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# Physical Design 



## Physical Design

$\square$ Physical design converts a circuit description into a geometric description.
$\square$ The description is used to manufacture a chip.
$\square$ Physical design cycle:

1. Logic partitioning
2. Floorplanning and placement
3. Routing
4. Compaction
$\square$ Others: circuit extraction, timing verification and design rule checking


## Physical Design Flow



A routing system

## Outline

$\square$ Partitioning
$\square$ Floorplanning
ロPlacement
$\square$ Routing
-Compaction

## Circuit Partitioning

$\square$ Course contents:

- Kernighang-Lin partitioning algorithm



## Circuit Partitioning

$\square$ Objective: Partition a circuit into parts such that every component is within a prescribed range and the \# of connections among the components is minimized.

- More constraints are possible for some applications.Cutset? Cut size? Size of a component?



## Problem Definition: Partitioning

$\square$ k-way partitioning: Given a graph $G(V, E)$, where each vertex $v \in V$ has a size $s(v)$ and each edge $e \in E$ has a weight $w(e)$, the problem is to divide the set V into K disjoint subsets $V_{1}, V_{2}, \ldots, V_{k}$, such that an objective function is optimized, subject to certain constraints.
$\square$ Bounded size constraint: The size of the i-th subset is bounded by $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{i}}$ (i.e., $\sum_{v \in V_{i}} s(v) \leq B_{i}$ ).

- Is the partition balanced?
$\square$ Min-cut cost between two subsets:
Minimize $\sum_{v e=(u, v) p(u) \neq p(v)} w(e)$, where $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{u})$ is the partition \# of node u.
$\square$ The 2-way, balanced partitioning problem is NP-complete, even in its simple form with identical vertex sizes and unit edge weights.


## Kernighan-Lin Algorithm

$\square$ Kernighan and Lin, "An efficient heuristic procedure for partitioning graphs," The Bell System Technical Journal, vol. 49, no. 2, Feb. 1970.
$\square$ An iterative, 2-way, balanced partitioning (bi-sectioning) heuristic.
$\square$ Till the cut size keeps decreasing
Vertex pairs which give the largest decrease or the smallest increase in cut size are exchanged.

- These vertices are then locked (and thus are prohibited from participating in any further exchanges).
- This process continues until all the vertices are locked.
- Find the set with the largest partial sum for swapping.

■ Unlock all vertices.

## K-L Algorithm: A Simple Example

$\square$ Each edge has a unit weight.

$\square$ Questions: How to compute cost reduction? What pairs to be swapped?

- Consider the change of internal \& external connections.


## Properties

Two sets $A$ and $B$ such that $|A|=n=|B|$ and $A \cap B=\varnothing$.External cost of $a \in A: E_{a}=\sum_{v \in B} C_{a v}$.Internal cost of $a \in A: I_{a}=\sum_{v \in A} C_{a v}$.$D$-value of a vertex $a$ : $D_{a}=E_{a}-I_{a}$ (cost reduction for moving a).Cost reduction (gain) for swapping a and $b: g_{a b}=D_{a}+D_{b}-2 c_{a b}$.If $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ are interchanged, then the new $D$-values, $D^{\prime}$, are given by$$
\begin{aligned}
& D_{x}^{\prime}=D_{x}+2 c_{x a}-2 c_{x b}, \forall x \in A-\{a\} \\
& D_{y}^{\prime}=D_{y}+2 c_{y b}-2 c_{y a}, \forall y \in B-\{b\} .
\end{aligned}
$$


$\operatorname{Gain}_{a=-B}: D_{a}-c_{a b}$
$\operatorname{Gain}_{b=a}: D_{b}-c_{a b}$
Intemat cost י's. Extemat cost

updating $D$-values

## A Weighted Example



|  | $a$ | $b$ | $c$ | $d$ | $e$ | $f$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $a$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| $b$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| $c$ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| $d$ | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| $e$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| $f$ | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |



Initial cut cost $=(3+2+4)+(4+2+1)+(3+2+1)=22$
$\square$ Iteration 1
$I_{a}=1+2=3 ;$
$E_{a}=3+2+4=9 ;$
$D_{a}=E_{a}-I_{a}=9-3=6$
$I_{b}=1+1=2 ; \quad E_{b}=4+2+1=7 ; \quad D_{b}=E_{b}-I_{b}=7-2=5$
$I_{c}=2+1=3 ; \quad E_{c}=3+2+1=6 ; \quad D_{c}=E_{c}-I_{c}=6-3=3$
$I_{d}=4+3=7 ; \quad E_{d}=3+4+3=10 ; \quad D_{d}=E_{d}-I_{d}=10-7=3$
$I_{e}=4+2=6 ; \quad E_{e}=2+2+2=6 ; \quad D_{e}=E_{e}-I_{e}=6-6=0$
$I_{f}=3+2=5 ; \quad E_{f}=4+1+1=6 ; \quad D_{f}=E_{f}-I_{f}=6-5=1$

## A Weighted Example (cont'd)

$\square$ Iteration 1:
$\begin{array}{lll}I_{a}=1+2=3 ; & E_{a}=3+2+4=9 ; & D_{a}=E_{a}-I_{a}=9-3=6 \\ I_{b}=1+1=2 ; & E_{b}=4+2+1=7 ; & D_{b}=E_{b}-I_{b}=7-2=5 \\ I_{c}=2+1=3 ; & E_{c}=3+2+1=6 ; & D_{c}=E_{c}-I_{c}=6-3=3 \\ I_{d}=4+3=7 ; & E_{d}=3+4+3=10 ; & D_{d}=E_{d}-I_{d}=10-7=3 \\ I_{e}=4+2=6 ; & E_{e}=2+2+2=6 ; & D_{e}=E_{e}-I_{e}=6-6=0 \\ I_{f}=3+2=5 ; & E_{f}=4+1+1=6 ; & D_{f}=E_{f}-I_{f}=6-5=1\end{array}$
$\square g_{x y}=D_{x}+D_{y}-2 c_{x y}$.
$g_{a d}=D_{a}+D_{d}-2 c_{a d}=6+3-2 \times 3=3$
$g_{a e}=6+0-2 \times 2=2$
$g_{a f}=6+1-2 \times 4=-1$
$g_{b d}=5+3-2 \times 4=0$
$g_{b e}=5+0-2 \times 2=1$
$g_{b f}=5+1-2 \times 1=4$ (maximum) $\quad\left(g_{1}=4\right)$
$g_{c d}=3+3-2 \times 3=0$
gce $=3+0-2 \times 2=-1$
$g_{c f}=3+1-2 \times 1=2$
Swap b and f.

## A Weighted Example (cont'd)

$D_{x}^{\prime}=D_{x}+2 c_{x p}-2 c_{x q}, \forall x \in A-\{p\}(\operatorname{swap} p$ and $q, p \in A, q \in B)$
$D_{a}^{\prime}=D_{a}+2 c_{a b}-2 c_{a f}=6+2 \times 1-2 \times 4=0$
$D_{c}^{l}=D_{c}+2 c_{c b}-2 c_{c f}=3+2 \times 1-2 \times 1=3$
$D_{d}^{\prime}=D_{d}+2 c_{d f}-2 c_{d b}=3+2 \times 3-2 \times 4=1$
$D_{e}^{\prime}=D_{e}+2 \mathrm{c}_{e f}-2 \mathrm{c}_{e b}=0+2 \times 2-2 \times 2=0$$\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{xy}}=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\prime}+\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{y}}^{\prime}-2 \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{xy}}$.
$g_{a d}=D_{a}^{\prime}+D_{d}^{\prime}-2 c_{a d}=0+1-2 \times 3=-5$
$g_{a e}=D_{a}^{\prime}+D_{e}^{\prime}-2 c_{a e}=0+0-2 \times 2=-4$
$g_{c d}=D_{c}^{\prime}+D_{d}^{\prime}-2 \mathrm{c}_{c d}=3+1-2 \times 3=-2$
$g_{c e}=D_{c}^{\prime}+D_{e}^{\prime}-2 \mathrm{c}_{c e}=3+0-2 \times 2=-1$ (maximum) $\quad\left(\hat{g_{2}}=-1\right)$
Swap c and e.

## A Weighted Example (cont'd)


$\square \mathrm{D}^{\prime \prime}{ }_{\mathrm{x}}=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\prime}+2 \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{xp}}-2 \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{xq}}, \forall \mathrm{x} \in \mathrm{A}-\{\mathrm{p}\}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& D_{a}^{\prime \prime}=D_{a}^{\prime}+2 \mathrm{c}_{a c}-2 \mathrm{c}_{a e}=0+2 \times 2-2 \times 2=0 \\
& D_{d}^{\prime \prime}=D_{d}^{\prime}+2 \mathrm{c}_{d e}-2 \mathrm{c}_{d c}=1+2 \times 4-2 \times 3=3
\end{aligned}
$$

$\square g_{x y}=D^{\prime \prime}{ }_{x}+D^{\prime \prime}{ }_{y}-2 c_{x y}$.

$$
g_{a d}=D_{a}^{\prime \prime}+D_{d}^{\prime \prime}-2 c_{a d}=0+3-2 \times 3=-3\left(g_{3}=-3\right)
$$

- Note that this step is redundant

Summary: $\widehat{g_{1}}=g_{b f}=4, \widehat{g_{2}}=g_{c e}=-1, \widehat{g_{3}}=g_{a d}=-3$. ( $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \widehat{g_{i}}=0$ ).
Largest partial sum $\max \sum_{i=1}^{k} \widehat{g_{i}}=4 \quad(\mathrm{k}=1) \Rightarrow$ Swap b and f .

## A Weighted Example (cont'd)

|  | $a$ | $b$ | $c$ | $d$ | $e$ | $f$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $a$ | 0 | $l$ | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| $b$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | $l$ |
| $c$ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| $d$ | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| $e$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| $f$ | 4 | $l$ | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |



Initial cut cost $=(l+3+2)+(l+3+2)+(l+3+2)=18(22-4)$
$\square$ Iteration 2: Repeat what we did at Iteration 1 ( Initial cost $=22-4=18$ ).
$\square$ Summary: $\hat{g}_{1}=g_{c e}=-1, \hat{g_{2}}=g_{a b}=-3, \hat{g_{3}}=g_{f d}=4$.
$\square$ Largest partial sum $=\max \sum_{i=1}^{k} \widehat{g}_{i}=0 \quad(\mathrm{k}=3) \Rightarrow$ Stop!

## Kernighan-Lin Algorithm

```
Algorithm: Kernighan-Lin(G)
Input: }G=(V,E),|V|=2n
Output: Balanced bi-partition A and B with "small" cut cost.
1 begin
2 Bipartition G into A and B such that |VA| = |VB|, V
    and \mp@subsup{V}{A}{}\cup\mp@subsup{V}{B}{}=V\mathrm{ .}
3 repeat
    Compute }\mp@subsup{D}{v}{},\forallv\inV\mathrm{ .
    for i=1 to n do
        Find a pair of unlocked vertices vai }\in\mp@subsup{V}{A}{}\mathrm{ and }\mp@subsup{v}{b}{}\in\mp@subsup{V}{B}{}\mathrm{ whose
        exchange makes the largest decrease or smallest increase in
        cut cost;
7 Mark vai and v}\mp@subsup{v}{bi}{}\mathrm{ as locked, store the gain }\hat{\mp@subsup{g}{i}{}}\mathrm{ , and compute
    the new }\mp@subsup{D}{v}{}\mathrm{ , for all unlocked v}\inV\mathrm{ ;
    Find k, such that G}\mp@subsup{G}{k}{}=\mp@subsup{\sum}{\tilde{f}=1}{k}\mp@subsup{\hat{g}}{\imath}{}\mathrm{ is maximized;
    if G}\mp@subsup{G}{k}{}>0\mathrm{ then
    Move \mp@subsup{v}{a1}{},\ldots,\mp@subsup{v}{ak}{}}\mathrm{ from }\mp@subsup{V}{A}{}\mathrm{ to }\mp@subsup{V}{B}{}\mathrm{ and }\mp@subsup{v}{b1}{},\ldots,\mp@subsup{v}{bk}{}\mathrm{ from }\mp@subsup{V}{B}{}\mathrm{ to }\mp@subsup{V}{A}{}\mathrm{ ;
10 Move va1,\ldots.,
12 until G}\mp@subsup{G}{k}{}\leq0
13 end
```


## Time Complexity

-Line 4: Initial computation of D: $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{2}\right)$
-Line 5: The for-loop: $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{n})$
$\square$ The body of the loop: $O\left(n^{2}\right)$.
-Lines 6--7: Step i takes $(\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}+1)^{2}$ time.

- Lines 4--11: Each pass of the repeat loop: $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{3}\right)$.
$\square$ Suppose the repeat loop terminates after $r$ passes.
$\square$ The total running time: $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{rn}^{3}\right)$.
$\square$ Polynomial-time algorithm?


## Extensions of K-L Algorithm

Unequal sized subsets (assume $n_{1}<n_{2}$ )1. Partition: $|A|=n_{1}$ and $|B|=n_{2}$.
2. Add $n_{2}-n_{1}$ dummy vertices to set $A$. Dummy vertices have no connections to the original graph.
3. Apply the Kernighan-Lin algorithm.
4. Remove all dummy vertices.
$\square$ Unequal sized "vertices"
5. Assume that the smallest "vertex" has unit size.
6. Replace each vertex of size s with s vertices which are fully connected with edges of infinite weight.
7. Apply the Kernighan-Lin algorithm.
$\square$ k-way partition
8. Partition the graph into $k$ equal-sized sets.
9. Apply the Kernighan-Lin algorithm for each pair of subsets.
10. Time complexity? Can be reduced by recursive bi-partition.

## Outline

$\square$ Partitioning
$\square$ Floorplanning
ロPlacement
$\square$ Routing
-Compaction

## Floorplanning

$\square$ Course contents

- Floorplan basics
- Normalized Polish expression for slicing flooprlans
- B*-trees for non-slicing floorplans
$\square$ Reading
Chapter 10


PowerPC 604


Pentium 4

## Floorplanning

Partitioning leads to- Blocks with well-defined areas and shapes (rigid/hard blocks).
- Blocks with approximate areas and no particular shapes (flexible/soft blocks).
- A netlist specifying connections between the blocks.
$\square$ Objectives
- Find locations for all blocks.

■ Consider shapes of soft block and pin locations of all the blocks.


## Early Layout Decision Example



## Early Layout Decision Methodology

$\square$ An integrated circuit is essentially a two-dimensional medium; taking this aspect into account in early stages of the design helps in creating designs of good quality.

- Floorplanning gives early feedback: thinking of layout at early stages may suggest valuable architectural modifications; floorplanning also aids in estimating delay due to wiring.
$\square$ Floorplanning fits very well in a top-down design strategy, the step-wise refinement strategy also propagated in software design.
$\square$ Floorplanning assumes, however, flexibility in layout design, the existence of cells that can adapt their shapes and terminal locations to the environment.


## Floorplanning Problem

- Inputs to the floorplanning problem:

A set of blocks, hard or soft.

- Pin locations of hard blocks.
- A netlist.
$\square$ Objectives: minimize area, reduce wirelength for (critical) nets, maximize routability (minimize congestion), determine shapes of soft blocks, etc.

| 7 | 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 2 |  |
| 1 |  | 3 |

An optimal floorplan, in terms of area


A non-optimal floorplan

## Floorplan Design



## Floorplanning Concepts

$\square$ Leaf cell
(block/ module) : a cell at the lowest level of the hierarchy; it does not contain any other cell.
$\square$ Composite cell (block/ module): a cell that is composed of either leaf cells or composite cells. The entire IC is the highest- level composite cell.

leaf cell

## Slicing Floorplan + Slicing Tree

$\square$ A composite cell's subcells are obtained by a horizontal or vertical bisection of the composite cell.
$\square$ Slicing floorplans can be represented by a slicing tree.
In a slicing tree, all cells (except for the top-level cell) have a parent, and all composite cells have children.
$\square$ A slicing floorplan is also called a floorplan of order 2.


## Skewed Slicing Tree

Rectangular dissection: Subdivision of a given rectangle by a finite \# of horizontal and vertical line segments into a finite \# of non-overlapping rectangles.Slicing structure: a rectangular dissection that can be obtained by repetitively subdividing rectangles horizontally or vertically.Slicing tree: A binary tree, where each internal node represents a vertical cut line or horizontal cut line, and each leaf a basic rectangle.$\square$ Skewed slicing tree: One in which no node and its right child are the same.

|  | 3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | 6 | 7 |

Non-slicing floorplan


Slicing floorplan


Another slicing tree (non-skewed)

## Slicing Floorplan Design by Simulated Annealing

$\square$ Related work
Wong \& Liu, "A new algorithm for floorplan design," DAC-86.
$\mathrm{CConsiders} \mathrm{slicing} \mathrm{floorplans}$.
Wong \& Liu, "Floorplan design for rectangular and L-shaped modules," ICCAD'87.
-Also considers L-shaped modules.
■ Wong, Leong, Liu, Simulated Annealing for VLSI Design, pp. 31--71, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988.

## Simulated Annealing

$\square$ Kirkpatrick, Gelatt, and Vecchi, "Optimization by simulated annealing," Science, May 1983.
$\square$ Greene and Supowit, "Simulated annealing without rejected moves," ICCD-84.


## Simulated Annealing Basics

$\square$ Non-zero probability for "up-hill" moves.
$\square$ Probability depends on

1. magnitude of the "up-hill" movement
2. total search time

$$
\operatorname{Prob}\left(S \rightarrow S^{\prime}\right)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } \Delta C \leq 0 \quad / * \text { "down - hill" moves } * / \\ e^{-\frac{\Delta C}{T}} & \text { if } \Delta C>0 \quad / * \text { "up-hill" moves } * /\end{cases}
$$

$\square \Delta C=\operatorname{cost}\left(S^{\prime}\right)-\operatorname{Cost}(S)$
$\square$ T: Control parameter (temperature)
$\square$ Annealing schedule: $T=T_{0}, T_{1}, T_{2}, \ldots$, where $T_{i}=$ $\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{T}_{0}$ with $\mathrm{r}<1$.

## Generic Simulated Annealing Algorithm

## 1 begin

2 Get an initial solution S;
3 Get an initial temperature $\mathrm{T}>0$;
4 while not yet "frozen" do
5 for $1 \leq i \leq P$ do
6 Pick a random neighbor S ' of S ;
$7 \quad \Delta \leftarrow \operatorname{cost}\left(\mathrm{~S}^{\prime}\right)-\operatorname{cost}(\mathrm{S})$; /* downhill move */
8 if $\Delta \leq 0$ then $\mathrm{S} \leftarrow \mathrm{S}^{\prime}$
/* uphill move */
9 if $\Delta>0$ then $\mathrm{S} \leftarrow \mathrm{S}^{\prime}$ with probability $e^{-\frac{\Delta}{T}}$;
$10 \mathrm{~T} \leftarrow \mathrm{rT}$; /* reduce temperature */
11 return S
12 end

## Basic Ingredients for Simulated Annealing

$\square$ Analogy:

| Physical system | Optimization problem |
| :--- | :--- |
| state | configuration |
| energy | cost function |
| ground state | optimal solution |
| quenching | iterative improvement |
| careful annealing | simulated annealing |

$\square$ Basic Ingredients for Simulated Annealing:

- Solution space
- Neighborhood structure
- Cost function
- Annealing schedule


## Solution Representation of Slicing Floorplan

$\square$ An expression $E=e_{1} e_{2} \ldots e_{2 n-1}$, where $e_{i} \in\{1,2, \ldots, n, H, V\}, 1 \leq i \leq$ $2 n-1$, is a Polish expression of length $2 n-1$ iff

1. every operand $\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{l} \leq \mathrm{j} \leq \mathrm{n}$, appears exactly once in E ;
2. (the balloting property) for every subexpression $E_{i}=e_{1} \ldots e_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq$ $2 \mathrm{n}-1$, \# operands > \# operators.

$\square$ Polish expression $\leftrightarrow$ Postorder traversal.ijH : rectangle i on bottom of j ; ijV : rectangle i on the left of j .

| 7 | 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  |  |  |

## Redundant Representations



$E=123 H 4 \mathrm{VV}$
non-skewed!

$E=123 H V 4 V$ skewed!

Non-skewed cases

$\qquad$ H $\qquad$

....... VV $\qquad$

Question: How to eliminate ambiguous representation?

## Normalized Polish Expression

$\square$ A Polish expression $E=e_{1} e_{2} \ldots e_{2 n-1}$ is called normalized iff $E$ has no consecutive operators of the same type (H or V), i.e. skewed.
$\square$ Given a normalized Polish expression, we can construct a unique rectangular slicing structure.

| 7 | 5 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 2 |  |
| 1 |  | 3 |



A normalized Polish expression

## Neighborhood Structure

Chain: HVHVH ... or VHVHV ...Adjacent: 1 and 6 are adjacent operands; 2 and 7 are adjacent operands; 5 and $V$ are adjacent operand and operator.
3 types of moves:

- M1 (Operand Swap): Swap two adjacent operands.
- M2 (Chain Invert): Complement some chain ( $\overline{\mathrm{V}}=\mathrm{H}, \overline{\mathrm{H}}=\mathrm{V}$ ).
- M3 (Operator/ Operand Swap): Swap two adjacent operand and operator.


## Effects of Perturbation



Question: The balloting property holds during the moves?

- M1 and M2 moves are OK.
- Check the M3 moves! Reject "illegal" M3 moves.Check M3 moves: Assume that the M3 move swaps the operand $e_{i}$ with the operator $e_{i+1}, 1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Then, the swap will not violate the balloting property iff $2 \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{i}+1}<\mathrm{i}$.
- $N_{k}$ : \# of operators in the Polish expression $E=e_{1} e_{2} \ldots e_{k}, 1 \leq$ $\mathrm{k} \leq 2 \mathrm{n}-1$


## Cost Function

$\square \phi=A+\lambda W$.

- A: area of the smallest rectangle
- W: overall wiring length
- $\quad \lambda$ : user-specified parameter


12V4H3V

${ }^{12 H 34 H V}$
$W=\sum_{i j} c_{i j} d_{i j}$.

- $c_{i j}$ : \# of connections between blocks $i$ and $j$.
- $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ : center-to-center distance between basic rectangles i and j .



## Area Computation for Hard Blocks

$\square$ Allow rotation


Wiring cost?

- Center-to-center interconnection length


## Incremental Computation of Cost Function

$\square$ Each move leads to only a minor modification of the Polish expression.
$\square$ At most two paths of the slicing tree need to be updated for each move.


## Incremental Computation of Cost Function (cont'd)



$$
\mathrm{E}=12 \mathrm{H} 34 \mathrm{~V} 56 \mathrm{HVH}
$$



$$
\mathrm{E}=123 \mathrm{H} 4 \mathrm{~V} 56 \mathrm{VHV}
$$

## Annealing Schedule

-I Initial solution: 12V3V ... nV.

| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |  | $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\square T_{i}=r^{i} T_{0}, i=1,2,3, \ldots ; r=0.85$.
$\square$ At each temperature, try kn moves ( $k=5-10$ ).
$\square$ Terminate the annealing process if

- \# of accepted moves < 5\%,
- temperature is low enough, or
$\square$ run out of time.


## Wong-Liu Algorithm

```
Input: (P, \varepsilon, r, k)
1 begin
2 E \leftarrow 12V3V4V ...nV; /* initial solution */
```



```
4 repeat 
MT \leftarrowuphill }\leftarrow\mathrm{ reject }\leftarrow0
    repeat
        SelectMove(M);
            Case M of
            M1)
```



```
            M3: done \leftarrow FALSE;
                    while not (done) do
                                    Select two adjacent operand e}\mp@subsup{e}{i}{}\mathrm{ and operator }\mp@subsup{\textrm{e}}{\textrm{i}+}{
                            if ( }\mp@subsup{\textrm{i}}{\textrm{i}-1}{}\not=\mp@subsup{\textrm{e}}{i+1}{}\mathrm{ ) and ( 2 N Ni+1
                            Select two adjacent operator }\mp@subsup{e}{i}{}\mathrm{ and operand e eni+1
                            if ( }\mp@subsup{\textrm{e}}{\textrm{i}}{\not= (\mp@subsup{e}{i+2}{}
            NE \leftarrow Swap(E, e, e, ei+1)
            MT \leftarrowMT+1; \Deltacost \leftarrowcost(NE) - cost(E);
            if (\Deltacost }\leq0)\mathrm{ or (Random < e - - Cost 
            then
                                    if ( }\Delta\mathrm{ cost > 0) then uphill }\leftarrow\mathrm{ uphill + 1;
                                    E}\leftarrowNE
                                    if cost(É) < cost(best) then best }\leftarrowE\mathrm{ ;
            else reject }\leftarrow\mathrm{ reject + 1;
        until (uphill >N) or (MT > 2N);
    T}\leftarrow\textrm{rT; /* reduce temperature */
    until (reject/MT > 0.95) or (T < ) or OutOfTime;
26 end
```


## Shape Curve

$\square$ Flexible cells imply that cells can have different aspect ratios.
$\square$ The relation between the width $x$ and the height $y$ is: $x y$ $=A$, or $y=A / x$. The shape function is a hyperbola.
$\square$ Very thin cells are not interesting and often not feasible to design. The shape function is a combination of a hyperbola and two straight lines.

Aspect ratio: $r<=y / x<=s$.



## Shape Curve (cont'd)

$\square$ Leaf cells are built from discrete transistors: it is not realistic to assume that the shape function follows the hyperbola continuously.
$\square$ In an extreme case, a cell is rigid: it can only be rotated and mirrored during floorplanning or placement.


The shape function of a $2 \times 4$ inset cell.

## Shape Curve (cont'd)

- In general, a piecewise linear function can be used to approximate any shape function.
$\square$ The points where the function changes its direction, are called the corner (break) points of the piecewise linear function.



## Addition for Vertical Abutment

$\square$ Composition by vertical abutment $\Rightarrow$ the addition of shape functions.



## Deriving Shapes of Children

$\square$ A choice for the minimal shape of composite cell fixes the shapes of the shapes of its children cells.


## Sizing Algorithm for Slicing Floorplans

$\square$ The shape functions of all leaf cells are given as piecewise linear functions.
$\square$ Traverse the slicing tree in order to compute the shape functions of all composite cells (bottom-up composition).
$\square$ Choose the desired shape of the top-level cell; as the shape function is piecewise linear, only the break points of the function need to be evaluated, when looking for the minimal area.
$\square$ Propagate the consequences of the choice down to the leaf cells (top-down propagation).
$\square$ The sizing algorithm runs in polynomial time for slicing floorplans

NP-complete for non-slicing floorplans

## Feasible Implementations

$\square$ Shape curves correspond to different kinds of constraints where the shaded areas are feasible regions.

(a) rigid, fixed orientation
(b) rigid, free (c) flexible, fixed (d) flexible, free orientation orientation orientation

## Wheel or Spiral Floorplan


$\square$ This floorplan is not slicing!

- Wheel is the smallest nonslicing floorplans.
$\square$ Limiting floorplans to those that have the slicing property is reasonable: it certainly facilitates floorplanning algorithms.
$\square$ Taking the shape of a wheel floorplan and its mirror image as the basis of operators leads to hierarchical descriptions of order 5.


## Order-5 Floorplan Examples

| A |  | B | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | E |  |  |
|  | F |  | G |
| I |  | H |  |
|  | J | K | L |



## General Floorplan Representation: Polar Graphs

$\square$ vertex: channel segment
$\square$ edge: cell/block/module


## horizontal polar graph


vertical polar graph


## B*-Tree: Compacted Floorplan Representation

$\square$ Chang et al., "B*-tree: A new representation for non-slicing floorplans," DAC 2000.

- Compact modules to left and bottom
- Construct an ordered binary tree ( $\mathrm{B}^{*}$-tree)
$\square$ Left child: the lowest, adjacent block on the right ( $x_{j}=x_{i}+w_{i}$ )
$\square$ Right child: the first block above, with the same $x$-coordinate $\left(x_{j}=\right.$ $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}$ )


A non-slicing floorplan


Compact to left and down


B*-tree

## B*-tree Packing

$x$-coordinates can be determined by the tree structure- Left child: the lowest, adjacent block on the right ( $x_{j}=x_{i}+w_{i}$ )
- Right child: the first block above, with the same $x$-coordinate $\left(x_{j}=x_{i}\right)$Y-coordinates?
- Horizontal contour: Use a doubly linked list to record the current maximum y-coordinate for each x-range
- Reduce the complexity of computing a y-coordinate to amortized O(1) time



## Contour Data Structure



## B*-tree Perturbation

- Op1: rotate a macro
-Op2: move a node to another place
$\square$ Op3: swap two nodes




## Simulated Annealing Using B*-tree

$\square$ The cost function is based on problem requirements


## Strengths of B*-tree

$\square$ Binary tree based, efficient and easy
$\square$ Flexible to deal with various placement constraints by augmenting the $B^{*}$-tree data structure (e.g., preplaced, symmetry, alignment, bus position) and rectilinear modules
$\square$ Transformation between a tree and its placement takes only linear time
$\square$ Operate on only one B*-tree (vs. two O-trees)
$\square$ Can evaluate area cost incrementally
$\square$ Smaller solution space: only $O\left(n!4^{n} / n^{1.5}\right)$ combinations
$\square$ Directly corresponds to hierarchical and multilevel frameworks for large-scale floorplan designs
$\square$ Can be extended to 3D floorplanning \& related applications

## Weaknesses of $B^{*}$-tree

$\square$ Representation may change after packing
$\square$ Only a partially topological representation; less flexible than a fully topological representation

B*-tree can represent only compacted placement


## Outline

$\square$ Partitioning
$\square$ $\square$ Floorplanning
-Placement
$\square$ Routing
-Compaction

## Placement

$\square$ Course contents:

- Placement metrics

■ Constructive placement: cluster growth, min cut

- Iterative placement: force-directed method, simulated annealing
$\square$ Reading
- Chapter 11



## Placement

Placement is the problem of automatically assigning correct positions on the chip to predesigned cells, such that some cost function is optimized.- Inputs: A set of fixed cells/modules, a netlist.
$\square$ Goal: Find the best position for each cell/module on the chip according to appropriate cost functions.
- Considerations: routability/ channel density, wirelength, cut size, performance, thermal issues, I/O pads.



## Placement Objectives and Constraints

What does a placement algorithm try to optimize?- total area
- total wire length
- number of horizontal/vertical wire segments crossing a line
$\square$ Constraints:
- placement should be routable (no cell overlaps; no density overflow).
- timing constraints are met (some wires should always be shorter than a given length).



## VLSI Placement: Building Blocks

$\square$ Different design styles create different placement problems.
■. g., building-block, standard-cell, gate-array placement $\square$ Building block: The cells to be placed have arbitrary shapes.
building block example


## VLSI Placement: Standard Cells

$\square$ Standard cells are designed in such a way that power and clock connections run horizontally through the cell and other I/O leaves the cell from the top or bottom sides.The cells are placed in rows.Sometimes feedthrough cells are added to ease wiring.


## Consequences of Fabrication Method

Full-custom fabrication (building block):- Free selection of aspect ratio (quotient of height and width).
- Height of wiring channels can be adapted to necessity.Semi-custom fabrication (gate array, standard cell):
- Placement has to deal with fixed carrier dimensions.
- Placement should be able to deal with fixed channel capacities.



## Relation with Routing

पIdeally, placement and routing should be performed simultaneously as they depend on each other's results. This is, however, too complicated.

P\&R: placement and routing
-In practice placement is done prior to routing. The placement algorithm estimates the wire length of a net using some metric.

## Wirelength Estimation

$\square$ Semi-perimeter method: Half the perimeter of the bounding rectangle that encloses all the pins of the net to be connected. Most widely used approximation!Steiner-tree approximation: Computationally expensive.Minimum spanning tree: Good approximation to Steiner trees.

- Squared Euclidean distance: Squares of all pairwise terminal distances in a net using a quadratic cost function

$$
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_{i j}\left[\left(x_{i}-x_{j}\right)^{2}+\left(y_{i}-y_{j}\right)^{2}\right]
$$

$\square$ Complete graph: Since \#edges in a complete graph is $\left(\frac{n(n-1)}{2}\right)$, wirelength $\approx \frac{2}{n} \sum_{(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}) \in \text { net }} \mathrm{dist}(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j})$.

## Wirelength Estimation (cont'd)


semi-perimeter len $=1 /$


Steinertree ien $=12$

complete gruph len $* 2 / n=17.5$


Spunning tree len $=13$

## Placement Algorithms

The placement problem is NP-completePopular placement algorithms:- Constructive algorithms: once the position of a cell is fixed, it is not modified anymore.
-Cluster growth, min cut, etc.
- Iterative algorithms: intermediate placements are modified in an attempt to improve the cost function.
$\square$ Force-directed method, etc
- Nondeterministic approaches: simulated annealing, genetic algorithm, etc.
$\square$ Most approaches combine multiple elements:
- Constructive algorithms are used to obtain an initial placement.
- The initial placement is followed by an iterative improvement phase.
- The results can further be improved by simulated annealing.


## Bottom-Up Placement: Clustering

## $\square$ Starts with a single cell and finds more cells that share nets with it.



## Placement by Cluster Growth

$\square$ Greedy method: Selects unplaced components and places them in available slots.

- SELECT: Choose the unplaced component that is most strongly connected to all of the placed components (or most strongly connected to any single placed component).
- PLACE: Place the selected component at a slot such that a certain "cost" of the partial placement is minimized.

layout surface


## Cluster Growth Example

$\square$ \# of other terminals connected: $c_{a}=3, c_{b}=1, c_{c}=1, c_{d}=1$, $c_{e}=4, c_{f}=3$, and $c_{g}=3 \Rightarrow e$ has the most connectivity.
$\square$ Place e in the center, slot 4. a, b, g are connected to e, and $\Rightarrow$ Place a next to e (say, slot 3). Continue until all cells are placed.
$\square$ Further improve the placement by swapping the gates.



## Top-down Placement: Min Cut

$\square$ Starts with the whole circuit and ends with small circuits.
$\square$ Recursive bipartitioning of a circuit (e.g., K\&L) leads to a min-cut placement.


## Min-Cut Placement

- Breuer, "A class of min-cut placement algorithms," DAC, 1977.Quadrature: suitable for circuits with high density in the center.
$\square$ Bisection: good for standard-cell placement.Slice/ Bisection: good for cells with high interconnection on the periphery.


quadrature

 bisection



## Algorithm for Min-Cut Placement

```
Algorithm: Min_Cut_Placement(N, n, C)
/* N: the layout surface */
/* n : # of cells to be placed */
/* n0: # of cells in a slot */
/* C: the connectivity matrix */
1 begin
2 if ( }n\leqn0)\mathrm{ then PlaceCells(N, n, C)
3 else
4 (N1, N2) \leftarrow CutSurface(N);
5 (n1, c1), (n2, c2) \leftarrow Partition(n, c);
6 Call Min_Cut_Placement(N1, n1, C1);
7 Call Min_Cut_Placement(N2, n2, C2);
8 end
```


## Quadrature Placement Example

$\square$ Apply the K-L heuristic to partition + Quadrature Placement: Cost $C_{1}=4, C_{2 L}=C_{2 R}=2$, etc.


## Min-Cut Placement with Terminal Propagation

$\square$ Dunlop \& Kernighan, "A procedure for placement of standard-cell VLSI circuits," IEEE TCAD, Jan. 1985.
$\square$ Drawback of the original min-cut placement: Does not consider the positions of terminal pins that enter a region.
$\square$ What happens if we $\operatorname{swap}\{1,3,6,9\}$ and $\{2,4,5,7\}$ in the previous example?


## Terminal Propagation

$\square$ We should use the fact that $s$ is in $L_{1}$ !

$\square$ When not to use $p$ to bias partitioning? Net $s$ has cells in many groups?


Don't use $p$ to bias the solution in either direction!


Use $p$ !


## Terminal Propagation Example

$\square$ Partitioning must be done breadth-first, not depth-first.


## General Procedure for Iterative Improvement

Algorithm: Iterative_Improvement()
1 begin
$2 s \leftarrow$ initial_configuration();
$3 c \leftarrow \operatorname{cost}(s)$;
4 while (not stop()) do
$5 \quad s^{\prime} \leftarrow \operatorname{perturb}(s)$;
$6 \quad c^{\prime} \leftarrow \operatorname{cost}\left(s^{\prime}\right)$;
7 if (accept(c, c'))
8 then $s \leftarrow s^{\prime}$;
9 end

## Placement by the Force-Directed Method

$\square$ Hanan \& Kurtzberg, "Placement techniques," in Design Automation of Digital Systems, Breuer, Ed, 1972.
$\square$ Quinn, Jr. \& Breuer, "A force directed component placement procedure for printed circuit boards," IEEE Trans. Circuits and Systems, June 1979.
$\square$ Reduce the placement problem to solving a set of simultaneous linear equations to determine equilibrium locations for cells.
$\square$ Analogy to Hooke's law: $\mathrm{F}=\mathrm{kd}, \mathrm{F}$ : force, k: spring constant, d : distance.
$\square$ Goal: Map cells to the layout surface.


## Finding the Zero-Force Target Location

Cell $i$ connects to several cells $j$ 's at distances $d_{i j}$ 's by wires of weights $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ 's. Total force: $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{i}}=\Sigma_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{ij}} \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{ij}}$$\square$ The zero-force target location ( $\widehat{x_{i}}, \widehat{y_{i}}$ ) can be determined by equating the x - and y -components of the forces to zero:
$\square$ In the example

$$
\sum_{j} w_{i j} \cdot\left(x_{j}-\hat{x_{i}}\right)=0 \Rightarrow \hat{x_{i}}=\frac{\sum_{j} w_{i j} x_{j}}{\sum_{j} w_{i j}}
$$

$$
\sum_{j} w_{i j} \cdot\left(y_{j}-\hat{y_{i}}\right)=0 \Rightarrow \hat{y_{i}}=\frac{\sum_{j} w_{i j} y_{j}}{\sum_{j} w_{i j}}
$$

$$
\widehat{x_{i}}=\frac{8 \times 0+10 \times 2+3 \times 0+3 \times 2}{8+10+3+3}=1.083
$$



## Force-Directed Placement

## $\square$ Can be constructive or iterative:

$\square$ Start with an initial placement.

- Select a "most profitable" cell p (e.g., maximum $F$, critical cells) and place it in its zero-force location.


## "Fix" placement if the zero-location has been

 occupied by another cell q. $\square$ Popular options to fix:" Ripple move: place p in the occupied location, compute a new zero-force location for q, ...

- Chain move: place p in the occupied location, move q to an adjacent location, ...
- Move p to a free location close to $q$.


## Force-Directed Placement

```
Algorithm: Force-Directed_Placement
    begin
2 Compute the connectivity for each cell;
3 Sort the cells in decreasing order of their connectivities into list L;
4 while (IterationCount < Iteration Limit) do
    Seed }\leftarrow\mathrm{ next module from L;
    Declare the position of the seed vacant;
        while (EndRipple = FALSE) do
            Compute target location of the seed;
            case the target location
            VACANT:
                Move seed to the target location and lock;
                EndRipple }\leftarrowT\mathrm{ TRUE; AbortCount }\leftarrow0
            SAME AS PRESENT LOCATION:
                EndRipple }\leftarrowT\mathrm{ TRUE; AbortCount }\leftarrow0
            LOCKED:
                    Move selected cell to the nearest vacant location;
                    EndRipple }\leftarrowT\mathrm{ TRUE; AbortCount }\leftarrow\mathrm{ AbortCount + 1;
                    if (AbortCount > AbortLimit) then
                            Unlock all cell locations;
                            IterationCount }\leftarrow\mathrm{ IterationCount + 1;
            OCCUPIED AND NOT LOCKED:
                        Select cell as the target location for next move;
                            Move seed cell to target location and lock the target location;
                    EndRipple}\leftarrowFALSE; AbortCount \leftarrow%;
end
```


## Placement by Simulated Annealing

$\square$ Sechen and Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, "The TimberWolf placement and routing package," IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits, Feb. 1985; "TimberWolf 3.2: A new standard cell placement and global routing package," DAC-86.
$\square$ TimberWolf: Stage 1
Modules are moved between different rows as well as within the same row.

- Module overlaps are allowed.
- When the temperature is reached below a certain value, stage 2 begins.
- TimberWolf: Stage 2
- Remove overlaps.
- Annealing process continues, but only interchanges adjacent modules within the same row.


## Solution Space \& Neighborhood Structure

$\square$ Solution Space: All possible arrangements of the modules into rows, possibly with overlaps.
$\square$ Neighborhood Structure: 3 types of moves
$\square M_{1}$ : Displace a module to a new location.

- $M_{2}$ : Interchange two modules.
$\square M_{3}$ : Change the orientation of a module.


M1


M2


M3

## Neighborhood Structure

$\square$ TimberWolf first tries to select a move between $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ : $\operatorname{Prob}\left(M_{1}\right)=0.8, \operatorname{Prob}\left(M_{2}\right)=0.2$.
$\square$ If a move of type $M_{1}$ is chosen and it is rejected, then a move of type $M_{3}$ for the same module will be chosen with probability 0.1 .
$\square$ Restrictions: (1) what row for a module can be displaced? (2)
what pairs of modules can be interchanged?
$\square$ Key: Range Limiter

- At the beginning, $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ is big enough to contain the whole chip.
- Window size shrinks as temperature decreases. Height \& width $\propto$ $\log (T)$.
- Stage 2 begins when window size is so small that no inter-row module interchanges are possible.



## Cost Function

Cost function: $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}_{1}+\mathrm{C}_{2}+\mathrm{C}_{3}$.$\mathrm{C}_{1}$ : total estimated wirelength.$\mathrm{C}_{1}=\sum_{\mathrm{i} \in \text { Nets }}\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{i}}+\beta_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$

- $\alpha_{i}, \beta_{i}$ are horizontal and vertical weights, respectively. $\left(\alpha_{i}=1\right.$, $\beta_{i}=1 \Rightarrow$ half perimeter of the bounding box of Net i.)
$\square$ Critical nets: Increase both $\alpha_{i}$ and $\beta_{i}$.
- If vertical wirings are "cheaper" than horizontal wirings, use smaller vertical weights: $\beta_{i}<\alpha_{i}$.
$\mathrm{C}_{2}$ : penalty function for module overlaps.
$\square \mathrm{C}_{2}=\gamma \sum_{\mathrm{i} \neq \mathrm{j}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{ij}}, \gamma$ : penalty weight.
- $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ : amount of overlaps in the x -dimension between modules i and $j$.
$\mathrm{C}_{3}$ : penalty function that controls the row length.
$\square \mathrm{C}_{2}=\delta \sum_{\mathrm{r} \in \text { Rows }}\left|\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{r}}-\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{r}}\right|, \delta:$ penalty weight.
- $D_{r}$ : desired row length.
- $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{r}}$ : sum of the widths of the modules in row r .


## Annealing Schedule

$\square T_{k}=r_{k} T_{k-1}, k=1,2,3, \ldots$
$\square r_{k}$ increases from 0.8 to max value 0.94 and then decreases to 0.8 .
$\square$ At each temperature, a total \# of nP attempts is made.
$\square \mathrm{n}$ : \# of modules; P: user specified constant.
-Termination: T < 0.1.

Outline

- Partitioning
- Floorplanning
- Placement
$\square$ Routing
- Global rounting
- Detailed routing
- Compaction


## Routing

-Course contents:

- Global routing
- Detail routing
$\square$ Reading
Chapter 12


Filling


Retrace

## Routing



## Routing Constraints

$\square 100 \%$ routing completion + area minimization, under a set of constraints:

- Placement constraint: usually based on fixed placement
- Number of routing layers
- Geometrical constraints: must satisfy design rules
- Timing constraints (performance-driven routing): must satisfy delay constraints
- Crosstalk?

■ Process variations?


Two-layer routing


Geometrical constraint

## Classification of Routing



## Maze Router: Lee Algorithm

$\square$ Lee, "An algorithm for path connection and its application," IRE Trans. Electronic Computer, EC10, 1961.
$\square$ Discussion mainly on single-layer routing
$\square$ Strengths

- Guarantee to find connection between 2 terminals if it exists.
- Guarantee minimum path.
$\square$ Weaknesses
- Requires large memory for dense layout.
- Slow.
$\square$ Applications: global routing, detailed routing


## Lee Algorithm

$\square$ Find a path from $S$ to $T$ by "wave propagation".


Filling


Retrace
$\square$ Time \& space complexity for an $\mathrm{M} \times \mathrm{N}$ grid: $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{MN})$ (huge!)

## Reducing Memory Requirement

$\square$ Akers's Observations (1967)

- Adjacent labels for k are either $\mathrm{k}-1$ or $\mathrm{k}+1$.
- Want a labeling scheme such that each label has its preceding label different from its succeeding label.
$\square$ Way 1: coding sequence 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 3, ..; states: 1, 2, 3, empty, blocked ( 3 bits required)
$\square$ Way 2: coding sequence $1,1,2,2,1,1,2,2, \ldots ;$ states: 1,2 , empty, blocked (need only 2 bits)


Sequence: $1,2,3,1,2,3, \ldots$


Sequence: $1,1,2,2,1,1,2,2, \ldots$

## Reducing Running Time

$\square$ Starting point selection: Choose the point farthest from the center of the grid as the starting point.
$\square$ Double fan-out: Propagate waves from both the source and the target cells.

- Framing: Search inside a rectangle area 10--20\% larger than the bounding box containing the source and target.
- Need to enlarge the rectangle and redo if the search fails.



## Hadlock's Algorithm

- Hadlock, "A shortest path algorithm for grid graphs," Networks, 1977.
$\square$ Uses detour number (instead of labeling wavefront in Lee's router)
- Detour number, d(P): \# of grid cells directed away from its target on path $P$.
- MD(S, T): the Manhattan distance between $S$ and $T$.
$\square$ Path length of $P, I(P): I(P)=M D(S, T)+2 d(P)$.
$\square \mathrm{MD}(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{T})$ fixed! $\Rightarrow$ Minimize $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{P})$ to find the shortest path.
- For any cell labeled $i$, label its adjacent unblocked cells away from $\mathrm{T} \mathrm{i}+1$; label i otherwise.
$\square$ Time and space complexities: O(MN), but substantially reduces the \# of searched cells.
$\square$ Finds the shortest path between S and T .


## Hadlock's Algorithm (cont'd)

- $d(P)$ : \# of grid cells directed away from its target on path $P$.
- MD(S, T): the Manhattan distance between $S$ and $T$.
- Path length of $P, I(P): I(P)=M D(S, T)+2 d(P)$.
$\square \mathrm{MD}(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{T})$ fixed! $\Rightarrow$ Minimize $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{P})$ to find the shortest path.
- For any cell labeled $i$, label its adjacent unblocked cells away from $\mathrm{T} \mathrm{i}+1$; label i otherwise.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | - |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | T |  |  |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | S | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

obstacle

## Soukup's Algorithm

- Soukup, "Fast maze router," DAC-78.
- Combined breadth-first and depth-first search.
- Depth-first (line) search is first directed toward target T until an obstacle or T is reached.
- Breadth-first (Lee-type) search is used to "bubble" around an obstacle if an obstacle is reached.
- Time and space complexities: O(MN), but 10~50 times faster than Lee's algorithm.
$\square$ Find a path between S and T , but may not be the shortest!

- DFS
- BFS
obstade


## Mikami-Tabuchi's Algorithm

Mikami \& Tabuchi, "A computer program for optimal routing of printed circuit connectors," IFIP, H47, 1968.Every grid point is an escape point.

## Hightower's Algorithm

$\square$ Hightower, "A solution to line-routing problem on the continuous plane," DAC-69.
$\square$ A single escape point on each line segment.

- If a line parallels to the blocked cells, the escape point is placed just past the endpoint of the segment.



## Global Routing Graph

-Each cell is represented by a vertex.
-Two vertices are joined by an edge if the corresponding cells are adjacent to each other.


Partitioned
Layout


Resource Modeling


Global Routing Graph

## Global-Routing Problem

$\square$ Given a netlist $N=\left\{N_{1}, N_{2}, \ldots, N_{n}\right\}$, a routing graph $G=(V, E)$, find a Steiner tree $T_{i}$ for each net $N_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $U\left(e_{j}\right) \leq c\left(e_{j}\right), \forall e_{j} \in E$ and $\sum_{i} L\left(T_{i}\right)$ is minimized, where
$\square c\left(e_{j}\right)$ : capacity of edge $e_{j}$
$\square x_{i j}=1$ if $e_{j}$ is in $T_{i} ; x_{i j}=0$ otherwise
$\square U\left(e_{j}\right)=\sum_{i} x_{i j}$ : \# of wires that pass through the channel corresponding to edge $e_{j}$
■ $L\left(T_{i}\right)$ : total wirelength of Steiner tree $T_{i}$
$\square$ For high performance, the maximum wirelength $\max _{i} L\left(T_{i}\right)$ is minimized (or the longest path between two points in $T_{i}$ is minimized).

## Classification of Global-Routing Algorithms

$\square$ Sequential approach:

- Select a net order and route nets sequentially in the order
- Earlier routed nets might block the routing of subsequent nets
- Routing quality heavily depends on net ordering

■ Strategy: Heuristic net ordering + rip-up and rerouting
$\square$ Concurrent approach:

- All nets are considered simultaneously -E.g., 0-1 integer linear programming (0-1 ILP)


## Net Ordering

$\square$ Net ordering greatly affects routing solutions.

- In the example, we should route net b before net a.

route net $a$ before net $b$

route net $b$ before net a


## Net Ordering (cont'd)

$\square$ Order the nets in the ascending order of the \# of pins within their bounding boxes.
$\square$ Order the nets in the ascending (descending) order of their lengths if routability (timing) is the most critical metric.
$\square$ Order the nets based on their timing criticality.

## Rip-Up and Re-routing

$\square$ Rip-up and re-routing is required if a global or detailed router fails in routing all nets.
$\square$ Approaches: the manual approach? the automatic procedure?
$\square$ Two steps in rip-up and re-routing

1. Identify bottleneck regions, rip off some already routed nets.
2. Route the blocked connections, and re-route the rippedup connections.
$\square$ Repeat the above steps until all connections are routed or a time limit is exceeded.

## Top-down Hierarchical Global Routing

$\square$ Recursively divides routing regions into successively smaller super cells, and nets at each hierarchical level are routed sequentially or concurrently.


level 0

level 1
o pin

## Bottom-up Hierarchical Global Routing

$\square$ At each hierarchical level, routing is restrained within each super cell individually.
$\square$ When the routing at the current level is finished, every four super cells are merged to form a new larger super cell at the next higher level.


level 0

level 1

level 2

> O pin
> o merging point

## Hybrid Hierarchical Global Routing

$\square(1)$ neighboring propagation, (2) preference partitioning, and (3) bounded routing


Find a routing path in the preferred regions
(b)


## The Routing-Tree Problem

Problem: Given a set of pins of a net, interconnect the pins by a "routing tree."
gate array

standard cell

building block

Minimum Rectilinear Steiner Tree (MRST) Problem: Given n points in the plane, find a minimum-length tree of rectilinear edges which connects the points.
$\square \operatorname{MRST}(P)=\operatorname{MST}(P \cup S)$, where $P$ and $S$ are the sets of original points and Steiner points, respectively.


## Theoretical Results for the MRST Problem

Hanan's Thm: There exists an MRST with all Steiner points (set S) chosen from the intersection points of horizontal and vertical lines drawn points of $P$.- Hanan, "On Steiner's problem with rectilinear distance," SIAM J. Applied Math., 1966.
$\square$ Hwang's Theorem: For any point set P, $\frac{\operatorname{Cost}(M S T(P))}{\operatorname{Cost}(M \operatorname{RST}(P))} \leq \frac{3}{2}$.
- Hwang, "On Steiner minimal tree with rectilinear distance," SIAM J. Applied Math., 1976.
- Best existing approximation algorithm: Performance bound 61/48 by Foessmeier et al.



Hanan grid

$\operatorname{Cost}(M S T) / \operatorname{Cost}(M R S T)$-> 3/2

## Coping with the MRST Problem

$\square$ Ho, Vijayan, Wong, "New algorithms for the rectilinear Steiner problem,"

1. Construct an MRST from an MST.
2. Each edge is straight or L-shaped.
3. Maximize overlaps by dynamic programming.
$\square$ About 8\% smaller than Cost(MST).


Two L-shaped MRST of the given MST


Two possible L-shaped layouts per edge

## Iterated 1-Steiner Heuristic for MRST

$\square$ Kahng \& Robins, "A new class of Steiner tree heuristics with good performance: the iterated 1-Steiner approach," ICCAD-90.

```
Algorithm: Iterated_1-Steiner(P)
P: set of n points.
1 begin
2S \leftarrow\varnothing;
    /* H(P \cupS): set of Hanan points */
    /* }\DeltaMST(A,B)=\operatorname{Cost(MST(A)) - Cost(MST(A U B)) */
3 while (Cand }\leftarrow{x\inH(P\cupS)|\DeltaMST(P\cupS,{x})>0}\not=\varnothing) d
4 Find }x\inC\mathrm{ and which maximizes }\triangleMST(P\cupS),{x})
5 S\leftarrowS\cup{x};
6 Remove points in S which have degree \leq2 in MST(P\cupS);
7 return MST(P\cupS);
8 end
```



## Outline

- Partitioning
$\square$ Floorplanning
- Placement
$\square$ Routing
- Global rounting
- Detailed routing
- Compaction


## Channel Routing

- In earlier process technologies, channel routing was pervasively used since most wires were routed in the free space (i.e., routing channel) between a pair of logic blocks (cell rows)



## Routing Region Decomposition

-There are often various ways to decompose a routing region.
-The order of routing regions significantly affects the channel-routing process.


## Routing Models

$\square$ Grid-based model:

- A grid is super-imposed on the routing region.
- Wires follow paths along the grid lines.
- Pitch: distance between two gridded lines
$\square$ Gridless model:
Any model that does not follow this "gridded" approach.

- pin $\square \mathrm{via}$


## Models for Multi-Layer Routing

$\square$ Unreserved layer model: Any net segment is allowed to be placed in any layer.
$\square$ Reserved layer model: Certain type of segments are restricted to particular layer(s).

Two-layer: HV (Horizontal-Vertical), VH
Three-layer: HVH, VHV


## Terminology for Channel Routing

Local density at column i, d(i): total \# of nets that crosses column i.Channel density: maximum local density
\# of horizontal tracks required $\geq$ channel density.


## Channel Routing Problem

Assignments of horizontal segments of nets to tracks.Assignments of vertical segments to connect the following:■ horizontal segments of the same net in different tracks, and

- terminals of the net to horizontal segments of the net.
$\square$ Horizontal and vertical constraints must not be violated
- Horizontal constraints between two nets: the horizontal span of two nets overlaps each other.
$\square$ Vertical constraints between two nets: there exists a column such that the terminal on top of the column belongs to one net and the terminal on bottom of the column belongs to another net.
$\square$ Objective: Channel height is minimized (i.e., channel area is minimized).


## Horizontal Constraint Graph (HCG)

HCG $G=(V, E)$ is undirected graph where■ $V=\left\{v_{i} \mid v_{i}\right.$ represents a net $\left.n_{i}\right\}$

- $E=\left\{\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \mid\right.$ a horizontal constraint exists between $n_{i}$ and $\left.n_{j}\right\}$.
$\square$ For graph G : vertices $\Leftrightarrow$ nets; edge $(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}) \Leftrightarrow$ net i overlaps net $j$.


A routing problem and its HCG.


## Vertical Constraint Graph (VCG)

$\square \mathrm{VCG} G=(\mathrm{V}, \mathrm{E})$ is directed graph where

- $V=\left\{v_{i} \mid v_{i}\right.$ represents a net $\left.n_{i}\right\}$
- $E=\left\{\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \mid\right.$ a vertical constraint exists between $n_{i}$ and $\left.n_{j}\right\}$.
$\square$ For graph G : vertices $\Leftrightarrow$ nets; edge $\mathrm{i} \rightarrow \mathrm{j} \Leftrightarrow$ net i must be above net j .


A routing problem and its VCG.


## 2-Layer Channel Routing: <br> Basic Left-Edge Algorithm

Hashimoto \& Stevens, "Wire routing by optimizing channel assignment within large apertures," DAC-71.$\square$ No vertical constraint.
$\square$ HV-layer model is used.
$\square$ Doglegs are not allowed.
$\square$ Treat each net as an interval.
$\square$ Intervals are sorted according to their left-end $x$ coordinates.
$\square$ Intervals (nets) are routed one-by-one according to the order.
$\square$ For a net, tracks are scanned from top to bottom, and the first track that can accommodate the net is assigned to the net.
$\square$ Optimality: produces a routing solution with the minimum \# of tracks (if no vertical constraint).

## Basic Left-Edge Algorithm

Algorithm: Basic_Left-Edge( U, track[j])
U : set of unassigned intervals (nets) I1, ..., In;
$\mathrm{Ij}=[\mathrm{sj}, \mathrm{ej}]$ : interval j with left-end x -coordinate sj and right-end ej; track[j]: track to which net j is assigned.

1 begin
$2 U \leftarrow\{\mid 1,12, \ldots, I n\}$;
$3 \mathrm{t} \leftarrow 0$;
4 while $(U \neq \varnothing)$ do
$5 \quad \mathrm{t} \leftarrow \mathrm{t}+1$;
$6 \quad$ watermark $\leftarrow 0$;
7 while (there is an $I j \in U$ s.t. sj > watermark) do
8 Pick the interval $\mathrm{lj} \in \mathrm{U}$ with $\mathrm{sj}>$ watermark, nearest watermark;
$9 \operatorname{track}[j] \leftarrow \mathrm{t}$;
10 watermark $\leftarrow$ ej;
$11 U \leftarrow U-\{I j\}$;
12 end

## Basic Left-Edge Example

$\square U=\left\{I_{1}, I_{2}, \ldots, I_{6}\right\} ; I_{1}=[1,3], I_{2}=[2,6], I_{3}=[4,8], I_{4}=[5$, 10], $\mathrm{I}_{5}=[7,11], \mathrm{I}_{6}=[9,12]$.
ㅁ $\mathrm{t}=1$ :

- Route $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ : watermark $=3$;
- Route $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ : watermark $=8$;
- Route $\mathrm{I}_{6}$ : watermark = 12;
$\square \mathrm{t}=2$ :
$\square$ Route $I_{2}$ : watermark $=6$;
- Route $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ : watermark = 11;
$\square \mathrm{t}=3$ : Route $\mathrm{I}_{4}$



## Basic Left-Edge Algorithm

- If there is no vertical constraint, the basic left-edge algorithm is optimal.
$\square$ If there is any vertical constraint, the algorithm no longer guarantees optimal solution.

result from basic left-edge algorithm 3 tracks

optimal routing: 2 tracks



## Constrained Left-Edge Algorithm

Algorithm: Constrained_Left-Edge( U, track[j])
$U$ : set of unassigned intervals (nets) $I_{1}, \ldots, I_{n}$;
$\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{j}}=\left[\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}, \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{j}}\right]$ : interval j with left-end x -coordinate $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}$ and right-end $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{j}}$;
track[j]: track to which net $j$ is assigned.
1 begin
$2 U \leftarrow\left\{\mathrm{I}_{1}, \mathrm{I}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{n}}\right\}$;
$3 \mathrm{t} \leftarrow 0$;
4 while $(U \neq \varnothing)$ do
$5 \quad \mathrm{t} \leftarrow \mathrm{t}+1$;
6 watermark $\leftarrow 0$;
7 while (there is an unconstrained $I_{j} \in U$ s.t. $s_{j}>$ watermark) do
8 Pick the interval $I_{j} \in U$ that is unconstrained, with $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}>$ watermark, nearest watermark;
$9 \operatorname{track}[j] \leftarrow \mathrm{t}$;
$10 \quad$ watermark $\leftarrow \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{j}}$;
$11 \quad U \leftarrow U-\left\{I_{j}\right\}$;
12 end

## Constrained Left-Edge Example

$\square I_{1}=[1,3], I_{2}=[1,5], I_{3}=[6,8], I_{4}=[10,11], I_{5}=[2$, $6], I_{6}=[7,9]$.
$\square$ Track 1: Route $I_{1}\left(\right.$ cannot route $I_{3}$ ); Route $I_{6}$; Route $I_{4}$.

- Track 2: Route $\mathrm{I}_{2}$;
$\square$ Track 3: Route $\mathrm{I}_{5}$.
$\square$ Track 4: Route $I_{3}$.



track 2

track 3
track 4


## Dogleg Channel Router

- Deutch, "A dogleg channel router," 13rd DAC, 1976.
$\square$ Drawback of Left-Edge: cannot handle the cases with constraint cycles.

$\square$ Drawback of Left-Edge: the entire net is on a single track.
Doglegs are used to place parts of a net on different tracks to minimize channel height.
Might incur penalty for additional vias.

save 2 tracks, with via penalty



## Dogleg Channel Router

Each multi-pin net is broken into a set of 2-pin nets.Modified Left-Edge Algorithm is applied to each subnet.column: 1 $22 \begin{array}{lllllllllllllll} & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & \text { column: } 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8\end{array}$


A routing instance



Multi-pin net decompositin


## Dogleg Channel Routing Example

| Net | Range |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $[1,4]$ |
| $1_{a}$ | $[2,5]$ |
| 4 | $[2,4]$ |
| $1_{\mathrm{b}}$ | $[5,7]$ |
| 3 | $[6,8]$ |
| 5 | $[7,8]$ |

(a) Nets ordered by left-end coordinates

(d) $\mathbf{1}_{b}$ and 2 are assigned to the $3^{\text {rd }}$ track

(b) $1_{\mathrm{a}}$ and 3 are assigned to the $1^{\text {st }}$ track

(c) 4 and 5 are assigned to the $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ track

(e) The final routing result with doglegs

## Modern Routing Considerations

$\square$ Signal/power Integrity
Capacitive crosstalk
Inductive crosstalk

- IR drop
$\square$ Manufacturability
- Process variation
- Optical proximity correction (OPC)
- Chemical mechanical polishing (CMP)
- Phase-Shift Mask (PSM)
$\square$ Reliability
- Double via insertion
- Process antenna effect
- Electromigration (EM)
- Electrostatic discharge (ESD)


## Outline

$\square$ Partitioning
$\square$ Floorplanning

■Placement
$\square$ Routing
$\square$ Compaction

## Layout Compaction

-Course contents
■ Design rules
■ Symbolic layout
■ Constraint-graph compaction


## Design Rules

Design rules: restrictions on the mask patterns to increase the probability of successful fabrication.
$\square$ Patterns and design rules are often expressed in $\lambda$ rules.
Most common design rules:

- minimum-width rules (valid for a mask pattern of a specific layer): (a).
- minimum-separation rules (between mask patterns of the same layer or different layers): (b), (c), (d).
- minimum-overlap rules (mask patterns in different layers): (e).


## CMOS Inverter Layout Example



Symbolic layout


Geometric layout

## Symbolic Layout

$\square$ Geometric (mask) layout: coordinates of the layout patterns (rectangles) are absolute (or in multiples of $\lambda$ ).
$\square$ Symbolic (topological) layout: only relations between layout elements (below, left to, etc.) are known.
■ Symbols are used to represent elements located in several layers, e.g. transistors, contact cuts.

- The length, width or layer of a wire or other layout element might be left unspecified.
- Mask layers not directly related to the functionality of the circuit do not need to be specified, e.g. n-well, p-well.
- The symbolic layout can work with a technology file that contains all design rule information for the target technology to produce the geometric layout.


## Compaction and its Applications

$\square$ A compaction program or compactor generates layout at the mask level. It attempts to make the layout as dense as possible.
$\square$ Applications of compaction:

- Area minimization: remove redundant space in layout at the mask level.
- Layout compilation: generate mask-level layout from symbolic layout.
- Redesign: automatically remove design-rule violations.
■ Rescaling: convert mask-level layout from one technology to another.


## Aspects of Compaction

$\square$ Dimension:

- 1-dimensional (1D) compaction: layout elements only are moved or shrunk in one dimension (x or y direction).
पlls often performed first in the $x$-dimension and then in the $y$-dimension (or vice versa).
- 2-dimensional (2D) compaction: layout elements are moved and shrunk simultaneously in two dimensions.
$\square$ Complexity:
- 1D compaction can be done in polynomial time.
- 2D compaction is NP-hard.


## 1D Compaction: X Followed By Y

$\square$ Each square is $2 \lambda * 2 \lambda$, minimum separation is $1 \lambda$.

- Initially, the layout is $11 \lambda * 11 \lambda$.
$\square$ After compacting along the $\times$ direction, then the $y$ direction, we have the layout size of $8 \lambda * 11 \lambda$.



## 1D Compaction: Y Followed By X

Each square is $2 \lambda * 2 \lambda$, minimum separation is $1 \lambda$.

- Initially, the layout is $11 \lambda$ * $11 \lambda$.
$\square$ After compacting along the $y$ direction, then the $x$ direction, we have the layout size of $11 \lambda * 8 \lambda$.



## 2D Compaction

$\square$ Each square is $2 \lambda^{*} 2 \lambda$, minimum separation is $1 \lambda$.
$\square$ Initially, the layout is $11 \lambda * 11 \lambda$.
$\square$ After 2D compaction, the layout size is only $8 \lambda * 8 \lambda$.

$\square$ Since 2D compaction is NP-complete, most compactors are based on repeated 1D compaction.

## Inequalities for Distance Constraints

Minimum-distance design rules can be expressed as inequalities.

$$
x_{j}-x_{i} \geq d_{i j} .
$$


$\square$ For example, if the minimum width is a and the minimum separation is $b$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x_{2}-x_{1} \geq a \\
& x_{3}-x_{2} \geq b \\
& x_{3}-x_{6} \geq b
\end{aligned}
$$

## The Constraint Graph

$\square$ The inequalities can be used to construct a constraint graph G(V, E):

- There is a vertex $v_{i}$ for each variable $x_{i}$.
- For each inequality $x_{j}-x_{i} \geq d_{i j}$ there is an edge $\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)$ with weight $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{ij}}$.
- There is an extra source vertex, $\mathrm{v}_{0}$; it is located at $\mathrm{x}=0$; all other vertices are at its right.
$\square$ If all the inequalities express minimum-distance constraints, the graph is acyclic (DAG).
$\square$ The longest path in a constraint graph determines the layout dimension.



## Maximum-Distance Constraints

Sometimes the distance of layout elements is bounded by a maximum, e.g., when the user wants a maximum wire width, maintains a wire connecting to a via, etc.

- A maximum distance constraint gives an inequality of the form: $x_{j}-x_{i} \leq c_{i j}$ or $x_{i}-x_{j} \geq-c_{i j}$
- Consequence for the constraint graph: backward edge $\square\left(v_{j}, v_{i}\right)$ with weight $d_{j i}=-c_{i j}$; the graph is not acyclic anymore.
$\square$ The longest path in a constraint graph determines the layout dimension.



## Longest-Paths in Cyclic Graphs

- Constraint-graph compaction with maximum-distance constraints requires solving the longest-path problem in cyclic graphs.
$\square$ Two cases are distinguished:
- There are positive cycles: No bounded solution for longest paths. (The inequality constraints are conflicting.) We shall detect the cycles.
- All cycles are negative: Polynomial-time algorithms exist.



## Longest and Shortest Paths

$\square$ Longest paths become shortest paths and vice versa when edge weights are multiplied by -1 .
$\square$ Situation in DAGs: both the longest and shortest path problems can be solved in linear time.
$\square$ Situation in cyclic directed graphs:

- All weights are positive: shortest-path problem in P (Dijkstra), no feasible solution for the longest-path problem.
- All weights are negative: longest-path problem in $P$ (Dijkstra), no feasible solution for the shortest-path problem.
■ No positive cycles: longest-path problem is in P.
■ No negative cycles: shortest-path problem is in P.


## Remarks on Constraint-Graph Compaction

$\square$ Noncritical layout elements: Every element outside the critical paths has freedom on its best position => may use this freedom to optimize some cost function.
$\square$ Automatic jog insertion: The quality of the layout can further be improved by automatic jog insertion.


- Hierarchy: A method to reduce complexity is hierarchical compaction, e.g., consider cells only.


## Constraint Generation

$\square$ The set of constraints should be irredundant and generated efficiently.
$\square$ An edge $\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)$ is redundant if edges $\left(v_{i}, v_{k}\right)$ and $\left(v_{k}, v_{j}\right)$ exist and $w\left(\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)\right) \leq w\left(\left(v_{i}, v_{k}\right)\right)+w\left(\left(v_{k}, v_{j}\right)\right)$.

- The minimum-distance constraints for $(A, B)$ and ( $B, C$ ) make that for ( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{C}$ ) redundant.

$\square$ Doenhardt and Lengauer have proposed a method for irredundant constraint generation with complexity $O$ ( $n$ log n).

