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DISTRIBUTED ARITHMETIC (DA) is so named because the arithmetic operations that appear in signal processing (e.g., addition, multiplication) are not "lumped" in a comfortably familiar fashion ("Aha, there's the multiplier over there," etc.), but are distributed in an often unrecognizable fashion. The most-often encountered form of computation in digital signal processing is a sum of products (or in vector analysis parlance, dot-product, or inner-product generation). This is also the computation that is executed most efficiently by DA.

Our motivation for using DA is its extreme computational efficiency. The advantages are best exploited in circuit design, but off-the-shelf hardware often can be configured effectively to perform DA. By careful design one may reduce the total gate count in a signal processing arithmetic unit by a number seldom smaller than 50 percent and often as large as 80 percent.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF DISTRIBUTED ARITHMETIC

The first widely known description of DA was given at a presentation by Abraham Peled and Bede Liu on IIR digital filter mechanization in 1974 at the Arden House Workshop on Digital Signal Processing. Their work on both FIR and IIR digital filter mechanization was also published in the IEEE ASSP Transactions [1,2]. Earlier work (pre-1971) on DA had been performed in France by Croisier et al. [3]. The earliest documented work in the U.S. was done by Zohar [4,5,6], who had independently invented DA in 1968. Other early work in the United States was reported by Little [7]. From the Arden House description of DA, Bona and Terhan at Rockwell International designed an integrated-circuit DA compensator for control systems applications [8], and White generalized its control system application [9]. The April 1975 special digital-signal processing issue of IEEE Proceedings contained an article by Frenley on DA applications to the telephone system at Bell Laboratories [10] and an article by White on general vector dot-product formation using DA [11]. Later that year White et al. developed an AGM digital autopilot based on DA [12], Classen et al. at Philips in the Netherlands described communications systems applications [13], and Büttner and Schüessler at the University of Erlangen in Germany showed how to reduce the memory requirements [14]. In 1975, Kai-Ping Yiu at Hewlett-Packard showed a convenient rule for handling the sign bit [15]; H. Schröder of Siemens in Munich [16] and C.S. Burrus of Rice University [17] have given some suggestions and insight for speeding up the algorithms, and K. D. Kammeyer gave a survey/summary [18]. Mechanization studies on application of DA to digital filters were discussed by Burrus [19], Jenkins and Leon [20], Zeman and Nagel [21], Tam and Hawkins [22], Arjmand and Roberts [23] and White [24,25]. Kammeyer [26] and Taylor [27] have presented error analyses, Smith and White [28] have considered DA for coordinate transformations, and Burleson and Scharf have applied it to a rotator array [29]. Taylor applied DA to a Gray-Markel filter [30], and Zohar discussed a VLSI implementation of a correlator/filter [31]. DA is also discussed by Taylor in his text [32], in the text by Smith and Denyer [33], and by Mintzer in Elliott’s handbook [34].

TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF DISTRIBUTED ARITHMETIC

DA is basically (but not necessarily) a bit-serial computational operation that forms an inner (dot) product of a pair of vectors in a single direct step. The advantage of DA is its efficiency of mechanization. A frequently argued disadvantage has been its apparent slowness because of its inherent bit-serial nature. This disadvantage is not real if the number of elements in each vector is commensurate with the number of bits in each vector element, e.g., the time required to input eight 8-bit words one at a time in a parallel fashion is exactly the same as the time required to input (simultaneously on eight wires) all eight words serially. Other modifications to increase the speed may be made by employing techniques such as bit pairing or partitioning the input words into the most significant half and least significant half, the least significant half...
of the most significant half, etc., thereby introducing parallelism in the computation. This will be described in Section 4.

As an example of direct DA inner-product generation, consider the calculation of the following sum of products:

\[ y = \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k x_k. \]  \hfill (1)

The \( A_k \) are fixed coefficients, and the \( x_k \) are the input data words. If each \( x_k \) is a 2's-complement binary number scaled (for convenience, not as necessity) such that \(|x_k| < 1\), then we may express each \( x_k \) as

\[ x_k = -b_{0k} + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} b_{ nk} 2^{-n}, \]  \hfill (2)

where the \( b_{nk} \) are the bits, 0 or 1, \( b_{0k} \) is the sign bit, and \( b_{k,N-1} \) is the least significant bit (LSB).

Now let us combine Equations 1 and 2 in order to express \( y \) in terms of the bits of \( x_k \):

\[ y = \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k \left[ -b_{0k} + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} b_{ nk} 2^{-n} \right]. \]  \hfill (3a)

Equation 3a is the conventional form of expressing the inner product. Direct mechanization of this equation defines a "lumped" arithmetic computation. Let us instead interchange the order of the summations, which gives us:

\[ y = \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k b_{nk} \right] 2^{-n} + \sum_{n=1}^{K} A_k (-b_{0n}). \]  \hfill (3b)

This is the crucial step: Equation 3b defines a distributed arithmetic computation. Consider the bracketed term in Equation 3b:

\[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k b_{nk}. \]  \hfill (3c)

Because each \( b_{nk} \) may take on values of 0 and 1 only, expression (3c) may have only \( 2^k \) possible values. Rather than compute these values on line, we may precompute the values and store them in a ROM. The input data can be used to directly address the memory and the result, i.e., the \( \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k b_{nk} \), can be dropped into an accumulator. After \( N \) such cycles, the memory contains the result, \( y \).

As an example, let \( K = 4 \), \( A_1 = 0.72 \), \( A_2 = -0.30 \), \( A_3 = 0.95 \), and \( A_4 = 0.11 \). The memory must contain all possible combinations (\( 2^4 = 16 \) values) and their negatives in order to accommodate the term

\[ \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k (-b_{0n}). \]  \hfill (3d)

which occurs at the sign-bit time. As a consequence, we need to use a \( 2 \times 2^4 \) word ROM. Figure 1a shows the simple structure (with \( 2 \times 2^4 = 32 \) word ROM) that can be used to mechanize these equations; Table 1 shows the contents of the memory. The \( T_i \) signal is the sign-bit timing signal. We assume that the data on the \( x_1, x_2, x_3, \) and \( x_4 \) lines (which with \( T_i \) comprise the ROM address words) are serial, 2's-complement numbers. Each is delivered in a one-bit-at-a-time (1BAAT) fashion, with LSBs \( \{b_{k,N-1}\} \) first. The sign bits \( \{b_{0k}\} \) are the last bits to arrive. The clock period in which the sign bits all simultaneously arrive is called the "sign-bit time." During the sign-bit time the control signal \( T_1 = 1 \), otherwise \( T_1 = 0 \). For the moment we will assume essentially zero time delay between the time of arrival of the address pattern to the ROM and the availability of its output. The delay around the accumulator loop is assumed to be one clock cycle and is concentrated in the summer. Switch SWA remains in Position 1 except during the clock cycle that follows the sign-bit time, when it toggles for one clock cycle to Position 2, and the fully formed result is output.

We may reduce the memory size by half to a \( 2^k \) word ROM by modifying the adder to an adder/subtractor and using \( T_1 \) as the add/subtract-control line as shown in Figure 1b. This configuration may now be mechanized with a 16-word ROM. The stored table is simply the upper half of Table 1.

The memory size may be halved again to \( 2^k \) words. In order to understand how this works, we shall interpret (not convert, but just interpret) the input data as being cast not in a \( (0,1) \) straight binary code, but instead as being cast in a \( (-1,1) \) offset binary code. Suppose that we think of \( x_k \) as

\[ x_k = \frac{1}{2} [x_k - (-x_k)], \]  \hfill (4)

and remember that in 2's-complement notation the negative of \( x_k \) is written as

\[ -x_k = -b_{0k} + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} b_{nk} 2^{-n} + 2^{-(N-1)}. \]  \hfill (5)

where the underscore symbol indicates the complement of a bit. From Equations 2 and 5 we may rewrite Equation 4 as:

\[ x_k = \frac{1}{2} \left[ -(b_{0k} - \bar{b}_{0k}) + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (b_{nk} - \bar{b}_{nk}) 2^{-n} - 2^{-(N-1)} \right]. \]  \hfill (6)

In order to simplify our notation later, it is convenient to define the new variables

\[ c_{kn} = b_{nk} - \bar{b}_{nk} \quad n \neq 0 \]  \hfill (7)

and

\[ c_{0n} = -(b_{0n} - \bar{b}_{0n}) \]  \hfill (8)

where the possible values of the \( c_{kn} \), including \( n = 0 \), are \pm 1. Now (6) may be rewritten as

\[ x_k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} c_{kn} 2^{-n} - 2^{-(N-1)}. \]  \hfill (9)

By substituting (9) into (1) we obtain

\[ y = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} c_{kn} 2^{-n} - 2^{-(N-1)} \right] \]  \hfill (10)

\[ = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Q(b_{kn}) 2^{-n} + 2^{-(N-1)} Q(0) \]  \hfill (11)

where
\begin{equation}
Q(b_n) = \frac{a}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{A_i}{2} c_{ni} \quad \text{and} \quad Q(0) = \frac{a}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{A_i}{2}
\end{equation}

Notice that \(Q(b_n)\) has only \(2^{n-1}\) possible amplitude values with a sign that is given by the instantaneous combination of bits. This is consistent with our earlier claim.

The computation of \(y\) is mechanized using a \(2^{n-1}\)-word memory, a one-word initial condition register for \(Q(0)\), and a single parallel adder/subtractor with the necessary control-logic gates. This is shown in Figure 1c, using the \(8\)-word ROM, which contains the \(Q(b_n)\).

Notice from the memory values of Table 2 that those values in the lower half under "+Q" are the mirror image of the values in the upper half, but with the signs re-

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Input Code & \(b_{5n}\) & \(b_{3n}\) & \(b_{2n}\) & \(b_{1n}\) \tabularnewline
\hline
\hline
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{32-Word Memory Contents}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Input Code & \(b_{5n}\) & \(b_{3n}\) & \(b_{2n}\) & \(b_{1n}\) \tabularnewline
\hline
\hline
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{8-Word Memory Contents, Q}
\end{table}

Figure 1a. Adder and Full Memory

Figure 1b. Adder/Subtractor and Memory

Figure 1c. Adder/Subtractor and Reduced Memory

Figure 1. DA mechanization of \(y = A_1x_1 + A_2x_2 + A_3x_3 + A_4x_4\) for bit serial (1 BAAT) implementation.
versed. If we look at the bit patterns in the left-hand column, we discover that if we EXOR \( b_{in} \) with the remaining set of \( b_{2n}, b_{3n}, \) and \( b_{4n} \), we properly address the 8-word memory to pull out the correct values of \( Q \) ... except for the sign. By using the \( b_{ns} \) as the add/subtract control line for the accumulator input, we also now have the proper sign. During the sign-bit time the add/subtract command must be inverted. We therefore combine the \( b_{in} \) and \( T \) signals through an EXOR gate in order to derive the proper add/subtract control signal.

The initial-condition memory that contains the value \( Q(0) \) is shown on the extreme right side of Figure 1c. When the LSBs of the \( x_i \) are addressing the ROM, the value that is ... in with switch SWA. This artifact of the binary-offset system can be seen in Equation 11. Subsequent values from the ROM are summed with the shifted previous sum. As before, we assume zero time delay between the application of the addressing bits and the availability of the contents of the ROM. There is a clock period of delay through the parallel adder, and the switches SWA and SWB are in Position 2 only for the clock cycle following the sign-bit time when \( T = 1 \). During the first clock cycle, the first output from the ROM, \( Q(b_{n-1}) \), is summed with \( Q(0) \); during the second clock cycle it is right shifted and summed with \( Q(b_{n-2}) \) to produce \( Q(b_{n-1}) + (Q(b_{n-2}) + Q(0))2^{-1} \); during the third clock cycle it is again right shifted and summed with \( Q(b_{n-2}) \) to produce \( Q(b_{n-1}) + (Q(b_{n-2}) + Q(0))2^{-1} \); up to the \( N \)th clock cycle when we add \( Q(b_{n}) \) to the right shifted previously computed quantity to produce \( Q(b_{n}) + (Q(b_{n}) + Q(0))2^{-1} \).

**INCREASING THE SPEED OF DA MULTIPLICATION**

One can see that ingesting the data serially, 1BAAT, results in a slow computation. If the input words are \( N \) bits in length, \( N \) clock cycles or periods are required in which to form the dot product. On the other hand, the equivalent of \( K \) separate products are being formed. If, therefore, \( K > N \), the DA processor is faster than a single parallel multiplier/accumulator.

Additional speed may be bought in two ways; one at the expense of linearly increased memory plus more arithmetic operations, the other at the expense of exponentially increased memory. The speed may be increased by a factor of \( L \) by partitioning each input word into \( L \) subwords (\( L \) must be a factor of \( N \)). This effectively increases the dimension of the input vector by a factor of \( L \). We can use \( L \) times as many memories with an expanded-capacity accumulator for combining their results, or we can stay with a single memory, but its word capacity becomes \( \frac{1}{2} 2^{nL} \) and the lengths of the words grow by \( \log L \) bits. The first approach is obvious and is shown in Figure 2. The second is described below. Both are illustrated by example.

We seek a computationally simple means to introduce parallelism in the mechanization of Equation 11. The summation over \( n \) is next broken into two sums: the one over \( n \) sums from 0 to \((N/L)-1\), and the second one sums 1

![Figure 2. 2-Memory, 2 BAAT version of Figure 1C.](image-url)
from 0 to \( L - 1 \). Now Equation 11 becomes:

\[
y = 2^{-(N-1)}P_L + \sum_{n=0}^{(N-1)} P(n)2^{-(N-n)}
\]  

(13)

where

\[
P(b_k) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} A_k 2^{-L-n_k}
\]  

(14)

and

\[
P_{ic} = -2^{-L} \sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k
\]  

(15)

Only \( N/L \) rather than \( N \) clock times are required to form the inner product, therefore the reader can see that we have succeeded in increasing the speed of the computation by a factor of \( L \).

We can parametrically explore the issue further. The total number of bits to be loaded is \( NK \), and the number of clock periods required to read in these \( NK \) bits is \( N/L \) clocks. The number of input lines is

\[
P = \frac{\text{total bits in}}{\text{number of clock periods}} = \frac{NK}{N/L} = KL.
\]  

(16)

There may be a relative cost

\[
w = \frac{\text{importance of minimizing pins}}{\text{importance of minimizing time}} = \frac{(N/L)}{KL} = \frac{N}{KL^2}
\]  

(17)

We can solve this for \( L \), the number of bits at a time (per input variable) that we are trying to load:

\[
L = \sqrt{\frac{N}{wk}}.
\]  

(18)

The Gauss brackets tell us to round up to the next integer. DA is often most efficient when the number of input lines is commensurate with the number of clocks required to load the data, or equivalently, when \( w = 1 \). For our example

\[
\sqrt{\frac{N}{wk}} = \sqrt{\frac{16}{1 \cdot 4}} = 2;
\]  

(19)

therefore, the data will be input 2 BAAT. Of each input bit pair, we identify the most significant bit (MSB) and the least significant bit (LSB). For all values of \( L \), the gate at which the most significant bit appears receives special treatment. The \( T_e \) control signal is EXOR'd with the MSB for sign-bit time correction (because the sign bit is the MSB of the word). In Figure 3, we can see the configuration and also see that the LSB of the input pairs of \( x_i \) controls the add/subtract line.

In order to demonstrate the validity of the approach, let us reconstruct by the same rules the structure for \( L = 1 \), as shown in Figure 4. Because for \( L = 1 \), a 1BAAT serial input line for each \( x_i \) uses the same line for the sign bit as for all other bits, all \( T_e \) correction must be EXOR'd with all \( x_i \). The equivalence between Figures 1c and 4 should be easy for the reader to see because the ROM

---

**Figure 3.** Single-memory, 2 BAAT version of Figure 1c.
address line in Figure 4 that is driven by \( x_k \) (\( k = 2, 3, 4 \)) actually sees \( x_k \oplus T_x \oplus (T_x \oplus x_1) = x_k \oplus x_1 \). This is the same as in Figure 1c. The derivation of the A/S control lines is the same in both figures.

In Figure 5, we see a demonstration of an \( L = 4 \) design in order to show the structure. The memory cost is extremely great for such a small computation, but it is presented to illustrate the principle. Some more practical cases are shown below.

**APPLICATION OF DA TO A BIQUADRATIC DIGITAL FILTER (AN EXAMPLE OF VECTOR DOT-PRODUCT AND VECTOR-MATRIX-PRODUCT MECHANIZATION)**

A typical biquadratic digital filter has a transfer function of the form

\[
\frac{Y(z)}{X(z)} = \frac{A_0 + A_1 z^{-1} + A_2 z^{-2}}{1 + B_1 z^{-1} + B_2 z^{-2}}
\]

where the poles are determined by the \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \), and the gain and zeros are determined by the \( A_0 \), \( A_1 \), and \( A_2 \). The time-domain description is

\[
y_n = [A_0, A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2] [x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, y_{n-1}, y_{n-2}]^T
\]

where the coefficient vector is \([A_0, A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2]^T\) and the data vector is \([x_n, x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}, y_{n-1}, y_{n-2}]\). A direct DA mechanization of the filter is shown in Figure 6. Notice the extreme economy of this filter. This figure differs slightly from those that we have seen above. We have a 5-dimensional input vector to the addressing logic, but a scalar input, \( x_n \), and a scalar output, \( y_n \), for the processor.

We have added a pair of delays (the \( z^{-1} \) blocks) in the input-signal path so that we could develop the delayed signals, \( x_{n-1} \) and \( x_{n-2} \) from the input, \( x_n \), and we have added a third delay block so that we could develop the delayed output, \( y_{n-2} \), from \( y_{n-1} \). We obtain \( y_{n-1} \) from a parallel-to-serial register (P/S), since the output from the summer in the accumulator loop is a parallel word. The contents of the 16-word ROM are shown in Table 3. We may, of course, use parallelism to increase the speed, as was discussed in the previous section.

There is another important (because of low roundoff noise, low coefficient sensitivity and favorable limit-cycle behavior) form of digital filter (the normal form) that serves to illustrate the vector-matrix form of DA, and which we will now discuss. An excellent tradeoff study was recently presented by Barnes [35] to show how one could design a normal-form second order digital filter to meet prescribed performance criteria. In this section, an extremely efficient set of realizations is shown, one in which the speed and complexity can be effectively traded. (Much of the following is taken from References 36 and 37.)

A block diagram of the normal-form structure is shown in Figure 7. The multipliers \( b_1 \), \( b_2 \), \( c_1 \), and \( c_2 \) determine the pole locations of the filter. The input multipliers \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) are used to determine the input scaling and the multipli-
ers $a_n$, $d_i$, and $d_i$ to determine the zero locations of the filter. There are nine multipliers in total, as compared to the five that are required in the so-called direct mechanization. Barnes shows procedures whereby one may reduce this number of multipliers; however, we shall show how to eliminate them.

The vector matrix equation that describes the configuration of Figure 7 is given below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{u}_n &= \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & b_1 & c_1 \\ a_2 & b_2 & c_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_n & b_n & c_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{n-1} \\
\end{bmatrix} \\
\mathbf{v}_n &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_n \\
\end{bmatrix} \\
\mathbf{y}_n &= \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & d_1 & d_2 \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_n \\
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

The relationships between Equations 20 and 22 are

\[
\begin{align*}
A_0 &= a_0 \\
A_1 &= a_1 d_1 + a_2 d_2 - a_0(b_i + b_j) \\
A_2 &= a_3(b_i d_1 - c_i c_j) + a_4(c_i d_1 - b_i d_2) \\
&\quad + a_5(c_i d_1 - b_i d_2) \\
B_1 &= b_i + b_j \\
B_2 &= -b_i d_1 + c_i c_j.
\end{align*}
\]

There are three common inputs to each of the “clumps” of Figure 7; so, for each output, we need to store $\frac{1}{2} 2^3 = 4$
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Code</th>
<th>b_{n2} b_{n3} b_{n4} b_{n5}</th>
<th>Contents of 16-Word Memory, Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 0 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 1 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 1 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 1 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 0 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 0</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>-1(A_0 + A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. DA implementation of direct form of biquadratic digital filter (1 BAAT).

Figure 7. Normal form biquadratic filter organized into three clumps of identically driven inner products.
words. If the words that are stored are 16 bits long, then our three outputs together call for $3 \times 16 = 48$ bits per stored word. The total number of bits stored, however, is a modest $4 \times 48 = 192$. The somewhat detailed DA realization is illustrated in Figure 8. Notice how the addressing section has reduced to a pair of EXOR gates. The 4-word by 48-bit memory is shown for clarity as comprising three memories. In fact, the ROM may physically consist of three identically addressed 4-word by 16-bit memories or a single 4-word extended length (48-bit) memory. Each 16-bit output segment drives a separate accumulator loop, each with its own initial-condition register, just as we encountered earlier. The add/subtract control line is common, and the outputs of two of the accumulator loops are converted to serial form in their parallel-to-serial registers to be fed back to the memory addressing gates.

In order to simplify our subsequent development, it will be useful to redraw Figure 8 as shown in Figure 9. We can see the essence and utter simplicity of the structure, which is somewhat startling when one realizes that this is a realization of the 9-multiplier configuration of Figure 7.

Figure 10 shows a factor-of-four speedup over the circuit of Figure 9 by using the data 4 bits at a time (4BAAT). The parallel-to-serial registers shown do not output a serial data stream, but rather provide a sequence of four 4-bit wide segments. The time required to perform the filtering function has been reduced to 4 clock periods. This increase in speed demands that the ROM size be increased to $(2^4)^4 = 2048$ words. One would like to be able to make the throughput rate equal to the clock rate, rather than just a quarter of that rate. By quadrupling the memory of the configuration of Figure 10 and complicating the 3 adders, we can create a very fast but memory-hungry (8K word by 48 bit) filter structure that can perform the filtering function in a single clock period, as shown in Figure 11.

An alternate approach, which is shown in Figure 12, may be used in which eight ROMs are addressed by the three data streams, 2 bits at a time (2BAAT). Each memory is now a more modest $(2^2)^2 = 32$ words, $48$ bits for a total memory requirement of $8 \times 32 \times 48 = 12,288$ bits. The three adders are each of a complexity less than that of a 16-bit modified-Booth multiplier. In this approach, we have reduced the memory size at the expense of complicating the adders.

The outputs from the memories are 16 (or whatever,
say N, number of bits. In the shift-and-add process that occurs in the accumulators, the accuracy of the results degrades because of the least-significant bits that are lost through the trauma of quantization. Figure 13 illustrates the problem; as the data circulates through the accumulator loop, LSB's are lost at the shift stage. (These lost bits are often modeled as an additive error.) From the point in the filter that this error is introduced (the accumulator outputs), we follow them around the recursive loop of the filter and see the reinforcement addition that is the cause of noise gain within recursive filters. We will create a parallel error path, now, with error subtractions that will nearly cancel the error additions.

Figure 14 shows the state-space filter of Figure 7 with
noise sources (quantization effects) $\epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_2$, and $\epsilon_3$ added at the outputs of the accumulators. We have also added, within the dotted lines, noise-cancellation paths whose gains are shift approximations to the actual gains. This technique is known as error feedback and has long been used in DA filters [39]. We mechanize the noise cancellation paths by modifying Figure 8 as shown in Figure 15. Since at most the tilde-marked gains consist of a shift, those gains shown in Figure 15 are physically trivial. They feed a serial adder in which they are bit-by-bit combined with the initial conditions (ICs), then loaded into a serial-to-parallel register; that register now contains a chimerical initial condition, which includes the error feedback. If the entity within the dotted line of Figure 15 is redefined as the adder and parallel-to-serial register, then Figure 9 is valid for the error-feedback mechanization. If the adders that are fed by the ICs are L BAAT adders, then this structure can be generalized for use with structures that are shown in Figures 10–12.

APPLICATIONS IN TRANSFORMERS

DA has found important use in low-complexity, high-performance FFT structures [39, 40, 41]. The effective use
of DA in the mechanization of a simple, direct, high-performance complex multiplier has been the reason for its success in FFT applications, and has spurred additional work in the development of efficient complex multipliers [42]. The development path for complex multipliers took an interesting twist with the advent of radix-3 and radix-6 FFT's [43,44]. Their charm is that they give larger-radix multiplier-free building blocks that lead to increased efficiency in transform processing. By the simple expedient of turning to non-orthogonal coordinate systems for complex arithmetic, the resulting FFT structures [45] gave birth to a new complex multiplier [46] to perform the reduced number of "twiddles" on the interstage coupling. Image processing has turned to the discrete-cosine
Figure 13. Accumulator loop showing LSB being dropped out on the right shift operation.

Figure 14. State space digital filter showing roundoff noise sources and cancellation loops.
transform (DCT) for more efficient processing. There, again, DA has found a home [47, 48].

**NONLINEAR AND/OR NONSTATIONARY PROCESSING WITH DA**

We have only considered the use of DA in linear, time-invariant systems. It is not so restricted. For variable coefficients, we may use RAM's rather than ROM's. In fact, one of the trailblazers in this approach was Schroder [16].

In 1981 Cowan and Mavor [49] described an 8-tap adaptive transversal filter that employed DA, and in 1983 an expanded version was published by Cowan, Smith, and Elliott [50]. Andrews [51] compared it favorably in a mechanization study involving traditional and nontraditional arithmetic mechanizations of adaptive filters. The capacity of the DA adaptive structure can be increased by using block-processing concepts [52, 53].

The mechanization of nonlinear difference equations by DA was presented by Sicuranza in [54], who represented the filter by a truncated discrete Volterra series. Chiang et al. in [55] report the results of a mechanization trade-off study of various implementations of quadratic filters. They conclude that DA is as efficient as matrix decomposition implemented with systolic arrays, but that DA lacks the modularity.

Satisfactory DA adaptive nonlinear filters have been investigated and reported by Sicuranza and Ramponi [56], and by Smith et al. [57].

**CONCLUSIONS**

DA is a very efficient means to mechanize computations that are dominated by inner products. As we have seen, the coefficients of the equations can be time varying, and the equations themselves can be nonlinear. When a great many computing methods are compared, DA has always fared well, not always (but often) best, and never poorly. As a consequence, whenever the performance/cost ratio is critical (especially in custom designs), DA should be seriously considered as a contender.
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