

CAD Algorithms for Physical Design - Placement

Christos P Sotiriou

1

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Contents


- ▶ **Min-cut**
 - ▶ Optimal Local Placement
- ▶ **Gordian**
 - ▶ QP
 - ▶ Centre of Mass
- ▶ **NTUPlace3**
 - ▶ QP
 - ▶ Density Mitigation
- ▶ **Timberwolf**
 - ▶ SA
- ▶ **Kraftwerk2**
- ▶ **ZSA**
- ▶ **Timing-Driven Placement**
 - ▶ Timingdragon

▶ 2

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Placement Algorithms

- ▶ Combinatorial methods
 - ▶ Min-cut placement
 - ▶ Cluster growth
- ▶ Nondeterministic methods:
 - ▶ Simulated annealing (SA)
 - ▶ Genetic algorithm (GA)
- ▶ Analytical methods:
 - ▶ Force-directed placement
 - ▶ Quadratic placement (QP)
 - ▶ Non-quadratic placement
- ▶ Mixed-size placement



▶ 3

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Placement Problem

- ▶ **Placement Problem:** assign cells to positions on the chip, such that no two cells overlap with each other (legalization) and some cost function (e.g., wirelength) is optimized
 - ▶ A major step in physical design that has been studied for 40+ years.

▶ 4

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Modern Placement Challenges

- ▶ **High complexity**
 - ▶ Millions of objects to be placed
- ▶ **Placement constraints**
 - ▶ Preplaced blocks
 - ▶ Chip density, etc.
- ▶ **Mixed-size placement**
 - ▶ Hundreds/thousands of large macros with millions of small standard cells
- ▶ **Datapath placement**
 - ▶ Regular structure, functional stage alignment
- ▶ **Many more**

▶ 5


CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Basic Wirelength Models

- ▶ **Half-perimeter wirelength (HPWL):** Half the perimeter of the bounding rectangle that encloses all the pins of the net to be connected
 - ▶ Most widely used approximation!
- ▶ **Squared Euclidean distance:** squares of all pairwise terminal distances in a net using a quadratic cost function

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{ij} [(x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2]$$


- ▶ **Steiner-tree approximation:** Computationally expensive
- ▶ **Minimum spanning tree:** Good approximation to Steiner trees



▶ 6

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Wirelength Estimation Examples




► 7

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Quadratic Wirelength vs. Linear Wirelength

- HPWL is convex, but not differentiable
- Quadratic wirelength is a convex, differentiable function
 - easier/faster to minimize
- Both models correlate with each other “to some degree”
 - (might incur large errors if two cells are far away)



► 8

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Placement Algorithm Paradigms


- ▶ The placement problem is NP-complete.
- ▶ Popular placement algorithms:
 - ▶ **Constructive algorithms:** once the position of a cell is fixed, it is not modified anymore
 - ▶ Cluster growth, min cut, QP, etc.
 - ▶ **Iterative algorithms:** intermediate placements are modified in an attempt to improve the cost function.
 - ▶ Force-directed method, nonlinear placement, etc
 - ▶ **Nondeterministic approaches:** simulated annealing, genetic algorithm, etc.
- ▶ May combine multiple elements:
 - ▶ Constructive algorithms are used to obtain an **initial placement**
 - ▶ The initial placement is followed by **iterative improvement**
 - ▶ The results can further be improved by **simulated annealing**

▶ 9

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Bottom-up Cluster Growth Placement

- ▶ Greedy method: Selects unplaced components and places them in available slots.
- ▶ SELECT: Choose the unplaced component that is most strongly connected to all of the placed components (or most strongly connected to any single placed component)
- ▶ PLACE: Place the selected component at a slot such that a certain “cost” of the partial placement is minimized



▶ 10

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

C.M. Kyung, J.M. Widder, D.A. Mlynksi, "Adaptive Cluster Growth (ACG): A New Algorithm for Circuit Packing in Rectilinear Region", Proceedings of EDAC, March 1990

Adaptive Cluster Growth




Figure 3: Assignment of modules to each of the four quadrant sections of a rectilinear region.





Figure 4: Criteria of selecting the deposition site




11

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Cluster Growth Example

- ▶ # of other terminals connected: $ca=3$, $cb=1$, $cc=1$, $cd=1$, $ce=4$, $cf=3$, and $cg=3$; e has the most connectivity
- ▶ Place e in the center, slot 4. a, b, g are connected to e, and $cae=2$, $cbe=cag=1$; Place a next to e (say, slot 3).
- ▶ Continue until all cells are placed
- ▶ Further improve the placement by swapping gates




12

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Partitioning-based Placement

- ▶ Rely on a good partitioner (e.g., hMetis) and partitionmetric (e.g., exact netweight modeling)
- ▶ Pros
 - ▶ Is very fast
 - ▶ Has very good scalability for handling large-scale designs
- ▶ Cons
 - ▶ Relatively harder to handle design with large white spaces




▶ 13

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Top-Down Min-Cut Placement

- ▶ Breuer, "A class of min-cut placement algorithms," DAC-77.
- ▶ **Quadrature**: suitable for circuits with high density in the center
- ▶ **Bisection**: good for standard-cell placement
- ▶ **Slice/Bisection**: good for cells with high interconnection on the periphery



▶ 14

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Min-Cut Placement Algorithm

► Algorithm: Min_Cut_Placement(N, n, C)

/* N : the layout surface */

/* n : # of cells to be placed */

/* n_0 : # of cells in a slot */

/* C : the connectivity matrix */

1 **begin**

2 **if** ($n \leq n_0$) **then** PlaceCells(N, n, C)

3 **else**

4 (N_1, N_2) = CutSurface(N);

5 (n_1, C_1), (n_2, C_2) = Partition(n, C);

6 **Call** Min_Cut_Placement(N_1, n_1, C_1);

7 **Call** Min_Cut_Placement(N_2, n_2, C_2);

8 **end**


► 15

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Quadrature Placement Example

- Apply the F-M or K-L heuristic to partition + Quadrature Placement:

- Cost $C_1 = 4$, $C_2L = C_2R = 2$, etc.




► 16

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Min-Cut Placement with Terminal Propagation

- ▶ Dunlop & Kernighan, "A procedure for placement of standard-cell VLSI circuits," *IEEE TCAD*, Jan. 1985.
- ▶ Drawback of the original min-cut placement: Does not consider the positions of terminal pins that enter a region
- ▶ What happens if we swap {1, 3, 6, 9} and {2, 4, 5, 7} in the previous example?




▶ 17

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Terminal Propagation

- ▶ Should use the fact that s is in $L1$!




- ▶ minimum WL solution is used to select which of the two partitions go into $R1$ (up) and $R2$ (down)

▶ 18

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Terminal Propagation Example




► 19

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Terminal Propagation in more Detail

- Assume that left half of the chip L is already partitioned into $\{P_c, P_d\}$, $y \in P_c$ is located at the center of P_c
- Now partitioning the right half R into $\{P_a, P_b\}$
- For each gate $x \in R$ connected to another gate y , outside R , check to see if y is too **closely located** to the cutline
 - **inside the “window”**; **two parallel lines to the cutline**
 - If y is outside the window, “propagate” y to p
 - where p is point **on the boundary of R**
 - p becomes the “propagated terminal” for y
 - We then connect x and p and ignore the x - y connection
 - During the partitioning refinement, p is fixed at this initial location, and acts like an “anchor” that pulls x into P_a that p is locked in
 - This is due to the fact that if x is not partitioned together with p , the x - p connection increases the cutsize by one




► 20

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Min-Cut Placement Example

- Perform quadrature mincut onto 4×4 grid
- Start with vertical cut first

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= \{e, f\} \\ n_2 &= \{a, e, i\} \\ n_3 &= \{b, f, g\} \\ n_4 &= \{c, g, l\} \\ n_5 &= \{d, l, h\} \\ n_6 &= \{e, i, j\} \\ n_7 &= \{f, j\} \\ n_8 &= \{g, j, k\} \\ n_9 &= \{l, o, p\} \\ n_{10} &= \{h, p\} \\ n_{11} &= \{i, m\} \\ n_{12} &= \{j, m, n\} \\ n_{13} &= \{k, n, o\} \end{aligned}$$



undirected graph model w/ k-clique weighting
thin edges = weight 0.5, thick edges = weight 1

► 21


CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Min-Cut Placement Example – Cuts 1, 2

- First cut has min-cutsizes of 3 (not unique)
- Both cuts 1 and 2 divide the entire chip



(a) cut 1





(b) cut 2, 1st-level quadrants formed

► 22

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Min-Cut Placement Example – Cuts 3, 4

- ▶ Each cut minimizes cutsize
 - ▶ Helps reduce overall wirelength





▶ 23

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Min-Cut Placement Example – Cuts 5, 6

- ▶ 16 partitions generated by 6 cuts
 - ▶ HPBB wirelength = 27




▶ 24

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Recursive Bisection Example with Terminal Propagation – Cuts 1 and 2

- ▶ Start with vertical cut
 - ▶ Perform terminal propagation with middle third window




▶ 25

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Recursive Bisection Example with Terminal Propagation – Cut 3

- ▶ Two terminals are propagated and are “pulling” nodes
 - ▶ Node k and o connect to n and j : p_1 propagated (outside window)
 - ▶ Node g connect to j , f and b : p_2 propagated (outside window)
 - ▶ Terminal p_1 pulls $k/o/g$ to top partition, and p_2 pulls g to bottom




▶ 26

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Recursive Bisection Example with Terminal Propagation – Cut 4

- ▶ One terminal propagated
 - ▶ Node n and j connect to $o/k/g$: p_1 propagated
 - ▶ Node i and j connect to $e/f/a$: no propagation (inside window)
 - ▶ Terminal p_1 pulls n and j to right partition




▶ 27

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Recursive Bisection Example with Terminal Propagation – Cut 5

- ▶ Three terminals propagated
 - ▶ Node i propagated to p_1 , j to p_2 , and g to p_3
 - ▶ Terminal p_1 pulls e and a to left partition
 - ▶ Terminal p_2 and p_3 pull $f/b/e$ to right partition




▶ 28

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Recursive Bisection Example with Terminal Propagation – Cut 6

- ▶ One terminal propagated
 - ▶ Node n and j are propagated to p_1
 - ▶ Terminal p_1 pulls o and k to left partition




▶ 29

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Recursive Bisection Example with Terminal Propagation – Cut 7

- ▶ Three terminals propagated
 - ▶ Node $j/f/b$ propagated to p_1 , o/k to p_2 , and h/p to p_3
 - ▶ Terminal p_1 and p_2 pull g and l to left partition
 - ▶ Terminal p_3 pull l and d to right partition




▶ 30

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Capo Placer Overview

- ▶ **Pure recursive bi-partitioning placer**
 - ▶ Multi-level FM for instances with > 200 cells
 - ▶ Flat FM for instances with 35-200 cells
 - ▶ Branch-and-bound for instances with < 35 cells
- ▶ **Careful handling of partitioning tolerance**
 - ▶ Uncorking: Prevent large cells from blocking smaller cells to move
 - ▶ Repartitioning: Several FM calls with decreasing tolerance
 - ▶ Block splitting heuristics: Higher tolerance for vertical cut
 - ▶ Hierarchical tolerance computation: Instance with more whitespace can have a bigger partitioning tolerance
- ▶ **Implementation with standard interfaces**
 - ▶ LEF/DEF and GSRC



▶ 33

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Placement by Simulated Annealing – TW6


- ▶ Sechen and Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, "The TimberWolf placement and routing package," *IEEE J. Solid-State Circuits*, Feb. 1985; "TimberWolf 3.2: A new standard cell placement and global routing package," DAC-86.
- ▶ iTools: <http://www.twolf.com>
- ▶ TimberWolf 6.0 – allows overlaps
- ▶ TimberWolf: Stage 1
 - ▶ Modules are moved between different rows, as well as within the same row
 - ▶ Modules overlaps are allowed
 - ▶ When the temperature is reached below a certain value, stage 2 begins
- ▶ TimberWolf: Stage 2
 - ▶ Remove overlaps
 - ▶ Annealing process continues, but only interchanges adjacent modules within the same row

▶ 34

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Timberwolf 6.0 Solution Space and Neighborhood Structure

- ▶ **Solution Space:** All possible arrangements of the modules into rows, possibly with overlaps.
- ▶ **Neighborhood Structure:** 3 types of moves
 - ▶ M1: Displace a module to a new location.
 - ▶ M2: Interchange two modules.
 - ▶ M3: Change the orientation of a module.




▶ 35

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Timberwolf 6.0 Solution Space and Neighborhood Structure

- ▶ TimberWolf first tries to select a move between M1 and M2: $Prob(M1) = 0.8, Prob(M2) = 0.2$.
- ▶ If a move of type M1 is chosen and it is rejected, then a move of type M3 for the same module will be chosen with probability 0.1
- ▶ Restrictions: (1) what row for a module can be displaced? (2) what pairs of modules can be interchanged?
- ▶ **Key: Range Limiter**
 - ▶ At the beginning, (W_T, H_T) is big enough to contain the whole chip.
 - ▶ Window size shrinks as the temperature decreases. Height, width are proportional to $\log(T)$
 - ▶ Stage 2 begins when window size is so small that no inter-row module interchanges are possible



▶ 36

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Timberwolf 6.0 Cost Function

- ▶ Cost Function $C = C1 + C2 + C3$

$$C1 = \sum_{i \in Nets} (\alpha_i w_i + \beta_i h_i) \quad C2 = \gamma \sum_{i \neq j} o_{ij}^2 \quad C3 = \delta \sum_{r \in Rows} |L_r - D_r|$$

- ▶ **C1: total estimated wirelength**
 - ▶ α_i, β_i are horizontal and vertical weights respectively
 - ▶ For $\alpha_i = 1, \beta_i = 1 \rightarrow (1/2) \times$ perimeter of BB of Net i
 - ▶ Critical nets: increase α_i, β_i
 - ▶ If vertical wirings are “cheaper”, use smaller vertical weights
- ▶ **C2: penalty function for module overlaps**
 - ▶ where γ is penalty weight, and O_{ij} is the amount of overlaps in x-dimension between modules i and j
- ▶ **C3: penalty function controlling row length**
 - ▶ where δ is the penalty weight, D_r is the desired row length and L_r is the sum of the widths of modules in row r

▶ 37

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Timberwolf 6.0 Annealing Schedule

- ▶ $T_k = r_k T_{k-1}$
- ▶ r_k increases from 0.8 to a maximum value of 0.94, and then decreases to 0.8
- ▶ At each T , a total number of nP attempts are made
 - ▶ Where n is the number of standard-cells
 - ▶ P is a user specified constraint
- ▶ Termination Condition
 - ▶ $T < 0.1$

▶ 38

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf 7.0

- ▶ Cost Function $C = CI + Cs$
- ▶ CI : total estimated wirelength due to move,
- ▶ Cs : additional wirelength due to inter-row cell shifting
 - ▶ Number of cells shifted per row are minimized
 - ▶ move to the left or to the right accordingly
- ▶ Hierarchical placement approach is used
 - ▶ Netlist is clustered twice in a recursive fashion
 - ▶ The top-level (= second-level) clusters are first placed during the high annealing temperature region
 - ▶ These clusters are then decomposed to reveal the first-level clusters
 - ▶ The placement among the first-level clusters is refined during the mid annealing temperature region
 - ▶ Lastly, the first-level clusters are decomposed to reveal the original gate-level netlist
 - ▶ TimberWolf 7.0 refines this gate-level placement during the low annealing temperature region

▶ 39

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf 7.0

- ▶ Cost Function $C = CI + Cs$
- ▶ CI : total estimated wirelength due to move,
- ▶ Cs : additional wirelength due to inter-row cell shifting
 - ▶ Number of cells shifted per row are minimized
 - ▶ move to the left or to the right accordingly
- ▶ Cs is estimated: for cell z to be shifted:
 - ▶ **Model A:** for each net incident to z , we find two “break points” a and b ($-z$), which defines range $[a, b]$, where the wirelength of the net
 - ▶ (1) does not change if z is located within the range, (2) increases if z is located to the right of b , and (3) decreases if z is located to the left of a ;
 - ▶ the superposition of break points estimates WL change $gradient(z) = \sum_{i \in N_z} D_i(0)$
 - ▶ **Model B:** we first compute the “gradient” of z as:
 - ▶ where N_z denotes the nets incident to z , $D_i(0)$ denotes the “rate of wirelength change of net i measured at the origin”;
 - ▶ If z is at the left boundary of the bounding box of net i , $D_i(0) = -1$, if at the right boundary, $D_i(0) = 1$, else $D_i(0) = 0$
 - ▶ Once the gradient of all cells to be shifted is computed, Cs is estimated as follows:

$$C_s = \sum_{j \in \text{shifted cell}} gradient(j) \cdot shift_amount(j)$$


▶ 40

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example

- ▶ Perform TimberWolf placement
 - ▶ Based on the given standard cell placement
 - ▶ Initial HPBB wirelength = x

$n_1 = \{a, e, g\}$
 $n_2 = \{f, o\}$
 $n_3 = \{b, c, k, n\}$
 $n_4 = \{d, h, i\}$
 $n_5 = \{j, l, m\}$
 $n_6 = \{d, k, j\}$
 $n_7 = \{c, e, f, h, n\}$
 $n_8 = \{d, l\}$
 $n_9 = \{b, g, i, m\}$
 $n_{10} = \{a, k, o\}$





▶ 41

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (b, e)

- ▶ Swap node b and e
 - ▶ We shift node h : on the shorter side of the receiving row
 - ▶ Node b included in nets $\{n_3, n_9\}$, and e in $\{n_1, n_7\}$



$n_1 = \{a, e, g\}$
 $n_2 = \{f, o\}$
 $n_3 = \{b, c, k, n\}$
 $n_4 = \{d, h, i\}$
 $n_5 = \{j, l, m\}$
 $n_6 = \{d, k, j\}$
 $n_7 = \{c, e, f, h, n\}$
 $n_8 = \{d, l\}$
 $n_9 = \{b, g, i, m\}$
 $n_{10} = \{a, k, o\}$

▶ 42

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (b, e)

► ΔW = wirelength change from swap

Let $w(x)$ and $w'(x)$ respectively denote the wirelength before and after the swap. Then,

$$\Delta(n_3) = w'(n_3) - w(n_3) = 24 - 19 = 5$$

$$\Delta(n_9) = w'(n_9) - w(n_9) = 26 - 19 = 7$$

$$\Delta(n_1) = w'(n_1) - w(n_1) = 26 - 19 = 7$$

$$\Delta(n_7) = w'(n_7) - w(n_7) = 28 - 28 = 0$$

Thus,

$$\Delta W = \Delta(n_3) + \Delta(n_9) + \Delta(n_1) + \Delta(n_7) = 19$$


► 43

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (b, e)

► ΔW_s = wirelength change from shifting

- h is shifted and included in $n_4 = \{d, h, i\}$ and $n_7 = \{c, e, f, h, n\}$
- h is on the right boundary of n_4 : $\text{gradient}(h)++$
- h is not on any boundary of n_7 : no further change on $\text{gradient}(h)$



► 44

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (b, e)

Thus, $\text{gradient}(h) = 1$. Since h is shifted to the right by 1

$$\text{shift_amount}(h) = 1$$

Thus,

$$\Delta W_S = \text{gradient}(h) \cdot \text{shift_amount}(h) = 1 \cdot 1 = 1$$

Based on the calculation of ΔW and ΔW_S , we get

$$\Delta C = \Delta W + \Delta W_S = 19 + 1 = 20$$


► 45

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (b, e)

- How accurate is ΔW s estimation?
 - Node h is included in $n_4 = \{d, h, i\}$ and $n_7 = \{c, e, f, h, n\}$
 - Real change is also 1: accurate estimation

$$w'(n_4) - w(n_4) + w'(n_7) - w(n_7) = 20 - 19 + 28 - 28 = 1$$




► 46

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (b, e) – Model A

- Based on piecewise linear graph
 - Shifting h causes the wirelength of n_4 to increase by 1 (19 to 20) and no change on n_7 (stay at 28)




▶ 47

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (m, n)

- Swap node m and o
 - We shift node d and g on the shorter side of the receiving row
 - Node m included in nets $\{n_5, n_9\}$, and o in $\{n_2, n_{10}\}$



▶ 48

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (m, n)

- ▶ ΔW = wirelength change from swap

$$\Delta(n_5) = w'(n_5) - w(n_5) = 12 - 11 = 1$$

$$\Delta(n_9) = w'(n_9) - w(n_9) = 22 - 26 = -4$$

$$\Delta(n_2) = w'(n_2) - w(n_2) = 7 - 14 = -7$$

$$\Delta(n_{10}) = w'(n_{10}) - w(n_{10}) = 23 - 23 = 0$$

Thus,


$$\Delta W = \Delta(n_5) + \Delta(n_9) + \Delta(n_2) + \Delta(n_{10}) = -10$$

▶ 49

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (m, n)

- ▶ Cell d and g are shifted
 - ▶ d is included in $n_4 = \{d, h, i\}$, $n_6 = \{d, k, j\}$, and $n_8 = \{d, l\}$
 - ▶ d is on the right boundary of n_6 and n_8
 - ▶ So, $\text{gradient}(d) = 2$




▶ 50

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (m, n)

- ▶ Cell d and g are shifted
 - ▶ g is included in $n_l = \{a, e, g\}$, and $n_g = \{b, g, i, m\}$
 - ▶ g is on the right boundary of n_l and n_g
 - ▶ So, $gradient(g) = 2$



▶ 51

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (m, n)

Both cell d and g are shifted to the right by 2. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W_S &= gradient(d) \cdot shift_amount(d) + \\ &\quad gradient(g) \cdot shift_amount(g) = 2 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 2 = 8 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the calculation of ΔW and ΔW_S , we get


$$\Delta C = \Delta W + \Delta W_S = -10 + 8 = -2$$

▶ 52

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (k, m)

- ▶ Swap node k and m
 - ▶ We shift node c : on the shorter side of the receiving row
 - ▶ Node k included in nets $\{n_3, n_6, n_{10}\}$, and m in $\{n_5, n_9\}$



▶ 53

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (k, m)

- ▶ ΔW = wirelength change from swap

$$\Delta(n_3) = w'(n_3) - w(n_3) = 25 - 24 = 1$$

$$\Delta(n_6) = w'(n_6) - w(n_6) = 16 - 23 = -7$$

$$\Delta(n_{10}) = w'(n_{10}) - w(n_{10}) = 13 - 23 = -10$$

$$\Delta(n_5) = w'(n_5) - w(n_5) = 21 - 12 = 9$$

$$\Delta(n_9) = w'(n_9) - w(n_9) = 22 - 22 = 0$$

Thus,

$$\Delta W = \Delta(n_3) + \Delta(n_6) + \Delta(n_{10}) + \Delta(n_5) + \Delta(n_9) = -7$$


▶ 54

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (k, m)

► Cell c is shifted

- c is included in $n_3 = \{b, c, k, n\}$ and $n_7 = \{c, e, f, h, n\}$
- c is on the left boundary of n_3
- So, $gradient(c) = -1$



► 55

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

TimberWolf Placement Example – Swap (k, m)

Since c is shifted to the left by 1,

$$shift_amount(c) = -1$$

Lastly,

$$\Delta W_S = gradient(c) \cdot shift_amount(c) = -1 \cdot -1 = 1$$

Based on the calculation of ΔW and ΔW_S , we get


$$\Delta C = \Delta W + \Delta W_S = -7 + 1 = -6$$

► 56

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Dragon Placer

- ▶ Dragon takes a hybrid approach that combines SA and partitioning
 - ▶ Recursive partitioning to reduce the problem size
 - ▶ Annealing to refine the solution generated by partitioning
- ▶ Top-down hierarchical placement
 - ▶ hMetis to recursively quadrisect into 4h bins at level h
 - ▶ Swapping of bins at each level by SA to minimize WL
 - ▶ Terminates when each bin contains < 7 cells
 - ▶ At final stage of GP, switch single cells locally among bins by SA to further minimize WL
- ▶ Detailed placement is done by greedy algorithm




▶ 57

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Dragon Placer

- ▶ GP and DP phases
- ▶ GP combines WL with min-cut based on 4 approaches



▶ 58

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Analytical Placement


- ▶ Key Idea: Solve a relaxed placement problem “optimally”
 - ▶ Ignore overlaps (fixed later)
 - ▶ Adopt linear or non-linear WL estimation
 - ▶ Need I/O Pads/Pins to pull cells outwards
- ▶ Approaches for overlap removal
 - ▶ Cell spreading
 - ▶ Legalization
- ▶ Pros: very good quality for existing benchmarks
- ▶ Cons: hard to handle big macros rotation constraints, region constraints, blockages, etc.

▶ 59

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Force-Directed Methods

- ▶ Hanan & Kurtzberg, “Placement techniques,” in *Design Automation of Digital Systems*, Breuer, Ed, 1972
- ▶ Quinn, Jr. & Breuer, “A force directed component placement procedure for printed circuit boards,” *IEEE Trans. Circuits and Systems*, June 1979
- ▶ Similar to Graph Drawing Algorithms
- ▶ Reducing the placement problem to solving a set of simultaneous linear equations to determine equilibrium locations for cells
- ▶ Analogy to Hooke's law: $F = kd$, F : force, k : spring constant, d : distance.
- ▶ Goal: Map cells to the layout surface.



▶ 60

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Force-Directed Approaches: Zero-Force Target Location


- ▶ Cell i connects to several cells j 's at distances d_{ij} , by wires of weights w_{ij} 's

- ▶ Total Force: $F_i = \sum_j w_{ij} d_{ij}$

- ▶ The zero-Force target location can be determined by equating the x- and y- components of forces to zero:

$$\sum_j w_{ij}(x_j - \hat{x}_i) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \hat{x}_i = \frac{\sum_j w_{ij} x_j}{\sum_j w_{ij}}$$

- ▶ In the example, $\hat{x}_i = \frac{8x_0+10x_2+3x_0+3x_2}{8+10+3+3} = 1.083, \hat{y}_i = 1.5$



▶ 61

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Force-Directed Placement

- ▶ Approach I (constructive):

- ▶ Start with an initial placement
- ▶ Compute the zero-force locations for all cells.
- ▶ Apply **linear assignment (matching)** to determine the “ideal” locations for the cells

- ▶ Approach II (can be constructive or iterative):

- ▶ Start with an initial placement.
- ▶ elect a “most profitable” cell p (e.g., maximum F , critical cells) and place it in its zero-force location
- ▶ “Fix” placement if the zero-force location has been occupied by another cell q .

- ▶ Popular options to fix:

- ▶ **Ripple move:** place p in the occupied location, compute a new zero-force location for q , ...
- ▶ **Chain move:** place p in the occupied location, move q to an adjacent location, ...
- ▶ Move p to a free location close to q .

▶ 62

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Example of Force-Directed Placement Algorithm

Algorithm: Force-Directed_Placement

```

1 begin
2 Compute the connectivity for each cell;
3 Sort the cells in decreasing order of their connectivities into list L;
4 while (IterationCount < IterationLimit) do
5   Seed ← next module from L;
6   Declare the position of the seed vacant;
7   while (EndRipple = FALSE) do
8     Compute target location of the seed;
9     case the target location
10    VACANT:
11      Move seed to the target location and lock;
12      EndRipple ← TRUE; AbortCount ← 0;
13    SAME AS PRESENT LOCATION:
14      EndRipple ← TRUE; AbortCount ← 0;
15    LOCKED:
16      Move selected cell to the nearest vacant location;
17      EndRipple ← TRUE; AbortCount ← AbortCount + 1;
18      if (AbortCount > AbortLimit) then
19        Unlock all cell locations;
20        IterationCount ← IterationCount + 1;
21    OCCUPIED AND NOT LOCKED:
22      Select cell as the target location for next move;
23      Move seed cell to target location and lock the target location;
24      EndRipple ← FALSE; AbortCount ← 0;
25 end


```

► 63

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Placement Algorithm

- Kleinhans, Sigl and Johannes, "GORDIAN:VLSI placement by quadratic programming and slicing optimization," TCAD, October 91 (ICCAD-90).
- Global placement (analytical scheme)
- Detailed placement (combinatorial search)




► 64

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Global Placement Optimization

- ▶ Apply QP (Quadratic Programming)
 - ▶ Objective Function: WL (Wire Length)
 - ▶ **Squared Distance** between Modules and Top-Level I/O Pins
- ▶ Constraints:
 - ▶ Centers of the regions of a partitioning level
 - ▶ **Cell Spreading Scheme**



▶ 65

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

QP Objective Function - 1

- ▶ General QP - Minimize: $\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + b^T x + c$
- ▶ **This is equivalent to solving the system:** $Ax = b$
- ▶ QP can be formulated independently in x, y directions
- ▶ For WL minimization:
 - ▶ For any connected cells i, j , let c_{ij} be the connection weight
 - ▶ Cost of a 2-point net between cells i and j :

$$c_{ij}((x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2)$$
 - ▶ **Ignoring cell overlapping**
- ▶ Total Cost:

$$\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + d_x^T x + \frac{1}{2}y^T Ay + d_y^T y + c$$

▶ 66

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

QP Objective Function - 1

- ▶ For WL minimization: $\frac{1}{2}x^T Ax + b^T x + c$
 - ▶ For any connected cells i, j , let c_{ij} be the connection weight
 - ▶ Cost of a 2-point net between cells i and j :


$$c_{ij}((x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2)$$

- ▶ Top-Level I/Os possess **fixed coordinates**
 - ▶ **Necessary for Analytical Placement Algorithms**

Horizontal cost

$$= \frac{1}{2}c_{12}(x_1 - x_2)^2 + \frac{1}{2}c_{2p}(x_2 - x_p)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & -c_{12} \\ -c_{12} & c_{12} + c_{2p} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -c_{2p}x_p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{2}c_{2p}x_p^2$$




▶ 67

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Simple QP Formulation Example

- ▶ Given a placement P with two fixed I/O pins
 - ▶ p1 @ (100, 175)
 - ▶ p2 @ (200, 225), and
- ▶ And three standard-cells a, b, c and 4 nets N1-N4:
 - ▶ N1(p1, a), N2(a, b), N3(b, c) and N4(c, p2)
- ▶ Find the Optimal coordinates of blocks a, b, c



▶ 68

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Simple QP Formulation Example

- Formulate Cost in x direction:

$$L_x(P) = (100 - x_a)^2 + (x_a - x_b)^2 + (x_b - x_c)^2 + (x_c - 200)^2$$

$$\frac{\partial L_x(P)}{\partial x_a} = -2(100 - x_a) + 2(x_a - x_b) = 4x_a - 2x_b - 200 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial L_x(P)}{\partial x_b} = -2(x_a - x_b) + 2(x_b - x_c) = -2x_a + 4x_b - 2x_c = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial L_x(P)}{\partial x_c} = -2(x_b - x_c) + 2(x_c - 200) = -2x_b + 4x_c - 400 = 0$$

- Put it in Matrix Form $Ax = b$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 4 & -2 & 0 \\ -2 & 4 & -2 \\ 0 & -2 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_a \\ x_b \\ x_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 200 \\ 0 \\ 400 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_a \\ x_b \\ x_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 100 \\ 0 \\ 200 \end{bmatrix}$$

- Solution: $x_a = 125, x_b = 150, x_c = 175$

► 69

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Simple QP Formulation Example

- Formulate Cost in y direction:

$$L_y(P) = (175 - y_a)^2 + (y_a - y_b)^2 + (y_b - y_c)^2 + (y_c - 225)^2$$

$$\frac{\partial L_y(P)}{\partial y_a} = -2(175 - y_a) + 2(y_a - y_b) = 4y_a - 2y_b - 350 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial L_y(P)}{\partial y_b} = -2(y_a - y_b) + 2(y_b - y_c) = -2y_a + 4y_b - 2y_c = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial L_y(P)}{\partial y_c} = -2(y_b - y_c) + 2(y_c - 225) = -2y_b + 4y_c - 450 = 0$$

- Put it in Matrix Form $Ax = b$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 4 & -2 & 0 \\ -2 & 4 & -2 \\ 0 & -2 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y_a \\ y_b \\ y_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 350 \\ 0 \\ 450 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y_a \\ y_b \\ y_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 175 \\ 0 \\ 225 \end{bmatrix}$$


- Solution: $y_a = 187.5, y_b = 200, y_c = 212.5$

► 70

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Simple QP Formulation Example

- ▶ Given a placement P with two fixed I/O pins
 - ▶ p1 @ (100, 175)
 - ▶ p2 @ (200, 225), and
- ▶ And three standard-cells a, b, c and 4 nets N1-N4:
 - ▶ N1(p1, a), N2(a, b), N3(b, c) and N4(c, p2)
- ▶ Find the Optimal coordinates of blocks a, b, c




▶ 71

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Another Simple QP Formulation Example

- ▶ Given a placement P with two fixed I/O pins
 - ▶ p1 @ (100, 170)
 - ▶ p2 @ (200, 300), and
- ▶ And four standard-cells a, b, c, d and 5 nets N1-N5:
 - ▶ N1(p1, a, b), N2(a, c), N3(b, d), N4(c, d), N5(d, p2)
- ▶ Find the Optimal coordinates of blocks a, b, c, d

Point to Point Model



	p1	p2
a	1	0
b	1	0
c	0	0
d	0	1

	a	b	c	d
a	2	0	-1	0
b	0	2	0	-1
c	-1	0	2	-1
d	0	-1	-1	3

	Dx	Dy
a	100	170
b	100	170
c	0	0
d	200	300

▶ 72

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for x

<http://wims.unice.fr/wims/wims.cgi>

	p1	p2
a	1	0
b	1	0
c	0	0
d	0	1

	a	b	c	d
a	2	0	-1	0
b	0	2	0	-1
c	-1	0	2	-1
d	0	-1	-1	3

Dx	Dy
100	170
100	170
0	0
200	300

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type $x^{\wedge}2$ or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 2x_1 - x_3 = 100 \\ 2x_2 - x_4 = 100 \\ -x_1 + 2x_3 - x_4 = 0 \\ -x_3 - x_2 + 3x_4 = 200 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

$$\{x_1 = 1300/11, x_2 = 1400/11, x_3 = 1500/11, x_4 = 1700/11\}.$$

► ax = 118, bx = 127, cx = 136, dx = 154

► 73

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for y

<http://wims.unice.fr/wims/wims.cgi>

	p1	p2
a	1	0
b	1	0
c	0	0
d	0	1

	a	b	c	d
a	2	0	-1	0
b	0	2	0	-1
c	-1	0	2	-1
d	0	-1	-1	3

Dx	Dy
100	170
100	170
0	0
200	300

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type $x^{\wedge}2$ or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 2x_1 - x_3 = 170 \\ 2x_2 - x_4 = 170 \\ -x_1 + 2x_3 - x_4 = 0 \\ -x_3 - x_2 + 3x_4 = 300 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

$$\{x_1 = 2130/11, x_2 = 2260/11, x_3 = 2390/11, x_4 = 2650/11\}.$$

► ay = 193, by = 205, cy = 217, dy = 240


► 74

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Another Simple QP Formulation Example

- ▶ Given a placement P with two fixed I/O pins
 - ▶ p1 @ (100, 170)
 - ▶ p2 @ (200, 300), and
- ▶ And four standard-cells a, b, c, d and 5 nets N1-N5:
 - ▶ N1(p1, a, b), N2(a, c), N3(b, d), N4(c, d), N5(d, p2)
- ▶ Find the Optimal coordinates of blocks a, b, c, d

Clique Model (2/k)



75

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for x

	p1	p2
a	2/3	0
b	2/3	0
c	0	0
d	0	1

	a	b	c	d
a	7/3	-2/3	-1	0
b	-2/3	7/3	0	-1
c	-1	0	2	-1
d	0	-1	-1	3

	Dx	Dy
a	200/3	340/3
b	200/3	340/3
c	0	0
d	200	300

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type x^2 or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 7/3 x_1 - 2/3 x_2 - x_3 = 200/3 \\ -2/3 x_1 + 7/3 x_2 - x_4 = 200/3 \\ -x_1 + 2 x_3 - x_4 = 0 \\ -x_2 - x_3 + 3 x_4 = 200 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

{ $x_1 = 5000/39$, $x_2 = 400/3$, $x_3 = 5600/39$, $x_4 = 6200/39$ }.

- ▶ ax = 128, bx = 133, cx = 144, dx = 158

76

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for y

	p1	p2
a	2/3	0
b	2/3	0
c	0	0
d	0	1

	a	b	c	d
a	7/3	-2/3	-1	0
b	-2/3	7/3	0	-1
c	-1	0	2	-1
d	0	-1	-1	3

Dx	Dy
200/3	340/3
200/3	340/3
0	0
200	300

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type $x^{\wedge}2$ or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 7/3 x_1 - 2/3 x_2 - x_3 = 340/3 \\ -2/3 x_1 + 7/3 x_2 - x_4 = 340/3 \\ -x_1 + 2x_3 - x_4 = 0 \\ -x_2 - x_3 + 3x_4 = 300 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

$\{ x_1 = 620/3, x_2 = 640/3, x_3 = 680/3, x_4 = 740/3 \}$.

► **ay = 206, by = 213, cy = 226, dy = 246**

► 77

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Octave Linear Solver

```

Octave
File Edit Debug Window Help News
Current Directory: C:\Users\c_cotr

File Browser
C:\Users\c_cotr
Name
.config
.m
.mh
Workspace
Filter

Name / Class Dimension Value
A double 4x4 [2.333; -0.6666;
B double 4x1 [66.667; 66.667;
ans double 4x1 [128.21; 133.33;

Command Window
>> A = [2, 0, -1, 0; 0, 2, 0, -1; -1, 0, 2, -1; 0, 2, -1, 0, -1, -1, 3];
>> B = [100; 100; 0; 200];
>> A\B:
>> ans
ans =
118.18
127.27
136.36
154.55

<: -2/3, 7/3, 0, -1; -1, 0, 2, -1; 0, 2, -1; 0, -1, -1, 3];
>> B = [200/3; 200/3; 0; 200];
>> A\B:
>> ans
ans =
118.18
127.27
136.36
154.55

>> |
128.21
133.33
143.59
158.97
  
```

► 78

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018


Another Simple QP Formulation Example

- Given a placement P with two fixed I/O pins
 - p1 @ (100, 170)
 - p2 @ (200, 300), and
- And four standard-cells a, b, c, d and 5 nets N1-N5:
 - N1(p1, a, b), N2(a, c), N3(b, d), N4(c, d), N5(d, p2)
- Find the Optimal coordinates of blocks a, b, c, d

Star Model (no weights)

	a	b	c	d
a	4	0	-1	0
b	0	4	0	-1
c	-1	0	4	-1
d	0	-1	-1	6

- s1 @ (120, 210)
- s2 @ (140, 280)
- s3 @ (160, 240)
- s4 @ (180, 260)
- s5 @ (190, 290)



	p1	p2	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5
a	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
b	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
c	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
d	0	1	0	0	1	1	1

Dx	Dy
360	690
380	650
320	540
730	1090

79

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for x

	p1	p2	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5
a	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
b	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
c	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
d	0	1	0	0	1	1	1

	a	b	c	d
a	4	0	-1	0
b	0	4	0	-1
c	-1	0	4	-1
d	0	-1	-1	6

Dx	Dy
360	690
380	650
320	540
730	1090

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type x^2 or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 4x_1 - x_3 = 360 \\ 4x_2 - x_4 = 380 \\ -x_1 + 4x_3 = 320 \\ -x_3 - x_2 + 6x_4 = 730 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

$$\{x_1 = 42340/329, x_2 = 45270/329, x_3 = 50920/329, x_4 = 56060/329\}.$$

- ax = 128.7, bx = 137.6, cx = 154.7, dx = 170.4

80

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for y

	p1	p2	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5		a	b	c	d		Dx	Dy
a	1	0	1	1	0	0	0		4	0	-1	0		360	690
b	1	0	1	0	1	0	0		0	4	0	-1		380	650
c	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		-1	0	4	-1		320	540
d	0	1	0	0	1	1	1		0	-1	-1	6		730	1090

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type x^2 or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 4x_1 - x_3 = 690 \\ 4x_2 - x_4 = 650 \\ -x_1 + 4x_3 - x_4 = 540 \\ -x_3 - x_2 + 6x_4 = 1090 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

$$\{x_1 = 78150/329, x_2 = 75100/329, x_3 = 85590/329, x_4 = 86550/329\}$$

► $ay = 237, by = 228.27, cy = 260.1, dy = 263.1$

► 81

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018


Another Simple QP Formulation Example

- Given a placement P with two fixed I/O pins
 - p1 @ (100, 170)
 - p2 @ (200, 300), and
- And four standard-cells a, b, c, d and 5 nets N1-N5:
 - N1(p1, a, b), N2(a, c), N3(b, d), N4(c, d), N5(d, p2)
- Find the Optimal coordinates of blocks a, b, c, d

Star Model (1/k)

	a	b	c	d
a	7/6	0	-1/3	0
b	0	7/6	0	-1/3
c	-1/3	0	4/3	-1/3
d	0	-1/3	-1/3	2

- s1 @ (120, 210)
- s2 @ (140, 280)
- s3 @ (160, 240)
- s4 @ (180, 260)
- s5 @ (190, 290)



	p1	p2	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5
a	1/4	0	1/4	1/3	0	0	0
b	1/4	0	1/4	0	1/3	0	0
c	0	0	0	1/3	0	1/3	0
d	0	1/3	0	0	1/3	1/3	1/3

	Dx	Dy
a	305/3	2350/12
b	325/3	365/2
c	320/3	540/3
d	730/3	1090/3

► 82

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for x

	p1	p2	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5		a	b	c	d		Dx	Dy
a	1/4	0	1/4	1/3	0	0	0	a	7/6	0	-1/3	0		305/3	2350/12
b	1/4	0	1/4	0	1/3	0	0	b	0	7/6	0	-1/3		325/3	365/2
c	0	0	0	1/3	0	1/3	0	c	-1/3	0	4/3	-1/3		320/3	540/3
d	0	1/3	0	0	1/3	1/3	1/3	d	0	-1/3	-1/3	2		730/3	1090/3

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type x^2 or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 7/6 x_1 - 1/3 x_3 = 305/3 \\ 7/6 x_2 - 1/3 x_4 = 325/3 \\ -1/3 x_1 + 4/3 x_3 - 1/3 x_4 = 320/3 \\ -1/3 x_3 - 1/3 x_2 + 2 x_4 = 730/3 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

$$\{ x_1 = 130450/991, x_2 = 140510/991, x_3 = 154320/991, x_4 = 169710/991 \}.$$

► $ax = 131.6, bx = 141.7, cx = 155.7, dx = 171.2$

► 83

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Solution for y

	p1	p2	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5		a	b	c	d		Dx	Dy
a	1/4	0	1/4	1/3	0	0	0	a	7/6	0	-1/3	0		305/3	2350/12
b	1/4	0	1/4	0	1/3	0	0	b	0	7/6	0	-1/3		325/3	365/2
c	0	0	0	1/3	0	1/3	0	c	-1/3	0	4/3	-1/3		320/3	540/3
d	0	1/3	0	0	1/3	1/3	1/3	d	0	-1/3	-1/3	2		730/3	1090/3

Linear solver

Hint. Want to enter x^2 ? Type x^2 or $x**2$.

You have entered the system

$$\begin{cases} 7/6 x_1 - 1/3 x_3 = 1175/6 \\ 7/6 x_2 - 1/3 x_4 = 365/2 \\ -1/3 x_1 + 4/3 x_3 - 1/3 x_4 = 180 \\ -1/3 x_3 - 1/3 x_2 + 2 x_4 = 1090/3 \end{cases}$$

This system has a unique solution, which is

$$\{ x_1 = 240425/991, x_2 = 229745/991, x_3 = 259275/991, x_4 = 261535/991 \}.$$

► $ay = 242.6, by = 231.83, cy = 261.6, dy = 263.9$

► 84

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Net Models Comparison

Model	X Coordinate	Y Coordinate
P2P (no weights)	ax = 118, bx = 127, cx = 136, dx = 154	ay = 193, by = 205, cy = 217, dy = 240
CLIQUE (2/n)	ax = 128, bx = 133, cx = 144, dx = 158	ay = 206, by = 213, cy = 226, dy = 246
STAR (no weights)	ax = 128.7, bx = 137.6, cx = 154.7, dx = 170.4	ay = 237, by = 228.27, cy = 260.1, dy = 263.1
STAR (1/n)	ax = 131.6, bx = 141.7, cx = 155.7, dx = 171.2	ay = 242.6, by = 231.83, cy = 261.6, dy = 263.9

Assumes Existing Placement


85

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Convexity

- ▶ The QP objective function is a **convex** function
 - ▶ If x is a single variable $f''(x) \geq 0$
 - ▶ If $x = [x_1 \ x_2 \ \dots \ x_n]^T, x^T H x \geq 0$

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} & \dots & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1 \partial x_n} \\ \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2 \partial x_1} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2^2} & \dots & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_2 \partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n \partial x_1} & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n \partial x_2} & \dots & \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_n^2} \end{bmatrix}$$




- A:** $(x, f(x))$
- B:** $(x', f(x'))$
- C:** $(cx + (1-c) x', f(cx + (1-c) x'))$
- D:** $(cx + (1-c) x', cf(x) + (1-c) f(x'))$
- Convex:** $cf(x) + (1-c) f(x') \geq f(cx + (1-c) x')$

86

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Partitioning Scheme

- ▶ After global optimization, modules are divided into two parts such that the module areas of both subsets are about the same
- ▶ Sort the x- (y-) coordinates of the modules and cut the region vertically (horizontally).




▶ 87

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Partitioning Constraints

- ▶ Constraints: make the center of module gravity correspond to the center of the region, $A^{(l)}x = u^{(l)}$
 - ▶ each entry in A gives the area ratio of the module in the corresponding region
 - ▶ f_m : area of module m, u_r = center of a region r,
 x_m = module coordinate



$$A^{(l)} = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} A & B & C & D & E & F & \dots \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} \vdots \\ \ell \\ \rho' \\ \vdots \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ * & * & * & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & * & * & * & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} x_a f_a + x_b f_b + x_d f_d &= u_r (f_a + f_b + f_d) \\ x_d f_d + x_e f_e + x_f f_f &= u_r' (f_d + f_e + f_f) \end{aligned}$$

▶ 88

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian QP Formulation

- ▶ The objective function is a convex quadratic function.
 - ▶ C is positive definite.
- ▶ Constraints are linear (and thus convex)
- ▶ QP has a unique global minimum x^*
- ▶ QP can be solved optimally in polynomial time
- ▶ Ignore the non-overlapping constraint at the global placement stage
- ▶ The problem in x- and y-directions can be separated and solved independently


$$QP: \min_x (F(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T A x + d_x^T x; A^{(l)} x = u^{(l)})$$

▶ 89

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Placement Example

- ▶ Perform GORDIAN placement
 - ▶ Uniform area and net weight, area balance factor = 0.5
 - ▶ Undirected graph model: each edge in k -clique gets weight $2/k$




▶ 90

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Top-Level I/O Placement

- Necessary for any Analytical Method to work




► 91

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Matrix A Build-up – **Adjacency Matrix**

- Shows connections among movable nodes
 - Among nodes a to j

$$\begin{pmatrix}
 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{7}{6} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 \frac{2}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{7}{6} & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{7}{6} & 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{7}{6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
 \frac{7}{6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
 \frac{1}{2} & 1 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0
 \end{pmatrix}$$




► 92

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Matrix A Build-up – Pin Connection Matrix

- Shows connections between movable nodes and IO
- Rows = movable nodes, columns = IO (fixed)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{2}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{2}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$




► 93

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Matrix A Build-up – Degree Matrix

- Based on **both adjacency and pin connection matrices**
- Sum of entries in the same row (= node degree)

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$



► 94

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Matrix A Build-up – Laplacian Matrix

- $L = D - A = \text{Degree Matrix} - \text{Adjacency Matrix}$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{7}{6} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{7}{6} & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{7}{6} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -\frac{7}{6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & -1 & -\frac{2}{3} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -\frac{2}{3} & 0 & -\frac{10}{3} & -\frac{12}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & \frac{11}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & \frac{10}{3} \end{pmatrix}$$

► 95

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Fixed Pin Vectors Build-up

- Based on pin connection matrix and IO location

Each entry i in d_x , denoted $d_{x,i}$, is computed as follows:

$$d_{x,i} = - \sum_j p_{ij} \cdot x(p_j)$$

where p_{ij} denotes the entry of the pin connection matrix, and $x(p_j)$ is the x -coordinate of the corresponding IO pin j .

- Y-direction is defined similarly

► 96

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018


Fixed Pin Vectors Build-up

$$d_{x,1} = -\left(\frac{2}{3} \cdot 0 + \frac{2}{3} \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 1 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2 + 0 \cdot 3 + 0 \cdot 4 + 0 \cdot 4\right) = -1$$

By examining the remaining 9 movable cells, we get

$$d_x^T = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & -\frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} & -1 & -1 & 0 & -3 & -4 & -4 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{2}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$



► 97

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018


Fixed Pin Vectors Build-up

$$d_{y,1} = -\left(\frac{2}{3} \cdot 1 + \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2 + 0 \cdot 3 + 0 \cdot 4 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 2\right) = -2$$

By examining the remaining 9 movable cells, we get

$$d_y^T = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & -\frac{13}{6} & -\frac{25}{6} & -\frac{25}{6} & -\frac{4}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{2}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$



► 98

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 0 QP Formulation

- ▶ No constraints necessary

Minimize

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T Cx + d_x^T x$$

and

$$\phi(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^T Cy + d_y^T y$$

We use MOSEK and obtain the following solution:

$$x^T = (0.95 \quad 0.92 \quad 1.21 \quad 1.32 \quad 1.32 \quad 1.61 \quad 1.98 \quad 2.13 \quad 2.59 \quad 2.51)$$

$$y^T = (1.27 \quad 1.83 \quad 2.48 \quad 2.61 \quad 1.16 \quad 1.45 \quad 1.84 \quad 0.92 \quad 1.41 \quad 2.03)$$


- ▶ MOSEK Alternatives:
 - ▶ **GSL, Intel's MKL**

▶ 99

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 0 Placement

- ▶ Cells with Actual Dimensions will Overlap!




▶ 100

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 1 Partitioning

- ▶ Perform level I partitioning
 - ▶ Obtain center locations for center-of-gravity constraints



▶ $\mathbf{u}_x^{(1)} = [1 \ 3]^T, \mathbf{u}_y^{(1)} = [2 \ 2]^T$

▶ 101

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 1 Constraint

We first sort the nodes based on their x -coordinates:

$$\{b, a, c, e, d, f, g, h, j, i\}$$

We perform partitioning under $\alpha = 0.5$:

$$S_{\rho'} = \{b, a, c, e, d\}, S_{\rho''} = \{f, g, h, j, i\}$$

The center location vectors are:

$$\mathbf{u}_x^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{u}_y^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

We build the matrix $A^{(1)}$ for the center-of-gravity constraint at level $l = 1$:

$$A^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} \end{pmatrix}$$

▶ 102

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 1 LQP Formulation

We now solve the following Linearly constrained QP (LQP) to obtain the new placement for the movable nodes:

$$\text{Minimize } \phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T Cx + d_x^T x, \text{ subject to } A^{(1)} \cdot x = u_x^{(1)}$$

$$\text{Minimize } \phi(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^T Cy + d_y^T y, \text{ subject to } A^{(1)} \cdot y = u_y^{(1)}$$

The solutions are as follows:


$$x^T = (0.70 \quad 0.71 \quad 1.17 \quad 1.21 \quad 1.22 \quad 2.17 \quad 3.10 \quad 2.84 \quad 3.56 \quad 3.33)$$

$$y^T = (1.34 \quad 1.94 \quad 2.66 \quad 2.76 \quad 1.30 \quad 1.83 \quad 2.45 \quad 1.32 \quad 1.91 \quad 2.49)$$

► 103

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 1 Placement



► 104

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Verification


- Verify that the LQP constraints are satisfied in the LHS partition

The following cells are partitioned to the left: $a(0.70, 1.34)$, $b(0.71, 1.94)$, $c(1.17, 2.66)$, $d(1.21, 2.76)$, and $e(1.22, 1.30)$. Thus, the center of gravity is located at:

$$\frac{0.70 + 0.71 + 1.17 + 1.21 + 1.22}{5} = 1.00$$

$$\frac{1.34 + 1.94 + 2.66 + 2.76 + 1.30}{5} = 2.00$$

This agrees with the center location $(1, 2)$.




► 105

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 2 Partitioning

- Add two more cut-lines
 - This results in $p_1=\{c,d\}$, $p_2=\{a,b,e\}$, $p_3=\{g,j\}$, $p_4=\{f,h,i\}$



► 106

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 2 Constraint

The center location vectors are:

$$u_x^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_y^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 3.2 \\ 1.2 \\ 3.2 \\ 1.2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Next, we build the matrix $A^{(2)}$ for the center-of-gravity constraint at level $l = 2$. Recall that $p_1 = \{c, d\}$, $p_2 = \{a, b, e\}$, $p_3 = \{g, j\}$, $p_4 = \{f, h, i\}$. Thus,

$$A^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where the rows denote the partitions p_1 through p_4 , and the columns denote the cells a through j .

► 107

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 2 LQP Formulation

We now solve the following LQP to obtain the placement of the movable nodes:

$$\text{Minimize } \phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^T Cx + d_x^T x, \text{ subject to } A^{(2)} \cdot x = u_x^{(2)}$$

$$\text{Minimize } \phi(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^T Cy + d_y^T y, \text{ subject to } A^{(2)} \cdot y = u_y^{(2)}$$

The solutions are as follows:

$$x^T = (0.83 \quad 0.78 \quad 1.00 \quad 1.00 \quad 1.39 \quad 2.28 \quad 2.89 \quad 3.06 \quad 3.66 \quad 3.11)$$


$$y^T = (1.01 \quad 1.78 \quad 3.08 \quad 3.32 \quad 0.82 \quad 1.44 \quad 3.18 \quad 0.59 \quad 1.57 \quad 3.22)$$

► 108

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Level 2 Placement

- ▶ Clique-based wiring is shown




▶ 109

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gordian Example Summary

- ▶ Center-of-gravity constraint
 - ▶ Helps spread the cells evenly while monitoring WL
 - ▶ Removes overlaps among the cells
 - ▶ Using actual cell dimension




▶ 110

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Clustered Placement QP Formulation

- ▶ each cluster is composed of arbitrary set of components
- ▶ N Components, M Clusters, T I/Os
 - ▶ A Matrix Size is $(M + N) \times (M + N)$
 - ▶ Pin Connection Matrix is $(M \times N) \times T$
- ▶ each (Component \rightarrow Cluster) Connection gets -1, or -weight in $(\text{component}_i, \text{cluster}_j)$ cell of Laplacian Matrix
- ▶ each (Cluster \rightarrow Component) Connection gets -1, or -weight in $(\text{cluster}_i, \text{component}_i)$ cell of Laplacian Matrix
- ▶ Thus, diagonal A entries (i, i) should **sum the total of relevant** (Component \rightarrow Cluster) or (Cluster \rightarrow Component) connections
 - ▶ Magnitude of diagonal entries (i, i) , per row, must be $>$ sum of (i, j) connections

is this right?




▶ 111

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Clustered Placement QP Formulation

- ▶ each pin may be connected to multiple cluster components
- ▶ multiple (Pin \rightarrow Cluster), (Cluster \rightarrow Pin) connections are collapsed to a single (Pin \rightarrow Cluster), (Cluster \rightarrow Pin) connections
 - ▶ each cluster is represented by a single pin connection column
- ▶ Cluster cells may be connected to multiple cells of another cluster
- ▶ multiple (Cluster \rightarrow Cluster) connections must also be collapsed to single (i, j) connections in Laplacian Matrix
 - ▶ -1 or -weight
- ▶ Thus, diagonal A entries (i, i) should **consider collapsed** (Cluster \rightarrow Cluster) connections
 - ▶ Magnitude of diagonal entries (i, i) , per row, must be $>$ sum of (i, j) connections

inconsistent!




▶ 112

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Clustered Placement QP Formulation

- ▶ each cluster is composed of arbitrary set of components
- ▶ N Components, M Clusters, T I/Os
 - ▶ A Matrix Size is $(M + N) \times (M + N)$
 - ▶ Pin Connection Matrix is $(M \times N) \times T$
- ▶ multiple (Component \rightarrow Cluster), (Cluster \rightarrow Component) connections are collapsed to a single (Component \rightarrow Cluster), (Cluster \rightarrow Component) connections
 - ▶ -1 or -weight
- ▶ Thus, diagonal A entries (i, i) should **sum the total of relevant** (Component \rightarrow Cluster) or (Cluster \rightarrow Component) connections
 - ▶ *Magnitude of diagonal entries (i, i), per row, must be $>$ sum of (i, j) connections*

consistent!




▶ 113

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Clustered Placement QP Formulation

- ▶ each pin may be connected to multiple cluster components
- ▶ multiple (Pin \rightarrow Cluster), (Cluster \rightarrow Pin) connections are collapsed to a single (Pin \rightarrow Cluster), (Cluster \rightarrow Pin) connections
 - ▶ each cluster is represented by a single pin connection column
- ▶ Cluster cells may be connected to multiple cells of another cluster
- ▶ multiple (Cluster \rightarrow Cluster) connections must also be collapsed to single (i, j) connections in Laplacian Matrix
 - ▶ -1 or -weight
- ▶ Thus, diagonal A entries (i, i) should **consider collapsed** (Cluster \rightarrow Cluster) connections
 - ▶ *Magnitude of diagonal entries (i, i), per row, must be $>$ sum of (i, j) connections*

consistent!




▶ 114

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Matrix A Build-up – **Adjacency Matrix**

- Shows connections among movable nodes
 - Among nodes *a* to *j*

0	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	0	$\frac{7}{6}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	0
$\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	0	0	0	0
0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{7}{6}$	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	0	0
0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{7}{6}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
$\frac{7}{6}$	0	0	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	0	0
$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	0
0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$
0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	0
0	0	0	0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{2}{3}$
0	0	0	1	0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	0




► 115

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Nets and CCs HPWL

- Component C1
 - Connected to C2, C3




► 116

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Analytical Net Models

► Weights Applied Directly on the Laplacian Matrix




- LHS: (a) Net, (b) Hyperedge, (c) Clique, (d) Star
- RHS: (a) routed Net, BB Model (for HPWL), MST, Steiner Tree

► 117

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018


Linearising Quadratic Distance



► 118

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Linearising Quadratic Distance



119

Analytical Net Models

TABLE 17.1
Bounds on the Ratios of Different Net Models

BB(V)	Steiner(V)	Clique(V)	Star(V)
1	1	1	1
$\frac{\lceil \sqrt{n-2} \rceil}{2} + \frac{3}{4}$	1	$\begin{cases} \frac{9}{8} & \text{for } n = 4 \\ 1 & \text{for } n \neq 4 \end{cases}$	1
$\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}{n-1}$	$\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}{n-1}$	1	1
$\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$	$\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$	$\frac{n-1}{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$	1

The following result tells how well the other three net models approximate the length of an optimum rectilinear Steiner tree. For two-terminal nets, all the net models are identical.

Theorem 1 Let V be a finite set of points in \mathbb{R}^2 and $n := |V| \geq 3$. Then Table 17.1 shows an upper bound on $\frac{\mathcal{M}_1(V)}{\mathcal{M}_2(V)}$ for net models \mathcal{M}_1 (row) and \mathcal{M}_2 (column) from BB, Steiner, Clique, and Star.

As an example how to read Table 17.1, the entry in the second row and third column says that $\text{Steiner}(V) \leq \frac{9}{8} \text{Clique}(V)$ for all V and $\text{Steiner}(V) \leq \text{Clique}(V)$ if $n \neq 4$. All inequalities are essentially tight for all n . This result is due to Brenner and Vygen (2001).

- ▶ **Steiner(V) ≤ Clique(V) ≤ Star(V) for n ≠ 4**
- ▶ **Clique is superior to Star**
- ▶ estimates the length of an optimum rectilinear Steiner tree more accurately

120

Analytical Net Models

TABLE 17.1
Bounds on the Ratios of Different Net Models

	BB(V)	Steiner(V)	Clique(V)	Star(V)
BB(V)	1	1	1	1
Steiner(V)	$\frac{\lceil \sqrt{n-2} \rceil + 3}{4}$	1	$\begin{cases} 9/8 & \text{for } n = 4 \\ 1 & \text{for } n \neq 4 \end{cases}$	1
Clique(V)	$\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}{n-1}$	$\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}{n-1}$	1	1
Star(V)	$\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}{2}$	$\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}{2}$	$\frac{n-1}{2}$	1

The following result tells how well the other three net models approximate the length of an optimum rectilinear Steiner tree. For two-terminal nets, all the net models are identical.

Theorem 1 Let V be a finite set of points in \mathbb{R}^2 and $n := |V| \geq 3$. Then Table 17.1 shows an upper bound on $\frac{M_1(V)}{M_2(V)}$ for net models M_1 (row) and M_2 (column) from BB, Steiner, Clique, and Star.

As an example how to read Table 17.1, the entry in the second row and third column says that $\text{Steiner}(V) \leq \frac{9}{8} \text{Clique}(V)$ for all V and $\text{Steiner}(V) \leq \text{Clique}(V)$ if $n \neq 4$. All inequalities are essentially tight for all n . This result is due to Brenner and Vysen (2001).

Star Weight =
 $k \times \text{Clique Weight}$,
for k -size net

- ▶ **Steiner(V) ≤ Clique(V) ≤ Star(V) for $n \neq 4$**
 - ▶ BUT: Clique is very compute intensive as Matrix is dense
 - ▶ **Hybrid Net Model**
 - ▶ For net size < 4 use Clique, ≥ 4 use Star

▶ 121

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Analytical Net Models

- ▶ **Weights Applied Directly on the Laplacian Matrix**
- ▶ **Clique Model**
 - ▶ Utilizes all possible two-pin connections of a net
 - ▶ For a net with p vertices a complete graph is considered,
where the weight of each edge is $\frac{1}{|p|-1}$ or $\frac{2}{|p|}$
 - ▶ Number of tree edges is $(|p| - 1)$
 - ▶ Number of clique graph edges is $\binom{n}{2} = \frac{n!}{2! \times (n-2)!} = \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)$
- ▶ **Sum of Clique edges is model**
- ▶ **Thus, under these models, for a clique of size p we have**
 - ▶ $\frac{2}{|p|} \frac{1}{2} |p|(|p| - 1) = |p| - 1$ or $\frac{1}{(|p| - 1)} \frac{1}{2} |p|(|p| - 1) = \frac{1}{2} |p|$

▶ 122

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Analytical Net Models

► Weights Applied Directly on the Laplacian Matrix

► Clique Model

- Utilizes all possible two-pin connections of a net
- For a net with p vertices a complete graph is considered,

where the weight of each edge is $\frac{1}{|p| - 1}$

- Number of tree edges is $(|p| - 1)$

- Number of clique graph edges is:

- **Quadratic Complexity on Net Size**

$$\binom{n}{2} = \frac{n!}{2! \times (n-2)!} = \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)$$

► Star Model

- Introduces an additional star pin per net (median)
- Connects each net pin to the star pin
- A net consisting of p vertices will be represented by $|p| - 1$ edges

► 123

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Bound2Bound Net Model


► Linear complexity – Matrix modification

► Net consists of one or more **two-pin connections**


► For each connection, **weight** is determined by:

$$w_{x,pq}^{\text{B2B}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if pin } p \text{ and pin } q \text{ are inner pins} \\ \frac{2}{P-1} \frac{1}{|x_p^{\text{pin}} - x_q^{\text{pin}}|}, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Clique Model
adds internal
net lengths



No inner pin connections, just
connections to the boundary pins.



Bound2Bound
does not

► 124

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Bound2Bound Net Model

- WL Quadratic to Linear Conversion through Bound2Bound Net Model: (left pin $p=1$, right pin $q=2$)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Gamma_{n,x} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{q=p+1}^P w_{x,pq}^{\text{B2B}} (x_p^{\text{pin}} - x_q^{\text{pin}})^2 \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{P-1} \left[|x_1^{\text{pin}} - x_2^{\text{pin}}| + \sum_{q=3}^P |x_1^{\text{pin}} - x_q^{\text{pin}}| \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \sum_{q=3}^P |x_2^{\text{pin}} - x_q^{\text{pin}}| \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{P-1} [w_n + (P-2)w_n] \\
 &= w_n.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$w_{x,pq}^{\text{B2B}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if pin } p \text{ and pin } q \text{ are inner pins} \\ \frac{2}{P-1} \frac{1}{|x_p^{\text{pin}} - x_q^{\text{pin}}|}, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$


$$w_n = |x_1^{\text{pin}} - x_2^{\text{pin}}|$$

► 125

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Incremental HPWL Computation

- For minor HPWL changes, it is best to incrementally update HPWL




► 126

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Incremental HPWL Computation

- For minor HPWL changes, it is best to incrementally update HPWL




► 127

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Incremental HPWL Computation

- For minor HPWL changes, it is best to incrementally update HPWL




► 128

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Incremental HPWL Computation

- For minor HPWL changes, it is best to incrementally update HPWL




► 129

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Incremental HPWL Computation

- For minor HPWL changes, it is best to incrementally update HPWL



► 130

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Map – 1

- ▶ The distribution of the cells is modeled by a Demand-Supply System **D**.

$$D(x, y) = D^{dem}(x, y) - D^{sup}sup(x, y)$$

- ▶ The $D^{dem}(x, y)$ refers to the cells and the $D^{sup}(x, y)$ refers to the placement area (usually the core)
- ▶ Cells are moved away from high density regions (high DEMAND) to low-density regions (high SUPPLY)

▶ 133

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Map - 2

- ▶ Due to the fact that $D^{dem} < D^{sup}$, the system **D** must be balanced and adapted as it is presented, below:

$$\iint_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D^{dem}(x, y) dx dy = \iint_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D^{sup}(x, y) dx dy$$

- ▶ To formulate the demand, a rectangle function **R** is used:

$$R(x, y, x_u, y_u, w, h) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 \leq x - x_u \leq w \\ & \wedge 0 \leq y - y_u \leq h \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

- ▶ where,
 - x, y represent all the points inside the rectangle
 - x_u, y_u represent either the center or the left corner of a module/cell
 - w, h represent the width and height of the cell, accordingly.

▶ 134

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Map - 3

- ▶ Cell i demand

$$D_{cell}^{dem}(x, y) = d_{cell,i} * R(x, y, x'_i - \frac{w_i}{2}, y'_i - \frac{h_i}{2}, w_i, h_i)$$

- ▶ The individual module density $d_{cell,i}$ is usually set to 1.

- ▶ Cell i supply

$$D_{cell}^{sup}(x, y) = d_{sup} * R(x, y, x_{chip}, y_{chip}, w_{chip}, h_{chip})$$

- ▶ Supply density:

$$d_{sup} = \sum_{i=1}^{M+F} \frac{(d_{cell,i} * A_m)}{A_{chip}}$$

▶ 135

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Map - 4

- ▶ D is interpreted as a charge distribution and creates an electrostatic potential φ , based on Poisson's equation:

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) * \varphi(x, y) = -D(x, y)$$

- ▶ Solving the equation determines target points

$$\dot{x}_i = x'_i - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \varphi(x, y) \Big|_{(x'_i, y'_i)}$$

previous location \nearrow

- ▶ Potential φ Gradients are collected in a vector

$$\Phi = \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \varphi \right) \Big|_{(x'_1, y'_1)}, \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \varphi \right) \Big|_{(x'_2, y'_2)}, \quad \dots, \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \varphi \right) \Big|_{(x'_M, y'_M)} \right)^T$$

▶ 136

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Map - 5

- ▶ correct preset supply value is indeed -1
 - ▶ i.e. negative bin unit supply
- ▶ Demand was NOT originally adapted to the Supply
 - ▶ When this is the case, the two surface integrals are not identical, i.e. there is more Supply than Demand
 - ▶ This will lead to an uneven poisson solution, particularly for Dirichlet boundary conditions, where the "more empty space" will create deep troughs (double integral of space produces potential, so maximises at its centre)
 - ▶ as a consequence causes spreading saturation.
 - ▶ This behaviour was indeed observed when using Dirichlet boundary constraints
 - ▶ Neumann boundary constraints do not exhibit this behaviour, due to the explicit gradient (zero) constraint.

▶ 137

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Map - 6


- ▶ to adapt demand to supply, $\text{totalsupply} = \text{totaldemand}$
 - ▶ component Area must be inflated by $(1/\text{utilisation})$
 - ▶ as $\text{utilisation} = \text{demand}/\text{supply}$
 - ▶ $\text{demand} = \text{supply} \times 1/\text{utilisation}$;
- ▶ The $(1/\text{utilization})$ area scaling factor can then be converted to
 - ▶ a dimensions factor for components, as $1/\text{SQRT}(\text{utilisation})$
- ▶ `utilisationwhscalingfactor = 1/sqrt(utilisation);`
`// dimensions, i.e. width, height scaling factor for demand`
`supply balancing //`
- ▶ `cw = cw * utilisationwhscalingfactor;`
`ch = ch * utilisationwhscalingfactor;`
`// scale component, cluster BB width, height by`
`utilisationwhscalingfactor, to adapt demand to supply //`

▶ 138

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Map – 7

- ▶ Boundary Conditions
 - ▶ Dirichlet vs. Neumann



▶ 139

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Quality Control - Acceleration

74 4 Kraftwerk: A Fast and Robust Quadratic Placement Using an Exact Linear Net Model

after loading the placement of the original circuit at different iterations: 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25. The results of Table 4.1 reveals that ECO can be applied at various iterations without harming the net length (increase below 0.1%) but with great improvement in the CPU time (up to 80%) compared if the changed circuit is placed from scratch.

4.4.2 Quality Control

In order to control the important trade-off between the quality of placement and the CPU time, a quality control procedure is called at the end of each iteration in global placement (see Figure 4.4).

This trade-off presents a challenge in everyday placement usage. On the one hand the deadline for placement can be near and therefore the chip has to be placed in short CPU time. On the other hand the quality of placement can be very important with no limit of CPU time.

Equation (4.11) shows that the quadratic cost function Γ consists of two-pin connections and each two-pin connection has the weights $w_{i,j}$ and $w_{i,j}$. These connection weights are changed in each iteration of global placement in order to adapt the quadratic cost function Γ to a realistic objective, e.g., to the net length measured in HPWL, or to fulfill timing requirements. Section 4.2.2 describes the Bounding-Box net model, which uses the connection weights in order to model the HPWL in the quadratic cost function Γ . The authors of [29] show a technique to modify the connection weights in order to model timing requirements in the quadratic cost function Γ .

Hence the more iterations are spent in global placement, the better is the modeling of the real objective and the higher is the quality. On the other hand, the more iterations the global placement needs, the higher is the CPU time, since every single iteration takes a fix CPU time.

If the average module movement μ is controlled to be μ_T in every iteration, then the iteration count I_{global} of global placement is indirectly proportional to μ_T . This is because each module has to move a certain length Δ in global placement in order to get an overlap-free placement and thus following holds true:

$$\Delta \approx \mu_T \cdot I_{global} \Leftrightarrow I_{global} \propto \frac{1}{\mu_T} \quad (4.27)$$

To control the module movement μ to be μ_T , the target points' spring constants \hat{a}_i are used, since a target point with a small spring constant attracts its module less than with a high spring constant.

Altogether, a certain target movement μ_T is set for the quality control and the average module movement μ is compared to μ_T in each iteration: if $\mu < \mu_T$, then every μ_T is increased and if $\mu > \mu_T$ then every μ_T is decreased. Details about this scaling process and the spring constants of the target points in general are explained in Sect. 4.4.3.

Figure 4.5 shows that the presented quality control can efficiently govern the important trade-off between quality of placement and CPU time by using its only

4.4 Implementation Details 75




Fig. 4.5 Trade-off between quality of placement, measured in HPWL, net length, and CPU time with quality control's parameter μ_T . The results are based on six circuits of the ISPD 2005 contest benchmarks. The values in the brackets express the average of iteration count I_{global} .

parameter μ_T . Here the quality of placement is measured in the HPWL of all nets. Compared to $\mu_T = 20$, the CPU time can be decreased to 50% at $\mu_T = 30$. At this point, the quality of placement is less than 2% worse than at the starting point. On the other side at $\mu_T = 10$, the quality can be improved by around 0.5% at a CPU time increase of 70%. With a quality range of less than 2% and a CPU time range more than 100%, Figure 4.5 also demonstrates that our placement algorithm is very robust in quality of placement but flexible in CPU time.

4.4.3 Spring Constants of the Target Points

Please note that the following detailed description of the target points' spring constants does not affect the proof of convergence in Sect. 4.3.2 since this proof is independent of the target points' spring constants.

The spring constants of the target points \hat{a}_i are initialized with

$$\hat{a}_i = \frac{1}{M} \quad M: \text{Number of movable modules} \quad (4.28)$$

Then a function $\kappa(\mu)$ is used in every iteration to scale the spring constants \hat{a}_i of the last iteration to the spring constants \hat{a}_i in the current iteration depending on the module movement μ , i.e., depending on the change of the modules positions during the last iteration:

$$\hat{a}_i \leftarrow \kappa(\mu) \cdot \hat{a}_i' \quad (4.29)$$


Figure 4.6 shows this scaling function $\kappa(\mu)$: At a smaller module movement μ than the target module movement μ_T , the scaling function $\kappa(\mu)$ is greater than one. With (4.29) the spring constants of the target points are increased. At a higher module movement μ than the target movement μ_T , the scaling function $\kappa(\mu)$ is smaller than one and the spring constants of the target points are decreased.

▶ 140

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Quality Control - Acceleration

- ▶ GP Algorithm Acceleration
 - ▶ Iteratively Calibrates Move Force to achieve a target movement
 - In addition, uses heuristic move weight scaling in first iteration



▶ 141

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Quality Control - Acceleration

- ▶ `// alternative, iterative QC weight scaling,`
`i.e. w(i) = qcfactor x w(i - 1) //`
- ▶ `// Update KW2weightmatrix_X, KW2weightmatrix_Y weight values //`
`// updated weight = (w x h) x 1/KW2avgcellarea x qcmultiplier x`
`weightmultiplier //`
- ▶ `KW2weightmatrix_X[i] =`
`min(maximumweight, KW2weightmatrix_X[i] * qcmultiplierx); // maximum`
`weight global is upper weight bound //`
- ▶ `KW2weightmatrix_Y[i] =`
`min(maximumweight, KW2weightmatrix_Y[i] * qcmultipliery); // maximum`
`weight global is upper weight bound //`
- ▶ The interaction between the two, provided the bin size is set to the average cell area and combined with Neumann boundary conditions for the Density Map, achieve a good HPWL result with a small number of GP iterations
- ▶ The iterative QC weight scaling, combined with the initial weight scaling, manage to accelerate the GP process around a larger value of target movements, without a significant loss in HPWL QOR
- ▶ Neumann boundary is necessary, as gradient values will scale gracefully with design size, as **Density Map height (initial) does not confine gradient values to smaller Density Map area**

▶ 142

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

$$\text{Density @ centre} = (D - 0)/Dx = (N/(N/Dx) - 0)/Dx = \sim I$$

Quality Control – Initial Iteration


- ▶ Weight multiplier
 - ▶ $I/(\text{total number of placeable elements})/(\text{average of bin width, bin height})$ is used to normalise, i.e. scale down the bin utilisation gradient value for the initial GP iteration
- ▶ Scaling avoids excess weight values being produced from the large initial bin utilisation gradient values
 - ▶ the latter are large due to placeable element stacking at the center of the Core Area, particularly for the **B2B/B2B** Net Model
 - ▶ no scaling would result in many upper movement bound violations in early iterations
- ▶ In scaling factor
 - ▶ $(\text{total number of placeable elements})/(\text{average of bin width, bin height})$
 - ▶ the numerator corresponds to the maximum bin demand at the centre of the core area for the B2B/B2B Net Model
 - ▶ this is identical to bin utilisation, if bin area corresponds to the average cell area, i.e. $\text{MAX}(\text{bin demand})$;
- ▶ As for the gradient value computation, neighbouring bins are used, thus dx used in the bin utilization gradient dy/dx is bin width or height
 - ▶ therefore, the gradient scaling factor value is $\text{MAX}(\text{bin demand})/\text{average } dx$.

▶ 143

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Quality Control - Acceleration

- ▶ Original Acceleration Function
 - ▶ $1 + \tanh(\log(1/x))$
- ▶ Introduced Polynomial Acceleration which is more versatile
 - ▶ $n/(x^2+1)$, where n is a weight factor
 - ▶ Example on RHS is with $n=3$
 - ▶ $1 + \tanh(\log(1/x))$ is equivalent to $2/(x^2+1)$
- ▶ Default is $2/(x^2+1)$
 - ▶ User may specify weight, if needed




▶ 144


CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Modern Placement Challenges

- ▶ **High complexity**
 - ▶ Millions of objects to be placed
- ▶ **Placement constraints**
 - ▶ Preplaced blocks
 - ▶ Chip density, etc.
- ▶ **Mixed-size placement**
 - ▶ Hundreds/thousands of large macros with millions of small standard cells
- ▶ **Many more**
 - ▶ Datapath
 - ▶ 3D IC
 - ▶ Analog, etc.




2.5M
placeable
objects
mixed-size
design




Macros in
SoC Design

Datapath
Placement



3DIC




▶ 145

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Typical Modern Placement Flow

- ▶ Chen, et al., "A high quality analytical placer considering preplaced blocks and density constraint," ICCAD-06 (TCAD-08)



Computes the best
position for each object to
minimize the cost, e.g. WL,
ignoring overlaps

Removes all overlaps
between objects

Improves the Legalised
solution cost further

▶ 146


CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

HPBB Wirelength Models

▶ Linear (Golden) HPBB Model:

$$W(x, y) = \sum_{e \in E} \left(\max_{v_i, v_j \in E} |x_i - x_j| + \max_{v_i, v_j \in E} |y_i - y_j| \right)$$

- ▶ Is neither smooth or differentiable
- ▶ Approximations
 - ▶ Quadratic (Gordian)
 - ▶ Lp-Norm
 - ▶ LSE (Log-Sum-Exponential),
i.e. Soft Max Approximation
 - ▶ CHKS, etc.



▶ 147

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Log-Sum-Exp (LSE) Wirelength Model

▶ Soft Max Definition

- ▶ The soft maximum of two variables x, y is the function:

$$g(x, y) = \ln(e^x + e^y)$$

- ▶ The soft maximum approximates the hard maximum and is a convex function just like the hard maximum (max)
 - ▶ the accuracy of the soft maximum depends on scale,
e.g. $g(1, 2) = 2.31$, but $g(10, 20) = 20.00004$
 - ▶ The *hardness* of the soft maximum can be controlled by a parameter k :

$$g(x, y) = \ln(e^{(kx)} + e^{(ky)})/k$$

▶ 148

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Log-Sum-Exp (LSE) Wirelength Model

- ▶ Introduced by Naylor in 2001

$$W_{LSE}(x, y) = \gamma \sum_{e \in E} \left(\ln \sum_{v_i \in E} e^{\frac{x_i}{\gamma}} + \ln \sum_{v_i \in E} e^{\frac{-x_i}{\gamma}} + \ln \sum_{v_i \in E} e^{\frac{y_i}{\gamma}} + \ln \sum_{v_i \in E} e^{\frac{-y_i}{\gamma}} \right)$$

- ▶ whereby:

$$\max(x) \cong \gamma \ln \sum_{v_i \in E} e^{\frac{x_i}{\gamma}} \quad -\min(x) = \max(-x)$$

- ▶ effective smooth, differentiable approximation for HPWL
- ▶ Approaches exact HPWL when $\gamma \rightarrow 0$
- ▶ **Has dominated modern placement for 10+ years!**

▶ 149

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Weighted-Average (WA) Model

- ▶ Hsu, Chang, Balabanov, DAC 2011

$$W_{WA}(x, y) = \sum_{e \in E} \left(\frac{\sum_{v_i \in e} x_i e^{\frac{x_i}{\gamma}}}{\sum_{v_i \in e} e^{\frac{x_i}{\gamma}}} - \frac{\sum_{v_i \in e} x_i e^{\frac{-x_i}{\gamma}}}{\sum_{v_i \in e} e^{\frac{-x_i}{\gamma}}} + \frac{\sum_{v_i \in e} y_i e^{\frac{y_i}{\gamma}}}{\sum_{v_i \in e} e^{\frac{y_i}{\gamma}}} - \frac{\sum_{v_i \in e} y_i e^{\frac{-y_i}{\gamma}}}{\sum_{v_i \in e} e^{\frac{-y_i}{\gamma}}} \right)$$

- ▶ Ratio-ed LSE
- ▶ Weighted average of a set of x coordinates, x_i , of a net i:
- ▶ $X(x_i)$ approximates the maximum value of x_i :

$$X(x_i) = \frac{\sum_{v_i \in E} x_i F(x_i)}{\sum_{v_i \in E} F(x_i)} = \frac{\sum_{v_i \in E} x_i e^{\frac{x_i}{\gamma}}}{\sum_{v_i \in E} e^{\frac{x_i}{\gamma}}}$$

- ▶ effective smooth, differentiable approximation for HPWL
- ▶ Approaches exact HPWL when $\gamma \rightarrow 0$

▶ 150

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Other Smooth Wire Models

► Quadratic Model: BonnPlace, FastPlace, Kraftwerk, mFAR

- Not exact Wirelength Modelling

$$W_{QP}(x, y) = \sum_{e \in E} \left(\sum_{v_i, v_j \in e, i < j} w_{ij} (x_i - x_j)^2 + \sum_{v_i, v_j \in e, i < j} w_{ij} (y_i - y_j)^2 \right)$$

► Lp-Norm Model


- Approaches exact HPWL when $p \rightarrow \infty$
- Is compute intensive

$$W_{LPN}(x, y) = \sum_{e \in E} \left(\sqrt[p]{\sum_{v_i \in e} x_i^p} - \sqrt[p]{\sum_{v_i \in e} x_i^{-p}} + \sqrt[p]{\sum_{v_i \in e} y_i^p} - \sqrt[p]{\sum_{v_i \in e} y_i^{-p}} \right)$$

► 151

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Wire Models Ranking




► 152

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Wireload Models Comparison

- Y-axis is Wirelength – smooth 2 variable functions




153

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Placement with Density Constraint

- Given the chip region and block dimensions, divide placement region into bins
- Determine (x, y) for all movable blocks
 - $\min W(x, y)$ -- wirelength function s.t.
 - $Density_b(x, y) \leq MaximumDensity_b$, for each bin b
 - 2. No overlap between blocks



Density Definitions:

$$Density(Global) = \frac{\sum Area_{stdcells}}{\sum Area_{bins}}$$


$$Density(bin\ b) = \frac{\sum_{bin\ b} Area_{stdcells}}{Area_{bin\ b}}$$

154

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Model

- Compute the block area of each bin to obtain the bin density




- Bin Density: $D_b(x, y) = \sum_{v \in V} P_x(b, v) P_y(b, v)$

► 155

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018


Density Smoothing

- Apply bell-shaped function to make bin density function smooth (Kahng & Wang)



$$D_b(x, y) = \sum_{v \in V} P_x(b, v) P_y(b, v)$$

$$D'_b(x, y) = \sum_{v \in V} c_v p_x(b, v) p_y(b, v)$$



$$p_x(b, v) = \begin{cases} 1 - ad_x^2, & 0 \leq d_x \leq \frac{w_v}{2} + w_b \\ b(d_x - \frac{w_v}{2} - 2w_b)^2, & \frac{w_v}{2} + w_b \leq d_x \leq \frac{w_v}{2} + 2w_b \\ 0, & \frac{w_v}{2} + 2w_b \leq d_x, \end{cases}$$

where

$$a = 4 / ((w_v + 2w_b)(w_v + 4w_b))$$

$$b = 2 / (w_b(w_v + 4w_b))$$

► 156


CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density Smoothing - Sigmoid

- ▶ $f(l, x, u) = 1$, if $l < x < u$

$$p(t) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\alpha t}}$$

- ▶ $f(l, x, u) \sim p(x - l)p(u - x)$




- ▶ effective smooth, differentiable approximation for the bin density function
- ▶ Approximates exact 0-1 logic function when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$

▶ 157

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Density-based Placement Process



▶ 158

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Analytical Placement Model

- ▶ Global Placement Problem with Density Constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \min W(x, y) \\ s. t. D_b(x, y) \leq M_b \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Minimise Wirelength, D_b : density, M_b : max density of bin b
- ▶ Constraints can be relaxed into the Objective Function

$$\min W(x, y) + \lambda \sum_{bins\ b} (D_{b(x,y)} - M_b)^2$$


- ▶ Use gradient methods to solve it
- ▶ Increase lambda gradually to reduce density penalty and find optimal (x, y) under density constraint

▶ 159

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Gradient Solvers

- ▶ $\min f(x)$
- ▶ $x_0 \leftarrow$ initial value
- ▶ Repeat until convergence
 - ▶ $x_{i+1} = x_i - f'(x)|_{x=x_i} * \text{stepsize}$



▶ 160


CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Dynamic Step-Size Control

- ▶ Step size is too large
 - ▶ May not converge to a good solution
- ▶ Step size is too small
 - ▶ Incur long running time
- ▶ Adjust the step size s.t. the **average Euclidean movement of all blocks is a fixed value**

$$\text{stepsize } \alpha_k = \frac{s}{\|d_k\|_2}$$

- ▶ d_k is conjugate direction(s)
- ▶ s is a user-specified factor



▶ 161

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Look-ahead Legalisation

▶ 162

CE439 - CAD Algorithms II 13/3/2018

Modern Academic Analytical Placers

Placer	Wirelength Model	Overlap Model	Integration	Optimization
APlace	LSE	Density	Penalty Method	Nonlinear
BonnPlace	Quadratic	Partitioning	Region Constraints	Quadratic
DPlace	Quadratic	Diffusion	Fixed Point	Quadratic
FastPlace	Quadratic	Cell Shifting	Fixed Point	Quadratic
FDP	Quadratic	Density	Fixed Point	Quadratic
Gordian	Quadratic	Partitioning	Region Constraint	Quadratic
hATP	Quadratic	Partitioning	Region Constraint	Quadratic
Kraftwerk2	Bound2Bound	Density	Fixed Point	Quadratic
mFAR	Quadratic	Density	Fixed Point	Quadratic
mPL6	LSE	Density	Penalty Method	Nonlinear
NTUPlace3	LSE/WA	Density	Penalty Method	Nonlinear
RQL	Quadratic	Cell Shifting	Fixed Point	Quadratic
SimPL	Bound2Bound	Partitioning	Region Constraint	Quadratic
Vastu	LSE	Fixed Point	Fixed Point	Nonlinear