Redundant States in Sequential Circuits

- ✓ Removal of redundant states is important because
  - Cost: the number of memory elements is directly related to the number of states
  - Complexity: the more states the circuit contains, the more complex the design and implementation becomes
  - Aids failure analysis: diagnostic routines are often predicated on the assumption that no redundant states exist

Equivalent States

- ✓ Let S_i and S_j be states of a completely specified sequential circuit. Let S_k and S_l be the next states of S_i and S_j, respectively for input I_p.

  S_i and S_j are *equivalent* if and only if for every possible I_p the following conditions are satisfied:

  - the outputs produced by S_i and S_j are the same;
  - the next states S_k and S_l are equivalent.



  - States S_i and S_j are equivalent and are combined to one state by pointing all arrows that go to S_j to state S_i and removing S_j with its all arrows

Equivalence and Partitions

- ***Equivalence relation***: let *R* be a relation on a set *S*. *R* is an equivalence relation on *S* if and only if it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.
- An equivalence relation on a set partitions the set into disjoint equivalence classes.
- A partition consists of one or more blocks, where each block comprises a subset of states that may be equivalent, but the states in a given block are definitely not equivalent to the states in the other blocks.
- The partitioning method initially assumes that all states are equivalent and then proceeds to determine those state which are not equivalent by analyzing each states k-successors.

Finding Equivalent States By Inspection



	x = 0	x = 1
A	B/0	C/1
B	C/0	A/1
C	D/1	B/0
D	C/0	A/1

(a)

	x = 0	x = 1
A	B/0	C/1
B	C/0	A/1
C	B/1	B/0

(b)

	x = 0	x = 1
A	B/0	C/1
B	B/0	A/1
C	D/1	B/0
D	D/0	A/1

(c)

	x = 0	x = 1
A	B/0	C/1
B	D/0	A/1
C	D/1	B/0
D	B/0	A/1

(e)

	x = 0	x = 1
A	B/0	C/1
B	B/0	A/1
C	B/1	B/0

(d)

Partitioning Minimization Procedure

- ✓ PROCEDURE:
  1) all states belong to the initial partition p_1
  2) p_1 is partitioned in blocks such that the states in each block generate the same output.
  3) continue to perform new partitions by testing whether the k-successors of the states in each block are contained in one block. Those states whose k-successors are in different blocks cannot be in one block.
  4) prcedure ends when a new partition is the same as the previous partition

Finding Equivalent States by Partitioning

	Partition blocks				Action
Partition P_0	$(ABCDE)$				
Output for $x = 0$	11100				Separate (ABC) and (DE)
Output for $x = 1$	00011				Separate (ABC) and (DE)
Partition P_1	(ABC)		(DE)		
Next state for $x = 0$	CCB		DE		
Next state for $x = 1$	BEE		BA		Separate (A) and (BC)
Partition P_2	(A)	(BC)	(DE)		
Next state for $x = 0$	C	CB	DE		
Next state for $x = 1$	B	EE	BA		Separate (D) and (E)
Partition P_3	(A)	(BC)	(D)	(E)	
Next state for $x = 0$	C	CB	D	E	
Next state for $x = 1$	B	EE	B	A	
Partition $P_4 = P_3$	(A)	(BC)	(D)	(E)	

States B and C are equivalent.

Implication Table

- ✓ The checking of each pair of states for possible equivalence in a table with a large number of states can be done systematically on an Implication Table.
- ✓ The Implication Table is a chart that consists of squares, one for every possible pair of states.

Present State	Next State		Output	
	X=0	X=1	X=0	X=1
a	*c*	*b*	0	1
b	*d*	*a*	0	1
c	*a*	*d*	1	0
d	*b*	*d*	1	0



(c,d) ⇔(a,b) ⟹ (c,d) && (a,b)

both pairs are equivalent

Implication Table

Present State	Next State		Output	
	$x = 0$	$x = 1$	$x = 0$	$x = 1$
a	d	b	0	0
b	e	a	0	0
c	g	f	0	1
d	a	d	1	0
e	a	d	1	0
f	c	b	0	0
g	a	e	1	0



- the equivalent states
  - (a,b), (d,e), (d,g), (e,g)
- the reduced states
  - (a,b), (c), (d,e,g), (f)
- the state table:

Present State	Next State		Output	
	$x = 0$	$x = 1$	$x = 0$	$x = 1$
a	d	a	0	0
c	d	f	0	1
d	a	d	1	0
f	c	a	0	0

Incompletely specified circuits

- ✓ Finding compatible states by inspection



Merging of the Flow Table

- ✓ The state table may be incompletely specified: combinations of inputs or input sequences may never occur (Some next states and outputs are don't care).
- ✓ Multi-input **primitive flow tables** are always incompletely specified
  - Several synchronous circuits also have this property
- ✓ Incompletely specified states are not "equivalent" as in completely specified circuits. Instead, we are going to find **compatible** states

Equivalent and Compatible States

- ✓ completely specified state table ⇨ equivalence

  If a and b are equivalent, and b and c are equivalent then also a and c are equivalent:

  (a,b), (b, c) ⇨(a, c)

- ✓ **un**completely specified state table ⇨ compatibility

  If a and b are compatible, and b and c are compatible not necessarily a and c are compatible:

y	0	1
a	(A),0	C,1
b	(B),-	C,-
c	(C),1	(C),1

- ✓ **Compatibility relation**: let *R* be a relation on a set *S*. *R* is a compatibility relation on *S* if and only if it is reflexive and symmetric. A compatibility relation on a set partitions the set into compatibility classes. They are typically not disjoint.



Incompletely specified circuits: partition method

- ✓ The partitioning minimization procedure which was applied to completely specified state tables can also be applied to incompletely specified state tables.
- ✓ To perform the partitioning process, we can assume that the unspecified outputs have a specific value.
- ✓ The partitioning method is equally applicable to Mealy type FSMs in the same way as for Moore-type FSMs.

Compatible Pairs (DG sequential circuit)

- ✓ Implication tables are used to find compatible states.
  - We can adjust the dashes to fit any desired condition.
  - Must have no conflict in the output values to be merged.



	00	01	11	10
a	*c*, –	(*a*), 0	*b*, –	–, –
b	–, –	*a*, –	(*b*), 1	*e*, –
c	(*c*), 0	*a*, –	–, –	*d*, –
d	*c*, –	–, –	*b*, –	(*d*), 0
e	*f*, –	–, –	*b*, –	(*e*), 1
f	(*f*), 1	*a*, –	–, –	*e*, –

(a) Primitive flow table

	a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*
b	✓				
c	✓	*d*, *e* ×			
d	✓	*d*, *e* ×	✓		
e	*c*, *f* ×	✓	*d*, *e* × *c*, *f* ×	×	
f	*c*, *f* ×	✓	×	*d*, *e* × *c*, *f* ×	✓

(b) Implication table

The compatible pairs are :

(a , b)
(a , c)
(a , d)
(b , e)
(b , f)
(c ,d)
(e , f)

Merger diagrams

- ✓ States are represented as dot in a circle
- ✓ Lines connect states couples compatible
- ✓ Maximal sets can be identified as those sets in which every states is connected to every other state by a line segment



Maximal Compatibles

- ✓ Maximal Compatibles: a group of compatibles that contains all the possible combinations of compatible states.
- ✓ n-state compatible ⇨ n-sided fully connected polygon.
  - All its diagonals connected.
  - Not all maximal compatibles are necessary
  - An isolated dot: a state that is not compatible to any other state

- a line: a compatible pair
- a triangle: a compatible with three states
- an n-state compatible: an n-sided polygon with all its diagonals connected





Closed Covering Condition

- ✓ The condition that must be satisfied is that the set of chosen compatibles must:
  - Cover all states.
  - Be closed: the closure condition is satisfied if there are no implied states or if the implied states are included within a set
- ✓ In the example of the DG sequential circuit, the maximal compatibles are:

  (a, b) (a, c, d), (b , e , f)
- ✓ If we remove (a, b), we get a set of two compatibles:

  (a, c, d), (b, e , f):
  - All the six states are included in this set.
  - There are no implied states for (a,c); (a,d);(c,d);(b,e);(b,f) and (e,f) [you can check the implication table] . The closer condition is satisfied

The original primitive flow table can be merged into two rows, one for each of the compatibles.

Closed Covering Condition (Example)

- From the aside implication table, we have the following compatible: pairs: (a, b) (a , d) (b, c) (c , d) (c , e) (d , e)
- From the merger diagram, we determine the maximal compatibles: (a , b) (a , d) (b , c) (c , d , e)
- If we choose the two compatibles: (a , b) (c, d, e)



Compatibles	(a, b)	(a, d)	(b, c)	(c, d, e)
Implied states	(b, c)	(b, c)	(d, e)	(a, d) (b, c)

Closure table

- All the 5 states are included in this set.
- The implied states for (a, b) are (b, c). But (b, c) are not include in the chosen set. This set is not closed.
- A set of compatibles that will satisfy the closed covering condition is (a, **d**) (b, **c**) (**c**, **d**, e)
- Note that: the same state can be repeated more than once



Minimization of campatible classes

Select a set of compatibility classes so that the following conditions are satisfied:

- ✓ Completeness: all states of the original machine must be covered
- ✓ Consistency: the chosen set of compatibility classes must be closed
- ✓ Minimality: the smallest number of compatibility classes is used

Bounding the number of states

- ✓ Unfortunately the process of selecting the set of compatibility classes that meets the three conditions must be done by **trial and error**.
- ✓ Let ***U*** be the **upper bound** on the number of states needed in the minimized circuit.

  Then *U* = minimum (NSMC, NSOC)
  - where NSMC = the number of sets of maximal compatibles
  - and NSOC = the number of states in the original circuit
- ✓ Let ***L*** be the **lower bound** on the number of states needed in the minimized circuit

  Then *L* = maximum($NSMI_1$, $NSMI_2$,…, $NSMI_i$)
  - where $NSMI_i$ = the number of states in the i^{th} group of the set of maximal **incompatibles** of the original circuit.

State Reduction Algorithm

- ✓ Step 1 -- find the maximal compatibles
- ✓ Step 2 -- find the maximal incompatibles
- ✓ Step 3 -- Find the upper and lower bounds on the number of states needed
- ✓ Step 4 -- Find a set of compatibility classes that is complete, consistent, and minimal
- ✓ Step 5 -- Produce the minimum state table

Example -- State reduction problem

	x = 0	x = 1
A	A/-	-/-
B	C/1	B/0
C	D/0	-/1
D	-/-	B/-
E	A/0	C/1

Compatibles pairs

$(AB)(AC)(AD)(AE)(BD)(CD)(CE)$

Incompatibles pairs

$(BC)(BE)(DE)$



Maximum Compatibles

(ABD)(ACD)(ACE)

U=3



Maximum Incompatibles

(BE)(BC)(ED)

L=2



	x = 0	x = 1
(ABD)	AC	B
~~(ACD)~~	~~AD~~	~~B~~
(ACE)	AD	C

Closure table

	x = 0	x = 1
A′	B′/1	A′/0
B′	A′/0	B′/1

$A' = (ABD)$

$B' = (ACE)$

Reduced state table

Another state table reduction problem

	x = 0	x = 1
A	B/1	D/0
B	–/–	B/0
C	E/0	D/–
D	B/1	A/0
E	–/–	C/1
F	–/0	E/1



(b)

Compatibles pairs

$(AB)(AD)(BC)(BD)$



(c)

Closure table

	x = 0	x = 1
(ABD)	B	ABD
(C)	E	D
(E)	–	C
(F)	–	E

(d)

Maximum Compatibles

(ABD)(C)(E)(F)

U=4

Incompatibles pairs

$(AC)(AE)(AF)(BE)(BF)(CD)(CE)(CF)(DE)(DF)(EF)$



(e)

Maximum Incompatibles

(ACEF)(CDEF)

(BEF)

L=4

	0	1
A′	A′/1	A′/0
B′	C′/0	A′/0
C′	–/–	B′/1
D′	–/0	C′/1

(f)

Reduced state table

Note that the resultant state table has considerable flexibility.

This property will serve to simplify the hardware realization

	x = 0	x = 1
(ABD)	B	ABD
(BC)	E	BD
(E)	–	C
(F)	–	E

	x = 0	x = 1
A′	A′, B′/1	A′/0
B′	C′/0	A′/0
C′	–/–	B′/1
D′	–/0	C′/1

Yet another state reduction problem

	x = 0	x = 1
A	D/-	A/-
B	E/0	A/-
C	D/0	B/-
D	C/-	C/-
E	C/1	B/-



Maximum Compatibles



Maximum Incompatibles



Maximum Compatibles
(ABC)(ACD)(DE)
U=3

Maximum Incompatibles
(BD)(BE)(CE)
L=2

	x = 0	x = 1
(ABC)	DE	AB
~~(ACD)~~	~~CD~~	~~ABC~~
(ADE)	CD	ABC

Closure table
Maximum Compatible

	x = 0	x = 1
(ABC)	DE	AB
(DE)	C	BC

Closure table

	x = 0	x = 1
A'	B'/0	A'/-
B'	A'/1	A'/-

Reduced state table

Generating Maximal Compatibles and Incompatibles

	x = 0	x = 1
A	A/–	C/1
B	B/–	A/–
C	G/–	E/0
D	C/1	C/–
E	A/1	C/–
F	D/–	A/–
G	G/–	G/–
H	H/–	D/–

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
B	AC						
C		BG AE					
D	AC	BC AC	CG CE				
E	√	AB AC	AG	AC			
F	AD AC	BD	DG AE	CD AC	AD AC		
G	CG	AG	EG	CG	AG CG	DG AG	
H	CD	AD	GH DE	CH CD	AH CD	DH AD	DG



Maximum Compatibles
(AEGH)(BCG)(CDG)
(CEG)(CFG)
U=5



Maximum Incompatibles
(ABDF)(AC)(BDEF)
(CH)(BDFH)
L=4

Reduced state table

	x = 0	x = 1
A	A/–	C/1
B	B/–	A/–
C	G/–	E/0
D	C/1	C/–
E	A/1	C/–
F	D/–	A/–
G	G/–	G/–
H	H/–	D/–

- ✓ Closure table: treat maximum compatibles as states and find their sets of next states

	x = 0	x = 1
(AEGH)	AGH	CDG
(BCG)	BG	AEG
(CDG)	CG	CEG
(CEG)	AG	CEG
(CFG)	DG	AEG

Closure table

	x = 0	x = 1
A′	A′/1	C′/1
B′	B′/–	A′/0
C′	B′, C′, D′, E′/1	D′/0
D′	A′/1	D′/0
E′	C′/–	A′/0

Reduced state table

- ✓ All maximal compatibles are used as states of the reduced machine. Hence, the final five states are:

$$A' = (AEGH), \quad D' = (CEG)$$
$$B' = (BCG), \quad E' = (CFG)$$
$$C' = (CDG)$$

State Assignment

- ✓ Primary Objective of Synchronous Networks
  - Simplification of Logic and Improvement of Performance
  - Improvement of Testability
  - Minimization of Power Consumption.
- ✓ Primary Objective of Asynchronous Networks
  - Prevention of Critical Races
  - Simplification of Logic

Race-Free State Assignment

- ✓ Objective: choose a proper binary state assignment to prevent critical races
- ✓ Only one variable can change at any given time when a state transition occurs
- ✓ States between which transitions occur will be given adjacent assignments
  - Two binary values are said to be adjacent if they differ in only one variable
- ✓ To ensure that a transition table has no critical races, every possible state transition should be checked
  - A tedious work when the flow table is large
  - Only 3-row and 4-row examples are demonstrated

3-Row Flow-Table Example

- ✓ Three states require two binary variables (in the flow table outputs are omitted for simplicity)
- ✓ Representation by a transition diagram
- ✓ a and c are not adjacent in such an assignment!
  - Impossible to make all states adjacent if only 3 states are used

	$x_1 x_2$ = 00	01	11	10
a	(a)	b	c	(a)
b	a	(b)	(b)	c
c	a	(c)	(c)	(c)

(a) Flow table



(b) Transition diagram

3-Row Flow-Table Example

- ✓ A race-free assignment can be obtained if we add an extra row to the flow table
- ✓ Only provide a race-free transition between the stable states
- ✓ The transition from a to c must now go through d

  00 ⇨ 10 ⇨ 11 (no race condition)
- ✓ Note that no stable state can be introduced in row d

	x_1x_2 = 00	01	11	10
a	(a)	b	d	(a)
b	a	(b)	(b)	c
c	d	(c)	(c)	(c)
d	a	–	c	–



	x_1x_2 = 00	01	11	10
a = 00	(00)	01	10	(00)
b = 01	00	(01)	(01)	11
c = 11	10	(11)	(11)	(11)
d = 10	00	(–)	11	(–)

don't care but cannot be 10 (cannot stable)

Shared-Row Method

- ✓ The shared row is not assigned to any specific stable state
- ✓ Used to convert a critical race into a cycle that goes through adjacent transitions between two stable states
- ✓ May require more extra rows

State adjacencies for assignments

UNIQUE STATE ASSIGNMENTS

States	Assignments 1 y_1y_2	2 y_1y_2	3 y_1y_2
A	00	00	00
B	01	11	10
C	11	01	01
D	10	10	11

y_1 \ y_2	0	1
0	A	B
1	D	C

y_1 \ y_2	0	1
0	A	C
1	D	B

y_1 \ y_2	0	1
0	A	C
1	B	D

Unique State Assignments

Present state	x = 0	x = 1
A	$A/0$	$B/0$
B	$A/0$	$C/0$
C	$C/0$	$D/0$
D	$C/1$	$A/0$

(a)

States	Assignments 1 $y_1\,y_2$	2 $y_1\,y_2$	3 $y_1\,y_2$
A	00	10	00
B	01	11	10
C	11	01	11
D	10	00	01

(b)

$$D_1 = y_1\bar{x} + y_2x \qquad D_1 = y_1\bar{x} + \bar{y}_2x \qquad D_1 = y_2\bar{x} + \bar{y}_2x$$
$$D_2 = y_1\bar{x} + \bar{y}_1x \qquad D_2 = \bar{y}_1\bar{x} + y_1x \qquad D_2 = y_2\bar{x} + y_1x$$

NUMBER OF STATE ASSIGNMENTS.

N_S	N_{FF}	N_{SA}	N_{UA}
1	0	—	—
2	1	2	1
3	2	24	3
4	2	24	3
5	3	6,720	140
6	3	20,160	420
7	3	40,320	840
8	3	40,320	840
9	4	4.15×10^9	10,810,800
10	4	2.91×10^{10}	75,675,600

$$N_{UA} = \frac{(2^{N_{FF}} - 1)!}{(2^{N_{FF}} - N_S)!N_{FF}!}$$

4-Row Flow-Table Example

- ✓ A flow table with 4 states requires an assignment of two state variables.
- ✓ If there were no transitions in the diagonal direction (from a to c or from b to d), it would be possible to find adjacent assignment for the remaining 4 transitions.

	00	01	11	10
a	*b*	*a*	*d*	*a*
b	*b*	*d*	*b*	*a*
c	*c*	*a*	*b*	*c*
d	*c*	*d*	*d*	*c*

(a) Flow table

- ✓ In general in order to satisfy the adjacency requirement, at least 3 binary variables are needed.



(b) Transition diagram

4-Row Flow-Table Example

- The following state assignment map is suitable for any table.
  - a, b, c, and d are the original states.
  - e, f, and g are extra states.
  - States placed in adjacent squares in the map will have adjacent assignments
  - **Please note that state variable order in figures is $y_3y_1y_2$**

	00	01	11	10
a	*b*	*a*	*d*	*a*
b	*b*	*d*	*b*	*a*
c	*c*	*a*	*b*	*c*
d	*c*	*d*	*d*	*c*

(a) Flow table



(a) Binary assignment



(b) Transition diagram

4-Row Flow-Table Example

- ✓ To produce cycles:
  - The transition from **a** to **d** must be directed through the extra state **e**
  - The transition from **c** to **a** must be directed through the extra state **g**
  - The transition from **d** to **c** must be directed through the extra state **f**

	00	01	11	10
a	*b*	*a*	*d*	*a*
b	*b*	*d*	*b*	*a*
c	*c*	*a*	*b*	*c*
d	*c*	*d*	*d*	*c*

(a) Flow table

	00	01	11	10
000 = *a*	*b*	*a*	*e*	*a*
001 = *b*	*b*	*d*	*b*	*a*
011 = *c*	*c*	*g*	*b*	*c*
010 = *g*	–	*a*	–	–
110 –	–	–	–	–
111 = *f*	*c*	–	–	*c*
101 = *d*	*f*	*d*	*d*	*f*
100 = *e*	–	–	*d*	–



Although the flow table has 7 rows, there are only 4 stable states.

Multiple Row Method

- ✓ Multiple-row method is easier. May not as efficient as in above shared-row method
- ✓ Each stable state is duplicated with exactly the same output. Behaviors are still the same
- ✓ While choosing the next states, choose the adjacent one among the two possibilities



(a) Binary assignment

	00	01	11	10
$000 = a_1$	b_1	(a_1)	d_1	(a_1)
$111 = a_2$	b_2	(a_2)	d_2	(a_2)
$001 = b_1$	(b_1)	d_2	(b_1)	a_1
$110 = b_2$	(b_2)	d_1	(b_2)	a_2
$011 = c_1$	(c_1)	a_2	b_1	(c_1)
$100 = c_2$	(c_2)	a_1	b_2	(c_2)
$010 = d_1$	c_1	(d_1)	(d_1)	c_1
$101 = d_2$	c_2	(d_2)	(d_2)	c_2

(b) Flow table

Don't Care Assignment

	00	01	11	10
a	(a)	b	–	c
b	(b)	(b)	c	d
c	–	d	(c)	(c)
d	a	(d)	(d)	(d)

Needed Transitions

column 00: $d \rightarrow a$

column 01: $a \rightarrow b, \quad c \rightarrow d$

column 11: $b \rightarrow c$

column 10: $a \rightarrow c, \quad b \rightarrow d$



- ✓ All possible transitions between pairs of rows are needed
- ✓ Fill in don't care to eliminate races
- ✓ Direct transitions for columns 01, 10 (No don't care)

Don't Care Assignment

	00	01	11	10
a	(a)	b	–	c
b	(b)	(b)	c	d
c	–	d	(c)	(c)
d	a	(d)	(d)	(d)

column 00: $d \rightarrow a$

column 01: $a \rightarrow b, \quad c \rightarrow d$

column 11: $b \rightarrow c$

column 10: $a \rightarrow c, \quad b \rightarrow d$

Needed Transitions



- ✓ All possible transitions between pairs of rows are needed
- ✓ Fill in don't care to eliminate races
- ✓ Direct transitions for columns 01, 10 (No don't care)



		00	01	11	10
00	a	(a)	b	c	c
01	b	(b)	(b)	a	d
10	c	a	d	(c)	(c)
11	d	c	(d)	(d)	(d)

In column 00: d⇨a changed to d⇨c⇨a.

In column 11: b⇨c changed to b⇨a⇨c.

State Assignment

- ✓ Universal Assignment for 8-Row Tables
  - Require 4 state variables.
  - Slow due to several successive changes needed.



- ✓ Universal Assignment as the Last Resort.
  - Try to use smaller number of state variables.
  - Try to take advantage of don't care.
  - Allow several state variables change simultaneously.
    - Make all races noncritical.
    - Faster.

Extra raw flow table

I	I_1	I_2	I_3	I_4
a	C,1	B,0	A,1	C,-
b	C,1	B,0	A,1	A,-
c	C,1	A,-	C,0	D,0
d	E,0	D,1	C,0	D,0
e	E,0	D,1	F,-	E,1
f	D,-	D,1	B,-	F,0

	I_1	I_2	I_3	I_4
a	C,1	G,0	A,1	C,-
b	C,1	B,0	G,1	A,-
c	C,1	A,-	C,0	D,0
d	E,0	D,1	C,0	D,0
e	E,0	D,1	H,-	E,1
f	D,-	D,1	B,-	F,0
g	-,-	B,-	A,-	-,-
h	-,-	-,-	F,-	-,-





y_3 \ y_1y_2	00	01	11	10
0	G	B	F	H
1	A	C	D	E

Alternative solution: transition changes

I	I_1	I_2	I_3	I_4
a	C,1	B,0	A,1	C,-
b	C,1	B,0	A,1	A,-
c	C,1	A,-	C,0	D,0
d	E,0	D,1	C,0	D,0
e	E,0	D,1	F,-	E,1
f	D,-	D,1	B,-	F,0

I	I_1	I_2	I_3	I_4
a	C, 1	B, 0	A, 1	C, -
b	A*, 1	B, 0	A, 1	A, -
c	C, 1	A, -	C, 0	D, 0
d	E, 0	D, 1	C, 0	D, 0
e	E, 0	D, 1	F, -	E, 1
f	E*, -	D, 1	B, -	F, 0







Summary

- ✓ Shared row method
- ✓ Multiple row method
- ✓ Don't care assignment
- ✓ Universal states assignment
- ✓ Transition changes
- ✓ Other approaches[1]

[1] VP Nelson et al., not presented here

Hazards in combinational circuits



(a) AND–OR circuit



(b) NAND circuit

- ✓ Static 1-hazard (sum of products)
  - The remedy
    - the circuit moves from one product term to another
    - additional redundant gate



(a) Static 1-hazard (b) Static 0-hazard (c) Dynamic hazard



(a) $Y = x_1x_2 + x'_2x_3$



(b) $Y = x_1x_2 + x'_2x_3 + x_1x_3$

Hazards in sequential circuits

✓ An asynchronous example:



(a) Logic diagram

y \ $x_1 x_2$	00	01	11	10
0	0	0	1	0
1	1	0	1	1

(b) Transition table



(c) Map for Y

111 → 110

111 → 010

Remove Hazards with Latches

- ✓ The implementation of the asynchronous circuits with SR latches can remove static hazards

(a) Static 1-hazard (b) Static 0-hazard (c) Dynamic hazard

- ✓ SR Latch (NOR type)
  - Allow 1-hazard (a momentary 0 has no effect)
  - The network realizing S and R must be free of 0-hazards.

- ✓ S'R' Latch (NAND type)
  - Allow 0-hazard (a momentary 1 has no effect)
  - The network realizing S and R must be free of 1-hazards.

- ✓ Note that a sum-of-products implementation is automatically free of static 0-hazards and a product-of-sums implementation is free of static 1-hazards.

Hazard-Free Realization

- ✓ S-R Latch (NOR type):

S-R Flip-Flop Driven by
2-level AND-OR Networks



Equivalent Network Structure
(in general faster)



Essential Hazards

- ✓ Besides static and dynamic hazards, another type of hazard in asynchronous circuits is called: **Essential Hazard**
- ✓ It is caused by unequal delays along two or more paths that originate from the same input
- ✓ Cannot be corrected by adding redundant gates
- ✓ Can only be corrected by adjusting the amount of delay in the affected path
  - Each feedback path should be examined carefully !!

Design Example

Recommended Design Procedure:

1. State the design specifications.
2. Derive a Primitive Flow Table.
3. Reduce the Flow Table by merging rows.
4. Make a race-free binary state assignment.
5. Obtain the transition table and output map.
6. Obtain the logic diagram using SR latches.

Design Example

1) Design Specifications:

The objective is to design a negative-edge-triggered T flip-flop. The circuit has two inputs T (toggle) and C (clock) and one output Q. The output state is complemented if T=1 and the clock changes from 1 to 0 (negative-edge-triggering). Otherwise, under all input condition, the output remains unchanged.

- A Negative-Edge-Triggered T FF
- Two inputs : T, C
- Flip-Flop changes state when T = 1 and C changes from 1 to 0
- Q remains constant under all other conditions
- T and C do not change simultaneously

Design Example

2) Primitive Flow Table

State	Inputs		Output
	T	C	Q
a	1	1	0
b	1	0	1
c	1	1	1
d	1	0	0
e	0	0	0
f	0	1	0
g	0	0	1
h	0	1	1

	TC = 00	01	11	10
a	– , –	f , –	(a), 0	b , –
b	g , –	– , –	c , –	(b), 1
c	– , –	h , –	(c), 1	d , –
d	e , –	– , –	a , –	(d), 0
e	(e), 0	f , –	– , –	d , –
f	e , –	(f), 0	a , –	– , –
g	(g), 1	h , –	– , –	b , –
h	g , –	(h), 1	c , –	– , –



Design Example

3) Merging of the Flow Table

Implication Table

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
b	a,c ×						
c	×	b,d ×					
d	b,d ×	×	a,c ×				
e	b,d ×	e,g × b,d ×	f,h ×	✓			
f	✓	e,g × a,c ×	f,h × a,c ×	✓	✓		
g	f,h ×	✓	b,d ×	e,g × b,d ×	×	e,g × f,h ×	
h	f,h × a,c ×	✓	✓	d,e × c,f ×	e,g × f,h ×	×	✓

Merger Diagram



Compatible pairs:

$(a,f)\ (b,g)\ (b,h)\ (c,h)\ (d,e)\ (d,f)\ (e,f)\ (g,h)$

The maximal compatibles pairs are:

$(a,f)\ (b,g,h)\ (c,h)\ (d,e,f)$

U=4

Maximal Incompatibles



L=4

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
b	a,c ×						
c	×	b,d ×					
d	b,d ×	×	a,c ×				
e	b,d ×	e,g × b,d ×	f,h ×	✓			
f	✓	e,g × a,c ×	f,h × a,c ×	✓	✓		
g	f,h ×	✓	b,d ×	e,g × b,d ×	×	e,g × f,h ×	
h	f,h × a,c ×	✓	✓	d,e × c,f ×	e,g × f,h ×	×	✓

Design Example

- ✓ In this particular example, the minimal collection of compatibles is also the maximal compatibles set that satisfy also the closed condition:

(a, f) (b, g, h) (c, h) (d, e, f)

TC

	00	01	11	10
a, f	e, –	(f), 0	(a), 0	b, –
b, g, h	(g), 1	(h), 1	c, –	(b), 1
c, h	g, 1	(h), 1	(c), 1	d, –
d, e, f	(e), 0	(f), 0	a, –	(d), 0

(a)

TC

	00	01	11	10
a	d, –	(a), 0	(a), 0	b, –
b	(b), 1	(b), 1	c, –	(b), 1
c	b, –	(c), 1	(c), 1	d, –
d	(d), 0	(d), 0	a, –	(d), 0

(b)

Design Example

4) State Assignment and Transition Table

- ✓ No diagonal lines in the transition diagram: No need to add extra states (**race-free binary state assignment!**)



$y_1 y_2$	TC = 00	TC = 01	TC = 11	TC = 10
$a = 00$	10	(00)	(00)	01
$b = 01$	(01)	(01)	11	(01)
$c = 11$	01	(11)	(11)	10
$d = 10$	(10)	(10)	00	(10)

(a) Transition table

$y_1 y_2$	TC = 00	TC = 01	TC = 11	TC = 10
00	0	0	0	X
01	1	1	1	1
11	1	1	1	X
10	0	0	0	0

(b) Output map $Q = y_2$

Design Example

5) Logic Diagram

y_1y_2 \ TC	00	01	11	10
00	1	0	0	0
01	0	0	1	0
11	0	X	X	X
10	X	X	0	X

(a) $S_1 = y_2\,TC + y'_2\,T'C'$

y_1y_2 \ TC	00	01	11	10
00	0	X	X	X
01	X	X	0	X
11	1	0	0	0
10	0	0	1	0

(b) $R_1 = y_2\,T'C' + y'_2\,TC$

y_1y_2 \ TC	00	01	11	10
00	0	0	0	1
01	X	X	X	X
11	X	X	X	0
10	0	0	0	0

(c) $S_2 = y'_1\,TC'$

y_1y_2 \ TC	00	01	11	10
00	X	X	X	0
01	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	1
10	X	X	X	X

(d) $R_2 = y_1\,TC'$