

Distinguishing thermal and pseudothermal light by testing the Siegert relation

XI JIE YEO,¹ JUSTIN YU XIANG PEH,¹ DARREN MING ZHI KOH,¹
CHRISTIAN KURTSIEFER,^{1,2,*} AND PENG KIAN TAN¹

¹Centre for Quantum Technologies, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543

²Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117551

*christian.kurtsiefer@gmail.com

Abstract: Thermal light, including blackbody radiation and spontaneous emission, exhibits photon bunching. Thermal light sources, however, typically yield low spectral densities, limiting their practical utility. Pseudothermal light sources with higher brightness and longer coherence time are often employed instead. While pseudothermal light also exhibits photon bunching, this property may not suffice to fully replicate the behavior of genuine thermal light. Here we demonstrate a method to directly test the Siegert relation for two sources of photon-bunched light, laser light scattered from a rotating ground glass and spontaneously emitted light from a gas discharge lamp, probing a fundamental criterion expected of thermal light.

© 2026 Optica Publishing Group

1. Thermal and pseudothermal light

Blackbody radiation forms stationary light fields across a broad frequency spectrum without fixed phase relationships between light at different locations or times [1]. Similarly, light with random phases between individual emission processes is produced when spontaneous emission arises from an ensemble of particles, like atoms, with motion in thermal equilibrium [2–5].

Thermal light, including blackbody radiation [6,7] and spontaneous emission from gas discharge lamps [8–11], exhibits photon bunching [12–16], where the photodetection events appear closer together than as described by random Poissonian timing statistics [17]; mathematically, this is expressed by a second order correlation function $g^{(2)}(\tau = 0) > 1$.

However, the spectral density of blackbody radiation is determined by its surface temperature, which limits its photon bunching output brightness below practical thresholds. The broadband nature of the blackbody spectrum shortens the coherence timescale of the bunching behavior to the femtoseconds regime, rendering its photon bunching inaccessible to standard photodetectors.

Alternative “pseudothermal” light sources are therefore commonly employed to demonstrate photon bunching. Typical implementations include laser beams scattered from time-varying dispersive media, such as rotating ground glass diffusers [18–23], or particles undergoing Brownian motion suspended in a liquid [24–27]. Such pseudothermal light sources generate bright photon-bunched light owing to the underlying laser excitation, with coherence timescales long enough to be readily resolved by available photodetectors.

Here, we demonstrate that pseudothermal light can yield photon correlations distinguishable from those of thermal radiation, even though both exhibit the temporal photon bunching characteristic.

2. Signature photon bunching

We compare two photon-bunched light sources: a thermal light source based on spontaneous emissions from a Mercury (Hg) low pressure gas discharge lamp, and a pseudothermal light source based on laser light scattered off a rotating ground glass plate (see Figs. 1(a) and (b)).

For thermal light, the spontaneous emission around 546.1 nm from the Hg lamp is selected by




Fig. 1. (a) Thermal light source based on a Mercury (Hg) vapor gas discharge lamp, (b) pseudothermal light generated by laser light scattered off a rotating ground glass diffuser. (c) Hanbury-Brown-Twiss interferometer to measure the second-order photodetection time correlations $g^{(2)}(\tau)$. (BPF: bandpass filter, LP: linear polariser, RGG: rotating ground glass, BS: fibre-based beamsplitter, APD: avalanche photodetectors, SMF: single mode fibre)

44 a 546 nm spectral filter with a 3 nm optical passband. Multiple spectral emission lines due to
 45 hyperfine splitting resulting from a natural mix of Hg isotopes with non-zero nuclear spins are
 46 captured. The presence of multiple emissions that are mutually incoherent reduce the resulting
 47 $g^{(2)}(0)$ from the ideal thermal light value of 2. The spectrally filtered light is transmitted through
 48 a linear polariser to increase interferometric visibility, and projected into a single spatial mode by
 49 a single mode optical fibre.

50 Pseudothermal light is prepared by scattering light from a 780 nm distributed feedback laser
 51 focused on a rotating ground glass diffuser of grit 1500 (see Fig. 1(b)). The bare tip of an optical
 52 fiber (single mode for 780 nm) is positioned about 19 cm away from the illuminated spot to
 53 collect light scattered from the ground glass. Light scattered from a rotating ground glass is
 54 expected to show photon bunching described by a second order correlation function $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ with
 55 a Gaussian profile [28–31],

$$g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 + e^{-\left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_{\text{RGG}}}\right)^2}, \quad (1)$$

56 where τ_{RGG} is the coherence timescale of the photon bunching signature of this source.

57 The focal spot size ϕ of the beam on the ground glass surface is about $4 \mu\text{m}$ in diameter, and
 58 positioned at a radial distance R of about 10 mm from the rotation axis. A motor rotates the
 59 ground glass with a period $T \approx 4$ ms. With the scattered light collected at a distance of 19 cm
 60 away, which is significantly larger than the spot size of $\phi = 4 \mu\text{m}$, the coherence timescale τ_{RGG}
 61 is predicted [28–31] as $\tau_{\text{RGG}} \approx \phi T / (4\pi R)$, or $\tau_{\text{RGG}} \approx 130$ ns for our parameters.

62 To detect for photon bunching signatures in light from the two sources, a Hanbury-Brown-Twiss
 63 (HBT) interferometer (see Fig. 1(c)) is used. For this, light from a source is sent through a
 64 beamsplitter to illuminate a pair of actively quenched Silicon avalanche photodiodes (APD). The
 65 photo-detection events were then timestamped, from which detection time differences between
 66 the detectors were histogrammed, and histograms were fitted with Gaussian models as illustrated




Fig. 2. Photon bunching signatures. (a) The Hg lamp exhibits photon bunching with $g_{\text{Hg}}^{(2)}(\tau = 0) = 1.142 \pm 0.007$ and coherence timescale $\tau_{\text{Hg}} = 0.35 \pm 0.02$ ns (both numeric values are results of fits, solid line). (b) Results for scattered light from the rotating ground glass yield $g_{\text{RGG}}^{(2)}(0) = 1.859 \pm 0.002$ and $\tau_{\text{RGG}} = 277.5 \pm 0.6$ ns.

67 in Fig. 2.

68 Light from both the Hg lamp and the rotating ground glass exhibit temporal photon bunching.
 69 The fitted peak $g_{\text{Hg}}^{(2)}(\tau = 0) = 1.142 \pm 0.007$ is significantly lower than the theoretical thermal
 70 light peak $g^{(2)}(\tau = 0) = 2$, as anticipated from the contribution of different spectral lines.
 71 Furthermore, the short coherence timescale of $\tau_{\text{Hg}} = 0.35 \pm 0.02$ ns makes it difficult for standard
 72 photodetectors to resolve the timing of photo-detection pairs.

73 In contrast, the output from the rotating ground glass exhibits a noticeably stronger photon
 74 bunching behaviour with $g_{\text{RGG}}^{(2)}(\tau = 0) = 1.859 \pm 0.002$, and a coherence timescale $\tau_{\text{RGG}} =$
 75 277.5 ± 0.6 ns that is 3 orders longer, and thus straightforward to resolve with readily available
 76 detectors. This makes scattering light from a rotating ground glass a popular pseudo-thermal light
 77 source to demonstrate photon bunching.

78 3. Testing the Siegert relation

79 Thermal light exhibits photon timing correlations, including the characteristic photon bunching,
 80 that satisfy the Siegert relation [32–37]

$$g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 + |g^{(1)}(\tau)|^2, \quad (2)$$




Fig. 3. Experimental setup for measuring interferometric photon correlations $g^{(2X)}(\tau)$. The delay fibers are chosen to introduce an optical delay of $\Delta = 2.22 \mu\text{s}$ for testing scattered light from the rotating ground glass, and $\Delta = 10 \text{ ns}$ for testing light from the Hg lamp. (BS: Beamsplitter, APD: avalanche photodetectors)

81 where $g^{(1)}(\tau)$ is the first order correlation function, and its modulus $|g^{(1)}(\tau)|$ is the interferometric
 82 visibility.

83 The $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ can be determined by photon bunching measurements in a HBT interferometer as
 84 shown in the previous section, and is adopted as a general test for thermal light due to its practical
 85 ease and convenience.

86 The $g^{(1)}(\tau)$ can be obtained with a Michelson interferometer scanning over a range of optical
 87 path length differences. This can be difficult as the scanning range needs to be on the order of the
 88 coherence timescale. For the example above with $\tau_{\text{RGG}} = 277.5 \text{ ns}$, this would necessitate an
 89 impractical scan over 83 metres of path length difference.

90 Alternatively, an asymmetric Mach-Zehnder interferometer can be used to test the Siegert
 91 relation via an interferometric correlation $g^{(2X)}(\tau)$ (see Fig. 3). This reveals both the second
 92 order correlation function $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ and the modulus of the first order correlation function $|g^{(1)}(\tau)|$
 93 simultaneously. This method has the advantage of being phase independent by measuring
 94 $|g^{(1)}(\tau)|$ instead of $g^{(1)}(\tau)$, and does not require a range of optical path length differences.

95 The respective light fields $E_{A,B}(t)$ at the output ports A, B of an intensity-balanced interferometer are
 96

$$E_{A,B}(t) = \frac{E(t) \pm E(t + \Delta)}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (3)$$

97 where $E(t)$ is the input light field of the interferometer. The fixed optical delay Δ is introduced by
 98 a single-mode optical fiber, chosen to be much larger than the expected characteristic coherence
 99 time of the light.

100 Photoevents in our implementation are detected by Silicon avalanche photodetectors (APDs) at
 101 the output ports of the interferometer and timestamped. The interferometric photon correlation
 102 $g^{(2X)}(\tau)$ between the photodetectors is

$$g^{(2X)}(\tau) = \frac{\langle E_A^*(t + \tau) E_B^*(t) E_B(t) E_A(t + \tau) \rangle}{\langle E_A^*(t) E_A(t) \rangle \langle E_B^*(t) E_B(t) \rangle} \quad (4)$$

103 where $\langle \dots \rangle$ is the ensemble average over measurement time t , and τ is the two-photoevent
 104 coincidence timing separation.

105 Upon expansion of Eq. (4) using Eq. (3), it can be shown [38, 39] that the non-zero terms are

$$g^{(2X)}(\tau) = \frac{1}{4} g^{(2)}(\tau + \Delta) + \frac{1}{4} g^{(2)}(\tau - \Delta) + \frac{1}{2} [g^{(2)}(\tau) - |g^{(1)}(\tau)|^2]. \quad (5)$$

106 The temporal photon bunching $g^{(2)}(\tau = 0)$ signature would now manifest into two side peaks
 107 $g^{(2X)}(\tau)$ at 1/4 of its original amplitude, positioned at photo-detection time delays $\tau = \pm\Delta$.




Fig. 4. Experimental results for interferometric photon correlations. (a) Light from the Hg lamp shows two bunching side peaks $g_{\text{Hg}}^{(2X)}(\tau = \pm\Delta) = 1.044 \pm 0.003$ at reduced amplitudes, with $\tau_{\text{Hg}} = 0.41 \pm 0.03$ ns. (b) Scattered light from the rotating ground glass exhibits a central bunching peak (blue dashed lines) $g_{\text{RGG}}^{(2X)}(\tau = 0) = 1.412 \pm 0.002$ and two smaller side peaks $g_{\text{RGG}}^{(2X)}(\tau = \pm\Delta) = 1.206 \pm 0.002$, with $\tau_{\text{RGG}} = 172.8 \pm 0.6$ ns. The solid line shows a fit to Eq. (5).

108 If the test light obeys the Siegert relation Eq. (2), and recalling that the optical delay length
 109 is chosen such that $g^{(2)}(\tau = \Delta) = 1$, then $g^{(2X)}(\tau = 0) = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2} = 1$. This results in a flat
 110 coincidence floor around $\tau = 0$.

111 Experimental results of $g^{(2X)}(\tau)$ for the two light sources tested in this work are shown in
 112 Fig. 4. The flat region near $\tau = 0$ for light emitted by the Hg lamp suggests good agreement with
 113 the Siegert relation, and therefore compatible with expectations for thermal light.

114 Light prepared by the rotating ground glass setup shows a non-flat bunching feature around
 115 $\tau = 0$, clearly violating the Siegert relation ($g^{(2)}(\tau) - |g^{(1)}(\tau)|^2 \neq 1$, see Fig. 4 (b)). The fit of
 116 the experimental $g_{\text{RGG}}^{(2X)}(\tau)$ to Eq. (5) yields a central bunching peak $g_{\text{RGG}}^{(2X)}(0) = 1.412 \pm 0.002$
 117 and $-|g^{(1)}(0)|^2 = -0.421 \pm 0.003$. However, although the amplitude of $|g^{(1)}(0)|^2$ is similar to
 118 the central bunching peak amplitude, its coherence timescale $\tau_c = 149 \pm 2$ ns is shorter than
 119 $\tau_{\text{RGG}} = 172.8 \pm 0.6$ ns, and so it does not fully cancel out the bunching feature around $\tau = 0$.

120 This deviation from the expectation for thermal light suggests the rotating ground glass source
 121 to be considered a pseudothermal light source, and not a thermal light source.

122 4. Conclusion

123 We find that the test of the Siegert relation can be a useful tool to distinguish thermal from
124 pseudo-thermal light, providing additional information beyond the observation of photon bunching.
125 Therefore, probing for the interferometric photon correlation $g^{(2X)}(\tau)$ can be a stronger witness
126 of thermal light.

127 Funding

128 This research is supported by the Quantum Engineering Programme through NRF2021-QEP2-
129 03-P02, the Ministry of Education, and the National Research Foundation, Prime Minister's
130 Office, Singapore.

131 Disclosures

132 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

133 References

- 134 1. C. C. Davis, *Lasers and electro-optics* (Cambridge university press, 1996).
- 135 2. M. Planck, "Über irreversible strahlungsvorgänge," *Ann. Phys.* **306**, 69–122 (1900).
- 136 3. A. Einstein, "Einstein's Proposal of the Photon Concept—a Translation of the Annalen der Physik Paper of 1905,"
137 *Am. J. Phys.* **33**, 367–374 (1965).
- 138 4. R. J. Glauber, "Photon correlations," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10**, 84–86 (1963).
- 139 5. R. Loudon, *The Quantum Theory of Light* (Oxford, UK, 2000).
- 140 6. P. K. Tan, A. H. Chan, and C. Kurtstiefer, "Optical intensity interferometry through atmospheric turbulence," *MNRAS*
141 **457**, 4291–4295 (2016).
- 142 7. Y. Deng, H. Wang, X. Ding, *et al.*, "Quantum interference between light sources separated by 150 million kilometers,"
143 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 080401 (2019).
- 144 8. R. V. Rebka, G. A. and Pound, "Time-correlated photons," *Nature* **180**, 1035–1036 (1957).
- 145 9. R. H. Brown and R. Twiss, "Interferometry of the intensity fluctuations in light. ii. an experimental test of the theory
146 for partially coherent light," *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* **243**, 291–319 (1958).
- 147 10. B. L. Morgan and L. Mandel, "Measurement of photon bunching in a thermal light beam," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **16**,
148 1012–1015 (1966).
- 149 11. D. B. Scarf, "Measurements of photon correlations in partially coherent light," *Phys. Rev.* **175**, 1661–1668 (1968).
- 150 12. R. H. Brown and R. Q. Twiss, "Lxxiv. a new type of interferometer for use in radio astronomy," *Lond. Edinb. Dublin*
151 *philos. mag. j. sci.* **45**, 663–682 (1954).
- 152 13. R. H. Brown and R. Q. Twiss, "Correlation between photons in two coherent beams of light," *Nature* **177**, 27–29
153 (1956).
- 154 14. R. J. Glauber, "The quantum theory of optical coherence," *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 2529–2539 (1963).
- 155 15. L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical coherence and quantum optics* (Cambridge university press, 1995).
- 156 16. M. Fox, *Quantum optics: An Introduction*, Oxford Master Series in Physics (OUP Oxford, 2006).
- 157 17. R. J. Glauber, "Photon correlations," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10**, 84–86 (1963).
- 158 18. W. Martienssen and E. Spiller, "Coherence and Fluctuations in Light Beams," *Am. J. Phys.* **32**, 919–926 (1964).
- 159 19. F. Arecchi and R. Bonifacio, "Theory of optical maser amplifiers," *IEEE J. Quantum Electron.* **1**, 169–178 (1965).
- 160 20. T. Gonsiorowski and J. C. Dainty, "Correlation properties of light produced by quasi-thermal sources," *J. Opt. Soc.*
161 *Am.* **73**, 234–237 (1983).
- 162 21. G. Scarcelli, A. Valencia, and Y. Shih, "Experimental study of the momentum correlation of a pseudo-thermal field in
163 the photon-counting regime," *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 051802 (2004).
- 164 22. A. Valencia, G. Scarcelli, M. D'Angelo, and Y. Shih, "Two-photon imaging with thermal light," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**,
165 063601 (2005).
- 166 23. Y. Zhou, F. Li, B. Bai, *et al.*, "Superbunching pseudo-thermal light," *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 053809 (2017).
- 167 24. F. T. Arecchi, M. Giglio, and U. Tartari, "Scattering of coherent light by a statistical medium," *Phys. Rev.* **163**,
168 186–194 (1967).
- 169 25. R. Pecora, *Dynamic light scattering: applications of photon correlation spectroscopy* (Springer Science & Business
170 Media, 1985).
- 171 26. D. Dravins, T. Lagadec, and P. D. Nuñez, "Optical aperture synthesis with electronically connected telescopes," *Nat.*
172 *Commun.* **6**, 6852 (2015).
- 173 27. P. K. Tan and C. Kurtstiefer, "Temporal intensity interferometry for characterization of very narrow spectral lines,"
174 *MNRAS* **469**, 1617–1621 (2017).
- 175 28. L. E. Estes, M. Narducci, and R. A. Tuft, "Scattering of light from a rotating ground glass*," *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **61**,
176 1301–1306 (1971).

- 177 29. E. Jakeman, "The effect of wavefront curvature on the coherence properties of laser light scattered by target centres
178 in uniform motion," J. Phys. A **8**, L23 (1975).
- 179 30. P. N. Pusey, "Photon correlation study of laser speckle produced by a moving rough surface," J. Phys. D **9**, 1399–1409
180 (1976).
- 181 31. T. A. Kuusela, "Measurement of the second-order coherence of pseudothermal light," Am. J. Phys. **85**, 289–294
182 (2017).
- 183 32. A. J. F. Siegert, *On the Fluctuations in Signals Returned by Many Independently Moving Scatterers*, Radiation
184 Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1943).
- 185 33. H. Z. Cummins and E. R. Pike, *Photon correlation and light beating spectroscopy* (Springer Science+Business
186 Media, 1974).
- 187 34. E. Jakeman, "On the statistics of k-distributed noise," J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **13**, 31 (1980).
- 188 35. P.-A. Lemieux and D. J. Durian, "Investigating non-gaussian scattering processes by using nth-order intensity
189 correlation functions," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **16**, 1651–1664 (1999).
- 190 36. D. Ferreira, R. Bachelard, W. Guerin, *et al.*, "Connecting field and intensity correlations: The siegert relation and
191 how to test it," Am. J. Phys. **88**, 831–837 (2020).
- 192 37. P. Lassègues, M. A. F. Biscassi, M. Morisse, *et al.*, "Field and intensity correlations: the siegert relation from stars to
193 quantum emitters," Eur. Phys. J. D **76**, 246 (2022).
- 194 38. A. Lebreton, I. Abram, R. Braive, *et al.*, "Unequivocal differentiation of coherent and chaotic light through
195 interferometric photon correlation measurements," Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 163603 (2013).
- 196 39. X. J. Yeo, E. Ernst, A. Leow, *et al.*, "Direct measurement of the coherent light proportion from a practical laser
197 source," Phys. Rev. A **109**, 013706 (2024).