

Aligning Netlist to Source Code using SynAlign

Sakshi Garg
sgarg3@ucsc.edu

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California, USA

Jose Renau
renau@ucsc.edu

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California, USA

Abstract

In current chip design processes, using multiple tools to obtain a gate-level netlist often results in the loss of source code correlation. SynAlign addresses this challenge by automating the alignment process, simplifying iterative design, reducing overhead, and maintaining correlation across various tools. This enhances the efficiency and effectiveness of chip design workflows.

Improving characteristics such as frequency through iterative design is essential for enhancing accelerators and chip designs. While synthesis tools produce netlists with critical path information, designers often lack the tools to trace these netlist cells back to their original source code. Mapping netlist components to source code provides early feedback on timing and power for frontend designers.

SynAlign automatically aligns post-optimized netlists with the original source code without altering compilers or synthesis processes. Its alignment strategy relies on the consistent design structure throughout the chip design cycle, even with changes in compiler flow. This consistency allows engineers to maintain a correlation between modified designs and the original source code across various tools. Remarkably, SynAlign can tolerate up to 61% design net changes without impacting alignment accuracy.

1 Introduction

Chip design requires multiple iterations of microarchitecture changes to improve performance metrics. These iterations involve multiple tools that perform synthesis, flattening¹, placement, and routing. Many tools further modify the netlists, resulting in significant differences from the original source code. Each iteration also necessitates efforts to correlate parts of the netlist to the source code to maintain alignment. Tools like PrimeTime [47] and OpenSTA [26] provide netlist insights, but designers need to manually trace net names back to their source code locations, which is complex and time-consuming. Our paper aims to automate this alignment process as shown in Figure 1.

Hardware flows, unlike software compilers, involve inter-procedural optimizations and multiple tools within a single chip design cycle. Software compilers like LLVM use “Source Locators” as metadata [4, 18], requiring consistent propagation of source locator information across all code transformations. While some FPGA tools also propagate source

location embeddings, their limited scope and restriction to a single tool reduce the choice of compilers for chip design. This limitation is particularly challenging due to the lack of source locator sharing between different tools and the extensive modifications introduced by synthesis.

Implementing source locators is resource-intensive [6, 11] and can introduce backward compatibility issues [20]. Significant structural changes, abstraction level shifts, and optimizations during synthesis complicate maintaining a direct correspondence between the original HDL code and the synthesized hardware. Transformations such as resource sharing, technology mapping, and inlining often result in hardware that no longer resembles the original RTL description, making it difficult to accurately track the original line of code through these transformations.

The effort required to implement source locators is exemplified by the Chisel team, which began embedding source information in 2016 and has continued updating it across various releases [21, 31–34]. This process is resource-intensive [6, 11] and can complicate code, introducing backward compatibility issues [20].




Figure 1. SynAlign Vs. current industrial practice.

The current chip design process typically involves weekly meetings between backend and frontend teams to discuss timing information and map critical paths. Due to the complexity of this task, some teams avoid aggressive optimization techniques like flattening to simplify the process.

We propose SynAlign, a tool that automatically maps annotated post-optimized netlists to the original source code. SynAlign leverages structural equivalence points to align

¹Flattening resembles function inlining in non-hardware flows.

nets in the netlist with their source code counterparts. By avoiding the need for source locators, SynAlign reduces compiler design overhead and eliminates the costs associated with source metadata, simplifying the process for compiler developers. Furthermore, SynAlign allows engineers to maintain a correlation between modulated designs and source code across multiple tools and Hardware Description Languages (HDLs).

Mapping remains possible without source locators because synthesis tools, such as Yosys [51] and Design Compiler [46], attempt to preserve some net names, particularly sequential ones like registers and memories, when feasible. This preservation aids Formal Equivalence Check (LEC) tools [40, 43] and supports engineers. However, net names often change to temporal names when their meaning changes, and typically, only 5% to 20% of net names are preserved during synthesis.

SynAlign uses design inputs/outputs and preserved net names as Anchors. Through an iterative process, SynAlign aligns equivalent nets between graph representations of the source code and the transformed or synthesized code. Notably, SynAlign does not impose any extra limitations on optimization when using these anchors.

To evaluate SynAlign, we tested various designs written in Chisel [17] and Verilog [42, 48]. Chisel designs present a unique challenge because Chisel, a Scala DSL, must be compiled into Verilog before synthesis. In contrast, Verilog designs are simpler to map as they do not require this additional generation step.

Across all examined designs, SynAlign correctly identifies the source code location 50-93% of the time. This represents the first automated correlation between netlists and source code separated by multiple tools, with no existing baseline for comparison. Our scalable approach contrasts with current solutions that require human intervention, often taking hours or days. SynAlign operates much faster than typical chip design iteration times. For example, when mapping the critical timing path from netlist to source code in a design like Rocket [16], SynAlign achieves 77% accuracy in less than 20 seconds.

In summary, our main contributions are:

- **Automating back annotation** between **fully flattened and optimized** designs and their hierarchical source code. Thus enabling chip designers to leverage full optimization capabilities while quickly relating the netlist to the source code for further iterations.
- Correlating different hardware design stages extracted from **multiple tools** within the same chip design cycle.
- Providing an approach applicable to **any hardware design language (HDL)** that can be translated to equivalent Verilog with Line-of-Code (LoC) information.

- Introducing the novel use of network alignment strategies to align synthesized netlists with their source code, exploring and utilizing hardware design attributes for comprehensive and efficient design analysis.

2 SynAlign Algorithm

SynAlign aims to identify equivalence points between two networks: the graph representation of the HDL source code (G_{ref}), which includes source code location information, and the graph of synthesized netlist (G_{synth}). Both are directed graphs where nodes have multiple drivers (outputs), sinks (inputs), and edges (or net). A user or tool annotates nets in G_{synth} , and SynAlign matches them to the original source code (G_{ref}).

Figure 2 illustrates a Verilog code snippet (Figure 2.a), the corresponding high-level structural representation (Figure 2.b) generated using netlistsvg [9], and the synthesized graph (G_{synth}) (Figure 2.c) obtained using Yosys [51], skywater130 liberty. The critical path, highlighted in red, includes cells ‘or3b’ and ‘xnor3’. Despite the simplicity, the mapping process is intricate, aligning gates with structural mapping operators like adder and mux. The pertinent lines of code are highlighted in the figure.

```

1 Anchor Point Matching (Section 2.1)
2 Topological traversals, calculate pending nets
3 for pending sequential nodes:
4   Full+Half Matching (Section 2.2)
5   Partial Matching (Section 2.3)
6 for pending combinational nodes:
7   Full+Half Matching (Section 2.2)
8   Surrounding Matching (Section 2.4)
9   Partial Matching (Section 2.3)
10 Print the annotated net and its aligned net(s)
    with the LoC

```

Listing 1. SynAlign algorithmic overview

After the annotation of nets in G_{synth} , the alignment process detailed in Listing 1, involves identifying Anchor Points. Anchor Points are graph nets with the same names in both G_{ref} and G_{synth} . The number of Anchor Points depends on the synthesis tool, but at a minimum, both graphs share the same top-level inputs and outputs as Anchor Points. During Synthesis, original nets may split into various nets or registers, creating a one-to-many mapping. Using Anchor Points as initial Resolved Points (RPs), SynAlign analyzes RPs in both the G_{synth} and G_{ref} . Resolved Points are the nets in both the graphs that have been confidently aligned as equivalent. These RPs are calculated for each graph node driver through topological traversal and include Start Resolved Points (SRPs) and End Resolved Points (ERPs). An RP connected through input nets is considered an SRP, whereas an RP connected through output nets is an ERP.

To reduce the compute costs, SynAlign employs two main loops as shown in Listing 1: first to align the sequential


```

module annotate(
    , input cond, input [1:0] a ,input [1:0] b
    , output [1:0] e);


reg [1:0] d;
always_comb begin
    if (cond) begin
        d = a + b;
    end else begin
        d = a + 1;
    end
    e = d + 1;
end
endmodule

```

(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 2. (a) Source code example with aligned part highlighted. (b) Reference graph (G_{ref}). (c) synthesized graph (G_{synth}) with annotations.

subgraph and the next for the pending-to-identify combinational subgraph. Nets aligned during matching passes also function as RPs for subsequent stages. Nets with identical Start and End RPs are marked as equivalent, and this process continues until no new matches are found. Unresolved nets may persist due to factors like optimized-away start points. If surrounding netlist nodes correspond to the same code line, their mapping is expanded. Nets with the highest number of equivalent matches are also considered for alignment. This method enables engineers to trace each net back to its original source code, ensuring high alignment accuracy.

With these prerequisites in place, we perform the alignment process outlined in Listing 1. Each alignment stage is discussed in detail subsequently.

Before identifying the pending combinational cells, SynAlign performs full and partial alignment only for a subgraph consisting of sequential cells and known RPs. In digital systems like RocketTile [16], this subgraph represents only 14% of the entire G_{synth} , significantly reducing the problem size.

After aligning all sequential cells, SynAlign iterates over the pending combinational cells to perform full and partial alignment. These steps reduce time complexity to less than quadratic because, in pipelined designs, combinational cells are separated by sequential cells. This makes SynAlign more efficient than traditional NP network alignment problems [53], which typically have quadratic [53] or cubic complexities [25].

2.1 Anchor Points Matching

Anchor Points are nets with identical hierarchies and names in both graphs, indicating nets that have retained their names throughout the synthesis cycle, allowing confident network alignment. The datatype of the driver node for nets identified as Anchor Points is also the same.

Anchor point matching starts by addressing nomenclature inconsistencies from different synthesis tools. For example, some compilers might name buses as $var_1_$, while others use $var[1]$. Unlike Yosys, Design Compiler (DC) appends

$_BAR$ to certain variables. Hierarchy naming also varies, with some tools using “.” and others using “_” to separate hierarchies. Each net in both the graphs is renamed to follow same nomenclature. This net name processing can be enhanced to accommodate various synthesis nomenclatures. Also, synthesis tools are designed to avoid generating new names that inadvertently match G_{ref} net names, as formal logical equivalence tools also rely on Anchor Points.

Initially, we identify Anchor Points by hierarchically traversing G_{ref} , treating these points as RPs for subsequent matching references. During this stage, G_{ref} is traversed first to capture connections as hashmaps for correlation during G_{synth} traversal. Assuming m edges in both the graphs, the total time complexity of this stage comes out to be $O(m) + O(m) = 2 * O(m)$. The cost of topological traversal is amortized by computing it once beforehand. A pending-points map is also created for each net in G_{synth} . Anchor Points are then omitted from the pending-points map to reduce the overall algorithm’s time complexity.

2.2 Full+Half Matching

Full match occurs when RPs in G_{synth} match all RPs in G_{ref} . If G_{synth} has a net name N_s and G_{ref} has a net name N_r , and both their SRPs and ERPs are identical, then N_r *fully matches* N_s . This principle underlies the concept of **Full Matching**.

Alignment is then performed for the “next most matching net name”. If either SRPs or ERPs are a complete match, we perform *Half Matching* based on the best match of ERPs or SRPs, respectively. This part of SynAlign, detailed in Listing 2, is called Full+Half Match.

As illustrated in Listing 1, Sequential nets (driver and sink nets of sequential nodes) are aligned first after Anchor Point Matching, with combinational nets temporarily removed from G_{ref} and G_{synth} . This simplifies the graph to Anchor points and sequential nets only, which can reduce the problem size to 15% as in a design RocketTile [16]. Reduced sequential graphs retain necessary RP information for alignment. Before starting the Combinational Full+Half

matching stage, sequential RPs are aligned and both graphs updated, thus reducing the time complexity.

```

1 for ( $N_s$  : pending nets of  $G_{synth}$ ) {
2    $SRP_{N_s}$  = SRPs of  $N_s$ 
3    $ERP_{N_s}$  = ERPs of  $N_s$ 
4   for ( $N_r$  : ( $G_{ref}$  nets with SRPs ==  $SRP_{N_s}$ )) {
5      $SRP_{N_r}$  = SRPs of  $N_r$ 
6      $ERP_{N_r}$  = ERPs of  $N_r$ 
7     if ( $ERP_{N_r}$  ==  $ERP_{N_s}$ )
8       record as Full match and break
9     else
10       $match\_wt$  =  $calc\_wt(ERP_{N_s}, ERP_{N_r})$ 
11   }
12   if (Full match was captured)
13      $N_s$  =  $N_r$  // record as aligned and break
14   else {
15      $N_s$  = ( $N_r$  with maximum  $match\_wt$ )
16     record as Half match for ERPs and break
17   }
18   for ( $N_r$  :  $G_{ref}$  nets with ERPs ==  $ERP_{N_s}$ )
19      $match\_wt$  =  $calc\_wt(SRP_{N_s}, SRP_{N_r})$ 
20      $N_s$  = ( $N_r$  with maximum  $match\_wt$ )
21   record as Half match for SRPs
22 }

```

Listing 2. Full+Half Matching algorithm overview

The datatype-specific edges for both graphs are m_d , where $m_d \ll m$. Thus, when aligning sequential only nets, m_d would represent the number sequential node edges, and while aligning the combinational logic, m_d would represent the number of combinational node edges. If a nets are aligned in previous stages, then $(m_d - a)$ are the pending nets in synthesized graph. This further lowers the number of entities to be considered for alignment. For G_{ref} , only nets with the same SRP as on G_{synth} are processed, termed as m'_d . This calculation of m'_d reduces the *inner for loop* of Listing 2 to 8% in designs like RocketTile. Therefore, the total time complexity of the current matching stage is $O((m_d - a) * m'_d)$.

2.3 Partial Matching

If the previous stage does not resolve the remaining nets of the targeted datatype, *Partial Matching* is performed. This process is also divided into two stages, depending on the datatype being processed. First, if all sequential net names are not aligned by line 4 in Listing 1, *Partial Matching* for the remaining sequential net names is carried out. Second, if line 8 in Listing 1 does not complete the alignment of annotated net names, *Partial Matching* for annotated combinational net names is performed. The goal is to get the best possible match for remaining unaligned net names. We formulated a $calc_wt()$ function based on experiments with benchmarks PipelinedCPU and SingleCycleCPU [27, 28], where $match_wt$ is directly proportional to the number of matches.

The overview of the Partial Matching algorithm is in Listing 3. Similar to the time complexity calculation in Section 2.2, Partial Matching time complexity computes to $O((m_d - a) * m'_d)$, where m'_d represents edges with common inputs, and a is updated as per previous matches. Partial Matching is done only if some annotated node is yet to be resolved. If only one node is pending resolution and annotated, then $(m_d - a)$ equals one.

```

1 float  $calc\_wt(synth\_set, ref\_set)$  {
2    $num\_matches$  = common entries in  $synth\_set$  and  $ref\_set$ 
3    $mismatches$  =  $synth\_set - num\_matches$ 
4   return  $(5 * num\_matches) / mismatches$ 
5 }
6 //Partial Matching:
7 for ( $N_s$  : pending nets of  $G_{synth}$ ) {
8   for ( $N_r$  :  $G_{ref}$  nets with atleast 1 SRP common to that of  $N_s$ )
9     {
10       $SRP\_match\_wt$  =  $calc\_wt(SRP_{N_r}, SRP_{N_s})$ 
11       $ERP\_match\_wt$  =  $calc\_wt(ERP_{N_r}, ERP_{N_s})$ 
12       $match\_wt$  =  $SRP\_match\_wt + ERP\_match\_wt$ 
13    }
14    $N_s$  = ( $N_r$  with maximum  $match\_wt$ )

```

Listing 3. Algorithm overview for Partial matching

2.4 Surrounding Matching

Since our goal is to reference the source code, we can utilize the Line-of-code (LoC) information in the G_{ref} . Let us define a graph node's directly connected nodes as Surrounding nodes. If the LoC of all the Surrounding nodes is the same, then the node and its associated driver RPs can be located at the same LoC as the surrounding nodes, as illustrated in Figure 4. We leverage this information to align more nodes in the G_{synth} with high confidence of alignment.




Figure 3. Concept demonstration of Surrounding Matching with collapsing nodes.




Figure 4. Surrounding Matching depicting the surrounding cells with same LoC used to resolve the source location of node “op”.

Another step in Surrounding Matching involves collapsing two nodes, as illustrated in Figure 3. For instance, to find the LoC of the “op” node, which is directly connected to “b” and “c” (with only “c” having a known LoC), we check if RPs of “b” and “op” are the same ($b_in == op_in \ \&\& \ b_out == op_out$). If true, nodes “b” and “op” can be collapsed into a single node and again undergo *Surrounding Matching* (Figure 4).

Given its intuitive nature, *Surrounding Matching* is expected to be more accurate than partial matching stages. However, it is performed later to leverage more resolved surrounding points. The time complexity of current stage is $O(2 * k * (m - a))$, where k (the average number of nodes directly connected to any node) is a constant, determined to be 5. The factor of 2 accounts for node collapsing, as shown in Figure 3.

Table 1. Time complexities of different alignment stages.

Stage	Complexity
Anchor points capturing	$2 * O(m)$
Full+Half matching	$O((m_d - a) * m'_d)$
Partial Matching	$O((m_d - a) * m'_d)$
Surrounding Node Matching	$O(2 * k * (m - a))$

These common steps result in a time complexity less than quadratic, making SynAlign more efficient than traditional NP network alignment problems [53]. Unlike SynAlign, general alignment problems typically have quadratic [53] or cubic [25] complexities. Table 1 summarizes the time complexities of all SynAlign matching stages. The complexity of each step is detailed below.

Thus, SynAlign iteratively aligns the synthesized graph with the reference graph while keeping the problem size to a minimum in each iteration.

3 Evaluation and Discussion

To demonstrate the independence of our research from specific synthesis tools, we evaluate our work using both an

open-source compiler, Yosys [51], and an industrial compiler, DC [46], with Skywater130 and SAED32 liberty technology files, respectively.

SynAlign provides a Line of Code (LoC) from G_{ref} for any annotated G_{synth} , but even careful manual inspection cannot easily confirm its accuracy. To address this, we propose two evaluation methods: Netlist-to-Netlist Evaluation and Manual Evaluation. The benchmarks used in these methods are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Benchmarks’ top module names with the corresponding Synthesis compiler and the generated netlist size (both in k gates and the precise number of gates).

Benchmark name (Yosys compiled)	Netlist Size (k gates)	Netlist Size
Mac [44]	1	1210
SingleCycleCPU [28]	17	17305
PipelinedCPU [27]	20	19596
Ibtida [39]	35	35494
Marmot [23]	84	83809
RocketTile [16]	117	116550
Benchmark name (DC compiled)	Netlist Size (k gates)	Netlist Size
SingleCycleCPU [28]	11	10613
PipelinedCPU [27]	14	13972
Marmot [23]	71	70784
RocketTile [16]	94	93549
UnoptRocketTile [16]	99	98857

3.1 Netlist to Netlist (NL2NL) Evaluation

NL2NL testing involves running alignment on a netlist against a name-changed version of itself to have a scriptable and scalable preliminary testing. This process, detailed in Listing 4, uses a design as V_{ref} and creates an annotated V_{synth} by randomly selecting and renaming a (noise) percentage of nets by appending `_changed` to their names. In this context, `synth_net` refers to nets from V_{synth} , and `ref_net` represents nets in V_{ref} .

To create V_{synth} from V_{ref} , we implement a compiler pass to collect all net names in the graph and randomly select a percentage (`noise%`) of these names. These selected nets, along with the module names, are then suffixed with `_changed`, thus creating the V_{synth} for NL2NL Evaluation. Subsequently, V_{synth} and V_{ref} (one with `_changed` and one without) are used for alignment.

The alignment results are used to assess accuracy, as depicted in Figure 5, for different RocketTile synthesis options from Table 2. At 0% noise, all net names are preserved, resulting in 100% accuracy due to Anchor Points matching. As

noise increases, SynAlign maintains 100% matching accuracy until about 60% noise. The three lines corresponding to RocketTile show similar trends. For brevity, we do not display individual curves for each benchmark, but all follow similar patterns, as reflected in Figure 6. Figure 6 shows data points at 70%, 80%, and 90% noise levels for all the designs in Table 2, indicating consistent performance across various designs, languages, and synthesis tools. This figure also indicates that SynAlign can tolerate significant noise levels in netlists. Figure 6 header denotes whether the source code is Verilog (V) or Chisel (C).

```

for (noise : [0, 20, 40, 60, 80, 90, 95, 100]% of  $V_{synth}$  nets) {
   $V_{synth}$  =  $V_{ref}$  with noise% nets appended with "_changed"
  Perform alignment.
  if ( $synth\_net.erase("_changed") == ref\_net$ )
    record as matched.
  else
    record as mismatched.
   $accuracy = \frac{\text{number of entries matched}}{\text{total number of entries}}$ 
}

```

Listing 4. NL2NL experimental setup overview




Figure 5. NL2NL accuracy Plot for different RocketTile compilations

Moreover, when sequential net names are preserved, and all other combinational net names are randomized, designs like SingleCycleCPU and PipelinedCPU can tolerate up to 100% noise with 100% accuracy. This suggests that SynAlign is more sensitive to noise at the sequential points than at the combinational points.

NL2NL testing provides valuable insights into the algorithm’s performance in a controlled environment, facilitating automated scalability testing. Thus, this approach is more manageable compared to the Manual Evaluation discussed next.




Figure 6. NL2NL accuracy testing in all the Verilog (V) and Chisel (C) designs

3.2 Manual Accuracy Evaluation

While NL2NL evaluation offers valuable insights, it does not account for structural changes introduced by synthesis tools. Hence, we set up the Manual Accuracy Evaluation. It is performed for larger benchmarks from Table 2. To validate that a synthesized node aligns with its source code, we manually verify if a node in the netlist corresponds to the intended LoC. Knowing the correct match beforehand is crucial, so we preserve only the variable to be aligned for this evaluation. In synthesized designs, many graph nodes and edges may be eliminated or duplicated due to synthesis. To address this, we manually mark certain variables in the source code as “dont_touch” or “keep” before synthesis.

Manual evaluation process involves the following steps:

- Script for random marking:** Write a script to randomly select multiple Chisel-assignment lines in the source code, ensuring these lines are within the Chisel-emitted Verilog. The chisel assignment lines with constant right-hand side (RHS) should not be selected. Mark the Left-Hand Side (LHS) of the selected lines as ‘dontTouch’ [36] for manual validation.
- Emit Reference Verilog (V_{ref}):** HDL compilers support Verilog generation with source LoC information [1, 5]. This generated Verilog, with the ‘dontTouch’ annotations, serves as V_{ref} in Chisel benchmarks. In Verilog benchmarks, the source code itself serves as V_{ref} .
- Synthesized Verilog (V_{synth}):** Use V_{ref} to create V_{synth} . Ensure synthesis does not remove ‘dontTouch’ variables by marking them with ‘keep’ [10, 50] in Yosys. For DC, use ‘set_dont_touch’ and implement punching through the design (as illustrated in figure 7) to preserve variables/nets through the synthesis cycle.

Punching is required in DC to ensure the ‘set_dont_touch’ directive is not overwritten during compilation. This is necessary because V_{ref} , being an HDL verilog, contains generic logic.

To achieve maximum optimization of the design, enable flattening and retiming in all the synthesis runs. To test the impact on unoptimized synthesized designs, we use the benchmark UnoptRocketTile. Its synthesized netlist was obtained from DC without enabling retiming and flattening, making the UnoptRocketTile a hierarchical, unoptimized benchmark.

4. **Annotation and Alignment:** Annotate V_{synth} using a JSON file with the module and node names. Additionally, the annotated net name is manually changed in the netlist to prevent Anchor Point matching of the same. The alignment algorithm detects the annotation attribute on nodes and marks them for matching against the source code. The result is printing of the annotated node name, its aligned G_{ref} -node name, and the LoC information from V_{ref} . This annotation and alignment process is carried out using an open-source framework called LiveHD [49]. By reading this information, an engineer can easily identify the location of the annotated cell in the source code.
5. **Aligned source LoC:** If the source HDL is not Verilog, a LoC containing V_{ref} is emitted for alignment. The LoC information printed during the alignment step can be used to trace back to the original HDL source code.




Figure 7. (a) Original net to be preserved (W), (b) punched net, (c) Punched nets connected back

Figure 5 shows manual marking accuracies, with the x-axis derived from the percentage of aligned Anchor points. For Manual-RocketTile-Yosys, this corresponds to 90-95% on the NL2NL noise axis, with a similar calculation for RocketTile_DC (Manual-DC). Manual evaluation accuracy is lower than NL2NL due to synthesis-induced structural changes and LoC precision loss in Verilog “always blocks” (Section 3.4). Manual-UnoptRocketTile represents a DC-generated netlist without flattening and retiming. It shows higher accuracy due to lower optimization levels, which preserve more of the original structure. It also preserves more sequential flop




Figure 8. Plot depicting the breakdown of different matching functions with the total benchmark accuracy on top of the bars. Sequential and combinational partial matching is combined as Partial. Similar case for Full+Half matching functions.

names: 85% compared to 79% in Manual-DC. SynAlign performs significantly better with higher preservation of sequential nodes, indicating consistency between NL2NL and Manual evaluation.

Figure 8 breaks down the accuracy for each stage from section 2. Crossed part of the bar (marked “X”) in this figure indicates the percentage of inaccurately matched annotated nets. As an example, in figure 8, RocketTile_DC (from Table 2) performs alignment of the annotated nodes in *Half*, *Surrounding*, and *Partial* matching functions. Around 50% of matching is done during *Partial Matching*, out of which the accurate matches are 30%, and “X” represents the rest with the incorrect alignment. We can observe that Full and Surrounding matches have 100% accuracy across all benchmarks, while Half and Partial Matching have an average error of around 25%. Thus, alignment during Anchor Point, Full, and Surrounding Matching can be highlighted in SynAlign result as most confident match. Manual accuracy ranges from 50% to 93% across languages, designs, and synthesis optimizations. Also, lower optimization levels meaning more Anchor points, show higher accuracy.

These combined evaluation methods demonstrate the robustness and accuracy of SynAlign across different designs and synthesis tools, highlighting its capability to tolerate significant noise levels in netlists.

3.3 Performace evaluation

To evaluate SynAlign’s performance, each benchmark is run 30 times, and a different node is annotated each time. Unlike previous evaluations, net names need not be changed.

SynAlign’s runtime is divided into four main stages mentioned in Section 2. Figure 10 shows that as netlist size increases, Partial Matching consumes most of the time, while Full+Half Matching consistently takes 10-20% of the time, regardless of netlist size and compiler used. This is due to the algorithmic optimization discussed in Section 2.2. Figure 11 presents the average runtime in seconds for random




Figure 9. Total Execution Time Variation as per Netlist Size.




Figure 10. Breakdown of different matching functions for all the Benchmarks.




Figure 11. Average time taken by different matching functions for random net alignment in RocketTile_Yosys.

net name annotations in each benchmark. It highlights that a trivial function variation can occur depending on the node annotated. This is reflected in Full+Half Matching time variation in the figure.

Scalability is illustrated in Figure 9. It shows that total execution time increases linearly with netlist size, with the




Figure 12. Time variation as per number of net names annotated for the Design RocketTile synthesized using Yosys.

Marmot-yosys benchmark taking significantly longer due to its V_{ref} being six times larger than that of RocketTile. The results demonstrate that SynAlign’s performance scales with problem size. These three figures focus on single net name annotations in each run.

The impact of annotating more than one cell was tested on the largest design in Table 2, i.e. RocketTile compiled with Yosys, with random selection varying from one cell to 100% of cells of V_{synth} . It was found to be almost linearly increasing. The results can be seen in Figure 12. Notably, the total time for single net name annotation in Figure 12 matches the total time consumed by the design in Figure 9. The results also show that the performance scales with problem size.

In Section 2, we highlighted that SynAlign’s overall time complexity is less than quadratic, which is an improvement over the general network alignment algorithms like [19, 29, 30, 52]. Overall, SynAlign provides results in seconds for

Annotated node	:	net name in Vref	:	LoC in Vref
dcache.tlb_pmp_io_addr_31_CHANGED	:	<unnamed edge>(module DCache)	:	[26]
dcache.tlb_pmp_io_addr_31_CHANGED	:	tlb__deny_access_to_debug_T(module DCache)	:	[70]
dcache.tlb_pmp_io_addr_31_CHANGED	:	<unnamed edge>(module DCache)	:	[70]

Listing 5. Excerpt from the log file in Section 3.4.1

```
26 wire [2:0] tlb_mpu_priv = tlb__mpu_priv_T ? 3'h1 : tlb__mpu_priv_T_2; //@[TLB 233]
70 wire tlb__deny_access_to_debug_T = tlb_mpu_priv <= 3'h3; //@[TLB 245]
```

Listing 6. Relevant V_{ref} lines with the line numbers for the example in section 3.4.1

Annotated node	:	net name in Vref	:	LoC in vref
fpuOpt.fpiu.potato2_CHANGED	:	<unnamed edge>(module FPToInt)	:	[5047]

Listing 7. Excerpt from the result in 3.4.2. The annotated node is aligned with the line number 5047 in Listing 11

Annotated node	:	net name in Vref	:	LoC in Vref
frontend.tlb.io_ptw_req_bits_valid_CHANGED	:	tlb_io_kill(module Frontend)	:	[132882]

Listing 8. Excerpt from the log file for the walkthrough of alignment analyzed as accurate, in section 3.4.3

large designs like RocketTile with few net name annotations, a common scenario for designers tracing connections from a small set of cells to the original source code.

3.4 Insights to evaluation

In this section, we discuss a few examples of how we evaluated any alignment result as inaccurate or accurate in Figure 8.

3.4.1 The first walkthrough of alignment analyzed as inaccurate. In the RocketTile (Yosys compiled) benchmark, one of the bits of “tlb_pmp_io_addr” was annotated with the help of a JSON file, as mentioned in Section 3.2. The precise and expected output in this case would align with line numbers 232, 235, and 236 in the source code shown in Listing 9.

```
232 val mpu_physaddr = Cat(mpu_ppn, io.r...
233 val mpu_priv = Mux[UInt](Bool(usingVM)&&...
234 val pmp = Module(new PMPChecker(lgMaxSize))
235 pmp.io.addr := mpu_physaddr
236 dontTouch(pmp.io.addr)
245 val deny_access_to_debug = mpu_priv <= ...
```

Listing 9. Source code lines for the example in Section 3.4.1

The alignment result in Listing 5 shows the annotated net along with its aligned nets and source code location. From this result, we can see that the node annotated was renamed using “_CHANGED” as explained in the evaluation strategy earlier. Further, the annotated node is aligned to line numbers 26 and 70 in V_{ref} . Thus, to obtain original source code, the output can be traced to V_{ref} shown in Listing 6 and further to the source code in Listing 9. Therefore, for non-Verilog HDLs, source location information in the reference Verilog is used to

trace back to the original source code. Since SynAlign points to LoC other than the expected output locations, we capture this alignment result as inaccurate. Even so, we can see that the correct location is nearby and logically related to the annotated position. It is evident that the matching occurred in the line adjacent to the accurate source. Therefore, there is significant potential for improving the accuracy of SynAlign.

```
when(cvtType==i){...}
↓
val potato2 = (cvtType==i)
when(potato2){...}
dontTouch(potato2)
```

Listing 10. Excerpt from source code preserved using dontTouch. We made a new variable called *potato2* for the example in 3.4.2

3.4.2 The second walkthrough of alignment analyzed as inaccurate. As in the first walkthrough (Section 3.4.1), we annotate another node in the RocketTile (Yosys compiled) benchmark and evaluate the alignment in this second walkthrough. As explained in section 3.2, we applied *dontTouch* on a while loop condition. The corresponding source code is presented in Listing 10. In order to evaluate the alignment, the condition “cvtType==i” was preserved in a random variable named “potato2”, as shown in Listing 10.

The alignment result for this preserved net is shown in Listing 7. This listing indicates that the annotated node points to line number 5047 in V_{ref} . V_{ref} -line 5047, as seen in Listing 11, points to the beginning of an “always” block. This “always” block connects to the annotated variable via a register “in_typ”. However, “in_typ” is not mentioned under the aligned *net name in Vref* in Listing 7, leading us to consider

this matching as inaccurate. For the current annotation to be recognized as an accurate match, the resultant Listing 7 should have mentioned either of 4920, 4919, or 5061 V_{ref} line numbers.

```
4919 wire cvtType = in_typ[1]; //@[package 154]
4920 wire potato2 = ~cvtType; //@[FPU 501]
5047 always @(posedge clock) begin
...
5061 in_typ <= io_in_bits_typ; //@[Reg 17]
...
5072 end // end of always block
```

Listing 11. Relevant lines with the line numbers from G_{ref} Verilog output generated using Listing 10. The LoC information is also available in G_{ref} as shown here.

```
447 io.ptw.req.bits.valid := !io.kill
452 dontTouch(io.ptw.req.bits.valid)
```

Listing 12. Source code lines for the walkthrough of alignment analyzed as accurate, as mentioned in section 3.4.3

3.4.3 A walkthrough of alignment analyzed as accurate. Now we discuss an example of a positive accuracy analysis used for Figure 8. The annotated node was “frontend.tlb.io_ptw_req_bits_valid_CHANGED”, and SynAlign aligned this node with “tlb_io_kill” from the module Frontend, as can be seen in Listing 8. Referring to the source code in Listing 12, it is evident that the annotated variable and the G_{ref} aligned variable are connected by single 1-input logic gate. Therefore, this alignment is considered a success and is marked as an accurate match.

4 Limitations and Future Work

This work relies on the availability of Anchor links. The presence of more Anchor links could significantly enhance reliability, and conversely, their absence could reduce it.

In sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.1, we observed that alignments marked as inaccurate were often indirectly connected to or near the preserved variable.

Open-source tools like LiveHD with Yosys frontend do not capture precise LoC. For instance, in Listing 13, an “always” block in the Verilog source code on line number 241 translates to 122 registers in the netlist notation via Yosys, all pointing to the beginning of the “always block”, as shown in Listing 14. This results in a loss of data when pinpointing the exact source location. Preserving the LoC for different flip-flops in Listing 14 would improve SynAlign’s accuracy.

```
241 always @(posedge clock) begin
...
248 id_reg_pause <= _GEN_1;
...
252 ex_ctrl_fp <= id_ctrl_dec; //@[RocketCore 445]
```

Listing 13. Always block in RocketTile’s Source Verilog

```
nid:715 type:flop module:Rocket loc:[241,0]
nid:716 type:flop module:Rocket loc:[241,0]
nid:717 type:flop module:Rocket loc:[241,0]
```

Listing 14. Some netlist nodes for Listing 13

Furthermore, we envision a GUI-based tool to facilitate chip design engineers in leveraging this work, as illustrated in Figure 2. For example, integrating SynAlign with tools like Verdi [12, 22, 37] would be beneficial. While this is an intriguing direction that could enhance the impact of our work, it is beyond the scope of this study.

5 Related Work

Tools like Formality verify functional equivalence by analyzing how inputs propagate through the design and ensuring the outputs match between RTL and gate-level netlists. While effective for functional verification, this method lacks a clear, user-friendly mapping of specific RTL elements to their netlist counterparts. This limitation reduces transparency in the debugging process and requires additional manual effort to trace synthesis transformations.

In contrast, SynAlign provides a detailed point-to-point alignment between the RTL and netlist, mapping each element directly to its post-synthesis equivalent. This detailed mapping offers greater insight into how synthesis optimizations affect specific RTL components, reducing manual intervention and speeding up debugging and analysis. This makes SynAlign superior for understanding the design flow compared to traditional equivalence tools that rely primarily on logic cone analysis [38].

5.1 HDL Compilers

Many HDL compilers, such as Chisel [17], XLS [14], and CIRCT [15], emphasize the importance of propagating source code locations through their compiler passes. XLS highlights that maintaining source correlation enhances debugging, visualization, and productivity [8]. However, these compilers often rely on external synthesis tools that discard the source locations preserved by the HDL compilers.

CIRCT developers also stress the importance of location tracking [2, 3], using LLVM infrastructure to maintain source locations. Accessing these details from LLVM IR involves navigating a complex hierarchy [13]. Each transformation in these compilers must maintain instruction debug locations, which is both complex and resource-intensive [6, 11]. Modifying or developing passes requires numerous considerations for source location [7].

In contrast, SynAlign does not impose restrictions on developers or require efforts to maintain source-level debugging information. No modifications to compiler passes or transformations are needed for debug information with SynAlign.

Recent work on equality saturation [41, 45] explores its application to EDA tasks but does not provide a line-by-line mapping between the netlist and the original source code.

This paper is the first to demonstrate how to connect a post-synthesis netlist with the original source code without propagating source locators.

5.2 Network Alignment

Network alignment, which involves matching two graph representations, is used in various fields such as protein-protein interaction analysis and cross-platform social network recommendations [29]. Traditional approaches often perform one-to-one node matching using bipartite graphs [19] and evaluate isomorphic networks with weighted edges [30, 52]. In contrast, SynAlign utilizes many-to-many matching to compare Verilog source code and synthesized netlists based on structural connections and explores hardware design attributes.

SynAlign is unique in applying graph alignment to hardware compilers, addressing the significant complexity and noise introduced by synthesis. Previous works like [19, 24, 54] consider 5% noise significant [24], whereas synthesis typically introduces over 80% noise. Unlike [54], which uses edge-weighted graphs for group coarsening, SynAlign’s approach is directly applicable in chip design because synthesis alters the network structure by dropping edges.

Similar to [35], SynAlign uses structural matching with Anchor Links (ports and preserved pin names). RefiNa [24] performs structural matching based on matched neighbourhood consistency (MNC), showing the relationship between MNC and alignment accuracy. RefiNa operates on graph isomorphism, treating edge/connection changes as noise. In contrast, SynAlign uses structural matching based on node datatype or functionality, making it suitable for highly noisy post-physical implementation design graphs that would have low accuracy under RefiNa.

SynAlign leverages the advantages of Multinetwork alignment, as seen in CAPER [54], to provide a multi-level solution. At the coarsest level, it evaluates Anchor links and sequential logic, followed by combinational logic matching. Section 2 detailed SynAlign’s multi-level approach.

While SynAlign addresses a network alignment problem, its application and noise properties differ significantly from traditional network alignment problems. We believe the principles introduced in this paper can be applied to other areas, such as compiler optimization. To our knowledge, network alignment has never been used in the chip design domain to reduce engineering efforts before.

SynAlign represents a novel application of network alignment in the domain of hardware compilers, specifically addressing the challenges posed by synthesis-induced noise. By leveraging many-to-many matching and a multi-level approach inspired by CAPER, SynAlign effectively compares

logical and synthesized netlists based on structural connections and hardware attributes. This innovative method significantly reduces engineering efforts in chip design, demonstrating the potential for network alignment principles to be applied in new and complex areas.

6 Conclusion

Obtaining the source code location for any part of the netlist offers multiple advantages. Front-end designers can receive early feedback on their designs’ timing and power, allowing them to optimize the source code in advance. Consequently, backend tools can be provided with mature constraints, reducing the time required for iterative cycles in chip design and significantly decreasing time-to-market.

The ability to trace synthesized netlist lines back to the source code, regardless of the optimization tools used, is crucial for reducing time-to-market in the chip design industry. SynAlign enables this back-tracing for any HDL translatable to Verilog with line-of-code (LoC) information without relying on a single EDA tool. SynAlign achieves an average of 75% accuracy in less than 20 seconds.

References

- [1] Chisel Users Community, Get Me Verilog. <https://www.chisel-lang.org/docs/resources/faqs#get-me-verilog>. Online; accessed on 16 April 2024.
- [2] Cirtc weekly discussion notes. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fOSRdyZR2w75D87yU2Ma9h2-_IEPL4NxvhJGJd-s5pk/edit#heading=h.56zyi32ygm3b.
- [3] Cirtc weekly discussion notes. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fOSRdyZR2w75D87yU2Ma9h2-_IEPL4NxvhJGJd-s5pk/edit#heading=h.awos2k698n33.
- [4] clang: Physical source locations. https://clang.llvm.org/doxygen/group__CINDEX__LOCATIONS.html#details.
- [5] Generating verilog in Rocket Chip Generator. <https://github.com/chipsalliance/rocket-chip?tab=readme-ov-file#building-the-project>. Online; accessed on 16 April 2024.
- [6] How to update debug info: A guide for llvm pass authors — llvm 17.0.0git documentation. <https://llvm.org/docs/HowToUpdateDebugInfo.html#when-to-drop-an-instruction-location>.
- [7] How to update debug info: A guide for llvm pass authors — llvm 17.0.0git documentation. <https://llvm.org/docs/HowToUpdateDebugInfo.html>.
- [8] Ideas and projects - xls: Accelerated hw synthesis. https://github.io/xls/ideas_and_projects.
- [9] netlistsvg. <https://github.com/nturley/netlistsvg>. Online; accessed on 21 May 2019.
- [10] openLane. <https://web.open-source-silicon.dev/t/442348/has-anyone-tried-using-the-keep-synthesis-attribute-is-follo>. Online; accessed on 16 April 2024.
- [11] Source level debugging with llvm — llvm 17.0.0git documentation. <https://llvm.org/docs/SourceLevelDebugging.html>.
- [12] verdi. <https://www.synopsys.com/verification/debug/verdi.html>.
- [13] Get source location details from ir code (function pass) 2021. <https://discourse.llvm.org/t/get-source-location-details-from-ir-code-function-pass/57372>, Jan 2021.
- [14] XLS: Accelerated HW Synthesis. <https://github.com/google/xls>, 2021. Online; accessed on 9 August 2021.

- [15] CIRCT: Circuit IR Compilers and Tools. <https://github.com/llvm/circt>, 2022. Online; accessed on 12 August 2022.
- [16] Krste Asanović, Rimas Avizienis, Jonathan Bachrach, Scott Beamer, David Biancolin, Christopher Celio, Henry Cook, Daniel Dabbelt, John Hauser, Adam Izraelevitz, Sagar Karandikar, Ben Keller, Donggyu Kim, John Koenig, Yunsup Lee, Eric Love, Martin Maas, Albert Magyar, Howard Mao, Miquel Moreto, Albert Ou, David A. Patterson, Brian Richards, Colin Schmidt, Stephen Twigg, Huy Vo, and Andrew Waterman. The rocket chip generator. Technical Report UCB/Eecs-2016-17, Apr 2016.
- [17] Jonathan Bachrach, Huy Vo, Brian Richards, Yunsup Lee, Andrew Waterman, Rimas Avizienis, John Wawrzyniak, and Krste Asanović. Chisel: constructing hardware in a scala embedded language. In *DAC Design Automation Conference 2012*, pages 1212–1221. IEEE, 2012.
- [18] G.D. Balogh, G.R. Mudalige, I.Z. Reguly, S.F. Antao, and C. Bertolli. Op2-clang: A source-to-source translator using clang/llvm libtooling. In *2018 IEEE/ACM 5th Workshop on the LLVM Compiler Infrastructure in HPC (LLVM-HPC)*, pages 59–70, 2018.
- [19] Mohsen Bayati, David F Gleich, Amin Saberi, and Ying Wang. Message-passing algorithms for sparse network alignment. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 7(1):1–31, 2013.
- [20] chipsalliance. Utils: add source locators by mwachs5 · pull request 2496 · chipsalliance/chisel. <https://github.com/chipsalliance/chisel3/pull/2496>, Apr.
- [21] chipsalliance. Source information via macros, rfc · issue 147 · chip-salliance/chisel. <https://github.com/chipsalliance/chisel3/issues/147>, Apr 2016.
- [22] Prokash Ghosh and Srivastava Rohit. Case study: Soc performance verification and static verification of rtl parameters. In *2019 20th International Workshop on Microprocessor/SoC Test, Security and Verification (MTV)*, pages 65–72. IEEE, 2019.
- [23] Hagiwara-shc, Jeff DiCorpo, Manar, Marwan Abbas, Kareem Farid, Mohamed Kassem, R. Timothy Edwards, Russell Friesenhahn, matt venn, Amr A. Gouhar, Mohamed Shalan. Marmot RISC-V SoC. https://github.com/Hagiwara-shc/marmot_asic.git, 2022. Online; accessed on March 2024.
- [24] Mark Heimann, Xiyuan Chen, Fatemeh Vahedian, and Danai Koutra. Refining network alignment to improve matched neighborhood consistency. In *Proceedings of the 2021 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*, pages 172–180. SIAM.
- [25] Mark Heimann, Haoming Shen, Tara Safavi, and Danai Koutra. Regal: Representation learning-based graph alignment. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 117–126, 2018.
- [26] James Cherry. OpenSTA. <https://github.com/abk-openroad/OpenSTA>. Online; accessed on 5 September 2019.
- [27] jlpteaching. dinocpu/cpu.scala (pipelinedcpu) at main · jlpteaching/dinocpu. <https://github.com/jlpteaching/dinocpu/blob/main/src/main/scala/pipelined/cpu.scala>.
- [28] jlpteaching. dinocpu/cpu.scala (singlecyclecpu) at main · jlpteaching/dinocpu. <https://github.com/jlpteaching/dinocpu/blob/main/src/main/scala/single-cycle/cpu.scala>.
- [29] Ehsan Kazemi. Network alignment: Theory, algorithms, and applications. Technical report, EPFL, 2016.
- [30] Johannes Kobler, Uwe Schöning, and Jacobo Torán. *The graph isomorphism problem: its structural complexity*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [31] Jack Koenig. Release chisel v3.5.0 · chipsalliance/chisel. <https://github.com/chipsalliance/chisel3/releases/tag/v3.5.0>, Jan 2001.
- [32] Jack Koenig. Release chisel v3.5.5 · chipsalliance/chisel. <https://github.com/chipsalliance/chisel3/releases/tag/v3.5.5>, Nov 2001.
- [33] Jack Koenig. Release chisel v3.6.0-m1 · chipsalliance/chisel. <https://github.com/chipsalliance/chisel3/releases/tag/v3.6.0-M1>, Dec 2001.
- [34] Jack Koenig. Release chisel v3.6.0-m2 · chipsalliance/chisel. <https://github.com/chipsalliance/chisel3/releases/tag/v3.6.0-M2>, Jan 2001.
- [35] Li Liu, William K Cheung, Xin Li, and Lejian Liao. Aligning users across social networks using network embedding. In *Ijcai*, volume 16, pages 1774–1780, 2016.
- [36] Ryan Lund. *Design and Application of a Co-Simulation Framework for Chisel*. PhD thesis, MA thesis. EECS Department, University of California, Berkeley, 2021.
- [37] Kakarlamudi Lakshmi Maidhili, Fazal Noorbasha, Allamsetty Vamsi, and Kakarla Hari Kishore. Reset logic verification of an iod at system on chip level using gatesim. *International Journal*, 8(7), 2020.
- [38] Priyambada Mishra. Understanding logic equivalence check (lec) flow and its challenges, and proposed solution. <https://www.design-reuse.com/articles/51622/understanding-logic-equivalence-check-lec-flow-and-its-challenges-and-proposed-solution.html>. Accessed: 2024-10-07.
- [39] Muhammad Hadir Khan, R. Timothy Edwards, Amr A. Gouhar, Manar, Mohamed Kassem, Mohamed Shalan, AireenAmirJalal, matt venn, Jeff DiCorpo. SoC - Google SKY130 Shuttle (ibtida). https://github.com/hadirkhan10/caravel_ibtida_soc.git, 2021. Online; accessed on March 2024.
- [40] Karolína Netolická et al. *Equivalence checking of retimed circuits*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2005.
- [41] Anjali Pal, Brett Saiki, Ryan Tjoa, Cynthia Richey, Amy Zhu, Oliver Flatt, Max Willsey, Zachary Tatlock, and Chandrakana Nandi. Equality saturation theory exploration à la carte. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 7(OOPSLA2):1034–1062, 2023.
- [42] Samir Palnitkar. *Verilog HDL: a guide to digital design and synthesis*, volume 1. Prentice Hall Professional, 2003.
- [43] Prathmesh Oza Pratik Patel and Rakesh Parmar. A Guide on Logical Equivalence Checking - Flow, Challenges, and Benefits. <https://www.design-reuse.com/articles/45547/a-guide-on-logical-equivalence-checking-flow-challenges-and-benefits.html>.
- [44] Shashank, Jeff DiCorpo, Manar, Marwan Abbas, Kareem Farid, Mohamed Kassem, R. Timothy Edwards, Russell Friesenhahn, Johan Euphrosine, Amr A. Gouhar, matt venn, Mohamed Gaber, Mohamed Shalan. Dual mac unit array with a single sigmoid activation function. https://github.com/Shashank-06/iit_indore_neuron.git, 2022. Online; accessed on March 2024.
- [45] Gus Henry Smith, Zachary D Sisco, Thanawat Techaumnaiwit, Jingtao Xia, Vishal Canumalla, Andrew Cheung, Zachary Tatlock, Chandrakana Nandi, and Jonathan Balkind. There and back again: A netlist’s tale with much egraphin’. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00786*, 2024.
- [46] Synopsys Inc. Design Compiler User Guide.
- [47] Synopsys, Inc. Primitime static timing analysis. <https://www.synopsys.com/implementation-and-signoff/signoff/primitime.html>. Online; accessed on 26 April 2019.
- [48] Donald Thomas and Philip Moorby. *The Verilog® hardware description language*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [49] Sheng-Hong Wang, Rafael Trapani Possignolo, Haven Blake Skinner, and Jose Renau. LiveHD: A Productive Live Hardware Development Flow. *IEEE Micro*, 40(4):67–75, 2020.
- [50] Clifford Wolf. Yosys manual. Retrieved January, 16:2021, 2021.
- [51] Clifford Wolf. Yosys Open SYnthesis Suite. <https://github.com/YosysHQ/yosys>, 2022. Online; accessed on December 2022.
- [52] Viktor N Zemlyachenko, Nickolay M Korneenko, and Regina I Tyshkevich. Graph isomorphism problem. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 29:1426–1481, 1985.
- [53] Si Zhang and Hanghang Tong. Final: Fast attributed network alignment. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1345–1354, 2016.
- [54] Jing Zhu, Danai Koutra, and Mark Heimann. Caper: Coarsen, align, project, refine-a general multilevel framework for network alignment.

