

# Experimentally straightforward detection of qubit-environment entanglement generated during qubit dephasing - witnessing non-classical nature of environmental noise

Katarzyna Roszak,<sup>1,2</sup> Damian Kwiatkowski,<sup>3</sup> and Łukasz Cywiński<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Fundamental Problems of Technology, Wrocław University of Science and Technology, 50-370 Wrocław, Poland*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 18221 Prague, Czech Republic*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute of Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Aleja Lotników 32/46, PL-02668 Warsaw, Poland*

(Dated: July 30, 2022)

We propose a straightforward experimental protocol to test whether qubit-environment entanglement is generated during pure dephasing of a qubit. The protocol is implemented using only measurements and operations on the qubit – it does not involve the measurement of the system-environment state of interest, but the preparation and measurement of the qubit in two simple variations. A difference in the time dependences of qubit coherence between the two cases testifies to the presence of entanglement in the state of interest. Furthermore, it signifies that the environment-induced noise experienced by the qubit cannot be modeled as a classical stochastic process independent of the qubit state. We demonstrate the operation of this protocol on a realistically modeled nitrogen vacancy center spin qubit in diamond interacting with a nuclear spin environment, and show that the generation of entanglement should be easily observable in this case.

The interaction between a quantum system and its environment leads to decoherence [1, 2] of superpositions of a system’s pointer states [3]. This ubiquitous and essentially inevitable feature of quantum open system dynamics has fundamental significance for the realistic description of all possible devices employing truly quantum features of physical systems for various tasks (such as quantum computation or quantum metrology), as well as for the understanding of the quantum-classical transition [1, 4, 5]. The sensitivity of experimentally investigated qubits to environmental influence has also led to the development of a whole field of research devoted to the use of qubits to characterize their environments [6, 7].

While any environment of a qubit (Q) should be in principle described quantum mechanically, it is now clear that environments (E) relevant for the description of *pure dephasing* of different kinds of qubits can often be modeled as sources of noise, the properties of which are *independent* of dynamics of these qubits, and even of their existence. Such noise sources that are completely external to a quantum system - their dynamics being unaffected by its presence - can be modeled classically, by specifying all the multi-point correlation functions that characterize the stochastic process. While the necessary conditions for applicability of this approximation are not known, a large size of the environment and its high temperature are, as expected, positively correlated with “classicality” of qubit dephasing. In the simplest - and very often realistic, as it arises for an environment consisting of many uncorrelated sub-environments, each weakly coupled to the qubit - case of noise with Gaussian statistics, full characterization of the noise is contained in its spectral density. In this case, qubits can be straightforwardly [8] used as noise spectrometers [6, 7]. However, while the

classical noise model of qubit dephasing is believed to be widely applicable, a vexing fundamental problem remains unsolved: how can one unambiguously prove that decoherence of a given qubit is in fact *truly quantum*, i.e. not amenable to description using classical environmental noise.

The general issue of quantum vs. classical nature of environmentally-induced qubit dephasing has another facet. For an initially pure state of E, the dephasing is in one-to-one correspondence with qubit-environment entanglement (QEE) generation [1, 9]. However, in the realistic case of a mixed initial state of E, decoherence *does not* have to be accompanied by generation of QEE [9–12]. In fact, a simple theoretical criterion showing when QEE is generated has been formulated only quite recently [9, 13]: it is generated, if and only if the evolutions of E conditioned on two pointer states of Q lead to distinct states of the environment. Obviously such a situation is incompatible with treating the environment as an entity that evolves independently of the qubit.

In this paper we propose a very simple experimental scheme, requiring only the ability to prepare distinct states of the qubit and to measure its coherence, which can be used to test the generation of QEE during the joint evolution of Q and its E initially in a product state, where the qubit is in a superposition of its pointer states, and the interaction leads to its pure dephasing. The scheme relies on the fact that only for entangling evolutions the environment behaves in a distinct way depending on which pointer state the qubit is in. Hence, only if an evolution is entangling can there be a difference in the evolution of qubit coherence (of an initial superposition qubit state) when the environment has been allowed to evolve for a finite time in the presence of qubit state  $|0\rangle$  or

$|1\rangle$  before the qubit superposition state was created. The observation of distinct evolutions of qubit coherence for the two preparation procedures is therefore a QEE witness, and also proves that environmental influence cannot be described as classical noise.

Critically, unlike the scheme proposed in [9], here only measurements on Q, not on E, are required, making the scheme completely straightforward to implement. Although it is common knowledge that detection of entanglement between two systems requires, in general, measurements on both of the systems, here we need to measure only one of the systems (the qubit), because the problem is constrained: we are interested in entanglement generated during pure dephasing of the qubit interacting with the environment. We illustrate the concept with a calculation performed for a nitrogen-vacancy (NV) center in diamond, a spin qubit coupled to a nuclear spin environment that is widely used for noise spectroscopy and nanoscale nuclear magnetic resonance purposes [6, 14].

We choose qubit states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  as pointer states, and since we are focusing here on pure dephasing decoherence, a general form of the Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{i=0,1} \varepsilon_i |i\rangle\langle i| + \hat{H}_E + \sum_{i=0,1} |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \hat{V}_i. \quad (1)$$

Here  $\varepsilon_i$  in the first term are the energies of the qubit states, the second term describes the environment, while the last term describes the qubit-environment (QE) interaction. The environmental operators  $\hat{V}_0$  and  $\hat{V}_1$  are arbitrary, the same as the environment Hamiltonian,  $\hat{H}_E$ . The QE evolution operator  $\hat{U}(t) = \exp(-i\hat{H}t)$  can be written as  $\hat{U}(t) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \hat{w}_0(t) + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \hat{w}_1(t)$ , where the operators  $\hat{w}_i(t) = \exp(-i\hat{H}_i t)$ , with  $i = 0, 1$ , and  $\hat{H}_i = \hat{H}_E + \hat{V}_i$ .

We begin with the main result of Ref. [9], which states that for a product initial state of Q and E,  $|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \otimes \hat{R}(0)$ , where  $|\phi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$  is any superposition of qubit pointer states ( $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$ ) and  $\hat{R}(0)$  is the initial state of the environment, QEE is present at time  $t$  after initialization, if and only if  $[\hat{w}_0^\dagger(t)\hat{w}_1(t), \hat{R}(0)] \neq 0$ . This condition can be rewritten [13] in the form

$$\hat{w}_0(t)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_0^\dagger(t) \neq \hat{w}_1(t)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_1^\dagger(t), \quad (2)$$

which is much more meaningful for what follows. Note that  $\hat{w}_i(t)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_i^\dagger(t)$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , is the state of the environment at time  $t$  conditional on the qubit being in state  $|i\rangle$ . Therefore, if and only if QEE is not generated, the evolution of the environment in the presence of either qubit pointer state will be the same, otherwise, it has to differ.

The idea for QEE detection is as follows. We first prepare the qubit in state  $|0\rangle$  and let Q and E evolve for time  $\tau$ . For pure dephasing evolutions this does not change the qubit state, but the environment evolves into  $\hat{R}_0(\tau) = \hat{w}_0(\tau)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_0^\dagger(\tau)$ . Now, if at time  $\tau$  the qubit

state is changed to  $|\psi\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$  by an appropriate unitary operation (the equal superposition state is chosen to maximize the visibility of the effect, but any superposition would work), further evolution will lead to pure dephasing of the qubit and the coherence (off-diagonal element of the qubit's reduced density matrix) will evolve according to

$$\rho_{01}^{(0)}(\tau, t) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \hat{w}_0(t)\hat{w}_0(\tau)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_0^\dagger(\tau)\hat{w}_1^\dagger(t) \right), \quad (3)$$

where  $t$  is the time elapsed from time  $\tau$ . This coherence needs to be measured. Next, if we perform the same procedure with the qubit in state  $|1\rangle$  between the initial moment and time  $\tau$ , the coherence will then evolve according to

$$\rho_{01}^{(1)}(\tau, t) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \hat{w}_0(t)\hat{w}_1(\tau)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_1^\dagger(\tau)\hat{w}_1^\dagger(t) \right). \quad (4)$$

Naturally if  $\hat{w}_0(\tau)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_0^\dagger(\tau) = \hat{w}_1(\tau)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_1^\dagger(\tau)$  (this condition states that there would be no QEE between a qubit initialized in any superposition state and an environment initially in state  $\hat{R}(0)$  after time  $\tau$  has elapsed), the evolution given by eq. (3) would be *the same* as the evolution given by eq. (4). Otherwise, if at any time  $t$ ,  $\rho_{01}^{(0)}(\tau, t) \neq \rho_{01}^{(1)}(\tau, t)$ , then there must be QEE at time  $\tau$  in a system initially in a product of any qubit superposition state and environmental state  $\hat{R}(0)$ . Therefore, unless the two coherence decay signals, (3) and (4), are in perfect agreement, pure dephasing of a superposition of qubit states lasting for time  $\tau$  must be accompanied by QEE generation.

The scheme outlined above is an entanglement witness, since there exists one situation when QEE is generated, which it does not detect. This is the case when  $[\hat{w}_0(t_1), \hat{w}_1(t_2)] = 0$  for all times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  (such commutation also implies commutation when one or both operators are hermitian conjugated), resulting in  $\hat{\rho}_{01}^{(0)/(1)}(\tau, t) = \text{Tr}[\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_1^\dagger(t)\hat{w}_0(t)]$ . This requires  $[\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1] = 0$ . Note that if we do not exactly know the form of  $\hat{H}_E$  and  $\hat{V}_i$ , we can check if  $[\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1] = 0$  by performing a spin-echo experiment, in which a superposition state of the qubit is initialized, it interacts with the environment for time  $\tau$ , is subjected then to a  $\hat{\sigma}_x$  operation, and the coherence read out after time  $\tau$  elapses again is given by

$$\rho_{01}^{\text{echo}}(\tau, \tau) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \hat{w}_1(\tau)\hat{w}_0(\tau)\hat{R}(0)\hat{w}_1^\dagger(\tau)\hat{w}_0^\dagger(\tau) \right). \quad (5)$$

Perfect recovery of initial coherence for any  $\tau$  is thus equivalent to  $[\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1] = 0$ .

Let us now connect the above QEE detection scheme with the question of the nature of noise that leads to qubit dephasing. If the dynamics of E is completely independent of the presence of the qubit, we can think of it as a source of a *field* that evolves in time in some complicated way, essentially stochastic. This field can couple

to the two levels of the qubit in a distinct way, so that the Hamiltonian of the qubit exposed to it is

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}(t) &= \sum_{i=0,1} \varepsilon_i |i\rangle \langle i| + \sum_{i=0,1} |i\rangle \langle i| \xi_i(t), \\ &= [\Delta\varepsilon + \Delta\xi(t)]\hat{\sigma}_z/2 + [\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{\xi}(t)]\mathbb{1}/2,\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

where  $\xi_i$  are stochastic fields coupling to the qubit state  $|i\rangle$ ,  $\Delta\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1$ ,  $\bar{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon_1$ , and  $\Delta\xi(t)$  and  $\bar{\xi}(t)$  are defined in an analogous way. It is now crucial to be aware that the dependence of  $\xi_i(t)$  on the qubit state  $|i\rangle$  *does not* mean that the actual dynamics of the environment depends on this state: both  $\xi_i(t)$  are related to an underlying dynamics of the environment itself, and the dependence on  $i$  is due to the fact that the two states might couple to the environmental noise in a distinct way (see below for a simple example). The density matrix describing the initialized  $|i\rangle$  state of the qubit does not change under the influence of the above Hamiltonian. The evolution for time  $\tau$  that precedes the creation of superposition state of the qubit is thus absent, and  $\rho_{01}^{(0)}(\tau, t) = \rho_{01}^{(1)}(\tau, t)$  while being also independent of  $\tau$ . Furthermore,  $\bar{\varepsilon}$  and  $\bar{\xi}(t)$  drop out from the expression for qubit coherence,

$$\rho_{01}^{(0/1)}(\tau, t) = e^{-i\Delta\varepsilon t} \left\langle e^{-i\int_0^t \Delta\xi(t') dt'} \right\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where  $\langle \dots \rangle$  denotes averaging over realizations of  $\Delta\xi(t')$  noise. Therefore, the observation of  $\rho_{01}^{(0)}(\tau, t) \neq \rho_{01}^{(1)}(\tau, t)$  means that the environment *cannot* be described as a source of classical noise.

In the following, we present an example of a system in which the creation of QEE, and at the same time the non-classicality of the environmental noise, can be detected using the scheme described above. We focus on a nitrogen-vacancy (NV) center spin qubit in diamond, which has been a subject of intense research aimed at using it as a nanoscale resolution sensor of magnetic field fluctuations [6, 14–18]. The low energy degrees of freedom of the NV center constitute an effective electronic spin  $S=1$ , subjected to zero-field splitting  $\Delta(S^z)^2$ , with the direction of  $z$  axis determined by the geometry of the center. The presence of a finite magnetic field (assumed here to be along the  $z$  axis) leads to a splitting of  $m_s = \pm 1$  levels, and therefore the energy level spacing is uneven, so that any two-dimensional subspace of the  $S=1$  manifold can be used as a qubit controlled by microwave electromagnetic fields. We focus on the most widely employed qubit based on  $m=0$  and 1 levels.

The relevant environment of this qubit consists of nuclear spins of either  $^{13}\text{C}$  spinful isotope naturally present in a diamond lattice, or nuclei of molecules attached to the surface of the diamond crystal [15, 18]. Due to a large value of the zero-field splitting ( $\Delta = 2.87$  GHz), and a large ratio of electronic and nuclear gyromagnetic factors, for almost all values of the magnetic field, the energy exchange between the qubit and the bath is very strongly

suppressed, and we can safely use the pure dephasing approximation [19]. Crucially, the  $m=0$  state of the qubit is completely decoupled from the nuclear environment (and if the nuclei can be treated as source of classical noise,  $\xi_0(t) = 0$  while  $\xi_1(t) \neq 0$ ), so that keeping the qubit in this state between the measurement and re-initialization does not perturb the state of the environment (this also leads to  $\rho_{01}^{(0)}(\tau, t)$  being in fact independent of  $\tau$ ). The QE Hamiltonian is thus given by

$$\hat{H} = (\Delta + \Omega) |1\rangle \langle 1| + \hat{H}_E + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes \hat{V}_1, \quad (8)$$

where  $\Omega = -\gamma_e B_z$  with the electron gyromagnetic ratio  $\gamma_e = 28.02$  GHz/T, and  $\hat{H}_E = \sum_k \gamma_k B_z \hat{I}_k^z + \hat{H}_{\text{nn}}$ , where  $k$  labels the nuclear spins,  $\gamma_k = 10.71$  MHz/T for  $^{13}\text{C}$  nuclei,  $\hat{I}_k^z$  is the operator of the  $z$  component of the nuclear spin  $k$ , and  $\hat{H}_{\text{nn}}$  contains the internuclear magnetic dipolar interactions. Finally, the interaction term describes the hyperfine NV-nucleus interaction, and

$$\hat{V}_1 = \sum_k \sum_{j \in (x,y,z)} \mathbb{A}_k^{z,j} \hat{I}_k^j. \quad (9)$$

We neglect the possible presence of nuclei so close to the NV center that the contact hyperfine interaction contributes to  $\mathbb{A}_k^{z,j}$ , so that  $\mathbb{A}_k$  is the dipolar coupling tensor:

$$\mathbb{A}_k^{z,j} = \frac{\mu_0 \gamma_e \gamma_n}{4\pi r_k^3} \left( 1 - \frac{3(\mathbf{r}_k \cdot \hat{\mathbf{j}})(\mathbf{r}_k \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}})}{r_k^2} \right), \quad (10)$$

where  $\mu_0$  is the magnetic permeability of the vacuum, and  $\mathbf{r}_k$  is a displacement vector between the  $k$ -th nucleus and the qubit.

We use  $B_z = 200$  Gauss, which was employed in a few recent experiments on qubit-based characterization of the small groups of nuclei [15–17]. Using a well-established and systematic procedure of Cluster-Correlation Expansion (CCE) [19–21], we have checked that intrabath interactions,  $\hat{H}_{\text{nn}}$ , do not give any visible contribution to decoherence of a freely evolving qubit. This is because the coherence decays practically completely before the inter-nuclear correlations created by their interactions become significant. We can then focus on single-spin precession as the only source of dynamics within the bath.

We consider a dynamically polarized nuclear bath. The justification is twofold: (1) without dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP), the density operator of the bath at low fields is  $\hat{R}(0) \propto \mathbb{1}$ , and according to Eq. (2) there is no QEE for such initial states; (2) DNP is expected to enhance the signal that the qubit experiences, and its controlled creation is currently vigorously pursued [22–24]. We assume that  $\hat{R}(0)$  does not contain any correlations between the nuclei, i.e.  $\hat{R}(0) = \prod_k \hat{\rho}_k$ , where  $\hat{\rho}_k$  is the density matrix of  $k$ -th nucleus, given in the case of spin-1/2 nuclei by  $\hat{\rho}_k = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1} + p_k \hat{I}_k^z)$ , where  $p_k$  is the polarization of  $k$ -th nucleus. Below we show results for the case in




FIG. 1. Difference between real (upper panel) and imaginary (middle panel) parts, as well as the absolute value (lower panel) of  $\rho_{01}^{(0)}(\tau, t)$  and  $\rho_{01}^{(1)}(\tau, t)$  coherence signals (normalized by the maximum qubit coherence) of NV center interacting with partially polarized nuclear bath for a single randomly generated spatial arrangement of environmental spins, plotted for  $t = \tau$ . The calculations are performed for magnetic field  $B_z = 200$  G. Solid, dashed, and dot-dashed lines correspond to polarization radius  $r_p = 0.5$  (one spin polarized), 0.7 (three spins polarized) and 0.9 nm (seven spins polarized), respectively. In the  $r_p = 0.5$  nm case there is only *one* polarized spin, hence the lack of evolution in the upper panel, as follows from Eq. (11).

which all the nuclei within a radius  $r_p$  from the qubit are fully polarized, while the remaining nuclei are in a completely mixed state. This mimics the experimentally relevant situation, in which the DNP is created by appropriate prior manipulations on the qubit, that lead to polarization of nuclei that are most strongly coupled to it (i.e. the ones that are the closest).

We work in the rotating frame in which the phase accumulated due to controlled energy splitting of qubit levels is absent. The coherence signal  $\rho_{01}^{(0/1)}(\tau, t)$  is then expressed as  $\prod_k L_k^{(0/1)}(\tau, t)$ , where  $L_k^{(0/1)}(\tau, t)$  are signals that would be obtained if the environment consisted *only* of the  $k$ -th nuclear spin. While the difference of the two signals,  $\Delta\rho_{01} \equiv \rho_{01}^{(0)} - \rho_{01}^{(1)}$ , is not easily expressed through  $\Delta L_k \equiv L_k^{(0)} - L_k^{(1)}$ , it is instructive to look at such quantities, which describe the difference of the coherence decay signals for an environment consisting of a single spin:

$$\Delta L_k = -i \frac{p_k A_x^2 \sin\left(\frac{t}{2}\omega_{xz}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\tau+t}{2}\omega_{xz}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\omega\right)}{\omega_{xz}^2}, \quad (11)$$




FIG. 2. Real (left) and imaginary (right) parts of  $\Delta\tilde{\rho}_{01}(\tau, t)$  as functions of  $\tau$  and  $t$  for all nuclei polarized within radius  $r_p = 0.7$  nm around the qubit, magnetic field  $B_z = 200$  G, and spatial arrangement of environmental spins as in Fig. 1. Dashed black line signifies  $t = \tau$ , which corresponds to the results shown in Fig. 1 for short times.

in which for clarity we only kept the  $z$  and  $x$  couplings to the qubit ( $A_z = \mathbb{A}_k^{z,z}$  and  $A_x = \mathbb{A}_k^{z,x}$ ),  $\omega_{xz} \equiv \sqrt{A_x^2 + (A_z + \omega)^2}$ , and  $p_k \in [-1, 1]$  is the polarization of the  $k$ -nucleus. The above expression vanishes when either  $p_k = 0$ ,  $A_x = 0$ , or  $\tau = 0$ . Since  $\Delta L_k$  is purely imaginary, we should carefully inspect both real and imaginary parts of  $\Delta\rho_{01}$ , not just its magnitude.

The results for an NV center interacting with natural concentration bath of  $^{13}\text{C}$  spins in diamond, obtained for a single randomly generated spatial arrangement of these spins, are shown in Figs 1 and 2. Both figures show the real and imaginary parts of  $\Delta\tilde{\rho}_{01}(\tau, t) = \Delta\rho_{01}(\tau, t)/\rho_{01}(\tau, 0)$  (the difference is normalized by the initial qubit coherence), while Fig. 1 additionally contains plots of the difference between the absolute values of  $\rho_{01}^{(0)}(\tau, t)$  and  $\rho_{01}^{(1)}(\tau, t)$  (identically normalized). When for a given delay time  $\tau$  any of these values is non-zero, this signifies that QEE would be present at time  $\tau$  during the joint the evolution of an initial product state of any superposition of the qubit and state  $\hat{R}(0)$  of the environment. In Fig. 1 the results shown are for equal evolution and delay times,  $t = \tau$ , since this ensures more pronounced results, as evidenced by the inspection of the maps in Fig. 2. The difference in both real and imaginary parts (corresponding to measurement of  $\hat{\sigma}_x$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_y$  of the qubit initialized in  $(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  state) can reach 40% with respect to the initial coherence of the qubit state. This should be easily measurable with the current level of control and readout quality in NV center qubits.

In conclusion, we have described a simple experimental protocol that allows to check, if QEE generation accompanies pure dephasing of a qubit. Importantly, this protocol requires operations to be performed only on the qubit. Although we focus on the fact that the proposed method allows for straightforward experimental verification, it is relevant to note that it is also a good theoretical tool. The advantage over the method of Ref. [9] stems

from the fact that only the evolution of qubit coherence (for two different initial states of the environment) needs to be calculated and neither the whole QE state (as in general methods) nor operators acting on the environment have to be found. A positive result of such a test not only certifies that QEE is created, but also that the influence of the environment cannot be described as classical (i.e. independent of the existence of the qubit) noise. We have presented theoretical results of the working of this protocol for an NV center coupled to a partially polarized environment consisting of nuclear spins. While quantifying the relation between the degree in which the zero-entanglement condition is broken and the magnitude of the signal observed in our protocol is beyond the scope of this paper, the fact that the signal is clearly visible means that the classical picture of environmental noise, while being widely adopted for analysis of data obtained with NV centers coupled to nanoscale nuclear environments, is definitely not exact in the case of the NV center interacting with polarized nuclei.

This work is supported by funds of Polish National Science Center (NCN), grant no. DEC-2015/19/B/ST3/03152.

- 
- [1] W. H. Żurek, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715 (2003).  
 [2] K. Hornberger, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **768**, 221 (2009).  
 [3] W. H. Żurek, *Phys. Rev. D* **26**, 1862 (1982).  
 [4] M. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the Quantum-to-Classical Transition* (Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg, 2007).  
 [5] W. H. Żurek, arXiv:quant-ph/0306072 (2003).  
 [6] C. L. Degen, F. Reinhard, and P. Cappellaro, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 035002 (2017).  
 [7] P. Szańkowski, G. Ramon, J. Krzywda, D. Kwiatkowski, and L. Cywiński, *J. Phys.:Condens. Matter* **29**, 333001 (2017).  
 [8] Spectroscopy of non-Gaussian noise has been theoretically put forward in [25], but the implementation of the protocol proposed there is definitely much more involved than in case of reconstruction of spectrum of Gaussian noise.  
 [9] K. Roszak and L. Cywiński, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 032310 (2015).  
 [10] J. Eisert and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 137902 (2002).  
 [11] S. Hilt and E. Lutz, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 010101 (2009).  
 [12] A. Pernice and W. T. Strunz, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 062121 (2011).  
 [13] K. Roszak and L. Cywiński, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 012306 (2018).  
 [14] J. Wrachtrup and A. Finkler, *J. Magn. Res.* **369**, 225 (2016).  
 [15] T. Staudacher, F. Shi, S. Pezzagna, J. Meijer, J. Du, C. A. Meriles, F. Reinhard, and J. Wrachtrup, *Science* **339**, 561 (2013).  
 [16] S. J. DeVience, L. M. Pham, I. Lovchinsky, A. O. Sushkov, N. Bar-Gill, C. Belthangady, F. Casola, M. Corbett, H. Zhang, M. Lukin, H. Park, A. Yacoby, and R. L. Walsworth, *Nature Nanotechnology* **10**, 129 (2015).  
 [17] T. Häberle, D. Schmid-Lorch, F. Reinhard, and J. Wrachtrup, *Nature Nanotechnology* **10**, 125 (2015).  
 [18] I. Lovchinsky, A. O. Sushkov, E. Urbach, N. P. de Leon, S. Choi, K. D. Greve, R. Evans, R. Gertner, E. Bersin, C. Müller, L. McGuinness, F. Jelezko, R. L. Walsworth, H. Park, and M. D. Lukin, *Science* **351**, 836 (2016).  
 [19] N. Zhao, S.-W. Ho, and R.-B. Liu, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 115303 (2012).  
 [20] W. Yang and R.-B. Liu, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 085315 (2008).  
 [21] D. Kwiatkowski and L. Cywiński, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 155202 (2018).  
 [22] G. A. Álvarez, C. O. Bretschneider, R. Fischer, P. London, H. Kanda, S. Onoda, J. Isoya, D. Gershoni, and L. Frydman, *Nature Communications* **6**, 8456 (2015), arXiv:1412.8635.  
 [23] J. Scheuer, I. Schwartz, S. Müller, Q. Chen, I. Dhand, M. B. Plenio, B. Naydenov, and F. Jelezko, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 174436 (2017), arXiv:1706.01315.  
 [24] F. Poggiali, P. Cappellaro, and N. Fabbri, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 1 (2017), arXiv:1612.04783.  
 [25] L. M. Norris, G. A. Paz-Silva, and L. Viola, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 150503 (2016).