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## Cyclic LDPC codes form an important class of structured

 LDPC codes.- As cyclic codes, they can be simply encoded with shift register.
- As LDPC codes, they provide good performance under iterative decoding with a reasonable decoding complexity.
- They have relatively large minimum distance.
- Some codes can be transformed into quasi-cyclic (QC) codes through row and column permutations on the parity-check matrix.


## Some Known Constructions

- Construction based on finite geometries (Lin et al.)
- Construction based on idempotents (Shibuya et al., Tomlinson et al.)
- Construction based on matrix decomposition (Lin et al.)


## Code Features

- The defining parity-check matrix is a circulant matrix or a column of circulant matrices.
- The party-check matrix is highly redundant.
- The column weight $\gamma$ is relatively large.
- The corresponding Tanner graph is free of length-4 cycles.
- The minimum distance of the code is at least $\gamma+1$. (Massey bound)


## Idempotent

Definition: Let $R_{n}$ be the ring of residue classes of $F_{q}[x]$ modulo $x^{n}-1$. Then a polynomial $e(x)$ of $R_{n}$ is called an idempotent if $e^{2}(x)=e(x)$.

## Properties:

- For a cyclic code $C$, there exists a unique idempotent $e(x)$ that generates $C$, called the generating idempotent of $C$.
- Let $e^{\perp}(x)$ be the generating idempotent of $C^{\perp}$, the dual code of $C$, then $e^{\perp}(x)=1-x^{n} e\left(x^{-1}\right)$.


## Modular Golomb Ruler

Definition: A set of integers $\left\{a_{i}: 0 \leq a_{i}<n, 1 \leq i \leq \gamma\right\}$ is called a Golomb ruler modulo $n$ with $\gamma$ marks, if the differences $\left(a_{i}-a_{j}\right)$ $\bmod n$ are distinct for all ordered pairs $(i, j)$ with $i \neq j$.
An example:


Figure: A Golomb ruler modulo 31 with 6 marks.
An inherent constraint: $\gamma \times(\gamma-1) \leq(n-1)$.

## Three Algebraic Constructions of Modular Golomb Rulers

- Singer construction (projective geometry plane)
- Bose construction (Euclidean geometry plane)
- Ruzza construction


## Code Definition

Consider a cyclic LDPC code $C$ of length $n$ over $F_{q}$, whose parity-check matrix is an $n \times n$ circulant

$$
\mathbf{H}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
c_{0} & c_{1} & \cdots & c_{n-1} \\
c_{n-1} & c_{0} & \cdots & c_{n-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
c_{1} & c_{2} & \cdots & c_{0}
\end{array}\right]
$$

The above code is specified by the polynomial

$$
\begin{aligned}
c(x) & =c_{0}+c_{1} x+\cdots+c_{n-1} x^{n-1} \\
& =c_{a_{1}} x^{a_{1}}+c_{a_{2}} x^{a_{2}} \cdots+c_{a_{\gamma}} x^{a_{\gamma}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\gamma$ is the row weight of $\mathbf{H}$ and $c_{a_{i}} \neq 0(i=1, \cdots, \gamma)$.

## Main Results

- If $c(x)$ is an idempotent, then the minimum distance of $C$ satisfies

$$
d_{\min } \leq \begin{cases}\gamma+1, & \text { if } c_{0}=0 \\ \gamma-1, & \text { if } c_{0}=1 \\ \gamma, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

- The Tanner graph corresponding to $\mathbf{H}$ is free of length-4 cycles if and only if $\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \cdots, a_{\gamma}\right\}$ is a Golomb ruler modulo $n$ with $\gamma$ marks.
- According to Massey bound, if the Tanner graph is free of length- 4 cycles, then $d_{\text {min }} \geq \gamma+1$.
- If $c(x)$ is an idempotent and $\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \cdots, a_{\gamma}\right\}$ is a modular Golomb ruler, then the minimum distance of $C$ is exactly $\gamma+1$.


## Preliminaries: Finite Field based Construction of QC-LDPC Codes (Lin et al.)

Let $\alpha$ be a primitive element of $F_{q}$, then $0, \alpha^{0}, \cdots, \alpha^{q-2}$ give all elements of $F_{q}$. Let $\beta \in F_{q}$, then it can be mapped to a $(q-1) \times(q-1)$ binary matrix $A(\beta)$, as shown below.


The matrix $A(\beta)$ is called the matrix dispersion of $\beta$ over $F_{2}$.

## Procedure for Finite Field based Construction

- First construct an $m \times n$ matrix over $F_{q}$, called the base matrix.

$$
\mathbf{W}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{w}_{0} \\
\mathbf{w}_{1} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{w}_{m-1}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
w_{0,0} & w_{0,1} & \cdots & w_{0, n-1} \\
w_{1,0} & w_{1,1} & \cdots & w_{1, n-1} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
w_{m-1,0} & w_{m-1,1} & \cdots & w_{m-1, n-1}
\end{array}\right]
$$

- Then replace each entry of $\mathbf{W}$ by its matrix dispersion and form the following matrix as the parity-check matrix

$$
\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{W})=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
A\left(w_{0,0}\right) & A\left(w_{0,1}\right) & \cdots & A\left(w_{0, n-1}\right) \\
A\left(w_{1,0}\right) & A\left(w_{1,1}\right) & \cdots & A\left(w_{1, n-1}\right) \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
A\left(w_{m-1,0}\right) & A\left(w_{m-1,1}\right) & \cdots & A\left(w_{m-1, n-1}\right)
\end{array}\right]
$$

## Design Constraint on W

For $0 \leq i, j \leq m-1, i \neq j$ and $0 \leq h, k \leq q-2$,

$$
d\left(\alpha^{h} \mathbf{w}_{i}, \alpha^{k} \mathbf{w}_{j}\right) \geq n-1
$$

where $d$ denotes the Hamming distance.
The constraint is called the $\alpha$-multiplied row distance ( $R D$ ) constraint, which guarantees that the Tanner graph corresponding to $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{W})$ is free of length- 4 cycles.

## Pseudo-Cyclic Code and MDS Code

Definition: A linear block code of length $n$ is a pseudo-cyclic code with parameter $\beta \in F_{q}$, if for any codeword ( $c_{0}, c_{1}, \cdots, c_{n-1}$ ), its pseudo-cyclic ( $\beta c_{n-1}, c_{0}, \cdots, c_{n-2}$ ) also forms a codeword.

Definition: An ( $n, k$ ) linear block code is a maximum-distance-separable (MDS) code, if the minimum distance $d_{\text {min }}=n-k+1$.

## Code Construction

Consider the the following $n \times n$ matrix over $F_{q}$

$$
\mathbf{W}=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
w_{0} & w_{1} & \cdots & w_{n-2} & w_{n-1} \\
\alpha w_{n-1} & w_{0} & \cdots & w_{n-3} & w_{n-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\alpha w_{2} & \alpha w_{3} & \cdots & w_{0} & w_{1} \\
\alpha w_{1} & \alpha w_{2} & \cdots & \alpha w_{n-1} & w_{0}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where the rows are codewords of a $(n, 2)$ pseudo-cyclic MDS code with $\beta=\alpha$.

It can be proved that the $\mathbf{W}$ satisfies the $\alpha$-multiplied RD constraint.

Through matrix dispersion, the obtained $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{W})$ defines a QC-LDPC code.

## Main Result

From the above QC-LDPC code, a cyclic LDPC code can be obtained by transforming $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{W})$ to a circulant parity-check matrix through row and column permutations.

## Automorphism Group of a Code

Definition: Let $C$ be a binary linear block code of length $n$. The set of coordinate permutations that map $C$ to itself forms a group under composition operation. The group is called the automorphism group of $C$, denoted by $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$.

For a binary cyclic code of odd length $n$, the automorphism group contains the following two cyclic subgroups:

- $S_{0}$ : The set of permutations $\tau^{0}, \tau^{1}, \cdots, \tau^{n-1}$, where

$$
\tau^{k}: j \rightarrow(j+k) \bmod n
$$

- $S_{1}$ : The set of permutations $\zeta^{0}, \zeta^{1}, \cdots, \zeta^{m-1}$, where

$$
\zeta^{k}: j \rightarrow\left(2^{k} \cdot j\right) \bmod n,
$$

and $m$ is the smallest positive integer such that $2^{m} \equiv 1 \bmod n$.

## Properties of Aut(C)

- Let $C^{\perp}$ be the dual code of $C$, then $\operatorname{Aut}\left(C^{\perp}\right)=\operatorname{Aut}(C)$.
- Let $\pi \in \operatorname{Aut}(C)$. If $\mathbf{H}$ is a parity-check matrix of $C$, then $\pi \mathbf{H}$ also forms a parity-check matrix of $C$.


## Decoder Diversity

- Two party-check matrices are called non-equivalent if they cannot be obtained from each other only by row permutations.
- The basic idea is to construct multiple non-equivalent parity-check matrices based on $\operatorname{Aut}(C)$. Different decoding attempts can be made on these parity-check matrices, thus providing decoder diversity gain.


## Main Results

- For cyclic LDPC codes constructed from idempotents and modular Golomb rulers, $S_{0}$ and $S_{1}$ cannot be used to generate non-equivalent parity-check matrices.
- For cyclic LDPC codes constructed from pseudo-cyclic MDS codes with two information symbols, $S_{1}$ can be used to generate non-equivalent parity-check matrices.


## Simulation Results

A $(341,160)$ cyclic LDPC code is constructed from $(31,2)$ pseudo-cyclic MDS code over $F_{32}$. The BPSK modulation over AWGN channel is assumed. The maximum number of iterations is set to be 100 .
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