

# Circuit Transformer: End-to-end Circuit Design by Predicting the Next Gate

Xihan Li  
University College London  
London, UK  
xihan.li@cs.ucl.ac.uk

Xing Li  
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab  
Hong Kong, China  
li.xing2@huawei.com

Lei Chen  
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab  
Hong Kong, China  
lc.leichen@huawei.com

Xing Zhang  
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab  
Hong Kong, China  
zhangxing85@huawei.com

Mingxuan Yuan  
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab  
Hong Kong, China  
Yuan.Mingxuan@huawei.com

Jun Wang  
University College London  
London, UK  
jun.wang@cs.ucl.ac.uk

## ABSTRACT

Language, a prominent human ability to express through sequential symbols, has been computationally mastered by recent advances of large language models (LLMs). By predicting the next word recurrently with huge neural models, LLMs have shown unprecedented capabilities in understanding and reasoning. Circuit, as the “language” of electronic design, specifies the functionality of an electronic device by cascade connections of logic gates. Then, can circuits also be mastered by a sufficiently large “circuit model”, which can conquer electronic design tasks by simply predicting the next logic gate? In this work, we take the first step to explore such possibilities. Two primary barriers impede the straightforward application of LLMs to circuits: their complex, non-sequential structure, and the intolerance of hallucination due to strict constraints (e.g., equivalence). For the first barrier, we encode a circuit as a memory-less, depth-first traversal trajectory, which allows Transformer-based neural models to better leverage its structural information, and predict the next gate on the trajectory as a circuit model. For the second barrier, we introduce an equivalence-preserving decoding process, which ensures that every token in the generated trajectory adheres to the specified equivalence constraints. Moreover, the circuit model can also be regarded as a stochastic policy to tackle optimization-oriented circuit design tasks. Experimentally, we trained a Transformer-based model of 88M parameters, named “Circuit Transformer”, which demonstrates impressive performance in end-to-end logic synthesis. With Monte-Carlo tree search, Circuit Transformer significantly improves over resyn2 while retaining strict equivalence, showcasing the potential of generative AI in conquering electronic design challenges.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Hardware** → **Electronic design automation**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed the tremendous success of large language models (LLMs) through world-changing products like ChatGPT and Gemini [12, 18]. While they mastered the art of human languages in an unprecedented way from storytelling to conversation, their overall workflow is surprisingly simple: “just adding one word at a time” [20]. That is, given the text so far, a LLM will


recurrently predict the next word via a huge neural model trained on large-scale corpora, and append it at the end of the text.

In the world of electronics, there is another fundamental “language”, circuits, that specifies the functionality of an electronic device by cascade connections of logic gates. Thus, it is appealing to wonder whether it is possible to master circuit design by a similar manner. That is, can we train a “circuit model” of substantial size, then design circuits via simply predicting the next logic gate? For instance, logic synthesis, which is to find a compact representation of a circuit, is analogous to text summarization that creates a concise summary of a long text. Then can we employ the same methodology to conquer both tasks, by recurrently predicting the next gate or word?

However, the essential differences between circuits and human languages formed a wide gap to such methodology sharing. The first gap arises from their inherently different natural structures. While all human languages are born to be sequential as people need to speak it word-by-word, circuits are not likely to be represented gate-by-gate, but rather in a cascade structure, given that logic gates typically involve two or more inputs. Such complex cascade structure brings significant difficulty for existing language models to predict gates and generate circuits, as they are designed for leveraging sequential information. Even if the circuits can be serialized in some standard text formats (e.g., AIGER [1] for And-Inverter Graph), such compact, storage-oriented formats are not sufficiently intuitive for neural models to decode, resulting in poor empirical performance in terms of scalability and accuracy.

The second gap, which might be more intractable, lies in the conflict between the precision demanded by circuits and the inherently approximate nature of neural models. While human languages are already much more tolerant to ambiguity and inaccuracy, LLMs still suffer from hallucination (i.e., the model-generated content may be false or misleading [9, 22]), not to mention that circuit design usually requires strict constraint satisfaction. In logic synthesis, for example, the synthesized circuit is typically mandated to be precisely equivalent to the original. A single bit of difference in truth table can result in a complete failure. Even if we can add a term in the loss function of neural models to penalise such circumstance, it will still only mitigate, if possible, rather than eliminating non-equivalence that is easily achievable in existing synthesis tools.

In this work, we take the first step to bridge the two gaps, aiming to design circuits through a fully generative approach supported



**Figure 1: The logic synthesis pipeline with Circuit Transformer. From left to right, the number of AND ( $\wedge$ ) nodes in the toy AIG network is reduced by one, while the logical functionality remains equivalent.**

by a large neural model. For the first gap, our emphasis is on devising an intuitive and efficient circuit encoding scheme tailored for neural models. Instead of tokenizing standard text formats, we propose a memory-less, depth-first traversal trajectory of circuits as the encoding. That is, we traverse through a circuit from its primary output in a depth-first manner, without labeling visited gates. The resulting full traversal trajectory serves as a serialized encoding to be tokenized. In this way, Transformer-based models are allowed to efficiently exploit the structural information via tree-based positional encodings, while retaining the complete circuit information. Given the above serialized encoding, we are able to define the circuit model probabilistically as  $P(g_n | g_{1:n-1}, e_{1:n-1})$ , the probability distribution of the  $n$ -th gate (or input)  $g_n$  in the traversal trajectory given the previous elements  $g_1, \dots, g_{n-1}$  with their positional encoding  $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}$ , facilitating a gate-by-gate generation of circuits.

For the second gap, we focus on one of the most common constraints in circuits — the equivalence constraint, which means the output of the generated circuit must be equal to specific values when given specific inputs. Our insight is that, instead of adding an expensive post-process to fix the equivalence issue, a more efficient direction is to ensure that every step remains within the feasible region. To achieve this, we propose an equivalence-preserving decoding process that detects potential conflicts at each step given current circuit encoding. A conflict masking layer is appended to the output of the probabilistic circuit model, assigning a probability of zero to conflict-causing tokens, so as to eliminate any risk of non-equivalence.

Moreover, circuit design is commonly associated with optimization, and the proposed circuit generation process can be also viewed as a sequential decision-making process in optimization tasks. In this context, we show that a trained probabilistic circuit model can serve as a policy to be integrated into Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS), to improve the optimality of the generated circuit.

To validate our proposed approaches, we trained a Transformer model with 88 million parameters, named “Circuit Transformer”, to perform end-to-end logic synthesis on 8-input, 2-output circuits. The model is trained on 20 million random generated circuits, accepting the original circuit as input and the synthesized circuit as output. Experimental results show that Circuit Transformer performs impressively in end-to-end logic synthesis. With the aid of Monte-Carlo tree search, it significantly outperforms resyn2 in ABC,

showcasing the potential of generative AI in conquering electronic design challenges.

## 2 RELATED WORK

While machine learning (ML) for electronic design automation (EDA) have been one of the trending topics with lots of studies, most of them focus on addressing ML-friendly subtasks, such as classification, regression and Markov decision process, to enhance the performance of existing EDA algorithms. For example, in logic synthesis, recent ML-based studies focus on scheduling existing traditional optimization strategies [11] and operators within the synthesis flow [5, 7, 21, 23]. Graph Convolution Networks are utilized in some studies to capture information from circuits [6]. None of them directly generates logic synthesis solutions, primarily due to the complicated constraints [8].

Recently, there are a few new ML researches [13–15] attempting to tackle circuits in a more generative way, including the employment of Transformer models [19] and pre-trained language models. However, since they have not fully addressed the aforementioned issues about circuit representation and constraint satisfaction, their application is currently confined to small-scale, approximated scenarios that permit constraint violation.

Along with the recent wave of LLM applications, there are emerging works on the integration of LLMs in EDA, including ChipGPT [4], Chip-Chat [2] and ChipNeMo [10]. Similar to LLMs’ integration in other fields, these works focus on natural language interaction in hardware design. They generate hardware description programs, EDA scripts and analyses in response to user prompts, rather than performing the actual EDA tasks (synthesis, verification, etc.) themselves.

## 3 METHODS

### 3.1 Neural Encoding of Circuits

In this section, we focus on finding an encoding scheme of logic circuits that is natural for neural models to process, not only for information capture, but also for transformation and generation. Unless otherwise specified, all the circuits are represented in And-Inverter Graph (AIG) format.

Traditionally, for encoding scheme design, what matters a lot is compactness, i.e., whether it makes efficient use of the memory or storage. The ease of decoding is usually of secondary importance once it can be programmed in advance. However, when entering the




Figure 2: A comparison between standard AIG encoding format (AIGER) and our proposed trajectory-based encoding.

realm of neural models, data encodings are deliberately redundant to facilitate neural decoding. For example, for a categorical label  $l$  with  $N$  possible values, most neural models will employ one-hot encoding  $I_l$ , i.e., a vector of  $N$  binary element whose values are all 0 except the  $l$ -th element which equals to 1. Such an encoding of  $N$  bits (or  $N$  floats) is far more redundant from a regular one of  $\lceil \log N \rceil$  bits (or a single float), but it “unfold” every possible value with a dedicated input, which allows neural models to simply process each input separately, without the need to learn a decode rule from value ranges to labels.

For the neural encoding of circuits, we follow the same methodologies: by allowing “unfolding” with additional redundancy, we free the neural models from learning complicated decode rules. More specifically, we employ a memory-less, depth-first traversal trajectory to serialize the circuit, as illustrated in Figure 2. Given a circuit, we start the traversal from each of its primary outputs (PO), and visit each connected gate in a depth-first, recursive manner. Backtracking occurs when a primary input (PI) is reached. The path from the PO to the current node will also be recorded. Importantly, such a traversal is memory-less, i.e., visited nodes will not be labelled during the traversal, thus a node will appear multiple times in the trajectory if its fan-out is larger than one.

Specifically, for Transformer models, a tokenized sequence with positional encodings is required to represent a sequence with each element’s position. To tokenize the traversal trajectory mentioned above for an  $N$ -input circuit, we use a vocabulary of  $2N + 4$  tokens: EOS (end of sequence), PAD (padding token to align sequences of different length),  $N$  primary inputs  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  with their inverses  $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_N$ , and AND gate  $\wedge$  with its inverse  $\bar{\wedge}$ . By doubling the PO and AND gate tokens to include their inverses, we avoid the occurrence of individual inverter tokens, which effectively shorten the tokenized trajectory. Also note that all AND gates in a circuit correspond to the same token “ $\wedge$ ”, which is very different from the AIGER format.

For the positional encoding, instead of regular sequential encoding, we utilize the recorded path from the PO as a node’s position, and encode it as a stack of one-hot encodings (“10” for the 1st input and “01” for the 2nd input). For example, in Figure 2, the position of the 2nd node  $a_1$  in the trajectory can be represented as  $e_2 = [10]$  (push “10” in the encoding stack of  $o_1$  which is empty, as it is  $o_1$ ’s first input), and the position of the 4th node  $x_2$  in the trajectory can

be represented as  $e_4 = [01; e_2] = [0110]$  (push “01” in  $e_2$  as  $x_2$  is  $a_1$ ’s second input) and  $e_6 = [10; e_5] = [1001]$  when  $x_2$  is secondly visited in [16] to handle tree-based structures. For circuits with multiple POs, we initialize the encoding stack of the  $k$ th PO  $o_k$  with a unique one-hot encoding  $I_k$ .


While such an encoding introduces apparent redundancies, it allows Transformer-based models to manipulate the circuit with ease. For a gate in the circuit, the position encoding of all its transitive fanins and fanouts can be accessed from its own positional encoding by linear transformations, which is easy to be learned by neural models. In contrast, the standard AIGER format shown in Figure 2 requires the model to extract the cascade structure from groups of triples defining AND gates, demanding a more advanced level of semantic understanding.

To provide a more accessible example, we sketch in Figure 3 how a simplified Transformer model may compute the truth table of a circuit with our proposed circuit encoding.<sup>1</sup> In this example, the Transformer only need to learn 1) the embedding of each PO as its own truth table (e.g., “01010101” for  $x_1$  and “00110011” for  $x_2$ ) 2) the query and value vectors to be identical to the corresponding positional encoding and the token embedding, while the key vectors equals to its position encodings left shifted by 2 (its fanout gate’s position). In such a way, a gate will have high attention score with its two inputs, with its attention value equals to the weighted sum of its inputs’ value vectors. 3) a feedforward neural network approximating non-linear functions such as  $\text{sgn}(x)$  and  $1 - \text{sgn}(-x)$  to output a valid truth table. By passing one attention layer, the truth table of AND gates  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are computed, and the truth table of  $a_1$  can also be computed with an additional layer.

### 3.2 Circuit Model: Predict the Next Logic Gate

Utilizing the efficient neural encoding of circuits proposed above, in conjunction with Transformer models and supervised learning, we can successfully address various circuit-related classification and regression tasks. However, in contrast to standard neural techniques for extracting graph information, such as graph neural networks,

<sup>1</sup>Note that the following results are for illustration only. An actual training may not lead to such a result due to the more complex model structure and the randomness in training.



**Figure 3: A simplified, hypothetical Transformer model to compute the truth table of the AIG in Figure 2.**

what distinguishes the proposed encoding is its generative capability. Now, let’s revisit our initial question: can we train a “circuit model” that design (generate) circuits via simply predicting the next logic gate, just like what large language models do to master human languages? In this section, we show the feasibility of such an generative approach based on our proposed neural encoding of circuits.

Similar to language models, we define a *circuit model* as one that computes the probability of a logic gate or PI,  $g_n$ , to be appeared as the  $n$ -th token in the traverse trajectory of a circuit. This probability is conditioned on the previous nodes  $g_1, \dots, g_{n-1}$  with their positional encodings  $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}$  in the trajectory, denoted as

$$P(g_n | g_{1:n-1}, e_{1:n-1}) \quad (1)$$

Most of the time, we design circuits under specific contexts that specify the characteristics of desired circuits, such as an original circuit to be equivalently simplified, a sentence “please generate a 2-bit adder” to be followed, or a picture of circuit to be interpreted. Generally, we denote such a context as  $c$ , and the circuit model should condition on the context, denoted as

$$P(g_n | g_{1:n-1}, e_{1:n-1}, c) \quad (2)$$

In such a way, once we obtained a conditional circuit model, we can construct a circuit by recurrently sampling a gate or PI  $g_n$  from the distribution  $P(\cdot | g_{1:n-1}, e_{1:n-1}, c)$ , computing  $e_n$ , adding  $g_n$  as the input of a previous gate, and updating the path from  $g_t$  to the current PO. Note that the nature of depth-first traversal determines the position of  $g_t$ , thus no additional position selection mechanism is required. Since a node may appear multiple times in the memory-less traversal trajectory, a set of non-isomorphic gates is also maintained so that all isomorphic gates will be merged during the construction. More details are shown in Algorithm 1. With such a generative routine, we can tackle circuit-related tasks in a very similar way to language models. An example is shown in Figure 4 how text summarization and logic synthesis can be solved with the same generative methodology.

### Algorithm 1 Circuit generation by predicting the next gate

**Input:** Context  $c$ , conditional circuit model  $P(g_n | g_{1:n-1}, e_{1:n-1}, c)$ .

**Output:** A circuit conforming with the context  $c$ .

Initialize  $path$  as an empty stack of gates,  $POs$  as an empty list.

Initialize  $G = \emptyset$  as a set of non-isomorphic gates

**for**  $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  **do**

    Sample  $g_t \sim P(\cdot | g_{1:t-1}, e_{1:n-1}, c)$

    Break the loop if  $g_t = \text{EOS}$

    Initialize  $g_t.input1 \leftarrow null, g_t.input2 \leftarrow null$

$e_t \leftarrow \text{Tokenize}(path)$  ▷ See subsection 3.1 for details

**if**  $path$  is empty **then** ▷  $g_t$  is a PO

        Append  $g_t$  to  $POs$  and push  $g_t$  to  $path$

**else** ▷  $g_t$  should be the input of the last gate in  $path$

$g \leftarrow path.peek()$  ▷ get the last gate added to  $path$

**if**  $g.input1 = null$  **then**  $g.input1 \leftarrow g_t$  **else**  $g.input2 \leftarrow g_t$

**if**  $g_t$  is a gate (i.e., not a PI) **then**

$path.push(g_t)$

**else** ▷ Pop fully constructed gates from  $path$

**while**  $g.input1 \neq null$  and  $g.input2 \neq null$  **do**

**if**  $g \in G$  **then**

                    Update  $path$  and  $POs$  to replace  $g$  with the isomorphic one in  $G$

**else**

                    Add  $g$  to  $G$

**end if**

$g \leftarrow path.pop()$

**end while**

**end if**

**end if**

**end for**

Return the circuit with  $POs$  as  $POs$

Context 1:							Context 1:								
an	apple	a	day	keeps	the	doctor	away	Λ	Λ	x <sub>1</sub>	x <sub>2</sub>	Λ	x <sub>2</sub>	x <sub>1</sub>	
Answer 1:							word	probability	Answer 1:						
apple	is	?	healthy	0.90	Λ	x <sub>1</sub>	?	gate/PI	probability	x <sub>2</sub>	0.90	Λ	0.05	Λ	0.04
			good	0.05						Λ	0.05	Λ	0.04		
			red	0.01						Λ	0.04				
			...	...						...	...				
Context 2:							Context 2:								
apple	earns	100	billion	dollars	in	this	year	Λ	Λ	x <sub>1</sub>	x <sub>2</sub>	Λ	x <sub>2</sub>	x <sub>3</sub>	
Answer 2:							word	probability	Answer 2:						
apple	is	?	rich	0.80	Λ	x <sub>1</sub>	?	gate/PI	probability	Λ	0.60	Λ	0.38	x <sub>2</sub>	0.01
			innovative	0.15						Λ	0.38				
			sweet	0.01						x <sub>2</sub>	0.01				
			...	...						...	...				


(a) Text summarization

(b) Logic synthesis

**Figure 4: Examples of probabilistic approaches for both (a) text summarization task in NLP and (b) logic synthesis task in EDA. Given the context information, a language model predicts the next word to be generated, while our proposed circuit model predicts the next gate or PI.**

### 3.3 Equivalence-preserving Generation of Circuits

The demand for accuracy, particularly in the form of strict equivalence preservation, is a fundamental aspect of circuit design, yet it poses a challenge for neural models. However, by leveraging the



**Figure 5: An example of the equivalence-preserving decoding process. During the whole depth-first construction process, the choice of tokens are restricted to conform with the truth table of the original logic function  $(x_1 \wedge x_2) \wedge (x_2 \wedge x_3)$ , which is “0000001”. For step 5, all tokens except  $x_3$  are masked, as  $x_3$  directly leads to a completed state.**

property of Boolean computation and our proposed circuit encoding, we demonstrate the feasibility of designing an equivalence-preserving decoding process, ensuring that every  $g_t$  predicted by the circuit model conforms with the provided equivalence constraints.

The key to the equivalent-preserving decoding is that, we can still infer part of the truth table for a Boolean function even when the function is not fully specified. For example, consider a 3-input Boolean function  $f_0(x_3, x_2, x_1) = x_1 \wedge ?$  (“?” represents any valid Boolean expression), even if  $f_0$  is not fully specified, we can still deduce part of the truth table as “0?0?0?0?”, due to the property of the AND operator that  $0 \wedge ? = 0$ . In this case, if we have an equivalence constraint  $f(0, 0, 0) = 1$ , then we already know that  $f_0$  violates this constraint even if only two elements (an AND gate and a PI) are specified. Therefore, if we have a chance to re-choose the first input of the AND gate in  $f_0$ , we should mask the choice of  $x_1$  (as well as  $x_2$  and  $x_3$ ) out of the available choices.

Given the insight above, our equivalence-preserving approach will try all possible gates and PIs before predicting a gate via a circuit model, and identify choices that would result in a violation of equivalence constraints. Then, we add a masking layer with softmax at the end of the circuit model, to assign probability zero to these violation-causing choices. Benefitted from the depth-first nature, the current choice of node will not change the truth table of past generated circuit components, thus the non-violated status will persist if every generated node does not cause a violation. Once the construction process is completed, the truth table of the circuit is determined, and a non-violated status ensures equivalence. The algorithmic detail is shown in Algorithm 2 and an example is given in Figure 5.

### 3.4 Circuit Generation as a Sequential Decision Process

Until now, we regard circuits as similar to languages, in which the circuit model try to “decode” a circuit as an “answer” that conforms

#### Algorithm 2 Get valid choices of $g_t$ to be inserted to a trajectory

**Input:**  $path$  and  $POs$  in Algorithm 1,  $K$  equivalence constraints  $[(PI_1, PO_1), \dots, (PI_K, PO_K)]$ .

**Output:** Valid choices of  $g_N$  to be added to the circuit under construction.

```

procedure COMPUTE( $g, PI$ )
  if  $g \in \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  then
    return the corresponding value of  $g$  in  $PI$ 
  else
     $i1 \leftarrow \text{COMPUTE}(g.\text{input1}, PI)$ 
     $i2 \leftarrow \text{COMPUTE}(g.\text{input2}, PI)$ 
    if ( $i1 = null$  and  $i2 = 0$ ) or ( $i1 = 0$  and  $i2 = null$ ) then
      if  $g$  is AND then return 0 else return 1
    else if  $i1 \neq null$  and  $i1 \neq null$  then
      if  $g$  is AND then return  $i1 \wedge i2$  else return  $\neg(i1 \wedge i2)$ 
    else
       $\triangleright$  Cannot determine the value due to incompleteness
      return null
    end if
  end if
end procedure
 $V \leftarrow [x_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, x_N, \bar{x}_N, \wedge, \bar{\wedge}]$ 
if  $path$  is empty then add EOS to  $V$ 
for  $g_t = x_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, x_N, \bar{x}_N, \wedge, \bar{\wedge}$  do
   $g \leftarrow path.\text{peek}()$ 
  if  $g.\text{input1} = null$  then  $g.\text{input1} \leftarrow g_t$  else  $g.\text{input2} \leftarrow g_t$ 
  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do
     $v = \text{COMPUTE}(r, PI_k)$ ,  $r$  is the most recent PO in  $POs$ 
    if ( $v = 0$  and  $PO_k = 1$ ) or ( $v = 1$  and  $PO_k = 0$ ) then
      Remove  $g_t$  from  $V$  and break the loop
    end if
  end for
  if  $g.\text{input2} \neq null$  then  $g.\text{input2} \leftarrow null$  else  $g.\text{input1} \leftarrow null$ 
end for
Return  $V$ 

```

with the context. However, compared with language tasks, circuit design are usually more directly involved to optimization, in which we aim to obtain a circuit with better metrics (e.g., less gates in logic synthesis). From such a perspective, since we successfully developed a sequential generation process, we can also interpret this process as a decisional one, in which we can define states, actions and rewards for each step to match a specific optimization objective. And the circuit model, which maps the current circuit encoding to a distribution of nodes, can be regarded as a policy to be leveraged and improved.

For example, in logic synthesis, we can define the state, action and reward for each step  $t$  as follows:

- State: the previous trajectory  $g_1, \dots, g_{t-1}$  with positional encodings.
- Action: the valid choices of  $g_t$  from Algorithm 2.
- Reward: -1 if  $g_t$  is a gate, or 0 if  $g_t$  is a PI. If there are one or more gates that is merged with previous ones in Algorithm 1, then the reward should also plus the number of merged gates.

In such a way, any optimization method for sequential decision processes, including heuristics search and reinforcement learning, can be employed to maximize the cumulative reward. To illustrate, we applied Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) to further minimize

#(layers)	1 layer	2 layers	3 layers	4 layers
#(parameters)	1,840	3,472	5,104	6,736
accuracy	0.8721	0.9776	0.9796	0.9993

**Table 1: Performance of computing the truth table of random 4-input AIGs with tiny Transformer models.**

the total number of gates of the generated circuit. It bears a resemblance to AlphaGo Zero [17] but incorporates several adaptations: 1) the branch with the maximum cumulative reward appeared is selected as the final action, instead of the most visited branch. This is done as we aim to identify the extreme value without the presence of an opponent. 2) we also use the circuit model  $P(\cdot|g_{1:n-1}, e_{1:n-1}, c)$  as a rollout policy, rather than training another action-value function. 3) no further training for policy improvement is done yet, which is leaved as a future work.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

### 4.1 Truth Table Computation with Tiny Models

To empirically demonstrate the ease of neural manipulation with our proposed circuit encoding in subsection 3.1, we show the feasibility to compute the truth table of a circuit (see Figure 3) with absurdly tiny Transformer models of  $\sim 10^3$  parameters based on our proposed encoding. The truth table computation problem of  $N$ -input, 1-output circuits is modelled as a multi-label classification task with  $2^N$  binary labels corresponding to the truth table, and we use a supervised learning approach with loss function set to be the cross entropy between predicted and true truth tables. 4-input, 1-output AIGs are randomly generated with a maximum depth of 3 to train and test the models. We employ an encoder-only Transformer architecture, setting the embedding width and intermediate size of the Transformer models to be 16, aligned with the length of the truth table. Four models are trained with different number of layers.

The result is shown in Table 1. A single-layer Transformer model with only 1,840 parameters can already reach initial capability with 87.2% accuracy, while a 4-layer model with 6,736 parameters can almost perfectly compute truth tables with over 99.9% accuracy. Actually, to the best of our knowledge, this is the smallest trained Transformer model in literature that can tackle a reasonably challenging task. This indicate the advantage of our encoding scheme that it can be easily understood and manipulated by Transformer models without millions of parameters.

### 4.2 Logic Synthesis

In this section, we select logic synthesis as a representative, comprehensive circuit design task covering all our proposed techniques. A Transformer model is trained with the traversal trajectory encoding of original AIGs as input (context  $c$  in the conditional circuit model described in subsection 3.2), and the encoding of synthesized AIGs as output, shown in Figure 4b.

To train the Transformer model, we build a large dataset containing 20 million randomly generated 8-input, 2-output AIGs. The supervised signal (i.e., the synthesized circuits) are generated by the resyn2 command in ABC [3]. We restrict that the length of the

traversal trajectory for each AIG should be no more than 200, all the 8 inputs should appear in the AIG, and each AIG has an unique truth table. The average number of AND gates are 24.10 for the original AIGs and 9.57 for the synthesized AIGs.

The details of the Transformer model are as follows. We employed an encoder-decoder architecture, each with 12 attention layers. The embedding width and the size of feedforward layer are set to 512 and 2048, leading to 88,225,800 total parameters. The vocabulary size is 20 (8 POs and AND gate with their inverse, plus [EOS] and [PAD]). Batch size and learning rate are set to 96 and  $10^{-3}$  respectively. We trained the model for 1 million batches.

To evaluate our trained model, we randomly sampled 960 AIGs that does not appear in the training set, and compare the result of each method on these AIGs to resyn2 in ABC. The maximum allowed trajectory encoding length of the synthesized circuit is set to 100. The result is shown in Table 2. Except for direct applying Circuit Transformer by which 7 AIGs failed to be synthesized within the length limit, all other methods succeeded in generating strictly equivalent, synthesized AIGs. The result shows that Circuit Transformer performs very closely to resyn2, even slightly better<sup>2</sup>. Also, Monte-carlo Tree Search boosted the performance significantly. Generally, the more steps and rollouts it takes, the better performance it achieves.

## 5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we proposed Circuit Transformer, a comprehensive pipeline including encoding, modeling, decoding and optimization, to design circuits in a fully generative way that is analogous to large language models. We demonstrated its high capability on logic synthesis, which improves over resyn2 in ABC while retaining strict equivalence. This work opens up an ambitious yet challenging direction: is it possible to train an even larger and more generic Circuit Transformer, to master the field of circuit design in a fully generative way, just like what LLMs did to the field of natural language processing? Time will tell.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Armin Biere. 2007. *The AIGER And-Inverter Graph (AIG) Format Version 20071012*. Technical Report 07/1. Institute for Formal Models and Verification, Johannes Kepler University, Altenbergerstr. 69, 4040 Linz, Austria.
- [2] Jason Blocklove, Siddharth Garg, Ramesh Karri, and Hammond Pearce. 2023. Chip-Chat: Challenges and Opportunities in Conversational Hardware Design. In *2023 ACM/IEEE 5th Workshop on Machine Learning for CAD (MLCAD)*. 1–6.
- [3] Robert Brayton and Alan Mishchenko. 2010. *ABC: An Academic Industrial-Strength Verification Tool*. In *Computer Aided Verification*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 24–40.
- [4] Kaiyan Chang, Ying Wang, Haimeng Ren, Mengdi Wang, Shengwen Liang, Yinhe Han, Huawei Li, and Xiaowei Li. 2023. ChipGPT: How far are we from natural language hardware design. arXiv:2305.14019 [cs.AI]
- [5] Antoine Grosnit, Cedric Malherbe, Rasul Tutunov, Xingchen Wan, Jun Wang, and Haitham Bou Ammar. 2022. BOILS: Bayesian Optimisation for Logic Synthesis. In *2022 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. 1193–1196.
- [6] Winston Haaswijk, Edo Collins, Benoit Seguin, Mathias Soeken, Frédéric Kaplan, Sabine Süsstrunk, and Giovanni De Micheli. 2018. Deep Learning for Logic Optimization Algorithms. In *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems (ISCAS)*. 1–4.
- [7] Abdelrahman Hosny, Soheil Hashemi, Mohamed Shalan, and Sherief Reda. 2020. DRiLLS: Deep Reinforcement Learning for Logic Synthesis. In *2020 25th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*. 581–586.

<sup>2</sup>We hypothesise that Circuit Transformer may manipulate the circuit in a more globalized manner due to the nature of the Transformer model, while resyn2 consists of local operators.

Methods	Better than resyn2	Equal to resyn2	Worse than resyn2	Average #(AND)
Circuit Transformer	111	758	91*	9.519**
MCTS-CT (S=1, R=5)	178	740	42	9.352
MCTS-CT (S=1, R=10)	207	722	31	9.265
MCTS-CT (S=1, R=20)	221	719	20	9.216
MCTS-CT (S=3, R=10)	226	716	18	9.196
MCTS-CT (S=3, R=20)	238	713	9	9.161
MCTS-CT (S=5, R=10)	235	713	12	9.173
MCTS-CT (S=5, R=20)	243	710	7	9.145
MCTS-CT (S=10, R=10)	249	703	8	9.148
MCTS-CT (S=10, R=20)	251	703	6	9.127
resyn2	0	960	0	9.578

**Table 2: Experimental result of logic synthesis on 960 random generated 8-input, 2-output AIGs, compared with resyn2 in ABC on #(AND) (the number of AND gates). MCTS-CT = Circuit Transformer with MCTS (S is the number of steps with MCTS enabled, and R is number of MCTS rollouts in each step). \*: 7 AIGs failed to complete construction in 100 steps. \*\*: The aforementioned 7 AIGs are not counted in this average.**

- [8] Guyue Huang, Jingbo Hu, Yifan He, Jialong Liu, Mingyuan Ma, Zhaoyang Shen, Juejian Wu, Yuanfan Xu, Hengrui Zhang, Kai Zhong, Xuefei Ning, Yuzhe Ma, Haoyu Yang, Bei Yu, Huazhong Yang, and Yu Wang. 2021. Machine Learning for Electronic Design Automation: A Survey. *ACM Trans. Des. Autom. Electron. Syst.* 26, 5, Article 40 (jun 2021), 46 pages.
- [9] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 12, Article 248 (mar 2023), 38 pages.
- [10] Mingjie Liu, Teo Ene, Robert Kirby, Chris Cheng, Nathaniel Pinckney, Rongjian Liang, Jonah Alben, Himyanshu Anand, Sanmitra Banerjee, Ismet Bayraktaroglu, et al. 2023. ChipNeMo: Domain-Adapted LLMs for Chip Design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00176* (2023).
- [11] Walter Lau Neto, Max Austin, Scott Temple, Luca Amaru, Xifan Tang, and Pierre-Emmanuel Gaillardon. 2019. LOracle: a Logic Synthesis Framework Driven by Artificial Intelligence: Invited Paper. In *2019 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*. 1–6.
- [12] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *arXiv:2303.08774* [cs].
- [13] Shubham Rai, Walter Lau Neto, Yukio Miyasaka, Xinpei Zhang, Mingfei Yu, Qingyang Yi, Masahiro Fujita, Guilherme B Manske, Matheus F Pontes, Leomar S da Rosa, et al. 2021. Logic synthesis meets machine learning: Trading exactness for generalization. In *2021 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 1026–1031.
- [14] Frederik Schmitt, Matthias Cosler, and Bernd Finkbeiner. 2023. Neural Circuit Synthesis with Pre-trained Language Models. In *First International Workshop on Deep Learning-aided Verification*.
- [15] Frederik Schmitt, Christopher Hahn, Markus N Rabe, and Bernd Finkbeiner. 2021. Neural Circuit Synthesis from Specification Patterns. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 15408–15420.
- [16] Vighnesh Shiv and Chris Quirk. 2019. Novel positional encodings to enable tree-based transformers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [17] David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al. 2017. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *nature* 550, 7676 (2017), 354–359.
- [18] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, et al. 2023. Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. *arXiv:2312.11805* [cs.CL].
- [19] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Ł ukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [20] S. Wolfram. 2023. *What Is ChatGPT Doing ... and Why Does It Work?* Wolfram Media, Incorporated.
- [21] Cunxi Yu, Houping Xiao, and Giovanni De Micheli. 2018. Developing Synthesis Flows without Human Knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Design Automation Conference (San Francisco, California) (DAC '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 50, 6 pages.
- [22] Dan Yu. 2023. Decoding LLM Hallucinations: Insights and Taming them for EDA Applications. <https://blogs.sw.siemens.com/verificationhorizons/2023/06/15/decoding-llm-hallucinations/> Section: News.
- [23] Keren Zhu, Mingjie Liu, Hao Chen, Zheng Zhao, and David Z. Pan. 2020. Exploring Logic Optimizations with Reinforcement Learning and Graph Convolutional Network. In *2020 ACM/IEEE 2nd Workshop on Machine Learning for CAD (ML-CAD)*. 145–150.