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ABSTRACT

Estimating the dynamic powers is crucial for power and energy efficient chip designs. With increasing variability from manufacture processes, dynamic powers can manifest significant variations due to uncertainties in device geometry and delay variations. In this paper, we propose a new statistical dynamic power estimation method considering the spatial correlation in process variation. We first show that channel length variation have significant impacts on the dynamic power of a gate. To consider the spatial correlation of channel length variation, we adopt a newly proposed spatial correlation model where a new set of uncorrelated variables are defined over virtual grids to represent the original physical random variables by least-square fitting. To compute the statistical dynamic power of a gate, we use the segment-based statistical power analysis method considering the spatial correlation of process variation. We first show that variations in the practical chips in nanometer technologies have significant characteristics than when they are far apart. It was shown that variations in the practical chips in nanometer range are spatially correlated [22]. Simple assumption of independence for involved random variables can lead to significant errors.

One great challenge from aggressive technology scaling is the increasing power consumption, which has become a major issue in VLSI design. And the variations in process parameters and timing delays result in variations in power consumption. Many statistical leakage power analysis methods have been proposed to handle both inter-die and intra-die process variation considering spatial variation [3, 11, 19, 23]. However, the problem is far from being solved for dynamic power estimation.

Dynamic power for a digital circuit in general is expressed as follows,

\[ P_{\text{dyn}} = \frac{1}{2} f_{\text{clk}} V_{\text{dd}}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n} C_j S_j \]  

where \( n \) is the number of gates on chip, \( f_{\text{clk}} \) is clock frequency, \( V_{\text{dd}} \) is the supply voltage, \( C_j \) is the sum of load capacitance, \( S_j \) is the switching activity for gate \( j \).

In this way, \( L_{\text{ox}} \) and \( T_{\text{ox}} \) are proved to have the most impact on gate dynamic power consumption. Fig. 1 shows dynamic power variations due to different effective channel length for an AND2 gate in 45nm technology. It can be seen that channel length of a gate has a significant impact on its dynamic power.

In this paper, we propose to develop a more efficient statistical power estimation considering channel length variations with spatial correlation and gate oxide thickness variations, which is not considered in the existing works. The new dynamic power analysis method explicitly considers the spatial correlations and glitch width variations on a chip. The new method follows the segment-based statistical power analysis method [7], where dynamic power is estimated based on the switching period instead of switching events to accommodate the glitch width variations. To consider the spatial correlation of channel length, we set up a set of uncorrelated variables over virtual grids to represent the original physical random variables via fitting. In this way, \( O(n^2) \) time complexity for computing the variances can be reduced to linear time complexity (\( n \) is the number of gates in the circuit). The algorithm works for

\[ \text{AND2 Gate Dynamic Power Variation under Full-swing and Partial-swing} \]

Figure 1: The dynamic power versus effective channel length for an AND2 gate in 45nm technology. (70ps active pulse as partial swing, 130ps active pulse as full swing)
both strong and weak correlations. Furthermore, a look-up table (LUT) is created to cache statistical information for each type of gate to avoid running SPICE repeatedly. The proposed method has no restrictions on models of statistical distributions for dynamic powers. Experimental results show that the proposed method has 5X speedup over recently proposed method [7] and many orders of magnitudes over the Monte Carlo method.

2. PRIOR WORKS

2.1 Existing relevant works

Many works on dynamic power analysis have been proposed in the past. Monte Carlo based simulation was proposed in [2] where the circuit is simulated for a large number of input vectors to gain statistics for average power. Later, probabilistic methods for power estimation were proposed and widely used [6, 9, 13, 14, 21] because statistical estimates can be obtained without time-consuming exhaustive simulation. In [14], the concept of probability waveforms is proposed to estimate the mean and variance of the current drawn by each circuit node. In [13], the notion of transition density is introduced and they are propagated through combinational logic modules without regard to their structure. However, the author did not consider the inner signal correlation, thus the algorithm is not applicable to combinational circuits. Ghosh et al. [9] extended the transition density theory to consider sequential circuits via the symbolic simulation to calculate the correlations between internal lines due to reconvergence. However, the performance of this algorithm is restricted due to its memory space complexity. In [6, 21], the authors used the tagged probabilistic simulation (TPS) to model the set of all possible events at the output of each circuit node and is more efficient compared with [9] due to its effectiveness in computing the signal correlation. The work [9] is based on zero-delay model and the works [2, 13, 21] are based on real delay model. However, all of them assume fixed delay model, which is no longer true under process variation. At the same time, all the previous works only consider full-swing transition and partial-swing effects are not well accounted for.

Recently, several approaches have been proposed for fast statistical dynamic power estimation [1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 17]. Alexander et al. [1] proposed to consider the delay variations and glitches for estimation dynamic powers. With efficient simulation of input vectors, this algorithm has a linear time complexity. But the variation model is quite simple where minimum and maximum bounds for delay were obtained, and partial swings are not considered. Pilli et al. [17] presented another approach, which divides the clock cycle into a number of time slots and the transition density is computed for each slot, but only mean value of dynamic power can be estimated. In [12], the authors used supergated and timed Boolean functions to filter glitches and consider signal correlations due to re-convergent fanouts, but failed to consider the correlations including placement information. Chou et al. [5] used probabilistic delay model based on Monte Carlo simulation technique for dynamic power estimation, also lacks the considerations including placement information. Harish et al. [10] used hybrid power model based on Monte Carlo analysis, the method is only applied to a small two-stage 2-input NAND gate, however, for large circuits, Monte Carlo simulation can be really time consuming.

2.2 Segment-based power estimation method

Dinh et al. [7] recently proposed a method not based on the fixed delay gate model to consider the partial-swing effect as well as the effect of process variation. This method accurately estimate the dynamic power in the presence of process variation, the work in [7] introduces the transition waveform concept, which is similar to the probability waveform [14] or tagged waveform [6] concepts except that variance of the transition time is introduced. Specifically, a transition wave consists of set of transition event, which is a triplet $(p, t, \delta_t)$ where $p$ is the probability for the transition to occur, $t$ is the mean time of the transition and $\delta_t$ is the standard deviation of the transition time. Fig. 2 shows an example of transition waveform for a node.

![Figure 2: A transition waveform example $\{E_1, E_2, ..., E_m\}$ for a node](image)

The triplets are then propagated from the primary inputs to the primary outputs and they are computed for every node. In addition to propagating the switching probabilities like tradition methods, this method also propagates the variances along the signal paths, which is done in straight forward way based on the second order moment matching. The glitch filtering is also performed to ensure accuracy and reduce the number of switches during the propagation.

Unlike the traditional power estimation methods in [6, 14], which count the transition times (or their probabilities), i.e. edges in the transition waveform, to estimate the dynamic power, the works [7] proposed to count the transition segments (duration), which are pairs of two transition events to take into account of the impacts of the different glitch widthes on the dynamic power consumption. For $n$ transition events in transition waveform, the number of segments is $C_n^2 = n(n - 1)/2$, which increases the complexity of the computation compared to the edge-based method. Another implication is the additional power edge-based consumption formula (1) can’t be used any more. As a result, a look-up table is built from the SPICE simulation results for different glitch widthes. The total dynamic power for a gate is then the probability-weighted average dynamic power for all the switching segments, which is then summed up to compute the total chip dynamic power. However, this method does not consider spatial correlation, which can lead to significant errors and is the main issue to be addressed in this paper.

3. VARIATIONAL MODELS FOR PROCESS PARAMETERS

Following the existing approaches, we also assume that the process variations of $L$ and $T_{DH}$ follow multivariate normal distributions [20], and both of them include intra-die and intra-die components. Since $T_{DH}$ is in vertical layout feature dimension, and is caused by chemical mechanical polishing processes, it only depends on local layout density and has no spatial correlation [16]. Therefore, we focus on the spatial correlation of $L$. In general, the number of process parameters that exhibit spatial correlation can be more than one, and it is understood that this is not a limitation of our approach.

The spatial correlation used in this paper is given by the following empirical exponential model [22],

$$\rho(d) = e^{-d^2/\eta^2}, \quad (2)$$

where $d$ is the distance between two grid centers and $\eta$ is the correlation length. Large $\eta$ means the spatial correlation is strong, vice versa. The spatial correlation can be captured by the spatial covariance matrix $\Omega_{n,n}$, where $n$ is the number of gates on chip. The elements in $\Omega_{n,n}$ are modeled as (2), which are only related to $d$. Dealing with spatial correlation leads to quadratic computations as all the correlated variables are enumerated pairwise for accurate variance estimation.

Spatial correlation makes the statistical computation to be quadratic as every pair of gates has to be considered
to accurately estimate statistical information such as variance. To mitigate this problem, some approaches have been proposed in the past. One way is to partition the circuit into many grids where all correlated variables in a grid will be represented by one grid variable [3]. Another way is by means of the variable reduction technique (by principal component analysis) [19]. The limitation is that both methods achieve linear time complexity in terms of gates only in case of strong spatial correlation. In this paper, we use virtual grid based spatial correlation modeling technique. It works for both weak and strong correlations for achieving linear time complexity for statistical information computation (see more on Subsection 4.2).

In addition to the variations in $L$ and $T_{ox}$, we also have the variations of glitch width due to the delay variations obtained during the propagation along signal paths. Specifically, for a switching segment defined by the two transitions $(t_1, \sigma_{t1})$ and $(t_2, \sigma_{t2})$ propagating through a gate or wire, glitch width is assumed to be of normal distribution with mean $\mu_w$, and standard deviation $\sigma_w = t_2 - t_1$, $\sigma_w = \sqrt{\sigma_{t1}^2 + \sigma_{t2}^2}$. In summary, in our variational model, we consider three variation sources: channel length $L$, oxide thickness $T_{ox}$, glitch width $W_g$.

4. THE NEW STATISTICAL DYNAMIC POWER ESTIMATION METHOD

4.1 Flow of the proposed analysis method

In this section, we present the new full-chip statistical dynamic power analysis method. The new approach follows the segment-based power estimation method [7]. The new algorithm propagates the triplet switching events from primary input to the output. Then it computes the statistical dynamic power at each node based on orthogonal polynomials and virtual grid-based variables for channel length to deal with spatial correlation. We first present the overall flow of the proposed method in Fig. 3, and then highlight the major computing steps later.

**Algorithm:** NEW FULL-CHIP DYNAMIC POWER ESTIMATION ALGORITHM.

**Input:** standard cell lib, netlist, placement information of design, standard deviation of $L$ and $T_{ox}$.

**Output:** analytical expression of the full-chip dynamic power in terms of Hermite polynomials.

1. Build the dynamic power look-up table for each kind of gate $P_{dyn} = f(L, T_{ox}, W_g, C_l)$ under different sets of the four parameters using SPICE simulation.

2. Build the sub look-up table for the coefficients of Hermite polynomial of dynamic power for each type of gate under different sets of $W_g$ and $C_l$ using the look-up table $P_{dyn} = f(L, T_{ox}, W_g, C_l)$.

3. Propagate the transition waveforms from primary inputs to the primary outputs based on segment-based analysis method.

4. Get the coefficients of Hermite polynomials for each gate from the sub look-up table and compute the dynamic power for each gate using (13).

5. Calculate the analytical expression of the full-chip dynamic power by simple polynomial additions and calculate mean value, standard deviation, PDF and CDF of the dynamic power if required.

![Figure 3: The flow of proposed algorithm.](image)

4.2 Virtual grid based spatial correlation modeling

The new modeling method is based on the observation that the spatial variation in dynamic power of a gate only correlates to its neighboring gates. If we can introduce a new set of uncorrelated variables which can catch the localized correlation, computing the dynamic power of one gate can be done in a constant time by only considering its neighboring gates. Hence total full-chip statistical dynamic power can then be computed by simply adding all dynamic powers at gate-level together in terms of the new set of variables in linear time. The idea is similar to the PCA-based approach but with different set of new independent variables.

Specifically, the chip area is still divided into a set of grid cells. In our case, the grid can be very small so that every grid can even contain one gate. Then we introduce a “virtual” random variable for each grid for one source of process variation.

These virtual random variables are independent and will be the basis for statistical dynamic power calculation that concerns spatial correlation. Then we can express the original physical random variable of a gate in a grid as a linear combination of the virtual random variables of its own grid as well as its nearby neighbors. Since each virtual random variable is defined for each grid, which has specific location in a chip, such location-dependent correlation model still retains the important spatial physical meaning (compared to PCA-based models). The grid can be rectangle or hexagonal or other shapes. We use hexagonal grids [4] in this paper since they have minimum anisotropy for 2-D space. And the proposed approach can be applied to any shape-based partition.

Here we define $d_i$ as the grid length. Gates located in the same grid have strong correlation (larger than a given threshold value $p_{high}$) and are assumed to have the same parameter variations. And “spatial correlation distance” $d_{max}$ is defined as the minimum distance beyond which the spatial correlation between any two grids is sufficiently small (or smaller than a given threshold value $p_{low}$) so that we can ignore it.

In this new model, the $i^{th}$ grid is associated with one virtual random variable $\xi_i \sim N(0, 1)$, which is independent of all other virtual random variables. $\Delta$ is defined as the minimum distance beyond which the spatial correlation between any two grids is sufficiently small (or smaller than a given threshold value $p_{low}$) so that we can ignore it.

![Figure 4: Location-dependent modeling with the $T(i)$ of grid $i$ defined as its seven neighboring cells.](image)
grids close to each other will share more common spatial random variables, which means the correlation is strong. On the other hand, two grids physically far away from each other will share less or no common spatial random variables.

Since $\rho(d)$ is only a function of distance, the number of unique distance values between two correlated grids equals the number of unique element values in $\Omega_{N,N}$. Take the $T(i)$ set we mentioned in Fig. 4 for example. There are only three unique correlation distances $d_1$ to $d_3$. Correspondingly, there are only three unique correlation coefficients in $\Omega_{N,N}$, without including 0 for $d \geq d_{\text{max}}$ or $\sigma^2_{\text{intra}}$ for distance within one grid.

Furthermore, the same correlation index can be used for all grids and the coefficient $\alpha_k$ should be the same for the same distance because of the homogeneity and isotropy of spatial correlation. For the grid marked 1 in Fig. 4, we only have two unique values among the seven coefficients, i.e., we set $\beta_0 = \alpha_1$, $\beta_1 = \alpha_i$, $i = 2, 3, \ldots, 7$. According to (2), a nonlinear over-determined system can be built to determine the two unique values of $\beta_0, \beta_1$ as follows,

\[
\begin{align*}
\beta_0^2 + 2\beta_1^2 &= \sigma^2_{\text{intra}}(0) \\
2\beta_0\beta_1 + 2\beta_2^2 &= \sigma^2_{\text{intra}}(d_1) \\
2\beta_1^2 &= \sigma^2_{\text{intra}}(d_2) \\
\beta_2^2 &= \sigma^2_{\text{intra}}(d_3)
\end{align*}
\]

In matrix form, we can rewrite (3) for whole chip as

\[
\Delta L_{\text{intra}} = B_{N,N} \vec{\xi},
\]

where $N$ is the number of grids, and $\vec{\xi} = [\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_N]$. According to (3), the correlation index set contains only $k$ neighboring spatial random variables, which is a very small fraction of the total spatial random variables. As a result, $B_{N,N}$ is a sparse matrix. Every gate only relates to $k$ random variables, which has specific location information.

We remark that the new independent spatial correlation model also works for medium and strong correlation cases, where $\xi$ has specific location information. In our problem, $\xi$ is a vector with $L_{\text{eff}}$ elements, which is in the form of $\xi = [\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_{L_{\text{eff}}}]^T$.

4.3 Computing gate power by orthogonal polynomials

A random variable $x(\vec{\xi})$ with limited variance can be approximated by truncated Hermite PC expansion as follows [8]:

\[
x(\vec{\xi}) = \sum_{q=0}^{Q} a_q H_q(\vec{\xi}),
\]

where $\vec{\xi} = [\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_N]$. $\xi_i \sim N(0,1)$, and are orthogonal to each other. $H_q(\vec{\xi})$ is Hermite polynomial and $a_q$ is the deterministic coefficient. For example, 2nd order Hermite polynomial set includes

\[
1, \xi_i, \xi_i^2 - 1, \xi_i \xi_j, (i \neq j).
\]

$a_q$ can be determined by

\[
a_q = x(\vec{\xi})H_q(\vec{\xi}) > \langle H_q^2(\vec{\xi}) \rangle \approx \sum x(\vec{\xi})H_q^2(\vec{\xi})w_i,
\]

which is a multi-dimensional integration and can be obtained by efficient Smolyak numerical quadrature method. Where $\gamma_i$ and $w_i$ are Smolyak quadrature abscissas (quadrature points) and weights, respectively [15].

In our problem, $x(\vec{\xi})$ will be the dynamic power for each gate, and eventually for the whole chip. For the $j$th gate, which is in the $i$th grid, $\Delta L_{\text{intra}}$ only relates to $k$ independent virtual random variables in $\gamma_i(\vec{\xi})$ from (3), and the corresponding variable vector, $\vec{\xi}_j$, is defined as

\[
\vec{\xi}_j = [\xi_{g,j}, g \in \Omega_i], \xi_{\text{intra}}, \xi_{\text{inter}}, \xi_{\text{ox, inter}}, \xi_{\text{ox, intra}}, \xi_{w_g},
\]

in which $\xi_g$, $\xi_{\text{ox, inter}}$, $\xi_{\text{ox, intra}}$, and $\xi_w$ stand for the independent variables of the intra-die variation of $L_{\text{eff}}$ in the grid, the intra-die variation of $T_{\text{ox}}$, the inter-die variation of $L_{\text{eff}}$, the inter-die variation of $T_{\text{ox}}$ and the glitch width variation of $W_g$, respectively. The variable vector $\vec{\xi}_j$ only includes $z = k + 4$ independent variables, where $k$ is the number of closest neighboring grids (see Subsection 4.2).

The dynamic power for one gate (under glitch width $W_g$ with variation and fixed load capacitance $C_l$) can be presented by Hermite polynomial expansion as

\[
P_{\text{dyn}}(W_g, C_l)(\vec{\xi}_{g,j}) = \sum_{q=0}^{Q} P_{\text{dyn,q,j}} H_q(\vec{\xi}_{g,j}),
\]

where $\vec{\xi}_{g,j}$ is Smolyak quadrature sample. From the dynamic power look-up table $P_{\text{dyn}} = f(L, T_{\text{ox}}, W_g, C_l)$, we can interpolate $P_{\text{dyn,q,j}}$, which is the dynamic power for every Smolyak sampling point.

4.4 Acceleration by building the look-up table

Since we follow the segment-based power estimation method, we have to characterize the powers from the SPICE simulation with different sets of parameters. The power of a gate is a function of $L$ and $T_{\text{ox}}$ as well as glitch width $W_g$ and load capacitance $C_l$ in the look-up table. $P_{\text{dyn}} = f(L, T_{\text{ox}}, W_g, C_l)$. We then perform SPICE simulation on different sets of those four parameters to get the accurate data and build the look-up table.

On the other hand, we observe that the coefficients of Hermite polynomials for dynamic power of one gate in (10) are only functions of the type of the gate, $\rho_{\text{high}}$, and $\rho_{\text{low}}$ (defined in Subsection 4.2) and $W_g$ and $C_l$. Therefore, another sub look-up table can be used to store the coefficients of Hermite polynomials for each kind of gate instead of computing the coefficients for the entire gate. The time complexity reduces from the number of gates, $O(N)$ to the number of grids, $O(N)$.

Algorithm: BUILD SUB LOOK-UP TABLE

Input: standard cell library, $\rho_{\text{high}}, \rho_{\text{low}}, W_g, C_l$, $P_{\text{dyn}}(L, T_{\text{ox}}, W_g, C_l)$

Output: look-up table for coefficients of Hermite polynomials of $P_{\text{dyn}}$ under fixed $C_l$ and $W_g$ for each type of gate.

1. Load dynamic power look-up table $P_{\text{dyn}} = f(L, T_{\text{ox}}, W_g, C_l)$ for each type of gate.
2. Calculate $d_{\text{max}}/d_3$ from $\rho_{\text{high}}$ and $\rho_{\text{low}}$ to determine the neighboring set. And then solve (4) to determine coefficients in (3).
3. Generate Smolyak quadrature points set with corresponding weights.
4. Calculate the coefficients of Hermite polynomials of dynamic power $P_{\text{dyn}}$ under fixed $C_l$ and $W_g$ for each type of gate in library.

Figure 5: The flow of building the sub look-up table.

4.5 Statistical gate power with glitch width variation

To compute the statistical gate power expression considering the glitch width variations, we need to compute the
probability of each switching segment assuming that they follow the normal distribution
\[
Pr(w = w_i) = \frac{1}{\sigma_w \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(w_i - \mu_w)^2}{2\sigma_w^2}\right)
\] (12)

The Hermite polynomial coefficients for (10) under glitch width \(w_i\) and load capacitance \(C_l\) can be interpolated from the sub look-up table. For a gate index \(j\) with the transition waveform \((p_j, t_j, \sigma_j)\), \((p_{j+1}, t_{j+1}, \sigma_{j+1})\), there are \(M(M - 1)/2\) segments. The resulting statistic power is the probabilistic addition of power from each segments (their Hermite polynomial expressions):
\[
P_{dyn,C_l}(\xi_{k,j}) = \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M} Pr(i,j) \times P_{dyn,C_l}(\xi_{k,i,j})
\] (13)
in which \(P_{dyn,C_l}(\xi_{k,i,j})\) is the dynamic power of gate \(k\) caused by the switching segment between transitions \(E_i\) and \(E_j\). \(Pr(i,j)\) is the probability that the switching segment \((E_i, E_j)\) occurs only if there are transitions at both \(E_i\) and \(E_j\), and there are no transitions between \(E_i\) and \(E_j\).

\[
Pr(i,j) = p_i \times p_j \times \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - p_k)
\] (14)

In the following, we write \(P_{dyn,C_l}(\xi_{k,j})\) as \(P_{dyn}(\xi_{k,j})\) without confusion.

### 4.6 Computation of full-chip dynamic power

The dynamic power for each gate are calculated using (13). To compute the full-chip dynamic power, we also need to transfer the local coefficients to corresponding global positions first. Then we can proceed to compute the dynamic power for the whole chip as follows,
\[
P_{dyn}^{total}(\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} P_{dyn}(\xi_{g,j})
\] (15)

The summation is done for each coefficient of global Hermite polynomials to obtain the analytic expression of the final dynamic power in terms of \(\xi\). We can then obtain the mean value, variance, PDF and CDF of full-chip dynamic power very easily. For instance, the mean value and variance for the full-chip dynamic power are
\[
\mu_{total} = P_{dyn,0th},
\]
\[
\sigma_{total}^2 = \sum P_{dyn,1st}^2 + 2 \sum P_{dyn,2nd type 1}^2
\]
\[
+ \sum P_{dyn,2nd type 2}^2,
\] (17)

where \(P_{dyn,0th}\) is the power coefficient for \(i^{th}\) Hermite polynomial of second order defined in (7).

### 5. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We implemented the proposed method and the segment-based analysis [7] in C++, and Matlab V7.8. All the experimental results are carried out in a Linux system with quad Intel Xeon CPUs with 3GHz and 16GB memory. The new method was tested on circuits in the ISCAS’89 benchmark set. The circuits were synthesized with Nangate Gate Cell Library under 45nm technology and the placement is from UCLA/UMich Capo [18]. For comparison purposes, we performed Monte Carlo (MC) simulations (10,000 runs) considering spatial correlation, the method in [7] and the proposed method on the benchmark circuits. In our Monte-Carlo implementation, similar to [7], we do not run the SPICE on the original circuits as it is too much time consuming for ordinary computer. Instead we compute the results via interpolation from the characterization data computed from SPICE runs. The 3σ range of \(L\) and \(T_{ox}\) is set as 20%, of which inter-die variations constitute 20% and intra-die variations, 80%. \(L, T_{ox}\) are modeled as Gaussian random variables. \(L\) is modeled as sum of spatial correlated sources of variations based on (2), \(T_{ox}\) is modeled as an independent source of spatial variation. The same framework can be easily extended to include other parameters of variations.

The characterization data for each type of gate in standard cell library is collected using HSPICE simulation. For each type of gate, we perform repeat simulation on sampling points in the 3σ range of \(L, T_{ox}\) and input glitch width \(W_g\) for several different load capacitances to obtain the gate dynamic powers and gate delays. The table of characterization data will be used to interpolate the value of dynamic power for each type of gate with different process parameters. We use 21 sample points for glitch width, from 50ps to 150ps.

In transition waveform computation, the gate delays are obtained through the table of characterization data and the input signal probabilities are 0.5, with switching probabilities of 0.75. The test cases are given in Table 1 (all length units in μm).

The comparison results of mean value and standard deviations of full-chip dynamic power are shown in Table 2, where MC Co represent Monte Carlo considering spatial correlation, and New is the proposed method. The method in [7] can not consider spatial correlation as it assumed that the power for the gates are independent gaussian random variables. In implementation of [7], we assume the same variation for \(L_{eff}\) and \(T_{ox}\) but without spatial correlations. The average errors for mean and standard deviation (σ) values of the New technique are 1.49% and 6.54% compared to MC Co, respectively. While for the method in [7], the average errors for mean value and σ are 3.04% and 96.97%, respectively.

As a result, without considering spatial correlations can lead to significant errors. Further more, from the comparison between mean and standard deviation of MC Co, the average std/mean is 7.21% which means spatial correlation in process parameter has significant impact on the distribution of dynamic power. The results in Table 2 also show that our method can handle both strong and weak spatial correlations by adjusting grid size.

### Table 1: Summary of benchmark circuits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testcase</th>
<th>Gate #</th>
<th>Grid #</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s1196 (s)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>95×90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1196 (w)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>95×90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s5378 (s)</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>209.5×198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s5378 (w)</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>209.5×198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s9234 (s)</td>
<td>5597</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>278.5×270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s9234 (w)</td>
<td>5597</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>278.5×270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison results of mean value and standard deviations of full-chip dynamic power are shown in Table 2, where MC Co represent Monte Carlo considering spatial correlation, and New is the proposed method. The method in [7] can not consider spatial correlation as it assumed that the power for the gates are independent gaussian random variables. In implementation of [7], we assume the same variation for \(L_{eff}\) and \(T_{ox}\) but without spatial correlations. The average errors for mean and standard deviation (σ) values of the New technique are 1.49% and 6.54% compared to MC Co, respectively. While for the method in [7], the average errors for mean value and σ are 3.04% and 96.97%, respectively.

As a result, without considering spatial correlations can lead to significant errors. Further more, from the comparison between mean and standard deviation of MC Co, the average std/mean is 7.21% which means spatial correlation in process parameter has significant impact on the distribution of dynamic power. The results in Table 2 also show that our method can handle both strong and weak spatial correlations by adjusting grid size.

### Table 3: CPU time comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Case</th>
<th>CPU time (s)</th>
<th>Speedup Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC Co</td>
<td>s1196 (s)</td>
<td>1261 12 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s1196 (w)</td>
<td>1225 13 0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s5378 (s)</td>
<td>7037 74 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s5378 (w)</td>
<td>6859 73 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s9234 (s)</td>
<td>14805 151 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s9234 (w)</td>
<td>13978 151 2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 compares the CPU times of three methods, which shows that the New method is much faster than the method in [7] and MC simulation. On average, the proposed technique has about 53X speedup over [7] and 5123X speedup over the MC method. In [7], the dynamic power of each gate needed to be interpolated from the look-up table due to different \(L, T_{ox}\) and glitch width value variations, the complexity is a linear function of the number of gates \(O(n)\), however, in New algorithm, only the coefficients of Hermite polynomials for each type of gate are needed to compute and
the overall complexity is a linear function of the number of grids $O(N)$. 

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed a new statistical dynamic power estimation method considering the spatial correlation in the presence of process variation. The new method considers the variational impacts of channel length on gate dynamic powers. To consider the spatial correlation, we adopt a newly proposed spatial correlation model where a new set of uncorrelated variables are defined over virtual grids to represent the original physical random variables by least-square fitting. To compute the statistical dynamic power of a gate on the new set of variables, the new method applies the flexible orthogonal polynomials based method, which can be applied to any gate models. We adopted the segment-based statistical power method to consider the impacts of glitch width variations on dynamic power. The total full chip dynamic power expressions are then computed by summing up the resulting orthogonal polynomials (their coefficients) on the new set of variables for all gates. Experimental results on ISCAS'89 benchmark with 45nm technology show that the proposed method has about 53x speedup over recently proposed segment-based statistical power estimation method [7] and many orders of magnitudes over the Monte Carlo method.
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Table 2: Statistical dynamic power analysis accuracy comparison against Monte Carlo.

| Test Case | Grid │ Mean Value (mW) | Errors | Standard Deviation (mW) | Errors |
|----------|------|-----------------|--------|------------------------|--------|
|          | MC Co | New             |        | MC Co                  | New    |
| s1196 (a) | 27   | 1.14 ± 0.19     | 1.14 ± 0.82 | 0.49 ± 0.0912 | 0.09845 | 93.68% | 7.33% |
| s1196 (w) | 1291 | 1.14 ± 0.19     | 1.14 ± 0.82 | 0.49 ± 0.0912 | 0.09845 | 93.68% | 7.33% |
| s5378 (a) | 93   | 6.09 ± 0.24     | 5.98 ± 2.46 | 1.85 ± 0.4700 | 0.0887 | 98.13% | 7.61% |
| s5378 (w) | 1300 | 6.09 ± 0.24     | 5.98 ± 2.46 | 1.85 ± 0.4700 | 0.0887 | 98.13% | 7.61% |
| s9234 (a) | 161  | 12.8 ± 0.32     | 12.5 ± 2.94 | 2.31 ± 0.964 | 0.0882 | 98.08% | 5.52% |
| s9234 (w) | 2358 | 12.8 ± 0.32     | 12.5 ± 2.94 | 2.31 ± 0.964 | 0.0882 | 98.08% | 5.52% |