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#### Abstract

The number of transistors on a chip plays the main role in increasing the speed and performance of a microprocessor; more transistors, more speed. Increasing the number of transistors will be limited due to the design complexity and density of transistors. This article aims to introduce a new approach to increasing the number of transistors on a chip. The basic idea is to construct two-layer crystal square for transistors; this allows to increase the number of transistors two additional times (four times as many) if the number of transistors incorporated in a one layer of crystal square will approximately double every 24 months according to Moore's Law without changing rapidly the design complexity and density in a crystal square and without changing the size of a chip (length and width), in this case the height of a chip must be changed for the two layers.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Different types of a microprocessor, is also known as a central processing unit (CPU), such as i80x86, Pentium (Intel), PowerPC (IBM), SPARC (Sun), Motorola and many other types perform the same thing in approximately the same way [1].

Moore's Law states that the number of transistors on a chip would double every two years [2, 3]. The designers of CPU are interested to increase the speed and performance of CPU with each new CPU-generation according to the Moore's law by doubling the number of transistors according to the design rule by reducing the size of the transistors, which allows to fit more transistors on a chip without changing rapidly the size of the chip; in general the size of the chip increases slowly over time. Increasing the number of transistors is one of the main factors used to increase the speed and performance of the CPU; more transistors, more clock cycles [4, 5].

## 2. PHYSICAL LIMITATION OF INCREASING THE NUMBER OF THRANSISTORS

Increasing the number of transistors will be limited due to the following limitation [6, 7, 8, 9]:

### 2.1 DESIGN RULE, DENSITY AND DESIGN COMPLEXITY [10,11,12,13]

Since the wires and transistors are drawn photographically on the chips, the size of the transistors and the width of the wires are determined by the pixel size of the imaging process. The number of transistors that can be fitted on a given chip size is determined by the size of the transistors. As the feature size on the chip goes down, the number of transistors rises, which means the smaller the transistors, the more transistors can be fitted on the chip. Feature sizes have decreased from 10 micron in 1971 to 0.022 micron in 2012; the semiconductor manufacturing processes have decreased from $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in 1971 to 22 nm in 2012 [4, 13, 14] (see Table 1).

Since the surface area of a transistor determines the transistor count per square millimeter of silicon, the transistors density increases quadratically with a linear decrease in feature size [1]. The increase in transistor performance is more complicated. As the feature sizes shrink, devices shrink quadratically in the horizontal and vertical dimensions. A reduction in operating voltage to maintain correct operation and reliability of the transistor is required in the vertical dimension shrink. This combination of scaling factors leads to a complex interrelationship between the transistor performance and the process feature size.

Due to the shrinking of the pixel size and the increasing of the density, the design complexity increases. If the pixel size shrinks double and the density increases double every two years according to Moore's Law, the physical limitation will definitely appear in few years, which means that it will be very difficult to apply Moore's Law in future. Some studies have shown that physical limitations could be reached by 2018 [6] or 2020-2022 [15, 16, 17, 18].

### 2.2 NUMBER OF TRANSISTORS AND DIE SIZE [5, 11, 19]

The die size is a size of a chip; the chip size depends on the chip manufacturing processes. As mentioned above, the smaller feature size, the larger number of transistors on a chip, this allows increasing the die size slowly over time. Owing to increasing of the number of transistors the chip size should be increased. The number of transistors of Intel microprocessors has increased from 2300 in 1971 to 3.1 billion in 2012 ( 1.35 million times during 40 years) and the die size has increased from 12 mm 2 in 1971 to 544 mm 2 in 2012 ( 45.34 times during 40 years). The number of transistors of MIPS microprocessors has increased from 110,000 (R2000) in 1986 to 7.15 million (R12000) in 1998 ( 65 times during 12 years) and the die size has increased from 80 mm 2 in 1986 to 229.22 mm 2 in 1998 ( 2.86 times during 12 years). The number of transistors of IBM microprocessors has increased from 1.5 million (Power3) in 1998 to 2.1 billion (Power7+) in 2012 ( 1400 times during 14 years) and the die size has increased from 270 mm 2 in 1998 to 567 mm 2 in 2012 ( 2.1 times during 14 years) (see Table 1).

### 2.3 PIXEL SIZE AND POWER CONSUMPTION [1,20]

The transistor's switching speed is determined by the pixel size, the smaller transistors switch faster, so they require less power to be switched. Small pixel size allows the battery life of portable devices to be saved for a long time. The energy consumption required for switching transistors is known as dynamic power consumption, which can be increased due to charging and discharging the capacitive output load. Increasing the amount of power requires more hot generation, which can cause an interference of transistors with each other.

Table 1. Evolution of Microprocessors: 1991 to 2012

| Manufacturer | Processor | Date of introduction | Number of transistors | Process | Area [mm ${ }^{2}$ ] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intel | Intel4004 | 1971 | 2,300 | $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 12 |
|  | Intel8008 | 1972 | 3,500 | $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 14 |
|  | Intel8080 | 1974 | 4,400 | $6 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 20 |
|  | Intel8085 | 1976 | 6,500 | $3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 20 |
|  | Intel8086 | 1978 | 29,000 | $3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 33 |
|  | Inte180286 | 1982 | 134,000 | $1.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 44 |
|  | Inte180386 | 1985 | 275,000 | $1.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 104 |
|  | Intel80486 | 1989 | 1,180,235 | $1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 173 |
|  | Pentium | 1993 | 3,100,000 | $0.8 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 294 |
|  | Pentium Pro | 1995 | 5,500,000 | $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 307 |
|  | Pentium II | 1997 | 7,500,000 | $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 195 |
|  | Pentium III | 1999 | 9,500,000 | $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 128 |
|  | Pentium 4 | 2000 | 42,00,000 | 180 nm | 217 |
|  | Itanium 2 McKinely | 2002 | 220,000,000 | 180 nm | 421 |
|  | Core 2 Duo | 2006 | 291,000,000 | 65 nm | 143 |
|  | Core i7 (Quad) | 2008 | 731,000,000 | 45 nm | 263 |
|  | Six-Core Core i7 | 2010 | 1,170,000,000 | 32 nm | 240 |
|  | Six-Core Core i7/8Core Xeon E5 | 2011 | 2,270,000,000 | 32 nm | 434 |
|  | 8-Core Itanium Poulson | 2012 | 3.100,000,000 | 32 nm | 544 |
| MIPS | R2000 | 1986 | 110,000 | $2.0 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 80 |
|  | R3000 | 1988 | 150,000 | $1.2 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 56 |
|  | R4000 | 1991 | 1,200,000 | $0.8 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 213 |
|  | R10000 | 1994 | 2,600,000 | $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 299 |
|  | R10000 | 1996 | 6,800,000 | $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 299 |
|  | R12000 | 1998 | 7,1500,000 | $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 229 |
| IBM | POWER3 | 1998 | 15,000,000 | $0.35 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | 270 |
|  | POWER4 | 2001 | 174,000,000 | 180 nm | 412 |
|  | POWER4+ | 2002 | 184,000,000 | 130 nm | 267 |
|  | POWER5 | 2004 | 276,000,000 | 130 nm | 389 |
|  | POWER5+ | 2005 | 276,000,000 | 90 nm | 243 |
|  | POWER6+ | 2009 | 790,000,000 | 65 nm | 341 |
|  | POWER7 | 2010 | 1.200,000,000 | 45 nm | 567 |
|  | POWER7+ | 2012 | 2.100,000,000 | 32 nm | 567 |

## 3. Two-Layer Crystal Square

This article suggests as a solution for avoiding the physical limitations mentioned above and for applying Moore's Law more years a new approach of constructing a crystal square contained transistors on a chip. This approach is called two-layer crystal square of transistors.

Assume a microprocessor (let's say X) has the following specifications: date of introduction 2015, one-layer crystal square of transistors, transistor count (number of transistors) - 3 billion, pixel size (feature size) - 0.038 micron, die size (area) - 600 mm 2 (see Figure 1).


Figure 1. Crystal Square of Transistors
A crystal square of transistors can be constructed using two layers that are equal in size and transistor count, this allows to increase the number of transistors twice (Moore's Law) without touching the feature size and die size (see Figure 2).


Figure 2. Two-Layer Crystal Square of Transistors
The two-layer crystal square of transistors shown in Figure 2 contains double transistor count without changing feature size and die size. Double number of transistors allows increasing a microprocessor's speed approximately twice. In this case the voltage of transistors must be decreased in order to reduce the dynamic power and energy.

Assume the second generation of the microprocessor (X1) has the following specifications: date of introduction - 2017, Two-layer crystal square, and each layer with the following characteristics: number of transistors -3 billion ( 6 billion both), pixel size -0.038 micron, die size - 600 mm 2 (see Figure 3).


Figure 3. Second Generation
Applying this approach would double transistor count and speed of the microprocessors every two years with slowly increasing the density and area, and decreasing feature size and voltage, so the physical limitations will be reduced and Moore's Law will be continued for many years (may be till 2037 or more).
Assume the third generation of the microprocessor (X2) has the following specifications: date of introduction - 2019, Two-layer crystal square, and each layer with the following characteristics: transistor count -6 billion ( 12 billion both), pixel size -0.035 micron, die size -688 mm 2 (see Figure 4).


Figure 4. Third Generation
The third generation doubles the transistor count with small decreasing of the feature size (from 0.038 micron to 0.035 micron) and small increasing of the area (from 600 mm 2 to 688 mm ), of course, with more density, which allows to fit more transistors in small area.

All the assuming characteristics of the microprocessors (X, X1, X2) and others (XN-1 and XN) are shown in Table 2. This table shows some of the assuming microprocessors from 2015 till the year 2037. The number of transistors will have doubled every two years. The feature size will have increased 3 nm (from 38 to 35) every two years (from the year 2019 - after applying a twolayer crystal technology in the year 2017), which means that the feature size would be reached 0.8 nm by the year 2037, which increases the design complexity and causes reaching the physical limitation. The area will also have increased about $12-15 \%$ every two years (from the year 2019); the small increasing of area can be applied if and only if the density of transistors increases with each generation. The increasing of the density would also be reached the physical limitation by the year 2037, as more density needs more power, which requires more hot generation.

Table 2. Assuming Evolution of Microprocessors: 2015 to 2037

| Processor | Date of <br> introduction | Number of <br> transistors <br> (billion) | Feature <br> size (nm) | Area [mm ${ }^{\mathbf{2}]}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| X | 2015 | 3 | 38 | 600 |
| X1 (Two-layer crystal) | 2017 | 6 | 38 | 600 (each layer) |
| X2 (Two-layer crystal) | 2019 | 12 | 35 | 688 (each layer) |
| X3 (Two-layer crystal) | 2021 | 24 | 32 | 770 (each layer) |
| X4 (Two-layer crystal) | 2023 | 48 | 29 | 882 (each layer) |
| -- | -- | -- | -- | --- |
| XN-1 (Two-layer crystal) | 2035 | 3072 | 11 | --- |
| XN (Two-layer crystal) | 2037 | 6144 | 0.8 | --- |

As shown in the table below, several measures of microprocessors technology, such as transistor count, is improving at exponential rate based on Moore's Law (see Figure 5).


Figure 5. Number of transistors related to Moore's Law

## 4. CONCLUSION

The problem of applying Moore's law in microprocessor technology as much as possible is still topical research field although it has been studied by the research community for many decades. The main objective of this article is to find as much as possible a complete and logical solution for avoiding physical limitation in manufacturing of microprocessors technology and applying Moore's Law for a long time.

As mentioned above, some studies have shown that physical limitations could be reached by 2018 or 2022. Applying the new approach in microprocessor technology will delay the physical limitation for few more years, because it doubles the transistor count every two years based on Moore's Law, which approximately double the microprocessor's speed, with small decreasing of the feature size and small increasing of the area.
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