# Evaluation of PTB primary caesium fountain frequency standard CSF1 between MJD 58514 - MJD 58539

PTB's primary caesium fountain frequency standard CSF1 was operated between MJD 58514, 0:00 UTC and MJD 58539, 0:00 UTC. Frequency comparisons were made with respect to PTB hydrogen maser H9, BIPM code 1400509.

The relative frequency instability of the relative frequency differences y(CSF1-H9) was  $12.1\times10^{-14}\cdot(\tau/s)^{-1/2}$  during the 25 days. The actual measurement time amounts to 94.4% of the 25 × 24 hours. This results in a statistical uncertainty  $u_A = 0.08\times10^{-15}$ , assuming that white frequency noise is the dominant noise source.

For the uncertainty due to the clock link  $u_{Lab} = 0.05 \times 10^{-15}$  is obtained by taking into account the actual measurement time. Finally, the estimated uncertainty for the link to TAI for 25 days is  $u_{TAI} = 0.15 \times 10^{-15}$ .

Frequency corrections for the following effects were applied to the raw data:

- Zeeman effect (magnetic field along the atoms' trajectory)
- black body effect (thermal radiation along the atoms' trajectory)
- relativistic redshift and relativistic Doppler effect
- cold collisions effect
- distributed cavity phase effect
- microwave lensing effect

The CSF1 standard uncertainty  $u_B$  is estimated as  $3.0 \times 10^{-16}$  (1  $\sigma$ ) for the relevant period [1].

#### Table of results of CSF1 compared to hydrogen maser H9 (1400509)

Interval of evaluation MJD 58514, 0:00 UTC – MJD 58539, 0:00 UTC

Fractional dead time 5.6%

Resulting frequency difference  $y(CSF1 - H9) = -12.59 \times 10^{-15}$ 

Type A uncertainty  $u_A$  (1  $\sigma$ )  $0.08 \times 10^{-15}$ 

Type B uncertainty  $u_{\rm B}$  (1  $\sigma$ )  $0.30 \times 10^{-15}$ 

Link to clock  $u_{Lab}$  (1  $\sigma$ )  $0.05 \times 10^{-15}$ 

Link to TAI  $u_{TAI}$  (1  $\sigma$ ) 0.15 × 10<sup>-15</sup> (25 days)

Combined uncertainty (1  $\sigma$ ) 0.35  $\times$  10<sup>-15</sup>

#### Type A (statistical) uncertainty of CSF1

For the microwave synthesis an optically stabilized microwave oscillator is utilized, which is locked to a hydrogen maser in the long-term [2]. Because of maintenance work the optically stabilized microwave system was out of operation during 46% of the 25 day TAI measurement interval and as a spare, the quartz based microwave synthesis was employed. The frequency instability  $12.1 \times 10^{-14} \ (\tau/s)^{-1/2}$  of the measured relative frequency differences y(CSF1 – Hmaser) is obtained for the combination of low and high density operation and gives the statistical measurement uncertainty  $u_A$  [1].

#### Type B (systematic) uncertainty of CSF1

In the table below we report the type B uncertainty evaluation results valid for the evaluation at hand. Detailed descriptions of the systematic uncertainty contributions of CSF1 have been published elsewhere [1].

At the 26<sup>th</sup> CGPM in November 2018, TAI has been newly defined (Resolution 2). As a result the relativistic redshift of a clock contributing to TAI is to be computed with respect to the conventionally adopted equipotential  $W_0$  = 62 636 856.0  $m^2s^{-2}$  of the Earth's gravity potential. The differentiation relating to the uncertainty of the relativistic redshift for the case of TAI contributions of the PTB fountain clocks in [1] is therefore no longer needed, so that a relativistic redshift uncertainty of  $0.02 \times 10^{-16}$  [1] is attributed now and in the future.

## Frequency shifts, corrections and type B uncertainties of CSF1 (parts in 10<sup>16</sup>):

Frequency shift	Correction	Uncertainty
Quadratic Zeeman shift	- 1078.26	0.10
Blackbody radiation shift	165.96	0.80
Relativistic redshift and Doppler effect	- 85.56	0.02
Collisional shift	4.4	2.7
Distributed cavity phase shift	- 0.04	0.93
Microwave lensing	-0.4	0.2
AC Stark shift (light shift)		0.01
Rabi and Ramsey pulling		0.013
Microwave leakage		0.01
Electronics		0.1
Background gas collisions		0.4
Total type B uncertainty		3.0

### References

[1] S. Weyers, V. Gerginov, M. Kazda, J. Rahm, B. Lipphardt, G. Dobrev and K. Gibble, Metrologia **55**, pp. 789–805 (2018), <a href="https://doi.org/10.1088/1681-7575/aae008">https://doi.org/10.1088/1681-7575/aae008</a>

[2] B. Lipphardt, V. Gerginov, S, Weyers, IEEE Transactions on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control **64**, pp. 761–766 (2017), <a href="https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7807353">https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7807353</a>