Mutual Information-Maximizing Quantized Belief Propagation Decoding of LDPC Codes

Xuan He, Kui Cai, and Zhen Mei
Singapore University of Technology and Design (SUTD), Singapore, 487372
Email: helaoxuan@126.com, cai_kui@sutd.edu.sg, mei_zhen@sutd.edu.sg

Abstract—A severe problem for mutual information-maximizing lookup table (MIM-LUT) decoding of low-density parity-check (LDPC) code is the high memory cost for using large tables, while decomposing large tables to small tables deteriorates decoding error performance. In this paper, we propose a method, called mutual information-maximizing quantized belief propagation (MIM-QBP) decoding, to remove the lookup tables used for MIM-LUT decoding. Our method leads to a very practical decoder, namely the MIM-QBP decoder, which can be implemented based only on simple mappings and fixed-point additions. We further present how to practically and systematically design the MIM-QBP decoder for both regular and irregular LDPC codes. Simulation results show that the MIM-QBP decoder can always considerably outperform the state-of-the-art MIM-LUT decoder. Furthermore, the MIM-QBP decoder with only 3 bits per message can outperform the floating-point belief propagation (BP) decoder at high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) regions when testing on high-rate codes with a maximum of 10–30 iterations.

Index Terms—Finite alphabet iterative decoding (FAID), lookup table (LUT), low-density parity-check (LDPC) code, mutual information (MI), quantized belief propagation (QBP).

I. INTRODUCTION

Low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes [1] have been widely applied to communication and data storage systems due to their capacity approaching performance. Many of these systems, such as the NAND flash memory, have strict requirements on the memory consumption and implementation complexity of LDPC decoding [2]–[4]. For the sake of simple hardware implementation, many efforts have been devoted to efficiently represent messages for LDPC decoding [4]–[18]. Among them, Chen et. al [18] approximated the belief propagation (BP) algorithm by representing log-likelihood ratios (LLRs) with a low resolution, generally 5 to 7 bits. The works in [4]–[17] focused on finite alphabet iterative decoding (FAID), which makes use of messages represented by symbols from finite alphabets instead of messages represented by LLRs. FAID algorithms with messages represented by 3 to 4 bits can approach and even surpass the performance of the floating-point BP algorithm [4]–[17].

Because the BP decoder may suffer from a high error floor due to the existing of small absorbing sets [19], the FAID algorithms [15]–[17] optimized the decoding of LDPC codes with variable node (VN) degree of three over the binary symmetric channel (BSC), by making use of the knowledge of the absorbing sets contained in the code graphs. As a result, the FAID algorithms [15]–[17] can surpass the performance of the floating-point BP algorithm in the error floor region. However, it is not easy to apply the FAID algorithms to decode LDPC codes with VN degrees larger than three due to high computational complexity involved in the optimization. Furthermore, it is challenging to extend the FAID algorithms to the other channels, such as the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel.

Non-uniform quantized BP (QBP) algorithms were investigated in [12]–[14], where a decoder was implemented based on simple mappings and additions (including subtractions). However, since only the decoding of the (3, 6) LDPC code (code with VN degree 3 and check node (CN) degree 6) is considered and significant amount of manual optimization is needed for the decoder design [12]–[14], we can hardly generalize the design to a different scenario.

Recently, mutual information-maximizing lookup table (MIM-LUT) decoding was considered in [4]–[11], among which [10] and [11] focused on the decoding of irregular LDPC codes. An MIM-LUT decoder can reduce the hardware complexity and increase the decoding throughput. However, a serious problem on the memory requirement may arise when the sizes of the lookup tables (LUTs) are large. To avoid this problem, these tables were decomposed into small tables at the cost of degraded error performance of the decoder [4]–[11].

In this paper, we propose a method, called mutual information-maximizing quantized belief propagation (MIM-QBP) decoding, to remove the tables used for MIM-LUT decoding [4]–[11] so as to greatly reduce the memory consumption. Our method leads to a hardware-friendly decoder, the MIM-QBP decoder, which can be implemented based only on simple mappings and fixed-point additions (including subtractions). From this point of view, our decoder works similarly to those presented by [12]–[14], but instead of using manual optimization, we show how to practically and systematically design the MIM-QBP decoder, for both the regular and irregular LDPC codes. Simulation results show that the MIM-QBP decoder can considerably outperform the state-of-the-art MIM-LUT decoder [4]–[11]. Moreover, the MIM-QBP decoder with only 3 bits per message can outperform the floating-point BP decoder at high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) regions when testing on high-rate codes with a maximum of 10–30 iterations.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II first introduces the optimal quantization method for binary-input discrete memoryless channel (DMC), and then gives a review of the MIM-LUT decoding and also highlights the
linkage between the two topics. Section III shows the necessity for removing the tables used for MIM-LUT decoding, and then proposes the MIM-QBP decoding for regular LDPC codes. Section IV describes how to practically design the MIM-QBP decoder. Section V illustrates the design of MIM-QBP decoder for irregular LDPC codes. Section VI presents the simulation results. Finally, Section VII concludes this paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Mutual Information-Maximizing Quantization of Binary-Input DMC

Due to the strong linkage between the mutual information-maximizing (MIM) based channel quantization and the MIM based LDPC decoding message quantization, we first review the quantization of a binary-input DMC. As shown by Fig. 1, the channel input $X$ takes values from $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ with probability $P_X(0)$ and $P_X(1)$, respectively. The channel output $Y$ takes values from $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_N\}$ with channel transition probability given by $P_{Y|X}(y|x) = Pr(Y = y|X = x)$, where $x = 0, 1$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. The channel output $Y$ is quantized to $Z$ which takes values from $\mathcal{Z} = \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}$. A well-known criterion for channel quantization [20], [21] is to design a quantizer $Q^* : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ to maximize the mutual information (MI) between $X$ and $Z$, i.e.

$$ Q^* = \arg\max_{Q} I(X; Z) $$

where

$$ I(X; Z) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_{X,Z}(x,z) \log \frac{P_{X,Z}(x,z)}{P_X(x)P_Z(z)}, $$(1)

A deterministic quantizer (DQ) $Q : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ means that for each $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, there exists a unique $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that $P_{Z|Y}(z|y) = 1$ and $P_{Z|Y}(z'|y) = 0$ for $z \neq z' \in \mathcal{Z}$. Let $Q^{-1}(z) \subset \mathcal{Y}$ denote the preimage of $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. We name $Q$ a sequential deterministic quantizer (SDQ) [21] if it can be equivalently described by an integer set $\Lambda = \{\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{M-1}, \lambda_M\}$ with $\lambda_0 = 0 < \lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_{M-1} < \lambda_M = N$ in the way given below.

$$
\begin{align*}
Q^{-1}(1) &= \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{\lambda_1}\}, \\
Q^{-1}(2) &= \{y_{\lambda_1+1}, y_{\lambda_1+2}, \ldots, y_{\lambda_2}\}, \\
& \vdots \\
Q^{-1}(M) &= \{y_{\lambda_{M-1}+1}, y_{\lambda_{M-1}+2}, \ldots, y_{\lambda_M}\}.
\end{align*}
$$

We thus also name $\Lambda$ an SDQ.

According to [20], $Q^*$ in (1) must be deterministic; meanwhile, $Q^*$ is an optimal SDQ when elements in $\mathcal{Y}$ are relabelled to satisfy

$$
\frac{P_{Y|X}(y_1|0)}{P_{Y|X}(y_1|1)} \geq \frac{P_{Y|X}(y_2|0)}{P_{Y|X}(y_2|1)} \geq \cdots \geq \frac{P_{Y|X}(y_N|0)}{P_{Y|X}(y_N|1)}. $$

(2)

Note that after merging any two elements $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $P_{Y|X}(y|0)/P_{Y|X}(y|1) = P_{Y|X}(y'|0)/P_{Y|X}(y'|1)$, the resulting optimal quantizer is as optimal as the original one [20]. A method based on dynamic programming (DP) [22, Section 15.3] was proposed in [20] to find $Q^*$ with complexity $O((N - M)^2M)$. Moreover, a general framework has been developed in [21] for applying DP to find an optimal SDQ $\Lambda^*$ to maximize $I(X; Z)$, for cases that the labeling of the elements in $\mathcal{Y}$ is fixed and $\Lambda^*$ is an SDQ.

The quantization model in Fig. 1 can be used to quantize the binary-input continuous memoryless channel, such as quantizing the binary-input AWGN channel. This can be done by first uniformly quantizing the AWGN channel to a DMC with $N$ outputs, where $N \gg M$. Then, the quantization model in Fig. 1 is applicable. If we use an SDQ to implement the quantization, the SDQ can be equivalently described by $M-1$ thresholds $\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_{M-1}$ with $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_{M-1}$, such that for any continuous channel output $y \in \mathbb{R}$, its quantization output $\bar{y}$ is given by

$$
\bar{y} = \begin{cases} 
1 & y \leq \tau_1, \\
M & y > \tau_{M-1}, \\
i & \tau_{i-1} < y \leq \tau_i, 1 < i < M.
\end{cases}
$$

(3)

More details can be found in [21]. Given $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_{M-1}\}$, implementing the quantization of (3) has complexity $O([ \log_2(M) ])$, which is illustrated by Fig. 2 for $M = 8$.

B. MIM-LUT Decoder Design for Regular LDPC Codes

Consider a binary-input DMC. Denote the channel input by $X$ which takes values from $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ with equal probability, i.e., $P_X(0) = P_X(1) = 1/2$. Denote $L$ as the DMC output which takes values from $\mathcal{L} = \{0, 1, \ldots, |L| - 1\}$ with channel transition probability $P_{L|X}$. By using the quantization method introduced in Section II-A, we can set $|L|$ for different decoding iterations if needed.

Consider the design of a quantized message passing (MP) decoder for a regular $(d_v, d_e)$ LDPC code. Denote $R = \frac{d_v}{d_e}$.
\(\{0,1,\ldots,|\mathcal{R}| - 1\}\) and \(S = \{0,1,\ldots,|S| - 1\}\) as the alphabets of messages passed from VN to CN and CN to VN, respectively. Note that \(L, \mathcal{R}, S\) and their related functions may or may not vary with iterations. We use these notations without specifying the associated iterations, since after specifying the decoder design for one iteration, the design is clear for all the other iterations.

For the message \(R \in \mathcal{R}\) (resp. \(S \in S\)) passed from VN to CN (resp. CN to VN), we use \(P_{R|X}\) (resp. \(P_{S|X}\)) to denote the probability mass function (pmf) of \(R\) (resp. \(S\)) conditioned on the channel input bit \(X\). If the code graph is cycle-free, \(R\) (resp. \(S\)) conditioned on \(X\) is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) with respect to different edges for a given iteration. The design of the MIM-LUT decoder [4]–[11] is carried out by using density evolution [12], [23] (by tracing \(P_{R|X}\) and \(P_{S|X}\)) with the assumption of a cycle-free code graph. However, the MIM-LUT decoder can work well on code graphs containing cycles.

For each iteration, we first design the update function (UF) \(Q_e : \mathcal{R}^{d_e-1} \to S\) (4) for the CN update, which is shown by Fig. 3(a). The MIM-LUT decoding methods design \(Q_e\) to maximize \(I(X;S)\). For easy understanding, we can equivalently convert it to the problem of DMC quantization, as shown by Fig. 4.

We assume \(P_{R|X}\) is known, since for the first iteration, \(P_{R|X}\) can be solely derived from the channel transition probability \(P_{L|X}\), and for the other iteration, \(P_{R|X}\) is known after the design at VN is completed. The joint distribution \(P_{R|X}\) of the incoming message \(R \in \mathcal{R}^{d_e-1}\) conditioned on the channel input bit \(X\) at a CN (i.e., the channel transition probability \(P_{R|X}\) of the DMC shown by Fig. 4) is given by [4]

\[
P_{R|X}(r|x) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\text{dim}(r)-1} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \prod_{i=1}^{\text{dim}(r)} P_{R|X}(r_i|x_i), \quad (5)
\]

where \(r = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_{d_e-1}) \in \mathcal{R}^{d_e-1}\) is a realization of \(R\), \(\text{dim}(r) = d_e - 1\) is the dimension of \(r\), \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) is a realization of \(X\), \(x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{d_e-1}) \in \mathcal{X}^{d_e-1}\) consists of channel input bits corresponding to the VNs associated with incoming edges, and \(\oplus x = x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{d_e-1}\) with \(\oplus\) denoting the addition in \(GF(2)\). Based on (5), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
P_{R|X}(r|0) & = P_{R|X}(r|1) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\text{dim}(r)-1}, \\
\prod_{i=1}^{\text{dim}(r)} (P_{R|X}(r_i|0) + P_{R|X}(r_i|1)),
\end{align*}
\]

\[
P_{X|R}(0|r) = P_{X|R}(1|r) = \prod_{i=1}^{\text{dim}(r)} (P_{X|R}(0|r_i) + P_{X|R}(1|r_i)).
\]

Given \(P_{R|X}\), the design of \(Q_e\) is equivalent to the design of \(Q^*\) in (1) by setting \(\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{R}^{d_e-1}\) and \(Z = S\). We can solve this design problem by using the DP method proposed in [20], after listing \(r\) in descending order based on \(P_{R|X}(r|0)/P_{R|X}(r|1)\) (see (2)). After designing \(Q_e\), a LUT is typically used for storing \(Q_e\), and the output message \(S\) is passed to the CN’s neighbour VNs, with \(P_{S|X}\) being given by

\[
P_{S|X}(s|x) = \sum_{r \in Q_e^{-1}(s)} P_{R|X}(r|x).
\]

\[
Q_e : L \times S^{d_e-1} \to \mathcal{R}\n\]

for the VN update, which is shown by Fig. 3(b). The MIM-LUT decoding methods also design \(Q_v\) to maximize \(I(X;R)\). For easy understanding, we can equivalently convert it to the problem of DMC quantization, as shown by Fig. 5.

The joint distribution \(P_{L,S|X}\) of incoming message \((L,S) \in L \times S^{d_e-1}\) conditioned on the channel input bit \(X\) at a VN (i.e., the channel transition probability \(P_{L,S|X}\) of the DMC shown by Fig. 5) is given by [4]

\[
P_{L,S|X}(l,s|x) = P_{L|X}(l|x) \prod_{i=1}^{\text{dim}(s)} P_{S|X}(s_i|x_i),
\]

where \(l \in L\) is a realization of \(L\), \(s = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{d_e-1}) \in S^{d_e-1}\) is a realization of \(S\), \(\text{dim}(s) = d_v - 1\) is the dimension of \(s\), and \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) is a realization of \(X\).

Given \(P_{L,S|X}\), the design of \(Q_v\) is equivalent to the design of \(Q^*\) in (1) by setting \(\mathcal{Y} = L \times S^{d_e-1}\) and \(Z = \mathcal{R}\). We can solve this design problem by using the DP method proposed in [20], after listing \((l,s)\) in descending order based on \(P_{L,S|X}(l,s|0)/P_{L,S|X}(l,s|1)\) (see (2)). After designing \(Q_v\),
a LUT is typically used for storing $Q_v$, and the output message $R$ is passed to the VN’s neighbour CNs, with $P_{R|X}$ given by

$$P_{R|X}(r|x) = \sum_{(l,s)\in Q_{v}^{-1}(r)} P_{L,S|X}(l,s|x).$$

For each iteration, we can design the estimation function

$$Q_e : \mathcal{L} \times S^d_{\text{BV}} \to \mathcal{X},$$

(11)

to estimate the channel input bit corresponding to each VN. The design of $Q_e$ can be carried out similarly to that of $Q_v$. The main differences involved in the design lie in the aspect that i) the incoming message alphabet $\mathcal{L} \times S^d_{\text{BV}}$ is changed to $\mathcal{L} \times S^d_{\text{BV}}$; and ii) the outgoing message alphabet $\mathcal{R}$ is changed to $\mathcal{X}$. We thus ignore the details.

After completing the design of $Q_e$, $Q_v$, and $Q_c$ for all iterations, the design of the MIM-LUT decoder is completed. In general, $|\mathcal{L}| = |\mathcal{R}| = |S| = 8$ (resp. 16) is used for all iterations, leading to a 3-bit (resp. 4-bit) decoder. Given $|\mathcal{L}|$, $|\mathcal{R}|$, $|S|$, and the maximum allowed decoding iterations, the performance of the MIM-LUT decoder depends greatly on the choice of $P_{L|X}$, which is essentially determined by the design noise standard derivation $\sigma_d$. The maximum noise standard derivation $\sigma^*$, which can make $I(X;R)$ approach 1 after reaching the maximum decoding iteration, is called the decoding threshold. Empirically, a good $\sigma_d$ should be around $\sigma^*$ as investigated in [4]–[11].

III. MIM-QBP DECODING FOR REGULAR LDPC CODES

A. Motivation

When implementing the MIM-LUT decoding, $Q_c$, $Q_v$, and $Q_e$ are implemented by using LUTs. The sizes of tables for implementing $Q_c$, $Q_v$, and $Q_e$ are $|\mathcal{R}|^{d_c-1}$, $|\mathcal{L}| \cdot |S|^{d_v-1}$, and $|\mathcal{L}| \cdot |S|^{d_e-1}$, respectively. Thus, a huge memory requirement may arise when the sizes of the tables are large in practice. To solve this problem, current MIM-LUT decoding methods [4]–[11] decompose $Q_c$, $Q_v$, and $Q_e$ into a series of subfunctions, each working on two incoming messages. After the decomposition, the sizes of tables for implementing $Q_c$, $Q_v$, and $Q_e$ are reduced to $(d_c-2)|\mathcal{R}|^2$, $(d_v-2)|\mathcal{L}|^2+|\mathcal{L}||S|$, and $(d_e-1)|S|^2+|\mathcal{L}||S|$, respectively. This decomposition technique can significantly reduce the cost for storage. However, it will degrade the performance of $Q_c$, $Q_v$, and $Q_e$ in terms of MI maximization, as shown in the example below.

Example 1: Consider the UF $Q_v : \mathcal{L} \times S^2 \to \mathcal{R}$ at a VN (i.e., $d_v = 3$). Assume that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R} = \{0,1\}$ and the conditional probabilities $P_{L|X}$ and $P_{S|X}$ are given by

$$P_{L|X}(l|x) = \begin{cases} 3/4 & l = x, \\ 1/4 & l \neq x, \end{cases}$$

(12)

and

$$P_{S|X}(s|x) = \begin{cases} 2/3 & s = x, \\ 1/3 & s \neq x, \end{cases}$$

(13)

respectively. Based on (9), the joint distribution $P_{L,S_1,S_2|X}$, with $L$ from channel and $(S_1, S_2)$ from CN, is given by Table I. $Q_v$ is an MIM quantizer (for the case that $(L, S_1, S_2)$ are listed in descending order from top to bottom based on $P_{L,S_1,S_2|X}$) maximizing $I(X;R)$ with $I(X;R) = 0.236$.

We now consider to decompose $Q_v$ into two subfunctions $Q_{v,1} : S^2 \to \mathcal{S}$ and $Q_{v,2} : \mathcal{L} \times S \to \mathcal{R}$, as shown by Fig. 6, where $Q_{v,1}$ deals with the two incoming messages from CN (i.e., $(S_1, S_2)$), and $Q_{v,2}$ deals with the incoming message $(L, S')$ with $L$ from channel and $S'$ from the output of $Q_{v,1}$. The joint distribution $P_{S_1,S_2|X}$ is given by Table II(a). $Q_{v,1}$

![Diagram](image-url)
is a quantizer maximizing $I(X, S')$, and we have

$$P_{S'|X}(s'|x) = \begin{cases} 8/9 & s' = 0, x = 0, \\ 1/9 & s' = 1, x = 0, \\ 5/9 & s' = 0, x = 1, \\ 4/9 & s' = 1, x = 1. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Using $L$ and $S'$ as input messages, the joint distribution $P_{L,S'|X}$ is given by Table II(b). $Q_{v,2}$ is an MIM quantizer (for the case that $(L, S')$ is the input message) maximizing $I(X; R)$ with $I(X; R) = 0.223$. The $Q_v$ corresponding to $Q_{v1}$ and $Q_{v,2}$ of Table II can be written as

$$Q_v(l, s_1, s_2) = Q_{v,2}(l, Q_{v,1}(s_1, s_2)) = \begin{cases} 0 & (l, s_1, s_2) = (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), \\ 1 & otherwise, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

which leads to a smaller $I(X; R)$ (i.e., 0.223) than that associated with $Q_v$ (given by Table I) due to the decomposition.

To overcome the drawback of the MIM-LUT decoding methods [4]–[11] due to the use of LUTs, in this work, we propose a systematic method, called MIM-QBP decoding, which is implemented based only on simple mappings and additions. Without applying the decomposition technique, our method can handle all incoming messages at a given node (CN or VN) at the same time without causing any storage problem. The proposed MIM-QBP decoding algorithm is presented in the next two subsections, for the updates at CN and VN, respectively.

### B. CN Update for MIM-QBP Decoding

The framework of CN update for MIM-QBP decoding is shown by Fig. 7. We implement the CN update with three steps: First, we use a reconstruction function (RF) $\phi_c$ to map each incoming message symbol to a specific number; second, we use a function $\Phi_c$ to combine all these numbers corresponding to the incoming messages together as defined by (18); third, we use an SDQ $\Gamma_c$ to map the obtained combined number to the outgoing message symbol. In this way, the CN UF $Q_c$ is fully determined by $\phi_c$, $\Phi_c$, and $\Gamma_c$. In the rest of this subsection, we show the principles for designing $\phi_c$, $\Phi_c$, and $\Gamma_c$ so as to result in a $Q_c$ that can maximize $I(X; S)$.

First, we use an RF

$$\phi_c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \quad (16)$$

to map each incoming message realization $r \in \mathbb{R}$ to a specific number $\phi_c(r)$ in the computational domain $\mathbb{D}$, where in general $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{Z}$ is considered. Let $sgn(\alpha)$ be the sign of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$sgn(\alpha) = \begin{cases} -1 & \alpha < 0, \\ 0 & \alpha = 0, \\ 1 & \alpha > 0. \end{cases}$$

For $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$LLR(r) = \log \left( P_{X|R}(0|r)/P_{X|R}(1|r) \right).$$

A good choice for $\phi_c(r)$ is that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} sgn(\phi_c(r)) = sgn(LLR(r)), \\ |\phi_c(r)| \propto \frac{1}{LLR(r)}. \end{array} \right. \quad (17)$$

In this way, we associate $\phi_c(r)$ to the channel input bit $X$ in the following way: we predict $X$ to be 0 if $sgn(\phi_c(r)) > 0$ and to be 1 if $sgn(\phi_c(r)) < 0$, while $|\phi_c(r)|$ indicates the unreliability of the prediction result.

Second, we represent each incoming message realization $r \in \mathbb{R}^{d_c-1}$ by

$$\Phi_c(r) = \prod_{i=1}^{dim(r)} sgn(\phi_c(r_i)) \sum_{i=1}^{dim(r)} |\phi_c(r_i)|. \quad (18)$$

We predict $X$ to be 0 if $\Phi_c(r) = \prod_{i=1}^{dim(r)} sgn(\phi_c(r_i)) > 0$, and to be 1 if $\Phi_c(r) < 0$, while $|\phi_c(r)| = \sum_{i=1}^{dim(r)} |\phi_c(r_i)|$ indicates the unreliability of the prediction result. Prediction in this way is consistent with the true situation shown by Fig. 4: $X$ is the binary summation of
the channel input bits associated with \( r \) (determined by
\[ sgn(\phi_c(r_i)), i = 1, 2, \ldots, d_c - 1, \) and more incoming mes-
sages lead to more unreliability (i.e., larger \( \dim(r) \) leads to
larger \( |\Phi_c(r)| \). This is the reason why we regard \( |\phi_c(r)| \) as the
unreliability.). Denote
\[ A = \{ a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{|A|} \} = \{ \Phi_c(r) : r \in \mathbb{R}^{d_c-1} \}. \] (19)

Elements in \( A \) are labelled to satisfy
\[ a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \cdots \succ a_{|A|}, \] (20)
where \( \succ \) is a binary relation on \( \mathbb{R} \) defined by
\[ \alpha \succ \beta \iff sgn(\alpha) > sgn(\beta) \text{ or } (sgn(\alpha) = sgn(\beta) \text{ and } \alpha < \beta) \]
for \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \). Assuming \( \Phi_c(r) = a_i \), from (20) we know that
it is more likely to predict \( X \) to be 0 for smaller \( i \) and to
be 1 for larger \( i \). Thus, the listing order of (20) has a similar
feature as the listing order of (2). Let \( A \) be a random variable
taking values from \( A \). We have
\[ P_{A|X}(a_i|x) = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}^{d_c-1}} P_{R|X}(r|x), \] (21)
where \( 1 \leq i \leq |A| \), and \( P_{R|X}(r|x) \) is given by (5).

Third, based on \( A \) and \( P_{A|X} \), we can apply the general DP
method proposed in [21] to find an SDQ
\[ \Lambda_c = \{ \lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{|S|-1}, \lambda_{|S|} = |A| \} : A \rightarrow S \] (22)
to maximize \( I(X; S) \) (in the sense that the labelling of
elements in \( A \) is fixed and given by (20) and \( \Lambda_c \) is an SDQ).
We also use \( \Lambda_c \) to generate the threshold set (TS) \( \Gamma_c \) given by
\[ \Gamma_c = \{ \gamma_i : 1 \leq i \leq |S|, \gamma_i = a_{\lambda_i} \}. \] (23)

Note that \( \Gamma_c \) is equivalent to \( \Lambda_c \) in quantizing \( A \) to \( S \).

Finally, the UF \( Q_c : \mathbb{R}^{d_c-1} \rightarrow S \) is fully determined by
\( \phi_c, \Phi_c, \) and \( \Gamma_c \) in the following way given by
\[ Q_c(r) = \begin{cases} 
0 & |S| - 1 \leq \gamma_i + 1 \leq |S| - 2, \\
|S| - 1 & \gamma_i \succ \Phi_c(r), \\
\gamma_i & \Phi_c(r) \succ \gamma_i \leq 1, \leq i \leq |S| - 2, \\
\end{cases} \] (24)
where \( \succ \) is a binary relation on \( \mathbb{R} \) defined by
\[ \alpha \succ \beta \iff \alpha > \beta \text{ or } \alpha = \beta \]
for \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \). In addition, instead of using (7), we can compute
\( P_{S|X} \) for the outgoing message \( S \) in a simpler way based on
\( \Lambda_c \), given by
\[ P_{S|X}(s|x) = \sum_{i=\lambda_{i+1}}^{\lambda_{i+1}} P_{A|X}(a_i|x). \] (25)

Note that \( Q_c \) is essentially determined by \( \phi_c \), since \( \Phi_c \)
and \( \Gamma_c \) can be computed accordingly after \( \phi_c \) is given. We
will illustrate the practical design of \( \phi_c \) in Section IV-A.

After completing the design of \( Q_c \) given by (24), the storage
complexity for storing \( Q_c \) is \( O(|R| + |S|) \) (\( O(|R|) \)) for storing
\( \phi_c \) and \( O(|S|) \) for storing \( \Gamma_c \), which is negligible. On the
other hand, implementing the CN update shown by Fig. 7 for
one outgoing message has complexity \( O(d_c + |\log_2(|S|)|) \).

In particular, computing \( \Phi_c(r) \) has complexity \( O(d_c) \) (binary
operations mainly including additions), which allows a binary
tree-like parallel implementation; meanwhile, mapping \( \Phi_c(r) \)
To \( S \) based on \( \Gamma_c \) has complexity \( O(|\log_2(|S|)|) \) (binary
comparison operations), which can be analogously explained
by Fig. 2. The simple implementation for mapping \( \Phi_c(r) \) to \( S \)
indeed benefits from the use of SDQs in (22) and (23). This is
the essential reason why we choose SDQs. Instead, if an
optimal DQ is used to map \( A \) to \( S \) in (22), we may in general
require an additional table of size \(|A| \) to store this optimal
DQ. On the other hand, we may achieve better \( I(X; S) \) and
can reduce the computational complexity for mapping \( \Phi_c(r) \)
to \( S \) from \( O(|\log_2(|S|)|) \) to \( O(1) \).

C. VN Update for MIM-QBP Decoding

The framework of VN update for MIM-QBP decoding is shown by
Fig. 8. We implement the VN update with three steps: First, we use two RFs \( \phi_v \) and \( \phi_{ch} \) to map each incoming
message symbol from CN and channel, respectively, to a
specific number; second, we use a function \( \Phi_v \) to combine
all these numbers corresponding to the incoming messages,
given by (29); third, we use an SDQ \( \Gamma_v \) to map the obtained
combined number to the outgoing message symbol. In this
way, the VN UF \( Q_v \) is fully determined by \( \phi_v, \phi_{ch}, \Phi_v, \) and
\( \Gamma_v \). In the rest of this subsection, we show the principles for
designing \( \phi_v, \phi_{ch}, \Phi_v, \) and \( \Gamma_v \) so as to result in a \( Q_v \) that can
maximize \( I(X; R) \).

First, we use an RF
\[ \phi_v : S \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \] (26)
to map each incoming message (from CN) realization \( s \in S \)
to \( \phi_v(s) \in \mathbb{D} \), and use another RF
\[ \phi_{ch} : L \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \] (27)
to map the incoming message (from channel) realization \( l \in L \)
to \( \phi_{ch}(l) \in \mathbb{D} \). For \( s \in S \), let
\[ LLR(s) = \log \left( \frac{P_X|S|(0|s)}{P_X|S|(1|s)} \right). \]
For $l \in L$, let
\[
LLR(l) = \log \left( \frac{P_{X|L}(0|l)}{P_{X|L}(1|l)} \right).
\]
A good choice for $\phi_v(s)$ and $\phi_{ch}(l)$ is that
\[
\begin{cases}
\phi_v(s) \propto LLR(s), \\
\phi_{ch}(l) \propto LLR(l).
\end{cases}
\]  
\tag{28}

In this way, we associate $\phi_v(s)$ and $\phi_{ch}(l)$ to the channel input bit $X$ in the following way: $X$ is more likely to be 0 (resp. 1) for larger (resp. smaller) $\phi_v(s)$ and $\phi_{ch}(l)$.

Second, we represent each incoming message realization $(l, s) \in L \times S^{d_v-1}$ by
\[
\Phi_v(l, s) = \phi_{ch}(l) + \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(s)} \phi_v(s_i).  
\]  
\tag{29}

The channel input bit $X$ is more likely to be 0 (resp. 1) for larger (resp. smaller) $\Phi_v(l, s)$. Denote
\[
B = \{b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_{|B|}\} = \{\Phi_v(l, s) : (l, s) \in L \times S^{d_v-1}\}. 
\]  
\tag{30}

Elements in $B$ are labelled to satisfy
\[
b_1 > b_2 > \cdots > b_{|B|}.  
\]  
\tag{31}

Assuming $\Phi_v(l, s) = b_i$, from (31) we know that $X$ is more likely to be 0 (resp. 1) for larger (resp. smaller) $i$. Thus, the listing order of (31) has a similar feature as the listing order of (2). Let $B$ be a random variable taking values from $B$. We have
\[
P_{B|X}(b_i|x) = \sum_{(l, s) \in L \times S^{d_v-1}, \Phi_v(l, s) = b_i} P_{L,S|X}(l, s|x),  
\]  
\tag{32}

where $1 \leq i \leq |B|$ and $P_{L,S|X}(l, s|x)$ is given by (9).

Third, based on $B$ and $P_{B|X}$, we can apply the general DP method proposed in [21] to find an SDQ
\[
\Lambda_v = \{\lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{|R|} = |B| : B \rightarrow R\}  
\]  
\tag{33}

to maximize $I(X; R)$ (in the sense that the labelling of elements in $B$ is fixed and given by (31) and $\Lambda_v$ is an SDQ). We also use $\Lambda_v$ to generate the TS given by
\[
\Gamma_v = \{\gamma_i = 1 \leq i < |R|, \gamma_i = b_{\lambda_i}\}.  
\]  
\tag{34}

Note that $\Gamma_v$ is equivalent to $\Lambda_v$ in quantizing $B$ to $R$.

Finally, the UF $Q_v : L \times S^{d_v-1} \rightarrow R$ is fully determined by $\phi_v$, $\phi_{ch}$, $\Phi_v$, and $\Gamma_v$ in the following way given by
\[
Q_v(l, s) = \begin{cases}
0 & \Phi_v(l, s) \geq \gamma_1, \\
|R| - 1 & \Phi_v(l, s) < \gamma_{|R|-1}, \\
i & \gamma_i > \Phi_v(l, s) \geq \gamma_{i-1}, 1 \leq i \leq |R| - 2.
\end{cases}
\]  
\tag{35}

In addition, instead of using (10), we can compute $P_{B|X}$ for the outgoing message $R$ in a simpler way based on $\Lambda_v$, given by
\[
P_{R|X}(r|x) = \sum_{i_{\lambda_{i-1}}+1}^{\lambda_{i+1}} P_{B|X}(b_i|x).  
\]  
\tag{36}

Note that $Q_v$ is essentially determined by $\phi_v$ and $\phi_{ch}$, since $\Phi_v$ and $\Gamma_v$ can be computed accordingly after $\phi_v$ and $\phi_{ch}$ are given. We will illustrate the practical design of $\phi_v$ and $\phi_{ch}$ in Section IV-B. After completing the design of $Q_v$ given by (35), the storage complexity for storing $Q_v$ is $O(|S| + |L| + |R|)$ ($O(|S|)$ for storing $\phi_v$, $O(|L|)$ for storing $\phi_{ch}$, and $O(|R|)$ for storing $\Gamma_v$), which is negligible. On the other hand, implementing the VN update shown by Fig. 8 for one outgoing message has complexity $O(d_v + \lceil \log_2(|R|) \rceil)$. In particular, computing $\Phi_v(l, s)$ has complexity $O(d_v)$, which allows a binary tree-like parallel implementation; meanwhile, mapping $\Phi_v(l, s)$ to $R$ based on $\Gamma_v$ has complexity $O(\lceil \log_2(|R|) \rceil)$, which can be analogously explained by Fig. 2. The simple implementation for mapping $\Phi_v(l, s)$ to $R$ also benefits from the use of SDQs in (33) and (34).

If we use the optimal DQ instead, we may in general require an additional table of size $|B|$ to store this optimal DQ. On the other hand, we may achieve better $I(X;R)$ and can reduce the computational complexity for mapping $\Phi_v(l, s)$ to $R$ from $O(\lceil \log_2(|R|) \rceil)$ to $O(1)$.

**Example 2:** We show a practical case for the framework illustrated by Fig. 8 to apply. Consider Example 1 again. If we use $\phi_v$ with
\[
\phi_v(s) = \begin{cases}
1 & s = 0, \\
0 & s = 1,
\end{cases}
\]  
and use $\phi_{ch}$ with
\[
\phi_{ch}(l) = \begin{cases}
1 & l = 0, \\
0 & l = 1,
\end{cases}
\]
the TS $\Gamma_v$ defined by (34) will be given by
\[
\Gamma_v = \{\gamma_1 = 2\}.  
\]  
Then, $Q_v$ defined by (35) will be exactly the same with the $Q_v$ defined by Table I, which maximizes $I(X;R)$ with $I(X;R) = 0.236$. Therefore, instead of using Table I to store $Q_v$, we can use $\phi_v$, $\phi_{ch}$, $\Phi_v$, and $\Gamma_v$ to fully determine $Q_v$ in the way indicated by (35).

### D. Remarks

For each decoding iteration, the design of $Q_v : L \times S^{d_v} \rightarrow X$ for the MIM-QBP decoding is quite similar to the design of $Q_v$ introduced in Section III-C. In particular, the same RFs $\phi_v$ and $\phi_{ch}$ can be used for the design of $Q_v$ and $Q_e$ for a given decoding iteration. We thus ignore the details.

The MIM-QBP decoding leads to a very practical decoder, namely the MIM-QBP decoder, which can be implemented based only on simple mappings and additions. The mappings refer to the RFs (i.e., $\phi_v$, $\phi_{ch}$, and $\phi_{ch}$) and the TSs (i.e., $\Gamma_v$ and $\Gamma_v$, derived from the RFs off-line), and the additions refer to the computation for $\Phi_v$ and $\Phi_v$. Compared to the MIM-LUT decoder, the MIM-QBP decoder can greatly reduce the memory consumption. Given the design noise standard deviation $\sigma_d$ (i.e., given $P_{B|X}$), the design of the MIM-QBP decoder is essentially determined by the design of the RFs $\phi_v$.
We use $\epsilon_I$ and the MIM-QBP decoding for the case $\phi_c$, $\phi_v$, and $\phi_{ch}$, which can be carried out off-line. We present the corresponding details in the next section.

IV. PRACTICAL DESIGN OF MIM-QBP DECODER FOR REGULAR LDPC CODES

The MIM-QBP decoder proposed in Section III works similarly to those presented by [12]–[14]. In fact, we borrow the terms "reconstruction function", "computational domain", "unreliability", and "threshold set" from [12]–[14]. However, unlike the works of [12]–[14] which relied on manual optimization to design the decoders, we show how to practically and systematilcally design the MIM-QBP decoder in this section.

As discussed in Section III, given the design noise standard deviation $\sigma_d$, the design of the MIM-QBP decoder is essentially determined by the design of the RFs $\phi_c$, $\phi_v$, and $\phi_{ch}$. One possible solution to this design problem is to use certain search methods, such as the differential evolution [24], to search for good RFs based on the suggestions of (17) and (28) so as to maximize $I(X; S)$ and $I(X; R)$. Instead, our solution is to first give the close form of the optimal RFs, say $\phi_c^*$, $\phi_v^*$, and $\phi_{ch}^*$, which can maximize $I(X; S)$ and $I(X; R)$. Then, since the optimal RFs work in the real number domain $\mathbb{R}$, we design the RFs by properly scaling the optimal RFs to an integer range of interest for practical implementation.

A. MIM-QBP Decoder Design at CN

Let $g(r) = P_{X|R}(0|r) - P_{X|R}(1|r)$ for $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and $g(r) = P_{X|R}(0|r) - P_{X|R}(1|r)$ for $r \in \mathcal{R}^{d_c-1}$. For $r \in \mathcal{R}$, let

$$\phi_c^*(r) = \begin{cases} 
\text{sgn}(g(r)) \epsilon, & \text{if } |g(r)| = 1, \\
\text{sgn}(g(r)) \log(|g(r)|), & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}$$

(37)

where $\epsilon$ satisfies

$$0 < \epsilon d_c < \min \{|\log(|g(r)|) - \log(|g(r')|)| : r, r' \in \mathcal{R}^{d_c-1}, g(r) \neq g(r'), \text{sgn}(g(r)) = \text{sgn}(g(r')) \neq 0\}.$$  

(38)

We use $\epsilon$ to ensure the condition of (17) to be valid for $\phi_c = \phi_c^*$.  

**Theorem 1:** If $\phi_c = \phi_c^*$, $Q_c$ defined by (24) can maximize $I(X; S)$ among all the functions mapping $\mathcal{R}^{d_c-1}$ to $\mathcal{S}$.

**Proof:** See Appendix A.

Theorem 1 indicates that $\phi_c^*$ is an optimal choice for $\phi_c$ in terms of maximizing $I(X; S)$. Note that the function

$$f(x) = \log((e^x + 1)/(e^x - 1)),$$

which was used in [1] for implementing the CN update for BP decoding, is closely related to $\phi_c^*$ in terms of $f(\text{LLR}(r)) = -\log(|g(r)|)$ and $\text{sgn}(\text{LLR}(r)) = \text{sgn}(g(r))$ for $r \in \mathcal{R}$. In addition, we handle all incoming messages by $\Phi_c$, which works similarly to the CN update based on $f(x)$ in [1]. This simple discussion implies a close connection between the CN updates of the BP decoding and the MIM-QBP decoding for the case $\phi_c = \phi_c^*$.

Note that $\phi_c^*$ requires the computational domain $\mathbb{D}$ to be $\mathbb{R}$, while $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{Z}$ is more suitable for practical situations for simple hardware implementation. In the following, we design $\phi_c : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ based on $\phi_c^*$ to simplify the implementation.

---

Corollary 1: Let $\eta$ be a positive number. If $\phi_c = \eta \phi_c^*$, $Q_c$ defined by (24) can maximize $I(X; S)$ among all the functions mapping $\mathcal{R}^{d_c-1}$ to $\mathcal{S}$.

**Proof:** Corollary 1 can be proved in a way similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.

Denote the maximum allowed absolute value of $\phi_c(\cdot)$ by $|\phi_c|_{\text{max}}$. Let

$$|\phi_c|^*_{\text{max}} = \max\{|\phi_c^*(r)| : r \in \mathcal{R}, g(r) \neq 0\}.$$  

Note that $|\phi_c|^*_{\text{max}} > 0$ holds for a general case. Then, inspired by Corollary 1, we design $\phi_c : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by scaling $\phi_c^*$ approximately (loosely speaking, by factors around $\eta = |\phi_c|_{\text{max}}/|\phi_c|_{\text{max}}$) to the valid integer range $[-|\phi_c|_{\text{max}}, |\phi_c|_{\text{max}}]$ given below

$$\phi_c(r) = \begin{cases} 
\text{sgn}(g(r)) \max\{1, |\phi_c^*(r)|\}, & g(r) \neq 0, \\
|\phi_c|_{\text{max}}, & g(r) = 0.
\end{cases}$$

(39)

where for $g(r) \neq 0$, we make $\phi_c(r) \neq 0$ to ensure $\text{sgn}(\phi_c(r)) = \text{sgn}(g(r))$. Meanwhile, for $g(r) = 0$, we use $\phi_c(r) = |\phi_c|_{\text{max}}$ instead of $\phi_c(r) = 0$ since the latter will bring two disadvantages: i) two bits are needed for representing the sign of $\phi_c$, and ii) it is not applicable for computing the sign of the $j$-th outgoing message during decoding in the way of $(\prod_{i=1}^{d_c} \text{sgn}(\phi_c(r_i))/\text{sgn}(\phi_c(r_j)))$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d_c$, which has a simple hardware-implementing architecture as shown by Fig. 9. Moreover, according to our simulations, the situation where $g(r) = 0$ hardly occurs; meanwhile, $\phi_c(r) = |\phi_c|_{\text{max}}$ and $\phi_c(r) = 0$ do not incur degradation in the error rate performance.

Suppose that the decoder is allowed to use at most $q_c$ bits for the additions for computing each outgoing message (refer to
\( \Phi_c \) defined by (18)). Note that one bit is needed for computing the sign of each outgoing message. Then, \( |\phi_c|_{\max} \) is given by
\[
|\phi_c|_{\max} = \left\lfloor (2^{q_c} - 1) / d_c \right\rfloor
\]
such that \( \sum_{i=1}^{d_c} |\phi_c(r_i)| \) does not overflow, and the decoder can use the simple architecture given by Fig. 9 to compute each outgoing message.

After the design of RFs given by (39), \( \Phi_c \) defined by (18) is a function mapping \( \mathbb{R}^{d_c} \) to \( \mathbb{Z} \) and the resulting integers can be represented by \( q_c \) bits. Moreover, we can compute \( A \) and \( P_{A|X} \) in a much faster way than using (19) and (21), respectively, since the computation in the ways of (19) and (21) can be a prohibitive task when \( |R|^{d_c} \) is large. In the following, we propose a fast method to compute \( A \) and \( P_{A|X} \).

**Proposition 1:** For \( k \geq 1 \) and \( R \in \mathbb{R}^k \), let
\[
P_{R|X}(r|x) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\dim(r)} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} P_{R_i|X}(r_i|x_i).
\]
In addition, let
\[
\mathcal{A}_k = \{a_{k,1}, a_{k,2}, \ldots, a_{k,|A_k|}\} = \{\Phi_c(r) : r \in \mathbb{R}^k\}
\]
and \( A_k \) be a random variable taking values from \( \mathcal{A}_k \). Moreover, define \( \delta_k^\pm(\cdot) \) and \( \delta_k^\pm(\cdot) \) by
\[
\delta_k^\pm(a_{k,i}) = P_{A_k|X}(a_{k,i}|0) \pm P_{A_k|X}(a_{k,i}|1).
\]
Then, for \( k = 1 \), we have
\[
\mathcal{A}_k = \{\phi_c(r) : r \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_k^\pm(a_{k,i}) = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}, \phi_c(r) = a_{k,i}} (P_{R|X}(r|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r|1)).
\]
For \( k > 1 \), we have
\[
\mathcal{A}_k = \{\phi_c(r) \circ a_{k-1,j} : r \in \mathbb{R}, a_{k-1,j} \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_k^\pm(a_{k,i}) = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}, \phi_c(r) = a_{k-1,j}} \left( P_{R|X}(r|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r|1) \right) \delta_k^\pm(a_{k-1,j}),
\]
where \( \circ \) is a binary operator given by
\[
\alpha \circ \beta = sgn(\alpha) sgn(\beta) (|\alpha| + |\beta|)
\]
for \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \).

**Proof:** For \( k = 1 \), (41) holds obviously. For \( k > 1 \), we have
\[
\mathcal{A}_k = \{\Phi_c(r) : r \in \mathbb{R}^k\} = \{\phi_c(r) \circ \Phi_c(r) : r \in \mathbb{R} \}, \quad \phi_c(r) \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}\}
\]
\[
= \{\phi_c(r) \circ a_{k-1,j} : r \in \mathbb{R}, a_{k-1,j} \in \mathcal{A}_{k-1}\};
\]

meanwhile, we have
\[
\delta_k^\pm(a_{k,i}) = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}^k, \phi_c(r) = a_{k,i}} (P_{R|X}(r|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r|1))
\]
\[
+ \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}^k, \phi_c(r) = a_{k,i}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-1} \prod_{u=1}^k (P_{R|X}(r_u|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r_u|1))
\]
\[
= \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}^k} \frac{1}{2} (P_{R|X}(r|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r|1))
\]
\[
\cdot \prod_{u=1}^k (P_{R|X}(r_u|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r_u|1))
\]
\[
+ \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}^k} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-2} \prod_{u=1}^k (P_{R|X}(r_u|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r_u|1))
\]
\[
= \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}^k, \phi_c(r) \circ a_{k-1,j} = a_{k,i}} P_{R|X}(r|0) \pm P_{R|X}(r|1)
\]
\[
\cdot \sum_{\phi_c(r) = a_{k-1,j}} \delta_k^\pm(a_{k-1,j}).
\]

This completes the proof.

According to Proposition 1, we can compute \( A_1, \delta_1^\pm, A_2, \delta_2^\pm, \ldots, A_{d_c-1}, \delta_{d_c-1}^\pm \) sequentially. Then, \( A \) and \( P_{A|X} \) equal to \( A_{d_c-1} \) and \( P_{A_{d_c-1}|X} \), respectively, where \( P_{A_{d_c-1}|X} \) can be easily computed based on \( \delta_{d_c-1}^\pm \). We summarize the corresponding computation by Algorithm 1. Since \( |A_{d_c-1}\) in line 7 of Algorithm 1 is upper-bounded by \( 2^{d_c} \), the complexity of Algorithm 1 is \( O(d, 2^{d_c} |R|) \).

At this point, starting from \( A \) and \( P_{A|X} \), we can compute the optimal SDQ \( \Lambda_c \) given by (22). The computational complexity is upper-bounded by \( O(2^{2q_c} |S|) \) [20], [21]. For the special situation where \( P_{A|X} \) satisfies
\[
\frac{P_{A|X}(a_1|0)}{P_{A|X}(a_1|1)} \geq \frac{P_{A|X}(a_2|0)}{P_{A|X}(a_2|1)} \geq \ldots \geq \frac{P_{A|X}(a_{|A|}|0)}{P_{A|X}(a_{|A|}|1)},
\]
the computational complexity can be reduced to \( O(2^{2q_c} |S|) \) [21], [25]. Our simulation results show that (43) frequently holds. This phenomenon is reasonable because for \( \eta > 0 \), \( \phi_c = \eta \phi_c^* \) can always make (43) hold according to (53), while \( \phi_c \) is defined by scaling \( \phi_c^* \) approximately (see (39)).

After the computation of \( \Lambda_c \), we can then compute the TS \( \Gamma_c \), the UF \( Q_c \), and the pmf \( P_{S|X} \) given by (23), (24), and (25) respectively. Till now, the MIM-QBP decoder design at CN is completed, which has a total complexity upper-bounded by \( O(d, 2^{d_c} |R| + 2^{2q_c} |S|) \) for one decoding iteration.

After the design of the MIM-QBP decoder at CN, we can use the hardware architecture shown by Fig. 9 to implement the CN update for all outgoing messages \( s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{d_c} \). The computational complexity is \( O(d_c + d_c \lceil \log_2(|S|) \rceil) \) for one CN per iteration, where \( O(d_c) \) refers to the complexity of addition and XOR operations, and \( O(d_c \lceil \log_2(|S|) \rceil) \) refers to
Algorithm 1 Computation of $A$ and $P_{A|X}$

Input: $F_{R|X}, \phi_c, d_c$.
Output: $A$ and $P_{A|X}$.
1. Set $A_k = \emptyset$ and $\delta_k^+(\cdot) = 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d_c - 1$.
2. for $r \in R$ do
3. $A_1 = A_1 \cup \{\phi_c(r)\}$. // See (41)
4. $\delta_1^+(\phi_c(r)) = F_{R|X}(r|0) \pm F_{R|X}(r|1)$.
5. end for
6. for $k = 2, 3, \ldots, d_c - 1$ do
7. for $r \in R, a_{k-1,j} \in A_{k-1} \cup \{\phi_c(r)\}$ do
8. $a_{k,j} = \phi_c(r) \cup a_{k-1,j}.
9. $A_k = A_k \cup \{a_{k,i}\}$. // See (42)
10. $\delta_k^+(a_{k,i}) = \frac{1}{2}(F_{R|X}(r|0) \pm F_{R|X}(r|1))(\delta_k^{-}(a_{k-1,j}) + 1).
11. end for
12. end for
13. for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d_c - 1$ do
14. for $a_{k,i} \in A_k$ do
15. $P_{A|X}(a_{k,i}) = (\delta_k^+(a_{k,i}) + \delta_k^{-}(a_{k,i}))/2$.
16. $P_{A|X}(a_{k+1,i}) = (\delta_k^+(a_{k+1,i}) - \delta_k^-(a_{k+1,i}))/2$.
17. end for
18. end for
19. $A = A_{d_c-1}$.
20. $P_{A|X} = P_{A_{d_c-1}|X}$.
21. return $A$ and $P_{A|X}$.

the complexity of mapping operations based on $\Gamma_e$ for the $d_c$ outgoing messages.

B. MIM-QBP Decoder Design at VN

For $s \in S$ and $l \in L$, let
\[
\begin{align*}
\phi_v^*(s) &= \log(P_{S|X}(s|0)/P_{S|X}(s|1), \\
\phi_{ch}^*(l) &= \log(P_{L|X}(l|0)/P_{L|X}(l|1)).
\end{align*}
\]
(44)

We can easily verify that the condition of (28) holds for $\phi_v = \phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch} = \phi_{ch}^*.

Theorem 2: If $\phi_v = \phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch} = \phi_{ch}^*$, $Q_v$ defined by (35) can maximize $I(X; R)$ among all the functions mapping $L \times S^{d_c-1}$ to $R$.

Proof: See Appendix B.

Theorem 2 indicates that $(\phi_v^*, \phi_{ch}^*)$ is an optimal choice for $(\phi_v, \phi_{ch})$ in terms of maximizing $I(X; R)$. Note that $\phi_v^*(s) = LLR(s) + \log(P_X(1)/P_X(0))$ and $\phi_{ch}^*(s) = LLR(l) + \log(P_X(1)/P_X(0))$, implying a close relation between the VN updates of the BD decoding and the MIM-QBP decoding for the case $\phi_v = \phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch} = \phi_{ch}^*$. In the following, we design $\phi_v : S \rightarrow Z$ and $\phi_{ch} : L \rightarrow Z$ based on $\phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch}^*$ for practical implementation.

Corollary 2: Let $\eta$ be a positive number. If $\phi_v = \eta \phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch} = \eta \phi_{ch}^*$, $Q_v$ defined by (35) can maximize $I(X; R)$ among all the functions mapping $L \times S^{d_c-1}$ to $R$.

Proof: Corollary 2 can be proved in a similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.

Denote the maximum allowed absolute value of $\phi_v(\cdot)$ and $\phi_{ch}(\cdot)$ by $|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}$. Let
\[
|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} = \max\{|\phi_{v,ch}^*(s)| : s \in S\} \cup \{|\phi_{v,ch}^*(l)| : l \in L\}.
\]

Note that $|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} > 0$ holds for a general case. Then, inspired by Corollary 2, we design $\phi_v : S \rightarrow Z$ and $\phi_{ch} : L \rightarrow Z$ by scaling $\phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch}^*$ approximately (loosely speaking, by factors around $\eta = |\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}/|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}$) to the valid integer range $[-|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}, |\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}]$ given below
\[
\begin{align*}
\phi_v(s) &= \text{sgn}(\phi_v^*(s)), \\
|\phi_{v,ch}^*(s)| &\leq |\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} + 0.5], \\
\phi_{ch}(s) &= \text{sgn}(\phi_{ch}^*(s)), \\
|\phi_{v,ch}^*(s)| &\leq |\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} + 0.5].
\end{align*}
\]
(45)

Suppose that the decoder is allowed to use at most $q_v$ bits for the additions for computing each outgoing message (refer to $\Phi_v$ defined by (29)). Then, $|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}$ can be taken as
\[
|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} = \lceil(|2^{q_v} - 1|)/(d_v + 1)\rceil.
\]
(46)

Let $|\phi_v|_{\max} = \{|\phi_v(s)| : s \in S\}$ and $|\phi_{ch}|_{\max} = \{|\phi_{ch}(l)| : l \in L\}$. (45) and (46) ensure that
\[
|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} + d_v|\phi_v|_{\max} \leq 2^{q_v} - 1,
\]
(47)

implying that the corresponding additions do not overflow. In this case, the decoder can compute the $j$-th outgoing message during decoding in the way of $\phi_{ch}(l) + \sum_{i=1}^{d_v} \phi_v(r_i) - \phi_{v,ch}(r_j)$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d_v$, which can be implemented by using the simple hardware architecture given by Fig. 10.

Note that if using (46), the gap $(2^{q_v} - 1) - (|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} + d_v|\phi_v|_{\max})$ can be quite large especially for initial decoding iterations (e.g., see Example 3). To save resource, we can use less than $q_v$ bits for the additions without changing the RFs. We adopt this approach in our simulations presented in Section VI. Alternatively, in order to make a full use of the $q_v$ bits, we can take the largest $|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}$ to make $|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max} + d_v|\phi_v|_{\max}$ as close to $2^{q_v} - 1$ as possible while maintaining (47). This task can be efficiently done by applying binary search on $|\phi_{v,ch}|_{\max}$.

After the design of RFs given by (45), $\Phi_v$ defined by (29) is a function mapping $L \times S^{d_c-1}$ to $Z$ and the resulting integers can be represented by $q_v$ bits. Moreover, we can compute $B$ and $P_{B|X}$ in a much faster way than using (30) and (32), respectively. Similar to Algorithm 1 for computing $A$ and $P_{A|X}$, we propose a fast method to compute $B$ and $P_{B|X}$. 

Fig. 10. Hardware architecture (similar to that given by [13, Fig. 3]) for the variable node update of mutual information-maximizing quantized belief propagation (MIM-QBP) decoder. The adders/subtractors are used for computing $\phi_{v,ch}(l) + \sum_{i=1}^{d_v} |\phi_v(s_i)| - |\phi_{v}(s_j)|$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d_v$. 

Proposition 2: For $k \geq 0$, $L \in \mathcal{L}$, and $S \in \mathcal{S}^k$, let $$P_{L,S|X}(l,s|x) = P_{L|X}(l|x) \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(s)} P_{S_i|X}(s_i|x),$$ where for $k=0$, let $$P_{L,S|X}(l,s|x) = P_{L|X}(l|x).$$ Let $$B_k = \{b_{k,1}, b_{k,2}, \ldots, b_{k,|B_k|}\} = \{\Phi_v(l,s) : l \in \mathcal{L}, s \in \mathcal{S}^k\},$$ where for $k=0$, let $$\Phi_v(l,s) = \phi_{ch}(l).$$ In addition, let $B_k$ be a random variable taking values from $B_k$. Then, for $k=0$, we have $$B_k = \{\phi_{ch}(l) : l \in \mathcal{L}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad P_{B_k|X}(b_{k,i}|x) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}, \phi_{ch}(l) = b_{k,i}} P_{L|X}(l|x). \quad (48)$$ For $k > 0$, we have $$B_k = \{\phi_v(s) + b_{k-1,j} : s \in \mathcal{S}, b_{k-1,j} \in B_{k-1}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad P_{B_k|X}(b_{k,i}|x) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}, b_{k-1,j} \in B_{k-1}, \phi_v(s) + b_{k-1,j} = b_{k,i}} P_{S|X}(s|x)P_{B_{k-1}|X}(b_{k-1,j}|x). \quad (49)$$

Proof: For $k=0$, (48) holds obviously. For $k>0$, we have $$B_k = \{\Phi_v(l,s) : l \in \mathcal{L}, s \in \mathcal{S}^k\}$$ $$= \{\phi_v(s) + \Phi_v(l,s) : s \in \mathcal{S}, l \in \mathcal{L}, s \in \mathcal{S}^{k-1}\}$$ $$= \{\phi_v(s) + b_{k-1,j} : s \in \mathcal{S}, b_{k-1,j} \in B_{k-1}\};$$ meanwhile, we have $$P_{B_k|X}(b_{k,i}|x) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}, s \in \mathcal{S}^k, \Phi_v(l,s) = b_{k,i}} P_{L|X}(l|x) \prod_{i=1}^k P_{S_i|X}(s_i|x)$$ $$= \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}, s \in \mathcal{S}^k, \Phi_v(l,s) = b_{k,i}} P_{L|X}(l|x) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} P_{S_i|X}(s_i|x)$$ $$= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}, b_{k-1,j} \in B_{k-1}, \phi_v(s) + \Phi_v(l,s) = b_{k,i}} P_{S|X}(s|x)P_{B_{k-1}|X}(b_{k-1,j}|x).$$ This completes the proof.

According to Proposition 2, we can compute $B_0$, $P_{B_0|X}$, $B_1$, $P_{B_1|X}$, $B_{d_v-1}$, $P_{B_{d_v-1}|X}$ sequentially. Then, $B$ and $P_{B|X}$ equal to $B_{d_v-1}$ and $P_{B_{d_v-1}|X}$, respectively. We summarize the corresponding computation by Algorithm 2. Since $|B_{k-1}|$ in line 7 of Algorithm 2 is upper-bounded by $2^{|S|}$, the complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(d_v 2^{|S|})$.

At this point, starting from $B$ and $P_{B|X}$, we can compute the optimal SDQ $\Lambda_v$ given by (33). The computational complexity is upper-bounded by $O(2^{2d_v |R|})$ [20], [21]. For the special situation where $P_{B_i|X}$ satisfies

$$P_{B_i|X}(b_1|0) \geq P_{B_i|X}(b_2|0) \geq \cdots \geq P_{B_i|X}(b_{|B_i|}|1), \quad (50)$$

the computational complexity can be reduced to $O(2^{2d_v |R|})$ [21], [25]. Our simulation results show that (50) frequently holds. This phenomenon is reasonable because for $n > 0$, $\phi_v = n\phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch} = n\phi_{ch}^*$ can always make (50) hold according to (55), while $\phi_v$ and $\phi_{ch}$ are defined by approximately scaling $\phi_v^*$ and $\phi_{ch}^*$ respectively (see (45)). After the computation of $\Lambda_v$, we can then compute the TS $\Gamma_v$, the UF $Q_v$, and the pmf $P_{R|X}$ given by (34), (35), and (36) respectively. Till now, the MIM-QBP decoder design at VN is completed, which has a total complexity upper-bounded by $O(d_v 2^{2d_v |S|} + 2^{2d_v |R|})$ (for one decoding iteration).

After the design of the MIM-QBP decoder at VN, we can use the hardware architecture shown by Fig. 10 to implement the VN update for all outgoing messages $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_{d_v}$. The computational complexity is $O(d_v + d_v [\log_2(|R|)])$ for one VN per iteration, where $O(d_v)$ refers to the complexity of addition operations, and $O(d_v [\log_2(|R|)])$ refers to the complexity of mapping operations based on $\Gamma_v$ for the $d_v$ outgoing messages.

C. Remarks

As illustrated by Section III-D, the design of $Q_v$ is quite similar to that of $Q_v$. In particular, the same RFs $\phi_v$ and $\phi_{ch}$ can be used for the design of $Q_v$ and $Q_v$ for a given decoding.
iteration, which is due to the reason that we can derive a theorem similar to Theorem 2 for the design of $Q_c$. In addition, the condition of (47) ensures that the additions involved in the design of $Q_c$ do not overflow. Moreover, we can also derive a theorem similar to Proposition 2 and an algorithm similar to Algorithm 2 for the design of $Q_c$. At this point, the design of $Q_c$ is determined, which has a complexity of $O(d_c 2^v |S| + 2^{2q_v} |\mathcal{X}|)$ (for one decoding iteration). After the design of $Q_c$, implementing $Q_c$ for each VN for one iteration during decoding has complexity $O(d_v)$, which is equal to the complexity of addition operations.

We have finished illustrating how to practically design the MIM-QBP decoder given the parameters $P_{L|X}, L, R, S, q_c$, and $q_v$. Similar to the MIM-LUT decoder, the performance of the MIM-QBP decoder also depends greatly on the choice of $P_{L|X}$, which is essentially determined by the design noise standard deviation $\sigma_d$. Our simulation results indicate that a proper choice of $\sigma_d$ should also be around the decoding threshold $\sigma^*$. It is an open problem that whether there exists a fast method, instead of using simulations, to find the best $\sigma_d$. We find that both the MIM-LUT decoder and the MIM-QBP decoder can be designed at a certain $\sigma_d$ around $\sigma^*$ while working very well at all noise levels (noise standard deviations). Furthermore, for any noise level $\sigma$ not around $\sigma^*$, the decoder designed at $\sigma_d = \sigma$ generally work very badly even at the noise level $\sigma$ according to extensive simulation results. The essential reason for the phenomenon we observed needs to be explored in future.

Since the MIM-LUT decoder [4]–[11] only uses table lookup operations during decoding, the addition operations may be regarded as a drawback of the MIM-LUT decoder. However, thanks to the use of additions, the MIM-QBP decoder can overcome the shortcoming of the MIM-LUT decoder due to the use of LUTs (leading to either large memory requirement or error rate performance loss caused by decomposition). Moreover, the addition operations enable the MIM-QBP decoder to have simple hardware architectures shown by Figures 9 and 10 for implementing the CN and VN update, respectively. On the contrast, the MIM-LUT decoder currently still lacks a general simple architecture for implementing its node updates [26].

To end this section, we explain why we name our proposed decoder the MIM-QBP decoder. On the one hand, our decoder is essentially derived by scaling $\phi^*_c$ given by (37) and $\phi^*_c, \phi^*_c, \phi^*_c$ given by (44). According to Corollaries 1 and 2, $\phi_c = \eta_1 \phi^*_c, \phi_v = \eta_2 \phi^*_c$, and $\phi_{ch} = \eta_2 \phi^*_c$ can maximize the MI between the channel input and each node’s output, where $\eta_i$ and $\eta_i$ are two positive numbers. This is what the term “MIM” refers to. On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, we closely relate our decoder to the BP decoder during the design of RFs. In fact, our decoder works over finite alphabets in which the symbols can be regarded as the quantization outputs of messages associated with LLRs, while the BP algorithm directly works on messages represented by LLRs. This is what the term “QBP” refers to.

V. MIM-QBP DECODING FOR IRREGULAR LDPC CODES

In this section, we derive the MIM-QBP decoding for the irregular LDPC codes. This section is carried out largely based on the previous three sections which describe the MIM-QBP decoding of regular LDPC codes. We will especially illustrate the connection between the MIM-QBP LDPC decoding for regular and irregular LDPC codes.

Denote $D_c = \{d_{c,1}, d_{c,2}, \ldots, d_{c,max}\}$. Denote $D_v = \{d_{v,1}, d_{v,2}, \ldots, d_{v,max}\}$ as the sets formed by the CN and VN degrees, respectively. For convenience, let $D'_c = \{i - 1 : i \in D_c\}$ and $D'_v = \{i - 1 : i \in D_v\}$. Denote

$$\rho(x) = \sum_{i \in D_c} \rho_i x^{i-1}$$

as the CN degree distribution, where $\rho_i$ is the fractions of edges incident to the degree-$i$ CNs. Denote $\theta(x) = \sum_{i \in D_v} \theta_i x^{i-1}$ as the VN degree distribution, where $\theta_i$ are the fractions of edges incident to the degree-$i$ VNs.

Denote the average CN and VN degrees by $d_{c} = 1/\sum_{i \in D_c} \rho_i$ and $d_{v} = 1/\sum_{i \in D_v} \theta_i$ respectively. For any set $U$ and any integer set $V$, denote $U^V = \cup_{i \in V} U^i$. We now illustrate the MIM-QBP decoder design at CN and VN for the irregular LDPC codes.

A. MIM-QBP Decoder Design at CN for Irregular LDPC Codes

For the CN update for irregular LDPC codes, since the outgoing edge connects to a degree-$i$ CN with probability $\rho_i$, the incoming message $R \in \mathcal{R}^{D'_c}$ takes $\text{dim}(R) = i \in D'_c$ with probability $\rho_i$. Then, the UF

$$Q_c : \mathcal{R}^{D'_c} \rightarrow S$$

is used for the CN update for irregular LDPC codes, which includes the UF (4) for regular LDPC codes as a subcase.
when $|D_r'| = 1$. We also design $Q_v$ to maximize $I(X; S)$. This design problem is equivalent to the DMC quantization problem shown by Fig. 11.

The joint distribution $P_{R|X}(r|x)$ of $R$ conditioned on the channel input bit $X$ at a CN (i.e., the channel transition probability $P_{R|X}(r|x)$ of the DMC shown by Fig. 11) is given by

$$P_{R|X}(r|x) = \rho_{\dim(r) + 1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{d_{c,max}} + \sum_{x: r = x} \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} P_{R|X}(r_i|x_i).$$

With each incoming message realization $r \in \mathcal{R}^{d_{c}-1}$ replaced by $r \in \mathcal{R}^{d_{c}}$, we can reuse Section III-B to illustrate the MIM-QBP decoder design at a CN for irregular LDPC codes.

We now describe how to practically design the MIM-QBP decoder at a CN of irregular LDPC codes following Section IV-A. Let $\epsilon$ used in (37) satisfy ($d_{c}$ is replaced by $d_{c,max}$)

$$0 < \epsilon_{d_{c,max}} \leq \min \{ \log (|g(x)|) - \log (|g(r)|) \} : r, r' \in \mathcal{R}^{D_{r'}}, g(r) \neq g(r'), \text{sgn}(g(r)) = \text{sgn}(g(r')) \neq 0 \}.$$

We can similarly prove Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 (replacing $\mathcal{R}^{d_{c}-1}$ with $\mathcal{R}^{D_{r'}}$) for the MIM-QBP decoder for irregular LDPC codes. Accordingly, we can practically design the RF $\phi_{c}$ based on (39) with $|\phi_{c}| = [(2^{d_{c}} - 1) - 1]/d_{c,max}$. Furthermore, since Proposition 2 still holds, we can use Algorithm 1 to compute $A_i$ and $P_{A_i|X}$ for $i \in D_{r'}$ with a total complexity of $O(d_{c,max}2^{d_{c}} |\mathcal{R}|)$. Then, for the MIM-QBP decoding for irregular LDPC codes, we have

$$A = \bigcup_{i \in D_{r'}} A_i, \quad P_{A_i|X}(a|x) = \sum_{i \in D_{r'}} \rho_{i+1} P_{A_i|X}(a|x).$$

Next, based on $A$ and $P_{A_i|X}$, we can sequentially compute the optimal SDQ $\Lambda_c$, the TS $\Gamma_c$, the UF $Q_v$, and the pmf $P_{Q_v}$ given by (22)–(25), respectively. Till now, the MIM-QBP decoder design at CN for irregular LDPC codes is completed, with a total complexity of $O(d_{c,max}2^{d_{c}} |\mathcal{R}|)$ for one decoding iteration.

**B. MIM-QBP Decoder Design at VN for Irregular LDPC Codes**

For the VN update for irregular LDPC codes, since the outgoing edge connects to a degree-$i$ VN with probability $\theta_i$, the incoming message $(L, S) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}^{D_{v'}}$ takes $\dim(S) = i \in D_{v'}$ with probability $\theta_{i+1}$. Then, the UF

$$Q_v : \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}^{D_{v'}} \to \mathcal{R}$$

is used for the VN update for irregular LDPC codes, which includes the UF of (8) for regular LDPC codes as a subcase when $|D_{v'}| = 1$. We also design $Q_v$ to maximize $I(X; R)$. This design problem is equivalent to the DMC quantization problem shown by Fig. 12.
TABLE III
DESIGN COMPLEXITY AND DECODING COMPLEXITY FOR THE MIM-QBP DECODER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Func.</th>
<th>Design (1 iter.)</th>
<th>Decoding (1 node, 1 iter.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q_c)</td>
<td>(O(d_{c,max}2^{q_c}</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q_v)</td>
<td>(O(d_{v,max}2^{q_v}</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q_e)</td>
<td>(O(d_{e,max}2^{q_e}</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Remarks

Instead of using (11), the estimation function

\[ Q_e: \mathcal{L} \times S^{D_v} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \]

is used to estimate the channel input bit corresponding to each VN for irregular LDPC codes. We still ignore the details since the design of \(Q_e\) is quite similar to the design of \(Q_v\).

We now compare the designs of the MIM-QBP decoder and the MIM-LUT decoder [10, 11] for irregular LDPC codes. The idea for designing the MIM-LUT decoder for irregular LDPC codes can be analogously shown by Figures 11 and 12, where a joint design is considered over all sub-channels (i.e., the channels labelled by “Ch\(_{d_{c,v}}\)”, “Ch\(_{d_{v,c}}\)”), with each sub-channel representing a CN or VN with a specific degree. Since a single LUT for storing the UFs/quantizers \(Q_c\) and \(Q_v\) is impractical, the authors of [10] and [11] applied individual design to each sub-channel to reduce its output size. This individual design coincides with the design of the MIM-LUT decoder for regular LDPC codes, as explained in previous sections, where the decomposition technique is employed to avoid memory overflow. After the individual design, each sub-channel has a manageable output alphabet, such as \(S\) or \(R\) in [11], and then the joint design can be taken over all sub-channels. Obviously, the individual design will deteriorate the performance of the MIM-LUT decoder for irregular LDPC codes, and it also results in different LUTs for different sub-channels. Instead, the MIM-QBP decoder has no problem in dealing with all sub-channels’ original output alphabet \(R^{D_v}\) or \(\mathcal{L} \times S^{D_v}\), and the same RFs and TSs can be used for different sub-channels i.e., for the update at nodes with different degrees.

During the decoding process of the MIM-QBP decoder for irregular LDPC codes, the simple hardware architecture shown by Fig. 9 (resp. Fig. 10) can be used to implement the CN (resp. VN) update for all outgoing messages from this node. The average computational complexity is \(O(d_c + d_c[\log_2(|S|)])\) (resp. \(O(d_v + d_v[\log_2(|R|)])\)) for one CN (resp. VN) per iteration. We summarize the design complexity and decoding complexity for the MIM-QBP decoder by Table III.

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

Monte-Carlo simulations are carried out to evaluate the error rate performance of the proposed MIM-QBP decoder, assuming binary phase-shift keying (BPSK) transmission over the AWGN channel. We design the MIM-QBP decoder by fixing \(|\mathcal{L}| = |\mathcal{R}| = |S| = 8/16\) (3-/4-bit decoder) for all iterations. We specify \(q_c\) (number of bits used for the additions for CN update), \(q_v\) (number of bits used for the additions for VN update), and \(\sigma_d\) (design noise standard deviation) for each specific example. In addition, at least 100 frame errors are collected for each simulated SNR.

A. Regular Codes

Example 3: Consider the regular (6, 32) LDPC code taken from [27]. This code has length 2048 and rate 0.84. We use \((q_c, q_v) = (10, 8)/ (12, 10)\) to design the 3-/4-bit MIM-QBP decoder at \(\sigma_d = 0.5343/0.5417\), respectively.
error rate (BER) and frame error rate (FER) performance of different decoders is illustrated by Fig. 13.

We show below the details of the 3-bit MIM-QBP decoder used in the simulations related to Fig. 13(a), which is designed by using the principles presented in Sections III and IV. The correspondingly obtained 7 thresholds \( r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_7 \) used for quantizing the AWGN channel (see Section II-A) are

\[-0.702, -0.39, -0.18, 0, 0.18, 0.39, 0.702,\]

respectively. The RFs \( \phi_e, \phi_c, \) and \( \phi_{ch} \) are presented in Tables IV, V, and VI, respectively. The TSs \( \Gamma_c \) and \( \Gamma_v \) are given by Tables VII and VIII, respectively. The TSs \( \Gamma_c = \{ \gamma_1 \} \) for the estimation function \( Q_e \) for iterations 1 to 10 are

\[\gamma_1 = 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,\]

respectively.

From Tables V and VI, we can see that 7 bits are enough for implementing the additions at VN for the 3-bit MIM-QBP decoder with a maximum of 10 iterations. Issues of how to save the resource or to make a full use of the \( q_v = 8 \) bits are discussed in Section IV-B.

From Fig. 13, we observe that our proposed 4-bit MIM-QBP decoder outperforms both the 4-bit MIM-LUT decoder (i.e. the 4-bit max-LUT decoder) [4] and the floating-point BP decoder, with 10-30 iterations. Moreover, even the 3-bit MIM-QBP decoder can outperform the floating-point BP decoder at high SNR regions.

**Example 4:** Consider the regular (4, 36) LDPC code with identifier 1998.5.3.2665 taken from [28]. This code has length 1998 and rate 0.89. A maximum of 10 iterations is used. Results for the max-LUT decoders are from [4, Fig. 4]. We set \( q_c = q_v = 12 \) for the MIM-QBP decoders.

![Fig. 14. BER and FER simulation results for the (4, 36) code (with identifier 1998.5.3.2665 in [28]) of length 1998 and rate 0.89. A maximum of 10 iterations is used. Results for the max-LUT decoders are from [4, Fig. 4]. We set \( q_c = q_v = 12 \) for the MIM-QBP decoders.](image-url)
MIM-QBP decoder at $\sigma_d = 0.4801/0.4899$, respectively. The BER and FER performance of different decoders is presented by Fig. 14.

Similar to the case shown by Example 3, the 3-bit and 4-bit MIM-QBP decoders achieve better error rate performance than the corresponding 3-bit and 4-bit max-LUT decoders [4]. Again, the MIM-QBP with just 3 bits per message can outperform the floating-point BP decoder in terms of BER performance, at high SNR regions and with a maximum of 10 iterations.

**Example 5:** Consider the regular (3, 6) LDPC code with identifier 8000.4000.3.483 taken from [28]. This code has length 8000 and rate 0.5. We use $(q_c, q_v) = (9, 8)/(10, 10)$ to design the 3/4-bit MIM-QBP decoder at $\sigma_d = 0.8479/0.8660$, respectively. The BER performance of different decoders is presented by Fig. 15.

Note that the 3/4-bit non-uniform QBP decoder taken from [13] requires $(q_c, q_v) = (9, 8)/(12, 10)$, respectively. In addition, the design of the corresponding decoders involves much manual optimization, while our proposed MIM-QBP decoders are designed systematically. From Fig. 15, we observe that the 3-bit MIM-QBP decoder outperforms the 3-bit non-uniform QBP decoder [13]; meanwhile, the 4-bit MIM-QBP decoder performs comparably to the 4-bit non-uniform decoder, while it requires 2 bits less than the latter for the additions for CN update. Moreover, the 4-bit MIM-QBP decoder achieves better performance than the 4-bit discrete decoder [8], and it only lags behind the floating-point BP decoder by around 0.05 dB at the BER of $10^{-6}$.

**B. Irregular Codes**

**Example 6:** Consider the three irregular codes $C_1, C_2,$ and $C_3$ whose CN degree distributions are given by

- $\rho^{(1)}(x) = 0.052632x^6 + 0.902256x^7 + 0.045113x^8$,
- $\rho^{(2)}(x) = 0.32338x^7 + 0.67662x^8$,
- $\rho^{(3)}(x) = 0.372093x^7 + 0.627907x^8$,

and VN degree distributions are given by

- $\theta^{(1)}(x) = 0.240602x^2 + 0.210526x^3 + 0.030075x^4 + 0.125313x^5 + 0.017544x^6 + 0.375940x^{14}$,
- $\theta^{(2)}(x) = 0.13805x + 0.40104x^2 + 0.02659x^8 + 0.43433x^{16}$,
- $\theta^{(3)}(x) = 0.139535x + 0.404651x^2 + 0.020930x^8 + 0.434884x^{16}$,

respectively. The three codes have length 10000 and rate 0.5. Both of $C_1$ and $C_3$‘s parity-check matrices consist of a $50 \times 100$ array of $100 \times 100$ circulants and are constructed by using the one-edge metric-constrained quasi-cyclic progressive edge-growth algorithm [29].

Here, $C_1$ is optimized for the BP decoder, while $C_2$ is optimized by [10] for the MIM-LUT decoder [10] for irregular LDPC codes, since the MIM-LUT decoder cannot perform well with $C_1$ due to $C_1$‘s high fraction of the edges connecting to degree-2 VNs [10]. We have found that the MIM-QBP decoder also cannot perform well with $C_1$ due to the similar reasons. To fairly compare with the MIM-LUT decoder, we test the MIM-QBP decoder on $C_1$ which has similar code parameters with $C_2$. We use $q_c = q_v = 12$ to design the 3/4-bit MIM-QBP decoder at $\sigma_d = 0.8989/0.9290$, respectively. The FER performance of different decoders is presented by Fig. 16.

From Fig. 16, we observe that the 3-bit and 4-bit MIM-QBP decoders can considerably outperform the 3-bit and 4-
bit MIM-LUT decoders [10], respectively. The 4-bit MIM-QBP decoder testing on $C_3$ only lags behind the floating-BP decoder testing on $C_3$ and $C_1$ by around 0.08 dB and 0.14 dB, respectively, at the FER of $10^{-4}$.

VII. Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a method to remove the tables used for MIM-LUT decoding [4]–[11] so as to greatly reduce the memory consumption. Our method leads to the hardware-friendly MIM-QBP decoder which can be implemented based only on simple mappings and fixed-point additions. From this point of view, our decoder works similarly to those presented by [12]–[14], but instead of using manual optimization, we have shown how to practically and systematically design the MIM-QBP decoder for both regular and irregular LDPC codes. In terms of error performance, simulation results show that the MIM-QBP decoder can always considerably outperform the state-of-the-art MIM-LUT decoder [4]–[11]. Moreover, the MIM-QBP decoder has advantages over the floating-point BP decoder when

- the maximum allowed number of decoding iterations is small (generally less than 30), and/or
- the code rate is high, and/or
- the operating SNR is high.

In particular, computer simulations demonstrated that the MIM-QBP decoder with only 3-bit per message can outperform the floating-point BP decoder at high SNR regions when testing on high-rate codes with a maximum of 10–30 iterations. Therefore, the proposed MIM-QBP decoding shows high potential for practical implementation in systems that have stringent requirements on memory consumption and complexity and latency of LDPC decoders.

Appendix A

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\phi_c = \Phi_c$. For $r \in \mathcal{R}_{d_c-1}$, we have

$$g(r) = \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} g(r_i)$$

according to (6). Let

$$h(r) = |\{r_i : 1 \leq i \leq \dim(r), |g(r_i)| = 1\}|.$$

Then, we have

$$|\Phi_c(r)| = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} |\phi_c^r(r_i)|$$

$$= - \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} \log(|g(r_i)|) + h(r)\epsilon$$

$$= - \log \left( \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} |g(r_i)| \right) + h(r)\epsilon$$

$$= - \log(|g(r)|) + h(r)\epsilon. \quad (51)$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$\text{sgn}(\Phi_c(r)) = \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} \text{sgn}(\phi_c^r(r_i))$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(r)} \text{sgn}(g(r_i)) = \text{sgn}(g(r)). \quad (52)$$

For $r, r' \in \mathcal{R}_{d_c-1}$, assume $\Phi_c(r) = a_i$ and $\Phi_c(r') = a_i'$, we are now to prove

$$\frac{P_{R|X}(r[0])}{P_{R|X}(r'[0])} > \frac{P_{R|X}(r'[0])}{P_{R|X}(r[0])} \implies i < i' \quad (53)$$

We have

$$P_{R|X}(r[0])/P_{R|X}(r'[0]) > P_{R|X}(r'[0])/P_{R|X}(r[0]) \implies g(r) > g(r')$$

If $\text{sgn}(g(r)) \neq \text{sgn}(g(r'))$, we have

$$P_{R|X}(r[0])/P_{R|X}(r[1]) > P_{R|X}(r'[0])/P_{R|X}(r'[1]) \implies \text{sgn}(g(r)) > \text{sgn}(g(r'))$$

$$\implies \text{sgn}(\Phi_c(r)) > \text{sgn}(\Phi_c(r'))$$

$$\implies \Phi_c(r) > \Phi_c(r')$$

$$\implies i < i' \quad (53)$$

where (a) and (b) are based on (52) and (20). Otherwise, we have $\text{sgn}(g(r)) = \text{sgn}(g(r')) \neq 0$, leading to

$$P_{R|X}(r[0])/P_{R|X}(r[1]) > P_{R|X}(r'[0])/P_{R|X}(r'[1]) \implies \text{sgn}(g(r))[g(r)] > \text{sgn}(g(r))[g(r')]$$

$$\implies - \text{sgn}(g(r))\log(|g(r)|) < -\text{sgn}(g(r))\log(|g(r')|)$$

$$\implies \text{sgn}(g(r))(-\log(|g(r')|) + h(r)\epsilon) < \text{sgn}(g(r))(-\log(|g(r)|) + h(r)\epsilon)$$

$$\implies \Phi_c(r) < \Phi_c(r')$$

$$\implies \Phi_c(r) > \Phi_c(r')$$

$$\implies i < i' \quad (53)$$

where (c), (d) and (e) are based on (38), (51), and (20), respectively. At this point, the proof of (53) is completed.

(53) implies that elements in $\mathcal{A}$ are listed in a way (see (20)) equivalent to listing $r \in \mathcal{R}_{d_c-1}$ in descending order based on $P_{R|X}(r[0])/P_{R|X}(r[1])$ (see (2)). Therefore, $Q_c$ defined by (24) can maximize $I(X; S)$ among all the functions mapping $\mathcal{R}_{d-c-1}$ to $\mathcal{S}$ according to Section II-A.

Appendix B

Proof of Theorem 2

Let $\phi_c = \Phi_c$ and $\phi_{ch} = \Phi_{ch}$. For $(l, s) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}_{d_c-1}$, according to (29), we have

$$\Phi_c(l, s) = \log \left( \frac{P_{L|X}(l[0])}{P_{L|X}(l[1])} \prod_{i=1}^{\dim(s)} \frac{P_{S|X}(s_i[0])}{P_{S|X}(s_i[1])} \right). \quad (54)$$
Then, for \((l, s), (l', s') \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}^{d_{l}-1}\), assume \(\Phi_{v}(l, s) = b_{i}\) and \(\Phi_{v}(l', s') = b_{j}\). We have

\[
\frac{P_{L,S}X(l', s'))}{P_{L,S}X(l', s'')} > \frac{P_{L,S}X(l, s')}{P_{L,S}X(l, s'')}
\]

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{d_{l}} P_{L,S}X(s_{i}) > \prod_{i=1}^{d_{l}} P_{L,S}X(s_{i}')
\]

\[
(\Phi_{v}(l, s) > \Phi_{v}(l', s'))
\]

where \((f), (g)\) and \((h)\) hold because of \((9), (54),\) and \((31),\) respectively.

\[(55)\]

implies that elements in \(B\) are listed in a way (see \((31)\)) equivalent to listing \((l, s) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}^{d_{l}-1}\) in descending order based on \(P_{L,S}X(l, s) / P_{L,S}X(l, s')\) (see \((2)\)). Therefore, \(Q_{v}\) defined by \((35)\) can maximize \(I(X; R)\) among all the functions mapping \(\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{S}^{d_{l}-1}\) to \(\mathcal{R}\) according to Section II-A.
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