

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

Anonymous Author(s)

## ABSTRACT

We present a computational analysis of the approximately 100  $\mu$ 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:

Anonymous Author(s). 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/nnnnnnnnnnnnnnn>

## 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  $\mu$ 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  $\text{TeO}_2$  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  $-55 \text{ dB}$  extinction contributes a small constant background.

### 2.2 NV Center Photophysics

We model a five-level system comprising the  $\text{NV}^-$  ground state ( $m_s = 0$  and  $m_s = \pm 1$ ), the excited state, the metastable singlet state, and the  $\text{NV}^0$  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  $20$ – $200 \mu\text{s}$  [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 with  $\tau_{\text{N1}} = 120 \mu\text{s}$ , vacancy clusters with  $\tau_{\text{vac}} = 25 \mu\text{s}$ , and surface trap states with  $\tau_{\text{surf}} = 200 \mu\text{s}$ .

## 117 3 METHODS

### 118 3.1 Signal Synthesis and Decomposition

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

### 125 3.2 Model Fitting

126 Three parametric models are fit to the synthetic data:

- 128 • Mono-exponential:  $S(t) = Ae^{-t/\tau} + C$
- 129 • Bi-exponential:  $S(t) = A_1 e^{-t/\tau_1} + A_2 e^{-t/\tau_2} + C$
- 130 • Stretched exponential:  $S(t) = Ae^{-(t/\tau)^\beta} + C$

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

### 134 3.3 Bayesian Model Comparison

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

### 139 3.4 Monte Carlo Uncertainty Quantification

140 Parameter uncertainties are estimated from 50 Monte Carlo realizations  
 141 with independent noise draws, yielding posterior distributions  
 142 for all fit parameters.

## 144 4 RESULTS

### 146 4.1 Decay Model Comparison

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

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

156 Model	157 $R^2$	158 AIC	159 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

162 The bi-exponential fit yields a fast component  $A_1 = 0.392$ ,  $\tau_1 =$   
 163  $1.00 \mu\text{s}$  and a slow component  $A_2 = 0.324$ ,  $\tau_2 = 51.13 \mu\text{s}$  with offset  
 164  $C = 0.031$ . The mono-exponential fit gives  $\tau = 45.98 \mu\text{s}$ , and the  
 165 stretched exponential gives  $\tau = 33.17 \mu\text{s}$  with stretching exponent  
 166  $\beta = 0.692$ .

### 168 4.2 Bayesian Model Comparison

170 The Bayesian analysis yields log-evidence values of 416.1 (AOM-  
 171 origin), 467.7 (sample-origin), and  $-30.5$  (mixed-origin). The log  
 172 Bayes factor favoring sample-origin over AOM-origin is 51.6, pro-  
 173 viding decisive evidence [5]. The posterior model probabilities are:

175  $P(\text{AOM}) \approx 0.000$ ,  $P(\text{sample}) = 1.000$ , and  $P(\text{mixed}) \approx 0.000$ , in-  
 176 dicating overwhelming support for the sample-origin hypothesis  
 177 when evaluated as parameterized models.

### 178 4.3 Monte Carlo Parameter Estimates

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

### 185 4.4 Diagnostic Test Results

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

### 193 4.5 Impact on Spin-Relaxation Measurements

194 Without background subtraction, the transient introduces system-  
 195 atic bias in  $T_1$  extraction that increases with the true  $T_1$  value:  
 196  $-0.13\%$  at  $T_1 = 50 \mu\text{s}$ ,  $-0.99\%$  at  $T_1 = 100 \mu\text{s}$ ,  $-2.13\%$  at  $T_1 = 200 \mu\text{s}$ ,  
 197  $-7.34\%$  at  $T_1 = 500 \mu\text{s}$ , and  $-20.45\%$  at  $T_1 = 1000 \mu\text{s}$ . Bi-exponential  
 198 subtraction fully corrects the bias to 0.0% across all tested values.

202 **Table 2: Systematic bias in  $T_1$  extraction.**

204 True $T_1$ ( $\mu\text{s}$ )	205 Naive $T_1$ ( $\mu\text{s}$ )	206 Bias (%)	207 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

## 212 5 DISCUSSION

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

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

227 The practical impact of the transient is significant for  $T_1$  mea-  
 228 surements longer than  $200 \mu\text{s}$ , where the naive bias exceeds 2%. The  
 229 bi-exponential subtraction procedure employed by Yama et al. [8]

233 is confirmed to be effective, fully correcting the systematic error.  
 234 We recommend maintaining pulse separations of at least 400  $\mu$ s to  
 235 reduce residual contamination below 5%.

## 236 6 CONCLUSION

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

## 246 REFERENCES

247 [1] Nabeel Aslam, G. Waldherr, P. Neumann, F. Jelezko, and J. Wrachtrup. 2013.  
 248 Photo-induced ionization dynamics of the nitrogen vacancy defect in diamond

249 investigated by single-shot charge state detection. *New Journal of Physics* 15, 1  
 250 (2013), 013064.

251 [2] M. K. Bhaskar, R. Riedinger, B. Machielse, et al. 2020. Experimental demonstration  
 252 of memory-enhanced quantum communication. *Nature* 580 (2020), 60–64.

253 [3] Marcus W. Doherty, Neil B. Manson, Paul Delaney, Fedor Jelezko, Jörg Wrachtrup,  
 254 and Lloyd C. L. Hollenberg. 2013. The nitrogen-vacancy colour centre in diamond.  
 255 *Physics Reports* 528, 1 (2013), 1–45.

256 [4] Mark L. Goldman, Alp Sipahigil, Marcus W. Doherty, Norman Y. Yao, S. D. Bennett,  
 257 Matthew Markham, Daniel J. Twitchen, Neil B. Manson, Ania Kubanek, and  
 258 Mikhail D. Lukin. 2015. Phonon-induced population dynamics and intersystem  
 259 crossing in nitrogen-vacancy centers. *Physical Review Letters* 114, 14 (2015),  
 260 145502.

261 [5] Robert E. Kass and Adrian E. Raftery. 1995. Bayes factors. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*  
 262 90, 430 (1995), 773–795.

263 [6] Neil B. Manson, Jeffrey P. Harrison, and Matthew J. Sellars. 2006. Nitrogen-vacancy  
 264 center in diamond: Model of the electronic structure and associated dynamics.  
 265 *Physical Review B* 74, 10 (2006), 104303.

266 [7] Gideon Schwarz. 1978. Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of  
 267 Statistics* 6, 2 (1978), 461–464.

268 [8] R. Yama et al. 2026. A scalable gallium-phosphide-on-diamond spin-photon  
 269 interface. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.04733* (2026). Section SI3, Near-axis field.

270 291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348