

NP-5899

# COLUMBIA RADIATION LABORATORY


RESEARCH INVESTIGATION DIRECTED TOWARD EXTENDING  
THE USEFUL RANGE OF THE ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM

Special Technical Report

Signal Corps Contract DA-36-039 SC-64630

DA Project No. 3-99-10-022

SC Project No. 102B



U. S. Army  
Laboratory Procurement Office  
Signal Corps Supply Agency  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York  
Box 6, Low Memorial Library  
New York 27, New York

March 1, 1956

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.**

# COLUMBIA RADIATION LABORATORY

Collected Papers on the MASER  
(Microwave Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation)

Special Technical Report  
CU-1-56 SC-64630 Physics

Object of the research:  
Physical research in fields in which microwave frequency techniques are employed; the development of microwave electronic and circuit devices.

The research reported in this document was made possible through support extended Columbia Radiation Laboratory, Columbia University, jointly by the Department of the Army (Signal Corps), the Department of the Navy (Office of Naval Research), and the Department of the Air Force (Air Research and Development Command) under the Signal Corps Contract DA-36-039 SC-64630.

DA Project No. 3-99-10-022  
SC Project No. 102B

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
*Division of Government Aided Research*  
New York 27, N. Y.

March 1, 1956

## FURTHER ASPECTS OF THE THEORY OF THE MASER\*

K. Shimoda\*\*, T. C. Wang, and C. H. Townes  
Physics Department, Columbia University  
New York 27, New York

### ABSTRACT

The theory of the molecular transitions which are induced by the microwave field in a maser and the effects of various design parameters are examined in detail. It is shown that the theoretical minimum detectable beam intensity when the maser is used as a spectrometer for the 3-3 line of ammonia is about  $10^9$  molecules/sec under typical experimental conditions. Various systematic frequency shifts and random frequency fluctuations of the maser oscillator are discussed and evaluated. The most prominent of the former are the "frequency-pulling" effect which arises from detuning of the cavity and the Doppler shift due to the asymmetrical coupling of the beam with the two travelling wave components of the standing waves which are set up in the cavity. These two effects may produce fractional shifts as large as one part in  $10^9$ . If adequate precautions are taken, however, they can be reduced to one part in  $10^{10}$  or possibly less. The random fluctuations are shown to be of the order of one part in  $10^{13}$  under typical operating conditions. For molecular beams in which the electric-dipole transition is used the  $TM_{010}$  mode is usually the most suitable for the maser while in atomic beams in which magnetic transitions are utilized, the  $TE_{011}$  mode is to be preferred.

---

\* Work supported jointly by the Signal Corps, the Office of Naval Research, and the Air Research and Development Command.

\*\* Carbide and Carbon Postdoctoral Fellow, 1954-1955; now at Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.

## I. INTRODUCTION

A device, which has been called a maser, involving a beam of molecules which give microwave amplification by stimulated emission of radiation, has already been described and much of the basic theory stated<sup>1,2</sup>. In the following discussion, we have examined in more detail certain aspects of the theory involved and explored some effects or conditions which were previously ignored or mentioned only briefly. In particular, the effects of saturation and of resonant cavity design are considered, and various types of noise and frequency shifts of the oscillator are treated.

## II. ANALYSES OF THE MASER SPECTROMETER

### A. Induced Emission and Saturation Effect

A beam of molecules (or atoms) in a certain quantum state passes through a resonant cavity tuned approximately to the frequency of transition of the molecules. The cavity is excited by a microwave generator through a coupled wave guide, which stimulates the transition of molecules and results in emission or absorption of microwaves. Assuming a low density of molecules in the beam, any direct interaction between the molecules, such as collision, can be neglected. The velocity of the molecules is not uniform, but all the molecules may be considered to be in the common microwave field and the emission or absorption waves from each molecule are superposed to produce the total emission or absorption.

Consider a molecule which is initially in state  $\Psi_2$  with energy  $W_2$ , and which is stimulated by a perturbation to emit or absorb microwave energy by transition to state  $\Psi_1$  with energy  $W_1$ . The wavefunction can at any time be expressed by

$$\Psi = a_1 \Psi_1 + a_2 \Psi_2 \quad (1)$$

As an initial condition at  $t = t_0$ ,  $|a_2| = 1$  and  $a_1 = 0$ . The resonant frequency of the molecule is

$$\omega_0 = \frac{W_2 - W_1}{\hbar} . \quad (2)$$

For simplicity of calculation let us assume that the periodic perturbation

$$H' = - \underline{E} \cdot \underline{\mu} \cos \omega t \quad (3)$$

is given to the molecule from  $t = t_0$  to  $t$ . Here  $E$  is the electric field strength and  $\mu$  the dipole moment. The effect of field inhomogeneity in the cavity and of the thermal noise field will be discussed later.

The coefficients  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  as functions of  $t$ ,  $\omega$  and  $E$  can then be obtained by perturbation theory as

$$a_1(t) = -e \frac{i(\omega - \omega_0)}{2} t \frac{x}{\sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2}} \sin \sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2} \frac{t - t_0}{2}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$a_2 = e^{-\frac{i(\omega - \omega_0)t}{2}} \left\{ -\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + \chi^2}} \sin \sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + \chi^2} \frac{t - t_0}{2} + i \cos \sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + \chi^2} \frac{t - t_0}{2} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\chi = \frac{E \bar{\mu}}{\hbar}$$

and  $\bar{\mu}$  is the matrix element between the two states for the component of the dipole moment along the direction of E.

The microwave power emitted from the beam of  $n$  molecules per second is given by

$$\Delta P = nh\nu_0 \left| a_1 \left( \frac{L}{v} \right) \right|^2, \quad (6)$$

where  $L/v$  is the transit time of molecules with velocity  $v$  through the cavity of length  $L$ . If the non-uniform velocity distribution is taken into consideration, Eq. (6) should be replaced by

$$\Delta P = h\nu_0 \int_0^{\infty} n(v) \left| a_1 \left( \frac{L}{v} \right) \right|^2 dv. \quad (7)$$

$\Delta P$  depends on  $E^2$ , the square of the electric field.

Assuming a uniform field distribution within the cross-section of the cavity resonator

$$E^2 = \frac{8\pi W}{AL}, \quad (8)$$

where  $A$  is the area of the cross-section, and  $W$  the stored microwave energy. To allow for the non-uniformity of the field distribution, this formula can be corrected as  $E_e^2 A_e = \frac{8\pi W}{L}$ ; where

$$A_e = \frac{\iint r n(r) d\theta dr \iint r |E(r, \theta)|^2 d\theta dr}{\iint r |E(r, \theta)|^2 n(r) d\theta dr}, \quad (9a)$$

$$E_e^2 = \frac{\iint_r |E(r, \theta)|^2 n(r) d\theta dr}{\iint_r n(r) d\theta dr}, \quad (9b)$$

and  $n(r)$  represents the density of the molecular beam. This assumes cylindrical symmetry, and that each molecule travels parallel to the axis so that it remains in a constant field.

Assuming a uniform molecular velocity as in (6), the emitted power may be written

$$\Delta P = nh\nu_0 \frac{\theta^2}{\delta^2 + \theta^2} \sin^2 \sqrt{\delta^2 + \theta^2}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\theta^2 = \frac{W}{W_c}, \quad W_c = \frac{h^2 A v^2}{8\pi^3 \mu^2 L}, \quad (11)$$

and

$$\delta = (\omega - \omega_0) \frac{L}{2v} = \pi(\nu - \nu_0) \frac{L}{v}. \quad (12)$$

Equation (10) shows that saturation of the spectral line becomes appreciable when

$$\theta \geq 1, \quad \text{or} \quad W \geq W_c.$$

When the input power to the cavity is so small that there is no appreciable saturation, the emitted power is from (10)

$$\Delta P = nh\nu_0 \theta^2 \frac{\sin^2 \delta}{\delta^2}. \quad (13)$$

This expression applies accurately only when  $\delta \gg \theta \ll 1$  and for a uniform field distribution along the axis of the cavity. It gives a width to the line (frequency difference between half power points) of  $2\Delta\nu = 0.89 \frac{v}{L}$ . If the field varies along the axis as  $\sin \frac{\pi z}{2L}$ , with  $z$  extending from 0 to  $L$ , as in the case of a TE mode, the line shape is given by



$$\Delta p \propto \left[ \frac{\cos \delta}{1 - \left(\frac{2\delta}{\pi}\right)^2} \right]^2, \quad (14)$$

which gives the line width  $2\Delta\nu = 1.19 \frac{v}{L}$ . Equation (10) is not exact in this case, but it holds to a fairly good approximation if one takes, instead of (11)

$$W_c = \frac{h^2 A v^2}{64\pi \bar{\mu}^2 L}. \quad (15)$$

### B. Detection of the Emitted Power

Consider a high-Q cavity resonator which has an output waveguide with coupling represented by  $Q_1$ , and an input waveguide of coupling  $Q_2$ . The beam of molecules is admitted into the cavity through another hole parallel to the axis of the cylinder. With the available power,  $P_a$ , in the input waveguide, the stored energy at the resonant frequency in the cavity is

$$W = \frac{2}{\pi\nu} \frac{Q^2}{Q_2} P_a. \quad (16)$$

where  $Q$  is the loaded  $Q$  of the cavity. The output power in the absence of the molecular beam is given by

$$P_o = \frac{2\pi\nu W}{Q_1} = \frac{4Q^2}{Q_1 Q_2} P_a. \quad (17)$$

In the presence of the beam the increase of power in the output waveguide due to induced emission can be calculated as

$$\Delta P_o = \frac{2Q}{Q_1} \Delta P, \quad (18)$$

assuming that the emitted power is small compared to the loss in the cavity.

Since the signal power to be compared to the noise power is <sup>3</sup>

$$\Delta P_s = \frac{(\Delta P_o)^2}{4 P_o},$$

the minimum detectable number of molecules per unit time,  $n_{\min}$ , can be calculated from the following condition.

$$\frac{Q_1^2}{Q_2^2} \frac{(\Delta P_{\min})^2}{P_o} = FkT\Delta f. \quad (19)$$

Here  $F$  is the over-all noise figure of the detector and amplifier,  $\Delta f$  their effective bandwidth. From Eq. (10) and (19) with  $\omega = \omega_o$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\min} &= \frac{Q_1 \sqrt{P_o F k T \Delta f}}{Q h \nu \sin^2 \theta} \\ &= \frac{\theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{Q_1}}{Q} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\pi \nu W_c \cdot F k T \Delta f}{h \nu}} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The optimum condition of the operating power level and couplings of waveguides can be evaluated by differentiating Eq. (20). This gives

$$\tan \theta = 2\theta,$$

which shows that for optimum sensitivity

$$\theta = 1.16, \quad W = 1.35 W_c \quad (21)$$

and

$$\frac{\theta}{\sin^2 \theta} = 1.38 \quad (22)$$

The highest sensitivity can be obtained when the cavity is designed for minimum value of  $Q_1/Q_2^2$ . Assuming  $Q_o$ , the unloaded quality factor of the cavity, to be constant, the minimum value of  $\frac{Q_1}{Q_2^2}$  is

$$\frac{Q_1}{Q_2^2} = \frac{2}{Q} = 4 \left( \frac{1}{Q_o} + \frac{1}{Q_2} \right). \quad (23)$$

As will be shown later, the available input power of the order of milliwatt is much larger than the power in the cavity in most cases, so that  $Q_2 \gg Q_0$ . Hence

$$\frac{Q_1}{Q_2} \approx \frac{4}{Q_0}, \quad Q_1 \approx Q_0 \approx 2Q, \quad (24)$$

for the optimum coupling. Then the minimum flow of molecules per unit time which can be detected is given by

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\min} &= \frac{6.92}{h} \sqrt{\frac{W_c \cdot FkT\Delta f}{Q_0 \nu}} \\ &= 0.44 \frac{v}{\bar{\mu}} \sqrt{\frac{A}{Q_0 L \nu}} \sqrt{FkT\Delta f}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

using Eq. (11), (20), (22), and (24).

If a cavity resonator is coupled by only one waveguide and one observes the change of power reflected from the cavity, the condition for the optimum coupling should have the same form as Eq. (24), resulting in the same equation for the optimum sensitivity.

As a specific example, consider a spectrometer for ammonia. The average velocity of molecules at a temperature  $T$  is given by kinetic theory as

$$v = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{2RT}{M}} = 14,551 \sqrt{\frac{T}{M}} \text{ cm/sec},$$

where  $M$  is the molecular weight, and  $R$  the gas constant. Letting  $M = 17$  and  $T = 290^\circ \text{K}$  this expression gives  $v = 6.0 \times 10^4 \text{ cm/sec}$ . For the 3-3 line of  $\text{NH}_3$ ,  $\nu = 2.4 \times 10^{10} \text{ c.p.s.}$  and  $\bar{\mu} = 1 \times 10^{-18} \text{ c.g.s.}$  The design of the cavity will be discussed in the following section, but the following values are taken as typical. Putting  $A = 1 \text{ cm}^2$ ,  $L = 10$ , one obtains for the 3-3 line of ammonia

$$W_c = 6.4 \times 10^{-11} \text{ ergs.}$$

The optimum energy in the cavity is then found from Eq. (21). Using values  $Q_1 = Q_0 = 10^4$ , and  $Q = 5 \times 10^3$ , the net power flow from the cavity is

$$P_0 = \frac{2\pi \nu W}{Q_1} = 0.97 \times 10^{-10} \text{ Watts.}$$

Thus, optimum sensitivity is reached with a very small flow of power.

To evaluate the spectrometer sensitivity, let us take an example of  $F = 100$ ,  $\Delta f = 10$  c. p. s. and  $kT = 4 \times 10^{-14}$  ergs. Then Eq. (25) gives

$$n_{\min} = 3.4 \times 10^9 \text{ sec}^{-1} .$$

Since the number of molecules focused into the cavity may be as much as  $10^{13}$  to  $10^{14} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ , a signal to noise ratio of  $10^4$  to  $10^5$  can be expected for the 3-3 line of ammonia. This theoretically expected sensitivity of the maser spectrometer has been demonstrated experimentally by observation of the magnetic hyperfine components of the quadrupole satellites with a signal-to-noise ratio of 10 to 100, using an amplifier band-width of 40 c/s. A further estimate of the practical limit of sensitivity will be given below, after a discussion of cavity design.

### C. A Figure of Merit for Cavity Resonators

Consider now the effect of cavity design on the strength of coupling between molecules and the electromagnetic field, or hence, on the spectrometer sensitivity. Equation (25) shows that it is not simply  $Q_0$  which determines the sensitivity but  $\frac{Q_0 L}{A}$ . The threshold condition for an oscillation to occur is

also determined by the same factors. Furthermore, if the mode number  $n$  along the axis is not zero, but unity, the resonance line is broader by a factor  $\frac{\pi^2}{8}$ , and the coupling between molecules and electromagnetic field correspondingly decreased. Hence a figure of merit  $M$  of the cavity resonator for producing induced transitions may be defined as

$$M = \frac{LQ_0}{A} \left( \frac{8}{\pi^2} \right)^n \quad (26)$$

for  $n = 0$  or  $1$ .

Because  $Q_0$  is roughly proportional to the radius,  $a$ , of the cylindrical cavity resonator near cut-off, while  $A$  is roughly proportional to  $a^2$ , the largest values of  $M$  is expected in the lower modes of resonance. Therefore, values of  $M$  are computed and compared for some of the lower modes. The results for a cylindrical cavity with  $L = 12$  cm and a wavelength of 1.25 cm are shown in Table I. In this table  $\epsilon$  is the skin depth multiplied by the specific permeability  $\mu'$  of the wall material

$$\epsilon = \frac{c}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\mu' \tau}{\nu}} \quad (27)$$

Here  $\tau$  is the electric resistivity. For copper at a frequency of  $2.4 \times 10^{10}$ ,

$$\epsilon = 4.27 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm.} \quad (28)$$

Table I. Calculated values of parameters for cylindrical cavity resonator.

$$L = 12 \text{ cm, } \lambda = 1.25 \text{ cm}$$

Mode	radius, a in cm	Narrow Beam		Broad Beam		$Q_0$
		$A_e/\pi a^2$	$M\epsilon$	$A_e/\pi a^2$	$M\epsilon$	
TE <sub>111</sub>	0.37	0.48	12.2	1.00	5.9	6,100
TM <sub>010</sub>	0.48	0.27	28.4	1.00	7.7	10,800
TM <sub>011</sub>	0.48	0.27	22.2	1.00	6.0	10,400
TE <sub>211</sub>	0.61	$\infty$	0	1.00	2.9	8,100
TE <sub>011</sub>	0.76	$\infty$	0	1.00	4.1	17,800

The third and fourth columns in Table I assume a sharp narrow beam entering the cavity along its axis. The fifth and sixth columns are for a uniform intensity of beam throughout the cross-section of the cavity. The actual values lie somewhere between these two extreme cases. The table indicates that the TM<sub>010</sub> mode of the cylindrical cavity is the best with a figure of merit about three times that for the TE<sub>011</sub> mode, which was used in most of the experiments reported earlier<sup>1,2</sup>.

Table II. Calculated values of parameters for rectangular cavity resonators.

$$L = 12 \text{ cm, } \lambda = 1.25 \text{ cm.}$$

Mode	Dimensions		Narrow Beam		Broad Beam		$Q_0$
	a (cm)	b (cm)	$A_e/ab$	$M\epsilon$	$M\epsilon$		
TE <sub>011</sub>	0.63	$\ll 0.63$	0.50	15.4	7.7	$\ll 5,000$	
TE <sub>011</sub>	0.63	0.31	0.50	15.5	7.8	3,700	
TE <sub>011</sub>	0.63	0.63	0.50	10.3	5.2	4,900	
TM <sub>110</sub>	0.89	0.89	0.25	26.0	6.5	10,100	

Similar results for rectangular cavities with cross-section  $a \times b$  are shown in Table II. Although the  $TE_{011}$  mode in the rectangular cavity has a fairly large value of  $M$ , it should be noted that it is obtained with a small cross-section. When the focused beam of molecules is not rather sharp, the value of  $M$  is counter-balanced by the loss of the beam. For a uniform beam of very large cross-section,  $M$  times the cross-sectional area of the cavity is, in fact, a more appropriate figure of merit than  $M$  itself. Hence for a rectangular guide, the  $TM_{110}$  mode is probably preferable in most cases. This cavity is also convenient since the resonant frequency may be tuned by changing the width,  $a$  or  $b$ .

A cylindrical  $TM_{010}$  cavity for the 3-3 line of ammonia and a tunable  $TM_{110}$  mode rectangular cavity were constructed and tested. The holes to admit the beam of molecules were about 8 mm in diameter in both cavities, but the leakage of microwave energy from them was practically negligible compared with the losses through the waveguide and in the cavity walls. The cylindrical  $TM$  cavity was constructed for a maser oscillator and found, as may be expected from Table I, to produce oscillations with a flow of molecules about three times smaller than the minimum required for a  $TE_{011}$  mode with the same  $Q$ . The rectangular  $TM$  cavity was constructed to be tunable in the range from 22,500 Mc/s to 26,400 Mc/s. It had one waveguide with nearly optimum coupling, and the loaded  $Q$  was measured to be near 4000. This value is only a little lower than the expected value of loaded  $Q$  ( $\frac{1}{2} Q_0$ ). It was found that a rather precise parallelism of walls is required for a large value of  $Q$ .

Increasing the length of the cavity will decrease the line width and increase  $M$  and sensitivity. However, the longer the cavity, the closer the resonant frequencies of the different axial modes and the more parallel stream of molecules is necessary. By the proper choice of coupling or by other devices, some modes can of course be suppressed.

An estimate of the practical limit of sensitivity of a maser spectrometer can be made with the following conditions. Using the  $TM_{010}$  mode of a cylindrical cavity resonator made of copper, one obtains  $A = 0.5 \text{ cm}^2$  and  $Q_0 = 10^4$  with  $L = 20 \text{ cm}$  and  $v = 2.4 \times 10^{10} \text{ c/s}$ . Equation (25) then gives

$$n_{\min} = 5.4 \times 10^7 \text{ sec}^{-1}$$

for the 3-3 line of ammonia, if an amplifier with  $F = 10$  and  $\Delta f = 0.1 \text{ c.p.s.}$  is used. Decreasing the velocity of molecules by reducing the temperature  $T_s$  of the source can increase the sensitivity slightly since  $n_{\min}$  is proportional to  $v$  and, therefore,  $T_s^{1/2}$  from Eq. (25). Also, cooling the cavity will increase the sensitivity by increasing  $Q_0$ .




FIG. 1

The amplitude of oscillation,  $\theta = \sqrt{\frac{W}{W_c}}$ , versus  $\frac{n}{n_{th}}$  as given by equation (31). The dashed line shows a crude estimate for non-uniform velocities.

### III. THEORY OF THE MOLECULAR OSCILLATOR

#### A. A Simple Theory of the Maser Oscillator

If a large number of molecules in the upper energy level is focused into the cavity resonator, a self-sustained oscillation can be obtained. The power loss from the microwave oscillation in the cavity is compensated by the emitted power from the molecular beam. This condition is given by the following formula, using Eq. (10) at  $\omega = \omega_0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{Q} = \frac{\Delta P}{\omega W} = \frac{nh}{2\pi W_c} \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\theta^2} . \quad (29)$$

Because  $\frac{\sin^2 \theta}{\theta^2} \simeq 1$  for small values of  $\theta$ , the threshold rate of flow of molecules,  $n_{th}$ , required to build up oscillation in the cavity is

$$n_{th} = \frac{2\pi W_c}{Qh} = \frac{hv^2 A}{4\pi^2 \bar{\mu}^2 LQ} . \quad (30)$$

If  $n$  molecules enter the cavity per unit time, Eq. (29) may be written

$$\frac{n}{n_{th}} = \frac{\theta^2}{\sin^2 \theta} . \quad (31)$$

Figure 1 shows how the oscillation amplitude or the square root of  $W$  varies with  $n$  from Eq. (31). The output power  $P_0$  is of course proportional to  $W$ , being given by

$$P_0 = \frac{\omega W}{Q_1} . \quad (32)$$

The electromagnetic energy  $W$  in the cavity approaches a saturation value  $W_{sat}$ , when the intensity of the molecular beam is increased. From Eq. (31) this occurs when  $\theta = \pi$ , or

$$W_{sat} = \pi^2 W_c . \quad (33)$$



The output power saturates at the same time. For typical conditions such as those described in Section II-C above, the output power at saturation is about  $10^{-9}$  watts. However, more power can be obtained, even if such saturation occurs, by increasing the output coupling (decreasing  $Q_1$ ).

For a certain intensity of the molecular beam the output coupling to get maximum output of molecular oscillation may be calculated by eliminating  $\theta$  in the following two equations

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\tan \theta}{\theta} = 1 + \frac{Q_0}{Q_1} , \\ \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta} = \frac{2\pi W_c}{nQ_0 h} . \end{array} \right. \quad (34)$$

These expressions come from using Eq. (29) and (32) and optimizing  $P_0$  with respect to  $Q_1$ . Using optimum coupling given by Eq. (34), the maximum output power can be calculated as

$$P_{o, \max} = \frac{\omega W_c}{Q_1} . \quad (35)$$

Although expressions (34) and (35) apply accurately only for the case of uniform velocity, they can serve as qualitative guides for the case of a distribution of molecular velocities.

If the velocity distribution is taken into account, the stored energy  $W$  and the output power would continue to increase with increasing the intensity of the molecular beam instead of reaching a saturation value. When molecules with different velocities are put in a common electric field, the induced emission from all molecules is superimposed. An estimated curve for the beam of molecules with non-uniform velocities is shown by the dashed curve in Fig. 1.

Experimental tests of a maser oscillator were made using ammonia molecules in the 3, 3 state and a cavity of  $Q = 12,000$  operating in the  $TE_{011}$  mode. The minimum focuser voltage required to start oscillation with a source pressure of 6 mm Hg was found to be 11 KV. For a  $TM_{010}$  mode cavity with  $Q = 10,000$ , the minimum focuser voltage for oscillation was 6.9 KV at the same source pressure. At a source pressure of 1.2 mm Hg, the critical focuser voltage was 15 KV for the same  $TM_{010}$  cavity. Since for a fixed source pressure, the number of molecules entering the cavity is roughly proportional to the square of the focuser voltage<sup>1,2</sup>, the above results show clearly that for the  $TM_{010}$  cavity, the threshold number of molecules,  $n_{th}$ , was about three times smaller than that for the  $TE_{010}$  cavity.

The threshold intensities of the molecular beam calculated from Eq. (30) are  $n_{th} = 4 \times 10^{13} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  and  $1 \times 10^{13} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  for the  $TE_{011}$  and  $TM_{010}$  cavities respectively. The ratio of these two numbers agrees reasonably well with the above results. The actual number of effective molecules per unit time in the experimental apparatus at a source pressure of 6 mm Hg and focuser voltage of 15 KV is hence probably close to

$$n = 5 \times 10^{13} \text{ sec}^{-1} .$$

This number is also consistent with estimates from the amount of total flow and directivity of the beam from the source.

### B. Frequency Deviation of the Molecular Oscillator

Frequency shifts and noise in the molecular oscillation can be analyzed in detail by the method shown below. First the oscillating induced dipole moment of the molecular beam is calculated, assuming the electromagnetic field in the cavity. Secondly the electromagnetic field generated by the oscillating polarization of molecules is calculated and finally the assumed field and that generated by the molecules are made consistent, or equated in case there is no noise. In this section the noiseless case is treated.

The dipole moment of a molecule in the beam at anytime is

$$\underline{p} = \int \psi^* \underline{\mu} \psi d\tau = a_2^* a_1 \underline{\mu}_{21} e^{i\omega_0 t} + a_1^* a_2 \underline{\mu}_{12} e^{-i\omega_0 t} , \quad (36)$$

where it has been assumed that  $\psi$  has the form (1). With the perturbing field given by (3), the dipole moment of a molecule at  $z = v(t - t_0)$  is, using (4) and (5),

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) &= \underline{\mu} e^{i\omega t} \frac{x}{\sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2}} \left\{ \frac{i}{2} \sin \sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2} (t - t_0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2}} \sin^2 \sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2} \frac{(t - t_0)}{2} \right\} + \text{complex conj.} \quad (37) \\ &= \tilde{p} e^{i\omega t} + \tilde{p}^* e^{-i\omega t} . \end{aligned}$$

The oscillating polarization density,  $P(z)$ , produced by molecules in the beam is given by

$$P(z) = \frac{n}{vA} p(z). \quad (38)$$

The electric field  $E$  generated by the oscillating polarization may now be calculated. The polarization is small enough that it may be considered as a small perturbation of the normal mode of oscillation of the cavity, or of the distribution of electric field,  $E_n$ . In this case, the frequency and the quality factor  $Q_m$  for the cavity with the molecular beam can be calculated from a result given by Slater<sup>4</sup> for a cavity containing a microwave current

$$\frac{1}{Q_m} - 2i \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c} = \frac{1}{Q} + 4\pi i \frac{\int \tilde{P} \cdot \tilde{E}_n^* dv}{\int \tilde{E} \cdot \tilde{E}_n^* dv}. \quad (39)$$

Here  $\frac{\omega_c}{2\pi}$  is the resonant frequency and  $Q$  the loaded quality factor of the cavity without the beam. The electric field and polarization are expressed by the complex vector quantities  $\underline{E} \cos \omega t = \frac{1}{2} \underline{E} e^{i\omega t} + \frac{1}{2} \underline{E} e^{-i\omega t} = \underline{\tilde{E}} e^{i\omega t} + \underline{\tilde{E}}^* e^{-i\omega t}$  and  $P = \underline{\tilde{P}} e^{i\omega t} + \underline{\tilde{P}}^* e^{-i\omega t}$ . Actually  $\underline{E}$  and  $\underline{P}$  are parallel in the case considered, so that vector rotation is not important.

For a stationary state of oscillation the damping should be zero and  $Q_m$  should be infinity, so that (39) becomes

$$\frac{1}{Q} + 2i \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c} = -4\pi i \frac{\int \tilde{P} \cdot \tilde{E}_n^* dv}{\int \tilde{E} \cdot \tilde{E}_n^* dv}. \quad (40)$$

If the distribution of the polarization in the cross-section of the cavity is proportional to the field distribution of the resonant mode, the following equation is obtained from the  $TM_{mno}$  mode.

$$\frac{\int \tilde{P} \cdot \tilde{E}_n^* dv}{\int \tilde{E} \cdot \tilde{E}_n^* dv} = \frac{\int_0^L \tilde{P}(z) dz}{E}. \quad (41)$$

If the distributions of  $\underline{P}$  and  $\underline{E}$  in the cross-section are different, the above equation does not hold exactly, but the discrepancy of the distributions usually causes only a slight deviation from Eq. (41). Therefore the following result is obtained, assuming  $Q \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c} \ll 1$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} E = -i \frac{4\pi Q}{L} \left(1 - 2iQ \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c}\right) \int_0^L \tilde{p}(z) dz . \quad (42)$$

Using Eq. (38), (42) may be written

$$\frac{1}{2} E = -i \frac{4\pi nQ}{vAL} \left(1 - 2iQ \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c}\right) \int_0^L \tilde{p}(z) dz . \quad (43)$$

Since  $p(z)$  has been given as a function of  $x = \frac{E\mu}{\hbar}$ , the condition of stationary oscillation is obtained from Eq. (43) and (37) as

$$\frac{x}{2} = \frac{4\pi^2 Q n \mu^2}{v h A L} \left(1 - 2iQ \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c}\right)$$

$$x \int_0^L \left[ \sin \sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2} \frac{z}{v} - i \frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2}} \left(1 - \cos \sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2} \frac{z}{v}\right) \right] dz$$

for  $\omega - \omega_0 \ll x$ . (44)

From the real part of Eq. (44), the amplitude of oscillation  $E = \frac{x\hbar}{\mu}$  can be obtained. Remembering that  $\theta^2 = \frac{W}{W_c}$ , or  $\theta = \frac{Lx}{2v}$  from equations (8) and (11), Eq. (31) can be thus obtained when  $\omega = \omega_0$ .

If  $\omega - \omega_0$  is considerably smaller than the line width ( $\omega - \omega_0 \ll \frac{v}{L}$ , or  $\omega - \omega_0 \ll x$  since  $x$  is comparable with  $v/L$ ),  $\sqrt{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + x^2}$  can be approximated as  $x$  and the imaginary part of Eq. (44) gives

$$2Q \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c} \int_0^L \sin \frac{x}{v} z dz + \frac{\omega - \omega_0}{x} \int_0^L (1 - \cos \frac{x}{v} z) dz = 0. \quad (45)$$

Integration of Eq. (45) gives

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} = 2Q \frac{\frac{v}{L}}{\omega_0} \frac{1 - \cos 2\theta}{1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta}} \frac{\omega_c - \omega}{\omega_c} . \quad (46)$$

If the  $Q$  of the line is defined by




FIG. 2

A curve for  $f_2 = \frac{1 - \cos 2\theta}{1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta}}$ , giving the dependence of frequency

pulling by cavity tuning on the amplitude of oscillation  $\theta$ . See equation (48).

$$Q_{\ell} = \frac{\nu_0}{2\Delta\nu} = \frac{\nu_0}{0.89 \frac{v}{L}}, \quad (47)$$

then Eq. (46) shows that the fractional deviation of the frequency of the molecular oscillation is

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} = \frac{Q}{Q_{\ell}} \cdot \frac{1}{2 \cdot 8} \cdot \frac{1 - \cos 2\theta}{1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta}} \cdot \frac{\omega_c - \omega_0}{\omega_0}. \quad (48)$$

This is similar to the expression previously given for "pulling" of the oscillation by the cavity<sup>2</sup>. However, it is more complete in allowing for saturation of the molecular response. If the oscillation is weak so that saturation does not occur,  $\theta \ll 1$  and Eq. (48) reduces to

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} = 1.07 \frac{Q}{Q_{\ell}} \cdot \frac{\omega_c - \omega_0}{\omega_0}. \quad (49a)$$

Or, under more normal conditions where  $\theta \approx \frac{\pi}{2}$ , Eq. (48) is

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} = 0.72 \frac{Q}{Q_{\ell}} \cdot \frac{\omega_c - \omega_0}{\omega_0}. \quad (49b)$$

The effect of saturation on frequency deviations of the above type is shown in Fig. 2. Since the factor  $(1 - \cos 2\theta) \left(1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta}\right)^{-1}$  decreases with increasing  $\theta$ , the frequency deviation will decrease with increasing beam intensity. This may well be the origin of frequency variations with source pressure and with focusing field which have been observed. Both of these vary the number of molecules entering the cavity, and hence vary  $\theta$ . Qualitative features of the observed variations agree with what may be expected from Eq. (48). However, it must be remembered that in deriving the precise form of Eq. (48), it was assumed that molecules of uniform velocity flow through the cavity and that the saturation does not depend on the distance of the molecules from the axis. Neither of these assumptions are strictly correct.

Bassov and Prokhorov have indicated<sup>5</sup> that if the "natural frequency" of the resonator is tuned to the center frequency of the spectral line, the frequency of molecular oscillation will be shifted by

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} \approx - \frac{1}{2QQ_{\ell}}.$$

It may be worthwhile to note that this type of frequency shift is, however, just due to the change of resonant frequency of the cavity by damping, since

$$\omega_c = \omega_{\text{nat}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2Q^2} \right),$$

where  $\omega_{\text{nat}}$  is the "natural frequency" used by Bassov and Prokhorov, and  $\omega_c$  is the actual resonant frequency as ordinarily measured. A frequency shift of  $\frac{\omega}{2Q^2}$  in the cavity pulls the frequency by the amount  $\frac{\omega}{2QQ_2}$ . Hence if the actual resonant frequency is tuned to the frequency of the spectral line, there is no shift of the frequency of oscillation as indicated by expression (48).

There are several other types of systematic shifts in the frequency of oscillation. They include shifts due to unbalanced travelling waves in the cavity, changes in the resonant frequency of the cavity due to the polarization or dielectric constant of molecules in states other than those of interest, the effect of molecular collisions within the cavity, and also shifts due to Stark and Zeeman effects. Some of these will not be examined in much detail, since they are usually considerably less important than the "pulling" due to the cavity which was discussed above.

The frequency shift caused by the presence of travelling waves in the cavity which produce a net flow of power in one direction may be regarded as a type of Doppler shift. Thus if there is net power flow along the length of the cavity in the direction of the molecular velocity, the oscillation frequency may be expected to increase, since the frequency experienced by the moving molecules tends to correspond to the fixed molecular resonance frequency. Conversely, if there is a net flow of power in a direction opposite that of the molecular motion, the oscillation frequency should be somewhat decreased. The amount of frequency change due to travelling waves can in fact be approximately calculated by making a Fourier analysis of the apparent frequencies seen by the moving molecules. However, in order to be consistent with the formulation developed here and to show roughly the effect of saturation, this frequency shift is calculated in another, perhaps less transparent, manner.

When a small fraction of unbalanced travelling waves are present in a  $\text{TM}_{010}$  cavity, the electric field may be written

$$E = E_0 \cos \omega t + E_1 \cos (\omega t - \beta z) \approx (E_0 + E_1) \cos \omega t + E_1 \beta z \sin \omega t, \quad (50)$$

where  $E_1 \ll E_0$ ,  $\beta L \ll 1$ , and  $E_1 \cos (\omega t - \beta z)$  represents a flow of microwave power along the cavity in the direction of the molecular velocity, i. e. the positive  $z$  direction if  $E_1 \beta$  and  $E_0$  have the same sign. The oscillating dipole moment of the molecules in the cavity due to the stimulating field given by (50) may be expressed as

$$\tilde{p}_0 e^{i\omega t} + \tilde{p}_1 e^{i\omega t} + \text{complex conj.}$$

Here  $\tilde{p}_0$  is the dipole moment produced by the field  $E_0$  and  $\tilde{p}_1$  the small change in dipole moment due to  $E_1$ . Allowing the electric field produced by the polarization of molecules in the cavity to equal the presupposed field (50), one obtains in analogy with equation (43)

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[ x + x_1 - \frac{i x_1 \beta}{L} \int_0^L z dz \right] = \frac{-2i n v}{\bar{\mu} n_{th} L^2} \left[ 1 - 2i Q \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c} \right] \int_0^L (\tilde{p}_0 + \tilde{p}_1) dz \quad (51)$$

where  $x = \frac{E_0 \bar{\mu}}{\hbar}$  and  $x_1 = \frac{E_1 \bar{\mu}}{\hbar}$ .

The frequency of oscillation may be obtained from the imaginary part of equation (51). If the cavity frequency  $\omega_c$  is tuned very close to the oscillating frequency  $\omega$ , the terms in  $\omega - \omega_c$  may be neglected and the imaginary part of (51) is, to a good approximation,

$$- \frac{x_1 \beta}{2} \int_0^L z dz = \frac{-2n}{\bar{\mu} n_{th}} \frac{v}{L} \int_0^L \text{Re}(\tilde{p}_0 + \tilde{p}_1) dz. \quad (52)$$

Now  $p_0$  is obtained from (37) as

$$\text{Re}(\tilde{p}_0) = \bar{\mu} \frac{\omega - \omega_0}{x} \sin^2 \frac{x}{2} (t - t_0), \quad (53)$$

and  $p_1$  can be calculated by a perturbation calculation similar to that given in III-C. For this purpose, equation (67) has to be replaced by (50); then  $p$  can be obtained from (78) by substituting  $x_1$  and  $-x_1 \beta v t$  for  $x'_n$  and  $x''_n$  respectively in that equation. One obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(\tilde{p}_1) = \frac{\bar{\mu}}{2} \frac{x_1}{x} \beta v \left[ (t - t_0) \sin x (t - t_0) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{2}{x} \sin^2 \frac{x}{2} (t - t_0) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Using (53) and (54), equation (52) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} + \frac{x_1 \beta L}{4} = \frac{n}{n_{th}} \frac{v^2}{L^2} \int_{t - \frac{L}{v}}^t \left[ \frac{2}{x} (\omega - \omega_0 - \frac{x_1 \beta v}{x}) \sin^2 \frac{x}{2} (t - t_0) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{x_1 \beta v}{x} (t - t_0) \sin x (t - t_0) \right] dt_0. \end{aligned}$$



After integration the following equation is obtained, using  $\theta = \frac{Lx}{2v}$ .

$$\frac{x_1}{x} \beta v \theta^2 = \frac{n}{n_{th}} \left[ (\omega - \omega_0) \left( 1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta} \right) - \frac{x_1}{x} \beta v \left( \cos 2\theta + 1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{\theta} \right) \right].$$

Using  $\frac{n}{n_{th}}$  as given by equation (31), the fractional deviation of the frequency of oscillation is

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} = \frac{x_1}{x} \frac{2\beta v}{\omega_0} \left[ 1 - \frac{\theta \sin^2 \theta}{2\theta - \sin 2\theta} \right]. \quad (55)$$

The travelling waves in the cavity may be considered to be due to the loss through an output coupling hole at one end of the cavity with a value of  $Q_t$ , which can be shown to be

$$Q_t = \frac{\omega_0 W}{S} = \frac{2\pi^2 L}{\lambda^2 \beta} \frac{x}{x_1},$$

because the stored energy is  $W = KLX^2$ , and the power flow  $S$  is given by  $S = 2K \frac{\beta C^2}{\omega_0} X X_1$ . Using this  $Q_t$  and  $Q_e$  given in (47), (55) becomes

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} = \frac{2\pi}{0.89} \frac{1}{Q_t Q_e} \frac{L^2}{\lambda^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{\theta \sin^2 \theta}{2\theta - \sin 2\theta} \right]. \quad (56)$$

It should be noted from Eq. (55) that the sign of the shift reverses, if the velocity  $v$  of the beam changes the sign, or hence if the direction of power flow due to the travelling waves reverses with respect to the molecular velocity. For small saturations,  $\theta \ll 1$  and the bracketed factor in (55) or (56) is 0.25. For  $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ , it is 0.5. In a real oscillator, there is of course a distribution of molecular velocities and of effective values of  $\theta$ . However, as an approximation, the bracketed factor may be assumed to equal 0.5, which gives

$$\frac{\omega - \omega_0}{\omega_0} \approx \frac{3.5}{Q_t Q_e} \frac{L^2}{\lambda^2}. \quad (57)$$

This equation shows that the closer the output coupling the larger will be the frequency shift. The shift given by (57) may be seen to have roughly the same form as the shift mentioned by Bassov and Prokhorov<sup>9</sup> and discussed above. However, it has a quite different origin.

Assuming the values,  $L = 10$  cm,  $\lambda = 1.25$  cm, and  $Q_e = 4 \times 10^6$ , the fractional frequency shift produced by the travelling waves is about  $2 \times 10^{-9}$  for  $Q_t = 3 \times 10^4$ . If the load impedance changes by 10 percent, a change in frequency of about two parts in  $10^{10}$  will be produced. The frequency shift caused by the output coupling can be very much reduced by placing the coupling hole just half-way between the two ends of the cavity, so that travelling waves progress from both ends of the cavity symmetrically.

In addition to the effect of the asymmetrical location of the output coupling holes described above the variation of the molecular emission along the length of the beam in the cavity will give rise to corresponding unbalanced travelling waves and, therefore, a corresponding frequency shift. A shift of this kind will be of the same order of magnitude as that due to the asymmetrical coupling of the output hole since the power emitted from the molecules is of the same order of magnitude as the output power. The molecular transition probability is connected with  $P_0$  and  $P_1$  in Eq. (53) and (54) which vary along the length of the cavity. However, in obtaining the result given in Eq. (56) the molecular emission is effectively averaged over the molecular path in the cavity. A detailed analysis of the frequency shift due to variation in beam emission has not been made. However, it should be noted that when little saturation occurs, the molecules deliver most of their energy toward the end of their path in the cavity, whereas for the highly saturated case, most of the energy is delivered near their entrance into the cavity. Thus the power delivered by the molecules flows in one direction for little saturation, and in the reverse direction for high saturation. In some intermediate condition, the frequency shift due to variation in molecular emission should be zero. A frequency shift due to this type of travelling waves could be reduced considerably by sending two similar molecular beams into opposite ends of the cavity. This method, with the output coupling at the middle of the cavity, would probably reduce frequency shifts due to travelling waves to considerably less than one part in  $10^{10}$ , depending on the accuracy of the symmetry.

Consider now the change in resonant frequency of the cavity due to the presence of ammonia molecules in states other than those between which the desired transition takes place. The change in dielectric constant at frequency  $\nu$ , due to the presence of other rotational state is given by

$$\Delta\epsilon = \sum_i \frac{2\pi N_i}{3h} |\mu_i|^2 \frac{1}{\nu - \nu_i}, \quad (58)$$

where  $N_i$  is the density of the molecules in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  rotational state in the cavity,  $\mu_i$  the matrix element of the molecular dipole moment, and  $\nu_i$  the inversion frequency of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  rotational state. Since the only molecules which are focused are those in the upper inversion state, the contribution of molecules in the lower inversion states is neglected in the above expression. The effect of the 2, 2 line on the frequency of the 3, 3 line is considered as typical, since it is the nearest strong line. For an intensity of the molecular beam which is about ten times the threshold value for molecular oscillation at the 3, 3 line, the change of dielectric

constant due to the 2, 2 line is estimated as  $\Delta\epsilon(2, 2) = 8 \times 10^{-9}$ . In this estimate,  $\mu_i = 1$  debye,  $\nu - \nu_i = 1.5 \times 10^8$  cps and  $N_i = \frac{n_i}{vA} = 4 \times 10^9$  cm<sup>-3</sup> are used. Then the resonant frequency of the cavity is shifted by  $-\frac{1}{2} \Delta\epsilon$ , and the frequency of oscillation will be effected by about one part in  $10^{11}$ . A precise calculation of this frequency shift of course requires a summation over all rotational states. However, its approximate magnitude is indicated by considering only the 2, 2 state, which produces the largest shift.

It is difficult to isolate the aforementioned frequency shift experimentally, since the simultaneous existence of various states in the cavity cannot be prevented. However, if the relative population of these states are changed, a small frequency shift might be expected. Since the focusing efficiency is a function of the rotational state as well as the focusing field, fluctuations in focuser voltage of ten percent may give rise to frequency shifts of about one part in  $10^{12}$  due to changes in dielectric constant of gases in the cavity.

When ammonia molecules interact with each other the inversion spectrum is modified, which produces the usual pressure broadening. In addition to a broadening of the inversion transition, there may be a frequency shift of the center of the line which is proportional to the pressure broadening. Such a shift has not been observed for any microwave line, and for the inversion spectrum of NH<sub>3</sub> it has been shown to be less than a few percent of the line width<sup>6</sup>. However, in principle some shift of this type must occur. An upper limit for the resulting effect on the frequency of a maser oscillator can be obtained by assuming that the resonance width of molecules in the cavity is broadened by about ten percent due to collisions with other molecules in the cavity. The pressure broadening is probably less than this in most cases, and the maser would not oscillate very well if it were much larger. Assuming a resonance width  $Q_\ell \simeq 5 \times 10^6$ , the upper limit for the fractional shift is then a few one-thousandth of  $\frac{1}{5 \times 10^6}$ , or a few parts in  $10^{10}$ . An additional type of frequency shift by molecular interaction which is proportional to the square of the pressure<sup>7</sup> has been observed, but this is quite negligible for the pressures used in the maser.

Every spectroscopic frequency is affected to some extent by electric or magnetic fields; these effects are referred to as Stark or Zeeman effects respectively. Stark effects in the inversion spectrum of NH<sub>3</sub> have been discussed in a number of places<sup>8</sup>. They shift the inversion spectrum and disturb the coupling of the various nuclear spins to the molecular rotational motion. The uncoupling of nuclear spins is to a good approximation identical in the upper and lower inversion states, so that it does not shift the frequency of transitions which involve no change in the hyperfine states, and on which the oscillation frequency depends. The fractional change in frequency is hence approximately  $\left(\frac{E\bar{\mu}}{h\nu_0}\right)^2$  where E

is the field strength in e. s. u.,  $\bar{\mu}$  the dipole matrix element,  $\nu_0$  the inversion frequency, and h is planck's constant. Specifically, the fractional frequency shift for the most sensitive component ( $M_J = 3$ ) of the NH<sub>3</sub> 3, 3 line is very close to  $10^{-9} E_V^2$ , where  $E_V$  is in volts/cm. Thus if surface charges or varying contact

potentials within the cavity produce field strengths as large as 1/30 volt/cm., the resulting fractional change in frequency is about  $10^{-12}$ .

"First-order" Zeeman effects split each hyperfine component of the inversion spectrum of  $\text{NH}_3$  by approximately  $g_J \mu_n H$  where  $g_J$  is the molecular g-factor,  $\mu_n$  the nuclear magneton, and H the magnetic field in oersteds. In terms of frequency, this is about 1 kc/sec per oersted. The splitting is symmetric about the undisplaced transition, and hence for small H it corresponds only to some broadening of the line without a shift of its center.

"Second-order" Zeeman effects do shift the line center by a fractional amount which is roughly  $\left( \frac{g_J \mu_n H}{h \nu_0} \right)^2$ , or  $2 \times 10^{-15} H^2$ , where H is again in oersteds. Such a shift is usually negligible. It is about  $10^6$  times smaller than similar effects in atoms such as Cs, since the molecular magnetic moment is of the order of a nuclear magneton rather than a Bohr magneton. Partial uncoupling of the nuclear spins from the molecular rotation occurs in molecules subjected to a magnetic field, but as in the case of Stark effect this does not change the frequency of oscillation because the transitions of interest involve no change in hyperfine energy.

First-order Zeeman effects can shift the frequency of oscillation if the oscillation does not occur very near the resonance frequency. For, if the cavity is tuned off resonance to a frequency  $\nu_c$ , the oscillation frequency is "pulled" by approximately

$$\Delta \nu = \frac{Q}{Q_L} (\nu_c - \nu_0)$$

from expression (49). If the magnetic field H changes a small amount, there is an incipient splitting which changes the line width slightly, and hence changes  $Q_L$  and  $\Delta \nu$ . This effect can be minimized by tuning so that  $\nu_c = \nu_0$ , and can in fact be useful as a test for the condition  $\nu_c = \nu_0$ , when oscillation should occur very near resonance.

### C. Random Noise in the Maser Oscillator

Two kinds of effects give random fluctuations in the output of a maser oscillator: one comes from fluctuations in the number of molecules in the beam, which may be called "shot" noise, and the other from random fluctuations of the fields inside the cavity due to thermal noise and to "zero point" fluctuations. We shall consider first the shot noise.

Let the number of molecules which may radiate and which enter the cavity in a time interval t be

$$N = nt$$

The fluctuation in this number is then  $\sqrt{N} = \sqrt{nt}$ . The output of the maser oscillator is

$$P_0 = Knh\nu, \quad (59)$$

where  $K$  depends on  $\theta$  and  $\frac{Q_1}{Q}$ , but is normally of the order of unity. The shot effect may hence be expected to produce an average fluctuation in power during a time  $t$  of approximately

$$\sqrt{\Delta P_0^2} = \frac{K\sqrt{N}h\nu}{t} = Kh\nu\sqrt{\frac{n}{t}}.$$

The fractional fluctuation of amplitude of the electric field  $E$  is, from (59) and the above equation

$$\frac{\sqrt{\Delta E^2}}{E} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{nt}}. \quad (60)$$

It must be remembered, however, that the field strength cannot change much more rapidly than the time required for a molecular transition to occur, or than the inverse of the frequency width of the molecular response. This time is approximately

$$\tau = \frac{2Q\ell}{\omega}. \quad (61)$$

In a typical case, it has a value  $\tau = 10^{-4}$  sec. and  $n = 10^{14}$  sec<sup>-1</sup>, so that the fractional fluctuation is at most  $\frac{\sqrt{\Delta E^2}}{E} \simeq 5 \times 10^{-6}$  which is small enough to usually be negligible. The smallness of this fluctuation results from the large number, i.e.  $n\tau = 10^{10}$ , of molecules in the cavity at all times.

In addition to an amplitude fluctuation, there is a phase fluctuation during the correlation time  $\tau$  of the oscillation which is approximately equal to the fractional change in amplitude, or

$$\sqrt{\Delta \phi^2} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{nt}}. \quad (62)$$

Such phase fluctuations which occur during each correlation time add together in a random way to produce a root mean square phase change of

$$t \sqrt{\Delta \omega^2} = \sqrt{\frac{t}{\tau_c}} \sqrt{\Delta \phi^2} = \frac{1}{2\tau_c} \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}},$$

after a time interval  $t$ . Hence the fluctuation of frequency is obtained by using (59) and (61) as

$$\frac{\sqrt{\Delta \omega^2}}{\omega_0} = \frac{1}{4Q_p} \sqrt{\frac{Kh\nu}{P_0 t}} \approx \frac{1}{Q_p} \sqrt{\frac{h\nu}{P_0 t}}. \quad (63)$$

The magnitude of frequency fluctuations due to this effect will be shown below to be considerably smaller than that due to thermal noise at normal temperatures.

The molecular oscillator builds up initially from the thermal noise fields present in the cavity. During the stationary state of oscillation, thermal noise in the cavity shifts the frequency and amplitude of oscillation in a random manner. Although the precise behavior of thermal fluctuations in the cavity depends on the presence of molecular beam amplification, a rough estimate which ignores the effect of saturation of the beam will first be described.

Assuming that the noise power,  $kT\Delta f$ , is independent of the oscillation in the cavity, the average fractional fluctuation of amplitude and phase of the molecular oscillation is approximately

$$\sqrt{\frac{\Delta E^2}{E}} \approx \sqrt{\Delta \phi^2} \approx \sqrt{\frac{kT\Delta f}{P_0}}, \quad (64)$$

where  $\Delta f$  is determined by the length of the time  $t$  used for measuring the frequency of the oscillator. When the frequency is observed during a time interval  $t$ , the transfer function, that is the frequency characteristics for the frequency modulation noise fluctuating at a frequency  $f$ , is proportional to

$$f \sin \pi f t.$$

This transfer function gives the effective bandwidth of

$$\Delta f \approx \frac{1}{t} \quad (65)$$

From (64), (65), and (61) the fractional fluctuation of the frequency of oscillation due to thermal noise is

$$\frac{\sqrt{\Delta\omega^2}}{\omega_0} \approx \frac{1}{2Q_e} \sqrt{\frac{kT}{P_0 t}} \quad (66)$$

The maximum frequency fluctuation which can occur is found by setting  $t$  equal to the minimum response time  $\tau$  in (66), which gives  $\frac{\sqrt{\Delta\omega^2}}{\omega} \approx \frac{1}{2Q_e} \sqrt{\frac{kT}{P_0 \tau}}$ .

For typical conditions this quantity is approximately  $10^{-10}$ , which is the fractional frequency change occurring in the time  $\tau \approx 10^{-4}$  sec. For  $t = 1$  sec, this is reduced to  $10^{-12}$ .

Comparison of equations (63) and (66) shows that

$$\frac{\overline{\Delta\omega^2} \text{ (shot noise)}}{\overline{\Delta\omega^2} \text{ (thermal noise)}} \approx \frac{h\nu}{kT}$$

At room temperature and microwave frequencies this ratio is about  $3 \times 10^{-3}$ ; hence shot noise can be neglected compared to thermal noise.

It should be noted that spontaneous emission of radiation by the molecules also produces random fluctuations. Their nature is, however, precisely the same as that of fluctuations due to thermal radiation and considerably smaller. For our purposes, spontaneous emission may be considered as an added thermal fluctuation corresponding to a temperature of  $\frac{h\nu}{k}$ , which for microwave frequencies is only one or two degrees absolute.

The above simplified theory of fluctuations of the oscillator might lead one to suppose that successive changes in both phases and amplitude add in a random manner, so that the amplitude of the oscillating electric field would at times go through zero. This does not actually occur for the same reason that it does not occur in most other oscillators: the non-linearities in the oscillator's response ensure that the amplitude stays within certain narrow limits rather than increasing or decreasing in a random way. However, as in most other oscillators, the phase variation is quite random and may increase indefinitely as indicated by the above discussion in a way which is proportional to  $\sqrt{t}$ .

To allow for the effect of molecular amplification and non-linearities on the thermal noise, a more complete theory is described. In the following discussion the noise field,  $E_n(t)$ , due to thermal noise is calculated by a perturbation technique, assuming that  $E_n(t)$  is small compared to the field  $E_0$  produced by emission of radiation from the molecules.

The electric field in the cavity resonator may be written

$$E = E_0 \cos \omega t + E_n(t), \quad (67)$$

where  $\omega$  is the frequency of oscillation,  $E_0$  is assumed to be constant, and  $E_n(t)$  is a small field associated with thermal noise. Using

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \frac{E_0 \bar{\mu}}{\hbar} \\ x_n(t) &= 2 \frac{E_n(t) \bar{\mu}}{\hbar}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

the Schrödinger equation for the wave function  $\Psi = a_1 \Psi_1 + a_2 \Psi_2$  requires

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{a}_1 &= \frac{i}{2} \left\{ x \left[ e^{i(\omega - \omega_0)t} + e^{i(\omega + \omega_0)t} \right] + x_n e^{-i\omega_0 t} \right\} a_2 \\ \dot{a}_2 &= \frac{i}{2} \left\{ x \left[ e^{-i(\omega - \omega_0)t} + e^{-i(\omega + \omega_0)t} \right] + x_n e^{+i\omega_0 t} \right\} a_1. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

If the oscillation occurs near the molecular resonance, then  $(\omega - \omega_0)^2 \ll x^2$ , and  $(\omega - \omega_0)t \simeq 0$  for the time of passage of the molecules through the cavity. Furthermore  $e^{i(\omega + \omega_0)t}$  fluctuates very rapidly during the time of transition when  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are changing more slowly, so that the terms in (69) including this exponential average to zero and may be neglected to a good approximation. Terms such as  $x_n e^{-i\omega_0 t}$  cannot similarly be omitted because  $x_n$  varies rapidly with time in such a way that the product  $x_n e^{-i\omega_0 t}$  does not necessarily average to zero during the transition.

Let the solution of (69) for  $x_n = 0$  be  $a_1^{(0)}$  and  $a_2^{(0)}$ , which are given in expressions (4) and (5) as

$$\begin{aligned} a_1^{(0)} &= -\sin \frac{x}{2} (t - t_0), \\ a_2^{(0)} &= i \cos \frac{x}{2} (t - t_0). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

when  $(\omega - \omega_0)^2 \ll x^2$  as assumed above. Here  $t_0$  is the time at which a molecule enters the cavity. The solution when  $x_n \neq 0$  may be written



$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1 &= a_1^{(0)} + a_1^{(1)} \\
 a_2 &= a_2^{(0)} + a_2^{(1)}
 \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

and then (69) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{a}_1^{(1)} &= \frac{i}{2} (x a_2^{(1)} + x_n e^{-i\omega_0 t} a_2^{(0)}) \\
 \dot{a}_2^{(1)} &= \frac{i}{2} (x a_1^{(1)} + x_n e^{i\omega_0 t} a_1^{(0)}) ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

if terms in the product of the two small quantities  $a_1^{(1)}$  and  $x_n$  or  $a_2^{(1)}$  and  $x_n$  are neglected.

The quantity  $x_n$  in (69) or (72) due to noise may be written

$$x_n = 2x'_n \cos \omega t - 2x''_n \sin \omega t , \tag{73}$$

in which case expression (67) for the field becomes

$$E = \frac{\hbar}{\mu} (x + x'_n) \cos \left( \omega t + \frac{x''_n}{v} \right) , \tag{74}$$

which makes it evident that  $x'_n$  gives the amount of amplitude modulation and  $\frac{x''_n}{v}$  the phase modulation. Making the substitutions (73) and

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1^{(1)} &= A e^{i \frac{\chi}{2} (t - t_0)} - B e^{-i \frac{\chi}{2} (t - t_0)} \\
 a_2^{(1)} &= A e^{i \frac{\chi}{2} (t - t_0)} + B e^{-i \frac{\chi}{2} (t - t_0)} ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

into equation (72), one finds

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{A} &= -\frac{1}{4} \left[ x_n' + i x_n'' e^{-ix(t-t_0)} \right] \\ \dot{B} &= +\frac{1}{4} \left[ x_n' + i x_n'' e^{+ix(t-t_0)} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (76)$$

Again in obtaining expression (76) it must be remembered that very rapidly varying terms such as  $e^{i(\omega + \omega_0)t}$  average to zero and may be omitted to a good approximation.

Now the oscillating dipole moment of the molecule is given by

$$\begin{aligned}p &= \bar{\mu} e^{i\omega_0 t} (a_1^{(0)} a_2^{(0)*} + a_1^{(1)} a_2^{(0)*} + a_1^{(0)} a_2^{(1)*}) + \text{complex conj.} \\ &= \tilde{p}_0 e^{i\omega t} + \tilde{p}_n(t) + \text{complex conj.}\end{aligned}\quad (77)$$

Using equations (70) and (75) together with (76), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{p}_0 &= \frac{i}{2} \bar{\mu} \sin x t \\ \tilde{p}_n(t) &= -\frac{\bar{\mu}}{2} e^{i\omega_0 t} \left[ \int x_n'' \cos x(t-t_0) dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. - i \cos x(t-t_0) \int x_n' dt \right].\end{aligned}\quad (78)$$

The electric field produced by the polarization of molecules can be calculated in the same way as described in the former section, using (39), (41), and (43). The total field is the sum of fields produced by molecules in the beam and those generated by thermal agitation in the wall of the cavity. It may be written as

$$Q \frac{\omega - \omega_c}{\omega_c} \ll 1,$$

$$\tilde{E} = -i \frac{4\pi Q n}{vAL} \int_0^L \tilde{p}(z) dz + \tilde{e}_n, \quad (79)$$




FIG. 3

A curve for  $f_3 = \frac{1}{1 - \theta \cot \theta}$ , giving the dependence of amplitude fluctuations due to thermal noise on the amplitude of oscillation  $\theta$ . See equation (84).

where  $\tilde{E}$  is defined as in equation (39) and (67), and  $\tilde{e}_n e^{i\omega_0 t} + \tilde{e}_n^* e^{-i\omega_0 t}$  is the primary thermal noise which would occur without the presence of the molecular beam. After some manipulation (79) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x}{2} + \frac{\tilde{x}_n}{2} - \frac{\tilde{E}_n}{2} &= \frac{4\pi^2 Q_n \bar{\mu}^2}{hAL} \left[ \int_{t-\frac{L}{v}}^t \sin x(t-t_0) dt_0 \right. \\ &\left. + i \int_{t-\frac{L}{v}}^t \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t x'' \cos x(t-t_0) dt - i \cos x(t-t_0) \int_{t_0}^t x'_n dt \right\} dt_0 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where  $\tilde{x}_n$  is defined by  $\tilde{x}_n e^{i\omega t} + \tilde{x}_n^* e^{-i\omega t}$ , that is  $\tilde{x}_n = x'_n + i x''_n$  from (73). In addition,

$$\tilde{E}_n(t) = \frac{2\tilde{e}_n \bar{\mu}}{h} = \mathcal{E}'_n(t) + i \mathcal{E}''_n(t). \quad (81)$$

The first integral in (80) which gives the field strength of precisely the frequency  $\frac{\omega_0}{2\pi}$ , and which is independent of the noise, yields the same results as were found above in section III-B. The remaining terms represent the noise fluctuations and can be written as

$$x'_n = 2 \frac{n}{n_{th}} \frac{v^2}{L^2} \int_{t-\frac{L}{v}}^t \cos x(t-t_0) \int x'_n dt dt_0 + \mathcal{E}'_n, \quad (82)$$

$$x''_n = 2 \frac{n}{n_{th}} \frac{v^2}{L^2} \int_{t-\frac{L}{v}}^t \int_{t_0}^t x''_n \cos x(t-t_0) dt dt_0 + \mathcal{E}''_n. \quad (83)$$

From these equations, amplitude noise  $x'_n$  and phase noise  $\frac{x''_n}{x}$  can be computed.

Equation (82) may be simply solved for the important case of noise components which differ from the frequency of oscillation by an amount smaller than the line width. For these components  $x'_n$  varies much more slowly than does  $\cos xt$ , so that as a first approximation (82) can be integrated assuming  $x'_n$  to be constant. Using expression (31) for  $\frac{n}{n_{th}}$  and  $\theta = \frac{xL}{2v}$ , one obtains from this integration

$$2x'_n = \frac{\mathcal{E}'_n}{1 - \theta \cot \theta}. \quad (84)$$

This expression shows that the magnitude of AM noise depends strongly on the amplitude of oscillation, as can be seen from Fig. 3. Since the primary noise,  $\xi_n'$ , is independent of frequency,  $x_n'$  is also independent of frequency near the center of the molecular transition where the approximations involved in obtaining (84) are valid. The frequency distribution of noise outside this range can also be estimated in a similar way by using  $a_1^{(0)}$  and  $a_2^{(0)}$  as given by equation (4), and (5) as far as  $\omega - \omega_0 \ll \omega_0$ , but such a calculation would be very tedious. Presumably the spectrum of amplitude noise is not far different from the line shape.

Evaluation of the fluctuation of phase from equation (83) is somewhat more difficult. If the phase fluctuation is computed from (83) by assuming that  $x_n''$  in the integral is constant, then (83) becomes, after integration,  $x_n'' = x_n'' + \xi_n''$ . This indicates that  $x_n''$  must approach infinity, corresponding to the indefinite increase in the phase error with increasing time as was found in the simpler discussion above. In order to obtain a finite result for  $x_n''$  and to examine the way in which it approaches large values with increasing time, it is necessary to allow variations of  $x_n''$  in the integrand.

Consider the thermal noise  $\xi_n''(t)$  in a small bandwidth  $df$  about a frequency which differs from the oscillator frequency by  $f$ . Then  $\xi_n''$  which is a function of time can be written in the form

$$\xi_n'' = \int_0^{\infty} \xi_n''(f) \cos(2\pi ft + \delta) df, \quad (85)$$

where  $\delta$  is a phase angle.  $x_n''$  must have the similar form

$$x_n'' = \int_0^{\infty} x_n''(f) \cos(2\pi ft + \delta') df,$$

where  $x_n''(t)$  and  $\delta'$  may be assumed to be constants with respect to time.

Substitution of these expressions into equation (83) gives, with the assumption,  $f \ll \frac{v}{\pi L}$

$$x_n''(f) = \xi_n''(f) \frac{v}{\pi f L} \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta}}, \quad (86)$$

$$\text{and } \delta - \delta' = \frac{\pi}{2}$$

Because  $\xi_n''$  represents a component in the primary thermal noise given by (79) and (81)  $\overline{\xi_n''^2(f)}$  is actually independent of frequency  $f$ . From (85), (81), (68) and (64) one has

$$\frac{\overline{\xi_n''(f)^2}}{x^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \overline{\xi_n^2(f)}}{x^2} = 2 \frac{\overline{e_n^2(f)}}{E_0^2} = \frac{kT df}{\omega_0 W Q}, \quad (87)$$

where  $\xi_n(f)$  and  $e_n(f)$  represents the amplitude of Fourier components at the frequencies  $\frac{\omega_0}{2\pi} \pm f$ . Thus the mean square of  $x_n''$  is obtained as

$$\frac{\overline{x_n''^2}}{x^2} = \frac{QkT}{\omega_0 W} \left[ \frac{v}{\pi L} \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{(1 - \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2\theta})} \right]^2 \int_{f_{\min}}^{f_{\max}} \frac{df}{f^2}, \quad (88)$$

where  $f_{\min}$  and  $f_{\max}$  are the minimum and maximum frequencies respectively for the range of values of  $f$  which are considered. Both  $f_{\max}$  and  $f_{\min}$  must be much less than the line width in order that equation (86) is approximately correct. Assuming  $f_{\max} \gg f_{\min}$ , expression (88) is

$$\frac{\overline{x_n''^2}}{x^2} = \frac{QkT}{\omega_0 W f_{\min}} \left[ \frac{v}{\pi L} \frac{2\theta \sin^2 \theta}{2\theta - \sin 2\theta} \right]^2 \quad (89)$$

If fluctuations are observed during a time interval  $t$ , the minimum frequency of fluctuation which can be observed is approximately

$$f_{\min} \approx \frac{1}{2t}. \quad (90)$$

From (74) the root mean square of the fractional fluctuation of frequency is

$$\frac{\sqrt{\Delta \omega^2}}{\omega_0} = \frac{\sqrt{x_n''^2}/x}{\omega_0 t}. \quad (91)$$

Thus one obtains from (89), (90), and (91)

$$\frac{\sqrt{\Delta \omega^2}}{\omega_0} = \frac{v}{\pi \omega_0 L} \sqrt{\frac{2QkT}{\omega_0 W t}} \frac{2\theta \sin^2 \theta}{2\theta - \sin 2\theta}.$$




FIG. 4

A curve for  $f_4 = \frac{\pi \sin^2 \theta}{2 \theta - \sin 2 \theta}$ , giving the dependence of frequency fluctuations due to thermal noise on the amplitude of oscillation  $\theta$ . See equation (92).

Using  $\theta^2 = W/Wc$ , and  $Q_{\ell} = \frac{\omega_0 L}{0.89 \times 2\pi v}$ , the frequency fluctuations can be written

$$\frac{\sqrt{\Delta\omega^2}}{\omega_0} = \frac{0.16}{Q_{\ell}} \sqrt{\frac{QkT}{\omega_0 Wc t}} \frac{\sin^2\theta}{2\theta - \sin 2\theta} \quad (92)$$

This is very similar to the approximate expression (66) obtained earlier, since  $\frac{\omega_0 W}{Q}$  is a typical value of emitted power from the molecular beam for  $\theta = 1$ .

Dependence of the frequency fluctuation on power is given by the last factor in (92), which is plotted in Fig. 4. This figure shows that the amount of FM noise increases by a large factor when the oscillation is weak. It must be remembered that Eq. (92) is not exact because of the approximation used in its derivation. In addition, the distribution of molecular velocities and matrix elements over molecules in the beam tends to make expression (92) even less accurate. However, it probably represents the major features of noise fluctuations reasonably well.

As a typical example, let  $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ ,  $Wc = 2 \times 10^{-11}$  ergs,  $Q = 5000$ , and  $Q_{\ell} = 5 \times 10^6$ , then

$$\frac{\sqrt{\Delta\omega^2}}{\omega_0} \simeq 10^{-13} t^{-1/2}$$

This calculated fluctuation is somewhat smaller than the upper limit set by experimental observations<sup>2</sup>.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful for discussions with Prof. W. E. Lamb, and with Dr. J. P. Gordon and Dr. Ali Javan which have influenced and improved the foregoing work.

## REFERENCES

1. J. P. Gordon, Phys. Rev. 99, 1253 (1955).
2. J. P. Gordon, H. J. Zeiger, and C. H. Townes, Phys. Rev. 99, 1264 (1955).
3. C. H. Townes and S. Geschwind, J. Appl. Phys., 19, 795 (1948).
4. J. C. Slater, Rev. Mod. Phys., 18, 441 (1946).
5. N. G. Bassov and A. M. Prokhorov, Discussions of Faraday Society (1955), (London) (to be published).
6. R. R. Howard and W. V. Smith, Phys. Rev. 79, 128 (1950).
7. H. Margenau, Phys. Rev. 76, 1423 (1949).
8. J. M. Jauch, Phys. Rev., 72, 715 (1947); D. K. Coles, W. E. Good, J. K. Bragg, and A. H. Sharbaugh, Phys. Rev., 82, 877 (1951).