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## Collect all the possible paths

Mitigation of the number of collected paths

| $\mathrm{X}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{z}_{1}$ | $3 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 1$ |
| $\mathrm{X}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{z}_{0}$ | $2 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 0$ |
|  | $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$ |
| $\mathrm{X}_{1} \rightarrow \mathrm{z}_{3}$ | $1 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 3$ |
|  | $3 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 3$ |
| $\mathrm{X}_{0} \rightarrow \mathrm{z}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 2$ |
|  | $2 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 2$ |

Collect all possible paths
that transfer

- $x_{3}$ to $z_{1}$
- $x_{2}$ to $z_{0}$
- $x_{1}$ to $z_{3}$
$x_{0}$ to $z_{2}$
Every $M_{i j}(i=0,1,2$ and
$j=0,1,2,3$ ) is represented by its index $j$.
The number of possible paths for each case is equal to the number of inputs $N=4$.
From every set of paths, one non-conflicting path should be selected.

1- The idea is to fix one path among $N=4$ paths associated to $\boldsymbol{x}_{3} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{z}_{1}$ (in this example $\mathbf{3} \rightarrow \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ ).
2- The paths with common multiplexer(s) with the fixed one are removed (to avoid conflicts). For example, for $x_{1} \rightarrow z_{3}$, the path $3 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 3$ is removed since the second multiplexer is in common with the fixed one.
3- The remaining set of paths are given to the solver Gecode [1] in order to select conflict-free paths.

## Solution with Gecode

1. Define a matrix of size $3 \times 3$

$$
\left[\begin{array}{lll}
a_{00} & a_{01} & a_{02} \\
a_{10} & a_{11} & a_{12} \\
a_{20} & a_{21} & a_{22}
\end{array}\right]
$$

2. Define domains for each row

Every row is associated to one transition: - first row $\left\{a_{00}, a_{01}, a_{02}\right\}$ is associated to transition $x_{2} \rightarrow z_{0}$
second row $\left\{a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}\right\}$ is associated to transition $x_{1} \rightarrow z_{3}$
third row $\left\{\mathrm{a}_{20}, \mathrm{a}_{21}, \mathrm{a}_{22}\right\}$ is associated to transition $\mathrm{x}_{0} \rightarrow \mathrm{z}_{2}$
Domains: $\left\{a_{00}, a_{01}, a_{02}\right\} \in\{\{2,2,0\},\{0,0,0\}$ $\{0,1,0\}\},\left\{a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}\right\} \in\{\{1,1,3\},\{1,0,3\}\}$ and $\left\{\mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{2 0}}, \mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{2 1}}, \mathrm{a}_{\mathbf{2 2}}\right\} \in\{\{0,0,2\},\{0,1,2\},\{2,2,2\}\}$
3. Define constraints on each column

In order to prevent any conflict in terms of multiplexer, the elements of each column should be disjointly different

More precisely, $a_{00} \neq a_{10} \neq a_{20}, a_{01} \neq a_{11} \neq a_{2}$ and $a_{02} \neq a_{12} \neq a_{22}$
4. Launch the constraint solver tool

After defining the matrix, the domains and the constraints. The constraint solver Gecode is ready to be launched. One possible solution is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\{a_{00}, a_{01}, a_{02}\right\} & =\{0,0,0\} \\
\left\{a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}\right\} & =\{1,1,3\} \\
\left\{a_{20}, a_{21}, a_{22}\right\} & =\{2,2,2\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Complexity Analysis

| $\boldsymbol{N}$ | Algorithm | Number of MUXs | Parallelism |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80 | Our model | 1664 | Unlimited |
|  | $[2]$ | 945 | Not possible |
|  | $[3]$ | 640 | Limited |
| 384 | Our model | 8704 | Unlimited |
|  | $[2]$ | 6273 | Not possible |
|  | $[3]$ | 3840 | Limited |

Even though the existing circular-shift rotation networks [2] and [3] require less number of Multiplexers (MUXs) when compared to our model, they cannot handle more than one set of elements with different lengths and different circular-shift rotation values.
Our model is able to handle such case which is a key point for high throughput rate architecture.

