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Abstract—Because of their capacity-approaching performance and their complexity/latency advantages, spatially-coupled (SC) codes are among the most attractive error-correcting codes for use in modern dense storage devices. SC codes are constructed by partitioning an underlying block code and coupling the partitioned components. Here, we focus on circulant-based SC codes. Recently, the optimal overlap (OO)-circulant power optimizer (CPO) approach was introduced to construct high performance SC codes for additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) and Flash channels. The OO stage operates on the protograph of the SC code to derive the optimal partitioning that minimizes the number of detrimental objects. Then, the CPO optimizes the circulant powers to further reduce this number. Since the nature of detrimental objects in the graph of a code critically depends on the characteristics of the channel of interest, extending the OO-CPO approach to construct SC codes for channels with intrinsic memory is not a straightforward task. In this paper, we tackle one relevant extension; we construct high performance SC codes for practical 1-D magnetic recording channels, i.e., partial-response (PR) channels. Via combinatorial techniques, we carefully build and solve the optimization problem of the OO partitioning, focusing on the objects of interest in the case of PR channels. Then, we customize the CPO to further reduce the number of these objects in the graph of the code. SC codes designed using the proposed OO-CPO approach for PR channels outperform prior state-of-the-art SC codes by around 3 orders of magnitude in frame error rate (FER) and 1.1 dB in signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), and more intriguingly, outperform structured block codes of the same length by around 1.6 orders of magnitude in FER and 0.4 dB in SNR.

I. INTRODUCTION
Similar to other data storage systems, magnetic recording (MR) systems operate at very low frame error rate (FER) levels [1], [2]. Consequently, to guarantee high error correction capability in such systems, binary [2] and non-binary (NB) [3], [4] graph-based codes are used. The objects that dominate the error floor region of low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes simulated in partial-response (PR) and additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) systems are different in their combinatorial nature because of the detector-decoder looping and the intrinsic memory in PR systems [5]. In particular, the authors in [5] introduced balanced absorbing sets (BASs) to characterize the detrimental objects in the case of PR (1-D MR) channels. Moreover, the weight consistency matrix (WCM) framework was introduced to systematically remove any type of absorbing sets from the graph of an NB-LDPC code [6], [7].

Spatially-coupled (SC) codes [8], [9] are graph-based codes constructed by partitioning an underlying block code into components of the same size, then rewiring these components multiple times [10]. In this work, the underlying block codes, and consequently our constructed SC codes, are circulant-based (CB) codes. SC codes offer not only complexity/latency gains (if windowed decoding [11] is used), but also an additional degree of freedom in the code design; this added flexibility is achieved via partitioning of the parity check matrix of the underlying block code. This observation makes SC codes receive an increasing level of attention in multiple applications. Contiguous [10] and non-contiguous [12], [13] partitioning schemes were introduced in the literature for various applications. Recently, the optimal overlap (OO)-circulant power optimizer (CPO) approach was introduced to design SC codes with superior performance for AWGN [14] and practical asymmetric Flash [15] channels. The OO partitioning operates on the protograph to compute the optimal set of overlap parameters that characterizes the partitioning. The CPO operates on the unlabeled graph (weights are set to 1’s) to adjust the circulant powers. The objective is to minimize the number of instances of a common substructure that exists in different detrimental objects. If the SC code is binary, the unlabeled graph is the final graph. If the SC code is non-binary, the WCM framework [6], [7] is used to optimize the edge weights after applying the OO-CPO approach.

In this paper, we propose an approach based on tools from combinatorics, optimization, and graph theory, to construct high performance SC codes for PR channels. Unlike the case of AWGN and Flash channels (see [14] and [15]), the common substructure, whose number of instances we seek to minimize, in the case of PR channels can appear in different ways in the protograph of the SC code, making the optimization problem considerably more challenging. For that reason, we introduce the concept of the pattern, which is a configuration in the protograph that can result in instances of the common substructure in the unlabeled graph of the SC code after lifting. We derive an optimization problem, in which we express the weighted sum of the counts (numbers of instances) of all patterns in terms of the overlap parameters. Then, we compute the optimal set of overlap parameters (OO) that minimizes this sum. Moreover, we propose the necessary modifications to the CPO algorithm presented in [14] and [15] to make it suitable for the common substructure in the case of PR channels. We demonstrate the gains achieved by our OO-CPO (-WCM for NB SC codes) approach through tables and performance plots that compare our codes not only with SC codes, but also with CB block codes of the same length and the same rate.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the necessary preliminaries. Different patterns of the common substructure are discussed in Section III. The analysis of the optimization problem is presented in Section IV. The needed modifications over the baseline CPO are...
detailed in Section VI. We present our experimental results in Section VII. Finally, the work is concluded in Section VIII.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we review the construction of SC codes and the definitions of the objects of interest. Here, each row (resp., column) in a parity-check matrix corresponds to a check node (CN) (resp., variable node (VN)) in the equivalent Tanner graph of the matrix. Each circulant is of the form $H_{i,j}$, where $i,j \leq \gamma - 1$, and $\sigma$ is the $z \times z$ identity matrix cyclically shifted one unit to the left. Circulant powers are defined in Section V. We present our experimental results on the unlabeled graphs and binary matrices. Labeled graphs and non-binary matrices will be discussed as needed. Let $H$ be the binary parity-check matrix of the underlying regular CB code that has column weight (VN degree) $\gamma$ and row weight (CN degree) $\kappa$. This matrix consists of $\gamma\kappa$ circulants. Each circulant is of the form $\sigma^{f_{i,j}}$, where $0 \leq i \leq \gamma - 1$, $0 \leq j \leq \kappa - 1$, and $\sigma$ is the $z \times z$ identity matrix cyclically shifted one unit to the left. Circulant powers are $f_{i,j}$, $\forall i,j$, and they are defined, in addition to $z$, as the lifting parameters. Separable CB (SCB) codes have $f_{i,j} = f(i)f(j)$, $z \geq \gamma$, and $z$ prime. The underlying block codes we use to design SC codes in this work are CB codes with no zero circulants.

The binary SC code is constructed as follows. First, $H$ is partitioned into $(m+1)$ disjoint components (they all have the same size as $H$): $H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_m$, where $m$ is defined as the memory of the SC code. Each component $H_p$, $0 \leq y \leq m$, contains some of the $\gamma\kappa$ circulants of $H$ and zero circulants elsewhere such that $H = \sum_{y=0}^{m} H_p$. While we have completed the framework for any $m$ and $\gamma \geq 3$, for simplicity, we focus on $m = 1$ in this paper, i.e., $H = H_0 + H_1$. Then, $H_0$ and $H_1$ are coupled $L$ times (see Fig. 1) to construct the binary parity-check matrix of the SC code, $H_{SC}$, which is of size $\gamma z(L+1) \times \kappa z L$. A replica is any $\gamma z(L+1) \times \kappa z$ submatrix of $H_{SC}$ that contains $[H_0^T \ H_1^T]^T$ and zero circulants elsewhere. Replicas are denoted by $R_{\rho, L}$, $1 \leq \rho \leq L$.

The protograph matrix (PM) of a binary CB matrix is the matrix resulting from replacing each $z \times z$ non-zero circulant with 1, and each $z \times z$ zero circulant with 0. The PMs of $H_0, H_1, H_2, H_3$ are $H_0^P, H_1^P, H_2^P$, and $H_3^P$, respectively, and they are all of size $\gamma \times \kappa$. The PM of $H_{SC}$ is $H_{SC}^P$, and it is of size $\gamma (L+1) \times \kappa L$. This $H_{SC}^P$ also has $L$ replicas, $R_{\rho, L}$, $1 \leq \rho \leq L$, but with 1 circulant. Non-binary SC (NB-SC) codes can be constructed from binary SC codes as described in [15] and guided by [7]. The NB codes we use in this work have parity-check matrices with their elements in $GF(q)$, and $q = 2^\lambda$, where $\lambda \in \{2, 3, \ldots\}$ (in the binary case, $q = 2$).

A contiguous technique for partitioning $H$ to construct $H_{SC}$, namely cutting vector (CV) partitioning, was investigated to generate SC codes for PR channels [10]. Multiple non-contiguous partitioning techniques were recently introduced in the literature, e.g., minimum overlap (MO) partitioning [12], general edge spreading [13], in addition to OO partitioning [14], [15]. These non-contiguous partitioning techniques significantly outperform contiguous ones [12], [14], [15]. However, as far as we know, no prior work has proposed non-contiguous techniques in the context of PR channels. The goal of this work is to derive the effective OO-CPO approach for partitioning and lifting to construct high performance SC codes optimzed for PR channels.

The intrinsic memory along with detector-decoder iterations (global iterations) result in changing the combinatorial properties of detrimental objects in LDPC codes simulated over PR channels compared with the case of canonical channels [5]. In particular, these detrimental objects were shown to be absorbing sets that can have unsatisfied CNs with degrees > 1, while having a fewer number of unsatisfied (particularly degree-1) CNs. These objects were named BASs. We now present the definitions of different objects of interest. Examples on these objects of interest are in Fig. 1. Let $g = \lfloor \frac{2^\lambda - 1}{2} \rfloor$.

**Definition 1.** Consider a subgraph induced by a subset $\mathcal{V}$ of VNs in the Tanner graph of a code. Set all the VNs in $\mathcal{V}$ to values in $GF(q) \setminus \{0\}$ and set all other VNs to 0. The set $\mathcal{V}$ is said to be an $(a, b, d_1, d_2, d_3)$ balanced absorbing set of type two (BAST) over $GF(q)$ if the size of $\mathcal{V}$ is $a$, the number of unsatisfied CNs connected to $\mathcal{V}$ is $b$, $0 \leq b \leq \lfloor \frac{2^\lambda - 1}{2} \rfloor$, the number of degree-1 (resp., 2 and > 2) CNs connected to $\mathcal{V}$ is $d_1$ (resp., $d_2$ and $d_3$), $d_2 > d_3$, all the unsatisfied CNs connected to $\mathcal{V}$ (if any) have either degree 1 or degree 2, and each VN in $\mathcal{V}$ is connected to strictly more satisfied than unsatisfied neighboring CNs (for some set of VN values).

While the above definition was introduced in the context of non-binary codes [5], it is valid in the binary case as well (set $q = 2$). An $(a, d_1, d_2, d_3)$ unlabeled BAST (UBS) is a BAST with the weights of all edges of its graph replaced by 1’s. All our abbreviations are short-handed for simplicity.

**Definition 2.** Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a subset of VNs in the unlabeled (binary) Tanner graph of a code. Let $O$ (resp., $T$ and $H$) be the set of degree-1 (resp., 2 and > 2) CNs connected to $\mathcal{V}$. This graphical configuration is an $(a, d_1)$ unlabeled elementary trapping set (UTS) if $|\mathcal{V}| = a$, $|O| = d_1$, and $|H| = 0$. A UTS is an unlabeled elementary absorbing set (UAS) if each VN in $\mathcal{V}$ is connected to strictly more neighbors in $T$ than in $O$.

A binary protograph configuration is also defined by $(a, d_1)$ for simplicity. The WCM framework removes a BAST from the graph of an NB code by careful processing of its edge weights (see [5], [6], and [7] for details).

III. THE COMMON SUBSTRUCTURE AND ITS PATTERNS

The idea of focusing on a common substructure in the design of the unlabeled graph of an SC code simplifies the optimization procedure. Additionally, minimizing the number of instances of the common substructure significantly reduces the multiplicity of several different types of detrimental objects simultaneously [10], [14], which is a lot more feasible compared with operating on all these detrimental objects separately (especially for partitioning). It was shown in [10] that the $(4, 4(\gamma - 2))$ UAS/UTS, $\gamma \geq 3$, is the common substructure of interest for PR channels (unlike the case for AWGN [13], [14] and Flash channels [15], where the substructure of interest is
Lemma 1. The number of distinct patterns (with different dimensions) in the protograph of a code that can result in (4, 4(γ − 2)) UASs/UTSs in the unlabeled graph of the code after lifting is 9, in the case of γ ≥ 4. The numbers of CNs and VNs in these 9 patterns are both in \{2, 3, 4\}. This number of distinct patterns reduces to 7 in the case of γ = 3.

Proof. Since the objects of interest in the unlabeled graph are cycles of length 8 with 4 CNs and 4 VNs, a protograph pattern that can generate some of them must have at most 4 CNs and 4 VNs. Moreover, to result in cycles of length 8 after lifting, the pattern must have at least 2 CNs and 2 VNs. Combining these two statements yields that the numbers of CNs and VNs of a protograph pattern that can result in (4, 4(γ − 2)) UASs/UTSs in the unlabeled graph must be in \{2, 3, 4\}.

Consequently, in order to have 9 patterns for the case of γ ≥ 4, we show that selecting any number of CNs in \{2, 3, 4\} and any number of VNs in \{2, 3, 4\} can result in a pattern (or more) that is capable of generating cycles of length 8 in the unlabeled graph. Fig. 2 demonstrates the above statement, focusing on the matrix representation of patterns and cycles. In the case of γ = 3, a pattern cannot have 4 ones in a column, which reduces the number of patterns to 7.

We define the 9 patterns according to the dimensions of their submatrices as follows. Pattern \(P_1\) is 2 × 2, Pattern \(P_2\) is 2 × 3, Pattern \(P_3\) is 3 × 2, Pattern \(P_4\) is 2 × 4, Pattern \(P_5\) is 4 × 2, Pattern \(P_6\) is 3 × 3, Pattern \(P_7\) is 3 × 4, Pattern \(P_8\) is 4 × 3, and Pattern \(P_9\) is 4 × 4 (all illustrated in Fig. 2).

Remark 2. Following the same logic we used in Lemma 1 and its proof for the \(\{3, 3(\gamma - 2)\}\) UAS/UTS, leads to a possibility to also have patterns for this case, with the number of CNs and VNs in \{2, 3\}. However, a careful analysis guides to the fact that only one protograph pattern can result in \(\{3, 3(\gamma - 2)\}\) UASs/UTSs (cycles of length 6) after lifting, which is the 3 × 3 pattern, and it is itself a cycle of length 6 [14], [15].

The following lemma discusses the relation between different protograph patterns and the resulting cycles after lifting. Define a cycle-8 candidate of Pattern \(P_\ell\) as a way to traverse...
Lemma 2. Let $\zeta_{P_\ell}$ be the number of distinct cycle-8 candidates of pattern $P_\ell$. Then,

$$
\zeta_{P_\ell} = \begin{cases} 
1, & \ell \in \{1, 6, 9\}, \\
2, & \ell \in \{7, 8\}, \\
3, & \ell \in \{2, 3\}, \\
6, & \ell \in \{4, 5\}. 
\end{cases}
$$

Proof. We define a cycle-8 candidate according to the connectivity as follows: $c_1 - v_1 - c_2 - v_2 - c_3 - v_3 - c_4 - v_4$ (each CN connects the next two VNs in a circular fashion, see Fig. [1]). From Fig. [2] there is only one cycle-8 candidate for pattern $P_1$, which is $c_1 - v_1 - c_2 - v_2 - c_1 - v_1 - c_2 - v_2$, and this is the case for all square patterns. Thus, $\zeta_{P_\ell} = 1$ for $\ell \in \{1, 6, 9\}$. It can be understood from Fig. [2] that $\zeta_{P_\ell} \neq 1$ for all the remaining patterns. In particular, we have two cycle-8 candidates for pattern $P_7$, that are: $c_1 - v_1 - c_2 - v_2 - c_1 - v_1 - c_3 - v_4$ and $c_1 - v_1 - c_2 - v_3 - c_1 - v_2 - c_4$ (which is the red cycle on $P_7$ in Fig. [2]). The situation is the same for Pattern $P_9$ because it is the transpose of $P_7$. Thus, $\zeta_{P_\ell} = 2$ for $\ell \in \{7, 8\}$. The rest of the cases can be derived similarly.

Pattern $P_3$ has $\zeta_{P_3} = 1$ (see [1]), and it results in $z/2$ or 0 cycles of length 8 after lifting (since $P_3$ is only $2 \times 2$), while all the remaining patterns result in $z$ or 0 cycles of length 8 after lifting [15], [16]. Thus, we define the pattern weight, $\beta_{P_\ell}$, which plays an important role in the discrete optimization problem of the OO, as follows:

$$
\beta_{P_\ell} = \begin{cases} 
1/2, & \zeta_{P_\ell} = 1, \\
\ell \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}. 
\end{cases}
$$

IV. OO: Building and Solving the Optimization Problem

Now, we are ready to build the optimization problem. Consider the protograph of an SC code. The weighted sum of the total number of instances of all patterns is given by:

$$
F_{tot} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{9} \beta_{P_\ell} F_{P_\ell},
$$

where $F_{P_\ell}$ is the total number of instances of pattern $P_\ell$. The goal is to express $F_{tot}$ through $F_{P_\ell}$, $\forall \ell$, as a function of the overlap parameters, then finding the optimal set of overlap parameters that minimize $F_{tot}$ for OO partitioning. We first recall the definition and the properties of overlap parameters. More details on that part can be found in [14].

Definition 3. For $m = 1$, let $\Pi = \begin{bmatrix} H_0 & H_1 \end{bmatrix}^T$, and let $\Pi^p$ be its PM (of size $2^\gamma \times \kappa$). A degree-$\mu$ overlap among $\mu$ rows (or CNs) of $\Pi^p$ indexed by $\{i_1, \ldots, i_\mu\}$, $1 \leq \mu \leq \gamma$, $0 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_\mu \leq 2\gamma - 1$, is defined as a position (column) in which all these rows have 1’s simultaneously. A degree-$\mu$ overlap parameter, $r_{\{i_1, \ldots, i_\mu\}}$, is defined as the number of degree-$\mu$ overlaps among the rows indexed by $\{i_1, \ldots, i_\mu\}$ in $\Pi^p$. A degree-1 overlap parameter $r_i, 0 \leq i_1 \leq 2\gamma - 1$, is defined as the number of 1’s in row $i_1$ of $\Pi^p$.

Note that a degree-$\mu$ overlap parameter, if $\mu > 1$, is always zero if in the set $\{i_1, \ldots, i_\mu\}$ there exists at least one pair of distinct row indices, say $(i_\tau_1, i_\tau_2)$, with the property that $i_\tau_1 \equiv i_\tau_2 \pmod{\gamma}$ [14]. Define the set of non-zero overlap parameters as $O$. The parameters in $O$ are not all independent. The set of independent non-zero overlap parameters, $O_{ind}$, is:

$$
O_{ind} = \{t_{\{i_1, \ldots, i_\mu\}} \mid 1 \leq \mu \leq \gamma, 0 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_\mu \leq \gamma - 1, \forall \{i_\tau_1, i_\tau_2\} \subset \{i_1, \ldots, i_\mu\}, i_\tau_1 \neq i_\tau_2 \pmod{\gamma}\}.
$$

The other non-zero overlap parameters in $O \setminus O_{ind}$ are obtained from the parameters in $O_{ind}$ according to [14] Lemma 3. Since we are focusing on $m = 1$, the cardinality of the set $O_{ind}$, which determines the complexity of the discrete optimization problem of the OO stage, is given by:

$$
N_{ind} = |O_{ind}| = \sum_{\mu=1}^{\gamma} \binom{\gamma}{\mu}
$$

As demonstrated in Fig. [2] for all the patterns of interest, the highest overlap degree is $\mu = 4$ (a pattern has at most 4 CNs). Note that while the overlap parameters themselves must be restricted to $\Pi^p$, the concept of the degree-$\mu$ overlap can be generalized from $\Pi^p$ to the PM of the SC code, $H_0^p$SC. We will use this generalization in the analysis of patterns.

We aim at expressing $F_{P_\ell}$, $\forall \ell$, in terms of the parameters in $O_{ind}$. Let $R_r$ be a replica in which at least one VN of the pattern being studied exists. We call $R_r$ the reference replica. Moreover, let the CNs (or rows) of the pattern be of the form $c_k = (r_1 - 1) \gamma + i_k$, $1 \leq k \leq 4$. For two replicas $R_\rho$ and $R_\nu$, define $\theta_{\rho,\nu} = \rho - \nu$. In the following, we consider the protograph of an SC code with parameters $\gamma \geq 3$, $\kappa = m = 1$, $L \geq 3$, and $O$. We define $[x]^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$, and $F_{P_\ell,1}$ as the number of instances of pattern $P_\ell$ that start at replica $R_1$ and span $k$ consecutive replicas. Note that each VN in a pattern corresponds to an overlap (see Fig. [2]).

The counts of different existence possibilities of the nine patterns in addition to the final formulas of $F_{P_\ell}$, $\forall \ell$, are presented in the forthcoming subsections.

A. Analysis of Pattern $P_1$ (size $2 \times 2$)

This pattern has two VNs that are adjacent (connected via at least one path of only one CN). Thus, Pattern $P_1$ has its VNs located in at most two replicas, and the pattern spans (i.e., its VNs span) at most $m + 1 = 2$ consecutive replicas (see [14] Lemma 1). Suppose $P_1$ has the CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$. The two overlaps forming the pattern are of degree-2, and they are both $c_1 - c_2$ overlaps (among $c_1$ and $c_2$).

Lemma 3. Case 1.1: The number of instances of $P_1$ with CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$, and all overlaps in one replica, $R_r$, is:

$$
A_{P_1} (t_{\{i_1, i_2\}}) = \binom{t_{\{i_1, i_2\}}}{2}.
$$

Case 1.2: The number of instances of $P_1$ with CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$, and all overlaps in two replicas, $R_r$ and $R_e$, $r < e$, is:

$$
B_{P_1} (t_{\{i_1, i_2\}}, t_{\{i_1 + \theta_{r,e}, i_2 + \theta_{r,e}\}}) = t_{\{i_1, i_2\}} t_{\{i_1 + \theta_{r,e}, i_2 + \theta_{r,e}\}}.
$$
Proof. In Case 1.1, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 2 overlaps out of \( t_{1,i_1,i_2} \) overlaps, which is given by (6). In Case 1.2, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 1 overlap out of \( t_{1,i_1,i_2} \) and 1 overlap out of \( t_{1,i_1+\gamma,i_2+\theta_R\gamma} \), which is given by (7).

\[ F_{P_1} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (L-k+1)F_{P_1,k}^k, \]  
where \( F_{P_1,k}, \ k \in \{1,2\}, \) are given by:  
\[ F_{P_1,1}^1 = \sum_{i_1,i_2 \in \{0,...,2\gamma-1\}} A_{P_1}(t_{i_1,i_2}), \]  
\[ F_{P_1,2}^2 = \sum_{i_1,i_2} B_{P_1}(t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1-\gamma,i_2-\gamma}) \]  
with \( \overline{t_1} \neq \overline{t_2} \), where \( \overline{t} = (t \mod \gamma) \).

Proof. To compute \( F_{P_2} \), we use the formula in [14] Theorem 1, with \( \chi = 2 \). Then, \( F_{P_2,1}^k \) is the sum of function \( A_{P_2} \) over all possible values of \( \{i_1,i_2\} \). Regarding \( F_{P_2,2}^2 \), we need to distinguish between two situations; when \( r < e \) (i.e., replica \( R_r \)), which has two overlaps, comes before replica \( R_e \), and when \( r > e \) (i.e., replica \( R_r \) comes after replica \( R_e \)). This distinction gives the two summations of function \( B_{P_2} \) in (13).

\[ \text{Proof.} \]

C. Analysis of Pattern \( P_3 \) (size \( 2 \times 2 \))

This pattern has two VNs that are adjacent. Thus, Pattern \( P_3 \) spans at most 2 consecutive replicas. Suppose \( P_3 \) has two spans, \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \). The two overlaps forming \( P_3 \) are of degree-3, and they are all \( c_1 = c_2 = c_3 \) overlaps.

\[ \text{Lemma 5. Case 3.1:} \] The number of instances of \( P_3 \) with two CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \), and all overlaps in one replica, \( R_r \), is:  
\[ A_{P_3}(t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}) = \binom{t_{i_1,i_2}}{3}. \]

\[ \text{Case 2.2:} \] The number of instances of \( P_2 \) with two CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and all overlaps in two replicas, \( r < e \), and one overlap is in \( R_r \), is:  
\[ B_{P_2}(t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1+\theta_R\gamma,i_2+\theta_R\gamma}) = \binom{t_{i_1,i_2}}{2} t_{i_1+\theta_R\gamma,i_2+\theta_R\gamma}. \]

\[ \text{Proof.} \]

\[ \text{Theorem 3.} \] The total number of instances of Pattern \( P_3 \) in the binary protograph of an SC code that has parameters \( \gamma \geq 3 \), \( m = 1, L \geq 3, \) and \( O \), is:  
\[ F_{P_3} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (L-k+1)F_{P_3,k}^k, \]
where \( F_{P_3,k}, \ k \in \{1,2\}, \) are given by:  
\[ F_{P_3,1}^1 = \sum_{\{i_1,i_2:i_3\}} A_{P_3}(t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}), \]  
\[ F_{P_3,2}^2 = \sum_{\{i_1,i_2:i_3\}} B_{P_3}(t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}, t_{i_1-\gamma,i_2-\gamma,i_3-\gamma}) \]
with \( \overline{t_1} \neq \overline{t_2} \), \( \overline{t_1} \neq \overline{t_3} \), and \( \overline{t_2} \neq \overline{t_3} \).

\[ \text{Proof.} \]

Theorem 2. The total number of instances of Pattern \( P_2 \) in the binary protograph of an SC code that has parameters \( \gamma \geq 3 \), \( m = 1, L \geq 3, \) and \( O \), is:  
\[ F_{P_2} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (L-k+1)F_{P_2,k}^k, \]
where \( F_{P_2,k}, \ k \in \{1,2\}, \) are given by:  
\[ F_{P_2,1}^1 = \sum_{\{i_1,i_2\}} A_{P_2}(t_{i_1,i_2}), \]  
\[ F_{P_2,2}^2 = \sum_{\{i_1,i_2\}} B_{P_2}(t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1-\gamma,i_2-\gamma}) \]
with \( \overline{t_1} \neq \overline{t_2} \), \( \overline{t_1} \neq \overline{t_3} \), and \( \overline{t_2} \neq \overline{t_3} \).

\[ \text{Proof.} \]
D. Analysis of Pattern $P_4$ (size $2 \times 4$)

This pattern has four VNs, with each pair of them being adjacent. Consequently, $P_4$ spans at most 2 consecutive replicas. Suppose $P_4$ has the CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$. The four overlaps forming $P_4$ are of degree-2, and they are all $c_1 - c_2$ overlaps.

**Lemma 6.** Case 4.1: The number of instances of $P_4$ with CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$, and all overlaps in one replica, $R_r$, is:

$$A_{P_4}(t_{(i_1,i_2)}) = \frac{t_{(i_1,i_2)}}{4}.$$  

(18)

Case 4.2: The number of instances of $P_4$ with CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$, and all overlaps in two replicas, $s.t.$ three overlaps are in $R_r$, and one overlap is in $R_{r-e}$, is:

$$B_{P_4}(t_{(i_1,i_2)}, t_{(i_1+\theta,r,i_2+\theta,r)}, t_{(i_1+\theta,r,i_2+\theta,r)}) = \binom{t_{(i_1,i_2)}}{3} t_{(i_1+\theta,r,i_2+\theta,r)}.$$  

(19)

Case 4.3: The number of instances of $P_4$ with CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$, and all overlaps in two replicas, $s.t.$ two overlaps are in $R_r$, and two overlaps are in $R_{r-e}$, $r < e$, is:

$$C_{P_4}(t_{(i_1,i_2)}, t_{(i_1+\theta,r,i_2+\theta,r)}) = \binom{t_{(i_1,i_2)}}{2} \binom{t_{(i_1+\theta,r,i_2+\theta,r)}}{2}.$$  

(20)

**Proof.** In Case 4.1, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 4 overlaps out of $t_{(i_1,i_2)}$, which is given by (18). In Case 4.2, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 3 overlaps out of $t_{(i_1,i_2)}$ and 1 overlap out of $t_{(i_1+\theta,r,i_2+\theta,r)}$, which is given by (19). In Case 4.3, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 2 overlaps out of $t_{(i_1,i_2)}$ and 2 overlaps out of $t_{(i_1+\theta,r,i_2+\theta,r)}$, which is given by (20).

**Theorem 4.** The total number of instances of Pattern $P_4$ in the binary protograph of an SC code that has parameters $\gamma \geq 3$, $\kappa = 1$, $\lambda \geq 3$, and $O$, is:

$$F_{P_4} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (L-k+1)F_{P_4,k,1}^k.$$  

(21)

where $F_{P_4,k,1}^k$, $k \in \{1, 2\}$, are given by:

$$F_{P_4,1}^1 = \sum_{(i_1,i_2) \in \{0,\ldots,2^\gamma-1\}} A_{P_4}(t_{(i_1,i_2)}),$$

$$F_{P_4,1}^2 = \sum_{(i_1,i_2) \in \{\gamma,\ldots,2^\gamma-1\}} B_{P_4}(t_{(i_1,i_2)}, t_{(i_1-\gamma,i_2-\gamma)}) + \sum_{(i_1,i_2) \in \{0,\ldots,\gamma-1\}} C_{P_4}(t_{(i_1,i_2)}, t_{(i_1+\gamma,i_2+\gamma)}) + \sum_{(i_1,i_2) \in \{\gamma,\ldots,2^\gamma-1\}} C_{P_4}(t_{(i_1,i_2)}, t_{(i_1-\gamma,i_2-\gamma)}),$$

(22)

with $\overline{i_1} \neq \overline{i_2}$.

**Proof.** To compute $F_{P_4}$, we use the formula in [14] Theorem 1], with $\chi = 2$. Then, $F_{P_4,1}^k$ (resp., $F_{P_4,2}^k$) is the sum of function $A_{P_4}$ (resp., $B_{P_4}$) over all possible values of $(i_1, i_2)$. Regarding $F_{P_4,1}^2$, we need to account for Case 4.2 and Case 4.3. For Case 4.2, we need to distinguish between two situations; when $r < e$ (i.e., replica $R_r$, which has three overlaps, comes before replica $R_{r-e}$), and when $r > e$ (i.e., replica $R_r$ comes after replica $R_{r-e}$). This distinction gives the two summations of function $B_{P_4}$ in (21). This distinction is not needed for Case 4.3 since the two replicas have the same number of degree-2 overlaps.

E. Analysis of Pattern $P_5$ (size $4 \times 2)$

This pattern has two adjacent VNs. Thus, Pattern $P_5$ spans at most 2 consecutive replicas. Pattern $P_5$ does not exist in the case of $\gamma = 3$. Suppose $P_5$ has the CNs $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$, and $c_4$. The two overlaps forming $P_5$ are of degree-4, and they are all $c_1 - c_2 - c_3 - c_4$ overlaps.

**Lemma 7.** Case 5.1: The number of instances of $P_5$ with CNs $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$, and $c_4$, and all overlaps in one replica, $R_r$, is:

$$A_{P_5}(t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) = \binom{t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}}{2}.$$  

(23)

Case 5.2: The number of instances of $P_5$ with $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$, and $c_4$, and all overlaps in two replicas, $R_r$ and $R_{r-e}$, $r < e$, is:

$$B_{P_5}(t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}, t_{(r+\gamma,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) = t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} t_{(r+\gamma,i_2,i_3,i_4)}.$$  

(24)

**Proof.** In Case 5.1, $R_r$, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 2 overlaps out of $t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}$, which is given by (23). In Case 5.2, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 1 overlap out of $t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}$ and 1 overlap out of $t_{(i_1+\gamma,i_2,i_3,i_4)}$, which is given by (24).

**Theorem 5.** The total number of instances of Pattern $P_5$ in the binary protograph of an SC code that has parameters $\gamma \geq 4$, $\kappa = 1$, $L \geq 3$, and $O$, is:

$$F_{P_5} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (L-k+1)F_{P_5,k,1}^k.$$  

(25)

where $F_{P_5,k,1}^k$, $k \in \{1, 2\}$, are given by:

$$F_{P_5,1}^1 = \sum_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4) \in \{0,\ldots,2^\gamma-1\}} A_{P_5}(t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}),$$

$$F_{P_5,1}^2 = \sum_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4) \in \{0,\ldots,2^\gamma-1\}} B_{P_5}(t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}, t_{(i_1-\gamma,i_2-\gamma,i_3-\gamma,i_4-\gamma)}),$$

(26)

with $\overline{i_1} \neq \overline{i_2}$, $\overline{i_1} \neq \overline{i_3}$, $\overline{i_1} \neq \overline{i_4}$, $\overline{i_2} \neq \overline{i_3}$, $\overline{i_2} \neq \overline{i_4}$, and $\overline{i_3} \neq \overline{i_4}$.

**Proof.** To compute $F_{P_5}$, we use the formula in [14] Theorem 1], with $\chi = 2$. Then, $F_{P_5,1}$ (resp., $F_{P_5,2}$) is the sum of function $A_{P_5}$ (resp., $B_{P_5}$) over all possible values of $(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4)$ (the degree-4 overlap indices in ITP).

F. Analysis of Pattern $P_6$ (size $3 \times 3$)

This pattern has three VNs, with each pair of them being adjacent. Thus, $P_6$ spans at most 2 consecutive replicas. Suppose $P_6$ has the CNs $c_1$, $c_2$, and $c_3$. Define distinct overlaps to be overlaps from different families, i.e., overlaps between different sets of CNs. Pattern $P_6$ is formed of three overlaps;
two (distinct) of degree-2 and one of degree-3. Define \( c_1 \) as the CN connecting the three VNs. Thus, the overlaps are \( c_1 - c_2, c_1 - c_3, \) and \( c_2 - c_3 \) (see \( P_6 \) in Fig. 2). Again, each VN corresponds to an overlap.

**Lemma 8.** Case 6.1: The number of instances of \( P_6 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in one replica, \( R_r, \) is:

\[
A_{P_6} \left( t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1,i_3}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) = t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - 1 \right)^+ \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - 2 \right)^+ + t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - 1 \right)^+ + \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - 1 \right)^+ + \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}.
\]  

(27)

**Case 6.2:** The number of instances of \( P_6 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in two replicas, s.t. the two degree-2 overlaps are in \( R_r, \) and the degree-3 overlap is in \( R_{r_e}, \) is:

\[
B_{P_6} \left( t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1,i_3}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) = \left[ t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \left( t_{i_1,i_3} - 1 \right)^+ + t_{i_1,i_2} \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) t_{i_1,i_2} \right] \cdot t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} + \theta_{r_e,\gamma,i_2,i_3,i_3} + \theta_{r_e,\gamma,i_3,i_2,i_3}.
\]  

(28)

**Case 6.3:** The number of instances of \( P_6 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in two replicas, s.t. the degree-3 overlap and the \( c_1 - c_2 \) overlap are in \( R_r, \) and the \( c_1 - c_3 \) overlap is in \( R_{r_e}, \) is:

\[
C_{P_6} \left( t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} + \theta_{r_e,\gamma,i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) = t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} - 1 \right)^+ t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} + \theta_{r_e,\gamma,i_1,i_2,i_3}.
\]  

(29)

**Proof.** In Case 6.1, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 1 overlap from each family (there exist three different families for \( P_6 \)). In order to avoid over-counting, it is required to distinguish between the two situations when a degree-2 overlap \( c_1 - c_2 \) or \( c_1 - c_3 \) is part of a \( c_1 - c_2 - c_3 \) degree-3 overlap, and when this is not the case. Taking this requirement into account yields the four added terms in (27). The same applies for Case 6.2, with the exception that here the degree-3 overlap is chosen from \( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} + \theta_{r_e,\gamma,i_1,i_2,i_3} \) overlaps, which reduces the number of added terms to the two in (28). Following the same logic gives (29).

**Theorem 6.** The total number of instances of Pattern \( P_6 \) in the binary proograph of an SC code that has parameters \( \gamma \geq 3, \) \( \kappa, m = 1, L \geq 3, \) and \( O, \) is:

\[
F_{P_6} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (L - k + 1)F_{P_6,1}^k,
\]  

(30)

where \( F_{P_6,1}^k, \) \( k \in \{1, 2\}, \) are given by:

\[
F_{P_6,1}^1 = \sum_{i_1 \in \{0,...,\gamma-1\}} A_{P_6} \left( t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1,i_3}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right),
\]

(31)

\[
F_{P_6,1}^2 = \sum_{i_1 \in \{0,...,\gamma-1\}} B_{P_6} \left( t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1,i_3}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} + \theta_{r_e,\gamma,i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) + \sum_{i_1 \in \{0,...,\gamma-1\}} C_{P_6} \left( t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right),
\]

(32)

with \( i_1 \neq i_2, i_1 \neq i_3, \) and \( i_2 \neq i_3. \)

**Proof.** To compute \( F_{P_6} \), we use the formula in [14] Theorem 1, with \( \chi = 2. \) Then, \( F_{P_6,1}^1 \) is the sum of function \( A_{P_6} \) over all possible values of \( i_1 \) and \( \{i_2, i_3\}. \) In Pattern \( P_6, \) CN \( c_1, \) which connects all three VNs, is different from the other two CNs. Moreover, in a group of three CNs that can form \( P_6, c_1 \) can be any one of these three CNs. These facts are the reason why \( i_1 \) of \( c_1 \) has to be separated from \( \{i_2, i_3\}, \) despite having the same range, in the expression of \( F_{P_6,1}^1 \). Regarding \( F_{P_6,1}^2, \) we need to account for Case 6.2 and Case 6.3. For each case of the two, we need to distinguish between two situations; when \( r < e \) and when \( r > e. \) This distinction gives the four summations of \( F_{P_6,1}^2 \) in (31). Note that the ranges of \( i_2 \) and \( i_3 \) are different in Case 6.3, unlike Case 6.2.

**G. Analysis of Pattern \( P_7 \) (size 3 × 4)**

This pattern has four VNs, with each pair of them being adjacent. Consequently, \( P_7 \) spans at most 2 consecutive replicas. Suppose \( P_7 \) has the CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3. \) The pattern is formed of four degree-2 overlaps that are evenly distributed over two different families. Define \( c_1 \) as the CN connecting the four VNs. Thus, the overlaps are two \( c_1 - c_2 \) and two \( c_1 - c_3 \) overlaps (see \( P_7 \) in Fig. 2 for clarification).

**Lemma 9.** Case 7.1: The number of instances of \( P_7 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in one replica, \( R_r, \) is:

\[
A_{P_7} \left( t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_1,i_3}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) = \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) \left( t_{i_1,i_3} - 1 \right)^+\left( t_{i_1,i_2} \right)^+ + t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) \left( t_{i_1,i_3} - 1 \right)^+ + \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) \left( t_{i_1,i_3} \right)^+.\]

(32)

**Case 7.2:** The number of instances of \( P_7 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in two replicas, s.t. three overlaps are in \( R_r, \) and one \( c_1 - c_3 \) overlap is in \( R_{r_e}, \) is:
\[ B_{P_7} \left( \frac{t_{i_1},i_2}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1},i_2}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1},i_2,i_3}{2}, t_{i_1,+\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} + t_{i_1,\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} \right) = \left( t_{i_1} \right) + \frac{t_{i_1},i_2}{2} \left( t_{i_1},i_2,i_3 \right) - 1. \] 

(33)

Case 7.3: The number of instances of \( P_7 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in two replicas, s.t. the two \( c_1 - c_2 \) overlaps are in \( R_r \), and the two \( c_1 - c_3 \) overlaps are in \( R_e, r < e, \) is:

\[ C_{P_7} \left( \frac{t_{i_1},i_2}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1},i_2}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1},i_2,i_3}{2}, t_{i_1,+\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} + t_{i_1,\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} \right) = \left( t_{i_1} \right) + \frac{t_{i_1},i_2}{2} \left( t_{i_1},i_2,i_3 \right) - 1. \] 

(34)

Case 7.4: The number of instances of \( P_7 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, \) and \( c_3 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in two replicas, s.t. two distinct overlaps (from different families) are in \( R_r \), and two distinct overlaps are in \( R_e, r < e, \) is:

\[ D_{P_7} \left( \frac{t_{i_1},i_2,i_3}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1},i_2,i_3}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1},i_2,i_3}{2}, t_{i_1,+\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} + t_{i_1,\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} \right) = t_{i_1} + t_{i_1},i_2,i_3 \left( t_{i_1},i_2,i_3 \right) - 1. \] 

\[ + \frac{t_{i_1},i_2,i_3}{2} \left( t_{i_1},i_2,i_3 \right) + \frac{t_{i_1},i_2,i_3}{2} \left( t_{i_1},i_2,i_3 \right) - 1. \] 

(35)

Proof. In Case 7.1, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 2 overlaps from each family (the pattern has two \( c_1 - c_2 \) overlaps and two \( c_1 - c_3 \) overlaps). In order to avoid over-counting, it is required to distinguish between the three situations when the two \( c_1 - c_2 \) overlaps are each part of a \( c_1 - c_2 - c_3 \) degree-3 overlap, when only one \( c_1 - c_2 \) overlap is part of a \( c_1 - c_2 - c_3 \) overlap, and when neither of them is. Taking this requirement into account yields the three added terms in (32). The same applies for Case 7.2, with the exception that here one \( c_1 - c_3 \) overlap is chosen from \( t_{i_1} \) overlaps in \( R_r \). In Case 7.3, there is no need to make this distinction. Finally, in Case 7.4, the distinction is applied separately on the \( c_1 - c_2 \) overlap in \( R_r \) and the \( c_1 - c_2 \) overlap in \( R_e \) to give (35).

Theorem 7. The total number of instances of Pattern \( P_7 \) in the binary protograph of an SC code that has parameters \( \gamma \geq 3 \), \( \kappa, m = 1, L \geq 3, \) and \( O, \) is:

\[ F_{P_7} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left( L - k + 1 \right) F_{P_{7,k},1} \] 

(36)

where \( F_{P_{7,k},1}, k \in \{1, 2\}, \) are given by:

\[ F_{P_{7,1}}^{1} = \sum A_{P_7} \left( \frac{t_{i_1,i_2}}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1,i_2}}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1,+\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} + t_{i_1,\theta,e,\gamma,i_3}}{2} \right) \] 

(37)

Proof. To compute \( F_{P_7} \), we use the formula in [2] Theorem 1, with \( \chi = 2 \). Then, \( F_{P_{7,1}}^{1} \) is the sum of function \( A_{P_7} \) over all possible values of \( i_1 \) and \( \{i_1, i_2\} \). In Pattern \( P_7 \), CN \( c_1 \), which connects all four VNIs, is different from the other two CNs. Moreover, in a group of three CNs that can form \( P_7 \), \( c_1 \) can be any one of these three CNs. These facts are again the reason why \( i_1 \) of \( c_1 \) has to be separated from \( \{i_2, i_3\} \) in the expression of \( F_{P_{7,1}}^{1} \). Regarding \( F_{P_{7,1}}^{2} \), we need to account for Case 7.2, Case 7.3, and Case 7.4. For Case 7.2, we need to distinguish between two situations; when \( r < e \) and when \( r > e \), which gives the two summations of \( B_{P_7} \) in (37). This distinction is not needed for neither Case 7.3 nor Case 7.4 since the two replicas have the same number and connectivity of degree-2 overlaps. Note that \( c_2 \) and \( c_3 \) are not adjacent (no path of only one VN connects them) in \( P_7 \), which means it is possible to have \( \bar{r}_2 = \bar{r}_3 \), but not \( i_2 = i_3 \), for that pattern.

H. Analysis of Pattern \( P_8 \) (size \( 4 \times 3 \))

This pattern has three VNIs, and the adjacent pairs are \( v_1 - v_2 \) and \( v_2 - v_3 \) (not all pairs) according to \( P_8 \) in Fig. 2. Thus, \( P_8 \) spans at most \( 2m + 1 = 3 \) consecutive replicas (see [2] Lemma 1). Pattern \( P_8 \) does not exist in the case of \( \gamma = 3 \). Suppose \( P_8 \) has the CNs \( c_1, c_2, c_3, \) and \( c_4 \). The pattern is formed of three overlaps, two of degree-2 and one of degree-4. The degree-2 overlaps are not only distinct, but also mutually exclusive (i.e., they do not share any CNs). Define the CNs such that \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) are directly connected twice, which is the same for \( c_3 \) and \( c_4 \). Thus, the overlaps are \( c_1 - c_2, c_3 - c_4, \) and \( c_1 - c_3 - c_4 \) (see also \( P_8 \) in Fig. 2).

Lemma 10. Case 8.1: The number of instances of \( P_8 \) with CNs \( c_1, c_2, c_3, \) and \( c_4 \) as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in one replica, \( R_r \), is:

\[ A_{P_8} \left( \frac{t_{i_1,i_2}}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1,i_2}}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}}{2}, \frac{t_{i_1,+\theta,e,\gamma,i_3} + t_{i_1,\theta,e,\gamma,i_3}}{2} \right) = \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) - 1. \] 

\[ + \frac{t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}}{2} \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) + \frac{t_{i_1,i_2,i_3}}{2} \left( t_{i_1,i_2,i_3} \right) - 1. \] 

(38)
Case 8.2. The number of instances of $P_8$ with CNs $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$, and $c_4$ as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in two replicas, s.t. the two degree-2 overlaps are in $R_\gamma$, and the degree-4 overlap is in $R_\varepsilon$, is:

$$\begin{align*}
B_{P_8}(t_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, t_{\{i_3,i_4\}}, t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}) &= \left( t_{\{i_1,i_2\}} - t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}} \right) \\
&\quad + t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}} - t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}.
\end{align*}$$

Case 8.3: The number of instances of $P_8$ with CNs $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$, and $c_4$ as defined in the previous paragraph, and all overlaps in two replicas, s.t. the degree-4 overlap and the $c_1 - c_2$ overlap are in $R_\gamma$, and the $c_3 - c_4$ overlap is in $R_\varepsilon$, is:

$$C_{P_8}(t_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, t_{\{i_3,i_4\}}, t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}) = t_{\{i_1,i_2\}} - t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}} + t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}.$$

Case 8.4: The number of instances of $P_8$ with $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$, and $c_4$ as defined previously, and all overlaps in three replicas, s.t. the $c_1 - c_2$ overlap is in $R_\gamma$, the $c_3 - c_4$ overlap is in $R_\varepsilon$, and the degree-4 overlap is in $R_\varepsilon$, $r < c, e$ is:

$$D_{P_8}(t_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, t_{\{i_3,i_4\}}, t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}) = t_{\{i_1,i_2\}} + t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}.$$

Proof. In Case 8.1, the number we are after is the number of ways to choose 1 overlap from each family (there exist three different families for $P_8$). In order to avoid over-counting, it is required to distinguish between the two situations when a degree-2 overlap ($c_1 - c_2$ or $c_3 - c_4$) is part of a $c_1 - c_2 - c_3 - c_4$ degree-4 overlap, and when this is not the case. Taking this requirement into account yields the four added terms in (38). The same applies for Case 8.2, with the exception that here the degree-4 overlap is chosen from $t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}$ overlaps, which reduces the number of added terms to the two in (39). Following the same logic gives (40). This distinction is not needed for Case 8.4.

Theorem 8. The total number of instances of Pattern $P_8$ in the binary graph of an SC code that has parameters $\gamma \geq 4$, $\kappa$, $m = 1$, $L \geq 3$, and $O$, is:

$$F_{P_8} = \sum_{k=1}^{3} (L - k + 1) F^k_{P_{8,k}},$$

where $F^k_{P_{8,k}}$, $k \in \{1,2,3\}$, are given by:

$$F^1_{P_{8,k}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_1,i_2} A_{P_8}(t_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}),$$

$$F^2_{P_{8,k}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_1,i_2} B_{P_8}(t_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}),$$

$$F^3_{P_{8,k}} = \sum_{i_1,i_2} D_{P_8}(t_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, t_{\{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4\}}),$$

with $i_1 \neq i_2$, $i_1 \neq i_3$, $i_1 \neq i_4$, $i_2 \neq i_3$, $i_2 \neq i_4$, and $i_3 \neq i_4$.

Proof. To compute $F_{P_8}$, we use the formula in [14] Theorem 1, with $\chi = 3$. Then, $F_{P_{8,k}}$ is the sum of function $A_{P_8}$ over all possible values of $\{i_1, i_2\}$ and $\{i_3, i_4\}$. In Pattern $P_8$, CNs $c_1$ and $c_2$ are directly connected twice, and CNs $c_3$ and $c_4$ are directly connected twice, which creates two separate groups of CNs. Consequently, the set $\{i_1, i_2\}$ has to be separated from the set $\{i_3, i_4\}$, despite having the same range, in the expression of $F^1_{P_{8,k}}$. Regarding $F^2_{P_{8,k}}$, we need to account for Case 8.2 and Case 8.3. For both cases, we need to distinguish between two situations; when $r < e$ and when $e > r$, which results in two summations for each case. Since it does not matter for the counts of $A_{P_8}$ and $B_{P_8}$ whether the set $\{i_1, i_2\}$ or the set $\{i_3, i_4\}$ is chosen first, we multiply by $\frac{1}{2}$ in $F^3_{P_{8,k}}$ to account for repetitions (it does matter for the count of $C_{P_8}$ because the degree-2 overlaps, $c_1 - c_2$ and $c_3 - c_4$, are in two different replicas). Regarding $F^3_{P_{8,k}}$, the only situation under which $P_8$ spans 3 consecutive replicas in the case of $m = 1$ is what is described in Case 8.4, with the addition that the degree-4 overlap has to be in the middle replica (i.e., $r < s < e$). This situation is accounted for in the last line of (43).
\[ A_{p9} = A_{p9,1} + A_{p9,2} + A_{p9,3} + A_{p9,4}, \]

\[ A_{p9,1} = t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \left( t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 1 + t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 1 \right) + (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 2 + t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 2). \]

\[ A_{p9,2} = (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \]

\[ A_{p9,3} = (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_4)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \]

\[ A_{p9,4} = (t_{(i_1,i_2)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} + t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}). \]

\[ B_{p9} = B_{p9,1} + B_{p9,2} + B_{p9,3} + B_{p9,4}, \]

\[ B_{p9,1} = t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \left( t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 1 + t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 1 \right) + (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 2 + t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} - 2). \]

\[ B_{p9,2} = (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \]

\[ B_{p9,3} = (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_4)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \]

\[ B_{p9,4} = (t_{(i_1,i_2)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} + t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}). \]

\[ C_{p9} = C_{p9,1} + C_{p9,2} + C_{p9,3} + C_{p9,4}, \]

\[ C_{p9,1} = t_{(i_1,i_2)} \left( t_{(i_1,i_2)} - 1 + t_{(i_1,i_2)} - 1 \right) + (t_{(i_1,i_2)} - 2 + t_{(i_1,i_2)} - 2). \]

\[ C_{p9,2} = (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \]

\[ C_{p9,3} = (t_{(i_1,i_2,i_4)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}) t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)} \]

\[ C_{p9,4} = (t_{(i_1,i_2)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} - t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3)} + t_{(i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4)}). \]
\[ D_{P_0}(t_{i_1,i_2}, t_{i_3,i_4}, t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4}) = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]
\[ = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]
\[ = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]
\[ = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]
\[ \cdot \left( t_{i_1} t_{i_2} + t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} t_{i_3,i_4} \right) \]
\[ \cdot \left( t_{i_1} t_{i_2} + t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} t_{i_3,i_4} \right) \]
\[ = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]
\[ = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]
\[ = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]
\[ = \left( t_{i_1,i_2} - t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} \right) t_{i_3,i_4} \]

**Theorem 9.** The total number of instances of Pattern \( P_0 \) in the binary protograph of an SC code that has parameters \( \gamma \geq 3 \), \( k, m = 1, L \geq 3 \), and \( \mathcal{O} \), is:
\[ F_{P_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{3} (L - k + 1)F^k_{P_0,1}, \]

where \( F^k_{P_0,1} \), \( k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), are given by:
\[ F^1_{P_0,1} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i_1 \in \{0, \ldots, 2\gamma - 1\}, \{i_2,i_3,i_4\} \subset \{0, \ldots, 2\gamma - 1\}} t_{i_1,i_2} t_{i_2,i_3} t_{i_3,i_4} t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4}, \]
\[ F^2_{P_0,1} = \sum_{i_1,i_2 \in \{0, \ldots, 2\gamma - 1\}} t_{i_1,i_2} t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4}, \]
\[ F^3_{P_0,1} = \sum_{i_1,i_2 \in \{0, \ldots, 2\gamma - 1\}} t_{i_1,i_2} t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4} t_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4}, \]

with \( \bar{t}_1 \neq \bar{t}_2, t_1 \neq t_3, \bar{t}_1 \neq \bar{t}_4, \bar{t}_2 \neq \bar{t}_4, t_2 \neq t_4, \text{ and } \bar{t}_3 \neq \bar{t}_4. \)

**Proof.** To compute \( F_{P_0} \), we use the formula in [14] Theorem 1, with \( \chi = 3 \). Then, \( F^1_{P_0,1} \) is the sum of function \( A_{P_0} \) over all possible values of \( i_1, \{i_2,i_3\}, \text{ and } i_4 \). In a group of four CNs, there exists 3 unique ways to construct \( P_0 \) (which is a cycle of length 8) among them. Since the above separation gives 12 options, we multiply by \( \frac{1}{4} \) in the expression of \( F^1_{P_0,1} \) to account for repetitions (similar logic applies for \( D_{P_0} \) in \( F^2_{P_0,1} \)). Regarding \( F^3_{P_0,1} \), we need to account for Case 9.2, Case 9.3, and Case 9.4. For Case 9.2, we need to distinguish between two situations; when \( r < c \) and when \( r > c \), which is not needed for Cases 9.3 and 9.4 since the two replicas in them have the same number and connectivity of degree-2 overlaps. Regarding \( F^3_{P_0,1} \), the only situation under which \( P_0 \) spans 3 consecutive replicas in the case of \( m = 1 \) is what is described in Case 9.5, with the addition that the three replicas with two-degree-2 overlaps has to be the middle replica (i.e., \( s < r < e \)). This situation is accounted for in the last line of (51). Note that \( c_1 \) and \( c_3 \) are not adjacent in \( P_0 \), and the same applies for \( c_2 \) and \( c_4 \). Thus, it is possible to have \( \bar{t}_1 = \bar{t}_3 \) and \( \bar{t}_2 = \bar{t}_4 \), but not \( i_1 = i_3 \) or \( i_2 = i_4 \), for that pattern.

After deriving the expressions of \( F_{P_0} \), \( \forall \gamma \), as functions of the overlap parameters in \( \mathcal{O} \), we use [3], [4], and [14] Lemma 3] to express \( F_{\text{not}} \) as a function of the parameters in \( \mathcal{O}_{\text{ind}} \) (which
is the set of independent, non-zero overlap parameters). Thus, our discrete optimization problem is:

$$F^*_t = \min_{O_{\text{ind}}} F_{\text{tot}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (52)

The constraints of the optimization problem in (52) are linear constraints capturing interval constraints in addition to the balanced partitioning constraint [15]. These are the constraints under which the partitioning becomes valid. Similar to the set $O_{\text{ind}}$, the optimization constraints depend only on code parameters, and not on the common substructure of interest (which depends on the channel). For the case of $\gamma = 3$, $m = 1$, and any $\kappa$, $O_{\text{ind}} = \{t_0, t_1, t_2, t_{(0,1)}, t_{(0,2)}, t_{(1,2)}, t_{(0,1,2)}\}$, and the optimization constraints are (see also [14] and [15]):

$$0 \leq t_0 \leq \kappa, \quad 0 \leq t_{(0,1)} \leq t_0, \quad t_{(0,1)} \leq t_1 \leq \kappa - t_0 + t_{(0,1)},$$
$$0 \leq t_{(0,1,2)} \leq t_{(0,1)}, \quad t_{(0,1,2)} \leq t_{(0,2)} \leq t_0 - t_{(0,1)} + t_{(0,1,2)},$$
$$t_{(1,2)} \leq t_{(1,2)} \leq t_{(1)} + t_{(0,1),2},$$
$$t_{(0,2)} + t_{(1,2)} - t_{(0,1,2)} \leq t_2,$$
$$\leq \kappa - t_0 - t_1 + t_{(0,1)} + t_{(0,2)} + t_{(1,2)} - t_{(0,1,2)},$$
$$\text{and} \quad \left[\frac{3\kappa}{2}\right] \leq t_0 + t_1 + t_2 \leq \left[\frac{3\kappa}{2}\right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (53)

The solution of this optimization problem is not unique. However, since all the solutions have the same performance (e.g., they all achieve $F^*_t$, see also [15]), we work with one of these solutions, and call it an optimal vector, $t^*$. 

**V. CPO: Customization for PR Systems**

Using the optimal vector $t^*$, computed as described in the previous section, $H_p$ is partitioned and the protograph matrix of the SC code, $H_{SC}^p$, is constructed. The next step is preventing as many objects in the protograph as possible from being reflected in the unlabeled graph of the SC code, via optimizing the circulant powers using the CPO. Here, the CPO is customized for the $(4, 4\gamma - 2\delta)$ object, which is the common substructure for detrimental configurations in the case of PR systems (see also Fig. [1]).

From the previous analysis, a Pattern $P_\ell$ spans at most either $m + 1 = 2$ or $2m + 1 = 3$ consecutive replicates, depending on the value of $\ell$. Thus, in the CPO, it suffices to operate on the PM $\Pi_1^{3,p}$, which is the non-zero part of the first 3 replicates in $H_{SC}^p$, and has the size $4\gamma \times 3\kappa$. Circulant powers associated with the 1’s in $H_p$ are defined as $f_{i,j}$, where $0 \leq i \leq \gamma - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq \kappa - 1$. Let the circulant powers associated with the 1’s in $\Pi_1^{3,p}$ be $f'_{i',j'}$, where $0 \leq i' \leq 4\gamma - 1$ and $0 \leq j' \leq 3\kappa - 1$. From the repetitive nature of the PM $\Pi_1^{3,p}$, $f'_{i',j'} = f_{\ell',\ell''}$, where $\ell = (i' \mod \gamma)$ and $\ell'' = (j' \mod \kappa)$. Define our cycle-8 candidate in the graph of $\Pi_1^{3,p}$ as $c_1 - v_1 - c_2 - v_2 - c_3 - v_3 - c_4 - v_4$, which is a particular way of traversing a pattern and not necessarily a protograph cycle (see also Figures [1] and [2]). This candidate results in $z$ (or $z/2$ in the case of $P_1$ only) cycles of length 8 after lifting if and only if [16]:

$$f'_{c_1,v_1} + f'_{c_2,v_2} + f'_{c_3,v_3} + f'_{c_4,v_4} \equiv f_{c_1,v_2} + f_{c_2,v_3} + f_{c_3,v_4} + f_{c_4,v_1} \mod (z).$$  \hspace{1cm} (54)

The goal is to prevent as many cycle-8 candidates in the graph of $H_{SC}^p$ as possible from being converted into $z$ (or $z/2$ in the case of $P_1$) $(4, 4\gamma - 2\delta)$ UASs/UTSs in the graph of $H_{SC}$, which is the unlabeled graph of the SC code. In other words, a cycle-8 candidate in the graph of $H_{SC}^p$ is allowed to be converted into multiple $(4, 4\gamma - 2\delta)$ UASs/UTSs with $\delta \in \{1, 2\}$, as long as they are not $(4, 0)$ UASSs, in the unlabeled graph since these are not instances of the common substructure of interest. These $(4, 4\gamma - 2\delta)$ UASs/UTSs, $\delta \in \{1, 2\}$, are cycles of length 8 with internal connections, which means $v_1$ and $v_3$ are adjacent or $v_2$ and $v_4$ are adjacent (see Fig. [1]). For the cycle-8 candidate in the graph of $\Pi_1^{3,p}$ that is described in the previous paragraph and has a CN, say $c_5$, connecting $v_1$ and $v_3$, in order to have this internal connection in the lifted cycles, the following condition for a cycle of length 6 must be satisfied in addition to (54):

$$f'_{c_1,v_1} + f'_{c_2,v_2} + f'_{c_3,v_3} \equiv f_{c_1,v_2} + f_{c_2,v_3} + f_{c_3,v_1} \mod (z).$$  \hspace{1cm} (55)

Similarly, for that cycle-8 candidate in the graph of $\Pi_1^{3,p}$ that has a CN, say $c_6$, connecting $v_2$ and $v_4$, in order to have this internal connection in the lifted cycles, the following condition for a cycle of length 6 must be satisfied in addition to (54):

$$f'_{c_1,v_1} + f'_{c_2,v_2} + f'_{c_4,v_4} \equiv f_{c_1,v_2} + f_{c_2,v_3} + f_{c_4,v_1} \mod (z).$$  \hspace{1cm} (56)

Note that the two CNs, $c_5$ and $c_6$, have to be different from the CNs of the pattern itself in order that we consider them in the CPO algorithm as internal connections. The reason is that the final unlabeled graphs of our codes must have no cycles of length 4 (which is also why (54) is applied for $P_1$ since $f_{c_1,v_1} + f_{c_2,v_2} \equiv f_{c_1,v_2} + f_{c_2,v_1} \mod (z)$ is not allowed for any protograph cycle of length 4, $c_1 - v_1 - c_2 - v_2$).

The following lemma discusses the internal connections for different patterns in the protograph.

**Lemma 12.** Let $\eta_{P_\ell}$ be the maximum number of internal connections Pattern $P_\ell$ can have (multiple internal connections between the same two VN's are only counted once). Then,

$$\eta_{P_\ell} = \begin{cases} 0, & \ell \in \{1, 3, 5\}, \\ 1, & \ell \in \{2, 6, 8\}, \\ 2, & \ell \in \{4, 7, 9\}. \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (57)

**Proof.** A protograph pattern, $P_\ell$, with only two variable nodes cannot have any internal connections ($\ell \in \{1, 3, 5\}$). A protograph pattern with three variable nodes can have at most one internal connection ($\ell \in \{2, 6, 8\}$). A protograph pattern with four variable nodes can have up to two internal connection ($\ell \in \{4, 7, 9\}$), which completes the proof. \(\blacksquare\)

The case of multiple internal connections between the same two VN's is addressed in the CPO algorithm.

The steps of the customized CPO algorithm for SC codes that have parameters $\gamma \geq 3$, $\kappa$, $m = 1$, and $L \geq 3$, are:

1. Assign initial circulant powers to all the $\gamma \kappa$ 1’s in $H_p$. In this work, our initial powers are as in SCB codes.
2. The steps of the customized CPO algorithm for SC codes that have parameters $\gamma \geq 3$, $\kappa$, $m = 1$, and $L \geq 3$, are:
2) Construct $\Pi^{3^3}_1$, via $H^p$ and $t^*$. Circulant powers of the 1's in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$, $f_{i,j}^{p,k}$, are obtained from the 1's in $H^p$.
3) Define a counting variable $\psi_{i,j}$, $0 \leq i \leq \gamma - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq \kappa - 1$, for each of the 1's in $H^p$. Define another counting variable $\psi'_{i,j}$, $0 \leq i \leq 4\gamma - 1$ and $0 \leq j' \leq 3\kappa - 1$, for each of the elements in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$. Initialize all the variables in this step with zeros. Only 3$\gamma$ 1's counting variables of the form $\psi'_{i,j}$ are associated with 1's in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$. The other variables remain zeros.
4) Locate all instances of the nine patterns in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$. Note that locating $P_1$ means also locating all cycles of length 4 in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$, which is needed.
5) Determine the $\zeta_{p_i}$ ways to traverse each instance of $P_k$, $\forall \ell$, to reach a (4, 4($\gamma - 2$)) UAS/UTS in the unlabeled graph, which are the cycle-8 candidates.
6) Specify all internal connections (CNs) in each candidate determined in Step 5 if they can exist.
7) For each cycle-8 candidate in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$, check whether [54] is satisfied for its circulant powers or not.
8) If [54] is satisfied, and the candidate has no internal connections, or [54] is satisfied and the candidate has internal connection(s) but neither [55] nor [56] is satisfied for any internal connection, mark this cycle-8 candidate as an active candidate.
9) Let $F_{P_i,1}^{k,a}$, where $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, be the number of active candidates of $P_i$ starting at the first replica and spanning $k$ consecutive replicas in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$. Thus, the number of active candidates of $P_i$ spanning $k$ consecutive replicas in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$ is $(4 - k)F_{P_i,1}^{k,a}$. (For example, for $k = 1$, $3F_{P_i,1}^{1,a}$ is the number of active candidates of $P_i$, for any value of $\ell$, spanning one replica in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$.)
10) Compute the number of $(4, 4($$\gamma - 2$)) UASs/UTSs in $H_{SC}$ using the following formula (see also [14]):

$$F_{SC} = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \sum_{\ell=1}^{9} \left( (L - k + 1)F_{P_i,1}^{k,a} \right) z_{P_i}, \quad (58)$$

where $z_{P_i} = \frac{z}{2}$ if $\ell = 1$, and $z_{P_i} = z$ otherwise.
11) Count the number of active candidates each 1 in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$ is involved in. Assign weight $w_k = (L - k + 1)/(4 - k)$ to the number of active candidates spanning $k$ consecutive replicas in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$ (see also [14]). Multiply $w_k$ by 1/2 if the candidate is associated to $P_1$. (For example, for $k = 3$, the weight of the number of active candidates spanning $3$ consecutive replicas is $(L - 2)$.)
12) Store the weighted count associated with each 1 in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$, which is indexed by $(i, j)$, in $\psi_{i,j}$, $\forall i, j$.
13) Calculate the counting variables $\psi_{i,j}$, $\forall i, j$, associated with the 1's in $H^p$ from the counting variables $\psi'_{i,j}$ associated with the 1's in $\Pi^{3^3}_1$ (computed in Steps 11 and 12) using the following formula:

$$\psi_{i,j} = \sum_{i',j' = i}^{i',j'} (\sum_{l=1}^{9} \psi'_{i',j'}^l \Sigma_{i'} |i'| = 0) \quad (59)$$

14) Sort these $\gamma \kappa$ 1's of $H^p$ in a list descendingly according to the counts in $\psi_{i,j}$, $\forall i, j$.
15) Pick a subset of 1's from the top of this list, and change the circulant powers associated with them.
16) Using these interim powers, do Steps 7, 8, 9, and 10.
17) If $F_{SC}$ is reduced while maintaining no cycles of length 4 and no (4, 0) objects (in the case of $\gamma = 3$) in $H_{SC}$, update $F_{SC}$ and the circulant powers, then go to Step 11.
18) Otherwise, return to Step 15 to pick a different set of circulant powers or a different subset of 1’s (from the 1’s in $H^p$).
19) Iterate until the target $F_{SC}$ (set by the code designer) is achieved, or the reduction in $F_{SC}$ approaches zero.

Step 15 in the CPO algorithm is performed heuristically.

Example 1. Suppose we are designing an SC code with $\gamma = 3$, $\kappa = 7$, $z = 13$, $m = 1$, and $L = 10$ using the OO-CPO approach for PR systems. Solving the optimization problem in [52] gives an optimal vector $t^* = [t_0, t_1, t_2, t_{(0.1)}, t_{(1.2)}, t_{(0.12)}] = [3, 3, 4, 0, 1, 2, 0]^T$, with $F_{SC}^0 = 5170$ patterns (rounded weighted sum) in the graph of $H_{SC}$. Fig. 3(a) shows how the partitioning is applied on $H^p$ (or $H$). Next, applying the CPO results in 2013 (4,4) UASs in the graph of $H_{SC}$. Fig. 3(b) shows the final circulant power arrangement for all circulants in $H$.
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Fig. 3. (a) The OO partitioning of $H^p$ (or $H$) of the SC code in Example 1. Entries with circles (resp., squares) are assigned to $H^0_p$ (resp., $H^1_p$). (b) The circulant power arrangement for the circulants in $H$.

Remark 3. After introducing the concept of patterns in this work, the OO-CPO approach can be easily extended to target other common substructures if needed.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we propose experimental results demonstrating the effectiveness of the OO-CPO approach compared to other code design techniques in PR (1-D MR) systems.

Remark 4. In this section, all the codes used have no cycles of length 4. Moreover, we opted to work with circulant sizes $z > \kappa$ in order to give more freedom to the CPO, which results in less detrimental objects.

First, we compare the total number of instances of the common substructure of interest in the unlabeled graphs of SC codes designed using various techniques. All the codes in this comparison have $\gamma = 3$ (i.e., the common substructure of interest is the (4,4) UAS in Fig. 1) and $m = 1$. In addition to the uncoupled setting ($H_0 = H$ and $H_1 = 0$), we show results for the following three SC code design techniques:
1) The CV technique (see [10]).
2) The OO technique with no CPO applied.
3) The OO technique with circulant powers optimized via the CPO (the OO-CPO approach).
In the uncoupled setting and the first two techniques, circulant powers as in SCB codes, \( f_{i,j} = f(i) f(j) = (i^2)(2j) \), are used.

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design technique</th>
<th>Number of (4, 4) UASs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coupled with SCB</td>
<td>32370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC CV with SCB</td>
<td>9464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC OO with SCB</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC OO-CPO</td>
<td>2613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for different choices of \( \kappa \), \( z \), and \( L \) are listed in Table I. For a particular choice of \( \kappa \), \( z \), and \( L \) codes designed using these different techniques all have block length \( = \kappa z L \) and rate \( \approx \frac{1−3(L+1)}{\kappa L} \). Table I demonstrates the significant gains achieved by the OO-CPO approach compared to other techniques. In particular, the proposed OO-CPO approach achieves a reduction in the number of (4, 4) UASs that ranges between 85% and 92% compared to the uncoupled setting, and between 61% and 78% compared to the CV technique. Moreover, the importance of the two stages (the OO and the CPO) is highlighted by the numbers in the table.

Second, we present simulation results of SC codes designed using various techniques over the PR channel. We use the PR channel described in [5]. This channel incorporates inter-symbol interference (intrinsic memory), jitter, and electronic noise. The normalized channel density [17], [18] we use is 1.4, and the PR equalization target is [8 14 2]. The receiver consists of filtering units followed by a Bahl Cocke Jelinek Raviv (BCJR) detector, which is based on pattern-dependent noise prediction (PDNP), in addition to a fast Fourier transform based \( q \)-ary sum-product algorithm (FFT-QSPA) LDPC decoder [19]. The number of global (detector) iterations is 10, and the number of local (decoder) iterations is 20. Unless a codeword is reached, the decoder performs its prescribed number of local iterations for each global iteration. More details about this PR system can be found in [5].

In the simulations, we use five different codes. All the codes are defined over GF(4). Codes 1, 2, 3, and 4 have \( \gamma = 3 \), \( \kappa = 19 \), \( z = 46 \), \( m = 1 \), and \( L = 5 \). Thus, these codes have block length \( = 8740 \) bits and rate \( \approx 0.81 \). Code 1 is uncoupled. Code 2 is an SC code designed using the CV technique for PR channels [10]. Codes 1 and 2 have SCB circulant powers of the form \( f_{i,j} = (i^2)(2j) \). Code 3 is an SC code designed using the OO-CPO approach. Codes 1, 2, and 3 do not have optimized edge weights. Code 4 is the result of applying the WCM framework to Code 3 in order to optimize its edge weights. The number of (4, 4) UASs in the unlabeled graphs of Codes 1, 2, and 3 are given in the last column of Table I. Code 5 is a block (BL) code, which is also protograph-based (PB), designed as in [6] and [7]. Code 5 has column weight \( = 3 \), circulant size \( = 46 \), block length \( = 8832 \) bits, rate \( \approx 0.81 \) (similar to all the other codes), and unoptimized weights (similar to all codes except Code 4). Note that because our main focus in this work is the performance, a relatively small value of \( L \) (which is 5) along with block decoding are used for SC Codes 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Fig. 4 demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed OO-CPO approach in designing high performance SC codes for PR channels. In particular, Code 3 (designed using the OO-CPO approach) outperforms Code 2 (designed using the CV technique) by about 3 orders of magnitude at SNR = 15 dB, and by about 1.1 dB at FER \( \approx 10^{-5} \). More intriguingly, Code 3 outperforms Code 5 (the block code) by about 1.6 orders of magnitude at SNR = 15 dB, and by almost 0.4 dB at FER \( \approx 10^{-6} \). The performance of Code 3 is better than the performance Code 5 not only in the error floor region, but also in the waterfall region. An interesting observation is that, in the error profile of Code 3, we found no codewords of weights in \{6, 8\} (which are \{6, 0, 0, 9, 0\} and \{8, 0, 0, 12, 0\} BASTs) despite the dominant presence of such low weight codewords in the error profiles of Codes 1, 2, and 5 (see also [5] and [7]). From Fig. 4, the WCM framework achieves 1 order of magnitude additional gain.

### VII. Conclusion

We proposed the OO-CPO approach to optimally design binary and non-binary SC codes for PR channels, via minimizing the number of detrimental objects in the graph of the code. SC codes designed using the OO-CPO approach were shown to significantly outperform SC codes designed using techniques from the literature. More importantly, SC codes designed using our approach were demonstrated to outperform structured block codes with the same parameters.
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