IX. NOISE IN ELECTRON DEVICES

A. OPTIMUM NOISE PERFORMANCE OF MULTITERMINAL AMPLIFIERS

The problem to be considered is the optimization of the output signal-to-noise ratio of a multiterminal pair linear noisy amplifier driven by a multiterminal pair linear noisy source. We shall begin by making some assumptions about the properties of the source and amplifier networks.

The source network (Fig. IX-1) has \( n \) terminal pairs and its terminal properties

\[
\begin{align*}
E_s & \quad E_{ni} & \quad I_{b1} \\
E_{sn} & \quad E_{nn} & \quad I_{bn}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
E_{nal} & \quad I_{a1} & \quad V_{al} \\
E_{nom} & \quad I_{am} & \quad V_{am}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
Z = \begin{bmatrix}
Z_{aa} & Z_{ab} & Z_{ac} \\
Z_{ba} & Z_{bb} & Z_{bc} \\
Z_{ca} & Z_{cb} & Z_{cc}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Fig. IX-1. Arbitrary lossless imbedding of source and amplifier networks.
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will be described on an impedance basis. It is characterized by an impedance matrix, Z, and by the complex Fourier amplitudes of two sets of independent open-circuit voltages, the source voltages and the noise voltages. The voltage sources are completely characterized by their cross-power matrices \( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{E_s} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{E_s}^\dagger \) and \( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{E_n} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{E_n}^\dagger \), where \( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_E \) is a column vector of the complex amplitudes of the open-circuit noise voltages, \( \hat{\mathbf{E}}_n \) is the Hermitian transpose of this vector, and the bar indicates an ensemble average. We use similar definitions for the signal voltages; rms values will be used for voltage amplitudes throughout this report. Both of the voltage matrices are positive definite or positive semidefinite. We shall assume that the Hermitian part of the source impedance matrix is positive definite. A positive definite impedance matrix implies that only a finite amount of power may be extracted from the source.

The amplifier network (Fig. IX-1) will also be described on an impedance basis with an impedance matrix \( \hat{Z}_a \) and an open-circuit noise voltage vector \( \hat{E}_{na} \). The only requirement that we shall make for these quantities is that the characteristic noise matrix

\[
\hat{N} = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{Z}_a + \hat{Z}_a^\dagger \right)^{-1} \hat{E}_{na} \hat{E}_{na}^\dagger
\]

have at least one positive eigenvalue. This is tantamount to assuming that the amplifier network is an active network that is capable of providing power gain.

We now wish to drive this amplifier with the source network in the most general way. To achieve this, we imbed the n-terminal pair source and the m-terminal pair amplifier in an \( n + m + 1 \) terminal pair lossless network (Fig. IX-1) and ask for the best signal-to-noise ratio that can be obtained at the single-output terminal pair. We require that the m-terminal pair amplifier provide net gain.

The equations characterizing this combined network are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{V}_b &= \mathbf{Z}_a \mathbf{I}_b + \mathbf{E}_s + \mathbf{E}_n \\
\mathbf{V}_a &= \mathbf{Z}_a \mathbf{I}_a + \mathbf{E}_{na} \\
\mathbf{V}_b &= \begin{bmatrix} 
Z_{aa} & Z_{ab} & Z_{ac} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
Z_{ba} & Z_{bb} & Z_{bc} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
Z_{ca} & Z_{cb} & Z_{cc}
\end{bmatrix} 
\begin{bmatrix}
-\mathbf{I}_a \\
\vdots \\
-\mathbf{I}_b \\
\vdots \\
+\mathbf{I}_c
\end{bmatrix} 
= \mathbf{Z}_T \begin{bmatrix}
-\mathbf{I}_a \\
\vdots \\
-\mathbf{I}_b \\
\vdots \\
+\mathbf{I}_c
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( Z_T + Z_T^\dagger = 0 \). Through algebraic manipulation we can obtain a relation involving only \( \mathbf{V}_c, \mathbf{I}_c \), and the sources, and from this we find the exchangeable power at the output terminals which is due to all of the sources.
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\[ P_{eo} = \frac{x_1^\dagger E_s E_s^\dagger x_1 + x_1^\dagger E_n E_n^\dagger x_1 + x_2^\dagger E_n E_n^\dagger x_2}{2x_1^\dagger (Z+Z_1^\dagger) x_1 + 2x_2^\dagger (Z_a+Z_a^\dagger) x_2}, \] (4)

where

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
Z & \ldots & 0 \\
\ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
0 & Z_a & \ldots \\
Z_{ba} & \ldots & Z_{bb}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
Z_{ac} \\
\ldots \\
x_1 \\
x_2
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
x_1 \\
x_2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Where, \( x_1 \) is an \( n \)-dimensional vector and \( x_2 \) is an \( m \)-dimensional vector. Both of these vectors may be varied arbitrarily by varying the lossless network.

From Eq. 4 we see that the signal power that is exchangeable at the output is

\[ P_{eo}^s = \frac{x_1^\dagger E_s E_s^\dagger x_1}{2x_1^\dagger (Z+Z_1^\dagger) x_1 + 2x_2^\dagger (Z_a+Z_a^\dagger) x_2}, \] (5)

and the ratio of the exchangeable signal power to the exchangeable noise power is

\[ \left( \frac{S}{N} \right)_o = \frac{x_1^\dagger E_s E_s^\dagger x_1}{x_1^\dagger E_n E_n^\dagger x_1 + x_2^\dagger E_n E_n^\dagger x_2}. \] (6)

The problem may now be restated in terms of Eqs. 5 and 6. We wish to vary \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) (by varying the lossless network) to optimize \( (S/N)_o \) and keep \( P_{eo}^s \) constant. Gain will be obtained by varying \( x_2 \) only through those values for which \( x_2^\dagger (Z_a+Z_a^\dagger) x_2 \) is negative.

Then, by adjusting only the relative lengths of the vectors \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \), we may obtain any negative values of \( P_{eo}^s \) and any positive values of \( P_{eo}^s \) for which

\[ P_{eo}^s > \frac{x_1^\dagger E_s E_s^\dagger x_1}{2x_1^\dagger (Z+Z_1^\dagger) x_1}. \] (7)

Solving Eq. 5 for \( 2x_2^\dagger (Z_a+Z_a^\dagger) x_2 \) and multiplying and dividing the second term in the denominator of Eq. 6 by this quantity, we obtain

\[ \left( \frac{S}{N} \right)_o = \frac{x_1^\dagger E_s E_s^\dagger x_1}{x_1^\dagger E_n E_n^\dagger x_1 + \left[ \frac{x_2^\dagger E_n E_n^\dagger x_2}{2x_2^\dagger (Z_a+Z_a^\dagger) x_2} \right] \left[ 2x_1^\dagger (Z+Z_1^\dagger) x_1 - \frac{1}{P_{eo}^s} x_1^\dagger E_s E_s^\dagger x_1 \right]} \] (8)
in which, because of the preceding assumptions, both of the quantities in brackets are positive. If we now begin our optimization by varying \( x_2 \) and holding \( x_1 \) and \( P^S_{eo} \) constant, we see that our constraints require that we vary \( x_2^\dagger \frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a2} \) while we keep \( x_2^\dagger \frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a2} \) at a constant negative value in order to have \( P^S_{eo} \) constant. But this is just the problem of finding the stationary values of the quantity 

\[-x_2^\dagger \frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a2} \]

The stationary value of this quantity which gives the best signal-to-noise ratio is the least positive stationary value, which, in turn, is the least positive eigenvalue of the characteristic noise matrix, \( N = -\frac{1}{2}(Z_a + Z^\dagger_a)^{-1}\frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a} \). We shall denote this eigenvalue by \( \lambda_1 \), and its corresponding eigenvector by \( x_2^{(1)} \).

Using this notation in Eq. 8, we have

\[
\left( \frac{S}{N} \right)_o = \frac{x_1^\dagger \frac{E^\dagger}{E_s}n_{s1}^\dagger n_{s1} \left[ x_1^\dagger \frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a2} + \frac{1}{P^S_{eo}} \right] x_1}{x_1^\dagger \frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a2}}.
\]

We may vary \( x_1^\dagger \) in a completely arbitrary fashion and keep \( \lambda_1 \) and \( P^S_{eo} \) constant. \( P^S_{eo} \) may be held constant by simultaneously varying the length of \( x_2 \); these variations have no effect on \( \lambda_1 \). Then the stationary values of the signal-to-noise ratio are found to be the eigenvalues \( \sigma_i \) of the equation

\[
\frac{E^\dagger}{E_s}n_{s1}^\dagger n_{s1} = \sigma \left[ \frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a2} + 2\lambda_1 \left( Z + Z^\dagger_a \right) \right] x_1 = 0.
\]

Or, if we let

\[
\mu = \frac{\sigma}{1 + \frac{1}{P^S_{eo}}},
\]

then

\[
\frac{E^\dagger}{E_s}n_{s1}^\dagger n_{s1} - \mu \left[ \frac{E^\dagger}{E_n}n_{na}^\dagger n_{a2} + 2\lambda_1 \left( Z + Z^\dagger_a \right) \right] x_1 = 0.
\]

The eigenvectors \( x_1^{(i)} \) of Eq. 12 are also eigenvectors of Eq. 10. Therefore, for each eigenvalue \( \mu_1 \) there is a corresponding \( \sigma_i \), which may be determined from \( \mu_1 \) by use of the equation

\[
\sigma = \frac{\mu}{1 - \frac{1}{P^S_{eo}}}.
\]
Fig. IX-2. Reduction of amplifier to a one-terminal pair device.

\[ E' = X_1 E \]

\[ Z' = X_1 Z \]

\[ E_n' = X_1^{1/2} E_n^{1/2} X_1^{1/2} \]

\[ Z_{na}' = X_2^{1/2} Z_a^{1/2} X_2^{1/2} \]

Fig. IX-3. Realization of the optimal network.
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We can show that the maximum signal-to-noise ratio, $\sigma_1$, corresponds to the largest eigenvalue $\mu_1$ of Eq. 12, by taking the derivative of Eq. 13 with respect to $\mu$. Since

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\mu} = \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\mu \lambda_1}{P_{eo}}\right)^2},$$

(14)

$\sigma$ is an increasing function of $\mu$ everywhere.

By referring to Eq. 13, we can make several statements concerning the optimum noise performance of multiterminal pair amplifiers. If two amplifiers that have the same best value $\lambda_1$ of their characteristic noise matrices are driven by the same positive definite source, and if under these conditions one of the amplifiers has a positive output impedance (positive exchangeable power) and the other has a negative output impedance (negative exchangeable power), then the best signal-to-noise ratio obtainable with the latter cannot be better than that obtainable with the former.

Along these same lines, we can state that since large amounts of output power are available only for large positive values of output exchangeable power or for negative values of exchangeable power, the best signal-to-noise ratio that can be obtained at large values of available output signal power is approximately $\mu_1$, which is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix

$$\left[\frac{E_n E_n^\dagger + 2\lambda_1 (Z + Z^\dagger)}{E_s E_s^\dagger}\right]^{-1}.$$

The foregoing optimization can be generalized somewhat to include more than one amplifier and lossy imbeddings. In particular, it can be demonstrated that an arbitrary passive dissipative interconnection of any number of independently noisy amplifiers with a given positive definite noisy source cannot produce a higher signal-to-noise ratio at large values of available power than the optimal lossless connection of the best amplifier with that source. This is most readily proved by regarding the imbedding network as a lossless interconnection of its canonic form with each of the amplifiers. We may then regard all of the amplifiers and the set of noisy resistors arising from the canonic representation of the imbedding network as a new amplifier. This new amplifier has as the eigenvalues of its characteristic noise matrix all of the eigenvalues of the characteristic noise matrices of each of the amplifiers and the resistors. Here, as before, we pick the least positive one of these eigenvalues, which proves the statement made above.

Realization of the Optimal Network

The simplest realization of the optimal amplifying device may be derived in a straightforward manner. We may reduce the amplifier to a one-terminal pair network with a lossless network consisting of ideal gyrators and ideal transformers as shown in
Fig. IX-2. If we adjust the gyrator coefficients so that $G_n = x_{2,n}^{(1)}$, where $x_{2,n}^{(1)}$ is the $n$th element of the vector $x_2^{(1)}$, we obtain the one-terminal pair amplifier shown in Fig. IX-3. A similar reduction may be performed on the source network with $G_n = x_{1,n}^{(1)}$. The optimal network is then the series connection shown in Fig. IX-3. Its signal-to-noise ratio at large values of available power is given by $\mu_1$.

An optimal unilateral device may be obtained by using the reduced source and amplifier networks shown in Fig. IX-3 in conjunction with an ideal lossless circulator.
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