

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Related Work . . . . .	3
1.1.1	Comparison with ISA . . . . .	3
1.1.1.1	Use of Logic and Abstraction Functions . . . . .	3
1.1.1.2	Theorem Proving . . . . .	6
1.1.1.3	Term Rewriting Systems . . . . .	8
1.1.1.4	ADL Driven Pipeline Validation . . . . .	11
1.1.1.5	FSM Based Methods . . . . .	12
1.1.1.6	Other Methodologies . . . . .	12
1.1.2	Assertion Based Verification . . . . .	14
1.1.2.1	Benefits of ABV . . . . .	14
1.1.3	Languages for Assertion Based Verification . . . . .	15
1.1.3.1	LTL - Linear Temporal Logic . . . . .	15
1.1.3.2	Applications and Extensions . . . . .	17
1.1.3.3	System Verilog Assertions . . . . .	17
1.1.3.4	Data-Orientation in SVA . . . . .	19
1.1.3.5	Dynamic Property Verification . . . . .	21
1.1.3.6	Formal Property Verification . . . . .	22
1.1.4	Test Generation . . . . .	23
1.1.4.1	Graph Model Based Test Generation . . . . .	24
1.1.4.2	Specification Language Driven Test Generation . . . . .	25
1.1.4.3	SAT based methods . . . . .	26
1.1.4.4	Property Checking based methods . . . . .	27
1.1.4.5	FSM based methods . . . . .	27
1.1.4.6	Other methods . . . . .	28
1.2	Motivation and Objectives . . . . .	29
1.2.1	Trace Equivalence: . . . . .	30
1.2.2	Assertion Based Verification of Pipeline: . . . . .	31
1.2.3	Test Generation . . . . .	32
1.3	Contribution of this Thesis . . . . .	33
1.3.1	A systematic framework for Validation and Debugging of Pipelined Simulators . . . . .	33
1.3.2	Simulation Based Verification using Temporally Attributed Boolean Logic . . . . .	35
1.3.3	A Framework for Scenario Driven Test Case Generation for Functional Verification of Pipelined Processors . . . . .	37
1.4	Thesis Organization . . . . .	38

<b>2 A Framework for Systematic Validation and Debugging of Pipeline Simulators</b>	<b>39</b>
2.1 Problem Formulation and Definitions . . . . .	41
2.1.1 Notations . . . . .	41
2.1.2 Problem Formulation . . . . .	42
2.1.2.1 The Model . . . . .	42
2.1.2.2 Assumptions . . . . .	44
2.1.2.3 Modeling Special Pipeline Techniques . . . . .	44
2.1.2.4 $D^*$ equivalence . . . . .	45
2.2 Proposed Algorithm and Analysis . . . . .	46
2.2.1 The Algorithm . . . . .	46
2.2.2 Proof of Correctness . . . . .	52
2.2.3 Complexity Analysis . . . . .	54
2.3 Examples . . . . .	55
2.4 Adaptations . . . . .	58
2.4.1 Runtime Mode . . . . .	59
2.4.2 Register Verification . . . . .	62
2.4.3 Temporary Buffering of Register Values . . . . .	62
2.4.4 Pipelines Where Incorrectly Predicted Instructions Access Registers . . . . .	63
2.4.5 Handling Certain Internal Semantics of Instructions . . . . .	63
2.5 Implementation and Results . . . . .	64
2.5.1 Experimental Setup . . . . .	64
2.5.2 Validation of Pipeline Simulator . . . . .	65
2.5.3 Fault Detection . . . . .	66
2.5.3.1 Bug A . . . . .	66
2.5.3.2 Bug B . . . . .	68
2.5.3.3 Bug C . . . . .	68
2.5.3.4 Bug D . . . . .	69
2.5.4 Debugging Through Faults . . . . .	69
2.6 Summary . . . . .	71
<b>3 Simulation Based Verification Using Temporally Attributed Boolean Logic</b>	<b>73</b>
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	73
3.2 TAB Logic Specifications . . . . .	77
3.2.1 Syntax of TAB Logic . . . . .	77
3.2.2 Temporal and TAB Expression . . . . .	78
3.2.2.1 Temporal Expressions: . . . . .	80
3.2.2.2 Temporally Attributed Boolean (TAB) Expressions: . . . . .	80
3.2.3 Semantics of Temporal Expressions . . . . .	81
3.2.4 Examples . . . . .	83
3.2.5 A nested TAB Logic Specification . . . . .	86
3.3 Algorithms for Checking TAB Specifications . . . . .	87
3.3.1 Temporal System of Equations (TSE) . . . . .	87
3.3.2 Temporal System Graph . . . . .	88
3.3.3 An Offline Algorithm for Checking TSE with An Acyclic TSG . . . . .	88
3.3.3.1 Correctness of the Offline Algorithm . . . . .	90

3.3.3.2	Example Trace of the Offline Algorithm . . . . .	92
3.3.4	An Online Algorithm for Checking TSE with An Acyclic TSG . . . . .	93
3.3.5	Steps of the Online Algorithm . . . . .	98
3.3.5.1	Evaluation of Temporal and TAB Expressions . . . . .	100
3.3.5.2	Updating the Frontiers . . . . .	101
3.3.5.3	Simulation History and Records Deletion . . . . .	102
3.4	Extensions to TAB Logic . . . . .	104
3.4.1	Evaluation Instant Based Extension . . . . .	104
3.4.2	Counter Based Extension . . . . .	108
3.5	Expressiveness of TAB Logic . . . . .	109
3.5.1	TAB Logic with Next Operator on an Infinite Trace . . . . .	109
3.5.1.1	Redefining the Next operator . . . . .	109
3.5.1.2	Representation of LTL expressions by TAB logic assertions . . . . .	110
3.5.1.3	Motivation for TAB logic with nested assertions . . . . .	110
3.6	Case Study - Processor Implementation Verification . . . . .	112
3.6.1	Architecture of the System . . . . .	112
3.6.2	Instruction Semantics Verification . . . . .	113
3.6.2.1	TAB specification for <i>loadw</i> instruction . . . . .	114
3.6.2.2	TAB specification for <i>stoww</i> instruction . . . . .	115
3.6.2.3	TAB specification for <i>tbitw</i> instruction . . . . .	115
3.6.2.4	TAB specification for <i>jump</i> instruction . . . . .	116
3.6.2.5	TAB specification for <i>jovf</i> instruction . . . . .	116
3.6.2.6	TAB specification for <i>cinv</i> instruction . . . . .	116
3.6.2.7	SVA description of the <i>loadw</i> instruction - A comparison . . . . .	117
3.6.3	Bus Transaction Verification . . . . .	118
3.6.3.1	Priority of Bus Transactions: . . . . .	118
3.6.3.2	TAB specification for Priority of Bus Transactions . . . . .	119
3.6.4	Interrupt and Exception Mode Verification . . . . .	119
3.6.4.1	TAB specification for Interrupt Processing . . . . .	120
3.7	Experimentation and Results . . . . .	122
3.7.1	Experimental Setup . . . . .	122
3.7.2	Validation of the Implementation . . . . .	123
3.7.2.1	Interrupt Behavior Validation . . . . .	124
3.7.3	Fault Detection . . . . .	125
3.7.3.1	Fault A: . . . . .	125
3.7.3.2	Fault B: . . . . .	126
3.7.3.3	Fault C: . . . . .	126
3.8	Case Study - Simulation Based Validation of Analog Circuits . . . . .	127
3.8.1	Frequency Analysis of Operational Amplifier . . . . .	128
3.8.2	Stability of DC-DC Converter . . . . .	128
3.9	Limitations of TAB Logic . . . . .	132
3.10	Summary . . . . .	133
4	A Framework for Scenario Driven Test Case Generation for Functional Validation of Pipelined Processors . . . . .	135
4.1	Problem Formulation and Definitions . . . . .	139
4.1.1	The Test Generation Framework . . . . .	140

4.1.2	Testcases . . . . .	141
4.1.2.1	Hazard Free and Hazard Based Test Case . . . . .	141
4.1.3	Pipeline Model . . . . .	141
4.1.3.1	Instruction Set Architecture (ISA) . . . . .	143
4.1.3.2	Pipeline Behavior Specification . . . . .	143
4.1.4	Scenario Description Language . . . . .	144
4.1.4.1	Syntax of the Scenario Description Language . . . . .	144
4.1.4.2	Semantics of Scenario Description Language . . . . .	145
4.2	Example Description of Scenarios . . . . .	146
4.2.1	Description of Standard Scenarios . . . . .	147
4.2.2	Insufficient Ports Hazard . . . . .	148
4.2.3	Exceptions . . . . .	148
4.2.4	Predictive Stalling . . . . .	148
4.3	Pipeline State Generation . . . . .	149
4.3.1	Pipeline State . . . . .	150
4.3.2	Predicate Table Generation . . . . .	150
4.3.2.1	The <i>before(X,I,J)</i> Predicate . . . . .	151
4.3.3	Variable Instantiation . . . . .	151
4.3.4	An Example . . . . .	152
4.4	Hazard Free Test Case Generation . . . . .	153
4.4.1	Test Generation Algorithm . . . . .	154
4.4.2	Example Run - RAW Hazard Test case . . . . .	155
4.4.3	Complexity Analysis of the Hazard Free Test Generation Algorithm	155
4.5	SAT based Test Generation . . . . .	156
4.5.1	Formulation of the Pipeline behavior using propositions . . . . .	157
4.5.2	Pipeline Constraints Modeled as Propositions . . . . .	159
4.5.2.1	Execution Flow Constraints . . . . .	159
4.5.2.2	Data Flow Constraints . . . . .	160
4.5.2.3	Resource Constraints . . . . .	161
4.5.3	Hazards . . . . .	161
4.5.3.1	Structural Hazards . . . . .	161
4.5.3.2	Multicycle Hazards . . . . .	162
4.5.3.3	Implicit Hazards . . . . .	162
4.5.3.4	Data Hazards . . . . .	162
4.5.4	VLIW Constraints . . . . .	163
4.5.5	Propositions of the Pipeline State . . . . .	163
4.5.5.1	Proposition Generation . . . . .	164
4.5.5.2	All Test Cases . . . . .	165
4.5.5.3	Minimal Test case . . . . .	165
4.5.6	Pipeline Clauses and Test Generation . . . . .	165
4.5.7	Optimization . . . . .	166
4.5.7.1	Optimization of 'E'-Clauses . . . . .	166
4.5.7.2	Optimization of 'H'-Clauses . . . . .	167
4.5.7.3	Optimization of State-Clauses . . . . .	168
4.5.8	Modeling Special Pipeline Behavior . . . . .	168
4.5.8.1	Forwarding . . . . .	169
4.5.8.2	Multiple Execution Units . . . . .	169
4.5.9	Example Test Program Generated by the SAT approach . . . . .	170

---

4.6	Implementation and Results . . . . .	171
4.6.1	Experimental Setup . . . . .	171
4.6.2	Pipeline Configurations . . . . .	171
4.6.3	Hazard Free Test Generation Results . . . . .	173
4.6.4	SAT Based Test Generation Results . . . . .	173
4.6.5	Comparison of the Approaches . . . . .	175
4.7	Summary . . . . .	176
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions and Future Work</b>	<b>177</b>
5.1	Summary of Contributions . . . . .	177
5.2	Scope of Future Research . . . . .	178
5.2.1	Extensions to $D^*$ Equivalence . . . . .	178
5.2.2	Extensions to TAB Logic - Software Verification . . . . .	179
5.2.3	Model Checking TAB Logic . . . . .	179
5.2.4	Exploring Complex Pipeline Features - Test Generation . . . . .	179
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>183</b>