Chapter 6 Turbo Codes



- 6.1 Introduction of Turbo Codes
- 6.2 Encoding of Turbo Codes
- 6.3 Decoding of Turbo Codes (Turbo Decoding)
- 6.4 Performance Analysis



§ 6.1 Introduction of Turbo Codes

- Invented by C. Berrou, A. Glavieux and P. Thitimajshima in 1993 [1].
- Integrate a couple of conv. codes in a parallel encoding structure. The two conv. codes are called the constituent codes of a turbo code.
- Exploit the interplay between the decoders of the two constituent codes in a soft information exchange decoding mechanism.
- Such a decoding mechanism is called turbo decoding, turbo decoding is NOT limited to decode turbo codes, but to any (serially or parallelly) concatenated code.
- Shannon capacity can be approached with the existence of error floor.

[1] C. Berrou, A. Glavieux and P. Thitimajshima, "Near Shannon limit error-correcting coding and decoding: turbo codes," *Proc. ICC*'93, pp. 1064-1047, Geneva, May 1993.



§ 6.1 Introduction of Turbo Codes

Why do we need code concatenation?

In BCJR decoding of a conv. code,



With a single conv. code, we do not have any knowledge of information bit $u_{t'}$ and the *a* priori prob. $P_a(u_{t'} = 0) = P_a(u_{t'} = 1) = 0.5$. With a couple of conv. codes that share the same information bits (but in different permutations), one decoder can gain the *a priori* prob. of information bits $u_{t'}$ from the output of the other decoder, and vice versa. As a result, BCJR decoding of each constituent code can be improved.



§ 6.1 Introduction of Turbo Codes



A priori **prob.**: knowledge about the information/coded bits before the decoding. It is also called the intrinsic prob.

Extrinsic prob.: $P_e = \frac{P_p}{P_a}$, the extra knowledge (excluding the *a priori* prob.) delivered by the SISO decoder.



Constituent codes: Recursive Systematic Conv. (RSC) codes. Normally, the two constituent codes are the same.

Interleaver (Π): Generate a different information sequence (a permuted sequence) as the input to the RSC encoder (2). Normally, it is a random interleaver.

Puncture: Control the code rate.





 $\begin{array}{c|c} u_{t'} & & & u_{t'} \\ \hline u_{t'} & & RSC & p_{t'}^{(1)} \\ \hline \Pi & & & Puncture \\ \hline \Pi & & & Puncture \\ \hline RSC & p_{t'}^{(2)} \\ \hline Enc. (2) & & & \end{array}$

- Given the binary message sequence as $\overline{u} = [u_1, u_2, \dots u_k]$, output of the turbo encoder should be

 $\bar{c} = [u_1 \, p_1^{(1)} \, p_1^{(2)} \, u_2 \, p_2^{(1)} \, p_2^{(2)} \, \cdots \, u_{t'} \, p_{t'}^{(1)} \, p_{t'}^{(2)} \, \cdots \, u_k \, p_k^{(1)} \, p_k^{(2)}].$

- Rate of the turbo code is 1/3. To increase the rate to 1/2, we can use puncturing whose pattern can be represented by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

puncture $p_{t'}^{(2)}$ when t' is odd $- \uparrow - \uparrow$ puncture $p_{t'}^{(1)}$ when t' is even
- After puncturing, output of the turbo encoder should be
 $\bar{c} = [u_1 p_1^{(1)} \ u_2 p_2^{(2)} \ \cdots \ u_k p_k^{(1)} (\underline{u_k p_k^{(2)}})]$
when k is odd $- \uparrow - [u_k p_k^{(1)} (\underline{u_k p_k^{(2)}})]$



Example 6.1 Given the turbo encoder shown below with constituent code of the $(1, 1/5)_8$ conv. code. The puncturing pattern is $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. The interleaving pattern is (8, 3, 7, 6, 9, 1, 10, 5, 2, 4). Determine the turbo codeword of message vector $\bar{u} = [1\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0]$.





The original message vector

 $\bar{u} = [1\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0]$

Output of the 1st constituent code is:

 $\bar{p}^{(1)} = [1\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0]$

After interleaving, the permuted message vector becomes

 $\bar{u}' = [0\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 0\ 1]$

Output of the 2nd constituent code is:

 $\bar{p}^{(2)} = [0\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 1]$

Before puncturing, the turbo codeword is

 $\bar{c} = [110\ 000\ 011\ 111\ 011\ 100\ 101\ 000\ 001\ 001]$

After puncturing, the turbo codeword is

 $\bar{c} = [11\ 00\ 01\ 11\ 01\ 10\ 10\ 00\ 01\ 1]$



Trellis of the $(1, 1/5)_8$ conv. code



- Parameterization
 - Turbo codeword $\bar{c} = [u_1 p_1^{(1)} p_1^{(2)}, u_2 p_2^{(1)} p_2^{(2)}, \cdots, u_k p_k^{(1)} p_k^{(2)}].$
 - Assume the turbo codeword is transmitted using BPSK.
 - Received symbol vector

$$\bar{y} = [y_1^{(0)} y_1^{(1)} y_1^{(2)}, y_2^{(0)} y_2^{(1)} y_2^{(2)}, \cdots, y_k^{(0)} y_k^{(1)} y_k^{(2)}].$$

- Interleaved message vector

$$\bar{u}' = \Pi(\bar{u}) = [u'_1, u'_2, \cdots, u'_k].$$

- Interleaved (information) symbol vector

$$\left[y_1^{(0)'}, y_2^{(0)'}, \cdots, y_k^{(0)'}\right] = \Pi([y_1^{(0)}, y_2^{(0)}, \cdots, y_k^{(0)}]).$$



Turbo decoding structure



- In BCJR (1), trellis transition probability is determined by $\Gamma_{\Omega \to \Omega'} = P_a(u_{t'})P_{ch}(u_{t'})P_{ch}(p_{t'}^{(1)}).$

In BCJR (2), trellis transition probability is determined by

$$\Gamma_{\Omega \to \Omega'} = P_a(u'_{t'}) P_{\rm ch}(u'_{t'}) P_{\rm ch}(p_{t'}^{(2)}).$$



Turbo decoding structure



- At the beginning of iterations, knowledge of information bits $u_{t'}$ is not available, and $P_a(u_{t'})$ are initialized as

$$P_a(u_{t'} = 0) = P_a(u_{t'} = 1) = 1/2.$$

- Once BCJR (1) delivers $P_e(u_{t'})$, knowledge of interleaved information bits $u'_{t'}$ will be gained by mapping

 $\Pi(P_e(u_{t'})) \to P_a(u'_{t'}),$ and BCJR (2) starts its decoding with $P_a(u'_{t'}), P_{ch}(u'_{t'})$ and $P_{ch}(p_{t'}^{(2)}).$





- Once BCJR (2) delivers $P_e(u'_{t'})$, knowledge of information bits $u_{t'}$ will be gained by mapping $\Pi^{-1}(P_e(u'_{t'})) \to P_e(u_{t'})$

$$\Pi^{-1}(P_e(u'_{t'})) \to P_a(u_{t'}),$$

and BCJR (1) performs another round of decoding with $P_a(u_{t'})$, $P_{ch}(u_{t'})$ and $P_{ch}(p_{t'}^{(1)})$.

- After a sufficient number of iterations, decisions will be made based on the *a posteriori* prob. $P_p(u_{t'})$ that are the deinterleaved version of output of BCJR (2), $P_p(u'_{t'})$.
- If parity bits $p_{t'}^{(1)}$ (or $p_{t'}^{(2)}$) have been punctured, the channel observations become $P_{ch}\left(p_{t'}^{(1)}=0\right) = P_{ch}\left(p_{t'}^{(1)}=1\right) = 1/2$, (or $P_{ch}\left(p_{t'}^{(2)}=0\right) = P_{ch}\left(p_{t'}^{(2)}=1\right) = 1/2$). And all the channel observations remain unchanged during the whole iterative process.



Advantage of systematic constituent codes

Using RSC

Encoding:

$$u_{t'} - \begin{bmatrix} RSC \\ Enc. (1) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow u_{t'} p_{t'}^{(1)} \\ RSC \\ Enc. (2) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow u_{t'}' p_{t'}^{(2)}$$

Transmission (coding rate is 1/3): $u_1 p_1^{(1)} p_1^{(2)} u_2 p_2^{(1)} p_2^{(2)} u_3 p_3^{(1)} p_3^{(2)} \dots u_{t'} p_{t'}^{(1)} p_{t'}^{(2)} \dots \dots$

Decoding of the constituent codes:

 $P_{\rm ch}(u_{t'}), P_{\rm ch}(p_{t'}^{(1)})$ are used in the 1st decoder, which is rate 1/2. $P_{\rm ch}(u_{t'}'), P_{\rm ch}(p_{t'}^{(2)})$ are used in the 2nd decoder, which is rate 1/2.



Using non-systematic constituent codes

Encoding:

$$u_{t'} - \begin{bmatrix} \text{NRSC} \\ \text{Enc. (1)} \\ \text{NRSC} \\ \text{Enc. (2)} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{} c_{2t'-1}^{(1)} c_{2t'}^{(1)}$$

NDCC

Transmission

(coding rate is 1/4): $c_1^{(1)} c_2^{(1)} c_1^{(2)} c_2^{(2)} c_3^{(1)} c_4^{(1)} c_3^{(2)} c_4^{(2)} \dots \dots c_{2t'-1}^{(1)} c_{2t'}^{(1)} c_{2t'-1}^{(2)} c_{2t'-1}^{(2)} c_{2t'}^{(2)} \dots \dots$

Decoding of the constituent codes :

 $P_{\rm ch}\left(c_{2t'-1}^{(1)}\right)$, $P_{\rm ch}\left(c_{2t'}^{(1)}\right)$ are used in the 1st decoder, which is rate 1/2.

 $P_{\rm ch}\left(c_{2t'-1}^{(2)}\right)$, $P_{\rm ch}\left(c_{2t'}^{(2)}\right)$ are used in the 2nd decoder, which is rate 1/2.



Using non-systematic constituent codes

 $u_{t'} \xrightarrow{\text{Enc. (1)}} c_{2t'-1}^{(1)} c_{2t'}^{(1)}$ Enc. (2) $c_{2t'-1}^{(2)} c_{2t'}^{(2)}$

In realizing a rate 1/3 coded transmission, we may puncture one coded bit in each time instant. E.g.,(i) puncture $c_{2t'}^{(2)}$ as

$$c_1^{(1)} c_2^{(1)} c_1^{(2)} c_3^{(1)} c_4^{(1)} c_3^{(2)} \dots c_{2t'-1}^{(1)} c_{2t'}^{(1)} c_{2t'-1}^{(2)} \dots$$

or (ii) puncture $c_{2t'-1}^{(2)}$ when t'is odd, and $c_{2t'-1}^{(1)}$ when t' is even, as $c_1^{(1)} c_2^{(1)} c_2^{(2)} c_4^{(1)} c_3^{(2)} c_4^{(2)} \dots c_{2t'-1}^{(1)} c_{2t'}^{(1)} c_{2t'}^{(2)} (c_{2t'}^{(1)} c_{2t'-1}^{(2)} c_{2t'}^{(2)}) \dots \dots$

Decoding of the constituent codes:

In case (i)

 $P_{ch}\left(c_{2t'-1}^{(1)}\right)$, $P_{ch}(c_{2t'}^{(1)})$ are used in the 1st decoder, which is rate 1/2. $P_{ch}\left(c_{2t'-1}^{(2)}\right)$ are used in the 2nd decoder, which is forced to be rate 1. In case (ii)

The 1st and 2nd decoders are forced to be rate 2/3.



Example 6.2 Message vector $\bar{u} = [1\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 0\ 0]$

Transmitted codeword $\bar{c} = [11\ 00\ 01\ 11\ 01\ 10\ 10\ 00\ 01]$

Received symbol $\bar{y} = [1.66, 2.49, -2.35, -1.39, 0.22, 1.27, -0.41, 0.30,$

-2.00, 1.16, 1.70, -1.69, 0.90, -0.38, -3.28, -0.82, 0.12, -1.30, -3.31, 2.28].

After iteration 1:

0

(-1,0)

(1,0)

$P_e(u_{t'}=0)$	0.010	.32	0.99	0.04	0.84	0.69	0.37	0.32	0.92	0.32
$P_e(u_{t'}=1)$	0.990	.68	0.01	0.96	0.16	0.31	0.63	0.68	0.08	0.68
$P_e(u_{t'}'=0)$	0.500	.82	0.50	0.08	0.50	0.67	0.50	0.23	0.50	0.03
$P_e(u_{t'}'=1)$	0.500	.18	0.50	0.92	0.50	0.33	0.50	0.77	0.50	0.97
$P_p(u_{t'}=0)$	0.00	.27	1.00	0.49	1.00	0.31	0.28	0.02	1.00	0.07
$P_{p}(u_{t'}=1)$	1.000	.73	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.69	0.72	0.98	0.00	0.93

Note: Only the real part of the received symbols are preserved here.



After iteration 2:

$P_e(u_{t'}=0)$	0.00	0.93	0.99	0.01	0.91	0.07	0.37	0.93	0.93	0.93
$P_e(u_{t'}=1)$	1.00	0.07	0.01	0.99	0.09	0.93	0.63	0.07	0.07	0.07
$P_e(u_{t'}'=0)$	0.50	0.99	0.50	0.04	0.50	0.14	0.50	0.34	0.50	0.01
$P_e(u_{t'}'=1)$	0.50	0.01	0.50	0.96	0.50	0.86	0.50	0.66	0.50	0.99
$P_p(u_{t'}=0)$	0.00	0.92	1.00	0.11	1.00	0.01	0.28	0.32	1.00	0.68
$P_p(u_{t'}=1)$	1.00	0.08	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.99	0.72	0.68	0.00	0.32

After iteration 3:

$P_e(u_{t'}=0)$	0.00	0.97	0.99	0.01	0.94	0.04	0.37	0.96	0.93	0.96
$P_e(u_{t'}=1)$	1.00	0.03	0.01	0.99	0.06	0.96	0.63	0.04	0.07	0.04
$P_e(u'_{t'}=0)$	0.50	0.99	0.50	0.03	0.50	0.09	0.50	0.37	0.50	0.01
$P_e(u_{t'}'=1)$	0.50	0.01	0.50	0.97	0.50	0.91	0.50	0.63	0.50	0.99
$P_p(u_{t'}=0)$	0.00	0.96	1.00	0.10	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.49	1.00	0.82
$P_p(u_{t'}=1)$	1.00	0.04	0.00	0.90	0.00	1.00	0.72	0.51	0.00	0.18



After iteration 4:



Observations:

(i) The iterative decoding corrects 3 errors;

(ii) Let $L_p(u_{t'}) = \ln \frac{P_p(u_{t'}=0)}{P_p(u_{t'}=1)}$. If $|L_p(u_{t'})|$ is greater, the decision made on $u_{t'}$ will be

more confident;

(iii) The decisions made on the message bits become more confident as the iteration progresses.



Log-MAP BCJR

Define function

$$\max^{*}(x, y) \triangleq \ln(e^{x} + e^{y}) = \max(x, y) + \ln(1 + e^{-|x-y|})$$

whose multivariate version can be defined recursively as

 $\max^*(x, y, z) \triangleq \ln(e^x + e^y + e^z) = \max^*(\max^*(x, y), z)$ Similarly, let *X* be a finite set so that

$$\max^*(X) \triangleq \ln \sum_{x \in X} e^x$$

Define BCJR metrics in log domain

$$\Gamma^*_{\Omega\to\Omega'} = \ln\Gamma_{\Omega\to\Omega'}$$

$$A_{t'}^*(\Omega) = \ln A_{t'}(\Omega) = \ln \sum_{(\Omega_0,\Omega)} e^{\left[A_{t'-1}^*(\Omega_0) + \Gamma_{\Omega_0 \to \Omega}^*\right]}$$
$$= \max^* \left(\left\{ A_{t'-1}^*(\Omega_0) + \Gamma_{\Omega_0 \to \Omega}^* \mid \forall(\Omega_0,\Omega) \right\} \right)$$



Similarly,
$$B_{t'+1}^*(\Omega') = \ln B_{t'+1}(\Omega') = \ln \sum_{(\Omega',\Omega'')} e^{\left[B_{t'+2}^*(\Omega'') + \Gamma_{\Omega'\to\Omega''}^*\right]}$$

= $\max^*\left(\left\{B_{t'+2}^*(\Omega'') + \Gamma_{\Omega'\to\Omega''}^* \mid \forall(\Omega',\Omega'')\right\}\right)$

$$L(u_{t'}) = \max_{\left(\Omega \to \Omega'\right)_{0}}^{*} \left(A_{t'}^{*}\left(\Omega\right) + \Gamma_{\Omega \to \Omega'}^{*} + B_{t'+1}^{*}\left(\Omega'\right) \right) - \max_{\left(\Omega \to \Omega'\right)_{1}}^{*} \left(A_{t'}^{*}\left(\Omega\right) + \Gamma_{\Omega \to \Omega'}^{*} + B_{t'+1}^{*}\left(\Omega'\right) \right)$$

The max-log-MAP algorithm is to replace $\max^*(\cdot)$ by $\max(\cdot)$.

Remark: Turbo decoding efficiency can be improved by the so-called log-MAP algorithm [1] or the max-log-MAP algorithm [2]. Both of the algorithms deal with log-likelihood ratios rather than probabilities. The max-log-MAP algorithm has a computational complexity of not more than three times of Viterbi algorithm, but suffers a slight performance loss compared to BCJR and log-MAP algorithms.

[1] C. Berrou and A. Glavieux, "Near optimum error correcting coding and decoding: turbo-codes," in *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 44, no. 10, pp. 1261-1271, Oct. 1996.

[2] J. Hagenauer, E. Offer und L. Papke, "Iterative Decoding of Binary Block and Convolutional Codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 42, 1996.



BER performance of rate half turbo code with constituent code of (1, 1/5) RSC over AWGN channel using BPSK.





The BER performance of the classical turbo code with length 1024 and rate 1/3 [1].



[1] Tasev, Zarko & Popovski, Petar & Maggio, Gian & Kocarev, Ljupco. "Bifurcations and Chaos in Turbo Decoding Algorithms," 2004.



Q: Why there is an error floor?

- The bit error rate (BER) (denoted as P_b) of a conv. code (and turbo code) is determined by

$$P_b \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} \frac{w_i}{k} Q\left(\sqrt{\frac{2d_i \cdot R \cdot E_b}{N_0}}\right).$$

- → Let \bar{u}_i denote a message vector and \bar{c}_i denote its corresponding codeword, $w_i = \text{weight}(\bar{u}_i)$ and $d_i = \text{weight}(\bar{c}_i)$.
- ▶ $k = \text{length}(\bar{u}_i)$ and there are 2^k codewords in the codebook.
- \triangleright *R* is the rate of the code.

 $\geq \frac{E_b}{N_0} - \text{signal-to-noise ratio (SNR).}$

Q function as
$$Q(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-\frac{\nu^2}{2}} d\nu$$
.



- Since $d_i = d_{\text{free}}, d_{\text{free}} + 1, \dots, k/R$, by grouping terms with the same d_i , the above inequality can be written as:

$$P_b \leq \sum_{d=d_{\text{free}}}^{k/R} \frac{W_d}{k} Q\left(\sqrt{\frac{2d \cdot R \cdot E_b}{N_0}}\right)$$
$$= \sum_{d=d_{\text{free}}}^{k/R} \frac{\widehat{W}_d N_d}{k} Q\left(\sqrt{\frac{2d \cdot R \cdot E_b}{N_0}}\right)$$

 $\succ \hat{w}_d$ — weight of message vectors that correspond to codeword of weight d.

- > N_d Number of codewords of weight d.
- > W_d Total weight of message vectors that correspond to codeword of weight d.



- When the SNR $\left(\frac{E_b}{N_0}\right)$ increases, the asymptotic behavior of P_b is dominated by the first term in the summation as

$$P_b \cong \frac{N_{d_{\text{free}}} \widehat{w}_{d_{\text{free}}}}{k} Q\left(\sqrt{\frac{2d_{\text{free}} \cdot R \cdot E_b}{N_0}}\right)$$

- In the log P_b vs. log $\frac{E_b}{N_0}$ graph, d_{free} determines the slope of the BER vs. SNR (dB) curve.

Remark: The error floor at high SNR is due to a small d_{free} , or alternatively the presence of low weight codewords.



Motivation of having an interleaver between the two encoders: Try to avoid the low weight conv. codewords and subsequently the low weight turbo codeword being produced.

Example 6.3 Following the encoder structure of *Example 6.1*, if the message vector $\bar{u} = [0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1]$, the output of the RSC (1) will be

 $\bar{c}_1 = [00\ 00\ 00\ 00\ 11].$

Without interleaving, the output of RSC (2) will be the same as RSC (1) as $\bar{c}_2 = \bar{c}_1$. And the turbo codeword is

 $\bar{c} = [000\ 000\ 000\ 000\ 111].$

With interleaving, $\bar{u}' = [1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0]$, the output of RSC (2) will now be

 $\bar{c}_2 = [11\ 00\ 01\ 00\ 01].$

And the turbo codeword becomes

 $\bar{c} = [001\ 000\ 001\ 000\ 111].$