An Island-Style Multi-Objective Evolutionary Framework for Synthesis of Memristor-Aided Logic

Umar Afzaal, Seunggyu Lee, and Youngsoo Shin

School of Electrical Engineering, KAIST, Korea

Outline

- Introduction
- Motivation
- Proposed method
- Experimental results
- Summary

Logic Operation

- Conventional method is executed within a processing unit (CPU, GPU)
 - Processed data is transferred to the memory for storage
 - Data transfer degrades both performance and energy
- Processing-in-memory (PIM) enables logic operations to be performed within the memory
 - Data transfer is significantly reduced
 - Repetitive operations (e.g., machine learning model) on large dataset can be accelerated

Memristor for PIM Logic Operation

- Non-volatile resistive memory (memristor) is leveraged for PIM logic operation
- Memristor offers low (or high) resistance state for logic-1 (or -0)
 - Resistance state is determined by applied voltage (V)
 - $V \leq V_{on}$: switching to low resistance state (LRS)
 - $V_{on} < V < V_{off}$: remaining current resistance state (CRS)
 - $V \ge V_{off}$: switching to high resistance state (HRS)

PIM Logic Operation

- After logic synthesis, in-memory mapping is performed [TCAS-I]
 - Logic function is synthesized into 2-input NOR and INV netlist
 - #Nodes of AND-INV graph (AIG) is reduced
 - Each gate of netlist is mapped into memristive crossbar array
 - Gate input and output are stored in distinct memristors



In-Memory Mapping

- All memristors for gates should be aligned either in a row or a column
 - Each gate is operated in one clock cycle
- Multiple gates can be computed in the same clock cycle → parallel operation
 - All input memristors are aligned, along with their corresponding output memristors





Parallel operation of g1 and g2

In-Memory Mapping

- Copying a value from one memristor to another can be executed → copy operation
 - Two INV operations are performed in two clock cycles
- #Copy operations depends on mapping methods



g3 copy from (2,0) to (2,2)

In-Memory Mapping

- Objective is to minimize #clock cycles and #memristors
- Key decision variables include:
 - Gate location
 - Gate alignment
 - #Memristors on the crossbar
 - Gates calculated in parallel

Mapping Example

- For a NIG illustrated in Fig.(a), there are 3 example mappings
 - Fig. (b): 5 cycles and 7 memristors
 - Fig. (c): 3 cycles and 6 memristors
 - Fig. (d): 2 cycles and 6 memristors
 - INV is treated as 2-input NOR with one input tied to logic-0



Previous Works

Integer linear programming (ILP) [ICCAD17]

 Optimization problem is formulated using coordinates of crossbar

Simple heuristic [TVLSI18]

 INV gates and NOR gates are mapped eastward and southward, respectively

Staircase-structure heuristic [ASPDAC19]

Gates at each level are alternatively mapped in rows and columns

Multiple ILP for a partitioned netlist [ICCAD19]

ILP formulation is individually solved for each partition

Motivation

- ILP solver is very time-consuming
- Heuristic methods target only a single objective
- Proposed: multi-objective optimization using genetic algorithm (GA)
 - Gate locations are modified by GA to satisfy multiobjective

Overall Flow

• Given: initial mapping from any heuristic methods

- GA relocates the gate locations using mutation and crossover
- Mapping rule violation is corrected by mapping completion algorithm



Mutation

Gates are moved to the same row or column

- Random #gates is selected from a Levy probability distribution
- If the new location is empty, gate is moved to there
- Otherwise, a swap occurs between two gate outputs



Initial mapping



Move g1



Swap g^2 and g^3

Crossover

- Gate locations from two different mappings are exchanged
 - Step 1) In each crossbar, list the gate locations
 - Step 2) Exclude common locations (e.g., g_2^A , g_3^B)
 - Step 3) Swap remaining gate locations in reverse order



- After performing genetic algorithm, gate locations are corrected based on mapping rules
 - Step 1) Find aligned gates in each row or column
 - Row-oriented: $\{g_4, g_5, g_7\} \{g_2, g_3, g_6\} \{g_1\}$
 - Column-oriented: $\{g_7\}$ $\{g_5, g_6\}$ $\{g_1, g_2\}$ $\{g_3, g_4\}$
 - Step 2) Remove subsets of other groups: $\{g_1\}, \{g_7\}$
 - Set = { g_4, g_5, g_7 } { g_2, g_3, g_6 } { g_5, g_6 } { g_1, g_2 } { g_3, g_4 }





15

Step 3) Resolve data dependency

- If two gates are sequentially connected in the same path, they cannot simultaneously operate
 - $\{g_4, g_5, g_7\} \rightarrow \{g_4\} \{g_5\} \{g_7\}$
 - $\{g_2, g_3, g_6\} \rightarrow \{g_2, g_3\} \{g_6\}$

• Step 4) Remove subsets of other groups: $\{g_4\}$ $\{g_5\}$ $\{g_6\}$

• Set = $\{g_7\}$ $\{g_2, g_3\}$ $\{g_5, g_6\}$ $\{g_1, g_2\}$ $\{g_3, g_4\}$



 Step 5) Assign a mapping direction D to each gate based on fanin locations

$$D(g) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{EAST} & \text{if } fanin(g) : \mathsf{EAST} \\ \mathsf{WEST} & \text{if } fanin(g) : \mathsf{WEST} \\ \mathsf{NORTH} & \text{if } fanin(g) : \mathsf{NORTH} \\ \mathsf{SOUTH} & \text{if } fanin(g) : \mathsf{SOUTH} \lor \\ & (fanin(g)[0] \lor fanin(g)[1]) : \mathsf{NORTH} \\ \mathsf{EAST} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$





Step 6) Ungroup gates with different directions

- In this example, no change
- Step 7) Remove subsets of other groups
 - Set = $\{g_7\}$ $\{g_2, g_3\}$ $\{g_5, g_6\}$ $\{g_1, g_2\}$ $\{g_3, g_4\}$



- Step 8) If a gate belongs to multiple groups, move the gate to the largest group
 - If multiple groups have the same size, move the gate in a way that preserves other groups

g2

g1

- $g_2 \in \{g_2, g_3\} \{g_1, g_2\}, g_3 \in \{g_2, g_3\} \{g_3, g_4\}$
- Set = $\{g_7\}$ $\{g_5, g_6\}$ $\{g_1, g_2\}$ $\{g_3, g_4\}$



- Step 9) Relocate gate outputs which are single member in each group
 - $\{g_7\}$ is aligned with fanins $\{g_5, g_6\}$
- Step 10) Copy gate outputs which are not aligned with fanins
 - g_1 is copied from (2,3) to (0,5) for fanin of g_4



- Step 11) Empty rows or columns are removed, and in the corrected mapping result,
 - #Memristors is counted \rightarrow 13
 - #Cycles = #groups + 2x#copies \rightarrow 4 + 2x1



Final mapping result

Experimental Setup

Test circuits: 8 benchmarks from IWLS-93 Format "#PI/#PO(#NIG nodes from ABC)"

5xp1:7/10(131),misex1:8/7(81),b12:15/9(94),misex2:25/18(159),clip:9/5(133),rd73:7/3(157),cordic:23/2(93),inc:7/9(149)

- Logic synthesis is conducted using Berkeley-ABC tool
- Hyperparameter values for GA:

n_process :	32,	cxpb:	0.7,
n_pops :	50,	mutpb :	0.3,
n_ind :	50,	mig_rate :	0.1,
mig_interval :	10		

Experimental Setup

- Multi-objective: minimize #memristors and #cycles
- 5 independent runs are performed per benchmark
- The proposed method is compared with the simulated-annealing (SA) approach [TVLSI18]

Experimental Results

Better results are shown than SA method [TVLSI18]

- For each run, multiple mapping results are generated
- #Memristors and #cycles are reduced by more than 10%, respectively



Experimental Results

- Our method demonstrates consistent improvement across all benchmarks
 - The objective curve patterns are similar over runtime
 - A significant reduction occurs within 1 hour



Summary

Multi-objective optimization approach is proposed

- Gate relocation is conducted using genetic algorithm
- Mapping completion algorithm corrects the relocated gates based mapping rules
- Experimental results exhibit consistent reductions of more than 10% in #memristors and #cycles for all benchmarks