# CBC3 front end design progress

Mark Raymond

systems meeting, 4<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.

# CBC3 front end specs, requirements and simulation constraints

#### simulation (design) constraints

VDDA = 1V minimum operation VDDA provided by LDO operating temperature ~0 deg. C simulate performance @ -20 and +30 process corners

#### sensor constraints

n-in-p (electrons)

can scrap dual polarity requirement (helps with  $VDDA_{min} = 1.0V$ )

AC coupled

no need to source leakage current (also helps with  $VDDA_{min} = 1.0V$ ) 5 cm length

 $C_{tot} \sim 7.5 \text{ pF} (C_{is} \sim 2.5 \text{pF}, C_{bp} \sim 2.5 \text{pF})$ 

8 cm length

provision to increase input FET current to cope with

#### performance contraints

pulse shape

peaking time <20nsec, pulse return to baseline within 50 nsec overload recovery

normal response resumed 2.5 usec following 4pC hip signal

noise

target ENC < 1000e

# CBC2 issues to address (in CBC3)

- leakage current in pipeline at low ionizing doses
   <u>http://www.hep.ph.ic.ac.uk/~dmray/CBC\_documentation/Phase\_2\_TID\_Davide\_Nov\_14.pdf</u>
   enclosed NMOS devices now implemented
- I2C register SEU immunity could be better <u>http://www.hep.ph.ic.ac.uk/~dmray/CBC documentation/Phase 2 SEU Kirika Nov 14.pdf</u> now plan to use Whitaker cells for registers
- CM effect in electrons polarity mode shows up when threshold low and many channels firing traced to postamp feedback FET biasing <u>http://www.hep.ph.ic.ac.uk/~dmray/systems\_talks/2015/CBC2\_CM\_systems\_Jan2015.pdf</u> a new method for biasing the feedback FET is required
- so-called "shadow effect" when signal injected into many channels, other channels fire, but ~50ns later traced to coupling through preamp cascode bias <u>http://www.hep.ph.ic.ac.uk/~dmray/systems\_talks/2015/CBC2\_shadow\_effect\_Apr\_2015.pdf</u> preamp cascode now individually biased using regulated cascode circuit



regulated cascode circuit

bigger open loop gain

self biasing so no need for common global bias (fix for "shadow effect")

small power penalty

# **CBC3** Preamp modifications

design changes reported last time

increase I/P device bias transistor width (last time) (allows to run more current if necessary)

scrap T-network for holes polarity

reduce Rf to **100k** (needed for reduced pulse peaking time)



### CBC2 Postamp





\* http://www.hep.ph.ic.ac.uk/~dmray/systems talks/2015/CBC2 CM systems Jan2015.pdf



extra precaution: VPLUS2 = copy of VPLUS, independently generated => no possibility of cross-coupling between bias network and postamp opamp +ve input would like to use resistor ladder DAC approach for VPLUS and VPLUS2

# beta multiplier plus start-up and adjustable R



all NMOS enclosed (leakage currents would mess things up)

exclusive OR of RST (startup) lines ensures we can't have a disaster (i.e. get polarity wrong and get stuck in permanent reset!!)

# beta multiplier performance vs. adjustable R



cycling through all possible resistor switch combinations

all process corners T=-20 & +30 VPLUS=0.45, 0.5, 0.55

strongest effect is T lower family -20 upper family +30



# postamp modifications finished

10



2.5 fC to 12.5 fC, 2.5 fC steps (one to five mips)

all process corners, 
$$T = -20 \& +30$$

least significant postamp fb current setting - 0001

Cin = 8p, Cstray = 2p, IPRE1 = 30 IPRE2 = 25, IPSF=25, IPA=20

preamp feedback 100k





2.5 fC to 12.5 fC, 2.5 fC steps (one to five mips)

all process corners, T = -20 & +30

least significant postamp fb current setting - 0010

Cin = 8p, Cstray = 2p, IPRE1 = 30 IPRE2 = 25, IPSF=25, IPA=20

preamp feedback 100k



2.5 fC to 12.5 fC, 2.5 fC steps (one to five mips)

all process corners, T = -20 & +30

least significant postamp fb current setting - 0100

Cin = 8p, Cstray = 2p, IPRE1 = 30 IPRE2 = 25, IPSF=25, IPA=20

preamp feedback 100k



2.5 fC to 12.5 fC, 2.5 fC steps (one to five mips)

all process corners, T = -20 & +30

least significant postamp fb current setting - 1000

Cin = 8p, Cstray = 2p, IPRE1 = 30 IPRE2 = 25, IPSF=25, IPA=20

preamp feedback 100k



2.5 fC to 12.5 fC, 2.5 fC steps (one to five mips)

all process corners, T = -20 & +30

least significant postamp fb current setting - 1111

Cin = 8p, Cstray = 2p, IPRE1 = 30 IPRE2 = 25, IPSF=25, IPA=20

preamp feedback 100k

VDDA = 1V

#### conclusion

pulse shape robust to process and T

some tunability of postamp pulse shape achievable using feedback FET bias

# effect of IPA



2.5 fC signal (1 mip)

typical process params, T = 0 deg.

postamp fb current setting - 1000

Cin = 8p, Cstray = 2p, IPRE1 = 30 IPRE2 = 25, IPSF=25, IPA=20

IPA 10u -> 30u , 5u steps

VPLUS = VDDA/2

#### conclusion

varying IPA gives extra handle on pulse shape tunability

## noise performance vs C





#### => ~1000e achievable for target power consumption

### noise vs power

dependence on power for fixed values of Cadded

varying current in input FET  $(P_{FET} = I_{FET} \times 1.2)$ 

choose 2 input capacitance values

simulations for typical process params only, T = +30 and -20





closed symbols

Cadded = 10 pF total (2 stray + 8 sensor) <1000e for ~250uW in I/P FET for T~0

open symbols

Cadded = 15 pF total (2 stray + 13 sensor) <1000e for ~600uW in I/P FET for T~0

must add ~100uW for rest of front end + digital

## front end conclusions

preamp/postamp pre-layout design modifications now well advanced

core amplifier circuits mostly left alone

specifications met

design robust to temperature and process variations

minimal pulse shape variations

CBC2 shortcomings addressed (preamp cascode and postamp feedback)

comparator still needs looking at to achieve neutral current consumption

# now look at hips behaviour - M.Huhtinen simulations

( mn ) Integral spectrum: total prob. of pion depositing energy > E10 X5 00 µm Probability (pe bility 10 10 CMS 10-10-6 120 GeV 200 MeV 10-6 120 GeV 200 MeV 1 MIP (300µ Si) = .090 MeV 10 100 MeV = 1111 MIP 10-0.1 MeV 1 MeV 10 MeV 100 MeV MeV) 0.1 MeV 1 MeV 10 MeV 100 MeV Ε E 4.4 pC 440 fC 44 fC

Differential Energy spectrum: Probability/incident pion of depositing energy E in 300µm Si layer

spec. based on what is achievable

channel receiving 4 pC signal should be sensitive to normal signals after 2.5 usec

# hips behaviour



#### single channel response

4 pC injected at t=100ns, 2.5 fC injected at t=2.5us

preamp can't "swallow" 4 pC

=> voltage builds up at input and discharges away through feedback resistance

preamp output saturates until charge has decayed away, then returns quickly to baseline

preamp output injects signal into postamp input via 1pF coupling capacitance. +ve signal discharges slowly (postamp feedback in high resistance region) -ve signal discharges quickly (postamp feedback in low resistance region)

postamp output initially saturates -ve when preamp output recovers postamp output initially saturates +ve, recovers quickly but overshoots then recovers more slowly to baseline

back to normal sensitivity within 2.5 usec

# hips behaviour - single channel response



single channel postamp output response

4 pC injected at t=100ns, 2.5 fC injected at t=2.5us all process corners, T=- 20 and +30

longest recovery for slow N & slow P corner at T= -20

## multi-channel behaviour



# interstrip crosstalk



2.5 fC charge injected T=-20/+30 all corners nominal biases

nearest neighbour peak crosstalk ~ 5 %



**40fC** injected on centre channel at t = 100 nsec (nominal bias conditions, typical process params)

2.5 fC injected on all channels at t = 2.5 usec

(5 mips = ~13 fC)



**100fC** injected on centre channel at t = 100 nsec

2.5 fC injected on all channels at t = 2.5 usec



400fC injected on centre channel at t = 100 nsec

2.5 fC injected on all channels at t = 2.5 usec



**1pC** injected on centre channel at t = 100 nsec

2.5 fC injected on all channels at t =2.6 usec

all channels recovered by ~1.5 usec



4pC injected on centre channel at t = 100 nsec

2.5 fC injected on all channels at t = 2.6 usec

all channels recovered within ~2 usec

centre channel recovers before nn, nn+1, ~nn+2

significant deadtime for centre chan., nn, nn+1, nn+2

nn+3 etc. ~ok

## hips worst case



4pC injected on centre channel at t = 100 nsec

2.5 fC injected on all channels at t = 2.5 usec

look at worst channel nn+1

T=-20, +30, all corners

all channels recovered by 2.5 usec irrespective of sim. conditions

## hips and multi-channel simulations summary

interchannel crosstalk at ~5% level for normal signals

hips effects confined to central hit strip and some neighbours

number of neighbours depends on signal size

worst case 7 channels for 4 pC

 $\sim$  3-4 channels for 400 fC

~ negligible effect up to ~40 fC

BACKUP

beta multiplier "explained"  $\beta = \mu C_{OX}(W/L)$  [proportional to W]



upper mirror forces same current (Iref) to flow in both lower transistors

ok if  $V_{GS}(left) > V_{GS}(right)$ , which can be achieved by making right NMOS wider than left by multiplier factor K (40/10)

in weak inversion Iref =  $\underline{nU_T lnK}$  (U<sub>T</sub> = kT/q) R

=> R ~ 5M for Iref = 10nA (n ~ 1.4, K=4, U<sub>T</sub> ~ 25 mV)

see CMOS Circuit Design, Layout and Simulation (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) R. Jacob Baker, chapter 20 (particularly page 635 for weak inversion design)

## why is nearest neighbour deadtime worse than centre channel?











**CBC2** Postamp







## CBC2 postamp feedback

