


| Systematic approach | Guard strengthening |
| :---: | :---: |
| States in which $\neg r i \mapsto l o \uparrow$ has undesirable effective firings or could pcause interference（conflicting set）： $*[\bullet[l i] ; \bullet r o \uparrow ; \bullet[r i] ; r o \downarrow ;[\neg r i] ; l o \uparrow ;[\neg / i] ; \bullet / \circ \downarrow]$ <br> States in which $\neg r i \mapsto l o \uparrow$ must fire： $*[[l i] ; r o \uparrow ;[r i] ; r o \downarrow ; \bullet[\neg r i] ; \bullet l o \uparrow ;[\neg / i] ; l o \downarrow]$ <br> $\Rightarrow$ select guard so that this is the case． | Consider $B \mapsto x \uparrow$ <br> HSE： $\ldots ; x \uparrow ; \ldots ; x \downarrow ; \ldots ; x \uparrow ;$ <br> firing set：set of states in which the rule could fire． （Determined by $B$ ） <br> disallowed set：set of states in which the production rule firing is not allowed because of interference or violation of HSE <br> Conflicting set：intersection of firing and disallowed set，should be empty！ <br> Yale |
| State variables | State variables |
| Sometimes it is not possible to identify each state uniquely using the variables we have in the handshaking expansion． $\ldots . . ; x o \uparrow ;[x i] ; x o \downarrow ;[\neg x i] ; \ldots$ <br> Solution：introduce a new variable that has different values in the two indistinguishable states． <br> There are several places where the assignment to the state variable can be inserted． | ```Handshaking: vector (li, lo, ri, ro) *[\{X000\}[li]; \{1000\}ro个; \{10X1\}[ri]; \{1011\}rol; \{10X0\}[ \(\neg\) ri]; \(\{1000\} / \mathrm{lo} \uparrow ;\{\mathrm{X} 100\}[\neg / i] ;\{0100\} / \circ \downarrow\) ] After state-variable insertion: vector ( \(x\), li, lo, ri, ro) \(x \downarrow ;\) *[\{0X000\}[li]; \{01000\}ro个; \{010X1\}[ri];\{01011\}×个; \{11011\}roฟ; \{110X0\}[ \(\neg\) ri]; \{11000\}/o个; \{1X100\}[ \(\neg / i]\); \(\{10100\} \times \downarrow ;\{00100\} / 0 \downarrow\) ]``` |
| Yale <br> AVLSI | Yale <br> AVISI |


| Production rule generation | Symmetrization |
| :---: | :---: |
| HSE: $\begin{aligned} & x \downarrow ; \\ & *[[l i] ; r o \uparrow ;[r i] ; x \uparrow ; r o \downarrow ;[\neg r i] ; l o \uparrow ;[\neg l i] ; x \downarrow ; l o \downarrow] \end{aligned}$ <br> PRS: $\begin{aligned} \neg x \wedge l i & \mapsto r o \uparrow \\ r i & \mapsto x \uparrow \\ x & \mapsto r o \downarrow \\ x \wedge \neg r i & \mapsto l o \uparrow \\ \neg l i & \mapsto x \downarrow \\ \neg x & \mapsto l o \downarrow \end{aligned}$ <br> Yale | $\begin{aligned} x \wedge \neg r i & \mapsto l o \uparrow \\ \neg x & \mapsto l o \downarrow \end{aligned}$ <br> Turn into combinational logic: $\begin{aligned} & r i \vee \neg x \mapsto l o \downarrow \\ & \neg l i \vee x \mapsto r o \downarrow \end{aligned}$ <br> Why is this legal? |
| Symmetrization | Operator reduction |
| Replacing a state-holding operator with a combinational one: $\begin{aligned} x \wedge \neg B & \mapsto z \uparrow \\ B & \mapsto z \downarrow \end{aligned}$ <br> If $B$ holds as a precondition of $\neg x$, we can replace the second rule with: $\neg x \vee B \mapsto z \downarrow$ <br> We must ensure that no new effective firings have been introduced, i.e., $x \vee B \vee \neg z$ <br> is invariant. | The last step consists of grouping together production rules into operators, and identifying standard operators in the production rule set. $\begin{aligned} l i \wedge r i & \mapsto x \uparrow \\ \neg r i \wedge \neg l i & \mapsto x \downarrow \\ \neg x \wedge l i & \mapsto r o \uparrow \\ \neg l i \vee x & \mapsto r o \downarrow \\ x \wedge \neg r i & \mapsto l o \uparrow \\ r i \vee \neg x & \mapsto l o \downarrow \end{aligned}$ <br> Yale |

