

Re: Debouncing....at About 1Mhz

Re: Debouncing....at About 1Mhz

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-11/msg01284.html>

- *From:* John Larkin <jjlarkin@xx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 09 Nov 2007 17:38:26 -0800
-

On Fri, 09 Nov 2007 18:46:37 -0600, John Fields
<jfields@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Thu, 08 Nov 2007 07:21:04 -0800, John Larkin
<jjlarkin@xx> wrote:

On Thu, 08 Nov 2007 08:18:04 -0500, Fred Bloggs
<nospam@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

John Larkin wrote:

Or this.

<http://s2.supload.com/free/Deglitch.JPG/view/>

Your stuff is so uglee, have to coin a new word: *uglionics*
for what
you do...

It has the compensating virtues of being fast, being hazard free,
being simple, and doing exactly what was requested.

Hazard free? There still remains the RFI issue from all that
chatter, which you haven't adequately addressed.

Re: Debouncing....at About 1Mhz

I was referring to timing hazards, which all of the hairball circuits have. And I can't understand your fears about running signals through gates. How are you ever going to do logic if you're afraid to run signals through gates? "All that chatter" is in fact the input signal.

Measuring the ugliness of your designs is like evaluating 0/0.

Fred's designs aren't ugly, they're just panoramic, and they work.

Fred doesn't design things. He's said so. He sure didn't take a shot at this problem. Mostly what Fred does is criticize designs for emotional reasons, and look up a lot of old papers and cite them.

And, evaluating 0/0 to the limit leads to:

$$\frac{0}{0} = 1$$

which would seem to lend credence to his designs as being valid, '1' being assumed to be true.

He doesn't design.

John

.