Anuranjan Jha anu@cisl.columbia.edu Columbia Integrated Systems Lab. Columbia University, New York 10027 Last revised: November 15, 2005

HOW TO SIMULATE MIXER NOISE?

Case A: 50 Ω *source with a resistive load*

Consider a very simple mixer as shown in the figure below. There is an RF source at 2.45 GHz with an amplitude of 100 mV. The switch is ideal and is driven by a sinusoidal LO of frequency 2.5 GHz. The source impedance is 50 Ω and the load is R_{load} . For simpler calculation, the load resistance is modeled as a noiseless *voltage controlled current source*.



Fig. 1. Setup

First find the small signal voltage conversion gain (CVG) from RF input to the IF output.

$$V_{out} = \frac{R_l}{R_s + R_l} V_{RF}, \quad \text{When } V_{LO} \text{ is high}$$

$$V_{out} = 0, \quad \text{When } V_{LO} \text{ is low, } V_{out} \text{ discharges through } R_2$$

$$V_{out} = \frac{R_l}{R_s + R_l} A_{RF} \cos(\omega_{RF} t) \operatorname{sq}_{1,0}(t)$$

$$V_{out} = \frac{R_l}{R_s + R_l} A_{RF} \cos(\omega_{RF} t) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi} \left(\cos(\omega_{LO} t) - \frac{1}{3} \cos(3\omega_{LO} t) + \ldots \right) \right\}$$

IF component,

$$V_{out} = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{R_l}{R_s + R_l} A_{RF} \cos((\omega_{LO} - \omega_{RF})t)$$

So,
$$CVG = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{R_l}{R_s + R_l}$$

If in place of V_{rf} , we had a **white noise** $(\overline{V_{in}^2} = 4kTR_s\Delta f)$ source due to the resistance R_s then at the IF output we would get output noise $\overline{V_{on}^2}$ given by (see Appendix),

$$\overline{V_{on}^2} = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \frac{R_l}{R_s + R_l} \right\}^2 4kTR_s \Delta f$$

The noise calculated above is *Single Sideband*. This is so because the input RF signal is *single-sideband*, since we only considered the case where $\omega_{LO} - \omega_{RF} = \omega_{IF}$.

R_l	CVG (calc.)	Output (siml.)	CVG (siml.)	IF-noise (calc.)	IF-noise (siml.)
$1 \text{ k}\Omega$	-10.37 dBV	-30.45 dBV	-10.45 dBV	-187.264 dB	-188.2 dB
100 Ω	-13.62 dBV	$-33.62 \mathrm{dBV}$	-13.47 dBV	-190.36 dB	-191.38 dB

For an input level of 100 mV (-20 dB) and $R_s = 50 \Omega$, simulation¹ gave:

Fig. 2 shows simulation results for $R_l = 100 \ \Omega$.



Fig. 2. Results for $R_l = 100 \ \Omega$ case.

The entries in the *pss* and *pnoise* analysis form look like as shown below.

If the RF signal is sufficiently small then *pxf/pac* can be used to find the small signal transfer function/gain from RF to the output in the presence of LO.

Notice that in the pnoise setup, sweep type is relative. If the relative harmonic is x and the reference sideband is y. Then the noise is calculated for (100 kHz to 10 GHz) + $(x+y) \times 50$ MHz. If x is 0 and the reference sideband is 1, then relative sweep type would mean that the noise is calculated for (100 kHz to 10 GHz) + 1×50 MHz. Similarly for reference sideband = -1, the noise is simulated for (100 kHz to 10 GHz) + $(-1) \times 50$ MHz.

¹All the simulations were done using TSMC018_teaching.scs model card.

~	Cancel	Defaults a	Apply		Help	ОК	Cancel	Defaults	Apply		H
		Periodic S	teady Stat	te Analysis	-			Perio	dic Noise Analy	sis	
Fund	amental	Tones				PSS 8	leat Freq	uency (Hz) 5M		
Na	ame	Expr	Value	Signal	SrcId				1		
L(ri) E	2.56 2.456	2.56 2.456	Large Large	V1 V2	Swe	eptype uency Sv	relative veep Rang	Relative e (Hz)	Harmonic	0
Г		Ľ		Large		Sta	art-Stop	- St	art 100e3	Stop	100e9 <u></u>
0	lear/Add	Delete	Upd	late From Sch	ematic	Swe	ер Туре		Points Per	Decade	
			di (1 <u>-2</u> -			Log	arithmic	-	Number of	Steps	10
)utp	ut harmo	nics	L Sú			Side	bands		-		
outp Iumi	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def	nics rmonics = aults (errpi	50 reset)	ĺ		Side	bands dimum sid out	leband 🖃] 2 <u>0</u>		
iutp lumi ccu	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def conserva	nics rmonics aults (empi ative - mo	j 5 <u>0</u> reset) oderate	liberal		Sidel Max Outp	bands kimum sic but	leband 🖃 Positive	20 20 second	/outž	Sel
utp uml ccu ddit	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def conserva ional Tim	nics rmonics - aults (empi ative = mi ne for Stabi	50j reset) oderate lization (ts	liberal (tab) 1111		Sidel Max Outp voit	bands dimum sid but tage == [leband 🖃 Positivi Negativ	20 20 2 Output Node 2 Output Node	/outį́ /gndlį́	Sel
)utp lum ccu iddit	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def conserva ional Tim Initial Ti	nics rmonics – aults (emp ative – mo e for Stabi ransient Re	j 5₫ reset) oderate ⊡ lization (ts sults (save	liberal tab) 1r <u>i</u> einit) _ no _	yes	Sidel Max Outp volt	bands dimum sid out lage] t Source	leband 🖃 Positive Negativ	20 20 2 Output Node re Output Node	∕outį̇́ ∕gnd.lį́	Sel
lumi ccu ddit ave	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def conserva ional Tim Initial Ti lator	nics rmonics – aults (emp ative – m ne for Stabi ransient Re	j 5₫ reset) oderate ⊡ lization (ts rsults (sav	liberal tab) 111 einit) _ no _	yes	Sidel Max Outp volt	bands dimum sid uut lage =] t Source lage =]	leband 🥃 Positivo Negativ Input V	20 e Output Node re Output Node pltage Source	/outi /gndli /VŽ	Sel
outp lumi ccu ddit ave	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def conserva ional Tim Initial Ti lator	nics monics = aults (emp ative = mo e for Stabi ransient Re	j 5₫ reset) oderate ⊒ lization (ts sults (sav	liberal :tab) 1 <u>ri</u> einit) _ no _	yes	Sidel Max Outp volt Input volt Refe	bands kimum sid uut Lage - 1 t Source Lage - 1	leband 🖃 Positive Negativ Input V Ie-band	20 e Output Node re Output Node oltage Source	/outř /gnd lí /VŽ	Sel Sel
utp lum ddit ave scil	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def conserva ional Tim Initial Ti lator	nics rmonics = aults (empi ative ■ m re for Stabi ransient Re	reset) oderate lization (ts sults (save	liberal :tab) 1ri einit) _ no _	yes	Sidel Max Outp volt Input volt Refe Ent	bands kimum sid uut kage _ [t Source kage _] rence sid ker in field	leband 🖃 Positive Negativ Input V Ie-band	20 e Output Node re Output Node oltage Source	∕outť ∕gndl[∕VŽ	Sel Sel
iutp lumi ccu ddit ave iscil	ut harmo ber of ha racy Def conserva ional Tim Initial Ti lator	nics monics – aults (emp ative = mu ne for Stabi ransient Re	reset) oderate lization (ts sults (sav	liberal tab) 1r <u>i</u> einit) _ no _	yes Options	Sidel Max Outp volt Input volt Refe	bands dimum sid nut lage t Source lage rence sid ler in field	leband Positive Negative Input V le-band I	20 e Output Node re Output Node oltage Source	/outi /gndli /Vž	Sel Sel

(a)

(b)

Fig. 3. (a) PSS Setup, (b) PNOISE setup

You can notice this in the *spectre.out* file when the simulation finishes. For the circuit presented above, you will not notice any change in the noise spectrum since the noise is white and the CVG is independent of the IF frequency. Try adding a capacitor in parallel with the load and then play with the *pnoise* settings to see the difference.

Case B: Noise figure of a Mixer with transconductor in the tail

Fig. 4(a) shows a mixer circuit using a transconductor stage at the RF input. LO drives an ideal switch. Noise figure is defined here for 50 Ω source impedance.

I first characterized the drain current noise power spectral density $(\overline{i_{dn}^2})$ of the nFET working as a transconductor in fig. 4(a). Fig. 4(b) shows the setup for noise characterization of the nFET (W/L = 40 μ m/210 nm). Noise summary was read from *Analog Design Env.* \rightarrow *Results* \rightarrow *Print* \rightarrow *Noise Summary* \rightarrow *Spot Noise at* 50 *MHz (Include All Types)*. The noise summary also gives the input referred noise voltage PSD $(\overline{v_{gn}^2})$.



Fig. 4. (a) Mixer with a transconductor stage, (b) Setup to characterize the noise of the nFET used as transconductor in the mixer.

At the input now we have two noise sources — $4kTR_s$ and $\overline{v_{qn}^2}$ which undergo same transformation because of mixing action. At the output we get $m \times (g_m R_l)^2$ times the input noise PSD. Same folding factor m as in Case A appears here. The major change is due to the noise of the transconductor. The folded noise PSD at the IF frequency of 50 MHz is, therefore, given by

$$\overline{v_{on}^2} = (4kTR_s + \overline{v_{gn}^2}) \times (g_m R_l)^2 \times m$$

= $(8.28 \times 10^{-19} + 4.4629 \times 10^{-18}) \times (13.5 \times 10^{-3} \times 100)^2 \times \frac{1}{4}$
= $2.4107 \times 10^{-18} \text{ V}^2/\text{Hz}$
= -176.18 dB

Simulation result for the mixer circuit is presented in fig. 5. The RF signal (2.45 GHz) amplitude is 10 mV (-40 dB). LO frequency is 2.5 GHz. The output amplitude at 50 MHzis -47.73 dB.

W/L	V_{GS}	V_{DS}	g_m	i_{dn}^2		v_{gn}^2
$40 \ \mu$ m/210 nm	m 751.1 mV	1.567 V	13.5 mS	8.1252×10^{-1}	22 A ² /Hz	$4.4629 \times 10^{-18} \text{ V}^2/\text{Hz}$
$\overline{v_{on}^2}$ (calc.)	$\overline{v_{on}^2}$ (siml.)	CVG	(calc.)	CVG (siml.)	NF	
-176.18 dB	$-176.53 \mathrm{dB}$	$\frac{g_m R_l}{\pi} = -$	7.34 dBV	$-7.73 \mathrm{dBV}$	11.37 dB	

The table below summarizes all the information.

Case C: What happens in balanced LO case?

The circuit is shown in fig. 6. In this case, noise power from the two sides will add leading to 3 dB higher output noise power spectral density. Though the noise originate from the same source viz. the transconductor, due to the non-linear operation of the switches,



Fig. 5. Simulation results for mixer of fig. 4(a) (unbalanced RF, unbalanced LO)

the noise power add up instead of cancellation. The cancellation would have happened in a differential amplifier where the noise due to the tail current source do not appear in the differential output. Here, the total output noise power goes up by a factor of 2 (3 dB). The gain from RF source to the IF however doubles (in terms of CVG). NF will therefore decrease by a factor of 2 (3 dB) compared to unbal-LO, unbal-RF case.

$$\overline{v_{on}^2} = (4kTR_s + \overline{v_{gn}^2}) \times (g_m R_l)^2 \times m$$
 where m is 1/4
 $CVG = \frac{2}{\pi} g_m R_l$

APPENDIX

A. Derivation of noise folding factor m

For the circuit in fig. 1, the output noise appears due to folding of the $4kTR_s$ noise when multiplied with a $sq_{0,1}(t)$ function.

In the frequency domain, the white noise can be interpreted as consisting of impulses at each frequency. Consider the output noise contribution from components at ω_{IF} , $\omega_{LO} - \omega_{IF}$



Fig. 6. Differential LO and unbalanced RF signal.

(or $\omega_{LO} + \omega_{IF}$), $3\omega_{LO} - \omega_{IF}$ (or $3\omega_{LO} + \omega_{IF}$)... at ω_{IF} .

$$\mathrm{sq}_{0,1}(t) \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi} \Big\{ \cos(\omega t) - \frac{1}{3}\cos(3\,\omega t) + \frac{1}{5}\cos(5\omega t) \dots \Big\}$$

Each term in the above equation causes noise to appear at ω_{IF} as shown in fig. 8.

Term	Noise component	Folded component
$\frac{1}{2}$	ω_{IF}	$\frac{1}{2}\cos\omega_{IF}t$
$\frac{2}{\pi}\cos\omega_{LO}t$	$\omega_{LO} - \omega_{IF}$	$\frac{1}{\pi}\cos\omega_{IF}t$
$\frac{1}{3}\frac{2}{\pi}\cos 3\omega_{LO}t$	$3\omega_{LO} - \omega_{IF}$	$\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{\pi}\cos\omega_{IF}t$
$\frac{1}{5}\frac{2}{\pi}\cos 5\omega_{LO}t$	$5\omega_{LO} - \omega_{IF}$	$\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{\pi}\cos\omega_{IF}t$

The noise add in power since each term is uncorrelated. Noting that the average power of $\cos(\omega_{IF}t)$ is 1/2, the output noise PSD is $m \times 4kTR_s$, where m is given by

$$m = \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right)^2\frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right)^2\frac{1}{5^2} + \dots$$
$$= \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \times \left(1 + \frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{5^2} + \dots\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2}\frac{\pi^2}{8} = \frac{3}{16}$$

Now taking into account the noise from both sides of LO, then

$$m = \frac{1}{8} + 2 \times \left\{\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{\pi^2}{8}\right\} = \frac{1}{4}$$

If we had $sq_{-1,1}(t)$, and we considered noise from just one side of LO, then

$$m = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{5^2} + \dots$$
$$= \frac{2}{\pi^2} \times \frac{\pi^2}{8} = \frac{1}{4}$$



Fig. 7. Simulation results for mixer of fig. 6 (unbalanced RF, balanced LO)



Fig. 8. Noise Folding in a Mixer

And finally considering noise contribution from both sides of LO, then

$$m = 2 \times \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{5^2} + \dots \right\} = \frac{1}{2}$$

B. Characterizing nFET drain current noise

When the nFET in fig. 4(b) was characterized at $V_{DS} = 0$ V, the drain current noise (spot noise at 50 MHz) was found to be 2.61×10^{-22} A²/Hz and the output conductance of the FET (for $V_{DS} = 0$ V), $g_{d0} = 15.74$ mS. When the current noise PSD is set to $\gamma 4kTg_{d0}\Delta f$, we get $\gamma \approx 1$, which is what we expect for short-channel devices [1].



However, what is important is the channel noise when the nFET is properly biased that is non-zero V_{DS} . The channel current noise is characterized in the fig. 9(a). Fig. 9(b)

Fig. 9. Characterization of nFET channel noise and input-referred noise for TSMC018_teaching.scs

shows comparison between drain current noise PSD and the input referred voltage noise PSD multiplied by g_m^2 . Apparently, only at $V_{DS} = 0$ V, they don't match since g_m is also zero there. This has been verified for Philips BiCMOS process too. So it is not a problem with the model card. In fact if you take V_{DS} close to zero instead of exactly zero, you should get the match. This again has been verified for $V_{DS} = 2$ mV for Philips process. I have not yet thought over an explanation for the shape of the noise spectral density, but the shape is maintained for Philips process too.

REFERENCES

Andries J. Scholten, Luuk F. Tiemeijer, Ronald van Langevelde, Ramon J. Havens, Adrie T. A. Zegers-van Duijnhoven, and Vincent C. Venezia, "Noise Modeling for RF CMOS Circuit Simulation", *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices*, vol. ED-50, pp.618-632, Mar. 2003.