

**FREQUENCY COMPARISON (H\_MASER 140 0889) - (LNE-SYRTE-FO2)**  
**For the period MJD 57689 to MJD 57719**

The primary frequency standard LNE-SYRTE-FO2 has been compared to the hydrogen Maser 140 0889 of the laboratory, during a measurement campaign between MJD 57689 and 57719 (28<sup>th</sup> October 2016 - 27<sup>th</sup> November 2016). The hydrogen maser presented a frequency step during the measurement period. Therefore the collected data have been separated into two intervals of 20 and 10 days, respectively. The fountain operation covers  $\sim 73.4\%$  of the total measurement duration.

The mean frequency difference at the middle date of the each period is given in the following table:

Period (MJD)	Date of the estimation	$y(\text{HMaser}_{140\ 0889} - \text{FO2})$	$u_B$	$u_A$	$u_{\text{link} / \text{maser}}$
57689 – 57709	57699	-3524.8	2.9	2.5	1.2
57709 – 57719	57714	-3563.1	2.9	3.0	1.4

*Table 1: Results of the comparison in  $1 \times 10^{-16}$ .*

The FO2 fountain was operated in the same mode during all the period: the interrogating signal is based on the down conversion to 9.192 GHz of a 11.98 GHz signal provided by a cryogenic oscillator phase locked to the maser 140 0889. A synthesizer is used to lock the microwave signal on the atomic resonance. The frequency difference between this maser and the fountain is deduced from the average correction applied to the synthesizer.

### Average value and statistical uncertainty

The frequency data are averaged over 0.2 day intervals. We then perform a linear unweighted fit to the average data points to determine the average frequency at the middle date of each interval, as given in Table 1. The statistical uncertainties  $u_A$  are estimated using the Allan variance of the frequency residuals, after removing the drift. We estimate conservative statistical uncertainties of  $2.5 \times 10^{-16}$  and  $3.0 \times 10^{-16}$  for the two segments, respectively.

We verified the result by applying a second method. We calculated the accumulated phase by integrating the data points, assuming a constant frequency during each segment, and during the dead times of the fountain operation. The average frequency is then obtained by dividing the total accumulated phase by the calibration period duration. The processing has been performed with segments of 0.01, 0.1 and 1 day durations. The results are in agreement with the values given in Table 1 within  $0.2 \times 10^{-16}$  and  $0.4 \times 10^{-16}$  for the two segments, respectively, which is consistent with the estimation of the statistical uncertainties  $u_A$  and the uncertainties due to the link.

## Accuracy

The frequency is corrected from the quadratic Zeeman, the Black Body radiation, the cold collisions and cavity pulling, the first order Doppler, the microwave lensing, and the red shift effects. Here the uncertainty in the cold collisions correction accounts for both a statistical uncertainty and a systematic uncertainty taken as 0.5% of the correction for high density measurements. The following table summarizes the budget of systematic effects and their associated uncertainties. The accuracy is the quadratic sum of all the systematic uncertainties.

	Correction ( $10^{-16}$ )	Uncertainty ( $10^{-16}$ )
Quadratic Zeeman effect	-1920.7	0.3
Black body radiation	168.8	0.6
Cold collisions and cavity pulling	70.0	2.0
Distributed cavity phase shift	-0.9	1.0
Microwave spectral purity&leakage	0	< 0.5
Ramsey & Rabi pulling	0	< 0.1
Microwave lensing	-0.7	0.7
Second order Doppler effect	0	< 0.1
Background gas collisions	0	<1.0
<b>Total</b>	-1683.4	2.7
Red shift	- 65.4	1.0
<b>Total with red shift</b>	<b>-1748.8</b>	<b>2.9</b>

Table 2: Budget of systematic effects and uncertainties for SYRTE-FO2 fountain for the MJD 57689 – 57719 period

$$\boxed{u_B = 2.9 \times 10^{-16}}$$

## Uncertainty of the link

The uncertainty of the link is the quadratic sum of 2 terms:

-A possible effect of phase fluctuations introduced by the cables that connect the primary standard to the Maser. It is estimated to be  $10^{-16}$ .

-The uncertainty due to the dead times of the frequency comparison.

To estimate this contribution, we use the comparison between the reference Maser and Maser 140 0809.

We calculate the time deviation of the normalized phase differences with the linear frequency drift removed. The uncertainty is given by:

$$\sigma_{\text{Dead Time}} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_i \sigma_{x_i}^2}}{T}$$

where  $\sigma_{x_i}$  are the extrapolated TVar for each dead times. We applied the method to the dead times longer than 600 s and obtained stability degradations of  $0.7 \times 10^{-16}$  and  $1.0 \times 10^{-16}$  for the two segments, respectively.