First we try the datasheet conditions, with the added 100 M for leakage measurement.


Leakage test:
ADG444 source leakage test @ VS=+/-15V


| Mkr | Trace | X-Axis | Value | Notes |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \nabla$ | Source | 480.0000 ms | -232.81 uV | Opamp offset |
| $2-1 \nabla$ | Source | 512.0000 ms | 135.78 uV | Switch leakage $=1.36 \mathrm{pA}$ |

The 1.36 pA leakage is OK .

Then we check the injected charge:
Untrimmed source charge test (D grounded) @ VS=+/- 15V


| Mkr | Trace | X-Axis | Value | Notes |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \nabla$ | S voltage | 0.0200 ms | -259.06 uV | Opamp offset |
| $2 \nabla$ | IN3 | 0.0010 ms | 50.00 mV | SW closed |
| $3 \nabla$ | IN3 | 0.5040 ms | 3.05 V | SW open |
| $4-1 \nabla$ | S voltage | 0.5800 ms | -1.53 mV | Qinj $=1.5 \mathrm{pC}$ |
| $5 \nabla$ | Trimmed | 0.4800 ms | -260.34 uV |  |
| $6-5 \nabla$ | Trimmed | 0.5200 ms | 1.13 uV | Trimmed Qinj $=1.1 \mathrm{fC}$ |

The red curve gives about 1.5 pC charge, for the untrimmed $+/-15 \mathrm{~V}$ supplies.
The blue curve shows the (roughly) trimmed case on the same scale for comparison. The black curve is the switch driving signal (low = switch ON / High = switch OFF).

The untrimmed 1.5 pC is OK .

Now we trim the power supplies $(+15 \mathrm{~V}$ here, while VS- is still $-15 \mathrm{~V})$ so as to null the injected charge and we zoom.


| Mkr | Trace | X-Axis | Value | Notes |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \nabla$ | IN3 | 0.0010 ms | 50.00 mV | SW closed |
| $3 \nabla$ | IN3 | 0.5040 ms | 3.05 V | SW open |
| $5 \nabla$ | Avg_Filtered | 0.4800 ms | -260.52 uV |  |
| $6-5 \nabla$ | Avg_Filtered | 0.5200 ms | 1.31 uV | Trimmed Qinj $=1.1 \mathrm{fC}$ |
| $7 \nabla$ | Avg_Filtered | 0.7000 ms | -256.52 uV | I leak integration |

The red curve is a 4096 average. The blue is a filtered (smoothed) version of the red curve.
We can see about $1.1 \mathrm{fC} \mathrm{Q}_{\text {inj }}$. This can easily be trimmed further (about $1 \mathrm{fC} / \mathrm{mV}$ supply) but the 5 mV step of my PSU wire wound pot don't allow this.
The rising slope of the second half is the operational amplifier + switch leakage current integration into the 1 nF capacitor.

The trimmed 1 fC is excellent.

Until now all is good,... but I had a gut feel and tried this:

... and the result is more than disappointing (note the 1 s time scale):
D+S charge test (slow) @ VS=+/- 15V


| Mkr | Trace | X-Axis | Value | Notes |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \nabla$ | D+S voltage | 1.0000 ms | -231.95 mV | 232 pC. Huhhh !!! |
| $2 \nabla$ | IN3 | 1.0000 ms | 250.00 mV | SW closed |
| $3 \nabla$ | IN3 | 504.0000 ms | 3.05 V | SW open |

now we have a 232 pC injected charge. Not bad for a 1 pC typ/6 WC switch and absolutely useless for me.

Now, the same conditions with a fast ON/OFF cycle makes this even worse, if possible:
D+S charge test (fast) @ VS=+/-15V


| Mkr | Trace | X-Axis | Value | Notes |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \nabla$ | D+S voltage | 0.0210 ms | -233.00 mV | $232 \mathrm{pC}$. Huhhh !!! |
| $2 \nabla$ | IN3 | 0.0020 ms | 250.00 mV | SW closed |
| $3 \nabla$ | IN3 | 0.5030 ms | 3.05 V | SW open |
| $4-1 \nabla$ | D+S voltage | 0.4970 ms | -6.70 mV | Even more charge: 7 pC |

Here we see the charge isn't, even partly, recovered when switching back to the initial position, but rather another 7 pC charge is injected.

Do all the AD low charge switches behave like that one?

