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Abstract:

Decision Feedback Equalizers (DFEs) are widely used in high speed serial links. DFE can compensate for severe distortion in transmitted signal due to band-limited channels. In this paper we demonstrate two different 1-tap DFE designs in 28 nm CMOS process with one reaching 66Gbps and the other reaching 83Gbps consuming 25mW and 32mW from a 0.9-V supply, respectively. No coils were used for bandwidth extension in the design.
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1. Introduction:

As the need for high throughput from chip-to-chip I/Os is increased, it is predicted that speeds of 40 Gbps per-lane will be needed in the near future [1]. Consequently, high speed serial links have been pushed to the technology limits – particularly DFE circuits – to achieve high speeds while maintaining adequate power consumption. The timing constraints of the design of the DFE feedback loop is directly set by the bit time interval, also referred to as Unit Interval (UI). As the UI decreases, timing constraints become more stringent and challenging for the DFE to meet.

The first tap in the DFE is faced with the toughest time constraints. In 50Gbps links it needs to settle in 20ps even for very small inputs at the input of the decision element. Generally, meeting the 1<sup>st</sup> tap time constraint is the most challenging part of DFE design.

In the next section, we will give a brief description of basic DFE architectures and their timing constraints. In section 3, we describe our DFE architectures and designs. Section 4 shows the simulation results in 28 nm CMOS and compares it to some prior art. Finally we conclude the paper in section 5.

2. Background:

At very high speeds, channel losses pose great challenge requiring the use of heavy equalization in both transmitter (TX) and receiver (RX). DFEs can only equalize post-cursor inter-symbol interference (ISI). They also need a large number of taps for very high-loss channels.

Extensive work has been done on DFEs resulting in several architectures [2] – [5]. This can be divided into direct or speculative (unrolled) architectures using either full-rate clocking or half-rate clocking as mentioned in [6].

Shown in Fig. 1, is the direct full-rate DFE architecture [2] (only 1<sup>st</sup> tap is shown for simplicity). The input (analog) signal is ‘sliced’ by the flip-flop (FF) and is converted to a digital signal, which is fed back to cancel the post-cursor ISI. The highlighted path is the critical path whose timing constraint is given by

\[ t_{eq} + t_{setup} + t_{FB} < \text{UI} \]  

(1)

Where \( t_{eq} \) is the clock-to-output delay of the FF, \( t_{setup} \) is the FF setup time, and \( t_{FB} \) is the feedback delay which arises from the time constant at the summing node.
In Fig. 2, the speculative (unrolled) full-rate DFE architecture is shown [3]. The critical path is highlighted and is given by

\[ t_{eq,FF} + t_{\text{setup}} + t_{sq,MUX} < 1UI \]  

(2)

Where \( t_{sq,MUX} \) is the select-to-output delay of the MUX. \( t_{sq,MUX} \) is usually smaller than \( t_{FB} \) because of the lack of the timing constant at the summing node.

\[ \text{Figure (1): Full-Rate Direct DFE Architecture [6]} \]

\[ \text{Figure (2): Speculative full-rate DFE architecture [6]} \]
In Fig. 3, the half-rate direct DFE architecture is presented [4]. The main benefit of this design is the use of half-rate clocks and the simplified design of clock and data recovery (CDR). The critical path is highlighted and is given by (1).

![Speculative full-rate DFE architecture](image)

**Figure (3): Speculative full-rate DFE architecture [6]**

Figure 4 shows the speculative half-rate DFE architecture [5] and its critical path which is given by (2). As well as having the benefit of using half-rate clocks, it has the benefit of the capacitance being outside of the feedback loop. The drawback of this architecture is its complexity and high power consumption.

### 3. Proposed DFE Architecture:

In this paper we present two architectures, direct half-rate architecture and direct half-rate merged summer-slicer architecture.

We chose to implement direct half-rate architecture and not to use speculation for it 1) is less power hungry, 2) uses half-rate clocks, and 3) is less complex compared to speculative design. Also the implementation of additional taps is more stringent in speculation as demonstrated in [7].

As shown in Fig. 3, the direct half-rate architecture consists of a summer and a latch. Description of circuits is presented next.
A. Analog summer

Our resistive analog summer has the schematic shown in Fig. 5. The analog summer function is to add or subtract (depending on previous bit) a certain amount of current from the output to compensate for the ISI effects. Note in designing the analog summer, we must make sure that the input differential voltage satisfy the following equation

\[ V_{\text{in-diff}} < \sqrt{2} * V_{\text{od}} \]  

(3)

Where \( V_{\text{in-diff}} \) is the input differential voltage and \( V_{\text{od}} \) is the over-drive voltage of the input differential pair. This is to avoid any clipping in the output signal and to insure operation in the linear region of the differential pair [8]. The opposite is needed for 1st tap differential pair. We need \( V_{\text{od}} \) to be as small as possible for complete current steering for small signal inputs.
B. CML latch

Current-mode logic (CML) latch consists of an input tracking stage utilized to sense and track the data variation and a cross-coupled regenerative pair being employed to store the data. The 1st is active when clock is high whereas the later is active when the CLK is low.

![CML latch schematic](image)

**Figure (5): Analog resistive summer**

The data is then fed to the analog summer of the other path to use it in equalization. The output signal should be just enough for the summer to perceive it as digital (the signal is considered digital if it is large enough to perform complete steering of the current in the 1st tap coefficient differential pair). By carefully sizing the 1st tap differential pair in the summer, we can reduce the output levels needed for complete current steering for the CML latch which decreases power consumption and increases the CML latch speed. The CML latch schematic is shown in Fig. 6

C. Merged summer-slicer

To increase the speed of the DFE, it was proposed in [7] to merge the summer and the slicer as shown in Fig. 7. When CLK is high, the circuit is ON and the output nodes are charged to the values depending on input and the previous bit. And when CLK is low, the differential pair is OFF and the output nodes maintain their value to be used in the odd/even stage to drive the 1st tap differential pair.
4. Simulation Results:

The designs were simulated using HSPICE in Synopsys Custom Design Environment. The two circuits were simulated with 200mV peak-to-peak pseudo random input signal filtered by a \((1 + 0.8Z^{-1})\) channel. Fig. 8 shows an 83Gbps 200mV pseudo random input and the effect of the channel on it.
The half-rate DFE achieved speeds of 66Gbps while consuming 25mW from a 0.9-V supply. The eye opening is about 85mV vertical opening and 13.5ps horizontal opening (90% of the UI). The eye diagram of the even path is shown in Fig. 9.

Figure (8): 83Gbps 200mV pseudo random input(left) and the effect of the channel on it(right)

We chose to implement direct half-rate architecture and not to use speculation for it 1) is less power hungry, 2) uses half-rate clocks, and 3) is less complex compared to speculative design. Also the implementation of additional taps is more stringent in speculation as demonstrated in [7].

The merged summer-slicer DFE achieved 83Gbps speed while consuming 31.1mW from a 0.9-V supply. The vertical eye opening is 100mV and horizontal eye opening of 19.4ps (81.25% of the UI). The eye diagram of the even path is shown in Fig. 10.

As shown in Fig. 3, the direct half-rate architecture consists of a summer and a latch. Description of circuits is presented next.
Table I compares our work to state of the art DFE designs. The simulation results show that our DFE achieves high speeds with good power efficiency. Fabrication of the given DFE will give us stronger confidence in our results.

Table (2): Rule base for the position controller
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>[7]</th>
<th>[9]</th>
<th>[10]</th>
<th>[11]</th>
<th>This work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process technology</td>
<td>65nm</td>
<td>32nm SOI</td>
<td>28nm</td>
<td>22nm</td>
<td>28nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Voltage</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Rate (Gbps)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of DFE Taps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power efficiency (pJ/bit)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Includes CTLE and clock distribution power
[^2]: Estimated based on [12]

5. Conclusion:

In this paper we have described and demonstrated two DFE designs achieving high speeds of 66Gbps and 83Gbps, in 28 nm CMOS technology, consuming 25mW and 32mW from a 0.9-V, respectively. The two designs show good power efficiency compared to prior art due to the use of 28 nm technology. The two designs were tested on a \((1 + 0.8Z^{-1})\) channel.
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