

EENG 426/CPSC 459/ENAS 876

Silicon Compilation

Function block compilation

Computer Systems Lab

<http://csl.yale.edu/~rajit>

Fall 2018

Function evaluation

How do we implement the following CHP?

$*[L?x; R!f(x)]$

- pick representation for variables
- process decomposition
- parallel composition of parts

Function block decomposition

First step: control data decomposition

$$*[L?x; R!f(x)]$$

▷

$$*[L'; R']$$

$$\parallel *[L' \bullet L?x]$$

$$\parallel *[R' \bullet R!f(x)]$$

How do we implement:

$$*[R' \bullet R!f(x)]$$

Function block decomposition

Another alternative is to design the computation of the function as a "filter" on the output of channel R .

Normal handshake on channel R :

$*[R \uparrow; [ri]; R \downarrow; [\neg ri]]$

$R \uparrow$: concurrent assignment of rails of R to a valid value

$R \downarrow$: concurrent assignment of rails of R to a neutral value

Environment:

$*[[v(R)]; ri\uparrow; [n(R)]; ri\downarrow]$

$v(R)$: true when the rails of R encode a valid data value

$n(R)$: true when the rails of R encode a neutral data value

Function block decomposition

We modify this as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & * [R' \uparrow; [ri]; R' \downarrow; [\neg ri]] \\ \parallel & * [[v(R')]; R \uparrow; [n(R')]; R \downarrow] \end{aligned}$$

where the data sent on R is a function of the data transmitted on R' .

The value is computed “on the rails” while the communication action is being performed.

- R becomes valid only after R' is valid
- R becomes neutral only after R' is neutral

Delay-insensitive (DI) codes

We have been using dual rail codes for communication.

Codes where data is exchanged in a four phase protocol are delay insensitive when:

- we have valid and neutral values (disjoint)
- when bits change from a neutral to a valid value no intermediate value is neutral or valid
- when bits change from a valid to a neutral value no intermediate value is neutral or valid

What are valid and neutral values for dual rail codes?

(Note: valid/neutral values can be state-dependent)

Operations on rails (wires):

$$\{n(X)\}X \uparrow \{v(X)\}$$

$$\{v(X)\}X \downarrow \{n(X)\}$$

In each statement, there can be at most one assignment to each data rail used to encode values.

Some practical considerations:

- implementation of waits should be simple
- codes should be simple
- small number of wires

Distributive codes:

- X can be divided into sets of *subcodes*
- validity/neutrality can be defined for subcodes
- If S is the set of subcodes, then
 - $(\forall y : y \in S : n(Y)) \Rightarrow n(X)$
 - $(\forall y : y \in S : v(Y)) \Rightarrow v(X)$

Dual rail codes are distributive in the obvious way.

Berger codes:

- Two parts: data bits and check bits.
- Initially data bits zero, check bits zero (neutral value)
- Check bits: # number of zeros in data
- Valid value: check bits consistent

k -out-of- N codes:

- Initially all data bits are zero (neutral value)
- Valid value: k of the N bits are one

Some observations:

- One hot codes: $k = 1$
- Dual rail codes: $k = 1, N = 2$
- Any *subset* of codewords can be used as well

Sperner codes: $k = N/2$

Function block decomposition

We focus on the implementation of:

$$* [[v(X)]; Y \uparrow; [n(X)]; Y \downarrow]$$

When the code is distributive, we can apply the following transformations:

$$* [[v(X)]; Y \uparrow; [n(X)]; Y \downarrow]$$

▷

$$* [[(\wedge k :: v(X_k))]; Y \uparrow; [(\wedge k :: n(X_k))]; Y \downarrow]$$

▷

$$* [[(\wedge k :: v(X_k))]; (\parallel k :: Y_k \uparrow); \\ [(\wedge k :: n(X_k))]; (\parallel k :: Y_k \downarrow) \\]$$

Function block decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} &* [\begin{aligned} &[(\wedge k :: v(X_k))] ; (\parallel k :: Y_k \uparrow); \\ &[(\wedge k :: n(X_k))] ; (\parallel k :: Y_k \downarrow) \end{aligned} \\ &] \end{aligned}$$

▷

$$\begin{aligned} &* [\begin{aligned} &(\parallel k :: [v(X_k)] ; Y_k \uparrow); \\ &(\parallel k :: [n(X_k)] ; Y_k \downarrow) \end{aligned} \\ &] \end{aligned}$$

▷

$$(\parallel k :: * [\begin{aligned} &[v(X_k)] ; Y_k \uparrow; [n(X_k)] ; Y_k \downarrow \end{aligned}])$$

Why are these transformations valid?

Function block examples

Example: complement

- $X_k = (xt_k, xf_k)$
- $Y_k = (yt_k, yf_k)$

$$\begin{aligned} &* [[xt_k \vee xf_k]; [xt_k \longrightarrow yf_k \uparrow \ \& \ xf_k \longrightarrow yt_k \uparrow]; \\ &\quad [\neg xt_k \wedge \neg xf_k]; yt_k \downarrow, yf_k \downarrow \\ &] \end{aligned}$$

Production rules:

$$\begin{array}{ll} xt_k \mapsto yf_k \uparrow & xf_k \mapsto yt_k \uparrow \\ \neg xt_k \mapsto yf_k \downarrow & \neg xf_k \mapsto yt_k \downarrow \end{array}$$

Function block examples

Example: logical AND

- $X_k = (at_k, af_k, bt_k, bf_k)$
- $Y_k = (yt_k, yf_k)$
- $*[[(at_k \vee af_k) \wedge (bt_k \vee bf_k)];$
 $[at_k \wedge bt_k \longrightarrow yt_k \uparrow \mid af_k \vee bf_k \longrightarrow yf_k \uparrow];$
 $[\neg at_k \wedge \neg af_k \wedge \neg bt_k \wedge \neg bf_k]; yt_k \downarrow, yf_k \downarrow$
 $]$

Production rules:

$$\begin{aligned} at_k \wedge bt_k &\mapsto yt_k \uparrow \\ \neg at_k \wedge \neg bt_k &\mapsto yt_k \downarrow \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} at_k \wedge bf_k \vee af_k \wedge (bt_k \vee bf_k) &\mapsto yf_k \uparrow \\ \neg at_k \wedge \neg af_k \wedge \neg bt_k \wedge \neg bf_k &\mapsto yf_k \downarrow \end{aligned}$$

An adder function block

Design of a simple N -bit ripple-carry adder:

- Three inputs: a , b , and c
- Two outputs: s , d

We can use the function block compilation strategy, where we pretend for the moment that the carry-in for each bit of the adder is an input to the block.

An adder function block

```
*[ (at ∨ af) ∧ (bt ∨ bf) ∧ (ct ∨ cf);  
  [at ∧ bt ∨ (a ≠ b) ∧ ct → dt↑  
  [af ∧ bf ∨ (a ≠ b) ∧ cf → df↑  
  ],  
  [ct ∧ (a = b) ∨ cf ∧ (a ≠ b) → st↑  
  [cf ∧ (a = b) ∨ ct ∧ (a ≠ b) → sf↑  
  ],  
  [¬at ∧ ¬af ∧ ¬bt ∧ ¬bf ∧ ¬ct ∧ ¬cf];  
  dt↓, df↓, st↓, sf↓  
]
```

Connect so that the d output of one stage is the c input for the next stage.

Distribute the validity test

$$\begin{aligned} & * [[at \wedge bt \vee (a \neq b) \wedge ct \longrightarrow dt \uparrow \\ & \quad \Box af \wedge bf \vee (a \neq b) \wedge cf \longrightarrow df \uparrow \\ & \quad], \\ & \quad ([(at \vee af) \wedge (bt \vee bf) \wedge (ct \vee cf)]; \\ & \quad [ct \wedge (a = b) \vee cf \wedge (a \neq b) \longrightarrow st \uparrow \\ & \quad \Box cf \wedge (a = b) \vee ct \wedge (a \neq b) \longrightarrow sf \uparrow \\ & \quad]); \\ & \quad [\neg at \wedge \neg af \wedge \neg bt \wedge \neg bf \wedge \neg ct \wedge \neg cf]; \\ & \quad dt \downarrow, df \downarrow, st \downarrow, sf \downarrow \\ &] \end{aligned}$$

The sum for bit position $k + 1$ waits for the carry-out of bit position k to be valid!

Distribute the neutrality test

$$\begin{aligned} & * [[at \wedge bt \vee (a \neq b) \wedge ct \longrightarrow dt \uparrow \\ & \quad [af \wedge bf \vee (a \neq b) \wedge cf \longrightarrow df \uparrow \\ & \quad], \\ & \quad ([(at \vee af) \wedge (bt \vee bf) \wedge (ct \vee cf)]; \\ & \quad [ct \wedge (a = b) \vee cf \wedge (a \neq b) \longrightarrow st \uparrow \\ & \quad [cf \wedge (a = b) \vee ct \wedge (a \neq b) \longrightarrow sf \uparrow \\ & \quad]); \\ & \quad [\neg at \wedge \neg af \wedge \neg bt \wedge \neg bf \longrightarrow dt \downarrow, df \downarrow], \\ & \quad [\neg ct \wedge \neg cf \longrightarrow st \downarrow, sf \downarrow] \\ &] \end{aligned}$$

The sum for bit position $k + 1$ waits for the carry-out of bit position k to be neutral!

Adder: fblock production rules

Production rules:

$$\begin{aligned}at \wedge bt \vee (af \wedge bt \vee at \wedge bf) \wedge ct &\mapsto dt\uparrow \\ \neg at \wedge \neg af \wedge \neg bt \wedge \neg bf &\mapsto dt\downarrow\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}af \wedge bf \vee (af \wedge bt \vee at \wedge bf) \wedge cf &\mapsto df\uparrow \\ \neg at \wedge \neg af \wedge \neg bt \wedge \neg bf &\mapsto df\downarrow\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}ct \wedge (at \wedge bt \vee af \wedge bf) \vee cf \wedge (at \wedge bf \vee af \wedge bt) &\mapsto st\uparrow \\ \neg ct \wedge \neg cf &\mapsto st\downarrow\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}cf \wedge (at \wedge bt \vee af \wedge bf) \vee ct \wedge (at \wedge bf \vee af \wedge bt) &\mapsto sf\uparrow \\ \neg ct \wedge \neg cf &\mapsto sf\downarrow\end{aligned}$$