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#### Abstract

A high frequency and high reliable level-up shifter is proposed. In the design, an initialize circuit, a voltage limiter and a dynamic biasing feed-back are added. In the simulation, our circuit based on $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ vertical MOSFETs shows more than $70 \%$ reduction of the overshoot voltages above $V_{D D}$ from the conventional. It achieves $164-\mathrm{MHz}$ operation frequency with 2-pF loads at $1.8-\mathrm{V}$ maximum voltage applied to the MOSFETS, which is larger than 1.6 times of the conventional frequency.


## 1. Introduction

Recently, many high-voltage tolerant level-up shifters using the thin-film MOSFETs for low $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ have been developed for high frequency-switching in the power management systems[1]. Though the circuit is comparatively fast with high $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$, the speed rapidly decreases as $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ decreases. Thus, the further speed-advanced circuit has also reported[2]. In the circuit, however, the large overshoot voltages above $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ are applied to the MOSFETs. To be overcome the problems, a new level-up shifter based on the vertical MOSFETs[3] with the dynamic biasing feed-backs is proposed. This paper describes our design and the excellent features.

## 2. Design for Overshoot Voltage reduction

Figure 1(a) and (b) show the conventional speed advanced level-up shifter[2] and our proposed one relatively. The input voltage swing between $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ and 0 V is converted to the swing between $2 \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ at $\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Qb}$. In our design, a voltage limiter VL(Fig. 1 (c)), a dynamic biasing feed-back $\operatorname{BD}\left(\right.$ Fig. 1(d)), and $\mathrm{N}_{21}, \mathrm{~N}_{2 \mathrm{r}}$ are added for the overshoot voltage reduction. INIT is initialize circuit. The overshoots arise at the output falling. Figure 2 shows the voltage waveforms in each circuit at the output falling. In the conventional, the level of Yb falls rapidly and Qb falls slow. Therefore, the large voltages(>> $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ ) are applied to the MOSFETs $\mathrm{P}_{21}, \mathrm{P}_{11}$ at Qb falling. In our circuit(Fig. 2(b)), Vgs of $\mathrm{P}_{21}$ is small enough, because of the voltage limiter. INIT, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{a} 5}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{a} 2}$ pre-charge to $\mathrm{QG}(\mathrm{QGb})$ at $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ rising. Thanks to the dynamic biasing feed-back, YGb becomes high- Z at Qb falling and the level drops momentary. Thus, Qb fall-time tf is reduced. Since Qb rapidly falls, the Vds overshoot of $P_{11}$ is suppressed. Furthermore, $N_{21}, N_{2 r}$ share the voltage drops.

## 3. Simulations

For the simulations, $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ planar MOS parameters (typical) are used. The vertical MOSFET with the large $\Phi$ (around $0.18 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) can be approximated by the planar models without the back-bias effect[3]. Using the multi-pillar body-isolated vertical MOSFETs[3-4] shown in Fig. 3(a), the turn-on current $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{b}}$ by the well-parasitic diode can be removed. Thus, JS of MOSFET models is set as zero(Fig. 3(b)). The gate width $W_{0}$ of a MOSFET pillar is set as $560 \mathrm{~nm}(\Phi=0.178 \mu \mathrm{~m})$ and number of pillar for each MOSFET is tuned for $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{ds}}$ tuning as shown in Table. I.

The relations between the maximum voltages $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{gsmax}}$, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{gdmax}}, \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dsmax}}$ of the MOSFETs and number of pillar $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{p} 2}$ (for $\mathrm{P}_{21}, \mathrm{P}_{2 \mathrm{r}}$ ) are shown in Fig. 4. The data with $3 \%$ or more overshoots are plotted. In the conventional, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{gsmax}}$ (or $\mathrm{V}_{\text {gdmax }}$ ) overshoots above $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\text {dsmax }}$ one are larager than 0.62 V , and 0.65 V respectively. The overshoots of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{gsmax}}\left(\right.$ or $\left.\mathrm{V}_{\text {gdmax }}\right)$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dsmax}}$ in our circuit are $0.08 \mathrm{~V}(>87 \%$ reduction) and $0.16 \mathrm{~V}(>75 \%$ reduction) respectively. The relations the maximum voltages to MOSFETs between and number of pillar $m_{p 1}$ (for $P_{11}, P_{1 r}$ ) are shown in Fig. 5. The conventional $\mathrm{V}_{\text {gsmax }}$ (or $\mathrm{V}_{\text {gdmax }}$ ) overshoots and $\mathrm{V}_{\text {dsmax }}$ one are larger than 0.63 V , and 0.66 V respectively. Those of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{gsmax}}\left(\right.$ or $\left.\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{gdmax}}\right)$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\text {dsmax }}$ in our circuit are $0.08 \mathrm{~V}(>87 \%$ reduction) and $0.19 \mathrm{~V}(>71 \%$ reduction) respectively. Thus, the overshoot voltages of our circuit are reduced by $70 \%$ or more from the conventional.

Figure 6 shows the output rise time tr, the fall time tf and the power consumption $\mathrm{P}_{\text {ower }}$ in the conventional and the proposed. tr of the conventional is about same as that of the proposed. When $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{p} 2}$ increases, tf of the conventional decreases. tf of the proposed is about flat to $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{p} 2}$. This reason is the main discharge-path difference; the paths of the conventional are $\mathrm{P}_{21}, \mathrm{P}_{2 \mathrm{r}}$ and those of the proposed are $\mathrm{P}_{11}, \mathrm{P}_{1 \mathrm{r}}$. In the simulations, the speed optimized $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{p} 1}$ for the conventional and our proposed are 8 and 2 relatively.

The trade-off relations between the maximum voltage $\mathrm{V}_{\text {MOSmax }}$ applied to all MOSFETs voltages and the operation frequency $f_{\text {max }}$ in the conventional and our circuit are shown in Fig. 7(a). The optimized $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{p} 1}$ for each circuit is used. $\mathrm{f}_{\text {max }}$ is calculated from tr and tf . Our circuit shows the highest frequency with the same $\mathrm{V}_{\text {MOSmax }}$, and achieves 164 MHz with $2-\mathrm{pF}$ loads and $1.8-\mathrm{V} \mathrm{V}_{\text {MOSmax }}$, which is larger than 1.6 times of the conventional[2]. The relations between the power consumption and $f_{\text {max }}$ are shown in Fig. 7(b). The reverse current to $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ is ignored. In $\mathrm{P}_{\text {ower }}-\mathrm{f}_{\text {max }}$ trade-off, our circuit is very advantageous to the conven-
tional[1] and is about same as the conventional[2].

## 4. Conclusions

The level-up shifters with applied voltage limiting is proposed. The circuit is designed using vertical MOSFET without the well-diode turn-on. In the simulations, the proposed circuit reduces the overshoot voltages above $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DD}}$ by $70 \%$ or more from the conventional, and achieves 164 MHz at $1.8-\mathrm{V}$ maximum voltages applied to MOSFETs, which is larger than 1.6 times of the conventional frequency.
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Fig. 1 Level-up shifter of conventional and proposed.


Fig. 2 Voltage waveforms at output falling.

(a) Structure[3][4]

(b) $I_{b}$ waveforms

Fig. 3 Structure and Ib of Vertical MOSFET.
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Fig. 4 Relations between $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{p} 2}$ and Maximum voltages to MOSFETs.


Fig. 5 Relations between $m_{p 1}$ and Maximum voltages to MOSFETs.


Fig. 6 Relations between $m_{p 2}, m_{p 1}$ and $t r, t f$.


Fig. 7 Trade-off relations $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {mosmax }}\right.$ vs $\mathrm{f}_{\text {max }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {ower }}$ vs $\mathrm{f}_{\text {max }}$ ).
Table. I Number of Pillars for each MOSFET's.

|  | Variables |  | Constants |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| symbole in Fig. 1 | $\mathrm{P}_{11}, \mathrm{P}_{1 \mathrm{r}}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{21}, \mathrm{P}_{2 \mathrm{r}}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{01}, \mathrm{P}_{0 \mathrm{r}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{11}, \mathrm{~N}_{1 \mathrm{r}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{21}, \mathrm{~N}_{2 \mathrm{r}}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{aj}}$ |  |  |
| $(\mathrm{j}=1,2 .)$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |\(\left.\left.) \begin{array}{c}\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{aj}} <br>

(\mathrm{j}=1,2 . .)\end{array}\right) $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { NMOS } \\
\text { in INV }\end{array}
$$\right]\)

