calculated as a power series in the fine structure constant $\alpha$. In higher orders of this perturbation theory, where ultraviolet divergences usually appear indicating a breakdown of the nonrelativistic approximation, the explicit form of the nonrelativistic solution facilitates the extraction of these divergences. They can then be canceled by matching with their finite counterparts calculated in the fully relativistic framework of the quantum electrodynamics.

Although the Schrödinger equation for, e.g., three particles bound by the Coulomb forces, can be solved numerically with very high accuracy [2], the lack of an analytic solution makes the problem of the divergences cancellation more complicated than in the two-body case. This problem was recently analyzed in Ref. [3] using singlet states of the helium atom as an example. Employing the nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics (NRQED) [4] in dimensional regularization, it was demonstrated in [3] how all divergences arising in the quantum-mechanical perturbation theory can be extracted and canceled at the operator level, i.e., without recourse to an explicit form of the helium wave function. The $\mathcal{O}\left(\alpha^{4}\right)$ correction to singlet $S$ levels of the $\mathrm{He}^{4}$ atom was represented as a sum of finite average values of the regularization-independent operators. Another approach, using an auxiliary parameter to separate hard- and soft-scale contributions, has been developed in [5].

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=\min _{\psi} \frac{\langle\psi| H|\psi\rangle}{\langle\psi \mid \psi\rangle} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the helium atom Hamiltonian taken in the nonrelativistic approximation,

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=\frac{p_{1}^{2}+p_{2}^{2}}{2}+\frac{P^{2}}{2 M}-\frac{Z}{r_{1}}-\frac{Z}{r_{2}}+\frac{1}{r} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $r_{1,2}=\left|\vec{r}_{1,2}\right|$ and $r=\left|\vec{r}_{1}-\vec{r}_{2}\right| ; \vec{p}_{1,2}$ are momenta of the electrons and $\vec{P}=-\vec{p}_{1}-\vec{p}_{2}$ is the momentum of the nucleus. Unless otherwise specified, we use the atomic units $e=\hbar=m_{e}=1$ and $c=1 / \alpha$ throughout this paper. In particular, the unit of energy is $m_{e} c^{2} \alpha^{2}$.

To construct the variational wave function, we use the simplest form of the basis,

$$
\begin{align*}
\psi_{n}=\exp \left(-k_{1}^{n} r_{1}\right. & \left.-k_{2}^{n} r_{2}-k_{3}^{n} r\right) \\
n & =1, \ldots, N \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

The complex exponents $k_{a}^{n}$ are chosen in a quasirandom manner from a rectangular area on the complex plane, for example,
$\operatorname{Re} k_{a}^{n}=K_{a}^{\min }+\left\lfloor\frac{n(n+1)}{2} \sqrt{p_{a}}\right\rfloor\left(K_{a}^{\max }-K_{a}^{\min }\right)$,
where $\lfloor x\rfloor$ denotes a fractional part of $x, p_{a}$ is some prime number, while $\left(K_{a}^{\min }, K_{a}^{\max }\right)$ is a variational interval. Imaginary parts of the exponents are generated in a similar way. We use both real and imaginary parts of $\psi_{n}$ to form a set of real basis functions. In particular, the ground-state wave function $\psi$ is a linear combination of $2 N$ basis functions $\operatorname{Re} \psi_{n}, \operatorname{Im} \psi_{n}, n=1, \ldots, N$, symmetric over the interchange of the electrons positions, $r_{1} \leftrightarrow r_{2}$.

Variational expansion in the basis (6) was shown in [2] to be very effective. It yields the best available nonrelativistic energies for many atomic and molecular systems and, in particular, for the ground state of the helium atom. Simplicity of the basis (6) allows us to evaluate analytically matrix elements of all the operators that appear in the calculation. By a proper differentiation and/or integration of the basic integral,

$$
\begin{align*}
\int d^{3} r_{1} \int d^{3} r_{2} & \frac{\exp \left(-k_{1} r_{1}-k_{2} r_{2}-k_{3} r\right)}{r_{1} r_{2} r} \\
& =\frac{16 \pi^{2}}{\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right)\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right)\left(k_{3}+k_{1}\right)} \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

with respect to $k_{1}, k_{2}$, and $k_{3}$, we express the matrix element of any operator involved in the calculation in terms of rational functions of $k$, their logarithms, and dilogarithms.

For the zeroth order approximation, a wave function built within a set of $2 N=1200$ basis functions has been used. It yields the nonrelativistic energy,

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=-2.90330455772794023(1) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here and below, we cite the uncertainty of the numerical results due to finiteness of the basis set. The uncertainties due to incomplete knowledge of the physical constants are included into the final result for the ionization potential (see Table I). The high accuracy of (9) is not redundant since the calculation of rather singular matrix elements of higher order corrections requires a very accurate wave function.

The first relativistic correction to the nonrelativistic energy (9) is the average value of the Breit Hamiltonian (see, e.g., [9]) over $\psi$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta^{(2)} E=\alpha^{2}\langle & -\frac{p_{1}^{4}+p_{2}^{4}}{8}-\frac{P^{4}}{8 M^{3}}+\pi Z \frac{\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right)+\delta\left(\vec{r}_{2}\right)}{2}+\pi \delta(\vec{r})-\frac{1}{2}\left[\vec{p}_{1} \frac{1}{r} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}+\left(\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{n}\right) \frac{1}{r}\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)\right] \\
& \left.+\frac{Z}{2 M}\left[\vec{p}_{1} \frac{1}{r_{1}} \cdot \vec{P}+\left(\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{n}_{1}\right) \frac{1}{r_{1}}\left(\vec{n}_{1} \cdot \vec{P}\right)+(1 \rightarrow 2)\right]\right\rangle=-1.95205077(1) \alpha^{2} \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\vec{n}=\vec{r} / r$ and $\vec{n}_{1,2}=\vec{r}_{1,2} / r_{1,2}$. To simplify the presentation, we explicitly take into account that the spin of the nucleus and the total spin of electrons are both equal to zero. In particular, we replace the product of the electron spin operators $\vec{s}_{1} \vec{s}_{2}$ by its eigenvalue in the singlet state, $-3 / 4$.

Order $\alpha^{3}$ and $\alpha^{3} / M$ corrections to the energy can be represented as follows (see [3] and references therein):

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta^{(3)} E= & \alpha^{3}\left[\frac{4 Z}{3}\left(-\ln \alpha^{2}-\beta+\frac{19}{30}\right)\left\langle\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right)+\delta\left(\vec{r}_{2}\right)\right\rangle+\left(\frac{14}{3} \ln \alpha+\frac{164}{15}\right)\langle\delta(\vec{r})\rangle+\frac{7}{3 \pi}\left\langle\frac{\ln r+\gamma}{r^{2}} i \vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}\right\rangle\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\frac{2 Z^{2}}{3 M}\left(-\ln \alpha-4 \beta+\frac{31}{3}\right)\left\langle\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right)+\delta\left(\vec{r}_{2}\right)\right\rangle+\frac{7 Z^{2}}{3 \pi M}\left\langle\frac{\ln r_{1}+\gamma}{r_{1}^{2}} i \vec{n}_{1} \cdot \vec{p}_{1}+(1 \rightarrow 2)\right\rangle\right] \\
= & 57.27034(2) \alpha^{3} \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\gamma=0.5772 \ldots$ is the Euler constant and $\beta$ is the helium Bethe logarithm [10] defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=\frac{\left\langle\left(\vec{p}_{1}+\vec{p}_{2}\right)(H-E) \ln [2(H-E)]\left(\vec{p}_{1}+\vec{p}_{2}\right)\right\rangle}{\left\langle\left(\vec{p}_{1}+\vec{p}_{2}\right)(H-E)\left(\vec{p}_{1}+\vec{p}_{2}\right)\right\rangle}=4.370039(2) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The cited value of $\beta$ was calculated for the finite mass of the nucleus. Details of the calculation in the limit of no recoil $(M \rightarrow \infty)$ can be found in [11]. For convenience of comparison with earlier results, it is worth writing explicitly the relation to the $Q$ term introduced by Araki and Sucher [12]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q=\lim _{\rho \rightarrow 0}\left\langle\frac{\Theta(r-\rho)}{4 \pi r^{3}}+(\ln \rho+\gamma) \delta(\vec{r})\right\rangle=-\frac{1}{2 \pi}\left\langle\frac{\ln r+\gamma}{r^{2}} i \vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}\right\rangle . \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

In Eqs. (11), (13), and below, all momentum operators standing to the right (left) of position-dependent operators are assumed to act on the right (left) wave function.
The next, $\mathcal{O}\left(\alpha^{4}\right)$ correction to the energy [3] is

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta^{(4)} E=\alpha^{4}\{ & -\frac{E^{3}}{2}+\frac{E^{2}\langle c\rangle}{4}+\frac{E}{4}\left\langle 2 C_{\mathrm{N}} C+c^{2}-\frac{p_{1}^{2} p_{2}^{2}}{2}-\pi Z\left[\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right)+\delta\left(\vec{r}_{2}\right)\right]\right\rangle \\
& +\left\langle V_{P} G V_{P}\right\rangle+\left\langle V_{S} G V_{S}\right\rangle+\pi k_{\mathrm{eN}}\left\langle\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right)+\delta\left(\vec{r}_{2}\right)\right\rangle+\pi k_{\mathrm{ee}}\langle\delta(\vec{r})\rangle \\
& +\left\langle-\frac{3 C_{1} C_{2} C_{\mathrm{N}}}{4}-\frac{c C_{\mathrm{N}} C}{2}-\frac{C_{\mathrm{N}} c\left[\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}+\vec{n}\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{1}\right) \vec{p}_{2}\right]}{4}+\frac{p_{1}^{2} C_{\mathrm{N}} p_{2}^{2}}{4}+\frac{\vec{p}_{1} \cdot c^{2} \vec{p}_{1}+\vec{p}_{2} \cdot c^{2} \vec{p}_{2}}{8}\right. \\
& +\frac{\left(\vec{p}_{1} \times \vec{p}_{2}\right) c\left(\vec{p}_{1} \times \vec{p}_{2}\right)}{4}-\frac{p_{1}^{2} c\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{n}\right)^{2} c p_{2}^{2}-3\left(\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{n}\right)^{2} c\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)^{2}}{8} \\
& -\frac{2\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)\left(\vec{E}_{1} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)+\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}_{1}\right)\left[\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)^{2}-p_{2}^{2}\right]}{4}+r \frac{3 \vec{E}_{1} \cdot \vec{E}_{2}-\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}_{1}\right)\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}_{2}\right)-2\left(\vec{E}_{1}-\vec{E}_{2}\right) \cdot \vec{e}}{8} \\
& -\frac{3}{32} \frac{P^{2}-3(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p})^{2}}{r^{3}}+\frac{\pi \delta(\vec{r})}{2}\left(\frac{9 P^{2}}{16}+C_{\mathrm{N}}\right)+\frac{\pi Z}{4}\left[\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right)\left(\frac{3 p_{2}^{2}}{2}-\frac{2 Z-1}{r_{2}}\right)+(1 \leftrightarrow 2)\right] \\
& -\frac{\left(\vec{E}_{1}-\vec{E}_{2}\right) \cdot \vec{e}}{32}+\frac{Z^{2}}{2}\left[\frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}}\left(i \vec{n}_{1} \cdot \vec{p}_{1}+Z\right)+(1 \leftrightarrow 2)\right]-\frac{\ln r+\gamma}{2 r^{2}} i \vec{n} \cdot \vec{p} \\
& \left.\left.+\frac{3}{2 r^{3}}\left(i \vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}-\frac{1}{2}\right)\right\rangle\right\}+\frac{\alpha^{2} \delta^{(2)} E\langle c\rangle}{2}=139.60(1) \alpha^{4} . \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Here we use the following notations: $C=C_{\mathrm{N}}+c$, $C_{\mathrm{N}}=C_{1}+C_{2}, c=1 / r, C_{1,2}=-Z / r_{1,2}, \vec{e}=\vec{n} / r^{2}$, and $\vec{E}_{1,2}=-Z \vec{n}_{1,2} / r_{1,2}^{2}$. The terms $\left\langle V_{P} G V_{P}\right\rangle$ and $\left\langle V_{S} G V_{S}\right\rangle$ in (14), where $G$ is the reduced Green function of the Schrödinger equation $(H-E) G\left(\vec{r}_{1}, \vec{r}_{2} \mid \vec{r}_{1}^{\prime}, \vec{r}_{2}^{\prime}\right)=$ $\psi\left(\vec{r}_{1}, \vec{r}_{2}\right) \psi\left(\vec{r}_{1}^{\prime}, \vec{r}_{2}^{\prime}\right)-\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}-\vec{r}_{1}^{\prime}\right) \delta\left(\vec{r}_{2}-\vec{r}_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, represent the effects of virtual transitions into triplet $P$ and singlet $S$ excited states, respectively (see [3] for details). Perturbations inducing those transitions are

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{P}=\frac{\vec{s}_{1}-\vec{s}_{2}}{4}\left(\frac{Z \vec{l}_{1}}{r_{1}^{3}}-\frac{Z \vec{l}_{2}}{r_{2}^{3}}+\frac{\vec{r} \times \vec{P}}{r^{3}}\right), \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\vec{l}_{1,2}=\vec{r}_{1,2} \times \vec{p}_{1,2}$, and

$$
\begin{align*}
V_{S}= & E \frac{C_{\mathrm{N}}+2 c}{2}+\frac{\left\{p_{1}^{2}+c, p_{2}^{2}+c\right\}}{8}-\frac{C_{\mathrm{N}} c}{2}-\frac{3 c^{2}}{4} \\
& +\frac{\vec{p}_{1}\left(C_{\mathrm{N}}-c\right) \vec{p}_{1}+(1 \rightarrow 2)}{4} \\
& -\frac{\vec{p}_{1} c \vec{p}_{2}+\left(\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{n}\right) c\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)}{2} . \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

TABLE I. Contributions to the total ionization potential of the helium ground state. Uncertainty in the nonrelativistic value is due to uncertainty in the nuclear mass.

|  | $\delta \nu_{\mathrm{th}}\left(1^{1} S\right), \mathrm{MHz}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Nonrelativistic approximation | $5945262288.62(4)$ |
| $\alpha^{2}$ | $-16800.338(4)$ |
| $\alpha^{3}$ | $-40483.984(50)$ |
| $\alpha^{4}$ | $-834.9(2)$ |
| $\alpha^{5} \ln ^{2} \alpha$ (and higher) | $84(42)$ |
| Finite charge radius | $-29.55(4)$ |
| Total | $5945204223(42)$ |

The contact terms enter into Eq. (14) with the coefficients

$$
\begin{align*}
k_{\mathrm{eN}}= & \frac{Z^{3}}{2}+\frac{427 Z^{2}}{96}-\frac{10 Z}{27}-\frac{9 Z \zeta(3)}{4 \pi^{2}}-\frac{2179 Z}{648 \pi^{2}} \\
& +\frac{3 Z-4 Z^{2}}{2} \ln 2=16.3557,  \tag{17}\\
k_{\mathrm{ee}}= & -\ln \alpha+\frac{3285}{216}-\frac{335}{54 \pi^{2}}-\frac{29 \ln 2}{2}+\frac{15 \zeta(3)}{4 \pi^{2}} \\
= & 10.37657 . \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

Average values for a part of the operators entering into Eq. (14) can be found in the literature (see, e.g., [13]). For the average values of the new operators, we have obtained the following results:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\langle V_{P} G V_{P}\right\rangle=-0.392, \quad\left\langle V_{S} G V_{S}\right\rangle=-18.48, \\
\left\langle-\frac{C_{\mathrm{N}} c\left[\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}+\vec{n}\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{1}\right) \vec{p}_{2}\right]}{4}\right\rangle=0.811, \\
\left\langle\frac{p_{1}^{2} C_{\mathrm{N}} p_{2}^{2}}{4}\right\rangle=-36.983, \\
\left\langle\frac{\vec{p}_{1} \cdot c^{2} \vec{p}_{1}+\vec{p}_{2} \cdot c^{2} \vec{p}_{2}}{8}\right\rangle=1.142, \\
\left\langle\frac{\left(\vec{p}_{1} \times \vec{p}_{2}\right) c\left(\vec{p}_{1} \times \vec{p}_{2}\right)}{4}\right\rangle=1.078, \\
\left\langle\frac{p_{1}^{2} c\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{n}\right)^{2} c p_{2}^{2}-3\left(\vec{p}_{1} \cdot \vec{n}\right)^{2} c\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)^{2}}{8}\right\rangle \\
=0.03,
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\langle\frac{2\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)\left(\vec{E}_{1} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)+\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}_{1}\right)\left[\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{2}\right)^{2}-p_{2}^{2}\right]}{4}\right\rangle=4.749 \\
\left\langle r \frac{3 \vec{E}_{1} \cdot \vec{E}_{2}-\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}_{1}\right)\left(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{E}_{2}\right)-2\left(\vec{E}_{1}-\vec{E}_{2}\right) \cdot \vec{e}}{8}\right\rangle=1.434, \\
\left\langle-\frac{3}{32} \frac{P^{2}-3(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{P})^{2}}{r^{3}}\right\rangle=-0.353, \quad\left\langle\frac{9 \pi \delta(\vec{r}) P^{2}}{32}\right\rangle=1.325, \quad\left\langle\frac{\pi \delta(\vec{r}) C_{\mathrm{N}}}{2}\right\rangle=-2.508 \\
\left\langle\frac{3 \pi \delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right) p_{2}^{2}}{2}+(1 \leftrightarrow 2)\right\rangle=18.421, \quad\left\langle\frac{3 \pi \delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right) C_{2}}{2}+(1 \leftrightarrow 2)\right\rangle=-25.066, \quad\left\langle-\frac{\left(\vec{E}_{1}-\vec{E}_{2}\right) \cdot \vec{e}}{32}\right\rangle=0.409 \\
\left\langle\frac{3}{2 r^{3}}\left(i \vec{n} \cdot \vec{p}-\frac{1}{2}\right)\right\rangle=-0.958, \quad\left\langle\frac{1}{r_{1}^{3}}\left(i \vec{n}_{1} \cdot \vec{p}_{1}+Z\right)+(1 \rightarrow 2)\right\rangle=4.706
\end{gathered}
$$

Finally, the part of the $\mathcal{O}\left(\alpha^{5}\right)$ correction enhanced by $\ln ^{2} \alpha$ (and, hence, presumably the leading one) [14] is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta^{(5)} E=-4 Z^{3} \alpha^{5} \ln ^{2}(Z \alpha)\left\langle\delta\left(\vec{r}_{1}\right)+\delta\left(\vec{r}_{2}\right)\right\rangle \approx 2070 \alpha^{5} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Numerical results for all the contributions to the helium ionization potential are collected in Table I. Appropriate expression for the ground-state energy of the helium ion is

$$
\begin{align*}
E_{\mathrm{He}^{+}}= & -\frac{\mu Z^{2}}{2}+\frac{2 \mu^{3} Z^{4} r_{\mathrm{N}}^{2}}{3} \\
& -\mu Z^{4} \alpha^{2}\left[\frac{5}{8}\left(1+\frac{\mu^{3}}{M^{3}}\right)-\frac{\mu^{2}}{2}+\frac{\mu^{2}}{M}\right] \\
& -\frac{4 \mu^{3} Z^{4} \alpha^{3}}{3 \pi}\left[\ln \mu(Z \alpha)^{2}+\beta_{\mathrm{H}}-\frac{19}{30}\right] \\
& -\frac{2 Z^{5} \alpha^{3}}{3 \pi M}\left[\ln (Z \alpha)+4 \beta_{\mathrm{H}}-7 \ln 2-\frac{31}{3}\right] \\
& +Z^{3} \alpha^{4}\left(k_{\mathrm{eN}}-\frac{9 Z^{3}}{16}\right)-\frac{4 Z^{6} \alpha^{5}}{\pi} \ln ^{2}(Z \alpha) \tag{20}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\beta_{\mathrm{H}}=2.9841285557655 \ldots$ is the Bethe logarithm for the hydrogen ground state, $r_{\mathrm{N}}=3.162(2) \times 10^{-5}$ is the nuclear charge radius $R_{\mathrm{N}}$ expressed in the atomic units, and $\mu=M /(M+1)$ is the reduced mass of the ion in units of the electron mass.

Comparison of our result (1) with the most recent experimental values,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{\mathrm{expt}}^{1 S-2 P}\left(1^{1} S\right)=5945204238(45) \mathrm{MHz} \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{\mathrm{expt}}^{1 S-2 S}\left(1^{1} S\right)=5945204356(48) \mathrm{MHz} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

extracted from the measurements of $1^{1} S-2^{1} P$ [15] and $1^{1} S-2^{1} S$ [16] intervals, respectively, shows that the theoretical value (1) agrees well with the former (21) and is within $2 \sigma$ from the latter (22) if the theoretical and experimental uncertainties are added linearly. Further theoretical and experimental efforts are desirable in order to further clarify the situation.
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