Evaluation of PTB primary caesium fountain frequency standard CSF1 between MJD 60519 - MJD 60549

PTB's primary caesium fountain frequency standard CSF1 was operated between MJD 60519, 0:00 UTC and MJD 60549, 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 12.4 \times 10⁻¹⁴ (τ /s)^{-1/2} during the 30 days. The actual measurement time amounts to 93.0% of the 30 \times 24 hours. This results in a statistical uncertainty $\mu_A = 0.08 \times 10^{-15}$, assuming that white frequency noise is the dominant noise source.

For the statistical uncertainty due to the clock link $u_{A/Lab} = 0.05 \times 10^{-15}$ is obtained by taking into account the actual measurement time, while the systematic uncertainty due to the clock link *u*B/Lab is negligible. Finally, the estimated uncertainty for the link to TAI for 30 days is $u_{\text{TAI}} = 0.13 \times 10^{-15}$.

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 4.0×10^{-16} (1 σ) for the relevant period $[1]$.

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

Combined uncertainty (1σ) 0.43 \times 10⁻¹⁵

Type A (statistical) uncertainty of CSF1

For the microwave synthesis the previously utilized optically stabilized microwave oscillator [2] has been replaced by a new system for the optical generation of ultrastable microwave signals. The new system utilizes the same cavity stabilized laser as before, but a new commercial frequency comb system, where the microwave signal is obtained from a photodiode. As before this signal is locked to a hydrogen maser in the long-term and employed as local oscillator for the PTB fountain clocks.

The frequency instability 12.4 \times 10⁻¹⁴ (τ /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].

The optically stabilized microwave system was available during 95.9% of the TAI measurement interval. Alternatively a quartz-based frequency synthesis system was employed.

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].

In the report interval, the microwave power in the state selection and Ramsey cavity was newly optimized, which on the one hand leads to an increased atom number and thus to improved frequency instability. On the other hand, this optimization leads to a changed ratio of the probability amplitudes of the two clock states after the first Ramsey interaction. Despite the increased atom number, in CSF1 this results in a smaller collisional shift and a smaller associated systematic uncertainty [1,3].

At the 26th 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 W₀ = 62 636 856.0 m²s⁻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 0.02×10^{-16} [1] is attributed now and in the future.

Frequency shifts, corrections and type B uncertainties of CSF1 (parts in 10¹⁶):

References

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

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

[3] K. Szymaniec, W. Chalupczak, E. Tiesinga, C. J. Williams, S. Weyers, and R. Wynands, Physical Review Letters **98**, 153002 (April 2007), <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.153002>