

Free Space Optical Frequency Comparison Over Rapidly Moving Links

Shawn M. P. McSorley,^{1,2} Benjamin P. Dix-Matthews,^{1,2} Alex M. Frost,¹ Ayden S. McCann,¹ Skevos F. E. Karpathakis,¹ David R. Gozzard,¹ Shane M. Walsh,¹ and Sascha W. Schediwy¹

¹*International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research,
The University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia*

²*These two authors contributed equally*

The comparison of optical reference frequency signals over free-space optical links is limited by the relative motion between local and remote sites. Extreme Doppler shifts experienced in rapidly moving optical links, such as for ground-to-space, prevent the narrow-band detection required to compare or transfer optical frequencies at the highest levels of stability. We demonstrate a system capable of optical frequency comparison in the presence of extreme Doppler shifts, using an electro-optic phase modulator with an actuation bandwidth of 10 GHz, sufficient to enable ground-to-space frequency comparison. This system was demonstrated over a retro-reflected drone link, with a maximum line-of-sight velocity of 15 m s^{-1} and Doppler shift of 20 MHz. The best fractional frequency stability obtained was 2×10^{-17} at an integration time of 2 s. These results suggest that optical frequency comparison between rapidly moving targets, as in ground-to-space applications, is possible with further system development.

The comparison of ultra-stable optical clocks will allow for unprecedented tests of fundamental physics. Optical clocks are already capable of testing Einstein's theory of General Relativity in the weak field regime [1, 2], providing extremely precise measurements of gravitational redshift. Their impact will be seen in geodesy, providing new means of defining and measuring the geoid [2, 3], as well as contributing to the redefinition of the SI second [4].

The fractional frequency stability achieved by current state-of-the-art optical clocks is on the order of 10^{-18} [2]. The comparison of these ultra-stable optical reference frequency signals (herein referred to as optical references) is not possible with conventional radio-frequency techniques, which are limited by their low carrier frequency. The past 20 years has seen rapid development on a variety of optical technologies capable of transferring or comparing optical references. Here, optical frequency transfer refers to the real-time delivery of an optical reference to a remote site, while optical frequency comparison refers to a comparison made between two optical references, but not necessarily made in real time.

One method of optical frequency transfer is the Doppler cancellation scheme, which has been used by several groups to transfer optical references from a local site to a remote site, on both optical fiber links [5–7] and free-space optical (FSO) links [8–12]. This scheme requires partial reflection of the delivered optical frequency from the remote site, so that round-trip phase disturbances experienced along the link can be measured using a phase-locked loop (PLL) and suppressed using optical frequency actuators.

The requirement of receiving a reflection from the remote site becomes a drawback as the optical links get longer, which result in less returned power. Furthermore, several groups have highlighted that Doppler cancellation with optical frequency actuators is not currently capable of dealing with extreme Doppler shifts [13–16], where either the optical frequency actuator no longer has the

tuning range to suppress the measured frequency shift, or the narrow-band measurement system is no longer able to measure the returned frequency.

Rather than delivering an optical frequency reference to a remote site, some groups have demonstrated that two-way frequency transfer (TWFT) can be used to compare optical frequencies in post processing [17, 18], similar to two-way time transfer techniques demonstrated in [16] and [19]. This technique does not require partial reflection from the remote site, as synchronised measurements of optical phase from the local site and remote site is sufficient for determining the experienced link noise, and inferring the frequency difference between optical references. This is beneficial, as the two-way technique will not suffer from the extreme power loss or noise degradation experienced when double-passing a long fiber or atmospheric link.

The link power loss necessitates that both the two-way technique and Doppler cancellation scheme have narrow bandwidth detection PLLs [15, 20]. However, relative motion between the local and remote site can add large Doppler shifts to the frequency of the optical carrier [13, 14, 21]. For example, the calculations from [22] indicate that optical TWFT to satellites in low earth orbit (LEO), operating at a wavelength of 1550 nm, are expected to experience Doppler shifts on the order of $\pm 4 \text{ GHz}$. This makes optical TWFT difficult when large Doppler shifts are present, as the narrow bandwidth detection PLLs are often on the order of 1 kHz or less.

In this Letter, we describe a system for optical frequency comparison over rapidly moving FSO links, using TWFT. The system, shown in Fig. 1(a), is capable of compensating Doppler shifts up to 10 GHz. We demonstrate this system over a moving retro-reflected link to an airborne drone with a maximum line-of-sight velocity of 15 m s^{-1} , limited by the maximum speed of the drone, or an equivalent Doppler shift of 20 MHz. This exceeds the experienced Doppler shift of similar demonstrations by an order of magnitude [13, 14]. A fractional frequency




FIG. 1. System diagram for free-space optical frequency transfer to rapidly moving targets. The general point-to-point architecture is shown in (a), while the folded experimental demonstration is shown in (b). Denoted are electro-optic modulators (EOM), acousto-optic modulators (AOM), photodetectors (PD) and phase-locked loops (PLL). Optical signals are shown in green and electrical signals are shown in blue. The time-varying optical time-of-flight is denoted by $T(t)$.

stability of 2×10^{-17} at an integration time of 2 s was obtained.

This system comprises two optical transceivers, each containing an optical reference. The two optical references can be modelled in terms of their phase denoted by $\phi_{L1}(t) = \omega_{L1}t + \Delta\phi_{L1}(t)$ and $\phi_{L2}(t) = \omega_{L2}t + \Delta\phi_{L2}(t)$. Here, ω_{L1} and ω_{L2} are the nominal frequency of each optical reference. Phase fluctuations around these nominal frequencies are denoted by $\Delta\phi_{L1}$ and $\Delta\phi_{L2}$. The difference in frequency, $\Delta\phi_L(t) = \Delta\phi_{L1}(t) - \Delta\phi_{L2}(t)$, is the primary metric of interest for frequency comparison.

Independent comparisons of $\phi_{L1}(t)$ and $\phi_{L2}(t)$ are made at both transceivers using PLLs to determine $\Delta\phi_L(t)$. The comparisons are made by forming two optical interferometers which provide two radio-frequency (RF) beat notes that encode $\Delta\phi_L(t)$, corrupted by the free-space link noise. The RF beat notes are centred on a known frequency using two acousto-optic modulators (AOM), with frequency shifts denoted by ω_1 and ω_2 .

This TWFT technique is limited by both the 250 MHz bandwidth of the detection photodetectors (PD) at either transceiver, and the narrow bandwidth of the PLL. For optical frequency comparison over rapidly moving links, where the optical signal experiences Doppler shifts exceeding the PD bandwidth, it becomes impossible to infer $\Delta\phi_L(t)$ without further system modifications. Furthermore, Doppler correction using AOMs is not feasible for frequency shifts exceeding the AOM actuation bandwidth (typically on the order of only 1 MHz).

To bypass these limitations, Doppler correction is achieved using an electro-optic modulator (EOM), which typically has a much greater actuation bandwidth (up to 100 GHz). In this system, a phase modulating EOM is driven at a frequency $\omega_m(t)$, which creates two optical sidebands at frequencies $\omega_L - \omega_m(t)$ and $\omega_L + \omega_m(t)$.

The instantaneous phase at both PDs is then given by,

$$\phi_1(t) = \phi_{L2}(t - T(t)) - \phi_{L1}(t) + \phi_m(t) + \omega_1 t + \omega_2(t - T(t)), \text{ and} \quad (1)$$

$$\phi_2(t) = \phi_{L1}(t - T(t)) - \phi_{L2}(t) + \phi_m(t - T(t)) + \omega_2 t + \omega_1(t - T(t)), \quad (2)$$

where $\phi_m(t) = \int_0^t \omega_m(\tau) d\tau$ and $T(t)$ is the optical time-of-flight of the link. The symmetric optical sidebands created by the EOM ensure that $\phi_m(t)$ is added to both PD phases.

The nominal instantaneous frequencies are determined as,

$$\dot{\phi}_1(t) = \omega_1 + \omega_2 - \dot{T}(t)(\omega_L + \omega_2) + \omega_m(t), \text{ and} \quad (3)$$

$$\dot{\phi}_2(t) = \omega_1 + \omega_2 - \dot{T}(t)(\omega_L + \omega_1) + \omega_m(t - T(t)). \quad (4)$$

These two frequencies are both centered on $\omega_1 + \omega_2$, with a Doppler shift term proportional to $\dot{T}(t)(\omega_L)$. If $\omega_m(t) \approx \dot{T}(t)(\omega_L)$, the instantaneous frequency at either PD will remain within the bandwidth of the PD and PLL. This can be achieved with either a servo tracking $\dot{T}(t)(\omega_L)$ from the PD1 phase, or with an *a priori* sweep.

For convenience, the EOM phase is separated into a static frequency term, ω_m , and a time varying term, $\Delta\phi_m(t)$, such that $\phi_m(t) = \omega_m t + \Delta\phi_m(t)$. As the transceiver laser sources are expected to be locked to optical or atomic clocks, their large-scale frequency differences will be slowly varying. Thus, it is assumed that $\Delta\phi_{L1,L2}(t - T(t)) \approx \Delta\phi_{L1,L2}(t)$.




FIG. 2. Time series obtained for a drone pass with maximum speed of 15 ms^{-1} and Doppler shift of 20 MHz. Shown on the left hand y-axes are the accumulated phase of the tracking EOM (a), the corrected residual phase difference from Equation 6 (b), the instantaneous frequency of the tracking EOM (c) and the instantaneous residual frequency difference (d). In plot (d), frequency impulses exceeding 400 Hz, shown in red, are masked. Shown on the right hand y-axes are the associated time-of-flight parameters, with phase in cycles corresponding to range in meters, and frequency in hertz corresponding to velocity in meters per second.

The difference $\Delta\phi_L(t)$ can then be determined as,

$$\Delta\phi_L(t) = -\frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2}\phi_{PD1}(t) + \frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}\phi_{PD2}(t) \quad (5)$$

$$+ \frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2}\Delta\phi_m(t) - \frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}\Delta\phi_m(t - T(t)).$$

where $k_1 = \omega_L + \omega_2$ and $k_2 = \omega_L + \omega_1 + \omega_m$.

By making the first order Taylor approximation $\Delta\phi_m(t - T(t)) \approx \Delta\phi_m(t) - T(t)\Delta\dot{\phi}_m(t)$, the TWFT laser difference simplifies to,

$$\Delta\phi_L(t) = -\frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2}\phi_{PD1}(t) + \frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}\phi_{PD2}(t) \quad (6)$$

$$+ \frac{k_2 - k_1}{k_1 + k_2}\Delta\phi_m(t) - \frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}T(t)\Delta\dot{\phi}_m(t).$$

This frequency difference can then be calculated in post processing with measurements of $\phi_{PD1}(t)$, $\phi_{PD2}(t)$ and $\omega_m(t)$. The optical time of flight $T(t)$ is determined from the measured EOM data,

$$T(t) = T_0 + \frac{\lambda\Delta\phi_m(t)}{c} \quad (7)$$

TABLE I. Drone Link Description

Parameter	Value
Link Distance	1.7–2.3 km
T1 Transmit Power exiting Fiber	4 dBm
T2 Transmit Power exiting Fiber	0 dBm
Typical Link Loss	30 dB

where T_0 is an arbitrary time offset, and λ is the wavelength of the optical source.

To simplify the experimental demonstration, a folded free-space test link was created using a corner cube retro-reflector (CCR) attached to a drone. This enabled the two optical transceivers to be co-located, reducing the complexity of the signal processing and electronics system design, as shown in Fig. 1(b).

Each transceiver was provided the same 1550 nm optical source (from an NKT X15 laser with linewidth <100 Hz; and power of 14 dBm). A Red Pitaya STEMLab 125-14 software defined radio was used for digitising the PD RF signals, monitoring their phase with an all-digital PLL (used in [9]), and servo control of the EOM.

We use the active tracking terminal described in [24] to minimise angular pointing errors, ensuring consistent




FIG. 3. Modified Allan deviation for two-way frequency transfer to a moving target with maximum Doppler shift of 20 MHz. Current state of the art clock performance [23] is shown as the dotted gray line.

retro-reflection of the optical signal from the drone. The nominal link parameters for this moving link are provided in Table I.

A drone manoeuvre involved accelerating the drone at an increasing rate forward and backwards along the line of sight of the optical terminal. The drone was held at maximum speed until loss-of-lock occurred, from either the Doppler tracking or tip-tilt active terminal. Several manoeuvres were undertaken over a 20 min window.

The PLL bandwidth is dependant on the return power, resulting in loss of lock when large power swings occur. To combat this, two analogue amplifier stages are used prior to digitization that saturate the measured beatnote. Having a small bandwidth also decreases the likelihood of phase cycle slips [20, 25].

A PI2 controller was designed inside the Red Pitaya to actuate the EOM's frequency $\omega_m(t)$ by the phase error seen on $\phi_1(t)$, such that $\omega_m(t) \approx \dot{T}(t)(\omega_L)$. When the controller lost lock, manual re-acquisition of the tracking system was performed.

The measured PD phases $\phi_1(t)$ and $\phi_2(t)$, and frequency measurement $\omega_{EOM}(t)$ were used to calculate the kinematics of the drone for a single manoeuvre. One manoeuvre example is shown in Fig. 2. The EOM phase and frequency are shown on the left-hand y-axes of Fig. 2(a) and Fig. 2(c). The laser phase and frequency difference, $\Delta\phi_L(t)$ and $\Delta\dot{\phi}_L(t)$, are shown on the left-hand y-axes of Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 2(d). The range and velocity, directly derived from phase and frequency, are also shown on the right-hand y-axes of each plot.

In this example, the system successfully tracks




FIG. 4. Phase power spectral density calculated for two-way frequency transfer to a moving target with maximum Doppler shift of 20 MHz (blue), and the one-way link noise (dashed blue).

300 Mcyc of accumulated laser phase, or a displacement of 300 m. The rate of change shows an accumulation of 20 MHz of frequency, or a maximum speed of 15 m s^{-1} . The laser residual difference, in terms of phase (range) and frequency (velocity), is on the order of $\pm 0.1 \text{ cyc}$ ($\pm 0.1 \mu\text{m}$), and $\pm 100 \text{ Hz}$ ($\pm 100 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$).

To minimise the impact of cycle slips on the data set, frequency impulses greater than 400 Hz in the residual error are masked. This value has been chosen to remove non-physical frequency impulses caused by loss-of-lock and cycle slipping, while minimising the impact on the residual laser noise seen in the data set.

The modified Allan deviation (MDEV) fractional frequency stability of the TWFT laser noise, calculated with Eq. 6, is provided in Fig. 3 (solid blue). The MDEV can be converted into a chronometric levelling sensitivity [14], as indicated on the right-hand axis. Also provided for comparison is the state-of-the-art lab-based optical atomic clock performance (dotted gray) [23].

The MDEV integrates down at a slope of roughly τ^{-1} , surpassing optical clocks at $\tau = 0.02 \text{ s}$, indicating white frequency noise. After 1 s of integration, the MDEV integrates at a slope of approximately τ^0 , indicating flicker frequency noise. The best obtained MDEV in the moving link is 2×10^{-17} at $\tau = 2 \text{ s}$.

The MDEV integrates up after $\tau = 5 \text{ s}$, which is likely caused by uncorrelated out of loop fiber noise, such as temperature fluctuations. The experimental system was not isolated from the environment, and was only optimised to remove macroscopic Doppler shifts from the phase at each transceiver PD. Thus, noise sources that

are not experienced identically by each transceiver will be seen in a difference measurement.

The phase power spectral density (PSD) is also provided in Fig. 4. Both the TWFT residual phase noise (solid blue) and one-way frequency transfer (dotted blue) are shown for comparison. The one-way PSD is approximated by the $\phi_m(t)$ time-series.

The one-way PSD is dominated by the kinematics of the link, and atmospheric drone noise. Below 1000 Hz, the two-way PSD shows improvement on the order of $10^{13} \text{ rad}^2 \text{ Hz}^{-1}$ at 1 Hz, and $10^4 \text{ rad}^2 \text{ Hz}^{-1}$ at 100 Hz. Between 1 Hz and 1000 Hz, this compensated PSD noise follows a f^0 profile, with a corrected noise floor of $10^{-8} \text{ rad}^2 \text{ Hz}^{-1}$, indicative of white phase noise. This white noise floor is likely a result of the analogue amplification chain.

Between 1 Hz and 10 Hz, the compensated PSD follows a f^{-1} profile, which becomes worse below 1 Hz, following a f^{-3} profile. This low frequency increase in phase noise can again be attributed to the uncorrelated out of loop fiber noise. Imperfect Doppler tracking can also contribute to this increase in noise.

In summary, we have demonstrated optical TWFT over a rapidly moving link. With further system op-

timisation and redesign, this system will be capable of comparing state of the art optical optical frequency references.

This system can also be extended to ground-to-space optical frequency transfer with the addition of an *a priori* EOM frequency sweep. This *a priori* sweep can be determined for satellites in LEO [15], with frequency sweeps capable of supporting Doppler shifts $>20 \text{ GHz}$ and Doppler rates $>100 \text{ MHz}$. An ultra-stable microwave source will be required for such a frequency sweep, to maintain the transferred stability of an optical clock.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by the SmartSat CRC, whose activities are funded by the Australian Government's CRC Program. S.M.P.M, A.M and A.F are supported by Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarships and Australian Space Agency Demonstrator Mission top-up scholarships. S.K is supported by a SmartSat CRC PhD Scholarship and a research award from The Andy Thomas Space Foundation and EOS Space Systems.

-
- [1] M. Takamoto, I. Ushijima, N. Ohmae, T. Yahagi, K. Kokado, H. Shinkai, and H. Katori, Test of general relativity by a pair of transportable optical lattice clocks, *Nature Photonics* **14**, 411 (2020).
 - [2] M. Takamoto, Y. Tanaka, and H. Katori, A perspective on the future of transportable optical lattice clocks, *Applied physics letters* **120** (2022).
 - [3] G. Lion, I. Panet, P. Wolf, C. Guerlin, S. Bize, and P. Delva, Determination of a high spatial resolution geopotential model using atomic clock comparisons, *Journal of geodesy* **91**, 597 (2017).
 - [4] J. Lodewyck, On a definition of the SI second with a set of optical clock transitions, *Metrologia* **56**, 55009 (2019).
 - [5] L.-S. Ma, P. Jungner, J. Ye, and J. L. Hall, Delivering the same optical frequency at two places: accurate cancellation of phase noise introduced by an optical fiber or other time-varying path, *Opt. Lett.* **19**, 1777 (1994).
 - [6] S. Droste, T. Udem, R. Holzwarth, and T. W. Hänsch, Optical frequency dissemination for metrology applications, *Comptes Rendus Physique* **16**, 524 (2015).
 - [7] S. W. Schediwy, D. Gozzard, K. G. H. Baldwin, B. J. Orr, R. B. Warrington, G. Aben, and A. N. Luiten, High-precision optical-frequency dissemination on branching optical-fiber networks, *Optics letters* **38**, 2893 (2013).
 - [8] D. R. Gozzard, L. A. Howard, B. P. Dix-Matthews, S. F. E. Karpathakis, C. T. Gravestock, and S. W. Schediwy, Ultrastable free-space laser links for a global network of optical atomic clocks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 020801 (2022).
 - [9] S. McSorley, D. R. Gozzard, S. F. E. Karpathakis, B. P. Dix-Matthews, and S. W. Schediwy, Stabilized free space optical frequency transfer using digitally enhanced heterodyne interferometry, *Opt. Lett.* **48**, 3637 (2023).
 - [10] B. P. Dix-Matthews, S. W. Schediwy, D. R. Gozzard, E. Savalle, F. X. Esnault, T. Lévêque, C. Gravestock, D. D'Mello, S. Karpathakis, M. Tobar, and P. Wolf, Point-to-point stabilized optical frequency transfer with active optics, *Nature Communications* 2021 12:1 **12**, 1 (2021).
 - [11] H. J. Kang, J. Yang, B. J. Chun, H. Jang, B. S. Kim, Y. J. Kim, and S. W. Kim, Free-space transfer of comb-rooted optical frequencies over an 18 km open-air link, *Nature communications* **10**, 4438 (2019).
 - [12] J. Yang, H. J. Kang, K. Lee, J. Lee, Y.-J. Kim, and S.-W. Kim, Phase-stabilized free-space link for optical frequency transfer, *Optics Communications* **504**, 127481 (2022).
 - [13] B. P. Dix-Matthews, D. R. Gozzard, S. F. E. Karpathakis, S. M. Walsh, A. McCann, A. Frost, and S. W. Schediwy, Experimental demonstration of velocimetry by actively stabilized coherent optical transfer, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **19**, 054018 (2023).
 - [14] B. P. Dix-Matthews, D. R. Gozzard, S. M. Walsh, A. S. McCann, S. F. E. Karpathakis, A. M. Frost, C. T. Gravestock, and S. W. Schediwy, Towards optical frequency geopotential difference measurements via a flying drone, *Opt. Express* **31**, 15075 (2023).
 - [15] N. Chiodo, K. Djerroud, O. Acef, A. Clairon, and P. Wolf, Lasers for coherent optical satellite links with large dynamics, *Appl. Opt.* **52**, 7342 (2013).
 - [16] H. Bergeron, L. C. Sinclair, W. C. Swann, I. Khader, K. C. Cossel, M. Cermak, J. D. Deschênes, and N. R. Newbury, Femtosecond time synchronization of optical clocks off of a flying quadcopter, *Nature Communications*

- 2019 10:1 **10**, 1 (2019).
- [17] C. E. Calosso, E. Bertacco, D. Calonico, C. Clivati, G. A. Costanzo, M. Frittelli, F. Levi, A. Mura, and A. Godone, Frequency transfer via a two-way optical phase comparison on a multiplexed fiber network, *Opt. Lett.* **39**, 1177 (2014).
 - [18] A. Bercy, F. Stefani, O. Lopez, C. Chardonnet, P.-E. Pottie, and A. Amy-Klein, Two-way optical frequency comparisons at 5×10^{-21} relative stability over 100-km telecommunication network fibers, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 061802(R) (2014).
 - [19] E. D. Caldwell, J.-D. Deschenes, J. Ellis, W. C. Swann, B. K. Stuhl, H. Bergeron, N. R. Newbury, and L. C. Sinclair, Quantum-limited optical time transfer for future geosynchronous links, *Nature* **618**, 721 (2023).
 - [20] G. J. Dick, M. Tu, D. Strelakov, K. Birnbaum, and N. Yu, Optimal phase lock at femtowatt power levels for coherent optical deep-space transponder, *Interplanetary Network Progress Report* **42-175**, 1 (2008).
 - [21] B. P. Dix-Matthews, S. W. Schediwy, D. R. Gozzard, S. Driver, K. U. Schreiber, R. Carman, and M. Tobar, Methods for coherent optical doppler orbitography, *Journal of Geodesy* **94**, 55 (2020).
 - [22] Q. Shen, J.-Y. Guan, T. Zeng, Q.-M. Lu, L. Huang, Y. Cao, J.-P. Chen, T.-Q. Tao, J.-C. Wu, L. Hou, S.-K. Liao, J.-G. Ren, J. Yin, J.-J. Jia, H.-F. Jiang, C.-Z. Peng, Q. Zhang, and J.-W. Pan, Experimental simulation of time and frequency transfer via an optical satellite-ground link at 10^{-18} instability, *Optica* **8**, 471 (2021).
 - [23] T. Bothwell, D. Kedar, E. Oelker, J. M. Robinson, S. L. Bromley, W. L. Tew, J. Ye, and C. J. Kennedy, JILA SrI optical lattice clock with uncertainty of 2×10^{-18} , *Metrologia* **56**, 065004 (2019).
 - [24] S. M. Walsh, S. F. E. Karpathakis, A. S. McCann, B. P. Dix-Matthews, A. M. Frost, D. R. Gozzard, C. T. Gravestock, and S. W. Schediwy, Demonstration of 100 Gbps coherent free-space optical communications at LEO tracking rates, *Scientific Reports* **12**, 18345 (2022).
 - [25] C. S. Sambridge, L. E. Roberts, A. R. Wade, J. T. Valliyakalayil, E. R. Rees, N. Chhabra, J. Zhang, A. J. Sutton, D. A. Shaddock, and K. McKenzie, Subfemtowatt laser phase tracking, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 193804 (2023).