

CVM: Crossbar-Based Circuit Verification Through Modeling

Rajesh Kumar Datta



Abstract: The implementation of Boolean functions using Nano crossbar-based switching lattices has been suggested as a substitute for conventional CMOS-based approaches in digital circuits. This alternative may satisfy the needs of future electronic designs, considering the expected end of Moore's law. This study introduces CVM, a Crossbar-based circuit Verification through Modeling technique.

Keywords: CVM, Crossbar-based Verification, Modeling Technique, Lattice Network

I.INTRODUCTION

Crossbar-based circuits are a promising substitute for traditional CMOS-based circuits as the latter approach has limitations in further miniaturization. In [4] the concept of four terminal or crossbar-based implementation of boolean function was proposed. These switches offer a more efficient implementation of Boolean functions with fewer switches compared to traditional CMOS switches. Twoterminal switches are controlled by Boolean literals, with a value of '1' turning the switch ON and '0' turning it OFF. In contrast, Cross-terminal switches are arranged in a rectangular lattice and can be mutually ON or OFF. These switches can also be controlled by Boolean literals and offer more connection flexibility. Technology development and circuit modeling of these structures were discussed in [10]. Different methods have([3] [9]) shown the implementation of the Boolean function with cross-bar-based switching lattices. The idea of using two-dimensional arrays of rectangular switches is not new[2]. In recent years, the fourterminal switch model has gained renewed attention due to advances in technology [6] [5]. Boolean functions can be implemented using crossbar-type switches [11], [8]. Figure 1 and 3 summarize the basic concept. In this work, we have presented the idea and implementation of CVM, which can be used to verify the accuracy of crossbar-based implementations of any given function. This is accomplished by modeling the characteristics of the lattice and comparing the output with the expected result.

Manuscript received on 13 May 2023 | Revised Manuscript received on 23 May 2023 | Manuscript Accepted on 15 September 2023 | Manuscript published on 30 September 2023. *Correspondence Author(s)

Rajesh Kumar Datta*, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Texas at Dallas, Dallas, USA. Email: rajeshcuet10@gmail.com, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8386-<u>352X</u>

© The Authors. Published by Lattice Science Publication (LSP). This is an article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license open access (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)



Figure 1: Two-terminal switches have two connection points and can be either on or off, depending on whether the terminals are closed or open, respectively. In contrast, crossbar switches have four terminals and can be used to form a switching lattice, which is a network of these switches. The valid connections from the top to bottom plates of the switching lattice can be used to implement the PRODUCT terms of any function.

II. MODELING OF LATTICE NETWORK

Given a lattice network, the position of the Boolean literals can be identified. However, as the size of the network increases, it becomes more difficult to verify the function implemented by the network due to the rapid increase in the number of product terms. Figure 2 presents the rapid increase of function size in the lattice network. To simplify the process of verifying the Boolean function implemented by a given lattice network, we can create a model of the network and find the SOPs implemented by it. This can make the verification process easier. Next, we will discuss the modeling technique of any lattice implementation.

Formation of a Lattice: If we take a 3x3 lattice network (Figure 3 right side), it contains 9 four-terminal switches, with the top and bottom parts referred to as 'TOP' and 'BOTTOM'. Every path connecting the TOP to the BOTTOM is a Product term of the implemented Boolean function. The lattice network can be represented as a graph and DFS algorithm is used to find the paths.



Retrieval Number: 100.1/ijvlsid.B1219093223 DOI:10.54105/ijvlsid.B1219.093223 Journal Website: www.ijvlsi.latticescipub.com Published By:



Figure 2: Size of function increases rapidly with the increasing size of the cross-bar-based network. Bigger Functions can be easily implemented with these structures with fewer switches.

Path formation: To generate paths in a 3 by 3 lattice, we begin by checking the adjacent nodes (or 'children') of the source four-terminal switch. Each four-terminal switch can be connected to a maximum of four other switches, so each switch can have up to four children. In the 3 by 3 lattice shown in Figure 3, the source node has three children: 'a', 'd', and 'g'. We then choose one of these children, such as 'a', and check its children. 'a' has one child, 'b', which has two children: 'e' and 'c'. If we choose 'c', the path reaches the bottom of the lattice and the product term becomes 'a b c'. If we choose 'e' instead, it has two children: 'h' and 'f'. If we choose 'f', the path reaches the bottom and the product term becomes 'a b e f'. This process is repeated recursively until all nodes and their children have been examined. Nodes that have already been marked as used in a previous path are not checked again.

Valid path selection: To determine if a generated path is a superset of another path, we have two options: we can either generate all the paths first and then check for supersets, or we can check the path as it is being generated. The latter option is faster, espeially for large functions with many paths. When adding a new node to the path, we can check if it is a child of any previous node in the path, except for the one that brought us to the new node. This avoids the need to generate all the paths and then remove the supersets.

Repetition of literals: To generate all possible paths in a lattice structure with repeated literals, we can initially treat all literals as distinct, and then replace the basic literals with the original, repeated literals. However, this may result in superset paths that need to be removed to obtain the final set of paths.



Figure 3: (Left side) The implementation of the function X = abc+abef+debc+def can be performed using either crossbarbased or two-terminal-based circuits. The crossbar-based implementation requires 6 switches, while the two-terminal-based implementation requires 11 switches [7].



Retrieval Number: 100.1/ijvlsid.B1219093223 DOI: 10.54105/ijvlsid.B1219.09322. Journal Website: www.ijvlsi.latticescipub.com Published By:



Lines from Top to Bottom shows the path which implements product terms of the function. In larger functions, the size of the network can be significantly reduced by using crossbar-based circuits. (Right side) A 3 by-3 switching lattice is also shown in the figure.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF CVM

To model a four-terminal lattice or cross-bar structure, all relevant features must be considered mentioned in the previous section. Once the model is designed, the implemented boolean function can be obtained and compared to the intended target function to ensure an accurate representation of the lattice structure's behavior.

We implemented and developed the verification tool CVM with the 'C' language. The input of the tool is the lattice structure. A demo of the tool is uploaded here as with some sample examples [1]. The user will give the input of the literals in the order of the structure. For example, in figure 3 a 3x2 lattice has been shown. For the input of the tool, we can assume the literals as 1,2,3..6 for the literals a,b,c...f. At the output, the tool will provide the function's product terms. If there is no repetition in the literals the lattice will generate the maximum number of product terms possible by the lattice. If there is a repetition of the literals there will be some invalid paths and CVM will discard those at the output. In Figure 4 two sample lattice and their output has been shown which has been generated from CVM. As we get the product terms of the lattice structure from CVM, we can verify if the lattice implements our required function or not. As in the bigger lattices, the number of product terms will be really high, CVM can help to understand if the implementation is correct or not.



Figure 4: Verification of a 3 by 3 (upper lattice) and 4 by 2 (lower lattice) crossbar-based lattice with CVM. A crossbar-based lattice has literals in its structure to implement a function. If no literals are repeated all the possible product terms will be generated. If there are repeated literals the product terms. After we give the lattice to CVM it will return the function that the lattice has implemented.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we presented **CVM** for verifying any switching lattice network by modeling it. We have implemented the tool and verified the modeling methodologies with different lattice structures.

DECLARATION

Funding/ Grants/ Financial Support	No, I did not receive.
Conflicts of Interest/	No conflicts of interest to the
Competing Interests	best of our knowledge.
Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate	No, the article does not require ethical approval and consent to participate with evidence.
Availability of Data and Material/ Data Access Statement	Not relevant.
Authors Contributions	I am only the sole author of the article.

REFERENCES

- https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1XE7g-fhCdM1oubDsYBwhRd_gy3PQN81?usp=sharing
- Sheldon B Akers. 1971. A rectangular logic array. In 12th Annual Symposium on Switching and Automata Theory (swat 1971). IEEE, 79–90.
- Levent Aksoy and Mustafa Altun. 2020. Novel Methods for Efficient Realization of Logic Functions Using Switching Lattices. IEEE Trans. Comput. 69, 3 (2020), 427–440. https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.2019.2950663 [CrossRef]
- Mustafa Altun and Marc D Riedel. 2012. Logic synthesis for switching lattices. IEEE Trans. Comput. 61, 11 (2012), 1588–1600. [CrossRef]
- Malgorzata Chrzanowska-Jeske and Alan Mishchenko. 2005. Synthesis for regularity using decision diagrams [logic IC synthesis and layout]. In 2005 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems. IEEE, 4721–4724.
- Malgorzata Chrzanowska-Jeske, Yang Xu, and Marek Perkowski. 1999. Logic synthesis for a regular layout. VLSI Design 10, 1 (1999), 35–55. [CrossRef]
- Rajesh Kumar Datta. 2022. Implementing Boolean Functions with switching lattice networks. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2202.09551
- Mary M Eshaghian-Wilner, Amar H Flood, Alex Khitun, J Fraser Stoddart, and Kang Wang. 2006. Molecular and nanoscale computing and technology. In Handbook of nature-inspired and innovative computing. Springer, 477–509. [CrossRef]
- M Ceylan Morgül and Mustafa Altun. 2019. Optimal and heuristic algorithms to synthesize lattices of four-terminal switches. Integration 64 (2019), 60–70. [CrossRef]
- Serzat Safaltin, Oguz Gencer, M Ceylan Morgul, Levent Aksoy, Sebahattin Gurmen, Csaba Andras Moritz, and Mustafa Altun. 2019. Realization of four-terminal switching lattices: Technology development and circuit modeling. In 2019 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE). IEEE, 504–509. [CrossRef]
- Matthew M Ziegler and Mircea R Stan. 2003. CMOS/nano co-design for crossbar-based molecular electronic systems. IEEE Transactions on Nanotechnology 2, 4 (2003), 217–230. [CrossRef]

AUTHORS PROFILE



Rajesh Kumar Datta a graduate student at the University of Texas at Dallas, USA. My main research focus is circuit level security, with particular interest in hardware security. I have also worked on circuit design optimization. Currently, I am dedicated to exploring and enhancing security measures at the hardware level,

aiming to develop robust solutions for protecting circuits from potential threats.

Retrieval Number:100.1/ijvlsid.B1219093223 DOI:<u>10.54105/ijvlsid.B1219.093223</u> Journal Website: www.ijvlsi.latticescipub.com



Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the Lattice Science Publication (LSP)/ journal and/ or the editor(s). The Lattice Science Publication (LSP)/ journal and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.



Retrieval Number:100.1/ijvlsid.B1219093223 DOI:10.54105/ijvlsid.B1219.093223 Journal Website: www.ijvlsi.latticescipub.com