The SR Domain

Stephen Edwards
Edward A. Lee

http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/~sedwards/

University of California, Berkeley

The SR Domain

- A specification scheme
  - Synchronous model of time
    - Predictable temporal behavior
    - Easier to design
    - Easier to analyze
  - Heterogeneous: compiler cannot see inside blocks
    - Mixing languages made easy
    - Allows separate compilation
    - Large designs are tractable
- Deterministic
  - Guaranteed by fixed-point semantics
- Fast, predictable execution time
  - Chaotic iteration-based scheme
  - Fully static scheduling

SR Systems

Zero-delay blocks compute continuous functions

Instantaneous communication with feedback



Single driver, multiple receiver wires with values from flat CPOs

- Block functions may change between instants for time-varying behavior
- Block functions may be specified in any language

Zero Delay and Feedback

How to maintain determinism?



Which goes first? *Need an order-invariant semantics*



Contradictory! *Need to attach meaning to such systems.*

Dealing with Feedback

Why bother at all?
Answer: *Heterogeneity*

- Cycles are usually broken by delay elements *at the lowest level*
- Some schemes (e.g., Lustre) insist on this
- False feedback often appears at higher levels
- Data dependent cycles can appear when sharing resources
- *Virtually all cycles are "false," yet must be dealt with.*

Fixed-point Semantics are Natural for Synchronous Specifications with Feedback

Why a fixed point?

Self-reference:
The essence of a cycle



System function (composition of block functions)

Vector of signals at time t (zero delay)

fixed point $\iff$ stable state

determinism $\iff$ unique solution

The Least Fixed Point of What?



Interpret as ↘



↗ Take LFP

$B(I, f(I)) = f(I)$



Unique Least Fixed Point Theorem

Recall:

> A monotonic function on a complete partial order (with $\perp$) has a unique least fixed point.

What does it mean to make the system function f monotonic and the signal values a CPO?

Vector of Signals is a CPO

Values along an upward path grow more defined.







vector-valued extension

Formally, $x \sqsubseteq y$ if y is at least as defined as x.

Adding $\perp$ Is Enough

Any set $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, \ldots\}$ can easily be "lifted" to give a flat partial order:



A CPO for signals with pure events:



A CPO for valued events:



Why not absent $\sqsubseteq$ present?

```
present A then ... else ... end
```

Violates monotonicity

Monotonic Block Functions

Giving a more defined input to a monotonic function always gives a more defined output.



Formally, $x \sqsubseteq y$ implies $f(x) \sqsubseteq f(y)$.

A monotonic function never recants ("changes its mind").

Many Languages Use Strict Functions, Which Are Monotonic

A strict function:

$$g(\underbrace{\ldots, \perp, \ldots}_{\text{inputs}}) = \underbrace{(\perp, \ldots, \perp)}_{\text{outputs}}$$

Outside: A strict monotonic function



Inside: Simple "function call" semantics

Most common imperative languages only compute strict functions.

Danger: *Cycles of strict functions deadlock—fixed point is all $\perp$—need some non-strict functions.*

A Simple Way to Find the Least Fixed Point

$$\bot \sqsubseteq f(\bot) \sqsubseteq f(f(\bot)) \sqsubseteq \cdots \sqsubseteq \text{LFP} = \text{LFP} = \cdots$$

For each instant,

1. Start with all signals at $\bot$
2. Evaluate all blocks (in some order)
3. If any change their outputs, repeat Step 2



$$\begin{aligned}
(a,b,c) &= (\bot,\bot,\bot) \\
f_0(\bot,\bot,\bot) &= (0,\bot,\bot) \\
f_1(0,\bot,\bot) &= (0,1,\bot) \\
f_2(0,1,\bot) &= (0,1,0) \\
f_2(f_1(f_0(0,1,0))) &= (0,1,0)
\end{aligned}$$

The Dependency Graph

Transform into single-output functions:



The Scheduling Algorithm

1. Decompose into strongly-connected components
2. Remove a head (set of vertices) from each SCC, leaving a tail
3. Recurse on each tail

Evaluating SCCs

Split a strongly-connected graph into a head and tail:



Good heads break T's strong connectivity.

Example

System



Graph



Head (1) (2)

Tail



Schedules





5 4 5 6 3 0 3 1 2 5 4 5 6 3 0 3 1 2 5 4 5 6 3 0 3

Finding Good Heads

Must break strong connectivity—remove a border of a set of vertices:



border of { A, B, C }

(vertices with incoming edges)



Choosing Good Border Sets

Heuristic: “Grow” a set starting from a vertex and greedily include the best border vertex:



Set	Border
1	5
1 5	2 3
1 5 2	3
1 5 2 3	7
1 5 2 3 7	4 6
1 5 2 3 7 4	6

2 is better (3 would increase border)

Scheduling Results



The Cost of Using the Heuristic



Asymptotic Schedule Cost



Conclusions

- Deterministic specification scheme combining synchrony and heterogeneity
- Semantics: the least fixed point of a continuous function on a CPO
- Iterative execution scheme based on recursive divide-and-conquer
- Exact scheduling practical for small graphs
- Heuristic practical for very large graphs
- Execution time for random graphs growing slower than $n^{1.5}$