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#### Abstract

This letter proposes a new level-shifting structure that can convert extremely low levels of input voltages to high output voltages while maintaining excellent delay and power dissipation. In order to reduce contention and voltage swing in the internal nodes, the proposed circuit uses a diode-connected level shifter between gate terminals of the output inverter. Using a control circuit, only during the high-to-low transitions of the output, a current is forced into the diode-connected device. Measurement results demonstrate that the proposed circuit can consume as small energy as $4.2 \mathrm{fJ} /$ transition with $V_{D D L}$ and $V_{D D H}$ of 0.35 V and 1.1 V , respectively when implemented in a $40-\mathrm{nm}$ CMOS technology. Furthermore, when fabricated in a $180-\mathrm{nm}$ technology, the level-shifting circuit can convert $V_{D D L} s$ as small as 80 mV to 1.8 V without using lowthreshold devices.


Index Terms-Level converter, level shifter, low power, nanometer-scale CMOS, wide range, sub-threshold.

## I. Introduction

In the relentless push towards an ultra-low-power circuit design of digital [1] and mixed-signal [2] system-on-chip (SoC), the most proven way is to reduce the supply voltage. This method is especially effective if the value of the supply voltage is chosen below the threshold level of CMOS devices (so-called sub-threshold design) [3], [4]. This technique results in dual- or multi-supply systems whereby time-critical parts are powered at a higher supply voltage (i.e., $V_{D D H}$ ) whereas other noncritical parts operate at a lower supply voltage (i.e., $V_{D D L}$ ). This allows to conveniently trade off performance versus power consumption of low and high supply voltages. Furthermore, even if the whole core of a chip could work in the sub-threshold domain, an above-threshold supply voltage would still be needed for the digital input/output (I/O) pad cells. Hence, level-shifting or level-converting circuits with short delay and low power dissipation are needed to interface the sub-threshold circuit parts with the above-threshold modules. In other words, the required level shifters must convert the low logic levels of $\left(0, V_{D D L}\right)$ to the high logic levels of $\left(0, V_{D D H}\right)$. One of the most common implementations of a voltage level-shifting circuit is shown in Fig. 1.

## Manuscript received Jan.10, 2018.

R. Lotfi is with Delft University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands, and also Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, I. R. Iran, (e-mail: rlotfi@ieee.org).
M. Saberi and R. Hosseini are with Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, I. R. Iran. (e-mails: msaberi@um.ac.ir, rasoolhosseini@yahoo.com).
S. A. R. Ahmadi-Mehr was with Delft University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands; he is now with Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, I. R. Iran (e-mail: a.ahmadimehr@cc.iut.ac.ir).
R. B. Staszewski is with Delft University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands and also University of Dublin, Dublin, Ireland (e-mail: r.b.staszewski@tudelft.nl).


Fig. 1. Schematic of the conventional voltage level shifter.
Its operation is as follows. When the input signal (i.e., $I N$ ) goes from " $V_{S S}$ " (i.e., ground) to " $V_{D D L}$ " $(\mathrm{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}$ transition), the input transistors $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 1}$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 2}$ are turned on and off, respectively. As $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 1}$ is trying to pull node $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ down to $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{SS}}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 2}$ is gradually turned on to pull node $\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ up to $V_{D D H}$ and to turn MP1 off. It can be observed that there is a contention between the pull-up transistor (i.e., MPı) driven to $V_{D D H}$ and the pull-down transistor (i.e., $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 1}$ ) driven by $V_{D D L}$ during the transition times in which the output is not yet corresponding to the logic level of the input. This leads to an increase of the propagation delay and, therefore, power dissipation. It also increases the minimum acceptable value of $V_{D D L}$ (i.e. $V_{D D L, m i n}$ ) for a given value of $V_{D D H}$. In [5]-[20], several efforts have been reported to improve the performance of level shifters; specifically to reduce the power consumption (or energy-per-transition), to increase the speed, and to reduce the value of $V_{D D L, \text { min }}$. In this letter, a high-performance voltage level shifter using a diode-connected transistor with dynamic current switching [21] is proposed. Not only this makes a considerable reduction in the delay and the power consumption, but also enables the circuit to operate correctly for a wide range of $V_{D D L}$ values.

## II. Proposed Voltage Level Shifter

The schematic of the proposed voltage level shifter is shown in Fig. 2. It consists of an input and an output branch. The input branch comprises a controllable current source, a diodeconnected transistor, $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 3}$, serving as an internal level shifter (ILS), and an nMOS switch transistor, $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 3}$. The output branch is a CMOS inverter consisting of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 4} / \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 4}$. Fig. 2(a) shows the conceptual schematics of the basic structure of the proposed level shifter where the gate terminals of the output stage (i.e., $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{N}}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{P}}$ where $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{P}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{N}}+\left|\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{GS}, \mathrm{P} 3}\right|$ ) are separated by the ILS (i.e., $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 3}$ ). Fig. 2(b) shows the detailed circuit where the switched current source is implemented using $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 1}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 2}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 1}$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 2}$. The operation of the circuit in both $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ and $\mathrm{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}$ transitions of the input signal will be explained here.

## A. High-to-Low Transition

During pull down (i.e. at the $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ transition of the input), $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 3}$ is
turned off while a current is injected into $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 3}$ (only during the transition). Therefore, the voltages of both $G_{p}$ and $G_{N}$ nodes rise and the pull-up pMOS device is weakened. Therefore, the existing contention between the pull-up and pull-down devices will be reduced leading to decrease the propagation delay and the power consumption of the circuit. The current $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ is injected during the $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow$ L transition since INB has become " H " and OUT is still " H " and thus the current in $M_{\mathrm{N} 1}$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 2}$ is mirrored through $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 1}$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 2}$. As soon as the output node falls below $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}, \mathrm{N} 2}$, where $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}, \mathrm{N} 2}$ is the threshold voltage of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 2}$, the current spike flowing through $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 2}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 1}$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 1}$ drops to zero. It should be noted that the current-mirror ratio, i.e., (W/L) MP1/(W/L) MP2 directly affects the circuit delay (i.e., $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}}$ ) as will be discussed in Section III.


Fig. 2. Schematic of the basic structure of the proposed level shifter: (a) conceptual schematics (b) detailed circuit.

## B. Low-to-High Transition

During pull up, since $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 3}$ is on and since no current is injected into $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 3}$, the drain terminal of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 3}$ (i.e., the gate terminal of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 4}$ ) is pulled down to ground; thus turning $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 4}$ off. The voltage of node GP, in this case, becomes low enough to turn MP4 on.
It should be emphasized that there is no static power consumption in the circuit since the current source is only on during the $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ transitions of the signal.

## III. Design Considerations

In this section, the impact of sizing for different devices on important merits of the circuit will be studied. Furthermore, for special requirements for the circuit, i.e. larger $V_{D D L}$ range (smaller $V_{D D L, m i n}$ ) at the output, a modified structure will be proposed.

## A. Circuit Speed

Considering the $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ transition, the propagation delay, i.e. $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{pH}} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ is strongly affected by the strength of the pull-down network and the contention at the output node. As explained in Section II, during the $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ transition, there is a contention between the pull-down $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 4}$ gradually turning on and the pull-up MP4 gradually turning off. In order to reduce the delay time, both the gate terminals of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 4}$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 4}$ must be raised quicker. Therefore, a larger current being injected to $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 2}$, increases the speed with which the voltages of the gate terminals rise. Furthermore, the smaller the parasitic capacitance at $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{N}}$ node, the higher the rising speed of the node becomes. Besides, the larger the voltage drop across $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P}}$, the higher the Gp node voltage and thus the weaker the pull-up strength. By increasing the mirroring ratio, the current injected to MP3 is increased and thus the delay is decreased. In order to reduce the power consumed in the current mirror, and to have a suitable mirroring ratio of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 1}$ and $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 2}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 1}$ was made much longer than the minimum gate length of the other transistors. Furthermore, by increasing the size of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P}}$, since the voltage drop across it is decreased and since the parasitic capacitances are also larger, the $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ propagation delay also increases.
Similarly, the $\mathrm{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}$ transition delay mainly depends on the strength of the pull-up network, i.e. MP4 and the contention at the output. It can be observed that by increasing the mirroring ratio, the delay becomes worsened due to the fact that the parasitic capacitances are larger. Also, the larger the size of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 3}$, the smaller the voltage drop and the larger the parasitic capacitance; increasing the delay. Based on the above, the designer can decide about the sizing of the devices. For minimum propagation delay that includes both the $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ and $\mathrm{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}$ delays, the designer can decide about the optimum value of the sizes.

## B. Power Consumption

In order to reduce the power consumption, not only the contention at the output node in both $\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{L}$ and $\mathrm{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}$ transitions but also the parasitic capacitances, including those associated with the internal nodes, must be minimized. Therefore, increasing the mirroring ratio, slightly increases the power consumption; however, by increasing the size of $\mathrm{Mp}_{\mathrm{P}}$, the power is reduced. In this work, the size of all nMOS devices are chosen as minimum and the corresponding pMOS devices are sized proportionally (to have equal pull-up and pull-down strengths). Just the length (i.e., L) of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 1}$ is chosen much larger than that of MP2 to have a suitable mirroring ratio between MP1 and MP2.


Fig. 3. Schematic of the wide-voltage range level shifter

## C. $V_{D D L}$ Range

Another important parameter of level shifters is the value of $V_{D D L, m i n}$ (for a given value of $V_{D D H}$ ). In order to increase the convertible $V_{D D L}$
range, i.e., reducing the value of $V_{D D L, m i n}$, the structure depicted in Fig. 3 with two modifications compared to Fig. 2 is proposed. First, another level-shifting diode-connected device, i.e., Mp5, is put in series with MP3. Second, in order to increase the pull-up strength at the $\mathrm{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}$ transition, the gate terminal of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 4}$ has to be pulled hard to $V_{S S}$, thus motivating the addition of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{N} 5}$. By increasing the number of internal diode-connected devices, the voltage drop between $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{P}}$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{N}}$ increases; further reducing the voltage swing of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{N}}$. Therefore during the $\mathrm{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}$ transition of the sub-threshold input signal, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{N}}$ is pulled down faster by $M_{\mathrm{N} 3}$ thus lowering both the $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{pL} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}}$ and the power consumption.

## IV. Measurement Results

In order to study the effect of the technology, the proposed circuit has been fabricated in both $40-\mathrm{nm}$ and $180-\mathrm{nm}$ standard CMOS technologies. Fig. 4 shows the chip micrograph of the one fabricated in $40-\mathrm{nm}$ CMOS. The area of the circuit is $8 \mu \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and $135 \mu \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in the $40-\mathrm{nm}$ and $180-\mathrm{nm}$ technologies, respectively. In the fabricated circuits in $40-\mathrm{nm}$ CMOS, the W/L size of almost all devices is set to $120 \mathrm{~nm} / 40 \mathrm{~nm}$ (i.e., the minimum allowed) to reduce the parasitic capacitances. Furthermore, all devices, except for MP3 (which is a nominal- $V_{T}$ device with a $\left|V_{T O}\right|$ of 416 mV ) are low- $V_{T}$ devices with threshold voltages of 311 mV and -337 mV for nMOS and pMOS, respectively. Note that in order to reduce the size and, therefore, the parasitic capacitance of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 3}$, it has not been put in a separate n-well and the body terminals of $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 1}-\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{P} 4}$ are all tied to $V_{D D H}$. . In order to measure the delay of the circuit, both input and output buffers are replicated in another "test" path, as shown in Fig. 5. Therefore, the delay between the "OUT_SIG" and "OUT_TEST" is an estimation of the delay between "IN" and "OUT" nodes. Of course, it is a pessimistic estimation of the delay since $V_{D D L}$ is always smaller than the supply voltage of the buffers, i.e., $V_{D D \_B U F F}$ and thus the corresponding inverter is slower in the main path compared to the "test" path. Furthermore, the input signal, IN, experiences the skewness practically happening for such a "low-swing" signal.


Fig. 4. Microphotographs of the chips fabricated in $40-\mathrm{nm}$ CMOS.

## A. 40-nm Implementation Results

Fig. 6 shows the measured waveforms of both OUT_SIG and OUT_TEST at the input pulse frequency of 1 MHz . The value of $V_{\text {DDL, }}$ min is 120 mV (that can be shifted to 1.1 V for a maximum operating frequency, $f_{\max }$, of 140 kHz ). For the circuit shown in Fig. 3 , the value of $V_{D D L, \text { min }}$ is reduced down to 50 mV for $f_{\max }=10 \mathrm{kHz}$. The level shifter consumes only $4.2 \mathrm{fJ} /$ Transition for a $0.35-\mathrm{V} \rightarrow 1.1-$ V conversion. As for the value of the delay, to exclude the effect of the technology, it should be expressed as a function of fanout-4 (FO4). For a $0.4-\mathrm{V} \rightarrow 0.9-\mathrm{V}$ conversion, the value of delay is 1.17 FO4 (using a simulated value for FO4). Furthermore, it should be mentioned that for smaller values of $V_{D D H}$, the power consumption and thus the energy-per-transition are reduced. At a frequency of 100
kHz , the energy-per-transition of the circuit is only 1.8 fJ for a 0.25 $\mathrm{V} \rightarrow 0.6-\mathrm{V}$ conversion.

## B. $0.18-\mu \mathrm{m}$ Implementation Results

In order to demonstrate the effect of the technology on the performance of the level shifter and the effectiveness of the proposed structure in older CMOS processes, both the circuit of Fig. 2-b and the one depicted in Fig. 3 have been fabricated in a standard $0.18-\mu \mathrm{m}$ CMOS technology. In this section, the value of $V_{D D H}$ is assumed to be 1.8 V unless explicitly stated otherwise. Measurements confirm that the circuit can convert $V_{D D L}$ levels of 180 mV and 400 mV for operating frequencies of 10 kHz and 5 MHz , respectively. The energy-per-transition of the level converter for the $0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ conversion at a frequency of 5 MHz is $46 \mathrm{fJ} /$ transition. The measured value of $V_{D D L, \text { min }}$ for the circuit shown in Fig. 3 capable to be converted to $V_{D D H}$ of 1.8 V is 80 mV at the frequency of 10 kHz . Finally, the performance of the circuits are compared to the state-of-the-art reports in Table I. It can be observed that not only the minimum convertible value of $V_{D D L}$ but also the energy-per-transition have considerably been improved in the proposed circuits.


Fig. 5. Test setup for the delay measurement.


Fig. 6. Oscilloscope screenshot of OUT_TEST (Ch.1) and OUT_SIG (Ch.2) for a $1-\mathrm{MHz}$ signal.

## V. CONClUSION

We have proposed a highly power-efficient level shifter covering a wide range of frequencies and voltages, which is capable of converting extremely low input voltages. The key enabling idea is to reduce contention between the output devices through a dynamically engaged diode-connected internal level-shifting transistor inserted between their gate terminals. Measurement results in both $40-\mathrm{nm}$ and $180-\mathrm{nm}$ CMOS technologies confirm the power efficiency of the proposed level shifter. Compared to the state-of-the art, the proposed circuits exhibit superior performance, especially from the power consumption viewpoint. For the case where a wider range for $V_{D D L}$ is required, i.e. if a smaller $V_{D D L, m i n}$ is desired, an additional internal level shifter has been inserted. The designer can therefore decide

TABLE I
COMPARISON WITH THE STATE-OF-THE-ART

|  | Technology | V ${ }_{\text {DDH }}$ | $\mathrm{V}_{\text {DLL, min }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay (ns) } \\ \left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{DDL}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{DDH}}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Static Power <br> (nW) @ VDDL | Energy per Transition (fJ) @ V ${ }^{\text {DDL }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mu \mathrm{m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Y. Osaki, JSSC '12 [9] | $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 3 V | 230 mV | $\begin{gathered} 10000 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 0.23@ 0.4V | 5800 @ 0.4 V | 1880 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { S.-C. Luo, } \\ \text { TCAS-I'14 [13] } \end{gathered}$ | 65 nm | 1.2 V | 100 mV | N.A. | 4.05@0.2V | 667 @ 0.2 V | 16 |
| J. Zhou, TCAS-I'15 [15] | 180 nm | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \mathrm{~V} \\ & 1.8 \mathrm{~V} \end{aligned}$ | 210 mV | $\begin{aligned} & 243 \mathrm{~ns}(0.3 \rightarrow 3.3) \\ & 167 \mathrm{~ns}(0.3 \rightarrow 1.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.97 @ 0.3 \mathrm{~V} \\ & 0.16 @ 0.3 \mathrm{~V} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 954(0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 3.3 \mathrm{~V}) \\ 39(0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 153 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Y. Kim, } \\ \text { VLSIC'11 [16] } \end{gathered}$ | 130 nm | 2.5 V | 300 mV | $\begin{gathered} 41.5 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 2.5 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 0.475@0.3V | 229 @ 0.3V | 102 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { W. Zhao, } \\ \text { TCAS-II,'15[17] } \end{gathered}$ | 65 nm | 1.2 V | 140 mV | $\begin{gathered} 25 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 2.5 | $30.7(0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V})$ | 17.6 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Y. Ho, } \\ \text { TCAS-II'16 [18] } \end{gathered}$ | 65 nm | 1 V | 200 mV | $\begin{gathered} 12.9 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.2 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | N.A. | 204(0.2V $\rightarrow$ 1V) | 1931 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { L. Wen, } \\ \text { TCAS-II ‘16 [19] } \end{gathered}$ | 65 nm | 1.2 V | 100 mV | $\begin{gathered} 13.7 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.2 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 1.24@0.2V | $90.9(0.2 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.2 \mathrm{~V})$ | 31.3 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { M. Lanuzza, } \\ \text { TCAS-II ‘17 [20] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 180 nm | 1.8 V | 100 mV | $\begin{gathered} 31.7 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.055@0.4V | 173 (0.4V $\rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | 108.8 |
| This work | $\begin{aligned} & 180 \mathrm{~nm} \\ & \text { (Fig. 2) } \end{aligned}$ | 1.8 V | 180 mV | $\begin{gathered} 180 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 1.5@0.1V | 46 ( $0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}$ ) | 135 |
|  | 180 nm <br> (Fig. 3) | 1.8 V | 80 mV | $\begin{gathered} 95 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 1.8@0.1V | $118(0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.8 \mathrm{~V})$ | 160 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \mathrm{~nm} \\ & \text { (Fig.2) } \end{aligned}$ | 1.1 V | 120 mV | $\begin{gathered} 15.5 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.4 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.1 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 0.55@0.2V | $4.2(0.35 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.1 \mathrm{~V})$ | 8 |
|  | 40 nm <br> (Fig.3) | 1.1 V | 50 mV | $\begin{gathered} 80 \mathrm{~ns} \\ (0.3 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.1 \mathrm{~V}) \end{gathered}$ | 0.6@0.2V | $18(0.35 \mathrm{~V} \rightarrow 1.1 \mathrm{~V})$ | 12 |

between the circuit configurations based on the application whether a higher speed or a larger $V_{D D L}$ range is required.
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