## PHASE MODULATION FOR REDUCED VIBRATION SENSTIVITY IN LASER-COOLED CLOCKS IN SPACE *

W.M. Klipstein[1], G.J. Dick[1], S.R. Jefferts[2], F.L. Walls[2]

[1]Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, U.S.A.
[2]National Institute of Standards and Technology, Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.

### ABSTRACT

The standard interrogation technique in atomic beam clocks is square-wave frequency modulation(SWFM), which suffers a first-order sensitivity to vibrations as changes in the transit time of the atoms translates to perceived frequency errors. Square-wave phase modulation (SWPM) interrogation eliminates sensitivity to this noise. We present a particular scheme utilizing independent phase control of the two cavities. The technique is being considered for use with the Primary Atomic Reference Clock in Space (PARCS), a laser-cooled cesium clock scheduled to fly aboard the International Space Station in 2005. In addition to eliminating first-order sensitivity to vibrations, the minimum attack time now in this scheme is the Rabi pulse time (t), rather than the Ramsey time (T). This helps minimize dead time and the degradation of stability due to aliasing.

### INTRODUCTION

The vibration spectrum on the International Space Station (ISS) is expected to be sufficiently severe that it can cause serious problems for atomic clocks using laser-cooled atoms and traditional (SWFM) techniques. As a result, we propose as a solution for the PARCS [1]clock, an old idea, dating back to Ramsey[2], of using phase modulation. SWPM is relatively easily realized in many modern frequency synthesizers which depend on direct digital synthesizers(DDS)[3,4] as a part of the synthesis chain. SWPM has several distinct advantages over SWFM, most importantly for PARCS, the vibration sensitivity is reduced by orders of magnitude. The actual implementation of SWPM for PARCS will use two independent frequency synthesizers, one driving each of the Ramsey interaction zones. With this topology, the duty cycle of the clock is significantly enhanced for the case of a multiple launch per "lineside" (or phase). Lastly, a whole class of systematic frequency shifts is greatly suppressed as will be discussed in a later paper[5].

While the focus of the present paper is towards laser-cooled atomic clocks in space, with two separated Ramsey interaction zones, many of the advantages apply equally well to other clock geometries, including traditional thermal beam clocks, pulsed fountain clocks and continuous fountain clocks[6]. We have tested SWPM in October 1999 on NIST-F1, the NIST primary frequency standard (a pulsed cesium fountain) and found no significant frequency offset relative to SWFM at the $10^{-15}$ level. SWPM has also recently been implemented on the USNO cesium fountain with success[7].

### LINE SHAPE and MODULATION

PARCS, as shown schematically in Fig. 1, has two Ramsey interaction zones separated by 75 cm. In the vicinity of the central Ramsey fringe the fringe can be described by

$$P_4 = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \cos(\Omega_o T_R + \phi)] \sin^2 b\tau \qquad (1)$$

where $P_4$ is the probability of transition from the $|3,0\rangle$ to the $|4,0\rangle$ level, $\Omega_o$ is the offset from the resonance frequency, $\Omega_o = \omega - \omega_o$, $T_R$ is the Ramsey time, and $\phi$ is the phase angle between the microwave fields in the two Ramsey interaction zones[8].



Figure 1 - The PARCS Ramsey zone (shown schematically) with independent phase control of the two cavities.

In the usual Ramsey interrogation technique, $\phi$ is set equal to zero and the interrogation frequency is modulated between the points a and b in Fig.2. The frequency at point a (or b) is adjusted to be higher (lower) by an amount $\delta\omega$ such that the phase of the microwave field in the second Ramsey interaction leads (lags) the phase of the atomic superposition by $\pi/2$ at a given Ramsey time of $T_R$. If $P_4(a)$ is larger (smaller) than $P_4(b)$, the synthesizer frequency is lowered (raised) by an appropriate amount so that $P_4(a)=P_4(b)$. The relative phase between the atomic superposition and the microwave field in the second Ramsey zone therefore depends on the Ramsey time. Vibrations of the atomic clock along the atomic trajectory

*Figure 2 - The central Ramsey fringe with no vibration is shown solid while the effects of vibration are shown as dotted fringes. The points a and b are the FWHM of the fringe, which is the normal modulation using SWFM.*

will change the Ramsey time resulting in Ramsey resonances depicted by the dotted lines in Fig2. These vibrations cause noise in the clock as a result of this "breathing" of the width of the Ramsey fringe[9].

If $\phi$ in equation 1 is set to $\pm\pi/2$ instead of 0 then the resulting Ramsey curve has either a rising or falling dispersion shape as shown in Fig 3. The $\pi/2$ phase difference between the two Ramsey interactions causes the $P_4(a)=P_4(b)$ point to occur at the resonance frequency of the atom. The frequency servo now works by first measuring $P_4$ for $+\pi/2$ relative phase between the Ramsey zones and then $-\pi/2$. The frequency is adjusted so that $P_4(\pi/2)=P_4(-\pi/2)$. Because the phase of the microwave field is advancing at the same rate as the phase of the atomic superposition, changes in the Ramsey time do not affect the relative phase between the atomic superposition and the microwave field in the second Ramsey interaction zone. Changes in the Ramsey time cause the slope of the dispersion curve to change, as is



*Figure 3 - The central Ramsey fringe under $\pm\pi/2$ phase modulation conditions. The servo steers the frequency to the fringe crossing point. The effect of vibration is illustrated by the dotted fringe.*

illustrated by the dotted lines in Fig. 3, but the crossing point (i.e. the point $P_4(\pi/2)=P_4(-\pi/2)$) is unchanged. This insensitivity to Ramsey time greatly reduces the vibration sensitivity of the atomic clock as will be shown below.

An additional advantage of the independent phase modulation technique is realized in the PARCS clock which launches many (of order 10) balls of atoms at either $\pi/2$ of phase lag or lead. In a traditional SWFM modulation scheme the servo must be blanked for a time on the order of the transit time of the atoms through the clock $\approx T_R$ between frequencies above and below the resonance. This blanking time contributes to the dead time and therefore increases aliasing of the local oscillator noise (Dick Effect)[10]. When using SWPM, however, the servo blanking time is reduced to the atom transit time through the second Ramsey cavity $\approx \tau$ and the dead time fraction therefore reduced, thus reducing the aliasing effect. The reduction in dead time fraction also reduces the total number of atoms which must be launched in order to support a given short term frequency stability, thus reducing the magnitude of the spin-exchange frequency shift as well as relaxing the short term stability requirements on the local oscillator through the aforementioned reduction in aliasing. This technique (SWPM) has significant terrestrial applications as well[11].

## Impact of Random Accelerations on Frequency Stability

Interrogation errors due to unwanted accelerations of the waveguide structures used to distribute microwave signals to two physically separated interrogation sites can substantially degrade the performance of a laser-cooled frequency standard. In such a standard, slow-moving laser-cooled bunches of atoms are sequentially interrogated as they arrive at one and then the other of the two interrogation regions. Errors arise if the phase of the microwave signal is systematically varied with respect to the atomic phase itself.

### F M Effects

Here, an error arises because physical acceleration of the beam tube causes microwave interrogations to take place too soon or too late, giving rise to an unwanted phase difference between atoms and L.O. due to the FM frequency offset.

The effect of random motions of the beam tube $x(t)$ have been properly analyzed in terms of an aliasing effect, where motions at frequencies near $f=1/2T_c$ are aliased to near zero frequency[9]. We rewrite eq. 2.26+ of [9], in terms of a dependence on interrogation (or drift) time $t_i$, and assuming the usual $\pi/2$ phase progression during the interrogation as:

$$y_{fm}(f) = \frac{x(f)}{4t_i v_o L} \qquad (2)$$

where $y=\delta v/v$ and $x(f)$ is a time dependent motion along the axis of the drift space.

Because the frequency error induced by a (e.g.) motion-delayed measurement shows periodic sign reversals due to frequency modulation, slow variations will show an aliasing effect, with the lowest frequencies effectively eliminated, and other frequencies aliased to near zero frequency. Actual aliasing amplitudes will depend on

details of the interrogation strategy; dead time, etc.

We calculate the effect for a model of SWFM with no dead time. This will give aliased responses at odd harmonics of the modulation frequency, with amplitudes given by the harmonic content of a square wave with unit amplitude. This methodology is similar to that developed in Ref[9], except we include a missing amplitude for the aliasing effect itself of $2/\pi$ for SWFM and also include the higher (odd) harmonics.

Because the characteristics of the ISS are given in terms of accelerations as $S_a(f)$ we rewrite the previous equation as:

$$s_y^{fm}(f) = \frac{S_a(f)}{(2\pi f)^4} \frac{1}{(4t_i v_o L)^2} \qquad (3)$$

If the frequency standard is interrogated with a half-cycle (frequency measurement) time of $T_c$, its operation will show aliased frequency fluctuations $S_y^a(0)$ as:

$$s_y^a(0) = (\frac{2}{\pi})^2 \sum_{n=1,3,..}^{\infty} [s_y^{fm}(\frac{n}{2t_c})\frac{1}{n^2}] \qquad (4)$$

This spectral density gives rise to an Allan deviation limit to the performance of the frequency standard of:

$$\sigma_y^a(\tau) = \sqrt{\frac{CS_y(0)}{\tau}} \qquad (5)$$

where $C=1/2$.

Figure 4 shows a smoothed plot of the acceleration spectrum expected on the ISS together with a conversion from the 1/3 octave plot to a more conventional spectral density of acceleration. This allows us to calculate an expected limitation to the $1/\sqrt{\tau}$ performance as given by the previous equations. The result of this calculation is shown in Fig.5.

It is clear from Fig. 5 that any problems due to FM interrogation are strongly dependent on the operating conditions of the frequency standard. For a short interrogation and a half cycle time of 1 second, as is planned for PHARAO, the aliasing effect is small.



Figure 4 *Smoothed approximation to ISS vibration specification. Shown are both the 1/3 octave form as specified by the ISS and the more traditional $Hz^{-1/2}$ form used in our calculations.*



**Half FM Cycle Time (seconds)**

*Figure 5. Vibration-induced limitation to white frequency noise performance due to aliasing with FM interrogation. Nominal PARCS conditions are a 5 second interrogation (drift) time and a 50 second frequency measurement time to match performance of the H-maser L.O.*

PARCS, is expected to operate with multiple balls of atoms per "lineside", long Ramsey times, a high-performance hydrogen maser local oscillator(LO). and half cycle times of typically 50 s, a process that involves hundreds of balls of atoms. For this case, aliased noise is clearly an issue because the performance is marginal. In particular PARCS is expected to operate before ISS construction is complete, during which time microgravity conditions are not obtained and frequency stability would be substantially degraded.

**Other Effects**

The linear phase progression as the atoms drift down the beam tube can be eliminated by the use of interrogation schemes using SWPM instead of frequency modulation. This eliminates the large frequency sensitivity discussed above.

However, there remain several smaller effects which are discussed here. It is worth mentioning that the signs of these remaining smaller effects do not reverse during the course of either phase or frequency modulation, and so the sensitivity to very low frequency physical acceleration is not reduced by averaging over many interrogation cycles.

**Phase Delay**

Even if the microwave interrogation structures move rigidly, any motion will give rise to phase shifts between the two interrogating cavities due to the fact that the microwave photons are not dragged with the waveguide structure that feeds the interrogating microwave signals to the cavities. Here we assume that the waveguides are empty and not filled with a dielectric. For this effect we write:

$$y_{pd}(f) = \dot{x}(f)\frac{L}{c^2 t_i} = 2\pi x(f)\frac{L}{c^2 t_i}. \qquad (6)$$

**Mechanical Compression**

A phase error can also result from mechanical compression of the waveguide structure under acceleration. Linear compression under a uniform acceleration $a(f)$ where

$f \approx 0$ is given by:

$$\delta L(f) = a(f)\frac{\rho L^2}{2Y} = a(f)\frac{L^2}{2v_s^2} = (2\pi)^2 f^2 \delta x(f)\frac{L^2}{2v_s^2} \quad (7)$$

where $\rho$ is the material density and $Y$ is the stiffness which combine to give the speed of sound as $v_s = \sqrt{Y/\rho}$. A change in waveguide length changes the rf phase to give rise to an imputed frequency error as:

$$y_{mc}(f) = \frac{\delta\phi(f)}{\phi} = \frac{\delta L(f)/\lambda}{v_o t_i} = \frac{\delta L(f)}{ct_i} \quad (8)$$

and so

$$\frac{y_{mc}(f)}{\delta x(f)} = \frac{2\pi^2 f^2 L}{v_s^2 ct_i} \quad (9)$$

## Comparison

We can compare the phase delay and mechanical-compression frequency tunings with that due to FM interrogation, irrespective of aliasing, and a comparison that is valid at frequencies higher than $f=1/(2T_c)$. Plugging in values of $v_o = 10^{10}$, $v_s = 10^4$ m/s, $L = 1$m, $f = 1$ Hz, and $t_i = 10$s gives a frequency sensitivity of

$$\frac{y_{fm}(f)}{a(f)} \approx 2.5\times 10^{-12}\,(\frac{1Hz}{f})^2\,/g \quad (10)$$

for FM, while the smaller underlying electromagnetic and electromechanical effects described by Eq. 6,9 combine to give a sensitivity remaining with SWPM of

$$\frac{y_{pm}(f)}{a(f)} \approx 2.5\times 10^{-18}(1 + \frac{0.1Hz}{f})/g \quad (11)$$

Note that while the FM term is a true position dependence, the two terms in the PM expression are actually velocity and acceleration dependencies, respectively. Thus while the PM terms do not show the nominally zero sensitivity at the lowest frequencies that characterize FM modulation, the terms are smaller by a power of f or $f^2$ at these low frequencies. Additionally they will not show the aliasing of relatively larger accelerations in the mid-frequency range to zero frequency, as does the FM sensitivity.

## INDEPENDENT PHASE CONTROL

The main operational difficulty in implementing independent phase control of the two cavities is in evaluating and maintaining the end-to-end cavity phase shift. In traditional beam tubes this shift results from differing electrical path lengths to the two cavities, a quantity which is typically extremely stable as it results from the mechanical properties of the waveguide only. This typically is evaluated by reversing the direction of the beam through the cavities and comparing the results.

In the cesium instrument of PARCS beam reversal is not practical, but several additional handles are available. Specifically, laser cooling provides extremely narrow velocity distributions and the ability to vary the launch velocity, which remains constant in the absence of gravity. Since the end-to-end shift is truly a phase offset, the apparent frequency error of interest can be related to the phase offset from Eqn. 1 as:

$$\delta\Omega_{end} = \frac{\phi_{end}}{T_R} \,. \quad (12)$$

For separation, L, between the two microwave cavities, the frequency error can be expressed in terms of the launch velocity as

$$\delta\Omega_{end} = \frac{\phi_{end}\,v_{launch}}{L} \,. \quad (13)$$

Eqn. 13 makes explicit the utility of varying the launch velocity as a technique for extracting the phase error, $\phi_{end}$. Measuring the clock frequency over a range of velocities allows a determination of the phase-offset as shown in Figure 6. The phase error could then be corrected by the synthesizer controlling the second cavity.

The performance goals of PARCS include accuracy of 5 x $10^{-17}$, which for a 5 s Ramsey time means that phase offsets must be known to 14 $\mu$rad. Just as long Ramsey times mitigate the effect of phase errors on the fractional frequency performance of the clock, so too can higher launch velocities make the phase errors measurable. Launch velocities of 10s of meters per second are attainable, with 15 m/s representing a 100-fold increase over the standard operation of PARCS, using 15 cm/s launches. Varying the launch velocity obviously impacts more than just the end-to-end shift, requiring some care in order to separate out the piece linear in velocity. First, one might worry that operating at high velocities would compromise the stability of the clock, since the line Q degrades linearly with velocity. However, since most launched atoms are never detected due to thermal expansion of the cloud, the immediate result of increasing the launch velocity is to increase the number of detected atoms getting through the final aperture, roughly

$$N_{det} \propto v_{launch}^2 \,. \quad (14)$$

The net result of increasing the launch velocity is that the stability improves as:

$$\sigma_y(\tau) \propto \sqrt{v_{launch}} \,. \quad (15)$$

This improvement holds up to the point at which most launched atoms are detected, which occurs at roughly 2 m/s, above which the stability would begin to degrade. Even out to launch velocities of 20 m/s, the stability would remain better than that obtained from the operating condition of 15



Figure 6 Apparent frequency error is linearly proportional to velocity. Launching at high velocities gives over 100-fold increase on the measurement of the phase offset.

cm/s. This comparison assumes only one ball is launched at a time, which is how the end-to-end evaluation will likely be performed, but during normal operation multiple launching will improve the stability by roughly a factor of 3. The design stability for PARCS is $5 \times 10^{-14}t^{-1/2}$, so launches at 15 m/s would be expected to run at a stability of $1 \times 10^{-13}t^{-1/2}$ taking these different factors into account. With a lever of 100 on the relative size of the phase error, this suggests that ongoing evaluation of this error term would take 4% of the time spent in normal clock operation. The extent to which this shift is stable will have to be empirically determined, and based on this a proper protocol for making these measurements will be developed.

Comparison of measurements made with 15m/s launches to those with 15cm/s launches is problematic since too many other factors could vary. The cold-collision shift which typically dominates cold-atom cesium clocks is of particular concern here. With a five second Ramsey time, the density will drop three orders of magnitude from one end of the clock to the other, while with a 0.05 second Ramsey time the density change is roughly 4%. The collision shift during the end-to-end evaluation will be roughly 35 times larger than in the operational mode, but with a lever of 100 on the phase error, variations in the density during fast launches will not be a limitation.

Of equal importance to the density is the collision energy involved in interatomic collisions, as the frequency shift is a strong function of energy as calculated by Williams and co-workers at NIST (submitted to Phys. Rev. A, 2000), growing in magnitude and even changing sign. Initially, the collision energy is roughly the thermal energy until the cloud has expanded an amount comparable to its initial size. Then the collision energy is dominated by phase space considerations: atoms at the same point in space must be traveling at nearly the same velocity, so the collision energy is reduced. Under normal operating conditions PARCS will strongly be in this latter condition, crossing into an intermediate condition at around 1 m/s, and significantly above that the thermal energy dominates. Comparing measurements using several fast launch velocities between 5m/s and 20m/s satisfies the requirement that collisional frequency offsets are stable.

The relative phase between the cavities will be affected by changes in the temperature and microwave power incident on the mixers. We have measured the temperature dependence of a mixer to determine this sensitivity, and find that in order to maintain an uncertainty of a few parts in $10^{17}$ the temperature must be stable to 10 mK. Note that this is not an absolute temperature, but the time scale over which this temperature stability holds could well set the limit on how often we must measure the end-to-end shift.

In order to realize a factor of 100 lever on the velocity, while maintaining $\pi/2$ excitation, we require 40 dB changes in the RF power. Matched attenuators can be quite stable over such a broad range, but not at the performance level we need. A more likely approach is to maintain the power level on the mixers at the highest level, but playing one of several tricks to maintain the p/2 condition. In order to determine the power stability requirement, we have directly measured the power sensitivity of a mixer and conclude that the power must be stable to 0.1% to keep phase errors to the low $10^{-17}$ level. One way to realize this would be to adjust the phase of the DDS output by pi on a time scale fast compared to the cavity ring time, spending a bit more time with the "plus" phase than the "minus" phase. The power in the microwave cavity will rapidly advance for a short time, then retreat, taking 100 steps forward and 99 back over and over again so that the net power in the cavity gives p/2 to the atoms. Other approaches similar in principle would involve using a variable amount of on-frequency RF with white noise added, or a mixture of on-resonant RF with an off-resonant frequency to make up the power budget without affecting the atomic spins.

One requirement of all these tricks, satisfied by the phase switching solution, is that the excitation must be spread over the entire transit time so the Rabi pedestal is not broadened artificially. This phase adjustment involves a single bit in the DDS, and seems to be the most elegant solution.

**Acknowledgments**

**REFERENCES**

1. Heavner, T.P. et al, "Characterization of a Cold Cesium Source for PARCS: Primary Atomic Reference Clock in Space", *Proc of the 2000 IEEE Freq. Control Symposium*, 2000, 656-658.

2. Ramsey, N.F., *Molecular Beams*, Oxford at the Calrendon Press, 1956. Ch. V.§4.

3. SenGupta, A., Popovic, D., Walls, F.L., "Cs Frequency Synthesis: A New Approach", *Proc of the 1999 Joint Meeting of the E.F.T.F and the IEEE F.C. S*, 1999, 615.

4. Rovera, G.D., Santarelli, G., Clairon, A., "Frequency Synthesis Chain for the Atomic Fountain Primary Standard", *IEEE Trans. Ultran., Ferroelect., Freq. Contr.*, **43**, 354-358 (1996).

5. Klipstein, W., et. al. to be submitted to the *IEEE Trans. Ultran., Ferroelect., Freq. Contr.*

6. Thomann, P, et.al. *These proceedings*.

7. Burt, E, et. al. *These proceedings*.

8. Vanier J., Audoin, C., *The Quantum Physics of Atomic Frequency Standards*, Adam Hilger, 1989, pg. 634.

9. Lemonde, P., "Pharao: Etude D'une Horologe Spatiale Utilisant des Atomes Refroids Par Laser; Relisation d'un Prototype", These De Doctorate de L'Universite Paris iV, 1997.

10. See for example the collection of articles in *IEEE Trans. Ultran., Ferroelect., Freq. Contr.*, **45**, 1998, 876-905 and the references contained therein.

11. Kujundzic, D., Heavner, T.P., Jefferts, S.R., "Design Studies for a high-Stability Laser-Cooled Rubidium Local-Oscillator at NIST" *to be presented at the 2001 IEEE Frequency Control Symposium.*