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Abstract

Graph dominators provide a general mechanism for identifying re-converging paths in circuits. This is useful in a number of CAD applications including computation of signal probabilities for test generation, switching activities for power and noise analysis, statistical timing analysis, cut point selection in equivalence checking, etc. Single-vertex dominators are too rare in circuit graphs to handle re-converging paths in a practical way. This paper addresses the problem of finding double-vertex dominators, which occur more frequently. First, we introduce a data structure, called dominator chain, which allows representing all possible \(O(n^2)\) double-vertex dominators of a given vertex in \(O(n)\) space, where \(n\) is the number of vertices of the circuit graph. Dominator chains can be efficiently manipulated, e.g. it takes constant time to look-up whether a given pair of vertices is a double-vertex dominator. Second, we present an efficient algorithm for finding double-vertex dominators. The experimental results show that the presented algorithm is an order of magnitude faster than existing algorithms for finding double-vertex dominators. Thus, it is suitable for running in an incremental manner during logic synthesis.

1 Introduction

This paper considers the problem of finding dominators in circuit graphs. A vertex \(v\) is said to dominate another vertex \(u\) if every path from \(u\) to the output of the circuit contains \(v\) [1]. For example, in the circuit graph in Figure 1, vertex \(n\) dominates vertex \(e\); vertex \(p\) dominates vertex \(h\).

Dominators provide a general mechanism for identifying re-converging paths in circuits. If a vertex \(v\) is the origin of a re-converging path, then the immediate dominator of \(v\) is the earliest point at which such a path converges. For example, in Figure 1, the re-converging path originated at \(e\) ends at \(n\); the re-converging path originated at \(g\) ends at \(f\).

Knowing the precise starting and ending points of a re-converging path is useful in a number of applications including computation of signal probabilities for test generation, switching activities for power and noise analysis, statistical timing analysis, cut point selection in equivalence checking, etc.

The signal probability of a net in a combinational circuit is the probability that a randomly generated input vector will produce the value one on this net [2]. Efficient signal probability analysis allows to improve the coverage of test generation for biased random simulation. The average switching activity in a combinational circuit is the probability of its net values to change from 0 to 1 or vice versa. It correlates directly with the average power dissipation of the circuit [3], thus its analysis is useful for guiding logic optimization methods targeting low power.

Computation of signal probabilities and switching activities based on topologically processing the circuit from inputs to outputs and evaluating the gate functions generally produces incorrect results due to higher-order exponents introduced by correlated signals. For example, if the functions \(f\) and \(g\) have variables in common, then \(P[f \land g] \neq P[f] \cdot P[g]\), where \(P\) is the signal probability. Dominators provide the earliest points during topological processing at which the re-converging paths meet and thus the signals cease to be correlated. Therefore, the computation of signal probabilities and switching activities can be efficiently partitioned along the dominator points [4, 5, 6]. At the origin of a reconverging path, \(v\), an auxiliary variable is introduced. At the end of the path, the immediate dominator of \(v\), this variable is eliminated. As a result, the computation is carried out using a minimum set of variables.

Single-vertex dominators can be found in time linear in the number of vertices of the graph [7, 8, 9]. However, they are quite rare in circuits. It is more common that a vertex is dominated by a set of vertices. For example, in Figure 1, primary input \(b\) is dominated by the set \(\{e, h\}\). To be able to deal with re-converging paths in a practical way, an efficient algorithm for computing multiple-dominators of a small size is needed. Small size is important because usually \(2^k\) combinations of values of a \(k\)-vertex dominator have to be manipulated [4].

General algorithms for finding multiple-vertex dominators have exponential worst case complexity [10]. Multiple-vertex dominators of a fixed size \(k\) can be computed in \(O(n^k)\) time, where \(n\) is the number of vertices of the circuit graph [11]. This paper presents an algorithm for finding double-vertex dominators \((k = 2)\), which is significantly faster than the algorithm [11]. The efficiency of our algorithm is due to a number of interesting properties of double-vertex dominators. The most important one is that the set of all possible double-vertex dominators of a given vertex can be represented by a unique dominator chain of linear size which can be looked-up in constant time.

Being able to efficiently represent and manipulate all double-vertex dominators for a given vertex is important, because it makes the computation of common dominators easy. As we show in the paper, double-vertex dominators for a set of vertices can be derived from the dominator chains of individual vertices.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the notation. Section 3 summarizes the previous work. Sections 4 and 5 introduce the new data structure and the dominator algorithm, respectively. The experimental results are shown in Section 6.
Definition 1 A set of vertices \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \) is a common multiple-vertex dominator of size \( k \) for a set of vertices \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_l\} \subseteq V - \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \), if

1. every path from any \( u_j, p \in \{1, \ldots, l\} \), to root contains some \( v_i, i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \)

2. for every \( v_i \), there exists at least one path from some \( u_p, p \in \{1, \ldots, l\} \), to root which contains \( v_i \), and does not contain any other \( v_j, i,j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}, i \neq j \)

In the paper, we omit the word "common" when \( l = 1 \), i.e. when a set dominates a single vertex.

The second condition of the Definition 1 is needed to remove redundancies. For example, in Figure 1(a), all paths from \( e \) to \( f \) pass through the set of vertices \( \{j,n\} \). However, vertex \( j \) is redundant, because \( n \) is a single-vertex dominator of \( e \).

Note, that the notion of dominator is more general than the notion of min-cut in circuit partitioning [13]. A min-cut is required to dominate all vertices in its transitive fanin.

A number of properties are specific for multiple-vertex dominators. First, in single-vertex case, any vertex \( v \in V - \{\text{root}\} \), is dominated by at least one vertex, \( \text{root} \). Multiple-vertex dominators may not exist for some vertices. For example, a tree-like circuit does not have any multiple-vertex dominators. In a tree structure, the condition (2) of the Definition 1 is not satisfied for any subset \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}, k > 1 \), since the individual vertices \( v_i, i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \), dominate all vertices in their transitive fanins.

Second, the immediate \( k \)-vertex dominators are not unique for \( k > 2 \). We define immediate \( k \)-vertex dominators as follows.

Definition 2 The set \( W = \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \) is an immediate common \( k \)-vertex dominator of \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_l\} \), if \( W \) is a common \( k \)-vertex dominator of \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_l\} \) and there is no other common \( k \)-vertex dominator of \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_l\} \), \( W' \), such that each vertex of \( W' \) is either dominated by \( W \) or belongs to \( W \).

Figure 1 gives an example. Vertex \( b \) has two immediate 3-vertex dominators: \( \{e,l,m\} \) and \( \{h,j,k\} \). In Section 4 we show that immediate \( k \)-vertex dominators are unique for \( k = 2 \).

3 Previous Work

The problem of finding single-vertex dominators was first considered in global flow analysis and program optimization. Lorry and Medlock [12] presented an \( O(n^4) \) algorithm for finding all immediate single-vertex dominators in a flowgraph with \( n \) vertices. Successive improvements of this algorithm were done by Aho and Ullman [14], Purdom and Moore [15], and Tarjan [16], culminating in Lengauer and Tarjan’s [1] \( O(\alpha(e,n)) \) algorithm, where \( e \) is the number of edges and \( \alpha \) is the standard functional inverse of the Ackermann function which grows slowly with \( e \) and \( n \).

The asymptotic time complexity of finding single-vertex dominators was reduced to linear by Harel [7], Alstrup et al. [8] and Buchbaum et al. [9]. However, these improvements in asymptotic complexity did not contribute much to reducing the actual runtime. For example, the algorithm [9] runs 10% to 20% slower than Lengauer and Tarjan’s [1]. Lengauer and Tarjan algorithm appears to be the fastest of algorithms for single-vertex dominators on graphs of large size.

While it is possible to compute all single-vertex dominators in linear time, algorithms for finding all multiple-vertex dominators for a directed graph have exponential worst case complexity [10]. In [11], it was shown that it is possible to compute multiple-vertex dominators of a fixed size \( k \) in polynomial time. The algorithm presented in [11] finds the set of all possible \( k \)-vertex dominators for a circuit graph \( C = (V,E, \text{root}) \) by iteratively restricting \( C \) with respect to one of its vertices, \( v \in V \). The restriction is done by removing from \( V \) all vertices dominated by \( v \), \( S(v) \). Dominators of size \( k = 1 \) are computed for the resulting restricted graph \( C' = (V',E',\text{root}) \), with \( V' = V - S(v) \) and
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4 Dominator Chain

In this section, we introduce a data structure called dominator chain which allows representing all possible \( O(|V|^2) \) double-vertex dominators of a given vertex in \( O(|V|) \) space.

**Definition 3** For any \( u \in V \), the dominator chain \( D(u) \) is a vector of type

\[
\langle V_{11}, V_{21} \rangle, \langle V_{12}, V_{22} \rangle, \ldots, \langle V_{1m}, V_{2m} \rangle
\]

whose elements \( V_{ij} \) are vectors of vertices of \( V \). Every pair \( \langle V_{1j}, V_{2j} \rangle \) satisfies the following properties:

1. For every \( v \in V_{ij} \), there exists a matching vector \( W = \langle w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_s \rangle \), which is a sub-vector of the dominator chain \( D(u) \).

2. The immediate double-vertex dominator of \( u \) is the first elements of \( V_{11} \) and \( V_{21} \). For all \( i \in \{2, \ldots, m\} \), the immediate common double-vertex dominator of the last elements of \( V_{1j-1} \) and \( V_{2j-1} \) is the first elements of \( V_{1j} \) and \( V_{2j} \). There is no common double-vertex dominator of the last elements of \( V_{1m} \) and \( V_{2m} \).

3. No pair \( \langle V_{1j}, V_{2j} \rangle \), \( j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \), can be partitioned into two pairs \( \langle V_{ij_1}, V_{2j_1} \rangle \) and \( \langle V_{ij_2}, V_{2j_2} \rangle \), where \( V_{ij_1} \cup V_{ij_2} = V_{ij}, V_{2j_1} \cup V_{2j_2} = V_{2j}, V_{ij_1} \cap V_{2j_2} = \emptyset \), which satisfy properties 1 and 2.

As an example, consider the circuit shown in Figure 2. The set of all double-vertex dominators for \( u \) is: \( \{a, b, e, c, d, e, c, d, \} \), \( \{b, c, d, \} \), \( \{b, c, d, e, c, d, g, \} \), \( \{k, l, \} \), \( \{m, n, \} \).

The dominator chain for \( u \) is

\[
\langle V_{11}, V_{21} \rangle, \langle V_{12}, V_{22} \rangle, \langle \{a, e, h\}, \{b, c, d, g\} \rangle, \langle \{k, m, \} \rangle, \langle \{l, n\} \rangle \rangle
\]

The matching vector \( W \) of any vertex \( v \) in the dominator chain contains all vertices \( w \) such that \( \{v, w\} \) is a double-vertex dominator of \( u \). In Figure 2, the matching vector for vertex \( a \) is \( \{b, c, d\} \); the matching vector for \( d \) is \( \{a, e, h\} \).

To prove that the dominator chain contains all possible double-vertex dominators of a vertex, we first show several fundamental properties of double-vertex dominators. Let \( \text{Dom}(u) \) denote the set of all possible double-vertex dominators of \( u \). The first Lemma says that, if two dominators have a vertex in common, then one of them dominates the non-common vertex of the other one.

**Lemma 1** If \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \) and \( \{v_3, v_4\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \), then either \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(v_3) \) or \( \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(v_1) \).

**Proof:** Suppose \( v_3 \) is not dominated by \( \{v_1, v_2\} \). Since \( \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \), there exists a path from \( u \) to \( \text{root}, p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \), which contains \( v_3 \) and does not contain \( v_2 \). Since \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \), \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \) contains \( v_1 \). Furthermore, \( \text{v1} \) precedes \( v_3 \) in \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \), because, by assumption, \( \{v_1, v_2\} \notin \text{Dom}(v_3) \) and thus there exists a path \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow \text{root}} \), which does not contain neither \( v_1 \) nor \( v_2 \).

The part \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \) of the path \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \) does not contain \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \). Each path \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow \text{root}} \) contains either \( v_1 \) or \( v_3 \), because otherwise the existence of the path \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \), \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow \text{root}} \) would contradict \( \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(v_1) \). Thus, by Definition 1, \( \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(v_1) \). Similarly, we can show that \( \{v_1, v_2\} \notin \text{Dom}(v_1) \) implies \( \{v_1, v_2\} \notin \text{Dom}(v_3) \).

The second Lemma covers the case of two dominators with no vertices in common.

**Lemma 2** If \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \) and \( \{v_3, v_4\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \), such that at least one of the vertices of \( \{v_1, v_2\} \) is not dominated by \( \{v_3, v_4\} \) and vice versa, then either

\[
\{v_1, v_4\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \quad \text{or} \quad \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(u)
\]

**Proof:** Suppose that \( \{v_1, v_4\} \notin \text{Dom}(v_1) \) and \( \{v_1, v_2\} \notin \text{Dom}(v_2) \). Then, there exists a path \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow \text{root}} \) which does not contain neither \( v_3 \) nor \( v_4 \). Also, there exists a path \( p_{v_2 \rightarrow \text{root}} \) which does not contain neither \( v_1 \) nor \( v_2 \). Two cases are possible: (1) there is a path \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2} \); (2) there is no such path.

**case 1:** (a) Suppose that \( v_1 \) precedes \( v_2 \) in \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2} \). Then, all paths from \( u \) to \( v_1 \) contain \( v_3 \), since \( \{v_3, v_4\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \) and \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow \text{root}} \) exists. Thus, every path \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \) containing \( v_3 \) contains \( v_1 \) as well. Since \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \), this implies that \( \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \).

(b) Suppose that \( v_4 \) precedes \( v_1 \) in \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2} \). Then, all paths \( p_{u \rightarrow v_4} \) contain \( v_2 \), which is the last vertex in \( \text{Dom}(u) \) and \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \) exists. Thus, each path \( p_{u \rightarrow \text{root}} \) contains \( v_4 \) as well. Since \( \{v_3, v_4\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \), this implies that \( \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \).

**case 2:** If there is no path \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2} \), then, similarly to (a), every path \( p_{v_1 \rightarrow \text{root}} \) containing \( v_1 \) should contain \( v_3 \) as well. Since \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \), this implies that \( \{v_2, v_3\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \).

Consider vertices \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \). Two cases are possible: (1) there exists a path \( p_{v_2 \rightarrow v_3} \); (2) there is no such path.

**case 1:** (a) Suppose that \( v_2 \) precedes \( v_3 \) in \( p_{v_2 \rightarrow v_3} \). Then \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(v_3) \) implies that \( v_1 \) is a single-vertex dominator of \( v_3 \). Thus, \( \{v_3, v_4\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \) implies that \( \{v_1, v_4\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \).

(b) Suppose that \( v_1 \) precedes \( v_2 \) in \( p_{v_2 \rightarrow v_3} \). Then \( \{v_3, v_4\} \notin \text{Dom}(v_3) \) implies that \( v_3 \) is a single-vertex dominator of \( v_2 \). Thus, \( \{v_1, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \) implies that \( \{v_4, v_2\} \in \text{Dom}(u) \).
The dominator chain exists for any $u \in V$. Let $D(u)$ be the dominator chain of $u$. For every vertex $u$, the immediate double-vertex dominator of $u$ is uniquely defined. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the over-all number of vertices $\sum_{j=1}^{m} |V_{ij}|$ is smaller than the longest path from $u$ to root.

For vertices with no double-vertex dominators, e.g. root, the dominator chain is an empty vector.

The following Lemma shows that different vectors $V_{ij}$’s of a dominator chain do not intersect.

**Lemma 3** Any two distinct vectors $V_{ij}$ and $V_{kl}$ in the dominator chain do not have vertices in common:

$$V_{ij} \cap V_{kl} = \begin{cases} V_{ij} = V_{kl}, & \text{if } i = k \text{ and } j = l, \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $i, k \in \{1, 2\}$, $j, l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$.

It follows from Lemma 3 that the dominator chain can be represented in an $O(|V|)$ space. To make possible constant-time look-up in the dominator chain $D(u)$, three parameters are assigned to vertices:

- For all $v \in V$: $flag(v) \in \{1, 2\}$, distinguishing whether $v$ belongs to $V_{1j}$ or to $V_{2j}$.
- For all $v \in D(u)$: $index(v) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |V_{ij}|\}$ indicating the position of $v$ in the vector $\{V_{1j}, V_{2j}, \ldots, V_{mj}\}$, $i = flag(v)$.
- By Lemma 3, $index(v)$ uniquely defined (up to permutation of vectors $V_{1j}$ and $V_{2j}$ in the pairs $\{V_{ij}, V_{kj}\}$).

In the example in Figure 2, $index(b) = 1$, $index(c) = 2$, $index(l) = 5$ and $index(n) = 6$.

For all $v \in D(u)$: a pair $(\min(v), \max(v) = (\text{index}(v_1), \text{index}(v_{wj}))$, where $v_1$ and $w_{wj}$ are the first and the last vertices of the matching vector $W$ of $v$. In the example in Figure 2, $(\min(b), \max(b)) = (1, 1)$, $(\min(c), \max(c)) = (1, 3)$, $(\min(d), \max(d)) = (1, 3)$ and $(\min(n), \max(n)) = (3, 3)$.

Then, checking whether $\{v_1, v_2\}$ dominates $u$ can be done as follows:

1. Check whether $flag(v_1)$ is not equal to $flag(v_2)$. If yes, go to step 2. Otherwise, $\{v_1, v_2\} \notin D(u)$.

2. Check whether $\min(v_1) \leq index(v_2) \leq \max(v_1)$. If yes, the $\{v_1, v_2\} \in D(u)$. Otherwise, $\{v_1, v_2\} \notin D(u)$.

For example, suppose we check whether $\{d, h\}$ dominates $u$ in the example in Figure 2. Vertex $d$ is in $V_{21}$, therefore $flag(d) = 2$. Vertex $h$ is in $V_{21}$, i.e. $flag(h) = 1$. Since $flag(d) \neq flag(h)$, we continue to step 2. We have $\min(d) = d, \max(d) = 3$ and $index(d) = 2$. Since $1 \leq 2 \leq 3$ holds, we conclude that $\{d, h\}$ dominates $u$.

As another example, let us check whether $\{g, a\}$ dominates $u$. On step 1, $flag(g) = 2$ and $flag(a) = 1$. Since $flag(g) \neq flag(a)$, we continue to the step 2. We have $\min(g) = g, \max(g) = 3$, and $index(g) = 1$. Since $3 \leq 1 \leq 3$ does not hold, we conclude that $\{g, a\}$ does not dominate $u$.

The problem of computing common double-vertex dominators for a set of vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$ can be transformed to the problem of computing double-vertex dominators for a single vertex using the following technique. We add a “fake” vertex $u$ as a predecessor of $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$. Clearly, each $\{v_1, v_2\} \in D(u)$ is a common dominator for the set $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$ as well. Thus, Definition 3 can be extended to the set of vertices $D(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k)$. A small modification that the first elements of $V_{1j}$ and $V_{2j}$ represent the immediate common double-vertex dominator of the set $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k$. Similarly, all presented theorems and lemmata can be extended to common double-vertex dominators.

Dominator chain $D(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k)$ can be computed directly from the dominator chains of individual vertices $D(u_i)$ in $O(k \cdot \min(|D_{\min}|, |D_{\max}|, \ldots, |D_{\max}|)$ time, $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

5 Dominator Algorithm

The presented algorithm takes as its input a Boolean circuit $C = (V, E, root)$ and a vertex $u \in V$. It returns the dominator chain $D(u)$. The pseudo-code is shown in Figure 3.
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vector dominator for the maximum possible flow is equal to the capacity of the min-cut through a vertex. According to min-cut maxflow theorem [17], idom algorithm dominators of DoubleIDom used to direct possible path construction only. An augmenting path and uses it to increase the maximum flow. At from the sources to the sink [17]. The algorithm repeatedly seeks w \in V_h with index(w) = min(v); W = \{w\}; V' = V - \{v\}; E' = E - \{(y,v) | y \in V - \{v\}\};

while l do
   idom(w) = SINGLEIDOM(w,V',E',root); if idom(w) = root do
      return W;
   else
      W = APPEND(W,idom(w));
      w = idom(w);
   return l;
end

algorithm UpdateIndex (i,W)
Find ith element of W, v_i; if index(v_i) is not defined
   index(v_i) = UpdateIndex(i-1,W) + 1;
return index(v_i);
end

Figure 4: Pseudo-codes of UpdateChain, FindMatchingVector and UpdateIndex.

AddVector(V_{idk},a,W,v) modifies V_{idk} to accommodate the matching vector W of v as a part of it. Then, indexes of vertices of V_{idk} are updated by the function UpdateIndex(V_{idk},V_{idk}) (Figure 4). Besides, AddVector assigns \{(\min(v),\max(v)) = (\index(v_1),\index(w_{1_k})) \} in V_{idk}, where w_1 and w_{1_k} are the first and the last elements of W, respectively. Further, for all w_i, i \in \{1,\ldots,|W|\}, the value a assigned to flag(w_i), and the values of \min(w_i) and \max(w_i) are updated as follows:

1. \min(w_i) is assigned the minimal of values \{\min(w_i), \index(v)\},
2. \max(w_i) is assigned the maximal of values \{\max(w_i), \index(v)\},
3. if \min(w_i) and \max(w_i) are not defined yet, \min(w_i) and \max(w_i) are set to (\index(v), \index(v)).

Next, the dominator chain is updated. UpdateChain applies FindMatchingVector(v,V_{idk},root) to find the matching vector for v which is ith element of V_{idk}. The resulting vector is added to V_{idk} using AddVector.

FindMatchingVector(v,V_{idk},root) works as follows. First, we look-up V_{idk} to find a vertex w with index(w) = min(v). Such a vertex w always exists. This vertex becomes the first element of W. Then, we compute the immediate single-vertex dominator of w for the restricted circuit C' = (V',E',root), with V' = V - v and E' = E - \{(y,v) | y \in V - \{v\}\}. By restricting the circuit we exclude from consideration all paths from u to root (root is local to FindMatchingVector(v,root)) which contain v. The computed idom(w) together with v is a double-vertex dominator for u, thus idom(w) is appended to the end of W. While-loop continues until the local root is reached.

When the current pair \{V_{idk},V_{2k}\} is updated for all vertices, it is added to D(u) as next element. When root is reached, DominatorChain terminates by returning the resulting dominator chain D(u) for u.
Table 1: Benchmark results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alu2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apx</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmb</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comp</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cordic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>des</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frg2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>5628</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frg</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>3298</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rot</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>4647</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>4603</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Experimental Results

This section compares the performance of the presented algorithm to the algorithm [11]. Table 1 summarizes the results for 30 largest benchmarks from IWLS’02 benchmark set. Columns 1, 2 and 3 show the name of the function, the number of primary inputs and primary outputs, respectively. Column 5 shows the total sum of double-vertex dominators which dominate at least one primary input. This number is the same for the presented algorithm and the algorithm [11], because they both compute all possible double-vertex dominators for a given vertex. For a comparison, we also show in Column 4 the total sum of single-vertex dominators which dominate at least one primary input, computed using Lengauer and Tarjan’s algorithm [11]. In both cases, common dominators are counted only once. Every output is treated as a separate function. The numbers shown in Columns 4 and 5 are the total sum for all outputs of the circuit.

Columns 7 and 8 show runtime, in seconds, measured using the Unix command `time` (user time). The experiments were performed on a PC with a 650 MHz Pentium 3 CPU and 256 MByte main memory. One can see that, on average, the presented algorithm is 27 times faster than the algorithm [11].

Some circuits may have less double-vertex dominators than single-vertex ones (C2670, des). Usually these are circuits with many single-vertex dominators. Recall that the definition of multiple-vertex dominator excludes redundancies. Therefore, in the extreme case of a tree-like circuit with n vertices “N single doms” would be n and “N double doms” would 0. No pair of vertices in a tree-like circuit satisfies the Definition 1.

7 Conclusion

This paper has two main contributions. First, we introduce a data structure for representing double-vertex dominators, which has a linear size and can be efficiently manipulated. Second, we design an algorithm for finding double-vertex dominators, which is, on average, an order of magnitude faster than the algorithm [11]. The speed of the presented algorithm makes it suitable for running in an incremental manner during logic synthesis.

Future work includes exploring new applications of the presented algorithm, e.g. statistical timing analysis.
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