

Security of Electrical, Optical and Wireless On-Chip Interconnects: A Survey

HANSIKA WEERASENA, University of Florida, USA

PRABHAT MISHRA, University of Florida, USA

The advancement of manufacturing technologies has enabled the integration of more intellectual property (IP) cores on the same system-on-chip (SoC). Scalable and high throughput on-chip communication architecture has become a vital component in today's SoCs. Diverse technologies such as electrical, wireless, optical, and hybrid are available for on-chip communication with different architectures supporting them. Security of the on-chip communication is crucial because exploiting any vulnerability would be a goldmine for an attacker. In this survey, we provide a comprehensive review of threat models, attacks and countermeasures over diverse on-chip communication technologies as well as sophisticated architectures.

CCS Concepts: • **Hardware** → **Network on chip**; • **Security and privacy** → **Hardware security implementation**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: network-on-chip security, communication security

1 INTRODUCTION

The number and complexity of computing devices are increasing rapidly and expected to grow to 75.44 billion devices in 2025 [1]. Most of these devices are IoT devices, edge computing devices, and portable devices. System-on-Chip (SoC) is the backbone of each devices to implement increasingly complex functionalities. A typical SoC consists of different heterogeneous Intellectual Property (IPs) cores such as a processors, memories, controllers, converters, etc. For example, an automotive SoC may have around one hundred IPs to support the required functionality. SoCs may also include numerous computing cores, popularly known as multiprocessor SoC (MPSoC), to support parallel computation and multi-programming workloads. For example, Altra® multicore server processor has 128 cores [6].

On-chip communication architecture in an MPSoC helps to communicate cache coherence protocol related messages between processors and memories. In a typical IoT SoC, on-chip communication is responsible for communication between multiple IP cores including processor, memory, converters, peripherals, DSPs, memories, peripheral controllers, gateways to networks on other chips, etc. Historically computation was the limiting factor while on-chip communication was not given much attention. With SoC having 100s of IP cores and modern processors having 100s of cores, on-chip communication has become the performance bottleneck. This has led to the development of fast, low-power and scalable on chip communication. To achieve different energy and performance goals, diverse communication technologies and different architectures are explored in designing suitable on-chip communication fabrics. There are also many applications that requires fast communication across many cores. For example, Deep Neural Networks accelerators engage with high data flows across 100+ small processing elements [28].

1.1 On-chip Communication Basics

Topology of a network defines the physical layout of the components of the network. The topology has a direct impact on network performance. After introduction of SoC architectures in 90's, the communication was primarily based on bus topology (Figure 1.a) and ad-hoc mixes of buses (Figure 1.b) [50]. For small SoCs with typically around 20 IPs, buses provide simple and low-cost

Authors' addresses: Hansika Weerasena, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, 32611, USA, hansikam.lokukat@ufl.edu; Prabhat Mishra, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, 32611, USA, prabhat@ufl.edu.




Fig. 1. Evolution of on-chip communication. Bus-topology, adhoc mix of buses and ring-based NoC [50].

communication. Bus-based architectures have an inherent advantage, once the bus arbitration is done, the full bandwidth of the wires can be utilized and data transfer timing is predictable. Bus-based architectures are the most widely used on-chip communication topology for small-scale SoCs. When the SoCs become more sophisticated, the concept of route packets are used instead of wires [33]. This leads to the introduction of Network-on-Chip (NoC). NoC isolates and manages the communication requirement of the whole SoC. Figure 1.c shows a NoC with ring topology. Some topologies such as mesh topology can be used across every technology used in on-chip communication while some topologies are tightly coupled with underline technology. There are multitudes of other topologies that can be chosen by evaluating design requirements such as power, performance, heat dissipation, connectivity, cost etc. Some interesting 3-D typologies have been proposed by [59] by stacking IPs. The main architectural difference is that a 3-D NoC will have vertical links to communicate across layers. 3-D NoCs have less average hop counts for communication which leads to the improvement in performance and power consumption.

Early NoC architectures are based on electrical (copper) interconnects that connect IPs together. Due to inherent technology limitations in electrical interconnects, it does not scale for large SoCs with 100+ IPs. The multi-hop communication structure of electrical interconnects increases the average latency and power consumption. There are studies Shacham et al. [73] to show that electrical interconnects are unable to scale up to adequate performance with acceptable area and power overheads in relatively large SoCs. In recent years, there are two technology alternatives namely wireless and optical interconnects adapted from traditional computer network domain to address scalability issues in electrical NoCs. These two technologies together with electrical interconnects can be used in a hybrid manner to address specific design, power, performance, and cost goals. For example, DNN accelerators tend to use wireless over multicast/broadcast for spatial reuse.

In wireless NoCs, the copper wired links in Electrical NoCs are replaced by wireless medium. The inherent multicast/broadcast nature of wireless transmission provides advantages in NoC that use many multicast messages. Optical communication technologies has been used in traditional computer networks to achieve higher data transmission rates. Optical NoCs provide high throughput data transmission while reducing power consumption at the same time. Optical NoCs encode data as light and use waveguides to transfer data throughout the chip [15]. The data transfer through optical interconnects does not need any repeaters or buffers which results in low power consumption and low latency [73].

1.2 Security Vulnerabilities and Challenges

We can discuss security of NoC from multiple perspectives. The NoC can be used by the attacker who is sitting outside of the boundary of NoC to access and modify transferred data. Therefore, NoC is used to detect and secure attack on SoC architectures. For example, FlexNoC [10] provides Resilience Package having hardware based data protection to protect SoC. However, the components

of the NoC itself can be malicious that can lead to attacks. Complex and large MPSoCs have made it easier for an attacker to hide malicious implants inside an SoC.

Sophisticated SoC design has led to significant increase in design and verification complexity. Reusable hardware IP based SoC design has become industry norm to reduce cost and meet critical time-to-market constraints. Typically only few IPs are designed in-house for any SoC design while others are outsourced from third-party vendors. For example, FlexNoc interconnect is used by four out of the top five Chinese fabless companies to facilitate their on-chip communication [46]. These third-party IPs may come with malicious implants, such as Hardware Trojans (HTs), due to the long and potentially untrusted supply chain. These malicious implants can be inserted into the RTL or netlist with the intention of launching attacks [57].

On-chip communication is responsible for sharing the resources and critical information. Exploiting attack vectors on a NoC will be a goldmine to any attacker. When we consider a practical scenario, a cloud computing infrastructure that provides virtual machines under the same hardware has to guarantee that it will not leak critical information to other tenants using the same hardware infrastructure. Therefore, the communication infrastructure across different users of the same hardware should be secured. Securing on-chip communication has its own unique challenges as follows.

Diverse Architectures and Technologies: NoCs will have a mixture of different architectures and technologies. Security attacks can be innovative to exploit the underline property or design limitation of the architectures and technologies. For example, inherent broadcasting property of wireless NoC makes it easier for an attacker to gather the messages than in an electrical NoC. Therefore, it is difficult to have security countermeasures that are generic across all the technologies and architectures. More importantly, countermeasures also have the advantage of utilizing the underline properties of the technology to defend against attacks.

Resource-constrained Environment: On-chip communication inherits many similarities from traditional computer networking domain. Although there are well established security countermeasures in traditional computer networks, they cannot be applied directly to NoCs due to resource-constrained nature of NoC-based SoCs. Specifically, area, power, and real-time execution requirements are the three main constraints in NoCs. For example, Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) is widely used for encryption in computer networks [32], however, it can introduce unacceptable overhead in terms of power, area and performance in resource-constrained NoCs. Therefore, the security countermeasures should focus on the trade-off between security and performance.

1.3 Major Differences with Existing Surveys

There are existing surveys on Network-on-chip technologies, architectures and security. [16] describes the fundamental concepts, system-level modeling, and design of NoCs. A comprehensive study on wireless NoC covers the topology, routing, flow control, antenna and reliability [80]. Werner et al. [84] presents a detailed review of existing optical NoC architectures. Details on optical interconnection technologies and underline basic physics can be found in [15]. [22] provides a extensive survey on network on chip attack and countermeasures which focus only on security of electrical NoCs. A recent survey [68] explores security on wired, wireless as well as 3-D NoCs. However, it has two major limitations. It does not discuss security attacks and countermeasures on optical on-chip interconnects or bus based architectures. Moreover, it does not describe technology-specific attacks rather focus more on countermeasures.

This paper makes three major contributions compared to existing surveys. First, it provides a comprehensive survey of all the existing communication technologies namely electrical, wireless and optical. Next, this paper provides equal emphasis on threat models, attacks as well as their countermeasures. Finally, the paper provides an executive summary of basic architectures

and technologies in on-chip communication which is essential to understand the attacks and countermeasures.

1.4 Survey Outline

There are various ways of classifying security attacks and countermeasures. Our survey considers classification in two layers as shown in Figure 2. First, the attacks are categorized under the technologies which are Electrical, Wireless and Optical NoCs. Even though some attacks are possible in multiple technologies, the primary discussion would be on the technology specified in the published literature. Next, we discuss the following six security concepts for each communication technology.




Fig. 2. NoC security survey for three communication technologies under six security concepts.

Confidentiality : Confidentiality during communication ensures that there is no unauthorized disclosure of secret information. Eavesdropping, snooping and utilization of side channel or covert channel for leaking sensitive data are some common attacks on confidentiality. Encryption is the most widely used solution to ensure confidentiality under eavesdropping or snooping attacks.

Integrity : Integrity ensures no unauthorized modification or destruction of information. Message tampering and message removal attack are some of the common attacks on integrity. Message authentication code is the most popular solution against these attacks.

Authenticity : Authenticity ensures that the data received by the receiver is originated from intended sender. Spoofing attack is the most common attack while various signature schemes can be used to defend against spoofing attacks.

Availability : Availability of the system ensures that data and the system are available for users whenever they need them. Denial-of-Service (DoS) is the most common attack on availability. Traditional DoS attacks can be further categorized into bandwidth or resource consumption DoS attacks.

Anonymity: Anonymity ensures that there is no unauthorized disclosure of information about communicating parties (source and destination).

Freshness : Freshness ensures that message passing in the system are up-to date. Replay attack is the main attack violating data freshness.

The remainder of the survey is organized as follows. Section 2 describes fundamentals of on-chip communication architecture under different communication technologies. Section 3-5 provide a comprehensive survey of NoC security for electrical, wireless and optical NoCs, respectively.

Specifically, it covers threat models, attacks and countermeasures for each technology. Finally, Section 6 concludes the survey.

2 ON-CHIP COMMUNICATION ARCHITECTURES

On-chip communication architecture separates the communication layer from other IPs which has allowed for diverse technologies and architectures with different performance goals. Understanding of fundamental building blocks of NoC architecture is essential to review their security. This section gives an overview of communication protocol and existing architectures under different technologies.

2.1 Networking Models and Communication Protocols

Bus-based communication protocols are simple and have few primitives such as master, slave, arbiter, decoder, bridge, etc. Bus architectures use a communication protocol in which one device or process (known as the master) has total control one or more other devices or processes (known as slaves). Bus has a master who initiates communication session and a slave who listens and responds to incoming transfers. Bus arbiter controls the access for a shared bus through an arbitration scheme such as Time Division Multiple Access. The decoder determines the intended recipients. More sophisticated hierarchical bus architectures have bridges to connect two buses together. A bus architecture enables the transfer of the following three types of information.

- Address: carries address of the destination node
- Data: carries data between destination and the source
- Control: carries control message requests and acknowledgements before transfers.

When a source wants to send a message through bus, it must first use the bus arbiter to acquire the bus. Once the bus is acquired, the address of the destination will be placed on the address line. Once the address is received, the corresponding decoder will read the data on data line. The data transfer to other way will happen similarly.




Fig. 3. NoC with 4x4 mesh topology. Each IP is connected to NoC via a network interface followed by a router. Node S is sending packets to D via NoC. A typical router micro-architecture of a NoC router.

Most of the definitions of NoC networking model is based on electrical NoCs so there are minor deviations from the basic networking concepts in other technologies. Figure 3 shows a simple mesh topology for NoC-based SoC. A typical NoC have the following basic components.

- Node: Any IP or cluster of IPs that have bus for internal communication.
- Link: Connects two nodes physically. Link may have one or more logical or physical channels.
- Network Interface: IPs and NoC communicates through network interface. It may include conversion of data between two mediums. It decouples communication from computation.
- Router: It forwards data according to pre-defined routing protocols.

A packet is the basic unit of transfer in a NoC. The idea of communication in a NoC is to route packets through a series of nodes between the source and destination nodes. The packet is further subdivided into basic flow control units, called flits, and the flits are transferred between the routers. A typical NoC protocol uses two types of packets, control and data packets. Figure 4 shows the structure of a data packet. As shown in Figure 3, the following steps will be followed when the source node (S) wants to request data from the destination node (D). First, the node S generates a control packet requesting data from the node D with necessary headers and injects to the network interface of S. Then, the network interface of S will divide the message into a head flit, multiple body flits, and a tail flit. The network interface injects the flits to the neighbouring router. The flits will hop from one router to the next (uses X-Y routing in this example) until it reaches the destination router. The final router will inject flits to the network interface of D. Then, the network interface of D will collect all the flits and provide D with the assembled message. Finally, D will generate a data packet and inject it to the network interface of D. Similar steps will commence and S will receive the data as the response.




Fig. 4. Packet contains headers and packet data. Packet is divided into a head flit, multiple body flits and a tail flit. Flits have their own headers.

2.1.1 Routing Protocol : Routing protocol defines the path of moving data from source to destination. There are some basic characteristics in a routing protocol:

Circuit versus Packet Switching : In circuit switching, first a path is established and dedicated to a session followed by the data transfer through it. In case of packet switching, the individual packets are forwarded independently per hop. Therefore, in packet switching each packet have routing information including the source and destination in their headers.

Deterministic versus Adaptive Routing : Deterministic routing considers only the source and destination for deciding the route path. Adaptive routing considers other factors such as link utilization and congestion on deciding the next hop of the route. XY routing is the most commonly used routing in mesh based electrical NoCs. XY routing is simple, it basically takes all the X links first followed by Y links. There are also adaptive routing algorithms such as odd-even, west-first, north-last, and negative-first [36].

Wormhole Routing : Wormhole routing looks at the incoming header flit and immediately forwards it to next hop without waiting for all the flits to arrive at the router. This mechanism is used to reduce buffer size and queuing delay of NoC packets.

2.2 Electrical Interconnects

Electrical interconnects can be considered as the traditional on-chip communication medium which most of the MPSoCs use today. Bus-based architectures are simple and straightforward while there are many topologies in NoCs. Figure 5 shows some of the commonly used 2-D topologies in electrical NoCs which are namely ring, star, mesh and torus. 2-D Mesh is the most commonly used topology in electrical NoCs. In a mesh topology, each node is connected to four other nodes: North, South, East and West neighbours (Figure 3). Most electrical NoCs use the similar network




Fig. 5. Common NoC topologies: ring, star, mesh and torus.

model discussed in Section 2.1. Both NoC based and bus based electrical interconnects can be seen in commercial designs. A typical NoC will use virtual channels for flow control. Figure 3 shows the routing micro-architecture of a virtual channel based router which is commonly used in electrical NoCs. The following are the main components and their functionalities in electrical NoCs.

- **Input and Output Buffers:** They are used to store flits for incoming and outgoing communication. There are multiple buffers for multiple virtual channels in a single port.
- **Route Computation Unit:** It determines the output port for the flit according to the routing protocol. Route computation will be done for the head flit. The body flits and tail flit will follow the same route.
- **VC Allocator:** It assigns a free virtual channel buffer at the downstream router for the outgoing port.
- **Switch Allocator:** It arbitrates between two or more flits that are going to use the same output port via switch simultaneously.
- **Crossbar Switch:** It allows flits to reach the output buffers according to previous calculations. The crossbar switch is capable of supporting multiple flits simultaneously.

IBM's CoreConnect [56] and ARM's AMBA (Advanced Micro-controller Bus Architecture) bus [9] can be considered as the most popular bus-based communication architectures used in complex SoCs. Oracle SPARC T5 (2013) has 16 multi-threaded cores and 8 L2 banks connected by a Crossbar NoC. Similarly, Intel Single-Chip Cloud Computer (2009) has 24 tiles with 2 cores connected through a mesh based NoC.

2.3 Wireless Interconnects

Inherent limitation of electrical NoC paved the way for wireless on-chip communication. In wireless NoC, the copper links between nodes are replaced by wireless links. wireless NoC topologies can be pure wireless with only wireless communication or a hybrid of electrical and wireless connections. Modern wireless NoCs [39, 79] tend to use hybrid wireless NoC architectures for three main reasons. (1) Electrical multi-hop communication between nodes that are far away has higher packet latency which can be reduced by introducing wireless links. (2) Electrical communication between two neighbouring node is robust and faster than wireless communication between them. (3) Limitation of channels in wireless medium [86] hinders scalability in fully wireless topologies. Therefore, hybrid wireless NoC architectures use wireless links as the highway for long distance communication between two IPs [39] while electrical connections are used for short-distance communications.

Figure 6 shows a simple 4x4 wireless NoC architecture [87] that uses multi-channel wireless links for communication. Similar to router connected to every node in mesh based electrical NoC, this architecture has wireless routers with wireless transceivers and antennas. There is a low bandwidth wired control network to support fast channel arbitration. The transmission radius of a router defines average hops for a packet but increasing transmission radius will increase channel arbitration time because there will be more nodes fighting for limited number of channels.

Recent work has proposed multiple hybrid wireless NoC topologies [12, 48, 53, 58]. Figure 7 shows an example hybrid wireless NoC architecture by Wang et al. [79]. The network is divided into four subnets and there is a wireless hub placed in the middle of each subnet. Wireless hubs have antennas and transceivers that use frequency division multiple access (FDMA) for multi-channel communication. There can be electrical interconnects similar to mesh-based NoC between the nodes. Imagine a scenario where node 2 wants to send message to node 60. First, the packet will use the electrical interconnection to reach the wireless hub 1 taking the path Node1 -> NodeX -> wireless hub 1. Then, the wireless hub uses wireless link to transfer packet to the wireless hub 4. Finally, the packet will use the electric interconnect again to reach the node 60. Although Figure 7 has mesh based electrical topology, small-world based topology [58] allows subnets to be completely independent and different topologies interconnected only by wireless hubs.

Traditional routing algorithms for electrical NoCs such as X-Y routing can be used in wireless NoCs. However, there are routing algorithms that utilize special characteristics of wireless NoC architectures such as location-based routing [87]. There are different types of antennas used in wireless NoC categorized as silicon integrated antennas, UWB antennas [85], and CNT antennas [40]. These multiple topologies and diverse components raise different set of security vulnerabilities in wireless NoCs. Although inherent characteristics of having a shared medium of wireless communication supports broadcast/multicast message passing, it affects negatively in terms of security and opens up new attack vectors to adversaries.




Fig. 6. McWiNoC: A wireless NoC topology with low-bandwidth electrical control network [87].

2.4 Optical Interconnects

Optical on-chip interconnects another promising alternative to address bandwidth and energy limitations of electrical interconnects. optical NoCs transfer data across the SoC as optical signals and the energy consumption of the signals are relatively distance-independent. Figure 8 represents a simple bus based optical interconnect with only a sender and a receiver. An off-chip laser acts as the source of the optical signals in different wavelengths. Waveguide can be represented as the dual of copper links in electrical NoC which is responsible to carry optical signals. Unlike electrical links, the waveguide supports parallel data transmission through dense wavelength-division multiplexing. Microring resonator (MR) [13, 17] is the fundamental component inside modulators, detectors and routers which is made out of mixture of circular and straight waveguide. MR is capable of removing all or keep all the optical signals in the waveguide which represents logical 0 and 1, respectively.




Fig. 7. 10x10 hybrid wireless NoC topology with four subnets and wireless nodes [79].




Fig. 8. Basic optical data transfer where the sender modulates off-chip laser in wave-guide [84].

When the sender wants to send a message, it will generate a packet which is initially represented as an electric signal. The modulator is responsible for electric to optical modulation. The MR inside the modulator will capture a light of a particular wavelength on the waveguide and modulates it to represent stream of logical 0s and 1s. At the receiver side, the detector will continuously listen on the selected wavelength. Upon receiving data, MR inside the detector will select the wavelength and remove it from the waveguide. Then the signal is converted to electrical signal and amplified before sending into the receiver. This optical bus can be considered as the fundamental building box for many complex topologies of optical interconnects [84]. λ -Router [54] and Folded Crossbar [61] are two optical only NoC architectures that route optical signals based on their wavelengths. Amon [83] and QuT [42] are two topologies that use a low bandwidth control network to agree upon a set of wavelengths before actual collision-free optical transmission. Similar to hybrid wireless NoCs, optical interconnects also have hybrid architectures that uses optical links for long distance communication and electrical links for short distance communication. Metor [49] is a hybrid optical NoC architecture that divides 8x8 NoC into four 4x4 clusters (Figure 9). Atac [8] uses a global optical crossbar that supports 32 buses with 64 wavelengths on each (Figure 10). Compared to Metor, it does not have fixed clusters, it uses a policy of using optical interconnects only if the destination is more than four hops away. Otherwise, the electrical NoC is used.

In 2013, optical interconnects were used in Intels Optical PCI-X motherboard. In 2015, Sun et al. have fabricated processor chip containing 850 photonic components that communicate using optical signals [76]. Practical photonic based on-chip interconnects are already in the path of major MPSoC vendors. Technology specific components and processes in optical interconnects have introduced new attack vectors to adversaries that will be discussed in Section 5.

3 ELECTRICAL ON-CHIP COMMUNICATION SECURITY

Electrical on-chip interconnects can be considered as traditional and widely used technology of all. In this section, we will survey recent research efforts on security of electrical NoCs. First, we discuss the threat models and attacks on electrical NoCs. Next, we describe suitable countermeasures to defend against these attacks.

3.1 Threat Models and Attacks

In this section, we explore threat models and attacks of electrical NoCs categorized into previously defined security concepts. Some of the threat models can be applied across other technologies as wireless.

3.1.1 Confidentiality.

Side-channel attacks utilize the implementation of a computer system rather than a software or hardware vulnerabilities to launch an attack. Some of the side-channel attacks require deep understanding about the internal physical implementation of the system. Timing information,




Fig. 9. Metor [49]: 8x8 hybrid optical NoC with four 4x4 clusters.




Fig. 10. Atac [8]: hybrid optical NoC with global optical crossbar.

electromagnetic signals and power analysis are some of the avenues for side-channel attacks. Sharing of multi-tenant application is more practical in cloud environments where same physical hardware is shared by two different virtual machines. These applications have concurrent network usage where they have to compete for the shared resource in NoC such as links. Latency and throughput variation in such scenarios can be used as a timing side channel to leak sensitive information. An adversary can also use the timing channel as covert channel to bypass any security mechanisms in NoC to leak sensitive data. We will first focus on side-channel attacks on confidentiality. Wang and Suh [81] talks about how to use side-channel and covert channel to hinder confidentiality data flowing through NoC. The attacker can use timing channel of the network interface to leak the sensitive information or use covert channel to leak information to colluding malicious application. For example, a program with high security profile would leak information to a lower security profile program via covert channel. The specific threat model assumes multiples security levels such as high and low security zones. Attacker is in control of a software in multiple processing cores along with it's placement at scheduling. Attacking program is assumed to be in low security zone but it can introduce packets to NoC which will affect timing characteristics of the high security zone traffic. Furthermore, the attacker is assumed to know the placement, scheduling, and traffic patterns of high security zone programs. Attacker will use throughput and timing change of it's own packets as the side channel to leak sensitive information from high security traffic flow.

Sepulveda et al. talked about timing based side channel attack to steal critical information communication through NoC. This attack is conducted by infecting a component in SoC with a hardware Trojan. The attack uses the performance degradation of the malicious IP to infer critical information in concurrent process running in SoC. Imagine a scenario when a source and destination are performing a symmetric key cryptographic function of such as AES [32]. When the source requests a particular data, it first looks at the local cache. If the requested data is not available, it will use the NoC to access the shared L2 cache or main memory. Node A is the attacker that lies in the routing path of this communication who is injecting packets continuously to the NoC. The performance degradation caused by A leaking information on crypto process will reduce the search-space for a secret key. In 2016, Sepulveda et al. [69] described about a Denial of Service

attack with minor changes to the threat model. Although the attack is similar, the HT affected IP in the NoC is replaced by a malicious program. Furthermore, the authors point out different ways how a malicious software can infect an IP. Most common way can be considered as a buffer overflow attack by a malicious program. The malicious program can leak sensitive information as secret keys through timing-side channel as discussed previously. Boraten and Kodi [21] uses a similar threat model where the adversary uses interference from contending applications to launch timing side channel attack to steal sensitive information. The authors further elaborate using of a covert channel to leak sensitive data captured from timing side channel attack. They point out that protecting against side channel attack is challenging since malicious application can hinder detection by artificially inducing interference. Reinbrecht et al. [63] proposes a stronger adversary for side-channel attacks which can be considered as an extension to previous attacks. This adversary uses distributed timing side channel attack to leak sensitive information. This attack has the advantages of reduced computation and storage requirements of the adversary. They introduced two types of malicious IPs, (1) injectors which inject traffic in high rate to increase congestion on NoC and (2) observers who injects traffic in low rates while monitoring their performance degradation. The attack described in the paper has three stages. The first stage is infection where the malicious IP uses a malware to position injectors and observers. At the calibration stage, the traffic injection rates will be adjusted to avoid unnecessary throughput degradation. During execution and cryptanalysis, the attack is conducted and a mathematical algorithm is used to infer sensitive data from the distributed side-channel data.




Fig. 11. Snooping of communication between S and D to colluding application via malicious router [7].




Fig. 12. HT inserted in router counting packets of communication between S and D [4].

Side-channel attacks and covert-channel attacks have been discussed in traditional bus based architectures. Shao et al. [74] talks about an attack where a run-time HT in bus can monitor communication between the master and slave of the bus. The HT can be activated from an external input. When HT is activated it will use power side channel to leak address information on the bus.

The next six attacks on confidentiality share similar threat model with subtle differences. The basic threat model is snooping by some malicious components of NoC which is colluding with a local or remote malicious application. Local colluding application can be considered as either colluding application or HT compromised local IP. Remote colluding application resides outside the boundary of SoC which can be considered to have higher processing power compared to that of local counterpart. Ancajas et al. [7] describe confidentiality violation via snooping in the presence of malicious NoC. The authors highlight that this threat is critical when using multi-tenant cloud

computing using MPSoCs. The malicious NoC has embedded hardware Trojan that is capable of activating covert backdoor which is working with a colluding malicious application running on a normal processing core. Figure 11 shows an example scenario in a mesh NoC when malicious application is running in node X in a compromised NoC when S and D are communicating. The attack has four phases. At design phase, a third party NoC IP provider fabricate a HT into the NoC. Then the colluding application running in the SoC use a dirty cache bit to activate the HT when necessary. At attacking phase, a malicious software request the compromised NoC to eavesdrop and duplicate packets of a specific communication. The compromised NoC will use covert channels to transfer duplicated classified information from legitimate communication between S and D. Finally, the attacker will deactivate the HT after the attack. The compromised NoC with HT have 4.62% area and 0.28% power overhead compared to baseline NoC. The authors highlight the fact that HT is harder to detect due to low overhead and HT being deactivated after an attack. Charles et al. [23] talks about snooping attack when NoC is malicious which uses similar threat model as [7] with the exception of not using covert channels. Similar threat models are explored in [71, 82] where there is a malicious router snooping packets inside NoC. Hussain and Guo [44] also talks about packet leaks in NoC where the NoC is a third-party IP. Here, hardware Trojan in NoC is capable of changing destination and source of request and response packets, respectively, to leak sensitive data. Charles and Mishra [27] also talks about a threat model in mesh topology where NoC IP is compromised. Specifically, they assume that some routers and IP cores in middle are malicious. The trusted IPs are introduced as secure IPs. When two secure IPs are communicating, a malicious router in middle can leak sensitive information to the malicious IP in the same chip through NoC.

Raparti and Pasricha [62] propose a harder to detect threat model for data snooping attack on NoC. The HT is placed in the Network Interface (NI) where NoC packets are generated from SoC data. There can be multiple malicious NIs which snoop packets and send it to the malicious program listening at a specific IP. The packetizer is the module which is responsible for creating NoC packets adding header information like destination ID, virtual channel ID, etc which is immediately followed by a set of flits. The flits are stored in a circular buffer where pointer is used to define the start and end of the buffer. The HT is capable of tampering with these pointers to re-send the duplicate packet with new destination ID as the IP with the malicious program. The authors point out that the area overhead of this HT is only 1.3% compared to baseline NI.

Ahmed et al. [4] proposed a lightweight and naive HT that can leak traffic patterns to an adversary so that the adversary can do traffic analysis. The HT is capable of the naive task of periodically counting number of packets in a time window and leak that information to the adversary. The HT can be in either router block or in an interconnection switch. For example according to Figure 12, when source S is communicating with D, the router with HT in the middle of the path will count the packets and send it to the attacking application. The HT is a 16-bit counter and the count is packetized every 5000 cycles. This is a passive attack where the data path and delay of the original packets are not affected making the detection of HT close to impossible. There maybe multiple such HT with counters. The area and power overhead of HT with small counter is insignificant in a large MPSoC design so they are hard to be detected. The adversary can use data mining techniques on top of the collected data to arrive at information such as application running on the system. This attack uses eavesdropping to extract user behaviors and violates privacy of the user. Ahmed et al. [3] talks about what an remote access Hardware Trojan can do to the confidentiality of NoC traffic. The authors highlight the severity of impact of the attack on multi-tenant servers. remote access Hardware Trojan has a relatively small area footprint compared to typical HT and can be used by a remote attacker to steal confidential information. The HT can have a simple functionality as leaking packet counts of a particular switch in a time window. After stealing information, the HT will packetize and transfer the information to remote attacker for further

processing. Similar to [4], the attacker uses a ML technique, specifically an artificial neural network, to infer properties of application running on the system and reverse engineer the architectural design. The authors shows that it can reveal information such as router micro-architecture, cache organization, processor platform, and NoC configurations. Four remote access Hardware Trojans in a 64 mesh can successfully reveal application running with an accuracy of 80%-98% in different scenarios.

3.1.2 Integrity.

Integrity of electrical NoC is less addressed compared to confidentiality. Sepúlveda et al. [71] assumes that NoC IP is malicious. The paper talks about 3 stages of the HT (1) Trojan design and insertion, (2) malicious behaviour activation, and (3) execution of the attack. Network interfaces are not considered malicious because integration of network interface needs in house development. The malicious NoC contains of compromised routers in both partially deactivated mode and fully deactivated mode. The malicious router is capable of replacing a portion of incoming packets using the information in *malicious data* register [71]. The HT to tamper and modify packets in router results in overheads of 1.3% , 0.1% and 0.3%. in area, power and performance, respectively. Apart from attacking the integrity, the authors presents two other HTs in router to spoof and launch replay attacks.

3.1.3 Availability.

In this section, we review attacks on availability that utilize compromised NoC components. JS et al. [46] discuss about bandwidth denial of service attack to disrupt availability of resources when running programs on MPSoC. This attack directly affects the performance of the programs running on MPSoC. Some application's performance will heavily depend on specific IPs in MPSoC. For example, a memory intensive task will heavily depend on memory controller, the proposed DoS attack try to hinder the traffic flow to such hotspots and cause application performance degradation. The authors show proposed attack degrade packet latency in the rage of 14.5% to 72% depending on the severity of the attack. The HT is inserted in the standard four-stage virtual channel router with an activation method of software-hardware collation, time based triggers and traffic characteristic based triggers. The victim node selection of the HT will select a victim IP that has noticeable drop by using heuristics such as high ingress/egress rate. Finally, the traffic flow manipulation module of HT affects arbitration and allocation stages of the packets to slow down and hinder performance. The HT will result in negligible overhead of 4.32% and 0.014% in area and power, respectively. A similar threat model is used in the discussion of [37].

Daoud and Rafla [34] propose a HT that results in DoS attack by misrouting packets. The proposed attack will cause deadlocks and virtual link failures. The HT can be implemented in malicious router with only 0.2% of additional overhead which can be considered insignificant to detect. The HT has an inactive and waiting state which is even harder to detect. In attacking state, the router will simply misroute the packet to incorrect output port. For example, if the packet need to be switched to south output port according to XY routing, the HT will direct it to the east output port. The experimental results show that the attack will result in reduction of number of received packets by the destination. Manju et al. [55] also talks about DoS attack by misrouting the packets at routers and attack selected set of nodes. The misrouting will also affect the flow control and results in injection suppression which will eventually freeze the communication in NoC. Similar to the threat model used in [34], this paper is also used threat model where router is malicious. Furthermore, they assumed that there is only one such infected router to avoid significant change in power consumption which will lead in detection of the HT. HT inserted to the router in pre-silicon stage either by adversary having access to design or by untrusted CAD tool. The HT will maliciously assign the head flit of the packet to a wrong output port where the rest of the packet will follow the

misrouted path due to wormhole routing. The misrouted packet counting cache coherence message will significantly degrade performance. When running SPEC CPU benchmarks [43], the HT infected router in NoC will result in only 80% delivery rate while 20% packets are lost in ping-pong inside the NoC. The attack will also increase average packet latency by 87% compared to the baseline without HT.

JYV et al. [47] propose a novel DoS attack on NoC that is induced by a HT. Unlike the previous HT triggered by special timing and external triggers, the proposed HT is triggered by special bit pattern in the message. The paper discussed four HTs that can be integrated in the router which can change flit count, address, head bit and tail bit. Once a flit enters the router through buffer, the HT will modify a field/bit in the flit. The router will react differently depending on the field changed by the HT. For example, flit quantity Trojan can change the header field that represents the number of flits in the packet. Mismatch between actual number of flits and the value in the header field will result in abandoning the packets and re-transmitting. HT changing tail and head bits results in 63% and 71% of throughput reduction, respectively. Experimental results show that the effect of address change and flit count change by HT results in more throughput reduction. The results show similar trend in average packet latency, and total number of packets received. Rather than having HTs at routers or network interfaces, Boraten and Kodi [19] introduce a novel DoS attack on NoC via lightweight HTs at compromised links. This HT is capable of inspecting the packets and injects faults to the systems so that the error correction mechanism get triggered though error correction code. Errors will inject into NoC where error detection mechanism is able to detect the error and unable to correct it resulting in re-transmission. Single error correction and double error detection is an example for such a simple error correction code. Repetitive and frequent fault injection will result in DoS since majority of the available bandwidth will be utilized by re-transmissions resulting in back-pressure and network resource starvation. The proposed HT has an externally controlled kill-switch to enable the attack and reduce the chances of detection during verification process. A single HT in a link incur less than 1% of the total power which makes the possibility of multiple compromised links. Furthermore, experimental results show that even if all 48 links include a HT, they will have only 2% overhead compared to whole NoC. A single HT can deadlock 81% of the injection ports and at least one link on 68% of the routers in a small number of cycles.

All previously discussed attacks on availability utilize a compromised NoC. For next few attacks, we focus on threat models where IPs are malicious. Sudusinghe et al. [75] use a threat model of flooding based DoS attack for their proposed countermeasure. The malicious IP targets a critical component for SoC performance as memory controller. For example, a node with malicious intent can flood packets to a node which is the neighbouring node to a memory controller. This will make hot-spots around frequently used and shared memory controller leading to a DoS. The authors point out the increase in traffic rate of the routers in the path of communication. This results in reduced performance, missed deadline, and insufficient energy consumption.

The next set of efforts focus on threat models that use multiple malicious IPs working collaboratively to launch attacks on availability instead of a single compromised component. Charles et al. [25, 26] elaborates distributed DoS (DDoS) attack on NoC. Multiple malicious IPs will flood the NoC with useless packets to eat up the bandwidth and disrupt normal communication. Most of the time these flooding will happen targeting critical and shared IP such as memory controller to have higher impact on the attack. Figure 13 shows several scenarios of DDoS attack in 3x3 mesh network where the paths for flooding packets may or may not overlap. The flooded packets will fill up buffers and eat up processing time of the routers in the path making extremely high latency for legitimate packets. Several flooding based DoS attack scenarios in mesh-based NoC has been implemented and evaluated in [36]. The authors present a novel congestion based attack model to




Fig. 13. Four scenarios of distributed DoS attack on NoC in the presence of malicious IPs [26].

evaluate bandwidth based congestion attack on NoC. The authors have used two scenarios of attack with two and four malicious nodes, respectively. They also have explored different placement of the malicious IPs. The malicious node is capable of generating constant bit rate traffic to the mesh based NoC. They have evaluated the impact of these DoS attacks on XY-routing and four other adaptive routing mechanisms namely odd-even, west-first, north-last and negative-first. The experimental results show that XY routing performs better in lower packet injection rates, and adaptive routing performs better at higher rates. The experimental results also reveal higher degradation of network performance with increasing number of malicious IPs flooding the network.

Charles et al. [24] discuss about a slightly different threat model that uses multiple malicious IPs for DoS attack. IPs in SoC are categorized into two zones as secure zone and non-secure zones considering the trustworthiness of the IPs. In order to preserve integrity of the packets, a message authentication code based authentication system is used. When a packet traverses through the non-secure zone, the content of the packet can be tampered by a malicious IP leading to failed message authentication code verification. This will result in dropping of initial packets and re-transmission of new packets. A malicious node can tamper either the request or the response resulting in re-transmission. Tampering a large number of packets in short interval can lead to a DoS attack. Tampering packets by multiple malicious IPs can be recognized as a distributed DoS attack.

3.1.4 Authenticity.

There are no recent efforts on explicitly attacking authenticity in electrical NoCs. However, the confidentiality countermeasures with authenticated encryption ensures authenticity which will be discussed in Section 3.2.

3.1.5 Anonymity.

Anonymity in electrical mesh NoCs has been studied by [24]. The threat model assumes that NoC is malicious. Specifically, there is a HT in a compromised router which is capable of sniffing into the packets routing through it. This HT can be triggered by a malicious program running in another core. It can steal critical information from data when payload is not encrypted. If payload is encrypted, it can gather packets that has same source and destination. An intelligent attacker can use these gathered data to launch complex cryptanalysis attacks. Sarihi et al. [67] use a similar threat model to [24]. Furthermore, they highlight the fact that header information needs to be kept in plain-text in order for a router to process the request fast without per hop costly decryption. This leads to various kind of attacks such as differential cryptanalysis attacks by collecting packets between the same endpoints.

3.1.6 Freshness.

There are no recent efforts on attacking freshness in electrical NoCs.

3.2 Countermeasures

This section surveys effective countermeasures to defend against attacks outlined in Section 3.1. Specifically, we discuss the countermeasures in the following six major categories.

3.2.1 Confidentiality.

We first review the countermeasures against side-channel attacks. Next, we will survey countermeasures to defend against other types of attacks. Wang and Suh [81] propose an efficient countermeasure against timing side-channel attack to steal critical information. The solution is to use multi-level security modeling of the SoC as IPs categorized into high and low security zones. They propose a priority bandwidth allocation scheme for one-way traffic from high security zone to low security zone. This ensures that low priority traffic is not affecting the high priority traffic. So an attacker cannot use throughput variations on high priority traffic to leak sensitive information. Furthermore, the proposed solution ensures that the low priority traffic will not be starved or lead to DoS by introducing static lower bounds to low priority traffic bandwidth. The proposed countermeasure can be implemented on routers with minimal power and area overhead while successfully eliminating one-way side channel from high to low security zone traffic. Furthermore, the authors propose two physical networks with spatial or temporal network partitioning to fully eliminate timing side channel for both directions.

Two mechanisms to avoid timing side channel attack by a malicious IP were proposed by [72]. Both of these approaches focus on dynamically allocating NoC resources. The first approach is random arbitration at the router. Arbitration is one of the five main steps of a typical NoC router that determines the input the router will serve as shown in 3. The authors introduce randomness to the traditional deterministic arbitration. The second approach is adaptive routing that mitigates timing side channel attack. Both approaches introduce low area and power overhead. Sepúlveda et al. [69] also proposed a security enhanced router for slightly different threat model. It assumes that the secure router is capable of mitigating timing side channel attack by a malicious program running in a MPSoC. This mechanism ensures that side channel is not aware of the actual communication. The allocator of this router dynamically allocates the number of virtual channel for a particular input port. This is done by a modification of memory management in a typical NoC router. Apart from the protection against timing side channel attack, the proposed micro-architecture has added advantage of better performance over a typical router. The secure router micro-architecture has 8% and 9% power and area overhead, respectively. Boraten and Kodi [21] propose a non-inference based adaptive routing mechanism to improve performance while securing against side channel attack posed by the threat model in [70]. This mechanism spatially divides routers into security domains and dynamically utilizes under-utilized routers through multiple adaptive routing algorithms. There are a set of virtual channel allocation policies implemented to provide security against inference between two security domains. The authors show that this mechanism improves security and performance with only 1.84% power overhead. A security enhanced architecture for distributed timing attack is proposed by [63]. Here, every router is equipped with a traffic monitor. These monitors can recognize anomalies via bandwidth monitoring. Once an anomaly is detected, it will send an alert message to the neighbouring routers. After successful detection of a possible attack, the routing algorithm of the sensitive path of the attack would change to bypass the attack. Furthermore, the authors provide a mechanism to avoid false-positives by introducing a confidence. Experimental results show reduction of effectiveness of a distributed timing attack from 59.63% to 6.62%. Shao et al. [74] provides a solution for power-side channel attacks on traditional bus based architectures. The countermeasure is combined with a novel bus arbiter and random number generator. When the bus arbiter receives a request, it will send the random number generated by the random number generator to both master and the slave of the communication. The master will

insert random dummy data with valid data. The slave can distinguish actual data using the random number. The dummy data in middle will obfuscate power values making it hard to correctly guess actual data values using power side channel analysis.

So far, we have discussed countermeasures to defend against side-channel attacks. Now we will focus on security countermeasures to defend against other types of attacks. Ancajas et al. [7] proposed Fort-NoC which is a solution for snooping eavesdropping attacks in a compromised NoC. The solution uses a series of techniques to provide both reactive and proactive multi-level protection. The data scrambling technique scrambles the critical data at SoC firmware before handing it over to NoCs' network interface. This technique affects the backdoor activation of the HT and also makes the leaked data incomprehensible to the attacker. The packet certification technique simply adds an encrypted tag at the end of the packet by the SoC firmware. The packets with invalid tags will be discarded making it harder for covert communication initiated at compromised NoC. Node obfuscation technique decouples and hides the source and destination of a given communication. These three fort-NoC techniques have minimum performance overhead of 3.8%, 2% and 001% in terms of packet latency. These methods highlight that multi-level security can mitigate the snooping attack in compromised NoC with low overhead.

Charles and Mishra [27] propose a lightweight encryption scheme using incremental cryptography. They highlight that most of the memory request and response communication inside NoC differs by only few bits. Incremental encryption compares two consecutive packets and encrypts only the difference. The authors utilize this feature to minimize data bits needed for encryption and decryption. They use Hummingbird-2 cipher [35] as the encryption algorithm. The authors observed 57% (30% on average) performance improvement over traditional routing mechanism with only 2% overhead. Sepúlveda et al. [71] use traditional encryption of counter-mode of the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES-CTR) to protect against eavesdropping attacks. They use unique key for each of their encryption and use linear feedback shift registers to generate initialization vector for each instance. They use encryption of initialization vector and counter to generate unique key for encryption. A lightweight encryption scheme that utilizes two basic concepts of chaffing and winnowing[66] and all-or-nothing transform [65] is proposed by Weerasena et al. [82]. All-or-nothing transform has a lightweight quasi-group based implementation. Chaffing and winnowing process utilizes inherent traffic characteristics of the NoC to speedup the overall encryption. The implementation of the encryption scheme at network interface is fast and lightweight compared to AES-CTR mode based countermeasure [71]. These results validate the fact that traditional security protocols do not adapt well for resource-constrained NoC.

Although traditional authenticated encryption mitigates eavesdropping attacks, they can introduce unacceptable overhead in resource constrained NoC. Charles et al. [23] propose a lightweight digital watermarking scheme to detect eavesdropping attacks. This solution replaces costly authentication tag generation while maintaining confidentiality through existing encryption scheme. A watermark will be embedded into every packet stream. Both watermark encoding and decoding logic implemented on NI while sender encodes and receiver decodes. The receiver will identify a packet stream as invalid in case of an attack, or valid otherwise. Hussain and Guo [44] introduced another countermeasure to detect attacks that will alter packet source and destination to leak packets. The proposed lightweight authentication scheme generates tag by authenticating both source and destination. The tag is scrambled with packet data. The tag inserted by source processing element is verified by packet leak detection unit in destination processing element. If the tag is altered or any of the address is altered, the destination will detect the packet and invalidate it.

A two-tier protection mechanism is introduced by [62] to protect against eavesdropping attack. A snooping invalidation module is presented as the first tier. This is implemented in output queue of every NI which will discard packets with invalid header flits. Additional encoding information

provided by the processing element is used for the detection of snoop packets. As second tier of protection will go after the source of the attack where a malicious program running in a processing core. The detector implemented at interface between NI and processing element needs to observe traffic ratios for few hours to detect source of the attack. This two-tier countermeasure protects NoC-based SoC from snooping attacks while reducing application execution time.

A Simulated Annealing based randomized routing mechanism is proposed by [4] to overcome traffic analysis attack. Since a fully randomized routing degrades performance of NoC, the authors used parameterized Simulated Annealing that can balance between security against traffic analysis and performance. The key idea of the countermeasure is to obfuscate traffic flows so that the attacker cannot launch successful data mining techniques. Simulated Annealing based randomized routing makes the path of the packet unpredictable so that the features for the Machine Learning(ML) model is obfuscated. This method reduces the user profile identification accuracy from 98% to 15%. An attack proposed by [3] has the similar basic intuition as [4]. Therefore, the solution presented by [3] to overcome ML-based attacks on eavesdropped data can be used. The solution is routing obfuscation through adaptive routing mechanism. This obfuscation will confuse the external adversary who conducts data mining techniques on these data. Similar to previous works, this countermeasure has configurability to trade-off between security and performance.

3.2.2 Integrity.

Sepúlveda et al. [71] proposed a tunnel based solution that protects electrical NoC against message modification attacks. The solution assumes that the network interface is trustworthy. The authors use SipHash-2-4 as the algorithm to generate the message authentication code. Siphash [11] is popular for generating message authentication code for shorter inputs. The proposed countermeasure generates 64-bit message authentication code and appends it to the message. The receiver regenerates the tag from that end and compares the tag for possible tampering of the message. Any mismatch between the two tags will indicate unauthorized modification of the message content. Furthermore, the authors makes the countermeasure configurable by controlling Siphash rounds.

3.2.3 Authenticity.

Although there are no threat models solely focused on authentication in recent literature, the solutions for confidentiality that provide authenticated encryption also ensures authenticity. Although the SipHash-2-4 implementation in [71] focuses on integrity, the inclusion of the source field in hash calculation guarantees that the data in the source field is authentic. Several other attempts to develop lightweight authenticated encryption can be found in the literature. The packet certification technique with an XoR cipher in [7] uses a tag to be validated by the receiver. The sender will append a tag to the message which can only be validated by the receiver. Another authentication scheme is proposed by Boraten and Kodi [20]. It is a reconfigurable packet validation and authentication scheme by merging two robust error detection schemes, namely, algebraic manipulation detection and cyclic redundancy check. Intel's TinyCrypt [45] is a cryptographic library targeting resource-constrained IoT and embedded devices. It provides fundamental cryptographic building blocks consisting of hash functions and message authentication codes that can be used in ensuring authenticity in NoC.

3.2.4 Anonymity.

A lightweight anonymous routing protocol to ensure anonymity inside NoC is introduced by [24]. The proposed technique initiates a tunnel between the sender and receiver through a three-way handshake. The handshake uses per hop encryption and decryption to ensure a secure tunnel creation. After the tunnel creation, a router in the path only knows about the preceding

Table 1. Summery of Attacks and countermeasures in electrical NoCs categorized by security concepts.

Security Concept	Attack	Countermeasure	Overhead Area Power
Confidentiality	Timing side-channel & Covert channel via Malicious Programs	Priority bandwidth allocation with security zones [81]	Minimal
	Timing side channel via Malicious IP	Adaptive routing and random arbitration [72]	5-11% 8-9%
	Timing side channel via Malicious Program	Dynamic VCs per input port at router [69]	9% 8%
	Distributed timing side channel using multiple malicious routers	Non-inference based adaptive routing [21]	NA 1.84%
	Traffic monitoring followed by adaptive routing [63]		21.2% 16.2%
	Power side channel in bus architecture	Novel bus arbiter with random number generator [74]	NA
	Snoop in presence of Malicious Router and Colluding Program (Local or Remote)	Data scramble, Packet certification, Node obfuscation at SoC firmware [7]	Minimal
		Incremental encryption at NI [27]	2%
		Encryption using AES-CTR [71]	NA
		Chaffing & Winnowing with All-or-nothing transform [82]	Minimal
		Authenticating source and destination of packets [44]	3.4% 2.6%
		Digital watermarking to detect snooping [23]	NA
	Snoop in presence of Malicious Network Interface and Colluding Program	Snooping Invalidation and Detection [62]	2.2 % 5.5%
	Eavesdropping using HT at router and ML to analyze traffic patterns.	Simulated annealing based randomized routing [4]	NA
		Obfuscation through randomized routing [3]	NA
Integrity	Message tamper via malicious router	Applying and Validation of message authentication code at Network Interface. [71]	NA
Anonymity	Complex cryptanalysis attacks by gathering packets via Malicious Router.	Tunnel based anonymous routing protocol [24]	NA
		Anonymous routing protocol with encrypted destination [67]	1% 10%
Availability	Bandwidth DoS via Malicious Router	Audit and Monitor at NoC Firmware [46]	12.37% 9.34%
		Monitoring and analysing traffic [37]	7.6% NA
	DoS by Misrouting via Malicious Router	Localize and Detour at Routers [34]	0.4% 0.6%
	DoS via Malicious Router	Detect, Shield & Detour at Routers [55]	2.78% 3%
	DoS via Multiple Malicious Links	Obfuscation at Routers [47]	22.2% NA
	DoS by Flooding via Malicious IP	Monitor & Obfuscate at Routers [19]	2% 6%
	Distributed DoS by flooding via Multiple Malicious IPs	ML based Detection [75]	6% 7%
	DoS by tampering packets via Multiple Malicious IPs	Monitor, Detect & Localize at Router and IP [25, 26]	6% 4%
		Hybrid Routing [36]	NA
		Trust aware routing [24]	6% NA

and following routers. Therefore, the data transfer in tunnel ensures anonymity. The proposed anonymous routing ensures anonymity with only 4% impact on performance while traditional onion routing implementation introduces 1.5X performance degradation.

Sarihi et al. [67] propose an anonymous routing mechanism in NoC. This routing mechanism uses encrypted destination address and prevent any malicious router in the middle collecting the packets of same flow. Instead of plain-text source and destination, approximate routes and turns are embedded into the packet with encrypted destination. Hummighbird-2 is used as the lightweight encryption needed in the scheme. The packets in the NoC are divided into secure and non-secure packets. Secure packet ensures that it's destination and source are not leaked to any unauthorized party through proposed routing mechanism. This solution incurs minimal area overhead of 1% and power overhead of 10%.

3.2.5 Availability.

JS et al. [46] proposes a bandwidth DoS runtime attack detection. The authors present RLAN (Runtime Latency Audition for NoCs) which is an auditor to monitor traffic characteristics of the system. RLAN does not need any support form NoC. The countermeasure is implemented in the

firmware module that interfaces the NI with processing element. RLAN performs this in two steps (1) RLAN will carefully inject selected packets to the network and the NoC firmware will monitor anomalies in the packet transfer delays. (2) RLAN will look for comparable latencies of two packets which has overlap in their path (spatial similarity) in the same time frame (temporal similarity). RLAN will generate packet by slightly altering the destination and source which will have the same hop count as legitimate packet. Before sending the packet for packetization, the RLAN will tag the packet with timestamp to establish latency thresholds. An adequate sample size can be used to detect DoS attack by comparing the latencies between a RLAN injected packet and its original counterpart. RLAN has the overhead of 12.73%, 9.34% and 5.4% in area power and network latency, respectively. A monitoring system to avoid bandwidth based DoS attack is proposed by [37]. The denial of service probe collects traffic statistics of packets generated by processing elements. Any unnatural condition in traffic flags a potential DoS attack. The authors point out the requirement of effective way to minimize false positives for incorrectly classifying normal anomalies as a DoS attack.

Daoud and Rafla [34] propose a method for real-time detection and localization of DoS attack. They also provide a prevention technique with new routing protocol which will avoid interaction with malicious nodes by detouring traffic around. The detection of the attack is straightforward as the downstream router can detect it by comparing it with the XY routing protocol decision for routing path violation. Once the downstream router detects a misrouted packet, it will inform the operating system and neighbouring routers where they will flag the upstream router of that packet as a malicious router. This can be visualized as the malicious router is covered by a shield ring by neighbouring routers. The neighboring routers of the malicious router will detour the packets avoiding any interaction with the malicious router while transferring the packets. This rerouting module has only 0.4% area overhead compared to the base router. The countermeasure increases packet latency due to detouring of the packet and it will incur 0.6% additional power overhead.

Manju et al. [55] describes Trojan aware routing mechanism for DoS attacks. This mechanism is implemented in all the routers. Trojan aware routing has 3 stages. The Trojan detection stage detects whether the neighbouring/upstream router is Trojan infected by the current router. The detection module of Trojan aware routing will detect violation of routing protocol and indicates it using two flags (Boolean alert flag and direction flag) in the current router. The dynamic shielding phase will create a virtual shield surrounding the malicious router. The router who detects the Trojan will send alert to the neighbouring routers of the malicious router so that the neighbouring routers update their flags. The bypass routing stage is a modified XY routing. At each router, it will look at the two flags and activate detour if the next hop is a malicious router, otherwise the normal XY routing will continue. Trojan aware routing shows reduction of 38% packet latency compared to HT infected router and has only 7% increase of packet latency compared to baseline NoC. Trojan aware routing has only 6% reduction of throughput compared to baseline. In terms of hardware overhead, Trojan aware routing has 2.78% of area and 3% of leakage power overhead.

Charles et al. [25, 26] present a mechanism to detect and localize distributed DoS attacks by multiple malicious IPs by monitoring communication patterns. At design time, the communication patterns are analyzed and parameterized as packet arrival curve at each router and packet latency curve at each IP. The routers will store packet arrival curve and use it to detect a real-time violation by comparing it with upper-bound from the curve. Once a router flags a detection of DDoS attack, the corresponding IP of that router is responsible for localizing the attack. The IP will compare with packet latency curve upper bound to determine abnormal latencies. Once it sort out the delayed packet, the IP will communicate with the routers in the path for congestion information and use that information to localize the malicious IPs. The experimental results show that attack detection

is faster when more malicious IPs are available. Experimental results also reveal fast localization time. The proposed approach has 6% and 4% area and power overhead, respectively.

Fang et al. [36] talk about robustness of the DDoS attacks on mesh-based NoC with different malicious IP numbers and placements. Among five routing algorithms (XY routing and four adaptive routing), XY routing performs better at traffic injection rates less than 0.65. However, the authors suggest that for higher traffic injection rates adaptive routing algorithms perform better. They also propose a set of design guidelines to elevate system performance in a DoS attack scenario. They suggest a hybrid scheme of deterministic routing and adaptive routing that will switch based on the traffic injection rates.

Fang et al. [36] propose a heuristic for DoS attack initiated by exploiting error correction mechanism in NoC. The threat detection mechanism implemented in the router will detect threat by probing and monitoring links with transient and frequent faults. The detector will examine all incoming flits in terms of whether they are having a fault and whether the fault is seen in similar locations earlier. After a successful detection, the authors propose multiple link obfuscation techniques to mitigate the effects of the proposed DoS attack. When an artificial fault in the packet is tagged by the detection module, the mitigation module will look for the fault location (whether the fault is in the header, payload or both). Next, it will use either shuffle, scramble or invert bits to obfuscate the target of the compromised link. The mitigation module may have to run multiple times to choose correct obfuscation technique. The experiment results show successful mitigation of the proposed attack with only 2% and 6% area and power overhead, respectively. Finally, the authors proposed optimized algebraic manipulation detection as a solution to maintain integrity in malicious links.

The authors in [47] propose a mitigation technique inside the router that may have Trojan to alter header fields (no of flits, destination, head flag bit, and tail flag bit) to cause DoS attacks. The basic idea is to shuffle the bit fields among themselves and other fields to obfuscate information. Furthermore, the authors propose a single bit error code correction on top of the obfuscation to mitigate effects from Trojans. Immediately after the flit enters the router, the shuffle encoder will shuffle header fields. The shuffling pattern is determined by the last few bits of the actual payload of the packet. For example, there will be eight shuffling patterns determined by the last three bits of the payload. After the router goes through its all stages, the de-shuffler returns the header fields to the normal bit pattern. Since the HT is inside the router, it cannot do meaningful attack by bit alterations from shuffled bits. For example, the HT is unaware of the position of the bits representing number of flits in the packet. Experimental results show that the proposed methodology is able to recover 67% and 45% in changing number of flits and destination address, respectively. The mitigation technique has area overhead of 21% compared to baseline router.

Sudusinghe et al. [75] observe that the real benchmarks in general purpose system may have unpredictable traffic patterns, and therefore, simple statistical patterns would not adapt well for them. So they propose a ML based approach for DoS attack detection. They have explored several supervised ML approaches for the DoS detection. During the design time, the data for both normal and attack scenarios are collected using known applications. A ML model is trained and stored in a dedicated core for security. At run-time, the probes are used to collect data from routers. Separate physical NoC is used to send data to the security core for prediction. The security core will predict the traffic pattern as attack or normal scenario. They have used 20 distinct features for this ML detection. Two physical NoCs have 6% and 7% area and power overhead, respectively. They have compared performance of 12 different ML models - XGBoost algorithm performs better with an accuracy of 99% in successfully detecting DoS attack in 4x4 mesh based NoCs.

Charles et al. [24] propose a trust aware routing mechanism to overcome DoS attack in the presence of multiple malicious IPs. The authors model trust of routers which calculates the trust based

on feedback from neighbouring routers and propagate the values through NoC. A neighbouring router will keep on trusting of the upstream router if the packet was not tampered and reduce it's trust if packet is tampered. When a particular IP wants to send data, an adaptive trust-aware routing algorithm will be used to route the packets avoiding untrusted routers. This lightweight mechanism can be integrated with any of the existing authentication protocol to mitigate DoS attacks that exploits authentication checking.

3.2.6 Freshness.

There are no recent efforts on attacks or defenses related to freshness in electrical NoCs.

Table 1 shows the summary of the surveyed papers attacking confidentiality, integrity, availability, authenticity and freshness in wireless NoCs and corresponding countermeasures. The first column shows the main security concept. The second column outlines the threat model. The second and third columns provide the countermeasure and associated overhead in terms of area and power.

4 WIRELESS ON-CHIP COMMUNICATION SECURITY

Wireless NoC is promising to mitigate the routing challenges associated with multi-hop communication in electrical NoCs. However, wireless NoCs introduce inherent vulnerabilities due to wireless communication. In this section, we survey recent research efforts in securing wireless NoCs. First, we discuss the threat models and attacks on wireless NoCs. Next, we describe the countermeasures to defend against these attacks.

4.1 Threat Models and Attacks

The attacks on wireless NoCs follow the similar threat models as the electrical NoC with subtle differences for wireless communication. In this section, we explore the attacks on wireless NoCs in the following categories.

4.1.1 Confidentiality.

Lebiednik et al. [51] consider multiple attacks in their threat model and one of them is the eavesdropping attack. The authors consider a single point of attack and avoids the scenarios where an unbound attacker can disrupt the system. They assume that their HT cannot affect physical layer since HT is placed in the digital circuit. Furthermore, since the chip is covered with metallic box, the the Radio Frequency (RF) signals cannot be leaked outside or attacker cannot inject RF signals from outside. Figure 14 shows typical wireless chip with metallic cover. The authors highlight that the broadcasting nature of messages in wireless NoC makes it inherently vulnerable to eavesdropping attack.




Fig. 14. Wireless NoC based SoC with metallic cover hinders access to an external attacker [51].

Pereñíguez-García and Abellán [60] describes multiple attacks in hybrid NoC. The target system has shared L3 banks distributed in 16 nodes and private L2 cache at each node. The authors

focus on the broadcast cache coherence message communication between L2 and L3 for all the attacks. They label L3 as sender and L2 as receivers while the communication is done via wireless NoC. The authors assume an ideal condition of all L2 and L3 nodes having wireless receivers and transceivers. The electrical NoC assumed to be secure while wireless medium is not secure. In proposed eavesdropping attack, the attacker captures messages over wireless medium which can lead to leaking sensitive information such as passwords and keys.

Vashist et al. [77] describe eavesdropping attack from both external and internal adversaries. The attack is passive and hard to detect in both cases. This is done by the attacker tuning into the unprotected wireless channel. An external attacker need to have external receiver tuned to the wireless band used inside wireless NoC with enough sensitivity. An internal attacker will forward eavesdropped packet to a malicious IP.

4.1.2 Integrity.

Pereñíguez-García and Abellán [60] describe unauthorized modification of packets in wireless medium in a hybrid wireless NoC. The attacker changes the content of the message and forwards it to the intended destination. The attacker is capable of full or partial modification of the content compared to the real version of the message. The authors point out the need for novel hashing mechanism with less than 30 cycles to harness fast broadcasting of cache coherence messages via wireless NoCs.

4.1.3 Availability.

We discussed the general attack model proposed by Lebednik et al. [51] earlier which also discusses about DoS attacks. The authors point out that misconfiguration in media access control protocol can lead to DoS attack. For example, two nodes transmitting in the same channel can cause collision and corruption of messages. A rouge node can transfer packets out of turn violating fundamental rule of collision-free media access control protocol. Therefore, repetitive collision can eat-up bandwidth which can lead to bandwidth DoS attack. The proposed attack can lead to throughput drop over 70% in the presence of a selfish node that unfairly consumes bandwidth.

DoS attacks on wireless NoC is first discussed by Ganguly et al. [38]. The threat model assumes HT in a processing core injecting dummy packets into the network. These garbage packets will occupy majority of the virtual channels and output ports of a switch. This will result in disturbance of traffic in and out of the switch. Further propagation of this congestion to neighbouring switches will result in DoS attack.

Persistent jamming-based DoS attacks by both internal and external attackers have been studied in [77]. During the attack period, the proposed attack is capable of making interference on wireless communication. This causes bit errors in contiguous bits known as burst errors. The attack will continue for a long period of time resulting in long contiguous bit errors that cannot be corrected by existing error correction codes. This will result in re-transmission that can eventually lead to DoS attack. The internal attack is initiated by a HT affected wireless interface.

Vashist et al. [78] also talks about persistent jamming based DoS attacks. They highlight the fact that it is impractical to use traditional channel-hopping technique as a countermeasure on wireless NoC due to use of limited number of channels. This attack has similar effect of burst errors as discussed in [77]. Ahmed et al. [2, 5] also outline a similar threat model in wireless NoC for persistent jamming based DoS. The attack was conducted on multicore-multichip topology where two wireless interfaces are available in a chip for inter-chip communication.

4.1.4 Authenticity.

Lebednik et al. [51] discuss spoofing attack on wireless NoCs. Wireless being the broadcast medium, it is inherently vulnerable to spoofing attacks. Malicious cores use this to impersonate

other cores by changing the source address of flits. The authors highlight that spoofing can be used to get access to unauthorized regions of memory or steal unauthorized information. Furthermore, the spoofing attack on authenticity can lead to attack on availability by responding with wrong information to legitimate signals by a rouge node. Lebednik et al. [52] discussed this attack in detail. The spoofing attacks are conducted from inside since the chip package blocks external signals. The HT is in the digital circuit of wireless NoC. The attacker sends spoof cache invalidations. The authors show that even 10% such spoof invalidations can lead to 27% drop in NoC performance.

Pereñíguez-García and Abellán [60] also talks about impersonation in hybrid wireless NoCs. The attacker simply tricks other IPs of the wireless NoC that they are having legitimate communication with actual IP while they are actually communicating with a malicious IP.

4.1.5 *Anonymity.*

There are no recent efforts on attacking anonymity in wireless NoCs.

4.1.6 *Freshness.*

Pereñíguez-García and Abellán [60] describe replay attack. The attacker will store a valid message exchanged over the wireless NoC. Then the attacker will inject the same packet without modification. The receiver will waste time or conduct an unwanted action for such artificially delayed redundant messages.

4.2 Countermeasures

This section surveys countermeasures to defend against the attacks discussed in Section 4.1 categorized by security concepts.

4.2.1 *Confidentiality.*

Lebednik et al. [51] propose a set of hardware solutions against multiple attacks including eavesdropping attack. The solution for eavesdropping attack is included as a module in the network interface. The authors use stream ciphers as the low cost solution for eavesdropping attack and highlight the fact that Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) [32] is not suitable for resource-constrained wireless NoCs. The proposed solution will take bit-wise decision of flipping bits using symmetric keys. The proposed Py [31] algorithm will take only 2.85 cycles compared to 20 cycles of AES. The area and power overhead of Py is minimal while having less network saturation compared to AES. However, Py is vulnerable to liner distinguishing attacks. Although [60] provides solutions for different kind of attacks they do not consider eavesdropping. They reasoned that all broadcast messages through wireless NoC only contain memory address and destination node ID and they are not critical information to hide. Many researchers argue that eavesdropping and collecting broadcasting messages can lead to complex attacks to disrupt confidentiality and privacy of SoC through machine learning based techniques. Vashist et al. [77] propose eavesdropping attack prevention technique embedded to each transceiver. It performs XOR-based data scrambling based encoding in each sensitive data transmission. The header bits are kept as plaintext for faster routing. This method is extremely lightweight and fast due to XOR operation. For internal eavesdropping attack, the authors propose a low complexity rule checker on destination address at wireless interface.

4.2.2 *Integrity.*

Usage of a hash function is proposed by [60] to overcome integrity issue in wireless NoC. The sender appends a tag with hash value at the end of the packet while receiver validates the tag upon receiving. The authors use a lightweight hash function of SPONGENT family [18] as the most reliable and efficient solution for wireless NoC. Specifically, they have used SPONGENT

configuration which results in a 88-bit length hash value and operates using 8-bit blocks. The authors assume that it will take 450 cycles for hash function to generate output in 1GHz frequency.

4.2.3 Availability.

Ganguly et al. [38] propose a design methodology to mitigate effect of DoS attack. The authors propose a small-world topology which is known for its inherent resilience to DoS attacks. The small-world topology has many short-distance links and a small number of long distance shortcuts. The topology has both wired and wireless links. The authors have optimized the defence against DoS attack by simulated annealing to mitigate spreading of DoS attack. Experimental results show that the proposed methodology assists high data transfer rate with low power dissipation.

A DoS prevention using unfairness detection is proposed as a module in Prometheus [51]. The module monitors possible collisions violating collision avoidance media access control protocol. After a successful detection of collision, the wired NoC of hybrid wireless NoC is used to send the message to suppress transmissions of the malicious node. Furthermore, the operating system will turn off the communication of the malicious node by ID. In a case of collision-based media access control protocol where collision is part of the protocol, the detection is hard. The authors define an unfairness ratio and a configurable threshold of its value to identify malicious nodes.

Vashist et al. [77] propose an attack detection and mitigation technique for jamming-based DoS attack. They use an ML-based model to distinguish random burst errors from burst errors by a DoS attack. After a successful detection, a defense unit at each transceiver is used to mitigate the attack depending on whether the attack is internal or external. In case of an external attacker, all the wireless interfaces will be disabled from data routing, instead wired links will be used. In case of an internal attacker, the power supply will be removed from the specific Trojan infected transceiver. The authors in [78] propose a modification of existing Built-In-Self-Test (BIST) framework used for testing to monitor jamming-based DoS attacks. The defense mechanism is similar to [77]. The proposed method is able to detect DoS attack with accuracy of 99.87% with only <3% communication overhead and <1% energy overhead. Ahmed et al. [2, 5] use a similar approach of utilizing BIST framework to detect persistent jamming based DoS attacks. They used both regular ML-model and adversarial ML classifier for this detection. A reconfigurable media access control protocol is used as the countermeasure to mitigate DoS attack. The reconfigurable media access control protocol is implemented at transceiver. It uses reservation-based media access control protocol in normal scenario and special attack mitigating media access control protocol otherwise. ML and adversarial ML classifiers show 99.87% and 95.95% accuracy in attack detection, respectively. Reconfigurable media access control protocol helps to mitigate the effect of DoS attack with 1.44x and 1.56x latency impact for internal and external attack, respectively. The authors have used K-nearest neighbours algorithm for the detection part of DoS attack in previous work with accuracy over 99%. The other parts of the solution is same with few subtle differences.

4.2.4 Authenticity.

RF power analysis is used in [51, 52] to detect spoofing attacks in wireless NoCs. The authors also highlight the impracticality of using asymmetric key signature schemes in NoCs despite their use in traditional wireless networks. The proposed solution can measure power level of the received transmission. Due to the topology, an effective source address can be derived from the observed power level. A mismatch in effective source address and actual address in packet header is recognized as a potential spoofing attack. To overcome the challenge of correctly identifying the nodes equidistant to a particular node, the authors propose to place attack detection modules at each corner of NoC.

Table 2. Summary of Attacks and countermeasures in wireless NoCs categorized by security concepts.

Security Concept	Attack	Countermeasure	Overhead Area Power
Confidentiality	Eavesdropping attack via HT	Encrypt using stream cipher at NI [51]	Minimal
	Eavesdropping of broadcasting L2 to L3 cache coherence messages	No mitigation, since broadcasting from L2 to L3 does not contain critical information [60]	NA
	External and internal eavesdropping	XoR-based data scrambling at transceiver [77]	NA
Integrity	Unauthorized Modification of packets	Usage of low-cost hashing [60]	NA
Availability	DoS attack visa misconfigured Media Access Control (MAC)	Prevention through unfairness detection [51]	NA
	DoS attack via flooding by malicious IP	Small-world topology with simulated annealing [38]	Low
	Persistent jamming-based DoS by Internal or External attacker	ML-based detection and avoiding [77]	NA
		Monitoring using built in test framework [78]	NA
		ML based detection using testing framework Reconfigurable MAC for mitigation [2, 5]	Low
Authenticity	Spoofing by malicious IP	Detection by RF power analysis [51, 52]	Low
		Authentication by symmetric cryptography [60]	NA
Freshness	Replay attack	Counter based scheme [60]	NA

Pereñíguez-García and Abellán [60] observe that there is no need for both sender (L3) and receiver (L2) to authenticate each other using a secret key because the specific message in the threat model are in the same application context. They suggest only one-way authentication of sender which is verified by the receiver. The scheme uses a key bind into a specific process to do this authentication using symmetric cryptography.

4.2.5 Freshness.

Pereñíguez-García and Abellán [60] suggest a counter-based scheme to monitor the freshness of the communication. This is a simple counter initialized into a random value by the operating system when creating the process. When broadcasting the message, the counter is incremented by one. The receiver will have local variable representing the counter for each sender. Upon receiving the packet, each receiver will compare it's local counter value with the value inside the packet. A mismatch in the counter will flag a redundant message and it will be discarded.

Table 2 shows the summary of the surveyed papers attacking confidentiality, integrity, availability, authenticity and freshness in wireless NoCs and corresponding countermeasures. The first column shows the main security concept. The second column outlines the threat model. The second and third columns provide the countermeasure and associated overhead in terms of area and power.

5 OPTICAL ON-CHIP COMMUNICATION SECURITY

Optical NoC design and security analysis is an active research field. In this section, we survey security of optical NoCs. First, we review the threat model and attacks on optical NoCs. Next, we survey the countermeasures to defend against these attacks.

5.1 Threat Models and Attacks

Bus-based topologies and their variations can be considered as the most common topologies in optical NoCs. Therefore, there are different set of threat models and vulnerabilities compared to mesh based electrical NoCs. In this section, we explore threat models and attacks on optical NoCs.

5.1.1 Confidentiality.




Fig. 15. Eavesdropping attack on optical NoCs in the presence of HT in Optical Station [14].

Bashir et al. [14] discuss multiple categories of attacks on optical NoCs. We focus on general threat model and specific attack on confidentiality in this section while other attacks are discussed in subsequent sections. The attack model trusts only the sender and receiver. In other words, it considers that NoC and other IPs connected to it can be malicious. Furthermore, the threat model assumes that an attacker cannot tamper with clock, power or ground lines. Eavesdropping attack on optical NoCs is simple. A malicious IP can simply listen into the shared waveguide and steal sensitive data without altering the original communication. According to Figure 15, station 1 sends message to station 3. Since station 2 is malicious, the HT will turn on and tune the detector (MR inside the detector) on wavelength used by station 1 and 3. Then station 2 can steal critical information intended for station 3. MRs are highly sensitive for temperature variations. Therefore, there is a control system for thermal sensing at different locations in optical NoC and corresponding tuning MRs. However, these sensed thermal data needs to be sent to collection node to calculate relevant tuning adjustments of each MR. In hybrid optical NoCs, electrical NoC is used to send these control signals. Zhou et al. [89] talks about attack on confidentiality when sending optical NoC control signal data (thermal sensing values) through insecure electrical NoC.

Chittamuru et al. [29, 30] introduced a spoofing attack through HT in MR tuning circuit. A gateway is responsible for interfacing shared wave-guide of optical NoC to processing cluster. An HT in gateway is able to manipulate tuning circuit of MR to partially tune the neighbouring wavelength. Once it snoops data from ongoing communication, the data will be sent to a malicious node to extract critical information. Multiple side channel attacks caused by resource contention is discussed by Guo et al. [41]. There is a malicious switch sharing common resource such as link with a legitimate communication. The malicious switch competes and intentionally allows the legitimate communication win. The malicious switch observes timing characteristics of the flow and extracts secret information from them. The authors discuss two side-channel attacks of one-way and two-way interference that uses discussed threat model. The authors also discuss an attack that leaks critical NoC temperature related control data that can be used by other attacks.

5.1.2 Integrity.

Bashir et al. [14] use the same basic threat model as discussed in Section 5.1.1 for attack on integrity. The attacker has the ability to actively modify packets of an ongoing legitimate communication. The attacker will simply capture and delete original packet from the bus, modify the content of the packet, and finally place the packet with tampered data on bus with the same destination. Figure 16 visualizes message tampering attack by compromised station 2 on legitimate data transfer. Similar to eavesdropping attack, tuning MR to a selected wavelength by HT is the origin of the attack.




Fig. 16. Message tampering attack on optical NoCs in the presence of HT in Optical Station [14].

As discussed earlier, optical networks are sensitive to temperature since thermal sensing is integrated into optical NoCs. Zhou et al. [88, 89] outline an attack that tampers the thermal-sensing control procedure of MRs. The optical router is the focal point of this attack where the thermal-sensing measurement is happening. HT in optical router will tamper modulation voltage which results in incorrect measurements. This will lead to negative impact on performance and reliability. The authors highlight that these HTs are harder to detect due to their negligible overhead.

5.1.3 Availability.

Multiple HT-based remote DoS attacks on optical NoCs have been studied by [41]. The threat model assumes that every node has a optical switching cell for switching of optical signal. A blackhole attack on optical NoC is led by HT inserted in switching cell. In blackhole attack, HT will drop packets without forwarding them to correct local output port. Sinkhole attack is also led by same HT in switch. When an upstream switch wants to forward data to a downstream switch, it considers available wavelengths and modes in the downstream switch. In sinkhole attack, the HT will notify more empty wavelength and modes than what the switch actually have. Both blackhole and sinkhole attacks result in performance degradation which will leads to DoS attack. The authors also elaborate flooding attack where a malicious cell continuously injects dummy packets to induce a DoS attack.

5.1.4 Authenticity.

A spoofing attack can also be easily conducted on top of the basic threat model by [14] which was discussed in Section 5.1.1. Malicious IP/station connected to the shared optical wave-guide can tune it's MR to listen to an on-going communication and impersonate the sender or the receiver. Similar to attack on integrity by [41], attacker can capture and remove a legitimate request from sender. After that either it can respond to the request impersonating as the destination or it can send it's own request back to the wave-guide impersonating as the legitimate sender. Impersonating as the sender can result in attacker obtaining sensitive information from the destination or make destination conduct an unintended task.

Zhou et al. [89] also talk about possible spoofing attack in thermal sensing control procedure. As discussed in Section 5.1.2, the optical router measures the raw data for temperature calculation. Then it needs to transfer this data to processing unit through low priority electrical NoC. The unique identifier for optical router in control packet can be changed so that the processing element can calculate and act on different optical router as intended. This will also lead to performance degradation and unreliable communication. The effects of the attack will be different in each instance making it harder to detect these attacks.

5.1.5 Anonymity.

There are no recent efforts on attacking anonymity in optical NoCs.

5.1.6 Freshness.

The same basic attack model discussed in Section 5.1.1 can be used by an attacker for replay attack [14]. An HT in the middle of a legitimate communication can tune itself through MR tuning circuit. Then the attacker can store selected messages from the session internally and inject them again to the wave-guide. This can result in destination doing unintended action. Frequent injections can result in unwanted bandwidth utilization affecting legitimate communication. The authors highlight the fact that this attack is possible even with encrypted payload in the packet.

5.2 Countermeasures

This section surveys the countermeasures to defend against the attacks outlined in Section 5.1 categorized by security concepts.

5.2.1 Confidentiality.

Bashir et al. [14] propose a layer of security in between optical station and processing elements. The authors highlight that optical networks are more sensitive to latencies in cryptographic operations. Therefore, naive implementations of exiting traditional countermeasures will not adapt well for optical NoCs. The authors propose a symmetric encryption based solution for eavesdropping attack. In the first stage of the solution, a key distribution algorithm is proposed which is executed during the boot time. The authors assume availability of specific hardware block for key generation. In co-existence of electrical NoC, the key distribution algorithm will use secure electrical NoC for key distribution. Otherwise, it will use low complexity public-key cryptography named BlueJay for key distribution. The proposed countermeasure uses One-Time Pad which can be executed in one cycle for encryption at sender and decryption at receiver. The First-In-First-Out (FIFO) property of optical bus is utilized for pre-computing and storing of tags for faster execution. To ensure that both sender and receiver use the same key for One-Time Pad, a minor key concat with main key is used. Incrementing of the minor key after every message and the FIFO property of the bus ensures synchronization of the keys used for One-Time Pad. The complete solution for addressing multiple security requirements incur only 1.6% area overhead and 14.2% performance overhead while eavesdropping only solution incurs even less overhead. In a hybrid optical NoC, Zhou et al. [89] use an encryption scheme to ensure confidentiality of control messages transfer via electrical NoC. The fabrication of optical NoC introduces Process Variations. The change of resonant wavelength due to the PV of MR is used as the key for this symmetric encryption scheme. Furthermore, they use simple and lightweight XoR operation in the encryption scheme.

Chittamuru et al. [29] introduce a process variation based authentication signature scheme to protect photonic networks against snooping attacks in both uni-cast and multi-cast scenarios. Specifically, the packet is encrypted by the process variation profile of detector in destination gateway. Architecture-level reservation-assisted security enhancement scheme is proposed and combined with authentication scheme to further increase the security of optical NoCs. The reservation scheme introduces a secure reservation wave-guide which prevents malicious Gateway Interface stealing information about another Gateway Interface. This framework secures optical NoC against snooping attack with moderate overhead of 14.2% in average latency and of up to 14.6% in energy delay product. Guo et al. [41] divide cells into trusted and malicious cells for countermeasure against timing side channel attack. This HT countermeasure limits locally-generated traffic leaving a cell that tagged as malicious. Furthermore, the static and dynamic partitioning of cells based on the trust of each cell will try to isolate sensitive traffic inside secure cells. Both of these approaches provide protection against timing side channels by avoiding malicious traffic been collided with sensitive traffic.

Table 3. Summary of Attacks and countermeasures in optical NoCs categorized by security concepts.

Security Concept	Attack	Countermeasure	Overhead Area Power
Confidentiality	Eavesdropping via Malicious Optical Station	One-Time-Pad with changing keys [14]	<1.6% NA
	Eavesdropping of control signal via electrical interconnect in hybrid optical NoC	Encryption scheme with Process Variation of Optical network as key [89]	<1% Low
	Snooping via HT in MR tuning circuit	Process variation based authentication signature [29, 30]	14.6% energy delay product
	Timing side channel by resource contention	T Restricting local traffic from malicious cell & static and dynamic partitioning [41]	NA
Integrity	Unauthorized packet modification	Hashing with piggybacking the tag [14]	<1.6% NA
	Tampering critical control data at Optical Router	Checking and Correcting raw data and security status detection using ML [89]	2.6% on energy
Availability	DoS by blackhole, sinkhole and flooding attacks	HT detection, localization and mitigation [41]	NA
Authenticity	Spoofing by impersonating sender and receiver via malicious IP	No countermeasure is given in [14]	NA
	Spoofing source identifier data in control messages	Using hash at Electrical NI [89]	NA
Freshness	Replay attack via Malicious Optical Station	Counter-based solution [14]	<1.6% NA

5.2.2 Integrity.

Bashir et al. [14] propose an integrity checking mechanism to avoid unauthorized packet modification. First, they point out that standard hash generation and verification is not practical in optical NoCs because it consumes too many cycles. The authors propose a piggybacking of the hash. When sender wants to send a message, hash generation of a the message starts in parallel of actual sending of the message through optical NoC. The message arrives at the destination without the hash. The hash for the current message will arrive with the next message. The receiver will process the message until the hash arrives but commits it only if hash is verified. If verification fails, the message is discarded and already processed action will not be committed. The hashing algorithm will use the same key distributed by key distribution algorithm (BlueJay) which was discussed in Section 5.2.1.

Zhou et al. [89] discuss on adding module to check optical sampling during thermal sensing. This module is implemented in the network interface of Electrical NoC because it will not affect the normal optical network communication. The module is capable of checking and correcting raw data sent by an optical router before transferring it to the relevant processing element via electrical NoC. The process can be seen as a theoretical checking and correction. In addition, they also introduce a mechanism for run-time detection of the security status of the whole NoC under the presence of discussed HTs. This scheme uses spiking neural networks for detection of the security status. This will help operating system to take more precautions in the presence of an attack. The experimental results show that the presented mitigation techniques allow secure thermal-sensing in optical NoC with overhead of 3.06% and 2.6% in average latency and energy consumption, respectively.

5.2.3 Availability.

Guo et al. [41] discuss countermeasures against DoS attack inducing HT detection, localization and mitigation. The authors assume that the optimal location for HT is hotspots in optical NoC. In the first step, a preliminary HT localization module tags hotspot locations as potential HT locations. Then, the exact localization algorithm tags HTs by identifying anomalies that surpass the upper-bound of the maximal packet count curve for that node. From initially tagged nodes, address of those abnormally delayed packets are tagged as HTs. Finally, the HT-detection stage has two countermeasures. The first countermeasure applies randomized permutation to the data so

that it is hard for HT to change the final destination address. The second countermeasure ensures integrity of data by detecting message removal from the system. After these three steps, there will be trusted and untrusted cells. As extra layer of security, the authors propose static and dynamic partitioning of cells resulting in traffic isolation.

5.2.4 Authenticity.

Although [14] discusses spoofing attack in optical NoCs, it does not provide countermeasure to overcome the proposed attack. Zhou et al. [89] discuss a countermeasure for their proposed spoofing attack on thermal-sensing process. The module for countermeasure is implemented on electrical NI. They propose using of hash algorithm to ensure authenticity. When sending the packet to the collection processing node from electrical NI, the module will append 128-bit tag. When the collection node receives the packet, it validates the tag with the same algorithm and proceed with it's actions. MD5 [64] is proposed as the hashing algorithm by the authors.

5.2.5 Freshness.

Bashir et al. [14] ensure freshness of the messages through a counter based solution. This solution will detect if a message is removed from the system or removed and reinserted back a message after considerable delay. Therefore, it can detect the proposed replay attack. This solution also utilizes the FIFO property of the optical waveguide. Every sender will maintain a major and minor counter. It will send the both counter values to destination in every n cycles. If the respective counter values in the destination matches, it will send a known response message. If sender does not receive a particular response withing a threshold time limit, it will flag for possible message removal from the system. The authors define these parameters in the algorithm based on simulation results. This solution has minimal area and performance overhead according to the experimental results.

Table 3 shows the summary of the surveyed papers attacking confidentiality, integrity, availability, authenticity and freshness in wireless NoCs and corresponding countermeasures. The first column shows the main security concept. The second column outlines the threat model. The second and third columns provide the countermeasure and associated overhead in terms of area and power.

6 CONCLUSION

NoC is the core component responsible for communication in SoCs with large number of tiles. In this paper, we perform a comprehensive survey about attacks, threat models and countermeasures of diverse on-chip communication technologies (electrical, optical, wireless, and hybrid) and architectures. The primary goal of this survey is to provide the reader with a clear insight into the technologies and recent developments in NoC communication security. The survey also consists of an extensive summary on architecture and technology primitives that are essential for the understanding about security of NoC. The survey contains state-of-the art security attacks and countermeasures from both industry and academic perspectives. The discussion about attacks and countermeasures are divided into six security areas.

We believe there are several NoC security challenges that need to be addressed in the near future. For example, emerging technologies can introduce vulnerabilities through inherent side channels. Similarly, it is possible to attack NoC security using machine learning techniques. While communication architecture and NoC security have been independently studied, designing them together would lead to secure and robust on-chip communication architectures. The future NoCs need to support sophisticated SoCs in diverse application domains implemented using novel technologies. This will lead to opportunities for exploring new attacks and developing effective countermeasures.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. Number of IoT devices 2015-2025. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/471264/iot-number-of-connected-devices-worldwide/>. Accessed: 2022-7-6.
- [2] M Meraj Ahmed, Abhishek Vashist, Sai Manoj Pudukotai Dinakarrao, and Amlan Ganguly. 2020. Architecting a Secure Wireless Interconnect for Multichip Communication: An ML Approach. In *2020 Asian Hardware Oriented Security and Trust Symposium (AsianHOST)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [3] M Meraj Ahmed, Abhijitt Dhaville, Naseef Mansoor, Sai Manoj Pudukotai Dinakarrao, Kanad Basu, and Amlan Ganguly. 2021. What Can a Remote Access Hardware Trojan do to a Network-on-Chip?. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [4] M Meraj Ahmed, Abhijitt Dhaville, Naseef Mansoor, Purab Sutradhar, Sai Manoj Pudukotai Dinakarrao, Kanad Basu, and Amlan Ganguly. 2020. Defense against on-chip trojans enabling traffic analysis attacks. In *2020 Asian Hardware Oriented Security and Trust Symposium (AsianHOST)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [5] M Meraj Ahmed, Amlan Ganguly, Abhishek Vashist, and Sai Manoj Pudukotai Dinakarrao. 2021. AWARE-Wi: A jamming-aware reconfigurable wireless interconnection using adversarial learning for multichip systems. *Sustainable Computing: Informatics and Systems* 29 (2021), 100470.
- [6] Ampere. 2022. Ampere Altra Max 64-Bit Multi-Core Processor. <https://amperecomputing.com/processors/ampere-altra/>. [Online].
- [7] Dean Michael Ancajas, Koushik Chakraborty, and Sanghamitra Roy. 2014. Fort-NoCs: Mitigating the threat of a compromised NoC. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Design Automation Conference*. 1–6.
- [8] Mark A Anders. 2014. High-performance energy-efficient noc fabrics: Evolution and future challenges. In *2014 Eighth IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip (NoCS)*. IEEE, i–i.
- [9] ARM. 1999. ‘Amba specification’, Technical report, ARM, Revision 2.0. developer.arm.com/products/architecture/amba-protocol. [Online].
- [10] Arteris. 2009. FlexNoC Resilience Package. www.arteris.com/flexnoc-resilience-package-functional-safety. [Online].
- [11] Jean-Philippe Aumasson and Daniel J Bernstein. 2012. SipHash: a fast short-input PRF. In *International Conference on Cryptology in India*. Springer, 489–508.
- [12] Jun Ho Bahn, Seung Eun Lee, and Nader Bagherzadeh. 2007. On design and analysis of a feasible network-on-chip (noc) architecture. In *Fourth International Conference on Information Technology (ITNG’07)*. IEEE, 1033–1038.
- [13] Carlos Angulo Barrios, Vilson R de Almeida, and Michal Lipson. 2003. Low-power-consumption short-length and high-modulation-depth silicon electrooptic modulator. *Journal of Lightwave Technology* 21, 4 (2003), 1089.
- [14] Janibul Bashir, Chandran Goodchild, and Smruti Ranjan Sarangi. 2020. SecONet: A Security Framework for a Photonic Network-on-Chip. In *2020 14th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip (NOCS)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [15] Janibul Bashir, Eldhose Peter, and Smruti R Sarangi. 2019. A survey of on-chip optical interconnects. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 51, 6 (2019), 1–34.
- [16] Tobias Bjerregaard and Shankar Mahadevan. 2006. A survey of research and practices of network-on-chip. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 38, 1 (2006), 1–es.
- [17] Wim Bogaerts, Peter De Heyn, Thomas Van Vaerenbergh, Katrien De Vos, Shankar Kumar Selvaraja, Tom Claes, Pieter Dumon, Peter Bienstman, Dries Van Thourhout, and Roel Baets. 2012. Silicon microring resonators. *Laser & Photonics Reviews* 6, 1 (2012), 47–73.
- [18] Andrey Bogdanov, Miroslav Knezevic, Gregor Leander, Deniz Toz, Kerem Varici, and Ingrid Verbauwhede. 2012. SPONGENT: the design space of lightweight cryptographic hashing. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* 62, 10 (2012), 2041–2053.
- [19] Travis Boraten and Avinash Kodi. 2018. Mitigation of Hardware Trojan based Denial-of-Service attack for secure NoCs. *J. Parallel and Distrib. Comput.* 111 (2018), 24–38.
- [20] Travis Boraten and Avinash Karanth Kodi. 2016. Packet security with path sensitization for nocs. In *2016 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 1136–1139.
- [21] Travis H Boraten and Avinash K Kodi. 2018. Securing NoCs against timing attacks with non-interference based adaptive routing. In *2018 Twelfth IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip (NOCS)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [22] Subodha Charles et al. 2021. A survey of network-on-chip security attacks and countermeasures. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 5 (2021), 1–36.
- [23] Subodha Charles, Vincent Bindschadler, and Prabhat Mishra. 2022. Digital Watermarking for Detecting Malicious Intellectual Property Cores in NoC Architectures. *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems* (2022).
- [24] Subodha Charles, Megan Logan, and Prabhat Mishra. 2020. Lightweight anonymous routing in NoC based SoCs. In *2020 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 334–337.
- [25] Subodha Charles, Yangdi Lyu, and Prabhat Mishra. 2019. Real-time detection and localization of DoS attacks in NoC based SoCs. In *2019 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 1160–1165.

- [26] Subodha Charles, Yangdi Lyu, and Prabhat Mishra. 2020. Real-time detection and localization of distributed DoS attacks in NoC-based SoCs. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 39, 12 (2020), 4510–4523.
- [27] Subodha Charles and Prabhat Mishra. 2020. Securing network-on-chip using incremental cryptography. In *2020 IEEE Computer Society Annual Symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI)*. IEEE, 168–175.
- [28] Kun-Chih Chen, Masoumeh Ebrahimi, Ting-Yi Wang, and Yuch-Chi Yang. 2019. NoC-based DNN accelerator: A future design paradigm. In *Proceedings of the 13th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip*. 1–8.
- [29] Sai Vineel Reddy Chittamuru, Ishan G Thakkar, Varun Bhat, and Sudeep Pasricha. 2018. SOTERIA: exploiting process variations to enhance hardware security with photonic NoC architectures. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Design Automation Conference*. 1–6.
- [30] Sai Vineel Reddy Chittamuru, Ishan G Thakkar, Sudeep Pasricha, Sairam Sri Vatsavai, and Varun Bhat. 2020. Exploiting process variations to secure photonic NoC architectures from snooping attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* 40, 5 (2020), 850–863.
- [31] Paul Crowley. 2006. Improved cryptanalysis of Py. *Cryptology ePrint Archive* (2006).
- [32] Joan Daemen and Vincent Rijmen. 1999. AES proposal: Rijndael. (1999).
- [33] W.J. Dally and B. Towles. 2001. Route packets, not wires: on-chip interconnection networks. In *Proceedings of the 38th Design Automation Conference (IEEE Cat. No.01CH37232)*. 684–689. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DAC.2001.156225>
- [34] Luka Daoud and Nader Rafla. 2018. Routing aware and runtime detection for infected network-on-chip routers. In *2018 IEEE 61st International Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems (MWSCAS)*. IEEE, 775–778.
- [35] Daniel Engels, Markku-Juhani O Saarinen, Peter Schweitzer, and Eric M Smith. 2011. The Hummingbird-2 lightweight authenticated encryption algorithm. In *International workshop on radio frequency identification: Security and privacy issues*. Springer, 19–31.
- [36] Dabin Fang, Huikai Li, Jun Han, and Xiaoyang Zeng. 2013. Robustness analysis of mesh-based network-on-chip architecture under flooding-based denial of service attacks. In *2013 IEEE Eighth International Conference on Networking, Architecture and Storage*. IEEE, 178–186.
- [37] Leandro Fiorin, Gianluca Palermo, and Cristina Silvano. 2008. A security monitoring service for NoCs. In *Proceedings of the 6th IEEE/ACM/IFIP international conference on Hardware/Software codesign and system synthesis*. 197–202.
- [38] Amlan Ganguly, Mohsin Yusuf Ahmed, and Anuroop Vidapalapati. 2012. A denial-of-service resilient wireless NoC architecture. In *Proceedings of the great lakes symposium on VLSI*. 259–262.
- [39] Amlan Ganguly, Kevin Chang, Sujay Deb, Partha Pratim Pande, Benjamin Belzer, and Christof Teuscher. 2010. Scalable hybrid wireless network-on-chip architectures for multicore systems. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* 60, 10 (2010), 1485–1502.
- [40] Amlan Ganguly, Paul Wettin, Kevin Chang, and Partha Pande. 2011. Complex network inspired fault-tolerant NoC architectures with wireless links. In *Proceedings of the fifth ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip*. 169–176.
- [41] Pengxing Guo, Weigang Hou, Lei Guo, Zizheng Cao, and Zhaolong Ning. 2020. Potential threats and possible countermeasures for photonic network-on-chip. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 58, 9 (2020), 48–53.
- [42] Parisa Khadem Hamedani, Natalie Enright Jerger, and Shaahin Hessabi. 2014. Qut: A low-power optical network-on-chip. In *2014 Eighth IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip (NoCS)*. IEEE, 80–87.
- [43] John L Henning. 2000. SPEC CPU2000: Measuring CPU performance in the new millennium. *Computer* 33, 7 (2000), 28–35.
- [44] Mubashir Hussain and Hui Guo. 2017. Packet leak detection on hardware-trojan infected nocs for mp soc systems. In *Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Cryptography, Security and Privacy*. 85–90.
- [45] Intel. 2016. Using TinyCrypt Library, Intel Developer Zone. software.intel.com/en-us/node/734330. [Online].
- [46] Rajesh JS, Dean Michael Ancajas, Koushik Chakraborty, and Sanghamitra Roy. 2015. Runtime detection of a bandwidth denial attack from a rogue network-on-chip. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip*. 1–8.
- [47] Manoj Kumar JYV, Ayas Kanta Swain, Sudeendra Kumar, Sauvagya Ranjan Sahoo, and Kamalakanta Mahapatra. 2018. Run time mitigation of performance degradation hardware trojan attacks in network on chip. In *2018 IEEE Computer Society Annual Symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI)*. IEEE, 738–743.
- [48] John Kim, James Balfour, and William Dally. 2007. Flattened butterfly topology for on-chip networks. In *40th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO 2007)*. IEEE, 172–182.
- [49] Nevin Kirman, Meyrem Kirman, Rajeev K Dokania, Jose F Martinez, Alyssa B Apse, Matthew A Watkins, and David H Albonesi. 2006. Leveraging optical technology in future bus-based chip multiprocessors. In *2006 39th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO'06)*. IEEE, 492–503.
- [50] Kanishka Lahiri, Anand Raghunathan, and Sujit Dey. 2001. Evaluation of the traffic-performance characteristics of system-on-chip communication architectures. In *VLSI Design 2001. Fourteenth International Conference on VLSI Design*. IEEE, 29–35.

- [51] Brian Lebiednik, Sergi Abadal, Hyoukjun Kwon, and Tushar Krishna. 2018. Architecting a secure wireless network-on-chip. In *2018 Twelfth IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip (NOCS)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [52] Brian Lebiednik, Sergi Abadal, Hyoukjun Kwon, and Tushar Krishna. 2018. Spoofing prevention via rf power profiling in wireless network-on-chip. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Advanced Interconnect Solutions and Technologies for Emerging Computing Systems*. 1–4.
- [53] Suk-Bok Lee, Sai-Wang Tam, Ioannis Pefkianakis, Songwu Lu, M Frank Chang, Chuanxiong Guo, Glenn Reinman, Chunyi Peng, Mishali Naik, Lixia Zhang, et al. 2009. A scalable micro wireless interconnect structure for CMPs. In *Proceedings of the 15th annual international conference on Mobile computing and networking*. 217–228.
- [54] Hui Li, Alain Fourmigue, Sébastien Le Beux, Ian O'Connor, and Gabriela Nicolescu. 2016. Towards maximum energy efficiency in nanophotonic interconnects with thermal-aware on-chip laser tuning. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computing* 6, 3 (2016), 343–356.
- [55] R Manju, Abhijit Das, John Jose, and Prabhat Mishra. 2020. SECTAR: secure NoC using Trojan aware routing. In *IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip (NOCS)*.
- [56] IBM Microelectronics. 1999. CoreConnect bus architecture. *IBM White Paper* (1999).
- [57] Prabhat Mishra, Swarup Bhunia, and Mark Tehranipoor. 2017. *Hardware IP security and Trust*. Springer.
- [58] Umit Y Ogras and Radu Marculescu. 2006. "It's a small world after all": NoC performance optimization via long-range link insertion. *IEEE Transactions on very large scale integration (VLSI) systems* 14, 7 (2006), 693–706.
- [59] Vasilis F Pavlidis and Eby G Friedman. 2007. 3-D topologies for networks-on-chip. *IEEE transactions on very large scale integration (VLSI) systems* 15, 10 (2007), 1081–1090.
- [60] Fernando Pereñíguez-García and José L Abellán. 2017. Secure communications in wireless network-on-chips. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Advanced Interconnect Solutions and Technologies for Emerging Computing Systems*. 27–32.
- [61] Luca Ramini, Paolo Grani, Sandro Bartolini, and Davide Bertozzi. 2013. Contrasting wavelength-routed optical NoC topologies for power-efficient 3D-stacked multicore processors using physical-layer analysis. In *2013 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 1589–1594.
- [62] Venkata Yaswanth Raparti and Sudeep Pasricha. 2019. Lightweight mitigation of hardware Trojan attacks in NoC-based manycore computing. In *2019 56th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [63] Cezar Reinbrecht, Altamiro Susin, Lilian Bossuet, and Johanna Sepúlveda. 2016. Gossip noc-avoiding timing side-channel attacks through traffic management. In *2016 IEEE Computer Society Annual Symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI)*. IEEE, 601–606.
- [64] Ronald Rivest. 1992. *The MD5 message-digest algorithm*. Technical Report.
- [65] Ronald L Rivest. 1997. All-or-nothing encryption and the package transform. In *International Workshop on Fast Software Encryption*. Springer, 210–218.
- [66] Ronald L Rivest et al. 1998. Chaffing and winnowing: Confidentiality without encryption. *CryptoBytes (RSA laboratories)* 4, 1 (1998), 12–17.
- [67] Amin Sarihi, Ahmad Patooghy, Mahdi Hasanzadeh, Mostafa Abdelrehim, and Abdel-Hameed A Badawy. 2021. Securing network-on-chips via novel anonymous routing. In *Proceedings of the 15th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip*. 29–34.
- [68] Amin Sarihi, Ahmad Patooghy, Ahmed Khalid, Mahdi Hasanzadeh, Mostafa Said, and Abdel-Hameed A Badawy. 2021. A survey on the security of wired, wireless, and 3D network-on-chips. *IEEE Access* (2021).
- [69] Johanna Sepúlveda, Daniel Flórez, Mathias Soeken, Jean-Philippe Diguët, and Guy Gogniat. 2016. Dynamic NoC buffer allocation for MPSoC timing side channel attack protection. In *2016 IEEE 7th Latin American Symposium on Circuits & Systems (LASCAS)*. IEEE, 91–94.
- [70] Johanna Sepúlveda, Guy Gogniat, Ricardo Pires, Wang J Chau, and Marius J Strum. 2011. Dynamic NoC-Based architecture for MPSoC security implementation. In *Proceedings of the 24th symposium on Integrated circuits and systems design*. 197–202.
- [71] Johanna Sepúlveda, Andreas Zankl, Daniel Flórez, and Georg Sigl. 2017. Towards protected MPSoC communication for information protection against a malicious NoC. *Procedia computer science* 108 (2017), 1103–1112.
- [72] Martha Johanna Sepulveda, Jean-Philippe Diguët, Marius Strum, and Guy Gogniat. 2014. Noc-based protection for soc time-driven attacks. *IEEE Embedded Systems Letters* 7, 1 (2014), 7–10.
- [73] Assaf Shacham, Keren Bergman, and Luca P Carloni. 2007. On the design of a photonic network-on-chip. In *First International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip (NOCS'07)*. IEEE, 53–64.
- [74] Fengjing Shao, Rencheng Sun, Kegang Diao, and Xiaopeng Wang. 2008. A new secure architecture of network computer based on single CPU and Dual Bus. In *2008 Fifth IEEE International Symposium on Embedded Computing*. IEEE, 309–314.
- [75] Chamika Sudusinghe, Subodha Charles, and Prabhat Mishra. 2021. Denial-of-service attack detection using machine learning in network-on-chip architectures. In *Proceedings of the 15th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip*. 35–40.

- [76] Chen Sun, Mark T Wade, Yunsup Lee, Jason S Orcutt, Luca Alloatti, Michael S Georgas, Andrew S Waterman, Jeffrey M Shainline, Rimas R Avizienis, Sen Lin, et al. 2015. Single-chip microprocessor that communicates directly using light. *Nature* 528, 7583 (2015), 534–538.
- [77] Abhishek Vashist, Andrew Keats, Sai Manoj Pudukotai Dinakarrao, and Amlan Ganguly. 2019. Securing a wireless network-on-chip against jamming based denial-of-service attacks. In *2019 IEEE Computer Society Annual Symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI)*. IEEE, 320–325.
- [78] Abhishek Vashist, Andrew Keats, Sai Manoj Pudukotai Dinakarrao, and Amlan Ganguly. 2019. Unified testing and security framework for wireless network-on-chip enabled multi-core chips. *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)* 18, 5s (2019), 1–20.
- [79] Chifeng Wang, Wen-Hsiang Hu, and Nader Bagherzadeh. 2011. A wireless network-on-chip design for multicore platforms. In *2011 19th international euromicro conference on parallel, distributed and network-based processing*. IEEE, 409–416.
- [80] Shuai Wang and Tao Jin. 2014. Wireless network-on-chip: a survey. *The Journal of Engineering* 2014, 3 (2014), 98–104.
- [81] Yao Wang and G Edward Suh. 2012. Efficient timing channel protection for on-chip networks. In *2012 IEEE/ACM Sixth International Symposium on Networks-on-Chip*. IEEE, 142–151.
- [82] Hansika Weerasena et al. 2021. Lightweight Encryption using Chaffing and Winnowing with All-or-Nothing Transform for Network-on-Chip Architectures. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Hardware Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)*. IEEE, 170–180.
- [83] Sebastian Werner, Javier Navaridas, and Mikel Luján. 2015. Amon: An advanced mesh-like optical NoC. In *2015 IEEE 23rd Annual Symposium on High-Performance Interconnects*. IEEE, 52–59.
- [84] Sebastian Werner, Javier Navaridas, and Mikel Luján. 2017. A survey on optical network-on-chip architectures. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 50, 6 (2017), 1–37.
- [85] Werner Wiesbeck, Grzegorz Adamiuk, and Christian Sturm. 2009. Basic properties and design principles of UWB antennas. *Proc. IEEE* 97, 2 (2009), 372–385.
- [86] Dan Zhao and Yi Wang. 2008. SD-MAC: Design and synthesis of a hardware-efficient collision-free QoS-aware MAC protocol for wireless network-on-chip. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* 57, 9 (2008), 1230–1245.
- [87] Dan Zhao, Yi Wang, Jian Li, and Takamaro Kikkawa. 2011. Design of multi-channel wireless NoC to improve on-chip communication capacity!. In *Proceedings of the Fifth ACM/IEEE International Symposium*. IEEE, 177–184.
- [88] Jun Zhou, Mengquan Li, Pengxing Guo, and Weichen Liu. 2020. Mitigation of tampering attacks for MR-based thermal sensing in optical NoCs. In *2020 IEEE Computer Society Annual Symposium on VLSI (ISVLSI)*. IEEE, 554–559.
- [89] Jun Zhou, Mengquan Li, Pengxing Guo, and Weichen Liu. 2021. Attack Mitigation of Hardware Trojans for Thermal Sensing via Micro-ring Resonator in Optical NoCs. *ACM Journal of Emerging Technologies in Computing System* 17, 3 (2021), 1–23.