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Abstract—This paper presents design trade-off and performance impacts of the amount of pipeline phase of control path signals in a wormhole-switched network-on-chip (NoC). The numbers of the pipeline phase of the control path vary between two- and one-cycle pipeline phase. The control paths consist of the routing request paths for output selection and the arbitration paths for input selection. Data communications between on-chip routers are implemented synchronously and for quality of service, the inter-router data transports are controlled by using a link-level congestion control to avoid lose of data because of an overflow. The trade-off between the area (logic cell area) and the performance (bandwidth gain) of two proposed NoC router microarchitectures are presented in this paper. The performance evaluation is made by using a traffic scenario with different number of workloads under 2D mesh NoC topology using a static routing algorithm. By using a 130-nm CMOS standard-cell technology, our NoC routers can be clocked at 1 GHz, resulting in a high speed network link and high router bandwidth capacity of about 320 Gbit/s. Based on our experiments, the amount of control path pipeline stages gives more significant impact on the NoC performance than the impact on the logic area of the NoC router.
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I. INTRODUCTION
Networks-on-Chips (NoC) is a bridge concept from System-on-Chip (SoCs) into Multiprocessor System-on-Chip (MPSoC). A SoC design approach uses sometimes more than one processing element (PE) to implement an integrated circuit for a certain system application. The PEs send messages to other PEs for sharing computational processes to complete tasks. A sophisticated communication structure is needed for inter-processor data exchange. Rather than using a bus for single communication among PEs, or using point-to-point communication, a concept of shared segmented communication infrastructures is proposed to support application-scalability.

Research studies with the Arteris NoC [1] have demonstrated the feasibility and advantages of NOCs over traditional bus-based architecture but have not focused on compatible communication standards. Computer bus-based communication architectures do not easily handle the real-time data flows associated with networking, telecommunication, and multimedia data streams [2]. On-chip networks will require the distinct challenges of providing functionally correct and reliable operation of interacting system-on-chip components [3].

The effectiveness of NoC platforms for MPSoCs is more and more significant when a huge number of PEs is used in the MPSoC. Therefore, NoCs enable promising concepts for the design of super-computers with multiprocessor cores. NoCs have also potential applications in integrated control systems, e.g. in automotive electronic control and entertainment systems. The NoC concept has potential to provide sustainable platforms and proposes a new paradigm in SoC architecture and multiprocessor systems [4].
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Inter switch/router data communication can be made also syn-
chronously. NoC prototypes that use asynchronous data communica-
tion are e.g. CHAIN [18], ASPIDA [19], MESCAL [20], PROTEO
[21], and ANoC [22]. MANGO [23] exhibits even an asynchronous
clock-less. In synchronous designs, global clock-trees are distributed,
which leads to electromagnetic interference effect and clock power
consumption. Asynchronous communication design is a promising
concept, but lacks of industrial standard tools support, especially with
respect to testability issues.

This paper is organized in the following sections. Section II shows
the related works and motivation of this work. Section III presents
the two proposed router architecture for the comparative study. The feature, microarchitectures and characteristics of the NoC
are presented in Section IV. Performance evaluations of the two
proposed router architecture are presented in Section V. The logic cell
area consumptions after gate-level synthesis using a logic synthesis
tool are exhibited in Section VI. Section VII concludes the work
by giving a brief description about the area and performance trade-off
of the two proposed architecture, as well as the next future of the work.

II. RELATED WORKS AND MOTIVATION

NoC architectures with inter-switch synchronous data communica-
tion have been presented by some NoC proposals e.g. by NOS-
TRUM [5], RAW [7], etc. Inter-switch data communication can
also be made by using asynchronous technique. Before the data
are transmitted from one link to another link, then they must be
propagated firstly through internal data paths of the switch (router).
The latency of the data propagation in the router is strongly dependent
on the number of data path and control path pipelines, as well as the
maximum data frequency of the router. Both aspects are related to
the microarchitecture of the router, and the feature size of the used
technology.

NoCs with TDM-based data transmission and scheduling use a cir-
cuit switching method which is naturally representing a synchronous
pipeline technique. This kind of data switching is used e.g. by
Æthereal NoC [14] and PNoC [8]. In the circuit switching technique, inter-
and intra switch data transmission can be controlled using a
handshaking mechanism, a link-level control mechanism or the
data is scheduled based on a time-division multiple access (TDMA)
mechanism.

In the Æthereal, a data can be switched in the next cycle after the
data has been buffered in an input Queue. This technique can be used
only if we can make sure that there will be no contention between
data that occurs during data communication by using the TDMA
mechanism. However, in order to guarantee the prerequisite condition,
a hard effort must be done in which a global network view is required
to develop a global network flow control. The required condition
can be formally found when the network flow control is develop at
design time. But, at runtime, the effort to realize the contention-free
condition is much harder.

The PNoC uses a handshaking mechanism to transfer data from
the input queue of a router to the next queue of a next router. The data
propagation in the internal data path and the link of the router is
delayed for a few cycle, because the master which sends a data must
wait for a few cycle to read the condition of the transmission and
acception validation signals from a slave which will receive the data.
This work uses the circuit switching technique but it is complemented
with a mechanism to control link level data transmission.

The work in [24] presents a low latency router that uses a two-stage
pipeline technique incorporating a look ahead routing and speculative
allocation. In the first stage, the router performs the look ahead
routing decision for the next hop, pre-selection of an optimal channel
for the incoming packet header. The actual flit transfer is essentially
split in two stages i.e., the preliminary semi-switch traversal through
the virtual channel selection and the decomposed crossbar traversal.
However, the 200 MHz data frequency of the router is lower than
our NoC router. Hence, the maximum bandwidth capacity of the link
and the NoC router is certainly lower than our NoC proposal.

We cannot present many examples of the data propagation in the
internal data paths of the router, because most of the NoC proposals
do not present it in detail. This paper presents not only the flexibility
of our NoC to make a runtime interconnect configuration, but also
presents the impacts of the data and control path signals over the
performance and logic cell area of a wormhole-switched network
on chip. Our NoC router uses a simple link-level control for inter-
switch data transmission and a simple request-acknowledge signals
to control data flow in the internal paths of the router. There is no other
work that investigates the trade-off between the performance and area
of the NoC router with different numbers of pipeline stages of its data
and control paths. We realize that our experiments are constrained only
for our router architecture. But, at least, this paper will exhibit the
results to readers the importance of considering the propagation of
data in the internal router to fulfill the bandwidth requirements.

III. ARCHITECTURAL SCHEMES FOR COMPARATIVE STUDY

Fig. 2(a) presents the architecture of a router architecture with 2-
cycle control path pipeline. As presented in the figure, signal paths
in crossbar area of the router are divided into data paths and control
paths. The data paths are signals presented in the figure connecting
the output ports of the Queue (Q) modules and the input ports of the
MIM (Multiplexor with ID-Management Unit) components. The Routing request (rr) control path signals are signals connecting the
output ports of the Routing Engine (RE) components and the input
ports of the Arbiter (A) components. The other control path signals
are the routing acknowledge (ra) signals connecting the output ports of the Arbiter units to the input ports of the Grant-Routing-
Acknowledge (G) units. For the sake of simplicity, the complete
crossbar interconnected signals are not presented in the figure. For
area efficiency purpose, the depth of FIFO queue is only 2 registers.

Timing diagram of the inter-router data transfer of the router
architecture is presented in Fig. 2(b). Data transmission from a link
(in cycle phase 1) at an input side (West input) of the router to another
link (in cycle phase 4) at the output side (East output) requires four
clock-cycle periods. Data outgoing from the Queue to the output port is delayed for two cycle periods. During these
phases, the control signals (routing-request and arbitration signals)
are pipelined in two stages. In the other words, the data flit is waiting
for routing phase (phase 2) made by the RE module and selection
phase (phase 3) made by the Arbiter unit. Hence, we call the router
prototype presented in Fig. 2 as the 2-cycle control-path pipeline
router architecture.

As an alternative architecture, a router with 1-cycle control path
pipeline is presented in Fig. 3(a). The main difference of the figure
with Fig. 2 is exhibited clearly. A new data path pipeline (register) is
given between the data output of the queue and the MIM module.
We rename the RE module to be REB (Routing Engine with a Data
Buffer). A data from the Queue module is stored in the cycle in a
register of the REB. At the same cycle, the routing mechanism is
made in the REB module. The routing direction is then forwarded to
the Arbiter module. Therefore, in this new architecture, each data
will be delayed for only one cycle period before it is sent to the
outgoing link. During this single cycle, the MIM is waiting for an
output selection (arbitration, in phase 3) signal made by the Arbiter.

The timing diagram of the alternative router architecture is pre-
sented in Fig. 3(b). If we compare the timing diagram with the
A. Packet Format and Routing Mechanism

1) Packet Format: The packet format used in the NoC is presented in Fig. 4. The 39-bit packet consists of a header flit followed by payload flits. The 32\textsuperscript{nd}–1\textsuperscript{st} bit are the data word. The 36\textsuperscript{th}–33\textsuperscript{rd} bits represent the ID-tag (Identity) bits, while the 39\textsuperscript{th}–37\textsuperscript{th} bits represent the type of the flits. The flit type can be a header, a data body, and the end of databody (the tail flit). A header flit contains source and target addresses of the message.

The 3D source and target address of the packet are asserted in the 3D NoC topology or hierarchical NoC. Each message is associated as single packet even if the size of the message is very large. It means that each unicast message will have only one header flit to find routing directions on each intermediate nodes. The payload data will then track the path set up by the header flit. Therefore, the terms “message” and “packet” used this paper have similar interpretation. The tail flit of each message has functionality to close the link reservation. Flits belonging to the same message will always have the same local identity number (ID-tag) to differentiate it from flits of other messages, when it passes through every communication link of the NoC. The ID-tag of each message will vary over different communication links in order to provide a flexible link setup and wire (link) sharing mechanism at runtime mode.

2) ID-based Routing Mechanism: Messages or packets in the NoC is routed based ID-tag. Each flit of the messages has a local ID-tag that is similar to the number of available ID slots on each communication link of the NoC routers. The local ID-tag is updated to manage ID slot allocation for messages which share the communication link and to allow message interleaving on the link. The left side of Fig. 5 presents how three messages which share the communication link and to allow message reservation. Flits belonging to the same message will always have a similar ID-tag on every communication link of the NoC routers. The right side of the Fig. 5 presents that the routing of NoC router consists of 15 ID slots.
Routing Engine computes a routing direction of the header flit. The routing direction is then stored in the routing table, exactly in the register number \( h \) in accordance with its ID-tag. In other words, the routing direction made the Routing Engine module is compressed, and the key used by databody or tail flits to open the compressed routing direction is the ID-tag. Therefore, flits belonging to the same message will always have the same local ID-tag on each outgoing port of the NoC routers. Alone with the ID-based routing mechanism, this ID-updating mechanism supports the flexible wire through-share methodology.

**B. Routing Algorithm and Crossbar Switch Structure**

The router prototypes implemented in this paper use a static XY or \( X \)-first routing algorithm. A message is routed firstly to \( X \)-coordinate direction (East or West) if \( x_{\text{offset}} = |x_{\text{target}} - x_{\text{source}}| > 0 \), and then to \( Y \)-coordinate direction (North or South) if \( y_{\text{offset}} = |y_{\text{target}} - y_{\text{source}}| > 0 \). Fig. 6(a) presents the turn model of the static XY routing algorithm for clockwise (upper) and counter-clockwise (bottom) turn models. The dashed lines and the solid lines represent the prohibited and the allowed turns. If the prohibited turns are implemented on the router as presented in Fig. 6(b), then it looks that the turns North-to-East, North-to-West, South-to-East and South-to-West are prohibited. Fig. 6(c) shows the crossbar interconnect structure of the switch/router based on the static XY routing algorithm.

**C. Simultaneous Parallel Crossbar Connection**

Our NoC can switch maximum \( N \) simultaneous crossbar interconnects in parallel. The \( N \) number depends on the number of I/O pairs in the router. This features is certainly not a new contribution in the NoC research area. However, we will present in this section, how the NoC performs such advantageous feature of a modern NoC router design with high bandwidth capacity. In line with the timing diagrams presented in Fig. 2(b) and in Fig. 3(b), three phases are needed to switch a data flit to an outgoing link after the flit has been buffered in an input queue. Fig. 7 presents graphical views (left side) and structural views (right side) of a five-simultaneous crossbar interconnection The five simultaneous connections are

1) **Routing-Request Phase:** After the flit is buffered and appears at the output port of the Queue, then in the next cycle phase, the RE module computes routing request bit signals and sends the signals to an Arbiter unit at the requested output port. Fig. 7(a) shows the graphical view and structural view of this phase.

2) **Request-Acknowledge Phase:** When the Arbiter units at the requested output ports detect the routing request signals, then each Arbiter sends back a grant or routing acknowledge signal to the RE component. At the same cycle the Arbiter unit sends also a selection signal to the MIM component. This phase is presented by Fig. 7(b).

3) **Output-Switching Phase:** The Arbiter responds the routing request signals by sending two signals as mentioned in phase IV-C2. The output selection signal determines a data from an input port that will be switched out to the outgoing port, and the routing acknowledge signal enables concurrently to read the data from the input port. Hence, in the next cycle, the considered data will be switched out from input ports to output ports as presented in Fig. 7(c).

**V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

**A. Traffic Scenario**

We use a transpose benchmark to evaluate the NoC performance over two alternative prototypes presented in Section In this scenario, a 4x4 mesh topology is selected. A processing element (PE) at node \((i, j)\) will send \( N \) number of flits (a message) to another PE at node \((j, i)\) (like matrix transpose operation). The message is then routed using the static XY routing algorithm presented in Section IV-B.

**Diagram:**

[Diagram of NoC with routing tables and crossbar connection]

**Figure 5:** ID-based routing organization.

**Figure 6:** (a) Turn models for static XY routing, (b) prohibited turns in the switch, and (c) crossbar connections of the mesh router.
Six internode data communication pairs are established in this scenario. An internode data communication is a pair of PE sending a message and a PE receiving the sent message. Communication 1 (Comm 1) is a communication pair between node (1,0) as data sender and (0,1) as the data acceptor. The communication pairs are represented as Comm 1((1,0) ⇔ (0,1)). The rest of the communication pairs are represented as Comm 2((2,0) ⇔ (0,2)), Comm 3((3,0) ⇔ (0,3)), Comm 4((2,1) ⇔ (1,2)), Comm 5((3,1) ⇔ (1,3)) and Comm 6((3,2) ⇔ (2,3)). Fig. 1 is helpful to overview the aforementioned scenario showing the (x, y) address of each processing element.

The (Register Transfer Level) RTL simulation is run in which six test pattern generators at the node (i, j) send various N numbers of flits to the destinations at the node (j, i). We use transfer latency measured in clock cycle metric to present the required number of clock cycles to transfer the last flit of each message from the data sender to the data acceptor. Each message injected from the sender nodes is encoded in such a way that it can be correctly identified at acceptor node, and can be differentiated from other message in the NoC. The data flits of each message are numbered in-order, so that it is easy for us to check whether any or some flits loose or are dropped in the NoC. The integrity of the message will be evaluated at the acceptance node by our test pattern evaluator units.

The main objective of the simulation is to check the quality of service provided by the router in such a way that all accepted data in the target nodes are equal to all data sent from the data sender node. We select the matrix transpose traffic scenario because the traffic pattern shows a potential data contention between certain considered traffics. The transpose traffics scenario under 2D 4x4 mesh NoC topology with static routing algorithm will present traffic patterns.
in such a way that one, two and three messages are contention to share the same communication links. Therefore, we can analyze the effect of the contentions over the NoC performance. We do not show other traffic scenarios, e.g. bit complement, bit reversal, butterfly, bit rotation or uniform traffic scenario, because they do not perform more traffic contentions than the transpose traffic.

B. Traffic Evaluation

When data flits are injected to the NoC under transpose traffic scenario, then the path of each sender–acceptor nodes is presented in Fig. 8. Data communications of Comm 1, Comm 2 and Comm 3 have to share the communication links of node (1,0) to node (0,0) and node (0,0) to node (0,1). Data communications of Comm 4 and Comm 5 must share the communication links of node (2,1) to node (1,1) and node (1,1) to node (1,2). While the Comm 6 has no contention with the other messages.

The performance evaluations of the two router prototypes are presented in Fig. 9. Variable numbers of flits are injected from the data sender nodes i.e., 250, 500, 1500, 2000, 2500, 3000, 3500 and 4000 flits per data producer node. In general, the figure shows that the transfer latencies of the tail flits of each message are increased linearly with the increased number of the flits from data sender nodes. The transfer latencies of the router prototype with 2-cycle control path pipeline are larger than the other router with 1-cycle control path pipeline.

This situation is actually can be prior estimated qualitatively when analyzing the timing diagram of both router prototypes presented in Section III. However, the impacts of the stage numbers of the pipelined control-path is quantitatively presented in Table I. It looks that the average communication rates can be increased about 1.5 times when the control path pipeline is reduced 1 cycle period by adding the new data buffer in the data path in parallel with the control path of the routing engine. In other words, the routing control path is made at the same overlapping cycle time with the new data buffer in the REB module (new data path pipeline).

The data communication rate of the Comm 6 presents the best data rate because this sender–acceptor communication pair has no contention with other messages to use the requested communication resources as presented in Fig. 8. Hence it enjoys the maximum bandwidth capacity of the links (about 0.5 flit per cycle). The rest communication pairs share the communication resources in the NoC. Hence, their data rates are lower than the Comm 6. The more messages share the same communication resources with other messages, the lower their data communication rates because the considered messages must share the maximum bandwidth capacity of the communication link. The data rates of Comm 4 for instance use only 50 % (about 0.25 flit per cycle) of the maximum bandwidth capacity of the links because the rest 50 % is shared for Comm 5.

Comm 3 presents the lowest data rates compared with the other data communication pairs. This sender–acceptor communication pair shares the West outgoing link connecting node (2,0) to node (1,0) with Comm 2. The Comm 3 alone with Comm 2 coming from East input port of the router node (1,0) shares the West outgoing link connecting node (1,0) to node(0,0) with Comm 1 injected from Local input port of the router node (1,0). The Comm 3 uses the smaller portion of the maximum bandwidth capacity of the West outgoing link connecting node (2,0) to node(1,0) because of two possible factors. Firstly, because a congestion phenomenon appears on the NoC, and secondly, because the flit-by-flit arbitration mechanism changes the selection instantly in every cycle although the requesting flit has not been selected to acquire the requested output port. Therefore, it has the lowest data communication rate compared with the other communication pairs. The longest path of the Comm 3 from the sender to the acceptor node affects also its communication rate.

VI. LOGIC CELL AREA EVALUATION

In order to analyze the trade-off between the logic area and the performances of our two alternative routers, this section will present the comparison of the total estimated logic cell areas between both routers. Table II exhibits the total cell areas using 130-nm standard-cell technology from Faraday Technology Corp. by utilizing Design Vision tool from Synopsys. The maximum data frequencies of both routers are similar. It seems that the router with 1-cycle control path pipeline has about 6.5 % area overhead over the other router prototype. Both router prototypes can be clocked at cycle-frequency of 1 GHz or in cycle-period of 1 ns (10^{-9}s).

If we reformulate the simulation result presented in Table I and the working frequency of the NoCs shown in Table II, then the average communication bandwidth of the sender–acceptor data communication can be calculated. If \( C_{\text{rate}} \) is the communication rate measured in \( fpc \) (flit per cycle), 1 flit consists of 1 Word or 4 Bytes, and \( F \) is the working frequency, then we can obtain the communication bandwidth \( C_{\text{bw}} \) of each sender–acceptor node i.e., \( C_{\text{bw}} = 4 \times F \times C_{\text{rate}} \). Table III shows the calculation results of each sender–acceptor data communication bandwidth measured in Mega-Byte per second.

Table IV shows also the direct comparison of each component in the routers. The MIM modules give the largest area contribution of the total area of the routers. The cell area of the MIM module is large because the ID-Management Unit that consists of ID slot tables (registers) is implemented in this module. The implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm 1</td>
<td>0.166 fpc</td>
<td>0.259 fpc</td>
<td>1.499 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 2</td>
<td>0.166 fpc</td>
<td>0.249 fpc</td>
<td>1.497 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 3</td>
<td>0.111 fpc</td>
<td>0.166 fpc</td>
<td>1.498 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 4</td>
<td>0.166 fpc</td>
<td>0.247 fpc</td>
<td>1.486 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 5</td>
<td>0.166 fpc</td>
<td>0.249 fpc</td>
<td>1.498 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 6</td>
<td>0.332 fpc</td>
<td>0.497 fpc</td>
<td>1.497 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comm.</th>
<th>2-cyc. ctrl. pipe.</th>
<th>1-cyc. ctrl. pipe.</th>
<th>Overhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm 1</td>
<td>0.077 mm²</td>
<td>0.082 mm²</td>
<td>6.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 2</td>
<td>1 GHz</td>
<td>1 GHz</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm 1</td>
<td>665 MB/s</td>
<td>997 MB/s</td>
<td>1.499 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 2</td>
<td>664 MB/s</td>
<td>995 MB/s</td>
<td>1.497 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 3</td>
<td>443 MB/s</td>
<td>664 MB/s</td>
<td>1.498 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 4</td>
<td>665 MB/s</td>
<td>988 MB/s</td>
<td>1.486 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 5</td>
<td>664 MB/s</td>
<td>995 MB/s</td>
<td>1.498 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm 6</td>
<td>1327 MB/s</td>
<td>1987 MB/s</td>
<td>1.497 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the slot tables consumes also a significant amount of logic cells. As shown in Table IV, the significant difference of the logic cell area is presented by the implementation of the Routing Engine modules of the routers. The REB module has larger area than the RE module because an additional register to store data is implemented alone with a routing state machine mechanism in the same module.

The router prototype with 1-cycle control path pipeline has also been implemented on 180-nm CMOS standard-cell technology from UMC (United Microelectronics Corporation). The circuit layout of the router is presented in Fig. 10. The left side of the figure presents the floorplanning result. The floorplan view presents the area allocation of each individual component at East (E), North (N), West (W), South (S) and Local (L) incoming and outgoing ports. While the right side figure shows the cell-placement and routing results. The circuit layout is designed using Silicon Encounter tool from Cadence.

Table V exhibits also the cell area of each component type in the router. The working frequency of the NoC prototype using the 180-nm technology is about 505 MHz.

### VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has presented the area and performance trade-off between two router prototypes having different numbers of pipeline stages in the routers. The first router prototype (2-cycle control path pipeline) has smaller logic cell area compared with the second

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>2-cyc. ctrl. pipe.</th>
<th>1-cyc. ctrl. pipe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbiter (A)</td>
<td>2127 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
<td>2042 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>45404 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
<td>44987 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFO Queue</td>
<td>17003 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
<td>16608 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Unit (G)</td>
<td>201 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
<td>195 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE/REQ</td>
<td>13094 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
<td>19041 $\mu$m$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Area (μm²)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbiter (A)</td>
<td>5397</td>
<td>2.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>130731</td>
<td>58.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFO Queue</td>
<td>43057</td>
<td>19.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Unit (G)</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE/REM</td>
<td>46113</td>
<td>20.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CELL AREA</td>
<td>225791</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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