

# Re: New control chip for compact fluorescent lamps

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-06/msg00200.html>

---

- *From:* Joerg <[notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 01 Jun 2007 17:25:15 -0700
- 

D from BC wrote:

On Fri, 1 Jun 2007 07:36:37 -0800, "Bob Eld" <[nsmontassoc@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:nsmontassoc@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"John Popelish" <[jpopelish@xxxxxxxx](mailto:jpopelish@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:go-dncxIqadHusPbnZ2dnUVZ\\_s\\_inZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:go-dncxIqadHusPbnZ2dnUVZ_s_inZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

<http://www.irf.com/product-info/datasheets/data/irs2168d.pdf>

I wonder what lamps will cost when made with these, and what their reliability will be. They certainly look like they could improve lots of performance details.

Way too complicated with a way too high parts count including three FETS and transformer/inductor for a single 40 or 80 Watt tube. An integrated solution has to reduce the parts count plus eliminate expensive parts to be viable. Secondly it has to operate two or more tubes in a typical lighting assembly.

I don't understand why more parts and more complexity can make a solution ugly. My designs tend to grow in size to increase performance and reliability.

So do mine but then it's all jelly-bean parts. Often to avoid an expensive chip or a single source situation for my clients. Transistors for 1.5c, BAV99 diodes for 1c, resistors for 0.5c, opamps for 10c a four-pack and so

Re: New control chip for compact fluorescent lamps

on. This ballast chip is over a buck! Not a chance IMHO unless they sharpen their pencils again.

Also, what rode them to call the chip IRS? :-)))

--

Regards, Joerg

<http://www.analogconsultants.com>

.