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Abstract—Quantized neural networks (QNNs) are being actively researched as a solution for the computational complexity and memory intensity of deep neural networks. This has sparked efforts to develop algorithms that support both inference and training with quantized weight and activation values without sacrificing accuracy. A recent example is the GXNOR framework for stochastic training of ternary and binary neural networks. In this paper, we introduce a novel hardware synapse circuit that uses magnetic tunnel junction (MTJ) devices to support the GXNOR training. Our solution enables processing near memory (PNM) of QNNs, therefore can further reduce the data movements from and into the memory. We simulated MTJ-based stochastic training of a TNN over the MNIST and SVHN datasets and achieved an accuracy of 98.61% and 93.99%, respectively.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Deep neural networks (DNNs) are the state-of-the-art solution for a wide range of applications, such as image and natural language processing. The classic DNN approach requires frequent memory accesses and is compute-intensive, i.e., it requires numerous multiply and accumulate (MAC) operations. For example, computing the first fully connected layer of VGG16 [1], which has 8192 × 4096 synapses, requires 32 million MAC operations, while storing and accessing 128MB of weights. As such, DNN performance is limited by computing resources and power budget. Therefore, efforts have been made to design dedicated hardware for DNNs [2–4]. Those solutions support training with high resolution such as 32-bit floating point. Still, DNN models are power hungry and not suited to run on low-power devices.

Ternary neural networks (TNNs) and binary neural networks (BNNs) are being explored as a way to reduce the computational complexity and memory footprint of DNNs. By reducing the weight resolution and activation function precision to quantized binary \{-1, 1\} or ternary \{-1, 0, 1\} values, the MAC operations are replaced by much less demanding logic operations, and the number of required memory accesses is significantly reduced. Such networks are also known as quantized neural networks (QNNs) [5]. This insight triggered recent research efforts to design novel algorithms that can support binary and/or ternary DNNs without sacrificing accuracy. Recently, the GXNOR algorithm for training such networks was proposed [6]. This algorithm uses a stochastic update function to facilitate the training phase. Unlike other algorithms [5, 7, 8], GXNOR does not require keeping the full value (e.g., in a floating point format) of the weights and activations. Hence, GXNOR enables further reduction of the memory capacity during the training phase.

Emerging memory technologies such as Spin-Transfer Torque Magnetic Tunnel Junction (STT-MTJ) or other memristive technologies such as Resistive RAM (RRAM), can be used to design dedicated hardware to support in-situ DNN training, with parallel and energy efficient operations. Furthermore, the near-memory computation enabled by these technologies reduces overall data movement. The MTJ is a binary device, with two stable resistance states. Switching the MTJ device between resistance states is a stochastic process, but this property limits the use of STT-MTJ device as a memory cell. Previous works have used the stochastic behavior of the STT-MTJ, or other memristive technologies such as Resistive RAM (RRAM), to implement hardware accelerators for BNNs [9–12]. In [9], the focus was on the architecture level of BNN accelerators, but without supporting online training. Other works have implemented hardware for bio-inspired artificial neural networks (ANNs), using the spike-timing-dependent plasticity (STDP) training rule [10, 11]. Although STDP is widely used for bio-inspired ANN, common DNNs are trained with gradient-based optimization such as stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and adaptive moment estimation (ADAM) [13].

A recently proposed MTJ-based binary synapse composed of a single transistor and a single MTJ device (1T1R) [12] supports QNNs with binary weights still using real values to represent the activations. The implementation requires two update operations to execute the SGD updates. Using real-valued activation will require digital-to-analog converters, which will increase the area and power consumption of the proposed solution.

In this paper, we explore the stochastic behavior of the MTJ and use it to support GXNOR training. We leverage the stochastic process to support the GXNOR algorithm. We propose a four-transistor two-MTJ (4T2R) circuit for a ternary stochastic synapse and a two-transistor single-MTJ (2T1R) circuit for a binary stochastic synapse, where the intrinsic stochastic switching behavior of the MTJ is used to perform the GXNOR stochastic update function. Such a design enables highly parallel and energy efficient accurate in-situ computation. Our designed synapse can support various DNN optimization algorithms, such as SGD and ADAM, which are used regularly in practical applications.

We evaluated the TNN and BNN training using the MTJ-based synapse with PyTorch over the MNIST [14] and
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SVHN [15] data-sets, where the circuit parameters were extracted from SPICE simulations using a GlobalFoundries 28nm FD-SOI process. Our results show that using the MTJ-based synapse for training yielded similar results as the ideal GXNOR algorithm, with a small accuracy loss of 0.7% for the TNN and 2.4% for the BNN. Moreover, the proposed hardware design is energy efficient, achieving 18.3 $\frac{TOPs}{W}$ for feedforward and 3 $\frac{TOPs}{W}$ for weight update.

This paper makes the following contributions:

- Exploit the MTJ stochastic properties to support QNN stochastic training based on the GXNOR framework. We showed that PNM of stochastic QNN training is possible using the MTJ-based synapse with small accuracy reduction.
- Suggested an MTJ-based ternary and binary synapse circuits. Those circuits 1) exploit the stochastic switching of the MTJ device to support stochastic weight update algorithm, 2) support in-situ weights update. The proposed solution can support standard optimization algorithms such as SGD and ADAM without reading the weight data out of the synapse array. 3) support near memory processing of the feedforward, and backpropagation computations.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sections II and III background on MTJ and the GXNOR algorithm is given. Section IV describes the proposed MTJ-based ternary synapse. In Section V we explain how to modify the proposed circuits to support BNNs. In Section VI the proposed circuits are evaluated for their ability to support TNN training and their energy efficiency. We conclude in Section VII.

II. GXNOR ALGORITHM

In recent years, efforts have been made to make DNN models more efficient and hardware compatible. Compression methods have been explored, where the DNN weights and activation functions are constrained to discrete values such as binary $\{-1,1\}$ or ternary $\{-1,0,1\}$. The MAC operations in TNNs and BNNs are replaced with the simpler XOR logic operations, and the memory footprint of the network is reduced dramatically. The GXNOR algorithm is a framework for constraining the weights and activations to the quantized space while training the QNN [6]. This section describes the GXNOR framework and focuses on the framework’s differences compared to regular DNN training.

Quantized Weights and Activations: The quantized space is defined by

$$Z_N = \{ z^N_n | z^N_n = \left( \frac{n}{2^{N-1}} - 1 \right), n = 0, 1, ..., 2^N \} ,$$

where $N$ is a non-negative integer which defines the space values and $z^N_n \in [-1,1]$. For example, the binary space is given for $N = 0$ and the ternary space for $N = 1$. The quantized space resolution, the distance between two adjacent states, is given by

$$\Delta z_N = \frac{1}{2^{N-1}}$$

Feedforward: The quantized activation is a step function, where the number of steps is defined by the space. To support backpropagation through the quantized activations, the derivative of the activation function is approximated. In this work we used a simple window function which replaces the ideal derivative, given by a sum of delta functions. The window function is given by

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_r(x)}{\partial x} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2a}, & \text{if } r - a \leq x \leq r + a, \\ 0, & \text{others} \end{cases}$$

where $r$, $a$ are positive parameters, defining the sparsity of the neurons and the window in the neighborhood of $x$, respectively. $\varphi_r$ is the discrete activation function. Using the approximated derivative, the backpropagation algorithm, thus the error value, compute with no further changes.

Weight Update: To support training with weights constrained to the discrete weight space (DWS), the GXNOR algorithm uses a stochastic gradient-based method to update the weights. First, a boundary function is defined to guarantee that the updated value will not exceed the $[-1, 1]$ range. The boundary function is

$$\varphi(\Delta W_{ij}^l(k)) = \begin{cases} \min(1 - W_{ij}^l(k), \Delta W_{ij}^l(k)), & \text{if } \Delta W_{ij}^l(k) > 0, \\ \max(-1 - W_{ij}^l(k), \Delta W_{ij}^l(k)), & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

where $W_{ij}^l$ is the synaptic weight between neuron $j$ and neuron $i$ of the following layer $(l+1)$, $\Delta W_{ij}^l$ is the gradient based update value, and $k$ is the update iteration. Then, the update function is

$$W_{ij}^l(k + 1) = W_{ij}^l(k) + \Delta w_{ij}^l(k),$$

where $\Delta w_{ij}^l(k) = P(\varphi(\Delta W_{ij}^l(k)) \in Z)$ is the discrete update value, obtained by projecting $\varphi(\Delta W_{ij}^l(k))$ to a quantized weight space. $P(\varphi)$ is a probabilistic projection function defined by

$$P(\varphi) = \begin{cases} \kappa_{ij} \Delta z_N + \text{sign}(\varphi)\Delta z_N, & \text{w.p. } \tau(\nu_{ij}), \\ \kappa_{ij} \Delta z_N, & \text{w.p. } 1 - \tau(\nu_{ij}) \end{cases},$$

where $\kappa_{ij}$ and $\nu_{ij}$ are, respectively, the quotient and the remainder values of $\varphi(\Delta W_{ij}^l(k))$ divided by $\Delta z_N$, and

$$\tau(\nu) = \tanh\left( m \cdot \frac{|\nu|}{\Delta z_N} \right), \tau(\nu) \in [0, 1],$$

where $m$ is a positive adjustment factor. Hence,

$$\Delta w_{ij}^l = \kappa_{ij} \Delta z_N + \text{sign}(\nu_{ij}) \text{Bern}(\tau(\nu_{ij})) \Delta z_N,$$

where $\text{Bern}(\tau(\nu_{ij}))$ is a Bernoulli variable with parameter $\tau(\nu_{ij})$.

In this work, we focus on TNN and BNN. The binary weight space (BWS) is given by $N = 0$ and $\Delta z_0 = 2$. The ternary weight space (TWS) is given by $N = 1$ and $\Delta z_1 = 1$. Figure I illustrates examples of TNN and BNN weight update for $W = -1$ and $W = 0$. 
III. MAGNETIC TUNNEL JUNCTION

An MTJ device is composed of two ferromagnetic layers, a fixed magnetization layer and a free magnetization layer, separated by an insulator layer. The resistance of the device is defined by the relative magnetization of the free layer as compared to the fixed layer. A parallel magnetization state (P) leads to low resistance ($R_{on}$) and an anti-parallel state (AP) leads to high resistance ($R_{off}$). The device resistance can be switched by the current flow through the device. The switching probability of the MTJ device depends on the current pulse, when three work regimes are defined: 1) low current, 2) intermediate current, and 3) high current [11]. For fast switching time, this work focuses on the high current regime, where the current $I$ is substantially higher than the critical current $I_{cr}$, given by

$$I_{cr} = \frac{2|e| \alpha V (1 \pm P)}{h} \mu_0 M_s M_{eff} \frac{\pi}{2}$$

(9)

where $\alpha$, $M_s$, $V$, $P$, $M_{eff}$ are, respectively, the Gilbert damping, the saturation magnetization, the free layer volume, the spin polarization of the current, and the effective magnetization [16]. The switching time is

$$\tau = \frac{2}{\alpha \gamma \mu_0 M_s} \frac{I_{cr}}{I - I_{cr}} \log\left(\frac{\pi}{2|\theta|}\right),$$

(10)

where $\gamma$ is the gyromagnetic ratio, and $\theta$ is the initial magnetization angle [16], given by a normal distribution $\theta \sim N(0, \theta_0)$, $\theta_0 = \sqrt{k_B T/(\mu_0 H_k M_s V)}$, where $H_k$ is the shape anisotropy field.

A. STOCHASTIC WEIGHT UPDATE USING MTJ

The MTJ conductivity represents the quantized synapse weight (see Section V-A for details). Therefore, we control the MTJ switching process to support the GXNOR weight update. The update is done in the high current domain to guarantee fast update operation. To switch the MTJ device a voltage pulse, $V_{up}$, is dropped over the device, for time interval, $\Delta t$. The resulted current direction sets the switching probability. Using equation (10) and the voltage pulse, the switching probability of the MTJ is given by

$$P_{sw} = P(\Delta t > \tau) = 1 - erf\left(\frac{\pi}{2 \sqrt{2} \theta_0 \exp\left(\frac{\Delta V_{up}}{CT}\right)}\right),$$

(11)

where $C = 2I_{cr}/\alpha \gamma \mu_0 M_s$, and $R$ is the resistance of the device.

IV. MTJ-BASED TERNARY SYNAPSES

In this section, we describe the proposed ternary synapse circuit to support stochastic GXNOR training. We leverage the stochastic behavior of the MTJ device to support the stochastic update function. In the following section (Section V), we explain how the proposed synapse can support binary weights as well.

A. PROPOSED SYNAPSE CIRCUIT AND SYNAPSE ARRAY

Synapse Circuit: The schematic of the proposed ternary synapse is shown in Figure 2a. The ternary synapse is composed of two MTJ devices connected together in their fixed layer port. The free layer port of each MTJ is connected to two access transistors. This synapse is similar to our previous work [17, 18], where the RRAM is replaced by the MTJ device, and two synapse structure are added together to support the ternary weight. Compare to [17, 18], which supports full precision weight values, the following section describes how this designed is optimized to support quantized weights.

Synapse Weight: Table I lists the different values of the synapse weight, $W$. This weight is defined and stored as the combination of the two MTJs resistances. The zero state in our ternary synapse has two representations, as opposed to one in a regular ternary synapse. Moreover, thanks to the bistability of the MTJ, the proposed synapse value is limited to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$; thus, the boundary function in (4) is enforced by the hardware synapse.

Synapse Array: The synapse circuit described in Fig 2a is the basic cells of an array structure, as shown in Figure 2b. The synapses are arranged in a $M \times N$ array, where each synapse is indexed by $(n, m)$. Each synapse in column $n \in [1, N]$ is connected to four inputs $\{u_{n1}, \bar{u}_{n1}, u_{n2}, \bar{u}_{n2}\}$ where all the input voltages are shared among all synapses in the same column. Likewise, each synapse in row $m \in [1, M]$ is connected to control signals $\{\bar{v}_{m(1,n)}, \bar{v}_{m(1,p)}, v_{m(2,n)}, \bar{v}_{m(2,p)}\}$. The control signals are shared among all synapses in the same row. The synapse located in $(m, n)$ produce an output current $I_{nn}$ which contrib to current through output row $m$. The operations on the synapse array are done in the analog domain, accumulated according to Kirchoff’s current law (KCL), where the GXNOR output is represented by the current.

B. TRAINING TNN

1) Gated XNOR and Feedforward: To perform the gated-XNOR logic operation between the synapse and activation values [6], we denote the input neuron values as the voltage sources. The logic values $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ are represented by $u \in \{-V_{rd}, 0, V_{rd}\}$, where $V_{rd}$ is set to guarantee the low...
current regime of an MTJ, so the switching probability is negligible. During this operation, \( u_1 = u \) and \( u_2 = -u \) are connected and the synapse output node is grounded. The result is the output current sign,

\[
I_{out} = (G_1 - G_2)u, \tag{12}
\]

where \( G_{1,2} \) are the conductance of the two MTJs. As listed in Table I, the polarity of \( I_{out} \) depends on the input voltage and the synapse weight. If \( u = 0 \) or \( W = \{0_w, 0_s\} \), the output current is \( I_{out} \approx 0 \). If the weight and input have the same polarity, then \( sign(I_{out}) = 1 \) else \( sign(I_{out}) = -1 \).

To perform feedforward with the GXNOR operation, we need to compute

\[
O_m = \sum_{n=1}^{N} GXNOR(w_{mn}, a_n), \forall m \in [1, M] \tag{13}
\]

where \( O_m \) is row \( n \) result. To that aim, each column voltage is mapped to the corresponding input activation \( u_m = V(a_m) \) \( \forall m \in [1, M] \) and the array row outputs are connected to ground potential and the output currents from all synapses are summed based on KCL. Thus, the current through row \( i \) is

\[
I_{row,i} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( G_{ij,R_1} - G_{ij,R_2} \right) u_j = \frac{R_{off} - R_{on}}{R_{off}R_{on}} (N_{+1,i} - N_{-1,i}) V_{rd}, \tag{14}
\]

where \( G_{ij,R_{1,2}} \) is the conductivity of each MTJ, \( N \) is the number of synapses per row, \( N_{+1,i} \) is the total number of positive products in row \( i \), and \( N_{-1,i} \) is the total number of negative products in row \( i \).

2) Synapse Weight Update: Unlike updating regular DNN, the proposed synapse supports the quantized update scheme suggested in [6]. The synapse weight update is done in the high current domain, guaranteed by the update input voltage \( V_{up} \) for the update period marked by \( T_{up} \). \( T_{up} \) is set to guarantee that if \( \Delta t = T_{up} \) then Eq. \((11)\) results \( \Delta w = F(V_{up}) \approx 1 \). As mention in Section III-A, the weight update is influenced by the current direction and the time interval in which the current flows through the MTJs.

To update the ternary synapse weight we need to update both MTJ devices while supporting the GXNOR update scheme. We used the control signals to set the current direction and the voltage pulse time interval. We consider two update cases: 1) supporting general optimization algorithms, and 2) supporting the SGD algorithms.

Support of General Optimization Algorithms: To support general optimization algorithms the update value, \( \Delta W \) is computed outside the synapse array. The array columns are updated iteratively, i.e., a single synapse array column is updated at each iteration. During this operation, the input voltages are set to \( u_1 = u_2 = V_{up} > 0 \) for all the synapse columns. To support the probabilistic projection (Section II), the control signals are given by

\[
e_{1,p} = -e_{2,p} = -\text{sign}(\Delta W_{ij})V_{dd}, \quad \text{if} \quad \kappa_{ij} \neq 0
\]

\[
e_{1,p} = e_{2,p} = V_{dd}, \quad \text{else}
\]

\[
e_{1,n} = \begin{cases} 
-\text{sign}(\Delta W_{ij})V_{dd}, & 0 < t < |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} \\
-V_{dd}, & |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} < t < T_{up} 
\end{cases} \tag{16}
\]

\[
e_{2,n} = \begin{cases} 
\text{sign}(\Delta W_{ij})V_{dd}, & 0 < t < |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} \\
-V_{dd}, & |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} < t < T_{up} 
\end{cases} \tag{17}
\]

where \( \Delta W, \nu, \) and \( \kappa \) were defined in Section II. Hence, the MTJ is updated proportionally to \( \kappa_{ij} = |\Delta W_{ij}| \) and
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\[ \nu_{ij} = \text{Remainder}(\Delta W_{ij}), \] meaning that for a single synapse, one MTJ is updated using a pulse width of \( \Delta t = |\kappa_{ij}|T_{up} \) and the other with \( \Delta t = |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} \). We assume that the \( \kappa \) and \( \nu \) data are inputs to the synapse array. Using this work scheme, the synapse weight is updated as follows. \( \kappa_{ij} \) is an integer, so if \( \kappa_{ij} \neq 0 \), then the MTJ switching probability is approximately 1 and can be described as an indicator variable \( \text{sign}(\kappa_{ij}) \mathbb{I}_{\kappa_{ij} \neq 0} \). \( \nu_{ij} \) is a fraction, so the switching probability of the MTJ with respect to \( \nu_{ij} \) is a Bernoulli variable with probability \( P_{sw}(\nu_{ij}) \). Thus, the MTJ-based synapse update is given by \( \Delta w_{ij} = \text{sign}(\Delta W_{ij})(\mathbb{I}_{\kappa_{ij} \neq 0} + \text{Bern}(P_{sw}(\nu_{ij}))) \); see examples in Section IV-C.

Support of Stochastic Gradient Descent: This update scheme is similar to the update scheme proposed in [4]. When the SGD algorithm is used to train the network, all the synapses in the array are updated in parallel. To support SGD training, minor changes need to be made to the general update scheme. Using SGD, the update is given by the gradient value, and the effective update duration are set as a function of \( y \) (the voltage source is selected according to \( u \)).

The functionality of the control signals remains unchanged, and the voltage source is selected according to \( u \). The voltage sign and the effective update duration are set as a function of \( \kappa \). \( u \) is the input. For TNN and BNN, the input activations are \( u \in \{-1,0,1\} = \{-V_{dd},0,V_{up}\} \) and \( u \in \{-1,1\} = \{-V_{dd},V_{up}\} \), respectively; thus, \( \Delta w_{ij} = y_{i}u_{j} = \text{sign}(u_{j})y_{i} \) or \( \Delta w_{ij} = 0 \) for \( u = 0 \). In this scheme, the voltage sources keep the activation values, so \( u_{1} = u_{2} = u \) (whereas in the general scheme the voltage sources are set to \( u_{1} = u_{2} = V_{dd} \)).

The control signals are the error \( y \), whereas in ADAM and other optimization algorithms they are a function of the update value \( \Delta W \). The control signal functionality for SGD is

\[
    e_{1,p} = -e_{2,p} = -\text{sign}(y_{i})V_{dd}, \quad \text{if} \quad \kappa_{ij} \neq 0
\]

\[
    e_{1,p} = e_{2,p} = V_{dd}, \quad \text{else}
\]

\[
    e_{1,n} = \begin{cases} 
    -\text{sign}(y_{i})V_{dd}, & 0 < t < |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} \\
    -V_{dd}, & |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} < t < T_{up}
    \end{cases}
\]

\[
    e_{2,n} = \begin{cases} 
    \text{sign}(y_{i})V_{dd}, & 0 < t < |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} \\
    -V_{dd}, & |\nu_{ij}|T_{up} < t < T_{up}
    \end{cases}
\]

The functionality of the control signals remains unchanged, the voltage source is selected according to \( y \), and the voltage sign and the effective update duration are set as a function of \( \kappa \) and \( \nu \), the integer and remainder values of \( y \), respectively. Therefore, the update equation is given by

\[
    \Delta w_{ij} = \text{sign}(y_{i})\text{sign}(u_{j})(\mathbb{I}_{\kappa_{ij} \neq 0} + \text{Bern}(P_{sw}(\nu_{ij})))
\]

3) Inverse Read: To train the TNN, backpropagation of the error must be performed. Thus, an inverse matrix vector multiplication \( W^{T}y \) is supported. Similarly to [4], we use the output row interface as an input. This allows reusing the same synapse array. Due to the synapse structure, the data is separated into two columns, as shown in Figure 2c. The output current, \( I_{x,R_{1}} - I_{x,R_{2}} \), is converted to voltage using a voltage comparator.

C. Ternary Synapse Update Examples

To clarify the update scheme proposed in this paper, two examples of synapse updates are given.

1) Example 1: Figure 3a shows the case where a synapse weight is \(-1\), and the update value is 1.5. Thus, \( k = 1 \) and \( v = 0.5 \). In that case, \( |\Delta W| \neq 0 \) and \( \text{sign}(\Delta W) = 1 \). Hence, \( e_{1,p} = -e_{2,p} = -V_{dd} \); therefore, \( P_{1} \) is ON and \( P_{2} \) is OFF for time interval \( T_{up} \). Hence, \( P_{sw,1} \approx 1 \). \( e_{1,n} = -V_{dd} \) for \( T_{up} \) and \( e_{2,n} \) is ON for 0.5\( T_{up} \), as given by

\[
    e_{2,n} = \begin{cases} 
    V_{dd} & 0 < t < 0.5T_{up} \\
    -V_{dd} & 0.5T_{up} < t < T_{up}
    \end{cases}
\]

Therefore, \( R_{2} \) will switch with probability \( P_{sw,2} = P(\frac{0.5T_{up}V_{dd}}{R_{sw}}) \). In this example, the synapse weight will be updated from \(-1 \rightarrow 0 \) with probability

\[
    P_{-1 \rightarrow 0} = P_{-1 \rightarrow 0,w} + P_{-1 \rightarrow 0,n} = P_{sw,1}(1 - P_{sw,2}) + (1 - P_{sw,1})(1 - P_{sw,2}) \approx (1 - P_{sw,2})
\]

and might switch to 1 with probability

\[
    P_{-1 \rightarrow 1} = P_{sw,1}P_{sw,2} \approx P_{sw,2}.
\]

Note that when \( W = -1 \), \( \{R_{1},R_{2}\} = \{R_{off},R_{on}\} \). Thus, if \( \Delta W < 0 \), the current flow direction will be from \( R_{2} \) to \( R_{1} \) and the MTJ cannot switch.

2) Example 2: Figure 3b shows the case where a synapse weight is \( 0_{w} \), and the update value is \(-0.5 \). Thus, \( k = 0 \) and \( v = -0.5 \). Hence, \( |\Delta W| \neq 0 \) and \( \text{sign}(\Delta W) = -1 \). Consequently, \( e_{1,p} = e_{2,p} = V_{dd} \); so both \( P_{1} \) and \( P_{2} \) are closed for \( T_{up} \). \( e_{2,n} = -V_{dd} \) for \( T_{up} \), and \( e_{1,n} \) is open for 0.5\( T_{up} \), as given by

\[
    e_{1,n} = \begin{cases} 
    V_{dd} & 0 < t < 0.5T_{up} \\
    -V_{dd} & 0.5T_{up} < t < T_{up}
    \end{cases}
\]

Therefore, \( R_{1} \) will switch with probability \( P_{sw,1} = P(\frac{0.5T_{up}V_{dd}}{R_{sw}}) \). In this example, the synapse weight is updated from \( 0_{w} \rightarrow -1 \) with probability \( P = P_{sw,1} \). Although theoretically no current should flow through \( R_{2} \), with probability \( P_{sw,2} \approx 0 \) it might switch from \( R_{on} \) to \( R_{off} \) due to leakage currents. It is important to note that the switching probability is a function of the resistance; therefore, the switching probability of \( 0_{w} = \{R_{off},R_{off}\} \) is lower than \( 0_{w} = \{R_{on},R_{on}\} \).

V. SUPPORT FOR BINARY NEURAL NETWORKS

In this section, we discuss how the proposed ternary synapse can support BNN. We address the changes that must be applied to the circuits to support binary weights.

A. MTJ-Based Binary Synapses

To support BNN instead of TNN, the GXNOR operation is replaced by a simple XNOR operation and the quantized space resolution is \( \Delta w = 2 \).

1) Proposed Synapse Circuit and Synapse Array:
Synapse Circuit: To support BWS, a 2T1R synapse is used as illustrated in Figure 4a. This synapse structure is similar to the synapse circuit suggested in our previous work, which used a resistive RAM device (RRAM) instead of an MTJ device [19, 20]. To reuse the ternary synapse proposed in this work to support binary weights, one “branch” of the synapse array is deactivated (see Figure 4b). To represent ±1 values, a reference resistor $R_{\text{ref}} = (\frac{G_{\text{on}}+G_{\text{off}}}{2})^{-1}$ is added per synapse, and is connected in parallel to $\nu$ of the corresponding synapse.

It seems that the ternary synapse could have been separated to two binary synapses with $e_{1,n} = e_{2,n}$ and $e_{1,p} = e_{2,p}$. Unfortunately, due to the use of the comparator, the ternary array cannot support the inverse read from all the columns; thus, it cannot support the backpropagation when the ternary synapse is split to two binary synapses (see Figure 4c). The 2T1R synapse can be used to design a dedicated engine for BNN; such a design does not need the comparators.

Synapse Weight: Table II defines the values of the weights when a 2T1R synapse is used. MTJ resistance of $R_{\text{on}}$ leads to $W = 1$ and resistance of $R_{\text{off}}$ leads to $W = -1$. To compute the XNOR operation between the weights and activation $\nu u$, the synapse current is compared to the reference value $I_{\text{ref}} = -\nu u G_{\text{ref}} = -\nu u\frac{G_{\text{on}}+G_{\text{off}}}{2}$. The result of the XNOR operation is given in the right column of Table II. While other methods to support binary weights can be considered (for example, using the resistance threshold value to separate the ±1 weight values), this solution was chosen due to the low ratio between $R_{\text{off}}$ and $R_{\text{on}}$, which is a common property of MTJ devices.

Synapse Array: If the proposed synapse array is used, each weight can use only one branch of the ternary synapse; thus the synapse can represent only a single bit, and half of the array is deactivated using binary mode. Similarly to the method in [19], the reference resistors added to each row are located together (see Figure 4e) and are active only during the feedforward phase of the BNN ($e_{br} = \nu' 0'$).

B. Training BNN

1) XNOR and Feedforward: As in the GXNOR operation, we denote the input neuron values as the voltage sources. The logic values $\{-1, 1\}$ are represented by $u \in \{-V_{\text{rd}}, V_{\text{rd}}\}$. The result of each XNOR operation is

$$I_{\text{out}} = G u,$$

where $G$ is the conductance of the MTJ. During feedforward, the control signal $e_{br} = \nu' 1'$, and hence the reference resistors are connected and the current through each row is

$$I_{\text{row}, i} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} G_{ij} u_j + \sum_{j=1}^{N} G_{ij} u_j = \frac{R_{\text{off}} - R_{\text{on}}}{2R_{\text{off}}R_{\text{on}}} (N_{+1,i} - N_{-1,i}) V_{\text{rd}},$$

where $G_{ij}$ is the MTJ conductivity of synapse $j$ in row $i$, $M$ is the number of synapses per row, $M_{+1,i}$ is the total number of positive products in row $i$, and $M_{-1,i}$ is the total number of negative products in row $i$.

2) Weight Update: In a manner similar to the TNN update scheme suggested in the paper, the MTJ device of each binary synapse is updated to support the GXNOR algorithm [6]. Figure II illustrates two update examples for the binary weights using the GXNOR algorithm.

The control signal must have the following functionality: if $\kappa_{ij} = |\Delta W_{ij}/2| \neq 0$, a switch will occur with probability $P_{\text{sw}} \approx 1$; otherwise the switching probability is a function of $\nu_{ij} = \text{reminder}(\Delta W_{ij}/2)$.

The control signals are set as follows. First, the reference resistors are disconnected, and thus $e_{br} = \nu' 0'$. The row control signals are

$$e_{2,n} = -V_{\text{dd}},
\begin{align*}
e_{2,p} &= V_{\text{dd}},
\end{align*}$$

so branch 2 of each synapse is deactivated. Signals $e_{1,p}$ and $e_{1,n}$, which control the weight update, are given by

$$e_{1,p} = \begin{cases} -\text{sign}(\Delta W_{ij}) V_{\text{dd}}, & 0 < t < \psi T_{\text{up}} \\ V_{\text{dd}}, & \psi T_{\text{up}} < t < T_{\text{up}} \end{cases},
\begin{align*}
e_{1,n} &= \begin{cases} -\text{sign}(\Delta W_{ij}) V_{\text{dd}}, & 0 < t < \psi T_{\text{up}} \\ -V_{\text{dd}}, & \psi T_{\text{up}} < t < T_{\text{up}} \end{cases}
\end{align*}$$

where $\psi = \max(|\kappa_{ij}|, |\nu_{ij}|)$.

3) Inverse Read: To compute the value of each multiplication, the current read from the activated synapse must be compared to the reference value $I_{\text{ref}} = -y G_{\text{ref}} = -y\frac{G_{\text{on}}+G_{\text{off}}}{2}$. As in the feedforward solution, a reference resistor is added per synapse in the column, and voltage $y$ is applied across it. The resistors are located together as illustrated in Figure 4c and are connected to the row only if $e_{\text{Bip}} = \nu' 1'$. Thus, the current comparator will compute

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} (I_{i,R_i} - I_{i,\text{ref}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left( G_{ij} - \frac{G_{\text{on}} + G_{\text{off}}}{2} \right) y_i,$$

where $N$ is the number of synapses per column.
VI. EVALUATION AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

This section presents the evaluation of the MTJ-based training performance. The synapse circuit and array are evaluated and the circuit parameters and behavior were extracted and used for the training simulations. In this section, the software and the MTJ-based implementations of the GXNOR algorithm are referred to as GXNOR and MTJ-GXNOR, respectively.

A. Circuit Evaluation

The synapse circuit was designed and evaluated in Cadence Virtuoso for the GlobalFoundries 28nm FD-SOI process. The MTJ device is based on device C from [16] and its parameters are listed in Table III. To achieve higher switching probability, the magnetization saturation ($M_s$) was changed according to [21]. The read voltage, $V_{rd}$, was set to guarantee a low-current regime and negligible switching probability for the feedforward and inverse read operations. Likewise, the update voltage, $V_{up}$, was set to guarantee a high-current regime. The update time period was set to match $P_{sw} \approx 1$.

1) MTJ Switching Simulation: To evaluate the MTJ transition resistance and the impact of the MTJ transient response on the synapse circuit operation, we ran a Monte-Carlo simulation of the MTJ operation. The simulation numerically solves the Landau–Lifshitz–Gilbert (LLG) [11, 22] differential equation (assuming the MTJ is a single magnetic domain) with the addition of a stochastic term for the thermal fluctuations [23] and Slonczewski’s STT term [24]. For each iteration of the Monte-Carlo simulation, a different random sequence was introduced to the LLG equation and the resulting MTJ resistance trace was retrieved. The equation was solved using a standard midpoint scheme [25] and interpreted in the sense of Stratonovich, assuming no external magnetic field [26] and a voltage pulse waveform. The resistance of the MTJ was taken as $R_{on}$, which is the spin polarization of the current. To approximate the time-variation resistance of an MTJ during the switch between states, all the traces from the Monte-Carlo simulation were aligned using the first time that the resistance of the MTJ reached $\frac{R_{on} + R_{off}}{2}$. After the alignment, a mean trace was extracted and used for the fit. This fit was used as the time-variation resistance when the MTJ made a state switch.

2) Circuit Schematic Model: The transistor and the interconnect affect the circuit performance and operations. Therefore, we adopt the circuit model illustrated in Figure 5 which considers the parasitic resistance and capacitance. We considered the corner cases (i.e., the synapses located at the four corners of the synapse array) to evaluate the effect of the wires and transistors on operation results, latency and power consumption. For the following circuit simulations, we considered the worst case where the wire resistance and capacitance are the most significant (i.e., for an array of size $M \times N$, the synapse located at [M,1]).
TABLE III
Circuit Parameters [16]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a$ [nm]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>( T )</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$ [nm]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>( R_{on} ) [( \Omega )]</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_f$ [nm]</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>( R_{off} ) [( \Omega )]</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu_0 M_s ) [T](^{1})</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\) To achieve higher switching probability, the value of $\mu_0 M_s$ was changed according to [21].

TABLE IV
ACCURACY OF STATE-OF-THE-ART ALGORITHMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Datasets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNNS [7]</td>
<td>MNIST: 98.6% SVHN: 97.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWNs [8]</td>
<td>MNIST: 98.82% SVHN: 97.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNOR TNN [6]</td>
<td>MNIST: 99.32% SVHN: 94.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNOR BNN [6]</td>
<td>MNIST: 98.54% SVHN: 91.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTJ-GXNOR TNN</td>
<td>MNIST: 98.61% SVHN: 93.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTJ-GXNOR Bin-Activation</td>
<td>MNIST: 98.6% SVHN: 93.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTJ-GXNOR BNN Full</td>
<td>MNIST: 97.84% SVHN: 89.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE V
TEST ACCURACY VS. PROCESS VARIATION FOR MNIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSD</th>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>( \theta_0 )</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>( \theta_0 )</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>98.61%</td>
<td>98.61%</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>94.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>98.13%</td>
<td>97.98%</td>
<td>0.1141</td>
<td>94.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>98.13%</td>
<td>97.92%</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>97.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>97.98%</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>98.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>98.15%</td>
<td>98.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>97.94%</td>
<td>98.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VI
TEST ACCURACY VS. \( \theta_0 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \theta_0 ) [rad]</th>
<th>Test Accu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>94.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1141</td>
<td>94.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2739</td>
<td>97.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>98.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Sensitivity to Process Variation

Variation in the device parameters and environment may affect the performance of the proposed circuits. In this section, we evaluate the sensitivity of the TNN training performance to process variation.

1) Resistance Variation and \( \theta \) Distribution Variation: Two cases of process variation were considered: 1) resistance variation; and 2) variation in \( \theta \) distribution. Variation in the device resistance and \( \theta \) distribution may lead to different switching probability per MTJ device. To evaluate the sensitivity of the training to the device-to-device variation, we simulated the MNIST-architecture training with variations in the resistance and \( \theta \) distributions. Several Gaussian variabilities were examined with different relative standard deviations (RSD). Table [V] lists the training accuracy for resistance variation and \( \theta \) variation. According to [11], the resistance RSD was found to be approximately 5%, while our simulations show that the training accuracy is robust to the resistance variation even for higher RSD values (e.g. only 0.46% accuracy degradation for RSD = 30%). The training accuracy is more sensitive to variations in \( \theta \). Nevertheless, high standard deviation of \( \theta \) values results in better training accuracy. We concluded that the performance of the MTJ-GXNOR algorithm improves for higher variations in \( \theta \). Table [VI] lists the training results for different \( \theta_0 \) values; the \( \theta_0 \) value used in this work is marked in bold. Larger \( \theta_0 \) values, which correspond to higher randomness of the MTJ switching process, yield better accuracy.

2) Sensitivity to Voltage Non-Ideality: The operation most sensitive to voltage variation is the weight update operation, where the update probability is a function of the voltage drop across the MTJ device. Therefore, in this section we evaluate the test accuracy obtained for variation in the voltage source. Increasing the voltage leads to higher switching probability and \( \theta_0 \) variance. Hence, increasing the voltage magnitude increases the randomness of the MTJ switching. Therefore, the voltage magnitude can be used to improve the stochastic switching process and to improve the network training performance when using an MTJ device with low \( \theta_0 \) variance. In the case simulated in this work, increasing the voltage magnitude above \( V_{up} = 1.1V \) only slightly improves test accuracy; hence, in this work we set \( V_{up} = 1V \) to constrain the power consumption of our design.

3) Sensitivity to Temperature: The ambient temperature affects the switching behavior of the MTJ [28]. When the...
As mentioned in Section VI-C, the training performance is highly dependent on the variance of \( \theta \). Thus, to evaluate the sensitivity of the MTJ-GXNOR training to the ambient temperature, we focused on \( \theta_0 \), and left the resistance and drivability evaluation for future work. To estimate the sensitivity of the MTJ-based synapse to the temperature, we simulated MTJ-based training with different temperatures in the range [260\( K \), 373\( K \)], where the resistances are extrapolated to emulate the temperature dependence. Table VII lists the test accuracy obtained for different temperatures. Although better accuracy is obtained for higher temperatures, the training phase and network accuracy are robust to temperature variations. Figure 6 shows the test accuracy over the training phase for the MNIST network. Higher temperatures, which correspond to higher \( \theta_0 \), increase the convergence rate of the network while the network converges to similar test accuracy for all the temperatures in the examined range. Further research on how the ambient temperature affects the synapse circuit and array is left for future work.

D. Performance Evaluation

In this section, the power and area of TNNs execution is presented.

### D. Performance Evaluation

In this section, the power and area of TNNs execution is presented.

#### 1) TNN Power and Area: The power consumption and area were evaluated for a single synapse and synapse array, including the interconnect parasitics. The results are listed in Table VIII. During the read operation, all the synapses are read in parallel; therefore, the feedforward power is higher than the write power, where the columns are updated serially.

#### 2) Potential Performance: QNNs were proposed as a way to reduce the overall power consumption and complexity of the full precision DNNs; hence, we evaluated the energy efficiency (in units of \( \frac{\text{TOPs}}{W} \)) of our design. For the feedforward phase in a 128 \( \times \) 128 synapse array, 128 \( \times \) (128 + 128) GXNOR and accumulate operations are done in parallel (1\( \text{OP} \) = 1\( \text{b} \) GXNOR/Accumulate/update). Therefore, the synapse array can reach 2299\( \frac{\text{TOPs}}{W} \) in this phase. When performing update, we count each update as a single operation; the energy efficiency when updating the weights is thus 39\( \frac{\text{TOPs}}{W} \). During the update phase the voltage source is set to guarantee a high current domain; the energy efficiency of the update operation is therefore bounded by the MTJ device properties.

#### 3) System Performance (Test Case): To evaluate the performance of the synapse array when integrating our design to a full system, we consider the following (but not the only possible) setup, when the performance will change for different setups. A 128 \( \times \) 128 synapse array is used. The synapse array is used as an analog computation engine and as memory for the weights; hence, the input and output to the array are converted to using 1-bit DAC and 8-bit ADC (for the array dimensions the output of each row is in [−128, 128] and a 9 bit ADC is needed). To reduce the overhead, we assume for this discussion that [−127, 127] is sufficient, hence, a 8 bit ADC is sufficient). In the inverse read phase, we consider the bit-streaming method as suggested in [30] to compute the multiplication with the full-precision error data; thus, only a 1-bit DAC a 8-bit ADC are needed. To generate the control signals, an 8-bit DAC, and voltage comparators are needed. The power and area of those components are listed in Table IX. The respective energy efficiency in the feedforward and update phases is 18.3\( \frac{\text{TOPs}}{W} \) and 3\( \frac{\text{TOPs}}{W} \), where the power consumption of the data converters limits the overall performance. For the bit-streaming method [30] with 8-bit precision for the error data, the energy efficiency of the inverse read operation is 1.43\( \frac{\text{TOPs}}{W} \).

E. Comparison to Previous Work

Previous works that propose in-situ hardware implementations of BNN and TNN support only inference. In [32], a CMOS-based computation-near-memory (CNM) engine was designed and fabricated. The design’s energy efficiency during
Inference is $532\tops$. They assumed that the binary activation can be done immediately after the convolution, thus eliminating the ADC. Similar assumption for our setup will increase the inference energy efficiency of our design to $180\tops$. BNN inference without the need for an ADC is also supported in [33], where energy efficiency of $1326\tops$ was reported. In that work, a RRAM device is used instead of an MTJ. The RRAM-based synapse can use smaller access transistors than the MTJ-based device, which is current driven. Moreover, a 1T1R synapse is sufficient when supporting only inference, thus reducing the complexity and overall power consumption of each synapse.

In [12], a 1T1R and 1R structure were proposed, and the stochastic behavior of the MTJ was also leveraged to support in situ BNN training. Two update operations are required for the 1T1R and four for the 1R, whereas our synapse can perform positive and negative operations in parallel, thus requiring only one update operation. Moreover, full precision activations are used in [12]. As a result, a high resolution DAC is still necessary to convert the input value to voltages. Using the DAC circuits listed at Table IX, the 8-bit DAC consume $5 \times$ more energy than the 1-bit DAC. The power consumption and complexity of the synapse array are greater as a result.

### VII. Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a novel MTJ-based synapse circuit and showed that a QNN, and especially a TNN and BNN, can be trained using the MTJ-based synapse, without sacrificing accuracy. The proposed circuit enables in-situ, highly parallel and energy efficient execution of weight-related computation. Such a circuit can accelerate TNN inference and training execution on low-power devices, such as IoT and consumer devices. To fulfill the potential of the MTJ-based synapse, the next step is to integrate it into a full system design. Further research on the effects of environmental factors, such as temperature and magnetic fields, on circuit performance will be explored in future work.

### References


