

# Frost HDL **structs** and **interfaces**

Andrew Clark

March 17, 2019

## Overview

`structs` and `interfaces` are two major features being borrowed from SystemVerilog. `structs` in Frost HDL will have more features than those in SystemVerilog. However, `interfaces` in Frost HDL will have fewer features than `interfaces` in SystemVerilog.

### `structs`

Notably, `structs` in Frost HDL can be `parameterized`. `structs` in SystemVerilog cannot be `parameterized`.

#### 2.1 The Three Forms

`structs` come in three forms in Frost HDL: `packed`, `unpacked`, and `splitvar`.

`packed` and `unpacked` `structs` are similar to the `structs` of SystemVerilog, but `unpacked` is a required keyword if that type of `struct` is desired in Frost HDL.

`splitvar` `structs` in Frost HDL are like an inbetween of `packed` and `unpacked` `structs`.

Additionally, `structs` in general can be used *as* `parameters` of other entities.

##### 2.1.1 `packed` `structs`

`packed` `structs` are the most restrictive type of `struct` in Frost HDL in terms of what their elements can be.

They can be placed on `module` ports and can be placed inside of `interfaces`.

They cannot store arrays of any type, but they can store scalars of built-in types and scalars of other `packed` `structs`.

Also, they compile into plain old Verilog vectors (of type `wire` or `reg`), with different (non-overlapping) slices of the vector indicating the element of the `packed struct`.

They can be used as vectors within Frost HDL source code, as well, but this will require manual casting.

### 2.1.2 `unpacked structs`

`unpacked structs` can not be placed on module ports or inside of `interfaces`.

However, other than this restriction, they are the most flexible type of `struct` in Frost HDL. They can contain arrays, even arrays of other other `structs`.

An array of `unpacked structs` will be compiled into a `structure` of arrays. This is the primary method by which one can use multi-dimensional arrays in Frost HDL. Simply use an array of `unpacked structs` where each `struct` contains another array. This will produce a multi-dimensional array in the generated Verilog. This is admittedly a little inconvenient, so direct support for multi-dimensional arrays *may* be added to the language later.

In some simple cases cases, an `unpacked struct` *may* be compiled into a vector in the generated Verilog.

### 2.1.3 `splitvar structs`

`splitvar structs` are inbetween `packed` and `unpacked structs` in terms of functionality.

They can be placed on ports.

They cannot be treated as vectors, but they can contain arrays of built-in types and arrays of `packed structs`. They can contain non-array elements of these as well.

The elements of a `splitvar struct` are compiled into separate variables in the generated Verilog, including if placed on `module` ports or inside of an `interface`. These variables will share the same port direction if their `splitvar struct` is used as `module` ports.

## **interfaces**

These are similar to basic `interfaces` in SystemVerilog. Unlike in SystemVerilog, however, they can not have their own ports.

`modport` must be used if an `interface` is used for a `module` port. A `modport` will be "flattened" into Verilog `module` ports.

In the `module` that an `interface` is instantiated, the component variables of that `interface` will be implemented, in the generated Verilog, as separate variables, similar to what *may* happen with `unpacked structs` and what *always* happens with `splitvar structs`.

`interfaces` cannot be instantiated inside of other `interfaces`, and `unpacked structs` may not be instantiated inside of `interfaces`.

All other types (built-in; `enums`; `packed structs`; `splitvar structs`) are fair game, and they may be instantiated inside of `interfaces`.

`interfaces` may be `parameterized`, and they may contain `functions` and `tasks`.

Note that any Frost HDL language constructs that are not mentioned here are probably *not* going to be allowed inside of an `interface`.

What I'm not sure about is if I want to support polymorphism via `interfaces` and the name of a `modport`. This seems like a desirable feature, and it would be feasible to implement because the compiler can see which `interfaces` are used where.

Perhaps some form of implementation inheritance for `interfaces` could be

supported as well.