Requirements:	
\checkmark	The design must be hierarchical (i.e., using blocks which you can reuse)
\checkmark	One of the modules must be a 4-bit ripple earry adder
\checkmark	You must use Structural Verilog (gate-level specification) for the RCAs. You may use Behavioral Verilog
	for the MUXes
\checkmark	You should use Behavioral Verilog for the verification logic. This will be presented in discussion sections
\checkmark	Base the 64-bit adders on 1-bit full adders made up of ANDs, ORs, and NOTs. In particular, if you use
	XORs or half adders, then you must create a module first and build them up from ANDs, ORs, and NOTs
\checkmark	For timing, set ANDs and Ors to count as one gate delay and NOTs to zero gate delays. The behavioral
	MUXes should also have zero gate delays.
\checkmark	Create two versions of all of the adders:
	Using standard logic gates.
	Using the "timed" gates to be provided.
\checkmark	Your timing diagram must include representative examples. This is relatively easy in this lab, but become
	more important later in the semester.
	e. Random small A&B input (w/ and w/o carry)
	d. Random combinations
Turn in:	
\checkmark	. v files
\checkmark	timing results description
\checkmark	waveforms from testbench
\checkmark	question answers

Questions:

What are the times of your adders in gate delays?

The timing varies depending on the size of the input. For small inputs, both the CSA and RCA are similar. As the input size increases, the RCA begins to struggle to keep up, and I wasn't able to extend the testbench window enough to keep up. The CSA handles the larger results much better, and does not increase in runtime at the same rate as the RCA.

Are they what you expect? Why or why not?

Yes, the RCA takes much longer to process larger inputs, since these inputs need to "ripple" throughout the entire structure. The CSA is able to do many more comparisons in parallel, so it is significantly faster as the size of the inputs increases. It's worth noting that the theoretical delay for the RCA is 128 gate delays, which is derived from 16 copies of a 4 bit RCA. For the CSA, this delay is cut in half to 64 gate delays, as it runs each half of the computation in parallel.

Timing Result Description:

The results with no delay are fairly similar between both the RCA and CSA. When running the RCA with large enough delays in the testbench to let it catch up to the new input values, it clearly struggles as the inputs increase. The CSA has a similar run speed to the RCA at low input values, but runs significantly faster as input values increase. The screenshots are as follows:

- CSA Odelay.png
 - The waveform of the carry select adder with no gate delays
- CSA 1delay
 - The waveform of the carry select adder with 1 gate delay, with testbench delays of 10
- CSA Idelay bigtb
 - The waveform of the carry select adder with 1 gate delay, with testbench delays of 100
- CSA Idelay behaviorcheck
 - The waveform of the carry select adder with 1 gate delay, with a behavioral check to ensure the correct answer
- RCA Odelay
 - The waveform of the ripple-carry-adder with no gate delays
- RCA 1delay
 - The waveform of the ripple-carry-adder with 1 gate delay, with a testbench delay of 10
- RCA Idelay bigtb
 - The waveform of the ripple-carry-adder with a gate delay of 1, with a testbench delay of 100
- RCA_1delay_behaviorcheck
 - The waveform of the ripple carry adder with 1 gate delay, with a behavioral check to ensure the correct answer

.v File Descriptions:

- CSA 64bit.v
 - Carry select adder top module (1 gate delays)
- RCA 64bit.v
 - Ripple carry adder top module (1 gate delays)
- RCA 4bit.v
 - o 4 bit ripple carry adder (1 gate delays)
- FullAdder.v
 - o Full adder (1 gate delays)
- CSA 64bit tb.v
 - Testbench for the carry select adder (1 gate delays)
- RCA 64bit tb.v
 - Testbench for the ripple carry adder (1 gate delays)

For the equivalent .v files with 0 gate delays, they each have an identical name to their 1 gate delay version, with a " 0" at the end.