Synchronous Languages—Lecture 07

Prof. Dr. Reinhard von Hanxleden

Christian-Albrechts Universität Kiel
Department of Computer Science
Real-Time Systems and Embedded Systems Group

21 Nov. 2016

Last compiled: November 21, 2016, 10:00 hrs

Esterel V—The Constructive Circuit Semantics

The 5-Minute Review Session

1. What is the derivative (*Ableitung*) of a program?
2. How is the *program transition* of an Esterel program defined?
3. How do program transitions express logical coherence?
4. Which semantics for Esterel exist?
5. What are the *constructive coherence laws*, how do they differ from the logical coherence law?

Overview

Translating Esterel to Circuits

- Can consider Esterel programs as SW or HW descriptions
- As it turns out, the HW-equivalent of constructiveness is that the synthesized circuit is delay-independent
  - This gives a firm, physical base for the constructive semantics we just considered
- Can in turn simulate this synthesized HW-circuit in SW
  - This is just what the Esterel v5 compiler does
  - Can then also take advantage of HW optimization techniques
  - Use BDD-based techniques to check constructiveness

Circuit Semantics—Introduction

```
module P1:
input I;
output O;
signal S1, S2 in
  present I then emit S1 end
||
  present S1 else emit S2 end
||
  present S2 then emit O end
end signal
end module
```

$\equiv$

circuit C1:
$S1 = I$
$S2 = \neg S1$
$O = S2$

- Resulting circuit is acyclic
- Hence always stabilizes
- Reactive and deterministic

Circuit Semantics—Introduction

```
module P3:
output O;
present O else emit O end
end module
```

$\equiv$

circuit C3:
$O = \neg O$

- Resulting circuit never stabilizes
- Not reactive

Circuit Semantics—Introduction

```
module P4:
output O;
present O then emit O end
end module
```

$\equiv$

circuit C4:
$O = O$

- Resulting circuit can stabilize at different values
- Not deterministic

Circuit Semantics—Introduction

```
module P9:
[
  present O1 then emit O1 end
||
  present O1 then
    present O2 else emit O2 end
  end
]
```

$\equiv$

circuit C9:
$O1 = O1$
$O2 = O1 \wedge \neg O2$

$\equiv$



- Reactive and deterministic
- But not constructive!

Circuit Semantics—Introduction

```
module P12:
present O then
  emit O;
else
  emit O
end
```

≡

circuit C12:
$O = O \vee \neg O$

≡



- Reactive and deterministic
- Meaning: If it stabilizes, there is only one possible value for each wire's voltage
- But: Does it always stabilize?

Circuit Semantics—Introduction

- Consider following delay assignment:



- Circuit is reactive and deterministic (Newtonian model)
- But: Circuit never stabilizes (Vibration model)
- **Hence: Electrical stabilization is not the conjunction of reactivity and determinism!**

This circuit can be expressed as
$x(t) = x_1(t-1) \vee x_2(t-1)$
with
$x_1(t) = \neg x(t-1)$ and $x_2(t) = x(t-3)$,
resulting in
$x(t) = \neg x(t-2) \vee x(t-4)$.
With $x(t) = 0$ for $t < 0$ this results in an oscillation of x, with period 2.

Circuit Semantics—Introduction

```
module P13:
present I then
  present O2 then emit O1 end
else
  present O1 then emit O2 end
end
```

$\equiv$

circuit C13:
$O1 = I \wedge O2$
$O2 = \neg I \wedge O1$

- Reactive and deterministic
- Cyclic, yet always stabilizes
- Hence: Electrical stabilization does not require acyclicity
- In fact: Electrical stabilization equivalent to constructiveness

Constructive Circuits

Basic building blocks



- Allow insertion of arbitrary delays
- Registers:
  - $reg(X) = 0 \rightarrow pre(X)$

Constructive Circuits

Constructive Boolean (intuitionistic) logic:

- Evaluate equations with constant folding rules
  - not 0 $\rightarrow$ 1
  - not 1 $\rightarrow$ 0
  - 1 or x $\rightarrow$ 1
  - x or 1 $\rightarrow$ 1
  - 0 or 0 $\rightarrow$ 0
  - 0 and x $\rightarrow$ 0
  - x and 0 $\rightarrow$ 0
  - 1 and 1 $\rightarrow$ 1
- There is no law of excluded middle (x or not x $\rightarrow$ 1)!
- Circuit equations yield solution iff circuit is delay insensitive (i.e., the original Esterel program is constructive)
  - Propagation of 1's corresponds to *Must*-analysis
  - Propagation of 0s corresponds to *Cannot*-analysis

The Basic Circuit Translation

- Structural translation
- Follows state semantics
  - Associate registers with "1" statements (pause)
  - Associate combinational logic with all other statements
  - Build up program-circuit from subcircuits
  - Additional boot register to implement initial state
- Basic circuit translation does not address schizophrenia (see later)

Interface for subcircuits



Inputs:

- GO: Starts statement afresh
- RES: Resumes execution of a selected statement
- SUSP: Suspend execution of the statement
  - Registers keep their current value unless killed because of the KILL input
- KILL: Unsets statement's registers in case of a trap exit

Interface for subcircuits contd.



Outputs:

- SEL: Indicates that a state in statement is currently selected for resumption, i.e. that some internal pause register is set
  - Is simply the disjunction of the internal registers.
- K0, K1, ...: Completion codes (1-hot encoding)

Interface for subcircuits contd.



- E and E': input/output signal interface
- Are compound pins or buses
  - Contain one elementary pin per signal visible in the scope of the current statement.
- May freely extract specific signals s or s' out of E or E'.
- As for the K pins, the E' pins are explicitly unset when the statement is not executed
  - I.e. when $\neg($ GO $\vee$ (RES $\wedge$ SEL))

The Global Environment



- Boot register sets GO input in initial instant
- At each clock cycle
  - set RES
  - clock the registers

- Note that the initial 1 for RES does no harm, as no register is selected yet
- SEL and K1 are not needed globally
- The output signal are also fed back to the input signals—as if they were declared as signals at the top-level (see signal declaration later)

Translating the Esterel Kernel

- Completion, with $k \neq 1$:

- $k = 1$ (pause):



Use these conventions to simplify diagrams:

- Unused inputs are not pictured.
- Not all outputs are pictured. An omitted output is assumed to be explicitly unset, i.e. to be driven by a 0 constant

Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $!s$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $p; q$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $s?p, q$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $s \supset p$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $p*$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $p \parallel q$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $p \parallel q$ (contd):
  - The synchronizer computes the maximum of the completion codes
  - Implemented with this (constructive) circuit:



- The inputs `LEM` and `REM` indicate the case where the sets of completion codes are empty—which is the case if neither `GO` is set nor one of the internal registers

Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $\{p\}$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $p \backslash s$:



Translating the Esterel Kernel

- $\uparrow p$:



Example

```
module P2:
signal S in
  emit S;
  present O then
    present S then
      pause
    end present;
    emit O
  end present
end signal
```

≡

circuit C2:
B = ¬ REG(1) // *Boot*
S = B
R = REG(B ∧ O ∧ S) // *pause*
O = (B ∧ O ∧ ¬S) ∨ R
K0 = (B ∧ ¬O) ∨ (B ∧ O ∧ ¬S) ∨ R
K1 = B ∧ O ∧ S

≡



Can you find the bug in the diagram?

- (Hint: have a look at the O- gate)

When evaluating this, it turns out that in the initial instant, it is

- B = S = 1
- R = O = 0
- K0 = 1—hence this terminates after the first instance
- K1 = 0—as expected, as K0 already evaluated to 1

To Go Further

- Gérard Berry, The Constructive Semantics of Pure Esterel, Draft book, current version 3.0, Dec. 2002, Chapters 10 and 11, `http://www-sop.inria.fr/members/Gerard.Berry/Papers/EsterelConstructiveBook.zip`