

# Parallel vs Serial Fault Simulator

Michalis Christou

May 7, 2020

## Introduction

The purpose of this project is to write a fault simulator in C++ that has both parallel and serial modes of operation. The goal is to examine the speedup of the parallel implementation compared to the serial version as well as compare any potential speedups that can occur with or without fault dropping in both cases.

## Background

### Single Stuck at Fault Model

Faults in circuits can be modeled in many ways. The model that was used for the purposes of this project was the single stuck at fault model. In this case the circuit, which is a gate level netlist, has only one faulty line that is either stuck permanently at 1 or 0 and the fault can be at an input or output of a gate. The number of possible fault sites in a given netlist is  $\#PI + \#GATES + \#(fanoutbranches)$  and subsequently since a fault site has 2 potential faults, the number of possible faults in a circuit is  $2 \cdot \#(faultsites)$ .

### Fault Equivalence

Despite a circuit having a maximum number of possible stuck at faults, using some mechanisms we can choose a subset of these faults and if we are able to detect these it means that we can also detect the ones we skipped. For example, fault equivalence means that two faults  $f_1, f_2$  are equivalent if all tests that detect  $f_1$  also detect  $f_2$  and vice versa. This means that if we are able to detect one of the two faults then we know for sure that we can detect the other. Thus we can keep only one of these equivalent faults in our list. This is called fault collapsing. The result is a collapsed fault set that contains one fault from each equivalence subset.

### Fault Dominance

The definition of fault dominance is as follows, if all tests of some fault  $f_1$  detect another fault  $f_2$  then  $f_2$  is said to dominate  $f_1$ . The rule that we use is if fault  $f_2$  dominates  $f_1$  then  $f_1$  is removed from the fault list.

### Checkpoint Theorem

The checkpoint theorem is the result of Fault Equivalence and Fault Dominance. Primary inputs and fanout branches of a combinational circuit are called checkpoints. The theorem suggests that a test set that detects all single stuck at faults on all checkpoints of a combinational circuit also detects all single stuck at faults in that circuit. The checkpoints in a circuit are considered to be primary inputs and fanout branches. This means that if we only consider these fault sites and detect all faults in them, we can also detect all possible stuck at faults in that circuit.

## Fault Simulation

Fault simulation is done in order to detect possible faults in a Boolean circuit. The algorithm is fairly simple and intuitive. First a set of test vectors is obtained. Then using these test vectors the non-faulty circuit response is computed. Then for each stuck at fault that is considered, the fault is injected in the circuit, the fault output is computed and compared to the normal non-faulty output. If the outputs differ, then the fault can be detected. In this case a detected fault counter is incremented. If fault dropping is enabled, then the stuck at fault is deleted from the set. After this is repeated for all test vectors and all faults in the set the fault coverage is computed which is the number of detected faults divided by the total number of faults considered.

$$FC = \frac{\#fd}{\#tf}$$

The pseudocode for the serial algorithm is depicted below.

---

**Algorithm 1** Serial Fault Simulation

---

```
1:  $\#fd = 0, \#tf = |F|$ 
2: for every test  $t \in T$  do
3:    $Rt = \text{true\_value\_simulation}(t, C)$ 
4:   for every fault  $f \in F$  do
5:      $\text{inject\_fault}(C, f)$ 
6:      $Rf = \text{fault\_simulation}(C, f)$ 
7:     if  $Rt \neq Rf$  then
8:        $\#rf ++$ 
9:        $F = \text{drop\_fault}(t, F)$ 
10:    end if
11:  end for
12: end for
13: return  $FC = \text{compute\_fault\_coverage}(\#fd, \#tf)$ 
```

---

## Implementation

This section is dedicated to explain the details and inner workings of the specific C++ implementation. The code is designed to parse `.bench` files that represent gate level netlists as well as test vectors of different formats. Then the code generates all faults according to the Checkpoint Theorem. Depending on the user input the program either runs the serial algorithm or parallel with or without fault dropping.

### Netlist Representation

The netlist is internally represented as a DAG (Directed Acyclic Graph). Specifically, since the purpose of the program is to simulate faults, the graph model that was chosen was  $G_2$ . This model uses one graph node per circuit line and one edge per pair of gates/fanout stems with direct connection, in order to explicitly represent fanout stems. This is necessary in this case because faults could happen in any circuit line thus explicit representation of every line is needed. The data structure used in this case was a  $1 - D$  array with linked lists, since generally speaking, Boolean circuits are sparse thus more memory is saved compared to using a  $2 - D$  array.

### Parallelizing Fault Simulation

When parallelizing algorithms a lot has to be considered. Data dependencies is one aspect that leads to race conditions which in turn, leads to unpredictable code behaviour. In this case, the most important part of parallelizing the algorithm is to ensure that no data dependencies or race conditions would occur. In this case this was achieved easily by splitting the work in equal chunks to  $N$  threads. Since each iteration is almost fully independent splitting the workflow to any number of threads was trivial once the serial algorithm was implemented. The workflow was split as follows: Each thread got a subset of the test vectors, then independently worked on identifying all faults that were previously generated with the checkpoint theorem and stored in a global variable. When using fault dropping threads that detect faults need to modify the global variable (that stores faults) in order to save time for other threads. To ensure that threads would not interfere with one another the global data structure was protected with a mutex since it was part of a critical region, but this was only a problem when using fault dropping. Without fault dropping each thread can work fully independent from any other one.

# Results

## Netlist Stats

The table below shows some useful netlist statistics for all simulated circuits. The table includes circuit data from both ISCAS85 and ISCAS89.

Circuit	NAND	AND	NOR	NOT	BUFF	PI	PO	Paths	KB
s27	1	1	4	2	0	7	4	28	5
s386	0	83	0	41	0	13	13	207	77
s510	61	34	55	32	0	25	13	369	100
s641	4	90	0	272	0	54	42	1722	130
s838.1	57	105	70	158	0	66	33	1714	186
s298	9	31	19	44	0	17	20	231	61
s382	30	11	34	59	0	24	27	400	78
s400	36	11	34	56	0	24	27	448	82
s526	22	56	35	52	0	24	27	410	106
s526	22	56	35	52	0	24	27	410	106
s713	28	94	0	254	0	54	42	21812	145
s344	18	44	30	59	0	24	17	344	65
s344.1	18	44	30	59	0	24	17	344	65
s420.1	29	49	34	78	0	34	17	474	91
s820	54	76	66	33	0	23	24	492	163
s953	114	49	112	84	0	45	52	1156	193
s208.1	15	21	16	38	0	18	9	142	43
s349	19	44	31	57	0	24	17	354	66
s444	58	13	34	62	0	24	27	535	90
s1238	125	134	57	80	0	32	32	3559	245
s1494	0	354	0	89	0	14	25	976	293
s5378	0	0	765	1775	15	214	228	13542	1064
s832	54	78	66	25	0	23	24	506	165
s1423	64	197	92	167	0	91	79	44726	289
s1196.1	119	118	50	141	0	32	32	3098	236
s1488	0	350	0	103	0	14	25	962	292
s9234	528	955	113	3570	0	247	250	244854	1823
s13207	849	1114	98	5378	0	700	790	1345369	2683
s15850	968	1619	151	6324	0	611	684	164738046	3176
s38417	2050	4154	2279	13470	0	1664	1742	1391579	7703
s38584	2126	5516	1185	7805	0	1464	1730	1080723	7734
s35932	7020	4032	0	3861	0	1763	2048	197141	7249
c17	6	0	0	0	0	5	2	11	3
c880	87	117	61	63	26	60	26	8642	174
c1355	416	56	0	40	32	41	32	4173216	267
c1908	377	63	1	277	187	33	25	729056	376
c2670	254	332	12	321	305	233	140	679954	560
c3540	298	495	68	490	246	50	22	28265874	689
c5315	454	718	27	581	419	178	123	1341305	1068
c6288	0	256	2128	32	0	32	32	1101055638	1218
c7552	1028	776	54	876	593	207	108	726494	1486

## Serial Results

Circuit	Time (s)	FC(%)	FD	Thr
s27	0.020549	87.50%	NO	1
s386	19.3314	25.99%	NO	1
s510	29.8353	88.96%	NO	1
s641	12.2275	62.21%	NO	1
s838.1	119.042	32.52%	NO	1
s298	4.39425	74.02%	NO	1
s382	7.73878	72.77%	NO	1
s400	8.28644	66.60%	NO	1
s526	30.6785	57.81%	NO	1
s526	30.6707	64.11%	NO	1
s713	16.9303	61.72%	NO	1
s344	2.4745	70.18%	NO	1
s344.1	2.47505	70.18%	NO	1
s420.1	16.2829	41.67%	NO	1
s820	140.13	42.18%	NO	1
s953	144.841	57.80%	NO	1
s208.1	2.34383	58.33%	NO	1
s349	2.57983	72.35%	NO	1
s444	9.96745	68.44%	NO	1
s27	0.008762	87.50%	YES	1
s386	16.0373	25.99%	YES	1
s510	9.66769	88.96%	YES	1
s641	6.6703	62.21%	YES	1
s838.1	83.4562	32.52%	YES	1
s298	2.30052	74.02%	YES	1
s382	3.67129	72.77%	YES	1
s400	4.37297	66.60%	YES	1
s526	16.823	57.81%	YES	1
s526	16.3637	64.11%	YES	1
s713	9.17699	61.72%	YES	1
s344	1.29709	70.18%	YES	1
s344.1	1.29469	70.18%	YES	1
s420.1	10.5001	41.67%	YES	1
s820	106.441	42.18%	YES	1
s953	80.7145	57.80%	YES	1
s208.1	1.27442	58.33%	YES	1
s349	1.54368	72.35%	YES	1
s444	5.74283	68.44%	YES	1

## Parallel Results

Circuit	Time (s)	FC(%)	FD	Thr
s27	0.018411	87.50%	NO	2
s386	17.3113	25.99%	NO	2
s510	26.352	88.96%	NO	2
s641	10.3201	62.21%	NO	2
s838.1	109.733	32.52%	NO	2
s298	3.82556	74.02%	NO	2
s382	6.72619	72.77%	NO	2
s400	7.27337	66.60%	NO	2
s526	28.301	57.81%	NO	2
s526	28.087	64.11%	NO	2
s713	16.0003	61.72%	NO	2
s344	2.16093	70.18%	NO	2
s344.1	2.22647	70.18%	NO	2
s420.1	15.1997	41.67%	NO	2
s820	130.983	42.18%	NO	2
s953	133.918	57.80%	NO	2
s208.1	2.19149	58.33%	NO	2
s349	2.15274	72.35%	NO	2
s444	7.97324	68.44%	NO	2
s27	0.006698	87.50%	YES	2
s386	15.0778	25.99%	YES	2
s510	9.21763	88.96%	YES	2
s641	5.77095	62.21%	YES	2
s838.1	79.2006	32.52%	YES	2
s298	1.7277	74.02%	YES	2
s382	3.10285	72.77%	YES	2
s400	3.93602	66.60%	YES	2
s526	15.9112	57.81%	YES	2
s526	15.0249	64.11%	YES	2
s713	8.43757	61.72%	YES	2
s344	1.42344	70.18%	YES	2
s344.1	1.13892	70.18%	YES	2
s420.1	10.4531	41.67%	YES	2
s820	95.0126	42.18%	YES	2
s953	71.9942	57.80%	YES	2
s208.1	0.943637	58.33%	YES	2
s349	1.38595	72.35%	YES	2
s444	5.07519	68.44%	YES	2