Photon emission correlation spectroscopy as an analytical tool for quantum defects
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Photon emission correlation spectroscopy has a long history in the study of atoms, molecules, and, more recently, solid-state quantum defects. In solid-state systems, its most common use is as an indicator of single-photon emission, a key property for quantum technology. However, photon correlation data can provide a wealth of information about quantum emitters beyond their single-photon purity — information that can reveal details about an emitter’s electronic structure and optical dynamics that are hidden by other spectroscopy techniques. We present a standardized framework for using photon emission correlation spectroscopy to study quantum emitters, including discussion of theory, data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation. We highlight nuances and best practices regarding the commonly used $g^{(2)}(\tau = 0) \leq 0.5$ test for single-photon emission. Finally, we illustrate how this experimental technique can be paired with optical dynamics simulations to formulate an electronic model for unknown quantum emitters, enabling the design of quantum control protocols and assessment of their suitability for quantum information science applications.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum defects originate from substitutional atoms, vacancies, or vacancy complexes in solid-state lattices. They can exhibit quantum-coherent spin and optical properties, and thus comprise foundational elements in quantum information science [1–5]. Quantum registers in diamond are optically-interfaced quantum memories supporting multi-qubit quantum algorithms [4, 5], and fluorescent nanodiamonds have advanced the field of quantum sensing [6–9]. Quantum defects are a subset of the larger category of quantum emitters, systems which host discrete electronic states that interact with individual photons. These include quantum dots, which are highly optimized single-photon sources for quantum photonics [10, 11] and quantum communication [12, 13], and fluorescent single molecules, which show promise for quantum information processing [14].

Inspired by the well-known examples of quantum dots [15, 16] and diamond color centers [17, 18], the list of established quantum defect systems has grown to include defects in silicon carbide [19–21], emitters in layered materials [22] such as hexagonal boron nitride [23] and transition metal dichalcogenides [24], and rare-earth ions [25]. Most solid-state defect systems remain unexplored, however, and many promise potential advantages for quantum-information applications in terms of scalability, device integration, optical properties, spin properties, and quantum coherence [2, 3, 26]. In each case, controlling and harnessing a defect’s quantum properties requires a detailed understanding of its electronic structure as well as its optical and spin dynamics, presenting formidable obstacles for efficient experimental or theoretical characterization.

Photon emission correlation spectroscopy (PECS) involves analyzing photon time correlations in the optical emission from a fluorescent system, as shown in Fig. 1. It is widely used to verify single-photon emission associated with quantum emitters through the observation of photon antibunching [27–32]. As a steady-state measurement requiring only constant excitation, single-photon detectors, and suitable timing electronics, PECS is relatively simple to implement, and yet it can provide a wealth of information about an emitter’s optical dynamics including excited-state lifetimes, radiative and nonradiative relaxation pathways, as well as spin and charge dynamics.

This paper describes the application of PECS as a general-purpose characterization tool for solid-state quantum emitters. We present application-specific guidelines for reliable data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation. In particular, we demonstrate how PECS can be used to reliably confirm single-photon emission and to hypothesize a model of the system’s electronic states and optical dynamics, enabling an assessment of the emitter’s suitability for quantum technology applications.

II. BACKGROUND

The method of intensity correlation spectroscopy was pioneered by Hanbury Brown and Twiss in 1956, when they recorded time-correlated photons while developing a new intensity interferometry technique to measure the diameter of stars, marking the first observation of the bunching of thermal light [33]. Glauber’s foundational 1963 paper [34], laying the theoretical framework for higher order quantum correlation functions, launched the field of quantum optics. Kimble et al.’s 1977
FIG. 1. Experimental overview. (a) Laser light is focused through a microscope objective onto a quantum defect in a solid-state crystal (grey block). The resulting fluorescence from the defect is emitted isotropically and collected through the objective as the signal. Background photons arising from surface fluorescence and other fluorescent defects are also collected. (b) The full process of PECS is illustrated. Starting in the upper left, excitation from a laser source causes the system to evolve between different electronic states, emitting a photon when passing through a radiative transition. The emitted photons (yellow circles) are collected into a photon time series, which includes experimental noise such as timing error, represented by light grey circles, and background photons (orange circle). Time correlations are calculated between either all photons or only subsequent photons to make up the autocorrelation or waiting time distribution respectively. Corrections and analysis of the photon emission statistics helps paint a clearer picture of the emitter’s internal dynamics model.

The observation of photon antibunching in emission from trapped ions confirmed the quantum-mechanical nature of light [27, 35], and numerous subsequent experiments revealed phenomena including quantum jumps [36] and non-classical light fields [37].

The technique also found purchase in single-molecule spectroscopy [38], where innovations in microscopy had unveiled a new realm of molecular physics [39]. PECS facilitated exploration of intra- and intermolecular dynamics [40] that had previously been unresolvable for systems with fast timescales or low quantum yields [41]. Arguably the largest contribution of PECS to single molecule spectroscopy was the development of Fluorescence Correlation Spectroscopy (FCS), which is widely used to resolve physical and kinetic dynamics such as diffusion rates, molecule size and orientation, blinking, and binding kinetics [42, 43]. With the emergence of quantum information science, the focus shifted to solid-state systems such as the nitrogen-vacancy (NV) center in diamond [28, 38] and quantum dots [43], since these systems were immune to the photo-bleaching tendencies of molecules and hence are more robust single-photon sources.

A. Single-photon emitters

A single-photon emitter (SPE) is a quantum system that emits one photon at a time. Single-photon emission is a key requirement for many quantum information technologies [44, 45]. In particular, single-photon purity, the extent to which a system creates a pure, single-photon number state, influences the security of quantum communication protocols [46, 47] and error rates in photonic quantum computing and simulation [44]. High purity single-photon emission is also a prerequisite for realizing indistinguishable single photons [48], which form the basis for linear-photonic quantum information processing protocols [49, 51] or quantum repeaters [52]. PECS enables precise measurements of both photon purity and indistinguishability for SPEs [44, 53].

B. Optical dynamics of quantum defects

The potential of quantum emitters, however, extends far beyond their use as SPEs. When their electronic or optical dynamics depend on internal orbital and spin states, these states become accessible as matter qubits for use in the storage or processing of quantum information. The challenge in exploring new materials and defect
systems is that a plethora of dynamical phenomena, including radiative and nonradiative transitions between electronic levels, spin dynamics, inter-system crossings to metastable states, and ionization/recombination, may occur under different conditions, or all in combination. In this section, we briefly discuss these phenomena and their importance for quantum information science. As we will see, PECS presents a versatile framework in which to hypothesize and test such dynamical models.

Spin states are desirable as quantum-mechanical degrees of freedom because they are insulated from most environmental noise yet manipulable through spin resonance techniques, striking a balance between control and coherence \[54\]. When spin states couple coherently to light, they form a light-matter interface that is integral for quantum communication and distributed quantum computing as an interface between static and flying qubits \[55\]. Even when the optical coupling to spin states is incoherent, as in the case of the NV center’s intersystem crossing between triplet and singlet states, spin-dependent optical dynamics can be used for spin initialization \[56\] and readout \[57\]. Quantum sensing similarly takes advantage of the intrinsic sensitivity of orbital and spin states to external fields, together with optical readout \[58\, 59\]. Many defects feature spin manifolds separated by electric-dipole forbidden transitions. Forbidden transitions to shelving states with long lifetimes can allow a state to be stored and protected in quantum memories \[60\].

Especially in wide-bandgap host materials, defects can exist in multiple stable charge states. Once a defect’s charge dynamics are understood and can be controlled, they present new opportunities for optical and electronic control, including electrical generation of single photons \[61\] and long-term information storage \[62\]. Charge states coupled to spin states can also be harnessed to significantly improve the efficiency of state initialization \[63\] and optical readout \[64\] for quantum computing or quantum sensing, or to enable photoelectric spin readout in microelectronic devices \[65\].

More generally, detailed understanding of an emitter’s electronic structure, along with radiative and nonradiative dynamics can also allow the design of additional resonant excitation schemes that improve spin readout efficiency \[66\] or achieve higher photon indistinguishability and entanglement \[67\].

### III. THEORY

PECS involves exciting and collecting emission from quantum emitters, often through a confocal microscope setup. These emitters, represented in Fig. 1(a) can take the form of quantum dots, single molecules, or sub-bandgap quantum defects in solid-state lattices. An overview of the process of PECS for quantum emitters is pictured in Fig. 1(b). The process begins with the internal dynamics of the system initially unknown. The evolution of this unknown system in response to excitation directly determines the timing of photon emission. Therefore, the core of PECS is experimental collection and analysis of an emitter’s photon time series to back out the dynamics that are responsible for observed correlations in the time series.

#### A. Types of photon correlations

There are two main types of photon intensity correlations that can be measured (see Fig. 2a)): Correlations between subsequent photons and correlations between all photons. Correlations between subsequent photons form a probability density function (PDF), called the waiting time distribution or \(W(\tau)\), that gives the distribution of arrival times between subsequent photons. Intuitively, this describes the likelihood of receiving a subsequent photon at a certain time given that one was just received. On the other hand, correlations between all photons paint a picture of the equilibrium stochastic evolution of the system. The full correlations make up the second-order intensity correlation function often referred to as the autocorrelation function or \(g^{(2)}(\tau)\), which intuitively represents the likelihood of receiving any two photons at a specific time delay separation. Here \(\tau = t_2 - t_1\) refers to the delay time separating a photon received at \(t_1\) and a photon received at \(t_2\).

Figure 2a depicts the different experimental setups for acquiring the two types of correlations. For \(W(\tau)\), an incoming photon is registered as a start pulse, starting the clock until a subsequent photon is registered as a stop pulse. This time difference is then collected into a histogram of subsequent arrival times. On the other hand, for \(g^{(2)}(\tau)\), each photon arrival must be time tagged, which requires a multi-channel high timing resolution machine, such as a time correlated single-photon counter, and additional processing to yield the correlations. While \(W(\tau)\) is simpler to acquire experimentally, we are going to show how \(g^{(2)}(\tau)\) is more straightforward to analyze for meaningful results.

#### B. Two-level model

The internal evolution of an emitter’s states is determined solely based on the initial conditions, electronic states, and transition rates between the states. Emission of a photon is dependent on which transitions are radiative. Therefore, an analytic expression that captures the photon time correlations must be a function of the state of the system over time and must reflect which transitions are radiative. The simplest model to demonstrate the two types of photon correlations is a two-level model, consisting of an excited state and a ground state. The system transitions from the ground state to excited state at a rate \(\Gamma_{ge}\) dependent on the excitation source, and then decays through a radiative transition from excited...
To derive an expression for the waiting time distribution, we must consider the probability of receiving the first subsequent photon at time \( t_2 \) given that a photon was received at time \( t_1 \). For a two-level model, this is equivalent to the probability of the system starting in the ground state at time \( t_1 \), then evolving to the excited state at time \( t \) after delay \( \tau' = t - t_1 \) and decaying back to the ground state at delay time \( \tau = t_2 - t_1 \), integrated over all possible excitation times:

\[
W(\tau) = \int_0^\tau d\tau' P_{e\rightarrow g}(\tau - \tau') P_{g\rightarrow e}(\tau').
\]

Here,

\[
P_{a\rightarrow b}(t) = \Gamma_{ab} e^{-\Gamma_{ab} t},
\]

is the normalized PDF for a transition from state \( a \) to \( b \) with transition rate \( \Gamma_{ab} \). Therefore, for a two-level system with unity collection efficiency, the waiting time distribution is given by

\[
W(\tau) = \frac{\Gamma_{ge} \Gamma_{eg}}{\Gamma_{ge} - \Gamma_{eg}} (e^{\Gamma_{ge} \tau} - e^{-\Gamma_{eg} \tau}).
\]

To derive an expression for autocorrelation, we must consider the probability of receiving any photon at time \( t_2 \), given one was received at time \( t_1 \). For any model with a single radiative transition, this is equivalent to \( P_e(t_2) P_g(t_1) = 1 \), the probability of being in the excited state at time \( t_2 \), given that the system was in the ground state at \( t_1 \). The convention is to normalize this probability to the steady-state population of the excited state, \( P_e^\infty \), to give

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau = t_2 - t_1) = \frac{P_e(t_2) P_g(t_1) = 1}{P_e^\infty},
\]

so that \( g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 \) corresponds to uncorrelated light and any deviations from 1 correspond to positive or negative correlations.

The time-dependent probability of each state’s occupation is determined by the transition rates. Therefore, the probability of excited state occupation can be found from the solution of a system of coupled ordinary differential equations (ODEs), which for a two-level model is

\[
\frac{dP_g}{dt} = -\Gamma_{ge} P_g(t) + \Gamma_{eg} P_e(t)
\]

\[
\frac{dP_e}{dt} = \Gamma_{ge} P_g(t) - \Gamma_{eg} P_e(t).
\]

Solving with the initial conditions of \( P_g(0) = 1 \) results in the expression for autocorrelation from a two-level model with unity collection efficiency,

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 - e^{-(\Gamma_{eg} + \Gamma_{ge})\tau}.
\]
C. Generalizing to higher-level models

In order to capture more complicated dynamics, higher-level models are necessary. Experimentally observed optical dynamics can often be the product of multiple electronic levels involving additional radiative and non-radiative transitions.

One example of a higher-level model, a three-level model, might include a two-level model with an additional non-radiative pathway from the excited state to a third metastable state, then to the ground state. In the following, we will consider the general cases of higher-level models with a single radiative transition and unity collection efficiency.

In the case of \( W(\tau) \), the addition of non-radiative decay pathways requires accounting for all possible paths of evolution that can occur prior to emission of a subsequent photon. With increasingly complex models, this problem quickly becomes intractable. For example, for the three-level system described above, the waiting time distribution becomes an infinite sum of nested integrals where the \( m \)-th term represents the probability of the system starting in the ground state and travelling through the non-radiative pathway \( m \) times before travelling the radiative pathway once.

\( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) is more straightforward to generalize to higher levels. As in the case of the two-level model, for any \( n \)-level electronic structure, the full dynamics are given by a system of \( n \) coupled differential equations. This system of equations can be summarized by the rate equation

\[
\dot{P} = GP, \tag{8}
\]

where \( P \) is a vector of state occupation probabilities and \( G \) is the transition rate matrix. Each off-diagonal element of the rate matrix, \( G_{ij} \), where \( i \neq j \), is the sum of transition rates into state \( i \) from state \( j \). Each diagonal element \( G_{ii} = -\sum_{j \neq i} G_{ij} \) in order to preserve probability. The time-dependent population of each state can be obtained by solving Eq. 8 with the initial condition set immediately following emission of a photon. \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) can then be calculated from equation 4, letting \( P_e \) be the excited state from which the radiative transition occurs.

D. Relationship between \( W(\tau) \) and \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \)

\( W(\tau) \) and \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) can be analytically related, as both sets of correlations originate from the same physical process, and the correlations contained in \( W(\tau) \) make up a subset of all those included in \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \). As a result, \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) can be constructed from \( W(\tau) \) through an infinite sum of self-convolutions [68]

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau) = W(\tau) + W(\tau) \ast W(\tau) + \cdots
= \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}[W](s)}{1 - \mathcal{L}[W](s)} \right\}(t), \tag{9}
\]

where \( \mathcal{L} \) is the Laplace transform and \( s \) is a complex frequency parameter. This is due to the fact that the probability of receiving two photons separated by time \( \tau \) with \( m \) intermediate detection events is equivalent to \( m \) convolutions of the probability of receiving consecutive photons.

Conversely, \( W(\tau) \) can be thought of as a first order approximation of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \). This relationship has led to the occasional practice of using \( W(\tau) \) and \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) interchangeably in experiments at short times. However, the accuracy of this approximation can be difficult to gauge, as it is dependent on the setup collection efficiency \( C \) and the relation between the pump rate \( (\Gamma_{ge}) \) and radiative decay rate \( (\Gamma_{eg}) \) as parameterized by

\[
\alpha = \frac{\Gamma_{eg} - \Gamma_{ge}}{\Gamma_{eg} + \Gamma_{ge}}. \tag{10}
\]

While \( C \) only affects the normalization of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \), the expression for \( W(\tau) \) is setup-dependent. Fig. 2(b) illustrates the effect of \( C \) and \( \alpha \) on the shape of \( W(\tau) \) and its comparison to \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) (solid black line) for a two-level model. Each shaded region depicts a range of \( W(\tau) \) curves at a particular \( C \). Within a shaded region, the shape of \( W(\tau) \) ranges from a solid colored line, representing \( W(\tau) \) for a system in which the pump rate is significantly higher or significantly lower than the decay rate \( (\alpha \rightarrow 1) \), to a dashed line, representing a system in which the two rates are equal \( (\alpha = 0) \). A lower collection efficiency leads to a closer approximation of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) as the quantity being measured is often not the correlations between two subsequently emitted photons due to high probability for loss. On the other hand, adjusting the excitation power so that the pump rate approaches the emission rate results in a farther off approximation of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \). The difficulty in determining the quantities of collection efficiency, excitation rate and emission rate makes it challenging to assess the validity of approximating \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) with \( W(\tau) \). Further, the dependence of \( W(\tau) \) on these three independent variables make it difficult to decouple collection efficiency from transition rates when measuring an unknown system. For this reason, rather than measuring and fitting \( W(\tau) \) or truncating \( W(\tau) \) and fitting it to \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \), it is often more informative to measure and fit \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) directly. Therefore, the remainder of this text will focus on the use of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \).

E. Single-photon emission criterion

Single-photon emission is a property well-suited to measurement using PECS because for a SPE, \( g^{(2)}(0) = 0 \) due to the inability to produce two photons separated by zero delay. This fact is typically justified by the relationship between \( g^{(2)}(0) \) and the number of photons, \( n \), in a photon number state \( \hat{n} \):

\[
g^{(2)}(0) = \frac{\langle \hat{n}(\hat{n}-1) \rangle}{\langle \hat{n} \rangle^2} = \frac{(n-1)}{n}. \tag{11}
\]
Using this relationship, it is apparent that a number state with \( n \geq 2 \) corresponds to a value of \( g^{(2)}(0) \geq 0.5 \). Therefore, an often-used criterion to confirm single-photon emission is checking whether an emitter’s measured \( g^{(2)}(0) < 0.5 \).

However, the origin of this criterion must be interrogated, as it does not accurately reflect the situation encountered in experiments. Equation \( g^{(2)}(0) < 0.5 \) arises from a fundamental quantum electrodynamics treatment that assumes photons are emitted by identical, two-level emitters into the same spatial and temporal modes, hence forming ideal photon number states. In reality, emission from \( n \) independent, nonidentical emitters depends on each emitter’s electronic dynamics and is highly unlikely to form a pure \( n \)-photon number state. Therefore, a different approach toward quantifying \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) is required to establish a rigorous single-photon emission criterion.

Starting with Eq. (1) under the assumption of unity collection efficiency, autocorrelation from \( n \) emitters can be represented as the sum of a correlated probability that both photons are received from the same emitter and an uncorrelated probability that two photons are received from different emitters.

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau = t_2 - t_1; n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{i}^{(1)}(t_1) P_{i}^{(2)}(t_2 | P_{i}^{(1)}(t_1) = 1) + \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} P_{j}^{(1)}(t_2 | P_{j}^{(1)}(t_1) = 1),
\]

where \( P_{i}^{(1)}(t) \) represents the probability emitter \( i \) is in state \( e \) at time \( t \) and \( P(A|B) \) is the probability of \( A \) given \( B \). In the case where emitter \( i \) has brightness \( I_i \) this gives

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau; n) = \left( \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k} \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} I_i (P_{i}^{(1)}(t_2 | P_{i}^{(1)}(t_1) = 1) + \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} I_j). \quad (13)
\]

As \( \tau \) approaches 0 (as \( t_2 \) approaches \( t_1 \) ), the probability of emission from the same source, \( P_{i}^{(1)}(t_2 | P_{i}^{(1)}(t_1) = 1) \), goes to zero and the expression reduces to

\[
g^{(2)}(0; n) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} I_i I_j}{(\sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k)^2} = \frac{(\sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k^2}{(\sum_{k=1}^{n} I_k)^2} \cdot \quad (14)
\]

For \( n \) identical emitters this returns Eq. (11). However, we find that Eq. (11) only holds in the case of identical emitters. For example, in the case where \( n = 2 \), Eq. (14) reduces to

\[
g^{(2)}(0; 2) = \frac{2I_1 I_2}{(I_1 + I_2)^2}. \quad (15)
\]

For two emitters of different intensity with \( I_2 > I_1 \) s.t. \( I_2 = I_1 + \delta \), we find

\[
g^{(2)}(0; 2) = \frac{1}{2 + \frac{\delta^2}{2I_1(I_1 + \delta)}}. \quad (16)
\]

We can see that for two emitters in the absence of experimental noise, \( g^{(2)}(0) < 0.5 \) for all cases unless \( \delta = 0 \) and the emitters are identical. A variety of factors, from multiple species of defects to misaligned excitation dipoles, can result in different emission rates and thus erroneously could be attributed as a single-photon emitter.

Hence, the \( g^{(2)}(0) < 0.5 \) criterion is insufficient to identify single-photon emitters. It can be erroneously satisfied even when multiple emitters are present. In contrast, a measurement of the ideal relationship \( g^{(2)}(0) = 0 \) would confirm single-photon emission. In order to apply this improved criterion to experiments, it is necessary to account for systematic and stochastic errors that can lead to measurements of \( g^{(2)}(0) > 0 \) even for a SPE. The next section shows how to account for these effects, in order to achieve measurements of \( g^{(2)}(0) = 0 \) within quantified uncertainties for a SPE.

### IV. EXPERIMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Experimental acquisition and analysis of photon emission statistics presents a number of challenges that must be considered in conjunction with the theory previously outlined. These challenges include working within the timing resolution of detectors, processing significant amounts of data, and correcting for experimental artifacts. Here we discuss the experimental setup for the collection of photon emission statistics, an algorithm to aid in processing the correlations for \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \), and how to correct for the dominant sources of experimental error: background photons that did not come from the emitter and timing jitter, the distribution of error in photon arrival times that arises from the acquisition instruments.

#### A. Acquisition

Photon emission statistics measurements of quantum emitters can be acquired with a confocal microscope. In order to measure dynamics within the resolution of the detector dead time, during which a detector clears out residual avalanches following a detection event, a beam-splitter must be introduced in the emission path, directing the photon stream into two different detectors (see Fig. 2(a)). Correlations are calculated across the two detectors, each corresponding to a channel. While \( W(\tau) \) can be acquired by collecting relative times, \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) requires time tagging each arrival and subsequently processing the photon correlations across the two channels.

#### B. Data processing

An algorithm based on Laurence et al. can be used to process the full counting statistics of two time-tagged photon streams. Rather than individually iterating through all the correlations between channels and then...
binning the results into the distribution of time differences, the algorithm sets a bin size at the beginning and counts the number of photons per bin, significantly reducing processing time. This method also allows for log scale processing with logarithmically-varying bin sizes, which enables analysis of correlations at both short and long times. The acquired data can also give the steady-state intensity over the course of acquisition, which can be referenced to control for factors such as fluctuations in emitter stability and setup drift. In particular, blinking, which can present a broadened intensity distribution or discontinuous steps in steady-state intensity over time, can be thresholded to allow for separate processing of the photon emission statistics of bright and dark blinking states. Setup drift can be reduced by implementing a tracking scheme that fits and adjusts to intensity maxima between successive autocorrelation measurements.

The algorithm assigns a channel to each detector and iterates through photons in Channel A, calculating correlations to bins in Channel B. Normalization is calculated as the product of the total number of photons in Channel A, $N_A = T I_A$ and the average number of photons per bin in Channel B, $N_B = w I_B$, where $T$ is the total acquisition time, $w$ is the bin width, and $I_A$ and $I_B$ are the average intensities at each channel. Thus,

$$\text{Norm.} = I_A T I_B w.$$  \hfill (17)

Similarly, because the predominant source of noise is shot noise, the uncertainties for each bin are estimated as the normalized Poisson error of the bin’s counts.

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{I_A I_B w T}}.$$  \hfill (18)

### C. Background correction

Once the correlations have been processed, the next step involves correcting the data for background. Background photons, which can arise from dark counts of the detection system, fluorescence of the host material, or other sources of room light, result in an inflated likelihood of seeing uncorrelated light at each delay time. As a result, background signal flattens the $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ function towards 1, decreasing the extent of deviation above or below 1 at all delay times.

The effect of background with average intensity $I_{bg}$ on $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ for an emitter of intensity $I_{em}$ can be derived following a similar logic to the derivation of Eq. (12). Here, the probability of receiving a photon from the background at time $t_2$ given the receipt of a photon from the background at $t_1$,

$$P^{bg}(t_2|P^{bg}(t_1)) = \frac{I_{bg}}{I_{em} + I_{bg}},$$  \hfill (19)

is uncorrelated. This results in the background incorporated expression \[28\],

$$g_{\text{uncorr}}^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 - \rho^2 + g^{(2)}(\tau) \rho^2,$$  \hfill (20)

where $\rho = \frac{I_{em}}{I_{em} + I_{bg}}$. As a result, correcting for background only requires measuring the value of $\rho$, which can be done in a number of ways, including measuring the sample photoluminescence ($I_{PL}$) at a point away from the emitter or approximating the emitter’s intensity cross-section as a Gaussian to obtain a more representative background value.

Figure 3(a) shows an example of raw photon emission statistics data from an emitter in hBN. (b) Intensity cross section across maximum intensity of emitter from photoluminescence scan in inset. White scale bar in inset shows 1 μm. Signal and background are denoted by arrows and are extracted from fit. (c) (lower panel) Background-corrected data and fit (orange), and timing-jitter- and background-corrected data (green). Convolution of the corrected data with the measured instrument response function (upper panel) gives the black dotted line. (d) The value of $g^{(2)}(0)$ before corrections (blue), after background correction only (orange), and after background and timing jitter correction (green).
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**FIG. 3.** Background and timing jitter correction to verify single-photon emission in hexagonal boron nitride (hBN). (a) Raw photon emission statistics data from an emitter in hBN. (b) Intensity cross section across maximum intensity of emitter from photoluminescence scan in inset. White scale bar in inset shows 1 μm. Signal and background are denoted by arrows and are extracted from fit. (c) (lower panel) Background-corrected data and fit (orange), and timing-jitter- and background-corrected data (green). Convolution of the corrected data with the measured instrument response function (upper panel) gives the black dotted line. (d) The value of $g^{(2)}(0)$ before corrections (blue), after background correction only (orange), and after background and timing jitter correction (green).
panels C and D). However, this is not always the case. To quantify the contributions to intensity from the emitter (first term below) and background (second term below), it is common practice to acquire a saturation curve of measured intensity vs excitation power, \( p \), using the form [71]

\[
I(p) = \frac{I_{sat}p}{p_{sat} + p} + C_{bg}p,
\]

where \( I_{sat} \) is the saturation intensity, \( p_{sat} \) is saturation power, and \( C_{bg} \) is the contribution from the background. Acquiring photon emission statistics at saturation power balances the desire for high \( p \) and sufficient signal and, in a two-level system, corresponds to the most efficient pumping regime in which \( \Gamma_{eg} = \Gamma_{ge} \).

D. Timing jitter correction

Timing jitter is the distribution of the time it takes the detector to signal an event after arrival also known as the instrument response function (IRF). While timing jitter can arise from any electronics in the path that can add arrival time error, the choice of detector has the largest contribution to the IRF [72]. The timing error manifests in the \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) trace as a convolution of the timing error distribution with the actual \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) signal from the emitter so that the measured \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) is

\[
g^{(2)}_{\text{meas}}(\tau) = \text{IRF} \ast g^{(2)}(\tau). \tag{22}
\]

The effect of the convolution is to modify the measured value of \( g^{(2)}(0) \) and the shape of \( g^{(2)}(t) \) at low times from that of the true underlying model.

Correcting for the timing jitter requires measuring the instrument response function of the setup. The IRF can be obtained by collecting the distribution of detection times from a highly attenuated (\( \sim 0.1 \) photons/pulse), pulsed laser source with a pulse width much less than the specified timing jitter of the detectors. When using two detectors to measure photon emission statistics, the IRF of both detectors can be acquired by measuring the autocorrelation from the pulsed source. This will give a convolution of the two detectors’ timing distributions and the shape of the pulsed source. However, the contribution of the excitation pulse can be neglected for pulse width much less than IRF width. While some IRFs can be approximated as Gaussian, the shape of the IRF can vary depending on the detector, and the functional form may not always be obvious [73]. Once the IRF of the setup is measured, the emitted \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) can be extracted. One method, deconvolution, involves solving Eq. 22 for \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \). However, deconvolution is often not useful since it amplifies noise and complicates propagation of uncertainty. Therefore, a useful method that can handle noise and uncertainties is to incorporate the measured IRF into the fit for the measured \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) data. This can be accomplished by modifying a basic weighted least squared error fit to include the numerical convolution of the measured IRF with the fit function for \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \). This method requires that the measured IRF and \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) be processed with the same time bin width. The true timescales of the emitter and uncertainties can be extracted from the resulting best fit.

Figure 3(c) illustrates an example of IRF correction through incorporation of the measured IRF into the fit. The measured IRF data is shown in red (top) and is binned with a 350ps width, as is the measured \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) data (orange, bottom), here shown after background correction but before IRF correction. The green line displays the IRF-corrected \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) trace with parameters extracted from the IRF-incorporated least-squares fit. As a check, the black dotted line shows that the convolution of the IRF-corrected \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) with the measured IRF aligns closely with the \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) data pre-IRF correction.

The extent of the IRF’s effect on the shape of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) hinges on how its standard deviation, \( \sigma \), compares to the internal timescales of the emitter. In the cases where \( \sigma \sim \tau_1 \), the shortest timescale to emit one photon, the emitter’s faster dynamics can be obscured by the timing jitter.

Figure 4 illustrates an example of the effect of a Gaussian IRF with width \( \sigma \) on \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) of an emitter represented by a three-level model:

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 - (1 + C_2)e^{-|\tau|/\tau_1} + C_2e^{-|\tau|/\tau_2}, \tag{23}
\]

with timescales \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) and bunching amplitude \( C_2 \). The left-hand side of the figure depicts the effect of various combinations of parameters on the value of \( g^{(2)}(0) \) and the right-hand side depicts the effect on the whole shape of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) for select combinations. A dashed line shows the threshold for measuring \( g^{(2)}(0) \) = 0.5. The upper two panels examine the effect for different bunching amplitudes at a fixed ratio of \( \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} = 30 \). The higher the bunching amplitude, the greater effect the convolution of the IRF and \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) have on the measured \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) at low times, an effect which is amplified for low \( \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \). The lower two panels examine the effect of the ratio \( \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \) for fixed \( C_2 = 1.5 \). As \( \tau_1 \rightarrow \sigma \) from above, the measured value of \( g^{(2)}(0) \) increases and the width of the dip at short times decreases.

V. ANALYSIS

The ability to analyze measured photon correlations to infer an emitter’s internal dynamics requires an understanding of how evolution through radiative and non-radiative states in an electronic model leads to features in \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \).

The empirical fit function for \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) originates from the rate equation, Eq. 8, governing the population dy-
FIG. 4. Effect of timing jitter on \( g^{(2)}(0) \). (Left) The value of \( g^{(2)}(0) \) is calculated as a function of the ratio of \( \bar{\tau} \) and \( \bar{\sigma} \) or \( C_2 \) for a three-level system with timescales \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) and bunching amplitude \( C_2 \), and a gaussian IRF with standard deviation \( \sigma \). (Right) Six points are selected from the parameter combinations on the left to illustrate how \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) at low times change for different ratios of \( \bar{\tau} \) (bottom) and different values of \( C_2 \) (top).

As a first-order, linear ODE with \( G \) constant in time has a solution of the form

\[
\bar{P}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} A_i e^{\lambda_i t} \bar{v}_i. \tag{24}
\]

Therefore, for an \( n \)-level system with a single excited state, the excited state probability is

\[
P_e(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} A_i (\bar{v}_i \cdot \bar{e}) e^{\lambda_i t}. \tag{25}
\]

The probability-conserving condition of \( \Sigma_i G_{ij} = 0 \) means that there will always be a zero eigenvalue corresponding to the solution of the steady state equation,

\[
0 = GP. \tag{26}
\]

In certain cases, \( G \) can have imaginary eigenvalues, which occur in conjugate pairs due to the real, non-negative transition rates. In all cases, the real part of any non-zero eigenvalues will be negative [74]. Therefore, from the eigenvalues, we can define \( \tau_i = -\frac{1}{\lambda_i} \) where \( \tau_i > 0 \) are timescales governing different processes. With the assumption of no background such that any detected photon projects the system into the ground state, we can follow Eq. [4] to obtain a general form of the autocorrelation function. Normalizing Eq. [24] to the steady state, this results in

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} C_i e^{-\frac{\tau}{\tau_i}}, \tag{27}
\]

where \( C_i = \frac{A_i \bar{\sigma}}{\tau_i} \) are constants, \( P^{\infty} = A_0 (\bar{v}_0 \cdot \bar{e}) \) is the steady-state excited state population, and \( n \) is the number of states. This defines a curve that starts at 0 for \( \tau = 0 \) and decays to the steady state population as \( \tau \to \infty \).

There are two important types of correlations that can appear in an autocorrelation trace. Regions where the curve dips below \( g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 \), indicating a decreased probability of detecting a photon at that delay separation, are referred to as antibunching. Regions where the curve rises above \( g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 \) indicating a positive correlation are referred to as bunching. Any region where \( g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 \) corresponds to uncorrelated light. Antibunching, a direct signature of quantum light [27, 41, 68, 69], arises in the autocorrelation of single-photon emitters as a consequence of the delay in emission of a second photon from the initial condition populating the ground state. Empirically, it is captured by terms in Eq. [27] with negative prefactors. In the case of a two-level model, antibunching occurs on the timescale of \( \tau_1 = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{ge} + \Gamma_{eg}} \), representing the time to evolve from the ground state to the excited state and back to the ground state again. Bunching dynamics arise from transitions to non-radiative states in processes which delay the emission of a photon, such as transitions between charge or spin manifolds. Such processes can result in the emitter’s excited state population(s) evolving non-monotonically toward the steady state, leading to bunching in the autocorrelation trace. Quantum emitters with more complex electronic structures often exhibit a single antibunching timescale and bunching dynamics, which can be fit to establish a baseline for the number of states in the model. Therefore, Eq. [27] can be expanded to give the empirical model,

\[
g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 - C_1 e^{-\frac{\tau}{\tau_1}} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} C_i e^{-\frac{\tau}{\tau_i}}. \tag{28}
\]

where all the \( C_i \)’s are positive. Applying a statistical comparison of model quality such as the Akaike Information Criterion and/or reduced chi-squared to empirically determine the number of timescales gives a lower limit for number of electronic levels involved. Potential electronic models can be further narrowed down by measuring \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) at different powers and fields and comparing with simulations.

A. Simulating photon emission statistics

Simulating \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) provides an effective tool to narrow down potential models that could give rise to features...
observed in experimental data. The state populations of a given model, consisting of $n$ states with transition rates designated by the $n \times n$ matrix, $G$, are governed by the rate equation, Eq. 8. As a result, state population dynamics can be simulated with a numerical ODE solver given a model specified by $G$ and initial conditions. In the case of simulating $g^{(2)}(\tau)$, the initial conditions are defined to be the state of the system immediately following the emission of a photon. Therefore, a model with a single, radiative transition from excited $P_e$ ground state $P_0$ has the initial conditions of $P_0(t_1) = 1$ with all other states population zero at time $t_1$. Equation 8 can be solved numerically with these initial conditions giving $P(t)$, the evolution of the state populations over time upon the emission of a photon. The steady-state populations, $P^\infty$, can also be found by numerically solving Eq. 26. Once the time-dependent and steady-state populations are found, quantities such as photoluminescence,

$$I_{PL} = G_{ge}P_e,$$

(29)

and autocorrelation (Eq. 4) can then be calculated.

This simulation tool can be paired with various model definitions to compare simulations across changing experimental parameters such as excitation power and fields. Power-dependent transitions, for example a pumped transition from a ground to excited state, can be incorporated by defining elements of a model’s transition matrix to be dependent on a power parameter. In a similar manner, electric or magnetic-field dependence of photostatistics can be simulated by defining transitions that are a function of a field parameter. This could take the form of defining spin-dependent transitions governed by the field dependence of a Hamiltonian. Figure 5 shows examples of simulated autocorrelation traces for four different models with varying excitation powers and magnetic fields. The transition rates for each model were chosen so that the black curves in Fig. 5(a-c) are qualitatively the same and match the amplitude and position of the black peak in Fig. 4. In doing so we illustrate how the effect of experimental parameters on the shape of $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ will differ depending on the defined model. Thus, in practice, these parameters can be varied to help narrow down potential models. Figure 5(a) depicts a basic three-level system, the simplest model that can host bunching dynamics. The single radiative transition is denoted by the wiggly arrow. A single power-dependent transition, designated by the solid red arrow, is varied in order to indicate the presence of optically addressable spin states. The effects of increasing (red) or decreasing (yellow) excitation power and a lower (light blue) or higher (dark blue) angle of magnetic field result in different $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ traces depending on the model.

Realistic systems such as Fig. 5(d), which depicts a nine-level model of a Nitrogen-Vacancy center with both spin-dependent and power-dependent transitions. Radiative transitions are shown as wiggly arrows. Parameters are chosen such that the black curves for each model are qualitatively the same in (a-c) and approximate the amplitude and peak position of (d). The field-dependent bunching dynamics (shown in blue) arise from the spin-dependent transitions in (c), an example of how changes in bunching amplitude for different magnetic fields can indicate the presence of optically addressable spin states.

Like Fig. 5(a), Fig. 5(b) shows a three-level model but with power dependent transitions to and from the metastable third state. Varying the excitation power differentiates between autocorrelation traces for (a) and (b), as the timescale $\tau_2$ changes in (b) with varying power. Observed experimentally, such behavior might point to charge states with power-dependent transitions between charge manifolds.

In Fig. 5(c), spin dependent transitions are introduced to the model, represented by the blue arrow. Here, applying an off-axis magnetic field can serve to differentiate between the models in (a) and (c), whose traces exhibit similar power-dependent behavior. The field-dependent bunching dynamics (shown in blue) arise from the spin-dependent transitions in (c), an example of how changes in bunching amplitude for different magnetic fields can indicate the presence of optically addressable spin states.
VI. PECS IN PRACTICE

Using PECS to characterize quantum emitters requires an assessment of the properties of the emitter and potential applications. The general method can be applied to any emitter, but the framework can further be tailored to the system and application of interest. For example, if a high purity SPE is desired, detector timing resolution together with background and timing jitter correction are critical.

PECS is most powerful when performed in conjunction with other experimental variables that reveal complementary information. When probing metastable charge or spin states, performing PECS measurements as a function of excitation power can unveil distinct dynamical processes and the dark states’ associated lifetimes. PECS measurements as a function of externally applied magnetic fields can reveal the energetics and dynamics of spin states. Finally, pairing PECS with other spectroscopic techniques such as polarization-dependent excitation and emission or photoluminescence excitation spectroscopy (PLE) can reveal properties of specific optical transitions. All of these processes can be incorporated in optical dynamics simulations for comparisons with experimental data and \textit{ab initio} theoretical predictions.

In conclusion, PECS is an easy-to-implement experimental technique to characterize quantum emitters, but it remains under-utilized. With proper attention to acquisition, analysis, and interpretation, PECS can provide detailed information about a defect’s electronic structure and dynamics that allows for the design of efficient quantum control protocols. Expanding the set of available quantum defects and host materials, each with specific advantages, will lead to continuous advances in science and technology.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank S. Thompson and J. Gudorff for their feedback on the manuscript. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under award DMR-1922278.

\[1\] I. Aharonovich, D. Englund, and M. Toth, Nat. Photonics \textbf{10} (2016), 10.1038/nphoton.2016.186
\[6\] J. Cramer, N. Kalb, M. Rol, B. Hensen, M. Blok, M. Markham, D. Twitchen, R. Hanson, and T. Taminiau, Nat. Commun. \textbf{7} (2016).
\[22\] https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.nanolett.6b05102.


