

Improving robustness to termination conditions in passivity enforcement of rational macromodels

Original

Improving robustness to termination conditions in passivity enforcement of rational macromodels / Carlucci, A., Bradde, T., Grivet-Talocia, S.. - In: IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON COMPONENTS, PACKAGING, AND MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY. - ISSN 2156-3950. - ELETTRONICO. - 15:1(2025), pp. 64-74. [10.1109/tcpmt.2024.3407526]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2989201 since: 2025-01-23T07:29:57Z

Publisher:

IEEE

Published

DOI:10.1109/tcpmt.2024.3407526

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

Improving Robustness to Termination Conditions in Passivity Enforcement of Rational Macromodels

Antonio Carlucci¹, Graduate Student Member, IEEE, Tommaso Bradde², Member, IEEE,
and Stefano Grivet-Talocia³, Fellow, IEEE

Abstract—Common design and verification flows of electronic systems under signal and/or power integrity (SI/PI) constraints often rely on the availability of accurate macromodels of components and interconnects. Such macromodels enable fast transient analysis at the system level and, consequently, the possibility to efficiently verify the quality of the design. Several approaches are available to construct macromodels whose response accurately matches the raw data used for their identification, most often tabulated scattering responses. However, for the sake of SI/PI optimization, it is mandatory that such models reproduce accurately the underlying structure response when inserted as a component in a larger network, possibly subjected to different or uncertain port termination schemes. This capability is not inherently guaranteed by standard macromodeling approaches. Recently, the authors proposed a modified vector fitting (VF) iteration that overcomes this issue by optimizing the macromodel accuracy with respect to sets of arbitrary terminations. This work completes this robust macromodeling framework by introducing a companion perturbation-based passivity enforcement (PE) scheme that preserves the macromodel accuracy with respect to the prescribed set of loads. The main innovation is the definition of a novel loss function to drive the perturbation routine, which allows to correct the nonpassive model while preserving the required robust performance. Numerical evidence on a set of relevant power delivery network (PDN) benchmarks confirms the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

Index Terms—Feedback, passivity, perturbation, power delivery networks (PDNs), power integrity (PI), rational approximation, robust performance, sensitivity, vector fitting (VF).

I. INTRODUCTION

TRANSIENT analysis of large-scale circuits is a mandatory step for verifying and optimizing the electrical performance of modern electronic systems, in particular for signal integrity (SI) and power integrity (PI) applications. Although, for a given design, many performance indices can be inferred based on frequency-domain descriptions, time-domain analysis represents the ultimate verification tool, especially when active/nonlinear devices are involved [1], [2], [3].

Very efficient transient analyses are typically enabled by representing the behavior of complex interconnects and components via state-space macromodels, whose extraction from tabulated scattering data from electromagnetic

solvers is nowadays considered an off-the-shelf commodity [4]. Among all methods, the rational approximation method known as vector fitting (VF) iteration currently represents the reference algorithm. Since the first appearance of VF [5], significant improvements have been proposed in the literature in order to increase its robustness [6], [7], [8], [9], efficiency [10], [11], [12], [13], and accuracy [14], as well as for extending the original frequency-domain formulation to time-domain measurements [15], [16] or to a more general multivariate setting [17]. Correspondingly, a number of available methods have been proposed to enforce the passivity of the resulting macromodels [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23]. This passivity enforcement (PE) step is fundamental since a nonpassive macromodel may induce spurious numerical instabilities when included in transient simulations in which it is interconnected with other (even passive) electrical networks [24]. For a comprehensive overview of passive macromodeling and its applications, see [4].

Macromodels are never solved as standalone components. Instead, they are typically inserted in a global network description as individual components, whose ports are interconnected to other components and subsystems to obtain a complete computational model of an entire system. Examples can be power delivery network (PDN) models at board, package, and chip levels, which are interconnected and loaded by decoupling capacitor banks, possibly integrated voltage regulator (VR) models with sense and feedback loops, and excited by chip loading patterns [25], [26]. The main objective of system-level transient verification is an accurate prediction of all port signals of such coupled and terminated global systems. The accuracy of a single macromodel is not important by itself, but rather as an enabler for an accurate prediction of the entire system behavior.

One relevant open problem affecting the above-described framework is related to the *sensitivity* of the passive macromodels to their actual operating conditions. As pointed out in a number of articles [27], [28], [29], [30], [31], [32], even when a macromodel matches with high accuracy one network function of the underlying component, it is not formally guaranteed that it will reproduce the desired port behavior when loaded with an arbitrary electrical network. Intuitively, this happens because the (even small) residual error affecting the macromodel response propagates through the feedback loops that arise from the electrical interconnections and terminations, undergoing uncontrolled and possibly large magnification. Although often overlooked, the macromodel sensitivity is not uncommon in scenarios of practical interest and especially in PI applications [30], [31], [32].

Manuscript received 23 February 2024; revised 6 May 2024; accepted 19 May 2024. Date of publication 30 May 2024; date of current version 21 January 2025. Recommended for publication by Associate Editor S. Chakraborty upon evaluation of reviewers' comments. (Corresponding author: Antonio Carlucci.)

The authors are with the Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, 10129 Turin, Italy (e-mail: antonio.carlucci@polito.it; tommaso.bradde@polito.it; stefano.grivet@polito.it).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TCPMT.2024.3407526




Fig. 1. General system topology under investigation, where the DUT is connected to a loading network \mathcal{L} with external excitations \mathbf{w} . Variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} denote the input and output signals of the DUT, respectively.

In recent articles [31], [32], the Authors proposed to alleviate the problem by optimizing the macromodel accuracy with respect to a prescribed (yet completely arbitrary) class of linear and time-invariant (LTI) terminations. The approach modifies the VF iteration, by explicitly incorporating in the optimization routine the information about the port behavior of the system under modeling when it is subjected to the admissible loads. It was verified that this strategy generates macromodels that are more robust, in the sense that their accuracy is less sensitive when the port terminations are changed. In this work, we build on these results, and we augment the proposed framework with an ad hoc PE postprocessing algorithm that preserves robustness to port loading conditions. The proposed approach inherits the strategy applied in most of the perturbation-based PE algorithms [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [33]. Starting from a nonpassive rational model, we perturb its residues iteratively in order to achieve passivity by solving a constrained optimization problem that minimizes model perturbation subject to passivity constraints. Robustness to loading conditions is here enforced by suitable penalization terms added to the cost function defining model accuracy. Several examples, mostly related to PI applications, are presented to demonstrate the excellent performance of this approach, despite its simplicity in both formulation and implementation.

This manuscript is structured as follows. Section II introduces preliminaries and notation. Background on robust macromodeling is presented in Section III. The proposed robust PE scheme is discussed in Section IV, and numerical examples are presented in Section V.

II. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

In the following, scalars will be denoted with lowercase italic fonts (x) and vectors and matrices with bold italic fonts, lowercase (\mathbf{x}) and uppercase (\mathbf{X}), respectively. The notations \mathbf{X}^\top and \mathbf{X}^* represent the matrix transpose and the Hermitian transpose of \mathbf{X} . The symbol \mathbb{I}_P is the identity matrix of size P . With $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$, we denote the Kronecker product between matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , and operator $\text{vec}\{\cdot\}$ stacks the elements of its matrix argument as a column vector. The imaginary unit is $j = \sqrt{-1}$, and the Laplace variable is $s = \sigma + j\omega$. The matrix norm notation $\|\mathbf{X}\|$ indicates the two-norm, whereas $\|\mathbf{X}\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. Similarly, for vectors, $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ is the standard Euclidean norm. We recall that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_F = \|\text{vec}\{\mathbf{X}\}\|$.

Let us consider an arbitrary passive LTI P -port network, labeled as device under test (DUT) in Fig. 1. An external port representation for the DUT can be given in terms of one of its network functions, e.g., its impedance, admittance,

or scattering matrices. We will generically denote a network function of the DUT as $\check{\mathbf{H}}(s) \in \mathbb{C}^{P \times P}$. Correspondingly, we will denote with $\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) \in \mathbb{C}^P$ and with $\check{\mathbf{y}}(s) \in \mathbb{C}^P$ the input and the output signals associated with this network representation, so that

$$\check{\mathbf{y}}(s) = \check{\mathbf{H}}(s)\check{\mathbf{x}}(s). \quad (1)$$

The accent $\check{\cdot}$ is used to label the *exact* network function of the DUT and its port signals, whereas any DUT quantity without accents will correspond to the (approximate) models to be constructed with related port signals.

With reference to Fig. 1, we will consider the scenario in which the DUT is a subnetwork of a larger interconnected system. Without loss of generality, we assume that the DUT is connected with an arbitrary loading LTI network \mathcal{L} , having P ports connected to the DUT and P' ports excited by ideal voltage or current sources. We will collect these sources in the vector $\mathbf{w}(s)$. Considering a representation of \mathcal{L} based on the same DUT port signals, we can write

$$\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) = \mathbf{\Gamma}(s)\check{\mathbf{y}}(s) + \mathbf{P}(s)\mathbf{w}(s) \quad (2)$$

where matrices $\mathbf{\Gamma}(s)$ and $\mathbf{P}(s)$ are supposed to be known. Combining (1) with (2) leads to the exact solution of the coupled system for the interface port signals

$$\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) = [\mathbb{I}_P - \mathbf{\Gamma}(s)\check{\mathbf{H}}(s)]^{-1}\mathbf{P}(s)\mathbf{w}(s) \quad (3a)$$

$$\check{\mathbf{y}}(s) = \check{\mathbf{H}}(s)[\mathbb{I}_P - \mathbf{\Gamma}(s)\check{\mathbf{H}}(s)]^{-1}\mathbf{P}(s)\mathbf{w}(s). \quad (3b)$$

III. ROBUST MACROMODELING

The objective of this article is to describe a procedure for the generation of a passive macromodel $\mathbf{H}(s)$ that reproduces the DUT behavior not only by matching its exact network function

$$\mathbf{H}(s) \approx \check{\mathbf{H}}(s) \quad (4)$$

as typical in standard macromodeling schemes but also when the model replaces the DUT in its operating environment, as shown in Fig. 1. This requirement is not trivial: while enforcing (4) is straightforward with state-of-the-art passive macromodeling approaches [4], ensuring that the port signals

$$\mathbf{x}(s) = [\mathbb{I}_P - \mathbf{\Gamma}(s)\mathbf{H}(s)]^{-1}\mathbf{P}(s)\mathbf{w}(s) \quad (5a)$$

$$\mathbf{y}(s) = \mathbf{H}(s)[\mathbb{I}_P - \mathbf{\Gamma}(s)\mathbf{H}(s)]^{-1}\mathbf{P}(s)\mathbf{w}(s) \quad (5b)$$

obtained by replacing the exact DUT with its macromodel match up to the desired accuracy their references (3)

$$\mathbf{y}(s) \approx \check{\mathbf{y}}(s), \quad \mathbf{x}(s) \approx \check{\mathbf{x}}(s) \quad (6)$$

requires additional care. This difficulty is evident from (3), basically due to the matrix $[\mathbb{I}_P - \mathbf{\Gamma}(s)\check{\mathbf{H}}(s)]$ that needs to be inverted. When such matrix is nearly singular with some small magnitude eigenvalue μ , the inevitable approximation error $\Delta\mathbf{H}(s) = \mathbf{H}(s) - \check{\mathbf{H}}(s)$ that affects the macromodel is amplified by μ^{-1} , possibly leading to highly inaccurate port signal estimates [27], [28], [29], [30], [31], [32]. In this situation, we say that macromodel accuracy is *sensitive*

to the actual termination condition. Conversely, a macromodel will be *robust* with respect to a particular termination network \mathcal{L} when (6) holds *concurrently*.

The derivations in [31] and [32] show that a straightforward solution to this problem is achieved by enforcing (4) together with the additional fitting condition

$$\mathbf{H}(s)\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) \approx \check{\mathbf{y}}(s) \quad (7)$$

where $\check{\mathbf{x}}(s)$ and $\check{\mathbf{y}}(s)$ are known from (3) as solutions of the nominal DUT under the prescribed termination condition. In practice, the starting point for the construction of a robust macromodel is a set of K frequency samples of the reference network function

$$\check{\mathbf{H}}_k = \check{\mathbf{H}}(j\omega_k), \quad k = 1, \dots, K \quad (8)$$

typically scattering responses computed by full-wave field solvers. In addition, we consider a set of M independent termination networks and associated sources

$$\mathcal{T}^{(m)} : \{\mathcal{L}^{(m)}, \mathbf{w}^{(m)}\}, \quad m = 1, \dots, M. \quad (9)$$

For each of such termination networks, we compute the nominal DUT port signals through a frequency-domain solution of (3), obtaining the signal pairs' data

$$\check{\mathbf{x}}_k^{(m)} = \check{\mathbf{x}}^{(m)}(j\omega_k), \quad \check{\mathbf{y}}_k^{(m)} = \check{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(j\omega_k). \quad (10)$$

Then, a rational macromodel structure is assumed

$$\mathbf{H}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^v \frac{\mathbf{R}_i}{s - p_i} + \mathbf{R}_\infty \quad (11)$$

where $\{p_i\}$ are the unknown model poles and $\{\mathbf{R}_i\}$ are the corresponding unknown residue matrices with direct coupling \mathbf{R}_∞ . The robust model is identified through a standard VF pole relocation iteration, where the multiple fitting conditions

$$\mathbf{H}(j\omega_k) \approx \check{\mathbf{H}}_k \quad (12a)$$

$$\mathbf{H}(j\omega_k)\check{\mathbf{x}}_k^{(m)} \approx \check{\mathbf{y}}_k^{(m)}, \quad m = 1, \dots, M \quad (12b)$$

are enforced concurrently for $k = 1, \dots, K$ at each iteration. Technical details are given in [31, Sec. IV].

We remark that two application scenarios are enabled by this approach. If the application at hand requires fine-tuning the model accuracy for a well-defined termination condition, which is never modified during model operation, then one can set $M = 1$ and base model identification on that specific termination. There will be, however, no guarantee of reduced sensitivity under different operating conditions. If, instead, the model is requested to be robust to a possibly ample class of terminations, then multiple samples $M > 1$ from this class (9) will be needed to reduce the likelihood of high sensitivity under varying termination conditions. The above statements are documented and illustrated through several examples in [31], [32]. A systematic procedure to design a *worst case* termination that emphasizes the sensitivity of a given DUT at one or more discrete frequencies is reported in the Appendix.

This article completes this framework by proposing a PE postprocessing that, combined with the above rational fitting scheme, produces a guaranteed passive model with enhanced robustness to terminations. In fact, the application of any of the standard and well-documented PE schemes to a robust macromodel will not preserve this robustness, thus spoiling all efforts previously spent to include termination effects in the rational fitting phase.

IV. PASSIVITY ENFORCEMENT

Starting from a stable macromodel in pole residue form (11), a popular and effective method to enforce passivity consists of iteratively applying small perturbations to the model residues until suitable passivity constraints are met. This method will be referred to as *Standard PE* in the following and is described in full detail in [4, Secs. 10.5 and 10.10] and references therein.

In the following, we will assume that the macromodel representation $\mathbf{H}(s)$ is a scattering network function. Similar results hold for immittance representations, as for other PE schemes. Under this assumption, a stable macromodel is passive if the transfer matrix norm is less than one [4], [34], [35], [36] for all frequencies

$$\|\mathbf{H}(j\omega)\| \leq 1 \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (13)$$

A nonpassive macromodel would violate this constraint on N_v frequency bands $\Omega^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, N_v$, where its norm is above unity, that is,

$$\|\mathbf{H}(j\omega)\| > 1, \quad \forall \omega \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_v} \Omega^{(i)}, \quad \Omega^{(i)} \triangleq (\omega_0^{(i)}, \omega_1^{(i)}) \quad (14)$$

where $\omega_0^{(i)}$ and $\omega_1^{(i)}$ are the interval endpoints. A necessary condition for (13) is asymptotic passivity, i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{R}_\infty\| \leq 1. \quad (15)$$

In the following, we assume that condition (15) is enforced during the final residue estimation stage of the robust VF iteration introduced in [31]. This can be done easily via semidefinite optimization solvers since (15) is convex in the unknown direct coupling term \mathbf{R}_∞ . Therefore, we assume that the violation intervals $\Omega^{(i)}$ are bounded.

The core idea behind residue perturbation-based PE algorithms [4] is to introduce a perturbation

$$\delta\mathbf{H}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^v \frac{\delta\mathbf{R}_i}{s - p_i} \quad (16)$$

such that the perturbed model $\mathbf{H}(s) + \delta\mathbf{H}(s) \triangleq \bar{\mathbf{H}}(s)$ is passive. Ideally, the model should be perturbed the least necessary to meet the constraints without impacting accuracy. These objectives can be encoded in an optimization problem where a cost function $J(\delta\mathbf{H})$ is minimized to find the optimal residue perturbation

$$\min_{\delta\mathbf{R}_i} J(\delta\mathbf{H}) \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \|\mathbf{H}(j\omega) + \delta\mathbf{H}(j\omega)\| \leq 1 \quad \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (17b)$$

In principle, the constraint (17b) could be translated into a finite-dimensional linear matrix inequality condition using the Kalman–Yakovich–Popov (KYP) lemma [37], and the resulting problem would be solvable by semidefinite programming. However, computational complexity scales badly and makes this approach oftentimes impractical for many common applications where the modeled device has more than a few tens of ports and its model involves a modest number of poles. This intractability justifies an approximate approach to enforce the set of infinitely many constraints (17b) through its *discretized* version, namely, a finite set of n_c passivity constraints localized at frequencies where (17b) is violated. In formulae, the constraint becomes

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{H}}(j\omega_\ell)\| \leq 1, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, n_c \quad (18)$$

where the set $\mathcal{C} = \{\omega_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n_c}$ is suitably chosen to target all frequency bands $\Omega^{(i)}$. For instance, these frequencies can be the mid-points of violation intervals. The consequence of enforcing the approximate constraint instead of (17b) is that new violations may appear in the perturbed model, at frequencies where passivity was not enforced. Hence, it is necessary to perform multiple PE steps iteratively (see [4], [19]).

Given this overview, we shall now turn to a detailed description of the two crucial aspects of the residue perturbation-based PE algorithm, namely, constraint formulation and the cost function. The only difference between the PE algorithm proposed here and standard PE is indeed in the cost function $J(\delta\mathbf{H}(s))$, and this is discussed in the foregoing Section IV-A. The iterative formulation of localized constraints is the same as in standard PE and is reviewed in Section IV-B. Implementation details are provided in Section IV-C.

A. Cost Function

The concurrent constraints (4) and (7) leading to a robust macromodel, suitably discretized as in (12), can be collected in a compact form and encoded in the following cost function:

$$J_{\text{fit}} = \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{H}(j\omega_k) - \check{\mathbf{H}}_k\|_F^2 + \lambda^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{H}(j\omega_k)\check{\mathbf{X}}_k - \check{\mathbf{Y}}_k\|_F^2 \quad (19)$$

where all input–output pairs $(\check{\mathbf{x}}_k^{(m)}, \check{\mathbf{y}}_k^{(m)})$ are collected in the following data matrices:

$$\check{\mathbf{X}}_k \triangleq (\check{\mathbf{x}}_k^{(1)} \dots \check{\mathbf{x}}_k^{(M)}) \quad (20a)$$

$$\check{\mathbf{Y}}_k \triangleq (\check{\mathbf{y}}_k^{(1)} \dots \check{\mathbf{y}}_k^{(M)}) \quad (20b)$$

and where λ plays the role of a penalization parameter. In (19), the model error is optimized with respect to the original data samples of network function and port signals.

In a PE based on structure (16), the model perturbation $\delta\mathbf{H}(s)$ depends linearly on the decision variables $\delta\mathbf{R}_i$. This suggests a formulation of the cost function for robust PE based on a local reference provided by the initial nonpassive model rather than the raw data samples. This approach is standard in so-called *model-based* PE methods [4] and is here

extended to account for the additional term in the enhanced cost function (19).

We need to ensure that the passive model $\bar{\mathbf{H}}(s)$ is robustly accurate based on both (4) and (7), which, in this setting, reads

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}(s) \approx \check{\mathbf{H}}(s), \quad \bar{\mathbf{H}}(s)\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) \approx \check{\mathbf{y}}(s). \quad (21)$$

However, we know that the initial nonpassive model obtained by minimizing (19) verifies (4) and (7). Combining with (21), this leads to

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}}(s) \approx \mathbf{H}(s), \quad \bar{\mathbf{H}}(s)\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) \approx \mathbf{H}(s)\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) \quad (22)$$

or equivalently

$$\delta\mathbf{H}(s) \approx 0, \quad \delta\mathbf{H}(s)\check{\mathbf{x}}(s) \approx 0. \quad (23)$$

A discretization process (as described in Section III) leads to the proposed modified cost function for robust PE

$$J_{\text{PE}} = \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\|\delta\mathbf{H}(j\omega_k)\|_F^2 + \lambda^2 \|\delta\mathbf{H}(j\omega_k)\check{\mathbf{X}}_k\|_F^2 \right) \quad (24)$$

where all frequency samples and all termination configurations (20a) are considered. Note that the above formulation does not require the data matrix (20b) and leads to a homogeneous cost function in the model perturbation. These two features are known to contribute to reducing computational cost on one side and improving convergence properties [4]. It should be noted that setting $\lambda = 0$ in (24), i.e., removing the second term in the proposed modified cost function J_{PE} , reduces the proposed formulation to the standard nonrobust PE.

B. Passivity Constraints

The constraint (17b) to be enforced for finding optimal perturbations is here approximated with a finite number of constraints (18), which are *localized* at a discrete set of frequencies $\{\omega_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n_c}$. Thus, an algorithmic method should be provided to identify this discrete set of frequencies at each PE iteration, based on the location of passivity violations, found through a *passivity check* stage. Several approaches are available for this task, either exploiting Hamiltonian spectral properties [21] or simpler adaptive sampling strategies [38]. This material is standard (see [4]). Therefore, we assume that the following passivity violation data are available:

$$\{\sigma_{\ell,q}, \mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}, \mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}\}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, n_c, \quad q = 1, \dots, Q_\ell \quad (25)$$

at frequencies ω_ℓ where the model $\mathbf{H}(j\omega_\ell)$ has Q_ℓ (one or more) singular values $\sigma_{\ell,q} > 1$, with associated left and right singular vectors $\mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}, \mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}$. In particular

$$\mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^* \mathbf{H}(j\omega_\ell) \mathbf{v}_{\ell,q} = \sigma_{\ell,q} \quad \forall \ell, q. \quad (26)$$

Following [4], a first-order approximation of the perturbed singular value $\bar{\sigma}_{\ell,q}$ as a result of model perturbation can be written as follows:

$$\bar{\sigma}_{\ell,q} \approx \sigma_{\ell,q} + \text{Re}\{\mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^* \delta\mathbf{H}(j\omega_\ell) \mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}\} \leq 1 \quad (27)$$

as $\|\delta\mathbf{H}\| \rightarrow 0$, which is required to be bounded by one. Assembling constraints (27) while minimizing the robust cost

function (24) leads to the proposed optimization problem for robust PE

$$\min_{\delta \mathbf{R}_i} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\|\delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_k)\|_F^2 + \lambda^2 \|\delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_k) \check{\mathbf{X}}_k\|_F^2 \right) \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \text{Re}\{\mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^* \delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_\ell) \mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}\} \leq 1 - \sigma_{\ell,q} \quad \forall \ell, q. \quad (28b)$$

C. Numerical Implementation

In (28), the unknown model perturbation is represented by $\delta \mathbf{H}$, which is, however, induced by a perturbation on the model residues (16). Let us define a vector $\delta \mathbf{r}$ containing all the problem unknowns

$$\delta \mathbf{r} \triangleq \text{vec}\{\delta \mathbf{R}\}, \text{ where } \delta \mathbf{R}^T \triangleq (\delta \mathbf{R}_1^T \dots \delta \mathbf{R}_V^T). \quad (29)$$

We further define the Cauchy matrix Φ with elements

$$[\Phi]_{k,i} = (j\omega_k - p_i)^{-1} \quad (30)$$

with its k th row denoted as $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times v}$. The model perturbation (16) is first rewritten as follows:

$$\delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_\ell) = (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_\ell \otimes \mathbb{I}_P) \delta \mathbf{R}. \quad (31)$$

Using the properties of the Kronecker product allows restating each of the localized constraints (28b) in the following compact form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^* \delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_\ell) \mathbf{v}_{\ell,q} &= (\mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}^T \otimes \mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^*) \text{vec}\{\delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_\ell)\} \\ &= (\mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}^T \otimes \mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^*) (\mathbb{I}_P \otimes \boldsymbol{\varphi}_\ell \otimes \mathbb{I}_P) \delta \mathbf{r} = \\ &= (\mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}^T \otimes \boldsymbol{\varphi}_\ell \otimes \mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^*) \delta \mathbf{r}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The model perturbations at all the sampled frequencies can be assembled from (31) as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_1) \\ \vdots \\ \delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_K) \end{pmatrix} = (\Phi \otimes \mathbb{I}_P) \delta \mathbf{R}. \quad (33)$$

This enables us to rewrite the cost function (24) in terms of $\delta \mathbf{r}$. The first term in (24) can be compactly written as follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \|\delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_k)\|_F^2 = \|(\mathbb{I}_P \otimes \Phi \otimes \mathbb{I}_P) \delta \mathbf{r}\|^2. \quad (34)$$

As for the second term in (24), the contribution of the k th frequency point can be written as follows:

$$\text{vec}\{\delta \mathbf{H}(j\omega_k) \check{\mathbf{X}}_k\} = \underbrace{(\check{\mathbf{X}}_k^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_P) (\mathbb{I}_P \otimes \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k \otimes \mathbb{I}_P)}_{\triangleq \Psi_k} \delta \mathbf{r}. \quad (35)$$

Upon substituting (34)–(35) in (24), J_{PE} becomes

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{PE}} &= \|(\mathbb{I}_P \otimes \Phi \otimes \mathbb{I}_P) \delta \mathbf{r}\|^2 + \lambda^2 \|\Psi \delta \mathbf{r}\|^2 \\ &= \|\Theta \delta \mathbf{r}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where Ψ vertically stacks Ψ_k for $k = 1, \dots, K$ as block rows, and where

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_P \otimes \Phi \otimes \mathbb{I}_P \\ \lambda \Psi \end{pmatrix} \quad (37)$$

plays the role of a *regressor* matrix, as in standard least squares problems. Thus, (36) and (32), respectively, give the explicit

Algorithm 1 Robust Passivity Enforcement

Require: initial model \mathbf{H} , terminations $\mathcal{T}^{(m)}$ as in (9)

- 1: Run passivity check on \mathbf{H} to find N_v violation bands $\Omega^{(i)}$
 - 2: $\bar{\mathbf{H}} \leftarrow \mathbf{H}$
 - 3: Compute regressor matrix Θ of J_{PE} as in (37)
 - 4: **while** $N_v > 0$ **do**
 - 5: Select violation frequencies $\{\omega_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^{n_c}$ from all $\Omega^{(i)}$
 - 6: **for** $\ell = 1, \dots, n_c$ **do**
 - 7: Compute $\{\sigma_{\ell,q} > 1, \mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}, \mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}\}$ as in (25)–(26)
 - 8: Setup constraint matrices $\forall \ell, q$ as in (38b)
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: Solve the minimization problem (38) to find $\delta \mathbf{r}$
 - 11: $\bar{\mathbf{H}} \leftarrow \bar{\mathbf{H}} + \delta \mathbf{H}$, i.e. update residues based on (16)
 - 12: Check passivity of $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$, retrieve N_v violation bands $\Omega^{(i)}$
 - 13: **end while**
 - 14: **return** $\bar{\mathbf{H}}$
-

dependence of (28a) and (28b) on the decision variables, leading to the optimization problem to be solved at each PE iteration

$$\min_{\delta \mathbf{r}} \|\Theta \delta \mathbf{r}\|^2 \quad (38a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \text{Re}\{\mathbf{v}_{\ell,q}^T \otimes \boldsymbol{\varphi}_\ell \otimes \mathbf{u}_{\ell,q}^*\} \delta \mathbf{r}\} \leq 1 - \sigma_{\ell,q} \quad \forall \ell, q. \quad (38b)$$

The proposed robust PE scheme is summarized in Algorithm 1.

D. Computational Cost

The computational complexity of the proposed approach differs from that of standard PE schemes only for the increased row dimension of the matrix $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(M+P)PK \times P^2v}$, which depends on the possibly large number M of termination conditions included in the model optimization. This drawback can be alleviated by preprocessing Θ before applying the robust PE scheme. This is possible because Θ is block diagonal up to a permutation. Applying such permutation and computing the QR factorization of the resulting diagonal blocks allows us to define the quadratic cost function of (38) in terms of a square block-diagonal matrix of size P^2v (the total number of unknowns). This procedure is entirely similar to the one described in [31] and originally in [10], to which the reader is referred for further details (additional implementation aspects are omitted here). The asymptotic computational cost of this preprocessing step is $O(MK P^3 v^2)$. The impact of this overhead is quantified in Table I, which anticipates the runtime (including preliminary QR factorizations) and PE iterations that were experimentally measured for the three testcases presented in Section V on a workstation equipped with a Core i9-7900X CPU running at 3.3 GHz with 64 GB of RAM.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The advantages of the proposed robust PE scheme are illustrated in three different PDN testcases. Such structures are in fact known to be quite sensitive to port terminations when scattering-based rational macromodels are used in simulations at the system level.

TABLE I

EXPERIMENTAL COMPARISON OF COMPUTATIONAL COST (STANDARD PE VERSUS ROBUST PE) FOR THE THREE BENCHMARKS OF SECTION V

Example	P	ν	Runtime		# of iterations	
			Standard	Robust	Standard	Robust
Sec. V-A	4	24	11.3 s	26 s	6	23
Sec. V-B	5	22	4.5 s	5.2 s	4	6
Sec. V-C	9	26	7.2 s	8.4 s	6	6

A. Testcase A

This section describes a canonical PDN structure consisting of a pair of parallel conducting planes of size 12×10 cm separated by a 1-mm dielectric FR4 layer ($\epsilon_r = 4.7$ and $\tan\delta = 0.01$). Five lumped ports are located at random plane locations, and one of them is connected to a 20 m Ω shunt resistor, so as to model the presence of a VR providing the main voltage and power supply. We consider the impedance matrix looking into the remaining four ports, for which a macromodel can be built. Note that this impedance matrix is well-defined at dc because of the low-impedance path provided by the resistive VR model.

This canonical example was already discussed in [31] as a template to demonstrate the load sensitivity of standard VF models. This sensitivity arises when loading the four remaining ports with decoupling capacitors, which is a standard operation in PDN design. We apply the robust fitting algorithm reviewed in Section III to obtain a macromodel ($\nu = 24$ model poles and 20 VF iterations, $K = 2 \cdot 10^3$ data samples) that is robust with respect to such termination class based on $M = 20$ random capacitive (RLC) loads. The R , L , and C values of the capacitor models are uniformly distributed in the intervals $R \in [0.5, 1]$ m Ω , $L \in [5, 10]$ pH, and $C \in [5 \text{ pF}, 1 \text{ nF}]$. Next, model passivity is enforced by residue perturbation using both the standard cost function and the proposed robust cost function (38), with $n_c = 30$ passivity constraints in the first iteration. As a measure to verify improvements and reduced load sensitivity, we evaluate the 4×4 impedance matrix of the DUT, including a set of randomly-generated RLC shunt loads that were not used in the model training phase.

Fig. 2 (top) compares the reference (exact) solution of three different models. The robust model before PE (black line) is very accurate compared to the exact solution. Standard PE degrades model accuracy after retermination, as shown by the green dashed line. Using, instead, the proposed robust cost function in the PE phase provides superior accuracy (red dashed line). Such improvements are mostly visible in close proximity to the resonance peaks.

A statistical analysis is reported in Fig. 2 (bottom), which reports the average absolute error over frequency on the input impedance $Z_{1,1}$ when the macromodels are loaded with 2000 random capacitive terminations (drawn according to the same statistical distribution as the training ones). The proposed PE scheme gives a passive model that can be considered robust with a wide range of capacitive loads so that the results displayed in Fig. 2 (top) hold consistently.

To further demonstrate the importance of a good approximation of the reterminated input impedance, we look at the time-domain voltage response to a current stimulus.




Fig. 2. Top: magnitude of the $Z_{2,2}$ entry of the impedance matrix of the canonical PDN example of Section V-A. The reference data are compared with the model response before PE, after standard PE, and after proposed robust PE. Bottom: average absolute error on the $Z_{1,1}$ entry after loading DUT with 2000 random capacitive terminations.




Fig. 3. Testcase A. Top: multisine current excitation signal. Bottom: port voltages obtained from macromodels after standard and robust PE.

Fig. 3 (top) depicts the adopted current excitation, consisting of a superposition of seven sine waves with different frequencies (corresponding to available ω_k) and equal amplitude (10 mA). This signal enables a trivial evaluation of an exact




Fig. 4. Testcase B. Comparison of standard and robust passive macromodel responses to reference data. Top: selected scattering matrix response $S_{1,4}$. Bottom: selected impedance matrix response $Z_{1,4}$.

solution to be used as a reference. The responses of the two passive models built using standard and robust cost functions were computed as well. Fig. 3 (bottom) shows the excellent accuracy of the robust passive macromodel, whereas the standard macromodel exhibits unacceptable transient voltage errors. These results clearly demonstrate the practical importance and impact of using the newly defined J_{PE} to obtain robustly reliable results.

B. Testcase B

The second testcase is an extraction of a real PDN with $P = 5$ modeled ports (courtesy of Jian Liu, Cadence). This structure shows strong error magnification when its macromodel, built in the native scattering representation ($R_0 = 1 \Omega$), is converted to impedance (Z -parameters). The robust VF algorithm was first applied with $\nu = 22$ poles and 15 VF iterations to simultaneously optimize the S -parameters with $R_0 = 1 \Omega$ and the Z -parameters (i.e., $M = 1$ termination scheme). The dataset contains $K = 1260$ samples. Given that the weighting coefficients (20) required to enforce the Z -parameters approximation are of much larger magnitude than the native scattering representation, we set the regularization parameter to $\lambda = 10^{-3}$. Then, we applied residue perturbation-based PE using the standard and the proposed robust cost functions, using $n_c = 9$ passivity constraints in the first iteration.

Results are depicted in Fig. 4. The top panel compares the two macromodels to the reference in terms of scattering parameters. All macromodels are accurate in this representation. However, when looking at the impedance responses in the




Fig. 5. Testcase C (five-port model). Comparison of macromodel responses after standard and robust PE to reference scattering responses (top) and after conversion to admittance representation (bottom).

panel figure, we see that only the proposed PE formulation provides a model that remains robust against error amplification induced by the S -to- Z conversion. The impedance response of the standard model is severely incorrect. This implies that the standard model is practically useless in any system-level simulation setting, especially those adopting high-impedance terminations.

C. Testcase C

The last testcase is extracted from an actual 45-port PDN package design [39]. We initially consider a subset of $P = 5$ ports to build an S -parameter macromodel that remains accurate when converted to the Y (admittance) representation. This requirement is not trivial because, for this particular example, a standard VF macromodel exhibits high sensitivity in the S -to- Y conversion, as we will see in the following. Thus, we simultaneously fit the native scattering representation with $R_0 = 1 \Omega$ while including weights (20) induced by the admittance parameter conversion ($M = 1$), using 14 poles and 15 VF iterations to fit $K = 317$ frequency samples. The resulting stable but nonpassive model is the starting point for PE using standard and proposed robust implementations. At the first iteration, $n_c = 11$ constraints are enforced. The resulting S -parameter responses, reported in Fig. 5 (top), demonstrate that standard PE works well in the native representation to which it is applied. However, conversion of the standard passive model to Y representation [see Fig. 5 (bottom)] reveals major accuracy degradation. Conversely, the proposed robust PE scheme meets the expectations of




Fig. 6. Transfer matrix norm of the testcase considered in Section V-C, before and after PE. See Fig. 5 for the corresponding model responses.




Fig. 7. Testcase C (nine-port model). Comparison of passive model responses (standard and robust) to reference data. Top: direct comparison of scattering responses. Bottom: one representative PDN impedance matrix element after retermination with VR and decoupling capacitor models.

preserving accuracy also in its admittance responses. Fig. 6 reports the frequency-dependent norm $\|S(j\omega)\|_2$ before and after PE, demonstrating that uniform passivity is achieved at all frequencies both for standard and robust implementations.

This package model is part of a larger PDN where it is connected to a prescribed set of terminations, including decoupling capacitors and a lumped VR model. Hence, it makes sense to build a model with optimized accuracy with respect to such prescribed loading network \mathcal{L} . To demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm in achieving this purpose, we now focus on nine ports, where the loading-induced error magnification effect is particularly visible. A nine-port ($P = 9$) S -parameter macromodel was built using the robust VF algorithm with 26 poles and 20 VF iterations, whose representative scattering responses are displayed in Fig. 7 (top).

Passivity was again enforced by residue perturbation using the standard PE, whose cost function does not take terminations into account, and the proposed robust PE (with $M = 1$). The resulting passive models are then loaded with decoupling capacitors, and the input impedance of the reterminated device is reported in Fig. 7 (bottom). This experiment confirms that the standard PE reintroduces the sensitivity issue (green dashed line) because its cost function minimizes the perturbation in S -parameters only (thus overlooking the error magnification issue), while the weighted PE seeks to perturb the model coefficients so as to retain the accuracy of both the S -parameters and the input impedance after loading (red dashed line).

VI. DISCUSSION

In this article, we have documented how a simple modification of the cost function defining model accuracy leads to dramatic improvements in macromodel robustness to changes in its termination conditions. The presentation has been concentrated on a modification of a well-defined PE method [4, Secs. 10.5 and 10.10], which is reviewed in Section IV. More precisely, this approach is based on the iterative enforcement of discretized constraints enforcing bounded realness of the scattering macromodel response at a finite set of frequency points. In the authors' opinion, this is by far the most effective PE approach among those based on perturbation, as demonstrated by the success of commercial tools (e.g., [40]) based on this method. Due to its good performance, this method has been successfully extended to the multivariate (parameterized) case, e.g., [41], [42], where the various methods differ mainly on the strategy used to select the frequency locations $\{\omega_\ell\}$ where the local constraints are applied. Upon removing the external parameters and focusing on univariate (frequency-dependent) macromodels only, the latter methods are basically identical to the reference PE approach that is enhanced in this work. Therefore, it is expected that the adoption of the robust cost function proposed in this work in the multivariate setting of [41] and [42] will lead to similar improvements on the sensitivity of parameterized macromodels. This investigation is left for future work.

A second remark is in order. Several strategies exist for PE, in addition to the local perturbation described in this work. The most notable approaches are the well-known methods based on Hamiltonian spectral perturbation [21] and those based on the KYP lemma [22]. Such methods, thoroughly discussed and compared in [4], are all based on the minimization of some cost function under specialized passivity constraints, displacement of Hamiltonian eigenvalues, or linear matrix inequalities (LMIs) of KYP type, respectively. Such constraints can be directly combined with the proposed cost function to make the corresponding PE methods robust to load variations. The local perturbation approach has been preferred in this work over KYP because the latter would require the solution of a semidefinite optimization program (SDP) with LMI constraints. Although SDP solvers are widely available and are being continuously improved, we found in our experiments that the approach documented in this article is numerically much more robust and can easily handle large-scale problems,

whereas an SDP solver would be excessively demanding in terms of runtime and memory. An SDP-based PE equipped with the proposed robust cost function (24) was, in fact, implemented and used to enforce passivity of the nine-port model of Fig. 7 and Section V-C. This process required 1480 s, whereas the preferred local perturbation approach required only 8.4 s, with no appreciable difference in the results.

We conclude this section with a final remark on convergence. In this work, we have not considered Hamiltonian spectral perturbation approaches since their specific constraints do not guarantee that the elimination of some passivity violation band will not generate another violation elsewhere. The only PE enforcement methods based on perturbation that guarantees convergence are those based on direct KYP constraints, which can be proved to be convex optimization problems in terms of the decision variables (residue perturbations). Unfortunately, as documented above, such methods are extremely demanding in terms of computing resources and are inapplicable on standard hardware to realistic large-scale SI/PI structures. The PE framework that is adopted in this work is based on frequency-dependent constraints (13) that are fully equivalent to KYP constraints (under proper technical conditions; see [4]), which are discretized as (18) and linearized as (27). If the discretization is sufficiently dense and accurate, it is known that the resulting method preserves the good convergence properties of the KYP approach, with a dramatically reduced computational cost.

VII. CONCLUSION

This article presented a systematic and effective approach to generate passive macromodels with reduced sensitivity to variations in their termination networks. The problem of load sensitivity is often overlooked in the rich literature on the subject. However, in the authors' opinion, such an issue still represents a fundamental roadblock that prevents the effective use of rational fitting algorithms in several application fields.

This article completed the framework initially introduced in [31], where a robust formulation of the VF scheme with reduced load sensitivity was presented. Here, a robust PE scheme was presented, which, combined with the above robust VF, can lead to behavioral macromodels of LTI systems that are at the same time passive, hence unconditionally stable upon loading the macromodel with arbitrary passive termination networks, as well as robust to variations of such termination networks. The effectiveness of the proposed algorithm was demonstrated on three PDN benchmarks.

APPENDIX

In this section, we elaborate on the sensitivity of a given LTI system to its port terminations, and we propose a simple procedure to design a passive network that emphasizes such sensitivity. We denote such network as *worst case termination*, not to be intended in a strict sense, but rather as a particular load that maximizes sensitivity at one or more discrete frequencies by design.

Let us consider the setting of Fig. 1 and Section II, namely, a DUT with input–output (scattering) representation (1) terminated into a passive LTI system (2). The solution for the interface port signals is reported in (3). Any modeling error $\Delta\mathbf{H}(s)$ in the approximation of $\check{\mathbf{H}}(s)$ with a macromodel $\mathbf{H}(s)$ is amplified in the port signals by matrix $\Xi^{-1}(s)$ where

$$\Xi(s) = \mathbb{I}_P - \Gamma(s)\check{\mathbf{H}}(s). \quad (39)$$

We attempt designing a passive P -port network with the scattering matrix $\Gamma(s)$ that maximizes the magnitude of the largest eigenvalue of $\Xi^{-1}(s)$, which is equivalent to minimizing the magnitude of the smallest eigenvalue of $\Xi(s)$.

Let us consider a fixed frequency $s_0 = j\omega_0$ and perform a singular value decomposition of the DUT scattering matrix

$$\check{\mathbf{H}}(s_0) = \mathbf{U}_0 \Sigma_0 \mathbf{V}_0^* = \sum_{i=1}^P \sigma_{0,i} \mathbf{u}_{0,i} \mathbf{v}_{0,i}^* \quad (40)$$

with sorted singular values $\sigma_{0,i} \geq \sigma_{0,i+1}$ and mutually orthonormal left (right) singular vectors $\mathbf{u}_{0,i}$ ($\mathbf{v}_{0,i}$). Given the assumption that the DUT is passive, we have $\sigma_{0,1} \leq 1, \forall \omega_0$. We then define a rank-one matrix

$$\Gamma(s_0) = \Gamma_0 = \alpha_{0,1} \mathbf{v}_{0,1} \mathbf{u}_{0,1}^*. \quad (41)$$

Replacing (40) and (41) in (39) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi(s_0) &= \mathbb{I}_P - \alpha_{0,1} \mathbf{v}_{0,1} \mathbf{u}_{0,1}^* \sum_{i=1}^P \sigma_{0,i} \mathbf{u}_{0,i} \mathbf{v}_{0,i}^* \\ &= \mathbb{I}_P - \alpha_{0,1} \sigma_{0,1} \mathbf{v}_{0,1} \mathbf{v}_{0,1}^* \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

from which we see that one eigenvalue of $\Xi(s_0)$ is equal to $\mu_{0,1} = 1 - \alpha_{0,1} \sigma_{0,1}$. The minimum value that can be attained by this eigenvalue under the constraint that also $\Gamma(s)$ is a passive LTI network (with $\alpha_{0,1} \leq 1$) occurs when $\alpha_{0,1} = 1$ and reads $\mu_{0,1} = 1 - \sigma_{0,1}$. This value is minimum at the frequency ω_0 where $\sigma_{0,1}$ is largest. The above considerations lead to the following procedure.

- 1) Find the frequency ω_0 that maximizes $\sigma_{0,1} = \|\check{\mathbf{H}}(j\omega_0)\|$.
- 2) Assemble the rank-one matrix (41) with $\alpha_{0,1} = 1$, namely,

$$\Gamma_0 = \mathbf{v}_{0,1} \mathbf{u}_{0,1}^*. \quad (43)$$

- 3) Find a real stable rational matrix function $\Gamma(s)$ that interpolates Γ_0 at $s = j\omega_0$ while satisfying the passivity condition $\|\Gamma(j\omega)\| \leq 1, \forall \omega \in \mathbb{R}$.

The resulting $\Gamma(s)$ provides the worst case termination at frequency ω_0 . The following generalizations can be envisioned.

- 1) If the largest singular value $\sigma_{0,1}$ has multiplicity m higher than one or similarly if m singular values are very close to 1, then a rank- m matrix Γ_0 can be defined as follows:

$$\Gamma_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{v}_{0,i} \mathbf{u}_{0,i}^* \quad (44)$$

resulting in multiple eigenvalues $\mu_{0,i} = 1 - \sigma_{0,i}$.

- 2) If there are multiple frequencies $j\omega_k$ at which $\sigma_{k,1} = \|\check{\mathbf{H}}(j\omega_k)\|$ are very close to one, then rank-1 or rank- m matrices Γ_k can be defined as in (43) or (44) and used to




Fig. 8. Error amplification factor for testcase B under loading with its worst case termination network.




Fig. 9. As in Fig. 8, but for testcase C.

construct a passive rational matrix $\Gamma(s)$ that interpolates all such Γ_k . The resulting termination network will emphasize sensitivity at all frequencies ω_k .

Circuit synthesis of $\Gamma(s)$ can be performed using the general methods discussed in [4] or [24].

We illustrate the above process with two examples, namely, testcases B and C discussed in Sections V-B and V-C, respectively. Figs. 8 and 9 report the frequency-dependent eigenvalues of $\Xi^{-1}(j\omega)$ based on the worst case terminations designed at dc and at some high-frequency point. In both cases, the largest eigenvalue reaches a value of $\approx 10^4$, denoting high sensitivity and error magnification. The theory and algorithms presented in this work demonstrate that by embedding such terminations in the fitting and PE cost functions, the resulting macromodel will remain accurate also under such worst case terminations.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Achar and M. S. Nakhla, "Simulation of high-speed interconnects," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 89, no. 5, pp. 693–728, May 2001.
- [2] A. Carlucci, T. Bradde, S. Grivet-Talocia, S. Mongrain, S. Kulasekaran, and K. Radhakrishnan, "A compressed multivariate macromodeling framework for fast transient verification of system-level power delivery networks," *IEEE Trans. Compon., Packag., Manuf. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 1553–1566, Oct. 2023.
- [3] A. Carlucci, S. Grivet-Talocia, S. Kulasekaran, and K. Radhakrishnan, "Structured model order reduction of system-level power delivery networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 18198–18214, 2024.

- [4] S. Grivet-Talocia and B. Gustavsen, *Passive Macromodeling: Theory and Applications*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley, Dec. 2015.
- [5] B. Gustavsen and A. Semlyen, "Rational approximation of frequency domain responses by vector fitting," *IEEE Trans. Power Del.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1052–1061, Jul. 1999.
- [6] B. Gustavsen, "Relaxed vector fitting algorithm for rational approximation of frequency domain responses," in *Proc. IEEE Workshop Signal Propag. Interconnects*, May 2006, pp. 97–100.
- [7] S. Lefteriu and A. C. Antoulas, "On the convergence of the vector-fitting algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Microw. Theory Techn.*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1435–1443, Apr. 2013.
- [8] D. Deschrijver, B. Haegeman, and T. Dhaene, "Orthonormal vector fitting: A robust macromodeling tool for rational approximation of frequency domain responses," *IEEE Trans. Adv. Packag.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 216–225, May 2007.
- [9] S. Grivet-Talocia and M. Bandinu, "Improving the convergence of vector fitting for equivalent circuit extraction from noisy frequency responses," *IEEE Trans. Electromagn. Compat.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 104–120, Feb. 2006.
- [10] D. Deschrijver, M. Mrozowski, T. Dhaene, and D. De Zutter, "Macro-modeling of multiport systems using a fast implementation of the vector fitting method," *IEEE Microw. Wireless Compon. Lett.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 383–385, Jun. 2008.
- [11] A. Chinae and S. Grivet-Talocia, "On the parallelization of vector fitting algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Compon., Packag., Manuf. Technol.*, vol. 1, no. 11, pp. 1761–1773, Nov. 2011.
- [12] S. Ganeshan, N. K. Elumalai, R. Achar, and W. K. Lee, "GVF: GPU-based vector fitting for modeling of multiport tabulated data networks," *IEEE Trans. Compon., Packag., Manuf. Technol.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 1375–1387, Aug. 2020.
- [13] C.-C. Chou and J. E. Schutt-Ainé, "On the acceleration of the vector fitting for multiport large-scale macromodeling," *IEEE Microw. Wireless Compon. Lett.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1–4, Jan. 2021.
- [14] B. Gustavsen and C. Heitz, "Rational modeling of multiport systems by modal vector fitting," in *Proc. IEEE Workshop Signal Propag. Interconnects*, May 2007, pp. 49–52.
- [15] S. Grivet-Talocia, "Package macromodeling via time-domain vector fitting," *IEEE Microw. Wireless Compon. Lett.*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 472–474, Nov. 2003.
- [16] T. Bradde, S. Chevalier, M. De Stefano, S. Grivet-Talocia, and L. Daniel, "Handling initial conditions in vector fitting for real time modeling of power system dynamics," *Energies*, vol. 14, no. 9, p. 2471, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/9/2471>
- [17] T. Bradde and S. Grivet-Talocia, "A comprehensive framework for training stable and passive multivariate behavioral models," in *Proc. IEEE 27th Workshop Signal Power Integrity (SPI)*, May 2023, pp. 1–4.
- [18] B. Gustavsen and A. Semlyen, "Enforcing passivity for admittance matrices approximated by rational functions," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 97–104, Feb 2001.
- [19] S. Grivet-Talocia and A. Ubolli, "A comparative study of passivity enforcement schemes for linear lumped macromodels," *IEEE Trans. Adv. Packag.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 673–683, Nov. 2008.
- [20] B. Gustavsen, "Fast passivity enforcement of rational macromodels by perturbation of residue matrix eigenvalues," in *Proc. IEEE Workshop Signal Propag. Interconnects*, May 2007, pp. 71–74.
- [21] S. Grivet-Talocia, "Passivity enforcement via perturbation of Hamiltonian matrices," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Fundam. Theory Appl.*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 1755–1769, Sep. 2004.
- [22] C. P. Coelho, J. Phillips, and L. M. Silveira, "A convex programming approach for generating guaranteed passive approximations to tabulated frequency-data," *IEEE Trans. Comput.-Aided Design Integr. Circuits Syst.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 293–301, Feb. 2004.
- [23] T. Dhaene, D. Deschrijver, and N. Stevens, "Efficient algorithm for passivity enforcement of S-parameter-based macromodels," *IEEE Trans. Microw. Theory Techn.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 415–420, Feb. 2009.
- [24] S. Grivet-Talocia, "On driving non-passive macromodels to instability," *Int. J. Circuit Theory Appl.*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 863–886, Oct. 2009.
- [25] M. Swaminathan, D. Chung, S. Grivet-Talocia, K. Bharath, V. Laddha, and J. Y. Xie, "Designing and modeling for power integrity," *IEEE Trans. Electromagn. Compat.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 288–310, May 2010.

- [26] K. Radhakrishnan, M. Swaminathan, and B. K. Bhattacharyya, "Power delivery for high-performance microprocessors—Challenges, solutions, and future trends," *IEEE Trans. Compon., Packag., Manuf. Technol.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 655–671, Apr. 2021.
- [27] B. Gustavsen, "Rational modeling of multiport systems via a symmetry and passivity preserving mode-revealing transformation," *IEEE Trans. Power Del.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 199–206, Feb. 2014.
- [28] B. Gustavsen and C. Heitz, "Modal vector fitting: A tool for generating rational models of high accuracy with arbitrary terminal conditions," *IEEE Trans. Adv. Packag.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 664–672, Nov. 2008.
- [29] A. Ubolli, S. Grivet-Talocia, M. Bandinu, and A. Chinae, "Sensitivity-based weighting for passivity enforcement of linear macromodels in power integrity applications," in *Proc. Design, Autom. Test Eur. Conf. Exhib. (DATE)*, Dresden, Germany, Mar. 2014, pp. 1–6.
- [30] S. Grivet-Talocia, A. Ubolli, M. Bandinu, and A. Chinae, "An iterative reweighting process for macromodel extraction of power distribution networks," in *Proc. IEEE 22nd Conf. Electr. Perform. Electron. Packag. Syst.*, Oct. 2013, pp. 125–128.
- [31] A. Carlucci, T. Bradde, and S. Grivet-Talocia, "Addressing load sensitivity of rational macromodels," *IEEE Trans. Compon., Packag., Manuf. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 1591–1602, Jul. 2023.
- [32] A. Carlucci, T. Bradde, and S. Grivet-Talocia, "Improving accuracy of rational macromodels under realistic loading conditions," in *Proc. IEEE 32nd Conf. Electr. Perform. Electron. Packag. Syst. (EPEPS)*, 2023, pp. 1–3.
- [33] B. Gustavsen, "Passivity enforcement by residue perturbation via constrained non-negative least squares," *IEEE Trans. Power Del.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 2758–2767, Oct. 2021.
- [34] M. R. Wohlers, *Lumped and Distributed Passive Networks*. New York, NY, USA: Academic, 1969.
- [35] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, and V. Balakrishnan, *Linear Matrix Inequal. in System and Control Theory*, vol. 15. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1994.
- [36] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [37] A. Rantzer, "On the Kalman-Yakubovich-popov lemma," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 7–10, 1996. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0167691195000631>
- [38] M. De Stefano, S. Grivet-Talocia, T. Wendt, C. Yang, and C. Schuster, "A multistage adaptive sampling scheme for passivity characterization of large-scale macromodels," *IEEE Trans. Compon., Packag., Manuf. Technol.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 471–484, Mar. 2021.
- [39] A. Chinae, S. Grivet-Talocia, D. Deschrijver, T. Dhaene, and L. Knockaert, "On the construction of guaranteed passive macromodels for high-speed channels," in *Proc. Design, Autom. Test Eur. Conf. Exhib. (DATE)*, Dresden, Germany, Mar. 2010, pp. 1142–1147.
- [40] *IdEM R2018, Dassault Systèmes*. Accessed: May 6, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.3ds.com/products-services/simulia/products/idem/>
- [41] A. Zanco, S. Grivet-Talocia, T. Bradde, and M. De Stefano, "Enforcing passivity of parameterized LTI macromodels via Hamiltonian-driven multivariate adaptive sampling," *IEEE Trans. Comput.-Aided Design Integr. Circuits Syst.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 225–238, Jan. 2020.
- [42] S. Grivet-Talocia, "A perturbation scheme for passivity verification and enforcement of parameterized macromodels," *IEEE Trans. Compon., Packag., Manuf. Technol.*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 1869–1881, Nov. 2017.



Antonio Carlucci (Graduate Student Member, IEEE) received the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in electronic engineering from the Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy, in 2019 and 2021, respectively, where he is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree with the EMC Group.

His research focuses on large-scale simulation of electronic systems using macromodeling methods.

Mr. Carlucci received the Best Student Paper Award of SPI 2023, the 27th IEEE Workshop on Signal and Power Integrity.



Tommaso Bradde (Member, IEEE) received the B.Sc. degree in electronic engineering from Roma Tre University, Rome, Italy, in 2015, and the M.Sc. degree in mechatronic engineering and the Ph.D. degree in electrical, electronic, and communications engineering from the Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy, in 2018 and 2022, respectively.

He is currently a Researcher and an Assistant Professor with the Politecnico di Torino. His current research is focused on data-driven parameterized macromodeling and its applications to system-level signal and power integrity assessments, with the inclusion of active devices.

Dr. Bradde was a co-recipient of the 2018 Best Paper Award from the IEEE International Symposium on Electromagnetic Compatibility, the 2020 and 2022 Best Paper Awards from the IEEE Conference on Electrical Performance of Electronic Packaging and Systems, and the Best Student Paper Award from the 23rd IEEE Workshop on Signal and Power Integrity.



Stefano Grivet-Talocia (Fellow, IEEE) received the Laurea and Ph.D. degrees in electronic engineering from the Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy, in 1994 and 1998, respectively.

From 1994 to 1996, he was with the NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA. He is currently a Full Professor of electrical engineering with the Politecnico di Torino. He co-founded the academic spinoff company IdemWorks, Turin, in 2007, as the President until its acquisition by CST in 2016. He has authored about 200 journal

articles and conference papers. His current research interests include passive macromodeling of lumped and distributed interconnect structures, model-order reduction, modeling and simulation of fields, circuits, and their interaction, wavelets, time-frequency transforms, and their applications.

Dr. Grivet-Talocia was a co-recipient of the 2007 Best Paper Award from IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ADVANCED PACKAGING. He received the IBM Shared University Research Awards in 2007, 2008, and 2009 and the Intel Strategic Research Segment Grant in 2022, 2023, and 2024. He was the General Chair of the 20th and 21st IEEE Workshops on Signal and Power Integrity (SPI2016 and SPI2017), the Co-Chair of SPI2023, and the Program Co-Chair of SPI2024. He was an Associate Editor of IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY from 1999 to 2001. He is currently an Associate Editor for IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON COMPONENTS, PACKAGING AND MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY.