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Abstract—We present the foundation of a sophisticated hierarchical multidimensional response surface modeling system for efficient yield-driven design. Our scheme dynamically integrates models and database updating in real optimization time. The method facilitates a seamless, smart optimization-ready interface. It has been specially designed to handle circuits containing complex subcircuits or components whose simulation requires significant computational effort. This approach makes it possible, for the first time, to perform direct gradient-based yield optimization of circuits with components or subcircuits simulated by an electromagnetic simulator. The efficiency and accuracy of our technique are demonstrated by yield optimization of a three-stage microstrip transformer and a small-signal microwave amplifier. We also perform yield sensitivity analysis for the three-stage microstrip transformer.

I. INTRODUCTION

A new multilevel multidimensional response surface modeling technique is presented for effective and efficient yield-driven design. This approach makes it possible, for the first time, to perform yield optimization as well as yield sensitivity analysis of circuits with microstrip structures simulated by an electromagnetic (EM) simulator.

Yield-driven design is now recognized as effective, not only for massively manufactured circuits but also to ensure first-pass success in any design where the prototype development is lengthy and expensive. The complexity of calculations involved in yield optimization requires special numerical techniques, e.g., [1]-[4]. In this paper we extend our previously published [2], [4], highly efficient quadratic interpolation technique to dynamic multilevel response surface modeling. It has been specially designed to handle circuits containing complex subcircuits or components whose simulation requires significant computational effort.

With the increasing availability of EM simulators [5]-[7] it is very tempting to include them into performance-driven and even yield-driven circuit optimization. However, direct utilization of EM simulation for yield optimization or sensitivity analysis might seem to be computationally prohibitive. By constructing what we call local Q-models for each component simulated by an EM simulator we effectively overcome the computational burden of repeated EM simulations, which would otherwise be invoked for many statistical circuit outcomes throughout all yield optimization iterations. To maintain high accuracy, the Q-models are automatically updated whenever an outcome leaves the validity region of the current Q-model.

We show that when the proposed multilevel Q-modeling technique is used together with expensive, but more accurate simulations at the component level, the results are more reliable than those obtained from traditional analytical/empirical component simulations.

Efficiency and accuracy of our technique are demonstrated by yield optimization of a three-stage microstrip transformer and a small-signal amplifier. For the three-stage microstrip transformer we additionally perform yield sensitivity analyses and investigate different sets of optimization variables. Optimization was performed within the OSA900/hope™ [8] simulation-optimization environment with Empiope™ [9] driving em™ [7] on a Sun SPARCstation 1+. We used the OSA900/hope one-sided $t_1$ optimizer [10] for yield optimization.

II. EFFICIENT Q-MODELING

A. Formulation of the Method

The Q-model of a generic response $f(x)$, i.e., any response or gradient function for which we want to build and utilize the model, is a multidimensional quadratic polynomial of the form

$$q(x) = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i (x_i - r_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} (x_i - r_i) (x_j - r_j)$$

(1)
where \( x = [x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n]^T \) is the vector of generic parameters in terms of which the response is defined, and \( r = [r_1, r_2, \cdots, r_n]^T \) is a chosen reference point in the parameter space.

To build the Q-model we use \( n + 1 \leq m \leq 2n + 1 \) base points at which the function \( f(x) \) is evaluated. The reference point \( r \) is selected as the first base point \( x^1 \). The remaining \( m - 1 \) base points are selected by perturbing one variable at a time around \( r \), namely,

\[
x^{i+1} = r + [0 \cdots 0 \beta_i 0 \cdots 0]^T, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, n
\]

\[
x^{i+1+i} = r + [0 \cdots 0 -\beta_i 0 \cdots 0]^T, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, m - (n + 1)
\]

where \( \beta_i \) is a predetermined perturbation. If a variable is perturbed twice the second perturbation is located symmetrically w.r.t. \( r \). We have applied the maximally flat quadratic interpolation (MFQI) technique [2] to such a set of base points (see [3], [4] for details). MFQI builds the Q-model by minimizing in the least-squares sense all the second-order term coefficients in (1). It is intuitively equivalent to constructing an interpolation that has the smallest deviation from the linear interpolation.

### B. Implementation

Applying MFQI to the base points defined by \( r \), (2), and (3) and reordering the variables such that the first \( m - (n + 1) \) variables are perturbed twice yields the following formulas for the coefficients in (1):

\[
a_{ii} = \frac{1}{2\beta_i} \left[ f(x^{i+i}) + f(x^i) - 2f(r) \right], \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, m - (n + 1)
\]

\[
a_{ii} = 0, \quad i = m - n, \cdots, n, m \neq 2n + 1
\]

\[
a_{ij} = 0, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n, i \neq j.
\]

The coefficients \( a_0 \) and \( a_i \) are given by

\[
a_0 = f(r)
\]

\[
a_i = \frac{1}{2\beta_i} \left[ f(x^{i+i}) - f(x^i) \right], \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, m - (n + 1)
\]

and

\[
a_i = \frac{1}{\beta_i} \left[ f(x^i) - f(r) \right], \quad i = m - n, \cdots, n, m \neq 2n + 1.
\]

Substituting (4), (5) and (6) into (1) results in the following formula for the Q-model \( q(x) \)

\[
q(x) = f(r) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-(n+1)} \left\{ (f(x^{i+i}) - f(x^{i+i+1})) + (f(x^{i+i}) + f(x^{i+i+1})) - 2f(r)(x_i - r_i)/\beta_i \right\} (2\beta_i)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{i=m-n}^{n} \left\{ (f(x^{i+i}) - f(r))(x_i - r_i)/\beta_i \right\}.
\]

It is important to realize that the variable number of base points \( m \) offers a trade-off between the accuracy and cost of circuit analysis. Reducing the number of base points decreases the number of function evaluations. However, perturbing a variable only once results in a linear rather than quadratic interpolation w.r.t. that variable. This provides a spectrum of available models from a linear model (L-model), for \( m = n + 1 \), to a quadratic model w.r.t. all variables for \( m = 2n + 1 \).

The simplicity of (7) results in high efficiency of the approach. It should be noted that the computational effort increases only linearly with the number of variables \( n \).

To apply a gradient-based optimizer we need to provide the gradients of functions \( q(x) \) that are actually used by the optimizer. Differentiating (7) w.r.t. \( x_i \) results in

\[
\frac{\partial q(x)}{\partial x_i} = \frac{1}{2\beta_i} \left[ (f(x^{i+i}) - f(x^{i+i+1}))/2 + (f(x^i)) + f(x^{i+i}) - 2f(r)(x_i - r_i)/\beta_i \right]/\beta_i
\]

\[
i = 1, \cdots, m - (n + 1)
\]

and

\[
\frac{\partial q(x)}{\partial x_i} = \frac{1}{\beta_i} \left[ (f(x^{i+i}) - f(r))/\beta_i \right]
\]

\[
i = m - n, \cdots, n, m \neq 2n + 1
\]

which again is very efficient.

### C. Linear Versus Quadratic Modeling

We use a simple example in which we approximate the response of a microstrip line simulated as a two-port network by the \textit{em} [7] simulator.

We fix the width of the microstrip line and sweep its length \( l \) with a step \( \Delta l \). First, we simulate the circuit at each point in the sweep. This provides us with the response reference data. Subsequently, we use both \( L \)- and \( Q \)-models to approximate responses at every other sweep point using adjacent sweep points as the model base points. Fig. 1 summarizes the results. It shows the real part of \( S_{11} \) with \( l \) swept from 3.2 to 3.8 mm and \( \Delta l = 0.1 \) mm. The responses for \( l = 3.3, 3.5, \) and 3.7 mm are modeled. The \( L \)-model uses responses at two adjacent points to model the response at the point in between, e.g., responses at points 3.2 and 3.4 mm are used to model the
response at 3.3 mm. The Q-model uses three points, e.g., responses at points 3.4, 3.6, and 3.8 mm are used to model the response at 3.7 mm. It can be seen that the Q-model is more accurate than the L-model.

III. MULTILEVEL SIMULATION AND MODELING

A. Multilevel Modeling

Multilevel modeling is depicted schematically in Fig. 2. The circuit under consideration is divided into subcircuits, possibly in a hierarchical manner. At the lowest level we have circuit components, e.g., a lumped capacitor or a microstrip structure.

Defining $f_c$, $f_s$, and $f_c$ as circuit, subcircuit and component responses, respectively, we can express the response of the circuit as a function of the subcircuit responses that are in turn functions of component responses. This hierarchy can be expressed formally as

\[ f_c = f_c(f_{c1}, f_{c2}, \ldots, f_{cm}) \]  
\[ f_s = f_s(f_{s1}, f_{s2}, \ldots, f_{sem}), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_s \] (9) (10)

and

\[ f_{eq} = f_{eq}(x), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_{eq}, \]  
\[ j = 1, 2, \ldots, n_{eqi} \] (11)

where $n_s$ is the number of subcircuits and $n_{eq}$ is the number of components in the $i$th subcircuit. $x$ is the vector of circuit parameters. The responses are typically frequency-domain functions of multiport responses.

We can create a single Q-model for the overall circuit. We can also create a hierarchy of Q-models to represent some or all of the subcircuits and components, as illustrated in Fig. 2.

If the base points of a Q-model are given as $x^1$, $x^2$, $\ldots$, $x^n$, where $x^1$ is treated as the reference point $r$ [see (2) and (3)] and $n + 1 \leq m \leq 2n + 1$, with $n$ being the number of model parameters, then we can express the simulation results at these base points as

\[ [f(x^1) \ f(x^2) \ \ldots \ f(x^n)] \] (12)

with

\[ f(x^i) = [f_i(x^1) \ f_i(x^2) \ \ldots \ f_i(x^m)]^T, \]  
\[ i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \] (13)

where $k$ is the total number of different responses. $f$ can include a response of either circuit, subcircuit, or a component. Then

\[ f(x) = q(x) = [q_1(x) \ q_2(x) \ \ldots \ q_k(x)]^T. \] (14)

The Q-models in (14) approximate $f(x)$ for $x$ belonging to the Q-model validity region centered around the reference point $r = x^1$.

B. Implementation

During optimization the design center moves, and so does the set of associated statistical outcomes. This may result in moving some or even all of the statistical outcomes out of the validity region of the current Q-models. In the present implementation the validity region $V$ is defined as

\[ V = \{ x \mid -\beta_i/2 < (x_i - r_i) \leq \beta_i/2, \]  
\[ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \} \] (15)

where $\beta_i$ is the perturbation used in (2) and (3) to compute the model base points. To use the model for a point outside the current $V$ requires that the Q-models in (14), and hence $V$, be appropriately updated. We have developed
an updating scheme in which the Q-models are updated automatically in real optimization time. If a statistical outcome is outside the current $V$, a new set of base points is generated and the responses at these base points are simulated but only if they have not been simulated previously. Updated $Q$-models follow immediately from re-computing (7). Our $Q$-model updating scheme is based on a database system storing results for newly simulated base points and providing extremely fast access to the results for already simulated base points. The database and $Q$-models are updated whenever new results become available.

If all components, subcircuits, and the overall circuit were to be simulated rather than modeled the evaluation of the circuit response $f_r$ could proceed as follows.

\begin{verbatim}
for the $i$th subcircuit, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_s$ {
  for the $j$th component in the $i$th subcircuit, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_{ci}$ {
    find $f_{c_{ij}}$ by simulating the component according to (11);
  }
  find $f_{c_i}$ according to (10);
}
find $f_r$ according to (9);
\end{verbatim}

Applying this algorithm to yield estimation or optimization may become prohibitive, especially if an EM simulator is to be used. Replacing costly circuit simulations with model evaluations yields an alternative algorithm.

\begin{verbatim}
if circuit model $q_c$ exists
  evaluate $q_c$;
else {
  for the $i$th subcircuit, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_s$ {
    if subcircuit model $q_{ci}$ exists {
      evaluate $q_{ci}$;
    }
    else {
      for the $j$th component in the $i$th subcircuit, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_{ci}$ {
        if component model $q_{c_{ij}}$ exists {
          evaluate $q_{c_{ij}}$;
        } else {
          find $f_{c_{ij}}$ by simulating the component according to (11);
        }
      }
      find $f_{c_i}$ according to (10);
    }
  }
  find $f_r$ according to (9);
}
\end{verbatim}

Here, some of the responses $f_{c_{ij}}, f_{c_i},$ or $f_r$ are replaced by the corresponding models $q_{c_{ij}}, q_{ci},$ or $q_c$.

C. Discrete Parameters

The circuit, subcircuits, and components may contain discrete parameters. For discrete parameters simulation can only be performed at discrete values located on the grid, as illustrated in Fig. 3. Normally, the reference vector $r$ is taken as the nominal point $x^1$. This is likely to be off-the-grid. Similarly, the other base points $x^{n + 1}$ and $x^{n + 1 + i}$ are likely to be off-the-grid. Local interpolation involving several simulations on the grid in the vicinity of each of the base points must then be performed. In order to avoid these excessive simulations those base points are modified to snap to the grid.
IV. Yield Optimization of a Three-Section Microstrip Transformer

A. The Transformer

A three-section 3:1 microstrip impedance transformer is shown in Fig. 4. The source and load impedances are 50 and 150 ohms, respectively. The design specification is set for input reflection coefficient as

$$|S_{11}| \leq 0.12 \text{ from } 5 \text{ to } 15 \text{ GHz.}$$

The error functions for yield optimization are calculated for frequencies from 5 to 15 GHz with a 0.5 GHz step. The transformer is built on a 0.635 mm thick substrate with relative dielectric constant 9.7.

For EM simulators, the circuit is typically partitioned into components that are defined to encompass parts of the structure that can be isolated from the other parts. This can significantly increase the efficiency of EM simulation.

The transformer was decomposed into three components, each corresponding to a different section of the transformer. In order to account for the discontinuity effects the first two sections were simulated as step discontinuities and the last section as a microstrip line. Each of the components is simulated as a two-port network.

As a verification, we also simulated the entire transformer structure as one piece. The results of simulating the circuit at the nominal minimax solution using the two methods are virtually the same.

B. Yield Optimization with Six Optimization Variables

We start yield optimization from the solution of a nominal design with $W_1$, $W_2$, $W_3$, $L_1$, $L_2$, and $L_3$ as variables. Normal distributions with 2 percent standard deviations were assumed for $W_1$, $W_2$, and $W_3$ and 1 percent standard deviations for $L_1$, $L_2$, and $L_3$. Three component-level $Q$-models were established for each section of the transformer at the nominal point using em [7]. The $Q$-models were updated during the optimization process whenever necessary.

Utilizing these $Q$-models we conducted two experiments to demonstrate multilevel $Q$-modeling: 1) yield optimization using single-level (component) modeling and 2) yield optimization using two-level (component and circuit response) modeling. 100 statistical outcomes were used for yield optimization. The solutions in both cases are almost identical: yield (estimated by 250 outcomes) is increased from 71 to 86 percent using single-level modeling and to 85 percent using two-level modeling. Fig. 5(a) illustrates the Monte Carlo sweep before optimization and Fig. 5(b) shows the corresponding sweep after yield optimization using single-level (component) modeling. The values of the optimization variables before and after yield optimization for both single- and two-level modeling are given in Table I. The solution of design centering is quite close to the nominal minimax design. This is expected, taking into account the small tolerances on the parameters.

CPU time for yield optimization, performed on a Sun SPARCstation 1+, was 16 min for single-level modeling and 3 min when two-level $Q$-models were used. Elapsed time for the em [7] simulations using single-level modeling was about 100 h. The two-level modeling approach exploited the database created during single-level optimization and did not require any additional em [7] simulations.
TABLE I
MICROSTRIP PARAMETERS OF THE THREE-SECTION MICROSTRIP TRANSFORMER (SIX VARIABLES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters¹</th>
<th>Nominal design</th>
<th>Centered design²</th>
<th>Centered design³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W₁</td>
<td>0.4294</td>
<td>0.4363</td>
<td>0.4377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W₂</td>
<td>0.2080</td>
<td>0.2055</td>
<td>0.2053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W₃</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>2.8875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.998</td>
<td>3.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₃</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.046</td>
<td>3.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield⁴%</td>
<td>71 percent</td>
<td>86 percent</td>
<td>85 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Parameters are in millimeters.  
²Single-level modeling.  
³100 outcomes were used in yield optimization and 250 outcomes for yield verification.

TABLE II
MICROSTRIP PARAMETERS OF THE THREE-SECTION MICROSTRIP TRANSFORMER (THREE VARIABLES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters¹</th>
<th>Nominal design</th>
<th>Centered design²</th>
<th>Centered design³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W₁</td>
<td>0.4294</td>
<td>0.4339</td>
<td>0.4333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W₂</td>
<td>0.2080</td>
<td>0.2081</td>
<td>0.2079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W₃</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L₃</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield⁴%</td>
<td>71 percent</td>
<td>79 percent</td>
<td>78 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Parameters are in millimeters.  
²Single-level modeling.  
³Two-level modeling.  
⁴Not optimized.  
⁵100 outcomes were used in yield optimization and 250 outcomes for yield verification.

C. Yield Optimization with Three Optimization Variables

We investigated yield optimization with W₁, W₂, and W₃ as variables. L₁, L₂, and L₃ were not optimized. The solutions obtained using component and both component and circuit modeling are again very similar. Yield is increased to 79 percent with component-level Q-models and to 78 percent with component- and circuit-level Q-models. Parameter values for both solutions are listed in Table II. The CPU time was 5 min for component-level and 41 s for two-level Q-modeling. The previously established database was sufficient for this experiment, so that no additional em [7] simulations were required.

D. Yield Sensitivity Analysis

We performed the yield sensitivity analysis at the centered solution obtained using six optimization variables.

Fig. 6 shows yield as a function of the specification. The specification is swept from 0.10 to 0.13 with a 0.005 step. 250 Monte Carlo outcomes were used. The diagram confirms high sensitivity of yield w.r.t. the specification. The yield varies from 0 to 100 percent over a very small range of the specification.

We performed sensitivity analysis w.r.t. all six optimization variables using 250 statistical outcomes. As expected, the yield is very sensitive to the widths of all the sections and it is insensitive to the lengths of the sections. We also observed that the yield exhibits the highest sensitivity w.r.t. the width of the third section W₃. The analysis required very little additional computational effort. See Fig. 7 for the results.

V. YIELD OPTIMIZATION OF A SMALL-SIGNAL AMPLIFIER

The specification for a typical single-stage 6-18 GHz small-signal amplifier shown in Fig. 8 is

\[ 7 \text{ dB} \leq |S_{21}| \leq 8 \text{ dB} \text{ from 6 to 18 GHz}. \]

The error functions for yield optimization are calculated at frequencies from 6 to 18 GHz with a 1 GHz step. The gate and drain circuit microstrip T-structures and the feedback microstrip line are built on a 10 mil thick substrate with relative dielectric constant 9.9.

First, we performed nominal minimax optimization using analytical/empirical microstrip component models. \( W_{g1}, L_{g1}, W_{g2}, L_{g2} \) of the gate circuit T-structure and \( W_{d1}, L_{d1}, W_{d2}, L_{d2} \) of the drain circuit T-structure were selected as optimization variables. \( W_{g3}, L_{g3}, W_{d3}, \) and \( L_{d3} \) of the T-structures, \( W \) and \( L \) of the feedback microstrip line, as
Fig. 7. Yield sensitivity analysis for the three-stage microstrip transformer at the centered solution. 250 Monte Carlo outcomes were used for yield estimation. The results are obtained with little additional computational effort. Yield as a function of (a) $W_1$, (b) $W_2$, (c) $W_3$, (d) $L_1$, (e) $L_2$, and (f) $L_3$.

Fig. 8. Circuit diagram of the 6–18 GHz small-signal amplifier. We use *em [7] to model the two T-structures and the microstrip line.

Fig. 9. Parameters of the feedback microstrip line and the microstrip T-structures.
well as the FET parameters were not optimized. Fig. 9 shows the parameters of the T-structures and the microstrip line. Fig. 10 shows the small-signal FET model.

We assumed a 0.5 mil tolerance and uniform distribution for all geometrical parameters of the microstrip components. The statistics of the small-signal FET model were extracted from measurement data [11] and are given in Table III. The correlations among the FET model parameters are listed in Table IV. The value of the feedback resistor was 1600 Ω.

Monte Carlo simulation with 250 outcomes performed at the nominal solution with analytical/empirical microstrip component models reported 91 percent yield. To obtain a more accurate estimate, we used component level Q-models built from em [7] simulations for the microstrip components. The yield dropped to 55 percent. Fig. 11(a) and (b) show the Monte Carlo sweeps obtained using analytical/empirical and our em [7] based Q-models, respectively. Close similarities can be observed for lower frequencies, while discrepancies become larger for higher frequencies.

Utilizing the component-level quadratic Q-models built from em simulations, we further performed yield optimization of this amplifier. Yield estimated by 250 Monte Carlo simulations was increased to 82 percent. The corresponding Monte Carlo sweep diagram is shown in Fig. 12. Yield and the values of the optimization variables before and after optimization are given in Table V.
VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a new multilevel quadratic modeling technique suitable for effective and efficient yield-driven design optimization. The method dynamically integrates the \( Q \)-models with database generation and updating, increasing both speed of processing and accuracy of the results. The approach is particularly useful for circuits containing complex subcircuits or components whose simulation requires significant computational effort. The efficiency of this technique allowed us to perform yield-driven design and analyze yield sensitivity for circuits containing microstrip structures accurately simulated by \textit{em} [7]. We used a three-stage microstrip transformer and a small-signal amplifier to demonstrate the efficiency and accuracy of the method. Our approach significantly extends the microwave CAD applicability of yield optimization techniques.
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