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Abstract—Accurate and fast characterization of the process variations of nano-CMOS circuits is becoming increasingly important for design for manufacturing (DFM) with highest yield. One of the ways to understand the circuit behavior under the process variations is to analyze the rare events that may happen due to such process variations. The Statistical Blockade (SB) is a approach for such rare events analysis. In SB, the classification threshold selection becomes very important for different tail regions which is related to the number of rare events simulation. This paper presents the values of classification threshold for different tail regions of typical circuits. It is shown that a given classifier requires different number of training samples depending on classification thresholds.

I. INTRODUCTION

The scaling down of CMOS technology has resulted in significant deviations from the nominal values of transistor parameters, such as channel length and threshold voltage [1]. For example, variation in gate length increases from 35% in a 130 nm technology to 60% in a 65 nm technology which results in large variations in the performance of the designed circuit. Traditional corner based analysis and design approaches provide guard-hands for parameter variations and therefore, are prone to introducing pessimism in the design [2]. However, in the nano-CMOS circuits small variations due to inaccuracies in the manufacturing process can cause large relative variations in the behavior of the circuit [3].

Process variations can be classified into two as follows: (1) inter-die variations are the variations from die to die and (2) intra-die variations correspond to variability within a single chip [4], [1]. In modern nano-CMOS, intra-die variations are rapidly and steadily growing and can significantly affect the variability of performance parameters on a chip.

The existing statistical static timing analysis (SSTA) tools have recognized these unavoidably random aspects of manufacturing variations. For example, a linear model is used in [5] for the gate delay as a function of varying gate parameters. In [4], [6], simple grid-based models are used to represent the spatial correlation between gates correlation. The Principal Components Analysis (PCA) techniques are used to extract uncorrelated parameters from this correlation model. Standard Monte Carlo (MC) techniques are most efficient for sampling the statistically likely cases due to nature of its construction. However, these techniques are extremely slow when used for simulating statistically unlikely or rare events. For example, on an average 100 million circuit simulations are required to simulate 5 rare events [7]. In [8], Statistical Blockade (SB) is proposed as a MC technique that allows to efficient filtering of unwanted samples. However, it is difficult to classify all the tail points to build the accurate tail model for high-dimensional data. So usually there is a relaxed boundary for the classifier to block most unwanted points. The tail threshold of whole distribution is denoted as $t$. The classification threshold is denoted as $t_c$. In particular, $t_c$ is defined as 97% to extract 1% tail samples (i.e. $t = 99\%$) [8].

II. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS PAPER

A detailed analysis of Statistical Blockade as a Monte Carlo technique is presented. This paper presents solutions for the following questions:

1) What is the minimal value of classification threshold that can ensure all the true tail points be covered in a loosely defined boundary?

2) What is the minimum number of initial sampling required to cover the given tail points?

After obtaining basic MC analysis, SB is used for analyzing rare events. This helps to obtain the minimum classification threshold $t_c$ required for a given specification. Furthermore, initial training sampling depends strongly on the value of $t_c$ and the portion of the tails that is intended to extract.

III. THE RARE EVENT STATISTICS

The SB approach is used to efficiently generate samples in the tail of the distribution of the performance metric of a circuit [8]. Standard MC is not suitable as it generates samples that follow the complete distribution. The tail portion is the point of interest for a designer for worst case power consumption. In other words, the problem that is of interest in this paper is the rare event statistics. If the tail threshold is the 99% point of the distribution then only one out of 100 simulations is useful.

SB applies “Extreme Value Theory” (EVT) to circuit analysis by blocking out the MC points which are unlikely to fall in the tail region. The classifier used in this research is called Support Vector Machine (SVM) [9], which is implemented as: LIBSVM [10], SVMlight [11] or WEKA [12]. The simulation data are divided into two classes: (1) body region and (2) tail.

...
region. Therefore, the C-Support Vector Classifier is chosen [13], [14]. There are 4 basic kernels of SVM as follows: (1) linear, (2) polynomial, (3) radial basis function (RBF), and (4) sigmoid. The RBF kernel is a good choice as it can non-linearly map samples into a higher dimensional space. One important modification for the classifier is the increment of the tail weight. The number of body points is much more than the tail. The classification error is very low as long as all the body points have been classified correctly no matter whether the tail points are misclassified. So the classifier is biased to the body points by default. Thus, the classification error is reversed by increasing the weight of the tail.

2-dimensional data is used to train a SVM classifier in a NAND Gate for the varying threshold voltages. The randomly generated samples which are classified by the SVM classifier into 2 classes is shown in Fig. 1. The two main problems in SB method focused are: (1) One is the appropriate classification threshold $t_c$ for different tail regions - 3%, 2% and 1% of typical high-replication blocks. (2) The other one is the minimal training samples size for given classification threshold $t_c$.

![Classification of Monte Carlo Generated Samples](image)

**Fig. 1.** Classification of Monte Carlo Generated Samples.

### IV. PROPOSED ALGORITHMS FOR RARE EVENT ANALYSIS

The method to measure the threshold $t_c$ of the classifier for the corresponding tail region is shown in Algorithm 1. The training samples size used is 2000. The function $F_{sim}(N)$ runs 10,000 MC simulation. $Y$ is a vector of output values; e.g. delay for an 8-bit adder. The function $\text{Percentile}(Y, t)$ calculates the value of delay $V$ for the corresponding tail threshold $t$. Then function $\text{Size}(Y_{\text{tail}})$ is used to count the number of tail points after $Y$ compared with $V$. The above steps are also used to select tail points from full MC simulation by empirical method. If threshold $t$ is defined as 99% point in 10,000 points, tail count should be approximately 100. Table I lists the values of $V$ and $S$ for different tail thresholds $t$ in the test case of an 8-bit adder.

The algorithm from step 7 to step 12 is SB method [3]. The function Monte Carlo$(n_0)$ randomly picks up 2000 training samples from $N$. For an 8-bit adder, $x$ is a $2000 \times 4$ matrix, since there are 4 variables to be varied. Each row of matrix $x$ is a point in 4 dimensions. $y$ is a vector of output values from simulation of training samples. $V_c$ is the value of delay for classification threshold $t_c$. It is computed from $y$. The function $\text{BuildClassifier}(x, y, V_c)$ trains and returns the SVM classifier $C$ using training data package $y$ and classification threshold $t_c$. First it is assumed that $t_c = t$. The function $\text{Filter}(C, N)$ filters out the non-tail points in $N$ by the classifier $C$. Only the tail points classified by $C$ will be simulated using the function $F_{sim}(\text{Filter}(C, N))$. Since classification threshold $t_c$ is usually smaller than the real tail threshold $t$, there are some safety margin with $t_c$. The current tail points are not the real tail points we want. Then the false tail points are eliminated by comparing with $V$, the value of output metric for the given tail threshold $t$ in full MC simulation $N$. Finally, the tail points size $S_c$ is obtained by SB method from the same 10,000 samples. $S_c$ is compared with the real size of tail points $S$ which is obtained in step-5. If $S_c < S$, that means not all the tail points can be collected using $t_c$ as the classification threshold. Then the safety margin for $t_c$ is increased. For each cycle, safety margin is increased 1% till $S_c$ is equal to $S$ to get all tail points. At last, $t_c$ is the minimal classification threshold for the corresponding tail region.

The minimal number of training samples $n$ for the fixed classification threshold $t_c$ is chosen using Algorithm 2. The number of training samples can not be less than $n$ for a given $t_c$ when SB method is applied to build the tail model.

### Algorithm 1 For choosing minimal classification threshold $t_c$ for given tail threshold $t$

1. $\text{Assume: training sample size } n_0$ (e.g., $n_0 = 2000$); total sample size $N$ (e.g., $N = 10,000$).
2. $Y = F_{sim}(N)$
3. $V = \text{Percentile}(Y, t)$
4. $Y_{\text{tail}} = \{y_i \in Y: Y_i > V\}$
5. $S = \text{Size}(Y_{\text{tail}})$
6. $\text{for all } t_c = t$ do
7. $x = \text{MonteCarlo}(n_0)$
8. $y = F_{sim}(x)$
9. $V_c = \text{Percentile}(y, t_c)$
10. $C = \text{BuildClassifier}(x, y, V_c)$ // $C$ is a classifier
11. $y_{\text{tail, true}} = \{y_i \in Y_{\text{tail}}: Y_i > V\}$
12. $S_c = \text{Size}(y_{\text{tail, true}})$
13. $\text{if } S_c < S \text{ then}$
14. $t = t - 1$
15. $\text{end if}$
16. $\text{Repeat}$
17. $\text{else}$
18. $t_c = t$
19. $\text{end if}$
20. $\text{end for}$

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tail Points Size and Delay of Corresponding Threshold for Different Tail Regions in 10,000 MC Points of 8-bit Adder.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tail Threshold ($t$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay for Corresponding Threshold ($V_c$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail Points Size ($S$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Otherwise the tail model will not be accurate enough, since not all the tail points are considered. The full tail points size \( S \) is obtained from Step-2 to Step-5 in Algorithm 2 which are the same with Algorithm 1. The cycle (Step-6 \( \sim \) Step-15) is used to collect values of \( S_i \) \((i = 1, 2, \ldots, 20)\) when the training sample size \( n \) is 100, 200, 300, \ldots, 2000, respectively \((n = i \times 100)\). \( S_i \) is the number of selected tail points when SB method is applied. The function \( \text{Find}(S_i = S \text{ and } S_{i+1} = S_{i+2} = \ldots = S_{20} = S) \) gets the value of \( i \) when \( S_i = S_{i+1} = S_{i+2} = \ldots = S_{20} = S \). It implies that full tail points \( S \) can be classified through classifier \( C \) when initial training sample size \( n \) is \( i \times 100 \). And with increasing of training samples size \( n \), the number of extracted tail points \((S_{i+1} \sim S_{20})\) remain stable - all equal to \( S \). Finally the minimal number of training samples \( n \) for the fixed threshold \( t_c \) is \( n = i \times 100 \).

Algorithm 2 For choosing minimal number of training samples \( n \) for the fixed threshold \( t_c \).

1: Assume: Initial training sample size \( n_0 \) (e.g., \( n_0 = 100 \)); total sample size \( N \) (e.g., \( N = 10,000 \)).
2: \( Y = F_{\text{sim}}(N) \)
3: \( V = \text{Percentile}(Y, t_c) \)
4: \( Y_{\text{tail}} = \{Y_i \in Y: Y_i > V \} \)
5: \( S = \text{Size}(Y_{\text{tail}}) \)
6: \textbf{for all} \((i = 1; n_0 \leq 2000; i++) \textbf{do} \)
7: \( x = \text{MonteCarlo}(n_0) \)
8: \( y = F_{\text{sim}}(x) \)
9: \( V_c = \text{Percentile}(y, t_c) \)
10: \( C = \text{BuildClassifier}(x, y, V_c) \)
11: \( y_{\text{tail, true}} = \{y_i \in Y_{\text{tail}}: y_i > V \} \)
12: \( S_i = \text{Size}(y_{\text{tail, true}}) \)
13: \( n_i = n_i + 100 \)
14: \textbf{end for} \)
15: \( \text{Find}(S_i = S \text{ and } S_{i+1} = S_{i+2} = \ldots = S_{20} = S) \)
16: \( n = i * 100 \)

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The experiments are focused on six test cases: an 8-bit adder, an 8-bit subtracter, a 16-bit MUX, a 16-bit comparator, a 4-bit multiplier and a 3-stage single-ended voltage controlled ring oscillator. All of them are realized for 45nm CMOS. MC simulations of 10,000 runs were performed with global, Gaussian distributed threshold voltage and gate oxide thickness with 20% variation. The metric measured is power for VCO and delay (e.g. Fig. 2 for an 8-bit adder) for the rest of test cases.

Fig. 3 shows the number of 1% tail points (tail threshold \( t = 99\% \)) collected in cases \( t_c \) is equal to 99%, 98% and 97% with training sample size increasing from 100 to 2000 for the 8-bit adder. The full 1% tail size of 10,000 samples is 100 as in Table I. From Fig. 3, it is evident that it is unable to pick up all the tail points when \( t_c = 99\% \) no matter how many samples have been used for training. In case \( t_c = 98\% \), 100 tail points can be obtained as well as \( t_c = 3\% \). The principle of how to choose \( t_c \) in Algorithm 1 is to make the safety margin as small as possible. Otherwise the number of the simulation for tail points will increase significantly. For example, for a million MC points, if the selected \( t_c \) has 1% more safety margin, it means about 10,000 more simulations will be needed. Thus, the best value of \( t_c \) is 98% to select 1% tail points.

After \( t_c \) is chosen, the minimal training sample size for \( t_c = 98\% \) is needed. Fig. 4 indicates when full tail points can be extracted in cases \( t_c = 99\% \), 98% and 97%. All 100 tail points are collected from the points (arrow in Fig. 4), and the following extracted tail points sizes all equal to full tail size -100 in case \( t_c = 98\% \). The training sample size in that point is 900. So the minimal number of training points is 900. The overall results are in Table II.

![Fig. 2. 10,000 MC simulation for delay variation in 8-bit adder for 20% variation in gate oxide thickness and threshold voltage.](image)

![Fig. 3. True Tail Points obtained with 100~2000 Training Samples for Different Classification Threshold.](image)

*Fig. 3. True Tail Points obtained with 100~2000 Training Samples for Different Classification Threshold.*

After \( t_c \) is chosen, the minimal training sample size for \( t_c = 98\% \) is needed. Fig. 4 indicates when full tail points can be extracted in cases \( t_c = 99\% \), 98% and 97%. All 100 tail points are collected from the points (arrow in Fig. 4), and the following extracted tail points sizes all equal to full tail size -100 in case \( t_c = 98\% \). The training sample size in that point is 900. So the minimal number of training points is 900. The overall results are in Table II.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal Classification Threshold and Minimal Number of Training Samples Required for 1% Tail of 8-bit Adder.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tail Threshold ((t))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Classification Threshold ((t_c))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Training Samples Size ((n))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5 compares the conditional Cumulative Distribution (CDFs) of tail points between empirical method and statistical blockade using the values from Table II. It shows a good match of two CDFs. The empirical method needs 10,000 MC runs. In SB method, 344 tail points are picked up after classification \((t_c = 98\%)\). Another 900 runs are used to train the classifier.
Fig. 4. Method for Obtaining Minimal Training Sample Size with Different Classification Threshold.

Totally it needs 1244 (344 + 900) MC simulations. Note that, if \( t_c = 97\% \) is chosen here, the total number of simulation, 865 (565 + 300), is even fewer. Since it is only for 10,000 MC samples, which is impossible in industry. For large quantities of MC points, the simulation size of \( t_c = 98\% \) is significantly fewer than \( t_c = 97\% \). For 10,000 MC simulation, it shows 10X speedup compared with empirical method. While it can demonstrate much higher speedup for millions or billions of MC samples.

Fig. 5. Adder Delay Analysis: Empirical vs. Statistical Blockade.

Then values of \( t_c \) and \( n \) are obtained by repeating above processes for 2% and 3% tails for a 8-bit adder and other blocks. The \( t_c \) and \( n \) for six different blocks are indicated in Table III. For 8-bit adder, the minimum classification threshold \( t_c \) is 98% and at least 900 training samples are needed to build 1% tail model (tail threshold \( t = 99\% \)). For extracting 2% tail, \( t_c \) is no larger than 97% and 800 samples should be used for training. When tail threshold \( t \) is 97%, the appropriate \( t_c \) is 96% and minimum initial training samples size is 1200.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Statistical Blockade is an efficient method for rare events analysis. However, the classification threshold and number of training samples are still major issues which may result in inaccurate tail model and slow simulation speed. This paper presented an effective way to the problem of finding the minimum threshold of classifier \( t_c \) for the given tail part and the minimum number of samples \( n \) required for corresponding classification threshold. Based on proposed algorithms, the values of \( t_c \) and \( n \) are derived for six commonly used, high-replication blocks. When the values are applied to Statistical Blockade method, the resulting tail model shows a good match with empirical model. It offers both the fastest speed of simulation and highest accuracy for Statistical Blockade.
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TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks</th>
<th>Tail Threshold ( t_c )</th>
<th>( 99% )</th>
<th>( 98% )</th>
<th>( 97% )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-bit</td>
<td>Minimal Classification Threshold ( t_c )</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adder</td>
<td>Minimal Training Sample Size ( n )</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub.</td>
<td>Minimal Training Sample Size ( n )</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUX</td>
<td>Minimal Classification Threshold ( t_c )</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Training Sample Size ( n )</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp.</td>
<td>Minimal Classification Threshold ( t_c )</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Training Sample Size ( n )</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult.</td>
<td>Minimal Classification Threshold ( t_c )</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Training Sample Size ( n )</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCO</td>
<td>Minimal Classification Threshold ( t_c )</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Training Sample Size ( n )</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>