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Abstract
This paper describes a Josephson-based full digital impedance bridge capable of comparing any two impedances, regardless of type (R-C, R-L, or L-C), over a large frequency range (from 1 kHz to 20 kHz). At the heart of the bridge are two Josephson arbitrary waveform synthesizer systems that offer unprecedented flexibility in high-precision impedance calibration, that is, it can compare impedances with arbitrary ratios and phase angles. Thus this single bridge can fully cover the entire complex plane. In the near future, this type of instrument will considerably simplify the realization and maintenance of the various impedance scales in many National Metrology Institutes around the world.
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1. Introduction
Impedance metrology makes intensive use of ac coaxial bridges for the realization of the capacitance, resistance and inductance scales at audio frequencies [1]. The type and complexity of the bridge depends on the type of the comparison: ratio bridges are used to compare impedances of the same kind, quadrature bridges are used to compare capacitances to resistances, and Maxwell–Wien or resonance bridges are used to compare inductances to resistances and capacitances [2, 3]. The common property of these measurement circuits is that, once the bridge is balanced, the impedance ratio to be measured is directly given by a voltage ratio. The precise and accurate generation [4–7] or measurement [8–10] of this voltage ratio is therefore the cornerstone of impedance metrology.

Prior to this work, the best voltage ratios were generated using transformers or inductive voltage dividers [11–13]. However, the main drawback of such devices is that the voltage ratio is set when the transformer is fabricated by choosing the number of turns of the different windings. The phase shift between the generated voltages is also limited to either 0 or 180 degrees.

Programmable Josephson voltage standards (PJVS) can generate stable and precise stepwise approximated ac waveforms and were previously used to generate an accurate voltage ratio. The first two-terminal-pair bridge based on PJVS synthesized voltages was recently demonstrated [14, 15]. This bridge was used to compare impedances of the same type (R-R and C-C) with an accuracy comparable to transformer-based bridges over a frequency range from 20 Hz to 10 kHz. However, the large harmonic content of the PJVS waveform makes the comparison of impedances of different kinds (R-C, R-L or L-C) more challenging and limits the frequency range to a few kilohertz.

On the other hand, Josephson arbitrary waveform synthesizers (JAWS) are perfect digital-to-analog converters that produce quantum-accurate distortion-free voltage waveforms over frequencies between a few Hertz and 1 MHz. Combining and synchronizing two such JAWS systems enables generation
of quantum-accurate, calculable voltages with arbitrary ratios and arbitrary relative phase angles.

In this work, these ideal voltage sources are implemented in a full digital bridge able to compare any impedances with arbitrary ratios and phase shifts over a large frequency range. The advantages offered by this Josephson-based full digital bridge (JB-FDB) are promising and will play a key role in simplifying impedance measurements:

- The JB-FDB currently operates up to 20 kHz, a factor of two higher than the coaxial ratio bridges. However, since the maximum frequency of the JAWS systems is much higher (i.e. 1 MHz), future developments will certainly lead to impedance measurement up to a few hundred kilohertz, approaching the cutting edge of high frequency coaxial bridges [16, 17].

- Impedances of different kinds can be compared over the entire frequency range with the JB-FDB, whereas the coaxial quadrature bridge can only do this type of comparison at a single frequency.

- The bridge ratio can be set to any desired value, in particular, to 12.906 : 10. This is important for realizing the decadic scale directly from the quantized Hall resistance and will eliminate numerous steps in the traceability chain.

At present, the JB-FDB is not outperforming the traditional coaxial bridges in terms of measurement accuracy [18–22]. However, it does outperform all of them in terms of flexibility, frequency range and automation. This single fully automated JB-FDB will simultaneously replace the ratio bridge, the quadrature bridge and the Maxwell–Wien bridges. The resulting simplification in the realization of the various impedance chains is significant. In addition, the accuracy of impedance standard calibrations using the JB-FDB is not dependent on phase angle. For comparison, the present coaxial bridge technique cannot perform calibrations at arbitrary phase angles. All these new features will considerably broaden the range of possible impedance calibrations.

In section 2 of this paper, the JAWS systems are described in detail. In section 3, the full four-terminal-pair digital bridge is presented. This bridge is based on a digitally assisted bridge (fully described in [23]), in which the ratio transformer has been replaced with the dual JAWS sources. The first test of the system is presented in section 4.1, where the frequency dependence of a 12.906 kΩ resistor was measured and compared with a calibration performed using a traditional transformer-based bridge. In section 4.2, a consistency check was carried out by performing a triangular comparison of an inductor, a capacitor and a resistor. A similar although more elaborate consistency check is depicted in section 4.3 involving two capacitors and two resistors of different values. Finally, the conclusions of this work are presented in section 5.

2. The dual JAWS systems

The two voltage sources required by the JB-FDB are provided by two independent pulse-driven JAWS systems (also known as the ac Josephson voltage standard or ACJVS) operated in two separate dewars of liquid helium. Each JAWS chip consists of four arrays of 12 800 double-stacked Josephson junctions (JJs) connected in series using on-chip superconducting traces. A single channel of a custom high-frequency pulse generator [24, 25] is split by an on-chip Wilkinson divider and drives two JJ arrays at a pulse rate of 14.4⋅10^9 s^-1. More system details are described in [26].

The smallest operating current range of the systems is 1.4 mA, that is, it can withstand ±0.7 mA of current on the input and still operate with quantum-accuracy (see [26] for details). This 1.4 mA operating current range was measured while each JAWS system was generating a 1 kHz sine wave with an rms amplitude of 950 mV. The maximum rms voltage output of each JAWS system is 1 V.

The success of the JB-FDB bridge relies on the intrinsic stability, linearity, and tunability of the two JAWS systems. The clocks of the JAWS system and the other components of the FDB are locked to a 10 MHz signal derived from a NIST primary reference frequency standard. The relative phase stability of the two JAWS pulse generators is guaranteed by having the two pulse generators share a single 14.4 GHz clock. The phase stability of the combined systems is determined by both the 10 MHz clock and by the repeatability of the response of one of the JAWS systems and the FDB to a fast rise-time trigger from the other JAWS system.

The amplitude and phase of the two JAWS output voltages are adjusted as part of the JB-FDB balancing procedure by re-calculating the required pulse pattern using a delta-sigma algorithm [27]. The phase of each synthesized waveform can be controlled to the duration of a single pulse, resulting in an approximate phase resolution of 70 ps. Since we require the output voltages to be repeatable within 1 part in 10^6, we also do not assume that the delta-sigma algorithm provides the correct voltage. Instead, we directly extract the amplitude and phase of each output voltage by performing a Fourier transform on each pulse pattern generated by the algorithm.

Prior to the impedance ratio measurement, the relative phase (time delay) between the two JAWS systems is calibrated by measuring the phase required to cancel the output voltages from the two systems. Once adjusted, the residual voltage (‘1 V’—‘1 V’ at 1 kHz) is less than 100 nV as measured by using a separate digitizer (see [28] for more details on this type of measurement).

Subsequent drift or instability in the trigger delay will cause an error in the relative phase of the waveforms generated by the two JAWS systems. The time delay between the trigger outputs of the two JAWS systems was monitored and found to vary by less than 1 ns. The error in the absolute voltage generated by each JAWS system is also proportional to the error in the frequency of the 10 MHz clock, but this error is small and will cancel in a ratio measurement.

The JAWS output voltage is quantum-accurate at the JJs, but the inductance and stray capacitance of the output voltage leads and the impedance of the load will affect the voltage delivered to the load [29–31]. The error due to the leads directly affects the accuracy of measurements of the synthesized JAWS signals, but a ratio measurement can be less sensitive. The two JAWS systems were constructed at the same
time using the same techniques, circuits and materials, so the voltage leads are nominally identical. The effect of the voltage lead frequency response on the output voltage of the two systems is therefore expected to be similar, which typically reduces the error by an order of magnitude.

An additional voltage error is caused by the low frequency compensation current biasing the inductance of the JJ array [32]. This induced error voltage is small at low frequencies and is phase-shifted by approximately $\pi/2$ relative to the voltage generated by the JJs. Again, the symmetry of the system means that this error will mostly cancel in a ratio measurement. This and other sources of error and their stability will need to be quantified in more detail to accurately measure impedance at higher frequencies, and an additional error cancellation technique will be discussed in section 3.

3. Bridge description

Figure 1 shows a detailed schematic of the JB-FDB which was developed to make a high accuracy comparison of two impedance standards, $Z_{\text{top}}$ and $Z_{\text{bot}}$. The working principle of the JB-FDB is very similar to that of the digitally assisted bridge (DAB) recently developed at METAS [23] and can be summarized as follows: the sources $S_{\text{top}}$ and $S_{\text{bot}}$ supply, through the $1:1$ injection transformers, the current to the standards to be compared. The amplitude and phase of these sources are adjusted until no current is flowing in the high potential leads, i.e., $V_{\text{top}}^{\text{HP}} = V_{\text{bot}}^{\text{HP}} = 0$ (current source balances). The amplitude and phase of the source $S_k$ is adjusted to null the voltage at the low potential port of the top standard, i.e., $V_{\text{top}}^{\text{LP}} = 0$ (Kelvin balance). Finally, the amplitude and the phase of the voltage $V_{\text{bot}}$ is adjusted to null the voltage at the low potential port of the bottom standard, i.e., $V_{\text{bot}}^{\text{LP}} = 0$ (main balance).

Once these balances are simultaneously reached, the four-terminal-pair definition [33] of the two impedance standards is realized and the impedance ratio is given by:

$$\frac{Z_{\text{bot}}}{Z_{\text{top}}} = -\frac{V_{\text{bot}}}{V_{\text{top}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The main differences between the JB-FDB and the DAB are the following:

- The accurate and stable voltage ratio is generated using two JAWS instead of a ratio transformer. In other words, the amplitudes and the phases of $V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{top}}$ and $V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{bot}}$ can each be set to any desired value, thus making the comparison of arbitrary impedances possible using a single bridge.
- The currents flowing through the impedance standards are entirely supplied by the signal generators $S_{\text{top}}$ and $S_{\text{bot}}$. In the DAB, only a fraction of this current was supplied by these sources. The remaining current was provided directly by the transformer.
- Double-screened isolation transformers are used to measure the voltage at the low-potential (LP) ports of the standards. These isolation transformers were added to improve the galvanic isolation between the bridge itself and the electronic parts of the generators and the digitizers.

The data processing and the balancing procedure used in the JB-FDB are similar to those used by the DAB and the reader can refer to [23] for further details. The only difference lies in the main balance procedure. In the DAB, the voltage ratio of the transformer is fixed so the main balance is achieved by tuning the injected voltage $S_{\text{inj}}$. For the JB-FDB, on the other hand, the main balance is achieved by directly changing the voltage ratio, that is, the phase and the amplitude of $V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{bot}}$. The injection voltage $S_{\text{inj}}$ is no longer required but the possibility of injecting a small voltage $S_{\text{inj}}$ has been maintained so that the JB-FDB is compatible with the DAB software. Moreover, additional consistency checks can be performed on the main balance of the bridge using $S_{\text{inj}}$.

3.1. Cable correction and bridge offset

For a classical transformer-based bridge, the voltage ratio at the transformer’s taps slightly differs from the ratio of the number of turns [34]. Therefore, the voltage ratio needs to be calibrated [11] to account for this small but significant error.

Similarly and as discussed in section 2, the quantum accurate reference voltages $V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{top}}$ and $V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{bot}}$ generated at the output of the JJ arrays slightly differ from the voltage $V_{\text{top}}$ and $V_{\text{bot}}$ in the JB-FDB due to the loading effect of the cables [29–31]. However, as shown below, this cable loading effect can be canceled by a simple repetition of the ratio measurement interchanging impedances $Z_{\text{top}}$ and $Z_{\text{bot}}$ [7].

The voltage $V_{\text{top}}$ is defined along the high-potential cable (HP in figure 1) and the detection transformer is used to ensure that no current is flowing at this point when the bridge is balanced. Therefore, the JJ arrays are only loaded by the cable between the output of the JJ arrays (inside the cryostat) and the detection transformer (at room temperature). Figure 2 shows the equivalent circuit of that part of the bridge. The relation between $V_{\text{top}}$ and $\frac{V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{top}}}{V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{bot}}}$ is then given by:

$$V_{\text{top}} = \frac{V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{top}}}{1 + Y_L [Z_n + Z_L/2]} = V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{top}} \left( 1 + \Delta_{\text{load}}^{\text{top}} \right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\Delta_{\text{load}}^{\text{top}}$ is a complex number that describes the loading correction to apply to the reference voltage $V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{top}}$ to obtain the voltage $V_{\text{top}}$. The real part of the loading correction increases with the square of the frequency and the square of the cable length at frequencies below 1 MHz, with a typical values of $1 \cdot 10^{-6}$ at 10 MHz [30].

A similar correction applies to the bottom voltage, and the impedance ratio (1) becomes:

$$\frac{Z_{\text{bot}}}{Z_{\text{top}}} = \Gamma = \frac{V_{\text{bot}}^{\text{LP}}}{V_{\text{bot}}^{\text{LP}}} = V_{\text{JAWS}}^{\text{top}} \left( 1 + \Delta_{\text{load}}^{\text{bot}} \right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $S_{\text{inj}} = 0$ was assumed for simplicity.

When the top and bottom standards are reversed, the new impedance ratio $\Gamma$ is given by:
As long as the loading corrections are the same during the direct and reverse measurements, equations (3) and (4) can be combined to obtain:

\[
\frac{Z_{\text{bot}}}{Z_{\text{top}}} = \pm \sqrt{-1} \sqrt{\frac{V_{\text{JAWS, bot}}}{V_{\text{JAWS, top}}}} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{V_{\text{JAWS, bot}}}{V_{\text{JAWS, top}}}}.
\]

where the loading corrections have been eliminated. The sign is determined by the kinds of impedances being compared.

3.2. Stability of the current sources

The realization of the four terminal-pair definition of the impedances requires that no current flows through the HP cables, i.e. \(V_{\text{top}}^\text{HP} = 0\) and \(V_{\text{bot}}^\text{HP} = 0\). This condition is obtained by adjusting the sources \(S_{\text{top}}\) and \(S_{\text{bot}}\). Therefore the source stability is a critical parameter that influences the accuracy of the bridge balance. The required source stability can be greatly reduced by adding an impedance \(Z\) to each of the HC leads, as described below.

Figure 3 shows the equivalent circuit of the top part of the bridge (see figure 1), including \(V_{\text{JAWS, top}}\), \(S_{\text{top}}\), \(Y_c\), and \(Z_{\text{top}}\). The impedance \(Z\) represents the output impedance of the JJ arrays as well as the series impedance of the cable between the array and the HP port. In this particular case, the loading effect due to the cable admittance can be neglected.

When the bridge is not balanced, a small current \(i\) flows through the port HP and the voltage \(V_{\text{top}}\) slightly differs...
4. Results of validation measurements

The JB-FDB was designed and tested at METAS using semiconductor DAC voltage sources and then sent to NIST-Boulder for validation measurements with the JAWS sources. In addition, seven impedance standards were also sent to NIST-Boulder from either METAS or NIST-Gaithersburg.

Table 1 lists the different impedance standards used for the validation measurements.

### Table 1. List of the seven impedance standards used for the validation measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Nominal value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$Z_{10k}$</td>
<td>Vishay VHP101</td>
<td>10 kΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$Z_{12k9}$</td>
<td>Vishay VHP101</td>
<td>12.906 kΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$Z_{12k9}$</td>
<td>Vishay VHP101</td>
<td>12.906 kΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$</td>
<td>Vishay VHP101</td>
<td>129.06 kΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$Z_{1,1}$</td>
<td>GenRad 1582-P</td>
<td>1 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$Z_{1404}$</td>
<td>GenRad 1404-A</td>
<td>1 nF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$Z_{106}$</td>
<td>NIST-built</td>
<td>10 nF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standards #2 and #3 are temperature stabilized, the others are not.

Instead, we compared the more-stable frequency dependence of the resistors and made more detailed consistency checks.

4.1. Resistance comparison

The first test performed was the measurement of the frequency dependence of the resistance standards. While the dc value of the resistances were subject to drift during transportation, their frequency dependence were stable.

The measurements performed with the JB-FDB at NIST were objectively compared to those carried out at METAS using the DAB.

The frequency dependence of the resistance $Z_{12k9}$ was measured using the resistance $Z_{12k9}^A$ as a reference. The bottom part of figure 4 shows the measurements carried out between 1 kHz and 20 kHz, and the symbols correspond to the values measured using the JB-FDB and the solid line is a quadratic fit to the measurements performed with the DAB.

In the top part of figure 4, the difference between values measured with the JB-FDB and the DAB are shown.

4.2. Closure of the RLC triangle

The ability of the JB-FDB to compare impedances of any kind opens the possibility of making consistency checks that are impossible to perform using transformer-based bridges. As represented in figure 5, a resistance, an inductance and a capacitance standard can be compared in a triangular manner. Their comparison, two by two, leads to three different complex numbers $\Gamma_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) that can be combined in the following way:

$$\Gamma_1 = \frac{Z_{top}}{Z_{ref}}.$$

$\Gamma_2$ is used to determine $Z_{top}$ from the reference voltage $V_{JAWS}$ by a quantity $\Delta V$ given by $V_{top} = V_{JAWS} + \Delta V$ where:

$$\Delta V = zi = \frac{\Delta V}{Z_{top}} = \frac{Z + Z_{top}}{Z_{top}} - S_{top}.$$  

Equation (7) shows that the accuracy of the voltage $V_{top}$ is limited by the stability of the source $\Delta S_{top}$, and the perturbation is proportional to the factor $[z/Z]$. The series impedance $z$ is typically smaller than 1 Ω at audio frequencies. Therefore, a resistance of $Z = 12.9$ kΩ was added at the output of both current sources that reduces the effects of noise and drift in the source generators $S_{top}$ and $S_{bot}$ by approximately a factor of 104.

3 Certain commercial equipment, instruments, or materials are identified in this paper in order to specify the experimental procedure adequately. Such identification is not intended to imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, nor is it intended to imply that the materials or equipment identified are necessarily the best available for the purpose.
\[ \Delta = \frac{\Gamma_2}{\Gamma_1} - \frac{1}{\Gamma_3} = \frac{Z_L/Z_R}{Z_C/Z_R}, \quad (8) \]

where the complex number \( \Delta \) should ideally be zero.

The main advantage of this consistency check is that the reference value of each standard does not need to be known; the standards only need to remain stable during the time required for the three comparisons which is typically less than 30 min.

This test has been realized by comparing \( Z_{10k} \), \( Z_{L1} \) and \( Z_{C10n} \) multiple times over a period of a few days. The comparisons were carried out at a frequency of 1592 Hz where both the impedance of the 10 nF capacitor and the 1 H inductor have a nominal value equal to 10 kΩ. Therefore, the measured voltage ratios \( |\Gamma_i| \) \( (i = 1, 2, 3) \) are close to unity.

Figure 6 shows the real and the imaginary components of \( \Delta \) obtained using the different comparisons. The values are clearly not randomly distributed around \( |\Delta| = 0 \) and a strong linear correlation between the real and imaginary components of \( \Delta \) is observed. This correlation can be explained by the large temperature coefficient of the series resistance and inductance of \( Z_{L1} \). Indeed, the impedance of the inductor has a temperature dependence given by:

\[ Z_{L1} = R_L(1 + c_1 \Delta T) + j\omega L_L(1 + c_2 \Delta T). \]

If the temperature changes by an amount \( \Delta T \) between the comparisons \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \), then \( \Delta \) will no longer be zero and will take the following expression:

\[ \Delta = \frac{\omega L_L R_L(c_2 - c_1)}{R_L^2 + \omega^2 L_L^2} \cdot \Delta T - j \frac{R_L^2 c_1 + \omega^2 L_L^2}{R_L^2 + \omega^2 L_L^2} \cdot \Delta T, \quad (9) \]

with the approximation \( Z_{C10n}/Z_{10k} \approx 1/(j\omega RC) \approx -j \) at a frequency of 1592 Hz.

The solid line in figure 6 was calculated using equation (9) and a maximum temperature variation of \( \Delta T = \pm 40 \) mK (ends of the black line). In this calculation, the value of the different parameters were taken from the inductance standard’s specification (type GenRad 1582-P): \( R_L = 616 \ \Omega \), \( L_L = 1 \ \text{H} \), \( c_1 = 3937 \ \mu\Omega/\text{K} \) and \( c_2 = 30 \ \mu\text{H}/\text{K} \). The good agreement between the measurements and the
calculated temperature dependence suggests that variation in the temperature of the inductance standard during the measurements is the main source of uncertainty in these measurements.

4.3. Closure of the RC square

As shown in the previous section, the accuracy of the consistency check that involves closing the RLC triangle is limited to a few $\mu\Omega$/$\Omega$ by the temperature stability of the inductance standard.

To circumvent this limitation, consistency check experiments have also been performed using only the more stable resistance and capacitance standards. Figure 7 graphically shows the different impedance comparisons that can be performed using an RC square that is made up of two capacitors and two resistors. Table 2 lists the different standards used for the RC square and gives the nominal impedance ratio expected at 1233 Hz. There are 1 : 1 and 1 : 10 comparisons both in phase and in quadrature. The comparison $\Gamma_6$ uses the same standards as $\Gamma_6$, but the JAWS systems generate different output voltages: a rms voltage of 1 V is used for $\Gamma_6$ and 0.1 V is used for $\Gamma_6$.

Inside the RC square, different consistency check loops $\Delta_Z$ can be formed that combine the different measured impedance ratios $\Gamma_i$ ($i = 4–9$). Four different loops are formed using three comparisons (triangles) and one loop is formed using four comparisons (square). Ideally, the measurements that make up these loops should be consistent and $\Delta_Z$ should be zero. Any deviation from zero implies an error in the bridge and/or an impedance that is unstable during the entire RC square measurement.

Table 3 lists the real and imaginary components of $\Delta_Z$ measured at a frequency of 1233 Hz. The last column contains the uncertainty component related to the accuracy of the main balance of the bridge (type A). The same uncertainty applies to both the real and imaginary components of $\Delta_Z$.

Figure 8 shows graphically the values listed in table 3. One observes that all loops are consistent to within 0.5 $\mu\Omega$/$\Omega$, indicating that the bridge works correctly to within this uncertainty.

For a few loops, the uncertainty is significantly larger than 0.1 $\mu\Omega$/$\Omega$. After investigating the raw data taken during the automated measurements, it appears that the main balance for the comparison $\Gamma_7$ (the 10 nF to 1 nF comparison) was not fully reached. The uncertainty of this comparison is therefore significantly larger than the uncertainty of the other comparisons. Consequently, the uncertainty of the loops involving this comparison are also larger (by a factor of 4–8). This balancing problem will be corrected in future measurements.

At this point, it is important to note that although the closure of the RC square is a necessary condition to prove the correctness of the JB-FDB measurements, it is not sufficient to fully validate the bridge. Indeed, the different loops in the RC square involve differences of possible errors in the voltage ratios. In case these errors are independent of the relative phase between the JAWS voltages, they will cancel each other and will not be detected. Therefore, our next experiment will pursue validation of the JB-FDB by performing a direct comparison between a co-located JB-FDB and transformer-based bridge. This last RC square consistency check is instead intended to demonstrate the flexibility and versatility of the JB-FDB, it does not represent the final validation test of the system.

Table 2. List of the impedances $Z_{\text{bot}}$ and $Z_{\text{top}}$ used in the comparison $\Gamma_i = Z_{\text{bot}} / Z_{\text{top}}$ represented in figure 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{bot}}$ (rms voltage)</th>
<th>$Z_{\text{top}}$ (rms voltage)</th>
<th>$\Gamma_{\text{nominal}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_4$</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (0.1 V)</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>0.1 + j 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_5$</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (0.1 V)</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>0 − j 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_6$</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (0.1 V)</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (0.1 V)</td>
<td>0 − j 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_7$</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (0.1 V)</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>0.1 + j 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_8$</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (0.1 V)</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>0 + j 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_9$</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>0 + j 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_6'$</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>$Z_{129k}$ (1 V)</td>
<td>0 − j 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The nominal rms voltage applied to the standard is given in parenthesis. The last column gives the nominal impedance ratio at a frequency of 1233 Hz.
5. Conclusion

For the first time, two JAWS systems have been integrated into a four-terminal-pair bridge. This single bridge can compare impedances of different kinds (R-C, R-L or L-C) over a broad frequency range.

The first test measurement involved comparing two resistances of 12.906 kΩ at frequencies between 1 kHz and 20 kHz. The measured frequency dependence of the resistance ratio is in good agreement (<0.05 /µΩΩ) with the frequency dependence measured with a classical transformer-based bridge.

Other type of internal consistency checks were carried out by checking that multiple impedance comparisons traversing an RLC triangle (at 1592 Hz) and an RC square (at 1233 Hz) were consistent.

The RLC triangle experiment showed that the JB-FDB can be used to compare any kind of impedance in a 1: 1 ratio. However, the accuracy of this RLC measurement was limited by the temperature stability of the inductance standard.

The RC square experiment demonstrated that the bridge is also able to compare impedances in a 1:10 ratio, either in phase or in quadrature. The loop measurements of the RC square are consistent with an accuracy better than 0.5 /µΩΩ. This accuracy is presently limited by the convergence of the main balance of the bridge.

These preliminary measurements were acquired during a two week measurement campaign; they represent a convincing demonstration of the capabilities and flexibility of the JB-FDB. The resistor frequency dependence measurements show the potential accuracy of the bridge, which is around a few parts in 10⁸ at frequencies up to 20 kHz. Further measurements are necessary, both to demonstrate similar accuracy in measurements of other types of impedances and to directly compare the JB-FDB to a transformer-based bridge. These measurements must be done in a laboratory having facilities to guarantee a direct traceability of the different impedance units to the quantized Hall resistor.

The results presented in this paper clearly show the potential of this JAWS-based digital bridge. In the near future, the JAWS system will become more compact and switch to using a cryocooler instead of liquid helium. This will allow these new JAWS-based digital bridges to replace their transformer-based counterparts leading to great simplification in the establishment and maintenance of impedance scales across the world.
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