Modeling and Evaluating Errors Due to Random Clock Shifts in Quantum-Dot Cellular Automata Circuits

Faizal Karim · Marco Ottavi · Hamidreza Hashempour · Vamsi Vankamamidi · Konrad Walus · André Ivanov · Fabrizio Lombardi

Received: 8 December 2007 / Accepted: 7 August 2008 / Published online: 18 September 2008 © Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2008

Abstract This paper analyzes the effect of random phase shifts in the underlying clock signals on the operation of several basic Quantum-dot Cellular Automata (QCA) building blocks. Such phase shifts can result from manufacturing variations or from uneven path lengths in the clocking network. We perform numerical simulations of basic building blocks using two different simulation engines available in the QCADesigner tool. We assume that the phase shifts are characterized by a Gaussian distribution with a mean value of $i\frac{\pi}{2}$, where *i* is the clock number and a standard deviation, σ , which is varied in each simulation. Our results indicate that the sensitivity of building blocks to phase shifts depends primarily on the layout while the reliability of all building blocks starts to drop once the standard deviation, σ exceeds 4°. A full adder was simulated to analyze the operation of a circuit featuring a combination of the building blocks considered here. Results are consistent with expectations and demonstrate that the carry output of the full adder is better able to withstand the phase shifts in the clocking network than

M. Ottavi is currently with Advanced Micro Devices Inc. This work done when the author was with the ECE Department of Northeastern University, Boston MA.			
V. Vankamamidi is currently with EMC Corporation.			
Responsible Editors: C. Bolchini and YB. Kim			
F. Karim (⊠) · K. Walus · A. Ivanov			

Department of ECE, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z4 e-mail: faizalk@ece.ubc.ca

M. Ottavi · H. Hashempour · V. Vankamamidi · F. Lombardi Department of ECE, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA the *Sum* output which features a larger combination of the simulated building blocks.

Keywords Quantum-dot cellular automata (QCA) • Clocked QCA • Emerging nanotechnologies • Phase shift

1 Introduction

The feature size of conventional field-effect transistors (FET) has been consistently decreasing in an attempt to increase device density and operating frequency of computing circuits. Today, transistors with gate lengths below 50 nm are fabricated and exhibit excellent electrical characteristics [5]. This trend has resulted in an exponential growth in the integration level of electronic chips captured in the well known Moore's law [25]. The architectural and fundamental limits to this growth have been revised several times to account for new technologies. Novel technological concepts based on nano-devices and nano-electronics are projected to play a significant role in future systems [8, 30]. Quantum-dot cellular automata (QCA) is a paradigm in which an array of cells, each electrostatically interacting with its neighbors, is employed in a locally interconnected manner to implement general purpose digital circuits [13]. Research into a physical realization of OCA using coupled quantum dots [1, 2, 16, 18, 27, 32, 34], nanomagnets [4, 10–12, 28, 40], or various molecular structures [14, 15, 19-23, 29] is ongoing. In practice, a system to clock individual cells is required for QCA operation, this involves additional wiring for clock distribution and field generation. While

Fig. 1 a The four phases of the QCA clock used to control information flow in the QCA circuit. b Implementation of clock waveform in QCADesigner as a clipped sinusoid



defect tolerance and testing of QCA circuits has been addressed in the past [24, 31, 33], little attention has been paid to variations in the required clock network and its implications on QCA circuit operation. A comprehensive review of QCA can be found in [36–38].

We employ "zone clocking" in this paper, where all the cells in a design are grouped into one of four available clocking zones; each cell in a particular clocking zone is connected to one of the four available phases of the QCA clock shown in Fig. 1a.

The clock signals act to pump information throughout the circuit as a result of the successive latching and unlatching of cells connected to the different clock phases. Cells latch to a polarization, P, that is driven by the state of neighboring cells and the strength of the electrostatic interaction to those cells [17]. Within the zone clocking scheme, each group of cells connected to a particular phase of the clock can be considered as a D-latch [39]. When the clock value is low, the cells in that clocking zone will become latched (i.e., switch to $P = \pm 1$) and hold their value until the clock is relaxed (or unlatched), at which point the cell will have P =0 and remain in this state until the clock returns to its low value once again, independent of changes in the polarization of cells in neighboring clocking zones. An example of a binary wire using zone clocking is shown in Fig. 2, where the different clocking zones are represented with different shades of gray. We will use



Fig. 2 QCA wire shown with cells and schematic representation. C0, C1, C2, C3 are the four phases of the clock. Each of the clocking zones maps to a numbered D-latch in the circuit representation

this gray scale to represent the different clocking zones throughout this paper.

2 Contribution

In this paper, we present the results of numerical simulations of QCA building blocks in the presence of random phase variations in the individual clock signals. It is well known that process variations in thickness, alignment, and width do occur in deep sub-micron conventional technologies. These can lead to unexpected variations in resistance, capacitance, and inductance [26]. Clock trees and networks used for field generation and switching in QCA circuits are susceptible to such variations, particularly because of high-speed switching and aggressive scaling of clock lines due to the inherently small size of QCA cells. The current simulation tools enable us to explore the effect of clock phase on the correct operation of QCA circuitry to determine how sensitive these circuits are to these phases. These results will enable us to develop upper bounds on acceptable phase variations which can be used to assess the feasibility of the QCA paradigm.

3 Method

In this section, we present our method of characterizing the different QCA building blocks. The goal of the simulations is to reproduce a random variation in the phase of the clock signals delivered to the different clocking zones and to evaluate its impact on the functional behavior of the building blocks. The simulation algorithm is summarized as follows:

 For each of the QCA building blocks considered in this work, we generate simulation results for the circuit without introducing any phase shifts. The output traces of these simulations are first digitized and then used to automatically compare against simulations with phase shifts in order to determine if the circuits continue to operate correctly.

- 2. A batch simulation with 1,000 samples is executed using a random variable, X, to represent the possible phase shifts. The random variable X is characterized by a Gaussian probability distribution function with mean value $\mu = i\frac{\pi}{2}$, where *i* is the clock number and standard deviation, σ .
- 3. The percentage of successful circuits is recorded. Success is judged based on the ability of the simulated circuit to reproduce the digitized output trace from step 1.
- 4. Step 2 is repeated for increasing values of σ .

Our objective is to obtain the percentage of successful circuits as a function of σ so that we can determine at what value the reliability of QCA circuits begins to drop in the presence of these clocking phase variations. The chosen interval, $\sigma \in (0, 45^\circ)$, with a step of 2.25° is used.

3.1 Building Blocks of QCA Circuits

The tested QCA building blocks are divided into wires shown in Fig. 3 (straight-wire and L-shaped wire), logical devices shown in Fig. 4 (inverter and majority gate), and branches shown in Fig. 5 (fanout with two and three outputs). To date, the crossover implementation in QCA remains an open discussion as various proposed architectures including coplanar crossover [9, 35], robust coplanar crossover [3] and multi-layer crossover [9] have all been discussed in recent years. However, none of these schemes provides a fully feasible fabricatable solution to wire crossings. Moreover, recent work has considered the use of logical crossing and gate duplication [6, 7] to avoid physical crossovers in QCA circuits thus suggesting that it may



Fig. 3 Simulated QCA building blocks: a straight-wire, b L-shaped wire



Fig. 4 Simulated QCA building blocks: a inverter, b majority gate

be possible to avoid wire crossings altogether. Given the uncertainty associated with the implementation of wire crossings in QCA, coplanar crossing and any other crossover schemes are not considered in this paper.

3.2 Simulation Setup

Simulations were conducted using both the bistable (time-independent) and coherence vector (time-dependent) simulation engines available in QCADesigner [38] to determine if the behaviour is dependent on the particular choice of model. Both models use the Hartree–Fock approximation which takes an *N*-cell system and decouples it into a set of *N* single-cell subsystems that are assumed to interact classically through expectation values without any quantum mechanical coherence between them [37]. The advantage of using this approximation is that it is only necessary to solve $N 2 \times 2$ Hamiltonians as opposed to one $2^N \times 2^N$



Fig. 5 Simulated QCA building blocks: a Fanout with two outputs, b Fanout with three outputs

Hamiltonian for an *N*-cell system. This allows large circuits, which would otherwise be intractable using a full quantum mechanical model, to be simulated on a classical computer [36]. The QCADesigner tool was extended to provide a batch simulation mode in which each individual simulation was executed with a random phase shift added to each of the clock signals. Cell sizes of 2 nm were used throughout with a dielectric constant, ϵ_r , selected to be 1.

3.2.1 Clock Optimization

A set of batch simulations were performed on each of the six building blocks to determine optimal values for both the clock high, C_H , and clock low, C_L , parameters. These values, shown in Fig. 1b, play an important role in the circuit in that they determine the strength of the latched and relaxed state of the cell. The larger C_H , the more relaxed a cell will be and the less likely it is to perturb any neighboring cells. Conversely, the smaller the C_L value, the more latched a cell will be and the less likely it is to be perturbed by any of its neighboring cells. The results of these simulations are shown in Figs. 6, 7, 8 and 9. 500 batch simulations were performed on each building block for the worst-case scenario ($\sigma = 45^{\circ}$), and then the number of successes were plotted versus the different C_H and C_L values as shown in Figs. 6 and 8. The C_H and C_L values were are shown in multiples of the kink energy, E_k , which describes the interaction between cells. For the 2 nm cells and dielectric constant used in these simulations, the E_k was found to be 0.293 eV for nearest neighbors. The average number of successes for each C_H and C_L value over the number of devices was calculated (Figs. 7 and 9) and then used to determine the optimal values for both simulation engines. We select the optimal value to be the C_H and C_L value that produces the highest average number of successes.

From Figs. 6, 7, 8 and 9, the simulated QCA building blocks behave similarly under both the bistable and coherence vector simulation engines with respect to the various C_H and C_L values with the exception that the bistable simulation engine produces higher success rates. Figures 6a and 8a show that the optimal C_H value lies at around $1.585E_k$ ($\approx 0.465 \text{ eV}$) for both simulation engines since the largest number of successes occur at this C_H value. Values smaller than $1.585E_k$ J may not allow a cell to fully unlatch—allowing it to perturb neighbouring cells in spite of its "relaxed" state. Ideally, large C_H values are desired because as the C_H value approaches infinity, the cells in that clocking zone will have P = 0. However, once random phase shifts are introduced into the clock, a clocking zone may enter a relaxed state before the next one has the opportunity to fully latch—creating a gap in the flow of information. In such cases, it is helpful to keep a C_H value slightly lower such that the cells in the relaxed zone retain some residual polarization (weak on-state) that can be used to perturb the neighbouring cells. Further work needs to be done to fully understand the mechanisms involved.

Figures 6b and 8b show that for a QCA circuit to function correctly, the C_L value must be smaller than $0.25E_k$ (≈ 0.073 eV). Larger values do not allow the cells to fully latch and hence the circuit will be unable to propagate the signal forward. While the results shown in Fig. 7b suggest that there exists no one optimal C_L value for the bistable engine, Fig. 9b shows that a C_L value of $0.25E_k$ provides, on average, the largest number of successes for the coherence vector simulation engine. Thus we select $0.25E_k$ as the value for C_L in both simulation engines.

3.2.2 Simulation Parameters

All simulations are performed at a temperature T = 1 K to minimize the influence of thermal noise. A relaxation time $\tau = 1.11 \times 10^{-16}$ s, a time step $t_{\text{step}} = 1.11 \times 10^{-18}$ s, and simulation time $t = 1.11 \times 10^{-12}$ s, were used in the coherence vector simulation engine to ensure that the solver converged, while the "radius of effect" parameter, which describes how far the simulator will look for neighboring cells, was kept at 200 nm in order to encapsulate the entire circuit. All other parameters were kept at their default values. A summary of the simulation parameters is shown in Table 1.

4 Simulation Results

The following two sets of simulations were performed:

- *Building Block Level:* Each of the six building blocks described in Section 3.1 were simulated individually using the Bistable and Coherence Vector simulation engines. Results are shown in Figs. 10 and 11.
- *Circuit Level:* A full adder circuit, created with several of the underling building blocks, was also simulated. The full adder circuit layout is shown in Fig. 15. Simulation results appear in Fig. 16.



Fig. 7 Average number of successes for the considered OCA building block vs. the C_H and C_L values using the bistable simulation engine. A C_H value of $1.585 E_k$ is optimal while any value smaller than $0.25 E_k$ provides a working value for \bar{C}_L



Fig. 9 Average number of successes for the considered QCA building block vs. the C_H and C_L values using the coherence vector simulation engine. A C_H value of $1.585 E_k$ is optimal while $0.25 E_k$ provides an optimal value for C_L





(a) Average Number of Successes vs Clock High



(b) Average Number of Successes vs Clock Low

Ek

Ek

Ek

Table 1 Simulation parameters

	Bistable engine	Coherence vector
Temperature	N/A	1 K
Relaxation time	N/A	1.11×10^{-16} s
Time step	N/A	1.11×10^{-18} s
Duration	N/A	$1.11 \times 10^{-12} \text{ s}$
Clock high	0.465 eV	0.465 eV
Clock low	0.073 eV	0.073 eV
Clock shift	0 J	0 J
Clock amplitude factor	2	2
Radius of effect	200 nm	200 nm
Relative permittivity	1.0	1.0
Layer separation	1.15 nm	1.15 nm
Algorithm	N/A	Euler
Number of samples	12,800	N/A
Convergence tolerance	0.001	N/A
Max iterations per sample	100	N/A

5 Discussion

5.1 Building Blocks

The results shown in Figs. 10 and 11 show that both simulation engines produce the same general trends, confirming that the behavior of the individual building blocks is not dependent on the choice of model. The figures also show that there appears to exist a threshold value of σ before which the probability of success for all building blocks is 100%. For the bistable engine, this σ value is 4°, and for the coherence vector engine,

_

3.5°. While this threshold value is common to all considered building blocks, the decrease in success rate as a function of σ is different for each individual building block output. This particular characteristic allows us to classify the outputs of each building block into distinct groups based on their ability to tolerate phase variations in the clocking network. For instance, the Fanout2 (F2), Fanout3 (F1) and Fanout3 (F2) building block outputs demonstrate the most dramatic decrease in success rate which is indicative of a high sensitivity to phase variation. This is discussed in further detail in Section 5.1.2.

Fig. 10 Success rates for building blocks versus standard deviation of phase shift for bistable simulation engine. In-lay figure was generated by simulating for σ $\in (0, 5^{\circ})$ in increments of 0.5°



Fig. 11 Success rates for building blocks versus standard deviation of phase shift for coherence vector simulation engine. In-lay figure was generated by simulating for $\sigma \in (0, 5^{\circ})$ in increments of 0.5°



5.1.1 Fault Analysis

Faults due to random phase shifts in the clock can manifest themselves in one of two ways. They can result in either an unwanted delay or an inversion at the primary outputs. The delays occur because the clocking zone to which the output is connected latches out of sequence, propagating the information either sooner or later than expected. These delays can often be masked at the output if an unwanted inversion were to occur at the same time and cause us to incorrectly identify a faulty circuit as functional. Thus, it is critical that the input pattern be selected appropriately such that no such false positives occur. Here, the test sequence $\{0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1\}$ is selected for all QCA building blocks featuring a single input, and $\{000, 100, 110, 010, 011, 001, 101, 111\}$ for the majority gate and full adder. These test sequences ensure that the values at the primary outputs do not depend on any of their previous values.

The unwanted inversions are less intuitive. Consider the fanout circuit shown in Fig. 12a. In this figure, the signal has already propagated to the cells in clocking zone C1. Here, we expect C2 to move into a latching state and propagate the signal forward. However, if phase shifts in clocking zones C2 and C3 are significant,

Fig. 12 Inversion error in the Fanout3 circuit. If clocking zone C3 latches before C2, then two of the outputs will experience unwanted inversion (F1, F3). The different clocking zones are labeled in the *top-left hand corner* for reference





(a) Fanout 3 before inversion error

(b) Fanout 3 after inversion error

(c) Fanout 3 exhibiting positive feedback between outputs

Fig. 13 Inversion error in the majority gate circuit. If clocking zone C3 latches before C2, then the output may exhibit an inversion error



(a) Majority Gate before inversion error



(b) Majority Gate recovering from inversion error

(c) Majority Gate failing due to inversion error

then it is possible that the cells in C3 will latch before those in C2. If this occurs, then the cells in C3 will relax to the opposite polarization as those in C1 due to the 45° angle that exists between their cells (which results in a negative interaction energy) as shown by the NOT gates in Fig. 12b. Output F2 is not affected by this phase shift since it is lined up directly with the input and is not subject to any inversion. As a result, we expect that F2 will be less sensitive to such phase variations. The same analysis applies to the Fanout2 building block.

If the C_H value, which determines how relaxed that cells are, is selected appropriately ($\approx 0.465 \text{ eV}$), then there will exist some residual polarization in the cells

in C2 which may be sufficient to perturb the cells in clocking zone C3 and overcome the inversion particularly since the interaction between cells in C2 and C3 is much higher than that between cells in C1 and C3. However, the LWire building block does not have any other outputs with which to interact and therefore, may be able to recover its correct output, provided that there exists enough residual polarization in the cells in clocking zone C2.

The majority gate behaves similarly to the Fanout3 building block. Consider the majority gate shown in Fig. 13a. Here, the signal has propagated to the cells in clocking zone C0. Assume that the variations in





Fig. 15 Layout of QCA full adder with no crossover

the clock phase have caused C2 to latch before C1. In this case, inputs A and C will have an inverting effect on the output, while input B will drive the output without inversion. Figure 13b, c outlines the two possible scenarios that need to be considered under these circumstances. The first results when inputs A and C are logically opposite. If this is the case, then the output will be equal to input B and the inverting error that occurs due to inputs A and C cancels out as shown in Fig. 13b. The second scenario occurs when both inputs A and C are logically equivalent. Under these circumstances, the combined inverting interaction with the output of these two inputs cannot be overcome and the output will polarize to the incorrect result as shown in Fig. 13c.

Another example of unwanted inversion can occur in the case of the inverter. Consider Fig. 14a. Here, the cells in clocking zone C0 are holding the signal to be propagated through the inverter. If the phase shifts are such that C3 latches before C1 and C2, then the signal will propagate directly from the cells in C0 directly to the output without undergoing any inversion as shown in Fig. 14b. Under this scenario, the inverter acts like a wire.

5.1.2 Grouping of QCA Building Blocks

The results shown in Figs. 10 and 11 demonstrate that the success rates of the different building block outputs are clustered into three distinct groups. The first group of outputs are those that have a straight path from input to output. The Wire, Fanout2(F1) and Fanout3(F2) all fall into this group of outputs. This group sees the highest success rate of any other group because the variations in clock phase can only cause delay at these outputs as mentioned in Section 5.1.1, and are not affected by any unwanted inversion.

The second group of outputs are those belonging to either Fanout2 or Fanout3 that do not have a straight path from the input to its output, i.e, there exists a 90° bend between the input and output. It is clear from Figs. 10 and 11 that the outputs that belong to this group—Fanout2 (F2), Fanout3 (F1) and Fanout3 (F2)—produce the worst success rate of any group due to the potential of unwanted inversion at the outputs as discussed in the previous section.

The third group consists of the LWire, MG, and Inverter building blocks. For reasons described in





Section 5.1.1, these building blocks have success rates that lie in between that of the other two groups.

5.2 Full Adder

The simulation results for the full adder (Fig. 15) are shown in Fig. 16. The carry output, C_{out} , whose inputs travel through a fanout, majority gate and straight wires, expectedly performs at a higher success rate than the Sum output whose inputs travel through multiple inverters and majority gates in addition to a fanout block and both straight and L-shaped wires. As σ increases, the success rates of both outputs of the full adder begin to resemble that of the Fanout3 (F1)/(F3) building block outputs, suggesting that the overall functionality of the full adder is eventually limited by the performance of the most sensitive QCA building block.

6 Conclusion

This paper has presented a case study of numerical simulations to evaluate the reliability of QCA circuit building blocks against the effect of random phase shifts on the underlying clocking network. Simulations were performed using a set of universal QCA building blocks, and were repeated using both the bistable and coherence vector simulation engines in QCADesigner. A preliminary assessment of the optimal values of clock strength has been performed to have the most meaningful results from the phase dependent simulations. The results from both simulation engines have remained fairly consistent, confirming that the behavior of the circuits is not dependent on the choice of model. A threshold value of σ before which the probability of success for all considered building blocks remains at 100% was found to be 4° for the bistable engine and 3.5° for the coherence vector engine. It was also found that the success rate of a given output within a building block is highly layout-dependent. Outputs with a straight path to the associated input displayed more robustness to the phase variations than those featuring 90° turns. Therefore, QCA building blocks can be grouped into distinct classes depending on the number of 90° turns and outputs that they contain, making it easier to assess overall circuit sensitivity. In addition to providing critical information for developing fabrication specifications for OCA clocking networks, these results will also help designers to design new QCA circuits while taking the sensitivity information into consideration. Finally, the QCA full adder circuit was also evaluated. The simulation results show that circuit level analysis is consistent with the analysis based on building blocks. As the standard deviation of the phase shift increases, the reliability of the outputs of the full adder begin to resemble the reliability of the outputs of fanout building block suggesting that the overall functionality of a circuit is eventually limited by its most sensitive building block.

References

- Amlani I, Orlov A, Snider GL, Lent CS (1998) Demonstration of a functional quantum-dot cellular automata cell. J Vac Sci Technol B 16:3795–3799
- Amlani I, Orlov AO, Toth G, Bernstein GH, Lent CS, Snider GL (1999) Digital logic gate using quantum-dot cellular automata. Science 284:289–291
- 3. Bhanja S, Ottavi M, Pontarelli S, Lombardi F (2006) Novel designs for thermally robust coplanar crossing in qca. In: Proc of design, automation and test in Europe, 2006. DATE '06., vol 1
- Bernstein GH, Imre A, Metlushko V, Ji L, Orlov A, Csaba G, Porod W (2005) Magnetic QCA systems. Microelectronics J 36:619–624
- Chau R, Kavalieros J, Roverts B, Schenker R, Lionberger D, Barlag D, Doyle B, Arghavani R, Murthy A, Deweyt G (2000) 30-nm physical gate length cmos transistors with 1.0ps nmos and 1.7-ps pmos gate delays. In IEDM Tech. Dig., pp 45–48
- Chaudhary A, Chen DJ, Hu XS, Niemier MT, Ravichandran R, Whitton K (2005) Eliminating wire crossings for molecular quantum-dot cellular automata implementation. In: IEEE/ACM international conference on computer-aided design, 2005. IICAD-2005, pp 564–571
- Chaudhary A, Chen DJ, Hu XS, Niemier MT, Ravichandran R, Whitton K (2007) Fabricatable interconnect and molecular QCA circuits. IEEE Trans On CAD of IC 26(11): 1978–1991
- Frank DJ, Dennard RH, Nowak E, Solomon PM, Taur Y, Wong HSP (2001) Device scaling limits of si mosfets and their application dependencies. In: Proc. of IEEE, vol 89, pp 259–288
- Gin A, Tougaw PD, Williams S (1999) An alternative geometry for quantum-dot cellular automata. J App Phys 85(12): 8281–8286
- György C, et al. (2002) Nanocomputing by field-coupled nanomagnets. IEEE Trans Nano 1(4):209–213
- György C, Porod W (2002) Simulation of field coupled computing architectures based on magnetic dot arrays. J Comp Elec 1(1):87–91
- Imre A, Csaba G, Ji L, Orlov A, Bernstein GH, Porod W (1999) Majority logic gate for magnetic quantum-dot cellular automata. Science 311(5758):205–208
- 13. International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS) (2004) [Online] http://public.itrs.net
- 14. Jiao J, Long GJ, Grandjean F, Beatty AM, Fehlner TP (2003) Building blocks for the molecular expression of quantum cellular automata. isolation and characterization of a covalently bonded square array of two ferrocenium and two ferrocene complexes. J Am Chem Soc 125(25):7522–7523
- Jin Z (2006) Fabrication and measurement of molecular quantum cellular automata (QCA) device. PhD thesis, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556

- Kummamuru RV, Timler J, Toth G, Lent CS, Ramasubramaniam R, Orlov A, Bernstein GH (2002) Power gain and dissipation in a quantum-dot cellular automata latch. Appl Phys Lett 81:1332–1334
- Lent CS (1993) Quantum cellular automata. Nanotechnology 4:49–57
- Lent CS, Snider GL, Bernstein GH, Porod W, Orlov A, Lieberman M, Fehlner T, Niemier MT, Kogge P (2003) Quantum-dot cellular automata. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boca Raton, FL, USA
- Lent CS, Isaksen B, Lieberman M (2003) Molecular quantum-dot cellular automata. J Am Chem Soc 125:1056– 1063
- Lent CS, Isaksen B (2003) Clocked molecular quantum-dot cellular automata. IEEE Trans Electron Devices 50(9):1890– 1896
- Li Z, Fehlner TP (2003) Molecular qca cells. 2. Characterization of an unsymmetrical dinuclear mixed-valence complex bound to a au surface by an organic linker. Inorg Chem 42(18):5715–5721
- Li Z, Beatty AM, Fehlner TP (2003) Molecular qca cells.
 Structure and functionalization of an unsymmetrical dinuclear mixed-valence complex for surface binding. Inorg Chem 42(18):5707–5714
- Lu Y, Lent CS (2005) Theoretical study of molecular quantum-dot cellular automata. J Comput Elec 4:115–118
- Momenzadeh M, Ottavi M, Lombardi F (2005) Modeling qca defects at molecular-level in combinational circuits. In: Proc IEEE conf on defect and fault tolerance, pp 208–216
- Moore GE (1995) Lithography and the future of moore's law. In: Proc of SPIE, advances in resist technology and processing, vol 2438, pp 2–17
- Natarajan S, Breuer MA, Gupta SK (1998) Process variations and their impact on circuit operation. In: Proc IEEE conf on defect and fault tolerance, pp 73–81
- Orlov AO, Kummamuru RK, Ramasubramaniam R, Lent CS, Berstein GH, Snider GL (2003) Clocked quantum-dot cellular automata shift register. Surf Sci 532–535:1193–1198
- Parish MCB (2003) Modeling of physical constraints on bistable magnetic quantum cellular automata. PhD thesis, University of London
- 29. Qi H, Sharma S, Li Z, Snider GL, Orlov AO, Lent CS, Fehlner TP (2003) Molecular quantum cellular automata cells. Electric field driven switching of a silicon surface bound array of vertically oriented two-dot molecular quantum cellular automata. J Am Chem Soc 125(49):15250–15259
- Risch L (2001) How small can mosfets get? In: Proc of SPIE, advances in microelectronic device technology, vol 4600, pp 1–9
- Schulhof G, Walus K, Jullien GA (2007) Simulation of random cell displacements in QCA. J Emerg Technol Comput Syst 3(1):2
- Snider GL, Amlani I, Orlov A, Toth G, Bernstein G, Lent CS, Merz JL, Porod W (1999) Quantum-dot cellular automata: line and majority gate logic. Jpn J Appl Phys 38:7227–7229
- 33. Tahoori MB, Momenzadeh M, Huang J, Lombardi F (2003) Defects and faults in quantum cellular automata at nano scale. In: Proc IEEE VLSI test symposium, pp 291–296
- Toth G, Lent CS (1999) Quasiadiabatic switching of metal-island quantum-dot cellular automata. J Appl Phys 85(5):2977–2984
- Tougaw PD, Lent CS (1994) Logical devices implemented using quantum cellular automata. J Appl Phys 75(3): 1818–1825

- Walus K, Jullien GA (2006) Design tools for an emerging SoC technology: quantum-dot cellular automata. Proc. IEEE, 94(6):1225–1244
- 37. Walus K, Dysart TJ, Jullien GA, Budiman RA (2004) QCADesigner: a rapid design and simulation tool for quantum-dot cellular automata. IEEE Trans Nano 3(1): 26–31
- Walus K, Schulhof G (2001) QCADesigner Homepage. [Online] http://www.qcadesigner.ca/
- 39. Walus K, Mazur M, Schulhof G, Jullien GA (2005) Simple 4-bit processor based on quantum-dot cellular automata (QCA). In: Proc of application specific architectures, and processors conference
- Welland ME, Cowburn RP (2000) Room temperature magnetic quantum cellular automata. Science 287:1466–1468

Faizal Karim received his B.Eng degree in Electrical Engineering from Ryerson University, Toronto, Canada, in 2005 and his M.A.Sc degree in Electrical Engineering at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada in 2007. He is currently pursuing his Ph.D in Electrical Engineering at the University of British Columbia.

Faizal's main research interest is on the emerging nanotechnology quantum-dot cellular automata (QCA) with a focus on modeling the quantum correlations that exist between neighboring cells.

Marco Ottavi received the Laurea degree in electronic engineering in 1999 from the University of Rome, (Italy) "La Sapienza", and the Ph.D. degree in microelectronic and telecommunications engineering from the University of Rome "Tor Vergata", in 2004. He is currently a senior design engineer at AMD working on test for fusion and server microprocessors.

In 2000 he was with ULISSE Consortium, Rome as a designer engineer of fault tolerant memory systems for space applications. He then joined the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department at Northeastern University in Boston (MA) as visiting research assistant in 2003 and from 2004 to 2007, he was a research associate at the same university. In his years at Northeastern Dr. Ottavi conducted research and published extensively on fault tolerance, manufacturing yield modeling, Quantum-dot Cellular Automata memory architectures and fault modeling.

During 2006 Dr. Ottavi was invited to Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque (NM) as a visiting research scholar to investigate on the design of reversible QCA systems for low power supercomputing.

Hamidreza Hashempour received the B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in Computer Engineering from Fanni Faculty of Tehran University, Tehran, Iran, and the Ph.D. degree from Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Dr. Hashempour worked in Tehran University Informatics Center (1993–1995), was a member of Tehran University CAD research group working on AIRE/CE HDL intermediate format (1996–1998), cofounded an FPGA/ASIC design house (1998– 2001), and worked for IC Development and Applied Research of LTX (2004–2005). He was a visiting research associate of Nanotechnology at Northeastern University (2005–2006). His current research interest is design and test of micro and the emerging nano electronics. **Vamsi Vankamamidi** received the B.S. degree in Computer Engineering from the University of Mumbai, India in 2000, and M.S. degree in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from University of Toledo, Toledo, OH in 2001. He conducted research in the field of Quantum-dot Cellular Automata and graduated with Ph.D. degree in Computer Engineering from Northeastern University, Boston, MA in 2007.

Vamsi is currently a Software Engineer at EMC Corporation working on RAID algorithms for Storage Area Networks. His interests include Storage Virtualization, Engineering Kernel code for Multi-core CPUs and Nonoscale Device technologies.

Konrad Walus received his degree, in Electrical Engineering, from the University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada, in 2001. He was a student systems engineer at AgentWare Systems Incorporated Canada, from 2000 to 2001. Konrad completed his Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering at the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada, in September 2005. Konrad started as an Assistant Professor at the University of British Columbia in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering in September 2005. His primary research focus is on modeling and computer aided design of emerging nanotechnologies with a focus on quantum-dot cellular automata (QCA). Konrad has received several awards including the Alberta Science and Technology, Leaders of Tomorrow award and the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies Distinguished Dissertation Award.

André Ivanov is Professor and Head of Electrical and Computer Engineering, at the University of British Columbia with a Ph.D. from McGill University. He chaired the IEEE Computer Society Test Technology Council (TTTC) for the term 2004–2007. He has published widely, and is an inventor of several patents, mostly on test and reliability of integrated circuits and systems. Over the years, Ivanov has served on steering, program, and/or organization committees of several international events sponsored by the Computer Society. He is currently serving on the steering committee of the International Test Conference. He was Technical Program Chair of the VLSI Test Symposium (VTS) in 01 and 02 and the General Chair in 03 and 04. In 2004, Ivanov founded the 1st IEEE International GHz/Gbps Test Workshop. Ivanov now serves as Associate Editor for the IEEE Transactions on CAD, and for the Design and Test of Computers Magazine, and for the Journal of Electronic Test: Theory and Applications (JETTA). He has served on the Computer Society's Conference and Tutorials Board and the Technical Activities Board. In 2008, he chaired the Computer Society Fellows Committee. He is a Golden Core Member of the Computer Society, a Fellow of the IEEE, and a Professional Engineer of British Columbia. In 2001, Ivanov co-founded Vector 12, a semiconductor IP company.

In 1995/96, he spent a sabbatical at PMC-Sierra and has held invited professor positions at the University of Montpellier II, the University of Bordeaux I, and Edith Cowan University, Perth, Australia.

Fabrizio Lombardi graduated in 1977 from the University of Essex (UK) with a B.Sc. (Hons.) in Electronic Engineering.

In 1977 he joined the Microwave Research Unit at University College London, where he received the Master in Microwaves and Modern Optics (1978), the Diploma in Microwave Engineering (1978) and the Ph.D. from the University of London (1982).

He is currently the holder of the International Test Conference (ITC) Endowed Chair Professorship at Northeastern University, Boston. At the same Institution during the period 1998–2004 he served as Chair of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. Prior to Northeastern University, he was a faculty member at Texas Tech University, the University of Colorado-Boulder and Texas A\&M University.

Since January 1, 2007 Dr. Lombardi is the Editor-In-Chief of the IEEE Transactions on Computers. He is also an Associate Editor of the IEEE Design and Test Magazine, IEEE Transactions on CAD of ICAS and the ACM Journal of Emerging Technologies in Computing. Dr. Lombardi serves as the Chair of the Committee on "Nanotechnology Devices and Systems" of the Test Technology Technical Council of the IEEE (2003–). In the past, Dr. Lombardi was an Associate Editor (1996–2000) and Associate Editor-in-Chief (2000–2006) of the IEEE Transactions on Computers and twice a Distinguished Visitor of the IEEE-CS (1990–1993 and 2001–2004).

Dr. Lombardi has received many professional awards: the Visiting Fellowship at the British Columbia Advanced System Institute, University of Victoria, Canada (1988), twice the Texas Experimental Engineering Station Research Fellowship (1991–1992,1997–1998) the Halliburton Professorship (1995), the Outstanding Engineering Research Award at Northeastern University (2004) and an International Research Award from the Ministry of Science and Education of Japan (1993–1999). Dr. Lombardi was the recipient of the 1985/86 Research Initiation Award from the IEEE/Engineering Foundation and a Silver Quill Award from Motorola-Austin (1996). At the IEEE DFT07 Symposium, one of his papers won the best paper award.

Dr. Lombardi has been involved in organizing many international symposia, conferences and workshops sponsored by professional organizations as well as guest editor of Special Issues in archival journals and magazines such as IEEE Transactions on Computers, IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement, IEEE Transactions on VLSI, the IEEE Micro Magazine and the IEEE Design & Test Magazine. He is the Founding General Chair of the IEEE Symposium on Network Computing and Applications and the IEEE International Workshop on Design and Test of Nano Devices, Circuits and Systems.

His research interests are bio-inspired and nano manufacturing/computing, VLSI design, testing, and fault/defect tolerance of digital systems. He has extensively published in these areas and coauthored/edited seven books.