ABSTRACT

Nitrogen vacancy (NV) centers in diamond have developed into a powerful solid-state platform for compact quantum sensors. Here, we compare different DC magnetometry methods like, e.g. continuous-wave optically detected magnetic resonance (CW-ODMR) and continuously excited (CE-) Ramsey measurements combined with lock-in detection to achieve high sensitivity using low optical excitation intensities. We achieve a sensitivity of 0.5 pT/Hz\(^{1/2}\) while retaining mm sized sensor form. We also demonstrate a gradiometer set up which achieves pT sensitivity in unshielded environments. Combined with previous efforts on the diamond AC magnetometry, the diamond magnetometer is promising to perform as a full range magnetometer with pT-fT sensitivity and mm\(^3\) sensing volume in ambient environments.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum sensors have made extraordinary progress in sensitivity, precision, bandwidth, spatial and temporal resolution over the past years [1-4]. This has enabled highly precise
measurements of various physical quantities, including precision frequencies measurements, magnetic and electric field detection, temperature, gyration and gravitational fields [5-10]. Among all the efforts dedicated to advancing measurement limits, measurements of stationary or very slowly varying magnetic fields (DC magnetometry) are one of the most important ones [11,12]. DC magnetometry allows a wide range of applications in e.g. medical as well as material science [13-17].

Highly sensitive DC magnetometry techniques have been developed across various platforms, achieving sensitivities from femto- to nanotesla [18-21]. Superconducting quantum interference devices (SQUID) were holding the sensitivity record of 1 fT/Hz$^{1/2}$ with spatial resolution of a couple of cm [22], until atomic vapor cells achieved a record sensitivity of 160 aT/Hz$^{1/2}$ in a measurement volume of 0.45 cm$^3$ [3,23]. However, there are still technical challenges in further miniaturization while keeping the ultrahigh sensitivity of SQUID and vapor cell magnetometer [24]. On the other hand, the nitrogen vacancy (NV) center in diamond proves to be a competitive room-temperature platform for magnetometry with exceptional spatial resolution, dynamic range, as well as sensitivity [2,25]. Requiring neither cryogenic nor heating in operation, the sensor head can be reduced to the size of the diamond itself, i.e. sub-mm$^3$, with a sensitivity below a pT [2,4]. Furthermore, the NV$^-$ centers can be operated in bias fields from zero to a few Tesla [26,27]. In 2015, subpicotesla AC sensitivity was achieved by NV$^-$ center ensembles at a frequency of kHz [4]. In 2016, a 15 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ DC sensitivity was demonstrated, and was successfully applied in sensing the neuron activity from a marine worm [28]. Recently, by applying a flux concentrator to enhance local magnetic field by more than a factor of 200, the DC sensitivity has been further improved to 0.9 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ [29]. Although this improvement in sensitivity comes at the price of a reduced spatial resolution and vector sensing property, it still has a cm$^3$ sensing volume at a significantly higher dynamic range compared to optical pumped magnetometers (OPMs).

In this work, we present DC magnetic field measurements with a diamond volume of (0.5 mm$^3$), which contains NV center ensembles demonstrating a <100 kHz ODMR linewidth and long dephasing time. Multiple diamond DC magnetometry methods are investigated. Pulsed schemes with continuous excitation and readout are demonstrated to get an improved signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) by using lock-in detection, e.g. a better sensitivity than by optimized CW-ODMR measurements. We demonstrate a 1.9 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ sensitivity by CE-Ramsey with low optical
excitation power, corresponding to a DC sensitivity per volume of $0.67 \text{ pT/(Hz}\cdot\text{mm}^3)^{1/2}$. The magnetic field noise floor spectrum is measured in a $0 – 200 \text{ Hz}$ frequency range at a sensitivity level of $2 – 3 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$. We present gradiometer measurements to suppress common mode magnetic field noise, showing a $4 – 6 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$ noise floor. Furthermore, by applying a ferrite flux guide (FG) the magnetic flux is amplified by 6.3 times, resulting in a sensitivity of $0.5 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$.

II. EXPERIMENT

A. Experimental setup and methods

Sensitivity optimization of diamond magnetometers has been reviewed in detail recently [30]. NV$^-$ magnetometry is based on the Zeeman shift of its ground state sublevels with magnetic field given by the electron spin gyromagnetic ratio of $28 \text{ GHz/T}$. The $S = 1$ spin can be initialized by green laser pumping, and the triplet ground state can be resonantly driven by microwaves (MW). The typical way of measuring the Zeeman shift is to detect the laser induced fluorescence change induced by the sublevel population difference. The sensitivity is defined as $\delta B = \sigma/(dS/dB)$, where $\sigma$ is the noise floor detected by the magnetometer, and the scalar factor $dS/dB$ is the change in signal $dS$ occurring per magnetic field change $dB$. In the case of diamond magnetometry, the sensitivity is essentially determined by the characteristics of the NV$^-$ ensembles, and scales with the sensing volume as well as the measurement time [4]. In this work, by applying an optimized diamond sample with narrow linewidth NV$^-$ ensembles, we mainly focus on compromising between the signal level and the technical noise and feasibility.

Figure 1 shows the experimental setup and the energy level diagram for the photo- and spin kinetic simulations. The setup is entirely enclosed by a magnetic shield to attenuate the magnetic field noise in the lab. The optical compound parabolic concentrator (CPC) is used for high fluorescence collection efficiency which exceeds 60% [4]. The high Q-factor MW resonator generates a uniform driving field for the NV ensemble [31]. We investigate the performance of a gradiometer by constructing two identical diamond sensors as shown in Fig. 1(b). A loop antenna is applied in the reference channel. In order to test the sensitivity enhancement by a flux guide, a ferrite rod (MN60) is placed between the diamond and a coil applying a test field as shown in Fig. 1(c).
FIG. 1 (a) The experimental setup is installed in a magnetic field shield for high sensitivity measurements. (b) Two identical diamond sensors are constructed to measure magnetic the noise floor in gradiometer configuration. The reference channel uses a loop antenna. (c) A ferrite rod is placed between the diamond and a coil to further improve the sensitivity. (d) NV⁻ center energy diagram.

In sensitive measurements, one of the most important techniques is lock-in detection to avoid low frequency $1/f$ noise. Figure 2(a) shows the typical continuous wave (CW-) ODMR output from the lock-in amplifier (LIA), with the NV centers spin transitions driven by a modulated MW field. The MW modulation phases are of opposite sign for the $|0⟩ → |1⟩$ and $|0⟩ → |−1⟩$ transitions [29]. Thus, $S_{−1}$ and $S_{+1}$ have the same amplitude but different sign when there is a common mode line shift $δ_{cm}$ affecting the two transitions, like e.g. caused by temperature fluctuations. This measurement scheme is further on called double resonance (DR). By tracking the resonance lines in cases of larger magnetic fields, one can maintain the maximum scalar factor and the linearity of the system.

Figure 2(b) shows a Ramsey sequence as an example for pulsed measurement sequences using a LIA, while Fig. 2(c) depicts the signal dynamics together with the acquisition methods. In the up to now used Ramsey measurements [2], the laser is turned off during the field acquisition time $τ_m$. The fluorescence signal is therefore gated and appears as pulses in the fluorescence detection phase. However, the signal $dS$ only amounts to a few percent of the overall signal. That means that most of the overall signal detected by the set-up, doesn’t contributes to $dS$, but requires most of the bits when the output is digitized. We thus modified the sequence to a continuous excitation mode with the laser turned on all time. Advantages include that only the fluorescence decrease is digitized rather than the fluorescence background, heating fluctuation induced by the pulsed laser can be removed and furthermore the photodetectors can be applied with narrower
bandwidth, so that the gain could increase for a better SNR. The disadvantage is that the laser repolarizes the NV center during $\tau_m$, which reduces $dS$. In a quantitative treatment of the measurements, this is treated as a lower polarization rate, i.e. it reduces the contrast, but doesn’t induce error to the phase accumulation. We would like to note that the continuous excitation mode can also be applied in other pulsed measurement schemes, such as echo and higher order decoupling sequences. The black curve in Fig. 2(c) is the fluorescence signal for a cycle time of 1 ms. The labeled grey areas and the inset formulas describe the acquisition method which has been used in AC magnetometry work [4]. For the calculation of the signal $S$, the noise scales as $1/\sqrt{T}$, the total acquisition time. The lock-in detection is equivalent to a method, in which $S_A$ and $S_B$ are the averaged signal level of each half reference cycle and $S$ is the amplitude of the full cycle. The LIA integrates all the detected fluorescence so that there is no acquisition time intermittency which reduces the sensitivity. Therefore, the shot noise limited sensitivity of our Ramsey measurement can be expressed as

$$
\delta B_{\text{Ramsey}} = \frac{\hbar}{g\mu_B C_{\text{det}} \sqrt{N\tau_m}},
$$

(1)

FIG. 2 (a) Lock in detected CW-ODMR signal profile and the corresponding scalar factor. $\delta_{cm}$ is the line shift of the two resonant lines. $S_-1$ and $S_+1$ are the corresponding signals. (b) Sequence for pulsed magnetometry. The Ramsey sequence is sketched as an example for the measurement sequences used. The laser is continuously applied during the lock-in detection. (c) Readout of photodetector in pulsed magnetometry. The figure plots both the regular readout method (for the solid 1 ms cycle signal) and the lock-in readout method (for the dotted 250 $\mu$s cycle signal). The signal in the grey area is calculated following the equations in the inset. In lock-in detection, the demodulation reference is applied according to the dashed sinusoidal line.
where $\tau_m$ is optimized from the dephasing time $T^*_Z$, $C_{det}$ is the detected contrast, $N$ is the photon detection rate. In Fig 2(c) the dotted line shows the fluorescence signal with 250 $\mu$s cycle time, and the dashed line is the corresponding lock-in reference. When the cycle time for each sequence part is significantly shorter than the repolarization time, $C_{det}$ is reduced. Thus, there is an optimum for the tradeoff between the technical noise floor and the signal contrast, which both decrease with higher demodulation frequencies.

**B. Parameters optimization**

Among all the diamond DC magnetometry schemes, Ramsey magnetometry is among the most sensitive methods. However, its practical sensitivity suffers from technical limitations. For example, a large laser power is needed for the initialization of the spin ensembles. This brings heating problems and extra noise with it. In contrast, CW-ODMR is a method which can be easily implemented with low laser power. In the following we first analyze the CW-ODMR sensitivity and the optimal laser and MW parameters. Then, Ramsey magnetometry is investigated based on the same laser power. The CW-ODMR shot noise limited sensitivity is described as

$$\delta B_{CW} = P_p \frac{h}{g\mu_B} \frac{\nu(s, \Omega_R)}{C_{det}(s, \Omega_R) \sqrt{N}}. \tag{2}$$

Here $P_p$ is a lineshape dependent factor, which is 0.77 for the Lorentzian line profile in this work. The key parameters for experimental optimization is the linewidth $\nu$ and the contrast $C_{det}$, which are dependent on the Rabi frequency $\Omega_R$, and the ratio of the applied laser power to the saturation power, $s$. Figure 3(a) plots the sensitivity dependence on the parameters. The optimized values are: $\Omega_R = 23$ kHz, and $s \sim 3 \times 10^{-4}$. The shot noise limited sensitivity is 2.86 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ for the signal of a single hyperfine line. By driving the three hyperfine lines, the contrast is increased three times, and the scalar factor is further improved by DR driving, by another factor of 2. Therefore, the shot noise limited sensitivity of the CW-ODMR method is expected to be 0.48 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$. 


In order to have an optimum SNR, the collected fluorescence emission power should be on the order of mW with roughly $3 \times 10^{-4}$ lower than the saturation laser power. To avoid applying an unnecessarily high laser power, the excitation power is optimized by comparing the experimental pumping rate with the simulation of the excitation kinetics. With a fluorescence emission rate of 66 MHz [33,34], the optimized pumping rate is estimated to be around 0.02 MHz. This parameter underestimates the pumping rate due to neglecting charge state conversion in the kinetics [35]. We apply a near optimal laser power with the pumping rate $k = 0.026$ MHz. Figure 3(b) plots the experimental fluorescence recovery curve and the simulated results with different parameters. The low pumping rate is the main reason for the millisecond repolarization time. Hence, in the low
pumping rate case, the influence from $T_1$ on the fluorescence recovery becomes important. For the optimization of the MW strength, we take the parameter linewidth/contrast as plotted in Fig. 3(c). We find the optimal $\Omega_R$ to be around 17 kHz. Figure 3(d) plots the calculated fluorescence response to different modulation frequencies to further investigate the magnetometer bandwidth. The demodulated output of the fluorescence drops from 1 kHz to roughly 20 kHz modulation frequency due to the limitation of the pumping and the spin lattice relaxation time $T_1$. The 3 dB bandwidth of the magnetometer is around 1.5 kHz at a pumping rate 0.026 MHz. It increases to 7.4 kHz with a lower contrast when the pumping rate is 10 times higher. In addition, with a roughly 10 times shorter $T_1$, the contrast also decreases, however, its 3 dB bandwidth only increases to 1.7 kHz. The SNR can be improved by modulation within the 3 dB bandwidth, since the technical noise floor also decreases with the increasing demodulation frequency. After the 3 dB frequency point, it is worth to investigate if the SNR can be further improved with a reduction of both the signal amplitude and the noise, which is discussed below.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Figure 4a shows a comparison of the linewidth between CW-ODMR, pulsed-ODMR and continuously excited pulsed-ODMR (CE-pulsed-ODMR) at different Rabi frequencies. While the CW-ODMR shows an obvious linewidth broadening with strong MW driving, the linewidths of the pulsed-ODMR and the CE-pulsed-ODMR measurement stay unchanged, when the $\pi$ pulse width exceeds $T_2^*$. Figure 4(a) also shows that pulsed-ODMR and CE-pulsed-ODMR are almost having the same linewidth. In order to determine whether the contrast reduction in CE-pulsed magnetometry degrades the sensitivity, we optimize the CW-ODMR sensitivity as a benchmark for comparison with the sensitivity of the CE-Ramsey measurement. We expect, that CE-Ramsey combines the narrow linewidth with the advantage of a good SNR due to the continuously readout. All the following measurements are based on the optimal laser power for the CW-ODMR method which can be easily achieved in the laboratory.

MW frequency modulation is implemented as discussed in Sec. II. Either frequency modulation (FM) or phase modulation (PM) can be applied, and the FM MW signal is given by

$$S_{FM} = A \cos[2\pi f_0 t + \beta \sin(2\pi f_m t)],$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)
where $f_0$ is the resonance frequency, $f_m$ is the modulation frequency, $\beta = f_d/f_m$ is defined as the modulation index in which $f_d$ is the frequency modulation amplitude. In the case of PM, the phase is modulated as $\phi_d \sin(2\pi f_m t)$, where the phase modulation amplitude $\phi_d$ is equivalent to $\beta$. In applications, the FM signal is usually more precise than the PM signal, but PM signal provides a more stable phase reference, which is important in applying a multi-MW signal for DR driving. Another parameter that is worth to discuss is the bandwidth of the modulated MW signal. The modulated MW bandwidth, e.g. Carson bandwidth is defined as, $BW_{FM} = 2(\beta + 1)f_m$, and the FM signal can be decomposed as

$$S_{FM} = A \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} I_n(\beta) \sin[2\pi(f_0 + nf_m) t].$$

(4)

![FIG. 4 (a) The linewidth measured with different Rabi frequencies by CW-ODMR (black dotted line), pulsed ODMR (red solid), and CE-pulsed-ODMR (blue dashed line). (b) Scalar factor measured for different modulation frequencies $f_m$ (CW-ODMR as function of the modulation amplitude $f_d$). $\beta$ is the modulation index defined as $f_d/f_m$. The solid lines are fittings according to the derivative of the Lorenzian line-shape, and the dashed line is the fitting including the signals generated by the sideband frequencies of the modulated MW. (c) The scalar factor measured with different modulation frequencies and modulation indexes (PM phase deviation), and the CE-Ramsey scalar factor with different measurement frequencies. (d) The measured noise floor within the frequency band of 1 kHz to 20 kHz, and the corresponding sensitivity measured by CE-Ramsey method.](image)
When $BW_{\text{FM}} > \text{FWHM}$, the demodulated fluorescence signal amplitude is reduced. Figure 4(b) plots the maximum scalar factor of the lock-in ODMR spectrum for $f_m$ as 1 kHz, 5 kHz, and 20 kHz, and $f_d$ ranging from 1 kHz to 20 kHz. The scalar factor is reduced with increasing $f_m$. The solid lines are fitting points with only the component $n = 0$ driving the transition, which is the case when $f_d + f_m$ is small, but the fitting becomes poor with higher $f_m$ and $f_d$. By adding the higher orders of the $S_{\text{FM}}$ spectral components, the fitting is significantly improved as the dashed line shows for $f_m = 20$ kHz in Fig. 4(b). Figure 4(c) plots the measured scalar factors as a function of increasing $f_m$ with different $\beta$. The scalar factor first rises with the increasing $f_d = f_m \cdot \beta$. For larger modulation frequencies the scalar factor is mostly limited by the magnetometer bandwidth. An additional reduction of the signal due to $BW_{\text{FM}}$ can be found when $f_m$ is close to 20 kHz with $\beta = 4$, $BW_{\text{FM}} = 100$ kHz.

The CE-Ramsey scalar factor is also plotted in Fig. 4(c) for different modulation frequencies together with CW-ODMR data. As depicted in Fig. 2(c), in this technique the signal is demodulated with the reference set by the measurement cycle. Because most of the effective fluorescence signal is at the beginning of each cycle, the LIA output decreases with reduced demodulation frequency because of the defect center spins are repolarized during the signal acquisition. Thus, the scalar factor of the CE-Ramsey measurement increases at the beginning. When the measurement time is 250 $\mu$s, corresponding 4 kHz demodulation frequency, the insufficient repolarization starts to reduce the signal. Nevertheless, the CE-Ramsey scalar factor is larger than the CW-ODMR over the entire demodulation frequency range investigated.

Furthermore, we investigate the instrument noise floor to get a clue on the magnetic field sensitivity. Figure 4(d) shows the noise floor as a function of the demodulation frequency ranging from 1 kHz to 20 kHz. When the setup operates with the laser switched on and the microwaves off resonance, the noise reduces by roughly 100 times. The magnetic field sensitivity can be estimated by dividing the noise floor with the scalar factor. Despite the scalar factor measured by CW-ODMR surpasses the CE-Ramsey method when the demodulation frequency is 1 kHz, neither of them lead to the best sensitivity due to the high instrumental noises. We plot the magnetic field sensitivity measured by CE-Ramsey in Fig. 4(d). It shows that the optimal demodulation frequency i.e. the best SNR is at 9 kHz, with the magnetic field sensitivity being 1.9 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$. Meanwhile, the scalar factor measured with the optimized CW-ODMR parameters is only 1.8 times lower,
corresponding to a $3.5 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$ in sensitivity. These numbers are measured and calculated both with MW driving the $|0\rangle \rightarrow | - 1\rangle$ transition, hyperfine lines included. These measurements have not included the DR driving, and a roughly 2 times improvement to $0.95 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$ is expected.

FIG. 5 (a) Measured noise floor spectrum compared to the OPM (Quspin, QTFM) sensor with $1 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$ sensitivity. The diamond magnetometer operates with a bias field of roughly $10 \text{ G}$ while the OPM operates near zero field. The black line is the off-resonant baseline showing the sensitivity limit of the diamond magnetometer. The noise floor measured by the diamond as the red line shows is close to the baseline and the level is $2 - 3 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$ from DC to 200 Hz. (b) The noise floor comparison measured with and without the ferrite rod. Green line is the direct output spectrum and shows a higher noise. The blue line shows the magnetic field spectrum measured with the flux guide and the dashed line indicates the sensitivity level. (c) Noise floor measured by the gradiometer setup: the endoscope channel 1, reference channel 2 and gradiometry signal are measured respectively. The sensitivity of channel 2 decreases due to the MW inhomogeneity generated by the loop antenna. The best gradiometry noise floor is measured at $4 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$. (d) summarizes the sensitivity achieved in this work. $1.9 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$ DC sensitivity is measured with the $(0.5 \text{ mm})^3$ diamond, and $0.9 \text{ pT/Hz}^{1/2}$ AC sensitivity was achieved [4] by similar sized diamond. The solid lines indicate the sensitivity scale limits with the sensor volume, and the AC line is lower because the active volume of $8.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mm}^3$ was smaller than the diamond size. The dash-dotted line is the sensitivity level reached with the FG, and the dashed line indicates the sensitivity scale with the spatial resolution of the FG. The gray area shows the sensitivity and volume that is expected with combination of the diamond sensor and the FG.

The resonantly measured magnetic field noise spectrum is depicted in Fig. 5(a). The magnetic field noise inside the shielding is measured by the OPM (Quspin Inc., QTFM) as a
benchmark with nominally 1 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ sensitivity. In Fig. 5(a), the noise peaks at 50 Hz and higher harmonics measured by the diamond magnetometer and the OPM coincide. The diamond magnetometer measures a noise floor of 2 – 3 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ for frequencies larger than 50 Hz. The sensitivity is improved by 1.75 times after applying the DR driving. The noise spectrum at a frequency lower than 50 Hz is limited by the residual low frequency noise inside the shielding. The off-resonant baseline in Fig. 5(a) marks the shot noise limit of the diamond magnetometer, which is 2 – 3 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ from 0 to 200 Hz.

The most efficient way to overcome this sensitivity limit is using a flux concentrator (FC). The increase in sensitivity using a FC follows simple geometric considerations, i.e. the ratio of the surface areas at the surface proximal to the diamond vs. the distal surface defines the amplification. In our case, it is possible to use a ferrite rod with millimeter diameter as a flux guide (FG), so that the diamond can measure an amplified magnetic field. Remote weak magnetic field sources can be detected in this way. Experimentally, the ferrite rod is placed as illustrated in Fig. 1(c) with the end diameter approximately to 2 mm. Therefore, the magnetic field of a test coil is guided and concentrated through the rod to the diamond. In the experiment, the diamond magnetometer detects a magnetic field 6.3 times larger than without FG. Figure 5(b) shows the comparison of the detected magnetic field noise floor. The measured noise floor with the ferrite rod is read as 3 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$. The flux amplification and the noise floor indicate that the sensitivity is enhanced to around 0.5 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$.

Following the gradiometer configuration described in Fig. 1(b), we measure the diamond magnetic gradiometry noise floor as shown in Fig. 5(c). Respectively, MW is applied to drive the transition of $|0\rangle \rightarrow |1\rangle$ in the probe channel (Channel 1) and $|0\rangle \rightarrow | - 1\rangle$ in the reference channel (Channel 2). The probe channel sensitivity degrades to about 5 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ due to the driving of single transition. The sensitivity of channel 2 is 10 – 20 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$, mainly because of the MW inhomogeneity generated by the loop antenna. Nevertheless, the gradiometer suppresses common mode magnetic field signal and the differential signal is amplified, measuring a noise floor of 4 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ with a distance between the two channels of roughly 10 cm. In principle, the gradiometry sensitivity is improved by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$ compared to a single channel magnetometer. With a 2 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ noise floor measured by the single channel magnetometer a 1.4 pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ gradiometry noise floor can be expected.
Figure 5(d) summarizes the sensitivity results based on our measurements and from references[28,29]. The solid lines indicate the sensitivity scaling with the active volume. The AC line doesn’t cross the experimental points because the active volume of $8.5 \times 10^{-4}$ mm$^3$ in the experiment is smaller than the diamond size [4]. The dash-dotted line labels the sensitivity level achieved with the combination of the FG. There are several things which could be further optimized in measurements with the FG, such as the distance between the diamond and the FG end and the symmetry of the FG structure. Finite elementary analysis can help with the design. The dashed line plots the sensitivity scale with an ideal gain from the FG as the ratio of the end-surface areas, and the gray area indicates the sensitivities that could be achieved within the corresponding sensor volumes. Although the MW antenna and fluorescence concentrator are not included in the sensor volume, the diamond consumes significantly less space compared to the vapor cell which requires heating. Moreover, because of the small diamond size, a flux guide can significantly increase the sensitivity. Using a geometry as in Ref. 29, our set-up would yield a magnetic field sensitivity of less than $100$ fT/Hz$^{1/2}$ at ambient environment.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

This work demonstrates the advances of diamond DC magnetometry sensitivity from picotesla to subpicotesla level with a mm$^3$ sensing volume. With the continuously excited Ramsey measurement, we can take advantage of both the narrow linewidth and the low noise floor of the lock-in detection with an optimized sensitivity of $1.9$ pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ in a (0.5 mm)$^3$ sized diamond with around $100$ mW laser excitation. This number is improved to $0.5$ pT/Hz$^{1/2}$ when combined with a flux guide. The gradiometer measures a noise floor at $4$ pT/Hz$^{1/2}$. Our device can be upgraded by a close-loop system to increase its operating range and get better linearity. Techniques such as double quantum driving, spin bath driving, multiple NV orientation driving etc., are all on the table for advancing the subpicotesla sensitivity [36,37]. With a demonstrated subpicotesla sensitivity and spatial resolution in both DC and AC NV ensemble magnetometry, diamond magnetometer can be expected to be a powerful platform for a wide range of applications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank for Andrej Denisenko, Jianpei Geng and Ayman Mohamed for fruitful discussions. We acknowledge financial support by EU via the project ASTERIQS, and the ERC Advanced grant Nr. 742610, SMel as well as the BMBF via the project MiLiQuant and the DFG
via the GRK 2198 and 2642. In addition, we acknowledge the support of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI (No. 17H02751).

REFERENCE