

Analog Integrated Circuits

ANALYSIS AND DESIGN OF A DOUBLE BALANCED GILBERT CELL BASED MIXER IN AMI06 TECHNOLOGY

Enrico Maria Renzi

Roberto Rubino

Politecnico di Torino

June 18, 2018

1 Analog multipliers theory

- Introduction
- Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier

2 Circuit design

- Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
- Design by simulation
- Layout of the Gilbert cell

3 Simulation vs schematic

- Simulation setup
- Time and frequency domain analysis
- Power and distortion parameters

4 Conclusions

1 Analog multipliers theory

- Introduction
- Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier

2 Circuit design

- Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
- Design by simulation
- Layout of the Gilbert cell

3 Simulation vs schematic

- Simulation setup
- Time and frequency domain analysis
- Power and distortion parameters


4 Conclusions

Analog multipliers working principles

Analog Multiplier circuit that performs the product between two signals. Spectral components from a certain frequency band are moved to another by means of intrinsic non-linear behaviour (modulation). The working principle is below:

$$x_1(t) = A_1 \cos(\omega_1 t + \varphi_1) \rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \bigcirc \\ \times \end{array} \rightarrow y(t) = \frac{A_1 A_2}{2} \cos(\omega_{LF} t + \varphi_{LF}) + \frac{A_1 A_2}{2} \cos(\omega_{HF} t + \varphi_{HF})$$

$x_2(t) = A_2 \cos(\omega_2 t + \varphi_2)$



Two **new** out-of-phase spectral component at output:

Down-converted at lower frequency: $\omega_{LF} = |\omega_1 - \omega_2| < \omega_1, \omega_2$

Up-converted at higher frequency: $\omega_{HF} = |\omega_1 + \omega_2| > \omega_1, \omega_2$

Analog multipliers working principles

Mixers are *bi-direction* three-port. At each port a signal is associated

RF radio frequency component, high frequency signal;

IF intermediate frequency component, low frequency signal;

LO local oscillator (pump), provided by external source.

Depending on input/output signal configuration we can have *downconverting* or *upconverting* modulators.





Figure: Working configuration: downconversion (right), upconversion (left).

Mixer figures of merit

To qualify the mixer operation some figures of merit are defined (downconversion mixer):

- **Conversion gain**

$$A_{conv} = \frac{P_{IF}}{P_{RF}}$$

whose behaviour is linear in log scale:

$$P_{IF}|_{dB_m} = A_{conv}|_{dB} + P_{RF}|_{dB_m} + 30dB$$

- **1dB compression point** defines the input power level for which the difference between the compressed and non-compressed output power is 1dB. It is due to gain saturation caused by harmonic distortion:

$$P_{IF}|_{-1dB} = P_{IF}|_{dB_m,ideal} - 1dB$$

- **Third order distortion** most important output spurious contribution due to gain compression:

$$\begin{aligned} i_D(t) &= I_D|_{V_{GS}} + av_{gs}(t) + bv_{gs}^2(t) + cv_{gs}^3(t) + \dots \\ &\propto av_{gs}(t) + bv_{gs}^2(t) + \frac{3}{4}c \cos(\omega_0 t) + \frac{1}{4}c \cos(3\omega_0 t) \end{aligned}$$

Even order distortion gives additional DC offset, odd order distortion gives always in-band unwanted components.

- **Third order intermodulation** it happens with two-tone input signals because of frequency intermodulation. Most important contribution comes from IM₃: $m = \pm 2, \pm 1$ and $n = \pm 2, \pm 1$. Given $f_{RF1} = f_0$ and $f_{RF2} = f_0 + \delta f$:

$$f_{IF,IM3} \Big|_{\substack{m=2 \\ n=-1}} = 2f_{RF1} - f_{RF2} - f_{LO} = f_{IF} - \delta f$$

1 Analog multipliers theory

- Introduction
- Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier

2 Circuit design

- Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
- Design by simulation
- Layout of the Gilbert cell

3 Simulation vs schematic

- Simulation setup
- Time and frequency domain analysis
- Power and distortion parameters


4 Conclusions

A Gilbert-cell mixer is an active double-balanced analog multiplier. This topology provides:


- Reasonable conversion gain;
- Good rejection of input frequency components at the output port, high linearity;
- Good isolation between ports;
- Integrability in CMOS technology.

We can recognise **four main blocks**: bias net, gain stage, mixing stage and load.

Gilbert cell circuit analysis - Bias net



(a) *Bias net*



(b) *Gilbert cell*

Figure: Full schematic

Ideally current mirroring only dependent on **geometrical** parameters. However, in real circuits:

- To have good current source long channel required, since $r_o = 1/\lambda I_0 \propto L$. Using short channel devices i_D more dependent on λ and tolerances;
- Due to fabrication precision, MOSFET's parameters may vary:

$$\frac{I_0}{I_{REF}} \simeq 1 + \frac{\Delta K_n}{K_n} + 2 \frac{\Delta V_{th}}{V_{od}}$$

Wide circuits, temperature gradients and small overdrive voltage significantly induce mirroring errors.

Gilbert cell circuit analysis - Gain stage

Thanks to source degeneration we reduce bias dependency and increase **linearity** (high order harmonics suppression).

$$G_{m,eq} = \frac{g_m}{1 + g_m R_S}$$




Figure: Gain stage.

Gilbert cell circuit analysis - Mixing stage




Figure: Mixing stage

Mixing stage is made up of switching-like driven transistors that acts as **pulse amplitude modulators**. A complementary sinusoidal signal is applied to the gates of each pair (V_{LO}), large enough to ensure the **abrupt switching** of one MOSFET whereas the other must be kept in saturation (not in triode!).

Gilbert cell circuit analysis - Mixing stage

Compromise in driving signal required:

- small LO signals produce slower switching speed and reduces efficiency (as common mode signal at the output);
- large LO signals drive the device in triode (spikes and unwanted feed-through reducing gain).

Switching speed is related to MOSFET transition frequency:

$$f_T \propto V_{od}/L$$

Then fast devices are obtained with **short channel** length and **large overdrive**. Larger devices introduce parasitic capacitance, detrimental for the conversion efficiency and speed. Maximum working frequency should be below $f_T/10$.

Gilbert cell circuit analysis - Mixing stage

Mixing stage is non linear, however given the square wave current flowing through each device:

$$i_D(t) = I_{pk} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{\pi} \sum_{n=1,3,5\dots} \frac{1}{n} \sin(n\omega t) \right)$$

one has the instantaneous gain:

$$A_c|_{switch} = \frac{2}{\pi}$$

associated to first harmonic, ideally not depending on device properties.
For real devices the actual gain is lower.

Gilbert cell circuit analysis - Load stage

Two resistors are employed as loads. They are less noisy than transistors (Flicker noise at low frequency), less reliable for what concern tolerances though. They are required to provide enough gain to the stage, if necessary active loads can be employed to maximize gain.

Gilbert cell circuit analysis - Conversion gain

The circuit is non-linear, therefore it is not possible to define a gain. It can be demonstrated that the static **conversion gain** for the cell is:

$$A_{vC} = \frac{V_{IF,rms}}{V_{RF,rms}} = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{R_L}{\frac{1}{g_{m3,4}} + R_S} \simeq \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{R_L}{R_S}$$

Some important facts hold:

- in first approximation the conversion gain does not depend on the amplitude of the LO signal;
- both LO and RF components are rejected at the output;

1 Analog multipliers theory

- Introduction
- Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier

2 Circuit design

- Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
- Design by simulation
- Layout of the Gilbert cell

3 Simulation vs schematic

- Simulation setup
- Time and frequency domain analysis
- Power and distortion parameters

4 Conclusions

Design specifications

Technology and purposes

Technology used is MOSIS AMI $0.6\mu\text{m}$. Loose constraint of $\sim 1\text{mm}$ is taken for maximum gate width. This technology is old fashioned and not the best for this purpose.

Supply voltage

Supply voltage is chosen 5V

Frequencies

Single frequency down-converting mixer with:
 $f_{\text{RF}}=110\text{ MHz}$, $f_{\text{LO}}=100\text{ MHz}$, $f_{\text{IF}}=10\text{ MHz}$.


Conversion Gain

Voltage conversion gain is chosen $A_{\text{VC}}=4$. All transistors are supposed in saturation.


Table

Parameter	Name	Value	Unit
A_{vC}	Voltage Conversion gain	4	
V_{DD}	Supply voltage	5	V
I_0	Cell biasing current	5	mA
V_{th0}	n-MOS threshold w.o. body effect	0.709	V
K_n	n-MOS physical parameter	116	$\mu A/V^2$
I_{dss}	Maximum channel current density	466	$\mu A/\mu m$
ϕ_P	Fermi potential	0.7	V
γ_B	Body effect coefficient	0.5	V
L_{min}	Technology minimum length	0.6	μm

Reference schematic



(a) *Bias net*



(b) *Gilbert mixer*

Figure: Bias net and Gilbert Mixer schematic

Current bias design

To have good mirroring this must be satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned}V_{GS1} &= V_{GS2} \\V_{DS1} &= V_{DS2} \\ \left(\frac{W}{L}\right)_1 &= \left(\frac{W}{L}\right)_2\end{aligned}$$

The values we impose are:

$$I_{ref} = I_0 = 5mA$$

$$V_{od1} = V_{od2} = 0.4V$$

$$L_1 = L_2 = 3L_{mim} = 1.8\mu m$$




Figure: Biasing current mirror

Current bias design

...we derive gate width and gate bias

$$W_1 = \frac{2I_0}{K_n V_{od1}^2} L_1 = 969.8 \mu m$$

$$V_{th1} = V_{th2} = V_{th0}$$

(no body effect)

$$V_{GS2} = V_{DS2} = V_{th0} + \sqrt{\frac{2I_0 L_1}{K_n W_1}} = 1.1 V$$




Figure: Biasing current mirror

Load resistance design

I_0 is evenly split into M3 and M4.
In each LO only one transistor per time is on.

In order to have enough output swing we decided to drop across the load:

$$V_{R_L} = \frac{1}{3} \cdot V_{DD}$$

This leads to the choosing of load

$$R_L = \frac{\frac{1}{3} V_{DD}}{I_0/2} = 667\Omega$$




Figure: Load voltage drop on mixing stage's equivalent circuit.

Gain stage design

R_S is chosen in order to increase stage linearity without provoking a too large voltage drop.

$$R_S = 10\Omega$$

$$V_{R_S} = \frac{R_S}{I_0/2} = 25mV$$




Figure: Gain stage

Gain stage design

Given the previous specification
 $A_{vC} = 4$ and conversion gain
 expression

$$A_{vC} = \frac{V_{IF,rms}}{V_{RF,rms}} = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{R_L}{\frac{1}{g_{m3,4}} + R_S}$$

We can then evaluate transconductance and gate width (provided $L = 3L_{min} = 1.8\mu m$)

$$g_{m3} = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1}{\frac{R_L}{A_{vC}} - R_S} = 10mS$$

$$W_3 = g_{m3}^2 \frac{2L_3}{K_n I_0} = 624 \mu m$$




Figure: Gain stage

Gain stage design

M3 is subjected to body effect, thus:

$$V_{SB3} = V_{DS1} + V_{R_S}$$

$$V_{th3} = V_{th0} + \gamma_B (\sqrt{2\phi_P + V_{SB3}} - \sqrt{2\phi_P}) = 0.957V$$

This leads to an higher gate-source voltage:

$$V_{od3} = \sqrt{\frac{I_0}{K_n W_3/L_3}} = 0.353V$$

$$V_{GS3} = V_{th3} + V_{od3} = 1.31V$$




Figure: Gain stage

Gain stage design

We impose to have half the supply voltage to drop on the gain and current mirror stages. From here:

$$V_{DS3} = \frac{1}{2} V_{DD} - V_{DS1} = 1.4V$$

Since this is higher than overdrive, M3 saturation is guaranteed if on. Based on this we evaluate the gate bias voltage that keeps underneath stages saturated:

$$V_{G3} = V_{GS3} + V_{RS} + V_{DS1} = 2.425V$$




Figure: Gain stage

Mixing stage design

A very small overdrive is needed to foster fast transitions on LO stage.

$$V_{od6} = 150mV$$

Small overdrives produce large gate width.

To limit this, the minimum gate length was chosen for LO stage.
Then we can derive gate width:

$$L_6 = L_{min}$$
$$W_6 = \frac{I_0 L_6}{K_n V_{od6}^2} = 1.1mm$$




Figure: Gain stage

Mixing stage design

Taking into account body effect:

$$V_{SB6} = V_{DS1} + V_{R_s} + V_{DS3} = 2.525V$$

$$V_{th6} = 1.18V$$

$$V_{GS6} = 1.326 V$$

$$V_{G6} = V_{GS6} + V_{DS1} + V_{R_s} + V_{DS3} = 3.855V$$

All short-channel effect that produce a more complex threshold voltage dependence are not taken into account here.




Figure: Gain stage

- 1 Analog multipliers theory
 - Introduction
 - Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier
- 2 Circuit design
 - Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
 - Design by simulation
 - Layout of the Gilbert cell
- 3 Simulation vs schematic
 - Simulation setup
 - Time and frequency domain analysis
 - Power and distortion parameters
- 4 Conclusions

A new design approach, based on **simulation and characterization of each device** is required, since:

- Level 1 model simulation result proven to be not enough accurate to correctly describe the behaviour of the circuit (no correspondence between calculation and simulation);
- Gate width suggested in literature by:

$$W_{opt} = \frac{1}{3\omega L C_{ox} R_g}$$

yield too large devices ($W \geq 1\text{mm}$).

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 1

Step 1: enhance g_{m3} , linearity and noise.

We **impose**:

- $M_{3,4}$ dimensions:

$$L_3 = 3L_{min} = 1.8\mu m$$

$$50\mu m \leq W_3 \leq 500\mu m$$

- Circuit consumption: $I_0 \approx 5mA$;
- Voltage drops on $M_{3,4}$ nodes:

$$V_{SB3} = V_{DS1} = V_{DS3} = 1.5V$$




Figure: Gain stage.

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 1





Figure: I_{D3} vs V_{GS3} curve. W_3 varying from $50\mu\text{m}$ to $500\mu\text{m}$, $V_{DS3} = 1.5\text{V}$.

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 1



We chose:

- $W_3 = 500\mu\text{m}$
- $V_{GS3} = 1.5\text{V}$
- $g_{m3} = 11.9\text{mS}$
- $I_0/2 = 2.9\text{mA}$

Figure: g_{m3} vs V_{GS3} curve. W_3 varying from $50\mu\text{m}$ to $500\mu\text{m}$, $V_{DS3} = 1.5\text{V}$.

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 2

Step 2: design the current sink. We **have**:

- voltage on R_S :

$$V_{R_S} = 2.9mA \times 10\Omega = 29mV$$

- Voltages on M_1

$$V_{DS1} = 1.5V - V_{R_S} = 1.471V$$

$$V_{GS1} = 1.471V$$

From simulation we get $W_3=373\mu m$ to have $I_0=5.8mA$.




Figure: Gain stage.

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 2




Figure: I_{D1} vs V_{GS1} curve. $W=373\mu m$

Step 3: design the mixing stage.

From **design spec** we have:

$$A_v \approx \frac{2}{\pi} \left(\frac{R_L}{R_S + \frac{1}{g_{m3}}} \right) = 4$$

therefore

$$R_L = A_v \cdot \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{g_{m3}} + R_S \right)$$

$$= 4 \times \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \times \frac{1}{11.9mS} + 10\Omega \right) = 577\Omega$$




Figure: Gain stage.

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 3

One has:

$$\begin{aligned}V_{SB6} &= V_{DS1} + V_{R_S} + V_{DS3} \\ &= 1.47V + 0.029V + 1.5V = 3V\end{aligned}$$

hence:

$$\begin{aligned}V_{R_L} &= 2.9mA \times 577\Omega = 1.673V \\ V_{DS6} &= V_{dd} - V_{R_L} - V_{SB6} = 327mV\end{aligned}$$

We need *switches* slightly above threshold.




Figure: Gain stage.

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 3




Figure: Extrapolation of M6 threshold voltage from transconductance versus the V_{GS} curve. The threshold is located at 1.27V.

Gilbert cell CAD design - Step 3

From simulation we chose $V_{od6}=60\text{mV}$. Then:

$$V_{GS6} = V_{th6} + V_{od6} = 1.33\text{V}$$

By characterizing the device:

$$W_6 = 170.3\mu\text{m}$$

$$L = L_{min} = 0.6\mu\text{m}$$

Minimum gate length: fast.




Figure: Gain stage.

Bias net design - M₅

Now the bias net is designed. From **spec**:

$$V_{G1} = 1.471V$$

$$V_{G3} = 3V$$

$$V_{G6} = 4.33V$$

We chose mirroring ratio 1:1, $L_2 = 1.8\mu m$ (same length of M₁) and $V_{GS2} = V_{DS2} = 1.471V$. To have $I_0 = 5.8mA$ from **simulation**:

$$W_2 = 373\mu m$$

Since $V_{G5} = 3V$, from **simulation**:

$$W_5 = 130.45\mu m$$

$$L_5 = 0.6\mu m$$




Figure: Reference biasing network schematic

Bias net design - R_2, R_4

Voltage drop on R_2 and R_4 :

$$R_2 + R_4 = \frac{V_{dd} - V_{G5}}{I_0} = 344\Omega$$

Since $V_{G6} = 4.33V$:

$$R_2 = 229\Omega$$

$$R_4 = 115\Omega$$

Total **static power consumption** is

$$P = 2 \times (5.8mA \times 5V) = 58mW$$




Figure: Reference biasing network schematic

Bias net design - $R_{1,3}$ and $C_{1,2}$

Resistors R_1 and R_3 act as AC block:

$$R_1 = R_3 = 30k\Omega$$

Equivalent resistance seen from C_1 :

$$R_{eq} \simeq R_2 || R_4 || \frac{R_3}{2} = 76.4\Omega$$

Pole frequency un decade before f_{LO} :

$$C_1 \geq 10 \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi \cdot R_{eq} \cdot \frac{f_{lo}}{10}} = 20.8pF$$

From **optimization**: $C_1 = C_2 = 25pF$.




Figure: Reference biasing network schematic

Design CAD validation - Full circuit




Figure: Gilbert cell and bias network schematic

Design CAD validation - Gain stage




Figure: Close up view on current sink and RF stage

Design CAD validation - Mixing stage




Figure: Close up view of LO stage

Design CAD validation - Bias net




Figure: Close up view of LO stage

- 1 Analog multipliers theory
 - Introduction
 - Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier
- 2 Circuit design
 - Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
 - Design by simulation
 - Layout of the Gilbert cell
- 3 Simulation vs schematic
 - Simulation setup
 - Time and frequency domain analysis
 - Power and distortion parameters
- 4 Conclusions

Layout strategy

- Common centroid, interdigitated structures: less gradients;
- Multi-finger structure with same-length for transistors fingers: minimize encroachment;
- Components with same alignment: uniform error distribution;
- Dummy elements: less border effects;
- Limited substrate noise with guard rings;
- Minimum number of crossed connections and metal changes in the routing process (less parasitics);
- Compact and symmetric structure;
- Multiple substrate contacts and isolating well used because of circuit width and shared body contact for each MOSFET: less substrate currents.
- **Every device has been optimized** to have matching between circuit and layout.

Layout - Gain and Mixing stage

- A **symmetric** input low noise differential stage is desired.
- A common centroid structure is employed. This minimizes **offset** voltage.
- Dummy elements to reduce **lateral diffusion** variations.
- Same approach with mixing stage: designed to be easily stacked above RF stage, with the two switching stages kept close to each other.





Figure: Common centroid structure used for differential RF stage

Layout - Gain stage

$M_{3,4}$ parameters:


- $m = 18(+2)$
- $w^* = 34.35\mu\text{m}$
- $W = 618.3\mu\text{m}$
(vs $500\mu\text{m}$)
- $L = 1.8\mu\text{m}$
- $y = 126\mu\text{m}$
- $x = 99.45\mu\text{m}$



Layout - Mixing stage

$M_{6,7,8,9}$ parameters:


- $m = 12(+2)$
- $w^* = 17.55\mu\text{m}$
- $W = 210.6\mu\text{m}$
(vs $170.3\mu\text{m}$)
- $L = 0.6\mu\text{m}$
- $y = 56.85\mu\text{m}$
- $x = 87.6\mu\text{m}$



Layout - Current mirror

$M_{1,2}$ parameters:

- $m = 10(+1)$
- $w^* = 39.15\mu\text{m}$
- $W = 391.15\mu\text{m}$ (vs $373\mu\text{m}$)
- $L = 1.8\mu\text{m}$
- $y = 61.5\mu\text{m}$
- $x = 87.75\mu\text{m}$




- Current mirror shows multi-finger interdigitated structure: **junction cap** approximately halved due to sharing of drain contacts.
- Same alignment and dummy elements reduce gradients and **diffusion differences**.
- Modular unitary width: Current ration independent on W_{enc} .
- Multiple contacts to reduce series resistance.

Layout - M₅

M₅ shows multifinger interdigitated structure with dummy elements. M₅ parameters:

- $m = 12(+2)$
- $w^* = 13.65\mu\text{m}$
- $W = 163.8\mu\text{m}$ (vs $130.45\mu\text{m}$)
- $L = 1.8\mu\text{m}$
- $y = 25.2\mu\text{m}$
- $x = 35.55\mu\text{m}$



- $C_{1,2}$ are poly capacitors (poly1 + elec) with dummy elements in order to reduce dimensions(G_{ox}) and improve tolerances.
- Common centroid layout inside n-well (connected to V_{DD}) to reduce **fringing** field leaks along with dummy elements.
- **Square units**: minimize random errors, same undercut keeps constant ratios.





Figure: Bias capacitors layout structure

Layout - C_{bias}

- $y = 448.65\mu\text{m}$
- $x = 472.5\mu\text{m}$
- $C_{bias} = 25.9\text{pF}$



- C_{signal} are large capacitances ($\simeq \text{nF}$).
- Multilayer structure impossible because of *CMOS design rule 11.6*.



- Good matching required then common centroid structure is used.
- Series resistance reduced by surrounding metal plates.
- N-well ring connected to V_{DD} to reduce fringing field.





Figure: Common centroid structure of the signal capacitors


Layout - C_{signal}

- $y = 678.45\mu\text{m}$
- $x = 480.25\mu\text{m}$
- $C_{\text{bias}} = 90.1\text{pF}$



Layout - $R_{1,3}$

- $R_{1,3}$ are large, then n-well technology necessary with common centroid structure to improve gradients (precision not necessary though).
- Since nearby mixing stage guard ring needed to avoid substrate currents.



Layout - R_2, R_4, R_L, R_S

- R_2, R_4, R_L and R_S are smaller than $R_{1,3}$ therefore poly1 resistors can be used, improving also precision.
- Common centroid structure with dummy elements.




Figure: Poly resistors layout


Table: Resistors parameters

Parameter	$R_{1,3}$	R_2	R_4	R_L	R_S
$y [\mu m]$	112.05	27.45	20.1	32.4	54
$x [\mu m]$	66.3	37.35	37.65	63	13.35
$h [\mu m]$	4.95	5.7	5.7	4.2	12.45
$w [\mu m]$	46.5	26.1	26.25	48.6	4.95
m	4	2	1	1	1
$R^* [\Omega]$	7545	114.5	115.1	289.3	9.94
$R_{tot} [\Omega]$	30180	229	115.1	289.3	9.94


Merging:

- Components placed to shorten interconnections, avoid crosstalk, emphasize symmetries to make paths equal for high frequency signals;
- Metal width dimension and number of vias to avoid electromigration.
- As many sub contacts as possible, connected to ground, to capture free charges in the substrate (less noise).
- Occupied area: $A \simeq 0.7mm \cdot 1.8mm = 1.26mm^2$;
- Large amount of area occupied by capacitors.
- Entire metal plates for V_{DD} and GND could not be used (too few).

Layout - Full circuit



Layout - Full circuit without capacitors



1 Analog multipliers theory

- Introduction
- Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier

2 Circuit design

- Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
- Design by simulation
- Layout of the Gilbert cell

3 Simulation vs schematic

- Simulation setup
- Time and frequency domain analysis
- Power and distortion parameters



4 Conclusions

Developed analysis:

- Bandwidth;
- Time domain output of mixed signal and spectral components;
- Oscillator signal amplitude to maximize output component;
- Conversion gain and 1dB compression point;
- Single tone IIP_3 ;
- Two tone IIP_3 and CIM_3 ;

Used frequencies: $f_{LO}=110\text{MHz}$, $f_{RF}=100\text{MHz}$, with expected $f_{IF}=10\text{MHz}$.

Simulation setup



Simulation setup




Figure: Balun schematic.

- Ideal baluns simulate a $50\ \Omega$ impedance matching condition and differential inputs.
- Mixer's loads, represented by 50Ω resistors connected to unitary gain driven generators. Used both for ideal impedance matching purposes and to convert differential output from mixers to single-ended.

- 1 Analog multipliers theory
 - Introduction
 - Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier
- 2 Circuit design
 - Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
 - Design by simulation
 - Layout of the Gilbert cell
- 3 Simulation vs schematic
 - Simulation setup
 - Time and frequency domain analysis
 - Power and distortion parameters
- 4 Conclusions

Bandwidth evaluation - Transition frequency


Dynamic analysis is complex when dealing with non-linear circuits. The following results try to qualify the circuit in the best way. Always monochromatic signals have been used.

Maximum working frequency
 $f < f_T/10$. From current gain measurements on M_3 and M_6 :

$$f_T|_{RF} = 9.43\text{GHz}$$


$$f_T|_{LO} = 1.12\text{GHz}$$

LO stage limits bandwidth.



Bandwidth evaluation - Transition frequency

Bandwidth evaluated by plotting conversion gain dependency on frequency. The simulation is performed keeping $f_{LO} = f_{RF} - 10\text{MHz}$. -3dB point is located almost two octaves above $f_{RF}=110\text{MHz}$.



It is important to notice that we **cannot rely on this results** because:

- The technology kit is probably not suited for RF operation;
- The layout extraction does not account for all device and circuit parasitics, that would affect the performances at high frequency and worsen The physical implementation behaviour;
- Pretending accurate results, the simulation emulate the worst case condition.


Max gain vs LO

LO amplitude must be optimized to get maximum conversion gain. RF power is kept constant, sweeping pump input power.

Layout seems to have better performance than schematic. From simulation:

$$V_{LO,opt}|_{layout} = 1.23V$$

$$V_{LO,opt}|_{schematic} = 2.5V$$



Time domain analysis




Figure: Time domain waveforms: double balanced differential output with $v_{RF}=200mV$, $f_{RF}=110MHz$, $v_{LO}=1.23mV$, $f_{LO}=100MHz$.

Output signal spectrum




Figure: Layout. Discrete Fourier transform: double balanced differential output with $v_{RF}=200mV$, $f_{RF}=110MHz$, $v_{RF}=1.23mV$, $f_{LO}=100MHz$, cosine squared smoothing function.

Output signal spectrum




Figure: Schematic. Discrete Fourier transform: double balanced differential output with $v_{RF}=200mV$, $f_{RF}=110MHz$, $v_{LO}=1.23mV$, $f_{LO}=100MHz$, cosine squared smoothing function.

- 1 Analog multipliers theory
 - Introduction
 - Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier
- 2 Circuit design
 - Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
 - Design by simulation
 - Layout of the Gilbert cell
- 3 Simulation vs schematic
 - Simulation setup
 - Time and frequency domain analysis
 - Power and distortion parameters
- 4 Conclusions

Conversion gain before compression

Given optimum $V_{LO} = 1.23V$, RF voltage was swept to evaluate conversion gain before compression. Obtained conversion gains are as in figure:

$$A_{VC}|_{layout} = 2.926$$
$$A_{VC}|_{schematic} = 2.675$$




Figure: Conversion gain vs v_{RF}

Single tone P_{in} P_{out}




Figure: Single tone P_{in} P_{out} for layout and schematic.

1dB compression points

RF power for which gains drops of 1dB are equal to

$$P_{RF,in}|_{layout} = -2.3dB_m$$

$$P_{RF,in}|_{schematic} = -4.8dB_m$$

then, respectively for schematic and layout, the corresponding voltages:

$$V_{RF,in}|_{layout} = 172mV$$

$$V_{RF,in}|_{schematic} = 128mV$$






Figure: 1dB compression point, one-tone analysis

Single tone 3rd and 5th order distortion

Increasing input power, powers of IF's 3rd and 5th harmonics were measured (most important contributions of output non-linearity at 30MHz and 50MHz). As expected from theory non-linear terms increase with the 3rd and 5th power of input power.




(a) Harmonics power for schematic




(b) Harmonics power for layout

Input and Output Intercept points

The amount of distortion is evaluated through the intercept points among the linear regressions of power on fundamental and the ones on harmonics. Coordinates and ordinates are called input and output intercept points (IIP3,IIP5 and OIP3,OIP5).



(a) Harmonics power for schematic




(b) Harmonics power for layout


IIP3, IIP5, OIP3, OIP5

IIPs and OIPs measured are shown zooming in on the compression, and reported in table:

Parameter	Schematic	Layout	unit
IIP_3	9.73	10.4	dB_m
OIP_3	18.3	19.7	dB_m
IIP_5	17.0	9.13	dB_m
OIP_5	25.6	18.5	dB_m




(a) Schematic detail of IPs




(b) Layout detail of IPs

Two tone analysis

Two tones are injected at 110MHz and 111MHz. In-band IIP₃ result to be at 9MHz and 12MHz. Graphs show that power related to fundamental is strongly reduced when two tones are injected, since power is spread among all intermodulation products.




(c) *schematic 1dB
compression point*




(d) *layout*

Two tone analysis 1dB compression

Compression points for both schematic and layout.



(e) *schematic*




(f) *layout*


Figure: 1dB compression points, two tones.

Two tone analysis: IM3s'IPs

Being the power moved from the fundamental to IMPs, input and output intercepts point result lowered with respect the 1-tone case.



(a) *schematic*




(b) *layout*


Figure: Harmonics power, IIP₃ in schematic and layout, two tone analysis.

Two tone analysis: spectra

Frequency spectra at difference input power have been retrieved for schematic and layout. It is clearly visible the intrinsic rejection of LO and RF frequencies of the Gilbert double balanced cell.



(a) *schematic*




(b) *layout*


Figure: DFT, comparison between layout and schematic; cosine2 smoothing function.

Two tone analysis: CIM3

The 1dB compression point spectrum has been chosen ($PRF = -9.68\text{dBm}$) to measure the CIM3 ratio, since this is set as the maximum input power accepted by the multiplier without heavy distortion.



(a) *schematic*




(b) *layout*


Figure: DFT, comparison between layout and schematic. CIM₃ measurement at 1dB compression point; cosine2 smoothing function.

Two tone analysis: CIM3

As it appears, power carried from fundamental tones (10MHz and 11MHz) barely increases after this point, whereas other tones keep increasing.



(a) *schematic*




(b) *layout*


Figure: DFT, comparison between layout and schematic. CIM₃ measurement at 1dB compression point; cosine2 smoothing function.

Two tone analysis: Summing up

The table with summarized results for the analysis is reported below.
Overall, the layout looks less performing as expected.



(a) *schematic*



(b) *layout*

Figure: DFT, comparison between layout and schematic. CIM_3 measurement at 1dB compression point; cosine2 smoothing function.

- 1 Analog multipliers theory
 - Introduction
 - Analysis of a Gilbert cell based multiplier
- 2 Circuit design
 - Design by hand of a down-converting Gilbert cell
 - Design by simulation
 - Layout of the Gilbert cell
- 3 Simulation vs schematic
 - Simulation setup
 - Time and frequency domain analysis
 - Power and distortion parameters
- 4 Conclusions

Good news:

- The circuit correctly mixes;
- Reasonable conversion gain ($A_{v,\text{layout}} \simeq 2.9$, $A_{v,\text{schem}} \simeq 2.7$) with good matching between simulations and hand calculations;
- Acceptable amount of distortion if the input power remains well below the 1dB compression point ($\simeq 100\text{mV}$);

Bad news:

- The AMI's 0.6 by MOSIS is old-fashioned, not meant for RF applications;
- The extractor used to generate the layout (Cadence Diva) was not able to provide the full set of parasitic elements, leading to inaccurate analysis;
- Wide circuit area necessary to fulfil the specifications (gain, power consumption), this produces a large amount of parasitic elements.

To sum up, the circuit functions properly, although it probably **overestimates** what would be the real behaviour.

