



Chapter 5

Combinational ATPG

組合電路自動輸入樣本產生器




Outline




- Introduction to ATPG
- ATPG for Combinational Circuits
- Advanced ATPG Techniques



Input and Output of an ATPG



- ATPG (Automatic Test Pattern Generation)
 - Generate a set of vectors for a set of target faults



Components of An ATPG System




To detect easily detectable faults

Find all faults captured by current vectors

Generate vectors for undetected faults or prove them to be undetectable

Revisiting Fault Coverage




- Fault efficiency (ATPG efficiency)
 - Percentage of faults being successfully processed by a ATPG
 - Proving a fault undetectable $\neq$ testing the fault
 - Undetectable faults can cause performance, power, reliability problems, etc.
 - Faults may be masked by undetectable faults.


$$\text{Fault coverage} = \frac{\text{\# of detected faults}}{\text{Total \# of faults}}$$

$$\text{Fault efficiency} = \frac{\text{\# of detected faults}}{\text{Total \# of faults} - \text{\# of undetectable faults}}$$


Fully V.S. Partially Specified Patterns



A fully specified test pattern
(every PI is either 0 or 1)




A partially specified test pattern
(certain PI's could be unknown)




- Applications of partially specified test patterns
 - Test compaction
 - Finding pattern of best test power, delay, etc.

Test Compaction



- To reduce the number of test vectors as long as we keep the same detectable fault coverage.
- Test compaction is important for randomly generated patterns.
 - Even for vectors generated by an ATPG, since the order of processing faults will decide which vectors are discovered first.


An Example of Different Vectors Detecting the Same Faults



- Assume we know the vectors and their detectable faults
 - If we start from f1, we find v1 to detect (f1, f3, f5).
 - And then continue with f2. We find v2 to detect it.
 - And for the remaining f4, we find v3 for detection.
 - In total, we need 3 vectors.

	f1	f2	f3	f4	f5
v1	x		x		x
v2	x	x	x		
v3			x	x	x
v4	x	x			x


An Example of Different Vectors Detecting the Same Faults (cont.)



- With the same assumption
 - If we order the faults as f4, f2, f5, f3, f1.
 - For f4, we find v3 to cover (f3, f4, f5)
 - And for f2, we find v2 or v4 to cover (f1, f2)
 - In total, we only need 2 vectors.


	f1	f2	f3	f4	f5
v1	x		x		x
v2	x	x	x		
v3			x	x	x
v4	x	x			x

Test Compaction Methods




- Use fault dictionary
 - Find essential vectors
 - No other vector can test faults covered only by essential vectors.
 - Find minimum vectors to cover all rest faults
 - A NP-complete problem.
- Try different orders of input vectors in a fault simulator.

Other Test Compaction Methods




- Static compaction
 - After a set of vectors has been generated
 - Use D-intersection
 - For example, $t1=01X$ $t2=0X1$ $t3=0X0$ $t4=X01$
 - after compaction: $t13=010$ $t24=001$
- Dynamic compaction
 - Process generated vectors on-the-fly
 - After generate a test for a fault, choose a secondary target fault to be tested and try to test the second fault by don't cares (X) not assigned by the first fault.

Combinational ATPG




- Test Generation (TG) Methods
 - Exhaustive methods
 - Boolean Equation
 - Structural Analysis
 - Implication Graph
- Milestone Structural ATPG Algorithms
 - D-algorithm [Roth 1967]
 - 9-Valued D-algorithm [Cha 1978]
 - PODEM [Goel 1981]
 - FAN [Fujiwara 1983]
 - Other advanced techniques

Exhaustive Test Generation




- Explore all possible input combinations to find input patterns detecting faults
- Complexity $\sim O(n \times 2^{\text{no_pi}})$

Generate tests for the stuck-at 0 fault, α .



Inputs	f	$f\alpha$
000	0	0
001	0	0
010	0	0
011	0	0
100	0	0
101	1	1
110	1	0
111	1	1

Boolean Equation Method



$$f = ab+ac, f_{\alpha} = ac$$

T_{α} = the set of all tests for fault α


$$= \{(a,b,c) \mid f \oplus f_{\alpha} = 1\}$$

$$= \{(a,b,c) \mid f * f_{\alpha}' + f' * f_{\alpha} = 1\}$$

$$= \{(a,b,c) \mid (ab+ac)(ac)' + (ab+ac)'(ac) = 1\}$$


$$= \{(a,b,c) \mid abc' = 1\}$$

$$= \{(110)\}.$$





- The complexity is high with the computation of faulty function.

Boolean Difference Method



- $f \oplus f_{\alpha=1}$
==
 $(\alpha=0) (f(\alpha=0) \oplus f(\alpha=1))$ for α stuck-at 1, or
 $(\alpha=1) (f(\alpha=0) \oplus f(\alpha=1))$ for α stuck-at 0
- Define Boolean difference
 $df/d\alpha = f(\alpha=0) \oplus f(\alpha=1)$
 - Meaning any change at α can be observed at the outputs of $f()$.

Example of Boolean Difference with Fault at PIs




$$df/da = f(a=0) \oplus f(a=1) = 0 \oplus (b+c) = (b+c)$$

$$\text{Test-set for } a \text{ s-a-0} = \{(a,b,c) \mid \underline{a} \bullet \underline{(b+c)} = 1\} = \{(11x), (1x1)\}.$$


**Fault activation
requirement**

**Fault sensitization
requirement**



Boolean Difference for Internal Signals



- Calculation
 - Step 1: convert the function F into a new one G that takes the signal w as an extra primary input
 - Step 2: $dF(x_1, \dots, x_n)/dw = dG(x_1, \dots, x_n, w)/dw$



Example of Boolean Difference with Internal Fault



G (i.e., F with h floating) $= h + ac$

$dG/dh = G(h=0) \oplus G(h=1) = (ac \oplus 1) = (a' + c')$

Test-set for h s-a-1 is

$$\{ (a,b,c) \mid h' \cdot (a' + c') = 1 \} = \{ (a,b,c) \mid (a' + b') \cdot (a' + c') = 1 \} = \{ (0xx), (x00) \}.$$



Test-set for h s-a-0 is

$$\{ (a,b,c) \mid \underline{h} \cdot \underline{(a' + c')} = 1 \} = \{ (110) \}.$$

For fault activation

For fault sensitization

Chain Rule



$$f = AB \quad \text{and} \quad G = f + CD$$

$$\rightarrow dG/df = (C' + D') \quad \text{and} \quad df/dA = B$$

$$\rightarrow dG/dA = (dG/df) \cdot (df/dA) = (C' + D') \cdot B$$


An Input vector v sensitizes a fault effect from A to G
iff v sensitizes the effect from A to f and from f to G

Test Generation Based on Structural Analysis




- Important algorithms
 - D-algorithm [Roth 1967]
 - 9-Valued D-algorithm [Cha 1978]
 - PODEM [Goel 1981]
 - FAN [Fujiwara 1983]
- Key techniques
 - Find inputs to (1) **activate**, and (2) **propagate** the fault through sensitized paths to POs
 - Branch and bounds

Structural Test Generation



- ATPG traverse circuit structures by the following process:




Common Concepts for Structural Test Generation




- Fault activation
 - Set the faulty signal to either 0 or 1
 - A line justification problem
- Fault propagation
 - Select propagation paths to POs
 - Inputs to the gates on the propagation paths are set to non-controlling values if the inputs are not on the path.
 - Side inputs are set to non-controlling values.
 - Multiple line justification problems
- Line justification
 - Find inputs that force certain signals to be 0 or 1.


Examples of Fault Activation and Propagation for Stuck-at Faults



- Fault activated by inverting the signal value: $d=1$.
- Fault propagation
 - Fault propagated to f by $e=0$.
- Line justification
 - To assign $d=1$, we need $(a\ b)=(1\ 1)$.
 - To assign $e=0$, we need $c=0$.




What are the Decision Points?




- On fault propagation
 - We **select** propagation paths to POs.
 - Involve decisions on which paths to choose.
- On line justification
 - Given a signal to justify, we need to make a decision on which inputs to set.
 - For example, to set the output of an OR gate to 1, we need to choose which input to set to 1.
- Backtrack
 - If we make a wrong decision (guess), we return and erase the decision (, and make another one).
 - All decisions are recorded.

Branch-and-Bound Search




- Test Generation is a branch-and-bound search
 - Every decision point is a **branching** point
 - If a set of decisions lead to a **conflict** (or **bound**), a **backtrack** is taken to explore other decisions
- A test is found when
 - (1) fault effect is propagated to a PO
 - (2) all internal lines are justified
- Since the search is **exhaustive**, it will find a test if one exists
- No test is found after all possible decisions are tried
 - Target fault is **undetectable**



An Illustration of Branch and Bounds




- Assume a , b , and c are internal signals





Decision on Fault Propagation Path




- Decision tree before we start:
- Fault activation
 - $G1=0 \rightarrow \{a=1, b=1, c=1\} \rightarrow G3=0$
- Fault propagation through G5 or G6
- Decision through G5:
 - $\rightarrow d=1 \rightarrow$ The resulting test is (1111X)
- Decision through G6:
 - $\rightarrow G4=1 \rightarrow e=0 \rightarrow$ The resulting test is (111x0)




Decisions On Line Justification



- Fault activation $\rightarrow$ set h to 0
- Fault propagation $\rightarrow e=1, f=1 \rightarrow o=0$
- Fault propagation $\rightarrow q=1, r=1$
- To justify $q=1 \rightarrow l=1$ or $k=1$ Decision point
- Decision: $l=1 \rightarrow c=1, d=1 \rightarrow m=0, n=0 \rightarrow r=0$
 $\rightarrow$ inconsistency at $r \rightarrow$ backtrack !
- Decision: $k=1 \rightarrow a=1, b=1$
- To justify $r=1 \rightarrow m=1$ or $n=1$ ($\rightarrow c=0$ or $d=0$) $\rightarrow$ Done !




Implications




- Implications
 - Computation of the values that can be uniquely determined
 - **Local implication**: propagation of values from one line to its immediate successors or predecessors
 - **Global implication**: the propagation involving a larger area of the circuit and re-convergent fanout
- Maximum Implication Principle
 - Perform as many implications as possible
 - It helps to either reduce the number of problems that need decisions or to **reach an inconsistency sooner**

An Example of Implication to Influence Decisions



- Fault activation
 - $G1=0 \rightarrow \{a=1, b=1, c=1\} \rightarrow \{G3=0, G2=0\} \rightarrow G5=0$
- Fault propagation through G6 only
- Decision through G6:
 - $\rightarrow G4=1 \rightarrow e=0 \rightarrow$ test pattern is (111x0)

Milestone Structural Test Generation Methods




- D-algorithm [Roth 1967]
- 9-Valued D-algorithm [Cha 1978]
- PODEM [Goel 1981]
- FAN [Fujiwara 1983]
- Other advanced techniques

The D-Algebra




- Allow the representation of the “good” and “faulty” behavior at the same time.
- Formally define/generate decision points in fault activation and propagation
- Introduce the symbol D in addition to 0, 1, x
 $D = 1/0$ ($D' \equiv 0/1$) represents a signal which has value 1 in fault-free circuit and 0 in the faulty circuit.




Forward implication conditions for NOT, AND, OR in D-algebra

A Quick Overview of D-Algorithm




- A structural algorithm
- Use 5-value logic (0, 1, X, D, D')
- Try to activate and propagate fault to outputs first with internal justification.
 - Then apply branch and bounds on line justification problems.

Fault Activation




- **Specify the minimal input conditions which must be applied to a logic element to produce an error signal at its output.**
- **Stuck-at faults at an AND output:**
 - Stuck-at-0 fault: 11D
 - Stuck-at-1 fault: 0xD' and x0D'
- **More complex fault model, e.g., bridging faults, gate type errors, can also be modeled.**

Fault Activation of Complex Fault Models




- Apply the concept of Boolean equation method
 - List the set of input patterns for function F .
 - F is the (local) representation function of the fault site.
 - (1) fault-free output=0 $\{F=0\}$
 - (2) fault-free output=1 $\{F=1\}$
 - (3) faulty output=0 $\{F_f=0\}$
 - (4) faulty output=1 $\{F_f=1\}$
- $\{F=0\} \cap \{F_f=1\}$ or $\{F=1\} \cap \{F_f=0\}$
- Example: 2-input AND gate output stuck-at 1
 - $\{F=0\}=\{00, 01, 10\}$, $\{F_f=1\}=\{00, 01, 10, 11\}$, $\{F=1\}=\{11\}$,
 $\{F_f=0\}=\{\}$
 - $\{F=0\} \cap \{F_f=1\} = \{00, 01, 10\}$
 - $\{F=1\} \cap \{F_f=0\} = \{\}$

Example of Complex Fault Models




- Assume the fault is to change an AND gate to an OR gate
 - $\{F=0\}=\{00, 01, 10\}$, $\{F_f=1\}=\{01, 10, 11\}$, $\{F=1\}=\{11\}$, $\{F_f=0\}=\{00\}$
 - $\{F=0\} \cap \{F_f=1\} = \{01, 10\}$
 - $\{F=1\} \cap \{F_f=0\} = \{\}$



Apply 01, we produce a 0/1 (D') at the output
Apply 10, we also produce a (D') 0/1.

D-frontiers and J-frontiers




- Two most important data structures in the D-algorithm.
 - Both store a list of gates.
- D-frontiers
 - Where to choose the propagation paths.
 - D-frontiers should not be empty during the search of test patterns.
- J-frontiers
 - Where to perform line justifications.
 - J-frontiers will be empty after a test pattern is found.

D-frontiers



- **D-frontiers** are the gates whose output value is X, while one or more inputs are D or D'.




- **Fault activation**
 - $G1=0 \rightarrow \{a=1, b=1, c=1\} \rightarrow \{G3=0\}$
- **Fault propagation** can be done through either G5 or G6
 - $D\text{-frontiers}=\{G5, G6\}$

J-frontiers



- **J-frontier**: is the set of gates whose output value is known (i.e., 0 or 1), but is not implied by its input values.




- **Fault activation** → set h to 0
- **Fault propagation** → $e=1, f=1 \rightarrow o=0$
- **Fault propagation** → $q=1, r=1$
- We need to justify both $q=1$ and $r=1$: **J-frontiers** = {q, r}.

D-drive Function




- The D-drive selects a gate in the D-frontier and attempts to propagate the D and/or D' from its input(s) to its output by setting side-inputs to non-controlling values.




- For more complex functions, we can use the truth table of 5-value logics.

Implication in D-Algorithm







- Involve D and D' in the implication.
- Basic principles are guided by the truth table of each logic gate (complex cell).
- Examples are given in the following pages.

Local Implications considering D/D' (Forward)







Before



J-frontier={ ...,a }

D-frontier={ ...,a }


After







J-frontier={ ... }

D-frontier={ ... }





Local Implications considering D/D' (Backward)




Before



After




Backward local Implication by Prime Cubes



- **Prime Cubes**

- A simplified form of truth table.
- Circle groups of 0 or 1 in the Karnaugh map.




		<i>a</i>	
		0	1
<i>b</i>	0	0	0
	1	0	1

Prime cubes of AND


<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>f</i>
1	1	1
0	x	0
x	0	0

Backward Implication for Complex Cells



Find the prime cubes of the function


$$f(a,b,c) = a'c' + b$$



<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>f</i>
0	x	0	1
x	1	x	1
1	0	x	0
x	0	1	0

In this example, if we want to justify $f=0$ and we know $c=1$, then we also obtain the backward implication of $ab=X0$

Checking Consistency




- We might assign different requirements from different decisions.
- We have to make sure every signal have compatible assignment in the circuit.

Consistency check for 5-V logic



	0	1	X	D	D'
0	0	ϕ	0	Φ	Φ
1	ϕ	1	1	Φ	Φ
X	0	1	X	D	D'
D	Φ	Φ	D	D	Φ
D'	Φ	Φ	D'	Φ	D'

Terminating Conditions for D-Algorithm





- Success:
 - (1) Fault effect at an output (D-frontier may not be empty)
 - (2) J-frontier is empty
- Failure:
 - (1) D-frontier is empty and fault is not at POs
 - (2) No decision left but J-frontier is not empty

Propagation Phase of the D-Algorithm




Line Justification Phase



Select an un-justified line,
and choose inputs for the gate (record decisions)

Perform implication, and
check consistency
update J-frontier





No alternative
decisions

Backtrack
(remove last decisions
and implied signals
recover J-frontiers)



No decision left, but
J-frontier not empty
Line justification
failed

D-Algorithm Example




- **Fault activation** → set G2 to 0 → I2=1, I3=1, D-Frontier={G5, G6}, J-Frontier={}
- **Fault propagation** → select G5 → I1=1 → G1=0 → G4=1, D-Frontier={G6, G9}, J-Frontier={}
- **Fault propagation** → select G9 → G6=1, G7=1 → I4=0, G3=0 → I4=1 (Contradictory) → propagation fails, backtrack to select another D-frontier from {G6}.

D-Algorithm Example (Cont.)





- Fault propagation $\rightarrow$ select G6 $\rightarrow$ I4=1, G3=0, G7=1

9-Value D-Algorithm




- Logic values (fault-free / faulty)
 - $\{0/0, 0/1, 0/u, 1/0, 1/1, 1/u, u/0, u/1, u/u\}$,
 - where $0/u=\{0,D'\}$, $1/u=\{D,1\}$, $u/0=\{0,D\}$, $u/1=\{D',1\}$, $u/u=\{0,1,D,D'\}$.
- Advantage:
 - Automatically considers **multiple-path sensitization**, thus reducing the amount of search in D-algorithm
 - The speed-up is **NOT** very significant in practice because most faults are detected through single-path sensitization

Example: 9-Value D-Algorithm




- **Fault activation** $\rightarrow$ set a to $0/u \rightarrow h=1/u$, **D-Frontier**={ g }
- **Fault propagation** $\rightarrow$ select $g \rightarrow b=u/1$, $c=u/1 \rightarrow$ **D-frontier**={ i, k, m }
- **Fault propagation** $\rightarrow$ select $i \rightarrow d=1/u \rightarrow$ **D-frontier**={ k, m, n }
- **Fault propagation** $\rightarrow$ select $n \rightarrow h=1$; $j, k, l, m=u/1 \rightarrow$ **J-frontier**={ j, k, l, m }
- **Justify j** $\rightarrow e'=u/0 \rightarrow e=u/1$ (consistent)
- Similarly $f=u/1$

Selecting Inputs for 9-Value D-Algorithm





- To derive the input test vector, we choose the values consistent with both fault-free and faulty circuits.
 - $A = (0/u) = \{0, D'\} \rightarrow 0$
 - $B = (1/u) = \{1, D\} \rightarrow 1$
 - $C = (1/u) = \{1, D\} \rightarrow 1$
 - $D = (u/1) = \{1, D'\} \rightarrow 1$
 - $E = (u/1) = \{1, D'\} \rightarrow 1$
 - $F = (u/1) = \{1, D'\} \rightarrow 1$
- The final vector
 - $(A, B, C, D, E, F) = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$

Problems with the D-Algorithm






- Assignment of values is allowed for internal signals
 - Large search space
 - Backtracking could occur at each gate
 - TG is done through indirect signal assignment for FA, FP, and LJ, that eventually maps into assignments at PI's
 - The decision points are at **internal lines**
 - The worst-case number of backtracks is exponential in terms of the number of decision points (e.g., at least 2^k for k decision nodes)
 - D-algorithm will continue even when D-frontier is empty
- Inefficient for large circuits and some special classes of circuits
 - Example: ECAT (error-correction-and-translation) circuits.

ECAT Circuits




- Primitive D-cube: $A = B = 1, H = D$
- To propagate through P to output R
 - One possible choice is $N = Q = 1$, but this is impossible.
- *D-algorithm will exhaustively enumerate all internal signals to confirm that $N = Q = 1$ is impossible.*

The Decision Tree




PODEM: Path-Oriented DEcision Making




- The test generation is done through a sequence of **direct assignments at PI's**
- Decision points are at PIs, thus the number of backtracking might be fewer
- Also a structural algorithm
- Also use 5-value logic and D-frontiers.
- Also a branch and bounds algorithm.
- In PODEM, to activate and propagate faults, a series of **objective** line justifications are selected (similar to D-algorithm), but then each objective is **backtraced** to PIs and a forward simulation is used to perform implications and confirm consistency .


Search Space of PODEM



- Complete Search Space
 - A binary tree with 2^n leaf nodes, where n is the number of PI's
 - For example, {a, b, c, d} are PIs in the following binary tree



PODEM: Recursive Algorithm



PODEM ()

begin

If(error at PO) return(SUCCESS);

If(D-Frontier is empty) return(FAILURE); /* terminating conditions*/

(k, v_k) = **Objective()**; /* choose a line, k , to be justified */

(j, v_j) = **Backtrace**(k, v_k); /* choose the PI, j , to be assigned */

ImPLY (j, v_j); /* make a decision */

If (**PODEM**() == SUCCESS) return (SUCCESS);

ImPLY (j, v_j'); /* reverse v_j */


If (**PODEM**() == SUCCESS) return(SUCCESS);

ImPLY (j, x); /* we have wrong objectives */


return (FAILURE);

end

An Example PI Assignments in PODEM



- Assume we have four PIs: a, b, c, d.
- Decision: a=0
- Decision: b=0 → fails
- Reverse decision: b=1
- Decision: c=0 → fails
- Reverse decision: c=1
- Decision: d=0 → fails
- Decision: d=1 → fails
- Backtrack: d=x
- Backtrack: c=x
- Backtrack: b=x
- Reverse decision: a=1
- ...




Objective() and Backtrace()



- Objective()
 - Guide decisions to **activate and propagate** faults.
 - Lead to sets of line justification problems.
 - A signal-value pair (w, v_w)
- Backtrace()
 - Guide decisions to **line justification**.
 - Backtrace maps a objective into a PI assignment that is likely to contribute to the achievement of the objective
 - Traverses the circuit back from the objective signal to PI's
 - Involves finding an all-x path from objective site to a PI, i.e., every signal in this path has value x
 - A PI signal-value pair (j, v_j)
 - No signal value is actually assigned during backtrace !

Objective() Routine



```
Objective() {
```

```
    /* The target fault is w s-a-v */
```

```
    if (the value of w is x) obj = (w, v');
```

```
    else {
```

```
        select a gate (G) from the D-frontier;
```

```
        select an input (j) of G with value x;
```

```
        c = controlling value of G;
```

```
        obj = (j, c');
```

```
    }
```


```
    return (obj);
```

```
}
```

fault activation

fault propagation

Backtrace() Routine



```
Backtrace(w, vw) {
```

```
    /* Maps objective into a PI assignment */
```

```
    G = w;
```

```
    v = vw;
```

```
    while (G is a gate output) { /* not reached PI yet */
```

```
        inv = inversion of G; /* inv=1 for INV, NAND, NOR*/
```

```
        select an input (j) of G with value x;
```

```
        G = j; /* new objective node */
```


```
        v = v ⊕ inv; /* new objective value */
```

```
    }
```


```
    return (G, v); /* G is a PI */
```

```
}
```


Backtrace Example



- Objective to achieved: (F, 1)



- Backtrace find $a=0$; Forward simulate $a=0$




- F is still x after we set $a=0$


Backtrace Example (Cont.)



- Objective to achieved: (F, 1)




- Backtrace find b=1; Forward simulate b=1




- F=1

Terminating Conditions





- Success:
 - Fault effect seen at an output.
- Failure:
 - D-frontier is empty and fault is not at any POs.

Example: PODEM




- **Fault activation** → set a to 0 → $h=1$, **D-Frontier**= $\{g\}$
- **Fault propagation** → select g → $b=1, c=1$ → **D-frontier**= $\{i, k, m\}$
- **Fault propagation** → select i → $d=1$ → **D-frontier**= $\{k, m, n\}$
- **Fault propagation** → select n → objective = $(k, 1)$
 - **Backtrace** → $e=0$ → $e'=1$ → $j=0$
 - Empty D-frontier and fault not at PO
 - Backtrack to $e=1$ → $e'=0$ → $j=1, k=D'$

Example: PODEM (Cont.)




- **D-frontier**={ m, n }
- **Fault propagation** $\rightarrow$ select $n \rightarrow$ objective =($m, 1$)
 - **Backtrace** $\rightarrow f=0 \rightarrow f'=1 \rightarrow l=0$
 - Empty D-frontier and fault not at PO
 - Backtrack to $f=1 \rightarrow f'=0 \rightarrow l=1, m=D' \rightarrow n=D$, success!!

Another PODEM Example: ECAT




- **Fault activation** → set H to 1 → A=1, B=1, **D-Frontier**=**{P}**
- **Fault propagation** → select P → objective =(N, 1)
 - **Backtrace** → C=1
 - **Backtrace** → E=1 → J=0, L=1
 - **Backtrace** → F=1
 - **Backtrace** → G=1 → K=0, M=1 → N=0, Q=1 → P=D → R=D'
- Note that there is no backtracking in this example.

Characteristics of PODEM




- A complete algorithm
 - like D-algorithm
 - Will find the test pattern if it exists
- Use of backtrace() and forward simulation
 - No J-frontier, since there are no values that require justification
 - No consistency check, as conflicts can never occur
 - No backward implication
 - Backtracking is implicitly done by simulation rather than by an explicit and time-consuming save/restore process
- Experimental results show that PODEM is generally faster than the D-algorithm

The Selection Strategy in PODEM




- In Objective() and Backtrace()
 - Selections are done arbitrarily in original PODEM
 - The algorithm will be more efficient if certain guidance used in the selection of objectives and backtrace paths
- Selection Principle
 - Principle 1: among several unsolved problems, attack the hardest one
 - Ex: to justify a '1' at an AND-gate output
 - Principle 2: among several solutions for solving a problem, try the easiest one
 - Ex: to justify a '1' at OR-gate output
- The key is to quantitatively define “hard” and “easy”.


Controllability As Guidance of Backtrace



- We usually use “controllability” to guide the selection.
 - More details will be provided in Ch 6. Testability Analysis.
- Objective $(g, 1) \rightarrow$ choose path $g \rightarrow f$ for backtracing
 - Two unsolved problems $e=1$ and $f=1$
 - Choose the harder one: $f=1$ (lower probability of being 1).
- Objective $(g, 0) \rightarrow$ choose path $g \rightarrow f$ for backtracing
 - Two possible solutions: $e=0$ or $f=0$
 - Choose the easier one: $f=0$ (higher probability of being 0).





FAN – Fanout-Oriented Test Generation





- Techniques to accelerate the test generation process
 - Immediate Implications
 - Unique sensitization
 - Headlines
 - Multiple backtrace

Immediate Implications




PODEM	FAN
Initial objective $L = 0$	Initial objective $L = 0$
Backtrace to PI: $B = 0$	Set $J = K = E = 1$
Implication: $H = 1, K = 1, J = 0, L = 1$	$J = 1 \rightarrow H = 0 \rightarrow A = B = 1$ $K = 1 \rightarrow C = 0$
Fail $\rightarrow$ backtrack.	

Unique Sensitization




- Only one path to propagate D on signal C to output H .
- Set all the off-path inputs to non-controlling values.
 - $G1 = 1, E = 1, F = 1, A = 1 \rightarrow B = 0$
- PODEM
 - Initial objective: set G1 to 1
Backtrace to PI: $A = 0$
 $\rightarrow$ assigning $A = 0$ will later block the propagation of D

Head lines





- Output of fanout-free regions with PIs as inputs.
 - Backtrace in FAN **stop at headlines**.
 - Reduce search space.




A line that is reachable from at least one stem is said to be bound

Breadth-First Multiple Backtrace




- PODEM's depth-first search is sometimes inefficient.
- Breadth-first multiple backtrace identifies possible signal conflicts earlier.
- Attempts to satisfy a set of objectives simultaneously

Why Multiple Backtrace ?





- Drawback of Single Backtrace
 - A PI assignment satisfying one objective → may preclude achieving another one, and this leads to backtracking
- Multiple Backtrace
 - Starts from a set of objectives (Current_objectives)
 - Maps these multiple objectives into head-line assignments that is likely to
 - Contribute to the set of objectives
 - Or show that objectives cannot be simultaneously achieved

Multiple objectives
may have conflicting
requirements at a stem



Example: Multiple Backtrace




Current_objectives	Processed entry	Stem_objectives	Head_objectives
(I,1), (J,0)	(I,1)		
(J,0), (G,0)	(J,0)		
(G,0), (H,1)	(G,0)		
(H,1), (A1,1), (E1,1)	(H,1)		
(A1,1), (E1,1), (E2,1), (C,1)	(A1,1)	A	
(E1,1), (E2,1), (C,1)	(E1,1)	A,E	
(E2,1), (C,1)	(E2,1)	A,E	
(C,1)	(C,1)	A,E	C
Empty → restart from (E,1)		A	C
(E,1)	(E,1)	A	C
(A2,0)	(A2,0)	A	C
empty		A	C

Multiple Backtrace Algorithm



```
Mbacktrace (Current_objectives) {  
  while (Current_objectives  $\neq \emptyset$ ) {  
    remove one entry (k,  $v_k$ ) from Current_objectives;  
    switch (type of entry) {  
      1. HEAD_LINE:      add (k,  $v_k$ ) to Head_objectives;  
      2. FANOUT_BRANCH:  
          j = stem(k);  
          increment no. of requests at j for  $v_k$ ; /* count 0s and 1s */  
          add j to Stem_objectives;  
      3. OTHERS:  
          inv = inversion of k; c = controlling value of k;  
          select an input (j) of k with value x;  
          if (( $v_k \oplus$  inv) == c) add(j, c) to Current_objectives;  
          else {      for every input (j) of k with value x  
                      add(j, c') to Current_objectives; }  
    }  
  }  
} (to next page)
```

Multiple Backtrace (con't)



```
if(Stem_objectives $\neq\phi$ ) {  
    remove the highest-level stem (k) from Stem_Objectives;  
     $v_k$  = most requested value of k;  
    if (k has contradictory requirements and  
        k is not reachable from target faults)  
        return (k,  $v_k$ )  
    /* recursive call here */  
    add (k,  $v_k$ ) to Current_objectives;  
    return (Mbacktrace(Current_objectives);  
}  
else {  
    remove one objective (k,  $v_k$ ) from Head_objectives;  
    return (k,  $v_k$ );  
}  
}
```


FAN Algorithm



```
FAN() // the target fault is  $f$  s.a.v
begin
  if ( $f = x$ ) then assign ( $f, v'$ )
  if ImPLY_and_check() = FAILURE then return FAILURE
  if (error at PO and all bound lines are justified) then
    begin
      justify all unjustified head lines
      return SUCCESS
    end
  if (error not at PO and  $D\_frontier = \emptyset$ ) then return FAILURE
  /* initialize objectives */
  add every unjustified bound line to Current_objectives
  select one gate ( $G$ ) from the D-frontier
   $c$  = controlling value of  $G$ 
```


(to next page)

FAN algorithm (con't)



```
for every input  $(j)$  of  $G$  with value  $x$ 
    add  $(j, c')$  to Current_objectives
/* multiple backtrace */
 $(i, v_i) = \text{Mbacktrace}(\text{Current\_objectives})$ 
Assign( $i, v_i$ )
if FAN() = SUCCESS then return SUCCESS
Assign( $i, v_i'$ ) /* reverse decision */
if FAN() = SUCCESS then return SUCCESS
Assign( $i, x$ )
return FAILURE
end
```

Advanced Concepts of ATPG




- Dominator ATPG
- Learning algorithms
- State hashing
- Satisfiability-based methods and Implication graphs


Dominators for Fault Propagation



Before




After unique D-drive analysis



- Unique D-Drive Implication


- If every gates in D-frontier pass through a dominator (**unique D-drive**), we can set non-controlling values at other side-inputs, and propagate D/D' further.

Learning Methods for ATPG



- Learning process systematically sets all signals to 0 and 1 and discover what other signal values are implied.
 - Used extensively in [implication](#).
 - Ex. $a=1 \rightarrow b=0$, even a and b are not implied immediately by gate relationship.
- Static learning
 - Start the learning process before ATPG
- Dynamic learning
 - Start the learning process in between ATPG steps when some signal values are known
 - Costly process

Modus Tollens for Learning




Given

$P \rightarrow Q$ is true


We can derive

$\sim Q \rightarrow \sim P$ is true

- Example:



P and Q are Boolean statements
 $\sim Q$ means that Q is not true




$(B=0) \rightarrow (F=0)$
 $\Rightarrow \sim(F=0) \rightarrow \sim(B=0) \Rightarrow (F=1) \rightarrow (B=1)$

(Static Learning)

When $A=1$
 $(B=1) \rightarrow (F=1) \Rightarrow (F=0) \rightarrow (B=0)$

(Dynamic Learning)

Constructive Dilemma for Learning




Given

- (1) $P \Rightarrow Q$ and $R \Rightarrow S$, and
(2) Either P or R is true



We can derive

Either Q or S is true.




- **Example:**

- Both $[(a=0) \Rightarrow (i=0)]$ and $[(a=1) \Rightarrow (i=0)]$ are true.
- Either $(a=0)$ or $(a=1)$ holds $\Rightarrow (i=0)$




Modus Ponens for Learning



Given

F and $F \Rightarrow G$ are true




We can derive

G is true.




- Example:
 - $[a=0]$ and $[(a=0) \Rightarrow (f=0)]$
 - $\Rightarrow (f=0)$

Recursive Learning




- From known signal values, try all possible decisions (recursively).
- If a certain signals have the same values among all decisions, they are implied values.

Example of Recursive Learning




State Hashing (EST)




- Records and compare E-frontiers
 - E-frontiers are the cut between known signals and unknown parts.
- Given identical E-frontiers
 - Previous implications can be used
 - Or inconsistency can be deduced from the previous run.

State Hashing Example



Step	Input Choice	E-frontier
1	B=0	{B=D'}
2	C=1	{C=1, B=D'}
3	E=0	{g=1, m=D}
4	A=1	{g=1, n=D'}
5	F=0	{Z=D}

Process for detecting B s-a-1
Test pattern = (CEFBA)=(10001)




Step	Input Choice	E-frontier
1	C=0	{h=D'}
2	B=1	{m=D}
3	E=0	{g=1, m=D}

Match found at step 3

Process for detecting h s-a-1
Test pattern = (CEFBA)=(00011)




Implication Graph ATPG




- Translate circuits into implication graphs
- Use transitive closure graph algorithm to perform ATPG
 - Some decisions and implications are better assigned with graph algorithms.
 - But experiences show that circuit structure is a very important information for ATPG.
- Satisfiability-based algorithms are currently the fastest implementation for justification and commonly applied to verification problems.
 - We have a separate set of slides about SAT.

Translating Gate to its Equivalent Implication Graph




- Use NAND as an example
- A two-input NAND can be described completely by the following 3 equations.
 - $a' \rightarrow c$
 - $b' \rightarrow c$
 - $c' \rightarrow ab$
 - Note that they cover all cubes.
- Implication graph
 - Each node represents a signal variable.
 - If there is a directed edge from one node ($v1$) to another ($v2$), $v1$ imply $v2$.




Equivalent implication graph for NAND.

Perform Implication on the Graph






- Assume we have $c=0$, we add an edge for $c \rightarrow c'$
 - $c \rightarrow c' == c' + c' == c'$
- Extra implication are found by tracing linked nodes.
- In this example, $a' \rightarrow a$ and $b' \rightarrow b$, hence $a=1$, $b=1$.




a	b	$\rightarrow$
0	0	1
0	1	1
1	0	0
1	1	1

Truth table for implication
 $a \rightarrow b == a' + b$

Implication Graph Examples



Equivalent Circuit Implication Graph




Implication Graph $d=0$

New paths: $a'-d-d'-a$, $F'-d-d'-F$, $b'-d-d'-b$

New conditions: $a' \rightarrow a$, $F' \rightarrow F$, $b' \rightarrow b$

Implied logic values: $a=1$, $F=1$, $b=1$



Implication Graph $F=1$ (i.e., $de=0$)

New paths: $b'-d-e-b$, $b'-e-d-b$

New conditions: $b' \rightarrow b$

Implied logic values: $b=1$