Some Good Block PSK Real Number Codes for Rayleigh Fading Channels

Shalini Periyalwar and Xin Jin Department of Electrical Engineering Technical University of Nova Scotia P.O. Box **1O00,** Halifax N.S. B3J **2x4**

Abstract — PSK real number codes for the Rayleigh fading channel were proposed in [I]. This paper tabulates the detailed mapping of some simple full-diversity low-delay codes in the original and the manually refined forms. The performance is examined by simulation at various interleaving depths. For the codes considered, the manually refined ones are found to be easy to implement and offer very little performance loss compared with the original.

I. INTRODUCrION

Optimum coded modulation design for mobile wireless channels which typically experience severe Rayleigh/Rician fading is a topic of continued research. The lengthy burst errors caused due to the Occurrence of deep fades, particularly at slow mobile speeds, results in the performance of coded modulation schemes being worse than that of uncoded modulation, even when significant interleaving depths are employed.

For Rayleigh fading channels, it has been shown that, using coherent maximum likelihood sequence estimation with known channel information, the pairwise error probability of the coded modulation schemes depends greatly on the degree of timediversity [24] instead of squared Euclidean distance. Although many BCM codes for Rayleigh fading channels [e.g. 5-91 have Already been designed based on criteria such **as** increased diversity, their diversity length is still less than the codeword length. To achieve a given diversity length, longer channel codewords are used, which leads to increased interleaving delay.

Block real number coding was introduced in [I] **as** a generalization of Block Coded Modulation (BCM). It uses a new design method and more accurate design criteria to search for the optimal code in the expanded code space. The codes *so* obtained are found to be able to provide full diversity for the Rayleigh fading channel.

In this paper, we choose a few good full diversity lowdelay low-complexity codes found in **[l]** for further investigation. The detailed mapping tables of the codes are presented; the manual refinements of the numerical solution are conducted; the performance of the codes **are** simulated for different interleaving depths in the Rayleigh faded channel.

11. REAL NUMBER CODE AND ITS DEsICN

This section briefly reviews the concept of the real number code and its design method, proposed in [ll.

An (n,k) block real number code transmits k information bits by *n* 2-dimensional channel symbols with coding **rate** *r* **^A** k/n bits/2D. Its encoder is shown in Fig. 1. The encoding operation is simply mapping each k -long binary information block \boldsymbol{b} **a** $(b_1, b_2, ..., b_i, ..., b_k) \in \boldsymbol{B}$ by a memoryless one-to-one correspondence to a 2n dimensional real vector $s \triangleq (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_1, x_2, y_2, y_1, x_2, y_2, y_1, x_2, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2, y_2, y_1, y_2,$ $y_2, ..., x_i, y_i, ..., x_n, y_n$ $\in S$, where the set B \triangle {(b_i, b₂, ..., b_i, ..., b_k) : $b_j = \{0,1\}$, $j=1,2,...,k\}$, and the set **S A** ${s^{(i)}}$ **A** $(x_i^{(i)}, y_i^{(i)}, ...,$ $x_i^{(i)}, y_i^{(i)}, ..., x_n^{(i)}, y_n^{(i)}$: $s^{(i)} \in R^{2n}, i = 1, 2, ..., M$, $M \triangle 2^k$. The real vector **s** is the final channel codeword sent through a 2ndimensional equivalent channel, which can **be** constructed, e.g.,

by a 2-dimensional physical channel and a pair of parallelto-serial and serial-to-parallel converters on either side. As there are in total $M=2^k$ combinations of input bits, *M* points in the $2n$ -dimensional
real space R^{2n} will be chosen **as** legal codewords; they **are** denoted as $s^{(i)}$, $i=1,2,...,M$. **Fig. 1**

 $(x_i^{(i)}, y_i^{(i)})$ are then the coordinates of the 2D signal point of the ith codeword at time slot *l*. In the receiver, the noisy and distorted counterpart *of* **s** cm be detected block by block by **a** maximum likelihood detector. The *codeward* length and the diversity length of the code are defined as the value of n and the minimum Hamming distance between the codewords respectively .

It is clear that the encoder mapping must be designed optimally so as to achieve **the** best perfmmce in **me** sense, and this task is in fact to choose the real number values of $2nM$ elements in $s^{(i)}$, $i=1,2,...,M$. In the design, we choose the criterion to be the minimization of the union-Chernoff upper bound of the word error rate **[2,3).** The code design problem can be transferred to a **multivariabk** constrained nonlinear optimization problem **[ll and** solved numerically. **The** optimization model is farmelated **as**

min
\n_glim_glim_g
$$
\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{M-1} \sum_{j=1+1}^{N} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left[1 + \frac{\overline{B_g}}{4N_0} \left[(x_1^{(1)} - x_1^{(1)})^2 + (y_1^{(1)} - y_1^{(1)})^2 \right] \right]^{-1} \right\}
$$

\nsubject to
\n $[x_1^{(1)}]^2 + [y_1^{(1)}]^2 = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., M; l = 1, 2, ..., n$

'Ihrs **mcarch was supported by** grants **from Burchdl Cmununicatims Rcscvch Croup.** Following the new design approach, the code is constructed

by a one-step mapping, rather than through some intermediate binary codes; however, the conventional BCM **PSK** codes **are** in fact still observed to be within its search space as special cases.

HI. THE CODES AND THEIR PERFORMANCE

This section discusses five codes and their simplified versions. All the codes are full diversity ones, i.e., the diversity length equals the codeword length.

In the simulation of the code performance, the system assumed is **as** follows: the coded channel block is converted to serial form and transmitted **as** a sequence of **20** symbols; the sequence is interleaved by **a** block-type symbol interleaver, then transmitted through the slow flat Rayleigh fading channel; in the receiver, the received sequence in deinterleaved accordingly and detected by a maximum likelihood block decoder with known channel state information and perfect timing [2-4]. The block-type interleaver Udeinterleaver) is realized by a **n** by *m* matrix which is written column by column (/row by row) and read row by row (/column by column), where *n* is the codeword length. The *interleaving depth* is defined as $n \times m$, which determines the total interleaving delay; the *interleaving degree* is defined as the dimension *m* of the matrix. In all the simulations, the normalized Doppler frequency f_d T_s is assumed to be 0.001.

1. Length **2** *Codes*

 $(2,2)$ code $(r= 1$ bit/2D): The original code mapping table obtained from the numerical solution of the optimization search is given in Table I (a). In the table, the first column indicates the codewords, each corresponds to one of **the** four combinations of 2-bit information block by certain one-to-one mapping rule; the *second* column lists the corresponding signal point coordinates of *the* two **20** channel symbols mapped to. The two *20* constellations **are** unequally spaced **4-ary PSK,** they are also depicted in Fig. 2.

Fig. 2

The constellations are observed to **Refined (2,2) code be almost equally** spaced. It can **be** expected that the performance would not change much if the signal point locations are replaced by the equally spaced **QPSK** accordingly. **By** doing *so,* the mapping table of the manually refined *code* is **obtaiined as** in Table I

(b), where a phase number *i* ($i=0, 1, \ldots, 2^k-1$) means the signal point has a phase of $2\pi i/2^k$, here $k=2$ for this code.

Fig. 3 shows the simulated word error rate of **the** original code (denoted by the abbreviation "0.") **and the refmed** code (denoted by **"R.")** *at* various interleaving **degrees.** The union-Chernoff upper bound [2,3] of the original and the refined codes **as** well **as** the exact uncoded **BPSK** performance *m* **also** plotted for comparison. It can be observed that: 1) the refined product for comparison. It can be observed that, I just reinfied code performs almost as well as the original in this case; 2) for good performance, the interleaving degree should be 90 or more at the simulated fading spe good performance, the interleaving degree should be 90 or more at the simulated fading speed.

 $(2,3)$ code $(r = 1.5$ bits $(2,0)$: The mapping table of the original and refined codes are given in [Tables I1](#page-2-0) (a) and (b) respectively. The original code is an *8-ary* unequally spaced

$Code-$	Codeword coordinates		
words	1st 2D	$2nd$ $2D$	
$\mathbf{B}^{(0)}$		$(5.6985E-1, -8.2221E-1) (8.0991E-1, -5.8713E-1)$	
$a^{(1)}$	$(9.8132E-1,-1.9435E-1)(-2.2708E-1, 9.7422E-1)$		
(2)		$7.6529E-1, 6.4427E-1$ ['] (9.7552E-1, 2.2143E-1)	
$5^{(3)}$		$(1.9742E-1, 9.8070E-1)(-5.9292E-1,-8.0568E-1)$	
(4)	$(-6.4188E-1, 7.6730E-1)$ $(-8.0223E-1, 5.9758E-1)$		
$\overline{3}^{(5)}$	$(-9.9487E-1, 1.0481E-1)$ ($2.1442E-1, -9.7709E-1$)		
$\mathbf{a}^{(6)}$		$(-7.9899E-1, -6.0198E-1)$ (5.5565E-1, 8.3182E-1)	
$a^{(7)}$	$(-1.4414E-1,-9.8994E-1)$ (-9.8459E-1, -1.7681E-1)		

Table II (a): The mapping of the original $(2,3)$ code

Refined $(2,3)$ code			
$Code-$ words	Phase number of codewords		
$\mathbf{B}^{(0)}$	0		
$\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$	3		
$\mathbf{g}^{(2)}$	2		
$\overline{B}^{(3)}$	3 6		
$\overline{a^{(4)}}$	4 4		
$\mathbf{s}^{(5)}$	5 7		
$\overline{e^{(6)}}$	6 2		
$\overline{3}^{(7)}$	ᠷ		

Table **I1** (b): **PSK** one, the constellations **are** given in [Fig.](#page-1-0) 4.

Fig. *5* gives the simulated word error performance together with the bounds of the original and the refined codes. The performance loss due **to** the refinement is nearly invisible and the complexity refined codes is greatly reduced by using standard **8PSK** constellations.

 $(2,4)$ code $(r = 2$ bits/2D): The mapping table of the original and

refined codes are given in [Tables](#page-3-0) **111** (a) and **(b)** respectively. The original code has unequally spaced **PSK** constellations of size 16, the constellations are given in Fig. 6. Simulation results of the original and the refined codes are presented in Fig. 7 with the simulated performance of uncoded **QPSK** for comparison. The union-Chemoff bounds are also plotted for both codes. Again, the refinement causes very little loss.

Fig. *5*

Table **III** (a): The mapping of the original (2,4) code

$Code-$	Codeword coordinates		
words	1st 2D 2nd 2D		
$\mathbf{e}^{(0)}$	$(1.0038E+0,-4.0075E-2)$ (9.7534E-1, -2.2921E-1)		
$\mathbf{a}^{(1)}$	$(9.3495E-1)$ $3.6754E-1$ $(-1.9089E-1, -9.8356E-1)$		
(2)	$(7.0547E-1)$ $7.1520E-1$ (-8.4535E-1, 5.3778E-1)		
$s^{(3)}$	$(3.7269E-1, 9.3290E-1) (9.7407E-1, 2.3456E-1)$		
$\mathbf{a}^{(4)}$	$(-4.8474E-3, 1.0046E+0)$ $(-6.1647E-1, -7.8981E-1)$		
(5)	$(-3.4510E-1)$ $9.4346E-1$ ($1.4177E-1$, $9.9183E-1$)		
$\mathbf{B}^{(6)}$	l(-6.8469E-1. $7.3512E-1$ (8.4407E-1, -5.3979E-1)		
(7)	$(-9.0281E-1)$ $4.4062E-1$ $(-9.8564E-1, 1.7984E-1)$		
$\mathbf{g}^{(8)}$	$(-1.0030E+0, 5.6614E-2)$ (5.8402E-1, 8.1410E-1)		
$\mathbf{z}^{(9)}$	$(-9.6960E-1,-2.6286E-1)$ (1.3539E-1, -9.9272E-1)		
(10)	$(-7.1438E-1, -7.0632E-1)$ $(-8.4750E-1, -5.3439E-1)$		
$a^{(11)}$	$(-3.3948E-1, -9.4550E-1)$ (6.1197E-1, -7.9330E-1)		
$a^{(12)}$	$(-4.3053E-2, -1.0037E+0)$ $(-6.1018E-1, 7.9468E-1)$		
(13)	$(3.8492E-1,-9.2793E-1)$ $(8.3920E-1, 5.4733E-1)$		
$a^{(14)}$	$(7.0193E-1,-7.1868E-1)(-9.8682E-1,-1.7323E-1)$		
$a^{(15)}$	$(9.3333E-1,-3.7163E-1)(-1.8703E-1, 9.8430E-1)$		

Fig. *6*

2. *A Length* **3** *Code*

The length 3 code has coding rate of 1 bit/2D, so it is a (3,3) code. The mapping for the original code and the refined version are tabulated in Table **IV** (a) and (b) respectively. The three 20 **PSK** constellations of the original code are plotted in [Fig. 8.](#page-3-0) Simulated performance and the bounds for the both code

versions are illustrated in Fig. 9 with **BPSK** performance for comparison.

Table **111** (b):

codewords

3

76

 $\overline{4}$

 $\overline{\mathbf{5}}$

 $\overline{2}$

Phase number of

8⁽⁴⁾ 4 5 1
8⁽⁵⁾ 5 2 7 **(51** 527

> 6 7

7 3

 $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$

 $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{6}$

5 4

Table IV (b): Refined (3.3) code

Code-

words $\overline{B}^{(0)}$

 $\overline{\mathbf{g}^{(1)}}$

 $\mathbf{s}^{(2)}$

 $B^{(3)}$

 $\overline{\mathbf{s}^{(7)}}$

Fig. 9

3. A *Length 4 Code*

This is a **(4,4)** rate **1** bit/2D code. The original code obtained from the searching program has the mapping as in Table V (a) on the next page, the four *2D* constellations are shown in Fig. **10;** its refined **16PSK** version realizes mapping given in Table V (b). Simulation results are shown in Fig. 11.

From the simulation results, it can be seen that upon sufficient interleaving, all the codes provides significant gains in average *SNR* over the uncoded counterparts (if available). An interleaving degree more than 90 should be used to realize the gain, a **degree between 180 and 360 is recommended. The loss** caused by simplifying the original codes to a symmetric **PSK** codes is less than 0.2 dB for all the five cases.

$Code-$	Codeword coordinates			
words	$1st$ 2D	$2nd$ $2D$	3rd2D	
	$(50 \text{ J} \cdot (-9.1317\text{E} - 1, -4.0771\text{E} - 1)$ (4.9031E-2, 9.9899E-1) (-9.3731E-1, 3.4887E-1)			
	\bullet ⁽¹⁾ $(-3.8901E-1, -9.2130E-1)$ (9.9450E-1, -1.0655E-1) (3.9318E-1, -9.1961E-1)			
	\bullet ⁽²⁾ [(3.4463E-1,-9.3880E-1)(-1.6370E-1,-9.8671E-1)(3.9538E-1, 9.1866E-1)			
	\bullet ⁽³⁾ $(9.4219E-1,-3.3525E-1)(-6.0818E-1, 7.9404E-1)(9.1507E-1,-4.0363E-1)$			
	$(9.3566E-1, 3.5306E-1)$ $(6.5402E-1, -7.5673E-1)$ $(-9.4075E-1, -3.3950E-1)$			
	$(3.8901E-1, 9.2130E-1)$ (-9.9450E-1, 1.0654E-1) (-3.9318E-1, 9.1961E-1)			
$\mathbf{a}^{(n)}$	$(-3.9948E-1, 9.1681E-1) (7.9948E-1, 6.0102E-1) (8.9541E-1, 4.4554E-1)$			
	$(1, 4, 4)$ $(1, 8, 9, 7, 4)$ $(1, 4, 4, 14, 8)$ $(1, 7, 6, 25, 8)$ $(1, -6, 4, 7, 19)$ $(1, 3, 4, 0, 4, 2)$ $(1, -9, 4, 0, 4, 2)$ $(2, -1, 4, 0, 4, 2)$			

Table **Iv (a): The mapping of the original (3,3)** code

Table V (a): The mapping of the original (4,4) code

$Code-$			Codeword coordinates	
words	$1st$ 2D	$2nd$ $2D$	3rd2D	$4th$ 2D.
\blacksquare				9.062E-1, 4.22BE-1)(8.684E-1, 4.966E-1)(2.464E-2, 1.000E+0)(-4.842E-1,-8.753E-1)
\mathbf{m}				$5.534E-1$, $8.329E-1$ ($3.322E-1$, $-9.436E-1$) ($6.981E-1$, $7.165E-1$) ($6.210E-1$, $7.842E-1$)
\mathbf{r}				$3.791E-1$, $9.253E-1$) (-9.990E-1, 5.234E-2) (-6.997E-1, -7.149E-1) (-7.533E-1, 6.582E-1)
ு				$(-2.074E-1, 9.783E-1)$ $(-7.372E-1, -6.762E-1)$ $(7.019E-1, -7.127E-1)$ $(4.338E-1, -9.014E-1)$
्रस				$(-3.927E-1, 9.197E-1)$ (4.302E-1, 9.031E-1) $(-9.994E-1, 4.267E-2)$ (-9.403E-1, -3.412E-1)
\mathbf{F}				$(-8.030E-1, 5.959E-1)$ ($3.973E-2, 9.996E-1$) ($9.297E-1, 3.692E-1$) ($9.935E-1, 1.163E-1$)
\mathbf{e}				$(-9.794E-1, 2.018E-1)$ $(6.564E-1, -7.549E-1)$ $(-6.993E-1, 7.153E-1)$ $(7.794E-1, -6.271E-1)$
\blacksquare				$(-9.815E-1, -1.913E-1)$ $(9.092E-1, 4.171E-1)$ $(-3.729E-1, -9.282E-1)$ $(2.782E-1, 9.609E-1)$
\blacksquare				$(-9.133E-1, -4.074E-1)$ $(-8.891E-1, 4.585E-1)$ $(4.232E-1, 9.064E-1)$ $(-9.994E-1, -4.233E-2)$
$\mathbf{s}^{(9)}$				$(-5.583E-1, -8.296E-1)$ (9.938E-1, -1.140E-1) (9.990E-1, 5.120E-2) (1.086E-1, -9.944E-1)
\mathbf{r}				$(-3.935E-1,-9.193E-1)$ $(-9.707E-1,-2.419E-1)$ $(-9.740E-1, 2.281E-1)$ $(9.075E-1, 4.209E-1)$
\mathbf{r}				$1.086E-1, -9.941E-1$ (-3.160E-1, 9.491E-1) (8.842E-1, -4.679E-1) (-4.187E-1, 9.085E-1)
\blacksquare				$3.426E-1, -9.395E-1$ $(-6.945E-2, -9.979E-1)$ $(-8.627E-1, -5.065E-1)$ $(-3.522E-1, -9.363E-1)$
\mathbf{r}				$8.551E-1, -5.184E-1$ ($8.347E-1, -5.513E-1$) ($3.818E-1, -9.246E-1$) ($-9.909E-1, 1.367E-1$)
\mathbf{r}				$9.666E-1, -2.565E-1$ $(-5.883E-1, -8.091E-1)$ $(-4.365E-1, 9.001E-1)$ $(-1.382E-1, 9.907E-1)$
\bullet ⁽¹⁵⁾				$9.975E-1, 7.082E-2$ $(-6.699E-1, 7.429E-1)$ $(-1.195E-1, -9.932E-1)$ ($9.070E-1, -4.219E-1$)

Table V (b):

Refined (4,4) code

Code- words	Phase number of codewords			
10)	δ	Õ	Ò	0
	1	11	14	ē
(7)	2	6	3	12
	3	8	10	3
	4	1	4	15
(۳۶	5	2	13	ζ
$\mathbf{e}^{(6)}$	6	$\overline{12}$	2	4
$\mathbf{s}^{(r)}$	7	15		9
$\overline{\mathbf{e}}^{(\overline{v})}$	g	ξ	15	14
্ৰাগ	ğ	14	$\overline{12}$	2
$5^{(10)}$	10	7	3	7
្តពេរ	11	3	11°	$\bf{11}$
$^{(12)}$	12	10	5	1
\mathbf{a}^{H3}	13	13	9	13
$\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{(H)}}$	14	9	1	10
\mathbf{e}^{top}	15	4	8	5

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The simulation confirmed **that** the full diversity **PSK real** number codes can provide significant coding **gain** when **the** symbols in **a block are** independently faded **or** when sufficient interleaving is used. The gain increases asymptotically with the **Mock** length, i.e., the diversity length at given coding rate, and also with the interleaving depth. The interleaving delay for these codes is low **because** *of* their short codeword lengths. **For** the codes considered in this paper, the loss

in coding gain is negligible when the original codes were refined *(or* simplified) to symmetric **PSK** codes. The refined codes *ate* simple for implementation.

REFERENCES

[l] Xin Jin and Shalini Periyalwar, **"Block PSK** Red Number Coding for Rayleigh Fading Channel", accepted for presentation at the Sixth **Annual** International Conference on Wireless Communications, Calgary, Canada, Julv 1994.

- [2] **D.** Divsalar and M. **K.** Simon, "Trellis Coded Modulation for 4800-9600 bits/s Transmission Over a Fading Mobile Satellite Channel, IEEE Journal on Selected *Areas* in Communications, Vol. SAC-5, No. 2, Feb. **1987.**
- [3] D. Divsalar and **M. K.** Simon, "The Design of Trellis Coded **MPSK** for Fading Channels: Performance Criteria", IEEE Trans. *on* Communications, Vol. **36,** No. 9, Sept. 1988.
- **[4]** J. K. Cavers and P. Ho, "Analysis **of** Error Performance **of** Trellis-Coded Modulations in Rayleigh Fading Channels", IEEE Trans. on Communications, Vol. **40, No.** 1, Jan. 1992.
- [51 L. Zhang and B. Vucetic, "Bandwidth Efficient **Block** Codes **for** Rayleigh Fading Channels", Electronics Letters, **Vol.** 26, NO. **5,** pp **301** - 303, Mar. 1990.
- [6] **B.** Vucetic, L. Zhang and G. Khachatrian, "Construction of Block Modulation Codes over Rings for **Fading** Channels", Electronics **L@ters+** V& 26, No. 24, pp *2020* - *2022,* Nov. 1990.
- **[7]** L. Zhang and B.Vucetic, "Multilevel **Modulation** *Codes* **for** Raykigh Fading Channels", Lecturer Notes in Computer Science, No. 539, pp 477 - **488,** Oct. 1991.
- **[8]** L. Zhang and B. Vucetic, "New **MPSK BCM Codes for** Rayleigh Fading Channels", Proceedings *of* **ICCS/ISITA'92,** pp **857** - 861, Nov. 1992, Singapore.
- **[9] N.** Seshadri **and** C. W. Sundberg, "Multi-level **Block** Coded Modulation **for** Rayleigh Fading Channel", Proceedi;. GLOBECOM'91, pp **47** - 51, Dec. 199J.