Fundamental bounds on the clock time variance of atomic clocks

Martin Fraas

Recent Advances in Quantum Metrology, Warsaw, March 2016

http://arxiv.org/pdf/1303.6083.pdf

### Abstract

1. Mathematical aspects and challenges in the atomic clock theory

2. Analytical bounds on long time stability of atomic clocks

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

# How well we can measure time?

Classical mechanics: There is no obstacle to built a perfect clock within the theory.

Quantum mechanics: Perfect clock requires infinite mass and infinite power.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

# Atomic clock model: variables and notation

- $\omega_0$  Quantum reference frequency
- $\omega(t)$  Clocks LO frequency; The relative frequency error is

$$y(t) = rac{\omega(t) - \omega_0}{\omega_0}$$

t<sub>clock</sub> – Clock time;

$$t_{clock} = rac{1}{\omega_0} \int_0^t \omega(s) \mathrm{d}s; \quad t_{clock} - t = \int_0^t y(s) \mathrm{d}s$$

•  $y_{LO}(t) - LO$  frequency in absence of a feedback

•  $\hat{y}$  – Feedback upon which

$$y(t) \rightarrow y(t) - \hat{y}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Atomic clock specifications

Free running LO noise  $y_{LO}(t)$ 

Frequency reference; Initial state  $\rho$ ; Interrogation dynamics;

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Feedback protocol

# Local oscillator model

Principle mathematical properties:

- Markov property. The LO noise  $y_{LO}(t)$  is a Markov process,  $y_{LO}(t) = K(t, 0)(y_{LO}(0)).$
- Martingale property. The LO frequency ω<sub>LO</sub>(t) has no knowledge about ω<sub>0</sub>, e.g. E[y<sub>LO</sub>(t)|y<sub>LO</sub>(0)] = y<sub>LO</sub>(0).

Adding two further reasonable properties, Autonomy and continuity we get

Example (Canonical example of LO-noise)

$$y_{LO}(t) = \sqrt{2D}W_t,$$

where  $W_t$  is the Wiener process.

## Feedback model

Interrogation: In each time window jT, (j + 1)T the initial quantum state of the reference evolves as

$$ho \quad o \quad 
ho(ar{y}_j); \quad ar{y}_j = rac{1}{T} \int_{j-1T}^{jT} y(s) \mathrm{d}s.$$

Feedback:  $\hat{y}_j$  is obtained by measurement  $\Pi(\hat{y})$  on the state, i.e.

$$Prob(\hat{y}_j = \hat{y}) = Tr(\rho(\bar{y}_j)\Pi(\hat{y})).$$

We denote  $F_T(\varphi)$  the QFI of the family  $\rho(\varphi)$  at a point  $\varphi$ .

# Example (Hamiltonian model) $\rho(\bar{y}_j) = \exp(-iHT\bar{y}_j)\rho\exp(iHT\bar{y}_j), \quad F = 4T^2 < \Delta E^2 >_{\rho}$

# Full, closed loop model

Put  $y_n(t) := y(t + nT), \quad t \in [0, T), \quad y_n := y_n(0).$ 

The evolution equations of the model are

 $y_n(t) = K_t y_n, \quad t \in [0, T)$  $y_{n+1} = K_T y_n - \hat{y}_n.$ 

Given specifications  $\rho(\varphi)$ ,  $\Pi(\hat{y})$ ,  $K_t$ , T we determine y(t).

#### Measures of instability

• Allan Variance:  $\sigma^2(\tau) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\tau}^{2\tau} y(s) ds - \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{0}^{\tau} y(s) ds \right)^2 \right]$ For atomic clocks  $\sigma^2(\tau) \sim D\tau^{-1}$  as  $\tau \to \infty$ .

- Clock Time Variance:  $\mathbb{E}[(t_{clock} t)^2]$ 
  - For large t,  $t^2\sigma^2(t) \sim \mathbb{E}[(t_{clock} t)^2] \sim Dt$ .

# Unbiased clock

Unbiased clock is accurate in average,  $\mathbb{E}[t_{clock}] = t$ .

 $\mathbb{E}[y(s)] = 0$  provided  $\mathbb{E}[y(0)] = 0.$ 

 $\Downarrow$  (variational argument)

For some  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[y - \hat{y}|y] = \zeta y$ ;  $(1 - \zeta)$  is the gain in the feedback loop.

1

#### Definition ( $\zeta$ -unbiased clock)

The clock is  $\zeta\text{-unbiased}$  if the estimation procedure is  $\zeta\text{-biased}$  with  $|\zeta|<1.$ 

### Stationary states - properties

#### Theorem

Suppose that  $\{\rho_T(\varphi), \Pi(\hat{y}), K_T\}$  is an  $\zeta$ -unbiased clock and let  $F_T(\varphi)$  be a Fisher inf. assoc. to the family  $\rho_T(\varphi)$ . Then for the associated clock time variance we have a bound

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}[(t_{clock}-t)^2]}{t}\geq T\frac{1}{F_T}+T\sigma_{LO}^2(T)\frac{\beta}{(1-\zeta)^2},$$

where  $\beta$  is a constant associated to the noise and

$$\sigma_{LO}^2(T) := \mathbb{E}[(\bar{y}_n - y_n)^2].$$

Above  $1/F_T$  is a shorthand for  $\mathbb{E}[1/F_T(\bar{y}_n)]$ .

#### Unitary model

For a unitary evolution  $F_T = 4T^2(\Delta E)^2$ , and a phenomenological dependence  $\sigma_{LO}^2(T) = DT^{\alpha}$  we can find optimal T in the latter bound and we get

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}[(t_{clock}-t)^2]}{t}\geq C\left(\frac{1}{4\Delta^2 E}\right)^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha+2}},$$

with constant

$$C = \frac{\alpha+2}{\alpha+1} \left( \frac{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha+2)D(\alpha+1)^2}{(1-\zeta)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+2}}$$

 $\alpha = 0$  is 1/f noise;  $\alpha = 1$  is Wiener process.

# Cramer-Rao bound

For a given prob. dist.  $q(\varphi)$  we introduce an average QFI,

$$ilde{F} = \int F(arphi) rac{ ilde{q}(arphi)^2}{q(arphi)} \mathrm{d}arphi, \quad ilde{q}(arphi) = rac{\int_arphi^\infty s q(s) \mathrm{d}s}{\sigma(q)^2}.$$

#### Theorem

Let  $\hat{\varphi}$  be an estimation of a ran. var.  $\varphi$  (of zero mean) with a prior prob. dist.  $q(\varphi)$ . Then it holds

$$\mathbb{E}[(arphi - \hat{arphi})^2] \geq rac{1}{ ilde{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbb{E}[arphi^2]^{-1}}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Mathematical Challenges

Phase-Frequency ambiguity (entanglement)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- Asymptotic normality
- Mixing times
- Entropy production

# Thank you for your attention!