Neuromorphic Digital and Hybrid Circuits for Spiking Neural Networks: A Comprehensive Review

Divya V[1], Pravitha V Devan[2]
[1,2]Associate Professor, Department of ECE, Sarabhai Institute of Science and Technology

doi.org/10.64643/IJIRTV12I10-204542-459

***Abstract*—Neuromorphic computing represents a paradigm shift in hardware design, moving away from traditional von Neumann architectures to mimic the brain's efficient information processing. This review examines three primary architectural approaches for Spiking Neural Networks (SNNs): fully digital designs, the massively parallel Spinnaker system, and hybrid digital-analog circuits. Digital architectures like True North and Loihi prioritize scalability and programmability, utilizing CMOS technology and asynchronous networks-on-chip to handle large-scale neural simulations. SpiNNaker specifically addresses real-time biological modeling through a unique packet-based interconnect architecture.**

***Index Terms*—Neuromorphic computing, Spiking Neural Networks, Digital circuits, Hybrid circuits, SpiNNake.**

I. INTRODUCTION

The increasing computational demands of modern artificial intelligence have highlighted the "power wall" and "memory wall" inherent in conventional von Neumann architectures [8]. As data movement between processing units and memory becomes the primary bottleneck for energy efficiency, neuromorphic computing has emerged as a viable alternative. By emulating the structure and function of biological nervous systems, neuromorphic circuits aim to achieve high-performance processing with minimal power consumption [1], [19].

Spiking Neural Networks (SNNs) are at the core of this transition. Unlike traditional Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) that use continuous activation values, SNNs communicate via discrete, asynchronous events called spikes [15]. This event-driven nature allows for significant energy savings, as neurons only consume power when active. The design of hardware to support these networks has branched into several distinct methodologies, ranging from high-precision digital implementations to biologically realistic mixed-signal designs [2], [11].

II. DIGITAL SNN ARCHITECTURES

Digital neuromorphic architectures are characterized by their high computational precision, robustness to noise, and programmability [11]. These systems typically utilize standard CMOS technology and leverage established digital design flows to implement large-scale neural arrays.

A. Key Digital Implementations

Several landmark digital neuromorphic chips have defined the current state of the art:

TrueNorth (IBM):
A many-core processor containing 1 million neurons and 256 million non-plastic synapses. It employs a Globally Asynchronous Locally Synchronous (GALS) design and achieves an energy efficiency of approximately 26 pJ per synaptic operation (SOP) [2], [6].

Loihi (Intel):
A fully asynchronous digital chip designed for on-chip learning. It supports 128 cores with a total of 131,072 Leaky-Integrate-and-Fire (LIF) neurons and 1 million programmable synapses. Loihi features microcode-specified plasticity rules, such as Spike-Timing-Dependent Plasticity (STDP), and operates at 23.6 pJ/SOP [2], [20].

Akida (Brain Chip):
A digital system capable of 1.2 million neurons and 10 billion synapses, focusing on incremental and one-shot learning with an efficiency of 1,000 frames per Watt [6].

B. Architectural Features

Digital SNNs frequently employ 2D mesh or tree-based routing strategies for spike distribution [1]. They rely on time-multiplexing to manage the trade-off between hardware area and neural density, allowing a single physical core to simulate thousands of virtual neurons [1], [2]. Reconfigurable digital implementations on FPGAs are also widely used for rapid prototyping, offering flexibility in neuron models and plasticity mechanisms while maintaining competitive performance through hardware optimization techniques [5], [11].

III. THE SPINNAKER SYSTEM

The SpiNNaker (Spiking Neural Network Architecture) project represents a unique class of digital neuromorphic hardware designed specifically for large-scale computational neuroscience modeling [12]. Unlike ASICs like TrueNorth or Loihi, SpiNNaker is a massively parallel computer built from a large number of simple, low-power ARM processor cores [2], [12]. The system's architecture is inspired by the mammalian brain's interconnectivity, utilizing a custom packet-based routing network to transmit neural "spikes" across the million-core array [12].

IV. DESIGN PHILOSOPHY

Unlike ASICs like TrueNorth or Loihi, SpiNNaker is a massively parallel computer built from a large number of simple, low-power ARM processor cores [2], [12]. The system's architecture is inspired by the mammalian brain's interconnectivity, utilizing a custom packet-based routing network to transmit neural "spikes" across the million-core array [12].

SpiNNaker is designed to simulate large-scale spiking neural networks in biological real-time. A single chip contains 18 cores, and the full system can scale to 1,036,800 cores [12]. Each core runs a real-time event-driven programming model, allowing researchers to implement diverse neural and synaptic models in software. It has been successfully used to simulate a 1mm^2 cortical column in real-time, demonstrating its utility as a flexible research platform for brain emulation [6].

V. HYBRID DIGITAL-ANALOG CIRCUITS

A. Mixed-Signal Neurons and Synapses

Hybrid systems often implement neuron dynamics (e.g., LIF) and synaptic integration using analog circuits. This approach mimics the continuous-time physics of biological neurons more closely than discrete-time digital simulations [1]. Systems like BrainScaleS use analog circuits to simulate neurons 10,000 times faster than biological time, while Neurogrid employs analog-to-mixed-signal (AMS) circuits to support 65,536 neurons with a power budget of 3.1W [6], [8].

A critical innovation in hybrid designs is the integration of computation within the memory array itself. In-memory computing (IMC) reduces energy consumption by eliminating the need to move weight data between memory and processing units [7], [13]. For example, the Braindrop chip uses a mixed-signal approach based on the Neural Engineering Framework (NEF) to achieve an exceptional energy efficiency of 0.38 pJ/SOP [2].

Recent research focuses on incorporating novel devices like memristors into hybrid circuits. Memristor crossbar arrays can act as both memory and computational elements, enabling extremely dense and energy-efficient implementations of synaptic weights and STDP-based learning [3], [18]. Memristor-based systems have shown potential to be 110x more energy-efficient than GPUs for certain SNN tasks [6].

VI. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE AND TRADE-OFFS

The choice of neuromorphic architecture depends on the specific requirements of the application, as summarized in the table below.

A. Efficiency vs. Flexibility

Hybrid systems offer the lowest energy per operation but are often specialized for specific network topologies or learning rules [2], [6]. Digital platforms and SpiNNaker provide the flexibility needed for general-purpose SNN research and the implementation of complex, software-defined plasticity mechanisms [12], [20].

B. Scalability Bottlenecks

Large-scale digital systems face challenges related to interconnect congestion and communication bandwidth as the number of chips increases [20]. Analog systems, while dense, suffer from sensitivity to process, voltage, and temperature (PVT) variations, which can lead to mismatch between neurons and synapses across the chip [1], [11].

Feature	Digital (e.g., Loihi, TrueNorth)	SpiNNaker	Hybrid/Analog (e.g., BrainScaleS, Braindrop)
Energy Efficiency	Moderate (~20-30 pJ/SOP) [2]	Lower (Software-overhead dependent) [2]	Very High (<1 pJ/SOP) [2]
Programmability	High (Programmable cores/GALS) [20]	Very High (Software-defined) [12]	Low (Fixed analog circuits) [6]
Scalability	High (Async mesh routing) [20]	Massively Parallel (Million cores) [12]	Limited (Sensitivity to PVT) [1]
Real-time Modeling	Possible [20]	Biological Real-time [12]	Faster than Biological [6]
Precision	High (Digital) [11]	High (Digital) [12]	Low (Analog noise/mismatch) [11]

VII. APPLICATIONS

Neuromorphic circuits are being deployed across a wide range of domains where traditional computing is inefficient.

- Edge AI and Low-Power Sensing:

The energy efficiency of mixed-signal and digital SNN chips makes them ideal for battery-powered edge devices [15]. Applications include keyword spotting, gesture recognition (e.g., 0.18W on TrueNorth), and biosignal processing [2], [6].

- Robotics:

Memristor-based neuromorphic circuits are being developed to provide robots with "human-like" brain capabilities, enhancing speed and decision-making for motor control and information integration [18].

- Neuroscience Research:

Massive systems like SpiNNaker and BrainScaleS are used by neuroscientists to test hypotheses about brain function and simulate large-scale neural dynamics that are computationally prohibitive on standard supercomputers [6], [12].

- Closed-Loop Control:

Neuromorphic systems are increasingly explored for adaptive edge computing in robotics and autonomous systems where low latency is critical [2].

VIII. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The field of neuromorphic hardware design is rapidly evolving, with several key areas identified for future research:

- Standardization of Benchmarks:

There is a significant lack of standardized datasets and communication protocols for SNNs. Developing widely accepted benchmarks for temporal data is essential for comparing different architectures fairly [1], [2].

- 3D Integration:

To overcome memory and routing bottlenecks, 3D integration technology is being explored to pack neurons and synapses more densely and reduce wire lengths [8].

- Memristor Element Base:

Further development of memristor technology for in-memory computing is expected to drive the next generation of energy-efficient and scalable neuromorphic chips [3], [6], [18].

- Quantum Neuromorphic Computing:

Investigating the integration of quantum computing principles with neuromorphic architectures could lead to even greater leaps in performance and efficiency [19].

- Trustworthy SNNs:

As SNNs are deployed in real-world applications, ensuring the trustworthiness and reliability of the hardware-algorithm co-design becomes paramount [13].

IX CONCLUSION

The development of neuromorphic digital and hybrid circuits has provided a diverse toolkit for overcoming the limitations of von Neumann computing. Digital architectures offer the robustness and flexibility required for large-scale modeling and complex learning, while hybrid systems push the boundaries of energy efficiency for edge applications. SpiNNaker serves as a critical bridge, providing a massively parallel platform for biological real-time simulation. The synergy between these "bottom-up" (biologically inspired) and "top-down" (application-driven) approaches is essential for achieving the full potential of neuromorphic intelligence and creating systems that rival the efficiency and versatility of the biological brain [2].

REFERENCES

[1] Basu *et al.*, “Spiking neural network integrated circuits: A review of trends and future directions,” in *Proc. IEEE Custom Integrated Circuits Conference (CICC)*, 2022.

[2] “Bottom-up and top-down approaches for the design of neuromorphic processing systems: Tradeoffs and synergies between natural and artificial intelligence,” Proceedings of the IEEE, 2023.

[3] B. Ivanov et al., “Neuromorphic artificial intelligence systems,” 2022.

[4] B. Cassidy et al., “Design of silicon brains in the nano-CMOS era: Spiking neurons, learning synapses and neural architecture optimization,” Neural Networks, vol. 45, pp. 4–26, 2013.

[5] N. Farsa et al., “Reconfigurable digital FPGA implementations for neuromorphic computing: A survey on recent advances and future directions,” IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence, 2025.

[6] B. Ivanov et al., “Neuromorphic artificial intelligence systems,” Frontiers in Neuroscience, 2022.

[7] “Spiking neural network integrated circuits: A review of trends and future directions,” in Proc. 2022 IEEE Custom Integrated Circuits Conference (CICC), 2022.

[8] “A survey of intelligent chip design research based on spiking neural networks,” IEEE Access, vol. 10, pp. 91705–91724, 2022.

[9] “Spiking neural network integrated circuits: A review of trends and future directions,” arXiv preprint, 2022.

[10] S. Misra and I. Saha, “Artificial neural networks in hardware: A survey of two decades of progress,” Neurocomputing, vol. 74, no. 1–3, pp. 239–255, 2010.

[11] S. Jawandhiya, “Hardware design for machine learning,” International Journal of Artificial Intelligence & Applications, vol. 9, no. 1, 2018.

[12] S. Furber et al., “The SpiNNaker project,” Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 102, no. 5, pp. 652–665, 2014.

[13] S. Kundu et al., “Recent advances in scalable energy-efficient and trustworthy spiking neural networks: From algorithms to technology,” arXiv preprint, 2023.

[14] “Hybrid neuromorphic systems: An algorithm-application-hardware-neuroscience co-design perspective,” in Proc. IEEE 4th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Circuits and Systems (AICAS), 2022.

[15] C. Ferreira et al., “A comparative review of deep and spiking neural networks for edge AI neuromorphic circuits.”

[16] Z. Lu et al., “Hybrid neuromorphic systems: An algorithm-application-hardware-neuroscience co-design perspective,” in Proc. International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Circuits and Systems, 2022.

[17] S. Chen et al., “A survey of intelligent chip design research based on spiking neural networks,” IEEE Access, 2022.

[18] L. Wang et al., “Neuromorphic circuits based on memristors: Endowing robots with a human-like

brain," Journal of Semiconductors, vol. 45, no. 6, 2024.

[19] V. Laxmi, "Neuromorphic computing: Innovations and future prospects," International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology, 2024.

[20] M. Davies et al., "Advancing neuromorphic computing with Loihi: A survey of results and outlook," Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 109, no. 5, pp. 911–943, 2021.