# **Floating Point CORDIC-based Architecture for Powering Computation**



Joshua Mack, Sam Bellestri, Daniel Llamocca jmack2545@email.arizona.edu sdbellestri@crimson.ua.edu

llamocca@oakland.edu



#### Abstract

This work presents an architecture for powering computation in floating point arithmetic that is based on an expanded hyperbolic CORDIC algorithm, where the user can select the 2-D domain of convergence that suits their application. The fully parameterized hardware implementation allows us to explore trade-offs among design parameters (numerical format, number of iterations), resource usage, accuracy, and execution time. We carry out an exhaustive design space exploration and generate Pareto-optimal realizations in the resource-accuracy space. Our approach allows us to select optimal hardware realizations that meet or exceed accuracy requirements.

#### **Setup and Design Space Exploration**

В	EW	FW	Min	Мах	Dyn. Range	A complete design
16	6	9	$9.313 \times 10^{-10}$	$4.291 \times 10^{9}$	373 dB	space exploration was
20	6	13	$9.313 \times 10^{-10}$	$4.295 \times 10^{9}$	373 dB	performed by varying
24	7	16	$2.168 \times 10^{-19}$	$1.845 \times 10^{19}$	759 dB	parameters such as
28	7	20	$2.168 \times 10^{-19}$	$1.845 \times 10^{19}$	759 dB	number representation
32	8	23	$1.175 \times 10^{-38}$	$3.403 \times 10^{38}$	1529 dB	and number of
36	9	26	$3.455 \times 10^{-77}$	$1.158 \times 10^{77}$	3071 dB	iterations. The floating
40	9	30	$3.455 \times 10^{-77}$	$1.158  imes 10^{77}$	3071 dB	noint formats tested are
44	9	34	$3.455 \times 10^{-77}$	$1.158 \times 10^{77}$	3071 dB	listed to the left. Each
48	10	37	$2.983 \times 10^{-154}$	$1.341 \times 10^{154}$	6153 dB	
52	10	41	$2.983 \times 10^{-154}$	$1.341 \times 10^{154}$	6153 dB	given format was tested
56	11	44	$2.225 \times 10^{-308}$	$1.798 \times 10^{308}$	12318 dB	with $M = 5$ , and N from
60	11	48	$2.225 \times 10^{-308}$	$1.798 \times 10^{308}$	12318 dB	8, 12,, 52.
64	11	52	$2.225 \times 10^{-308}$	$1.798 \times 10^{308}$	12318 dB	

# **Key Contributions**

- **Design Space Exploration** •
- **Pareto-Optimal Realizations based on accuracy and** ۲ resource usage
- Fully customizable architecture validated on an FPGA •

# **Methodology and Architectures**

Hyperbolic CORDIC provides two modes of operation (rotation and vectoring) that allow for the direct computation of  $\cosh x$ ,  $\sinh x$ ,  $tanh^{-1} x$ , and  $e^x$ . By combining the identities  $\ln(x) = 2 \tanh^{-1} \frac{x-1}{x+1}$  and  $x^{y} = e^{y \ln(x)}$ , we can calculate  $x^{y}$ . The expanded hyperbolic CORDIC algorithm is given by:

For 
$$i \le 0$$
:  
 $X_{i+1} = X_i + \delta_i Y_i (1 - 2^{i-2})$ 



#### Table 1 : Floating Point Formats Tested

CORDIC does not converge for all values of x and y.

If chosen values of x and y are bounded by the given corresponding curve for a chosen value of M, the expanded CORDIC algorithm will converge.

In our testing, we choose a range of test points evenly distributed within this range for M = 5.



**Figure 3: Range of Convergence Plot for** *x*<sup>*y*</sup>

 $maxval^2$ For our accuracy metric, we use PSNR, defined as  $PSNR(dB) = 10 \log_{10} \frac{1}{2}$ 

## Results

The execution times in Table 2 and the number of slices in Figure 5 are for a Xilinx® Zynq-7000 XC7Z010-1CLG400 SoC running at 125 MHz.

The Pareto front shows the optimal





2. Load  $x_0 = y_0 = 1/A_n$  and  $z_0 =$  $y \ln x$  onto the CORDIC engine in **Figure 1 : Expanded Hyperbolic CORDIC** Architecture.



hardware profiles for our  $x^{y}$ architecture.

We note that 44 bits with 32 iterations provides the highest accuracy at the expense of a large amount of resource usage. In addition, we consider the Pareto point circled in blue to have too poor of accuracy to be considered.

As a result, the case of 28 bits with 16 iterations provides the smallest hardware implementation that gives a usable architecture at the expense of lower accuracy.

If we restrict to accuracy  $\geq 100 dB$ , 32 bits with 20 iterations provides the implementation with minimum resources.

Figure 4 :  $x^{y}$  Architecture - Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) vs. Number of iterations.



Table 2: Execution Time  $(\mu s)$  vs N for x<sup>y</sup> Architecture.



Figure 5:  $x^{y}$  Resources vs. PSNR with Pareto Front

## Conclusion

A fully parameterized floating point iterative architecture for  $x^{y}$  was presented and thoroughly validated. Floating point arithmetic features high accuracy and large dynamic range at the expense of resources. The expanded CORDIC approach allows for customized bounds on the domain of  $x^{y}$ . We extracted the Pareto-optimal set of architectures from the multi-objective design space. Further work will explore other



#### This work was sponsored in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under award number EEC-1263133.