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Abstract—In this paper, we propose an accurate and computationally efficient Gradient Boosting approach for the estimation of statistical variations aware leakage power and propagation delay in the CMOS/FinFET standard digital cells. The proposed model estimates the leakage power and propagation delay w.r.t delay in the CMOS/FinFET standard digital cells. The proposed model is consistent with various technology nodes. Exhaustive tests report an average error of <1% in 16nm CMOS and FinFET standard digital cells w.r.t analog HSPICE simulations with several orders increase in computational speed. Further, the complex cell estimation can be carried out through pre-characterized standard cells abstaining longer simulations.

Index Terms—Machine learning (ML), Gradient Boosting Model (GBM), Leakage power, Propagation delay, CMOS, FinFET, VLSI

I. INTRODUCTION

The challenges in accurate estimation of power and delay in digital VLSI circuits are increasing in the nanometer regime. The aggressive scaling down of CMOS/MGFETs devices has led to a profound increase in process variability in turn, an enormous increase in leakage power. The existence of process variations in both devices and interconnect networks increases the randomness in the behavior of the digital circuits and affect their performance. This phenomenon is building difficulties in the device characterization of VLSI circuits and in turn, could result in the parametric degradation of manufacturing yield. The process variations together with the environmental variation sources affect the electrical behavior of the circuit leading to circuit deviation and deterioration of the overall performance of the chip [1]. Although, FinFETs are more tolerant to leakage than CMOS devices, the performance degradation due to the process variation is inevitable [2].

Therefore, the accurate and efficient estimation of leakage and delay of CMOS/FinFET devices under the influence of random variations in process, temperature and supply voltage is emphasized in the nanometer regime prior to fabrications of ICs. A common approach for the estimation of leakage and delay is through Monte-Carlo simulations from HSPICE [3]. The HSPICE Monte-Carlo simulations guarantee accurate results at the cost of a huge simulation time [4]. That makes them unfeasible for the estimation of complex devices. One solution for avoiding long simulation runs is to develop surrogate models that approximate the performance of a circuit as a function of statistical parameters. The surrogate models can then replace the simulator in large Monte-Carlo simulations thus reducing the computational time.

We propose a computationally efficient surrogate model for PVT variations aware leakage and delay estimation in digital CMOS/FinFETs of standard digital logic cells using the Gradient Boosting algorithm. To our knowledge, this is the first paper developing a statistical black-box model based on gradient boosting for the estimation of leakage and delays in CMOS/FinFET circuits. We also presented a comparative analysis of results from other machine learning techniques reported in literature; linear, polynomial regression [5] and support vector machine (SVM) [6].

II. RELATED WORKS

Several surrogate techniques are proposed in the literature for the estimation of leakage and delay in digital circuits. Kim et al. [4] presented a calculation model for estimating propagation delay in digital circuits converting an arbitrary logic gate into an equivalent inverter. The model does not require any pre-simulation step but it shows 5% error w.r.t HSPICE. D.Helms et al. [7] introduced RT level leakage macro models for the gate level leakage estimation which reported an error of 2.1% (for 16nm LP) 6.8% (for 65-nm bulk) w.r.t HSPICE simulations. The paper considers 90000 training samples and limited the process variations to 10 due to complexity reasons. Garg et al. [6] presented a stack-based macro model for statistical aware gate-level leakage power estimation (CMOS) using support vector machines (SVM) with a 17x improvement in speed. In [8], Xingsheng Wang et al. discussed the statistical variability and reliability of FinFETs taking into consideration the impact of different design and process parameters. But the paper does not address the effect of these variations on the leakage and delay.

A more accurate estimation through the proposed surrogate models is crucial for the realistic estimation of the fabrication yield. A model that does estimations on par with HSPICE is entailed. Our paper reports a negligible average error rate of <1% with 15000 PVT variations. Moreover, the model is an...
efficient black-box technique on CMOS and FinFET nanoscale digital circuits at different technology nodes.

III. THE PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

Process variations can be broadly characterized into global (inter-die) and local (intra-die) variations. Global variations (e.g. $t_{ox}$) are chip-to-chip or wafer-to-wafer variations and therefore have long-range influences and affect every device of the same type in identical fashion [2]. Local process variations may occur due to Random Dopant Fluctuations (RDF), Line Edge Roughness (LER) and other intrinsic fluctuations affecting every device in a chip individually, i.e. variability between two devices may look identical to each other. The effect of RDF causes random threshold voltage ($V_{th}$) that lead to exponential changes in device currents especially in sub-threshold [9].

Estimating the effect of process variations through process corners is not effective at present technology nodes. The design needs to be verified over the entire range of variations. The proposed algorithm exploits the strength of statistical approach by intermittently varying its worst-case process variations and it is efficient in this sense when compared to conventional worst-case method [2].

A. SIMULATION SETUP

The training data for the gradient boosting algorithm is generated as a vector of random values from the Gaussian distribution of each process parameter in the targeted technology node considering ±10% variations at 3σ. Along with these statistical distributions, random samples of temperature ranging from −55°C to 125°C and supply voltage with a ±10% deviation from the nominal value (0.8V) are included. These variations are combined with the standard cell CMOS/FinFET netlists through Monte-Carlo simulations for training samples generation.

In this work, we consider 14 process parameters (PMOS and NMOS) for CMOS - Channel Length, Transistor Width, Physical and Electrical equivalent of oxide thickness, nominal gate oxide thickness, Source/Drain junction depth, Channel doping concentration [10], [11], [12]. Keeping into account the major performance variations in FinFETs [13], [14], 16 FinFET process variations (PFET and NFET) - Gate length, Fin height, Body thickness, Physical equivalent of oxide thickness, equivalent gate dielectric thickness, Conduction band density of states, Intrinsic carrier concentration of channel, Source/Drain doping concentration are considered [15], [16]. The model is capable of handling more process parameter variations than forth mentioned as its complexity is less affected by the number of process parameters.

We analyzed the impact of number of training samples on the accuracy of the proposed model and reported in Fig.1. The error metrics - Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Coefficient of Determination (R2Score) are the statistical measures for the model evaluation [17]. The hyperparameters of gradient boosting algorithm are tuned such that $RMSE$ and $MAE$ are less than the order of $E^{-6}$ with an $R2Score > 0.95$. The accuracy of the training improves with the number of training samples. The proposed work considers 15000 training samples from HSPICE Monte-Carlo simulations as an optimum solution w.r.t accuracy and training time. The model shows an impressive speed-up over HSPICE as reported in Fig.2. For 15K samples, the proposed model takes an average training time of 40secs and a testing time of < 1 sec. This paper targets 16nm CMOS/FinFET high-performance technology models. Successful estimations performed on different technology nodes - 32nm, 22nm, 16nm CMOS and 16nm, 7nm FinFETs (Fig.3) validate the proposed model to be an efficient black-box technique.
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Besides, propagation delay varies with the load capacitance and slew time.

\[ t_{pd} = f(C_L, V_{DD}, W, t_s) \]  

(1)
The delays are also affected by the associated parasitic capacitance of a digital circuit whose voltage switches with the input transitions.

\[ C_{Total} = C_{LOAD} + C_{parasitic} \]  

(2)
The parasitic capacitances contributing to the total input capacitance, \( C_{Total} \) of a cell vary with input voltage transitions [18]. As the proposed approach estimates the delay of complex cells through pre-characterized cells, an accurate estimation of the total capacitance is necessary with the coupling of the driver and driven cells. Hence, the proposed approach computes equivalent gate capacitance values (equation 2) for all possible combinations of the standard logic cells (table II) with all possible input transitions and static input combinations (1/0) on other inputs of a driven cell as shown in Fig 4. Along with process variations, range of equivalent \( C_{Load} \) values between smallest and highest possible load combinations are randomly applied as inputs to HSPICE while computing training samples for the accurate estimation of delays. We considered slew time \( (t_s) \) to be is a constant at 10 pico-sec in this work. In future, slew time can be incorporated in our model as a linear interpolation model [3].

The model calls the pre-computed standard cell leakages/delays for appropriate input combinations and capacitance values for each driver and driven cell combination in a complex cell for total leakage and delay estimations respectively [19].

This paper considers 12 digital cells for standard library characterization. Nevertheless, the proposed approach can be extended to more number of digital cells. We have considered a single transition on input nodes in this work wherein other transitions can be accommodated in the proposed approach.

C. GRADIENT BOOSTING ALGORITHM

The proposed Gradient Boosting Algorithm (GBM) is a learning-based statistical estimation approach using ensemble learning. Gradient boosting adaptively combines a large number of relatively simple tree models to produce an accurate predictive rule. The design of each decision tree is simple and speeds up the process of training. Boosting improves the accuracy of the estimation in each iteration by reducing the residue of the previous training model (decision tree) [20]. In each iteration, extra weights are given to the incorrectly predicted points by earlier predictors. Each iteration takes closer to the global optimization value using gradient descent [21].

**Algorithm: Statistical Leakage/Delay Estimation using Gradient Boosting**

1: while \( i < N \)
2: while \( j < k \)
3: \( X_p \leftarrow \text{random}(\pm 10\% \text{ variations at } 3\sigma \text{ of } j_{th} \text{ process}) \)
4: endwhile
5: \( X_r \leftarrow \text{random} \text{(temperature,}\pm 10\% \text{ variations of } V_{sup}) \)
6: \( X_t \leftarrow \text{random}(C_{Load}, t_s) \) for delay estimation
7: endwhile
8: \( \text{CallHSPICE()} \)
9: while \( i < N \)
10: \( \{y\{\text{target}\},X\{X_p,X_r\}\} \leftarrow \text{target}(X_p^k, X_r^k) \)
11: endwhile
12: Extract feature set \( X\{X_p,X_r\} \)
13: Define target variable \( y\{\text{target}\} \)
14: while \( j < k \)
15: Calculate Pearson coefficient, \( r \) for all process
16: Sensitivity analysis of leakage to variations
17: endwhile
18: Determine effective feature set \( X_r\{X_{se},X_{pe}\} \)
19: Call \( \text{GradientBoosting}(y\{\text{target}\},X_r\{\text{hyperparameters}\}) \)
20: \( F_0(x) = (\text{argmin}_\gamma \sum_{i=1}^{N} L(y_i, \gamma) \)
21: for \( m=1 \) to \( M \) do:
22: \( w_{im} = -\frac{\partial L(y_i,F(x))}{\partial F(x)} | F(x) = F_{m-1}(x); \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, N \)
23: \( R_{jm} = (\text{argmin}_\gamma)R_j, \eta \sum_{i=1}^{N} [w_{im} - \eta I(x_i, R_j)]^2 \)
24: \( \gamma_{jm} = (\text{argmin}_\gamma \sum_{x,E} \sum_{R_{jm}} L(y_i, F_{m-1}(x)+\gamma);i = 1, \ldots N \)
25: \( F_m(x) = F_{m-1}(x) + \eta \sum_{j=1}^{jm} \gamma_{jm} I(xE_{jm}) \)
26: \text{end for}
27: end GradientBoostingAlgorithm
28: Calculate RMSE, MAE, R2Score
29: if \( R2Score < 0.95 \) & \( \text{RMSE} > \) the order of \( E^{-6} \)
30: Hyper-parameter fine tuning
31: Repeat steps 14 to 26 by tuning hyperparameters
32: until \( R2Score > 0.95 \)
33: end if
34: return trained \( \text{GradientBoostingModel} \)
35: Call \( \text{GradientBoostingModel}(\text{new test } X\{X_s,X_p\}) \)
36: return \text{estimated target} (leakage/delay)
37: CallHSPICE\{new X\{X_s,X_p\}\}
38: return \text{actual leakage}
39: Determine \%error \{(actual,estimated)leakages/delays
40: if \%error > 1% \)
41: increase \( N \) by 5%
42: Repeat step 1 to 37
43: until \%error < 1

In the proposed approach, \( N \) represents number of training samples and \( k \) is the number of process parameters. The Gradient Boosting Algorithm is described between lines 20
to 26. The parameters of the algorithm are minimum value of the loss function, $\gamma$, residue from the previous tree, $w_{im}$ for $i_{th}$ sample of $m_{th}$ tree among $M$ trees (M is chosen to be 100 in this work), $R_{jm}$ is the terminal region for $j_{th}$ leaf node of $m_{th}$ tree and learning rate $\eta$. In each iteration from $m=1$ to $M=100$, the loss function is minimized and getting closer to the optimum solution. A learning rate of 0.1 is chosen as an optimum value in the proposed model with 100 leaf nodes.

IV. MODEL ACCURACY VERIFICATION

A two-fold analysis is performed to test the efficiency of the proposed model. Each dataset is split into training and testing datasets with $N$ samples and $M=nN$ samples respectively where $n$ represents the total number of samples in the dataset. $M$ is chosen to be 10% of the total number of samples. RMSE and MAE values reported quite a minimum for all the standard cells which demonstrates the efficiency of the proposed estimation model.

Table I Test cases at nominal values of process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temp(°C)</th>
<th>Supply(V)</th>
<th>$C_{th}$ (pF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II %Error w.r.t HSPICE for test cases (Table I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic Cell</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>CMOS</th>
<th>FinFET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0.91 \pm 0.17$</td>
<td>$0.58 \pm 0.15$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-input NAND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.86 \pm 0.15$</td>
<td>$1.13 \pm 0.16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-input NOR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0.86 \pm 0.12$</td>
<td>$0.86 \pm 0.12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-input AND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0.84 \pm 0.12$</td>
<td>$0.84 \pm 0.12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-input XOR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0.97 \pm 0.12$</td>
<td>$0.76 \pm 0.12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-input NAND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0.58 \pm 0.15$</td>
<td>$1.10 \pm 0.15$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-input NOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.95 \pm 0.11$</td>
<td>$1.10 \pm 0.11$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-input AND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0.90 \pm 0.12$</td>
<td>$1.00 \pm 0.12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUX 2x1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0.50 \pm 0.12$</td>
<td>$0.72 \pm 0.12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULLADDER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.99 \pm 0.12$</td>
<td>$0.99 \pm 0.12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOI12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0.64 \pm 0.16$</td>
<td>$0.64 \pm 0.16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOI31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1.06 \pm 0.10$</td>
<td>$1.06 \pm 0.10$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an example, we have also examined the estimation accuracy of the proposed model for an arbitrary chosen test data listed in Table I and the estimation results are reported in Table II. The test data is chosen such that it spans across the limits of temperature and voltage variations for the nominal process. And different values of equivalent load are considered for the delay estimations.

A comparative analysis of the proposed model is made with polynomial regression [5] and support vector regression [6] in Fig. 5 (demonstrated for FinFET AOI12 cell; Delay at nominal process, voltage, and temperature). The proposed model depict higher accuracy compared to other reported models. The same is again validated in the Fig.6, illustrating the mean and standard deviation distribution of different ML models with reference HPSICE distribution. It is clearly visible that GBM distribution completely overlaps the HSPICE estimations for both the leakage and delays estimations. Table III and IV show the leakage power and delays estimation in complex circuits using pre-modelled basic cells.

V. CONCLUSION

We propose a computationally efficient machine learning based estimation model using Gradient Boosting Algorithm for an accurate estimation of PVT variations aware leakage power and propagation delays in CMOS/FinFET digital VLSI circuits. The obtained results show negligible average error < 1% and < 3% for basic standard cells and complex circuits respectively w.r.t SPICE simulation value with several order of faster estimations, even better for complex cells due to the utilization pre-estimated basic cell characterization. For future work, we aim to develop a robust estimation tool incorporating input and output slew times in delays estimations.
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