

# Self and turbo iterations for MIMO receivers and large-scale systems

Irene Santos and Juan José Murillo-Fuentes

**Abstract**—We investigate a turbo soft detector based on the expectation propagation (EP) algorithm for large-scale multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems. Optimal detection in MIMO systems becomes computationally unfeasible for high-order modulations and/or large number of antennas. In this situation, the linear minimum mean square error (LMMSE) exhibits a low-complexity with a good performance, however far from optimal. To improve the performance, the EP algorithm can be used. In this paper, we review previous EP-based detectors and enhance their estimation in terms of complexity and performance. Specifically, we improve the convergence of the self-iterated EP stage by replacing the uniform prior by a non-uniform one, which better characterizes the information returned by the decoder once the turbo procedure starts. We also review the EP parameters to avoid instabilities when using high-order modulations and to reduce the computational complexity. Simulation results illustrate the robustness and enhanced performance of this novel detector in comparison with previous approaches found in the literature. Results also show that the proposed detector is robust in the presence of imperfect channel state information (CSI).

**Index Terms**—Expectation propagation (EP), MMSE, low-complexity, MIMO, turbo detection, feedback.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) antennas are of great interest in communications systems due, among others, to the need of transmitting at high rates [1]. In MIMO detection we aim at estimating the symbols transmitted by the transmit antennas using the output of the receive ones. This estimation can be probabilistic, resulting in a high benefit for modern channel decoders. In addition, the performance can be further improved with a turbo detection scheme, i.e., by exchanging information between the decoder and the soft detector iteratively.

Optimal detectors, such as the maximum a posteriori (MAP) algorithm, suffer from an intractable computational complexity for high order constellations and/or large number of transmit antennas. In this scenario, non-optimal approximate solutions are used instead. The sphere decoding (SD) method provides an approximated marginal posterior probability density function (pdf) in a subspace of the whole set of possible transmitted words given by the constellation [2]. Another alternative to approximate the posterior distribution is the use of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms [3]. However, their required complexity to obtain an accurate enough performance remains unfeasible for large scale scenarios.

The linear minimum mean square error (LMMSE) is a quite extended solution due to its low computational complexity. Since its performance is far from the optimal, alternative approaches can be found in the literature. The Gaussian tree approximation (GTA) algorithm [4] firstly ignores the discrete nature of symbols to construct a tree-factorized Gaussian approximation to the a posteriori probabilities (APP). Then, it estimates the marginals with belief propagation (BP). The channel hardening-exploiting message passing (CHEMP) [5] is a message-passing algorithm where all the exchanged messages are approximated by Gaussian distributions. However, its performance degrades when using high-order modulations [6], [7].

Recently, the expectation propagation (EP) algorithm [8], [9] has been proposed as better approach to approximate the posterior. This algorithm has been already applied to equalization [10]–[12] and MIMO detection [6], [7], [13]. In these works, it was showed that the EP detector improved the performance of LMMSE, GTA and CHEMP with complexity proportional to the LMMSE algorithm. The extension to MIMO turbo detection is introduced in [7], [14]. Approach [7] is based on a self-iterated EP approach implemented with a damping procedure, although uniform priors are employed to describe the information from the decoder. On the other hand, the method in [14] does not include self-iterations within the EP stage, but assumes non-uniform priors instead. Since a non-uniform prior for the symbols better characterizes the information returned by the decoder, approach [14] improves the performance in [7].

In this paper, we focus on the interaction between self and turbo iterations, outperforming both [7], [14] approaches. We use non-uniform priors distributed according to the channel decoder output during the moment matching procedure, borrowing from [14]. Then, this procedure is repeated at the self-iterated EP stage to update its estimation, including a damping procedure similar to the one proposed in [7]. Following the guidelines in [12], we also optimize the EP parameters to avoid instabilities with high-order modulations and reduce the computational complexity of the algorithm. This novel solution outperforms [14] due to the self-iterated EP approach and the damping procedure. For large constellations this self-iterated EP approach greatly improves convergence compared to the LMMSE.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

The turbo architecture of a soft MIMO detector where  $N_t$  transmit antennas communicate to a receiver with  $N_r$  antennas can be divided into three parts.

I. Santos and J.J. Murillo-Fuentes are with the Dept. Teoría de la Señal y Comunicaciones, Universidad de Sevilla, Camino de los Descubrimientos s/n, 41092 Sevilla, Spain. E-mail: {irenesantos,murillo}@us.es

This work was partially funded by the Spanish government (TEC2016-78434-C3-R) and the European Union (MINECO/FEDER, UE).

### A. Transmitter

The information bit vector,  $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, \dots, a_K]^\top$ , is encoded into the codeword  $\mathbf{b} = [b_1, \dots, b_V]^\top$  with a code rate  $R = K/V$ . The codeword is partitioned into  $N = \lceil V/\log_2 M \rceil$  blocks,  $\mathbf{b} = [\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_N]^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{b}_k = [b_{k,1}, \dots, b_{k,Q}]$  and  $Q = \log_2(M)$ . Every  $\mathbf{b}_k$  is modulated to get one out of  $M$  possible complex-valued symbols that belong to the alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$ . The modulated symbols are partitioned into  $P$  blocks of length  $N_t$ ,  $[\mathbf{u}[1], \dots, \mathbf{u}[P]]^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{u}[p] = [u_{p,1}, \dots, u_{p,N_t}]$ . Each block is demultiplexed into  $N_t$  substreams through the serial to parallel (S/P) converter. Then, the block frames are transmitted over the channel. Hereafter, we focus on the transmission and estimation of any block  $\mathbf{u}[p]$  and, to keep the notation uncluttered, we will omit the index  $p$ .

### B. Channel model

The channel is completely specified by the known noise variance,  $\sigma_w^2$ , and the weights between each transmitting and receiving antenna,  $h_{k,j}$ , where  $k = 1, \dots, N_r$  and  $j = 1, \dots, N_t$ , with  $N_r \geq N_t$ . The received signal for a channel use,  $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, \dots, y_{N_r}]^\top$ , is given by

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}$  is a  $N_r \times N_t$  full matrix where each  $h_{k,j}$  element represents the channel weight of  $k$ th receiving antenna and  $j$ th transmitting antenna and  $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{0}, \sigma_w^2 \mathbf{I})$  is a complex-valued additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) vector. We assume the coherence time to be larger than the block duration.

### C. Turbo receiver

The posterior probability of the transmitted symbol vector  $\mathbf{u}$  given the whole vector of observations  $\mathbf{y}$  yields

$$p(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{u})p_D(\mathbf{u})}{p(\mathbf{y})} \propto \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{H}\mathbf{u}, \sigma_w^2 \mathbf{I}) \prod_{k=1}^{N_t} p_D(u_k), \quad (2)$$

where the true prior returned by the decoder,  $p_D(u_k)$ , is clearly non-Gaussian but a non-uniform discrete distribution. If no information is available from the decoder, then the true prior is assumed to be equiprobable.

The extrinsic distribution computed by the detector is demapped and given to the decoder as extrinsic log-likelihood ratios<sup>1</sup>,  $L_E(b_n)$ . The channel decoder computes an estimation of the information bit vector,  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ , and an extrinsic log-likelihood ratio (LLR) of the coded bits,  $L_D(b_n)$ . These LLRs are again mapped and given to the detector as updated priors,  $p_D(\mathbf{u})$ . This process is repeated iteratively for a given maximum number of iterations,  $T$ , or until convergence.

## III. THE BLOCK-EP DETECTOR

The EP algorithm provides a feasible approximation to the posterior distribution in (2),  $p(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y})$ , by an iteratively estimated Gaussian approximation,  $q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u})$ , where  $\ell$  denotes the iteration number. In this approximation, the product of non-Gaussian

terms,  $p_D(u_k)$ , in (2) is replaced by a product of to be estimated Gaussians, denoted as  $t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k) = \mathcal{CN}(u_k : \mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]}, \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]})$ . We next develop the expression for this approximated posterior as it will be needed later on. The approximated posterior factorizes as

$$\begin{aligned} q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u}) &\propto p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{u}) \prod_{k=1}^{N_t} t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k) = & (3) \\ &= \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{H}\mathbf{u}, \sigma_w^2 \mathbf{I}) \prod_{k=1}^{N_t} \mathcal{CN}(u_k : \mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]}, \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}) & (4) \end{aligned}$$

and it is distributed according to a Gaussian given by

$$\begin{aligned} q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u}) &= \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{u} : \boldsymbol{\mu}_q^{[\ell]}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_q^{[\ell]}) \\ &\propto \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{u} : (\mathbf{H}^H \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{H}^H \mathbf{y}, \sigma_w^2 (\mathbf{H}^H \mathbf{H})^{-1}) \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{u} : \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{[\ell]}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{[\ell]}) & (5) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{[\ell]} = \text{diag}([\sigma_{t_1}^{2[\ell]}, \dots, \sigma_{t_{N_t}}^{2[\ell]}])$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{[\ell]} = [\mu_{t_1}^{[\ell]}, \dots, \mu_{t_{N_t}}^{[\ell]}]^\top$ . The mean and covariance of  $q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u})$  can be computed as (see (A.7) in [15]),

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_q^{[\ell]} = \left( \sigma_w^{-2} \mathbf{H}^H \mathbf{H} + \left( \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{[\ell]} \right)^{-1} \right)^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_q^{[\ell]} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_q^{[\ell]} \left( \sigma_w^{-2} \mathbf{H}^H \mathbf{y} + \left( \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^{[\ell]} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{[\ell]} \right). \quad (7)$$

The  $k$ th marginal of  $q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u})$  can be easily computed from this expression as  $q^{[\ell]}(u_k) \sim \mathcal{CN}(u_k : \mu_k^{[\ell]}, \sigma_k^{2[\ell]})$ , where  $\mu_k^{[\ell]}$  is the  $k$ th entry of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_q^{[\ell]}$  and  $\sigma_k^{2[\ell]}$  is the  $k$ th diagonal entry of matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_q^{[\ell]}$ . Bearing these expressions in mind we next face the update of the factors  $t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k)$  by means of the EP algorithm.

The EP is based on the minimization of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the true distribution in (2) and its Gaussian approximation in (5), which corresponds to matching the expected sufficient statistics between both distributions [16]. Since (5) is Gaussian distributed this is equivalent to matching their means and variances, which is commonly referred to as moment matching. Hence, along  $\ell = 1, \dots, S$  iterations, we estimate the new values of its moments,  $\mu_{t_k}^{[\ell+1]}$  and  $\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]}$ , by

$$\frac{q^{[\ell]}(u_k)}{t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k)} p_D(u_k) \xleftrightarrow{\text{moment matching}} \frac{q^{[\ell]}(u_k)}{t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k)} t_k^{[\ell+1]}(u_k). \quad (8)$$

Note that in both terms in (8) we have the marginal of the full approximation,  $q^{[\ell]}(u_k)$  in (3)-(7), divided by the estimation of the  $k$ th factor,  $t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k)$ , and then multiplied by the true prior and the new factor, respectively. We define  $q_E^{[\ell]}(u_k)$ , that plays the role of an extrinsic marginal distribution, as

$$q_E^{[\ell]}(u_k) = q^{[\ell]}(u_k) / t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k) = \mathcal{CN}(u_k : \mu_{E_k}^{[\ell]}, \sigma_{E_k}^{2[\ell]}). \quad (9)$$

<sup>1</sup>For  $n = (p-1)N_t Q + 1, \dots, (p-1)N_t Q + N_t Q$ .

Using (5)-(7) to compute  $q^{[\ell]}(u_k)$  and by the definition of the approximating factors,  $t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k)$ , it follows that (see (A.7) in [15]),

$$\mu_{E_k}^{[\ell]} = \frac{\mu_k^{[\ell]} \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]} - \mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]} \sigma_k^{2[\ell]}}{\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]} - \sigma_k^{2[\ell]}}, \quad \sigma_{E_k}^{2[\ell]} = \frac{\sigma_k^{2[\ell]} \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}}{\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]} - \sigma_k^{2[\ell]}}. \quad (10)$$

Finally, to derive the new moments of  $t_k^{[\ell+1]}(u_k)$  from (8), we need to compute the moments of

$$p^{[\ell]}(u_k) = q_E^{[\ell]}(u_k) p_D(u_k). \quad (11)$$

We will denote its first and second moments as  $\mu_{p_k}^{[\ell]}$  and  $\sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]}$ , respectively. We update the factor  $t_k^{[\ell+1]}(u_k)$  with these new values at every iteration  $\ell$ , using a damping approach, as described in Algorithm 1, where the selection of parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $\beta$  will be discussed later in this section. The control of negative variances proposed in [6], [7] is also included. In Table I is included a brief description of every function used, with the notation employed for its moments.

	Mean, Covariance	Description
$q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u})$	$\mu_q^{[\ell]}, \Sigma_q^{[\ell]}$	Full approximation to the posterior
$q^{[\ell]}(u_k)$	$\mu_k^{[\ell]}, \sigma_k^{2[\ell]}$	Marginal of $q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u})$
$t_k^{[\ell]}(u_k)$	$\mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]}, \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}$	Factors in the approximation $q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u})$
$p_D(u_k)$		Prior of the transmitted symbols
$q_E^{[\ell]}(u_k)$	$\mu_{E_k}^{[\ell]}, \sigma_{E_k}^{2[\ell]}$	Extrinsic marginal distribution
$p^{[\ell]}(u_k)$	$\mu_{p_k}^{[\ell]}, \sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]}$	Product $q_E^{[\ell]}(u_k) p_D(u_k)$

TABLE I: Description of functions used and their parameters, at iteration  $\ell$  of Algorithm 1.

### A. Turbo Detection

The whole EP procedure for a turbo detector is detailed in Algorithm 2, where  $\ell = 1, \dots, S$  is the iteration number of EP and  $t = 0, \dots, T$  is the iteration number of the turbo detection. Unlike [6], [7], at Step 2 of this algorithm the priors used in the moment matching (see (8)) are the non-uniform probability mass function (pmf) at the output of the decoder,  $p_D^{[t]}(u_k)$ . For this reason, we denote this approach as non-uniform block expectation propagation (nuBEP) detector. Note that for  $T = 0$  we have a standalone version of the detection, with no turbo detection. Also, we may have different values of  $\beta$  for each turbo iteration.

### B. EP parameters

The update of the EP solution is a critical issue due to instabilities, particularly for high-order modulations. In this subsection, we review the EP parameters used in related approaches [6], [14] to propose some values. These parameters are: the minimum allowed variance ( $\epsilon$ ), a damping factor ( $\beta$ ) and the number of EP iterations ( $S$ ). The first two parameters determine the speed of the algorithm to get a stationary solution and control instabilities. The computational complexity of the algorithm depends linearly with  $S$ .

---

### Algorithm 1 Moment Matching and Damping (MMD)

---

**Given inputs:**  $p_D(u_k)$ ,  $\mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]}, \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, N_t$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\beta$

- 1) Compute  $q^{[\ell]}(\mathbf{u})$  in (5)-(7) and its marginals,  $q^{[\ell]}(u_k)$ .
- 2) Compute the extrinsic marginal distributions,  $q_E^{[\ell]}(u_k)$  in (9)-(10).

**for**  $k = 1, \dots, N_t$  **do**

- 3) Compute the moments of  $p^{[\ell]}(u_k)$  in (11), i.e.,  $\mu_{p_k}^{[\ell]}$  and  $\sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]}$ . Set a minimum allowed variance as  $\sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]} = \max(\epsilon, \sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]})$ .
- 4) Match moments: compute new values of the moments of  $t_k^{[\ell+1]}(u_k)$  using (8),

$$\sigma_{q_k, new}^{2[\ell+1]} = \frac{\sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]} \sigma_{E_k}^{2[\ell]}}{\sigma_{E_k}^{2[\ell]} - \sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]}}, \quad (12)$$

$$\mu_{q_k, new}^{[\ell+1]} = \sigma_{q_k, new}^{2[\ell+1]} \left( \frac{\mu_{p_k}^{[\ell]}}{\sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]}} - \frac{\mu_{E_k}^{[\ell]}}{\sigma_{E_k}^{2[\ell]}} \right). \quad (13)$$

- 5) Run damping: Update the values as

$$\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]} = \left( \beta \frac{1}{\sigma_{q_k, new}^{2[\ell+1]}} + (1 - \beta) \frac{1}{\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}} \right)^{-1}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mu_{t_k}^{[\ell+1]} = \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]} \left( \beta \frac{\mu_{q_k, new}^{[\ell+1]}}{\sigma_{q_k, new}^{2[\ell+1]}} + (1 - \beta) \frac{\mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]}}{\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}} \right). \quad (15)$$

**if**  $\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]} < 0$  **then**

$$\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]} = \sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}, \quad \mu_{t_k}^{[\ell+1]} = \mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]}. \quad (16)$$

**end if**

**Output:**  $\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]}, \mu_{t_k}^{[\ell+1]}$

**end for**

---

In [6], the authors set  $S = 10$  and introduced fast updates of EP solution by setting  $\beta = 0.95$ . To avoid instabilities due to the fast updates, they set a gradual decrease for the minimum variance, starting with a high value along the first 4 iterations and then decreasing it exponentially as  $\epsilon = 2^{-\max(\ell-4, 1)}$ . However, we found that for large-size modulations and turbo schemes, the fast updates can provoke instabilities, as it will be showed in Section IV. For this reason and following our proposal in [12], we let  $\beta$  start with a conservative value and increase it exponentially with the number of turbo iterations,  $\beta_t = \min(\exp(t/1.5)/10, 0.7)$ , where  $t \in [0, T]$  is the number of the current turbo iteration. This growth of  $\beta$  allows to reduce the number of EP iterations once the turbo procedure starts. We propose to reduce it from 10 in [6] to  $S = 3$ . We also set  $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ . Regarding the control of negative variances, we just update the EP solution when the computed variance is positive (see (16)), as proposed in [6].

In [14] only one iteration of the EP procedure is computed, i.e.,  $S = 1$ . They do not introduce any damping or control of minimum variances. In case of negative variances, they update the EP solution with the moments computed in Step 3

---

**Algorithm 2** nuBEP Turbo Decoder for MIMO
 

---

**Given inputs:**  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $[\beta_1, \dots, \beta_T]$ .

**Initialization:** Set  $p_D(u_k) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{A}} \delta(u_k - u)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, N_t$ .

**Turbo Iteration:**
**for**  $t = 0, \dots, T$  **do**

 1) Compute the mean  $\mu_{t_k}^{[1]}$  and variance  $\sigma_{t_k}^{2[1]}$  of  $p_D(u_k)$ .

**Self Iteration:**
**for**  $\ell = 1, \dots, S$  **do**

 2) Run the moment matching procedure in Algorithm 1 with inputs  $p_D(u_k)$ ,  $\mu_{t_k}^{[\ell]}$ ,  $\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell]}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\beta_t$ , to obtain  $\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]}$  and  $\mu_{t_k}^{[\ell+1]}$ .

**end for**

 3) With the values  $\sigma_{t_k}^{2[S+1]}$ ,  $\mu_{t_k}^{[S+1]}$  obtained, calculate the extrinsic distribution  $q_E^{[S+1]}(u_k)$  as in (9).

 4) Demap the extrinsic distribution and compute the extrinsic LLR,  $L_E(b_n)$ , and deliver it to the channel decoder.

 5) Run the channel decoder to output  $p_D(u_k)$ .

**end for**


---

of Algorithm 1, i.e.,

$$\sigma_{t_k}^{2[\ell+1]} = \sigma_{p_k}^{2[\ell]}, \quad \mu_{t_k}^{[\ell+1]} = \mu_{p_k}^{[\ell]}. \quad (17)$$

In Table II, we describe the values of the EP parameters used in the current proposal (nuBEP) and the other EP-based detectors in the literature. The computational complexity per turbo iteration of these algorithms is included in Table III. The computational complexity of the MPEP [14], EPD [6] and nuBEP is  $S + 1$  times the complexity of the LMMSE, of cubic order with  $N_t$ , where  $S = 1$  for the MPEP,  $S = 10$  for the EPD and  $S = 3$  for the nuBEP.

Algorithm	$\epsilon$	$\beta$	$S$
nuBEP	$1e^{-8}$	$\min(\exp(t/1.5)/10, 0.7)$	3
EPD [6]	$2^{-\max(\ell-4, 1)}$	0.95	10
MPEP [14]	-	-	1


TABLE II: Values for the EP parameters.

Algorithm	Computational Complexity Order
MPEP [14]	$2\mathcal{O}(N_t^3)$
EPD [6]	$11\mathcal{O}(N_t^3)$
nuBEP	$4\mathcal{O}(N_t^3)$

TABLE III: Computational complexity order.

## IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section we illustrate the performance of the proposed nuBEP turbo detector and compare its performance to the ones of the EP-based detectors proposed in [6] and [14], hereafter denoted as EPD and MPEP, respectively. We also depict the BER of the LMMSE. We do not include the SD [2], MCMC [3], GTA [4] or CHEMP [5] algorithms in the simulations because it has already been showed that the EPD [6] quite


 Fig. 1: BER along  $N_t E_s / N_0$  for nuBEP, EPD [6], MPEP [14] and LMMSE detectors, 128-QAM and averaged over 100 randomly channels in a  $6 \times 6$  system after  $T = 5$  turbo iterations.

outperforms these three approaches [7], [13]. The modulator uses a Gray mapping and a 128-QAM constellation. The results are averaged over 100 random channels and  $10^4$  random encoded words of length  $V = 4096$  (per channel realization). A number of  $T = 5$  turbo iterations were run. Each channel coefficient is independent and identically Gaussian distributed with zero mean and unit variance. A (3,6)-regular low-density parity-check (LDPC) of rate  $1/2$  is used. The absolute value of LLRs given to the decoder is limited to 5 in order to avoid very confident probabilities. The decoder runs a maximum of 100 iterations.

In Fig. 1 we include the BER obtained for a system with  $N_t = N_r = 6$  antennas. It can be observed that the EPD [6] improves the performance of the LMMSE but it is far from the results of the nuBEP and the MPEP. The reason is that the true prior used by EPD in the moment matching procedure is set to a uniform distribution, while nuBEP and MPEP use a non-uniform one given by the output of the decoder, which better characterizes the prior after the turbo feedback. The MPEP approach [14] quite outperforms both the LMMSE and the EPD because it uses a non-uniform prior. However, it does not achieve the performance of the nuBEP because it just computes one iteration of the EP algorithm and does not use any damping procedure. The new proposed approach, nuBEP, exhibits the most accurate and robust performance, due to its carefully chosen EP parameters, having gains of 14 dB and 6 dB with respect to the LMMSE and MPEP, respectively.

In Fig. 2 we increase the number of antennas to  $N_t = N_r = 32$ . In this scenario, the EPD approach shows instabilities at large  $N_t E_s / N_0$  since its parameters are not optimized for large-scale constellations and turbo schemes. Again, the best performance is obtained with the nuBEP, that has a remarkable improvement of 8 dB with respect to the LMMSE and of 1.5 dB compared to the MPEP algorithm.

Finally, in Fig. 3 we include some results for the case of imperfect channel state information (CSI). Each coefficient of the channel matrix is i.i.d. generated as  $\hat{h}_{k,j} = h_{k,j} + \delta h_{k,j}$  where  $\delta h_{k,j} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\delta h_{k,j} : 0, \sigma_H^2)$ . We set  $\sigma_H^2 = 10^{-3}$ . In solid lines we represent the BER of the algorithms as described in the previous section, where the nuBEP exhibits a good and




Fig. 2: BER along  $N_t E_s / N_0$  for nuBEP, EPD [6], MPEP [14] and LMMSE detectors, 128-QAM and averaged over 100 randomly channels in a  $32 \times 32$  system after  $T = 5$  turbo iterations.




Fig. 3: BER along  $N_t E_s / N_0$  for nuBEP, EPD [6], MPEP [14] and LMMSE detectors, 128-QAM and averaged over 100 randomly noisy channels with  $\sigma_H^2 = 10^{-3}$  in a  $32 \times 32$  system after  $T = 5$  turbo iterations. Solid lines correspond to a noise variance of  $\sigma_w^2$ , while dashed lines to  $N_t \sigma_H^2 E_s + \sigma_w^2$ .

robust behavior except for high  $E_s / N_0$ . The results in dashed lines were obtained by modelling the effect of the error in the channel estimation as i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian distributed noise of variance  $N_t \sigma_H^2 E_s$ . Accordingly, we replaced  $\sigma_w^2$  by  $N_t \sigma_H^2 E_s + \sigma_w^2$  in the algorithms. It can be observed that the BER quite improves, avoiding the degradation in the performance at large  $E_s / N_0$ . Also, the result in dashed line for the nuBEP is close to the one in Fig. 2, i.e., when no error is introduced in the channel matrix. More complex covariances for the noise could be introduced [17].

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have proposed an EP-based turbo detector (nuBEP) for MIMO systems and large-size modulations where the optimal MAP algorithm is computationally unfeasible. The nuBEP detector quite outperforms the classical LMMSE and other EP-based detectors found in the literature. Specifically, it uses a non-uniform prior, rather than a uniform one as in [6]. This prior better characterizes the true prior used in the self-iterations of the EP algorithm, during the moment matching procedure, once the turbo procedure has started.

The proposed detector also optimizes its parameters to avoid some instabilities that appear at large  $E_s / N_0$  and to reduce its complexity. Specifically, it reduces the number of EP iterations from 10 (used in [6]) to 3 after the feedback from the decoder. It also outperforms the EP detector in [14] since we include a self-iterated stage with damping and a different control of negative variances, that endow the nuBEP approach with a more accurate solution. Simulations results show that the proposed nuBEP turbo detector has gains in the range 5-11 dB with respect to the EPD [6] and 1.5-6 dB compared to the MPEP [14].

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Rusek, D. Persson, B. K. Lau, E. G. Larsson, T. L. Marzetta, O. Edfors, and F. Tufvesson, "Scaling up MIMO: Opportunities and challenges with very large arrays," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 40–60, Jan 2013.
- [2] C. Studer, A. Burg, and H. Bolcskei, "Soft-output sphere decoding: algorithms and VLSI implementation," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 290–300, February 2008.
- [3] T. Datta, N. A. Kumar, A. Chockalingam, and B. S. Rajan, "A novel monte-carlo-sampling-based receiver for large-scale uplink multiuser MIMO systems," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 3019–3038, Sept 2013.
- [4] J. Goldberger and A. Leshem, "MIMO detection for high-order QAM based on a gaussian tree approximation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 8, pp. 4973–4982, Aug 2011.
- [5] T. L. Narasimhan and A. Chockalingam, "Channel hardening-exploiting message passing (CHEMP) receiver in large-scale MIMO systems," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 847–860, Oct 2014.
- [6] J. Céspedes, P. M. Olmos, M. Sánchez-Fernández, and F. Pérez-Cruz, "Probabilistic MIMO symbol detection with expectation consistency approximate inference," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 3481–3494, April 2018.
- [7] J. Céspedes, "Approximate inference in massive MIMO scenarios with moment matching techniques," Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Jan 2017.
- [8] T. P. Minka, "A family of algorithms for approximate Bayesian inference," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2001.
- [9] M. Seeger, "Expectation propagation for exponential families," *Univ. Calif., Berkeley, CA, USA, Tech. Rep.*, 2005.
- [10] I. Santos, J. J. Murillo-Fuentes, R. Boloix-Tortosa, E. Arias-de-Reyna, and P. M. Olmos, "Expectation propagation as turbo equalizer in ISI channels," *IEEE Trans. on Communications*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 360–370, Jan 2017.
- [11] I. Santos, J. J. Murillo-Fuentes, E. Arias-de-Reyna, and P. M. Olmos, "Probabilistic equalization with a smoothing expectation propagation approach," *IEEE Trans. on Wireless Communications*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 2950–2962, May 2017.
- [12] I. Santos, J. J. Murillo-Fuentes, E. A. de Reyna, and P. M. Olmos, "Turbo EP-based equalization: A filter-type implementation," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 66, no. 9, pp. 4259–4270, Sept 2018.
- [13] J. Céspedes, P. M. Olmos, M. Sánchez-Fernández, and F. Pérez-Cruz, "Expectation propagation detection for high-order high-dimensional MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. on Communications*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 2840–2849, Aug 2014.
- [14] M. Senst and G. Ascheid, "How the framework of expectation propagation yields an iterative IC-LMMSE MIMO receiver," in *Proc. IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, Dec 2011, pp. 1–6.
- [15] C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams, *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2006.
- [16] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning (Information Science and Statistics)*. Secaucus, NJ, USA: Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006.
- [17] K. Ghavami and M. Naraghi-Pour, "MIMO detection with imperfect channel state information using expectation propagation," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 66, no. 9, pp. 8129–8138, Sept 2017.