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#### Abstract

This brief presents an energy-efficient level shifter able to convert extremely low levels input voltages to the nominal voltage domain. To obtain low static power consumption, the proposed architecture is based on the single stage Differential Cascode Voltage Switch scheme. Moreover, it exploits selfadapting pull-up networks to increase switching speed and to reduce dynamic energy consumption, while a split input inverting buffer is used as output stage to further improve energy efficiency. When implemented in a commercial 180 nm CMOS process, the proposed design can up-convert from the deep subthreshold regime (sub- 100 mV ) to the nominal supply voltage (1.8V). For the target voltage level conversion from 0.4 V to 1.8 V , our level shifter exhibits an average propagation delay of 31.7 ns , an average static power of less than 60 pW and an energy per transition of 173 fJ , as experimentally measured across the test chips.


Index Terms-differential cascode voltage switch, level shifter, subthreshold circuit.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Multiple supply voltage (MSV) [1] technique is gaining broad popularity for the design of advanced system on chips (SoCs). The MSV approach consists of partitioning (also dynamically) the design into separate voltage domains (or "voltage islands"), each operating at a proper power supply voltage depending on its timing requirements [1]. Timecritical domains run at higher supply voltage $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}\right)$ to maximize the speed, whereas noncritical sections operate at lower supply voltage $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}\right)$ to optimize energy. In this way, elaboration tasks that require substantially different performance capabilities are effectively managed [1].

Aggressive voltage scaling into the sub/near-threshold region for sections operating at $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}$ would provide a better use of the available energy budget [2]. One of the main challenges in the design of effective MSV SoCs is the minimization of delay and energy for level conversion between different voltage domains [3]. This issue becomes

[^0]particularly critical when the number of power domains and/or the bus data width in the SoC increase.

Several level shifter (LS) circuits were recently proposed [4-18] to allow voltage conversion from the deep subthreshold regime up to the nominal supply voltage level. The LS proposed in [5] is based on the Wilson current mirror configuration. This circuit results to be fast at the expense of large standby power consumption [11], which is problematic for long period or low duty cycle applications. To manage static power issues, some modified Wilson current mirrorbased LS circuits were recently presented in [11, 14]. However, static power consumption remains considerable. Differently from current mirror configurations, LSs based on Differential Cascode Voltage Switch (DCVS) structure have close-to-zero standby power consumption, due to the presence of complementary pull-up networks (PUNs) and pull-down networks (PDNs). Unfortunately, they suffer from the current contention occurring between the PUN and PDN during the output switching, which affects both the transition time and the dynamic power. The above effects are exacerbated when a low voltage input signal has to be up-converted to a significantly higher voltage level $[6,8,12]$. One obvious way to deal with this problem is to increase the strength of the PDNs relative to PUNs. However, some works [5, 6] demonstrated that the PDN transistors need to be upsized by several orders of magnitude in order to correctly overcome the strength of PUNs for converting from sub- to above-threshold voltage levels, which is often impractical. To solve the above issue, a two stage Differential Cascode Voltage Switch (DCVS)-based LS circuit was proposed in [6]. Although, the double stage topology facilitates wide-range voltage upconversion, the conversion delay is increased with respect to a single stage DCVS-based structure. The single stage DCVSbased LSs presented in [8] and in [12] use diode-connected transistors to limit current contention at the critical discharging internal nodes during the output switching. A similar achievement is obtained in the LS circuit proposed in [10], through the use of two current generators. The design, previously proposed by one of the authors of this work [13], exploits a different idea based on self adapting PUNs to speedup both high-to-low and low-to-high transitions of critical internal nodes.

In this work, we present the design of an ultra-low voltage energy-efficient LS in 180 nm CMOS and we validate it through measurements on fabricated samples. The proposed circuit exploits improved self adapting PUNs to achieve fast and energy-efficient voltage level conversion from deep


Fig.1. The proposed level shifter.
subthreshold to nominal supply voltage domain, while a split input inverting buffer is used as output stage to reduce short circuit and stand-by energy consumption. Measurement results show that our design can up-convert from 50 mV to the nominal voltage of 1.8 V . For a 0.4 V input pulse, an average propagation delay of about 32 ns was measured across the test chips with stand-by power consumption smaller than 60 pW .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II describes the proposed LS design and provides a simulationbased comparative analysis. Section III presents the measurement results compared with previously published competitors. Finally, conclusions are given in Section IV.

## II. Proposed Level Shifter and Simulation-based Comparison

## A. Proposed design

As shown in Fig.1, our design consists of an input inverter to provide differential low-voltage signals, a modified DCVSbased conversion stage, which is responsible of the voltage shifting operation and an inverting buffer designed to assure adequate output driving strength. The key improvements with respect to the conventional DCVS-based structure are highlighted in Fig.1. Two p-MOS diodes [4] (i.e. MP1 and MP2), acting as current limiters, are used to mitigate the current contention at the beginning of NH or $N L$ discharging transition. The output buffer is driven in a split way [9] by NH and $N H H$ nodes, whose voltage values differ from the voltage drop ( $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{D}}$ ) on MP1. This ensures that one of the devices (either the pull-up or the pull-down transistor) in the output inverter is completely turned OFF when the other turns ON. In this way, the short circuit current in the output buffer is significantly reduced with respect to the option used in [4, 8, 12, 13], while the output switching speed is also improved. To further improve the charge and the discharge operations of the critical internal node, self-adapting PUNs able to dynamically adjust their strengths depending on the occurring output transition, were considered for the two branches of the conversion stage. For this purpose two pull-up boost circuits were introduced in parallel to the pull-up devices (i.e. MP3 and MP4) of the conventional DCVS structure.
Fig. 2 better illustrates the behavior of the proposed LS with


Fig.2. Simulated transient behavior of the proposed level shifter.
TABLE I
TRANSISTOR SIZES

| Transistor | W/L[ $\boldsymbol{\mu \mathrm { m } ]}$ | Transistor | W/L[ $\boldsymbol{\mu \mathrm { m } ]}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MN1 | $0.24 / 0.18$ | MP4 | $0.24 / 0.2$ |
| MN2 | $0.24 / 0.18$ | MP5 | $0.24 / 0.18$ |
| MN3 | $0.24 / 0.18$ | MP6 | $0.24 / 0.18$ |
| MP1 | $0.24 / 0.18$ | MP7 | $0.24 / 0.18$ |
| MP2 | $0.24 / 0.18$ | MP8 | $0.24 / 0.18$ |
| MP3 | $0.24 / 0.2$ | MP9 | $0.36 / 0.18$ |

reference to the voltage up-conversion of an input voltage pulse amplitude from 150 mV to 1.8 V . When the input signal $A$ is low, the voltage on node $N H$ is high $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}-\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{MPI}}\right)$ and the voltage on node $N L$ is low ( 0 V ). A low-to-high (high-tolow) input signal $A(A N)$ transition causes $M N 1$ (MN2) to be switched ON (OFF) and, consequently the $N H$ node starts to be discharged. This operation is in a first phase greatly favored by the current-limiting action of MP1 and by the presence of $M P 2$ which forms a voltage divider to keep the node $N L L$ at a voltage higher than $G N D$. In this way, $\left|\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{GS}}\right|$ of $M P 3$ is reduced and the pull-up of the left branch is weakened to allow faster discharging of node $N H$. As $N H$ discharges through $M N 1$, the pull-up boost of right branch turns ON (i.e. the pull-up of the right branch is strengthened), thus leading the $N L L$ node to be fast charged towards the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}-\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{MP} 7}$ voltage. As a consequence, a positive feedback is triggered causing MP3 to be completely turned OFF and NH to be fully discharged. At the same time the pull-up boost of the right branch turns OFF (i.e. the MP7 diode becomes OFF) and NLL is raised to $V_{D D H}$ through MP4. In this way, the voltage levels of the internal nodes are established to assure fast switching and reduced energy consumption in the subsequent input transition (i.e. the pull-up of the right branch is now weakened due to the reduced $\left|\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{GS}}\right|$ of MP4). The proposed LS was designed for the 180 nm UMC CMOS technology and sized as reported in Table I.
Although the multi-threshold CMOS technique [12-13] can be exploited to emphasize the operating characteristics of the proposed LS, in our design, we used only regular threshold (RVT) devices to better evaluate advantages offered by the


Fig.3. Delay-Energy characteristics versus $V_{\text {DDL }}\left(@ V_{\text {DDH }}=1.8 \mathrm{~V}\right.$, Freq. 100 kHz ) evaluated for different process-temperature corners.
circuit topology without any interference from the $\mathrm{V}_{\text {th }}$ of the devices.

## B. Comparative Simulation-based Analysis

In order to demonstrate the benefits of the proposed design, we performed a comparative analysis with three among the most efficient and recent LS proposals [10-12]. For the sake of fair comparison, we replicated the above designs in the considered CMOS process, while imposing a transistor length of 180 nm and maintaining the same W/L ratios indicated in the referenced papers. Also, all the compared circuits use only RVT devices.
Fig. 3 compares delay and energy per transition results for input voltage levels ranging from 0.2 V to 0.6 V . Simulations were performed for three Process-Temperature (PT) corners, considering an input signal frequency of $100 \mathrm{kHz}, \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}$ fixed to 1.8 V and an output load of 20 minimum-sized inverters. The typical PT corner involves both typical n/p-MOS transistors and a temperature of $27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The second corner was determined by considering the worst case operating condition occurring when the input signal has sub-threshold voltage levels. In such a condition, the weakly driven n-MOS transistors (i.e. MN1 and MN2) have to overcome the opposing p-MOS devices (i.e. MP3 and MP4) to enable output switching. Thus, slow n-MOS and fast p-MOS devices are used, while a temperature of $-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was considered because it implies a weaker operation for $M N 1$ and $M N 2$. As opposite PT corner, fast n-MOS, slow p-MOS and a temperature of $125^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ were taken into account.


Fig.4. Monte Carlo comparison on 4000 runs $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}=0.3 \mathrm{~V}, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}=1.8 \mathrm{~V}\right.$, Freq. $100 \mathrm{kHz}, \mathrm{T}=27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ )


Fig.5. Micrograph of the testing chip and layout of the proposed level shifter.
From results given in Fig.3, the LS in [12] fails to operate properly in the worst case PT corner with $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}=0.2 \mathrm{~V}$. Both our design and the LS topology proposed in [10] lead to the smaller propagation delay in the sub/near-threshold regions $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}} \approx 0.32 \mathrm{~V}\right.$ for TT process corner at $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DS}}=1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ and $\left.\mathrm{T}=27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, while the proposed solution has proved to be always the most efficient in terms of energy consumption.
To investigate the robustness of the proposed LS against device mismatch, we have performed a 4000 -points Monte Carlo (MC) simulation. The related results are shown in Fig. 4. The normalized standard deviations ( $\sigma / \mu$ ) of the delay and of the energy consumption are 0.21 and 0.26 , respectively. Such values are comparable to those obtained for the previous proposed circuits [10-12]. However, as can be easily observed in Fig.4, our design still remains the preferable choice due to the significantly reduced mean energy and competitive mean delay, coming from the use of self-adapting PUNs.

## III. Measurement Results and Discussion

Fig. 5 shows the layout view of the proposed LS, which has been designed exploiting only metal-1\&2 wires and following the double-cell-height strategy suggested in [18]. Power supplies are available through the top and the bottom metal-1


Fig.6. $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}, \min$ measurements: a) Distribution of minimum $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}$ for successful up-conversion to 1.8 V ; b) Measured waveform for a 50 mV to 1.8 V conversion.
rails, while a shared metal-1 ground rail crosses the cell in the center. We fabricated a proof-of-concept chip using the 0.18 $\mu \mathrm{m}$, 1-poly, 6-metal UMC CMOS process. In such technology, the physical design of the proposed LS occupies a silicon area of only $108.8 \mu \mathrm{~m}^{2}(11.7 \mu \mathrm{~m} * 9.3 \mu \mathrm{~m})$.
Static measurements have been performed on a set of ten samples at wafer level. In particular, the static current was measured by means of the Keithley 4200-SCS parameter analyzer equipped with source measure units with preamplifiers, which extend the current range to 0.1 fA resolution. On the other hand, a custom printed circuit board was fabricated for measuring the dynamic response of our LS. Dynamic measurements were performed on four packaged samples by stimulating the device under test through a RF waveform generator and using an active broadband probe connected to a $10 \mathrm{GSa} / \mathrm{s}$ Rohde \& Schwarz RTO1044 digital oscilloscope. High bandwidth (DC-18 GHz) SMA-type cables were used for these experiments.
Fig. 6a shows the distribution of the measured minimum $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}$ for successful up-conversion to 1.8 V . The minimum up-convertible voltage level can be as low as 50 mV , while the worst case is 170 mV among the 10 characterized chips. Fig. 6 b shows the measured up conversion to 1.8 V for the best case 50 mV input pulse waveform.
Fig. 7 illustrates the typical static power results evaluated for $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}=1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}$ ranging from 0.1 V to 0.6 V . For $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}$ larger than 0.2 V the standby power consumption saturates to about 60 pW , thus demonstrating the suitability of the proposed LS also for long period or low duty cycle applications. By observing the insert of Fig. 7, it can be noted that the very low standby power consumption has been achieved with a normalized variation $(\sigma / \mu)$ lower than $20 \%$.

Fig. 8 illustrates measurement results of the mean propagation delay for different $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}$. In this plot, error bars are also reported as a measure of the uncertainty in delay measurements. The worst case delay is $49 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ when the input


Fig.7. Measured static power versus $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}$.


Fig.8. Measured delay versus $V_{\text {DDL }}$.


Fig.9. Measured delay versus $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}$.
supply is 100 mV , whereas at $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}=0.6 \mathrm{~V}$ the LS delay decreases down to 3.5 ns . The measurement results given in Fig. 8 also show that the delay of our circuit is within the range predicted by the process variability evaluated using post-layout simulations.
Fig. 9 shows the measured average delay for different $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}$ and for $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}}=0.3 \mathrm{~V}$. In addition to the measured absolute delay values, the FO4 delay is also plotted (the unit-FO4 delay was obtained by simulations for $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}=0.3 \mathrm{~V}$ and $\mathrm{T}=27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). As $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}$ increases, the delay decreases mainly due to the decrease of the output inverting buffer delay.
Table II compares the proposed circuit with several state-of-the-art ultra-low-voltage LSs. The table is divided into two sections: the first one refers to measurements on the fabricated prototypes, while the second section is related to the comparison with only simulated previously proposed circuits. The LS proposed in [7] and fabricated using a $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ process exhibits relatively low standby power consumption at the expense of very long delay and high energy per transition.
Among the LSs realized in the $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ technology node, the one presented in [4] results to be the most energy hungry. On

TABLE II
Comparison with State-of-The-Art Ultra Low Voltage Level shifters

| Design | Tech. | Conversion range | Delay <br> (ns) | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{tr}}$ <br> (fJ) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{S}} \\ (\mathrm{pW}) \end{gathered}$ | Area ( $\mu \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | Results |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [7] | $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 0.23V - 3 V | $10^{4}(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~V})$ | $5.8 * 10^{3}(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~V}-10 \mathrm{kHz})$ | 230 (0.4V) | 1880 | Meas. |
| [4] | $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.13 \mathrm{~V}-1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ | $45(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | $\approx 2 * 10^{3}(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}-100 \mathrm{kHz})$ | N.A. | N.A. | Meas. |
| [14] | $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 0.21V-1.8V | $\approx 167(0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | $39(0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}-100 \mathrm{kHz})$ | 160 (0.3V) | 153.01 | Meas. |
| this work | $0.18 \mathrm{\mu m}$ | 0.1V-1.8V | 31.7 (0.4V $\rightarrow \mathbf{1 . 8 V}$ ) | $173{ }^{\#}(\mathbf{0 . 4 V} \rightarrow \mathbf{1 . 8 V - 1 0 0 ~ k H z )}$ | 55 (0.4V) | 108.8 | Meas. |
| [6] | $0.13 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.18 \mathrm{~V}-1.2 \mathrm{~V}$ | $\approx 25(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V})$ | N.A. | N.A. | $\approx 96$ | Meas. |
| [9] | $0.13 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.25 \mathrm{~V}-2.5 \mathrm{~V}$ | 58.8 (0.3V $\rightarrow 2.5 \mathrm{~V})$ | 191 (0.3V $\rightarrow 2.5 \mathrm{~V}-\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. | 724 (0.3V) | 71.94 | Meas. |
| [11] | 65 nm | $0.165 \mathrm{~V}-1.2 \mathrm{~V}$ | $<162^{\text {III }}$ ( $0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V}$ ) | $136^{\text {\#\#I }}(0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V}-20 \mathrm{kHz})$ | N.A. | 16.8 | Meas. |
| [12] | 65 nm | $0.14 \mathrm{~V}-1.2 \mathrm{~V}$ | $25(0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V})$ | 30.7 ( $0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V}-1 \mathrm{MHz}$ ) | 2500 (0.3V) | 17.6 | Meas. |
| [11]^ | $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 0.1V-1.8V | $38(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | 544 (0.4V $\rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}-100 \mathrm{kHz})$ | 866 (0.4V) | N.A. | Sim. |
| [12]^ | $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.2 \mathrm{~V}-1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ | $30(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | 350 (0.4V $\rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}-100 \mathrm{kHz})$ | 1920 (0.4V) | N.A. | Sim. |
| [10] | $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.1 \mathrm{~V}-1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ | $\approx 30(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | $\approx 250$ (0.4V $\rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}-1 \mathrm{MHZ})$ | 130 (0.4V) | 120.9 | Sim. |
| [15] | $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.19 \mathrm{~V}-1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ | 21.6 (0.4V $\rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | 390 (0.4V $\rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}-100 \mathrm{kHz}$ ) | 160 (0.4V) | 95.6 | Sim. |
| [16] | $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.32 \mathrm{~V}-1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ | $31(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | 680 (0.4V $\rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}-1 \mathrm{MHZ}$ ) | 1160 (0.4V) | N.A. | Sim. |

"mean on 1000 -run MC post layout simulation ${ }^{\text {\#\# }}$ data reported in [14] ^ replicated in this work
the other hand, the design proposed in [14] exhibits the lowest energy consumed per transition at expense of a minimum upconvertible $\mathrm{V}_{\text {DDL }}$ of only 0.21 V .
As shown above, the proposed circuit reliably extends the operating voltage conversion range down to 0.1 V , while consuming 2.6 times less static power than the circuit proposed in [14] and decreasing the silicon area of about $30 \%$. Fabricated circuits in more advanced technology nodes are not directly comparable with our proposal. However, as specified in Section II, the two most recent LSs [11, 12] were replicated in the adopted $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ CMOS process. To further extend our comparison analysis, three additional recent proposals [10, 15, 16], designed with the same technology node and evaluated for the same operating conditions, were also considered.
From results of the second portion in Table II, it can be observed that the LS, proposed by Matsuzuka et al. [15], represents the fastest solution. From simulated delay ( 25.5 ns ) reported in Section II, the proposed LS is about $18 \%$ slower but it results extremely competitive exhibiting a power consumption (both static and dynamic) by far lower than that of all its counterparts as well as the widest conversion range.

## IV. Conclusion

In this brief, we presented an energy-efficient DCVS-based level shifter which can up-convert from the deep subthreshold regime to the nominal supply voltage of 1.8 V . The proposed design was fabricated in the 180 nm UMC technology process and validated through experimental measurements. Obtained results demonstrate that the proposed circuit can convert an input signal as low as 96 mV (on average) to 1.8 V . Moreover, when converting a 400 mV input to 1.8 V , it exhibits average propagation delay of 31.7 ns and energy per transition of 173 fJ. This is obtained while consuming an average static power of less than 60 pW and occupying only $108.8 \mu^{2}$.
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