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Abstract—Due to the sequential nature of the successive-cancellation (SC) algorithm, the decoding of polar codes suffers from significant decoding latencies. Fast SC decoding is able to speed up the SC decoding process, by implementing parallel decoders at the intermediate levels of the SC decoding tree for some special nodes with specific information and frozen bit patterns. To further improve the parallelism of SC decoding, this paper present a new class of special node composed of a sequence of rate one or single-parity-check (SR1/SPC) nodes, which envelops a wide variety of existing special node types. Then, we analyse the parity constraints caused by the frozen bits in each descendant node, such that the decoding performance of the SR1/SPC node can be preserved once the parity constraints are satisfied. Finally, a generalized fast SC decoding algorithm is proposed for the SR1/SPC node, where the corresponding parity constraints are taken into consideration. Simulation results show that compared with the state-of-the-art fast SC decoding algorithms, the proposed decoding algorithm achieves a higher degree of parallelism, especially for high-rate polar codes, without tangibly altering the error-correction performance.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Polar codes are a class of error correction codes which are theoretically proved to have capacity-achieving capabilities under binary-input memoryless channels [1]. Due to the capacity-achieving error-correction performance and low-complexity successive cancellation (SC) based algorithm, polar codes are adopted in the control channel of the enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB) use case in the latest 5G cellular standard [2]. However, there are two main drawbacks associated with the SC decoding algorithm. First, according to the polarization theory [11], polar codes under SC decoding can achieve the channel capacity only when the code length tends toward infinity. As a result, SC decoding falls short in providing a reasonable error-correction performance for practical moderate code lengths. Second, the sequential bit-by-bit nature of SC decoding leads to high decoding latency and low throughput in terms of hardware implementation, which hinders its application in low-latency communication scenarios such as the ultra-reliable low-latency communication (URLLC) [4] use case of 5G.

The first drawback mentioned above is mainly due to the fact that SC decoding is suboptimal with respect to maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding. To partially compensate for this sub-optimality, an SC list (SCL) decoding algorithm was presented in [4], which maintains a list of candidate codewords at the cost of increased implementation complexity [5]. By concatenating polar codes with simple cyclic redundancy check (CRC), it was observed that the performance of the SCL decoder can be significantly improved [6]. With a large list size, the decoding performance provided by the CRC-aided SCL (CA-SCL) decoder can approach that of the ML decoder, which makes polar codes competitive with the other state-of-the-art channel codes, such as low-density parity-check (LDPC) and turbo codes [7].

The second drawback stems from the sequential nature of SC decoding. To tackle this issue, many parallel decoding schemes have been developed for polar codes [8]-[19]. The main idea behind these schemes is to decode at the intermediate levels of the SC or SCL decoding tree, instead of the leaf nodes. In particular, it was shown in [8] that ML decoding of the intermediate nodes can be employed to parallelize the SC decoding. Similarly, an exhaustive search based decoding algorithm called multi-bit decision was proposed in [9], [10], which measures the likelihood of each possible codewords of the intermediate nodes and is able to avoid the traversal of the complete decoding tree. However, these schemes are only suitable for nodes with short lengths. On the contrary, the work [11] proposed a low-complexity simplified SC (SSC) decoding algorithm for certain frozen bit patterns. In particular, a rate zero (Rate-0) node without information bits or a rate one (Rate-1) node without frozen bits can be decoded efficiently without exploring the complete SC decoding tree, i.e., the output codeword of a Rate-0 node is always an all-zero vector, and the output codeword of a Rate-1 node can be directly obtained by performing hard decisions on the log-likelihood ratio (LLR) vector. Likewise, single-parity-check (SPC) and repetition (REP) nodes along with their fast decoding techniques were proposed in [12], which is known as the fast SSC (FSSC) decoding algorithm. Furthermore, the work [13] advanced the studies in [11] and [12] by proposing fast decoders for five new types of special nodes, namely the Type I-V nodes, which further reduces the SC decoding latency. In [14], a generalized REP (G-REP) node and a generalized parity-check (G-PC) node were proposed to reduce the latency of SC decoding even further. Moreover, the identification and utilization of the aforementioned special nodes were also extended to SCL decoding [15]-[18]. However, all these works require the design of a separate decoder for each class of nodes, which inevitably increases the implementation complexity. In [19], a class of sequence...
Rate-0/REP (SR0/REP) nodes was proposed which provides a unified description of most of the existing special nodes.
With the introduction of SR0/REP nodes, a generalized fast SC decoding algorithm was proposed to achieve a higher degree of parallelism without degrading the error-correction performance.

In this paper, a new fast SC decoding algorithm is proposed to further reduce the decoding latency of polar codes. First, a new class of multi-node information and frozen bit patterns is introduced, which is composed of a sequence of Rate-1 or SPC (SR1/SPC) nodes, and thus provides a unified description of a wide variety of existing special nodes. The proposed SR1/SPC node is typically found at higher levels of the decoding tree, thus a higher degree of parallelism can be exploited as compared to the existing special nodes. Then, we investigate the impact of the frozen bits contained in the proposed SR1/SPC node, which leads to two types of parity constraints that are imposed on the decoded codeword. Furthermore, a simple and efficient decoding algorithm is proposed to decode the proposed SR1/SPC node, which can achieve a high degree of parallelism without error-correction performance degradation. By combining the proposed SR1/SPC nodes with other types of special nodes, such as the SR0/REP nodes [19], we show that the overall decoding latency can be reduced by 36.1% and 58.6% as compared to the state-of-the-art SC decoder and the renowned FSSC decoder [12], respectively.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews the backgrounds on polar codes, SC decoding, and fast SC decoding techniques. In Section III we introduce the SR1/SPC node, and then analyse the induced parity constraints. Fast SC decoding of the proposed SR1/SPC node is presented in Section IV. Section V provides simulation results to evaluate the decoding performance and latency. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

Notations: Scalars, vectors, and matrices are respectively denoted by lower case, boldface lower case, and boldface upper case letters. \( I_N \) and \( 0_N \) denote the \( N \times N \) identity matrix and the \( N \times N \) all-zero matrix, respectively. For a matrix \( A \), \( (A)_i \) represents its \( i \)-th column vector. \( \lfloor \cdot \rfloor \) and \( \lfloor \cdot \rfloor \) denote the round-up and round-down operations, respectively. For an arbitrary vector \( a \), \( a[i : k : j] \) represents a subvector of \( a \) which is constructed by \( \{a[i], a[i + k], \ldots, a[i + mk]\} \), where \( k \) is the step size and \( m \) is the length of the subvector. If \( k = 1 \), \( a[i : k : j] \) is simply written as \( a[i : j] \), \( \text{sgn}(a) \) denotes the sign of a scalar \( a \) and \( \min(a) \) returns the minimum element in a vector \( a \). Besides, \( \oplus \) denotes the bitwise XOR operation and \( \otimes \) denotes the Kronecker product. \( A^{\otimes n} \) denotes the \( n \)-th Kronecker power of \( A \).

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Polar Codes

A polar code with code length \( N = 2^n \) and information length \( K \) can be represented as \( \mathcal{P}(N, K) \), which has code rate \( R = K/N \). The transmitted polar codeword \( x = (x[1], x[2], \ldots, x[N]) \) is obtained by \( x = uG_N \), where \( u = (u[1], u[2], \ldots, u[N]) \) is the message vector and \( G_N = F^{\otimes n} \) is the generator matrix with \( F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \) being the base polarizing matrix. The message vector \( u \) is constructed by choosing \( K \) bit-channels with high reliability to transmit information bits, while the remaining \( N - K \) bits are frozen to some fixed values (usually set to 0). With the help of an indicator vector \( c = (c[1], c[2], \ldots, c[N]) \), we are able to distinguish information and frozen bit-channels according to

\[
c[k] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k \in A \\ 0, & \text{if } k \in A^c \end{cases},
\]

where \( A \) and \( A^c \) denote the sets of information and frozen bits indices, respectively, which are both known to the encoder and decoder. The codeword vector \( x \) is then modulated and transmitted over the channel. Throughout this paper, we consider binary phase shift keying (BPSK) modulation and additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel.

B. SC Decoding

SC decoding originated in [1] is a greedy search algorithm for decoding polar codes, and only the best decoding result is reserved in each decoding step. The decoding procedure of SC can be interpreted as a binary tree search process that starts from the root node to the leaf node and from the left branch to the right. At the \( p \)-th (0 \leq p \leq n) level of the decoding tree, each parent node, referred as \( N_p \), has a left child node \( N_{p+1} \) and a right child node \( N_{p+1}^c \), where \( 1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-p} \).

There are two types of messages, i.e., the soft LLRs \( \alpha_p^{(1)}[1 : 2^p] \) and a right child node \( \alpha_p^{(2)}[1 : 2^p] \) that are propagated from the parent node to their child nodes, and the hard codeword \( \beta_p^{(1)}[1 : 2^p] \) that is propagated from the child nodes to their parent node in return. The \( 2^p \) LLRs of the left child node \( \alpha_{p+1}^{(1)}[1 : 2^{p+1}] \) and those of the right child node \( \alpha_{p+1}^{(2)}[1 : 2^{p+1}] \) can be respectively obtained by

\[
\alpha_p^{(1)}[1] = \text{sgn}(\alpha_p^{(1)}[k]) \text{sgn}(\alpha_p^{(1)}[k + 2^{p-1}]) \times \min(\alpha_p^{(1)}[k], \alpha_p^{(1)}[k + 2^{p-1}])),
\]

\[
\alpha_p^{(2)}[1] = \alpha_p^{(2)}[k + 2^{p-1}] + (1 - 2\beta_{p-1}^{(1)}[k])\alpha_p^{(2)}[k],
\]

where \( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{p-1}\} \). Besides, the hard codeword of \( N_{p+1} \), i.e., \( \beta_p^{(1)}[1 : 2^p] \), is calculated based on the hard codewords of \( N_{p-1}^{2^p} \) and \( N_{p-1}^{2^p-1} \) as follows:

\[
\beta_p^{(1)}[k] = \begin{cases} \beta_{p-1}^{(2)}[k] \oplus \beta_{p-1}^{(1)}[k], & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq 2^{p-1} \\ \beta_{p-1}^{(1)}[k], & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.
\]

At the leaf level \( p = 0 \), bit \( u[k] \) can be estimated by performing hard decision on \( \alpha_0^{(1)}[1] \) according to

\[
\hat{u}[k] = \beta_0^{(1)}[1] = \text{HD}(\alpha_0^{(1)}[1]) = \begin{cases} 1 - \text{sgn}(\alpha_0^{(1)}[1]), & \text{if } k \in A \\ 0, & \text{if } k \in A^c \end{cases},
\]

where \( \hat{u}[k] \) is the estimate of \( u[k] \) and \( \text{HD}(\cdot) \) is the hard decision function.
traversing the entire decoding tree. Based on this idea, the work [8] presented a highly parallel ML decoder to estimate the codeword of node $N_p^i$, i.e.,

$$\beta_p^i[1 : 2^p] = \arg \max_{\beta_p^i[1 : 2^p]} \sum_{k=1}^{2^p} (-1)^{\beta_p^i[k]} \alpha_p^i[k], \quad (6)$$

where $\beta_p^i$ is the set of all codewords associated with node $N_p^i$. However, the complexity of solving (6) can be very high, especially for nodes with long lengths. Therefore, the work [12] proposed the FSSC decoding algorithm, based on the discovery that the calculation of (6) can be significantly simplified for some nodes with special information and frozen bit patterns. In particular, four types of special nodes, i.e., Rate-0, Rate-1, REP and SPC, are considered in the FSSC decoder, and their structures are described as follows:

- **Rate-0**: all bits are frozen bits, $c = \{0, 0, \ldots, 0\}$.
- **Rate-1**: all bits are information bits, $c = \{1, 1, \ldots, 1\}$.
- **REP**: all bits are frozen bits except the rightmost one, $c = \{0, \ldots, 0, 1\}$.
- **SPC**: all bits are frozen bits except the leftmost one, $c = \{0, 1, \ldots, 1\}$.

Moreover, the work [13] further improved the FSSC decoding speed by investigating five additional special nodes along with their efficient SC decoders. The five additional special nodes are summarized as follows:

- **Type-I**: all bits are frozen bits except the rightmost two, $c = \{0, \ldots, 0, 1, 1\}$.
- **Type-II**: all bits are frozen bits except the rightmost three, $c = \{0, \ldots, 0, 1, 1, 1\}$.
- **Type-III**: all bits are information bits except the leftmost two, $c = \{0, 0, 1, \ldots, 1\}$.
- **Type-IV**: all bits are information bits except the leftmost three, $c = \{0, 0, 0, 1, \ldots, 1\}$.
- **Type-V**: all bits are frozen bits except the rightmost three and the fifth-to-last, $c = \{0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1\}$.

In [14], two types of generalized fast decoding techniques for G-REP and G-PC nodes were introduced. G-REP is a node at level $p$ with all its descendants being Rate-0 nodes, except the rightmost one at a certain level $q < p$, which is a generic node of rate $C$ ($0 \leq C < 1$). Similarly, G-PC is a node at level $p$ having all its descendants as Rate-1 nodes except the leftmost one at a certain level $q < p$, which is a Rate-0 node.

Recently, the work [19] proposed a new class of multi-node information and frozen bit patterns, namely SR0/REP node, which includes most of the existing special nodes as special cases. For an SR0/REP node at level $p$, all its descendants are Rate-0 or REP nodes except the rightmost one at level $q$, which is a generic source node. The general structure of the SR0/REP node is depicted in Fig. 1 where $N_q^{R_q}$ denotes the source node at level $q$ with $R_q = 2^{p-q}$. Note that an SR0/REP node will reduce to a G-REP node if all its descendants except the source nodes are Rate-0 nodes.

An SR0/REP node can be decoded based on the codeword of its source node. Let $s_l = \{s_l[1], \ldots, s_l[2^p-1]\}$ denote the repetition sequence given by

$$s_l = [\eta_q, 1] \otimes [\eta_{q+1}, 1] \otimes \cdots \otimes [\eta_{p-1}, 1], \quad l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |S|\}, \quad (7)$$

where $S$ denotes the set containing all possible $s_t$, and $\eta_{r}$ denotes the rightmost bit value of the descendant R0/REP node $N_r^{R_{r-1}}$ at level $r$, i.e.,

$$\eta_k = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } N_r^{R_{r-1}} \text{ is Rate-0} \\ 1 - 2 \beta_{k_{R_{r-1}}-1}[2^k], & \text{if } N_r^{R_{r-1}} \text{ is REP} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Note that $s_l$ can be pre-determined based on the SR0/REP node structure before decoding. Let $\alpha_{q_{R_q}}[1 : 2^p]$ represent the LLR vector of the source node associated with $s_l$, then in order to decode an SR0/REP node, the LLRs of the source node are first calculated as

$$\alpha_{q_{R_q}}[k] = \sum_{m=1}^{2^q} \alpha_{p_{(m-1)2^q+k}}[s_l[m]], \quad k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^q\}, \quad (9)$$

Then, the optimal decoding path index $\hat{l}$ can be selected according to

$$\hat{l} = \arg \max_{l \in \{1, \ldots, |S|\}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^q} |\alpha_{q_{R_q}}[k]|. \quad (10)$$

Subsequently, the source node is decoded to obtain $\beta_{q_{R_q}}[k]$ using $\alpha_{q_{R_q}}[1 : 2^p]$. In particular, fast decoding techniques can be utilized if the source node has a special structure, otherwise the plain SC decoding is used. Finally, the decoding result of the SR0/REP node is obtained by

$$\beta_{p}^{i}[k : 2^p] = \beta_{q_{R_q}}[k] \oplus s_l, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^p\}. \quad (11)$$

Compared with the plain SC decoding, all of the aforementioned fast SC decoding algorithms can preserve the decoding performance with reduced latency by exploiting the special structure of the nodes at intermediate levels of the decoding tree. As a result, if the level of the special node to be decoded is higher, the decoding speed would be faster, but the decoding algorithm might be more difficult to be conducted since the associated bit pattern is more complicated.

**III. SEQUENCE RATE-1 OR SPC NODES**

In this section, we introduce a new special node, known as the SR1/SPC node, which is characterized by a source node
combined with a sequence of Rate-1 or SPC nodes. Then, we characterize the parity constraints induced by the proposed special node that should be satisfied in order to facilitate fast decoding without performance degradation.

A. Node Structure

Similar to the SR0/REP node [19], the proposed SR1/SPC node is defined as any node at stage \( p \) whose descendants are all Rate-1 or SPC nodes, except the leftmost one at a certain stage \( q \) with \( 0 \leq q \leq p \). The leftmost node is referred as the source node, which is a generic node of rate \( C \). For illustration purpose, the structure of the SR1/SPC node is depicted in Fig. 2.

Given an SR1/SPC node, denoted by \( NS(p, q, \mathcal{L}) \), it is characterized by three key parameters, where \( p \) is the root node level, \( q \) is the source node level, and \( \mathcal{L} \) represents a level index set which consists of the level indices of each descendant SPC node, i.e., \( \mathcal{L} = \{ r | N_{r+1}^L \text{ is an SPC node, } q \leq r < p \} \) with \( L_r = 2^{p-r}(i-1)+1 \). Without loss of generality, we assume that the level indices are sorted in ascending order. For instance, a \( \mathcal{P}(32,27) \) polar code with

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{REP} & \quad \text{SPC} & \quad \text{SPC} & \quad \text{Rate-1} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

can be represented as an SR1/SPC node with \( NS(5,2,\{2,3\}) \). Note that in case \( \mathcal{L} = \{ p, p-1, \ldots, q+1 \} \) or \( \mathcal{L} = \emptyset \), an SR1/SPC node is reduced to a sequence Rate-1 (SR1) or a sequence SPC (SSPC) node, respectively.

Since the source node can be any generic node, most of the existing special nodes can be viewed as special cases of the proposed SR1/SPC node. For example, the G-PC and Type IV nodes can be seen as special cases of the SR1 node with the source node being Rate-0 and REP, respectively. Besides, it is worth mentioning that exploring other types of source nodes and descendant nodes may lead to the discovery of more special node types that can be decoded efficiently, however further exploration is left for future work.

B. Induced Parity Constraints

As pointed out in [14], each frozen bit at the leaf level of the decoding tree will impose a parity constraint on the possible codewords at the intermediate levels. For an arbitrary SR1/SPC node, the parity constraints induced by the frozen bits in the source node can be obtained as follows:

**Theorem 1.** For an SR1/SPC node \( N_p^q \), the source node at level \( q \) will impose the following \( 2^q \) parallel parity constraints \((P-PC)\) on the root node at level \( p \):

\[
\bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^{p-q}} \beta_j^p[(j-1)2^q+k] = \beta_q^{L_q}[k], \quad k \in \{1,2,\ldots,2^q\}. \quad (12)
\]

**Proof.** See Appendix A. \( \square \)

For an SR1 node, since there is no other frozen bit except for those in the source node, we do not need to consider other parity constraints except the P-PCs in (12). However, for a general SR1/SPC node, each of its descendant SPC node will induce an additional parity constraint on its root node, which is shown as follows:

**Theorem 2.** For an SR1/SPC node \( N_p^q \), the descendant SPC node at level \( r \), i.e., \( N_r^{L_r+1} \), will impose a segmental parity constraint \((S-PC)\) on the root node at level \( p \), which is given by

\[
\bigoplus_{k=1}^{2^q} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^{p-r-1}} \beta_j^p[(2j-1)2^r+k] = 0. \quad (13)
\]

**Proof.** See Appendix B. \( \square \)

According to Theorems 1 and 2, in order to decode an SR1/SPC node, the aforementioned two types of parity constraints, i.e., P-PCs and S-PCs, derived from the source and descendant SPC nodes, should both be taken into consideration. For illustration purpose, Fig. 3 depicts all the P-PCs and S-PCs of an SR1/SPC node denoted by \( NS(5,2,\{2,3\}) \). It can be observed that the source node with length 4 imposes 4 P-PCs on the root node, while the descendant SPC nodes at levels 2 and 3 introduce two separate S-PCs. Besides, we note that the P-PCs introduce parity constraints on the root bits that are equally spaced in \( \beta_p^q[1 : 2^p] \), whereas the bits involved in the S-PCs are located in different segments of the root node.

**Remark 1.** It should be noted that the properties (37) and (38) in Appendices A and B are not limited to the proposed SR1/SPC nodes. In particular, for the source node at level \( q \), (37) is valid regardless of the node structure. By substituting the parity constraints associated with \( \beta_q^{L_q}[1 : 2^q] \) into (37) (e.g., \( \bigoplus_{k=1}^{2^q} \beta_q^{L_q}[k] = 0 \) if the source node is an SPC node), we can derive a generic parity constraint for \( \beta_p^q[1 : 2^p] \). However, in this paper, we choose to directly calculate \( \beta_q^{L_q}[1 : 2^q] \) to reduce the difficulty/complexity of decoding the root node. Likewise, (38) is also valid for other descendant node types.

In this paper, we only consider descendant Rate-1 nodes (which incur no parity constraints since they do not contain any frozen bits) and SPC nodes (which lead to the S-PCs as shown in Theorem 2).
IV. FAST SC DECODING

In this section, fast SC decoding algorithms are proposed to decode the SR1/SPC node with high degree of parallelism. First, the decoding of two special cases of the SR1/SPC node, i.e., the SR1 node and the SSPC node, are considered where the introduced P-PCs and S-PCs are taken into consideration, respectively. Then, a generalized decoding algorithm for SR1/SPC nodes is proposed. Finally, the decoding latencies of SR1/SPC nodes is to flip the hard decision bits at the root node should satisfy the P-PCs and S-PCs are taken into consideration.

A. Decoding of SR1 nodes

The results in Theorems 1 and 2 indicate that the decoding output of SR1/SPC node should satisfy the P-PCs and S-PCs simultaneously, and these constraints actually reduce the codeword space $B_{\alpha}$ in (6). In essence, the principle of decoding an SR1/SPC node is to flip the hard decision bits at the root level such that the P-PCs and S-PCs are not violated, and meanwhile the ML rule in (6) is satisfied. In the following, we present an efficient decoding algorithm for SR1 nodes.

An SR1 node can be decoded using $2^r$ parallel Wagner decoders [20]. First, we divide both the LLRs and codeword of the SR1 node into $2^r$ parts such that

$$ \alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^r-q \right] = \alpha_{k}^{p} \left[ 2^r : 2^q \right], \quad k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^q\},$$

$$ \beta_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^r-q \right] = \beta_{k}^{p} \left[ 2^r : 2^q \right], \quad k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^q\},$$

where $\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^r-q \right]$ denotes the LLR subvector associated with the $k$-th P-PC, and $\beta_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^r-q \right]$ represents the corresponding codeword of $\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^r-q \right]$. Then, the LLR vector $\alpha_{q}^{L-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^q \right]$ of the source node can be obtained by

$$ \alpha_{q}^{L-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^q \right] = \prod_{j=1}^{2^r-q} \text{sgn} (\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ j \right]) \min (|\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^r-q \right]|),$$

$$ k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^q\}. $$

Subsequently, the source node is decoded either by plain SC decoding, or by fast decoding techniques if it has a special pattern, to obtain the codeword $\beta_{q}^{L-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^q \right]$. According to Theorem 1, each LLR sub-vector $\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^r-q \right]$ can be interpreted as an SPC subcode and the corresponding codeword should satisfy the parity check $\beta_{q}^{L-PC} \left[ 1 : 2^q \right]$. In particular, parity check and bit-flipping will be performed by the Wagner decoder to decode these SPC subcodes. For the $k$-th SPC subcode, the parity check of the $k$-th P-PC, denoted by $\gamma_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ k \right]$, and the least reliable position for bit-flipping, denoted by $\eta \left[ k \right]$, are respectively determined by

$$ \gamma_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ k \right] = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^r-q} \text{HD} (\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ j \right]) \oplus \beta_{q}^{L-PC} \left[ k \right],$$

$$ \eta \left[ k \right] = \arg \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, 2^r-q\}} \alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ j \right].$$

Finally, each codeword bit of the SR1 node is obtained via hard decision, i.e.,

$$ \beta_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ j \right] = \begin{cases} \text{HD} (\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ j \right]) \oplus \gamma_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ k \right], & \text{if } j = \eta \left[ k \right] \\ \text{HD} (\alpha_{k}^{P-PC} \left[ j \right]), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

The decoding procedure of SR1 nodes is summarized in Algorithm 1. Note that the identification of the source node can be performed offline before decoding, according to (18).

In Algorithm 1, the source node is decoded according to its type (lines 1-5). In particular, in case it is an Rate-0 node,
its codeword can be obtained directly (line 2) since there is no information bit to be estimated. Otherwise, LLR calculation is performed (line 4), followed by a specific decoding procedure to obtain the codeword of the source node (line 5). Since the source node might be composed of one or several special nodes, the fast decoding techniques in [11]–[13], [19], can be applied. Finally, in line 6, \( 2^q \) parallel Wagner decoders are implemented to decode the root node according to (18). Since SR1 nodes only contain P-PCs, the proposed decoding algorithm is optimal, which means that there is no performance loss as compared to ML decoding.

B. Decoding of SSPC nodes

For SSPC nodes, the P-PCs as well as \( p-q \) additional S-PCs should be taken into consideration, according to Theorems 1 and 2. However, each S-PC is dependent on the P-PCs and other S-PCs due to the bits in common, which makes it difficult for efficient decoding since flipping one bit may impact the parity checks of both P-PCs and S-PCs. To tackle this issue, we propose to consider the P-PCs first and ignore the S-PCs temporarily. To this end, an SSPC node can be viewed as an SR1 node and is decoded using Algorithm 1. Then, the obtained codeword should undergo bit-flipping operations to satisfy the S-PCs. In the following, we will show how to flip the bits of the codeword obtained via Algorithm 1 to fulfill the ML rule and S-PCs simultaneously.

Similar to (14), we first divide the LLRs and codeword of the SSPC node into \( 2^p-q \) parts such that

\[
\alpha_k^{S-PC}[1 : 2^q] = \alpha_k^p[(k-1)2^q + 1 : k2^q], \\
\beta_k^{S-PC}[1 : 2^q] = \beta_k^p[(k-1)2^q + 1 : k2^q],
\]

where \( k \) denotes the segment index, \( \alpha_k^{S-PC}[1 : 2^q] \) denotes the LLR subvector associated with the root bits from \( (k-1)2^q + 1 \) to \( k2^q \) in the \( k \)-th segment, and \( \beta_k^{S-PC}[1 : 2^q] \) represents the corresponding codeword of \( \alpha_k^{S-PC}[1 : 2^q] \). Then, we say an SSPC node is of order \( p-q \) if there are \( p-q \) S-PCs that should be fulfilled, and let \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p-q] \) denote the parity check vector of these S-PCs, which can be calculated based on Theorem 2 as follows:

\[
\gamma_{S-PC}[t] = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^p-q-t} \bigoplus_{k=1}^{2^q} \beta_j^p((2j-1)2^{q-t}+1+k) \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^p-q-t} \bigoplus_{k=(2j-1)2^{q-t}+1}^{2^q} \beta_k^{S-PC}[m],
\]

\[ t = r - q + 1 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p-q\}. \]

Note that \( \gamma_{S-PC}[t] \) is able to indicate whether the \( t \)-th S-PC is satisfied or not, since a satisfied S-PC leads to an even check and an unsatisfied one leads to the opposite. Besides, for an arbitrary even numbers of segments, the \( m \)-th bits in these segments should be flipped to maintain the \( m \)-th P-PCs \((m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^q\})\). Thus, let \( \mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2, m\} \) denote a flip coordinate set, which indicates a pair of bit positions to be flipped, i.e., \( \beta_{k_1}^{S-PC}[m] \) and \( \beta_{k_2}^{S-PC}[m] \), where \( k_1, k_2 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^p-q\} \) are segment indices and \( k_1 < k_2 \).

For simplicity, we drop the bit index \( m \) and \( \mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2, m\} \) is simply written as \( \mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2\} \) in the following. Based on \( \mathcal{E} \), we are able to determine the feasible flip coordinates and flipping the corresponding bits can correct the S-PCs with odd checks without violating the P-PCs.

As mentioned above, a feasible flip coordinate should correct the odd S-PC checks while maintain the even ones. Therefore, for a feasible flip coordinate \( \mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2\} \), only one of the two segment indices should be involved in the S-PCs with odd checks. Besides, \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) should both be involved or not involved by the remaining S-PCs such that these S-PC checks can be maintained. For simplicity, we say two segments are equivalent if they are both involved or not involved in the \( t \)-th S-PC. On the contrary, two segments are not equivalent if only one of them is involved in the \( t \)-th S-PC. From (20), we can readily determine whether a segment is related to the \( t \)-th S-PC or not. Specifically, segments with indices in

\[
\mathcal{I}_t = \{2^{t-1} + 1, 2^{t-1} + 2, \ldots, 2^q\},
\]

\[
\{2(j-1)2^{t-1} + 1, (2j-1)2^{t-1} + 2, \ldots, j2^q, j \in \mathbb{Z}\},
\]

\[
2^p-q - 2^t + 1, 2^p-q - 2^t + 2, \ldots, 2^p-q - 2^t - 1\}
\]

are involved in the \( t \)-th S-PC, whereas those with indices in

\[
\mathcal{I}'_t = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{t-1}\},
\]

\[
\{j-1)2^{t-1} + 1, (j-1)2^{t-1} + 2, \ldots, 2(j-1)2^{t-1} + 2, \ldots, j2^q, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}.
\]

are not involved, where \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^p-q-t\} \). By identifying the segments that impact each S-PC, we can obtain the following theorem to determine whether two segments are equivalent or not.

**Theorem 3.** For the \( t \)-th S-PC, segments \( k + \mu 2^t \) with \( \mu \in \{-k/2^t, \ldots, (2^p-q-k)/2^t\} \setminus \{0\} \) are equivalent to segment \( k \). Besides, segments \( k + (2\nu - 1)2^{t-1} \) with \( \nu \in \{-k/2^t + 1/2, \ldots, (2^p-q-k)/2^t + 1/2\} \) are not equivalent to segment \( k \).

**Proof.** Refer to Appendix C.

**Theorem 3** implies that applying bit-flipping on the coordinate \( \{k, k + \mu 2^t\} \) is able to maintain the \( t \)-th S-PC, while performing bit-flipping on \( \{k, k + (2\nu - 1)2^{t-1}\} \) changes the \( t \)-th S-PC. For the special case that \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p-q] = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, 1) \), the feasible flip coordinates can be determined by resorting to the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** For SSPC nodes, the feasible flip coordinates associated with \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p-q] = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, 1) \) are

\[
\mathcal{E} = \{k, k + 2^p-q, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^p-q-1\}\}
\]

**Proof.** A feasible flip coordinate must contain the indices of two equivalent segments in order to maintain the S-PCs with even checks from \( t = 1 \) to \( t = p-q - 1 \). Besides, if the parity check of the \( p-q \)-th S-PC is odd, then it must be corrected by flipping two inequivalent segments. Starting from \( t = 1 \), the indices of involved and uninvolved segments can be respectively obtained as \( \mathcal{I}_1 = \{2, 4, 6, \ldots, 2^{p-q}\} \) and
Lemma 2. For SSPC nodes, given a feasible flip coordinate \( \mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2\} \) associated with \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p-q-1] \), if the parity check of the additional \((p-q)\)-th S-PC is even, i.e., \( \gamma_{S-PC}[p-q] = 0 \), then the following two flip coordinates associated with \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p-q] \) are feasible:
\[
\mathcal{E}_1 = \{k_1, k_2\}, \\
\mathcal{E}_2 = \{k_1 + 2^{p-q-1}, k_2 + 2^{p-q-1}\}. 
\]

Proof. For the \((p-q)\)-th S-PC whose parity check is even, the two segment indices in a feasible flip coordinate should be equivalent, while keeping the parity checks of the other S-PCs unchanged. It can be observed from (21) and (22) that \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) are both involved in the \((p-q)\)-th S-PC, while \( k_1 + 2^{p-q-1} \) and \( k_2 + 2^{p-q-1} \) are both involved, thus \( \mathcal{E}_1 = \{k_1 + 2^{p-q-1}, k_2\} \) and \( \mathcal{E}_2 = \{k_1, k_2 + 2^{p-q-1}\} \) can correct the parity check of the \((p-q)\)-th S-PC. Besides, according to Theorem 3 segments \( k \) and \( k + 2^{p-q-1} \) are equivalent for the \(t\)-th S-PC with \( t \leq p-q-1 \), which means that both \( \mathcal{E}_1 = \{k_1 + 2^{p-q-1}, k_2\} \) and \( \mathcal{E}_2 = \{k_1, k_2 + 2^{p-q-1}\} \) will not violate the other S-PCs. Therefore, \( \mathcal{E}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{E}_2 \) are feasible for the new SSPC node of order \( p-q \) can be constructed based on the original one of order \( p-q-1 \), which are shown as follows:

Lemma 3. For SSPC nodes, given a feasible flip coordinate \( \mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2\} \) associated with \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p-q-1] \), if the parity check of the additional \((p-q)\)-th S-PC is odd, i.e., \( \gamma_{S-PC}[p-q] = 1 \), then the following two flip coordinates associated with \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p-q] \) are feasible:
\[
\mathcal{E}_1 = \{k_1 + 2^{p-q-1}, k_2\}, \\
\mathcal{E}_2 = \{k_1, k_2 + 2^{p-q-1}\}. 
\]
Then, we select the optimal flip coordinate that has the least penalty metric for bit-flipping, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}} \doteq \arg \min_{\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{S-PC}}} \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}.$$ (27)

Finally, for the codeword obtained from Algorithm 1 bit-flipping operations are performed on the pair of bit positions determined by $\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}}$, which are shown as follows:

$$\beta_{k_1}^{\text{S-PC}}[m] = \beta_{k_2}^{\text{S-PC}}[m] \oplus 1,$$
$$\beta_{k_2}^{\text{S-PC}}[m] = \beta_{k_2}^{\text{S-PC}}[m] \oplus 1.$$ (28)

Based on Algorithms 1 and 2 the overall decoding procedure of SSCP nodes is summarized in Algorithm 3 As can be seen, an SSCP node is first decoded using Algorithm 1 (line 1) to obtain the codeword $\beta_{k_1}^{\text{S-PC}}[1:2^p]$, and at this point the P-PCs of the SSCP node are satisfied. Then, the parity checks of the S-PCs $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[1:p-q]$ are calculated (line 2). In case that all the S-PCs are satisfied (depending on the channel conditions), which indicates that the current codeword $\beta_{k_1}^{\text{S-PC}}[1:2^p]$ is optimal, then the whole algorithm is terminated. Otherwise, bit-flipping operations on $\beta_{k_1}^{\text{S-PC}}[1:2^p]$ are required to correct the odd S-PC checks (lines 3-8), i.e., flipping a pair of bits on $\beta_{k_1}^{\text{S-PC}}[1:2^p]$ associated with the flip coordinate. All the feasible flip coordinates are contained in the flipping set which can be determined using Algorithm 2 (line 4). Note that by taking all possible values of $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[1:p-q]$ into consideration, all the flipping sets associated with $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[1:p-q]$ can be generated offline before decoding. Thus, for a specific vector consists of the S-PC checks, the corresponding flipping set can be determined instantly during decoding. For each feasible flip coordinate in the flipping set, we evaluate its penalty metric according to (26) (lines 5-6). Then, the optimal flip coordinate is selected by comparing these penalty metrics (line 7). Finally, the pair of bits indicated by the optimal flip coordinate are flipped to obtain the final codeword vector (line 8).

### C. Decoding of SR1/SPC nodes

As an general case of SSCP nodes, the decoding of an SR1/SPC node is similar to that of an SSCP node, which should take both P-PCs and S-PCs into consideration. However, in the case of $0 < |L| < p-q$, the flipping set of an SR1/SPC node is different from that of an SPC node since fewer S-PCs are involved. For an SR1/SPC node, each SPC check $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[t]$ can be obtained according to its descendant special node at level $r$, i.e.,

$$\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[t] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } N_r^{L_r+1} \text{ is an SPC node} \\ -1, & \text{if } N_r^{L_r+1} \text{ is a Rate-1 node} \end{cases}.$$ (29)

where $-1$ indicates that the descendant node $N_r^{L_r+1}$ has no SPC as it is a Rate-1 node, and this also means that the number of feasible flip coordinates is larger. Similar to the results in Lemmas 1 and 2 the feasible flip coordinates for SR1/SPC nodes can also be constructed by a recursion procedure, by considering an additional case which is given as follows.

**Lemma 4.** For SR1/SPC nodes, given a feasible flip coordinate $\mathcal{E} = (k_1, k_2)$ ($k_1, k_2 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{p-q-1}\}$) associated with $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[1:p-q-1]$, if the additional $(p-q)$-th descendant node is Rate-1, i.e., $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[p-q] = -1$, the following four feasible flip coordinates associated with $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[1:p-q]$ are feasible:

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = (k_1, k_2),$$
$$\mathcal{E}_2 = (k_1 + 2^{p-q-1}, k_2),$$
$$\mathcal{E}_3 = (k_1, k_2 + 2^{p-q-1}),$$
$$\mathcal{E}_4 = (k_1 + 2^{p-q-1}, k_2 + 2^{p-q-1}).$$ (30)

**Proof.** Since the additional descendant node imposes no SPC on the codeword of the SR1/SPC node, a feasible flip coordinate associated with $\gamma_{\text{S-PC}}[1:p-q]$ only needs to keep all S-PC checks unchanged. As mentioned in the proof of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 segments $k$ and $k + 2^{p-q-1}$ are
Algorithm 2: Generate Flipping Set $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}$ for SPC Nodes

**Input:** Parities for checking S-PCs $\gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p - q]$

**Output:** Flipping set $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}$

1. \( \mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}} = \emptyset \);
2. **if** \( p - q = 1 \) **then**
   3. **if** $\gamma_{S-PC}[1] = 1$ **then**
      4. \[ \text{return } \mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}} = \{1, 2\} \]
   5. **else**
      6. \[ \text{return } \mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}} = \emptyset \]
3. **else**
   4. **if** $\gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p - q] = (0, \ldots, 0, 1)$ **then**
      5. **for** $k = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^{p-q-1}\}$ **do**
         6. $\mathcal{E} = \{k, k + 2^{p-q-1}\}$
         7. $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}} = \{\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}, \mathcal{E}\}$
      8. **return** $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}$
   9. **else**
      10. **if** $\gamma_{S-PC}[p - q] = 0$ **then**
         11. **for each** $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathcal{F}$ **do**
               12. $\mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2\}$
               13. $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}} = \{\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}, \mathcal{E}\}$
      14. **else**
         15. **for each** $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathcal{F}$ **do**
               16. $\mathcal{E} = \{k_1, k_2 + 2^{p-q-1}\}$
               17. $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}} = \{\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}, \mathcal{E}\}$
      18. **return** $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}$

Algorithm 3: Decoding of SPC Nodes

**Input:** LLR vector $\alpha_p[1 : 2^p]$ of $\mathcal{N}_p$, node parameters NS($p, q, \mathcal{L}$)

**Output:** Codeword vector $\beta_p[1 : 2^p]$ of $\mathcal{N}_p$

1. Obtain $\gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p - q]$ using Algorithm 1
2. Calculate $\gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p - q]$ using (26);
3. **if** $\gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p - q] \neq 0$ **then**
   4. Generate $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}$ using Algorithm 2
   5. **for each** $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}$ **do**
      6. Calculate $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}$ using (26);
      7. Choose $\mathcal{E}_{\text{opt}}$ from $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_{S-PC}}$ according to (27);
      8. Perform bit-flipping operations on $\beta_p[1 : 2^p]$ using (28);
   9. **return** $\beta_p[1 : 2^p]$ shown in (30), which completes the proof.

Accordingly, the flipping set generation procedure in Algorithm 2 can be readily modified to adapt for SR1/SPC nodes, which is presented in Algorithm 4. Algorithm 4 takes the case that the additional descendant node is Rate-1, i.e., $\gamma_{S-PC}[p - q] = -1$, into consideration, which leads to a new splitting procedure (lines 14-20) based on Lemma 4.

Also, the decoding of SR1/SPC nodes is similar to Al-
Algorithm [5], which is shown in Algorithm [5]. The only two differences between these two algorithms lie in line 3 and line 4, where the condition in line 3 implies that the codeword needs to undergo bit-flipping operations if any S-PC is not satisfied, and the generation of the flipping set in line 4 is based on Algorithm [2]. By identifying the proposed SR1/SPC nodes, Algorithm [5] can be incorporated into the existing fast decoding algorithms, which further reduces the decoding latency.

D. Decoding Latency

In this subsection, we measure the decoding latency of Algorithm [5] by the number of required time steps, where the same assumptions as in [13] are utilized, which are shown as follows:

- Addition/subtraction of real numbers can be performed in one time step.
- Bit operations can be carried out instantly.
- Wagner decoding consumes one time step.

According to line 1 of Algorithm [5], we first analyse the number of time steps required by Algorithm [1]. As can be seen, the decoding of an SR1 node depends on the source node structure. In case that the source node is Rate-0, its codeword can be obtained immediately. Otherwise, calculating the LLRs and decoding the source node require one and \( T_{SN} \) time steps, respectively, where the value of \( T_{SN} \) is determined by the decoding algorithm for the source node. Moreover, applying Wagner decoding to the root node requires one time step. Following [13] and [19], we note that Wagner decoding can be performed in parallel with the decoding of the source node if the source node is an REP node, by assuming the REP codeword to be \( \beta_q^{L_q}[1 : 2^q] = 0 \) or \( \beta_q^{L_q}[1 : 2^q] = 1 \). As such, two time steps are required when implementing Algorithm [1] if the source node is REP. Therefore, the total number of time steps required by Algorithm [1] denoted by \( T_{SR1} \), can be expressed as

\[
T_{SR1} = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if the source node is Rate-0} \\
2, & \text{if the source node is REP} \\
T_{SN} + 2, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \quad (31)
\]

Subsequently, we can see that calculating the parity checks of the S-PCs in line 2 of Algorithm [5] can be performed instantaneously since it only involves XOR bit operations. Note that the flipping set can be generated offline, thus conducting line 4 incurs no latency. The calculation of the penalty metrics in lines 5-6 only involves addition operations and can be executed in parallel, which requires one time step. The following selection of the optimal flip coordinate in line 7 is based on a comparison tree, and thus consuming another one time step. Finally, performing bit-flipping operations (line 8) requires no time step, since only XOR bit operations are involved as shown in [23]. To summarize, the total number of time steps required to decode an SR1/SPC node is given by

\[
T_{SR1/SPC} = \begin{cases} 
T_{SR1} + 2, & \text{if } \exists t \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p - q\}, \gamma_{S-PC}[t] = 1 \\
T_{SR1}, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \quad (32)
\]

As can be seen, \( T_{SR1/SPC} \) is a variable depending on \( \gamma_{S-PC}[1 : p - q] \) and \( T_{SR1} \), which are further dependent on the channel conditions and the source node structure, respectively. Furthermore, the lower and upper bounds of \( T_{SR1/SPC} \), denoted by \( T_{LB} \) and \( T_{UB} \), respectively, are given by

\[
T_{LB} = T_{SR1}, \quad T_{UB} = T_{SR1} + 2. \quad (33)
\]

Consequently, for a given polar code, the overall, minimum and maximum numbers of time steps required for decoding can be calculated based on (32) and (33).

V. Simulation Results

In this section, the average decoding latency and error-correction performance of the proposed decoding algorithms are investigated, and comparison with the state-of-the-art fast SC decoding algorithms is provided. We consider polar codes with length \( N \in \{128, 256, 512, 1024, 4096\} \). When \( N \leq 1024 \), polar codes are constructed according to the 5G standard [2], while for \( N = 4096 \), the Gaussian Approximation (GA) method [21] is utilized for code construction.

Table II shows the number of SR1/SPC nodes with different lengths contained in a polar code under different code lengths \( N \) and code rates \( R \). It can be seen that generally, the number of SR1/SPC nodes increases with the increasing of the code length \( N \), i.e., more latency savings can be achieved for longer polar codes. When \( R > 1/2 \), it is observed that the number of SR1/SPC nodes decreases as the node length \( N \) becomes larger. This is because as the code rate increases, SR1/SPC nodes tend to be located on higher levels of the decoding tree, and thus the number of such nodes is smaller. However, this will lead to more overall latency reduction since a higher degree of parallelism can be exploited. Besides, thanks to the proposed generalized decoder for SR1/SPC nodes, the implementation complexity can be significantly reduced since we do not need to develop a dedicated decoder for each special node type. In particular, 5G polar codes with \( N = 128 \) can be represented by only SR0/REP and SR1/SPC nodes.

In Table II we compare the required time steps by the state-of-the-art fast SC decoding algorithms in [12], [13], [19] and the proposed fast SC decoding algorithm, where four code lengths \( N \in \{128, 512, 1024, 4096\} \) and five code rates \( R \in \{1/6, 1/3, 1/2, 2/3, 5/6\} \) are considered. The FSSC decoding algorithm proposed in [12], which takes Rate-0, Rate-1, REP and SPC nodes into consideration, is selected as the baseline. Furthermore, the decoding of Type I-V nodes [13] and SR0/REP nodes [19] are progressively applied to the baseline algorithm, leading to two hybrid fast SC decoders, namely HFSC1 and HFSC2. To evaluate the effects of the proposed SR1/SPC nodes on the decoding speed, the decoding of Rate-0, Rate-1, REP, SPC and SR0/REP nodes is combined with the decoding of the proposed SR1/SPC node in Algorithm [5] and the resulting fast SC decoder with sequence nodes, abbreviated as SN-FSC, is used for comparison. The decoding latency of the proposed SN-FSC decoder is measured by the average number of time steps at \( E_b/N_0 = \{0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0\} \, \text{dB} \), since the required
TABLE I
NUMBER OF SR1/SPC NODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>FSSC</th>
<th>HFSC1</th>
<th>HFSC2</th>
<th>SN-FSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Constructed according to the 5G standard [2].
2 Constructed by GA method [21].

TABLE II
NUMBER OF REQUIRED TIME STEPS OF DIFFERENT DECODING ALGORITHMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>FSSC</th>
<th>HFSC1</th>
<th>HFSC2</th>
<th>SN-FSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>89.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>101.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>91.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>236.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>309.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>336.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>295.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>188.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 FSSC + Type I-V [13].
2 FSSC + Type I-V + SR0/REP [19].
3 FSSC + SR0/REP + SR1/SPC.

time steps of decoding SR1/SPC nodes $T_{SR1/SPC}$ is a variable affected by the channel condition, while those of the baseline algorithms are fixed. Besides, the minimum and maximum numbers of required time steps are also presented, which are denoted by ‘LB’ and ‘UB’, respectively. As can be seen, the proposed decoder requires fewer time steps with respect to the other decoders for all considered $N$ and $R$. For different values of $N$, it can be observed that the gain brought by decoding the proposed SR1/SPC nodes increases with $R$. In particular, when $N = 512$, $R = 5/6$ and $E_b/N_0 = 4.0$ dB, the proposed decoder can save up to 58.6% and 36.1% time steps as compared to the FSSC decoder and the HFSC2 decoder. However, the speedup gain is limited when the code length is short and the code rate is low, which is mainly because the numbers of SR1/SPC nodes in these cases are small. Besides, the gain brought by SR1/SPC nodes is larger when $E_b/N_0$ is higher, and when $E_b/N_0 = 4.0$ dB the decoding latency $T_{SR1/SPC}$ tends to approach the lower bound $T_{SR1}$. This implies that the S-PCs of the SR1/SPC nodes are naturally satisfied under good channel conditions.

Finally, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 illustrate the frame error rate (FER) curves of the original SC decoder [1] and the proposed SN-FSC decoder, when $N \in \{256, 1024\}$ and $R \in \{1/3, 1/2, 2/3\}$. It is observed that decoding the proposed...
Fig. 5. FER performance comparison of the SC decoder [1] and the proposed SN-FSC decoder with SR1/SPC nodes, for 5G polar codes with length N = 256 and R = {1/3, 1/2, 2/3}.

Fig. 6. FER performance comparison of the SC decoder [1] and the proposed SN-FSC decoder with SR1/SPC nodes, for 5G polar codes with length N = 1024 and R = {1/3, 1/2, 2/3}.

SR1/SPC nodes does not impact the error-correction performance, yet the decoding latency can be significantly reduced.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we introduced a new class of multi-node information and frozen bit patterns, namely the SR1/SPC nodes, and proposed the corresponding fast SC decoding algorithm. The proposed SR1/SPC node can be identified by a sequence of Rate-1 or SPC nodes, and it provides a unified description of a wide variety of special nodes. Moreover, the decoding rules for the proposed SR1/SPC nodes were derived to facilitate fast SC decoding, with which a higher degree of parallelism can be obtained. The proposed decoding algorithm was compared with the state-of-the-art fast SC decoding algorithms, in terms of decoding latency and error-correction performance. Simulation results showed that by combining the existing special nodes with the proposed SR1/SPC nodes, we can achieve much lower decoding latency yet without performance degradation. The proposed SR1/SPC nodes are promising as they can also be adopted in the SCL decoder, which is left for future work.

APPENDIX A

Proof of Theorem 1

Given the codeword of each node at level $q$, the codeword of the root node at level $p$ can be derived based on the bit recursion formula in (2), i.e.,

$$\beta^i_p[1 : 2^p] = \beta_q(\mathbf{F} \otimes 2^q \otimes \mathbf{I}_{2^q}),$$  

(34)

where $\beta_q = (\beta^1_q[1 : 2^q], \beta^2_q[1 : 2^q], \ldots, \beta^R_q[1 : 2^q]).$

Then, using the identity $(\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}) \otimes \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A} \otimes (\mathbf{B} \otimes \mathbf{C})$ with $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I}_{2^q}$, (34) can be rewritten as

$$\beta^i_p[1 : 2^p] = \beta_q(\mathbf{F} \otimes 2^q-1 \otimes (\mathbf{F} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{2^q}))$$

$$= \beta_q\left(\mathbf{F} \otimes 2^q-1 \otimes \left(\mathbf{I}_{2^q} \mathbf{0}_{2^q} \mathbf{I}_{2^q}\right)\right).$$  

(35)

Repeating the above procedures $p - q - 1$ times leads to

$$\beta^i_p[1 : 2^p] = \beta_q G'_{2p-q},$$  

(36)

where $G'_{2p-q}$ is obtained by replacing the 0 and 1 elements in $G_{2p-q}$ by $\mathbf{0}_{2^q}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{2^q}$, respectively. Then, for any $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^q\}$, we have

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^q} \beta^i_p((j-1)2^q + k)$$

$$= \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^q} (\beta_q G'_{2p-q})((j-1)2^q + k)$$

$$= \beta_q \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^q} (G'_{2p-q})((j-1)2^q + k)$$  

(37)

where $(a)$ is based on the property of the generator matrix, i.e., $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^q} (G'_{2p-q}) = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)^T$, and $(b)$ is due to the definition of $\beta_q$. This thus completes the proof.

APPENDIX B

Proof of Theorem 2

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1 the following equality can be obtained:

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^p-1} \beta^i_p((2j - 1)2^r + k)$$

$$= \beta_r \bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^p-1} (G'(2j-1)2^r + k)$$

(38)

where

$$\beta_q(0_{2^r}, \mathbf{I}_{2^r}, \mathbf{0}_{2^r}, \mathbf{0}_{2^r}^T)$$

$$= \beta_r(0_{2^r}, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)^T$$

$$= \beta_q[2^r + k] = \beta^r_{q+1}[k],$$
where \(\beta(a)\) is based on (36) and (b) is because \(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{2^r-1} (G_{2^r-j})_{2j} = (0,1,\ldots,0)^T\). Since \(N_r^{L_r+1}\) is an SPC node, its corresponding codeword should satisfy

\[
\bigoplus_{k=1}^{2^r} \beta_{L_r+1}[k] = 0. \tag{39}
\]

By replacing \(\beta_{L_r+1}[k]\) on the left-hand-side of (39) by (38), (13) can be readily proved.

### APPENDIX C

**Proof of Theorem 3**

First, we prove the equivalence of segments \(k\) and \(k + \mu 2^t\), \(\mu = \{[-k/2^t], \ldots, [(2^r-q-k)/2^t]\} \setminus \{0\}\). Starting from \(\mu = 1\), if segment \(k\) is involved in the \(t\)-th S-PC, i.e., \(k \in I_t\), the range of \(k + 2^t\) can be accordingly determined by

\[
k \in I_t \Rightarrow (2j-1)2^{t-1} + 1 + 2^t \leq k + 2^t \leq (2j-1)2^{t-1} + 2^t
\]

\[
\Rightarrow j2^t + 1 \leq k + 2^t \leq (2j + 1)2^{t-1}\]

\[
\Rightarrow k + 2^t \in I_t^c,
\]

which shows that segment \(k + 2^t\) is not related to the \(t\)-th S-PC. Therefore, segments \(k\) and \(k + 2^t\) are equivalent for \(j = 1\). Then, following a similar procedure, it can be proved that segment \(k + 2^t\) is equivalent to segment \(k + 2 \times 2^t\) and the latter is further equivalent to \(k + 3 \times 2^t\), etc. To sum up, we can say that segment \(k + 2^t\) is equivalent to segments \([[-k/2^t], \ldots, [2^r-q-k)/2^t]\) \(\mu\), which thus proves that segments \(k + \mu 2^t\), \(\mu = \{[-k/2^t], \ldots, [(2^r-q-k)/2^t]\}\) are equivalent with each other.

Then, we prove that segments \(k\) and \(k + (2\nu - 1) 2^t - 1\) are inequivalent (\(\nu \in \{[-k/2^t+1/2], \ldots, [(2^r-q-k)/2^t+1/2]\}\)). Let \(\nu = 1\), depending on whether segment \(k\) is involved in the \(t\)-th S-PC or not, the range of \(k + 2^t - 1\) can be respectively obtained as follows based on (27) and (28):

\[
k \in I_t \Rightarrow (2j-1)2^{t-1} + 1 + 2^t \leq k + 2^t - 1 \leq j2^t + 2^t - 1
\]

\[
\Rightarrow j2^t + 1 \leq k + 2^t \leq (2j + 1)2^{t-1}\]

\[
\Rightarrow k + 2^t \in I_t^c,
\]

\[
k \in I_t^c \Rightarrow (j-1)2^{t-1} + 1 + 2^t - 1 \leq k + 2^t - 1 \leq (2j-1)2^{t-1} + 2^t - 1
\]

\[
\Rightarrow (2j-1)2^{t-1} + 1 \leq k + 2^t - 1 \leq 2j2^{t-1}\]

\[
\Rightarrow k + 2^t \in I_t.
\]

As can be seen, only one of the two segments \(k\) and \(k + 2^t - 1\) is involved in the \(t\)-th S-PC. Therefore, for the \(t\)-th S-PC, segments \(k\) and \(k + 2^t - 1\) are inequivalent, which proves the case of \(\nu = 1\). Then, since segments \(k + 2^t - 1\) and \(k + 2^t + \mu 2^t\) are equivalent based on the above proof, we can conclude that segment \(k\) is also inequivalent to segment \(k + (2\nu - 1) 2^t - 1\) with \(\nu \in \{[-k/2^t + 1/2], \ldots, [(2^r-q-k)/2^t + 1/2]\}\). This thus completes the proof.
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