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Overview

- Single-bit vs. multi-bit modulator
- Dual quantization
- Dynamic element matching (DEM)
- Digital correction

Single-bit vs. multi-bit

High SNR with single-bit ΔΣ → high-order modulators (however, stability issues) and/or high OSR

High OSR, and bandwidth of the op-amps that must be higher than clock frequency → ok for audio or instrumentation applications (in general, for "low frequency" applications)

Usable $V_{ref}$ with single-bit is a small fraction of the supply voltage, since the swing at the op-amp outputs is rather large – assume that the dynamic range at the op-amp output is $\alpha V_{swing}$, and that a -6dBFS input gives rise to a swing of $\pm \beta V_{swing} V_{ref}$ at the output of the first integrator → the maximum $V_{ref}$ is then given by

$$|V_{ref}| < \frac{\alpha V_{ref}}{2\beta_{swing}}$$

For low supply voltages, $\alpha$ may be only 0.7, and $\beta_{swing,slewrate} = 2$ →

$$|V_{ref}| = 0.175V_{DD}$$

Single-bit vs. multi-bit – II

Such a low value of $V_{ref}$ is problematic, because of the constraints on the $kT/C$ noise (if DT modulator) and op-amp thermal noise ($\gamma kT/C_L$), especially for the first op-amp → 1-bit quantization is easier with medium-high supply voltages

Slew-rate issue → input of first integrator is the difference between analog input and DAC output; the DAC output follows the input with an accuracy dependent on the DAC resolution (and input bandwidth) → reasonable to assume that the maximum difference is $2\Delta$ → if 1-bit, this becomes $2V_{ref}$, either very high SR, or low $V_{ref}$ → with multi-bit, integrator input is reduced by the number of quantization levels

Multi-bit → additional power in ADC

On the other hand, the resolution of a modulator can be increased by increasing the OSR → optimal use of power entails a trade-off between increased speed in op-amps (if higher OSR) and more comparators in quantizer (if more quantizer bits)
Single-bit vs. multi-bit – III

Rule-of-thumb: very roughly, the power used by a comparator is 1/20 of that used by an op-amp, operated at the same speed.

More comparators also means more complexity, multi-bit digital signal processing in the decimator filter, and extra logic for digital calibration and dynamic element matching (if needed).

Typically, 3 to 15 comparators are used (i.e., up to 4 quantizer bits).

Multi-bit DAC → usually implemented as a capacitive MDAC in a DT modulator.

Multi-bit quantizers – many advantages

1) $q$-error reduced by 6dB for every added bit of resolution → SQNR increased by same amount, and decimation/reconstruction filters easier to implement (less q-noise → less filtering needed).

2) Feedback loops becomes more linear → stability is more robust, performance closer to what linear analysis predicts.

3) Improved stability → NTF can be chosen more aggressively → higher SQNR; also, larger input signals can be allowed (again, higher SQNR) – example: in a 5th-order single-bit modulator, stability considerations limit the SQNR to 60dB with OSR=16; with a 4-bit quantizer, lower q-noise and higher input signal yield SQNR=120dB!

4) DAC output changes less from sample to sample → slew rate of opamps can be reduced → power saving.

5) Difference between input signal and DAC signals is smaller → linearity requirement on input stage of the loop can be relaxed.

6) In CT modulators, lower sensitivity to clock jitter.

Improved linearity

Instantaneous gain $k$ of the multi-bit quantizer is

$$ k(n) = \frac{v(n)}{y(n)} = \frac{v(n) + e(n)}{y(n)} = 1 + \frac{e(n)}{y(n)} $$

Gain deviation from nominal value of 1 is at most $\frac{\Delta}{y(n)}$, where $\Delta$ is the LSB of the quantizer.

Deviation is large for small $y$, which cannot overload the quantizer, and small for large $y$, where instability is most likely to occur. By contrast, in single-bit quantizers the instantaneous gain is $1/y(n)$, which can take any value and tends to 0 (instead of 1) for a large $y$, and we have seen that a small $k$ is likely to result in instability for higher-order loops.

Multi-bit modulator – one major drawback

The multi-bit DAC is located on the feedback path → any error $e_D$ in the DAC response is injected at the modulator input, and appears at the output without any shaping! This is the single (but momentous) disadvantage of the multi-bit approach.

Of special concern is the fact that any distortion on the DAC signals results in a distorted output → for an N-bit modulator linearity, the DAC needs to be at least N-bit linear → DAC linearity is at most 12-bit without trimming → other methods are needed to achieve a higher linearity (needed in e.g. audio applications) → these methods are:

1) dual quantization    2) mismatch shaping    3) digital correction.
1) – Dual quantization – I

Single-bit quantizer/DAC for outer feedback loop (error not shaped), and multi-bit for the inner loops (shaped error) → modulator with two or more digital outputs, combined in a way that the large q-error of the single-bit quantizer is cancelled.

Simplest example of this approach: Leslie-Singh modulator

![Diagram of Leslie-Singh modulator](image)

Single-bit quantizer is linear, and the large q-error is converted by the multi-bit ADC in digital form and cancelled at the output with suitable expression for $H_1$ and $H_2$.

2) – Dynamic element matching (DEM)

DAC components are made equal on average in the time domain! e.g. below: $I_{\text{ref}}$ is split into two equal currents $I_1$ and $I_2$ by $M_1$ and $M_2$, and $R_1$ and $R_2$ improve matching by reducing the impact of the MOS threshold mismatch – however, resistor mismatch impacts as well → the four switches multiply $I_{\text{ref}}$ on average 50% of the time with $+1$, and 50% with $-1$ with a pseudo-random sequence → mismatch becomes noise-like, and noise shaping improves further the technique.

![Diagram of Dynamic Element Matching](image)
DEM – example with Nyquist DAC

7-b DAC, binary weighted elements with current splitting as in previous slide, matching with large variance to make impact more clear → DEM reduces the tones due to INL, but these tones are turned into noise → DEM increases the noise floor, as is clear from the simulations below.

---

Randomization

Control of DEM in DACs with thermometric selection of unit elements can be problematic → typically, randomization as below: randomizer receives N thermometric 1s out of M input lines, and generates a scrambled set of M controls, N of which are 1s – the number of possible scrambled outputs is M! → huge number: 5040 for M=7, and 3.628.800 for M=10 → however, this is an overkill; it is enough to avoid frequent repetitions of the same (or similar) code.

---

Butterfly randomization

A simple solution is to use an M-port barrel shifter which rotates one increment every clock – more effective is the butterfly randomizer → the use of log2 M stages (see below) ensures that any input can be connected to any output – more stages increase the number of possible connections – the control of the butterfly switches can use log2 M bits from a k-bit random number generator, or, more simply, by the successive frequency division by 2 of the clock (clocked averaging).

If the value of the M elements in the set is Xᵢ, their average is \( \bar{X} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} Xᵢ \), while the addition of N random elements yields

\[
Y(N) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} dᵢ Xᵢ
\]

where \( dᵢ \) is 1 if \( Xᵢ \) is selected → the error on Y is given by

\[
eᵦ(N) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} dᵢ Xᵢ - N\bar{X}
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{M} dᵢ Xᵢ - \frac{N}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} Xᵢ
\]

Therefore, if all amplitudes are equally probable, the mismatch noise power is

\[
P_{\text{mismatch}} = \frac{M}{6} \bar{X}^2 \sigmaᵦ^2
\]

---

Randomization and noise

Assume that \( Xᵢ = \bar{X} + \delta Xᵢ \), that the variance of \( \delta Xᵢ \) is \( \bar{X} \sigmaᵦ^2 \), and that the various \( \delta Xᵢ \) are uncorrelated with each other → the variance of the error becomes

\[
\sigmaᵦ^2 = E\{eᵦ^2(N)\} = \left( \frac{N}{M} \right) \bar{X} \sigmaᵦ^2
\]

→ dependent on input amplitude, zero for N=0 or N=M, and maximum for N=M/2.

Mismatch in space is transformed into mismatch in time → if randomizer works properly, trades discrete tones with additional white noise.

---
Randomization and noise – II

The peak-to-peak amplitude of the output signal is \( M \frac{X}{2} \) the power of a full-scale sine wave is \( M^2 \frac{X^2}{8} \) the SNR determined only by the mismatch error and OSR becomes

\[
\text{SNR} = \frac{3M}{4\sigma_x^2} \text{OSR}
\]

If \( M=8 \), OSR=1 (Nyquist-rate converter), and \( \sigma_x = 2 \times 10^{-3} \) \( \Rightarrow \text{SNR}=62\text{dB} \)

If \( M=8 \), OSR=32, and \( \sigma_x = 2 \times 10^{-3} \) \( \Rightarrow \text{SNR}=77\text{dB} \)

The white-noise assumption depends on how effective the randomizer is – with \( b \) butterfly stages, the clocked averaging repeats the same pattern every \( 2^b \) clock periods, introducing tones at \( f_s/2^b \)

– a pseudo-random number generator requires more hardware, but is more effective, especially when \( b \) is low

Example 8.2

2nd-order 3-bit \( \Delta \Sigma \) with OSR=20 and 0.5% random mismatch in the 8 DAC elements \( \Rightarrow \) ideally, SNR=69dB with input = -2dB\(_{FS}\)

top: mismatches introduce non-linearities \( \Rightarrow \) tones clearly visible above the noise floor \( \Rightarrow \) SFDR=60dB (unfiltered)

bottom: butterfly randomizer \( \Rightarrow \) tones are actually still present, but pushed higher up in frequency, where they are below the noise floor – however, the noise floor in the signal band has clearly increased \( \Rightarrow \) SNR=SNDR is approx. 60dB (instead of 69B)

Randomization and noise – III

Randomization turns tones into white-like noise – however, the total error power caused by mismatches is not reduced \( \Rightarrow \) for Nyquist-rate converters, the SNDR remains almost constant, while the SFDR improves - for oversampled converters, the SNR improves, but only by 3dB for an OSR doubling, as in plain oversampled architectures

In \( \Delta \Sigma \) converters, on the other hand, it would be very advantageous to shape the mismatch noise towards higher frequencies, where it can be filtered off together with quantization noise

Basically, the approach to mismatch noise shaping is to use all the elements in the array in fast cycles, as this gives rise to high-frequency noise terms

Individual level averaging (ILA)

The goal is to use each of the M elements with equal probability for each digital input code – use of indexes \( I_k(i) \), where \( k = \text{input code} \), and \( i = \text{time} \) – the elements used when \( k \) is applied are those indexed by \( I_k(i), I_k(i)+1, \ldots, I_k(i)+k-1 \) (with wrap-around when this exceeds M)

Rotation approach \( \Rightarrow I_k \) is increased by 1 every time code \( k \) is used – below, we see indexes and elements used with the input sequence \( \{ 5 6 3 5 2 3 6 5 5 \} \) (all indexes start with value 1) – right: busy elements, good spreading of mismatches into white-like noise
ILA – II

Addition approach → \( I_k \) is increased by \( k \) (modulo \( M \)) every time the code \( k \) is used – below, we see indexes and elements used with the input sequence \( \{5 \ 6 \ 3 \ 5 \ 2 \ 3 \ 6 \ 5 \ 5\} \)

All elements are even more busy than with the rotation approach – however, the effectiveness of the methods should be assessed via extensive computer simulations

Example 8.3

2nd order 3-bit \( \Delta \Sigma \) with OSR=64 → with input at -6dBFS, we have ideally:

\[ SNDR = -6 + \left( 6.02 \cdot 3 + 1.76 - 12.9 + 15.05 \cdot \log_2 (OSR) \right) = 91\text{dB} \]

\( \Rightarrow \) a 0.2\% mismatch results in more noise and discrete tones, with an SNDR=75dB (i.e., a deterioration as large as 20dB)

Next slide → both ILA methods remove the tones – however, the rotation methods achieves an SNDR of 84dB, while the addition method is more effective in shaping the noise, and yields SNDR=87dB

Data weighted averaging (DWA)

Uses only 1 index, updated by adding the new input code to its content → very fast, changes at every clock period – the same sequence \( \{5 \ 6 \ 3 \ 5 \ 2 \ 3 \ 6 \ 5 \ 5\} \) results in the indexing and element usage as below – very busy – both ILA and DWA perform noise shaping; however: simulations suggest that ILA is better for a small \( M \), while DWA is better for \( M > 7 \)

In practice, DWA is by far the commonest DEM method used today
Example 8.4

2\textsuperscript{nd} order 3-bit \(\Sigma\Delta\) with OSR=64, \(f_s=20\text{MHz}\) \(\rightarrow\) \(f_b=156\text{kHz}\) \(\rightarrow\) with input at -6\text{dBFS} and 0.4% mismatch, Butterfly randomization results in a flat spectrum up to 400kHz \(\rightarrow\) very significant spectrum degradation \(\rightarrow\) SNR=70dB

Example 8.4 – II

DWA \(\rightarrow\) mismatch noise is 1\textsuperscript{st}-order shaped \(\rightarrow\) 20dB/dec slope also in the signal band \(\rightarrow\) no degradation of the SNR with respect to the ideal case with SNR=91dB! (compare the plots below with previous simulations referring to the same ideal converter)

3) – Digital correction

Dual quantization and DEM rely on oversampling and noise shaping \(\rightarrow\) less effective when OSR = 8 or lower – digital correction is in this case more powerful

Below: “digital correction” is a RAM storing the accurate digital equivalent of the actual output values \(v'(n)\) of the N-bit DAC for all possible input codes \(v(n)\)

Spectrum of \(u(n)\) is very close to the in-band spectrum of the DAC output \(v'(n)\) (exactly true with infinite loop gain) \(\rightarrow\) \(u(n)\) and \(w(n)\) have very similar in-band spectra \([i.e., u(n)=v'(v(n)) \rightarrow w(n)=v'(v(n)) \rightarrow w(n)=u(n)]\)

Acquisition phase

At power up: an N-bit counter generates all input codes of the DAC, each code being held for at least \(2^M\) clock periods, with \(M\) the required linearity of the modulator (in bits) – during this time the DAC output is fed as input to a single-bit (hence very linear) modulator having a digitally filtered output – the resulting code is the desired DAC output equivalent, and is stored in the RAM

A more efficient approach is to store only the errors in the RAM
Example

DAC linearity = 10.5 bits → SFDR of 63dB and increased noise floor.
The corrected signal at the RAM output has a 20dB lower noise floor, and an SFDR of some 105dB!

ΔΣ DACs with digital correction

The RAM contains again the accurate digital replicas of the actual DAC output levels → as with the previous ADC, the spectrum of x(n) is very close to the in-band spectrum of the RAM output → x(n) and DAC output have very similar in-band spectra.

Background calibration

Power-up calibration cannot correct changes (such as thermal drift) occurring during operation → background calibration is more robust.

Correlation algorithms are very popular, and growing still.

Below: v(n) is thermometer-coded, and its bits are scrambled pseudo-randomly → as we have seen, this reduces the correlation of b(n) with all other signal in the system, especially u(n) and q(n) → the DAC errors are estimated from the correlation between b(n) and v(n).

Background calibration

If ETF is the transfer function of the DAC error to the output, we have

\[ v(n) = [u * stf](n) + [q * ntf](n) + [e * ETF](n) \]

Again, only the deviation \( d_i \) of the unit element \( u_i \) from the average value of the DAC component is important (notice that here \( d_i \) is the deviation, while in Maloberti’s book is a digital 1) → the DAC error is

\[ e(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} d_i \cdot b_i(n) \]
Background calibration

Estimate of $i$th DAC error $d_i$ → from the expected value of $v(n) \cdot b_i'(n)$, where

$$b_i'(n) = [b_i \ast \text{eff}](n)$$

Calling $u'(n) = [u \ast \text{stf}](n)$ and $q'(n) = [q \ast \text{ntf}](n)$, we obtain

$$E\{v(n) \cdot b_i'(n)\} = E\{u'(n) \cdot b_i'(n)\} + E\{q'(n) \cdot b_i'(n)\} + E\{e'(n) \cdot b_i'(n)\}$$

Assuming that $u$, $q$, and $b_i$ have zero mean, and that $v(n)$ is uncorrelated with $u$ and $q$, the first two terms will be zero; assuming also that each $b_i$ is uncorrelated to all other $b_j$, the last term simplifies to

$$E\{e'(n) \cdot b_i'(n)\} = E\{d \cdot b_i(n) \ast \text{eff}(n)\} \cdot [b_i(n) \ast \text{eff}(n)]$$

$$= E\{d \cdot b_i(n) \ast \text{eff}(n)\} \cdot [b_i(n) \ast \text{eff}(n)] = d \cdot E\{b_i(n)\}$$

The result from which we obtain

$$d_i = \frac{E\{v(n) \cdot b_i'(n)\}}{E\{b_i'(n)\}}$$

Thus, $d_i$ can be found by accumulating the two products, and taking their ratio – this is performed by the correlator block, and the operation is referred to as correlation. $d_i$ is stored in a RAM, periodically updated, and used to correct $v(n)$ by subtracting the expected error $e'(n)$ due to the DAC.

Unfortunately, it is not really true that all $b_i$ are uncorrelated to all other sequences, and that all sequences have zero mean → large residual error → nevertheless, more advanced approaches can greatly reduce the harmful correlations and detect the desired one.

Results can therefore be excellent → here, 2-0 MASH, OSR=4, 32-unit DAC → below: ideal DAC and DAC with 0.1% random element errors, with and without digital correction

In-band SNDR = 102.6dB for ideal modulator, 76.2dB for the non-ideal non-corrected, and 101.5dB for the non-ideal corrected (after $2^{17}$ clock cycles needed by the algorithm)