

資工所 碩一 田少谷 P76071268

[illegible]

Flow Summary	
Flow Status	Successful - Tue Nov 13 17:26:21 2018
Quartus II 32-bit Version	12.1 Build 177 11/07/2012 SJ Web Edition
Revision Name	ate
Top-level Entity Name	ate
Family	Cyclone II
Device	EP2C70F896C8
Timing Models	Final
Total logic elements	97 / 68,416 ( < 1 % )
Total combinational functions	82 / 68,416 ( < 1 % )
Dedicated logic registers	55 / 68,416 ( < 1 % )
Total registers	55
Total pins	19 / 622 ( 3 % )
Total virtual pins	0
Total memory bits	496 / 1,152,000 ( < 1 % )
Embedded Multiplier 9-bit elements	0 / 300 ( 0 % )
Total PLLs	0 / 4 ( 0 % )

 $\frac{1}{3}$

[illegible]

**Explanation:**

1. When reset==1, initialize the value of all regs as 0.
2. I add an extra buffer[64] so that it can be compared to the value of the threshold.
3. With the advise of others, I set the range of the value of block\_count between 0 to 5, so that the code will be easier (namely, no need to write if block\_count==6, 12 bla bla bla)
4. Also, the value of bin has to be set up in "assign", as it can assign value **instantly** when the value of block\_count changes. This is the adjustment I made after encountering errors.

**Extra thoughts during completing the homework:**

## 1. Code Simplification

I tried to improve my codes after it succeeded to function, with the guidance of masters in our lab.

Firstly, express numbers in their complete bit length, so that the program will not fill the empty bits with wrong numbers.

```
before: if (block_count== 5)
after:  if (block count== 5'd5)
```

Then, I was told to use **bit comparison** to substitute number comparison.

```
before: if (block_count== 5'd5)
after: if (block count[2] & block count[0])
```

As in my code, the value range of `block_count` is between 0 and 5, so it's impossible to have 7(111 in binary) but only 5(101 in binary). Therefore, use **and** comparing the [0] and [2] position of `block count` can achieve the same idea as comparing `==5`.

## 2. Division of Combinational and Sequential circuit

At first, I was told that I could improve my coding style by **dividing combinational and sequential circuit**. However, I wasn't sure if it's about coding style or the performance of circuits.

Therefore, after some further explanation, I came to understand that the circuit produced by the following two codes are actually the same:

```
always @(*)
    c = a+b

always @(posedge clk)
    out<= c

always @(posedge clk)
    out<= a+b
```

Of course the first one will be easier to debug; however, under the situation that this homework doesn't require thousands of lines of code, it's totally fine to code in the second instance's way.

Eventually, I stick to the second coding style, as I feel comfortable coding this way, and I can write a few lines less. Since it does no harm, why not?

tags: IC Design Adaptive Threshold Engine ATE image segmentation