

SFQmap: A Technology Mapping Tool for Single Flux Quantum Logic Circuits

Ghasem Pasandi, Alireza Shafaei and Massoud Pedram
 Department of Electrical Engineering-Systems
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089.

Abstract—Single flux quantum (SFQ) logic is a promising candidate to replace the CMOS logic for high speed and low power applications due to its superiority in providing high performance and energy efficient circuits. However, developing effective Electronic Design Automation (EDA) tools, which cater to special characteristics and requirements of SFQ circuits such as depth minimization and path balancing, are essential to automate the whole process of designing large SFQ circuits. In this paper, a novel technology mapping tool, called SFQmap, is presented, which provides optimization methods for minimizing first the circuit depth and path balancing overhead and then the worst-case stage delay of mapped SFQ circuits. Compared with the state-of-the-art technology mappers, SFQmap reduces the depth and path balancing overhead by an average of 14% and 31%, respectively.

I. INTRODUCTION

Logic synthesis is an important step in the design flow of digital circuits and systems with a big impact on the final delay and area of the chip. Logic synthesis has two main phases: *technology-independent* optimizations, and *technology mapping*. The first phase includes several algebraic or Boolean optimizations such as restructuring, resubstitution, common subexpression extraction, node minimization. The second phase performs mapping or binding of logic expressions to actual gates in a given cell library to minimize the circuit delay, area or other desired metrics.

Rapid SFQ (RSFQ) is a family of Single Flux Quantum circuits, which was developed in late 1980s [1]. More recent versions of SFQ logic family include ERSFQ [2], [3] and eSFQ [4] as well as AQFP [5]. Generally, SFQ logic has been touted as a good candidate for achieving energy efficient and high performance circuits [6]. SFQ devices are made of Josephson Junctions, which are superconducting devices that exhibit the Josephson effect, i.e., the phenomenon of a current (called super-current) that flows indefinitely long without any applied voltage. The propagation delay through these devices is as low as $1ps$, while each switching action consumes in the order of $10^{-19}J$ energy [7]. The JJ switching energy is 2-3 orders of magnitude lower than that of the end-of-CMOS-scaling devices as stated in [8], which again shows the promise of SFQ circuits as a replacement for CMOS circuits. SFQ gates can operate as fast as 370GHz at $T = 4.2K$ [7].

Although advantages of SFQ logic in achieving super fast and very low-power circuits have been proven, state of the art in Electronic Design Automation (EDA) technologies is not advanced. On the other hand, due to key differences

between SFQ and CMOS logic, CMOS Computer Aided Design (CAD) tools cannot be directly used to optimize SFQ circuits. Therefore, it is critical to develop appropriate CAD tools including synthesis, place and route, timing and power analysis, and verification tools to fully automate the design and test process of SFQ circuits.

In this paper, we present SFQmap, a technology mapping tool for SFQ circuits. To the best of authors' knowledge, this is the first paper which presents a technology mapping tool designed specifically for optimizing SFQ circuits. There are some tools for logic synthesis of SFQ, but they either provide simple optimizations or are based on standard CMOS CAD tools with minor pre or post optimizations (Section III-A). SFQmap includes two main phases: (i) logical depth minimization with path balancing, and (ii) peephole optimization to reduce the worst-case delay of any stage of the logic circuit. SFQmap improves key parameters of SFQ circuits considerably compared with the state-of-the-art technology mappers. For example, it decreases the number of path balancing D-Flip-Flops (DFFs), and the Product of the worst-case Stage delay with the logical Depth of the circuit (which we shall denote as PSD) by up to 43%, and 63%, respectively (Section IV).

II. BACKGROUND

A. Background on SFQ (SFQ Basics)

Single Flux Quantum (SFQ) logic uses a single quantum of magnetic flux ($\Phi_0 = h/2e = 2.07mV \times ps$) to represent the binary information. This SFQ typically appears as a voltage pulse with a peak amplitude of 2-4mV and a duration of 1-2ps. In this representation, the presence of a SFQ pulse is considered as "logic-1", while the absence of the pulse is interpreted as "logic-0" [9]. In the following, we explain characteristics and key circuit/gate level requirements of SFQ logic.

1) *Fanout in SFQ*: In conventional SFQ logic, each gate can only drive one other node (fanout count is one). If a gate needs to have more than one fanout, a special SFQ gate called a splitter cell is inserted at the output of that gate to enable fanout to two gates. To support additional fanouts, a binary tree of splitter cells can be used. Fig. 1 shows the circuit-level schematic of a splitter gate, its corresponding waveform, and an example of a splitter tree for fanout of 4 (FO4).




Fig. 1: (a) Splitter gate in SFQ electronics, (b) the waveform corresponding to the operation of the splitter gate, and (c) a splitter tree to provide FO4. The waveform is borrowed from [10].

2) *Gate-level pipeline*: All SFQ gates, except splitters, require a clock signal to transfer the stored quantum flux to their output. In addition, operation of all SFQ gates is synchronized by the clock. For distribution of the clock signal in a SFQ chip, there are three main methods: *counter-flow clocking* in which the clock flows in the opposite direction of the data, *concurrent-flow clocking*, where clock and data flow in the same direction, and *clock-follow-data*, in which the clock arrives after the data input to a gate have arrived and been processed by the gate. For more information on the clock distribution network of the SFQ circuits, please refer to [10], [11]. The take-away is that nearly all SFQ gates (with the exception of some asynchronous gates such as a splitter or a Josephson Transmission Line) can be thought of as purely combinational gates followed by clocked DFFs. The combinational gate responds to its inputs by changing its internal loop current state whereas the gate output will change only after the clock pulse comes, which will in turn reset the gate's internal state while producing the correct gate output value. In other words, every SFQ circuit must be completely gate-level pipelined.

3) *Path Balancing*: Due to gate-level pipelining in SFQ, for correct operation of the SFQ gates, all inputs of a gate should have the same logic level¹. If inputs of a gate do not have the same logic level, some DFFs should be inserted into the path with smaller depth to balance the network. For example, if the first input (in_1) in an AND2 gate has the logic level of 2 and the second input (in_2) has the logic level of 3, one DFF should be added to in_1 . This path balancing is needed because once the clock arrives at a gate, the available input data (which is stored as a loop current in the gate) is reset in order to produce the correct output value. So, if inputs to a gate arrive too early or too late, the gate will produce wrong

results when corresponding clock pulses arrive at the gate. In the above example, if in_1 and in_2 are both logic 1 values, in_1 arrives early, but in_2 does not arrive until after the clock pulse has come in (the AND2 gate will produce a wrong output result of logic 0 in response to the clock pulse.)

4) *Product of Stage Delay and Circuit Depth*: Due to the gate-level pipelined nature of the SFQ logic, the input-to-output latency of a SFQ circuit is determined as the product of the clock cycle time and the logical depth of the circuit. The clock cycle time is in turn set by the worst-case delay of any single stage (gate plus any present splitters plus interconnect) of logic in the circuit.

III. TECHNOLOGY MAPPING

A. Prior Work

In [12], [13], a tree mapping and decomposition method is presented to generate minimum area or low power circuits. In [14], a cut-enumeration-based method which involves cut generation and cut selection was presented targeting the depth-optimal area optimization for the FPGAs. For the SFQ circuits, there are couple of papers addressing the logic synthesis [15]–[17]. In [15], a framework is proposed for synthesizing the SFQ circuits by constructing a virtual cell called “2-AND/XOR”. In [16], a top-down design methodology for the SFQ circuits based on the Binary Decision Diagram (BDD) is presented. In [17], an academic logic synthesis tool (ABC) [18] is modified to meet the requirements of SFQ logic without developing any SFQ specific optimization algorithms for the technology mapping.

B. Motivation

To map the Boolean expression, $F = a \cdot b \cdot (!c) \cdot d$, the ABC mapper [18] produces the circuit shown in Fig. 2(a). As explained in Section II-A3, the SFQ circuits need to be path balanced. Thus, for the mapped circuit generated by ABC, three path balancing DFFs have to be inserted into the network. Another circuit with fewer number of required path balancing DFFs can be found to implement the given Boolean expression, as shown in Fig. 2(b). On the other hand, as discussed in Section II-A4, to reduce the computation latency, the PSD should be minimized. In practice, between the logical depth and the worst-case stage delay, the former has more impact on the overall computation latency; therefore, we target the minimization of the logical depth (along with minimization of the path-balancing DFF overhead) first; Only after this optimization is done we turn to direct minimization of the product of the stage delay and logical depth. Based on this explanation, the circuit shown in Fig. 2(c) is more desirable than the other two. This is because it requires only one DFF while its logical depth is less. We need to develop a technology mapper for SFQ which prefers the circuit shown in Fig. 2(c) over the other two mapping solutions.

C. Algorithms

Our proposed technology mapping for the SFQ circuits consists of two main phases: *depth minimization* and *path*

¹Logic level of gate i denotes the length of the longest path (in terms of the gate count) from any Primary Input (PI) of the network to this gate.




Fig. 2: Three mapping solutions for the expression $F = a \cdot b \cdot (lc) \cdot d$. (a) the circuit generated by ABC mapper [18] requiring three path balancing DFFs and has depth of three; two other mapping solutions requiring only one DFF with depth of (b) three, and (c) two.




Fig. 3: Showing 3-feasible cuts of node i : C1 to C3.

balancing, and peephole optimization for reducing the PSD. The aforesaid phases are discussed in more details in the following.

1) *Depth Minimization with Path Balancing*: In this subsection, we present the problem of tree-mapping as a Dynamic Programming (DP) problem. The optimal solution is the one with the least depth and in the case of a tie, it is the one which requires less number of path balancing DFFs. A similar cut-enumeration methods as in [19], [20] is used. As mentioned in [19], this method provides the optimal depth solution for general DAGs. The main difference between the method which is presented in [19] and our depth minimization and path balancing method is that we optimize both depth and balancing, while in [19] only depth is considered.

Fig. 3 shows a binary tree and the 3-feasible cuts for node i . (refer to [19] for the definition of k -feasible cuts.) Eq. 1 defines the value of optimal depth solution, $D[i]$, as the minimum achievable logical depth for mapping a tree rooted at node i . $D[i]$ is calculated recursively as follows:

$$D[i] = \min\{ \begin{aligned} &\max(D[i+1], D[i+2]) + 1, \\ &\max(D[i+1], D[i+5], D[i+6]) + 1, \\ &\max(D[i+2], D[i+3], D[i+4]) + 1, \\ &\dots \end{aligned} \} \quad (1)$$

The three terms in the Eq. 1 corresponds to the depth of cuts $C1 - C3$ (Fig. 3), respectively. Basically, in Eq. 1 a mapping solution with the least depth (D_{min}) among all choices corresponding to the k -feasible cuts is being computed. Among all the solutions with depth D_{min} , the one which requires fewer path balancing DFFs is selected recursively in a Dynamic Programming approach as shown in Eq. 2. In this equation, $DFF[i]$ gives the DFF count for a solution with depth of D_{min} and the least number of path balancing DFFs (#DFFs).

$$DFF[i] = \min\{ \begin{aligned} &DFF[i+1] + DFF[i+2] + B(i+1, i+2), \\ &DFF[i+1] + DFF[i+5] + DFF[i+6] + B(i+1, i+5, i+6), \\ &DFF[i+2] + DFF[i+3] + DFF[i+4] + B(i+2, i+3, i+4), \\ &\dots \end{aligned} \} \quad (2)$$

In the above equation, $B()$ accounts for the required number of DFFs for balancing the inputs of the corresponding cut because of the level difference among cut's inputs. For example, if the level of node $i+1$ is 2 and $i+2$ is 3, $B(i+1, i+2)$ returns 1.

The complexity of computing the k -feasible cuts is $O(kmn)$, where m is the edge count, and n is the node count [19]. The complexity of our depth minimization and path balancing algorithm by having the k -feasible cuts is $O(K'gn)$, where K' is the maximum number of k -feasible cuts for a node in the network, g is the number of gates in the library, and n is the total number of nodes in the network. Usually K' and g are small numbers. Thus, the complexity for this algorithm is determined by the number of nodes in the network with linear relationship ($= O(n)$).

2) *Peephole Optimization for Reducing the Sequential Depth*: As explained in Section II-A4, despite in CMOS, in the SFQ circuits to reduce the computation latency, PSD has to be reduced. To reduce the PSD, we perform the following heuristic:

After finding the minimum depth and most balanced solution for each node of the network as in Section III-C1, a gate with the worst stage delay is found. This gate is usually a gate with high fanout count. Next, a temporary network consisting this gate and its immediate fanins and fanouts is generated. The temporary network is re-mapped while the fanout count for any node is limited. If the product of the worst stage delay and the length of the longest path decreased, the move will be accepted. Otherwise, we increase the fanout counts' limit and re-do the process. This process is repeated p times. Experimental results show that for having $p = 5$, there will be a considerable decrease in the PSD of the circuit while the run-time is acceptable (Tables I,II).

The complexity of the peephole optimization is $O(m+n)$, where, m is the edge count and n is the node count of the network. This is because for calculating the fanout dependent stage delay for all nodes (to find the worst stage delay), a breath-first search should be done. The peephole optimization

TABLE I: Experimental results for SFQmap, and ABC mapper using mcnlib library. The run-time, which measures the amount of time it takes to generate the mapping solution, is measured in second s .

Circuits	#DFFs		#Gates		Logical Depth		PSD		Run-time	
	SFQmap	ABC	SFQmap	ABC	SFQmap	ABC	SFQmap	ABC	SFQmap	ABC
s4863	3381	4274	1183	1010	30	36	297	378	0.198	0.15
c5315	2519	4437	1399	1206	20	25	179	234	0.2	0.12
c7552	2603	3639	1786	1457	19	21	267.9	718.2	0.25	0.22
s6669	7621	9638	1517	1462	46	52	510.6	842.4	0.258	0.145
s38417	13953	23253	8363	7471	14	16	180.6	252.8	0.667	0.32

Algorithm 1 SFQmap

```

1: procedure MAIN-PROCEDURE
2:   input: Network pNtk, output: mapped network pNtkMap
3:   //perform pre-mapping computations:
4:   Compute k-feasible cuts for pNtk;
5:   Initialize the mapping manager, pMan to map the input network, pNtk;
6:   // two phases of SFQmap:
7:   Minimize_Depth_PBOVerhead(pMan,pNtk);
8:   pNtkNew = Tune_PSD(pMan,pNtk); //peephole optimization
9:   pNtkMap = NetworkFromMap (pMan, pNtkNew); //generating the mapped
network
10:  return pNtkMap;
11:
12: procedure MINIMIZE_DEPTH_PBOVERHEAD
13:  input: Network pNtk, output: depth-optimal and path balanced mapping
solutions for nodes;
14:  for each node pNode in network pNtk do
15:    Find min-depth and balanced mapping solution based on Eqs. 1, 2.
16:  end for
17:
18: procedure TUNE_PSD
19:  inputs: Network pNtk, iterations  $p$ , output: Network pNtkNew with reduced
PSD
20:  Set(InitFanoutCount,MaxFanoutCount);
21:  pNtkNew = Copy (pNtk)
22:  FanoutCout = InitFanoutCount // initial fanout count
23:  while  $p > 0$  do
24:    if FanoutCount  $\leq$  MaxFanoutCount then
25:      Find the node with worst stage delay, pNodeWorst;
26:      Generate a network comprising pNodeWorst and its FanIOs, pNtkTemp;
27:      Remap pNtkTemp subject to the FanoutCout limit;
28:      if PSD is reduced then
29:        Substitute pNtkTemp into pNtkNew;
30:      else
31:        Increase FanoutCount;
32:        Decrease  $p$  by 1;
33:    end while
34:  return pNtkNew

```

TABLE II: Improvement percentages of “SFQmap -i 5” and “SFQmap -i 0” over ABC mapper for key parameters. These results are the average of all five tested benchmark circuits. \downarrow shows a decrease, and \uparrow shows an increase in the corresponding quantity.

Mapper	Logical Depth	#DFFs	PSD	Run-time
SFQmap -i 5	\downarrow 14%	\downarrow 31%	\downarrow 35%	\uparrow 34%
SFQmap -i 0	\downarrow 15%	\downarrow 37%	\downarrow 13%	\uparrow 12%

determines the overall complexity of the SFQmap tool to be $O(m + n)$.

Algorithm 1 describes the pseudo code of the SFQmap. In this algorithm, the main procedure as well as functions for combined depth minimization and path balancing, and then peephole optimization for reducing the PSD are shown.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We implemented our SFQ specific technology mapping algorithms inside ABC [18]. We used several *ISCAS* benchmark circuits [21] for testing our developed technology mapper. The mcnlib library is used. Table I lists the key parameters for different benchmark circuits for SFQmap and ABC technology mapping tools. As explained in Section III-C, our developed technology mapper focuses on improving three important parameters in SFQ circuits including *logical depth*, *#DFFs*, and *PSD*. As shown in Tables I,II, SFQmap provides considerable improvements on all of these critical parameters on average of all five benchmark circuits. However, its average run-time is increased by 34% over the ABC mapper. This is mainly because of the peephole optimization phase which dominates the run-time of the SFQmap. We implemented the peephole optimization phase with the capability of determining the number of iterations. The experimental results in the Table I is for five iterations of peephole optimization (*SFQmap -i 5*). If we cross out the peephole optimization phase to trade the PSD with the run-time, the run-time overhead over the ABC mapper will be decreased to less than 12%. In Table II, “*SFQmap -i 0*” is for not having any peephole optimization runs. i stands for the number of iterations.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a novel technology mapping tool, SFQmap, is presented which is developed for the SFQ circuits. This mapper performs two main optimizations to improve the most important parameters for the SFQ circuits including the logical depth, the number of path balancing DFFs, and the PSD. The implementation of this mapper allows to select the number of iterations for the optimization runs. “SFQmap -i 5” improves the logical depth, #DFFs, and the PSD by 14%, 31%, and 35%, respectively over the ABC [18] mapper for five *ISCAS* benchmark circuits with 34% increase in run-time. “SFQmap -i 0” reduces the overhead of run-time to less than 12% and provides even more improvements on the logical depth, and #DFFs over ABC (see Table II).

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research is based upon work supported by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (IARPA), via the U.S. Army Research Office grant W911NF-17-1-0120. The U.S.

Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation herein.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Likharev and V. Semenov, "Rsfq logic/memory family: A new josephson-junction technology for sub-terahertz-clock-frequency digital systems," *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity*, vol. 50, no. 1, 1991.
- [2] A. F. Kirichenko, S. Sarwana, and I. V. Vernik, "Ersfq-zero static power dissipation single flux quantum logic," in *Government Microcircuit Appl. and Critical Techn. Conf.(GOMACTech-12)*, pp. 319–322.
- [3] O. Mukhanov, V. Semenov, and K. Likharev, "Ultimate performance of the rsfq logic circuits," *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 759–762, 1987.
- [4] O. A. Mukhanov, "Energy-efficient single flux quantum technology," *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 760–769, 2011.
- [5] N. Takeuchi, Y. Yamanashi, and N. Yoshikawa, "Energy efficiency of adiabatic superconductor logic," *Superconductor Science and Technology*, vol. 28, no. 1, p. 015003, 2014.
- [6] D. S. Holmes, A. L. Ripple, and M. A. Manheimer, "Energy-efficient superconducting computing-power budgets and requirements," *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1 701 610–1 701 610, 2013.
- [7] P. Bunyk, A. Oliva, V. Semenov, M. Bhushan, K. Likharev, J. Lukens, M. Ketchen, and W. Mallison, "High-speed single-flux-quantum circuit using planarized niobium-trilayer josephson junction technology," *Applied physics letters*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 646–648, 1995.
- [8] T. N. Theis and H. S. P. Wong, "The end of moore's law: A new beginning for information technology," *Computing in Science Engineering*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 41–50, Mar 2017.
- [9] R. Gross, A. Marx, and F. Deppe, *Applied superconductivity: Josephson effect and superconducting electronics*. De Gruyter, 2015.
- [10] N. Katam, A. Shafaei, and M. Pedram, "Design of multiple fanout clock distribution network for rapid single flux quantum technology," in *Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC), 2017 22nd Asia and South Pacific*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 384–389.
- [11] E. G. Friedman, "Clock distribution networks in synchronous digital integrated circuits," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 89, no. 5, pp. 665–692, 2001.
- [12] K. Keutzer, "Dagon: technology binding and local optimization by dag matching," in *Design Automation, 1987. 24th Conference on*. IEEE, 1987, pp. 341–347.
- [13] K. Chaudhary and M. Pedram, "Computing the area versus delay trade-off curves in technology mapping," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 1480–1489, 1995.
- [14] D. Chen and J. Cong, "Daomap: A depth-optimal area optimization mapping algorithm for fpga designs," in *Proceedings of the 2004 IEEE/ACM International conference on Computer-aided design*. IEEE Computer Society, 2004, pp. 752–759.
- [15] S. Yamashita, K. Tanaka, H. Takada, K. Obata, and K. Takagi, "A transduction-based framework to synthesize rsfq circuits," in *Proceedings of the 2006 Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*. IEEE Press, 2006, pp. 266–272.
- [16] N. Yoshikawa and J. Koshiyama, "Top-down rsfq logic design based on a binary decision diagram," *IEEE transactions on applied superconductivity*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1098–1101, 2001.
- [17] N. Katam, A. Shafaei, and M. Pedram, "Design of complex rapid single-flux-quantum cells with application to logic synthesis," in *16th International Superconductive Electronics Conference, ISEC 2017*.
- [18] U. Berkeley, "ABC: A system for sequential synthesis and verification," *Berkeley Logic Synthesis and Verification Group*, 2011.
- [19] J. Cong and Y. Ding, "Flowmap: An optimal technology mapping algorithm for delay optimization in lookup-table based fpga designs," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 1994.
- [20] A. Mishchenko, S. Cho, S. Chatterjee, and R. Brayton, "Combinational and sequential mapping with priority cuts," in *Proceedings of the 2007 IEEE/ACM international conference on Computer-aided design*. IEEE Press, 2007, pp. 354–361.
- [21] M. C. Hansen, H. Yalcin, and J. P. Hayes, "Unveiling the iscas-85 benchmarks: A case study in reverse engineering," *IEEE Design & Test of Computers*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 72–80, 1999.