

New Techniques for Upper-Bounding the ML Decoding Performance of Binary Linear Codes

Xiao Ma, Jia Liu and Baoming Bai

Abstract

In this paper, new techniques are presented to either simplify or improve most existing upper bounds on the maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding performance of the binary linear codes over additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channels. Firstly, the recently proposed union bound using truncated weight spectrums by Ma *et al* is re-derived in a detailed way based on Gallager's first bounding technique (GFBT), where the "good region" is specified by a sub-optimal list decoding algorithm. The error probability caused by the bad region can be upper-bounded by the tail-probability of a binomial distribution, while the error probability caused by the good region can be upper-bounded by most existing techniques. Secondly, we propose two techniques to tighten the union bound on the error probability caused by the good region. The first technique is based on pair-wise error probabilities, which can be further tightened by employing the independence between the error events and certain components of the received random vectors. The second technique is based on triplet-wise error probabilities, which can be upper-bounded by proving that any three bipolar vectors form a non-obtuse triangle. The proposed bounds improve the conventional union bounds but have a similar complexity since they involve only the Q -function. The proposed bounds can also be adapted to bit-error probabilities.

Index Terms

Additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel, binary linear block code, Gallager's first bounding technique (GFBT), list decoding, maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding, union bound.

X. Ma and J. Liu are with the Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China. (E-mail: maxiao@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

B. Bai is with State Key Lab. of ISN, Xidian University, Xi'an 710071, China. (E-mail: bmbai@mail.xidian.edu.cn)

I. INTRODUCTION

In most scenarios, there do not exist easy ways to compute the exact decoding error probabilities for specific codes and ensembles. Therefore, deriving tight analytical bounds is an important research subject in the field of coding theory and practice. Since the early 1990s, spurred by the successes of the near-capacity-achieving codes, renewed attentions have been paid to the performance analysis of the maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding algorithm. Though the ML decoding algorithm is prohibitively complex for most practical codes, tight bounds can be used to predict their performance without resorting to computer simulations. As shown in [1][2], most bounding techniques have connections to either the 1965 Gallager bound [3][4][5][6] or the 1961 Gallager-Fano bound. This paper is relevant to the 1961 Gallager-Fano bound, which is also called Gallager's first bounding technique (GFBT) in the literature. Our efforts focus on tightening the simplest conventional union bound, which is simple but loose and even diverges in the low-SNR region. Similar to many previously reported upper bounds surveyed in [2], our basic approach is based on GFBT

$$\Pr\{E\} = \Pr\{E, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} + \Pr\{E, \underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}\} \quad (1)$$

$$\leq \Pr\{E, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} + \Pr\{\underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}\}, \quad (2)$$

where E denotes the error event, \underline{y} denotes the received signal vector, and \mathcal{R} denotes an arbitrary region around the transmitted signal vector which is usually interpreted as the “good region”. As pointed out in [2], the choice of the region \mathcal{R} is very significant, and different choices of this region have resulted in various different improved upper bounds [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13]. Intuitively, the more similar the region \mathcal{R} is to the Voronoi region of the transmitted codeword, the tighter the upper bound is. However, most existing improved upper bounds have higher computational complexity than the conventional union bound.

Different from most of the existing works, we define the good region by the use of a sub-optimal list decoding algorithm. The basic idea is as follows. Upper bounds for a list decoding algorithm can also be applied to ML decoding, while the list decoding algorithm can limit competitive candidate codewords. The main results as well as the structure of this paper are summarized as follows.

- 1) In Sec. II, we prove that any three bipolar vectors form a non-obtuse triangle, which will be used to upper-bound the triplet-wise error probabilities. The conventional union bound




Fig. 1. Geometrical representation of three bipolar vectors.

and three tighter upper bounds based on GFBT are also reviewed in Sec. II.

- 2) In Sec. III, we re-derive, in a detailed way within the framework of the GFBT, the recently proposed union bound using truncated weight spectrums by Ma *et al* [14]. On one hand, the truncation technique is helpful when the whole weight spectrum is unknown or not computable. On the other hand, the truncation technique can be combined with any other upper-bounding techniques, potentially resulting in tighter upper bounds.
- 3) In Sec. IV, we propose two techniques to improve the union bound. The first technique is based on the pair-wise error probabilities, which can be tightened by employing the independence of the error event and certain components of the received random vectors. The second technique is based on the triplet-wise error probabilities, which is shown to be a non-decreasing function of the angle formed by the transmitted codeword and the other two codewords.
- 4) In Sec. V, the proposed bounds are adapted to ensembles of codes and bit-error probabilities. Sec. V also provides a numerical example.
- 5) Sec. VI concludes this paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Geometrical Properties of Binary Codes

Let $\mathbb{F}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{-1, +1\}$ be the binary field and the bipolar signal set, respectively. We use $W_H(\underline{v})$ to denote the Hamming weight of a binary vector $\underline{v} \triangleq (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$.

We use $\|\underline{y}\|$ to denote the magnitude of a real vector $\underline{y} \triangleq (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathcal{C}[n, k]$ be a binary linear block code of dimension k and length n with a generator matrix G of size $k \times n$, that is,

$$\mathcal{C} \triangleq \{\underline{c} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \mid \underline{c} = \underline{u}G, \underline{u} \in \mathbb{F}_2^k\}. \quad (3)$$

The *input output weight enumerating function (IOWEF)* of \mathcal{C} is defined as [2]

$$A(X, Z) \triangleq \sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} X^i Z^j, \quad (4)$$

where X, Z are two dummy variables and $A_{i,j}$ denotes the number of codewords $\underline{c} = \underline{u}G$ with $W_H(\underline{u}) = i$ and $W_H(\underline{c}) = j$. Then the *weight enumerating function (WEF)* $A(Z) \triangleq \sum_j A_j Z^j$, where $A_j = \sum_i A_{i,j}$, $0 \leq j \leq n$, is referred to as the weight spectrum of the given code \mathcal{C} .

Consider the binary phase shift keying (BPSK) mapping $\phi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \mapsto \mathcal{A}_2^n$ taking $\underline{s} = \phi(\underline{v})$ by $s_t = 1 - 2v_t$ for $0 \leq t \leq n-1$. The image of \mathcal{C} under this mapping is denoted by $\mathcal{S} \triangleq \phi(\mathcal{C})$. Hereafter, we may not distinguish $\underline{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ from its image $\underline{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ when representing a codeword. Let $d_H(\underline{v}^{(1)}, \underline{v}^{(2)}) \triangleq W_H(\underline{v}^{(1)} - \underline{v}^{(2)})$ be the Hamming distance between two binary vectors $\underline{v}^{(1)}$ and $\underline{v}^{(2)}$. Then their Euclidean distance $\|\phi(\underline{v}^{(1)}) - \phi(\underline{v}^{(2)})\|$ is equal to $2\sqrt{d_H(\underline{v}^{(1)}, \underline{v}^{(2)})}$. Obviously, the vectors in \mathcal{A}_2^n (hence the bipolar codewords) are distributed on an n -dimensional sphere of radius \sqrt{n} centered at the origin O of \mathbb{R}^n . We have the following lemmas.

Lemma 1: Any three bipolar vectors form a non-obtuse triangle.

Proof: Let \underline{u} , \underline{v} and \underline{w} be three bipolar vectors of length n . There must exist a three-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^n that contains \underline{u} , \underline{v} and \underline{w} . With a properly chosen orthogonal transformation \mathbf{T} , the three vectors can be viewed as three points in \mathbb{R}^3 , as shown in Fig. 1 (a). Let θ be the angle formed by $\overrightarrow{uv} \triangleq \mathbf{T}(\underline{v} - \underline{u})$ and \overrightarrow{uw} . It suffices to prove that the inner product $\overrightarrow{uv} \cdot \overrightarrow{uw}$ is non-negative. Actually, if $v_t \neq w_t$, $(v_t - u_t)(w_t - u_t) = 0$ since either $v_t = u_t$ or $w_t = u_t$ must hold; if $v_t = w_t$, $(v_t - u_t)(w_t - u_t) \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\overrightarrow{uv} \cdot \overrightarrow{uw} = \mathbf{T}(\underline{v} - \underline{u}) \cdot \mathbf{T}(\underline{w} - \underline{u}) = \sum_t (v_t - u_t)(w_t - u_t) \geq 0, \quad (5)$$

where we have used the fact that orthogonal transformations preserve inner products. \blacksquare

Lemma 2: Let \underline{u} , \underline{v} and \underline{w} be three bipolar vectors of length n . Let θ be the angle formed by \overrightarrow{uv} and \overrightarrow{uw} . Then we have

$$\theta \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\pi}{2}, \arccos \sqrt{\frac{d_1}{n}} + \arccos \sqrt{\frac{d_2}{n}} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where $d_1 = d_H(\underline{u}, \underline{v})$ and $d_2 = d_H(\underline{u}, \underline{w})$.

Proof: From Lemma 1, we have $\theta \leq \pi/2$. To complete the proof of this lemma, consider the circumscribed circle of the triangle formed by the three points \underline{u} , \underline{v} and \underline{w} (Fig. 1 (b)). Let r be its radius. The angle can be written as $\theta = \theta_1 + \theta_2$, where $\cos \theta_1 = \|\vec{uv}\|/(2r)$ and $\cos \theta_2 = \|\vec{uw}\|/(2r)$. It is then not difficult to verify that

$$\theta = \arccos \frac{\sqrt{d_1}}{r} + \arccos \frac{\sqrt{d_2}}{r}. \quad (7)$$

Noticing that the RHS of (7) is increasing with r and that $r \leq \sqrt{n}$, we have

$$\theta \leq \arccos \sqrt{\frac{d_1}{n}} + \arccos \sqrt{\frac{d_2}{n}}. \quad (8)$$

■

B. Union Bounds

Let $\underline{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{C}$ be a codeword. Suppose that $\underline{s} = \phi(\underline{c})$ is transmitted over an AWGN channel. Let $\underline{y} = \underline{s} + \underline{z}$ be the received vector, where \underline{z} is a sample from a white Gaussian noise process with zero mean and double-sided power spectral density σ^2 . For AWGN channels, the ML decoding is equivalent to finding the nearest signal vector $\hat{\underline{s}} \in \mathcal{S}$ to \underline{y} . A decoding error occurs whenever $\hat{\underline{s}} \neq \underline{s}$. Let E be the decoding error event (under ML decoding). Generally, it is a difficult task to calculate the decoding error probability $\Pr\{E\}$. Hence one usually turns to bounding techniques. Without loss of generality, assume that the all-zero codeword $\underline{c}^{(0)}$ is transmitted. The simplest upper bound is the union bound

$$\Pr\{E\} = \Pr\left\{\bigcup_d E_d\right\} \quad (9)$$

$$\leq \sum_d \Pr\{E_d\} \quad (10)$$

$$\leq \sum_d A_d Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sigma}\right), \quad (11)$$

where E_d is the event that there exists at least one codeword of Hamming weight d that is nearer than $\underline{c}^{(0)}$ to \underline{y} , and $Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sigma}\right)$ is the pair-wise error probability with

$$Q(x) \triangleq \int_x^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}} dz. \quad (12)$$

The question is, how many terms do we need to count for the summation in the above bound? If too few terms are counted, we will obtain a lower bound of the upper bound, which may be neither an upper bound nor a lower bound; if too many are counted, we need pay more efforts to compute the distance distribution and only a loose upper bound will be obtained. To get a tight upper bound, we may determine the terms by analyzing the facets of the Voronoi region of the codeword $\underline{c}^{(0)}$ [15] [16], which is a difficult task for a general code.

It is well-known that the conventional union bound is loose and even diverges (≥ 1) in the low-SNR region. One objective of this paper is, without too much complexity increased, to reduce the involved terms in the conventional union bound. The other objective of this paper is to tighten the bound on $\Pr\{E_d\}$, which used to be upper-bounded by the pair-wise error probability, where intersections of half-spaces related to codewords other than the transmitted one are counted more than once. Before doing this, we make a brief review of some existing improved upper bounds.

1) *The Sphere Bound:* In 1994, Herzberg and Poltyrev [10] derived the sphere upper bound based on GFBT in which the region \mathcal{R} is chosen to be an n -dimensional sphere with center at the transmitted signal vector and radius r . Let

$$N(r) \triangleq \max\{d \mid d < r^2\} \quad (13)$$

$$U(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, & x \geq 0 \\ 0, & x < 0 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$\Gamma(x) \triangleq \int_0^{+\infty} t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt, x > 0. \quad (15)$$

The sphere bound (SB) on the frame-error probability is

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \min_{r>0} \left\{ \sum_{d=1}^{N(r)} A_d \Pr\{E_d, \|\underline{z}\| \leq r\} + \Pr\{\|\underline{z}\| > r\} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\Pr\{E_d, \|\underline{z}\| \leq r\} = \int_0^{r^2} \int_{\sqrt{d}}^r \frac{(y - z_1^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} e^{-\frac{y}{2\sigma^2}} U(y - z_1^2)}{\sqrt{\pi} 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \sigma^n \Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)} dz_1 dy, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\Pr\{\|\underline{z}\| > r\} = \int_{r^2}^{+\infty} \frac{y^{\frac{n-2}{2}} e^{-\frac{y}{2\sigma^2}}}{2^{\frac{n}{2}} \sigma^n \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} dy. \quad (18)$$

The optimization of the radius r in (16) can be obtained by a numerical solution of the following equation

$$\sum_{d=1}^{N(r)} A_d \int_0^{\arccos\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{r}\right)} \sin^{n-2} \phi \, d\phi = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}. \quad (19)$$

It is worth pointing out that, as shown in [17], the SB (16) is equivalent to the bound proposed by Kasami *et al* [8] [9].

2) *The Tangential-Sphere Bound*: In 1994, Poltyrev [11] derived the tangential-sphere bound (TSB) based on GFBT where the region \mathcal{R} is chosen to be an n -dimensional circular cone whose central line passes through the origin O and the transmitted signal. The TSB bound with a parameter r on the frame-error probability is

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq Q\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sigma}\right\} + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{dz_1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{z_1^2}{2\sigma^2}} \left\{ \int_{r_{z_1}^2}^{+\infty} \frac{y^{\frac{n-3}{2}} e^{-\frac{y}{2\sigma^2}}}{2^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sigma^{n-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)} dy + \sum_{d: r_{z_1} > \beta_d(z_1)} \left\{ A_d \int_{\beta_d(z_1)}^{r_{z_1}} \frac{e^{-\frac{z_2^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \int_0^{r_{z_1}^2 - z_2^2} \frac{v^{\frac{n-4}{2}} e^{-\frac{v}{2\sigma^2}}}{2^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \sigma^{n-2} \Gamma\left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)} dv \, dz_2 \right\} \right\},$$

where $r_{z_1} = r \left(1 - \frac{z_1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ and $\beta_d(z_1) = \frac{r_{z_1} \sqrt{d}}{r \sqrt{1 - \frac{d}{n}}}$. The parameter r in the TSB can be optimized by a numerical solution of the following equation

$$\sum_{d < nr^2/(n+r^2)} A_d \int_0^{\arccos\left(\frac{\sqrt{nd}}{r\sqrt{n-d}}\right)} \sin^{n-3} \phi \, d\phi = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}. \quad (20)$$

Many techniques [18], [19], [20], [21] have been proposed to improve the TSB, which was considered as one of the tightest upper bounds [2].

3) *The Divsalar Bound*: In 1999, Divsalar derived a simple upper bound [12] [13] based on GFBT, where the region \mathcal{R} is chosen to be an n -dimensional sphere centered at a scaled transmitted signal vector. Both the radius and the center of the sphere can be optimized. Let d_{\min} denote the minimum Hamming weight. The Divsalar bound on the frame-error probability is

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \sum_{d=d_{\min}}^{n-k+1} \min \left\{ e^{-nE(\delta, \beta, \gamma)}, A_d Q\left(\sqrt{2d\gamma}\right) \right\}, \quad (21)$$

where $\gamma = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}$, $\delta = \frac{d}{n}$, $r_n(\delta) = \frac{\ln A_d}{n}$,

$$E(\delta, \beta, \gamma) = -r_n(\delta) + \frac{1}{2} \ln (\beta + (1 - \beta)e^{2r_n(\delta)}) + \frac{\beta\gamma\delta}{1 - (1 - \beta)\delta} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\beta = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma(1 - \delta)}{\delta} \frac{2}{1 - e^{-2r_n(\delta)}} + \left(\frac{1 - \delta}{\delta}\right)^2 [(1 + \gamma)^2 - 1]} - \frac{1 - \delta}{\delta}(1 + \gamma). \quad (23)$$

Remarks. After carefully checking the derivations of the aforementioned bounds, we find that these bounds can also be applied to non-linear codes under the assumption that the all-zero codeword is transmitted. Let T_u be an upper-bounding technique, resulting in an upper bound $T_u(\mathcal{C})$. We also assume that T_u can be employed to upper-bound the conditional error probability given that the all-zero codeword is transmitted when the sub-code $\mathcal{C}_t \triangleq \{\underline{c} \in \mathcal{C} \mid W_H(\underline{c}) \leq t\}$ is used over AWGN channels. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$0 = T_u(\mathcal{C}_0) \leq T_u(\mathcal{C}_1) \leq \dots \leq T_u(\mathcal{C}_n) = T_u(\mathcal{C}). \quad (24)$$

III. UPPER BOUNDS USING TRUNCATED WEIGHT SPECTRUMS

Recently, Ma *et al* [14] proposed a union bound which involves only truncated weight spectrums. In this section, we re-derive this “truncated” union bound within the framework of GFBT, where the region \mathcal{R} is defined in an unusual way based on the following conceptual suboptimal list decoding algorithm.

Algorithm 1: (A list decoding algorithm for the purpose of performance analysis)


S1. Make hard decisions, i. e., for $0 \leq t \leq n - 1$,

$$\hat{y}_t = \begin{cases} 0, & y_t > 0 \\ 1, & y_t \leq 0 \end{cases}. \quad (25)$$

Then the channel $c_t \rightarrow \hat{y}_t$ becomes a memoryless binary symmetric channel (BSC) with cross probability $p_b \triangleq Q\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)$.

- S2. List all codewords within the Hamming sphere with center at $\underline{\hat{y}}$ of radius $d^* \geq 0$. The resulting list is denoted as $\mathcal{L}_{\underline{\hat{y}}}$.
- S3. If $\mathcal{L}_{\underline{\hat{y}}}$ is empty, declare a decoding error; otherwise, find the codeword $\underline{c}^* \in \mathcal{L}_{\underline{\hat{y}}}$ such that $\phi(\underline{c}^*) \in \mathcal{S}$ is closest to \underline{y} .

□



(a) The error event that the all-zero codeword is not in the list.
 (b) The error event that the all-zero codeword is in the list but not the closest one.

Fig. 2. Graphical illustrations of the decoding error events.

Now we define

$$\mathcal{R} \triangleq \left\{ \underline{y} \mid \underline{c}^{(0)} \in \mathcal{L}_{\underline{y}} \right\}. \quad (26)$$

In words, the region \mathcal{R} consists of all those \underline{y} having at most d^* non-positive components. The decoding error occurs in two cases under the assumption that the all-zero codeword $\underline{c}^{(0)}$ is transmitted.

Case 1. The all-zero codeword is not in the list $\mathcal{L}_{\underline{y}}$ (see Fig. 2 (a)), that is, $\underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}$, which means that at least $d^* + 1$ errors occur over the BSC. This probability is

$$\Pr\{\underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}\} = \sum_{m=d^*+1}^n \binom{n}{m} p_b^m (1 - p_b)^{n-m}. \quad (27)$$

Case 2. The all-zero codeword is in the list $\mathcal{L}_{\underline{y}}$, but is not the closest one to \underline{y} (see Fig. 2 (b)), which is equivalent to the event $\{E, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\}$. This probability is upper-bounded by

$$\Pr\{E, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} \leq \Pr\left\{ \bigcup_{d \leq 2d^*} E_d, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R} \right\} \quad (28)$$

since all codewords in the list $\mathcal{L}_{\underline{y}}$ are at most $2d^*$ away from the all-zero codeword. The above upper bound involves only truncated weight spectrums. However, the region \mathcal{R} is in unknown shape and may not be symmetric, which causes difficulties when computing the upper bound.

To circumvent this difficulty, we may enlarge \mathcal{R} to \mathbb{R}^n and get,

$$\Pr \{E, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} \leq \Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{d \leq 2d^*} E_d, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R} \right\} \quad (29)$$

$$\leq \Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{d \leq 2d^*} E_d, \underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} \quad (30)$$

$$= \Pr \left\{ \bigcup_{d \leq 2d^*} E_d \right\} \leq T_u(\mathcal{C}_{2d^*}), \quad (31)$$

where $T_u(\mathcal{C}_{2d^*})$ is a computable upper bound on $\Pr \{ \bigcup_{d \leq 2d^*} E_d \}$, which depends only on the sub-code \mathcal{C}_{2d^*} consisting of all codewords with Hamming weight no greater than $2d^*$. As we have mentioned in Sec. II that, although \mathcal{C}_{2d^*} may not be linear, most bounding techniques [2] can be applied to \mathcal{C}_{2d^*} to get such an upper bound under the assumption that the all-zero codeword is transmitted.

For convenience, we define

$$B(p, N_t, N_\ell, N_u) \triangleq \sum_{m=N_\ell}^{N_u} \binom{N_t}{m} p^m (1-p)^{N_t-m}. \quad (32)$$

The function $B(p, N_t, N_\ell, N_u)$, which will be used over and over again in this paper, is just the probability that the number of bit-errors occurring in a binary vector of total length N_t , when passing through a BSC with cross error probability p , ranges from N_ℓ to N_u . Note that $B(p, N_t, N_\ell, N_u)$ can be calculated recursively independent of codes.

Combining (27), (31) and (32) with (2), we get an upper bound

$$\Pr \{E\} \leq T_u(\mathcal{C}_{2d^*}) + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n), \quad (33)$$

where the second term in the right hand side (RHS) is computable without requiring the code structure and the first term depends only on the sub-code \mathcal{C}_{2d^*} . On one hand, similar to the SB [10] and the TSB [11], the proposed upper bound (33) involves only truncated weight spectrums, which is hence helpful when the whole weight spectrum is not computable. On the other hand, if the complete weight spectrum is available, the proposed bounding technique can potentially improve any existing upper bounds.

Proposition 1: Let T_u be an upper-bounding technique. We have

$$\Pr \{E\} \leq \min_{0 \leq d^* \leq n} \{T_u(\mathcal{C}_{2d^*}) + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n)\}, \quad (34)$$

which delivers an upper-bound strictly less than 1 and no looser than any existing upper-bounds $T_u(\mathcal{C})$.

Proof: Noting that $T_u(\mathcal{C}_0) = 0$ and $B(p_b, n, 1, n) = 1 - (1 - p_b)^n$, we have, by setting $d^* = 0$,

$$\min_{0 \leq d^* \leq n} \{T_u(\mathcal{C}_{2d^*}) + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n)\} \leq T_u(\mathcal{C}_0) + B(p_b, n, 1, n) \quad (35)$$

$$= 1 - (1 - p_b)^n < 1. \quad (36)$$

By setting $d^* = n$, we have

$$\min_{0 \leq d^* \leq n} \{T_u(\mathcal{C}_{2d^*}) + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n)\} \leq T_u(\mathcal{C}_{2n}) + B(p_b, n, n + 1, n) \quad (37)$$

$$= T_u(\mathcal{C}) \quad (38)$$

since $B(p_b, n, n + 1, n) = 0$. ■

Taking the conventional union bound as T_u , we have

Theorem 1:

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \min_{0 \leq d^* \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{d \leq 2d^*} A_d Q\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sigma}\right) + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n) \right\}. \quad (39)$$

Proof: It is omitted here. ■

Remark. The bound (39), which is slightly different from that proposed in [14], requires more computational loads than the conventional union bound. The overhead is caused by recursively computing $B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n)$ and minimizing over d^* . If we do not perform the optimization and simply set $d^* = n$, we get the conventional union bound, implying that the technique can potentially improve the conventional union bound, as stated in Proposition 1.

IV. IMPROVED UNION BOUNDS

We have interpreted the “truncated” union bound as an upper-bounding technique based on the GFBT, where the region \mathcal{R} is defined by a sub-optimal decoding algorithm. To bound $\Pr\{E, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\}$, we have enlarged \mathcal{R} to \mathbb{R}^n , as shown in the derivation from (29) to (30). The objective of this section is to reduce the effect of such an enlargement.

Noticing that the event $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}$ is equivalent to the event $W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*$, we have

Proposition 2:

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \min_{0 \leq d^* \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{d \leq 2d^*} \Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n) \right\}. \quad (40)$$




Fig. 3. Geometrical interpretation of the triplet-wise error probability.

Proof: For any d^* ($0 \leq d^* \leq n$),

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \Pr\{E, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} + \Pr\{\underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}\} \quad (41)$$

$$\leq \Pr\left\{\bigcup_{d \leq 2d^*} E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\right\} + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n) \quad (42)$$

$$\leq \sum_{d \leq 2d^*} \Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n). \quad (43)$$

■

In this section, we focus on how to upper-bound $\Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\}$ for any given d and d^* . Without loss of generality, we assume that $A_d \geq 1$ and denote all the codewords with weight d by $\underline{c}^{(\ell)}$, $1 \leq \ell \leq A_d$. Let $E_{0 \rightarrow \ell}$ be the event that $\underline{c}^{(\ell)}$ is nearer to \underline{y} than $\underline{c}^{(0)}$.

A. Union Bounds Using Pair-Wise Error Probability

Lemma 3:

$$\Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \leq Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma)B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1). \quad (44)$$

Proof: Without loss of generality, let $\underline{c}^{(1)} \triangleq (\underbrace{1 \cdots 1}_d \underbrace{0 \cdots 0}_{n-d})$. Denote $\underline{y}_0^{d-1} \triangleq (y_0, \dots, y_{d-1})$ and $\underline{y}_d^{n-1} \triangleq (y_d, \dots, y_{n-1})$. Evidently, only \underline{y}_0^{d-1} can cause the decoding error event that $\underline{c}^{(1)}$ is nearer to \underline{y} than $\underline{c}^{(0)}$. In other words, the event $E_{0 \rightarrow 1}$ is independent of \underline{y}_d^{n-1} and $\Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1}\} =$

$Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma)$. Then we have

$$\Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \leq \Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}_d^n) \leq d^* - 1\} \quad (45)$$

$$= \Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1}\} \Pr\{W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}_d^n) \leq d^* - 1\} \quad (46)$$

$$= Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1). \quad (47)$$

In the above derivation, we have used the fact that

$$\Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}_d^{n-1}) = d^*\} = 0. \quad (48)$$

■

Theorem 2:

$$\Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \leq A_d Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1). \quad (49)$$

Proof: By union bounds and the symmetries of the error events,

$$\Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} = \Pr\left\{\bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq A_d} E_{0 \rightarrow \ell}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\right\} \quad (50)$$

$$\leq \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq A_d} \Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow \ell}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \quad (51)$$

$$= A_d \Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \quad (52)$$

$$\leq A_d Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1). \quad (53)$$

■

B. Union Bounds Using Triplet-Wise Error Probability

Temporarily, we assume that $A_d \geq 2$ is even. Then we have

$$\Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \leq \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq A_d/2} \Pr\left\{E_{0 \rightarrow (2\ell-1)} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2\ell}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\right\} \quad (54)$$

$$= \frac{A_d}{2} \Pr\left\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\right\}. \quad (55)$$

If we can find ways to calculate or upper-bound $\Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\}$, we may improve the conventional union bound.

In this paper, we refer to the probability $\Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2}\}$ as *triplet-wise error probability*. Consider the three codewords $\underline{c}^{(0)}$, $\underline{c}^{(1)}$ and $\underline{c}^{(2)}$. Let θ be the angle formed by $\overrightarrow{\underline{c}^{(0)} \underline{c}^{(1)}}$ and

$\overrightarrow{\underline{s}^{(0)} \underline{s}^{(2)}}$, see Fig. 3. Let ξ_1 and ξ_2 be the two independent Gaussian random variables obtained by projecting the noise vector \underline{Z} onto the two-flat determined by $\overrightarrow{\underline{s}^{(0)} \underline{s}^{(1)}}$ and $\overrightarrow{\underline{s}^{(0)} \underline{s}^{(2)}}$. Define

$$\mathcal{R}_1 \triangleq \left\{ (\xi_1, \xi_2) \mid \xi_1 \cos \theta + \xi_2 \sin \theta \geq \sqrt{d} \right\} \quad (56)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2 \triangleq \left\{ (\xi_1, \xi_2) \mid \xi_1 \geq \sqrt{d}, \xi_1 \cos \theta + \xi_2 \sin \theta < \sqrt{d} \right\}. \quad (57)$$

We have

Lemma 4: The triplet-wise error probability

$$\Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2} \right\} = \Pr \{ \mathcal{R}_1 \} + \Pr \{ \mathcal{R}_2 \} \quad (58)$$

$$= Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) + \int_{\sqrt{d}}^{+\infty} f(\xi_1) \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{\sqrt{d}-\xi_1 \cos \theta}{\sin \theta}} f(\xi_2) d\xi_2 d\xi_1, \quad (59)$$

where $f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-x^2/(2\sigma^2)}$ is the probability density function of $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. The triplet-wise error probability is a non-decreasing function of θ .

Proof: The first part can be proved with the help of Fig. 3. To prove the second part, it suffices to prove that $\frac{\sqrt{d}-\xi_1 \cos \theta}{\sin \theta}$ increases with θ for $\xi_1 \geq \sqrt{d}$. This can be verified by noting that its derivative $\frac{\xi_1 - \sqrt{d} \cos \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \geq 0$ for $\xi_1 \geq \sqrt{d}$. ■

Lemma 5: For any two codewords $\underline{c}^{(1)}$ and $\underline{c}^{(2)}$ of Hamming weight d , the triplet-wise error probability

$$\Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2} \right\} \leq 2Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma). \quad (60)$$

Proof: From Lemmas 1 and 4, we can substitute $\theta = \pi/2$ into (59) to complete the proof. ■

Lemma 6: For any two codewords $\underline{c}^{(1)}$ and $\underline{c}^{(2)}$ of Hamming weight d ,

$$\Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2}, W_H(\hat{\underline{y}}) \leq d^* \right\} \leq \left(2Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1). \quad (61)$$

Proof: Without loss of generality, assume that

$$\underline{c}^{(1)} \triangleq (c_0^{(1)} \cdots c_{2d-1}^{(1)} \underbrace{0 \cdots 0}_{n-2d}) \quad (62)$$

and

$$\underline{c}^{(2)} \triangleq (c_0^{(2)} \cdots c_{2d-1}^{(2)} \underbrace{0 \cdots 0}_{n-2d}). \quad (63)$$

Then only \underline{y}_0^{2d-1} can cause the event that $\underline{c}^{(1)}$ or $\underline{c}^{(2)}$ are nearer to \underline{y} than $\underline{c}^{(0)}$. We have

$$\Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* \right\} \leq \Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}_{2d}^n) \leq d^* - 1 \right\} \quad (64)$$

$$= \Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2} \right\} \Pr \left\{ W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}_{2d}^n) \leq d^* - 1 \right\} \quad (65)$$

$$\leq \left(2Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1) \quad (66)$$

from Lemma 5. ■

The main result of this subsection is the following theorem, which shows that the union bound based on triplet-wise error probabilities can be tighter than the conventional union bound based on pair-wise error probabilities.

Theorem 3: If A_d is even,

$$\Pr \{ E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* \} \leq A_d \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1); \quad (67)$$

if A_d is odd,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \{ E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* \} &\leq (A_d - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1) \\ &\quad + Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Proof: Here we only give the proof for the case that A_d is odd.

$$\Pr \{ E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* \} \quad (69)$$

$$\leq \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq (A_d - 1)/2} \Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow 2\ell - 1} \bigcup E_{0 \rightarrow 2\ell}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* \right\} + \Pr \left\{ E_{0 \rightarrow A_d}, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* \right\} \quad (70)$$

$$\leq (A_d - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1) \quad (71)$$

$$+ Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1), \quad (72)$$

which follows from the symmetries of the error events and Lemmas 3 and 6. ■

Note that the bounds in Theorem 3 may not improve the bounds in Theorem 2, since it may happen that $B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1) > B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1)$.

V. ADAPTATIONS OF THE IMPROVED UNION BOUNDS

A. Bounds for An Ensemble of Codes

As we know, most existing bounds are applied to ensembles of codes as well as specific codes. However, the bounds given in Theorem 3 can not be applied directly to ensembles of codes because the average weight spectrum of a code ensemble may not be integer-valued.

Theorem 4: Consider a code ensemble \mathcal{C} with probability distribution $\Pr\{\mathcal{C}\}$, $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\{A_d^c\}$ be the weight spectrum of a specific code. Then $A_d = \sum_c \Pr\{\mathcal{C}\} A_d^c$ is referred to as the average weight spectrum. Define

$$h(A_d) \triangleq \min \left\{ \begin{array}{c} A_d Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n-d, 0, d^*-1), \\ (A_d - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n-2d, 0, d^*-1) + Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (73)$$

Then $\Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \leq h(A_d)$.

Proof: From Theorem 2, we have

$$\Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} = \sum_c \Pr\{\mathcal{C}\} \Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* | \mathcal{C}\} \quad (74)$$

$$\leq \sum_c \Pr\{\mathcal{C}\} A_d^c Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n-d, 0, d^*-1) \quad (75)$$

$$= A_d Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n-d, 0, d^*-1). \quad (76)$$

From Theorem 3, we can verify the following unified bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} &\leq (A_d - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n-2d, 0, d^*-1) \\ &\quad + Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma). \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Then, we have

$$\Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^*\} \quad (78)$$

$$= \sum_c \Pr\{\mathcal{C}\} \Pr\{E_d, W_H(\underline{\hat{y}}) \leq d^* | \mathcal{C}\} \quad (79)$$

$$\leq \sum_c \Pr\{\mathcal{C}\} \left((A_d^c - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n-2d, 0, d^*-1) + Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) \quad (80)$$

$$= (A_d - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n-2d, 0, d^*-1) + Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma). \quad (81)$$

■

We now summarize the main result in the following theorem, which can be applied to both specific codes and ensembles of codes.

Theorem 5: Let $\{A_d\}$ be the (average) weight spectrum of a specific code or a code ensemble. The frame-error probability can be upper-bounded by,

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \min_{0 \leq d^* \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{d \leq 2d^*} h(A_d) + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n) \right\}. \quad (82)$$

Proof: It is omitted here. ■

B. Bounds for Bit-Error Probabilities

In order to adapt the upper-bound (82) to the bit-error probability, we define

$$\hat{i}_d \triangleq \max \{i \mid A_{i,d} > 0\}, \quad (83)$$

$$A'_d \triangleq \sum_i \frac{i}{k} A_{i,d} \quad (84)$$

and

$$h'(A_d) \triangleq \min \left\{ \begin{aligned} & A'_d Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1), \\ & \frac{\hat{i}_d}{k} \left((A_d - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1) + Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 6: The bit-error probability can be upper-bounded by

$$P_b \leq \min_{0 \leq d^* \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{d \leq 2d^*} h'(A_d) + B(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n) \right\}. \quad (85)$$

Proof: Recall that the bit-error probability is defined as

$$P_b \triangleq \mathbf{E} \left\{ \frac{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}})}{k} \right\}, \quad (86)$$

where \mathbf{E} is the mathematical expectation and $\hat{\underline{U}} \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$ is the binary output vector from the decoder given that the all-zero codeword is transmitted. Without loss of generality, we make an assumption that $\hat{\underline{U}}$ is uniformly at random chosen from \mathbb{F}_2^k whenever the decoder reports a decoding error. We assume the following partition $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_d \mathcal{R}_d$, where $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d$ whenever the decoder outputs one of the codewords with weight d .

$$\begin{aligned} kP_b &= \Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} \mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}) | \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} + \Pr\{\underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}\} \mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}) | \underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}\} \\ &\leq \Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} \mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}) | \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} + k\Pr\{\underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{d \leq 2d^*} \Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d\} \mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}) | \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d\} + kB(p_b, n, d^* + 1, n), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}|\underline{y} \notin \mathcal{R})\} \leq k$.

On one hand, since $\mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}|\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d)\} \leq \hat{i}_d$ and $\Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d\} \leq \Pr\{E_d, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\}$, we have

$$\Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d\} \mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}|\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d)\} \leq \hat{i}_d \left((A_d - 1) \left(Q(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} Q^2(\sqrt{d}/\sigma) \right) B(p_b, n - 2d, 0, d^* - 1) + Q(\sqrt{d}/n) \right).$$

On the other hand, we assume that the following partition $\mathcal{R}_d = \bigcup_{\ell} \mathcal{R}_d^{(\ell)}$, where $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d^{(\ell)}$ whenever the decoder outputs $\underline{c}^{(\ell)}$, $1 \leq \ell \leq A_d$. Denote by $\underline{u}^{(\ell)}$ the input binary vector to the encoder corresponding to the codeword $\underline{c}^{(\ell)}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d\} \mathbf{E}\{W_H(\hat{\underline{U}}|\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d)\} &= \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq A_d} \Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d^{(\ell)}\} W_H(\underline{u}^{(\ell)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq A_d} \Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow \ell}, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\} W_H(\underline{u}^{(\ell)}) \\ &\leq k A'_d Q \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sigma} \right) B(p_b, n - d, 0, d^* - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\Pr\{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}_d^{(\ell)}\} \leq \Pr\{E_{0 \rightarrow \ell}, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{R}\}$. ■

Remark. The bound on the bit-error probability given above is applicable to the optimal decoding algorithm that minimizes the bit-error probability, but may not be applied to the ML decoding algorithm. In other words, the ML decoding algorithm, which is not optimal for minimizing the bit-error probability, may have a higher bit-error probability.

C. Numerical Results

Fig. 4 shows the comparisons between the original union bound, the TSB and the proposed bound on frame-error probability of [100, 95] random linear code, which has been used as an example in [2]. The proposed bound is obtained by optimizing the parameter d^* , which may be varied with SNRs, for example, $d^* = 2$ for SNR = 5 dB. We can see that the proposed bound improves the original union bound and even tighter than the TSB in the low-SNR region. In addition, the computational complexity of the proposed bound is much lower than that of the TSB.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have presented new techniques to improve the conventional union bounds. The basic idea is to define Gallager's region using a sub-optimal list decoding algorithm, which




Fig. 4. Comparison between the upper bounds on the frame-error probability under ML decoding of random binary linear block codes $[100, 95]$. The compared bounds are the union bound, the TSB and the proposed bound.

reduces the number of competitive codewords. We have also derived an upper bound on the triplet-wise error probability, which can be used to improve the union bound. The advantage of the proposed bound is that it involves only the Q -function.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank X. Huang and Q.-T. Zhuang for their help.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Shamai and I. Sason, "Variations on the Gallager bounds, connections, and applications," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 48, pp. 3029–3051, December 2002.
- [2] I. Sason and S. Shamai, "Performance analysis of linear codes under maximum-likelihood decoding: A tutorial," in *Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory*. Delft, The Netherlands: NOW, July 2006, vol. 3, no. 1-2, pp. 1–225.
- [3] T. M. Duman and M. Salehi, "New performance bounds for turbo codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 717–723, June 1998.
- [4] T. M. Duman, "Turbo codes and turbo coded modulation systems: Analysis and performance bounds," Ph.D. dissertation, Elect. Comput. Eng. Dept., Northeastern Univ., Boston, MA, May 1998.
- [5] N. Shulman and M. Feder, "Random coding techniques for nonrandom codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 2101–2104, September 1999.
- [6] M. Twitto, I. Sason, and S. Shamai, "Tightened upper bounds on the ML decoding error probability of binary linear block codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 53, pp. 1495–1510, April 2007.
- [7] E. R. Berlekamp, "The technology of error correction codes," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 68, pp. 564–593, May 1980.

- [8] T. Kasami, T. Fujiwara, T. Takata, K. Tomita, and S. Lin, "Evaluation of the block error probability of block modulation codes by the maximum-likelihood decoding for an AWGN channel," in *Proc. of the 15th Symposium on Information Theory and Its Applications*, Minakami, Japan, September 1992.
- [9] T. Kasami, T. Fujiwara, T. Takata, and S. Lin, "Evaluation of the block error probability of block modulation codes by the maximum-likelihood decoding for an AWGN channel," in *Proc. 1993 IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, January 1993, p. 68.
- [10] H. Herzberg and G. Poltyrev, "Techniques of bounding the probability of decoding error for block coded modulation structures," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 40, pp. 903–911, May 1994.
- [11] G. Poltyrev, "Bounds on the decoding error probability of binary linear codes via their spectra," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 40, pp. 1284–1292, July 1994.
- [12] D. Divsalar, "A simple tight bound on error probability of block codes with application to turbo codes," in *Proc. 1999 IEEE Communication Theory Workshop*, Aptos, CA, May 1999.
- [13] D. Divsalar and E. Biglieri, "Upper bounds to error probabilities of coded systems beyond the cutoff rate," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 2011–2018, December 2003.
- [14] X. Ma, C. Li, and B. Bai, "Maximum likelihood decoding analysis of LT codes over AWGN channels," in *Proc. of the 6th International Symposium on Turbo Codes and Iterative Information Processing*, Brest, France, September 2010.
- [15] E. Agrell, "Voronoi regions for binary linear block codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 42, pp. 310–316, January 1996.
- [16] —, "On the voronoi neighbor ratio for binary linear block codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 44, pp. 3064–3072, November 1998.
- [17] X. Ma, J. Liu, and Q. Zhuang, "Equivalence of the KSB and the HPSB," in preparation.
- [18] I. Sason and S. Shamai, "Improved upper bounds on the ML decoding error probability of parallel and serial concatenated turbo codes via their ensemble distance spectrum," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 46, pp. 24–47, January 2004.
- [19] J. Zangl and R. Herzog, "Improved tangential sphere bound on the bit error probability of concatenated codes," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 19, pp. 825–830, May 2001.
- [20] S. Yousefi and A. K. Khandani, "Generalized tangential sphere bound on the ML decoding error probability of linear binary block codes in AWGN interference," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, pp. 2810–2815, November 2004.
- [21] —, "A new upper bound on the ML decoding error probability of linear binary block codes in AWGN interference," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, pp. 3026–3036, November 2004.