Polysynchronous Stochastic Circuits

M. Hassan Najafi, David J. Lilja, Marc Riedel, and Kia Bazargan

{najaf011, lilja, mriedel, kia}@umn.edu

ASP-DAC 2016

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Driven to Discoversm

Overview

- Introduction
 - Synchronous systems: CDNs a major design bottleneck
 - Completely asynchronous, GALS
- Our proposed approach
 - Polysynchronous stochastic
- Background
 - Stochastic computation
- Basic Stochastic Operations with polysynchronous inputs
- Stochastic Circuits with Polysynchronous Inputs
- Experimental results
 - High level simulation
 - Circuit level simulation
- Conclusion

Introduction

- Electronic systems are inherently **asynchronous**
 - They can be adapted to behave **synchronously**
- Synchronism
 - brings significant advantages:
 - Simplifies the design effort, Performance guarantee
 - But comes at a significant cost:
 - Must create clock distribution network (CDN)
 - A single clock signal arrival time (zero clock skew)
- CDNs is becoming a major design bottleneck
 - Accounts for significant area,
 - consumes significant **power**,
 - limits the circuit performance



Figure 1. A global CDN

Introduction

- Completely asynchronous design methodologies
 - Have been studied for decades
 - have never gained widespread acceptance
- Globally asynchronous, but locally synchronous (GALS)
 - **Pros.** reduces the cost of the distribution network
 - By Splitting the domains
 - Cons. complex circuitry for handshaking
 - So splitting is only performed at a **coarse level**.

Our proposed approach

- We propose a radically new approach:
- Splitting clock domains at a very fine level
- Domains consisting of only a handful of gates each
- Each domain is **synchronized by**
 - an inexpensive clock signal, generated locally
 - A ring of inverters.
- This is feasible by adopting
 - a stochastic representation for signal values.

- Logical computation is performed on random bit streams.
- The signal values are encoded by
 - the probability of obtaining a one versus a zero.
- Unipolar encoding: $0 \le x \le 1$
 - Each bit has probability x of being 1 and 1 x of being 0.
- **Bipolar** encoding: $-1 \le x \le 1$
 - Each bit has probability ^{x+1}/₂ of being 1 and 1 ^{x+1}/₂ of being 0.
- Example. 11010, 00111, 1111001100,...

0.6 in unipolar, 0.2 in bipolar

- Stochastic representation is less compact than a binary radix.
 - binary radix: a compressed, positional encoding
 - Stochastic. an uncompressed, uniform encoding.
- Complex operations can be performed with very simple logic.



using an AND gate

Figure 3. An example of scaled addition using a MUX unit

A reduction in area of 50x or 100x compared to7/27conventional Poips Jacineon texts Office is action Office

- Another advantage over binary radix: Error Tolerance
- In a noisy environment:
 - With a **binary** representation in **the worst case**
 - the most significant bit gets flipped => a large error.
 - With a **stochastic** representation
 - all the bits in the stream have **equal weight**.
 - A single flip results in a small error.
 - Stochastic representation is high error rate tolerant.

- A more compelling advantage:
 - with a stochastic representation,
 - computational units can tolerate skew in the arrival time of their inputs.
 - Obviates the need for a global clock signal
- This stems from the fact: the stochastic representation is
 uniform
 - All that matters:
 - the fraction of time that the signal is high.
- The correct value is computed even when the inputs are misaligned temporally.

• We call this approach polysynchronous stochastic

- Stochastic operations with polysynchronous inputs:
- Multiplication



Fig 4. Stochastic multiplication using an AND with unsynchronized bit streams.

Scaled addition



Fig 5. Stochastic scaled addition using a MUX with unsynchronized bit streams.

- Stochastic Number Generator (SNG)
 - To generate a stochastic bit stream with probability *x*:
 - 1. Obtain an unbiased random value r from random source
 - physical random sources
 - pseudo-random constructs such as LFSRs.
 - 2. Compare it to the target value x;
 - 3. Output a **1** if $r \ge x$ and a **0** otherwise.



Fig 6. Stochastic Number Generator

Basic Stochastic Operations with polysynchronous inputs

- Consider an AND gate, responsible for multiplying two input bit streams, P1 and P2
- P1 and P2 are generated by SNGs driven by two clocks with different periods, T1 and T2.
- Simple case.
 - If we **connect two clocks** with periods of **T1** and **T2** to the inputs
 - The inputs are both representing **P=0.5**
 - Therefore, the expected output value is Y=0.25.
 - We verify three different scenarios:

1) T1=2ns, T2=3.5ns,

2) T1=2ns, T2=3.2ns,

3) T1=1.8ns, T2=3.2ns.

Basic Stochastic Operations with polysynchronous inputs



Fig 7. Input clock signals and the corresponding output from connecting polysynchronous inputs to an AND gate.

Table 1. Different observed lengths of high pulses at the output of the AND gate and the number of occurrences of each one for three pairs of clock periods when executing the multiplication operation for 1000ns.

T1=2ns		T1=	2ns	T1=1.8ns		
T2=3.5ns		T2=3	3.2ns	T2=3.2ns		
\mathbf{Length}	#	Length	#	Length	#	
0.25	72	0.2	63	0.1	35	
0.50	72	0.4	63	0.2	35	
0.75	71	0.6	62	0.3	35	
1.00	142	0.8	62	0.4	35	
-	-	1.0	125	0.5	35	
-	-	-	-	0.6	35	
-	-	-	-	0.7	35	
-	-	-	-	0.8	34	
-	-	-	-	0.9	138	
Total High	249.25		249.60		249.40	

Temporal misalignment of input values does not affect the accuracy of the computation.

Basic Stochastic Operations with polysynchronous inputs

 Functionality of a MUX unit performing scaled addition with temporally misaligned inputs.

Table 2. The measured output of the **MUX** when **three polysynchronous clocks** with **distinct periods** are connected to its

INDUTS TOP I UUUNS							
T1(ns)	T2(ns)	T3(ns)	Total High Time	Measured Output	Expected Output		
2.00	1.80	3.75	499.43	0.499	0.500		
1.90	2.63	2.12	500.21	0.500	0.500		
3.20	1.60	2.00	498.80	0.499	0.500		
2.87	2.43	2.10	499.23	0.499	0.500		

The measured output values are essentially equal to the expected output value of 0.5
 (0.5 + 0.5)/2=0.5

General case.

Table 3. Stochastic **multiplication** and **scaled addition**, using an AND gate and a MUX, with **inputs generated by unsynchronized**

				SINGS.	AND Output		MUX Output	
In1	T1(ns)	In2	T2(ns)	T3(ns)	Meas.	Expec.	Meas.	Expec.
0.50	2.10	0.50	2.30	2.00	0.247	0.250	0.502	0.500
0.35	2.82	0.66	3.11	3.68	0.237	0.231	0.498	0.505
0.27	2.81	0.48	2.36	3.61	0.128	0.129	0.372	0.375
0.18	1.60	0.53	3.70	2.20	0.096	0.095	0.350	0.355

- Results are based on bit streams of length 1024, generated with 32-bit LFSRs.
- In spite of the polysynchronous clocking, the results are accurate to within the error bound expected for stochastic computation.

Stochastic Circuits with Polysynchronous Inputs

Extending the analysis to more complex stochastic circuits



$$S_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} \times \left(\frac{1}{2} \left| r_{i,j} - r_{i+1,j+1} \right| + \frac{1}{2} \left| r_{i,j+1} - r_{i+1,j} \right| \right)$$



$$f(x) = x^{0.45}$$

Fig. 8. Stochastic implementation of the **Robert's cross edge detection** algorithm.

Fig. 9. Stochastic implementation of the Gamma Correction function

[Peng Li, D.J. Lilja, Weikang Qian, K. Bazargan, and M.D. Riedel. **Computation on stochastic bit streams digital image processing case studies**. TVLSI 2014.]

Stochastic Circuits with Polysynchronous Inputs

• Extending the analysis to more complex stochastic circuits



Fig. 10.b. Stochastic implementation of the basic sorting unit.



Fig. 10.c. A stochastic implementation of a **3*3 Noise reduction median filter**

[Peng Li, D.J. Lilja, Weikang Qian, K. Bazargan, and M.D. Riedel. **Computation on** stochastic bit streams digital image processing case studies. TVLSI 2014.]

Stochastic Circuits with Polysynchronous Inputs

• Parallel processing of a 4x4 input image



The input bit streams arriving from neighboring are generated by SNGs driven by their local clocks and so are all potentially misaligned temporally.

Fig. 11. 16 Robert's Cross Cells processing a 4x4 input image concurrently.

- Circuits are implemented in Verilog,
- Simulation in Modelsim
- a 256*256 sample input image
- For the Robert's cross circuit,
 - 3 out of 4 streams are received asynchronously
- For the Median Filtering circuit,
 - 8 out of 9 streams are received asynchronously
- For the Gamma correction circuit,
 - Bernstein coefficients streams are generated with SNGs driven by local clocks.
- For the SNGs: 32-bit maximal period LFSR, seeded with a random initial value for each trial, Bit streams of length 1024

- Generating a golden case
 - All local clocks are **synchronized** (period of 2ns).
 - Even with synchronized clocks there are some inaccuracy when comparing with the conventional binary outputs.



Fig. 12. The original sample image, and the outputs of processing the sample image using stochastic circuits working with **synchronized** local clocks.

- We compare 6 different clocking schemes
- Scheme 1. The period of the local clock in all processing cells
 - Is fixed at **2ns** (the **golden case**).
- Scheme 2. The period of the local clock in each cell
 - a random real value between 2-3 ns
 - So **50%** variation between the clock periods.
- Scheme 3. The period of the local clock in each cell
 - a random real value between 2-4ns
 - so 100% variation.

- We compare 6 different clocking schemes
- Scheme 4. The periods of the local clocks
 - random values between 2-4ns,
 - but high output pulses that are **less than 10%** of the 2ns clock period (0.2ns) are **filtered out** (i.e., they are set to 0).
- Scheme 5. Same as Scheme 4, but we filter out high output pulses that are less than 15% of the 2ns clock period.
- Scheme 6. Same as Scheme 4, but we filter out high output pulses that are less than 20% of the 2ns clock period

- To produce more reliable results
 - Simulate each circuit based on the six clocking schemes
 - 10 times, each time with different initial conditions:
 - 10 different LFSR seed values for each SNGs
 - 10 different sets of values for the periods of the local clocks.
 - We calculate the average output error rate as follows:

$$E = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{256} \sum_{j=1}^{256} |T_{i,j} - S_{i,j}|}{255.(256 \times 256)} \times 100$$

Table 4. The mean of the output error rates for the three implemented stochastic circuits, simulated in six different clocking

schemes.							
	Clocking Schemes						
	S.1	S.2	S.3	S.4	S.5	S.6	
Robert	2.88%	2.89%	2.94%	2.89%	2.92%	2.88%	
Gamma	2.56%	2.50%	2.49%	2.51%	2.59%	2.64%	
Median.	3.15%	3.19%	3.31%	3.28%	3.39%	3.31%	

- The accuracy of the computations is essentially independent of how synchronized the local clocks are.
- **Polysynchrony** might actually **help** instead of **hurting**!

SPICE-Level Verification

- SPICE netlist of the Robert's cross circuit
- Simulation using **45-nm** gate library in **HSPICE**
- 500 sets of random input values,
- For the conventional **synchronous**: clock periods =>**1ns**.
- For the **polysynchronous**: clock periods => **random (1ns-2ns)**
- On 500 trials, the mean of the output error rates were
 - **4.91%** for the **synchronous** approach.
 - 4.42% for the **polysynchronous** approach.
 - Polysynchronous stochastic circuits are essentially as accurate as conventional synchronous circuits.

Conclusion

- We presented "Polysynchronous Stochastic Computation"
 - As a proof of concept
- It is predicated on the paradigm of **stochastic computing**.
 - Low cost, low power consumption, high resiliency
- Another important benefit of the stochastic paradigm
 - the **flexibility** it provides for **the clocking mechanism**.
 - Computation is accurate irrespective of the temporal alignment of input values,
 - So it can tolerate arbitrary amounts of clock skew.
 - We can **remove the CDN** and instead use
 - Locally inexpensive generated clocks
 - Improving area, power, and design complexity

Questions?

M. Hassan Najafi Najaf011@umn.edu

27 / 27