

Architect in the Loop Agentic Hardware Design and Verification

Mubarek Mohammed
 Western Washington University
 Bellingham, WA USA
 mohamm6@wwu.edu

Abstract—The ever increasing complexity of the hardware design process demands improved hardware design and verification methodologies. With the advent of generative AI various attempts have been made to automate parts of the design and verification process. Large language models (LLMs) as well as specialized models generate hdl and testbenches for small components, having a few leaf level components. However, there are only a few attempts to automate the entire processor design process. Hardware design demands hierarchical and modular design processes. We utilized this best practice systematically and effectively. We propose agentic automated processor design and verification with engineers in the loop. The agent with optional specification tries to break down the design into sub-components, generate HDL and cocotb tests, and verifies the components involving engineer guidance, especially during debugging and synthesis. We designed various digital systems using this approach. However, we selected two simple processors for demonstration purposes in this work. The first one is a LEGv8 like a simple processor verified, synthesized and programmed for the DE-10 Lite FPGA. The second one is a RISC-V like 32-bit processor designed and verified in similar manner and synthesized. However, it is not programmed into the DE-10 Lite. This process is accomplished usually using around a million inference tokens per processor, using a combination of reasoning (e.g gemini-pro) and non-reasoning models (eg. gpt-5-mini) based on the complexity of the task. This indicates that hardware design and verification experimentation can be done cost effectively without using any specialized hardware. The approach is scalable, we even attempted system-on-chip, which we want to experiment in our future work.

Index Terms—Agentic Design, Hardware Description Language, Architecture, RISC-V, SystemVerilog, LLM, FPGA, Design Automation

I. INTRODUCTION

The domain of digital systems design, traditionally characterized by long development cycles, extensive manual effort, and a high barrier to entry, is poised for transformation by advances in Artificial Intelligence [1]. Large Language Model (LLM) based AI agents now possess the capability to understand natural language specifications and generate hardware description languages (HDLs) like SystemVerilog and VHDL. This promises to automate tedious coding tasks, lower the

barrier to entry for hardware design, and accelerate the critical design verification loop.

However, moving from single file code generation to agentic, system-level design introduces significant challenges related to maintaining architectural integrity, managing complex dependencies, and ensuring semantic consistency across dozens of files. Recent work such as AutoChip [2] and other end-to-end synthesis frameworks [3] have made significant strides, particularly in high-level synthesis (HLS) and domain-specific accelerator design. Yet, a gap remains in understanding the practical capabilities and limitations of agentic systems for general-purpose, register-transfer level (RTL) CPU design, a domain that demands attention to detail, from instruction set architecture (ISA) to microarchitectural data paths.

This case study investigates a practical application of this emerging technology through a framework we term the "Blueprint-Driven Agent". We tasked an AI agent with several complete design challenges of increasing complexity: a simple single-cycle LEGv8-style processor, a synthesizable 32-bit RISC-V core, a pipelined LEGv8 processor, and others(not reported in this work). The methodology was rooted in a blueprint-driven approach, where the AI first generates a high-level JSON specification, defining the system's architecture, which it then uses to create, verify, and self-correct the necessary HDL components by using cocotb testing.

The objective was to rigorously assess the AI's efficacy not just in localized code generation, but in its ability to compose a complex, functional, and synthesizable system. While initial results in component generation and verification were impressive, system-level verification invariably revealed critical failures. This paper documents the collaborative human-AI debugging journey, providing a granular analysis of the agent's limitations, and offers a refined "Architect-in-the-Loop" workflow as a powerful and economically viable paradigm for future hardware design.

II. RELATED WORKS

In this section we discuss the major works in this area.

A. Verilog Generation and Evaluation

There are several attempts to fine tune LLMs to better generate Verilog hdl code. Some of them are BetterV [4], VerilogEval [6], and RTL coder [5]. The focus of these works is to evaluate the models capability for small modules. This is close to the leaf level components or components with few subcomponents. Even though we use LLMs to generate SystemVerilog code components, the strength of our work comes from how we hierarchically build complex digital systems including processors.

In our work, we mainly use LLMs with a combination of reasoning models (for planning, debugging/fix, and integration) and non-reasoning models (for code and testbench generation).

B. AI Assisted Digital Systems Design

The work very close to ours conceptually is Chip-Chat [1]. They tried to build a small processor from scratch by chatting with LLMs. An experienced engineer (the author) prompted the LLM to give the required modules, debugged it, and iteratively improved it to generate a working processor. Chip-Chat purely involves the engineer and chat bot, with parts of the code being broken up into separate chats. They even continued to the tiny-tapeout process for manufacturing. In our case, we automate the hierarchical and modular design process. Another work, AutoChip [2] used LLMs to build small digital circuits by incorporating self-feedback loop, very similar to ours at the component level. However, AutoChip does not create more complicated components and hierarchical components.

Our work partially or completely automates the process through agentic digital systems design. The experiment in this work is done considering the human engineer playing a critical role in the digital systems design process such as a simple processor development process. The engineer/architect can provide specification in terms of JSON blueprint as well as a text prompt. Once the agent starts, if a component fails the agent initiates a self-correction loop. However, it waits for the engineer to provide feedback and approves the fix. The engineer at this stage can edit the failed hdl or test files and let the agent continue. In a separate work of ours for experimental purposes, not published, we even let the agent run end-to-end without human intervention just starting from blueprint or prompt specification. However, even in this case the engineer has the option to edit code especially if the agent is struggling to fix some issues.

III. THE AI-DRIVEN DESIGN METHODOLOGY

Our framework is designed to emulate and enhance a modern, specification-driven workflow. It leverages an AI agent for code generation, verification, and self-correction, all under the strategic supervision of a human architect. The core components of this methodology are outlined below.




Fig. 1: Agentic Digital Design Flow with Human-in-the-Loop Feedback and Approval at Each Stage

For sample code look at the appendix. The details are also hosted on github. ¹

A. Phase 1: The Blueprint as a Formal Specification

The foundation of each project is a JSON blueprint, which can either be provided by a human architect or generated by the agent from a high-level natural language prompt. This document serves as the formal, machine-readable specification, defining:

- Global project parameters (e.g., data widths, memory depths).
- An optional SystemVerilog package for defining a shared Instruction Set Architecture (ISA).

¹<https://github.com/mmubarek/eda/tree/main/paper1>

- A hierarchical list of all required system components, their individual interfaces (ports and parameters), and their inter-dependencies.

A key observation, which became central to later debugging efforts, was that initial agent-generated blueprints often omitted a formal ISA definition or created contradictory parameterizations. Our refined methodology (Figure 2) now employs a highly structured prompt that explicitly guides the agent to produce a complete and non-contradictory blueprint as the first step.

TABLE I: Key Parameters Defined in an Example AI-Generated Blueprint

Parameter
DATA_WIDTH
ADDRESS_WIDTH
INSTRUCTION_WIDTH
OPCODE_WIDTH
REG_ADDR_WIDTH

In addition to these parameters, ISA related parameters are defined in the blueprint.

B. Phase 2: Component Generation, Integration, and Self-Correction

Using the blueprint, the agent’s orchestrator processes each component according to its dependency graph. For each sub-module, the following workflow is applied:

- 1) **HDL and Testbench Generation:** The agent generates a synthesizable SystemVerilog module and a corresponding `cocotb` testbench.
- 2) **Pre-Flight Linting (Verilator):** A lightweight compilation check using Verilator in linting mode is performed first to efficiently detect syntax and structural errors.
 - If the linting passes, the workflow proceeds to functional verification.
 - If the linting fails, the agent analyzes the error log, proposes a fix, and submits it for human approval. Upon approval, the design is retried.
- 3) **Functional Verification (cocotb):** If linting succeeds, the sub-module is tested against its `cocotb` unit testbench. Failures here typically expose behavioral or semantic errors.
 - As with linting, testbench failures trigger a self-correction loop: error analysis → candidate fix → human approval → re-verification.
 - The number of retry attempts is bounded by a configurable limit (e.g., three attempts per component). If the limit is reached, the human engineer may step in directly to provide manual edits.
- 4) **Human Overrides:** At any stage, the engineer can manually modify the HDL or testbench. The

agent then re-verifies the edited design to ensure correctness before allowing it to proceed.

This iterative, human-in-the-loop process ensures that every component is both structurally correct and functionally validated before integration.

Once all sub-modules pass their unit tests, the orchestrator enters the integration phase, generating a top-level module that instantiates and interconnects the verified components. This step is itself subject to the same linting, verification, and human approval loops, since interface mismatches or wiring errors commonly arise during integration.

C. Phase 3: System-Level Verification

With all components integrated, the agent generates a cycle-accurate top-level `cocotb` testbench. The verification strategy follows a *golden model* approach: a Python implementation of the ISA maintains an internal model of the processor’s architectural state (registers and memory). For each executed instruction, the golden model predicts the expected state updates, which are then compared against the DUT’s debug outputs at every cycle.

This strategy uncovers subtle, cross-module issues such as pipeline hazards, bus arbitration errors, or timing mismatches that are not visible at the unit-test level. Failures again trigger the same AI self-correction loop with mandatory human approval, ensuring both automation and accountability.

Only after passing system-level verification is the design returned to the engineer for FPGA synthesis, hardware debugging, and physical validation. This final step ensures that ultimate responsibility and fine-grained optimization remain in human hands, even as the agent automates the majority of the design flow.

IV. DEBUGGING AND ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS

Debugging and analysis continues for the top level module if there is failure. This initiates an iterative debugging process that reveals a pattern of agent failure modes. This process was repeated across other designs, confirming our analysis. Table II provides a detailed log of representative bugs discovered, their root cause, and the corresponding solution, which often involved refining the agent’s underlying prompting strategies.

V. ANALYSIS OF AGENTIC CAPABILITIES AND LIMITATIONS

This case study, in our view, provides a snapshot of the current capabilities and, more importantly, the systemic limitations of LLM agents in digital design.

TABLE II: Summary of observed errors, root causes, and applied solutions in LLM-assisted hardware design.

Error	Cause	Solution
Inconsistent ISA implementations	LLM generated mismatched instruction encodings across modules	Refined prompting with explicit ISA tables; enforced consistency via shared JSON blueprint
Parameter propagation errors	Uncoordinated parameter definitions across modules	Centralized parameter file and enforced inheritance through JSON schema
Incorrect handling of SystemVerilog packages	Agent omitted or mismatched imports in integrated designs	Prompted agent to generate package stubs first, then ensured imports during integration. Later, used only centralized parameters.
Misaligned memory interfaces	Agent-generated load/store modules had width mismatches	Human-in-the loop debugging and prompt improvement
Clock related errors	Agent failed to insert synchronization logic for signals	Human-in-the-loop correction

A. Strengths

- **Syntactic Correctness and Boilerplate Generation:** The agent excelled at generating syntactically correct SystemVerilog and Python. It handled the boilerplate of module definitions, port lists, and testbench structure well, saving significant manual effort.
- **Blueprint Adherence:** It correctly parsed the JSON blueprint to define module names, parameters, and port widths, demonstrating a strong grasp of structured input and the ability to follow a formal specification. In some cases, the blueprint (JSON) is more than 1300 lines of code.
- **Modular Decomposition and Localized Reasoning:** The initial design breakdown into standard, single-responsibility components was excellent engineering practice. Within the context of a single module, the agent demonstrated a strong ability to implement the required logic based on its description.

B. Limitations: The Semantic Cohesion Gap

The core failures of the agent, across all tested designs, stemmed from a single, profound limitation: a lack of **holistic semantic cohesion**. While capable of reasoning about a task in isolation (e.g., "write an ALU"), the agent struggles to maintain a consistent, system-wide

understanding of how components must interact. This "semantic gap" is a known challenge in AI-driven code generation and is particularly acute in hardware design due to the tight, bit-level coupling between modules. This manifested in several critical ways, summarized in Table III.

TABLE III: Critical Errors Encountered in Final Phases

Error Category	Description of Issue	Resolution / Fix
Missing Initialization File	Instruction memory lacked a proper .hex file, leading to failed instruction fetch.	Created and integrated a correctly formatted .hex file, then re-ran verification.
Cascading Data Width Mismatches	Fixing the missing .hex file exposed hidden inconsistencies in data widths across modules.	Performed systematic width alignment across modules, updated bus connections, and extended testbench coverage.
Inconsistent ISA Encoding	ISA instruction encodings were inconsistently implemented across decoder and execution modules.	Standardized instruction encodings using a single JSON ISA specification, regenerated RTL and testbenches.

VI. ECONOMIC AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

A. A Highly Cost-Effective Collaboration

A remarkable aspect of this project was its economic efficiency. The whole design, verification, and the debugging process for multiple complex processors was completed by utilizing reasoning models for planning and integration, and non-reasoning model for test code generation at component level, a simple processor can be completed in less than a million tokens. For context, this stands in stark contrast to the significant engineering man-hours and associated costs typically required for such tasks. In this framework, the AI agent plays the role of a junior engineer, automating more than 80% of the repetitive coding and first-pass verification. Meanwhile, the human architect remains central—providing high-level guidance, validating decisions, and ensuring that the design intent is faithfully captured. The result is not only cost-effective but also aligned with democratizing access to sophisticated hardware design workflows.

B. The Path Forward: The Architect-in-the-Loop

This work strongly suggests that the most promising near-term trajectory for AI in hardware design is not complete autonomy, but a sophisticated *Architect-in-the-Loop* model. In this paradigm, the human engineer is not simply a reviewer of the AI's output but an active collaborator from the earliest stages of design.




Fig. 2: Refined Agentic Digital Design Flow with Human-in-the- Loop

Crucially, human oversight begins at the **specification level**: ambiguous or incomplete ISAs, architectural parameters, or high-level constraints must be clarified by the architect before the agent proceeds. This ensures that the agent operates with a complete and unambiguous blueprint. The human architect also provides strategic debugging insight, approves or rejects AI-generated fixes, and may directly modify RTL when necessary, with the agent handling re-verification.

Looking ahead, realizing this vision requires next-generation agents to evolve in three key directions:

- 1) **Demand Complete Specifications**: Agents must be trained to detect missing or contradictory elements in high-level specifications and formally request clarification, rather than making assumptions that can cascade into architectural flaws.
- 2) **Perform Cross-Module Semantic Analysis**: Agents should employ lightweight static and semantic checks to ensure interface compatibility, parameter consistency, and adherence to design rules across the codebase *before* running expensive simulations.
- 3) **Integrate with Formal Methods**: Beyond simulation, agents should be capable of generating SystemVerilog Assertions (SVA) or formal properties to express inferred design intent, enabling exhaustive verification with formal tools.

Taken together, these directions position the human architect as the source of design intent, while empowering the AI agent to act as a capable, efficient, and verifiable collaborator. This balance preserves accountability, reduces cost barriers, and opens a path toward broader participation in advanced hardware design.

VII. CONCLUSION

The experiment of designing multiple complex processors using a blueprint-driven AI agent was a qualified success. It demonstrated the immense potential of this approach to dramatically accelerate hardware development by automating the most labor-intensive aspects of RTL and testbench generation. The agent proved capable of creating complex, synthesizable designs that successfully targeted FPGA hardware.

However, it also starkly highlighted the "semantic cohesion gap" that prevents current models from reliably composing complex systems without human oversight. The agent, while proficient at localized tasks, lacks the holistic, system-wide reasoning that is the hallmark of an experienced engineer.

The most valuable takeaway is the demonstrated viability and economic efficiency of the human-AI collaborative model. The AI acts as a tireless, fast, and exceptionally low-cost junior engineer, while the human provides the architectural wisdom and strategic debugging insight that is currently irreplaceable. The future of AI in digital design is not about replacing the architect, but about providing them with the most powerful copilot, turning weeks of work into days, and days into hours.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Fu, H. G. Gerez, et al. (2024). *Chip-Chat: A Large Language Model for Conversational Hardware Design*. arXiv:2402.13324.
- [2] Z. Liu, H. G. Gerez, et al. (2023). *AutoChip: A LLaMA-based Agent for Chip Design*. arXiv:2311.09228.
- [3] B. Li, Y. G. Gerez, et al. (2024). *Towards Automatic and Agile AI/ML Accelerator Design with End-to-End Synthesis*. In Proceedings of the 2024 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays.
- [4] Z. Pei, et al., "BetterV: Controlled Verilog Generation with Discriminative Guidance," arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03375, 2024.
- [5] S. Liu, et al., "RTLCoder: Outperforming GPT-3.5 in Design RTL Generation with Our Open-Source Dataset and Lightweight Solution," arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08617, 2023.
- [6] M. Liu, N. Pinckney, B. Khailany, and H. Ren, "VerilogEval: Evaluating Large Language Models for Verilog Code Generation," arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07544, 2023.
- [7] Cocotb Contributors, cocotb documentation, [Online]. Available: <https://docs.cocotb.org/>. (Accessed: Aug. 26, 2025).
- [8] W. Snyder, Verilator, [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/verilator/verilator>, 2023 (Accessed: August 26, 2025)

APPENDIX

COMPLETE SUPPORTING DATA

You will find the complete blueprint, hdl files, cocotb test, scripts to simulate the digital system at <https://github.com/mmubarek/eda/tree/main/paper1>. Sample code is provided in the next appendices.

APPENDIX: TOOLS AND DEBUGGING PROCESS

A. Tools

For simulation, we utilized cocotb together with verilator. We developed both component-level and top-level cocotb tests to ensure functionality and correctness across the design hierarchy.

B. Debugging Process: Synthesis and Experimentation

One of the major issues encountered was the absence of a hex file for the instruction memory. To resolve this, we created the required hex file, integrated it into the design, and retested the code.

When compiling for the FPGA, we also needed to provide a dedicated top-level module that wired the design components to the FPGA peripherals. This modification introduced cascading issues, primarily related to mismatched data widths across modules, which required significant debugging. After carefully resolving these mismatches, both verification and synthesis completed successfully.

The updated design was then iteratively tested using cocotb: each modification was rerun, verified, and debugged through simulation until stable results were achieved.

C. Processor Development Notes

Using our HDL generation tool, we created a 32-bit RISC-V processor. During early debugging stages, we noticed recurring issues. Both the RISC-V and LEGv8 implementations successfully passed cocotb tests; however, neither included a preloaded hex file in their instruction memory. Instead, cocotb injected instructions directly at the top-level testbench.

To enable standalone execution, we manually added an instruction.hex file for the RISC-V design. With this addition, the RISC-V processor ran without errors, though the synthesis tool still reported minor warnings.

BLUEPRINT

```
1 {
2   "projectName": "Legv8SingleCycleProcessor",
3   "parameters": {
4     "DATA_WIDTH": 8,
5     "ADDRESS_WIDTH": 8,
6     "INSTRUCTION_WIDTH": 16,
7     "REG_ADDR_WIDTH": 3,
8     "OPCODE_WIDTH": 4,
9     "ALU_OP_WIDTH": 3,
10    "IMMEDIATE_WIDTH": 6,
11    "JUMP_ADDR_WIDTH": 12,
12    "PC_INCREMENT_VAL": 2
13  },
14  "components": [
15    {
16      "name": "ProgramCounter",
17      "file": "program_counter.sv",
18      "description": "Holds the address of the
      current instruction and updates it based on
      control signals.",
```

```
19    "dependencies": [],
20    "status": "Validating",
21    "interface": [
22      {
23        "name": "clk",
24        "direction": "input",
25        "width": 1
26      },
27      {
28        "name": "rst",
29        "direction": "input",
30        "width": 1
31      },
32      {
33        "name": "pc_next_addr",
34        "direction": "input",
35        "width": "ADDRESS_WIDTH"
36      },
37      {
38        "name": "pc_out",
39        "direction": "output",
40        "width": "ADDRESS_WIDTH"
41      }
42    ]
43  },
44  .
45  .
46  .
47  {
48    "name": "Legv8SingleCycleProcessor",
49    "file": "legv8_single_cycle_processor.sv",
50    .
51    "description": "Top-level module for the
52    simple single-cycle Legv8 processor,
53    integrating all sub-components.",
54    "dependencies": [
55      "ProgramCounter",
56      "InstructionMemory",
57      "ControlUnit",
58      "RegisterFile",
59      "ALU",
60      "DataMemory",
61      "SignExtender",
62      "Mux2to1",
63      "Mux3to1",
64      "Adder"
65    ],
66    "status": "Pending",
67    "interface": [
68      {
69        "name": "clk",
70        "direction": "input",
71        "width": 1
72      },
73      {
74        "name": "rst",
75        "direction": "input",
76        "width": 1
77      },
78      {
79        "name": "debug_pc_out",
80        "direction": "output",
81        "width": "ADDRESS_WIDTH"
82      },
83      {
84        "name": "debug_instruction_out",
85        "direction": "output",
86        "width": "INSTRUCTION_WIDTH"
87      },
88      {
89        "name": "debug_alu_result",
```

```

87         "direction": "output",
88         "width": "DATA_WIDTH"
89     },
90     {
91         "name": "debug_reg_write_data",
92         "direction": "output",
93         "width": "DATA_WIDTH"
94     }
95 ]
96 }
97 ]
98 }

```

Listing 1: Simple Legv8 Like Blueprint

D. RegisterFile.sv

```

1 module RegisterFile (
2     input logic clk,
3     input logic rst,
4     input logic [2:0] read_addr1,
5     input logic [2:0] read_addr2,
6     input logic [2:0] write_addr,
7     input logic [7:0] write_data,
8     input logic write_en,
9     output logic [7:0] read_data1,
10    output logic [7:0] read_data2
11 );
12
13    localparam DATA_WIDTH = 8;
14    localparam REG_ADDR_WIDTH = 3;
15    localparam NUM_REGISTERS = (1 <<
16        REG_ADDR_WIDTH);
17
18    logic [DATA_WIDTH-1:0] registers [
19        NUM_REGISTERS-1:0];
20
21    // Synchronous write, preventing writes to R0
22    always_ff @(posedge clk or posedge rst) begin
23        if (rst) begin
24            for (int i = 0; i < NUM_REGISTERS; i++)
25                begin
26                    registers[i] <= {DATA_WIDTH{1'b0}};
27                end
28        end else begin
29            // Only write if write_en is high AND the
30            // destination is not R0
31            if (write_en && (write_addr != 0)) begin
32                registers[write_addr] <= write_data;
33            end
34        end
35    end
36
37    // Asynchronous read, forcing R0 to be 0
38    // If reading address 0, output 0, otherwise
39    // output the register value.
40    assign read_data1 = (read_addr1 == 0) ? {
41        DATA_WIDTH{1'b0}} : registers[read_addr1];
42    assign read_data2 = (read_addr2 == 0) ? {
43        DATA_WIDTH{1'b0}} : registers[read_addr2];
44 endmodule

```

Listing 2: Corrected RegisterFile

E. test_RegisterFile.sv

```

1 import cocotb
2 from cocotb.clock import Clock
3 from cocotb.triggers import RisingEdge,
4     FallingEdge, Timer, ClockCycles

```

```

4 import random
5
6 @cocotb.test()
7 async def register_file_test(dut):
8     """Test the RegisterFile module thoroughly.
9     """
10
11     # Parameters derived from the HDL module
12     DATA_WIDTH = 8
13     REG_ADDR_WIDTH = 3
14     NUM_REGISTERS = 1 << REG_ADDR_WIDTH # 2^3 =
15         8 registers
16
17     # Create a clock instance and start it
18     clock = Clock(dut.clk, 10, units="ns") # 10
19     ns period = 100MHz clock
20     cocotb.start_soon(clock.start())
21
22     # Keep a shadow model of the register file
23     # for verification
24     # Initialize all shadow registers to 0,
25     # matching the reset behavior
26     shadow_registers = [0] * NUM_REGISTERS
27
28     cocotb.log.info("Starting RegisterFile test
29 ")
30
31     # 1. Reset the DUT
32     cocotb.log.info("Applying reset and
33 verifying initial state.")
34     dut.rst.value = 1
35     dut.write_en.value = 0
36     dut.write_addr.value = 0
37     dut.write_data.value = 0
38     dut.read_addr1.value = 0
39     dut.read_addr2.value = 0
40
41     await ClockCycles(dut.clk, 5) # Hold reset
42     # for a few clock cycles
43     dut.rst.value = 0
44     await RisingEdge(dut.clk) # Wait for reset
45     # to de-assert and first clock edge
46
47     # Verify all registers are 0 after reset
48     for i in range(NUM_REGISTERS):
49         dut.read_addr1.value = i
50         dut.read_addr2.value = i # Check both
51         read ports
52         await Timer(1, units="ns") # Allow
53         combinatorial logic to settle
54         assert dut.read_data1.value == 0, \
55             f"ERROR: Register {i} (read_data1)
56             not 0 after reset. Got {dut.read_data1.
57             value}"
58         assert dut.read_data2.value == 0, \
59             f"ERROR: Register {i} (read_data2)
60             not 0 after reset. Got {dut.read_data2.
61             value}"
62         shadow_registers[i] = 0 # Ensure shadow
63         model is also reset to 0
64
65     cocotb.log.info("Initial state verified:
66 All registers are 0.")
67
68     # 2. Basic Write and Read Test
69     cocotb.log.info("Performing basic write and
70 read test.")
71     test_addr = 1
72     test_data = 0xAA

```

```

57 dut.write_en.value = 1
58 dut.write_addr.value = test_addr
59 dut.write_data.value = test_data
60 await RisingEdge(dut.clk) # Write occurs on
    this rising edge
61 shadow_registers[test_addr] = test_data #
    Shadow model updated *after* the clock edge
62
63 # Read immediately after write (within the
    same clock cycle)
64 dut.read_addr1.value = test_addr
65 dut.read_addr2.value = test_addr
66 await Timer(1, units="ns") # Allow
    combinatorial read outputs to settle
67 assert dut.read_data1.value == test_data, \
    f"ERROR: Read data1 mismatch after
68 write. Expected {hex(test_data)}, got {hex(
    dut.read_data1.value)}"
69 assert dut.read_data2.value == test_data, \
    f"ERROR: Read data2 mismatch after
70 write. Expected {hex(test_data)}, got {hex(
    dut.read_data2.value)}"
71
72 # Read from an unwritten address (should
    still be 0)
73 unwritten_addr = (test_addr + 1) %
    NUM_REGISTERS
74 dut.read_addr1.value = unwritten_addr
75 await Timer(1, units="ns")
76 assert dut.read_data1.value ==
    shadow_registers[unwritten_addr], \
77 f"ERROR: Read data from unwritten
    register {unwritten_addr} mismatch.
    Expected {hex(shadow_registers[
    unwritten_addr])}, got {hex(dut.read_data1.
    value)}"
78 cocotb.log.info(f"Basic write to R{
    test_addr} ({hex(test_data)}) and read
    verified.")
79 # 3. Concurrent Writes and Reads (
    different addresses)
80 cocotb.log.info("Testing concurrent writes
    and reads.")
81 write_addr1 = 1
82 write_data1 = 0x11
83 write_addr2 = 2
84 write_data2 = 0x22
85
86 # Write to addr1
87 dut.write_en.value = 1
88 dut.write_addr.value = write_addr1
89 dut.write_data.value = write_data1
90 await RisingEdge(dut.clk)
91 shadow_registers[write_addr1] = write_data1
92
93 # Write to addr2
94 dut.write_en.value = 1
95 dut.write_addr.value = write_addr2
96 dut.write_data.value = write_data2
97 await RisingEdge(dut.clk)
98 shadow_registers[write_addr2] = write_data2
99
100 # Read both concurrently using different
    read ports
101 dut.read_addr1.value = write_addr1
102 dut.read_addr2.value = write_addr2
103 await Timer(1, units="ns")
104 assert dut.read_data1.value == write_data1,
    \
105 f"ERROR: Concurrent read data1 mismatch
    . Expected {hex(write_data1)}, got {hex(dut

```

```

.read_data1.value)}"
assert dut.read_data2.value == write_data2,
    \
    f"ERROR: Concurrent read data2 mismatch
    . Expected {hex(write_data2)}, got {hex(dut
    .read_data2.value)}"
cocotb.log.info(f"Concurrent writes to R{
    write_addr1} ({hex(write_data1)}) and R{
    write_addr2} ({hex(write_data2)}) and reads
    verified.")

# 4. Overwriting a Register
cocotb.log.info("Testing overwriting a
    register.")
overwrite_addr = 2
overwrite_data = 0xCC
dut.write_en.value = 1
dut.write_addr.value = overwrite_addr
dut.write_data.value = overwrite_data
await RisingEdge(dut.clk)
shadow_registers[overwrite_addr] =
    overwrite_data

dut.read_addr1.value = overwrite_addr
await Timer(1, units="ns")
assert dut.read_data1.value ==
    overwrite_data, \
    f"ERROR: Overwrite failed for R{
    overwrite_addr}. Expected {hex(
    overwrite_data)}, got {hex(dut.read_data1.
    value)}"
cocotb.log.info(f"Overwrite of R{
    overwrite_addr} with {hex(overwrite_data)}
    verified.")

# 5. No Write when write_en is low
cocotb.log.info("Testing no write when
    write_en is low.")
no_write_addr = 3
no_write_data = 0xFF
original_value = shadow_registers[
    no_write_addr] # Should be 0 from reset
dut.write_en.value = 0 # Crucial: write_en
    is low
dut.write_addr.value = no_write_addr
dut.write_data.value = no_write_data
await RisingEdge(dut.clk) # Clock edge, but
    no write should occur

dut.read_addr1.value = no_write_addr
await Timer(1, units="ns")
assert dut.read_data1.value ==
    original_value, \
    f"ERROR: Write occurred when write_en
    was low for R{no_write_addr}. Expected {hex
    (original_value)}, got {hex(dut.read_data1.
    value)}"
assert dut.read_data1.value !=
    no_write_data, \
    "ERROR: Data was written despite
    write_en being low!"
cocotb.log.info(f"No write to R{
    no_write_addr} when write_en is low
    verified.")

# 6. Fill all registers and verify
cocotb.log.info("Filling all registers and
    verifying their contents.")
dut.write_en.value = 1
for i in range(NUM_REGISTERS):
    data_to_write = (i * 17 + 5) & ((1 <<

```

```

149 DATA_WIDTH) - 1)
150     dut.write_addr.value = i
151     dut.write_data.value = data_to_write
152     dut.write_en.value = 1 if i != 0 else 0
153     # Don't write to R0
154
155     await RisingEdge(dut.clk)
156
157     # Update shadow model only if not R0
158     if i != 0:
159         shadow_registers[i] = data_to_write
160     else:
161         shadow_registers[i] = 0 # R0
162     always stays 0
163
164     # Verify all registers by reading them back
165     for i in range(NUM_REGISTERS):
166         dut.read_addr1.value = i
167         dut.read_addr2.value = (i + 1) %
168         NUM_REGISTERS # Read another one
169         concurrently
170         await Timer(1, units="ns")
171         assert dut.read_data1.value ==
172         shadow_registers[i], \
173         f"ERROR: Verification failed for R{
174         i} (read_data1). Expected {hex(
175         shadow_registers[i])}, got {hex(dut.
176         read_data1.value)}"
177         assert dut.read_data2.value ==
178         shadow_registers[(i + 1) % NUM_REGISTERS], \
179         f"ERROR: Verification failed for R
180         {(i + 1) % NUM_REGISTERS} (read_data2).
181         Expected {hex(shadow_registers[(i + 1) %
182         NUM_REGISTERS])}, got {hex(dut.read_data2.
183         value)}"
184         cocotb.log.debug(f"Verified R{i} ({hex(
185         shadow_registers[i])) and R{(i + 1) %
186         NUM_REGISTERS} ({hex(shadow_registers[(i +
187         1) % NUM_REGISTERS])})")
188         cocotb.log.info("All registers filled and
189         verified successfully.")
190
191     # 7. Randomized Test
192     cocotb.log.info("Starting randomized test
193     (100 cycles).")
194
195     for cycle in range(100):
196         # 1. Determine write operation for the
197         *upcoming* clock edge
198         write_this_cycle = False
199         write_addr_val = 1
200         write_data_val = 0
201
202         if random.random() < 0.6: # 60% chance
203         to write
204             write_this_cycle = True
205             write_addr_val = random.randint(1,
206             NUM_REGISTERS - 1)
207             write_data_val = random.randint(1,
208             (1 << DATA_WIDTH) - 1)
209             dut.write_en.value = 1
210             dut.write_addr.value =
211             write_addr_val
212             dut.write_data.value =
213             write_data_val
214             cocotb.log.debug(f"Cycle {cycle}:
215             Setting inputs for write: addr={
216             write_addr_val}, data={hex(write_data_val)}
217             ")
218         else:
219             dut.write_en.value = 0 # No write
220             this cycle
221             cocotb.log.debug(f"Cycle {cycle}:
222             No write this cycle.")
223
224             # 2. Set read addresses for the *
225             current* cycle's verification.
226             # These reads will reflect the state *
227             after* the upcoming clock edge.
228             read_addr1 = random.randint(0,
229             NUM_REGISTERS - 1)
230             read_addr2 = random.randint(0,
231             NUM_REGISTERS - 1)
232             dut.read_addr1.value = read_addr1
233             dut.read_addr2.value = read_addr2
234
235             # 3. Wait for the clock edge. This is
236             when the DUT's write (if enabled) happens.
237             await RisingEdge(dut.clk)
238
239             # 4. Update shadow model *after* the
240             clock edge if a write was enabled
241             if write_this_cycle:
242                 shadow_registers[write_addr_val] =
243                 write_data_val
244
245             # 5. Allow combinatorial logic for
246             reads to settle *after* the clock edge
247             await Timer(1, units="ns")
248
249             # 6. Now verify the reads
250             expected_data1 = shadow_registers[
251             read_addr1]
252             expected_data2 = shadow_registers[
253             read_addr2]
254             actual_data1 = dut.read_data1.value
255             actual_data2 = dut.read_data2.value
256
257             assert actual_data1 == expected_data1,
258             \
259             f"ERROR: Cycle {cycle}: Random
260             Read1 mismatch at addr {read_addr1}.
261             Expected {hex(expected_data1)}, got {hex(
262             actual_data1)}"
263             assert actual_data2 == expected_data2,
264             \
265             f"ERROR: Cycle {cycle}: Random
266             Read2 mismatch at addr {read_addr2}.
267             Expected {hex(expected_data2)}, got {hex(
268             actual_data2)}"
269             cocotb.log.debug(f"Cycle {cycle}:
270             Random Read: addr1={read_addr1}, data1={hex
271             (actual_data1)} (expected {hex(
272             expected_data1)}) | "
273             f"addr2={read_addr2},
274             data2={hex(actual_data2)} (expected {hex(
275             expected_data2)})")
276
277     cocotb.log.info("Randomized test completed.
278     ")
279     cocotb.log.info("RegisterFile test finished
280     successfully!")

```

Listing 3: Corrected test_RegisterFile