Simulation
Symbolic and ternary simulation
BDDs
Quaternary lattice
Symbolic trajectory evaluation
The traditional method for testing and debugging hardware designs is *simulation*.

This is just testing, done on a formal circuit model.

Feed sets of arguments in as inputs, and check whether the output is as expected.
We can generalize basic simulation in two different ways:

- **Ternary** simulation, where as well as 0 and 1 we have a “don’t care” value X.

- **Symbolic** simulation, where inputs may be parametrized by Boolean variables, and outputs are functions of those variables.

Rather surprisingly, it’s especially useful to do both at the same time, and have ternary values parametrized by Boolean variables.

This leads on to *symbolic trajectory evaluation* (STE) and its generalizations.
We might use Boolean variables for all inputs:

\[ a_0 \land \cdots \land a_6 \]

or just some of them:
Example of ternary simulation

If some inputs are undefined, the output often is too:

```
7-input AND gate
```

but not always:
Consider the 7-input AND gate. To verify it exhaustively:

- In conventional simulation, we would need 128 test cases, 0000000, 0000001, \ldots, 1111111.

- In symbolic simulation, we only need 1 symbolic test case, $a_0a_1a_2a_3a_4a_5a_6$, but need to manipulate expressions, not just constants.

- In ternary simulation, we need 8 test cases, XXXXXXX0, XXXXX0X, \ldots, 0XXXXXX and 1111111.

If we combine symbolic and ternary simulation, we can *parametrize* the 8 test cases by just 3 Boolean variables.

This makes the manipulation of expressions much more economical.
Representing Boolean expressions

We could just represent Boolean expressions as formulas in the usual way.

- Need to check equivalence of output expression and expectation
- Essentially the same approach as in previous lecture

Main alternative is to use a *canonical* representation for Boolean formulas.

- Testing equivalence is trivial (are the expressions the same?)
- There is more work in composing the operations internally

The most popular canonical representation is (reduced ordered) *binary decision diagrams* (BDDs).
Boolean functions are represented by directed acyclic graphs with maximal sharing and a canonical variables ordering.

The variable ordering can make a big difference!
Quaternary simulation

It’s theoretically convenient to generalize ternary to *quaternary* simulation, introducing an ‘overconstrained’ value $T$.

We can think of each quaternary value as standing for a set of possible values:

$$
T = \emptyset \\
0 = \{0\} \\
1 = \{1\} \\
X = \{0, 1\}
$$

This is essentially a simple case of an abstraction mapping.
We consider the quaternary values laid out in an information ordering:

```
[0]  [1]
```

The lattice ordering indicates that one value has ‘more information’ than another.
The truth-tables for basic gates are extended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>( p \land q )</th>
<th>( p \lor q )</th>
<th>( p \implies q )</th>
<th>( p \equiv q )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that when composing gates in this simple way, we may lose information.

Example: feeding \( X \) to \( \neg p \land p \) gives \( X \), not \( 0 \).

But the abstraction is sound under preservation, and still often yields useful information.
Parametrizing quaternary values

Parametrize sets of quaternary values using Boolean variables:

\[
a_0 = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } p \land q \land r \\
0 & \text{if } \neg p \land \neg q \land \neg r \\
X & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
a_6 = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } p \land q \land r \\
0 & \text{if } p \land q \land \neg r \\
X & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

We can represent quaternary values as a pair of Boolean values during simulation, and thus use the standard BDD representation in terms of the parameters.
Symbolic trajectory evaluation (STE) is a further development of ternary symbolic simulation.

The user can write specifications in a restricted temporal logic, specifying the behaviour over bounded-length trajectories (sequences of circuit states).

A typical specification would be: if the current state satisfies a property $P$, then after $n$ time steps, the state will satisfy the property $Q$.

The circuit can then be checked against this specification by symbolic quaternary simulation.

STE is used extensively at Intel.
Summary

• Simulation is the standard technique for testing and debugging circuit designs.

• The two generalizations to ternary and symbolic simulation are independently valuable.

• A canonical representation of Boolean functions using BDDs often works well.

• We can generalize simulation to quaternary simulation, considering it as an abstraction mapping.

• STE arises by combining symbolic and ternary simulation, and using it to check properties expressed in a simple temporal logic.