# Low-Power High-Speed 180-nm CMOS Clock Drivers

## Tadayoshi Enomoto, Suguru Nagayama, and Nobuaki Kobayashi

Chuo University, 1-13-27 Kasuga, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-8551, Japan tenmt@ise.chuo-u.ac.jp

Abstract - The power dissipation ( $P_T$ ) and delay time ( $t_{dT}$ ) of a CMOS clock driver were minimized. Eight test circuits, each of which has 2 two-stage clock drivers, and a register array were fabricated using 0.18-µm CMOS technology. The first and second stages of the driver consisted of a single inverter and *m* inverters, respectively, and the register array stage was constructed with *N* delay flip-flops (D-FFs). A single inverter in the second stage drove *N/m* D-FFs where *N* was fixed at 40 and *m* varied from 1 to 40. Minimum  $P_T$  and  $t_{dT}$  were 251 µW and 0.640 ns, respectively and were both obtained at an *m* of 8. These values were 48.6% and 29.4% of maximum  $P_T$  and  $t_{dT}$ , respectively. Simulated and measured results agreed well with these SPICE simulated results.

## **I. Introduction**

The power dissipation  $(P_{\rm T})$  of clock drivers is extremely large, 30 to 50% of the total power dissipation of a CMOS LSI chip, such as video codec LSIs, multi-media processors, etc [1]. Therefore, to significantly reduce the total power dissipation of CMOS LSI chips, the power dissipation of clock drivers must be minimized. The power dissipation  $(P_{\rm T})$ of CMOS random logic circuits is the sum of the power dissipation  $(P_D)$  due to the dynamic current, and power dissipation  $(P_s)$  due to the short-circuit current [2]. For conventional random logic circuits,  $P_{\rm S}$  is much smaller than  $P_{\rm D}$ , which means  $P_{\rm T}$  is approximately equal to  $P_{\rm D}$ . However, the  $P_{\rm S}$  of a clock driver that consists of multi-stage inverter trees, each of which has a large number of delay flip-flops (D-FFs), is considerably larger. Furthermore, the large number of D-FFs also lengthens the signal propagation delay times  $(t_{dT})$ . Thus, clock drivers must be designed in such a way that both  $P_{\rm T}$  and  $t_{\rm dT}$  are minimized.

## **II. Circuit Design and Fabrication**

An MPEG4 8-bit absolute difference accumulation (ADA) circuit for motion estimation consists of an 8-bit absolute difference circuit, a 16-bit ripple carry type accumulator, and registers with 40 D-FFs each [3]. The test circuit shown in Fig. 1(a) was designed for this type of ADA circuit using 0.18- $\mu$ m double-well, 5-layer interconnection CMOS technology. It consists of 2 two-stage clock drivers and a register array. These clock drivers generate a pair of complement clock pulses (*cl* and *clb*). The register array is constructed with 40 D-FFs. A circuit diagram of this type of D-FF is also shown in Fig. 1(b). There are one and *m* inverters in the first and second stages in the clock drivers, respectively. The number of fan-outs of the inverter in the first stage is *m*, and the number of D-FFs that are driven by a single inverter in the second stage is *n* (=*N/m*, where *N* is the



Fig. 1. A circuit diagram of a CMOS test circuit. (a) Clock drivers and a register array. (b) D-FF.



Fig. 2 Photograph of a 180-nm, CMOS LSI chip with 8 test circuits.

number of D-FFs). The  $m \times n$  (=N=40) of the eight test circuits are 1×40, 2×20, 4×10, 5×8, 8×5, 10×4, 20×2, and 40×1.

A CMOS LSI chip in which the eight above test circuits are included is shown in Fig. 2. The chip was fabricated using 0.18- $\mu$ m CMOS technology. The areas of the test circuits and the LSI chip were 1,025×744  $\mu$ m<sup>2</sup> and 2.8×2.8 mm<sup>2</sup>, respectively. Both the nMOSFET and pMOSFET have gate lengths of 0.18  $\mu$ m. The channel widths of the nMOSFET and pMOSFET are 2.05 and 6.15  $\mu$ m, respectively, and their threshold voltages are 0.435 V and -0.415 V, respectively.

# **III. Circuit Characteristics**

#### **3.1 Speed Performance**

The SPICE simulated output waveforms at various nodes in the test circuit with m=1 and n=40 are shown in Fig. 3(a).



Fig. 3. Simulated output waveforms at various nodes in test circuit with N = 40. (a) m = 1 and n = 40. (b) m = 8 and n = 5.

 $cl_1$ ,  $cl_2$ , and  $cl_3$  are inputs of the first stage, second stage, and register array, respectively, and  $v_0$  is the output of D-FF. The simulated delay times of the first  $(t_{d1})$ , second  $(t_{d2})$ , and third stages  $(t_{d3})$  (i.e.,  $t_{d3}$  is the set-up time of D-FF), are 0.064, 1.314, and 0.927 ns, respectively, and the total delay time  $(t_{dT}=t_{d1}+t_{d2}+t_{d3})$  is 2.306 ns. The rise time  $(t_r)$  and fall time  $(t_f)$  (not shown) of  $cl_3$  are extremely long because a single inverter in the second stage must drive a large number of D-FFs (i.e., n=40).  $cl_1$ ,  $cl_2$ ,  $cl_3$ , and  $v_0$  of the test circuit with m = 8 and n (=N/m) = 5 are also shown in Fig. 3(b).  $t_{d1}$ ,  $t_{d2}$ , and  $t_{d3}$  are 0.168, 0.278, and 0.271 ns, respectively.  $t_{d2}$ , and  $t_r$  and  $t_f$  (not shown) of  $cl_3$  are considerably reduced because the number of load D-FFs is optimized to 5.

The solid lines in Fig. 4 represent the average  $t_{dT}$ ,  $t_{d1}$ ,  $t_{d2}$ , and  $t_{d3}$  for N = 40 as a function of m.  $t_{d1}$  increases linearly, while  $t_{d2}$  is inversely proportional to m (i.e.,  $t_{d2}$  is proportional to n=N/m).  $t_{d3}$  is also inversely proportional to m because  $t_r$  and  $t_f$  of  $cl_3$  decrease as m increases. Thus, as mincreases,  $t_{dT}$  quickly decreases, reaches a minimum at about m=8, and then slowly increases. The minimum  $t_{dT}$ (0.717 ns), at m=8, is considerably reduced, to 31.1% of the  $t_{dT}$  (2.305 ns) with m=1 (Fig. 3). Similar  $t_{dT}$  performances were obtained for various N, from 20 to 320.

### **3.2 Power Dissipation**

Figure 5 shows the experimentally measured and simulated power dissipations of the first stage ( $P_1$ ), second stage ( $P_2$ ), register array stage ( $P_3$ ), and all stages ( $P_T=P_1+P_2+P_3$ ) in the test circuits. The measured results of the fabricated test circuits (Fig. 2) correlate well with the simulated results.  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  increase, while  $P_3$  decreases, as *m* increases.  $P_2$  consists of dynamic power consumed by MOSFET switches in the 40 D-FFs and short-circuit power consumed by *m* inverters in the second stage. The former is almost constant (about 110  $\mu$ W) and independent of *m*, but the later is proportional to *m*.  $P_3$  decreases quickly as *m* increases slowly in the region where *m* is greater than 8, since  $t_r$  and  $t_f$  of  $cl_3$  supplied to the register array stage are reduced by increasing *m*. That is, short-circuit currents in







the D-FFs decrease with an increase in *m*.  $P_3$  with m = 8 is 126 µW that is 43.3% of the  $P_3$  (291 µW) with m = 1. Thus,  $P_T$  quickly decreases, reaches a minimum at m = 8, and then slowly increases as *m* increases. The minimum  $P_T$  (251 µW) of the test circuit with m = 8 is greatly reduced to 48.6% of the  $P_T$  with m = 40 (517 µW). Similar  $P_T$  characteristics were also obtained for various N (20 to 320).

# **IV. Conclusion**

A 0.18- $\mu$ m CMOS test circuit consisting of a two-stage clock driver (with one and *m* inverters in the first and second stages, respectively) and a register array with 40 delay flip-flops (D-FFs), was fabricated. The power dissipation and delay time of an optimized test circuit were successfully reduced to 1/2 and 1/3 of the maximum power dissipation and delay time, respectively.

#### References

- [1] M. Usami, M. Igarashi, F. Minami, T. Ishikawa, M. Kanazawa, M. Ichida, and K. Nogami, "Automated low-power technique exploiting multiple supply voltages applied to a media processor", IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuit, SC-33, 3, pp. 463-472, 1998.
- [2] H. J. M. Veendrick, "Short-circuit dissipation of static CMOS circuitry and its impact on the design of buffer circuits", IEEE Journ. of Solid-State Circuits, SC-19, 4, pp. 468 - 473, 1984.
- [3] N. Kobayashi, T. Ei, and T. Enomoto, "Low Dynamic Power and Low Leakage Power Techniques for CMOS Motion Estimation Circuits", IEICE Tran. on Electronics, E89-C, 3, pp. 271-279, 2006.