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# Abstract <br> Comparison of CMOS XOR and XNOR Gate Design 

Makara Tang<br>M.S, OGI School of Science and Engineering at OHSU<br>August 2002

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Shih-Lien Lu

Two new methods are proposed to implement the exclusive-OR and exclusiveNOR functions at the transistor level. The first method uses non-complementary signal input and the least number of transistors. The second method improves the performance but two additional transistors are utilized. The proposed method uses the same number of transistors but adds with more drive capability. These circuits were first implemented using a Physical Layout Design tool produced by Mentor Graphics. These layouts were extracted and simulated using circuit simulator HSPICE and ACCUSIM. Delay and power consumption of these circuits were characterized and compared with previously known designs.

### 1.0 Synopsis

Complementary Metal Oxide Semiconductor (CMOS) technology is advancing for microprocessors. Supply voltage ( $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}$ ) and transistor size continue to scale smaller sizes with lower power dissipation and faster microprocessors. The exclusive-OR (XOR) and exclusive-NOR (XNOR) functions are popular gates in microprocessors. The XOR/XNOR gates are fundamental unit circuits used in comparators, parity checkers, error detectors and correctors, multipliers, adders (ALU, AGU), etc. Many circuit implementations of XOR/XNOR gates have been proposed previously. One circuit that is implement the XOR/XNOR gates was published by Jyh-Ming Wang, Sung-chuan Fang, and Wu-shiung Feng [12]. In their work, Jyh-Ming Wang compared several circuit implementations using supply voltage ( $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}=5 \mathrm{volt}$ ) with TSMC $0.8 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology.

This thesis proposes several circuit-level implementations of XOR/XNOR gates. These circuits were simulated using a circuit simulator (HSPICE) with various supply voltages. The various supply voltages are important because as technology continues to scale to smaller feature size, supply voltage ( $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}$ ) also needs to scale down for reliability and power reduction [9].

The optimizations in this thesis have been performed through simulations with HSPICE using various supply voltages from $V_{d d}=1$ volt to $V_{d d}=2.5$ volt on TSMC $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology. First part in thesis simulations with HSPICE using TSMC $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology is devoted to re-evaluation of these circuit implementations using more advanced technology. Second part of the thesis proposes two new combination XOR/XNOR circuit implementations and simulated with Mentor Graphic using TSMC $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology. The Design Architecture (DA) tool was used for designing the circuits and the ACCUSIM tool was used for simulation. The optimization in this thesis has also been performed through simulations with Mentor Graphics Software using various supply voltages from $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}=1$ volt to $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}=2.5 \mathrm{volt}$ on TSMC $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology.

### 1.1 Physical Layout

The Mentor Graphics Physical Layout tool was used to design the XOR/XNOR circuits. The Lambda value was used, specifying Lambda equal to $0.125 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ( $\lambda=0.125$ ). In addition, the supply voltage used was $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}=2.5$ volt with TSMC $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology for this Physical Layout Design [5]. The stick rule was used for the component layout and applied the design rule applied for the component layout space requirements. The dimension-width scaling of the gate-area ratio in Complementary Metal Oxide Semiconductor P-channel (CMOSP) and Complementary Metal Oxide Semiconductor $N$-channel (CMOSN) is 3:1. The physical W/L sizes of CMOSP and CMOSN are $2.1 \mu \mathrm{~m} / 0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ and $1.05 \mu \mathrm{~m} / 0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ respectively, in order to meet the optimal design of low power with high performance.

### 1.2 Fan-Out

The term "fan-out" as used with digital circuits describes the maximum number of load gates (circuits) of similar design as the driver gate that can be connected to the output of XOR/XNOR thus helping to drive the output signal for the driver gate [12].

### 1.3 Input Vector Generation

Non-complementary [12] inputs, signal A and signal B vectors, were generated so as to test the design in four cases: $A B=00, A B=01, A B=10$, and $A B=11$. Also the complementary inputs, signal $A$ and signal $A '$, signal $B$ and signal $B$ ' vector, were generated to test the design in four cases: $A B=00, A B=01$, $A B=10$, and $A B=11$. The XOR logic gate operates based on a truth table where if input signal A and signal B are the same value then the output signal is "LOW." If input signal A and signal B are different values then the output signal is "HIGH." The exclusive-OR and exclusive-NOR functions are shown in Table 1.1. Assuming the input signals are $A$ and $B$, then the exclusive-OR of $A$ and $B$,
denoted $A \oplus B$ is logically equivalent to $A^{\prime} B+A B^{\prime}$; and the exclusive-NOR of $A$ and $B$, denoted as $A \otimes B$, is logically equivalent to $A B+A^{\prime} B^{\prime}$.

Table 1.1
Functions of XOR and XNOR

| A | B | XOR | XNOR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Exclusive-OR
A XOR $\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{A} \oplus \mathrm{B}$
$=A^{\prime} B+A B^{\prime}$
Exclusive-NOR A XNOR $B=A \otimes B$
$=A B+A^{\prime} B^{\prime}$

### 1.4 MOSFET Scaling

MOSFET Scaling determines how threshold voltage should be decreased by the scaling factor, K , in proportion to the power supply voltage. In this work, MOSFET Scaling is applied to CMOSN and CMOSP from the TSMC $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology. According to the fundamentals of modern VLSI devices by Yuan Taur and Tak H. Ning [9], when the TSMC fabrication technology scales down the threshold voltage $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {th }}\right)$, it is also necessary to scale down the physical dimension.

### 1.5 Adder Experiment

The XOR gates that were chosen for the design of the adders listed in appendix A were the XOR transmission gate (Figure 2.1) and the proposed XOR structure (Figure 2.5). The advantage of the proposed XOR structure is the PassTransistor and the ability to transmit the signal HIGH (or " 1 ") and signal LOW (or " 0 ") directly from the input. The disadvantage of the proposed XOR structure
is that the Pass-Transistor does not scale well. The advantage of the XOR transmission gate is that it is a powerful device that scales well, and has a full swing signal level. The disadvantage of the XOR transmission gate is its complementary inputs. As in Figure 1.1, the 8 -bit adder given a general idea of how many XOR gates need to use. Microprocessors use the XOR gate everywhere so they are very important.


Figure 1.1, Logic Gate of 8-bit Adder

### 1.6 Comparison of Results

Results were compared between our proposed XOR gates and other conventional XOR gates, comparing average power dissipation and average delay measuring from 50 percent of the waveform between the inputs and the outputs. We also compared average rising time delay measuring from 10 to 90 percent of the waveform between the inputs and the outputs and average falling time delay measuring from 90 to 10 percent of the waveform between the inputs and the outputs [12]. Compared data analysis was also done for the average power dissipation, average delay, and average rising/falling delay time. For average delay and average rising/falling delay time must fit in the negative linear slope. Also, the average power dissipation must fit in the positive linear slope [11].

### 2.0 Background

The exclusive-OR (XOR) and exclusive-NOR (XNOR) functions are fundamental for various circuits used in comparators, parity checkers, full adders, multipliers, etc. There are two kinds of MOS; the N-channel Metal Oxide Semiconductor (NMOS) and the P-channel Metal Oxide Semiconductor (PMOS). It is well known that NMOS transistor can transmit the signal "LOW" (or "0") completely, but it has poor performance when transmitting the signal "HIGH" (or " 1 "). If one takes a NMOS transistor to implement a switch device, a control signal is added to the gate terminal and sets one end of the signal "HIGH", where the other end will drop to the threshold voltage of NMOS, Vnth. The PMOS transistor can pass a signal "HIGH" fully but handles a signal "LOW" poorly. As a switch device, if a signal "LOW" appears on the source end of the PMOS transistor, the destination end will not sink to signal "LOW", as it will keep a higher than threshold voltage of PMOS, $\left|\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{ptt}}\right|$.

Based on the transmission gate theory, the realized XOR/XNOR circuit uses transmission gates (Figure 2.1). This structure needs only four transistors, but the complementary inputs can lose driving capacity. In general if the output signal of a circuit comes from $V_{d d}$ or $\mathrm{V}_{\text {ss }}$ directly, this circuit has drive capability. However, it is well known that a transmission gate has no drive capability. Using this technique, the circuit can have configurations of XOR and XNOR as in Figure 2.1, but adds an inverter behind each case. Therefore, the improved versions of the transmission gates shown in Figure 2.1 are illustrated in Figure 2.2 as transmission gates with driving output.

### 2.1 Fan-Out of XOR/XNOR Gates

The fan-out of a logic gate is the total number of gate inputs that are driven by a gate output. This is usually expressed in terms of some default gate size. For instance, one might express the loading of a minimum-sized inverter as unity, and capacitor load are between 1 pF and 5 pF . The circuit implementations
shown in Figures 2.2, 2.4b, 2.6, 2.12a, 2.12c, and 2.12d with two input XOR/XNOR gates and four input XOR/XNOR gates all have a fan-out of one. Also, in the combination-circuits implementations shown in Figures 2.M2, 2.M3, and 2.M5, the two input XOR/XNOR gates and the four input XOR/XNOR gates all have a fan-out of one.

When the amount of fan-out is small, the poor signal level can still drive other circuits correctly. If the amount of fan-out is no longer small or the poor signal has to pass through several improper transistors, i.e., transmit signal "HIGH" by NMOS or pass signal "LOW" by PMOS, then the poor signal level may degenerate and no longer be guaranteed to work right. In order to overcome the individual defects, combining the NMOS and the PMOS yields a transmission gate that can pass both signal "HIGH" and signal "LOW" with excellent performance.

### 2.2 Transmission Gates

Although a CMOS transmission gate has better quality, there is full swing signal in a CMOS transmission gate, i.e., it needs complementary signal values to control the gates of PMOS and NMOS. Usually, an inverter is needed to generate a complementary input. Conventionally, a logical circuit can be realized with a canonical CMOS transistor. According to transmission gate theory [7] if a high impedance state is available, fewer transistors can be used. The performances with the proposed design are better than the past designs [5] and are proven after a careful analysis of appropriate simulations.


Figure 2.1 The XOR and XNOR Functions Implemented by Transmission Gates.


Figure 2.2 The XOR and XNOR Functions Implemented by Transmission Gates with Driving Output.

### 2.3 Inverter-Base Gates

Based on the inverter configuration, two inverters can be arranged appropriately for the XOR function as well as the XNOR structure. The circuits are shown in Figure 2.3. For the structure shown in Figure 2.3(a), when input signal A is "HIGH", input signal A' must be "LOW". The signal A and signal A'
are connected to the Vdd end of PMOS and the Vss end of NMOS in the second inverter. The second inverter functions like a standard inverter, and outputs the signal B' is the output signal of XOR/XNOR gates. Therefore, the output signal of the XOR/XNOR gates will be a perfect AB' signal. On the other hand, when the input signal A is "LOW", input signal A' must be "HIGH". The output of the inverter will be a poor signal B because it transmits a signal "HIGH" by NMOS and a signal "LOW" by PMOS. That is, if only four transistors are used to implement an XOR function based on the inverter configuration, its output will be complete on signal $A B^{\prime}$ but poor on an A'B signal. An additional transmission gate can correct the problem. In Figure 2.4(a) [7], when input signal A is "HIGH" the output of the structure is signal $\mathrm{B}^{\prime}$, as described above, the additional transmission does nothing. It will be a good AB ' signal level. When input signal A is "LOW", the transmission gate will pass signal B to the output end directly and fully. Hence the output will be a good A'B signal level. This function will be complete on all of the input cases. In Figure 2.4(b), an additional tailing inverter can also improve the poor signal coming from the output end of the four transistors XNOR structure, and output the good signal level. For these two cases, they do not need the complementary signal inputs and the driving property is better than Figure 2.1 as well. However, these structures have some disadvantages such as not having full driving capability on the output end, or more delay time.


Figure 2.3(a) Inverter-Base XOR Structure (b) Inverter-Base XNOR Structure.


Figure 2.4(a) Improved Version of XOR Structure.


Figure 2.4(b) Another Improved Version of XOR Structure.

### 2.4 Proposed Structures

For the four transistor designs, the proposed structures require noncomplementary inputs and their output is nearly perfect [12]. The configurations for the proposed XOR and XNOR structures are shown in Figure 2.5. For analysis of the XOR structure the output signals are applied to the inputs to test the XOR gates with the values as $\mathrm{AB}=01, \mathrm{AB}=10$, and $\mathrm{AB}=11$ were completed with good output signals. For an incomplete output signal, when applied the input signal to test the XOR gates with the values as $\mathrm{AB}=00$, each PMOS will be on and will pass a poor "LOW" signal level to the output end. That is, if the input signal to test the XOR gates with the values as $\mathrm{AB}=00$, the output will have a threshold voltage $\left|V_{\text {ptht }}\right|$, a little higher than "LOW." For the XNOR function, the output signal in the case of $\mathrm{AB}=00, \mathrm{AB}=01$, and $\mathrm{AB}=10$ will be complete. When $\mathrm{AB}=11$, each NMOS will be on and pass the poor "HIGH" signal level to the output end.

The proposed structure discussed above uses four transistors and does not have driving output. By cascading a standard inverter (fan-out) to the XNOR circuit, a new type of XOR, as shown in Figure 2.6 will have a driving output, and the signal level at the output end will be perfect in all cases. The same technique may use structure as shown in Figure 2.7.


Figure 2.5 Proposed XOR and XNOR Structures.


Figure 2.6 The Proposed XOR Structure with Driving Output.


Figure 2.7 The Proposed XNOR Structure with Driving Output.

### 2.5 Realistic Gates

All of the six transistor structure and the previous ones using transmission gates with driving output (Figure 2.2), improved version of XOR structure (Figure 2.4(a)), another improved version of XOR structure (Figure 2.4(b)), and the proposed XNOR structures with driving output (Figure 2.6) were simulated under nearly realistic conditions to determine drive capability. For the XOR structure, the circuit was redesigned as a realistic-simulated circuit as shown in Figure 2.2 (Figure 2.12(a)), Figure 2.4(a) (Figure 2.12(b)), Figure 2.4(b) (Figure 2.12(c)), and Figure 2.6 (Figure 2.12(d)).

The output waveform of an inverter will be a more realistic signal in the physical design. For convenience, we generate input signal A' and input signal B' from actual simulated realistic inverters. The signals displayed at the input ends of the XOR function will be signal A and signal $B$, and the output value at the output end of the XOR function will be $(\mathrm{A} \oplus \mathrm{B})$. In order to determine the driving capability, an additional capacitor is connected to the output end of each case. Then the driving capability can be determined by the capacitor rising time and falling time. If a circuit has strong driving output, the rising time and falling time will be shorter than the one with poor driving output. If one uses the proposed methods of four transistors to drive canonical CMOS circuits, it can still work correctly. When the output levels of both four transistor cases are poor, an added tailing inverter can improve the defect, and the driving capability is present for the proposed six transistor version, and one can utilize it as a generalized XOR or XNOR function.


Figure 2.12a Realistic-Simulated Circuit for Figure 2.2.


Figure 2.12b Realistic-Simulated Circuit for Figure 2.4a.


Figure 2.12c, Realistic-Simulated Circuit for Figure 2.4b.
(d)


Figure 2.12d Realistic-Simulated Circuit for Figure 2.6.

### 2.6 Combination Circuit Design XOR/XNOR

Combination XOR/XNOR circuit designs are shown in Figures 2.M1, 2.M2, 2.M3, 2.M4, and 2.M5. The XOR/XNOR gates are given the structure names off full restored combination circuit design XOR/XNOR (Figure 2.M1), complementary pass gate logic (Figure 2.M2), complementary pass gate logic cross bar (Figure 2.M3), swing restored gate logic (Figure 2.M4), and full restored Combination circuit design XOR/XNOR with driving output (Figure 2.M5). A comparison of the advantages and disadvantages for the circuits in Figures 2.M1, 2.M2, 2.M3, 2.M4, and 2.M5 are shown on Table 2.1.

|  | Table 2.1 Circuit Comparison |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Advantage | Disadvantage |
| Figure 2.M1 | static gate for low power circuit design | slow circuit |
| Figure 2.M2 | high speed and fewer stages of delay | body effect |
| Figure 2.M3 | improved cross bar current | high power |
| Figure 2.M4 | low standby current/less delay | less output drive |
| Figure 2.M5 | more driving output | hard scaling |



Figure 2.8/Figure 2.M1 Full Restored Combination Circuit Design XOR/XNOR (HSPICE and Mentor).


Figure 2.M2 Complementary Pass Gate Logic.


Figure 2.M3 Complementary Pass Gate Logic Cross Bar.


Figure 2.M4 Swing Restored Pass Gate Logic.


Figure 2.M5 Full Restored Combination Circuit Design XOR/XNOR Driving Output.

### 2.7 Basic Physical Layout Design of XOR/XNOR Gates

We will examine the physical layout of CMOS gates in a general sense to study the impact of the physical structure on the behavior of the circuit. These XOR/XNOR gates begin with an outline of inverter layout forms. To simplify layouts, "unit" sized transistors will generally be shown. In actual layouts, the correct dimension transistors would be arrived at via detailed circuit design. ptransistors will often be shown to be double in "unit" size. A symbolic layout style is used to show most layouts. Wires and transistors are arranged on a grid and actual layouts would space the grid proportionately to design results.

By examining the circuit diagram for the two inverters (Figure 2.3(a)), we should be able to lecture a physical layout by substituting layout symbols for the schematic symbols [5]. Any non-planar situation is dealt with by simply crossing two lines, i.e., the connection between the drain of the n-transistor and the drain of the p-transistor. However, in a physical layout, we have to concern ourselves with the interaction of physical different interconnection layers. We know from our consideration of the fabrication process that the source and drain of the n transistor are n -diffusion regions and the p -transistor uses p -diffusion regions for these connections. Additionally in a bulk CMOS process we cannot make a direct connection from $n$-diffusion to p -diffusion. Thus we have to implement the simple inter-drain connection in the structural domain with at least one wire and two contacts in the physical domain. Assuming that the process does not have local interconnect or buried contacts, this connection has to be in metal.

Alternatively, if a metal line is to be passed from left to right at the top or bottom of the cell, the power and ground connections to the transistors may be made in the appropriate diffusion layer (Figure 2.3(a)-layout). This in effect makes the inverter transparent to horizontal metal connections that may have to be routed through the cell. From considerations that affect performance, the previous deviations from the original layout have little effect. In the case of a vertical poly-silicon drain connection, an extra connection resistance is incurred.

This would be approximately (2R-contact) + (R-poly) where R-contact is the resistance of a metal poly-silicon contact and R-poly is the resistance of the polysilicon runner. Additionally, a slight extra capacitance may be incurred. Usually the result of both of these effects would be inconsequential. For the power and ground diffusion connections, the penalty is a series-connection resistance and increased capacitance. The layout designs developed are listed in Appendix D: Inverter-base XOR structure (Figure 2.3(a)), Inverter-base XNOR structure (Figure 2.3(b)), Inverter-base XNOR structure with driving output (Figure 2.3(a)), and Inverter-base XOR structure driving output (Figure 2.4(b)).

## Pass-Transistor Based Multiplexer



Figure 2.13, Layout Design of Figure 2.2

### 3.0 Results of Simulation

The process technology used is "CMOS TSMC" $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology with parameters in CMOSN and CMOSP transistors listed in Appendix B in Table 1. The input signals depicted as the input signals A and B (Figure 3.1) cover four types of combinations; i.e., $\mathrm{AB}=00, \mathrm{AB}=01, \mathrm{AB}=10$, and $A B=11$. The output simulation waveforms of the design results are shown in Figure 3.2 and Figure 3.3 where the worst case occurs on the both input signals $A B=00$. The output signal level in the XOR structure cannot sink to "LOW." In such a condition the poor signal level can still drive the next inverter stage correctly, as in the waveform in Figure 3.2 where the worst case happens on the both input signals $\mathrm{AB}=11$. The output signal level cannot pull-up to " HIGH ", but is still able to make the next inverter stage work correctly.

The results can improve if the threshold value $\left|\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}}\right|$ decreases. The lower $\left|V_{t h}\right|$ is, the smaller the gap between the defect case and the normal case. In the Figure 3.2 and Figure 3.3, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{nth}}=0.49$ volt and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{pth}}=-0.66$ volt as shown in Appendix B on Table 1. Figure 3.4 shows the simulation result of the proposed XOR structure with the same parameters as in Appendix B on Table 1 except decreasing the value of $\mathrm{V}_{\text {nth }}=0.25$ volt and $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{pth}}=-0.36$ volt. From the waveform shown in Figure 3.2 and Figure 3.4, it can be concluded that the smaller $\left|\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}}\right|$ used, the better the performance achieved, such as increasing the signal level and decreasing the delay time.


Figure 3.1 The input signal A and B.


Figure 3.2 (a) The output of 4 transistors XOR and (b) 6 transistors XNOR.


Figure 3.3 (a) The output of 4 transistors XNOR and (b) the 6 transistors XOR.


Figure 3.4 (a) The output of 4 transistors XOR and (b) the 6 transistors XNOR.

### 3.1 MOSFET Scaling

In MOSFET Scaling the threshold voltage should be decreased by the scaling factor " $k$ " in proportion to the power supply voltage [9]. When the TSMC $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology scales down the threshold voltage ( $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}}$ ), it also needs to scale down physical dimensions as well. Table 3.2 lists the output simulation file of the transistor parameter model for CMOSN and CMOSP relating to the threshold voltage, sub threshold voltage, and mobility. Table 3.1 lists the generalized MOSFET Scaling theory. The circuit delay scales down by a factor between " $k$ " and " $\mathrm{f} \cdot \mathrm{k}$ ", depending on degree of velocity saturation. The most serious issue with generalized scaling is the increase of the power density by a factor of " f " to " f ". The power density increase puts a great burden on VLSI packaging technology to dissipate the extra heat generated on the chip. The power delay product is also a factor of " f " higher than for constant field scaling.

Table 3.1
Generalized MOSFET Scaling Theory

| MOSFET Device and Circuit Parameters |  | Multiplication Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (k>1) |
| Scaling assumptions: Device dimensions$\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ox}}, \mathrm{~L}, \mathrm{~W}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)$ |  | 1/k |
| Doping concentration ( $\left.\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{a}}, \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ |  | f*k |
| Voltage(V) |  | f/k |
| Derived scaling: Electric field | ( $\mathrm{E}_{\text {-field }}$ ) | f |
| Behavior of device: Depletion layer w | th $\left(W_{d}\right)$ | 1/k |
| Parameters: Capacitance (C | EA/t) | 1/k |
| Inversion layer charge density ( $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) |  | f |
|  | Long channel | Velocity <br> Saturation |
| Carrier velocity | f | 1 |
| Current, drift (I) | $\mathrm{f}^{2} / \mathrm{k}$ | f/k |
| Derived scaling: $\quad$ Circuit delay time $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{au}} \sim \mathrm{CV} / \mathrm{I}\right)$ | 1/f•k | 1/k |
| Behavior of circuit: Power dissipation <br>  per circuit $(\mathrm{p} \sim \mathrm{VI})$ | $\mathrm{f}^{3} / \mathrm{k}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{f}^{2} / \mathrm{k}^{2}$ |
| Parameters: Power delay product <br>  per circuit $\left(\mathrm{P} \bullet \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{au}}\right)$ | $\mathrm{f}^{2} / \mathrm{k}^{3}$ |  |
| Circuit density ( $\mathrm{f} \bullet \mathrm{L} / \mathrm{A}$ ) | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ |  |
| Power density (P/A) | $\mathrm{f}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ |

Table 3.2
Output simulation file of the transistor parameter model for CMOSN and CMOSP, TSMC 0.25 um fabrication technology

| **************************************************** |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *** Threshold voltage related model parameters of CMOSP *** <br> $* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$ |  |  |  |
| VTH0 $=-6.01 \mathrm{E}-01 \mathrm{~V}$ | DELVT | $=0 \mathrm{~V}$ | K1=5.85E-01 V^1/2 |
| $\mathrm{K} 2=1.48 \mathrm{E}-02$ | NCH | $=4.16 \mathrm{E}+17 \mathrm{At} / \mathrm{cm}^{\wedge} 3$ | K3= 0 |
| $\mathrm{K} 3 \mathrm{~B}=7.78 \mathrm{E}+01 / \mathrm{V}$ | DVTO | $=2.35 \mathrm{E}+0$ | DVT1=7.16E-01 |
| DVT2 $=-1.13 \mathrm{E}-011 / \mathrm{V}$ | DVTOW | = 0 | DVT1W $=0 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| DVT2W $=01 / \mathrm{V}$ | DSUB | $=1.37 \mathrm{E}+0$ | ETA0 = 1 |
| ETAB $=-2.22 \mathrm{E}-011 / \mathrm{V}$ |  |  |  |

***Sub threshold voltage related model parameters of CMOSP***
*******************************************************

| NFACTOR $=1.15$ | CDSC $=2.4 \mathrm{E}-04 \mathrm{~F} / \mathrm{m}^{\wedge} 2$ | CDSCB $=0$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CDSCD $=0$ | VOFF $=-1.19 \mathrm{E}-01 \mathrm{~V}$ | $\mathrm{CIT}=0$ |
| PDIBLC1 $=1$ | PDIBLC2 $=1.00 \mathrm{E}-02$ | PDIBLCB $=5.64 \mathrm{E}-21 / \mathrm{V}$ |
| DROUT $=9.31 \mathrm{E}-1$ | VSAT $=1.36 \mathrm{E}+05 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ | PSCBE1 $=3.21 \mathrm{E} 8 \mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{m}$ |
| PSCBE2 $=8.7 \mathrm{E}-8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{V}$ | PRWB $=-2 \mathrm{E}-1 \mathrm{~V} \wedge-1 / 2$ | PRWG $=1.15 \mathrm{E}-11 / \mathrm{V}$ |
| RDSW $=2.86 \mathrm{E}+2$ | AGS $=3.01 \mathrm{E}-011 / \mathrm{V}$ |  |

*** Threshold voltage related model parameters of CMOSN $* * *$

| $\mathrm{VTH}=4.1 \mathrm{E}-01 \mathrm{~V}$ | $\mathrm{DELVTO}=0 \mathrm{~V}$ | $\mathrm{~K} 1=5 \mathrm{E}-1 \mathrm{~V}^{\wedge} 1 / 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~K} 2=1.46 \mathrm{E}-02$ | $\mathrm{NCH}=2.35 \mathrm{E}+17 \mathrm{At} / \mathrm{cm}^{\wedge} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K} 3=1.00 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| $\mathrm{~K} 3 \mathrm{~B}=7.781 / \mathrm{V}$ | $\mathrm{DVTO}=0$ | $\mathrm{DVT} 1=1.68 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| $\mathrm{DVT2}=5.00 \mathrm{E}-011 / \mathrm{V}$ | $\mathrm{DVTOW}=0$ | DVT1W $=01 / \mathrm{m}$ |
| $\mathrm{DVT} 2 \mathrm{~W}=0 \quad 1 / \mathrm{V}$ | DSUB $=1.47 \mathrm{E}+02$ | $\mathrm{ETA} 0=1.09 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| $\mathrm{ETAB}=5.50 \mathrm{E}-051 / \mathrm{V}$ |  |  |

***Sub threshold voltage related model parameters of CMOSN***

| NFACTOR $=1.09$ | CDSC $=2.4 \mathrm{E}-04 \mathrm{~F} / \mathrm{m}^{\wedge} 2$ | CDSCB $=0$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDSCD $=0$ | VOFF $=-1.05 \mathrm{E}-01 \mathrm{~V}$ | CIT $=0$ |

***Mobility related Model parameters CMOSN***
*******************************************

| $\mathrm{UA}=1.04 \mathrm{E} 02$ |  | $\mathrm{UB}=1.27 \mathrm{E} 10$ | $\mathrm{UC}=2.39 \mathrm{E} 18(\mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{V})^{\wedge} 2$ | $11 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{V}^{\wedge} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{U} 0=3.92 \mathrm{E}$ |  |  |  |  |

### 4.0 Results of XOR Gates with HSPICE

Results of average delay, rising delay time, and falling delay time of the XOR gates are illustrated in Tables 4.1 and 4.2, respectively. When either signal A or signal B changes state due to propagation delay, the ON or OFF of the transmission gate element would not be fully synchronized to the first inverter in the XOR structure of the improved version XOR structure (Figure 4a). It results in both the NMOS transistor and the PMOS transistor turning on instantly. Comparisons of the XOR gates are summarized in Table 4.3. The competing factors are the number of transistors, the driving capability, non-complementary signal inputs, and the output signal levels. From Table 4.3, it is obvious that these designs are the most competitive ones among all methods. The measured average power dissipation of each XOR gates is shown in Table 4.4. For the data shown in Tables 4.1 to 4.4 and Figures 4.1 to 4.4 , all the XOR gates are listed in the Figures 2.2, 2.4(a), 2.4(b), 2.6, and 2.7. These XOR gates have been fully simulated at the HSPICE Level 49 with TSMC $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology.

Table 4.1 @ 2.5 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.5 Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.2 | 1.14 | 0.95 | 1.21 | 1.09 | 1.10 |
| Figure 2.4a | 2.26 | 0.51 | 1.12 | 1.00 | 1.22 |
| Figure 2.4b | 2.88 | 3.0 | 1.07 | 1.09 | 2.01 |
| Figure 2.6 | 1.15 | 0.66 | 1.08 | 0.38 | 0.85 |
| Figure 2.8 | 1.45 | 1.31 | 1.35 | 1.17 | 1.32 |

Remark: $00->10$ : input signals AB change from 00 to 10 , delay time $=$ time difference between input transistor $50 \%$ level and the $50 \%$ output level. This is the time taken for a logic transition to pass from input to output.

Table 4.1 @ 2.0 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.0Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.2 | 0.74 | 1.05 | 1.31 | 1.19 | 1.20 |
| Figure 2.4a | 2.46 | 0.71 | 1.32 | 1.20 | 1.42 |
| Figure 2.4b | 2.98 | 3.20 | 1.17 | 1.39 | 2.18 |
| Figure 2.6 | 1.45 | 0.86 | 1.28 | 0.58 | 1.04 |
| Figure 2.8 | 1.65 | 1.51 | 1.55 | 1.37 | 1.52 |

Table 4.1 @ $1.5 v o l t$
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.5 Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.2 | 1.44 | 1.25 | 1.51 | 1.39 | 1.40 |
| Figure 2.4a | 2.56 | 0.81 | 1.42 | 1.40 | 1.55 |
| Figure 2.4b | 3.08 | 3.32 | 1.97 | 1.79 | 2.54 |
| Figure 2.6 | 1.55 | 1.06 | 1.48 | 0.78 | 1.22 |
| Figure 2.8 | 1.75 | 1.61 | 1.65 | 1.47 | 1.72 |

Table 4.1 @ 1.0volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.0Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.2 | 1.74 | 1.55 | 1.81 | 1.69 | 1.71 |
| Figure 2.4a | 2.86 | 1.11 | 1.72 | 1.60 | 2.06 |
| Figure 2.4b | 3.28 | 3.70 | 2.17 | 1.99 | 2.78 |
| Figure 2.6 | 1.85 | 1.36 | 1.78 | 0.88 | 1.46 |
| Figure 2.8 | 2.15 | 2.01 | 2.05 | 1.87 | 2.11 |



Figure 4.1 Average Delay

Table 4.2 @ 2.5 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.5 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.2 | 2.1 | 1.46 | 2.09 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.48 |
| Figure 2.4a | 4.79 | 3.11 | 3.86 | 2.65 | 4.33 | 2.88 |
| Figure 2.4b | 6.94 | 2.96 | 2.1 | 1.49 | 4.52 | 2.23 |
| Figure 2.6 | 2.1 | 0.98 | 2.22 | 0.26 | 2.11 | 0.62 |
| Figure 2.8 | 2.79 | 4.65 | 2.61 | 4.51 | 2.70 | 4.58 |

Remark: Rising time = time for a waveform to rise from $10 \%$ to $90 \%$ of its Steady-state value.
Falling time: time for a waveform to fall from $90 \%$ to $10 \%$ of its Steady-state value.

Table 4.2 @ 2.0 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.0volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.2 | 2.20 | 1.66 | 2.19 | 1.70 | 2.2 | 1.67 |
| Figure 2.4a | 4.89 | 3.31 | 3.96 | 2.85 | 4.43 | 3.08 |
| Figure 2.4b | 7.04 | 3.16 | 2.21 | 1.69 | 4.62 | 2.44 |
| Figure 2.6 | 2.2 | 1.18 | 2.32 | 0.46 | 2.21 | 0.82 |
| Figure 2.8 | 2.89 | 4.85 | 2.70 | 4.71 | 2.81 | 4.78 |

Table 4.2 @ 1.5 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.5 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.2 | 2.40 | 1.76 | 2.39 | 1.80 | 2.41 | 1.77 |
| Figure 2.4a | 5.09 | 3.41 | 4.16 | 2.95 | 4.63 | 3.18 |
| Figure 2.4b | 7.24 | 3.26 | 2.41 | 1.79 | 4.82 | 2.54 |
| Figure 2.6 | 2.41 | 1.28 | 2.52 | 0.56 | 2.41 | 0.92 |
| Figure 2.8 | 3.10 | 4.95 | 2.90 | 4.81 | 3.02 | 4.88 |

Table 4.2 @ 1.0 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.0 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.2 | 2.60 | 1.96 | 2.59 | 2.00 | 2.61 | 1.97 |
| Figure 2.4a | 5.29 | 3.61 | 4.36 | 3.15 | 4.83 | 3.38 |
| Figure 2.4b | 7.44 | 3.46 | 2.61 | 1.99 | 5.02 | 2.74 |
| Figure 2.6 | 2.61 | 1.48 | 2.72 | 0.76 | 2.61 | 1.12 |
| Figure 2.8 | 3.30 | 5.15 | 3.10 | 5.01 | 3.22 | 5.08 |



Figure 4.2 Average Rising Delay


Figure 4.3 Average Falling Delay

Table 4.3
Comparison of Each XOR Function

|  | 00 | 01 | 10 | 11 | \#Tr | Driving Output | Complement Output |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.1 | O | O | O | O | 4 | No | Yes |
| Figure 2.2 | O | O | O | O | 6 | better | Yes |
| Figure 2.3 | X | X | O | O | 4 | No | No |
| Figure 2.4 | O | O | O | O | 6 | good | No |
| Figure 2.4b | O | O | A | O | 6 | worse | No |
| Figure 2.5 | O | O | O | X | 4 | No | No |
| Figure 2.6 | O | O | O | O | 6 | best | No |
| Figure 2.8 | O | O | O | O | 6 | No | No |

Symbols: $\mathrm{AB}=00,01,10,11$. \#Tr is number of transistors, O is good X is poor signal level. A is nearly good signal level.

Table 4.4
Average Power Dissipation from 0 through 100ns of XOR Gates
Unit: uW, Power@1v, Power@ 1.5v, Power@2v, Power@2.5v, Power@2.5v/Vth

| Figure 2.2 | 15.21 uW | 30.42 uW | 40.92 uW | 62.98 uW | 68.98 uW |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.4a | 5.20 uW | 19.40 uW | 30.90 uW | 43.91 uW | 47.92 uW |
| Figure 2.4b | 8.41 uW | 15.63 uW | 26.13 uW | 53.13 uW | 58.23 uW |
| Figure 2.6 | 7.31 uW | 12.53 uW | 20.03 uW | 48.03 uW | 53.09 uW |
| Figure 2.8 | 15.32 uW | 30.52 uW | 45.02 uW | 70.02 uW | 76.03 uW |

Power Dissipation Equation measure from HSPICES:
.meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from $=2.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ to $=100.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param $=$ ' - avg_curr*Vdd'


Figure 4.4 Average Power Dissipation
(Note: Two marks at $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}=2.5$ volt was shown on the chart, for the bottom mark is simulated at $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}=2.5$ volt and the top mark is simulated with decreased threshold voltage)

### 4.1 Results of XOR Gates with Mentor Graphics

Results of average delay, rising delay time, and falling delay time of XOR gates are listed in Table 4.5 and 4.6. The comparison of each XOR gate is summarized in Table 4.7. The average power dissipation of each XOR gate is summarized in Table 4.8. Charts for data analysis are shown in Table 4.5 to 4.8. For the data shown in Tables 4.5 to 4.8 and Figures 4.5 to 4.8, all the XOR gates are listed in the Figures 2.M1, 2.M2, 2.M3, 2.M4, and 2.M5. These XOR gates have been fully simulated at the Mentor Graphics Level 53 with TSMC $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology.

Table 4.5 @ 2.5 volt with scale $V_{\text {th }}$
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.5 Volt with scale Vth

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1/Vth | 1.80 | 2.01 | 1.97 | 2.00 | 1.94 |
| Figure 2.M2/Vth | 3.09 | 3.98 | 3.71 | 4.01 | 3.69 |
| Figure 2.M3/Vth | 1.21 | 1.41 | 1.22 | 1.39 | 1.31 |
| Figure 2.M4/Vth | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.22 |
| Figure 2.M5/Vth | 2.50 | 2.40 | 2.50 | 2.40 | 2.45 |

Remark: $00->10$ : Input signals AB change from 00 to 10 , delay time $=$ time difference between input transistor $50 \%$ level and the $50 \%$ output level. This is the time taken for a logic transition to pass from input to output.

Table 4.5 @ 2.5 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.5 Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.20 | 2.21 | 2.27 | 2.43 | 2.03 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 3.29 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.21 | 4.04 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 1.41 | 1.61 | 1.42 | 1.59 | 1.51 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.35 | 0.26 | 0.38 | 0.28 | 0.31 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.75 |

Table 4.5 @ 2.0 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.0Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.50 | 2.41 | 2.57 | 2.73 | 2.33 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 3.49 | 4.38 | 4.11 | 4.41 | 4.24 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 1.61 | 1.81 | 1.62 | 1.79 | 1.71 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.65 | 0.56 | 0.68 | 0.58 | 0.60 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 2.85 |

Table 4.5 @ 1.5 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.5Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.80 | 2.71 | 2.87 | 3.03 | 2.63 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 3.79 | 4.58 | 4.31 | 4.61 | 4.32 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 1.81 | 2.01 | 1.82 | 1.99 | 1.91 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.75 | 0.66 | 0.78 | 0.64 | 0.72 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 3.00 | 3.10 | 3.00 | 3.10 | 3.05 |

Table 4.5 @ 1.0 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.0Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 3.10 | 3.01 | 3.17 | 3.33 | 3.15 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 3.99 | 4.88 | 4.61 | 4.81 | 4.57 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.11 | 2.31 | 2.12 | 2.19 | 2.20 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 1.05 | 0.96 | 1.08 | 0.94 | 1.02 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 3.20 | 3.30 | 3.20 | 3.30 | 3.25 |



Figure 4.5 Average Delay XOR Gates
(Note: Two marks at $V_{d d}=2.5$ volt was shown on the chart, for the bottom mark is simulated at $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dd}}=2.5$ volt and the top mark is simulated with decreased threshold voltage)

Table 4.6 @ 2.5 volt with scale $V_{\text {th }}$
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.5 volt with scale Vth

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1/Vth | 2.30 | 2.73 | 2.31 | 2.74 | 2.31 | 2.74 |
| Figure 2.M2/Vth | 3.90 | 4.38 | 3.92 | 4.40 | 3.91 | 4.39 |
| Figure 2.M3/Vth | 1.40 | 1.63 | 1.42 | 1.64 | 1.41 | 1.63 |
| Figure 2.M4/Vth | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.52 | 0.22 | 0.51 |
| Figure 2.M5/Vth | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.70 |

Remark: Rising time $=$ time for a waveform to rise from $10 \%$ to $90 \%$ of its Steady-state value.
Falling time: time for a waveform to fall from $90 \%$ to $10 \%$ of its Steady-state value.

Table 4.6 @ 2.5 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.5 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.50 | 2.93 | 2.51 | 2.94 | 2.51 | 2.94 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 4.10 | 4.58 | 4.12 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 4.59 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 1.60 | 1.83 | 1.62 | 1.84 | 1.61 | 1.83 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.58 | 0.80 | 0.60 | 0.82 | 0.52 | 0.81 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 4.50 | 3.51 | 4.50 | 3.51 | 4.50 | 3.51 |

Table 4.6 @ 2.0 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 2.0volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.75 | 3.18 | 2.76 | 3.19 | 2.76 | 3.18 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 4.40 | 4.88 | 4.42 | 4.90 | 4.31 | 4.89 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 1.80 | 2.03 | 1.82 | 2.04 | 1.81 | 2.03 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.78 | 2.00 | 0.80 | 1.02 | 0.72 | 1.01 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 4.70 | 3.71 | 4.60 | 3.71 | 4.65 | 3.71 |

Table 4.6 @ 1.5 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.5 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.96 | 3.48 | 2.97 | 3.49 | 2.97 | 3.48 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 4.60 | 5.08 | 4.62 | 5.10 | 4.61 | 5.09 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.01 | 2.33 | 2.02 | 2.34 | 2.02 | 2.33 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.98 | 2.30 | 1.00 | 1.32 | 0.92 | 1.81 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 4.95 | 3.94 | 5.00 | 3.96 | 4.97 | 3.95 |

Table 4.6 @ 1.0 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XOR Structure at 1.0 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 3.16 | 3.78 | 3.37 | 3.89 | 3.27 | 3.84 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 5.10 | 5.58 | 5.12 | 5.50 | 5.11 | 5.59 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.61 | 3.03 | 2.62 | 3.04 | 2.62 | 3.03 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 1.68 | 2.90 | 1.60 | 1.92 | 1.52 | 2.41 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 5.20 | 4.10 | 5.30 | 4.20 | 5.25 | 4.15 |



Figure 4.6 Average Rising Delay XOR Gates


Figure 4.7 Average Falling Delay XOR

Table 4.7

Comparison of Each XOR Function

|  | 00 | 01 | 10 | 11 | $\# T r$ | Driving Output | Complement Output |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | O | O | O | O | 6 | No | No |
| Figure 2.M2 | O | O | O | O | 8 | best | No |
| Figure 2.M3 | O | A | O | O | 10 | best | No |
| Figure 2.M4 | O | A | O | O | 8 | best | No |
| Figure 2.M5 | O | O | O | O | 10 | best | Yes |

Symbols: $\mathrm{AB}=00,01,10,11$. \#Tr is number of transistors, O is good signal level. X is poor signal level. A is nearly good signal level.

Table 4.8
Average Power Dissipation from 0 through 100ns XOR Gates

| Unit: uW, | Power@1v | Power@1.5v | Power@2v | Power@2.5v | $\frac{\text { Power@2.5v }}{V_{\mathrm{th}}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 143.77uW | 157.88uW | 175.44uW | 185.11uW | 187.45uW |
| Figure 2.M2 | 27.28uW | 38.40 uW | 49.67uW | 62.25 uW | 67.54uW |
| Figure 2.M3 | 98.78 uW | 148.20 uW | 197.67uW | 247.00 uW | 252.90uW |
| Figure 2.M4 | 13.00uW | 19.50uW | 26.00 uW | 32.50 uW | 37.50uW |
| Figure 2.M5 | 69.76uW | 104.64uW | 139.52uW | 174.40 uW | 202.30uW |



Figure 4.8 Average Power Dissipation XOR Gates

### 4.2 Results XNOR Gates with Mentor Graphics

Results of average delay, rising delay time, and falling delay time of XNOR gates in Table 4.9 and 4.10. The comparison of each XNOR gate is summarized in Table 4.11. The average power dissipation of each XNOR gates is summarized in Table 4.12. All the XNOR gates are shown in the Figures 2.M1, 2.M2, 2.M3, 2.M4, and 2.M5. These XNOR gates have been fully simulated on the Mentor Graphics Level 53 with TSMC $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ fabrication technology.

Table4.9@2.5volt with scale $V_{\text {th }}$
Delay Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 2.5Volt with scale Vth

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1/V Vth | 1.11 | 1.08 | 1.37 | 1.43 | 1.24 |
| Figure 2.M2/V | 2.26 | 2.15 | 1.48 | 1.37 | 1.81 |
| Figure 2.M3/V V th | 2.51 | 2.52 | 1.33 | 1.34 | 1.92 |
| Figure 2.M4/V $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}}$ | 0.07 | 0.06 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 0.58 |
| Figure 2.M5/V $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{th}}$ | 2.50 | 2.40 | 2.50 | 2.40 | 2.45 |

Remark: $00->10$ : Input signals AB change from 00 to 10 , delay time $=$ time difference between input transistor $50 \%$ level and the $50 \%$ output level. This is the time taken for a logic transition to pass from input to output.

Table 4.9 @ 2.5 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 2.5Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 1.21 | 1.18 | 1.47 | 1.53 | 1.34 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 2.36 | 2.25 | 1.58 | 1.47 | 1.91 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.61 | 2.62 | 1.63 | 1.64 | 2.22 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.17 | 0.16 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 0.68 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.75 |

Table 4.9 @ 2.0volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 2.0Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 1.40 | 1.31 | 1.67 | 1.73 | 1.53 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 2.56 | 2.45 | 2.78 | 1.67 | 2.11 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.81 | 2.82 | 1.83 | 1.84 | 2.42 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 1.81 | 1.81 | 1.28 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 2.85 |

Table 4.9 @ 1.5 volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 1.5Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 1.70 | 1.61 | 1.97 | 2.03 | 1.83 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 3.16 | 3.05 | 2.98 | 2.27 | 2.87 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 3.31 | 3.32 | 2.23 | 2.24 | 2.82 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 1.91 | 1.91 | 1.38 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 3.00 | 3.10 | 3.00 | 3.10 | 3.05 |

Table 4.9@1.0volt
Delay Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 1.0Volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ | $10->11$ | $11->01$ | $01->00$ | Average |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.20 | 2.11 | 2.47 | 2.53 | 2.33 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 3.66 | 3.55 | 3.20 | 2.57 | 3.24 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 3.81 | 3.82 | 2.73 | 2.74 | 3.32 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 1.37 | 1.36 | 2.41 | 2.41 | 1.88 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 3.20 | 3.30 | 3.20 | 3.30 | 3.25 |



Figure 4.9 Average Delay XNOR Gates

Table 4.10 @ 2.5 volt with scale Vth
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 2.5 volts with scale Vth

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1/Vth | 1.70 | 1.83 | 1.81 | 1.84 | 1.75 | 1.84 |
| Figure 2.M2/V $\mathrm{V}_{\text {th }}$ | 1.89 | 2.61 | 1.87 | 2.51 | 1.88 | 2.56 |
| Figure 2.M3/V $\mathrm{V}_{\text {th }}$ | 1.40 | 1.63 | 1.42 | 1.64 | 1.41 | 1.63 |
| Figure 2.M4/Vth | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.52 | 0.22 | 0.51 |
| Figure 2.M5/Vth | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.70 |

Remark: Rising time $=$ time for a waveform to rise from $10 \%$ to $90 \%$ of its Steady-state value.
Falling time: time for a waveform to fall from $90 \%$ to $10 \%$ of its Steady-state value.

Table 4.10 @ 2.5 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 2.5 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 1.90 | 2.03 | 1.91 | 2.04 | 1.90 | 2.04 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 2.06 | 2.81 | 2.07 | 2.81 | 2.06 | 2.81 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 1.70 | 2.93 | 1.74 | 2.94 | 1.73 | 2.93 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 1.41 | 0.87 | 1.40 | 0.88 | 1.41 | 0.87 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 4.50 | 3.51 | 4.50 | 3.51 | 4.50 | 3.51 |

Table 4.10 @ 2.0 volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 2.0volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.20 | 2.33 | 2.21 | 2.34 | 2.20 | 2.34 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 2.46 | 3.11 | 2.47 | 3.11 | 2.46 | 3.11 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.00 | 3.23 | 2.04 | 3.24 | 2.03 | 3.23 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 1.71 | 1.17 | 1.70 | 1.18 | 1.71 | 1.17 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 4.70 | 3.71 | 4.60 | 3.71 | 4.65 | 3.71 |

Table $4.10 @ 1.5 v o l t$
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 1.5 volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.60 | 2.73 | 2.61 | 2.74 | 2.60 | 2.74 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 2.86 | 3.51 | 2.87 | 3.41 | 2.86 | 3.46 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.50 | 3.63 | 2.54 | 3.64 | 2.53 | 3.63 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 1.91 | 1.50 | 1.90 | 1.49 | 1.91 | 1.49 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 4.95 | 3.94 | 5.00 | 3.96 | 4.97 | 3.95 |

Table 4.10 @ 1.0volt
Rising/Falling Time Analysis of Each XNOR Structure at 1.0volt

| Unit: ns | $00->10$ <br> Rising | $10->11$ <br> Falling | $11->01$ <br> Rising | $01->00$ <br> Falling | Average <br> Rising | Average <br> Falling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Figure 2.M1 | 2.90 | 3.03 | 2.91 | 3.04 | 2.90 | 3.04 |
| Figure 2.M2 | 3.06 | 3.71 | 3.07 | 3.61 | 3.06 | 3.66 |
| Figure 2.M3 | 2.90 | 4.03 | 2.94 | 4.04 | 2.93 | 4.03 |
| Figure 2.M4 | 2.41 | 1.70 | 1.30 | 2.28 | 2.31 | 1.98 |
| Figure 2.M5 | 5.20 | 4.10 | 5.30 | 4.20 | 5.25 | 4.15 |



Figure 4.10 Average Rising Delay XNOR


Figure 4.11 Average Falling Delay XNOR Gates

Table 4.11
Comparison of Each XNOR Function

|  | 00 | 01 | 10 | 11 | \#Tr | Driving Output | Complement Output |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Figure 2.M1 | O | O | O | O | 6 | No | No |
| Figure 2.M2 | O | O | O | O | 8 | best | No |
| Figure 2.M3 | O | X | O | O | 10 | best | No |
| Figure 2.M4 | O | A | O | O | 8 | best | No |
| Figure 2.M5 | O | O | O | O | 10 | best | Yes |

Symbols: $\mathrm{AB}=00,01,10,11$. \#Tr is number of transistors, O is
Good signal level. X is poor signal level. A is nearly good signal level.

Table 4.12
Average Power Dissipation at $2 \mathrm{~ns}-100 \mathrm{~ns}$ of XNOR

| Unit: uW | Power@1v | Power@1.5v |  | Power@2v | Power@2.5v |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |

Power Dissipation measure from the Mentor Graphics Unit in Watt:
.meas tran avg_curr avg $I\left(V_{d d}\right)$ from $=2.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ to $=100.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param $=$ ' -avg _curr* $\mathrm{V}_{\text {dd }}$ '

### 4.3 Experimental

This experiment used the full-restored combination circuit design XOR/XNOR (Figure 2.M1) designed for series connection of 128 XOR/XNORgates (Figure 4.12 and Figure 2.13). The first XOR gate has the name "XOR1" and the last XOR gate the name "XOR128". The series connections of 128 XOR/XNOR-gates are cascaded together such as the output of XOR1 connects to the input of XOR2 and so on. This experiment was devoted to a comparison of the output waveform from XOR1/XNOR1 to XOR127/XNOR127 gates. The output waveform shifts between the simulation graphs from XOR1 to XOR127. The simulation result was that the output waveforms worked correctly from XOR1 to XOR127 gates without degeneration. Appendix D lists the full schematic design of the series connection 128 XOR/XNOR-gates.


Figure 4.12 Series Connection of 128 XOR-Gates

In this thesis, the author has proposed new configurations of CMOS designs for the exclusive-OR and exclusive-NOR functions. For all four-transistor configurations, based on the output waveform results, the designs no longer need the complementary signal inputs and only one poor signal input. For the six transistor types that arise from adding the fan-out (inverter) connected to the output XOR/XNOR gates to help drive the output signal, the proposed designs have non-complementary inputs, good signal level outputs and the best driving capability. Based on the simulation results of both the four-transistor and sixtransistor types, the designs are better and more competitive than traditional XOR circuits. An experiment where series connected 128 XOR/XNOR gates was designed with a static gate for low power circuit design and was verified by using the Mentor Graphics simulation. The simulation results showed the signal output waveforms working correctly from XOR1 gate to XOR127 gate without degeneration.
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APPENDIX A: Carry Selected Full Adder
10 Transistors for Half Adder (Transmission Gate)


16 Transistors for Full Adder (Transmission Gate)



14 Transistors Full Adder (Pass Transistor)


## APPENDIX B: TSMC CMOS Fabrication Technology

## Table 1

TMSC $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Fabrication Technology
TSMC $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Typical SPICE Model
.MODEL CMOSN/NMOS Level 49
Web page: ftp://ftp.mosis.org/pub/mosis/vendors/tsmc-035/t08s_lp4m-params.txt

| * DATE: Oct 30/98 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *LoT: n88y | WAF: 11 |  |
| * Temperature_parameters=Default |  |  |
| . MODEL CMOSN NMOS 1 | LEVEL= 49 |  |
| +VERSION $=3.1$ | TNOM $=27$ | TOX= $7.6 \mathrm{E}-9$ |
| $+\mathrm{XJ}=1.5 \mathrm{E}-7$ | $\mathrm{NCH}=1.7 \mathrm{E} 17$ | $\mathrm{VTHO}=0.4964$ |
| $+\mathrm{K} 1=0.5307769$ | $\mathrm{K} 2=0.0199705$ | K3 $=0.2963637$ |
| $+\mathrm{K} 3 \mathrm{~B}=0.2012165$ | W0 $\quad=2.836319 \mathrm{E}-6$ | NLX=2.8942E-7 |
| + DVT0W $=0$ | DVT1W $=5.3 \mathrm{E} 6$ | DVT2W $=-0.032$ |
| + DVT0 $=0.112017$ | DVT1 $=0.2453972$ | DVT2 $=-0.1719$ |
| +U0 $=444.9381976$ | UA $\quad=2.921 \mathrm{E}-10$ | $\mathrm{UB}=1.7732 \mathrm{E}-18$ |
| $+\mathrm{UC}=7.067896 \mathrm{E}-11$ | VSAT $=1.130785 \mathrm{E} 5$ | $\mathrm{A} 0=1.135$ |
| +AGS $=0.2810374$ | $\mathrm{B0}=2.844393 \mathrm{E}-7$ | $\mathrm{B} 1=5 \mathrm{E}-6$ |
| +KETA $=-7.8181 \mathrm{E}-3$ | $\mathrm{A} 1=0$ | A2 $=1$ |
| + RDSW $=925.2701982$ | PRWG $\quad=-1 \mathrm{E}-3$ | PRWB $=-1 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| $+W \mathrm{R}=1$ | WINT $=7.186965 \mathrm{E}-8$ | LINT $=1.7315 \mathrm{E}-9$ |
| $+\mathrm{XL}=0$ | $\mathrm{XW}=0$ | DWG $=-1.79 \mathrm{E}-8$ |
| + DWB $=5.851691 \mathrm{E}-9$ | $\mathrm{VOFF} \quad=-0.132935$ | NFACTOR= 0.5710 |
| + CIT $=0$ | CDSC $=8.607229 \mathrm{E}-4$ | CDSCD $=0$ |
| + CDSCB $=0$ | ETA0 $=2.128321 \mathrm{E}-3$ | $\mathrm{ETAB}=0$ |
| +DSUB $\quad=0.0257957$ | PCLM $=0.6766314$ | PDIBLC1 $=1$ |
| +PDIBLC2 $=1.787424 \mathrm{E}-3$ | PDIBLCB $=0$ | DROUT $=0.787$ |
| + PSCBE1 $=6.973485 \mathrm{E} 9$ | PSCBE2 $=1.46235 \mathrm{E}-7$ | PVAG $=0.05$ |
| +DELTA $=0.01$ | MOBMOD $=1$ | PRT $=0$ |
| +UTE $=-1.5$ | KT1 $=-0.11$ | KT1L= 0 |
| +KT2 $=0.022$ | UA1 $=4.31 \mathrm{E}-9$ | UB1 $=-7.61 \mathrm{E}-18$ |
| + UC1 $=-5.6 \mathrm{E}-11$ | $\mathrm{AT}=3.3 \mathrm{E} 4$ | WL= 0 |
| +WLN $=1$ | WW= 0 | WWN= 1 |
| + WWL $=0$ | $\mathrm{LL}=0$ | LLN $=1$ |
| +LW $=0$ | LWN $=1$ | LWL $=0$ |
| +CAPMOD $=2$ | CGDO $=1.96 \mathrm{E}-10$ | CGSO $=1.96 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| $+\mathrm{CGBO}=0$ | $\mathrm{CJ}=9.276962 \mathrm{E}-4$ | $\mathrm{PB}=0.8157962$ |
| $+\mathrm{MJ}=0.3557696$ | CJSW $=3.181055 \mathrm{E}-10$ | PBSW $=0.6869149$ |
| $+\mathrm{MJSW}=0.1$ | PVTH0 $=-0.0252481$ | PRDSW $=-96.428$ |
| +PK2 $\quad=-4.805372 \mathrm{E}-3$ | WKETA $=-7.643187 \mathrm{E}-4$ | LKETA $=-0.014$ ) |
| .MODEL CMOSP/PMOS Level 49 |  |  |



## APPENDIX C: HSPICE NETLIS Files

** HSPICE NETLIS of Fig 2.1 AXORB include TSMC $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Fabrication **
**
Technology
** Circuit: Fig. 1 The XOR functions implemented by transmission gates

* File:axorb_fig1.sp
* Vcc $=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$

M1 out b a Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=14u
M2 out a b Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=14u
M3 out out1 Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=7u
M4 out1 a b Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=7u
M5 outl b a Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=7u
M6 out out Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=14u
******WAVEFORM SETUP***********
Va a 0 pulse ( 1.501 ns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 20 ns 66.66 ns )
$\mathrm{Vb} \quad \mathrm{b} 0$ pulse( 1.50 1ns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 40 ns 86.66 ns )
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
C out Vss 1 pF
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out) I(Vdd) V(outl)
.probe tran out=V(out) outl=V(out1) Vdd=I(Vdd)

* let's measure average power consumption .meas tran avg_curr avg $I(V d d)$ from $=2.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ to $=100.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr*Vdd'
******* TSMC 0.35um fabrication technology
* DATE: Oct 30/98
*LoT: n88y WAF: 11
* Temperature_parameters=Default
.MODEL CMOSN NMOS ( LEVEL $=49$

TNOM $=27 \quad$ TOX $=7.6 \mathrm{E}-9$
$+\mathrm{XJ} \quad=1.5 \mathrm{E}-7 \quad \mathrm{NCH}=1.7 \mathrm{E} 17 \quad \mathrm{VTHO}=0.4964448$
$+\mathrm{K} 1 \quad=0.53077 \quad \mathrm{~K} 2=0.0199705 \quad \mathrm{~K} 3=0.2963637$

+ K3B $\quad=0.20121 \quad \mathrm{~W} 0=2.836319 \mathrm{E}-6 \quad \mathrm{NLX}=2.8948 \mathrm{E}-7$
+ DVT0W $=0$
+ DVT0 $=0.1120$
+U0 $\quad=444.9381 \quad U A=2.921284 \mathrm{E}-10 \quad \mathrm{UB}=1.7732 \mathrm{E}-18$
$+\mathrm{UC} \quad=7.0678 \mathrm{E}-11 \quad \mathrm{VSAT}=1.130785 \mathrm{E} 5 \quad \mathrm{~A} 0=1.1356246$

```
+AGS =0.28103
+KETA =-7.8181E-3
+RDSW =925.27019
+WR =1
+XL =0
+DWB = 5.8516E-9
+CIT =0 CDSC= 8.60722E-4 CDSCD=0
+CDSCB =0 ETA0 = 2.128321E-3 ETAB=0
+DSUB =0.02579 PCLM=0.6766 PDIBLC1= 1010
+PDIBLC2 = 1.7874E-3 PDIBLCB = 0 DROUT =0.7873539
+PSCBE1 =6.9734E9 PSCBE2=1.46235E-7 PVAG =0.05
+DELTA =0.01 MOBMOD=1 RT=0
+UTE =-1.5 KTl =-0.11 KTlL=0
+KT2 =0.022 UA1=4.31E-9 UB1=-7.61E-18
+UC1 =-5.6E-11 AT =3.3E4 WL=0
+WLN = 1 WW=0 WWN=1
+WWL =0 LL=0 LLN=1
+LW =0 LWN=1 LWL=0
+CAPMOD =2 CGDO = 1.96E-10 CGSO = 1.96E-10
+CGBO = C CJ =9.2769E-4 PB =0.815796
+MJ =0.3557 CJSW =3.181E-10 PBSW=0.686914
+MJSW = 0.1 PVTH0=-0.0252 PRDSW=-96.4502
+PK2 =-4.8053E-3 WKETA= -7.6431E-4 LKETA = -0.01291)
*
.MODEL CMOSP PMOS ( LEVEL = 49
+VERSION = 3.1 TNOM = 27 TOX = 7.6E-9
+XJ = 1.5E-7 NCH=1.7E17 VTH0 = -0.6636594
+K1 = 0.456478 K2 = -0.019447 K3=39.382919
+K3B =-2.8930 W0 =2.6555E-6 NLX = 1.5102E-7
+DVT0W =0 DVT1W=5.3E6 DVT2W = -0.032
+DVT0 = 1.1744581 DVT1=0.7631 DVT2 = -0.1035171
+U0 = 151.3305606 UA=2.061E-10 UB=1.8234E-18
+UC =-8.973E-12
+AGS =0.3961
+KETA = -9.27E-3
+RDSW =2.307E3
+WR = 1 WINT = 5.9622E-8 LINT =4.309E-9
+XL =0 XW =0 DWG = -1.596E-8
+DWB = 1.378919E-8 VOFF =-0.15 NFACTOR =2
+CIT =0 CDSC = 6.593E-4 CDSCD =0
+CDSCB =0 ETA0 =0.0286 ETAB=0
+DSUB =0.2436027
+PDIBLC2 = 4.256E-3 PDIBLCB = 0 DROUT =0.0120292
PCLM = 4.3597 PDIBLC1 =7.4470E-4
+PSCBE1 = 1.3476E10 PSCBE2 = 5E-9 PVAG =3.669793
```

| +DELTA | $=0.01$ | MOBMOD | $=1$ | PRT | $=0$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| +UTE | $=-1.5$ | KT1 | $=-0.11$ | KT1L | $=0$ |
| +UT2 | $=0.022$ | UA1 | $=4.31 \mathrm{E}-9$ | UB1 | $=-7.61 \mathrm{E}-18$ |
| +UC1 | $=-5.6 \mathrm{E}-11$ | AT | $=3.3 \mathrm{E} 4$ | WL | $=0$ |
| +WLN | $=1$ | WW | $=0$ | WWN | $=1$ |
| +WWL | $=0$ | LL | $=0$ | LLN | $=1$ |
| +LW | $=0$ | LWN | $=1$ | LWL | $=0$ |
| +CAPMOD | $=2$ | CGDO | $=2.307 \mathrm{E}-10$ | CGSO | $=2.307 \mathrm{E}-10$ |
| +CGBO | $=0$ | CJ | $=1.4202 \mathrm{E}-3$ | PB | $=0.99$ |
| +MJ | $=0.5490$ | CJSW | $=4.7736 \mathrm{E}-10$ | PBSW | $=0.99$ |
| +MJSW | $=0.1997$ | PVTH0 | $=6.5870 \mathrm{E}-3$ | PRDSW $=-93.5582228$ |  |
| +PK2 | $=1.0113 \mathrm{E}-3$ | WKETA | $=-0.01013$ | LKETA $=6.0279 \mathrm{E}-3)$ |  |
| + |  |  |  |  |  |

$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$

| $* *$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $*$ This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.2, AXORB | $* *$ |
| $* * \quad$ Circuit: Fig. 2 The XOR functions implemented by | $* *$ |
| $* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$ |  |

* File:axorb_fig2.sp
* $\mathrm{Vcc}=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$

M1 out b a Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=14u
M2 a bn out Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=7u
M3 out bn an Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=14u
M4 an b out Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=7u
M5 out1 out Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=17u
M6 outl out Vss Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 u \mathrm{~W}=7 \mathrm{u}$
******WAVEFORM SETUP $* * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
Va a 0 pulse ( $1.5,01 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Van an 0 pulse( $0,1.5$ lns $3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns})$
Vb b 0 pulse ( $1.5,0 \mathrm{lns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 40 \mathrm{~ns} 86.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Vbn bn 0 pulse( $0,1.5 \mathrm{lns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 40 \mathrm{~ns} 86.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
C out1 Vss
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V (out1) I(Vdd)
.probe tran out=V(out1) Vdd=I(Vdd)

* let's measure average power consumption
.meas tran avg_curr avg $\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{Vdd})$ from $=2.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ to $=10.0 \mathrm{~ns}$
.meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* 1.5 '
.end
***********************************************

* File:axnorb_fig2.sp
* Vcc $=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$

| M1 out | bn | a | Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=14u |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M2 a | b | out | Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} \mathrm{W}=7 \mathrm{u}$ |
| M3 out | b | an | Vdd CMOSP $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} \mathrm{W}=14 \mathrm{u}$ |
| M4 an | bn | out | Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} \mathrm{W}=7 \mathrm{u}$ |
| M5 out | out | Vdd | Vdd CMOSP $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} \mathrm{W}=21 \mathrm{u}$ |
| M6 out1 | out | Vss | Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} \mathrm{W}=7 \mathrm{u}$ |

*WAVEFORM SETUP
Va a 0 pulse( $1.5,01 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Van an 0 pulse( $0,1.5 \mathrm{lns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns})$
Vb b 0 pulse( $1.5,0$ 1ns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 40 ns 86.66 ns )
Vbn bn 0 pulse( $0,1.51 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 40 \mathrm{~ns} 86.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
Coutl Vss 1pF
.TRAN .02ns 100 ns
.PRINT TRAN V(out1) I(Vdd)
.probe tran out1=V(out1) Vdd=I(Vdd)

* let's measure average power consumption .meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from=2.0ns to $=10.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* $1.5^{\prime}$ .end
*************************************************
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.3/AXORB **
** Circuit: Fig. 3(a) Inverter-base XOR structure **
*************************************************
* File:axorb_fig3.sp
* Vcc $=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$

| M1 out | a | Vdd | Vdd CMOSP $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} W=10 \mathrm{u}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M2 out | a | Vss | Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} \mathrm{W}=10 \mathrm{u}$ |
| M3 out1 | b | a | Vdd CMOSP $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} W=10 \mathrm{u}$ |
| M4 out1 | b | out | Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{u} W=10 \mathrm{u}$ |

## ****WAVEFORM SETUP

Va a 0 pulse ( $1.5,0$ 1ns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 20 ns 66.66 ns )
Vb b 0 pulse ( $1.5,0$ lns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 40 ns 86.66 ns )
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
R outl Vss 100
*C out1 Vss 1 pF
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out1) I(Vdd) .probe tran outl=V(outl) Vdd=I(Vdd)

* let's measure average power consumption .meas tran avg_curr avg I (Vdd) from $=2.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ to $=10.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* 1.5 '
.end

```
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.3/AXNORB ** ** Circuit: Fig. 3(b) Inverter-base XNOR structure ** ************************************************
```

* File:axnorb_fig3.sp
* Vcc $=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$

M1 out a Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=30u
M2 out a Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=10u
M3 out1 b out Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=3u
M4 out1 b a Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=1u
****WAVEFORM SETUP
Va a 0 pulse ( 01.5 1ns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 20 ns 66.66 ns )
Vb b 0 pulse( 01.5 lns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 40 ns 86.66 ns )
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
R out1 Vss 550
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(outl) I(Vdd) .probe tran outl=V(out1) Vdd=I(Vdd)

* let's measure average power consumption .meas tran avg_curr avg $\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{Vdd})$ from $=2.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ to $=10.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* 1.5 '
.end

```
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.4a/AXORB **
** Circuit: Fig. 4a Improved version of XOR structure
*************************************************
* File:axorb_fig4a.sp
* Vcc \(=1.5 \mathrm{~V}\)
****** Inverted
M1 out a Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=15u
M2 out a Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=5u
********** Tranmission gate
M3 b a out1 Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=2u
M4 b out outl Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=2u
******* Inverter
M5 out1 b a Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=9u
M6 out1 b out Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=3u
*WAVEFORM SETUP
Va a 0 pulse( \(1.5,0 \operatorname{lns} 3.33 n s 3.33 n s 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66\). 66 ns )
Vb b 0 pulse( \(1.5,01 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 40 \mathrm{~ns} 86\). 66ns)
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5 V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
*C outl GND 1pF
R outl GND 600
.TRAN .02NS 100 ns
.PRINT TRAN V(out1) I(Vdd)
.probe tran outl=V(outl) Vdd=I(Vdd)
* let's measure average power consumption
.meas tran avg_curr avg \(\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{Vdd})\) from \(=2.0 \mathrm{~ns}\) to \(=100 \mathrm{~ns}\)
.meas avg_power param \(=\) '-avg_curr* 1.5 '
.end
```

** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.4b/AXORB **
** Circuit: Fig. 4b Another improved version of XOR structure **

* File:axorb_fig4b.sp
* Vcc $=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$
M1 out a Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=30u
M2 out a Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=10u
M3 out 1 b out Vdd CMOSP $L=0.35 \mathrm{U} W=3 u$
M4 out1 b a Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=1u
M5 out 2 out 1 Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=9u
M6 out2 out 1 Vss Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{U} W=3 u$

```
*WAVEFORM SETUP
Va a 0 pulse(0, 1.5 1ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 20ns, 66.66ns)
Vb b 0 pulse(0, 1.5 lns 3.33ns 3.33ns 40ns 86.66ns)
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
R out1 Vss 550
R1 out2 Vss 50
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out1) I(Vdd)
.probe tran outl=V(outl) Vdd=I(Vdd)
* let's measure average power consumption
.meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from=2.0ns to=10.0ns
.meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* 1.5'
.end
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.5/AXORB **
** Circuit: Fig.5 Proposed XOR **
* File:axorb_fig5.sp
* Vcc = 1.5V
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
M1 out B y Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=lu
M2 y A Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=1u
M3 out B A Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=2.5u
M4 out A B Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=2.5u
C out Vss . 1pF
V1 A 0 pulse(1.5,0 1ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 20ns, 66.66ns)
V2 B 0 pulse(1.5, 0 1ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 40ns, 86.66ns)
.TRAN 0.020NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out)
.probe tran out=V(out)
* let's measure average power consumption
.meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from=1.0ns to=10.0ns
.meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* 1.5'
.end
```

```
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.5/AXNORB **
** Circuit: Fig. 5 Proposed XNOR **
*************************************************
* File:axnorb_fig5.sp
* Vcc=1.5V
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
M1 out B y Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=25u
M2 y A Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=25u
M3 out B A Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=10u
M4 out A B Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=10u
C out Vss .1pF
Vl A 0 pulse(0, 1.5 1ns 3.333ns 3.33ns 20ns, 66.66ns)
V2 B 0 pulse(0,1.5 1ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 40ns, 86.66ns)
.TRAN 0.020NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out)
.probe tran out=V(out)
* let's measure average power consumption
.meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from=1.0ns to= 10.0ns
.meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr*}1.5
.end
```

** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.6/AXORB **
** Circuit: Fig. 6 The Proposed XOR structure with **
** driving output **
*File:axorb_fig6.sp, l=.35u, WP=2.1u
$* V c c=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5 V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
M1 out1 out Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=15u
M2 out1 out Vss Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{U}$ W=5u
M3 out $\mathrm{B} \quad$ ydd CMOSP $L=0.35 \mathrm{U} \mathrm{W}=2.1 \mathrm{u}$
M4 y A Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=2.1u
M5 out B A Vss CMOSN $L=0.35 \mathrm{U}$ W $=1.05 \mathrm{u}$
M6 out A B Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=1.05u
Cl out1 Vss 1 pF
Va A 0 pulse( $0,1.5$ Ins $3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Vb B 0 pulse( $0,1.5 \mathrm{lns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 40 \mathrm{~ns} \quad, 86.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
.TRAN 0.020NS 100NS
．PRINT TRAN V（out）V（out1）
．probe tran out＝V（out）out $1=\mathrm{V}$（out1）
＊let＇s measure average power consumption．meas tran avg＿curr avg I（Vdd）from＝1．0ns to＝10．0ns．meas avg＿power param＝＇－avg＿curr＊ 1.5 ＇
.end
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.6/AXNORB **
Circuit: Fig. 6 The Proposed XNOR structure with **
** driving output **
*** * 水 $* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$

* File:axnorb_fig6.sp, l=.35u, WP=2.1u
* Vcc $=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V

| outl | out | Vdd | Vdd | CMOSP L＝0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M2 outl | out | Vss | Vss | CMOSN L＝0．35U W＝5u |
| M3 out | B | y | Vss | CMOSN L＝0．35U W＝1．05u |
| M4 | A | Vss | Vss | CMOSN L＝0．35U W＝1．05u |
| M5 out | B | A | Vdd | CMOSP L＝0．35U W＝2．1u |
| M6 | A | B | Vdd | CMOSP L＝0．35U W＝2．1u |
| C outl Vss 1pF |  |  |  |  |
| V1 A 0 pulse（ $1.5,03 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ ） |  |  |  |  |
| V2 B 0 pulse（ $1.5,03 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 40 \mathrm{~ns}, 86.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ ） |  |  |  |  |

.TRAN 0.020NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out1)
.probe tran out1=V(out1)

* let's measure average power consumption
.meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from=1.0ns to $=10.0 \mathrm{~ns}$
.meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* 1.5 '
.end
水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水 $* * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.7//Fig 2.M1 XOR/XNOR **
** Circuit: Fig. 7/ Fig. M1 Full restored Combination circuit design **
** XOR/XNOR **

* File:axorb_fig12.sp
* Vcc $=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$
M1 out b a Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=5u
M2 out a b Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=5u

*WAVEFORM SETUP
Va a 0 pulse( $1.5,01 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Van an 0 pulse( $0,1.5$ lns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 20 ns , 66.66 ns )
Vb b 0 pulse( $1.5,0$ lns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 40 ns 86.66 ns )
Vbn bn 0 pulse ( $0,1.5$ 1ns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 40 ns 86.66 ns$)$
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5 V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
C outl Vss 1 pF
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out1) I(Vdd)
.probe tran out=V(out1) Vdd=I(Vdd)
* let's measure average power consumption.meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from=2.0ns to=10.0ns
.meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr*1.5'
.end

** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.12b /AXORB **
** Circuit: Fig. 12b Realistic-simulated circuit for Fig. 4 **

* File:fig12b.sp
* $\mathrm{Vcc}=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$
****** Inverter
M1 out a Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=15u
M2 out a Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=5u
*********** Tranmission gate
M3 b a out1 Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=2u
M4 b out out1 Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=2u
******* Inverter
M5 out1 b a Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=9u
M6 out1 b out Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=3u
************input_an, output_a
M7 a an Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=6u
M8 an Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=2u
**********input_bn, output_b
M9 b bn Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=6u
M10 b bn Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=2u


## *WAVEFORM SETUP

Va a 0 pulse( $1.5,0$ lns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns $20 n \mathrm{~ns}$, 66. ..... 66ns)
Vb b 0 pulse( $1.5,0$ lns 3.33 ns 3.33ns 40 ns 86.6 ..... 6ns)
Van an 0 pulse ( $0,1.5$ 1ns $3.33 n s 3.33$ ns $20 n s, 6$ ..... 6.66ns)

Vbn bn 0 pulse( $0,1.5$ lns $3.33 n s$ 3.33ns 40 ns 86.66 ns )
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
*C out1 GND 1pF
R outl GND 600
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(out1) I(Vdd)
.probe tran out1 $=\mathrm{V}$ (out1) $\mathrm{Vdd}=\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{Vdd})$

* let's measure average power consumption .meas tran avg_curr avg I(Vdd) from=2.0ns to $=10.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param $=$ '-avg_curr* 1.5 ' .end
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.12c /AXORB **
** Realistic-simulated circuit for Fig. 4
* File:Fig. 12c.sp
* $\mathrm{Vcc}=1.5 \mathrm{~V}$

M1 out a Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=30U
M2 out a Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=10U
M3 out 1 b out Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=3u
M4 outl b a Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=1u M5 out2 out 1 Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=9U M6 out2 out1 Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=3U $* * * * * * * * * * *$ input_an, output_a

M7 a an Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=6u
M8 a an Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=2u
$* * * * * * * * * *_{\text {input_bn, }}$ output_b
M9 b bn Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=6u
M10 b bn Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=2u
*WAVEFORM SETUP
Va a 0 pulse( $0,1.51 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}$, 66.66 ns )
Vb b 0 pulse $(0,1.5 \mathrm{lns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 40 \mathrm{~ns} 86.66 \mathrm{~ns})$
Van an 0 pulse ( $1.5,01 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 3.33 \mathrm{~ns} 20 \mathrm{~ns}, 66.66 \mathrm{~ns}$ )
Vbn bn 0 pulse ( $1.5,0$ 1ns 3.33 ns 3.33 ns 40 ns 86.66 ns )
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5 V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
R outl Vss 550
R1 out2 Vss 50
.TRAN .02NS 100NS
.PRINT TRAN V(outl) I(Vdd)
.probe tran outl=V(out1) Vdd=I(Vdd)

* let's measure average power consumption .meas tran avg_curr avg $\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{Vdd})$ from=2.0ns to $=10.0 \mathrm{~ns}$ .meas avg_power param = '-avg_curr* 1.5 '
.end

```
** This file is HSPICES NETLIS of Fig 2.12d /AXORB **
** Circuit: Fig. 12d Realistic-simulated circuit for Fig. 6 **
***************************************************
* File:fig12d.sp, l=.35u,WP=2.1u
* Vcc = 1.5V
Vdd Vdd 0 DC 1.5V
Vss Vss 0 DC 0V
M1 outl out Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=15u
M2 out1 out Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=5u
M3 out B y Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=2.1u
M4 y A Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35U W=2.1u
M5 out B A Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=1.05u
M6 out A B Vss CMOSN L=0.35U W=1.05u
M7 a an Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=6u
M8 a an Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=2u
**********input_bn, utput_b
M9 b bn Vdd Vdd CMOSP L=0.35u W=6u
M10 b bn Vss Vss CMOSN L=0.35u W=2u
Cl out1 Vss 1pF
Va A 0 pulse(0,1.5 1ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 20ns, 66.66ns)
Vb B 0 pulse(0,1.5 1ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 40ns, 86.66ns)
Van an 0 pulse(1.5,0 1ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 20ns, 66.66ns)
Vbn bn 0 pulse(1.5,01ns 3.33ns 3.33ns 40ns 86.66ns)
.TRAN 0.020NS 100NS
.probe tran out=V(out) outl=V(out1)
.meas tran avg_curr av g I(Vdd) from=1.0ns to=10.0ns
.meas avg_power param= '-avg_curr* 1.5'
.end
********* END OF HSPICES NETLIS ****************
```

APPENDIX D: The Layout of XOR/XNOR Works on Mentor Graphics, Design Architecture (DA) from Figures 2.M1 to 2.M5, and Schismatic of 128 XOR/XNOR-Gates.
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Fig.3(b) Inverter-base XNOR structure




Fig. 4(b) Inverter-base XOR structure driving out put
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