

Metastability-Containing Circuits

Stephan Friedrichs^{1,2}, Matthias Függer¹, and Christoph Lenzen¹

¹Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany,

Email: {sfriedri,mfuegger,clenzen}@mpi-inf.mpg.de

²Saarbrücken Graduate School of Computer Science

Abstract

Communication across unsynchronized clock domains is inherently vulnerable to metastable upsets; no digital circuit can deterministically avoid, resolve, or detect metastability (Marino, 1981). Traditionally, a possibly metastable input is stored in synchronizers, decreasing the odds of maintained metastability over time. This approach costs time, and does not guarantee success.

We propose a fundamentally different approach: It is possible to *contain* metastability by logical masking, so that it cannot infect the entire circuit. This technique guarantees a limited degree of metastability in—and uncertainty about—the output. We present a synchronizer-free, fault-tolerant clock synchronization algorithm as application, synchronizing clock domains and thus enabling metastability-free communication.

At the heart of our approach lies a model for metastability in synchronous clocked digital circuits. Metastability is propagated in a worst-case fashion, allowing to derive deterministic guarantees, without and unlike synchronizers. The proposed model permits positive results while at the same time reproducing established impossibility results regarding avoidance, resolution, and detection of metastability. Furthermore, we fully classify which functions can be computed by synchronous circuits with standard registers, and show that masking registers are computationally strictly more powerful.

1 Introduction

A classic image invoked to explain metastability is a ball “resting” on the peak of a steep mountain. In this unstable equilibrium the tiniest displacement exponentially self-amplifies, and the ball drops into a valley. While for Sisyphus metastability admits some nanoseconds of respite, it fundamentally disrupts operation in VLSI circuits by breaking the abstraction of Boolean logic. This phenomenon has been studied for decades [15] with the following key results.

- No digital circuit can reliably avoid, resolve, or detect metastability [20]. Any digital circuit, including “detectors,” producing different outputs for different input signals can be forced into metastability.
- The probability of an individual event generating metastability can be kept low. Large transistor counts and high operational frequencies, however, disallow to neglect the problem [4].
- Being an unstable equilibrium, the probability that, e.g., a memory cell remains in a metastable state decreases exponentially over time [16, 26]. Thus, waiting for a sufficiently long time reduces the probability of sustained metastability to within acceptable bounds.
- In special cases one can rely on *logical masking*: If, e.g., one input of an AND-gate is stable 0, its output remains 0 even if its other input is metastable.

The impossibility of avoidance, the hazard of “infecting” entire circuits, and the unpleasant property of breaking Boolean logic have led to the predominant belief that waiting—usually using well-designed synchronizers [3, 11]—essentially is the *only* feasible method of coping with the threat of metastability.

1.1 Our Contribution

We challenge this point of view and present a radically new approach: It is possible to *contain* metastability to a limited part of the circuit instead of attempting to resolve, detect, or avoid it altogether. Given Marino’s result [20], this is surprising, but not a contradiction.




Figure 1: The separation of concerns (analog – digital metastability-containing – analog) for fault-tolerant clock synchronization in hardware.

More concretely, we show that a variety of operations can be performed in the presence of a limited¹ degree of metastability in the input — maintaining an according guarantee on the output. We assume worst-case metastability propagation, and still are able to *guarantee* correct results. This opens up an alternative to the classic approach of *postponing* the actual computation by first using synchronizers that merely decrease failure probabilities. Furthermore, our approach permits, but does not require, stabilization *during the calculation*. Advantages over synchronizers are:

- (i) No time is lost waiting for (possible) stabilization,
- (ii) correctness is guaranteed deterministically, and
- (iii) stabilization can, but is not required to, happen “during” the computation, i.e., synchronization and calculation happen simultaneously.

1.2 Application: Clock Synchronization

As a consequence, we are the first to demonstrate the physical implementability of the fault-tolerant clock synchronization algorithm by Lundelius Welch and Lynch [19] with deterministic correctness guarantee, despite the unavoidable presence of metastable upsets.

The algorithm by Lundelius Welch and Lynch is widely applied, e.g. in the TTP [17] and FlexRay [6] clock synchronization protocols. While the software-hardware based implementations of TTP and FlexRay achieve a precision in the order of one millisecond, higher operating frequencies ultimately require a pure hardware implementation. Recently, an FPGA-based implementation of Lundelius Welch and Lynch has been presented by Huemer et al. [13].

All known implementations, however, synchronize potentially metastable inputs *before* computation — a technique that becomes less reliable with increasing operating frequencies, since less time is available for metastability resolution. Moreover, classical MTBF-bounds for metastable upsets assume a uniform distribution of input transitions; this is inherently not the case in clock synchronization. Either way, synchronizers do not deterministically guarantee stabilization, and errors are bound to happen eventually when n clocks take $n(n - 1)$ samples at, e.g., 1 GHz.

The combination of ever-increasing operating frequencies and the inevitability [20] of metastable upsets when measuring relative timing deviations leads us to a fundamental question: Does the unavoidable presence of metastable upsets pose a principal limit on the operating frequency?

In this paper we show that this is not the case. We present a hardware design of the Lundelius Welch and Lynch algorithm that does not depend on metastability-free inputs and thus does not suffer from system failures induced by metastable upsets.²

A *separation of concerns*, compare Figure 1, is key to our approach. We start in the *analog* world: nodes generate clock pulses. Each node measures the time differences between its own and all other nodes’ pulses using Time-to-Digital Converters (TDCs). Since this involves entering the *digital* world, metastability in the measurements is unavoidable [20]. The traditional approach would hold the TDC outputs in synchronizers. It is, however, possible to limit the metastability of each measurement to an “uncertainty between x and $x + 1$ clock ticks” (see Figure 9). Using Gray code, this uncertainty amounts to at most one metastable bit — the aforementioned limited degree of metastability. We then apply *metastability-containing* components to digitally process these inputs — Gray code numbers with at most one metastable bit each — to derive a digital correction parameter for the node’s oscillator. This parameter contains at most one metastable bit, as above accounting for a limited amount of uncertainty. However, we convert it to an *analog* control signal for the oscillator. This way the metastability translates to a small frequency offset within the uncertainty from the initial TDC measurements.

¹The precise meaning of “limited” depends on the application, see e.g. Section 1.2.

²In this work, we prove feasibility of a metastability-containing implementation. An optimized 65 nm ASIC implementation is currently under design, the details of which are well beyond the scope of this paper.

In short, metastability is introduced at the TDCs, *deterministically* contained in the digital subcircuit, and ultimately absorbed in the analog control signal.

1.3 Overview

Our foundation is a rigorous model for metastability in clocked and in purely combinational digital circuits (Section 2). Metastability is propagated in a worst-case fashion, allowing to derive deterministic guarantees concerning circuit behavior under metastable inputs. As an example, metastability-containing multiplexers demonstrate our approach (Section 3). We justify the model by showing that it reproduces known properties of the physical world, in particular, the inability of digital circuits to reliably avoid, resolve, or detect metastability [20] (Section 5).

We provide a complete classification of the functions computable with only standard registers. Additionally, we demonstrate that masking registers (registers “hiding” internal metastability using high- or low-threshold inverters [15]) are computationally strictly more powerful than standard registers: The set of computable functions grows with each clock cycle available to the circuit. Circuits restricted to standard registers do not benefit from additional clock cycles, they can be “unrolled” (Sections 6 and 7).

Applying our results, we demonstrate that all arithmetic operations required by the clock synchronization application — max and min, sorting, and conversion between thermometer and Gray code — are possible in a *metastability-containing* manner without losing precision (Section 8). By extension, the entire algorithm can be implemented this way, providing the deterministic guarantee that the algorithm works correctly at all times, despite metastable upsets originating in the TDCs.

Note that one can utilize the clock synchronization algorithm’s timing guarantees to ensure metastability-free communication between clock domains without synchronizers!

1.4 Further Related Work

Logically masking metastability is related to glitch/hazard propagation in circuits. Huffman [14] and McCluskey presented methods to remove hazards from Boolean combinational circuits. Kleene introduced a three-valued extension of Boolean logic that was used to model static hazards [27]. The authors discuss the detection of hazards in combinational circuits, and the synthesis of hazard-free circuits fulfilling a Boolean specification. The work was extended to dynamic hazards [10]. Later work studied extensions of the simulation algorithm [8], generalizations to higher-valued logics allowing for more refined hazard classification [7], and requirements of the underlying circuit delay model to guarantee consistency of simulated and physical results [21].

While we too resort to ternary logic to model metastability, our work differs from previous work on hazards in several aspects: (i) When studying synthesis, we allow for specifications where outputs may contain metastable bits. This is necessary for non-trivial specifications in presence of metastable inputs [20]. (ii) Metastable inputs may behave arbitrarily; we do not assume single input change restrictions. (iii) We allow a circuit to compute a function in multiple clock cycles. (iv) Glitch-freedom is no requirement for metastability-containment. (v) Circuits may comprise metastability-masking registers [15].

1.5 Notation

\mathbb{N}_0 and \mathbb{N} denote the natural numbers with and without 0. We abbreviate $[k] := \{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \ell < k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Tuples a, b are concatenated by $a \circ b$, and given a set S , $\mathcal{P}(S) := \{S' \subseteq S\}$ is its power set.

2 Model of Computation

We propose a model in which signals and registers can become metastable; it supports synchronous, clocked circuits composed of registers and combinational logic, and purely combinational circuits. It is an extension of traditional binary logic, and as such behaves as expected in the absence of metastability. In order to obtain *deterministic* guarantees, we assume worst-case propagation of metastability: if a signal can be “infected” by metastability, there is no guarantee that it is not.

Section 3 demonstrates our model using metastability-containing multiplexers, and Section 5 ensures that it is not “too optimistic” by proving that it reproduces well-known impossibility results. Concretely, we show that for circuits in our model avoiding, detecting, and resolving metastability is impossible, just




Figure 2: Output and state of registers as non-deterministic state machines. The dashed state transitions can be left out.

as in physical circuits [20]. Clearly, this obliges us to provide evidence that our model has practical relevance, i.e., that it is indeed possible to perform meaningful computations. Surprisingly, the classification derived in Section 7 entails that many interesting functions can be implemented by circuits, which is discussed in Section 8.

In our model circuits are synchronous state machines: combinational logic, represented by gates, maps a circuit state to possible successor states. Combinational logic uses, and registers store, *signal values* $\mathbb{B}_M := \{0, 1, M\}$. M represents a *metastable* signal, the only source of non-determinism. The classical *stable* Boolean signal values are $\mathbb{B} := \{0, 1\}$. Let $x \in \mathbb{B}_M^k$ be a k -bit tuple. Stored in registers over time, the metastable bits may resolve to 0 or 1. The set of partial resolutions of x is $\text{Res}_M(x)$, and the set of metastability-free, i.e., completely stabilized, resolutions is $\text{Res}(x)$. If m bits in x are metastable, $|\text{Res}_M(x)| = 3^m$ and $|\text{Res}(x)| = 2^m$, since M serves as “wildcard” for \mathbb{B}_M and \mathbb{B} , respectively. Formally,

$$\text{Res}_M(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{B}_M^k \mid \forall i \in [k]: x_i = y_i \vee x_i = M\}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Res}(x) := \text{Res}_M(x) \cap \mathbb{B}^k. \quad (2)$$

2.1 Registers

We consider three types of single-bit registers, all of which behave just like in binary circuit models unless metastability occurs: (i) *simple* registers which are oblivious to metastability, and (ii) registers that mask an internal metastable state to an output of 1 (*mask-1*) or (iii) to 0 (*mask-0*). Physical realizations of masking registers are obtained by flip-flops with high- or low-threshold inverters at the output, amplifying an internal metastable signal to 1 or 0 [25]. A register R has a *type* (simple, mask-0, or mask-1) and a state $x_R \in \mathbb{B}_M$. R behaves according to x_R and its type’s non-deterministic state machine in Figure 2. Each clock cycle, R performs one state transition annotated with some $o_R \in \mathbb{B}_M$, which is the result of reading R during that clock cycle.

Consider a simple register in Figure 2(a). When in state 0, its output and successor state are both 0; it behaves symmetrically in state 1. In state M , however, any output in \mathbb{B}_M combined with any successor state in \mathbb{B}_M is possible.

Since our goal is to construct circuits that operate correctly under metastability even if it never resolves, we make two pessimistic simplifications: (i) If there are three parallel state transitions from x to x' with outputs 0, 1, M , we only keep the one with output M , and (ii) if, for some fixed output $o \in \mathbb{B}_M$, there are state transitions from x to all states 0, 1, M , we only keep the one with successor state M . This simplification is obtained by ignoring the dashed state transitions in Figure 2, and we maintain it throughout the paper. Mask- b registers, $b \in \mathbb{B}$, shown in Figure 2(b), have the following property: As long as their state remains M , they output $b \neq M$; only when their state changes from M to $1 - b$ they output M .

2.2 Gates

We model the behavior of combinational gates in the presence of metastability. A *gate* is defined by $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ input ports, one output port,³ and a Boolean function $f: \mathbb{B}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$. We generalize f to $f_M: \mathbb{B}_M^k \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_M$

³Gates with $k \geq 2$ distinct output ports are represented by k single-output gates.




Figure 3: Combinational logic DAG with gates (gray) and registers (white). The input (I_1), output (O_1), and local (L_1 and L_2) registers occur as sources, sinks, and both, respectively.

as follows. Each metastable input can be perceived as 0, as 1, or as metastable superposition M . Hence, to determine $f_M(x)$, consider $O = \{f(x') \mid x' \in \text{Res}(x)\}$, the set of possible outputs of f after x fully stabilized. If there is only a single possible output, i.e., $O = \{b\}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{B}$, the metastable bits in x have no influence on $f(x)$ and we set $f_M(x) := b$. Otherwise, $O = \mathbb{B}$, i.e., the metastable bits can change $f(x)$, and we set $f_M(x) := M$. Observe that $f_M(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{B}^k$.

f^{AND}	0	1
0	0	0
1	0	1

f_M^{AND}	0	1	M
0	0	0	0
1	0	1	M
M	0	M	M

Table 1: Gate behavior under metastability.

As an example, consider the above table and the AND-gate with two input ports implementing $f^{\text{AND}}(x_1, x_2) = x_1 \wedge x_2$. We extend $f^{\text{AND}}: \mathbb{B}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ to $f_M^{\text{AND}}: \mathbb{B}_M^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_M$. For $x \in \mathbb{B}^2$, we have $f^{\text{AND}}(x) = f_M^{\text{AND}}(x)$. Now consider $x = M1$. We have $\text{Res}(M1) = \{01, 11\}$, so $O = \{f^{\text{AND}}(01), f^{\text{AND}}(11)\} = \{0, 1\} = \mathbb{B}$, and thus $f_M^{\text{AND}}(M1) = M$. For $x = M0$ we obtain $\text{Res}(x) = \{00, 10\}$, and $O = \{f^{\text{AND}}(00), f^{\text{AND}}(10)\} = \{0\}$. Hence, $f_M^{\text{AND}}(M0) = 0$, i.e., the metastable bit is masked.

Refer to Figure 5 for a more involved example of metastability propagation through combinational logic.

2.3 Combinational Logic

We model combinational logic as Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) $G = (V, A)$ with parallel arcs, compare Figure 3. Each node either is a *source*, a *sink*, or a *gate*.

Sources have indegree 0 and outdegree at least 1, and sinks have indegree 1 and outdegree 0. If $v \in V$ is a gate, denote by $f_v: \mathbb{B}_M^{k_v} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_M$ its gate function with $k_v \in \mathbb{N}_0$ parameters. For each parameter of f_v , v is connected to exactly one node (source or gate) w by an arc $(w, v) \in A$. Every sink v is connected to exactly one source or gate w by an arc $(w, v) \in A$. Note that sources and gates can serve as input to multiple gates and sinks.

Suppose G has m sources and n sinks. Then G defines a function $f^G: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_M^n$ as follows. Starting with input $x \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$, we evaluate the nodes $v \in V$. If v is a source, it evaluates to x_v . Gates of indegree 0 are constants and evaluate accordingly. If v is a gate of non-zero indegree, it evaluates to $f_v(\bar{x})$, where $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{B}_M^{k_v}$ is the recursive evaluation of all nodes w with $(w, v) \in A$. Otherwise, v is a sink, has indegree 1, and evaluates just as the unique node w with $(w, v) \in A$. Then $f^G(x)_v$ is the evaluation of sink v .

2.4 Circuits

Definition 1 (Circuit). *A circuit C is defined by:*

- (i) m input registers, k local registers, and n output registers, $m, k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Each register has exactly one type — simple, mask-0, or mask-1 (see Section 2.1) — and is either input, output, or local register.

(ii) A combinational logic DAG G as defined above. G has $m + k$ sources, exactly one for each non-output register, and $k + n$ sinks, exactly one for each non-input register. Local registers appear as both source and sink.

(iii) An initialization $x_0 \in \mathbb{B}_M^{k+n}$ for non-input registers.

Each $s \in \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n}$ is a state of C .

A meaningful application clearly uses a stable initialization $x_0 \in \mathbb{B}^{k+n}$; this restriction, however, is not formally required. We denote by

$$\text{In}: \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_M^m, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Loc}: \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_M^k, \text{ and} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Out}: \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_M^n \quad (5)$$

the projection of (a projection of) a circuit state to its (remaining) input, local, and output registers, respectively. $\text{Out}(x_0)$ is arbitrary because output registers are never read (see below). We use the convention that for any state s , $s = \text{In}(s) \circ \text{Loc}(s) \circ \text{Out}(s)$.

2.5 Executions

Consider a circuit C in state s , and let $x = \text{In}(s) \circ \text{Loc}(s)$ be the state of the non-output registers. Suppose each register R is read, i.e., makes a non-dashed state transition according to its type, state, and corresponding state machine in Figure 2. This state transition yields a value read from, as well as a new state for, R . We denote by

$$\text{Read}^C: \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^{m+k}) \quad (6)$$

the function mapping x to the set of possible values read from non-output registers of C depending on x . When only simple registers are involved, the reading operation becomes deterministic:

Observation 2. *In a circuit C with only simple registers, $\text{Read}^C(x) = \{x\}$.*

Proof. By Figure 2(a), the only non-dashed state transition for simple registers in state $x \in \mathbb{B}_M$ has output x . \square

In the presence of masking registers, $x \in \text{Read}^C(x)$ can still occur, but the output may partially stabilize:

Observation 3. *Consider a circuit C in state s . Then for $x = \text{In}(s) \circ \text{Loc}(s)$*

$$x \in \text{Read}^C(x), \text{ and} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Read}^C(x) \subseteq \text{Res}_M(x). \quad (8)$$

Proof. Check the non-dashed state transitions in Figure 2. For (7), observe that in all state machines, a state transition with output $b \in \mathbb{B}_M$ starts in state b . Regarding (8), observe that registers in state M are not restricted by the claim, and registers of any type in state $b \in \mathbb{B}$ are deterministically read as $b \in \text{Res}_M(b) = \{b\}$. \square

Let G be the combinational logic DAG of C with $m + k$ sources and $k + n$ sinks. Suppose $o \in \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k}$ is read from the non-output registers. Then the combinational logic of C evaluates to $f^G(o)$, uniquely determined by G and o . We denote all possible evaluations of C w.r.t. x by $\text{Eval}^C(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Eval}^C: \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k} &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^{k+n}), \\ \text{Eval}^C(x) &= \{f^G(o) \mid o \in \text{Read}^C(x)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

When registers are written, we allow, but do not require, signals to stabilize. If the combinational logic evaluates the new values for the non-input registers to $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{B}_M^{k+n}$, their new state is in $\text{Res}_M(\bar{x})$; the input registers are never overwritten. We denote this by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Write}^C: \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k} &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^{k+n}), \\ \text{Write}^C(x) &= \bigcup_{\bar{x} \in \text{Eval}^C(x)} \text{Res}_M(\bar{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Observe that this is where metastability can cause inconsistencies: if the output of a gate is M and it is copied to three registers, it is possible that one stabilizes to 0, one to 1, and one remains M.

For the sake of presentation, we write $\text{Read}^C(s)$, $\text{Eval}^C(s)$, and $\text{Write}^C(s)$ for a circuit state $s \in \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n}$, meaning that the irrelevant part of s is ignored.

Let s_r be a state of C . A *successor state* s_{r+1} of s_r is any state that can be obtained from s_r as follows.

Read phase First read all registers, resulting in read values $o \in \text{Read}^C(s_r)$. Let $\iota_{r+1} \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$ be the state of the input registers after the state transitions leading to reading o .

Evaluation phase Then evaluate the combinational logic according to the result of the read phase to $\bar{x}_{r+1} = f^G(o) \in \text{Eval}^C(s_r)$.

Write phase Pick a partial resolution $x_{r+1} \in \text{Res}_M(\bar{x}_{r+1})$ of the result of the evaluation phase, i.e., some $x_{r+1} \in \text{Write}^C(s_r)$. The successor state is $s_{r+1} = \iota_{r+1} \circ x_{r+1}$.

In each clock cycle, our model determines some successor state of the current state of the circuit; we refer to this as *round*. Note that due to worst-case propagation of metastability, the evaluation phase is deterministic, while read and write phase are not: Non-determinism in the read phase is required to model the non-deterministic read behavior of masking registers, and non-determinism in the write phase allows copies of metastable bits to stabilize inconsistently.

Let C be a circuit in state s_0 . For $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, an *r-round execution (w.r.t. s_0)* of C is a sequence of successor states s_0, s_1, \dots, s_r . We denote by $S_r^C(s_0)$ the set of possible states resulting from r -round executions w.r.t. s_0 of C :

$$S_0^C(s_0) := \{s_0\}, \text{ and} \tag{11}$$

$$S_r^C(s_0) := \{s_r \mid s_r \text{ successor state of } s \in S_{r-1}^C(s_0)\}. \tag{12}$$

An *initial state of C w.r.t. input $\iota \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$* is $s_0 = \iota \circ x_0$. We use $C_r: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$ as a function mapping an input to all possible outputs resulting from r -round executions of C :

$$C_r(\iota) := \{\text{Out}(s_r) \mid s_r \in S_r^C(\iota \circ x_0)\}. \tag{13}$$

We say that *r rounds of C implement $f: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$* if and only if $C_r(\iota) \subseteq f(\iota)$ for all $\iota \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$, i.e., if all r -round executions of C result in an output permitted by f . If there is some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, such that r rounds of C implement f , we say that C implements f .

Observe that our model behaves exactly like a traditional, deterministic, binary circuit model if $s_0 \in \mathbb{B}^{m+k+n}$.

3 Case Study: Multiplexer

In this section, we demonstrate the model proposed in Section 2 by developing a metastability-containing multiplexer. Despite its simplicity, it demonstrates our concept, and is a crucial part of the more complex metastability-containing components of the clock synchronization circuit outlined in Section 8.1 and of metastability-containing Gray code sorting networks [18].

From a broader perspective, this section shows that our model, especially the worst-case propagation of metastability, is not “too pessimistic” to permit positive results. We show in Section 5 that it is not “too optimistic,” either.

Prior to discussing improved variants, let us examine a standard multiplexer. A *(1-bit) multiplexer* is a circuit C with 3 inputs, such that C implements

$$f_{\text{MUX}}(a, b, s) = \begin{cases} \text{Res}_M(a) & \text{if } s = 0, \\ \text{Res}_M(b) & \text{if } s = 1, \text{ and} \\ \mathbb{B}_M & \text{if } s = M. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

In the case of a stable select bit s , it determines whether to output (some stabilization of) a or b . If s is metastable, an arbitrary output may be produced. Figures 4(a) and 4(b) show typical implementations in terms of combinational logic and transmission gates, respectively.

A desirable property of a multiplexer is that if $a = b$, the output is a , regardless of s . Being uncertain whether to select a or b should be insubstantial in this case. If, however, $s = M$ and $a = b = 1$, $C^{\text{MUX}1}$, compare Figure 5(a), yields

$$(\neg s \wedge a) \vee (s \wedge b) = (\neg M \wedge 1) \vee (M \wedge 1) = M \vee M = M. \tag{15}$$




Figure 4: Multiplexer implementations. Figures (a) and (b) depict the gate-level circuit and the transmission gate implementation of a standard multiplexer. The circuits in Figures (c) and (d) mask a metastable select bit s in the case of $a = b$ employing additional gates (c), or a masking register (d).




Figure 5: Multiplexer behavior for $a = b = 1$, in which case the output should be 1, regardless of the select bit s . For $s = M$, however, the standard multiplexer (a) can become metastable, but the metastability-containing multiplexer (b) outputs 1.

Hence, we ask for an improved circuit that implements

$$f_{\text{MMUX}}(a, b, s) = \begin{cases} \text{Res}_M(a) & \text{if } s = 0 \text{ or } a = b, \\ \text{Res}_M(b) & \text{if } s = 1, \text{ and} \\ \mathbb{B}_M & \text{if } a \neq b \wedge s = M. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

We call such a circuit *metastability-containing (1-bit) multiplexer*. Circuit C^{MMUX1} in Figure 4(c) implements (16): The problematic case of $s = M$ and $a = b = 1$ is handled by the third AND-gate, which becomes 1, providing the OR-gate with a stable 1 as input, see Figure 5(b).

Lemma 4. $C_1^{\text{MMUX1}} \subseteq f_{\text{MMUX}}$ from Equation (16).

Proof. C^{MMUX1} has no internal registers and its combinational logic DAG implements

$$o = (\neg s \wedge a) \vee (s \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge b). \quad (17)$$

It is easy to check that for $s \neq M$, (17) implements the first two cases of (16). If $s = M$, and $a \neq b$ or $a = b = M$, C^{MMUX1} may output anything, so consider $s = M$ and distinguish two cases: (i) If $a = b = 0$, all clauses in (17) are 0, hence $o = 0$, and (ii) if $a = b = 1$, $a \wedge b = 1$ and $o = 1$, regardless of the other clauses. \square

The price for this improvement is an additional AND-gate and a ternary OR-gate, which can be costly if a and b are of large bit-width. We reduce the gate number using a masking register to implement (16) in two steps. First, we show how to implement (16) using two rounds, and then derive an unclocked circuit with fewer gates. Algorithm 1 specifies the clocked circuit by assignments of logic expressions to registers. The trick is to sequentially read s from a mask-1 register, ensuring that at most one copy of s can be metastable, compare Figure 2(b). This guarantees that in the case of $s = M$ and $a = b = 1$, one of the AND-clauses is stable 1.

Lemma 5. *Two rounds of Algorithm 1 implement (16).*

Algorithm 1 Metastability-containing multiplexer.

input: a and b (simple), s (mask-1)
local: s' (simple)
output: o (simple)

each round:

$$s' \leftarrow s$$

$$o \leftarrow (\neg s \wedge a) \vee (s' \wedge b)$$

end

Proof. If $s \neq M$, we have $s = s'$ after round 1 and the first two cases of (16) are easily verified. In case $s = M$, and $a \neq b$ or $a = b = M$, the output is not restricted. Hence, consider $s = M$ and $a = b$. If $s = M$ and $a = b = 0$, $o = (\neg s \wedge 0) \vee (s' \wedge 0) = 0$. If $s = M$ and $a = b = 1$, the read and write phases of round 1 have two possible outcomes (compare Figure 2(b)): (i) s is read as M , so its copy in s' may become metastable, but s is guaranteed to be read as 0 in round 2 because s is a mask-1 register. Then we have $o = (\neg 0 \wedge 1) \vee (s' \wedge 1) = 1 \vee s' = 1$. (ii) $s' = 1$ due to s masking state M , in which case we obtain $o = (\neg s \wedge 1) \vee (1 \wedge 1) = \neg s \vee 1 = 1$. \square

In fact, (16) has an efficient, unlocked realization: Enforcing the required serialization can be done by local delay constraints instead of clock cycles. The resulting slim circuit is depicted in Figure 4(d). Given that the propagation delay from s to the AND-gate with non-negated s input is larger than the delay from s to the AND-gate with negated input s , the circuit exhibits the specified behavior. Note that the circuit scales well with increasing bit-widths of a and b : Compared to the standard multiplexer in Figure 4(a), it only requires to store the select bit in a masking register.

4 Basic Properties

We establish properties about register types and computability regarding circuits in the model from Section 2. There are two resources regarding the computability of functions: the number $r \in \mathbb{N}$ of rounds and the register types available to a circuit. In order to capture this, let Fun_S^r be the class of functions implementable with r rounds of circuits comprising only simple registers. Analogously, Fun_M^r denotes the class of functions implementable with r rounds that may use masking and simple registers.

First consider the combinational logic. Provided with a partially metastable input x , some gates—those where the collective metastable input ports have an impact on the output—evaluate to M . So when stabilizing x bit by bit, no new metastability is introduced at the gates. Furthermore, once a gate stabilized, its output is fixed; stabilizing the input leads to stabilizing the output.

Lemma 6. *Let G be a combinational logic DAG with m sources. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$,*

$$x' \in \text{Res}_M(x) \Rightarrow f^G(x') \in \text{Res}_M(f^G(x)). \quad (18)$$

Proof. We show the statement by induction on $|V|$. For the sake of the proof we extend f^G to all nodes of $G = (V, A)$, i.e., write $f^G(x)_v$ for the evaluation of $v \in V$ w.r.t. input x , regardless of whether v is a sink. The claim is trivial for $|V| = 0$. Hence, suppose the claim holds for DAGs with at most $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ vertices, and consider a DAG $G = (V, A)$ with $|V| = i + 1$. As G is non-empty, it contains a sink $v \in V$. Removing v allows applying the induction hypothesis to the remaining graph, proving that $f^G(x')_w \in \text{Res}_M(f^G(x)_w)$ for all nodes $w \neq v$.

Concerning v , observe that the claim is immediate if v is a source, by Observation 3 for registers and by definition for gates of indegree 0. Otherwise, consider the nodes $w \in V$ with $(w, v) \in A$. For input x , v is fed with the input string $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{B}_M^{k_v}$, whose components are given by $f^G(x)_w$; define \bar{x}' analogously w.r.t. input x' . Note that $\bar{x}' \in \text{Res}_M(\bar{x})$, since we already established that $f^G(x')_w \in \text{Res}_M(f^G(x)_w)$ for all $w \neq v$. If $f_v(\bar{x}) = M$, the claim holds because $\text{Res}_M(M) = \mathbb{B}_M$. On the other hand, for the case that $f_v(\bar{x}) = b \neq M$, our gate definition entails that $f_v(\bar{x}') = b$, because $\bar{x}' \in \text{Res}_M(\bar{x})$. \square

Stabilizing the input of the combinational logic stabilizes its output. The same holds for the evaluation phase: If one result of the read phase is x and another is $x' \in \text{Res}_M(x)$, the combinational logic stabilizes its output to $f^G(x') \in \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))$. Recall Observations 2 and 3: In state x , simple registers are deterministically read as x , and masking registers as some $x' \in \text{Res}_M(x)$. Hence, the use of masking

registers might partially stabilize the input to the combinational logic and, by Lemma 6, its output. The same stabilization, however, can also occur in the write phase. This implies that Write^C is not influenced by the register types.

Lemma 7. *Consider a circuit C in state s . Let C_S be a copy of C that only uses simple registers, and $x = \text{In}(s) \circ \text{Loc}(s)$ the projection of s to the non-output registers. Then*

$$\text{Write}^C(s) = \text{Write}^{C_S}(s) = \text{Res}_M(f^G(x)). \quad (19)$$

Proof. In C_S , we have $\text{Read}^{C_S}(s) = \{x\}$ by Observation 2. So $\text{Eval}^{C_S}(s) = \{f^G(x)\}$, and $\text{Write}^{C_S}(s) = \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))$ by definition.

In C , $x \in \text{Read}^C(s)$ by Observation 3, so $\text{Res}_M(f^G(x)) \subseteq \text{Write}^C(s)$. All other reads $x' \in \text{Read}^C(s)$ have $x' \in \text{Res}_M(x)$ by Observation 3, and $f^G(x') \in \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))$ by Lemma 6. It follows that $\text{Write}^C(s) = \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))$. \square

Carefully note that the write phase only affects non-input registers; input registers are never written. Hence, Lemma 7 does not generalize to multiple rounds: State transitions of input registers in the read phase affect future read phases.

In 1-round executions, however, masking registers are not more powerful than simple registers, because their state transitions only affect rounds $r \geq 2$.

Corollary 8. $\text{Fun}_S^1 = \text{Fun}_M^1$.

Due to the aforementioned state changes, differences do arise for $r \geq 2$ rounds; we show this in Section 6.2.

In contrast, simple and masking registers used as non-input registers behave identically, regardless of the number of rounds: A circuit C in state s_r overwrites them regardless of their state. Since $\text{Write}^C(s_r)$ is oblivious to register types by Lemma 7, so is $\text{Loc}(s_{r+1}) \circ \text{Out}(s_{r+1})$ for a successor state s_{r+1} of s_r .

Corollary 9. *Simple and masking registers are interchangeable when used as non-input registers.*

Consider a circuit C in state s , and suppose $x \in \text{Read}^C(s)$ is read. Since the evaluation phase is deterministic, the evaluation $y \in \text{Eval}^C(x)$ is uniquely determined by x and C . Recall that we may resolve metastability to $\text{Write}^C(x) = \text{Res}_M(y)$ in the write phase: The state of an output register R becomes 0 if $y_R = 0$, 1 if $y_R = 1$, and some $b \in \mathbb{B}_M$ if $y_R = M$. Consequently, output registers resolve independently:

Corollary 10. *For any circuit C , $C_1 = g_0 \times \cdots \times g_{n-1}$, where $g_i: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \mathbb{B}_M\}$.*

Proof. Let $s = \iota \circ x_0$ be the initial state of C w.r.t. input ι , and $x = \text{In}(s) \circ \text{Loc}(s)$. By Lemma 7, $\text{Write}^C(s) = \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))$, i.e., $C_1(\iota) = \{\text{Out}(s') \mid s' \in \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))\}$. By definition, $\text{Res}_M(f^G(x)) = \prod_{i \in [n]} \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))_i$. Hence, the claim follows with $g_i(\iota) := \text{Res}_M(f^G(x))_i$ for all $\iota \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$ and $i \in [n]$. \square

We show in Section 7 that Corollary 10 generalizes to multiple rounds of circuits with only simple registers. This is, however, not the case in the presence of masking registers, as demonstrated in Section 6.

Lemmas 6 and 7 apply to the input of circuits: Partially stabilizing an input partially stabilizes the possible inputs of the combinational logic, and hence its evaluation and the circuit's output after one round.

Observation 11. *For a circuit C and input $\iota \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$,*

$$\iota' \in \text{Res}_M(\iota) \Rightarrow C_1(\iota') \subseteq C_1(\iota). \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let x_0 be the initialization of C , $s = \iota \circ x_0$ its initial state w.r.t. input ι , and $x = \text{In}(s) \circ \text{Loc}(s)$ the state of the non-output registers; define s' and x' equivalently w.r.t. input ι' . Using Lemmas 6 and 7, and that $\text{Res}_M(x') \subseteq \text{Res}_M(x)$ for $x' \in \text{Res}_M(x)$, we obtain that $\text{Write}^C(s') = \text{Res}_M(f^G(x')) \subseteq \text{Res}_M(f^G(x)) = \text{Write}^C(s)$. \square

Finally, note that adding rounds of computation cannot decrease computational power. For any $f \in \text{Fun}_S^r \cup \text{Fun}_M^r$, a respective circuit can be transformed into one computing f in $r + 1$ rounds by buffering the result for one round. Furthermore, allowing masking registers does not decrease computational power.

Observation 12. For all $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have

$$\text{Fun}_S^r \subseteq \text{Fun}_S^{r+1}, \quad (21)$$

$$\text{Fun}_M^r \subseteq \text{Fun}_M^{r+1}, \text{ and} \quad (22)$$

$$\text{Fun}_S^r \subseteq \text{Fun}_M^r. \quad (23)$$

5 Reality Check

Section 3 demonstrates that our model permits the design of metastability-containing circuits. Given the elusive nature of metastability and Marino’s impossibility result [20], non-trivial positive results of this kind are surprising, and raise the question whether the proposed model is “too optimistic” to derive meaningful statements about the physical world. Put frankly, a reality check is in order!

In particular, Marino established that no digital circuit can reliably (i) avoid, (ii) resolve, or (iii) detect metastability [20]. It is imperative that these impossibility results hold in any model comprising metastability. We show in Theorem 16 and Corollaries 17–18 that (i)–(iii) are impossible in the model proposed in Section 2 as well. We stress that this is about putting the model to the test rather than reproducing a known result.

We first verify that avoiding metastability is impossible. Consider a circuit C that produces different outputs for inputs $\iota \neq \iota'$. The idea is to observe how the output of C behaves while transforming ι to ι' bit by bit, always involving intermediate metastability, i.e., switching the differing bits from 0 to M to 1 or vice versa. This can be seen as a discrete version of Marino’s argument for signals that map continuous time to continuous voltages [20]. The following definition formalizes the step-wise manipulation of bits.

Definition 13 (Pivotal Sequence). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ be integers, and $x, x' \in \mathbb{B}_M^k$. Then $(x^{(i)})_{i \in [\ell+1]}$ is a pivotal sequence (from x to x') if and only if it satisfies

- (i) $x^{(0)} = x$,
- (ii) $x^{(\ell)} = x'$,
- (iii) for all $i \in [\ell]$, $x^{(i)}$ and $x^{(i+1)} \in \mathbb{B}_M^k$ differ in exactly one bit, and
- (iv) this bit is metastable in either $x^{(i)}$ or $x^{(i+1)}$.

For $i \in [\ell]$, we call the differing bit the pivot from i to $i+1$ and denote by P_i the corresponding pivotal register.

We start with Lemma 14 which applies to a single round of computation. It states that feeding a circuit C with a pivotal sequence x of states results in a pivotal sequence of possible successor states y . Hence, if C is guaranteed to output different results for $x^{(0)}$ and $x^{(\ell)}$, some intermediate element of y must contain a metastable output bit, i.e., there is an execution in which an output register of C becomes metastable. We argue about successor states rather than just the output because we apply Lemma 14 inductively below. A sample circuit with pivotal sequences is depicted in Figure 6.

Suppose the pivotal register P_i changes from stable to M from $x^{(i)}$ to $x^{(i+1)}$. This means that some outputs of Eval^C become M. The key insight is that due to $x^{(i)} \in \text{Res}_M(x^{(i+1)})$, the stable bits in Eval^C remain unchanged by Lemma 6. Leveraging this, we obtain a sequence of successor states, changing the affected output bits from stable to M one by one. A reversed version of this argument applies when P_i changes from stable to M.


Lemma 14. Let C be a circuit, and $(x^{(i)})_{i \in [\ell+1]}$, $x^{(i)} \in \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n}$, a pivotal sequence of states of C . Then there is a pivotal sequence $(y^{(j)})_{j \in [\ell'+1]}$, $y^{(j)} \in \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n}$, each a successor state of some $x^{(i)}$, satisfying that $y^{(0)}$ and $y^{(\ell')}$ are successor states of $x^{(0)}$ and $x^{(\ell)}$, respectively.

Proof. See Figure 6 for an illustration of our arguments. Starting from $x^{(0)}$, we inductively proceed to $x^{(\ell)}$, extending the sequence y by a suitable subsequence for each step from $x^{(i)}$ to $x^{(i+1)}$, $i \in [\ell]$. We maintain the invariant that

- (i) $x^{(i)} \in \text{Read}^C(x^{(i)})$ is read in the execution for each such subsequence, and that
- (ii) the state $y^{(j)}$ corresponding to $x^{(i)}$ fulfills

$$\text{Loc}(y^{(j)}) \circ \text{Out}(y^{(j)}) = f^G(\text{In}(x^{(i)}) \circ \text{Loc}(x^{(i)}). \quad (24)$$

Let $\iota = \text{In}(x^{(0)})$ be the state of the input registers. By Lemma 7, $f^G(\iota \circ \text{Loc}(x^{(0)})) \in \text{Write}^C(x^{(0)})$. Define $y^{(0)} = \iota' \circ f^G(\iota \circ \text{Loc}(x^{(0)})) \in S_1^C(x^{(0)})$, where ι' is the (uniquely determined) state of the input registers after reading ι . By construction, $x^{(0)}$ and $y^{(0)}$ fulfill the invariant.



	$x^{(i)}$			$f^G(x^{(i)})$		$y^{(j)}$				
	I_1	I_2	L_1	L_1	O_1	I_1	I_2	L_1	O_1	
$x^{(0)}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	$y^{(0)}$
$x^{(1)}$	0	0	M	0	0	0	0	0	0	
$x^{(2)}$	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
$x^{(3)}$	0	M	1	M	M	0	M	0	0	$y^{(1)}$
	0	M	1	M	M	0	M	M	0	$y^{(2)}$
$x^{(4)}$	0	M	1	M	M	0	M	M	M	$y^{(3)}$
	0	1	1	1	1	0	M	1	M	$y^{(4)}$
	0	1	1	1	1	0	M	1	1	$y^{(5)}$
	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	$y^{(6)}$

Figure 6: A Circuit with input (I_1 and I_2), local (L_1), and output (O_1) registers, and a pivotal sequence of non-output register states $x^{(0)}, \dots, x^{(4)}$ with the resulting pivotal sequence of successor states $y^{(0)}, \dots, y^{(6)}$. Each change in x is reflected in a re-evaluation of the combinational logic $f^G(x^{(i)})$, which may affect several registers of the successor state. In order to be pivotal, the output sequence y has to account for the changes bit by bit.

We perform the step from $x^{(i)}$ to $x^{(i+1)}$, $i \in [\ell]$. Let P_i be the pivotal register from $x^{(i)}$ to $x^{(i+1)}$; if P_i is an output register, y does not change, so assume that P_i is an input or local register. From the previous step (or the definition of $y^{(0)}$) we have an execution resulting in state $y^{(j)}$ for some index j , such that $x^{(i)}$ is the result of the read phase. For the next step, we keep the result of the read phase for all registers except P_i fixed. Regarding all registers that do not depend on P_i , i.e., may attain the same states regardless of what is read from P_i , we rule that they attain the same states as in $y^{(j)}$, the state associated with $x^{(i)}$.

Suppose first that $x_{P_i}^{(i)} = b \neq M$ and $x_{P_i}^{(i+1)} = M$ (e.g. the step from $x^{(2)}$ to $x^{(3)}$ in Figure 6). Consider the set of (non-input) registers \mathcal{R} that depend on P_i , i.e., $\mathcal{R} := \{R \mid f^G(x^{(i)})_R \neq f^G(x^{(i+1)})_R\}$ ($\mathcal{R} = \{L_1, O_1\}$ in our example). Since $x^{(i)} \in \text{Res}_M(x^{(i+1)})$, by Lemma 6 $f^G(x^{(i)}) \in \text{Res}_M(f^G(x^{(i+1)}))$. Hence, $f^G(x^{(i+1)})_R = M \neq f^G(x^{(i)})_R$ for all $R \in \mathcal{R}$.

If P_i is an input register, we first extend y by one item that only changes y_{P_i} to M , increase j by one if that is the case (e.g. the step from $y^{(0)}$ to $y^{(1)}$ in Figure 6). Then we extend y by $y^{(j+1)}, \dots, y^{(j+|\mathcal{R}|)}$ such that in each step, for one $R \in \mathcal{R}$, we change y_R from $b_R \neq M$ to M ; this is feasible by Corollary 10, as the product structure of C_1 implies that we can flip any written bit without affecting the others (e.g. steps $y^{(2)}$ and $y^{(3)}$ in our example). By construction, in state $y^{(j+|\mathcal{R}|)}$ the state of the non-input registers is $f^G(\iota \circ x^{(i+1)})$, i.e., our invariant is satisfied.

To cover the case that $x_{P_i}^{(i)} = M$ and $x_{P_i}^{(i+1)} = b \neq M$, observe that we can apply the same reasoning by reversing the order of the constructed attached subsequence. As y is pivotal by construction, this completes the proof. \square

Given a pivotal sequence of inputs, there are executions producing a pivotal sequence of attainable successor states. Using these states for another round, Lemma 14 can be applied inductively.

Corollary 15. *Let $(\iota^{(i)})_{i \in [\ell+1]}$, $\iota^{(i)} \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$, be a pivotal sequence of inputs of a circuit C , and x_0 its initialization. Then there is a pivotal sequence of states $(y^{(j)})_{j \in [\ell'+1]}$, $y^{(j)} \in \mathbb{B}_M^{m+k+n}$, that C can attain after $r \in \mathbb{N}$ rounds satisfying $y^{(0)} \in S_r^C(\iota^{(0)} \circ x_0)$ and $y^{(\ell')} \in S_r^C(\iota^{(\ell')} \circ x_0)$.*

Proof. Inductive application of Lemma 14 to C and states $(\iota^{(i)} \circ x_0)_{i \in [\ell+1]}$. \square

We wrap up our results in a compact theorem. It states that a circuit which has to output different results for different inputs can produce metastable outputs.

Theorem 16. *Let C be a circuit with $C_r(\iota) \cap C_r(\iota') = \emptyset$ for some $\iota, \iota' \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$. Then C has an r -round execution in which an output register becomes metastable.*

Proof. Apply Corollary 15 to a pivotal sequence from ι to ι' and C . Since $C_r(\iota) \ni \text{Out}(y^{(0)}) \neq \text{Out}(y^{(\ell')}) \in C_r(\iota')$, some $\text{Out}(y^{(j)})$ contains a metastable bit. \square

Marino proved that no physical realization of a circuit, be it synchronous or not, can reliably (i) compute a non-constant function in a way guaranteeing that the output cannot become metastable, (ii) detect whether a register is metastable, or (iii) resolve metastability of the input while faithfully propagating stable input [20]. Theorem 16 captures (i), and Corollaries 17 and 18 settle (ii) and (iii), respectively. The key is to observe that a circuit detecting or resolving metastability is non-constant, and hence, by Theorem 16, can become metastable—defeating the purpose of detecting or resolving metastability in the first place.

Corollary 17. *There exists no circuit that implements $f: \mathbb{B}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M)$ with*

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \{1\} & \text{if } x = M, \text{ and} \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Proof. Assume such a circuit C exists and implements f in r rounds. $C_r(0) \cap C_r(M) = \emptyset$, so applying Theorem 16 to $\iota = 0$ and $\iota' = M$ yields that C has an r -round execution with metastable output, contradicting the assumption. \square

Corollary 18. *There exists no circuit that implements $f: \mathbb{B}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M)$ with*

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \{0, 1\} & \text{if } x = M, \text{ and} \\ \{x\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Proof. As in Corollary 17 with $(\iota, \iota') = (0, 1)$. \square

In summary, our circuit model (Section 2) is consistent with physical models of metastability, yet admits the computation of non-trivial functions (Section 3) that proved crucial in constructing complex metastability-containing circuits [18]. This gives rise to further questions: (i) Is there a fundamental difference between simple and masking registers? (ii) Which functions can be implemented? We study these questions in Sections 6 and 7, respectively.

6 Computational Hierarchy

In this section, we determine the impact of the number of rounds $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and the available register types on the computational power of a circuit. Recall that Fun_S^r denotes the functions implementable using r rounds and simple registers only, and Fun_M^r those implementable using r rounds and arbitrary registers. The main results are the following.

- (i) Circuits restricted to simple registers can be unrolled (Section 6.1): $\text{Fun}_S^r = \text{Fun}_S^{r+1}$.
- (ii) With masking registers, more functions become implementable with each additional round (Section 6.2): $\text{Fun}_M^r \subsetneq \text{Fun}_M^{r+1}$.

By Corollary 8, we obtain the following hierarchy:

$$\dots = \text{Fun}_S^2 = \text{Fun}_S^1 = \text{Fun}_M^1 \subsetneq \text{Fun}_M^2 \subsetneq \dots \quad (27)$$

We believe this to make a strong case for further pursuing masking registers in research regarding metastability.

6.1 Simple Registers

It is folklore that binary-valued synchronous circuits can be unrolled such that the output after $r \in \mathbb{N}$ clock cycles of the original circuit is equal to the output after a single clock cycle of the unrolled circuit. Theorem 19 states that this result also holds in presence of potentially metastable simple registers. Note that—defying intuition—masking registers do not permit this, see Theorem 21.

Theorem 19. *Given a circuit C with only simple registers such that $r \in \mathbb{N}$ rounds of C implement f , one can construct a circuit C' such that one round of C' implements f .*

Proof. We construct a circuit C' with $C'_1(\iota) = C_2(\iota)$; the claim for $r > 2$ then follows by induction.

Given C , we construct C' as follows, compare Figure 7. Let G be the combinational logic DAG of C , make two copies $G_1 = (V_1, A_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, A_2)$ of G , and let $G' = (V_1 \cup V_2, A_1 \cup A_2)$ be the combinational logic DAG of C' , up to the modifications below. Every input register I of C corresponds




Figure 7: Unrolling 2 rounds of the circuit in Figure 3 with three gates (gray), and four registers (white). Local registers become fan-out buffers, and early output is ignored.

to sources $v_1^I \in V_1$ and $v_2^I \in V_2$. Contract $\{v_1^I, v_2^I\}$ to a source in G' (compare I_1 in Figure 7), and associate it with a new input register in C' ; repeat this for all input registers. In order to ignore “early” output, delete each sink in G_1 corresponding to an output register in C (like the first, ignored, copy of O_1 in Figure 7); this may lead to some gates’ outputs being ignored. The remaining sources and sinks are associated with local registers. Each local register L of C corresponds to exactly one sink $v_1^L \in V_1$ and one source $v_2^L \in V_2$. Contract $\{v_1^L, v_2^L\}$ to a fan-out buffer gate that simply forwards its input in G' (the center copies of L_1 and L_2 in Figure 7). Associate the k remaining sources of G_1 and sinks of G_2 with local registers. Observe that G' has n input, m output, and k local registers. Define the initial state of C' as that of C .

To check that one round of C' is equivalent to two rounds of C , let $\iota \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$ be an input, s_0 the initial state of both C and C' w.r.t. input ι , and $x_0 = \text{In}(s_0) \circ \text{Loc}(s_0)$. First recall that by definition (Figure 2(a)), simple registers never change their state when read. Hence by construction of G' , we have $\text{Eval}^{C'}(s_0) = \{f^{G'}(x_0)\} = \{f^G(\iota \circ \text{Loc}(f^G(x_0)))\}$.

In C , we have $\text{Write}^C(s_0) = \text{Res}_M(f^G(x_0))$ by Lemma 7. Thus, in the second round of C , for any $s_1 \in S_1^C$ we have that $\text{Read}^C(s_1) = \{\iota \circ \text{Loc}(s_1)\} \subseteq \text{Res}_M(\iota \circ \text{Loc}(f^G(x_0)))$, and by Lemma 6 $\text{Eval}^C(s_1) \subseteq \text{Res}_M(f^G(\iota \circ \text{Loc}(f^G(x_0))))$. This means that the second evaluation phase of C yields a stabilization of the first evaluation phase of C' , i.e., $S_2^C \subseteq S_1^{C'}$, because the write phase allows arbitrary stabilization.

On the other hand, the unstabilized $\iota \circ \text{Loc}(f^G(x_0)) \in \text{Eval}^C(s_1)$, so $S_1^{C'} \subseteq S_2^C$. Together, we have $S_2^C = S_1^{C'}$ and $C'_1(\iota) = C_2(\iota)$ follows. \square

Naturally, the unrolled circuit can be significantly larger than the original one. However, the point is that adding rounds does not affect the computational power of circuits with simple registers only.

Corollary 20. For all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Fun}_S^r = \text{Fun}_S^1 =: \text{Fun}_S$.

6.2 Arbitrary Registers

For simple registers, additional rounds make no difference in terms of computability — the corresponding hierarchy collapses into Fun_S . In the following, we demonstrate that this is not the case in the presence of masking registers: $\text{Fun}_M^r \subsetneq \text{Fun}_M^{r+1}$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$. We demonstrate this using a metastability-containing fan-out buffer specified in Equation (28). It creates r copies of its input bit, at most one of which is permitted to become metastable:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \{x^r\} & \text{if } x \neq M, \\ \bigcup_{i \in [r]} \text{Res}_M(0^i M 1^{r-i-1}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

Theorem 21. $\text{Fun}_M^r \subsetneq \text{Fun}_M^{r+1}$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Fix $2 \leq r \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider f from (28). We first show $f \in \text{Fun}_M^r$, and then that $f \notin \text{Fun}_M^{r-1}$.

f is implemented by r rounds of the circuit C which uses a 0-masking input register R_{r-1} and a chain of local registers R_{r-2}, \dots, R_0 . In each round, the value read from register R_{i+1} , $i \in [r-1]$, is copied to R_i , and output register O_i , $i \in [r]$, gets the value read from R_i . Observe that the specification of a 0-masking register is such that, given an initial state, r reads (and possibly stabilization in the write phase) may return exactly the sequences specified in (28). Since C faithfully copies these values, it follows that $f = C_r \in \text{Fun}_M^r$.




Figure 8: Simulating a masking register with a selector.

We claim that for $r > 1$, $f \notin \text{Fun}_M^{r-1}$. Assume for contradiction that there is a circuit C such that $C_{r-1} \subseteq f$. We derive a contradiction by simulating the behavior of C in a circuit C' with $r - 1$ simple input registers, which may initially hold any possible sequence of values read from the input register of C in $r - 1$ rounds.

To specify this circuit, we first observe that the following subcircuits are straightforward to implement: **r -round counters** take no input and have r outputs, such that the i -th output is 1 in round $1 \leq i \leq r$ and 0 else. This is implemented by a linear chain of local registers R_i , $i \in [r]$ (i.e., R_i is copied to R_{i+1} for $i \in [r - 1]$), where R_0 is initialized to 1 and all others to 0, output O_{i+1} , $i \in [r]$, is fed the XOR of R_i and R_{i+1} , and R_{r-1} is copied to O_r .

r -round selectors take r inputs x_i , $i \in [r]$, and have one output O , such that the state of O in round $1 \leq i \leq r$ is in $\text{Res}_M(x_{i-1})$ (i.e., holds a copy of x_{i-1}). This is achieved by using an r -round counter and feeding the AND of x_i and c_i (the i -th counter output) into an r -ary OR-gate whose output is written into O .

By Corollary 9, we may assume w.l.o.g. that all non-input registers of C are simple. If the input register is also simple, $M^r \in C_{r-1}(M) \notin f(M)$ by Theorem 19 and Lemma 7.

Consider the case that the input register is a mask-0 register. Compare Figure 8. Define C' as a copy of C , except that $r - 1$ simple input registers serve as input to an $(r - 1)$ -round selector. This compound represents the only input register R of C : Every gate or sink driven by R in C is instead wired to the selector's output in C' .

A surjective mapping of executions of C' with inputs restricted to $\{0^i M 1^{r-i-1} \mid i \in [r - 1]\}$, i.e., all possible reads from R in state M , to executions of C is defined as follows. We interpret the selector's output in round r as the value read from R in round r and “copy” the remaining execution of C' (without inputs and the selector) to obtain a complete execution of C . Due to our restriction on the inputs, the result always is a feasible execution of C with input M .

By Theorem 19, we may w.l.o.g. assume that a single round of C' implements f . Consider the sequence of C' -inputs from 0^{r-1} to 1^{r-1} in which we flip the bits one by one from right to left, from 0 to 1. By the pigeon hole principle, there must be some $1 \leq \bar{r} \leq r - 1$ so that two output bits of C' change compared to $\bar{r} - 1$. Since, when fixing the other input bits, two outputs $\ell \neq \ell'$ depend on the \bar{r} -th input bit and C' only uses simple registers, we have by Lemma 7 that $MM \in \text{Write}^{C'}(0^{r-1-\bar{r}} M 1^{\bar{r}-1})_{\ell, \ell'}$. Hence, ℓ and ℓ' can become metastable in the same execution of C' . We map this execution to an execution of C , in which the corresponding output registers attain the same state (i.e., two of them are M) after $r - 1$ rounds. This covers the case that the input register is 0-masking; a 1-masking register is handled analogously.

We arrive at the contradiction that $C_{r-1} \not\subseteq f$, implying that $f \notin \text{Fun}_M^{r-1}$. Overall, $\text{Fun}_M^{r-1} \neq \text{Fun}_M^r$. As $r > 1$ was arbitrary and, by Observation 12, $\text{Fun}_M^{r-1} \subseteq \text{Fun}_M^r$, this concludes the proof. \square

7 The Power of Simple Registers

The design of metastability-containing circuits requires a quick and easy check which metastability-containing components are implementable, and which are not. In this section, we present such a test for circuits without masking registers.

First, we present sufficient and necessary conditions for a function to be implementable with simple registers only (Section 7.1). Using this classification, we demonstrate how to take an arbitrary Boolean

function $f: \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$ and extend it to the most restrictive specification $[f]_M: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$ that is implementable. This is an easy process—one simply applies Definition 24 to f (Section 7.2).

The way to make use of this is to start with a function f required as component, “lift” it to $[f]_M$, and check whether $[f]_M$ is restrictive enough for the application at hand. If it is, one can work on an efficient implementation of $[f]_M$, otherwise a new strategy, possibly involving masking registers, must be devised; in either case, no time is wasted searching for a circuit that does not exist. Sections 7.2.1–7.2.2 summarize our findings.

Since we discuss functions implementable with simple registers only, recall that the corresponding circuits can be unrolled by Theorem 19, i.e., it suffices to understand C_1 , a single round of a (possibly unrolled) circuit.

7.1 Natural Subfunctions

From Corollary 10 and Observation 11, we know that C_1 , the set of possible circuit outputs after a single round, has three properties: (i) its output can be specified bit-wise, (ii) each output bit is either 0, 1, or completely unspecified, and (iii) stabilizing a partially metastable input restricts the set of possible outputs. Hence C_1 —and, by Corollary 20, all circuits using only simple registers—can be represented in terms of bit-wise Karnaugh-Veitch (KV) diagrams with values “0, 1, \mathbb{B}_M ” instead of “0, 1, D.” We call such functions *natural* and show below that $f \in \text{Fun}_S$ if and only if f has a natural subfunction.

Definition 22 (Natural and Subfunctions). *The function $f: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$ is natural if and only if it is bit-wise, closed, and specific:*

Bit-wise *The components f_1, \dots, f_n of f are independent:*

$$f(x) = f_1(x) \times \cdots \times f_n(x). \quad (29)$$

Closed *Each component of f is specified as either 0, as 1, or completely unspecified:*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_M^m: f(x) \in \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \mathbb{B}_M\}^n. \quad (30)$$

Specific *When stabilizing a partially metastable input, the output of f remains at least as restricted:*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_M^m: x' \in \text{Res}(x) \Rightarrow f(x') \subseteq f(x). \quad (31)$$

For functions $f, g: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$, g is a subfunction of f (we write $g \subseteq f$), if and only if $g(x) \subseteq f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_M^m$.

Note that, due to being closed, natural functions being specific means that (partially) stabilizing the input can only lead to reducing an output set of \mathbb{B}_M to either $\{0\}$ or $\{1\}$, i.e., making the output “more specific.”

Suppose we ask whether a function f is implementable with simple registers, i.e., if $f \in \text{Fun}_S$. Since any (unrolled) circuit C implementing f must have $C_1 \subseteq f$, Corollary 10 and Observation 11 state a necessary condition for $f \in \text{Fun}_S$: f must have a natural subfunction. Theorem 23 establishes that this condition is sufficient, too.

Theorem 23. *Let $g: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$ be a function. Then $g \in \text{Fun}_S$ if and only if g has a natural subfunction.*

Proof. For the only-if-direction, suppose that C is a circuit with only simple registers such that $C_1 \subseteq g$; by Theorem 19, such a circuit exists. C_1 is bit-wise and closed by Corollary 10, and specific by Observation 11. Hence, choosing $f := C_1$ yields a natural subfunction of g .

We proceed with the if-direction. Let $f \subseteq g$ be a natural subfunction of g , and construct a circuit C that implements f . As f is bit-wise, we may w.l.o.g. assume that $n = 1$. If $f(\cdot) = \{1\}$, or $f(\cdot) = \{0\}$ or $f(\cdot) = \mathbb{B}_M$, let C be the circuit whose output register is driven by a CONST1- or CONST0-gate, respectively. Otherwise, we construct C as follows. Consider $f_B: \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \{\{0\}, \{1\}\}$ given by

$$f_B(x) = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \text{if } f(x) = \{0\} \text{ or } f(x) = \mathbb{B}_M, \text{ and} \\ \{1\} & \text{if } f(x) = \{1\}. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Construct C from AND-gates, one for each prime implicant of f_B , with inputs connected to the respective, possibly negated, input registers present in the prime implicant. All AND-gate outputs are fed into a single OR-gate driving the circuit’s only output register.

By construction, $C_1(x) \subseteq f_B(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{B}^m$. To see $C_1 \subseteq f$, consider $x \in \mathbb{B}_M^m \setminus \mathbb{B}^m$ and make a case distinction.

- (i) If $f(x) = \mathbb{B}_M$, then trivially $C_1(x) \subseteq f(x)$.
 - (ii) If $f(x) = \{0\}$, we have for all $x' \in \text{Res}(x)$ that $f(x') = f_{\mathbb{B}}(x') = \{0\}$ by (31). Thus, for each such x' , all AND-gate outputs are 0, entailing that for each AND-gate, there must be at least one input that is stable 0—otherwise, there would be some $x' \in \text{Res}(x)$ making one AND-gate output 1, resulting in $f_{\mathbb{B}}(x') = \{1\}$. By our definition of gate behavior, this entails that all AND-gates output 0 for all $x' \in \text{Res}_M(x)$ as well, and hence $C_1(x) = \{0\} = f(x)$.
 - (iii) If $f(x) = \{1\}$, all $x' \in \text{Res}(x)$ have $f(x') = f_{\mathbb{B}}(x') = \{1\}$ by (31). Thus, for each such x' , some AND-gate outputs 1, entailing that there must be an AND-gate for which all inputs are stable 1—otherwise, there would be some $x', x'' \in \text{Res}(x)$ differing in a single bit for which an AND-gate outputs 1 and 0, respectively, yet $f_{\mathbb{B}}(x') = f_{\mathbb{B}}(x'') = 1$; this contradicts the minimality of prime implicants. Hence, the OR-gate has at least one stable input 1, and $C_1(x) = \{1\} = f(x)$.
- Since f is closed, this case distinction is exhaustive and the claim follows. \square

Theorem 23 is useful for checking if a circuit implementing some function actually *exists*; its proof is even constructive. However, we obtain no non-trivial bound on the *size* of the respective circuit—covering all prime implicants can be costly. While efficient metastability-containing implementations exist [18], it is an open question (i) which functions can be implemented efficiently *in general*, and (ii) what the overhead for metastability-containment w.r.t. an implementation oblivious to metastability is.

7.2 Metastable Closure

We propose a generic method of identifying and creating functions implementable with simple registers. Consider a classical Boolean function $f: \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$ defined for stable in- and outputs only. Lift the definition of f to $[f]_M$ dealing with (partly) metastable inputs analogously to gate behavior in Section 2.2: Whenever all metastable input bits together can influence the output, specify the output as “anything in \mathbb{B}_M .” We call $[f]_M$ the *metastable closure of f* , and argue below that $[f]_M \in \text{Fun}_S$. For $f: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$, i.e., for more flexible specifications, $[f]_M$ is defined in a similar way.

Definition 24 (Metastable Closure). *For a function $f: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$, its metastable closure $[f]_M: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$ is defined component-wise for $i \in [n]$ by*

$$[f]_M(x)_i = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \text{if } \forall x' \in \text{Res}_M(x): f(x')_i = \{0\}, \\ \{1\} & \text{if } \forall x' \in \text{Res}_M(x): f(x')_i = \{1\}, \\ \mathbb{B}_M & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

The metastable closure generalizes to Boolean functions. For $f: \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$, we define $[f]_M: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$ as

$$[f]_M(x)_i = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \text{if } \forall x' \in \text{Res}(x): f(x')_i = 0, \\ \{1\} & \text{if } \forall x' \in \text{Res}(x): f(x')_i = 1, \\ \mathbb{B}_M & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

By construction, $[f]_M$ is bit-wise, closed, specific, and hence natural.

Observation 25. $[f]_M \in \text{Fun}_S$ for all $f: \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$ and for all $f: \mathbb{B}_M^m \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^n)$.

7.2.1 Showing what is Possible

An immediate consequence of Observation 25 for the construction of circuits is that, given an arbitrary Boolean function $f: \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$, there is a circuit without masking registers that implements $[f]_M$.

For $f: \mathbb{B}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$, Theorem 23 shows that $[f]_M$ is the minimum extension of f implementable with simple registers: by (31) any natural extension g of f must satisfy

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_M^m, \forall i \in [n]: \bigcup_{x' \in \text{Res}(x)} f(x')_i \subseteq g(x)_i, \quad (35)$$

and thus $\exists x', x'' \in \text{Res}(x): f(x')_i \neq f(x'')_i \Rightarrow g(x)_i = \mathbb{B}_M$ by (30).

7.2.2 Showing what is Impossible

In order to show that a function is not implementable with simple registers only, it suffices to show that it violates the preconditions of Theorem 23, i.e., that it has no natural subfunction.

Example 26. Consider $f: \mathbb{B}_M^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_M^2)$ with

$$f(x) = \text{Res}_M(x) \setminus \{\text{MM}\}. \quad (36)$$

This function specifies to copy a 2-bit input, allowing metastability to resolve to anything except MM. No circuit without masking registers implements $f: f \notin \text{Fun}_S$.

The recipe to prove such a claim is:

- (i) For contradiction, assume $f \in \text{Fun}_S$, i.e., that f has some natural subfunction $g \subseteq f$ by Theorem 23.
- (ii) By specification of f , the individual output bits of g can become metastable for input MM.
- (iii) Since g is bit-wise, it follows that $\text{MM} \in g(\text{MM})$.
- (iv) This contradicts the assumption that $g \subseteq f$.

Proof. Assume for contradiction $f \in \text{Fun}_S$, i.e., that f has a natural subfunction $g \subseteq f$ by Theorem 23.

As specified in (36), $f(00)_1 = \{0\}$ and $f(11)_1 = \{1\}$. Since $g \subseteq f$ and $g(x) \neq \emptyset$ because g is closed, we have $g(00)_1 = \{0\}$ and $g(11)_1 = \{1\}$. The fact that g is specific implies that $g(00)_1 \cup g(11)_1 \subseteq g(\text{MM})_1$, i.e., $\{0, 1\} \in g(\text{MM})_1$. This in turn means that $g(\text{MM})_1 = \mathbb{B}_M$, because g is closed. Furthermore, we know that g is bit-wise, so $g = g_1 \times g_2$ with $g_1(00) = \{0\}$, $g_1(11) = \{1\}$, and $g_1(\text{MM}) = \mathbb{B}_M$. Analogously, $g_2(00) = \{0\}$, $g_2(11) = \{1\}$, and $g_2(\text{MM}) = \mathbb{B}_M$.

Since g is bit-wise, $g(\text{MM}) = g_1(\text{MM}) \times g_2(\text{MM}) \ni \text{MM}$, but $\text{MM} \notin f(\text{MM})$, contradicting the assumption $g \subseteq f$. As we did not make any restrictions regarding g , this holds for all natural subfunctions of f . It follows that $f \notin \text{Fun}_S$. \square

8 Arithmetic Components

This section demonstrates the power of our techniques: We establish that a variety of metastability-containing components are a reality. Due to the machinery established in the previous sections, this is possible with simple checks (usually using Observation 25). The list of components is by no means complete, but already allows implementing a highly non-trivial application: a hardware implementation of the fault-tolerant clock synchronization algorithm of Lundelius Welch and Lynch [19].

We go into detail about clock synchronization — and the required components — in Section 8.1, argue that the right encoding is crucial in Section 8.2, and handle each digital component in Section 8.3.

8.1 Application: Clock Synchronization

We are the first to demonstrate the physical implementability of the fault-tolerant clock synchronization algorithm by Lundelius Welch and Lynch [19] with deterministic correctness guarantee, despite the unavoidable presence of metastable upsets. For n nodes, the algorithm (outlined in Section 1.2) tolerates $f < n/3$ faulty nodes. Our core strategy is a *separation of concerns*, compare Figure 1, between the analog and the digital part of the circuit:

- (i) Analog signals are measured with a TDC,
 - (ii) metastability-containing components ensure that the digital part of the circuit handles the partially metastable outcome of the conversion *without loss of precision*, and
 - (iii) the digital, still partially metastable, signals are converted to analog signals controlling an oscillator.
- Given Marino’s result [20], we find it highly surprising that this is possible. The key is that the digital part of the circuit can become metastable, but that metastability is *contained* and ultimately translated into *bounded* fluctuations in the analog world, not contradicting Marino.

In our implementation, each (clock synchronization) node does the following.

8.1.1 Step 1: Analog to Digital

First, we step from the analog into the digital world: the delays between remote pulses and the local pulse are measured with TDCs. The measurement can be realized such that at most one of the output bits, accounting for the difference between x and $x + 1$ ticks, is metastable.⁴

⁴We call this *precision-1*, and define it in Section 8.2.




Figure 9: Tapped delay line TDC. It is read as either $1^k 0^{n-k}$ or $1^k M 0^{n-k-1}$, i.e., produces at most one metastable bit and hence has precision-1.

TDCs can be implemented using tapped delay lines or Vernier delay line TDCs [12, 23, 24]; see Figure 9: A line of delay elements is tapped in between each two consecutive elements, driving the data input port of initially enabled latches. The rising transition of the remote clock signal fed into the delay line input then passes through the line, and sequentially sets the latches to 1; the rising transition of the local clock signal is used to disable all latches at once. After that, the delay line’s latches contain the time difference as (unary) Thermometer Code (TC). Choosing the propagation delays between the latches larger than their setup/hold times, we ensure that at most one bit is metastable, i.e., their status is of the form 1^*0^* or 1^*M0^* . The output is hence a precision-1 TC-encoded time difference.

A traditional implementation would use synchronizers on the TDC outputs. This delays the computation, and encourages stabilization, but does not enforce it. However, clock synchronization cannot afford to wait. Furthermore, we prefer guaranteed correctness over a probabilistic guarantee.⁵ Hence, we use metastability-containing arithmetic instead of synchronizers.

8.1.2 Step 2: Encoding

We translate the time differences into Binary Reflected Gray Code (BRGC), making storage and subsequent components much more efficient. The results are BRGC-encoded time differences with at most one metastable bit of precision-1.

In this step, metastability-containing TC to BRGC conversion is needed — discussed in Section 8.3.1.

8.1.3 Step 3: Sorting Network

A sorting network selects the $(f + 1)$ -th and $(n - f)$ -th largest remote-to-local clock differences (tolerating f faults requires to discard the smallest and largest f values).

This requires 2-sort building blocks that pick the minimum and maximum of two precision-1 BRGC-encoded inputs preserving precision-1 — we discuss this in Section 8.3.2; an efficient implementation is given in [18].

8.1.4 Step 4: Decoding and Digital to Analog

The BRGC-encoded $(f + 1)$ -th and $(n - f)$ -th largest remote-to-local clock differences are translated back to TC-encoded numbers. As discussed in Section 8.3.3, this can be done preserving precision-1, i.e., such that the results are of the form 1^*0^* or 1^*M0^* .

Finally, we make the step back into the analog world, again without losing precision: The two values are used to control the local clock frequency via a Digitally Controlled Oscillator (DCO). However, the DCO design must be chosen with care. Designs that switch between inverter chains of different length to modify the frequency of a ring oscillator cannot be used, as metastable switches may occur exactly when a pulse passes. Instead, we use a ring oscillator whose frequency is controlled by analog effects such as changes in inverter load or bias current, see e.g. [9, 22, 28]. While the at most two metastable control bits may dynamically change the load of two inverters, this has a limited effect on the overall frequency change and does not lead to glitches within the ring oscillator.

Carefully note that this gives a *guaranteed end-to-end uncertainty* of a single bit through all digital computations.

⁵Four nodes sampling at 1 GHz sample more than 10^{10} times per second; synchronizers cannot provide sufficiently small error probabilities when allocating 1 ns or less for metastability resolution [5].




Figure 10: Efficient TC-to-BRGC conversion.

8.2 Encoding and Precision

An appropriate encoding is key to designing metastability-containing arithmetic components. If, for example, a control bit u indicating whether to increase $x = 7$ by 1 is metastable, and x is encoded in binary, the result must be a metastable superposition of 00111 and 01000, i.e., anything in $\text{Res}(0\text{MMMM})$ and thus an encoding of any number $x' \in [16]$ —even after resolving metastability! The original uncertainty between 7 and 8 is massively amplified; a good encoding should *contain* the uncertainty imposed by $u = M$.

Formally, a *code* is an injective function $\gamma: [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^k$ mapping a natural number $x \in [n]$ to its encoded representation. For $y = \gamma(x)$, we define $\gamma^{-1}(y) := x$, and for sets X , $\gamma(X) := \{\gamma(x) \mid x \in X\}$ and $\gamma^{-1}(X) := \{x \mid \gamma(x) \in X\}$.

In this work, we consider two encodings for input and output: TC and BRGC. For the 4-bit (unary) TC we use $\text{un}: [5] \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^4$ with $\text{un}(1) = 0001$ and $\text{un}^{-1}(0111) = 3$; $\text{un}^{-1}(0101)$ does not exist. BRGC, compare Figure 10(a), is represented by $\text{rg}(x)$, and is much more efficient, using only $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ bits.

The presented modules make heavy use of BRGC. This makes them more involved, but they are exponentially more efficient than their TC-encoded counterparts in terms of memory (bearing the hope for smaller circuits as well), and avoids the amplification of uncertainties incurred by standard binary encoding.

We choose un and rg due to the property that in both encodings, for $x \in [k - 1]$, $\gamma(x)$ and $\gamma(x + 1)$ differ in a single bit only. This renders them suitable for metastability-containing operations. We revisit the above example with the metastable control bit u indicating whether to increase $x = 7$ by 1. In BRGC, 7 is encoded as 00100 and 8 as 01100, so their metastable superposition resolves to $\text{Res}(0\text{M}100)$, i.e., only to 7 or 8. Since the original uncertainty was whether or not to increase $x = 7$ by 1, the uncertainty is perfectly contained instead of amplified as above.

We formalize the notion of the amount of uncertainty in a partially metastable code word: $x \in \mathbb{B}_M^k$ has *precision- p* (w.r.t. the code γ) if

$$\max\{y - \bar{y} \mid y, \bar{y} \in \gamma^{-1}(\text{Res}(x))\} \leq p, \quad (37)$$

i.e., if the largest possible difference between resolutions of x is bounded by p . The precision of x w.r.t. γ is undefined if some $y \in \text{Res}(x)$ is no code word, which is not the case in our application.

8.3 Digital Components

In the following, we show that all metastability-containing components required for the clock synchronization algorithm outlined in Section 8.1 exist. As motivated above, the components have to maintain meaningful outputs in face of limited metastability; more precisely, we deal with precision-1 inputs due to the nature of TDCs (see Section 8.1.1). Note that this section greatly benefits from the machinery established in previous sections—in particular from Observation 25 which immediately shows which components exist.

8.3.1 Thermometer to Binary Reflected Gray Code

At the hand of the example circuit in Figure 10, we show how precision-1 TC-encoded data can be efficiently translated into precision-1 BRGC-encoded data. Figure 10(b) depicts the circuit that translates a 7-bit TC into a 3-bit BRGC; note that gate count and depth are optimal for a fan-in of 2. The circuit

can be easily generalized to n -bit inputs, having a gate depth of $\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$. While such translation circuits are well-known, it is important to check that the given circuit fulfills the required property of preserving precision-1: This holds as each input bit influences exactly one output bit, and, due to the nature of BRGC, this bit makes exactly the difference between $\text{rg}(x)$ and $\text{rg}(x + 1)$ given a TC-encoded input of $1^x M 0^{7-x-1}$.

8.3.2 Sorting Networks

It is well-known that sorting networks can be efficiently composed from 2-sort building blocks [1, 2], which map (x, y) to $(\min\{x, y\}, \max\{x, y\})$. We show that \max (and analogously \min) of two precision-1 k -bit BRGC numbers is implementable without masking registers, such that each output has precision-1. Observe that this is straightforward for TC-encoded inputs with bit-wise AND and OR for \min and \max , respectively. We show, however, that this is possible for BRGC inputs as well; an efficient implementation of the proposed 2-sort building block is presented in [18].

Lemma 27. *Define $\max_{BRGC}: \mathbb{B}^k \times \mathbb{B}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^k$ as*

$$\max_{BRGC}(x, y) = \text{rg}(\max\{\text{rg}^{-1}(x), \text{rg}^{-1}(y)\}). \quad (38)$$

Then $[\max_{BRGC}]_M \in \text{Fun}_S$ and it determines precision-1 output from precision-1 inputs x and y .

Proof. Since x and y have precision-1, $\text{rg}^{-1}(\text{Res}(x)) \subseteq \{a, a + 1\}$ for some $a \in [2^k - 1]$ (analogously for y w.r.t. some $b \in [2^k - 1]$). W.l.o.g. assume $a \geq b$ (the other case is symmetric), i.e., for all possible resolutions of x and y , the circuit must output $\text{rg}(a)$ or $\text{rg}(a + 1)$. By Definition 24 and the fact that $\text{rg}(a)$ and $\text{rg}(a + 1)$ differ in a single bit only, $[\max_{BRGC}]_M(x, y)$ has at most one metastable bit and precision-1. \square

An analogous argument holds for

$$\min_{BRGC}(x, y) = \text{rg}(\min\{\text{rg}^{-1}(x), \text{rg}^{-1}(y)\}). \quad (39)$$

8.3.3 Binary Reflected Gray to Thermometer Code

A BRGC-encoded number of precision-1 has at most one metastable bit: For any up-count from (an encoding of) $x \in [2^k - 1]$ to $x + 1$, a single bit changes, which thus can become metastable if it has precision-1. It is possible to preserve this guarantee when converting to TC.

Lemma 28. *Define $\text{rg2un}: \mathbb{B}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^{(2^k-1)}$ as*

$$\text{rg2un}(x) = \text{un}(\text{rg}^{-1}(x)). \quad (40)$$

Then $[\text{rg2un}]_M \in \text{Fun}_S$ converts its parameter to TC, preserving precision-1.

Proof. If x has precision-1, then $\text{rg}^{-1}(\text{Res}(x)) \subseteq \{a, a + 1\}$ for some $a \in [2^k - 1]$. Hence, $\text{un}(a)$ and $\text{un}(a + 1)$ differ in a single bit, proving the claim. \square

9 Conclusion

No digital circuit can reliably avoid, detect, or resolve metastable upsets. So far, the only known counter strategy has been to use synchronizers — trading time for an increased probability of resolving metastability.

We propose a fundamentally different method: It is possible to design efficient circuits that tolerate a certain degree of metastability in the input. This technique features critical advantages: (i) Where synchronizers decrease the odds of failure, our techniques provide deterministic guarantees, (ii) it saves the time required by synchronizers if all digital operations are metastability-containing, and (iii) even if metastability needs to be resolved eventually, one can still save time by allowing for stabilization *during* the metastability-containing computations. In light of these properties, we expect our techniques to prove useful for a variety of applications, especially in time- and mission-critical scenarios.

As a consequence of our techniques, we are the first to establish the implementability of the fault-tolerant clock synchronization algorithm by Lundelius Welch and Lynch [19] with deterministic correctness guarantee, despite the unavoidable presence of metastable upsets.

Furthermore, we fully classify the functions computable with circuits restricted to standard registers. Finally, we show that circuits with masking registers become computationally more powerful with each round, resulting in a non-trivial hierarchy of computable functions.

Future Work In this work, we focus on feasibility rather than efficiency. Reducing gate complexity and latency of circuits—as well as determining the complexity overhead of metastability-containing arithmetic in general—poses a variety of compelling research questions. Recently, promising results have been obtained for sorting networks [18].

Masking registers are computationally strictly more powerful than simple registers (Theorem 21). An open question is which metastability-containing circuits benefit from masking registers.

Our model does not capture clock gating, i.e., non-input registers are overwritten in every clock cycle. Hence, storing intermediate results in masking registers is pointless: Taking advantage of at most one read from an input masking-register becoming metastable does not apply to results of intermediate computations. It is an open problem whether this makes a difference in terms of computability.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Attila Kinali, Ulrich Schmid, and Andreas Steininger for many fruitful discussions.

References

- [1] M. Ajtai, J. Komlós, and E. Szemerédi. An $O(n \log n)$ sorting network. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1–9, 1983.
- [2] K. E. Batcher. Sorting networks and their applications. In *American Federation of Information Processing Societies, AFIPS*, pages 307–314, 1968.
- [3] S. Beer and R. Ginosar. Eleven ways to boost your synchronizer. *IEEE Transactions on VLSI Systems*, 23(6):1040–1049, 2015.
- [4] S. Beer, R. Ginosar, J. Cox, T. Chaney, and D. M. Zar. Metastability challenges for 65nm and beyond: simulation and measurements. In *Design, Automation and Test in Europe, DATE*, pages 1297–1302, 2013.
- [5] S. Beer, R. Ginosar, M. Priel, R. R. Dobkin, and A. Kolodny. The devolution of synchronizers. In *IEEE International Symposium on Asynchronous Circuits and Systems, ASYNC*, pages 94–103, 2010.
- [6] R. Belschner, J. Berwanger, F. Bogenberger, C. Ebner, H. Eisele, B. Elend, T. Forest, T. Führer, P. Fuhrmann, F. Hartwich, et al. Flexray communication protocol, 2003. EP Patent App. EP20,020,008,171.
- [7] J. A. Brzozowski, Z. Ésik, and Y. Iland. Algebras for hazard detection. In *ISMVL*, page 3, 2001.
- [8] J. A. Brzozowski and M. Yoeli. On a ternary model of gate networks. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-28(3):178–184, March 1979.
- [9] V. De Heyn, G. Van der Plas, J. Ryckaert, and J. Craninckx. A fast start-up 3ghz–10ghz digitally controlled oscillator for uwb impulse radio in 90nm cmos. In *European Solid State Circuits Conference*, pages 484–487, September 2007.
- [10] E. B. Eichelberger. Hazard detection in combinational and sequential switching circuits. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 9(2):90–99, March 1965.
- [11] R. Ginosar. Fourteen ways to fool your synchronizer. In *International Symposium on Advanced Research in Asynchronous Circuits and Systems, ASYNC*, pages 89–97, 2003.
- [12] C. Gray, W. Liu, W. Van Noije, J. Hughes, T.A., and R. Cavin. A sampling technique and its cmos implementation with 1 gb/s bandwidth and 25 ps resolution. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, 29(3):340–349, March 1994.
- [13] F. Huemer, A. Kinali, and C. Lenzen. Fault-tolerant clock synchronization with high precision. In *IEEE Symposium on VLSI, ISVLSI*, 2016.

- [14] D. A. Huffman. The design and use of hazard-free switching networks. *Journal of the ACM*, 4(1):47–62, January 1957.
- [15] D. J. Kinniment. *Synchronization and Arbitration in Digital Systems*. Wiley, 2008.
- [16] D. J. Kinniment, A. Bystrov, and A. V. Yakovlev. Synchronization circuit performance. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, 37(2):202–209, February 2002.
- [17] H. Kopetz and G. Bauer. The time-triggered architecture. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 91(1):112–126, 2003.
- [18] C. Lenzen and M. Medina. Efficient metastability-containing gray code 2-sort. In *IEEE International Symposium on Asynchronous Circuits and Systems, ASYNC*, 2016.
- [19] J. Lundelius Welch and N. A. Lynch. A new fault-tolerant algorithm for clock synchronization. *Information and Computation*, 77(1):1–36, 1988.
- [20] L. R. Marino. General theory of metastable operation. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 30(2):107–115, February 1981.
- [21] M. Mendler, T. R. Shiple, and G. Berry. Constructive boolean circuits and the exactness of timed ternary simulation. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 40(3):283–329, 2012.
- [22] T. Olsson and P. Nilsson. A digitally controlled pll for soc applications. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, 39(5):751–760, May 2004.
- [23] T. Rahkonen and J. T. Kostamovaara. The use of stabilized cmos delay lines for the digitization of short time intervals. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, 28(8):887–894, August 1993.
- [24] G. W. Roberts and M. Ali-Bakhshian. A brief introduction to time-to-digital and digital-to-time converters. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, 57-II(3):153–157, 2010.
- [25] C. L. Seitz. System timing. *Introduction to VLSI systems*, pages 218–262, 1980.
- [26] H. J. Veendrick. The behaviour of flip-flops used as synchronizers and prediction of their failure rate. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, 15(2):169–176, 1980.
- [27] M. Yoeli and S. Rinon. Application of ternary algebra to the study of static hazards. *Journal of the ACM*, 11(1):84–97, 1964.
- [28] J. Zhao and Y.-B. Kim. A 12-bit digitally controlled oscillator with low power consumption. In *51st Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, pages 370–373, August 2008.