# Pilot study on the detection efficiency measurement of InGaAs/InP single-photon detectors

Marco López<sup>1</sup>, Alice Meda<sup>2</sup>, Geiland Porrovecchio<sup>3</sup>, Robert Kirkwood<sup>4</sup>, Marco Genovese<sup>2</sup>, Giorgio Brida<sup>2</sup>, Marek Šmid<sup>3</sup>, Christopher Chunnilall<sup>4</sup>, Ivo Pietro Degiovanni<sup>2</sup> and Stefan Kück<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB), Braunschweig, Germany,
 <sup>2</sup> Instituto Nazionale di Ricerca Metrologica (INRIM), Torino, Italy,

<sup>3</sup> Cesky Metrologicky Institut (CMI), Brno, Czech,

<sup>4</sup>Republic, National Physical Laboratory (NPL), Hampton Road, Teddington, TW11 0LW, United Kingdom

Corresponding e-mail address: marco.lopez@ptb.de

We present the results of a pilot study on the detection efficiency calibration of a free-running fibre-coupled InGaAs/InP single-photon avalanche detector carried out by four European national metrology institutes (NMIs). The performed calibration is using different experimental setups and reference standards with independent traceability chains at the wavelength of 1550 nm. The detection efficiency of the singlephoton detector under test was determined for a mean photon number from 0.07 to 1.8, which correspond to approx. from 16250 photons/s to 203 000 photons/s, respectively.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

InGaAs/InP single-photon avalanche detectors (SPADs) are today the most frequently used detectors in ultra-high sensitivity applications such as quantum communication and quantum information processing, specifically fibre-based Quantum Key Distribution (QKD) [1-2] usually operated at the wavelength of 1550 nm. The traceable calibration of such detector is of great importance to fully guarantee the reliability of a quantum detection systems. Therefore, several national metrological institutes (NMIs) are currently great efforts into developing novel putting measurement methods and calibration facilities, enabling the performance of traceable calibration of such detectors by using reference standards.

In this paper we present the results of the pilot study on the detection efficiency measurements carried out by four European metrology institutes: CMI, INRIM, NPL and PTB, whose main purpose is to provide a snapshot of their measurement capabilities in the field of photon counting detection at telecom wavelengths.

## **DEVICE UNDER TEST**

The device under test (DUT) used in this study was a fibre-coupled free-running InGaAs/InP single-photon avalanche detector from ID Quantique, model: ID-220, see Figure 1(a). Previous to the calibration, the detection probability level and the dead time of the DUT were configured to 10 % and 10  $\mu$ s, respectively. Furthermore, to achieve high reproducibility of the measurements, the DUT was operated with a single-mode FC/PC fibre patch cable connected to its input optical port, where the measurement setups of all participating laboratories were connected by means of an FC/PC mating sleeve. Thus, the detection efficiency measured by all participating laboratories is referenced to this optical connection.

### **MEASUREMENT PRINCIPLE**

The measurement principle used by all participating laboratories for determining the detection efficiency of the DUT  $\eta_{\text{DUT}}$  is based on the substitution method



**Figure 1.** (a) InGaAs/InP free-running single-photon avalanche detector (ID Quantique ID-220). (b) Simplified scheme of the measurement principle (substitution method) used for determining the detection efficiency of the SPAD detector.

(see the simplified setup in Figure 1(b)). This method consists in comparing the optical power, corresponding to the effective number of photons per second, registered by the SPAD detector with the incident mean optical power per laser pulse determined by using a reference analogue detector. That is,  $\eta_{\text{DUT}} = Pc/\alpha \cdot P_0$ , where  $P_0$  is the optical power measured with the variable attenuator set to 0 dB,  $\alpha$  is the attenuation factor of the variable attenuator and  $P_{\rm C}$  is the average optical power corresponding to the effective photon rate measured by the DUT.  $P_{\rm C}$  is calculated from the photon rate  $\rho$ absorbed by the DUT, corrected for dead time and dark counts, and the energy of the photon  $h \cdot c/\lambda$ , that is,  $P_{\rm C} = \rho \cdot h \cdot c / \lambda$ .

The light source used for the detector calibration was a short-pulse laser source (ID Quantique, id300) externally triggered to produce sub-nanosecond pulses of approximately 300 ps duration at a repetition rate  $f_{\text{lase}}=110$  kHz. Thus, the value of the photon rate absorbed by the DUT is calculated by  $\rho = -f_{\text{laser}} \cdot (1 - q)$ , where q is the probability of having a "*click*" per laser pulse during the detection process. However, since the dead time D of the DUT is larger than  $\tau=1/f_{\text{laser}}$ ; i.e.  $\tau < D < 2\tau$ , a correction to obtain the real value of q is required. The model developed in this work for q corrects the influence of the dark counts and the dead time D of the detector during the detection process. That is,

$$q = \frac{\rho_{\text{click}}}{f_{\text{laser}} - \rho_{\text{click}}} + \frac{f_{\text{laser}} \cdot (\rho_{\text{click}} - \rho_{\text{click}}^2 D + f_{\text{laser}} \cdot (\rho_{\text{click}} D + \rho_{\text{click}}^2 D^2 - 1))}{D \cdot (f_{\text{laser}} - \rho_{\text{click}})^2 (f_{\text{laser}} - \rho_{\text{click}} + \rho_{\text{click}} \cdot f_{\text{laser}} D)} \cdot \rho_{\text{dark}} \cdot D$$

$$(1)$$

where  $\rho_{click}$  is the photon rate counted by the DUT and  $\rho_{dark}$  is the dark counts. In addition, since the detector dead time *D* also affects the detector dark counts, we corrected it by  $\rho_{dark} = \rho'_{click,dark}/(1 - \rho'_{click,dark} \cdot D)$ , where  $\rho'_{click,dark}$  is the dark counts measured in absence of light.

#### RESULTS

Figure 2 shows the detection efficiency of the DUT determined by all participants for a mean photon number per pulse between 0.07 and 1.8, which corresponds to a photon rate of approx. 16250 photons/s and 203 000 photons/s, respectively. The detection efficiency without dead time corrections, obtained from the measurements performed by CMI, is also included, which clearly shows the typical detection efficiency saturation of the detector. Moreover, the average value and the expanded



**Figure 2.** Detection efficiency of the InGaAs/InP SPAD detector measured by all participants between the mean photon number per pulse from 0.07 and 1.8, which correspond to a photon rate of approx. 16250 photons/s and 203 000 photons/s, respectively. Error bars: expanded uncertainty (k=2). Solid line: detection efficiency without detector dead time correction.

uncertainty reported by the participants are shown in Table 1.

 Table 1. Average and expanded uncertainty of the detection efficiency reported by each participant laboratory.

| Laboratory | Participant          | Expanded      |
|------------|----------------------|---------------|
|            | detection            | uncertainty   |
|            | efficiency, $\eta_p$ |               |
| CMI        | 0.1042               | 0.0054 (5.2%) |
| INRIM      | 0.1086               | 0.0050 (4.7%) |
| NPL        | 0.1089               | 0.0026 (2.4%) |
| PTB        | 0.1076               | 0.0024 (2.2%) |

#### CONCLUSIONS

A pilot study on the measurement of the detection efficiency of fibre-coupled free-running InGaAs/InP-SPAD detectors was presented. The evaluation of the detection efficiency included the correction of the dead time of the device under test. The measured values reported by all participants are within the expanded uncertainty of the mean.

Acknowledgment: The work reported on this paper was funded by project EMPIR 14IND05 "MIQC2" and 17FUN06 SIQUST. This project received funding from the EMPIR program co-financed by the Participating States and from the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation program.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. R. H. Hadfield, Nature Photonics 3, 696-705 (2009).
- 2. D. Stucki, et al., Journal of Modern Optics, 48, Issue 13, 1967-1981 (2001).