



**HAL**  
open science

## Evaluation of VLSI Layout Implementation for Efficiency

Michel Robert, Joel Trauchessec, Guy Cathébras, Vincent Bonzom, Nadine Azemard, Denis Deschacht, Daniel Auvergne

► **To cite this version:**

Michel Robert, Joel Trauchessec, Guy Cathébras, Vincent Bonzom, Nadine Azemard, et al.. Evaluation of VLSI Layout Implementation for Efficiency. EURO-ASIC 1991 - European Conference on Design Automation with European Event in ASIC Design, May 1991, Paris, France. pp.362-365, 10.1109/EUASIC.1991.212836 . lirmm-00239384

**HAL Id: lirmm-00239384**

**<https://hal-lirmm.ccsd.cnrs.fr/lirmm-00239384>**

Submitted on 19 Mar 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# EVALUATION OF VLSI LAYOUT STYLE IMPLEMENTATIONS FOR EFFICIENCY

M. Robert, J. Trauchessec, G. Cathebras,  
V. Bonzom, N. Azemard, D. Deschacht, D. Auvergne

LABORATOIRE D'AUTOMATIQUE ET DE MICROÉLECTRONIQUE DE MONTPELLIER  
UA CNRS D0 3710

UNIVERSITÉ MONTPELLIER II, SCIENCES ET TECHNIQUES DU LANGUEDOC  
Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier cedex 5  
FRANCE

Telex: 490944F, Fax: (+33) 67 52 14 96, Phone: (+33) 67 54 45 90

## Abstract

*As an attempt to define a priori mapping rules for performance driven layout, we show in this paper how an automatic module generator can be used to compare different implementation styles of regular layout.*

*Speed and area performances of gate and linear matrix approaches are compared. It is clearly shown that abutment of diffusions results in lower "locox" parasitic capacitances inducing higher speed performances for linear matrix style.*

## I - INTRODUCTION

As part of the design automation project conducted in the Microelectronics Department (LMM) of Montpellier, we have been exploring ways to automate structural synthesis of integrated circuits. As a design rule independent and flexible way to design on Silicon non regular structures, we are developing a structural compiler, PRINT /1/ based on a symbolic library associated to a technology interpreter, compaction procedures, post layout extraction, temporal evaluation and optimal sizing (Figure 1). In the way to obtain an adaptative module that generates cells automatically to satisfy loading and constraint conditions in terms of performance /2/ and layout, we present an application of the automatic layout and evaluation modules of PRINT, to compare layout style efficiencies, with parameterization of the parasitic capacitances.

## II - LAYOUT STYLE RELATED WORK

Generally, cell compilers with fixed layout architectures attempt to regularize placement of randomly connected logic as found in control and glue logic. Two fixed layout methods for CMOS circuits can be categorized with respect to the growing dimension of the cell with the number of components : **linear-matrix** and **gate-matrix** arrays.

A **linear-matrix** architecture has been introduced by Uhuera and Van Cleemput /3/, to lay out complex gates in a single row of N and P transistors, aligned at the common gate connection (Figure 2-a). Minimizing the number of separations between diffusion strips, reduces the overall length of the cell. Intra cell routing is realized between rows, using vertical polysilicon and horizontal metal wires.

A **gate matrix** architecture has been introduced by Lopez and Law /4/ and widely applied to dedicated generators /5/, /6/, /7/. It extends the style of complex cell layout to




Figure 1 : Structure of the PRINT Compiler

several cells (Figure 2-b), by aligning transistors along vertical polysilicon lines following the order of the control inputs. All transistors controlled by the same gate net are placed in a single column. Connections are made by abutment of the horizontal diffusions or by vertical diffusion links between polysilicon lines, and with horizontal metal lines.

### III - LAYOUT STYLE COMPARISON.

Each layout style induces the general characteristics of the cells, such as their aspect ratio and mostly their speed




Figure 2 : Examples of Layout Styles, col.: (a) Linear Matrix, (b) Gate Matrix rows: (1) Symbolic layout, (2) layout with minimum transistor sizes, (3) layout with sized transistors




Figure 3 : Comparison between layout styles (adder slice). (1) linear matrix, (2) gate matrix style (3) manual optimization of the stick diagram.

area efficiency through the layout associated interconnect and diffusion parasitic capacitances. In order to evaluate these different styles, we used the symbolic editor of the PRINT generator and compared post layout characteristics of an automatically generated adder bit slice. Speed characteristics, are obtained from direct temporal evaluation (PATH RUNNER /8/) of the extracted layout.

Table 1 summarizes area and speed characteristics of the different layout implementations of the adder slice (Figure 3). We have compared :

- automatic linear-matrix style, obtained from PRINT compiler,
- gate-matrix with polysilicon oriented style /5/,
- by hand optimized (jog insertion) gate-matrix (referred as manual stick in the table), to minimize cell area.

Area and speed characteristics have been determined for different transistor sizing options : minimum width, constant width (standard cell approach), optimal width /2/.

From the data shown in Table 1, it appears that the best speed area trade off is obtained with the "linear-matrix" approach. As it can be observed on the parasitic capacitances extracted from the layout, this is a direct consequence of the abutment of the diffusions which minimizes the locox side wall capacitances. As shown in the Figure 4, free diffusion ends, which characterize gate-matrix style, result in locox parasitic capacitances 3 or 4 times larger than for abutted diffusions. This observation explains the rather poor speed performance of gate-matrix layout style. This is confirmed by the results of manual stick layout which gives smaller area cell with lower speed than for linear-matrix implementation.

As a minimum layout parasitic capacitance style, "linear-matrix" layout appears to be an efficient style of implementation for fast cells. This result justify the choice of "linear-matrix" style we did for the regular cell generator of PRINT compiler.

#### IV - PARASITIC CAPACITANCE PARAMETERIZATION

As an attempt to predict cell performances to drive higher level of design (synthesis or mapping level), we use in this part the regularity allowed in the "linear-matrix" style to parameterize the parasitic layout capacitances. For each electrical node, we can derive the diffusion parasitic capacitance from the number and the width of the transistors connected to this node and from constant parameters depending on the design rules of the selected technology.

As illustrated in Figure 4, the total diffusion capacitance of a node can be described as :

$$C_{par} = A_N.C_{jN} + L_N.C_{jSWN} + L_{chN}.C_{jSWchN} + \quad (1)$$

$$A_P.C_{jP} + L_P.C_{jSWP} + L_{chP}.C_{jSWchP}$$

where  $C_j$ ,  $C_{jSW}$  and  $C_{jSWch}$  are respectively the diffusion bottom area capacitance, the "locox" periphery capacitance and the "channel" periphery capacitance.

The parameters  $A_N$ ,  $L_N$ ,  $L_{chN}$ ,  $A_P$ ,  $L_P$  and  $L_{chP}$  are obtained from the widths ( $W_N$ ,  $W_P$ ) and the numbers ( $n_N$ ,  $n_P$ ) of transistors connected to the electrical node, by the following equations :

$$L_{chN} = n_N.W_N \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{if } n_N = 2 \text{ and } n_P = 0 \text{ then } \begin{cases} A_N = L_1.W_N \\ L_N = 2.L_1 \end{cases} \quad (2b)$$

$$\text{else if } n_N \text{ is even then } \begin{cases} A_N = \frac{n_N}{2}.L_2.W_N \\ L_N = n_N.L_2 \end{cases} \quad (2c)$$

$$\text{else if } n_N \text{ is odd then } \begin{cases} A_N = \left(\frac{n_N-1}{2}.L_2 + L_3\right).W_N \\ L_N = (n_N-1).L_2 + 2.L_3 + W_N \end{cases} \quad (2d)$$




Figure 4 : Evaluation of diffusion area and periphery (locox) capacitances for different configurations (transistors N,  $W = 16\mu\text{m}$ )





Figure 5 : Schematic and layouts of the nand cells referenced in Table 2.

Where  $L_1$ ,  $L_2$  and  $L_3$  are constant parameters derived from design rules and defined in Figure 4. Identical expressions can be written for the P diffusions by exchanging subscript N and P respectively.

Application of equations (1) and (2) to logic gates leads to pre-layout temporal evaluation closed to post-layout ones, as shown in Table 2 where we compared, for NAND gates, the node capacitances obtained directly from the layout (post-layout) to the values calculated from equations (1) and (2) (pre-layout). Labels A, B, C and D of the left columns identify the output node and the serial array intermediate nodes, respectively (Figure 5). The good agreement obtained between calculated and measured values, confirms the validity of this parameterization. In the right column we give evaluation of delays obtained from post-layout files ( $t_{ref}$ ), pre-layout estimations ( $t_{cpar}$ ) and from electrical description without parasitics ( $t$ ). The satisfactory agreement between  $t_{ref}$  and  $t_{cpar}$ , reinforces the validity of the proposed parameterization. However the large difference obtained for delays ( $t$ ) evaluated without parasitic capacitances gives strong evidence of the necessity, for performance driven synthesis, to take account as soon as possible of the layout style of implementation.

#### V - CONCLUSION.

Performances of cell compilers as well as regular layout style of implementation have been mainly investigated with respect to total cell area. We showed in this paper that layout styles induced parasitic capacitances are of prime importance in determining speed performances of any implementation.

Using automatic module generator, we compared speed and area performances of gate and linear matrix approaches for regular layout. We showed that the regularity of transistor implementation, in linear style, results in lower parasitics and faster cells. Moreover this regular style allows to parameterize layout parasitic capacitances in a simple and satisfactory way. This constitutes a good star-

ting point to define a priori mapping rules for performance driven layout. This gives also the possibility of accurate pre-layout estimation of cell delays as well as good initial sizing of transistors. Future application of these results will be the definition of technological thresholds for logical synthesis.

|   |               |               | area                |                     |                       | delay (nS)           |               |                        |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------|
|   |               |               | X ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) | Y ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) | S ( $\mu\text{m}^2$ ) | $C_L = 1 \text{ pF}$ |               | $C_L = 100 \text{ fF}$ |               |
|   |               |               |                     |                     |                       | $t_{A,S}$            | $t_{A,Carry}$ | $t_{A,S}$              | $t_{A,Carry}$ |
| <b>Table a</b><br>L = 2 $\mu\text{m}$<br>W = 3 $\mu\text{m}$  | linear matrix |               | 138                 | 81                  | 11178                 | 17.1                 | 14.4          | 8.6                    | 5.7           |
|   | gate          | poly oriented | 128                 | 141                 | 18048                 | 19.5                 | 16.1          | 10.9                   | 6.9           |
|   | matrix        | manual stick  | 63                  | 114                 | 7182                  | 17.8                 | 15.2          | 9.2                    | 6.3           |
| <b>Table b</b><br>L = 2 $\mu\text{m}$<br>W = 16 $\mu\text{m}$ | linear matrix |               | 138                 | 107                 | 14766                 | 4.7                  | 3.7           | 3.0                    | 1.9           |
|   | gate          | poly oriented | 128                 | 253                 | 32384                 | 5.9                  | 4.4           | 4.2                    | 2.6           |
|   | matrix        | manual stick  | 63                  | 210                 | 13230                 | 5.5                  | 4.3           | 3.8                    | 2.5           |
| <b>Table c</b><br>L = 2 $\mu\text{m}$<br>W #                  | linear matrix |               | 138                 | 128                 | 17664                 | 4.1                  | 2.9           | 3.3                    | 1.9           |
|   | gate          | poly oriented | 128                 | 259                 | 33152                 | 5.3                  | 3.4           | 4.4                    | 2.4           |
|   | matrix        | manual stick  | 63                  | 210                 | 13230                 | 4.9                  | 3.4           | 4.0                    | 2.3           |

Delays are measured, with a timing analyser (PATH RUNNER 181) after automatic extraction of layout capacitances, between the switching input (A) and the sum (S) or Carry outputs for different load conditions ( $C_L$ ):  $t_{A,S} = t_{LH} + t_{HL}$ . Technology parameters (2 $\mu\text{m}$ CMOS):  $V_{IN} = |V_{iP}| = 0.9\text{V}$ ,  $K_{pN} = 5 \cdot 10^{-5} A/V^2$ ,  $K_{pP} = 2 \cdot 10^{-5} A/V^2$ . Diffusion N capacitances: area  $C_j = 57 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ pF}/\mu\text{m}^2$ , periphery  $C_{jswlocox} = 450 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ pF}/\mu\text{m}$ ,  $C_{jswchannel} = 75 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ pF}/\mu\text{m}$ . Diffusion P capacitances: area  $C_j = 175 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ pF}/\mu\text{m}^2$ , periphery  $C_{jswlocox} = 345 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ pF}/\mu\text{m}$ ,  $C_{jswchannel} = 145 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ pF}/\mu\text{m}$ . In Table a and Table b, all transistors have the same sizes. In Table c, the transistor widths have been adjusted taking into account load conditions  $-Cl = 1\text{pF}- (12)$ .

|       | Measured Cap. (fF) |       |      |      | Calculated Cap. (fF) |      |      |      | $t_{ref}$ (nS) |      | $t_{epar}$ (nS) |      | t (nS) |      |
|-------|--------------------|-------|------|------|----------------------|------|------|------|----------------|------|-----------------|------|--------|------|
|       | A                  | B     | C    | D    | A                    | B    | C    | D    | rise           | fall | rise            | fall | rise   | fall |
| nand2 | 51.82              | 9.65  |      |      | 43.52                | 9.65 |      |      | 0.16           | 0.16 | 0.15            | 0.15 | 0.07   | 0.08 |
| nand3 | 80.78              | 9.65  | 9.65 |      | 69.85                | 9.65 | 9.65 |      | 0.33           | 0.22 | 0.30            | 0.21 | 0.12   | 0.08 |
| nand4 | 82.30              | 11.46 | 9.65 | 9.65 | 69.58                | 9.65 | 9.65 | 9.65 | 0.52           | 0.25 | 0.45            | 0.24 | 0.20   | 0.11 |

## REFERENCES :

- /1/ M.Robert, D.Deschacht, G.Cathebras, S.Pravossoudovitch, D.Auvergne "PRINT methodology: a compilation approach for cell library generation", IEEE IS-CAS'88, Helsinki (Finland), June 1988.
- /2/ D.Auvergne, N.Azemard, V.Bonzom, D.Deschacht, M.Robert "formal sizing rules of CMOS circuits", the European Design Automation Conference, Amsterdam (Netherlands), February 1991.
- /3/ T.Uheara, W.M.Van Cleemput, "optimal layout of CMOS functional arrays", IEEE Trans., vol C-30, May 1981.
- /4/ A.D.Lopez, H.F.S.Law, "a dense gate-matrix layout method for CMOS VLSI", IEEE trans. Electron Devices, vol ED-27, August 1980.
- /5/ S.Huang, O.Wing, "improved gate-matrix layout", IEEE Transactions on computer-aided design, vol.8, n58, August 1989.
- /6/ C.Piguet, G.Berweiler, C.Voirol, E.Dijkstra, J.Rijmenants, R.Zinszner, M.Stauffer, M.Joss, "ALADDIN: a CMOS Gate-Matrix layout system", IEEE IS-CAS'88, Helsinki (Finland), June 1988.
- /7/ R.L.Maziasz, J.P.Hayes "layout optimization of static CMOS functional Cells", IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design, Vol.9, N57, July 1990.
- /8/ D.Deschacht, P.Pinède, M.Robert, D.Auvergne, "PATH RUNNER: an accurate and fast timer analyser", the European Design Automation Conference, Glasgow (Scotland), March 1990.