Secure Scan Design Using Shift Register Equivalents against Differential Behavior Attack
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Abstract - There is a need for an efficient design-for-testability to satisfy both testability and security of digital circuits. In our previous work, we reported a secure and testable scan design approach by using extended shift registers that are functionally equivalent but not structurally equivalent to shift registers, and showed a security level by clarifying the cardinality of those classes of shift register equivalents (SR equivalents). However, SR equivalents are not always secure for scan-based side-channel attacks. In this paper, we consider a scan-based side-channel attack called differential-behavior attack and propose several classes of SR-equivalent scan circuits using dummy flip-flops in order to protect the scan-based differential-behavior attack. To show the security level of those extended scan circuits, we introduce differential-behavior equivalent relation, and clarify the number of SR-equivalent extended scan circuits, the number of differential-behavior equivalent classes and the cardinality of those equivalent classes.

I. Introduction

Scan registers or scan chains are proven to be effective in improving the testability of digital circuits [1], [2]. However, its effect on the circuit, which makes its registers easily accessible from primary inputs and outputs, allows attackers to exploit this opportunity to extract key streams, copy intellectual property (IP), and even manipulate the circuit. This makes it difficult for scan chains to be used especially in special cryptographic circuits where secret key streams are stored in internal registers. However, sacrificing testability for security will degrade/affect product quality of these circuits, which conflicts with the high demand of reliable secure systems [3]. Fundamentally, the problem lies on the inherent contradiction between testability and security for digital circuits. Hence, there's a need for an efficient solution such that both testability and security are satisfied.

To solve this challenging problem, different approaches have been proposed. In [4], [5], a scan-chain design based on scrambling was proposed, where flip-flops are dynamically reordered in a scan chain. An alternative is given in [6], [7]. In this method, a secure scan-chain architecture with mirror key register (MKR) was introduced. Any crypto chip with the proposed architecture can be switched between test/normal mode (insecure) and normal mode only (secure). A similar scheme using insecure and secure modes is the lock & key security technique proposed in [8], [9]. It uses a test security controller (TSC) to switch between secure and insecure modes. This method divides the scan chain into smaller subchains of equal length. Moreover, Paul et al. in [10] claims to provide a superior technique compared to the ones mentioned. It is a Vlm-Scan that utilizes some flip-flops in a scan chain for authentication to move to test mode. The circuit can proceed to test mode only if the proper sequence of test keys are scanned in to the used flip-flops. The test controller can be tested, which is an advantage compared to the others, however, a long test key sequence is still needed. All of the proposed techniques [4 – 12] add extra hardware outside of the scan chain. This entails several disadvantages such as high area overhead, timing overhead or performance degradation, increased complexity of testing, and limited security for the registers part among others.

Sengar et al. discussed a model called secured flipped-scan-chain in [13], which works as conventional scan chains do except that it uses inverters in the scan path to flip part of the register content for protection. There are no additional test keys or clock cycles in the method. Testing the architecture can be done the same way with scan chains, only with additional NOT gates. However, Sengar’s approach [13] has not considered the possibility of resetting (to zero) of all flip-flops in the scan chain. In this case, the positions of all inverters, despite a sufficient number, can still be determined by simply scanning out after reset. Thus, the internal state can be identified and the security is breached.

In [14], we proposed a secure and testable scan design approach by using extended shift registers that are functionally equivalent but not structurally equivalent to shift registers. The proposed approach is only to replace the original scan register with a modified scan register that requires little area overhead and no performance overhead with respect to normal operation. To show the security level for the proposed approach, we clarified the cardinality of those classes of shift register equivalents (SR-equivalents) [15]. However, SR-equivalents are not always secure for scan-based side-channel attacks. In this paper, we consider a scan-based side-channel attack called differential-behavior attack and propose several classes of SR-equivalent scan circuits using dummy flip-flops in order to protect the scan-based differential-behavior attack. To show the security level of those extended scan circuits, we introduce differential-behavior equivalent relation, and clarify the number of SR-equivalent extended scan circuits, the number of differential-behavior equivalent classes and the cardinality of those equivalent classes for several linear structure circuits.

II. Extended Shift Registers

Figure 1 illustrates a 3-stage register and the state transition graph. Based from this, we define extended shift registers and shift register equivalent circuits (SR-equivalents) as follows.

**Extended Shift Register.** A circuit whose state transition graph is isomorphic to that of k-stage shift register is called a k-stage extended shift register.

**Shift Register Equivalent.** A circuit C is called functionally equivalent to a k-stage shift register (or SR-equivalent) if the state transition graph of C is isomorphic to that of the shift register and the input/output assignment is the same as that of the shift register. The state assignment is not necessarily the same as that of the shift register.
Figure 2(a)-(b) illustrates examples of 3-stage extended shift registers; an extended shift register which is not SR-equivalent and an extended shift register which is SR-equivalent. Underlined symbols indicate differences from the state transition graph shown in Figure 1. Here, we consider the following five types of linear circuits that can realize extended shift registers; inversion-inserted shift registers (I²SR), linear feed-forward shift registers (LF²SR), linear feedback shift registers (LFSR), inversion-inserted linear feed-forward shift registers (I² LF²SR), and inversion-inserted linear feedback shift registers (I² LFSR). Figure 3 shows those examples.

Figure 1. Shift register

Figure 2. Extended shift registers

Figure 3. Five types of linear circuits

A. How to Design SR-Equivalents

Let us consider how to adapt the design of proposed SR-equivalents in DFT flow that generally needs to conform to some requirements and constraints. Let the constraint be the power consumption during scan operation. First, we insert NOT and feed-forward XOR gates into a scan chain to minimize power consumption during scan operation by using the method of [16]. Next, we check if the augmented scan register or extended shift register is SR-equivalent or not. If not, we augment it to SR-equivalent with minimal modification.

We have presented how to modify a given extended SR into SR-equivalent in [14], [15]. A k-stage LF²SR given in Figure 4(a) is used as an example to demonstrate how a modification to SR equivalent is done. Here, k=3. By symbolic simulation illustrated in Figure 4(c), the output z at time k+1=4 becomes $a_3+a_2$ after applying an input sequence $a_3$ to x, where $x(1)=a_3$, $x(2)=a_2$, and $x(3)=0$. To change $a_3+a_2$ into $a_3$, we add another value $a_2$ to the output z, i.e., $a_2+a_3+a_2=a_3$. To do so, we modify the circuit by adding a feed-forward from $y_2$ to z as shown in Figure 4(b). Then the modified circuit becomes SR-equivalent. In this way, for a k-stage LF²SR, the additional feed-forward line is uniquely determined from the output expression at time $k+1$ obtained by symbolic simulation.

Symbolic simulation is very fast, and hence it is not so hard to construct a long stage of SR-equivalent by modification shown in Figure 4. However, the additional hardware might increase as the stage $k$ increases.

B. How to Control/Observe SR-Equivalents

For a synthesized SR-equivalent circuit, the following two problems are important in order to utilize the SR-equivalent circuit as a scan shift register in testing. One problem is to generate an input sequence to transfer the circuit into a given desired state. This is called state-justification problem. The other problem is to determine the initial state by observing the output sequence from the state. This is called state-observation problem. In [14], we showed that for any SR-equivalent circuit, those problems can be solved uniquely similar to SR. That is, for any desired state, a transfer sequence to the state can be uniquely generated, independently of the initial state, and any present state (initial state) can be uniquely identified only from the output sequence.

Consider a 3-stage LF²SR given in Figure 5(a). This LF²SR is SR-equivalent. By using symbolic simulation, we can obtain an input sequence $x(t+3), x(t+2), x(t+1)$ that transfers the circuit from any state to the desired final state ($y_1(t)$, $y_2(t)$, $y_3(t)$) as illustrated in Figure 5(b). Similarly, as illustrated in Figure 5(c), we can determine the initial state ($y_1(t)$, $y_2(t)$, $y_3(t)$) from the output sequence ($z(t)$, $z(t+1)$, $z(t+2)$). For other type of
SR-equivalent structures, we can obtain those equations similarly and easily from symbolic simulation.

(a) Extended shift register R

(b) Extended scan register S

(c) Kernel with extended scan register

**Figure 6.** Scan design with extended scan register

**Figure 7.** Long secure scan chain

**Figure 8.** Extended scan circuits with dummy FF

**Figure 9.** Scan design with extended scan circuit

III. Extended Scan Circuits

A scan-designed circuit consists of a single or multiple scan registers or scan chains and the remaining combinational logic circuit (kernel). A scan register is regarded as a shift register with multiplexers that select the normal data from the combinational logic circuit and the shifting data from the preceding flip-flop. Here, we replace the shift register with an extended shift register. The scan register with the extended shift register as shown in Figure 6 is called the extended scan register (ESR).

In the proposed secure scan design, not all scan registers are replaced with ESRs. As shown in Figure 7, only the scan registers necessary to be secure are replaced with ESRs that cover the secrete registers and the size of ESRs is large enough to make them secure. So, the area overhead can be low. The delay overhead due to additional XOR gates influences only scan operation, and hence there is no delay overhead for normal operation.

In the following section, we consider a differential behavior attack as a scan-based side-channel attack. To protect the attack, we introduce a dummy flip-flop as shown in Figure 8. A circuit consisting of an extended shift register and a dummy FF is called an extended scan circuit. Figure 8 illustrates three extended scan circuits with three types of dummy flip-flops. Figure 9 shows scan design with the extended scan circuit.

IV. Differential Behavior

Let us consider the following scan-based attack. First, the circuit under test is reset and then run in normal mode. Next, it is switched to scan mode to scan out the contents of scan registers. These steps are repeated using another input sequence that is slightly different from the first input sequence. By applying such two input sequences that are slightly different from each other, the contents of scan registers have a single bit or multiple bit difference between two input sequences, i.e., one can insert different values (referred to differential value) into a single or multiple flip-flops between two input sequences (or a pair of input sequences) and observe the differences between the pair of output sequences by scan operation. Such a pair of two scan-out sequences including differential values is called a differential behavior (or d-behavior, for short). Figure 10 shows four d-behaviors for the extended scan register S in Figure 6 (b). A single differential value is inserted into x, y1, y2, y3, and y4, respectively.

**Differential-behavior attack.** The attack that inserts differential values into extended scan registers in normal mode and observes the differential behaviors in scan mode is called a differential-behavior attack. For the differential-behavior attack, we consider the possibility of the worst case such that arbitrary number of differential values can be inserted into any flip-flops except dummy flip-flops though the inserted positions are unknown, and that differential values can also be inserted simultaneously from scan-input at any time again and again.

**Differential-behavior set.** A set of all d-behaviors for an extended scan circuit S is called the differential-behavior set of S (or d-behavior set of S, for short). A set of all single-bit d-behaviors for S is called the fundamental differential-behavior set of S (or fundamental d-behavior set of S, for short). Figure 10 shows the fundamental d-behavior set of S in Figure 6 (b).

**Differential-behavior equivalent relation.** Let S1 and S2 be extended scan circuits. S1 and S2 are said to be differential-behavior equivalent (or d-behavior equivalent, for short) if the d-behavior sets of S1 and S2 are the same.
XOR operation of differential value \(d\) and constant \((-)\) is as follows. \((d) \oplus (d) = (-), (d) \oplus (-) = (d), (-) \oplus (-) = (-)\). Then, the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 1:** Any differential behavior can be uniquely expressed by XOR-superposition of fundamental \(d\)-behaviors only.

Figure 11 illustrates two examples of Theorem 1. From Theorem 1, we see that two extended scan circuits can be identified to be \(d\)-behavior equivalent or not, only by checking their fundamental behavior sets are the same.

**Theorem 2:** Let \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) be extended scan circuits. \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) are \(d\)-behavior equivalent if and only if fundamental \(d\)-behavior sets of \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) are the same.

V. Identification of Scan Structure

The extended shift register \(R_L\) of Figure 6(a) is \(SR\)-equivalent. The total number of \(SR\)-equivalent circuits with 3 flip-flops is \(N(3) = 2^{3!/3!} - 1 = 6719\). Since they are all functionally equivalent to the 3-stage shift register, their input/output relations are the same for all of them. Therefore, the probability that an attacker can identify it to be \(R_L\) by guessing is \(1/6719\). The number of 3-stage \(SR\)-equivalent \(LFSR\)-type circuits is \(2^{2^{3!/3!} - 1} = 7\), and hence the guessing probability is one seventh. However, the guessing probability approaches to zero as the number of \(LFSR\)-type circuits increases. In the above discussion, we considered only attacks via scan operation for extended scan registers. However, if we target extended scan circuits, we need to consider differential-behavior attacks.

Suppose the extended scan register \(R_L\) and the scan circuit \(S_L\) in Figure 6. \(S_L\) consists of \(R_L\). The fundamental \(d\)-behavior set of \(S_L\) is shown in Figure 10. As explained later in Section VI.B, every class of differential behavior equivalent for \(LFSR\)-type scan circuits consists of one element or singleton, i.e., the cardinality of every \(d\)-behavior equivalent class is 1. Hence, we can see any extended scan circuit that has the same fundamental \(d\)-behavior set as that of \(S_L\) is only \(S_L\) itself. Therefore, we can uniquely identify \(S_L\) from the \(d\)-behavior set, and hence the structure of \(S_L\) is identified and \(S_L\) is not secure.

The probability that an attacker can identify the configuration of an extended scan circuit \(S\) approximates to the reciprocal of the cardinality of the class of extended scan circuits that are \(d\)-behavior equivalent to \(S\). To evaluate the security level against \(d\)-behavior attacks, for each type of extended scan circuits we clarify the total number of \(SR\)-equivalent extended scan circuits in the class, the number of \(d\)-equivalent classes, and the cardinality of those equivalent classes in the following sections.

VI. Cardinality of Differential Behavior Equivalents

From Theorem 2, we see that two extended scan circuits can be identified to be \(d\)-behavior equivalent or not, only by checking their fundamental behavior sets are the same. Therefore, we consider only fundamental behaviors from now on.

A. \(I^*SR\) without Dummy FF

Consider an \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*SR\)-type scan circuit without dummy FF. If a differential value is inserted into the \(j\)-th FF \(y_j\), the \(d\)-behavior becomes \((- , ..., , - , d , - , ..., - )\) of length \(k+1\). Therefore, the following \(k+1\) \(d\)-behaviors are obtained.

\( (- , ..., , d) , (- , ..., , - , d) , ..., (d , - , ..., - )\)

Therefore, the total number of \(SR\)-equivalent \(k\)-stage \(I^*SR\)-type scan circuits is \(2^k - 1\).

They are all \(d\)-behavior equivalent each other. Hence, the number of \(d\)-behavior equivalent classes is 1. The cardinality of the unique equivalent class is \(2^k - 1\).

B. \(L^2SR\) and \(L^2FSR\) without Dummy FF

Consider an \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(L^2SR\)-type scan circuit without dummy FF. If a differential value is inserted into the \(j\)-th FF \(y_j\), the \(d\)-behavior becomes \((x_1, x_2, ..., x_{k+1}, d, -, ..., - )\) of length \(k+1\) where \(x_1, x_2, ..., x_{k+1}\) are either \((-)\) or \((d)\). The number of total such different patterns are \(2^{k+1}\).

Since a differential value can be inserted in \(y_1, y_2, ..., y_k\), the number of different \(d\)-behavior sets (the number of equivalent classes) including \(SR\) becomes \(\prod_{j=1}^{k} 2^{k+1} = 2^{k(k+1)}\).

The total number of \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(L^2SR\)-type scan circuits including \(SR\) is \(2^{k(k+1)/2} - 1\). Hence, the cardinality of every equivalent class is 1, i.e., singleton.

As for \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(LFSR\)-type scan circuits, we can obtain similarly, i.e., the number of extended scan circuits, the number of \(d\)-behavior equivalent classes, and the cardinality of those equivalent classes are the same as those of \(L^2SR\)-type scan circuits.

C. \(I^*L^2SR\) and \(I^*LFSR\) without Dummy FF

Consider an \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*L^2SR\)-type scan circuit without dummy FF. By considering the superposition of \(I^*SR\) and \(L^2SR\), the total number of \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*L^2SR\)-type scan circuits is

\[
(\frac{2^{k(k+1)/2}}{2^k} - 1)(2^k - 1)
\]

The total number of \(d\)-equivalent classes is \(2^{k(k+1)/2} - 1\). Hence, there exists an equivalent class whose cardinality is at least \(2^k - 1\).

As for \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*LFSR\)-type scan circuits without dummy FF, we can obtain similarly, i.e., the number of extended scan circuits, the number of \(d\)-behavior equivalent classes, and the cardinality of those equivalent classes are the same as those of \(I^*L^2SR\)-type scan circuits without dummy FF.

D. \(I^*SR\) with One Dummy FF

Consider \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*SR\)-type scan circuits with one dummy FF. The total number of \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*SR\)s is \(2^k - 1\).

For each \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*SR\), there exist the following number of different patterns of placing one dummy FF as shown in Figure 12. In the case that a constant 0 or 4 is connected to the normal input of one dummy FF, there are 2k cases. In the case that a normal input of other FF is connected to the normal input of one dummy FF, there are 3(k−1)/2 cases. Therefore, the total number of \(SR\)-equivalent k-stage \(I^*SR\)-type scan circuits with one dummy FF is

\[
\left(2^k + \frac{3}{2} \frac{k(k−1)}{2}\right)(2^k - 1) = \frac{3k^2 + k}{2}(2^k - 1)
\]

Inserting a differential value becomes either inserting a
differential value into a FF or inserting two differential values into two FFs. Therefore, the total number of d-equivalent classes is
\[
\left(\begin{array}{c}
k \\
1
\end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{c}
k \\
2
\end{array}\right) = k + \frac{k(k-1)}{2} = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}
\]
Hence, there exists an equivalent class whose cardinality is at least
\[
\frac{3k^2 + k}{2(k+1)} = \frac{3k + 1}{k+1} \cdot \left(2^i - 1\right) = 3^i - 1
\]

E. \(\bar{F}LFSR\) and \(LFSR\) with One Dummy FF

Consider SR-equivalent k-stage \(\bar{F}LFSR\)-type scan circuits with one dummy FF. The total number of SR-equivalent k-stage \(\bar{F}LFSR\)'s is
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{2^k-1} (2^k-1)
\]

For each SR-equivalent k-stage \(\bar{F}SR\), there exist the following number of different patterns of placing one dummy FF as shown in Figure 12. In the case that a constant 0 or 1 is connected to the normal input of one dummy FF, there are 2k cases. In the case that a normal input of other FF is connected to the normal input of one dummy FF, there are 3k(k-1)/2 cases. Therefore, the total number of SR-equivalent k-stage \(\bar{F}LFSR\)-type scan circuits with one dummy FF is
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{2^k-1} (2^k-1)
\]

Similar to the discussion of Section VI.D, inserting a differential value becomes either inserting a differential value into a FF or inserting two differential values into two FFs. Therefore, the total number of d-equivalent classes is
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{2^k-1} (2^k-1)
\]

On the other hand, the number of scan circuits is
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{2^k-1} (2^k-1)
\]

Therefore, there exists an equivalent class whose cardinality is at least
\[
\frac{3k^2 + k}{2} \cdot \left(2^i - 1\right) = O(k^2)
\]

F. \(\bar{F}LF\)SR and \(\bar{F}LFSR\) with One Dummy FF

Consider an SR-equivalent k-stage \(\bar{F}LF\)SR-type scan circuit with one dummy FF. By considering the superposition of \(\bar{F}SR\) and \(LFSR\), the total number of SR-equivalent k-stage \(\bar{F}LF\)SR-type scan circuits is
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{2^k-1} (2^k-1)
\]

The total number of d-equivalent classes is
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{2^k-1} (2^k-1)
\]

Therefore, there exists an equivalent class whose cardinality is at least
\[
\frac{3k^2 + k}{2} \cdot \left(2^i - 1\right) = O(k^2)
\]

As for SR-equivalent k-stage \(\bar{F}LFSR\)-type scan circuits with one dummy FF, we can obtain similarly, i.e., the number of extended scan circuits, the number of d-behavior equivalent classes, and the cardinality of those equivalent classes are the same as those of \(\bar{F}LF\)SR-type scan circuits with one dummy FF.

### Table I. Cardinality of d-behavior equivalent classes (without dummy FF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(LFSR)</th>
<th>(\bar{F}LSR)</th>
<th>(\bar{F}LFSR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\bar{F}^2LFSR) ((\bar{F}LFSR))</th>
<th>(\bar{F}^2LFSR) ((\bar{F}LFSR))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II. Cardinality of d-behavior equivalent classes (with one dummy FF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\bar{F}LFSR) ((\bar{F}LSR))</th>
<th>(\bar{F}LFSR) ((\bar{F}LSR))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table III. Cardinality of d-behavior equivalent classes (without dummy FF) by SREEP-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\bar{F}LFSR) ((\bar{F}LSR))</th>
<th>(\bar{F}LFSR) ((\bar{F}LSR))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IV. Cardinality of d-behavior equivalent classes (with one dummy FF) by SREEP-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\bar{F}LFSR) ((\bar{F}LSR))</th>
<th>(\bar{F}LFSR) ((\bar{F}LSR))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
<td>(2^{2k-1} - 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Enumeration Results by SREEP-2

In the previous sections, for each type of extended scan circuits with/without dummy FF, we have clarified the total number of SR-equivalent extended scan circuits in the class, the number of d-equivalent classes, and the cardinality of those equivalent classes. Regarding the cardinality of d-equivalent classes, we showed the existence of an equivalent class whose cardinality is at least 1. However, all other classes in Table I and Table II
are secure. Especially the classes of $\mathcal{I}^n\mathcal{L}$FSR and $\mathcal{I}^n\mathcal{L}$FSR with dummy FF are the most secure thanks to high cardinality.

To examine the actual cardinalities of $\mathcal{d}$-equivalent classes for each type of extended scan circuits, we made a program called SREEP-2 (Shift Register Equivalents Enumeration and Synthesis Program -2).

The enumeration results for extended scan circuits without and with dummy FF are shown in Table III and Table IV, respectively. The third column shows the number of SR-equivalent scan circuits in each class of extended scan circuits. The fourth column shows the number of $d$-equivalent classes. The fifth column shows the guaranteed cardinality, i.e., there exists an equivalent class whose cardinality is at least the guaranteed one. The sixth column shows the range of cardinality, i.e., the minimal cardinality to the maximal cardinality.

As for the number of SR-equivalent scan circuits and the number of $d$-equivalent classes, theoretical values computed from the expressions in Section VI coincide with the actual values obtained from SREEP-2. As for the guaranteed cardinalities, they are all exactly within the range of cardinality. Hence, it is indeed guaranteed that there exist equivalent classes whose cardinality is larger than the guaranteed cardinality.

Next, let us consider the overhead of SR-equivalent scan circuits. The performance or delay overhead for normal operation is zero. The delay overhead due to extra XOR gates influences only scan operation. If the area overhead, as mentioned in Section III, is not all scan registers are replaced with extended scan registers but only the registers necessary to be secure are replaced with extended scan registers, as shown in Figure 7. So, the area overhead of whole scan circuits is expected to be low. Further, the area overhead of each extended scan register can be very low.

Figure 13 shows an example of the outcome of an SR-equivalent 16-stage $\mathcal{I}^n\mathcal{L}$FSR-type extended scan register without dummy FF obtained by SREEP-2 under the constraint of at most two XOR gates. Hence, the area overhead is very low.

VII. Conclusions

In this paper, we considered a scan-based differential-behavior attack and proposed several classes of SR-equivalent scan circuits using dummy flip-flops in order to protect the scan-based differential-behavior attack. In order to show the security level of those extended scan circuits, we introduced differential-behavior equivalent relation, and clarified the number of SR-equivalent extended scan circuits, the number of differential-behavior equivalent classes and the cardinality of those equivalent classes. It is shown that the proposed extended scan design is very secure as well as easily testable, the normal delay or performance overhead is zero, and the area overhead can be very low.
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Figure 13. Outcome of SR-equivalent extended scan register by SREEP-2.