Hardware Verification 2IMF20

Julien Schmaltz

Lecture 03:
Reachability and SEC
(some slides courtesy of Brayton, Kuelman & Mishchenko)

TU/e Technische Universiteit Eindhoven University of Technology

Where innovation starts

Previously …

- Conversion from Hardware to Booleans
- Representation of Boolean functions
  - SoP
  - AIGs
  - BDDs
- Basic SAT solving (CNF)
- Combinational Equivalence Checking
  - SoP, BDDs: normal form and equality
  - (FR)AIGs: prove equivalence using SAT/BDD sweeping

CEC - BDDs, AIGs, etc.



Recall these two circuits



Equivalence classes

7,8

2,6

3,5

Registers at equivalent nodes



Equivalence classes

7,8

2,6

3,5

Registers at other nodes



Initial values = 1, inputs = 1



Let’s make the initial states equal



Let’s look at other inputs



Conclusion

- SEC much harder than CEC
  - in practice, SEC less used than CEC
  - still, big steps forward

- General approach
  - try reducing to CEC (find name matching)
  - structural/functional register correspondence
  - **reachability analysis**

Program for today and next lecture

- Look at sequential circuits
- Equivalence defined as always producing the same output
- Reachability techniques for SEC
  - Forward, backward reachability
  - Symbolic reachability with BDD
  - Induction and k-induction with SAT

Basic Model Finite State Machines



M(X,Y,S,S_0,δ,λ):

X: Inputs

Y: Outputs

S: Current State

S_0: Initial State(s)

δ: $X \times S \rightarrow S$ (next state function)

λ: $X \times S \rightarrow Y$ (output function)

Delay element(s):

- Clocked: synchronous
  - single-phase clock, multiple-phase clocks
- Unclocked: asynchronous

Sequential circuit and its state graph





Finite State Machines Equivalence

Build Product Machine $M_1 \times M_2$:



Definition:

M_1 and M_2 are functionally equivalent iff the product machine

$M_1 \times M_2$ produces a constant 0 for all valid input sequences $\{X_1,\ldots,X_n\}$.

State Traversal Techniques

Forward Traversal:

- start from initial state(s)
- traverse forward to check whether “bad” state(s) is reachable



Backward Traversal:

- start from bad state(s)
- traverse backward to check whether initial state(s) can reach them



Combines Forward/Backward traversal:

- compute over-approximation of reachable states by forward traversal
- for all bad states in over-approximation, start backward traversal to see whether initial state can reach them



Transition relation *T*



sequential circuit

Definition.

$$(s', s) \in T \equiv \exists x.s' = \delta(x, s)$$



state graph representation

Example.

T = { (11,10),(11,00),(00,01),(00,11),
(10,11),(10,01),(01,01),(01,11)}

Forward image of a set of states



$$Fwd(P,T) = \{s' | \exists s.s \in P \wedge (s',s) \in T\}$$

Fwd image - Example.



sequential circuit

Compute.

Fwd({(11)}, T) = ?

Fwd({(10),(00)}, T) = ?



Example.

T = { (11,10),(11,00),(00,01),(00,11),
(10,11),(10,01),(01,01),(01,11)}

$$Fwd(P,T) = \{s' | \exists s.s \in P \wedge (s',s) \in T\}$$

Backward image of a set of states



$$Bwd(P,T) = \{s | \exists s'.s' \in P \wedge (s',s) \in T\}$$

Bwd image - Example.



sequential circuit

Compute.

Bwd({(01)}, T) = ?

Bwd({(00),(10)}, T) = ?



Example.

T = { (11,10),(11,00),(00,01),(00,11),
(10,11),(10,01),(01,01),(01,11)}

$$Bwd(P,T) = \{s | \exists s'.s' \in P \wedge (s',s) \in T\}$$

Forward state traversal

```
Algorithm TRAVERSE_FORWARD(t, λ ,S⁰) {
  reached = ∅
  current = S⁰                                    // start from init
  while (reached ≠ (reached ∨ current)) {  // fixed point
    reached = reached ∨ current                    // add new states
    next    = IMG(t,current)                       // one trans.
    current = next                                 // rename variab.
  }
  return ∃x.(λ(x,s) ∧ reached)                     // not equivalent?
}
```

Termination guaranteed because **finitely** many states.

Backward state traversal

```
Algorithm TRAVERSE_BACKWARD(t, λ ,S⁰) {
  reached = ∅
  current = ∃x.(λ(x,s)=1)                          // start from bad
  while (reached ≠ (reached ∨ current)) {  // fixed point
    reached  = reached ∨ current                   // add new states
    previous = PRE_IMG(t,current)                  // one trans.
    current  = previous                            // rename variab.
  }
  return (S⁰ ∧ reached)                            // reached init?
}
```

Termination guaranteed because **finitely** many states.

Symbolic reachability with BDDs

- Explicit state traversal
  - suffers from the state-explosion problem
  - sometimes faster than BDDs

- Efficient alternative
  - represent state transitions using BDDs
  - suffers from high memory usage (GBs in practice)

General Approach to EC

State Space of
$S = M_1 \times M_2$



miscomparing states
i.e. $\lambda \neq 0$

comparing states
i.e. $\lambda = 0$

Initial State S^0

R "Good half"
r(s) = 1

(S-R) "Bad half"
r(s) = 0

Inductive proof of equivalence:

Find subset $R \subseteq S$ with characteristic function f: $S \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ such that:

1. $r(s^0) = 1$ (initial state is in good half)
2. $(r(s) = 1) \Rightarrow r(\delta(x,s)) = 1$ (all states from good half lead go to states in good half)
3. $(r(s) = 1) \Rightarrow \lambda(x,s)) = 0$ (all states in good half are comparing states)

Soundness and Completeness

- With a candidate for R we can:
  - prove equivalence
    - that means the method is “sound”
    - we will not produce “false positives”

  - but not disprove it:
    - that means the method is “incomplete”
    - we may produce “false negatives”

Inductive proofs

Base case: P(s0)

Induction step: P(s) & T(s,s') implies P(s')

Note that both steps can be solved using a SAT solver.

Issues: properties not always inductive

There might be a transition from an unreachable state to a bad state.

Example violating induction step



Transition from s7 to s8 (bad state)

k-induction

Generalise to a given number of steps, called the induction depth.

Base case at depth i:

$$P(s_0) \wedge \exists \pi(s_0, s_i) \rightarrow P(s_0) \wedge ... \wedge P(s_i)$$

Induction step:

$$\exists \pi(s_0, s_{i+1}) \rightarrow P(s_{i+1})$$

Show again on example from paper



Transition from s6 to s8 (bad state). To succeed depth = 4.

Sometimes no depth work



Solved by removing duplicate states in induction step.

How Do We Obtain R?

- Reachability analysis:
  - state traversal until no more states can be explored
    - forward
    - backward
    - explicit
    - symbolic

- Relying on the design methodology to provide R:
  - equivalent state encoding in both machines
  - synthesis tool provides hint for R from sequential optimization
    - manual register correspondence
    - automatic register correspondence

- Combination of them

Register Correspondence

- Find registers in product machine that implement identical or complemented function
  - these are matching registers in the two machines under comparison
  - BUT: might be more, we may have redundant registers

Definition: A register correspondence $RC \subseteq \underline{s} \times \underline{s}$ is an equivalence relation in the set of registers $\underline{s}$

(This definition includes only identical functions, it can be extended to also include complemented functions)

A register correspondence can be used as a candidate for R:

$$r(s) = \prod_{\forall (s^i, s^j) \in RC} (s^i \equiv s^j)$$

Functional Register Correspondence

```
Algorithm REGISTER_CORRESPONDENCE {
  RC' = {(s^i,s^j) | s^i_0 = s^j_0}   // start with registers with
  do {                                // identical initial states
    RC   = RC'
    r(s) = Π_{∀(si,sj)∈RC} (s^i ≡ s^j)
    RC'  = {(s^i,s^j) | (s^i,s^j) ∈ RC ∧ δ^i(x,s)=δ^j(x,s) ∧ r(s)}
  } while (RC' != RC)
  return RC
}
```

In essence:

- the algorithm starts with an initial partitioning with two equivalence classes, one for each initial value
- the algorithm computes iteratively the next state function, assuming that the RC is correct
  - if yes, fixed point is reached and RC returned
  - if no, split equivalence classes along the mis-compares
- termination because adding finitely many state pairs (max # regs prod mach)

Another sequential circuit



x=0

x=0

x=1

x=0

(1,1,1)

(0,1,1)

(0,0,1)

x=1

x=1

(1,0,1)

1/1

0/0

0/1

0/1

(0,0,0)

1/1

1/0

(1,0,0)

Example



Instead of using constraint, use fresh variable for each class



Result:

$\{s^1, s^4\}$

$\{s^2, s^3, s^5\}$

Cutpoint-based EC

Cutpoints are used to partition the Miter



Cutpoint guessing:

- Compute net signature with random simulator
- Sort signatures + select cutpoints
- Iteratively verify and refine cutpoints
- Verify outputs

Product machine - state traversal



As an exercise, compute forward and backward traversal on this example.

Product machine with induction



As an exercise,
check the depth needed
to prove equivalence
using induction.

Another question



For which initial states are the machines equivalent? What which ones are they different?

When they are different, can you give a distinguishing sequence?