Introduction

Any spin resonance technique, including nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), is based on the occupation difference of the energy levels associated with different magnetic quantum numbers at a given magnetic field. Unfortunately, this is given by the Boltzmann distribution and leads to a tiny occupation difference at room temperature. In recent years, more and more experimental as well as theoretical contributions are published in the literature dealing with nuclear hyperpolarization utilizing the negatively charged nitrogen vacancy (NV) center in diamond [1–9]. Recently, a nuclear hyperpolarization method without the need of microwave application was presented [10, 11]. There, it is shown that cross relaxation (CR) between NV centers and substitutional nitrogen (P1) centers leads to a $^{13}$C hyperpolarization in several narrow magnetic field regions in the range of 48.5–53.5 mT. An additional advantage of this technique is the applicability of type I diamonds without the need of ultra pure and expensive samples. Here, we investigate the time dynamics of this method. Furthermore, a comparison of hyperpolarized signals with conventional measurements in the thermodynamic equilibrium (TE) will be used to identify the polarised regions with respect to the paramagnetic defects.

Results

Time dependence of nuclear hyperpolarization

The experimental setup for the hyperpolarization measurements is described in detail in [10]. We used a single crystal
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diamond sample with an estimated nitrogen content of 200 ppm, primarily present as P1 centers. The NV density is estimated to be maximal in the range of several ppm. The crystallographic [1 1 1] direction of the diamond sample was set parallel to the external magnetic field. All nuclear free induction decay (FID) signals were recorded at 7.05 T (300 MHz proton Larmor frequency), if not described differently. The advantage of using bulk NMR techniques in comparison to optically detected magnetic resonance (ODMR) is that this technique is sensitive to all nuclear spins, even if they are far away from any ODMR active center.

In the following, we present the characteristic build up time as well as the decay time at four different magnetic fields of the nuclear hyperpolarization. For the build up time measurement, the sample was exposed to a 5 W laser light at 532 nm for varying illumination times at a magnetic field of about 49.5 mT. This corresponds to the magnetically first resonant CR between parallel aligned NV centers and P1 centers which are oriented in an angle of 109° (figure 1(b)). After the illumination the sample was transferred into the NMR probe at 7.05 T and a π/2 pulse was applied immediately. Figure 1(a) shows the average over three runs of this procedure per illumination time. The characteristic pumping time in this experiment was determined to about $T_{\text{pump}} = 102(14)$ s. In addition, the linewidth (full width at half maximum (FWHM)) of the Fourier transformed NMR signal was analyzed and the values are given in the inset of figure 1(a) and scatter around 200 kHz. Due to low signal to noise (SNR) ratios for short illumination times, two types of evaluations were performed: first, the FWHM value of the linearly interpolated raw data and second the value extracted from a fit of two Gaussian (for details see supplemental material\(^1\)).

Another important parameter is the typical depletion time of the hyperpolarization signal. For this reason, we measure the decay time at four characteristic magnetic fields, namely slightly below, exactly at, slightly above and far above the resonant spin polarization transfer magnetic field. The polarization procedure for each experiment takes place at the indicated field point in figure 1(b), where also the pumping time was investigated. The decay of the polarization was measured with a pumping time of 200 s to 250 s which is sufficient to be in the saturated region of the pumping process. Afterwards, the laser was switched off and the magnetic field was set to the selected value. The NMR measurement takes place after varying duration in this selected magnet field. The decay was fitted to an single exponential function. Within the accuracy of the measurement no significant change in the decay times was noticeable. The values range from 50 s to 80 s, in consideration of the uncertainty of the fits. This is about 2.5 times faster than the characteristic pumping time. A possible reason is discussed below. With increasing the magnetic field to 7.05 T there is a tremendous increase in the decay time by a factor of 200 with a time constant in the range of 2.5 h. Due to this long time, no change in the signal can be recognized within the first 300 s (figure 3(a)) and even an observation time over 200 min

\(^1\) See supplemental material at (stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/30/305803/mmedia) for raw data and calculation of spin diffusion.

**Figure 1.** (a) Integral intensity of the real part of the Fourier transformed NMR signal ($I_R$) after different illumination times (5 W, 532 nm). Red curve is a fitted exponential function (with time constant $T_{\text{pump}}$). The inset shows the corresponding linewidths of the spectra. All values are the average over 3 measurement runs. (b) Section of the magnetic field dependent hyperpolarization pattern after an irradiation time of 200 s. The red circle indicates the magnetic field, where the time dependent measurements were performed.

For a proof of concept and as reliability check a series of solid echo measurements was conducted under hyperpolarization. This kind of pulse sequence is used to verify dipolar coupling of magnetically equivalent spin-1/2 pairs among themselves. After a specific delay time (in this case 0.5 ms) the first π/2 pulse is followed by a second one with a relative phase of ±90°. The receiver phase is equal to that of the first pulse. The accumulated signal in the time domain over two full phase cycles (8 measurements per cycle) is shown in figure 4(a) and the correspondingly pulse sequence is given in figure 4(c) and the table figure 4(b). The clear increase after 0.5 ms indicates a dipolar coupling of the hyperpolarized $^{13}$C spin.

**Thermal equilibrium NMR**

In addition to the hyperpolarization measurements, conventional measurements in quasi thermal (QT) equilibrium were conducted in the very same setup. This means, the diamond was attached to the transfer shuttle but stays in the NMR probe in the center of the 7.05-T magnet. The absence of hyperpolarization and the long lattice relaxation time requires a large number of accumulations and causes a long measurement times. Standard FID measurements with different delay times between every sequence were performed. The linewidths of the NMR spectra are calculated as described above and shown in figure 5 (see supplemental material for raw data). With increasing delay time, the linewidth decreases and reaches a value around 300 Hz for a delay time of 4 h.

To improve the SNR and to investigate the nuclear spin system in more detail, we performed QT measurement in a 11.74-T magnet (500 MHz proton Larmor frequency) in combination with a Bruker Avance III HD spectrometer. The
specific decays of the hyperpolarization signal (integrated real part of the Fourier transform $I_R$) depending on the magnetic field after an illumination time of 200 s ((a), (c)) and 250 s (b) and (d), respectively (532 nm, 5 W). The polarization procedure for each experiment takes place at the indicated field point in figure 1(b), where the pumping time was investigated. The $T_1$ time in the 7.05 T field (c) is about 2.5(10) h and were measured with the same polarization conditions like in (b).

Figure 3. Time behavior of the hyperpolarization effect at the 7.05 T field within the first 400 s (a) and first 200 min (b) after shuttling (integrated real part of the Fourier transform $I_R$). In both cases each data point is averaged over three measurements.

Figure 4. (a) The NMR signal of a hyperpolarized solid echo experiment with $\tau = 500 \mu$s in the time domain (real part). (b) The table shows the phases of one phase cycle for the first and second $\pi/2$ pulse as well as the receiver phase. Here 0, 1, 2, 3 correspond to a phase of 0, $\pi/2$, $\pi$ and $3\pi/2$. The signal in (a) is accumulated over two phase cycles. (c) Pulse sequence of the hyperpolarized solid echo experiment.

The diamond sample was placed in a HF coil with a quality factor of $Q \approx 190$ and was oriented with its crystallographic [111] direction parallel to the applied magnetic field. A carrier frequency of 125.758189 MHz was used and the length for a $\pi/2$ pulse was determined to be 5.5 $\mu$s. The measurements were conducted as ‘saturation recovery’ with four $\pi/2$ pulses at the beginning of each measurement sequence, see figure 6(d). Figure 6(a) shows the increasing integral NMR signal for different delay times after die saturation pulses. For the first two data points (10 s, 30 s) 512 scans were accumulated, four scans for the data points from 102 s to 300 s ($\approx 3$ d) and a single measurement for $26 \times 10^4$ s (≈3 d). The data is fitted to a double exponential function with a slow $S_s(t)$ and a fast component $S_f(t)$:

$$S(t) = S_s(t) + S_f(t) = A_i \cdot \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{t}{T_s^i}\right)\right) + A_f \cdot \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{t}{T_f}\right)\right).$$

The fit yields $T_s^i = 2.0(4)$ h and $T_f^i = 4.4(4)$ min, respectively. A closer look at the peaks reveals a shifting of the center frequency as well as a narrowing of the peak width (figures 6(b) and (c)) with increasing delay time. Although the effect of shifting is rather small the line width (FWHM) decreases by 30% from 1.1 KHz to 0.8 KHz. This corroborates the trend of a decreasing linewidth with increasing repetition time of the QT measurement at 7.05 T.

**Discussion**

The results and in particular the comparison of hyperpolarized and QT measurements give evidence that the described method
of CR is based on weakly coupled nuclear spins and induces spin diffusion. This is discussed further in the following section.

**Magnetic field dependence**

First of all, the distance of 0.114 mT of each peak pair of the magnetic field sweep corresponds to a coupling of the $^{13}$C spins in the range of 2 MHz [10, 11]. At this point, it is unclear if this is intrinsically caused by the hyperpolarization process or can be explained by statistical arguments. Since the strongly coupled $^{13}$C spins in the first shells around the paramagnetic center have a lower probability of occurrence. The first shell hyperfine (hf) coupling parameters for a NV center in the principal axis system are $A_{xx} = 30$ MHz, $A_{yy} = 123$ MHz and $A_{zz} = 227$ MHz [12]. Therefore, this coupling can not explain the experimental data. In [13] it was found experimentally as well as verified by theoretical *ab initio* calculations, that a NV-$^{13}$C hf coupling around 2.5 MHz can be associated with 9 possible sites in a distance of 5 Å. In [14] couplings even below 1 MHz are reported. For P1 centers hf couplings with $^{13}$C spins between 341 MHz and 1 MHz depending on the lattice site are reported [15–17]. Hence, the assumed hf coupling of ~2 MHz between the regarded paramagnetic centers and a $^{13}$C spin is in accordance with the current literature.

**Thermal measurements**

Taking into account the double exponential decay as well as the narrowing of the line width in the QT measurements at 11.74 T, the $^{13}$C spins can be separated at least in two groups. The first one is located in the neighborhood of paramagnetic defects like NV or P1 centers (fast decay with $T_1' = 4.4(4)$ min, broad line width) and the second group far away from any paramagnetic impurities (slow decay with $T_1' = 2.0(4)$ h, narrow line width). Regarding the hyperpolarization decay at 7.05 T for short times, like shown in figure 3(a), no change in the NMR intensity in the range of $T_1' \geq 4$ min is noticeable. Obviously, the main part of the hyperpolarized signal is contributed by $^{13}$C beyond a minimal distance to the paramagnetic defects with long $T_1$ times. This is emphasized by the fact, that the line width of the hyperpolarized data is comparable with the QT measurements at 7.05 T only for long delay times in the latter (figure 5).

**Spin diffusion**

The dipolar echo experiment indicates a dipolar coupling among the hyperpolarized $^{13}$C spins, which is a requirement for spin diffusion. But spin diffusion can take place only if the Larmor frequency of neighboring spins are in resonance. In the vicinity of a paramagnetic center a strongly magnetic field gradient is produced, inducing a shift of the nuclear Larmor frequency of the surrounding spins depending on their distance to the defect. This creates a diffusion barrier in the distance $b$ around the defect. Within a radius $r < b$ the diffusion is supressed (diffusion constant $D = 0$). The increase of $D$ to its unperturbed value can be described by $\exp[-(b/r)^{\frac{3}{2}}]$ [18]. Assuming a hf coupling of ~2 MHz for NV-$^{13}$C and extracting the NV-$^{13}$C distance from [13] results in $b = 5\text{Å}$. The nuclear hf coupling with P1 centers is highly anisotropic but for a distance of 2.6 Å values from 1 MHz to 3 MHz are found [17]. Using the equation from [19] the diffusion barrier radius can be estimated with

$$b = \left( \frac{\hbar^2 B}{2k_B T^{13C}} \right)^{1/4} \cdot a$$

and gives $b = 3.2 \text{ Å}$ for the P1 center. This corresponds roughly to an exclusion of $^{13}$C spins in the range of one lattice constant. Here, $\gamma$ denotes the electronic gyromagnetic ratio, $\gamma_{13C}$ the $^{13}$C gyromagnetic ratio, $k_B$ the Boltzmann constant, $T$ the temperature, $B$ the external magnetic field and $a$ the average nearest neighbor $^{13}$C distance, with $T = 300$ K and $a = 4.4 \text{ Å}$. The parameter $a$ is calculated via $1/2 = \exp\{-4\pi N_{13C}a^3/3\}$ to $a = 0.55 N_{13C}^{-1/3}$ [20]. This is depicted in the sketch of figure 8. For the NV center an additional region around the defect exists, where the strongly coupled $^{13}$C spins get hyperpolarized directly via the excited state level anticrossing (ESLAC) in the investigated field region [21]. On the one hand this process seems to be less efficient for the bulk hyperpolarization and on the other hand this ESLAC polarized region overlaps at least partly with the diffusion barrier region.

The nuclear spin diffusion itself, shows a low diffusion constant $D = 67 \text{ Å}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ leading to a slow propagation and therefore a short spatial range (see supplemental material) [19]. However, the polarization in the order of several percent indicates a spread of the polarization over a wide region in the
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**Figure 6.** (a) NMR signal (integrated real part of the Fourier transform $I_0$) for different times after saturation at 11.74 T. The fitting parameters are: $T_1' = 263(24)$ s, $T_1 = 8700(1300)$ s with the ratio $A_x/A_y \approx 0.8$. A shift in the center frequency (b) as well as a narrowing of the NMR peaks (c) with increasing time is clearly visible. (d) Pulse sequence that was used with four $\pi/2$ pulses for saturation.

The data as well as verified by theoretical *ab initio* the experimental data. In [13] it was found experimentally

---
sample. This can not be explained by classical $^{13}$C spin diffusion solely. An unknown effect seems to increase the diffusion range. We speculate that the diffusion enhancement is driven by the dipolar coupled P1 network.

**Time dependence**

The characteristic pumping time is at least roughly twice the decay time in the same field region. On the one hand, an unstable laser output in the first seconds can not be excluded, causing the longer pumping time. On the other hand, a reason for this could be the spread of the hyperpolarization over the bulk via diffusion and the fact, that the NV system is frequently in the excited state during the polarization. But the upper-state electronic configuration is different from that in the ground state, where the NV center is in resonance with the P1 defects.

Besides the $^{13}$C spins, the NV centers as well as the coupled P1 centers are polarised during the laser illumination [22]. After switching off the laser light, the electronic spins of the paramagnetic centers decay quickly back into thermal equilibrium and induce magnetic noise which can influence the T1 time of the nuclear $^{13}$C spins. In the literature, the typical correlation times $\tau_c$ for magnetic noise around NV centers ranges from 1 $\mu$s to 25 $\mu$s [23–25]. For example, in [23] a $\tau_c = 3(2)\mu$s for a nitrogen concentration of 100 ppm and a NV density of $10^{16}$ cm$^{-2}$ were found. Assuming a Lorentzian spectral density for this noise, this can effect the relaxation times for the $^{13}$C spins around 50 mT but not in the high field regime at 7.05 T and 11.74 T. Even a correlation time of $\tau_c = 0.1\mu$s would have a low spectral density in the high field region (figure 7). Lower values of $\tau_c$ are reported for very impure systems like surface near NV centers in nanodiamonds [26]. A correlation time for the magnetic noise of $\tau_c > 0.1 \mu s$ would explain the unchanged decay time of the hyperpolarization at the three measured low magnetic fields and the long relaxation time for high magnetic fields. For a random fluctuating magnetic field $B_x$ this can be modeled by the formula

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \gamma_{\text{C}}(B_x^2) \frac{\tau_c}{1 + (\omega_L \tau_c)^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

following from the theory of random fluctuating magnetic fields [27]. According to this equation, the previous reported correlation times around 3 $\mu$s give reasons for the observed $T_1$ times in the low magnetic field region (figure 8).
Conclusion and outlook

Hyperpolarization measurements were compared with conventional measurements in QT equilibrium. The linewidth as well as the lattice relaxation times in both cases indicate a weak coupling to the directly hyperpolarized 13C spins, an assertion that is supported by the magnetic field dependent hyperpolarization pattern.

Based on estimates for the radius of direct hyperpolarization via CR and the diffusion barrier, a scenario where the coupling between a NV and a P1 center leads to a polarization transfer to a nearby 13C spin in a minimal distance beyond the diffusion barrier emerges, see figure 9. This polarization can be passed to the bulk 13C spins via the dipolar network.

Further studies should also take into account an increasing range of effective spin diffusion with the aid of the network of coupled P1 centers. This could enhance the effective diffusion range of effective spin diffusion with the aid of the network of dipolar network.
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