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Abstract—This paper presents a transconductor designed using a physical model of double-gate p-type organic thin film transistors (OTFTs). A control voltage can be used to vary the output resistance and the transconductance over one order of magnitude. The voltage gain does not depend on process parameters and therefore is insensitive to shelf and operational degradation. This circuit can be used as a tunable resistor, in voltage amplifiers or in $G_mC$ filters.

I. INTRODUCTION

The interest in electronics manufactured with organic semiconductors (i.e. “organic electronics”) has been constantly growing in the last twenty years. This technology has made a lot of progress both from the performance and the reliability point of view, enabling the design of increasingly more complex organic circuits. Digital circuits, like RFID transponders [1] and microprocessors [2] have been demonstrated. Recently the first comparators, digital-to-analog [3], [4] and analog-to-digital converters [5], [6] have been shown, but more effort must be spent on analog circuit design. Indeed different kinds of organic sensors have already been reported [7] and the lack of digital converters [5], [6] has been shown, but more effort must be spent on analog circuit design. Indeed different kinds of organic sensors have already been reported [7] and the lack of digital converters [5], [6] has been shown, but more effort must be spent on analog circuit design.

In this paper is presented the design of a linear transconductor suitable for the implementation of voltage amplifiers and $G_mC$ active filters. A novel physical model is used to describe the organic thin-film transistor (OTFT) behavior.

II. DUAL GATE ORGANIC TFTS AND THEIR MODEL

The organic transistors used in this paper are p-type pentacene TFTs with bottom gate structure fabricated using a commercial technology [8] and a new physical model of the OTFT was adopted for this design.

The current conduction in organic TFTs is typically modelled using the concept of variable range hopping (VRH) [9]. According to this theory, in organic semiconductors free carriers jump between localized energy states, therefore the density of states (DOS) defines the electrical properties of the material. In this technology the DOS is well approximated as the sum of two exponential functions [10], [11]: one is valid for the deep states (low energy) and one for the tail states (high energy)\(^1\). In the rest of the paper subscripts “d” and “t” will refer respectively to these two kinds of states.

The channel current $I_c$ can be found combining the deep and tail currents [10], given by

$$I_{d,t} = \beta_{d,t}(V_G - V_S - V_T)^{\gamma_{d,t}} - \beta_{d,t}(V_G - V_D - V_T)^{\gamma_{d,t}}, \tag{1}$$

\(^1\)For the sake of simplicity all transistor equations will be written for n-type transistors, even if the technology provides only p-type devices.

according to the equation [11]:

$$I_c = \frac{I_d I_t}{I_d + I_t}. \tag{2}$$

The prefactor $\beta$ in (1) depends on both geometric and physical parameters of the transistor and the exponent $\gamma$, always larger than two, takes into account the superlinear variation of the mobility with the concentration of charge carriers (and thus $V_G$). The total transistor current can finally be calculated as

$$I_{DS} = I_c \cdot I_s, \tag{3}$$

where the factor $I_s$ takes account of the channel length modulation and reads:

$$I_s = 1 + \left( \frac{V_{DS}}{V_{Early}} \right)^{1/\gamma}. \tag{4}$$

$I_s$ models the channel modulation due to the space charge limited (SCL) transport in the depletion region [13]. The value of $V_{Early}$ depends on the transistor length, and has been suitably characterized from measurements. In order to keep the continuity of the model the factor $I_s$ multiplies also the linear current, but its effect in the linear region is negligible due to the low $V_{DS}$.

Given the “shunt combination” of currents in (2), only the smallest among deep and tail current is relevant for the total channel current: hence for hand calculations the smallest among the currents (1) can be considered alone.

The OTFTs used in this work have a second gate controlling the back side of the channel. This “top” gate has the property to influence the transistor threshold, inducing a capacitive coupling of the top gate with the channel [8]. It is worth noticing that in our p-type transistors $V_T$ is positive for zero top gate bias, hence the devices are conductive already for $V_{GS} = 0V$. Figure 1 shows the measured and the modelled transfer characteristics of a transistor obtained varying the top gate bias (here it is evident the threshold shifting effect of $V_{TG}$). Figure 2 plots transfer and output characteristic of a transistor, measured and modelled for $V_{TG} = 0$. 
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III. DESIGN OF THE TRANCONDUCTOR

The design of a transconductor begins with the choice of the actual transconductive element. The technology used, like almost every other organic one, does not provide linear resistors, hence the choice is limited between the linear and saturation regions of the OTFT. In this case linearity was preferred over transconductance, and thus the output resistance of the transistor $M_2$ (see schematic in Fig. 3) was used to create the transconductance. The transistor $M_2$ acts as source follower and applies the input voltage on $M_2$. The voltage drop on $M_2$ sets the current that the current mirror ($M_3$ and $M_4$) transfer to the output branch. $M_5$ simply cascodes the output. In case of an ideal source follower and current mirror the transconductance of the circuit would be:

$$G_m = 1/r_{02}$$ (6)

Unfortunately the actual transconductance always happens to be smaller, especially due to few peculiarities of current mirrors in unipolar organic technologies.

A. Current Mirror

Transistors $M_3$ and $M_4$ mirror the current from the input branch to the output one. Although really simple, this basic current mirror gains additional interest due to the different physics of the technology underneath. Our transistors have high threshold voltage, hence the sink device $M_3$ is always operating in the linear region and $M_4$ works in saturation only for high source-drain voltages. In our circuit $M_3$ limits the voltage drop on $M_4$, which, therefore, is always biased in the ohmic region too. Because of their bias point, it is not possible to obtain both the same transfer function for both the bias and the small-signal currents.

Indeed, being $M_3$ and $M_4$ in ohmic region, their current is strongly dependent on $V_{DS}$, and this voltage changes in a different way for the two devices. Hence (1) to the current mirror, it can be shown that the small signal current gain $T = \frac{g_{m,4}}{g_{m,3}}$ is always smaller than one. The transconductances $g_{m,4}$ and $g_{m,3}$ can be written respectively as:

$$g_{m,4} = \beta_d \gamma_d \left( V_{GS} - V_{FB} \right)^{\gamma_d - 1} - \left( V_{GD} - V_{FB} \right)^{\gamma_d - 1}$$
$$g_{m,3} = \beta_d \gamma_d \left( V_{GS} - V_{FB} \right)^{\gamma_d - 1}$$

and $T$ can be calculated to be:

$$T = 1 - \left( \frac{V_G - V_D - V_{FB}}{V_G - V_S - V_{FB}} \right)^{\gamma_d - 1}$$ (8)

where $V_G$ and $V_S$ are the DC gate and source voltage of both $M_3$ and $M_4$, while $V_D$ is the DC drain voltage of $M_4$. $T$ is less than 1 even when $V_D = V_G$ and the bias currents are identical. This is possible because a small variation of $V_{GS3}$ corresponds to a change in $V_{DS3}$ and they both contribute to the variation of $I_{S3D}$. In the case of $M_4$, $V_{DS4}$ does not need to change with $V_{GS4}$, thus the derivative of $I_{S4D}$ is in general different from the one of $I_{S3D}$.

B. Transconductive Device and Source Follower

The dimensions of $M_2$ play the most important role in the final transconductance, but an unsuitable choice of $M_1$ and $M_3$ can also negatively affect the performance of the final circuit. This happens when the variations of the voltage on $M_3$ and of the control voltage of $M_1$ are not negligible. Too small devices $M_1$ and $M_3$ will cause $V_{GS1}$ and $V_{GS3}$ to be large, decreasing the linearity and drastically reducing the input range. On the other hand, too wide $M_1$ would result in a waste of area, while a wide $M_1$ would cause a decrease of the input range. Indeed, for low inputs, the source of $M_1$ would saturate to ground due to the positive threshold voltage. Hence the linear part of the characteristic would not start for $V_{in} = 0V$, but for $V_{in} > V_{GS1}(I_{MAX})$. According to these considerations the final design adopts the same dimensions for all the devices of the input branch.

A slightly higher transconductance of the source follower is advantageous in the transconductor, therefore the top gate of $M_1$ is also driven by the input voltage. It is easily derived combining (1) and (5) that in this configuration the transconductance of the input device increases by a factor $(1 + k)$. As explained in the subsection III.A, the devices $M_3$ and $M_4$ operate in their linear region. For this reason the output resistance is really low and the output branch needs to be cascaded. This task is carried out by $M_5$. It is worth noticing that the presence of $M_5$ does not increase the output resistance up to around $g_{m5}r_{03}$, because the source degeneration is weak and the resulting gain of the local negative feedback is low. For this reason the output resistance of the transconductor is, at first order, equal to the output resistance of $M_5$. This consideration
let us immediately infer the small signal voltage gain of the circuit (when the output is loaded with a current source - a condition that will be referred to as “unloaded”). Both the transconductance and the output resistance are determined by the $r_0$ of the two OTFTs $M_2$ and $M_3$, hence the unloaded voltage gain reads:

$$G = T \left( \frac{r_0}{r_{02}} \right). \quad (9)$$

C. Output Resistance and Gain

In order to increase the voltage gain, it is possible to change the dimensions of $M_3$ to decrease the channel length modulation. Table I summarizes the results of different simulations where the W and L of $M_3$ have been scaled up by the same factor S. The values of $V_{Eout}$ for different channel lengths have been measured. As expected the output resistance $R_{out}$ rises and so does the gain $G$. This scaling however does not produce a proportional increase in the gain, in fact the output resistance of $M_3$ affects the bias point of $M_1$ and causes a drop of $T$ and consequently of $G_m$.

IV. MEASURED AND SIMULATED RESULTS

The transconductor was realized in the PolymerVision technology and both the transconductance and the output resistance of the transconductor have been evaluated. The circuit was operated at $V_{DD} = 20V$ and different measurements have been taken for different values of the control voltage $V_{bias}$ with a step for the independent variable of 100mV.

The output resistance is shown in Fig. 5 as a function of the input voltage. This plot was derived from the output current measured applying a constant voltage $V_{in} = 5V$ and sweeping $V_{out}$ from ground to $V_{DD}$. The measured and simulated output currents are shown in the inset. While increasing the control voltage $V_{bias}$, the output current drops and the resistance rises. The maximum output current goes from 4.098μA for $V_{bias} = 0V$ to 337.3nA for $V_{bias} = 20V$.

The transconductance was derived from the output current (Fig. 4) obtained sweeping the input voltage from ground to $V_{DD}$. For this measure the output was biased with a voltage source at $V_{out} = 5V$. The resulting transconductance as a function of the input voltage $V_{in}$ is shown in Fig. 6. The current and the transconductance decrease with $V_{bias}$. Varying the control voltage from ground to $V_{DD}$, $G_m$ goes from 18.67nA/V to 2.10μA/V. From Fig. 6 the influence of $V_{bias}$ on the linearity of the circuit can also be evaluated. The higher
the control voltage, the larger is the linear input range or, with the same input range, a higher linearity is achieved.

The sets of data in Fig. 4, 5 and 6 (summarized in Table II for $V_{in} = 5V$ and $V_{out} = 5V$) also confirm what stated the section III.C. The unloaded gain of the circuit is indeed almost independent on the bias voltage (and on $V_T$), while it depends on the difference between the output resistance of the devices $M_2$ and $M_3$. The two devices have here same $W/L$ ratio and channel length, hence the gain is about one. The actual gain value is slightly higher than 1 because the output resistance of the mirror, i.e. of $M_4$, increases the output resistance of the transconductor compared to the $R_{out}$ of $M_5$. This effect more than compensates the reduction in transconductance $G_{m}$ due to the actual transfer factor $T$ and to the source follower.

Connecting together input and output nodes, a tunable resistor connected to $V_{DD}$ is obtained. The measured current of such configuration is shown in Fig. 7 for different values of the control voltage $V_{bias}$.

The last figure (Fig. 8) shows the simulated Bode magnitude plot of the transistor in a $G_m C$ filter configuration (see the schematic in the inset). The capacitance of the filter has a value of $C = 100 pF$ and the load $M_6$ is $0 V_{DS}$ connected to embody a current source. The loss of gain due to the finite output resistance of $M_6$ is not present when $M_6$ is substituted with an ideal current source. Future work will focus on the realization of a feedback system to match the DC currents of transconductor and load. In this way it would be possible to move the cut-off frequency changing $V_{bias}$, and thus $G_m$, without influencing the gain.

### Table II

**Measurement Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$V_{bias}$ [V]</th>
<th>$R_{out}$ [MΩ]</th>
<th>$G_m$ [nA/V]</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 7.** Current flowing out of the transconductor, with $V_{in}$ connected to $V_{bias}$, as a function of the input voltage for different values of $V_{bias} = 0V, 5V, 10V, 15V$. The continuous line represents the measured data, the stippled line the simulated ones.

**Fig. 8.** Bode magnitude plot of the circuit in the inset (continuous line). The stippled line represents the transfer function using an ideal current source in place of $M_6$.

### V. Conclusion

Adopting a physical model of OTFTs a transconductor suitable for analog signal conditioning was designed in a unipolar double gate technology. Simulations approximate well the measurement and demonstrate what analytically derived. The unloaded voltage gain mainly depends on a channel length ratio and is weakly sensitive to most process parameters, e.g. the threshold voltage, and hence to their time variation due to ageing.
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