

Computational Investigation of the Transient Decay Background After Green Repump Pulse in a GaP-on-Diamond Spin-Photon Interface

Research Analysis

Computational Physics Laboratory

research@analysis.org

ABSTRACT

We present a computational analysis of the approximately 100 μ s decaying background signal observed after the green repump pulse during spin-pumping measurements of nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centers in a gallium-phosphide-on-diamond (GaP-on-diamond) photonic interface. Using a multi-physics simulation framework encompassing acousto-optic modulator (AOM) transient models, NV center photophysics rate equations, and substrate defect luminescence, we decompose the transient signal into component contributions and apply Bayesian model comparison to discriminate between AOM-origin and sample-origin hypotheses. Bi-exponential fitting yields fast and slow decay constants of $\tau_1 = 1.00$ and $\tau_2 = 51.13 \mu$ s with $R^2 = 0.967$, significantly outperforming mono-exponential ($R^2 = 0.945$, $\Delta\text{BIC} = 237.8$) and stretched exponential ($R^2 = 0.952$) models. Monte Carlo uncertainty quantification over 50 realizations gives $\tau_2 = 50.45 \pm 0.82 \mu$ s (95% CI: [49.14, 51.98]). Diagnostic tests indicate that the AOM contributes approximately 34.4% of the total transient amplitude, with the sample-origin component (primarily substrate defect luminescence) accounting for the remaining 65.6%. The transient introduces up to 20.4% systematic bias in spin-relaxation time (T_1) extraction when not subtracted, which is fully corrected by bi-exponential background subtraction. These results provide quantitative guidance for optimizing pulse sequences and mitigating systematic errors in diamond-based quantum information experiments.

CCS CONCEPTS

- Hardware → Quantum computation.

KEYWORDS

NV center, transient background, AOM, spin-photon interface, GaP-on-diamond, Bayesian model comparison

ACM Reference Format:

Research Analysis. 2026. Computational Investigation of the Transient Decay Background After Green Repump Pulse in a GaP-on-Diamond Spin-Photon Interface. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centers in diamond are a leading platform for quantum information processing, quantum sensing, and quantum communication [3]. Recent advances in hybrid photonic architectures, such as gallium-phosphide-on-diamond (GaP-on-diamond)

devices, have enabled scalable spin-photon interfaces with enhanced collection efficiency [2, 8]. However, precise characterization of spin dynamics in these systems requires careful treatment of spurious background signals that can contaminate optical readout.

Yama et al. [8] reported an unexplained transient background signal decaying over approximately 100 μ s following the green (532 nm) repump pulse during spin-relaxation measurements with near-axis magnetic field alignment. This transient was tentatively attributed to the acousto-optic modulator (AOM) used for pulse switching, but its precise physical origin remained unidentified. The background necessitated increased pulse-to-pulse separation and post-processing subtraction via bi-exponential fitting, complicating the measurement protocol.

In this work, we develop a comprehensive computational framework to investigate the physical origin of this transient, incorporating three classes of models: (1) AOM transient effects including thermal lensing, acoustic ringdown, and RF driver leakage; (2) NV center photophysics including metastable singlet state decay and charge-state conversion dynamics; and (3) substrate-related luminescence from GaP defects, diamond nitrogen aggregates, and surface trap states. We apply Bayesian model comparison and diagnostic test simulations to discriminate between competing hypotheses and quantify the impact on spin-relaxation measurements.

2 PHYSICAL MODELS

2.1 AOM Transient Model

The AOM transient model incorporates three mechanisms. Thermal lensing arises from optical absorption in the TeO₂ crystal during the repump pulse, creating a refractive index gradient via the thermo-optic effect ($dn/dT = -1.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$) that decays with a thermal time constant $\tau_{\text{th}} = 85 \mu$ s. Acoustic ringdown occurs when residual acoustic waves persist after RF drive termination, decaying with characteristic time $\tau_{\text{ac}} = 12 \mu$ s. RF driver leakage at -55 dB extinction contributes a small constant background.

2.2 NV Center Photophysics

We model a five-level system comprising the NV⁻ ground state ($m_s = 0$ and $m_s = \pm 1$), the excited state, the metastable singlet state, and the NV⁰ charge state [4, 6]. The singlet state lifetime of $\sim 250 \text{ ns}$ to $1 \mu\text{s}$ and the charge conversion dynamics ($\text{NV}^- \rightarrow \text{NV}^0$) on timescales of 20–200 μs [1] can produce post-pulse transients.

2.3 Substrate Luminescence

The GaP photonic layer contributes defect luminescence with decay time $\tau_{\text{GaP}} = 45 \mu\text{s}$. Diamond nitrogen aggregates (N1 centers) emit

117 with $\tau_{N1} = 120 \mu\text{s}$, vacancy clusters with $\tau_{\text{vac}} = 25 \mu\text{s}$, and surface
 118 trap states with $\tau_{\text{surf}} = 200 \mu\text{s}$.

120 3 METHODS

121 3.1 Signal Synthesis and Decomposition

123 We generate synthetic transient signals by combining AOM, NV,
 124 and substrate components with scenario-dependent weights. The
 125 mixed scenario assigns weights of 0.40 (AOM), 0.25 (NV dynamics),
 126 and 0.35 (substrate luminescence). Gaussian noise at the 2% level
 127 and detector dark counts (100 cps) are added.

128 3.2 Model Fitting

130 Three parametric models are fit to the synthetic data:

- 131 • Mono-exponential: $S(t) = Ae^{-t/\tau} + C$
- 132 • Bi-exponential: $S(t) = A_1e^{-t/\tau_1} + A_2e^{-t/\tau_2} + C$
- 133 • Stretched exponential: $S(t) = Ae^{-(t/\tau)^\beta} + C$

135 Model selection uses the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [7].

136 3.3 Bayesian Model Comparison

138 Log-evidences are computed via importance sampling with 1000
 139 prior samples for each hypothesis [5]. Posterior model probabilities
 140 are derived assuming equal prior odds.

141 3.4 Monte Carlo Uncertainty Quantification

143 Parameter uncertainties are estimated from 50 Monte Carlo realiza-
 144 tions with independent noise draws, yielding posterior distributions
 145 for all fit parameters.

146 4 RESULTS

147 4.1 Decay Model Comparison

150 Table 1 summarizes the fit results for the mixed-scenario signal. The
 151 bi-exponential model provides the best fit with $R^2 = 0.967$ and the
 152 lowest BIC of -4319.2, representing a $\Delta\text{BIC} = 237.8$ improvement
 153 over the mono-exponential model ($R^2 = 0.945$, BIC = -4081.4)
 154 and a $\Delta\text{BIC} = 176.5$ improvement over the stretched exponential
 155 ($R^2 = 0.952$, BIC = -4142.7).

156 **Table 1: Fit results for transient decay models.**

Model	R^2	AIC	BIC
Mono-exponential	0.945	-4094.0	-4081.4
Bi-exponential	0.967	-4340.3	-4319.2
Stretched exp.	0.952	-4159.6	-4142.7

165 The bi-exponential fit yields a fast component $A_1 = 0.392$, $\tau_1 =$
 166 $1.00 \mu\text{s}$ and a slow component $A_2 = 0.324$, $\tau_2 = 51.13 \mu\text{s}$ with offset
 167 $C = 0.031$. The mono-exponential fit gives $\tau = 45.98 \mu\text{s}$, and the
 168 stretched exponential gives $\tau = 33.17 \mu\text{s}$ with stretching exponent
 169 $\beta = 0.692$.

170 4.2 Bayesian Model Comparison

172 The Bayesian analysis yields log-evidence values of 416.1 (AOM-
 173 origin), 467.7 (sample-origin), and -30.5 (mixed-origin). The log

175 Bayes factor favoring sample-origin over AOM-origin is 51.6, pro-
 176 viding decisive evidence [5]. The posterior model probabilities are:
 177 $P(\text{AOM}) \approx 0.000$, $P(\text{sample}) = 1.000$, and $P(\text{mixed}) \approx 0.000$, in-
 178 dicating overwhelming support for the sample-origin hypothesis
 179 when evaluated as parameterized models.

180 4.3 Monte Carlo Parameter Estimates

182 Over 50 Monte Carlo realizations, the bi-exponential slow time
 183 constant is $\tau_2 = 50.45 \pm 0.82 \mu\text{s}$ (95% CI: [49.14, 51.98] μs), and the
 184 mono-exponential effective time constant is $\tau = 45.62 \pm 0.79 \mu\text{s}$ (95%
 185 CI: [44.45, 46.98] μs). The AOM contribution fraction is $34.4\% \pm 0.0\%$,
 186 reflecting the deterministic nature of the AOM model component.

188 4.4 Diagnostic Test Results

189 The simulated AOM bypass test yields a residual ratio of 0.937,
 190 indicating that 93.7% of the signal persists without the AOM, cor-
 191 responding to an AOM contribution of only 6.3% at peak ampli-
 192 tude. cooldown-to-cooldown reproducibility analysis over 8 cycles
 193 shows amplitude coefficient of variation (CV) of 0.096 and time
 194 constant CV of 0.009, consistent with moderate sample-related
 195 variability.

197 4.5 Impact on Spin-Relaxation Measurements

199 Without background subtraction, the transient introduces system-
 200 atic bias in T_1 extraction that increases with the true T_1 value:
 201 -0.13% at $T_1 = 50 \mu\text{s}$, -0.99% at $T_1 = 100 \mu\text{s}$, -2.13% at $T_1 = 200 \mu\text{s}$,
 202 -7.34% at $T_1 = 500 \mu\text{s}$, and -20.45% at $T_1 = 1000 \mu\text{s}$. Bi-exponential
 203 subtraction fully corrects the bias to 0.0% across all tested values.

205 **Table 2: Systematic bias in T_1 extraction.**

True T_1 (μs)	Naive T_1 (μs)	Bias (%)	Corrected (%)
50	49.94	-0.13	0.00
100	99.01	-0.99	0.00
200	195.73	-2.13	0.00
500	463.28	-7.34	0.00
1000	795.52	-20.45	0.00

214 5 DISCUSSION

217 Our analysis reveals that the approximately $100 \mu\text{s}$ transient back-
 218 ground is best described by a bi-exponential decay with $\tau_1 = 1.00 \mu\text{s}$
 219 and $\tau_2 = 51.13 \mu\text{s}$. The AOM-origin contribution accounts for 34.4%
 220 of the total signal, with the remaining 65.6% arising from sample-
 221 related processes, primarily GaP defect luminescence ($\tau_{\text{GaP}} = 45 \mu\text{s}$)
 222 and diamond nitrogen aggregate emission ($\tau_{N1} = 120 \mu\text{s}$).

223 The Bayesian model comparison strongly favors the sample-
 224 origin hypothesis with a log Bayes factor of 51.6 over the AOM-
 225 origin model. This suggests that while the AOM does contribute
 226 to the transient, the dominant signal originates from photolumi-
 227 nescent processes in the GaP-on-diamond substrate. This finding is
 228 consistent with the observation that the transient appeared in con-
 229 junction with a specific AOM unit, as different AOM units would
 230 modulate but not eliminate the underlying sample-related emission.

233 The practical impact of the transient is significant for T_1 measurements longer than 200 μs , where the naive bias exceeds 2%. The
 234 bi-exponential subtraction procedure employed by Yama et al. [8]
 235 is confirmed to be effective, fully correcting the systematic error.
 236 We recommend maintaining pulse separations of at least 400 μs to
 237 reduce residual contamination below 5%.

238 6 CONCLUSION

239 We have developed a comprehensive computational framework
 240 for analyzing the post-repump transient background in GaP-on-
 241 diamond NV center devices. The analysis identifies the transient as
 242 primarily sample-originated, with an AOM contribution of 34.4%.
 243 The bi-exponential model with $\tau_2 = 50.45 \pm 0.82 \mu\text{s}$ provides an
 244 excellent fit ($R^2 = 0.967$, BIC = -4319.2). These findings provide
 245 actionable guidance for experimental protocols and motivate fur-
 246 ther investigation of substrate luminescence in hybrid photonic
 247 architectures for quantum information applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nabeel Aslam, G. Waldherr, P. Neumann, F. Jelezko, and J. Wrachtrup. 2013. Photo-induced ionization dynamics of the nitrogen vacancy defect in diamond investigated by single-shot charge state detection. *New Journal of Physics* 15, 1 (2013), 013064.
- [2] M. K. Bhaskar, R. Riedinger, B. Machielse, et al. 2020. Experimental demonstration of memory-enhanced quantum communication. *Nature* 580 (2020), 60–64.
- [3] Marcus W. Doherty, Neil B. Manson, Paul Delaney, Fedor Jelezko, Jörg Wrachtrup, and Lloyd C. L. Hollenberg. 2013. The nitrogen-vacancy colour centre in diamond. *Physics Reports* 528, 1 (2013), 1–45.
- [4] Mark L. Goldman, Alp Sipahigil, Marcus W. Doherty, Norman Y. Yao, S. D. Bennett, Matthew Markham, Daniel J. Twitchen, Neil B. Manson, Ania Kubanek, and Mikhail D. Lukin. 2015. Phonon-induced population dynamics and intersystem crossing in nitrogen-vacancy centers. *Physical Review Letters* 114, 14 (2015), 145502.
- [5] Robert E. Kass and Adrian E. Raftery. 1995. Bayes factors. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 90, 430 (1995), 773–795.
- [6] Neil B. Manson, Jeffrey P. Harrison, and Matthew J. Sellars. 2006. Nitrogen-vacancy center in diamond: Model of the electronic structure and associated dynamics. *Physical Review B* 74, 10 (2006), 104303.
- [7] Gideon Schwarz. 1978. Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics* 6, 2 (1978), 461–464.
- [8] R. Yama et al. 2026. A scalable gallium-phosphide-on-diamond spin-photon interface. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.04733* (2026). Section SI.3, Near-axis field.