I estimate the *sigma* from original data wher $\hat{\sigma} = 1.02719$ and $\hat{\kappa} = 0.972$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}^{new} &= \frac{\hat{\sigma}^{original}}{1 + n + n\hat{\kappa}^{original}} \\
\hat{\sigma}^{new} &= \frac{1.02719}{1 + 1 + 0.972} \\
\hat{\sigma}^{new} &= 0.346
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\kappa}^{new} &= \frac{\hat{\kappa}^{original}}{1 + n + n\hat{\kappa}^{original}} \\
\hat{\kappa}^{new} &= \frac{0.972}{1 + 1 + 0.972} \\
\hat{\kappa}^{new} &= 0.327
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mu}_1^{(2)} &= \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{2} \\
\hat{\mu}_1^{(2)} &= \frac{0.346}{2} \\
\hat{\mu}_1^{(2)} &= 0.173
\end{aligned}$$

If I used your equation I get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mu}_1^{(2)} &= \hat{\mu} + \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{1 - \kappa} \\
\hat{\mu}_1^{(2)} &= \frac{0.346}{1 - 0.327} \\
\hat{\mu}_1^{(2)} &= 0.514
\end{aligned}$$

You can see the second result it is very closed to your result, but in the first case when I used the equation in the table (1) I got 0.173, so I think the difference in the result because we used different equations.