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ABSTRACT: Turbo codes are the most exciting and potentially important development in coding theory in many years. They were introduced in 1993 by Berrou, Glavieux and Thitimajshima [1] and claimed to achieve near Shannon-limit error correction performance with relatively simple component codes and large interleavers. A required $E_b/N_0$ of 0.7 dB was reported for BER of $10^{-3}$ and code rate of 1/2 [1]. However, some important details that are necessary to reproduce these results were omitted. This paper confirms the accuracy of these claims, and presents a complete description of an encoder/decoder pair that could be suitable for PCS applications. We describe a new simple method for trellis termination, we analyze the effect of interleaver choice on the weight distribution of the code, and we introduce the use of unequal rate component codes which yields better performance. Turbo codes are extended to encoders with multiple codes and a suitable decoder structure is developed, which is substantially different from the decoder for two-code baseline encoders.

1. Introduction

Coding theorists have traditionally attacked the problem of designing good codes by developing codes with a lot of structure which lends to feasible de-coders, although coding theory suggests that codes chosen “at random” should perform well if their block size is large enough. The challenge to find practical decoders for “almost” random, large codes has not been seriously considered until recently. Perhaps the most exciting and potentially important development in coding theory in recent years has been the dramatic announcement of “Turbo-codes” by Berrou et al. in 1993 [1]. The announced performance of these codes was so good that the initial reaction of the coding establishment was deep skepticism, but recently researchers around the world have been able to reproduce those results [3]-[4]. The introduction of turbo-codes has opened a whole new way of looking at the problem of constructing good codes and decoding them with low complexity.

These codes are claimed to achieve near Shannon-limit error correction performance with relatively simple component codes and large interleaves. A required $E_b/N_0$ of 0.7 dB was reported for BER of $10^{-3}$ [1]. However, some important details that are necessary to reproduce these results were omitted. The purpose of this paper is to shed some light on the accuracy of these claims, and to present a complete description of an encoder/decoder pair that could be suitable for personal communications systems (PCS) applications, where lower rate codes can be used.

For example, in multiple-access schemes like CDMA the capacity (maximum number of users per cell) can be expressed as $C = \frac{E_b}{N_0} + 1$, where $n$ is the processing gain and $E_b/N_0$ is the required signal-to-noise ratio to achieve a desired bit error rate (BER) performance. For a given BER, a smaller required $E_b/N_0$ implies a larger capacity or cell size. Unfortunately, to reduce $E_b/N_0$, it is necessary to use very complex codes (e.g. large constraint length convolutional codes). In this paper, we design turbo codes, suitable for CDMA and PCS applications that can achieve superior performance with limited complexity. For example, if a (7,1/2) convolutional code is used at BER=$10^{-3}$, the capacity is $C = 0.5n$. However, if two (5,1/3) punctured convolutional codes or three (4,1/3) punctured codes are used in a turbo encoder structure, the capacity can be increased to $C = 0.8n$ (with 192-bits and 256-bits interleavers which correspond to 9.6 Kbps and 13 Kbps with roughly 20ms frames). Higher capacity can be obtained with larger interleaves. Note that low rate codes can be used for CDMA since an integer number of chips per coded symbol is used and bandwidth is defined mainly by chip rate.

Three new contributions are reported in this paper: a new simple method for trellis termination, the use of unequal rate component codes which results in better performance, and the development of decoders for multiple-code encoders. The original turbo decoder scheme operates in serial mode, while for multiple-code encoders we found that the decoder for the whole turbo code based on the optimum MAP rule must operate in parallel mode, and we derived the appropriate metric as illustrated in Sec. III.

II. Parallel Concatenation of Convolutional Codes

The codes considered in this paper consist of the parallel concatenation of multiple convolutional codes with random interleavers (permutations) at the input of each encoder. Fig. 1 illustrates a particular example that will be used in this paper to verify the performance of these codes. The encoder contains three recursive binary convolutional encoders, with $M_1$, $M_2$, and $M_3$ memory cells respectively. In general, the three component encoders may not be identical, The first component encoder operates directly on the information bit sequence $u$ = $(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N)$ of length $N$, producing the two output sequences $x_{1p}$ and $x_{1q}$. The second component encoder operates on a reordered sequence of information bits $u_1$ produced by an interleaver $I_1$ of length $N$, and outputs the sequence $x_{1r}$. Similarly, subsequent component encoders operate on a reordered sequence of information bits $u_j$ produced by interleaver $I_j$ and output the sequence $x_{j}$.

The interleaver is a pseudo-random block scrambler defined by a permutation of $N$ elements with no repetitions: a complete block is read into the the interleaver and read out in a specified (fixed) random order. The same interleaver is used repeatedly for all subsequent blocks. Figure 1 shows an example where a rate $r = 1/n = 1/4$ code is generated by three
component codes with \( M_1 = M_2 = M_3 = M = 2 \), producing the outputs \( x_{u} = u \), \( x_{1p} = u \), \( x_{2p} = u \gamma \delta / \delta \alpha \), \( x_{3p} = u \gamma \delta / \delta \alpha \), where the generator polynomials \( g_a \) and \( g_b \) have octal representation \((7)_{\text{octal}}\) and \((5)_{\text{octal}}\), respectively. Note that various code rates can be obtained by proper puncturing of \( x_{1p}, x_{2p} \) and \( x_{3p} \). The design of the constituent convolutional codes, which are not necessarily optimum convolutional codes, is still under investigation. It was suggested in [5] that good codes are obtained if \( g_a \) is a primitive polynomial.

**Trellis Termination** — We use the encoder in Fig. 1 to generate a \((n(N + M), N)\) block code, where the \( M \text{tail} \) bits of code 2 and code 3 are not transmitted. Since the component encoders are recursive, it is not sufficient to set the last \( M \) information bits to zero in order to drive the encoder to the all zero state, i.e. to terminate the trellis. The termination (tail) sequence depends on the state of each component encoder after \( N \) bits, which makes it impossible to terminate both component encoders with just \( M \) bits. This issue has not been resolved in previously proposed turbo code implementations. Fortunately, the simple stratagem illustrated in Fig. 2 is sufficient to terminate the trellis at the end of the block. (The specific code shown is not important). Here the switch is in position “A” for the first \( N \) clock cycles and is in position “B” for \( M \) additional cycles, which will flush the encoders with zeros. The decoder does not assume knowledge of the \( M \) tail bits. The same termination method will be used for all encoders.
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**Figure 2: Trellis Termination**

**Weight Distribution** — In order to estimate the performance of a code it is necessary to have information about its minimum distance, weight distribution, or actual code geometry, depending on the accuracy required for the bounds or approximations. The challenge is in finding the pairing of codewords from each individual encoder, induced by a particular set of interleavers. Intuitively, we would like to avoid joining low-weight codewords from one encoder with low-weight words from the other encoders. In the example of Fig. 1, the component codes have minimum distances 5,2, and 2. This will produce a worst-case minimum distance of 9 for the overall code. Note that this would be unavoidable if the encoders were not recursive since, in this case, the minimum weight word for all three encoders is generated by the input sequence \( u = (00 . . 000100 . . 00) \) with a single “1”, which will appear again in the other encoders, for any choice of interleavers. This motivates the use of recursive encoders, for any choice of interleavers. This motivates the use of recursive encoders, for any choice of interleavers.

With permutations before the second and third encoders, a weight-2 sequence with its 1’s separated by 2 \( \neq \delta \) zeros will be permuted into two other weight-2 sequences with 1’s separated by 2 \( \neq \delta \) zeros, \( i = 2, 3 \), where each \( t_i \) is defined as a multiple of \( 1/3 \). If any \( t_i \) is not an integer, the corresponding encoded output \( y \) will have a high weight because then the convolutional code output is non-terminating (until the end of the block). If \( t_i’s \) are integers, the total encoded weight will be \( 14 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{3} t_i \). Thus, one of the considerations in designing the interleaver is to avoid integer triplets \((t_1, t_2, t_3)\) that are simultaneously small in all three components. In fact, it would be nice to design an interleaver to guarantee that the smallest value of \( \sum_{i=1}^{3} t_i \) (for integer \( t_i \)) grows with the block size \( N \).

For comparison we consider the same encoder structure in Fig. 1, except with the roles of \( g_a \) and \( g_b \) reversed. Now the minimum distances of the three component codes are 5, 3, and 3, producing an overall minimum distance of 11 for the total code without any permutations. This is apparently a better code, but it turns out to be inferior as a turbo code. This paradox is explained by again considering the critical weight-2 data sequences. For this code, weight-2 sequences with \( 1 + 2t_i \) zeros separating the \( t_i \)’s produce self-terminating output and hence low-weight encoded words. In the turbo encoder, such sequences will be permutated to have separations \( 1 + 2t_i \), \( i = 2, 3 \), for the second and third encoders, where now each \( t_i \) is defined as a multiple of \( 1/2 \). But now the total encoded weight for weight-2 sequences, say \( t_4 \) for the code in Fig. 1, is \( 11 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} t_i \). Notice how this weight grows only half as fast with \( \sum_{i=1}^{3} t_i \) as the previously calculated weight for the original code. If \( \sum_{i=1}^{3} t_i \) can be made to grow with block size by proper choice of interleave, then clearly it is important to choose component codes that cause the overall weight to grow as fast as possible with the individual separations \( t_i \). This consideration outweighs the criterion of selecting component codes that would produce the highest minimum distance if unpermuted.

There are also many weight-n, \( n = 3, 4, 5, \ldots \) data sequences that produce self-terminating output and hence low encoded weight. However, as argued below, these sequences are much more likely to be broken up by the random interleavers than the weight-2 sequences and are therefore likely to produce non-terminating output from at least one of the encoders. Thus, turbo code structures, which would have low minimum distances if unpermuted, can still perform well if the low-weight codewords of the component codes are produced by input sequences with weight higher than two.

**Weight Distribution with Random Interleavers** — Now we briefly examine the issue of whether one or more random interleavers can avoid matching small separations between the 1’s of a weight-2 data sequence with equally small separations between the 1’s of its permuted version(s). Consider for example a particular weight-2 data sequence \( (00100100 . . .) \) which corresponds to a low weight codeword in each of the codes of Fig. 1. If we randomly select an interleaver of size \( N \), the probability that this sequence will be permuted into another sequence of the same form is roughly \( 2^N \) (assuming that \( N \) is large, and ignoring minor edge effects). The probability that such an unfortunate pairing happens for at least one possible position of the original sequence \( (00100100 . . .) \) within the block size of \( N \) is approximately \( 1 - (1 - 2/N)^N \approx 1 - e^{-2/N} \). This implies that the minimum distance of a two-code turbo code constructed with a random permutation is not likely to be much higher than the encoded weight of such an unpermuted weight-2 data sequence, e.g. 14 for the code in Fig. 1. (For the worst case permutations, the \( d_{\text{min}} \) of the code is still 9, but these permutations are highly unlikely if chosen randomly). By contrast, if we use three codes and two different interleavers, the probability that a particular sequence \( (00100100 . . .) \) will be reproduced by both interleavers is only \((2/N)^2\). Now the probability of finding such an unfortunate data sequence somewhere within the block of size \( N \) is roughly \( 1 - (1 - 2/N)^2N \approx 4/N \). Thus it is probable that a three-code turbo code using two random interleavers will see an increase in its minimum distance beyond the encoded weight of an unpermuted weight-2 data sequence. This argument can be extended to account for other weight-2 data sequences which may also produce low weight codewords, e.g. \( (00100000 . . .) \) for the code in Fig. 1.
us consider a weight-3 data sequence such as (.. 0011100 ...) which for our example corresponds to the minimum distance of the code (using no permutations). The probability that this sequence is reproduced with one random interleave is roughly $6/N^2$, and the probability that some sequence of the form (.. 0011100 ...) is paired with another of the same form is $1 - (6/N^2)^N \approx 6/N$. Thus for large block sizes, the bad weight-3 data sequences have a small probability of being matched with bad weight-3 permuted data sequences, even in a two-code system.

For a turbo code using $q$ codes and $q - 1$ random interleaves this probability is even smaller, $1 - (1 - (6/N^2)^q)^N \approx 6/N$. This implies that the minimum distance codeword of the turbo code in Fig. 1 is more likely to result from a weight-2 data sequence of the form (.. 0011100 ...) than from the weight-3 sequence (.. 0011100 ...) that produces the minimum distance in the unpermuted version of the same code. Higher weight sequences have even smaller probability of reproducing themselves after being passed through a random interleave.

For a turbo code using $q$ codes and $q - 1$ interleaves, the probability that a weight-$n$ data sequence will be reproduced somewhere within the block by all $q - 1$ permutations is of the form $1 - [(1 - \beta/N^{n-1})^{q-1}]^N$, where $\beta$ is a number that depends on the weight-$n$ data sequence but does not increase with block size $N$. For large $N$, this probability $p$ is proportional to $(1/N)^{n-1} q$, which falls off rapidly with $N$, when $n$ and $q$ are greater than two. Furthermore, the symmetry of this expression indicates that increasing either the weight of the data sequence $n$ or the number of codes $q$ has roughly the same effect on lowering this probability.

In summary, from the above arguments we conclude that weight-2 data sequences are an important factor in the design of the component codes, and that higher weight have decreasing importance. Also, increasing the number of codes may result in better turbo codes. More accurate results and derivations are discussed in [6].

The minimum distance is not the most important quantity of the turbo code, except for its asymptotic performance, at very high $E_b/N_0$. At moderate SNRs, the weight distribution for the first several possible weights is necessary to compute the code performance. Estimating the complete weight distribution of these codes for large $N$ and fixed interleavers is still an open problem. However, it is possible to estimate the weight distribution for large $N$ for random interleaves by using probabilistic arguments. (See [4] for further considerations on the weight distribution).

Interleaver Design — Interleavers should be capable of spreading low-weight input sequences so that the resulting codeword has high weight. Block interleavers, defined by a matrix with $v_r$ rows and $v_c$ columns such that $N = v_r v_c$, may fail to spread certain sequences. For example, the weight 4 sequence shown in Fig. 3 cannot be broken by a block interleaver. In order to break such sequences random interleavers are desirable. (A method for the design of interleaves is discussed in [3]).

Block interleavers are effective if the low-weight sequence is confined to a row. If low-weight sequences (which can be regarded as the combination of lower weight sequences) are confined to several consecutive rows, then the $v_c$ columns of the interleaver should be sent in a specified order to spread as much as possible the low-weight sequence. A method for reordering the columns is given in [8]. This method guarantees that for any number of columns $v_c = a q + r$, $(r \leq a - 1)$, the minimum separation between data entries is $q - 1$, where $a$ is the number of columns affected by a burst. However, as can be observed in the example in Fig. 3, the sequence 1001 will still appear at the input of the encoders for any possible column permutation. Only if we permute the rows of the interleaver in addition to its columns it is possible to break the low-weight sequences. The method in [8] can be used again for the permutation of rows. Appropriate selection of $a$ and $q$ for rows and columns depends on the particular set of codes used and on the specific low-weight sequences that we would like to break. We have also designed random permutations (interleaves) by generating random integers $i, 1 \leq i \leq N$, without replacement. We define a “$S$-random” permutation as follows: each randomly selected integer is compared to $S$ previously selected integers. If the current selection is equal to any $S$ previous selections within a distance of $\pm S$, then the current selection is rejected. This process is repeated until all $N$ integers are selected. While the searching time increases with $S$, we observed that choosing $S < \sqrt{N/2}$ usually produces a solution in reasonable time. (For $S = 1$ we have a purely random interleaver).

In the simulations we used $S = 11$ for $N = 256$ and $S = 31$ for $N = 4096$.

The advantage of using three or more constituent codes is that the corresponding two or more interleaves have a better chance to break sequences that were not taken care by another interleaver. The disadvantage is that, for an overall desired code rate, each code must be punctured more, resulting in weaker constituent codes. In our experiments, we have used randomly selected interleavers and interleaves based on the row-column permutation described above. In general, randomly selected permutations are good for low SNR operation (e.g., PCS applications requiring $P_b = 10^{-3}$) where the overall weight distribution of the code is more important than the minimum distance.

III. Turbo Decoding Configuration
The turbo decoding configuration proposed in [1] for two codes is shown schematically in Fig. 4. This configuration operates in serial mode, i.e. “Dec 1” processes data before “Dec 2” starts its operation, and so on. An obvious extension of this configuration to three codes is shown in Fig. 5(a), which also operates in serial mode. But, with more than two codes, there are other possible configurations, as that shown in Fig. 5(b) where “Dec 1” communicates with the other decoders, but these decoders do not exchange information among each other. This “Master & Slave” configuration operates in a mixed serial-parallel mode, since all other decoders except the first operate in parallel. Another possibility, shown in Fig. 5(c) is that all decoders operate in parallel at any given time. Note that self loops are not allowed in these structures since they cause degradation or divergence in the decoding process (positive feedback). We are not considering other possible hybrid configurations. Which configuration performs better? Our selection of the best configuration and its associated decoding rule is based on a detailed analysis of the minimum bit error decoding rule (MAP algorithm) as described below.

Turbo Decoding for Multiple Codes — Let $u_k$ be a binary random variable taking values in $\{0, 1\}$, representing the sequence of information bits $u = (u, ..., U, N)$. The MAP algorithm [7] provides the log likelihood ratio $L_k$ given the received symbols $y$:

$$L_k = \log_2 P(u_k = 1 | y) - P(u_k = 0 | y)$$

Figure 3: Example where a block interleaver fails to “break” the input sequence.

Figure 4: Decoding structure for two codes.
Figure 5: Different decoding structures for three codes.

\[ L_i = \log \sum_{u_{i-1}} P(y_i | u_i) \prod_{j \neq i} P(u_j) \log P(u_i | 1) \]

For efficient computation of eq. (2) when the a-priori probabilities \( P(u_j) \) are non-uniform, the modified MAP algorithm in [2] is simpler to use than the version considered in [1]. Therefore, in this paper we use the modified MAP algorithm of [2] as we did in [4].

The channel model is shown in Fig. 6 where the \( n_{i\ell} \)'s and the \( n_{p\ell} \)'s are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian random variables with unit variance, and \( \rho = \sqrt{2F_E^2/N_0} \) is the signal-to-noise ratio. (The same model is used for each encoder). To explain the basic decoding concept we restrict ourselves to three codes, but extension to several codes is straightforward.

In order to simplify the notation, consider the combination of permuter and encoder as a block code with input \( u \) and outputs \( y_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \) and the corresponding received sequences \( y_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \). The optimum MAP decision metric on each bit is (for data with uniform probabilities)

\[ L_i = \log \sum_{u_{i-1}} P(y_i | u_i) \prod_{j \neq i} P(u_j) \log P(u_i | 1) \]

but in practice we cannot compute eq. (3) for large \( N \). Suppose that we evaluate \( P(y_i | u_i), i = 2, 3 \) in eq. (3) using Bayes’ rule and using the following approximation

\[ P(u_i | y_i) \approx \prod_{k=1}^N \tilde{P}_k(u_i) \]

Note that \( P(u_i | y_i) \) is not separable in general. A reasonable criterion for this approximation is to choose \( \prod_{k=1}^N \tilde{P}_k(u_i) \) such that it minimizes the Kullback distance or free energy [9, 10]. Define

\[ \tilde{P}_i(u_i) = \frac{e^{L_i(u_i)}}{1 + e^{L_i(u_i)}} \]

where \( u_i \in \{0, 1\} \). Then the Kullback distance is given by

\[ f(\tilde{L}_i) = \sum_{u} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l=1}^N \tilde{L}_i \right) \log \frac{e^{L_i(u_i)}}{\sum_{u} e^{L_i(u_i)}} \]

Such minimization involves forward and backward recursions analogous to the MAP decoding algorithm! Therefore, if such an approximation can be obtained, we can use it in eq. (3) for \( i = 2 \) and \( i = 3 \) (by Bayes’ rule) to complete the algorithm. Now, instead of using eq. (6) to obtain \( \{\tilde{P}_i\} \) or equivalently \( \{\tilde{L}_i\} \), we use (4) and (5) for \( i = 2, 3 \) (by Bayes’ rule) to express (3) as

\[ L_i = f(y_i, \tilde{L}_1, \tilde{L}_2) \]

Figure 6: Channel model.

Figure 7: Structure of block decoder 2
one with the iterations, as often done in simulated annealing methods. We start the recursion with the initial condition $L^{(0)}_1 = L^{(0)}_2 = L^{(0)}_3 = 0$. For the computation of $f(i)$ we use the modified MAP algorithm with 
permute (direct and inverse) where needed, as shown in Fig. 7 for block decoder 2. The MAP algorithm always starts and ends at the all-zero state since we used perfect termination. Similar structures apply for block decoder 1 ($G = I$, identity), and block decoder 3. The overall decoder is composed of block decoders connected as in Fig. 5(c), which can be implemented as a pipeline or by feedback.

Multiple Code Algorithm Applied to Two Codes. — For turbo codes with only two constituent codes, Eq. (13) reduce to

\[ L^{(m+1)}_1 = a_1^{(m)} f(y_1, L^{(m)}_1, k), \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, N \]

\[ L^{(m+1)}_2 = a_2^{(m)} f(y_2, L^{(m)}_2, k), \quad m = 1, 2, \ldots \]

where, for each iteration, $a_1^{(m)}$ and $a_2^{(m)}$ can be optimized (simulated annealing) or set to 1 for simplicity. The decoding configuration for two codes, according to the previous section, is shown in Fig. 8. In this spe-

Figure 8: Parallel structure for two codes.

cial case, since the two paths in Fig. 8 are disjoint, the decoder structure reduces to that of Fig. 4, i.e. to the serial mode.

If we optimize $a_1^{(m)}$ and $a_2^{(m)}$, our method for two codes is similar to the decoding method proposed in [1], which requires estimates of the variances of $L^{(m)}_1$ and $L^{(m)}_2$ for each iteration in presence of errors. In the method proposed in [2] the received “systematic” observation was subtracted from $L^{(m)}_1$, which results in performance degradation. In [3] the method proposed in [2] was used but the received “systematic” observation was interleaved and provided to decoder 2. In [4], we argued that there is no need to interleave the received “systematic” observation and provide it to decoder 2, since $L^{(m)}_1$ does this job. It seems that our proposed method with $a_1^{(m)}$ and $a_2^{(m)}$ equal to 1 is the simplest and achieves the same performance reported in [3] for rate 1/2 codes. Terminated Parallel Convolutional Codes as Block Codes. — Consider the combination of permuter and encoder as a linear block code. Define $P_i$ as the parity matrix of the terminated convolutional code $i$. Then the overall generator matrix for three parallel codes is

\[ G = [I \ P_1 \ P_2 \ P_3 P_3 P_1] \]

where $P_i$ are the permutations (interleaves). In order to maximize the minimum distance of the code given by $G$ we should maximize the number of linearly independent columns of the corresponding parity check matrix $H$. This suggests that the design of $P_i$ (code) and $P_i$ (permutation) are closely related and it does not necessarily follow that optimum component codes (maximum $d_{\text{min}}$) yield optimum parallel concatenated codes. For very small $N$ we used this concept to design jointly the permuter and the component convolutional codes.

IV. PERFORMANCE

Two Codes — The performance obtained by turbo decoding the code with two constituent codes $(g_b/g_a)$, where $g_b = (37)_{\text{octal}}$ and $g_a = (21)_{\text{octal}}$, and with random permutations of lengths $N = 4096$ and $N = 16384$ is compared in Fig. 9 to the capacity of a binary-input Gaussian channel for rate $r = 1/4$. The best performance curve in Fig. 9 is approximately 0.7 dB from the Shannon limit at BER $= 10^{-3}$.

Unbalanced Rate Encoders — We now extend the results to encoders with unequal rates with two $K = 5$ constituent codes $(1, g_b/g_a,g_c/g_a)$ and $(g_b/g_a)$, where $g_a = (37)_{\text{octal}}, g_b = (33)_{\text{octal}}$ and $g_c = (25)_{\text{octal}}$. This structure improves the performance of the overall, rate 1/4, code, as shown in Fig. 9. This improvement is due to the fact that we can avoid using the interleaved information data at the second encoder and that the rate of the first code is lower than that of the second code. For PCS applications, short interleaves should be used, since the vocoder frame is usually 20ms. Therefore we selected 192 and 256 bits interleaves as an example, corresponding to 9.6 and 13 Kbps. (Note that this small difference of interleaver size does not affect significantly the performance). The performance of codes with short interleave is shown in Fig. 10 for the $K = 5$ codes described above for random permutation and row-column permutation with $a = 2$ for rows and $a = 4$ for columns.

Three Codes — The performance of a three-code turbo code with random interleaves is shown in Fig. 11 for $N = 4096$. The three recursive codes shown in Fig. 1 where used for $K = 3$. Three recursive codes with $g_a = (13)_{\text{octal}}$ and $g_b = (11)_{\text{octal}}$ were used for $K = 4$. Note that the non-systematic version of this encoder is catastrophic, but the recursive systematic version is non-catastrophic. We found that this $K = 4$ code has better performance than several others.

Although it was suggested [5] that $g_a$ be a primitive polynomial, we found several counterexamples that show better performance, e.g. $g_a$ for $K = 5$ proposed in [1] is not primitive.

In Fig. 11, the performance of the $K = 4$ code was improved by going to 30 iterations and using a $S$-random interleave with $S = 31$. For shorter blocks (192 and 256), the results are shown in Fig. 10 where it
can be observed that approximately 1 dB SNR is required for BER = 10^{-1}, which implies a CDMA capacity $C = 0.87$. We have noticed that the slope of the BER curve changes around BER = 10^{-5} (flattening effect) if the interleaver is not designed properly to maximize $d_{\text{min}}$ or is chosen at random.

![Figure 10](image)

Figure 10 Performance with short block sizes.

V. Conclusions

We have shown how turbo codes and decoders can be used to improve the coding gain for PCS applications. These are just preliminary results that require extensive further analysis. In particular, we need to improve our understanding of the influence of the interleaver on the code performance, to explore the sensitivity of the decoder performance to the precision with which we can estimate $E_b/N_0$.

An interesting theoretical question is to determine “how random” these codes can be so as to draw conclusions on their performance based on comparison with random coding bounds. In [4] we obtained the complete weight distribution of a turbo code, calculated the upper bound on BER and compared it with maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding. Those results showed that the performance of turbo decoding is close to ML decoding and to optimum MAP decoding. However, the approximation used in eq.(4) implies that turbo decoding is only close to but not equal to MAP decoding.
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