

4-Cycle Free Spatially Coupled LDPC Codes with an Explicit Construction

Zeinab Roostaie, Mohammad Gholami, Farzad Parvaresh

Abstract—Spatially coupled low-density parity-check (SC-LDPC) codes are a class of capacity approaching LDPC codes with low message recovery latency when a sliding window decoding is used. In this paper, we first present a new method for the construction of a class of SC-LDPC codes by the incidence matrices of a given non-negative integer matrix E , and then the relationship of 4-cycles between matrix E and the corresponding SC-LDPC code are investigated. Finally, by defining a new class of integer finite sequences, called *good sequences*, for the first time, we give an explicit method for the construction of a class of 4-cycle free SC-LDPC codes that can achieve (in most cases) the minimum coupling width.

Index Terms—Spatially coupled LDPC codes, girth, coupling width, sliding window decoding.

I. INTRODUCTION

As originally invented by Gallager in 1962, low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes is a type of error correction code with long block lengths which can be decoded efficiently using the low-complexity iterative belief-propagation (BP) decoding algorithms. In general, LDPC codes consist of two categories: random/ pseudo-random LDPC codes [1], and the structured LDPC codes [1]-[10]. In the ensemble of structured LDPC codes, *cyclic* or *quasi-cyclic* (QC) LDPC codes have been widely used in many practical applications as they are much easier for hardware implementation [1].

Spatially coupled (SC) LDPC codes [5]-[15] can be viewed as a sequence of LDPC block codes whose graph representations are coupled together over time, resulting in a convolutional structure with block-to-block memory. A remarkable property of SC-LDPC codes, established numerically in [13] and analytically in [14], [15], is that asymptotically their iterative message passing decoding threshold is equal to the MAP decoding threshold of the underlying LDPC block code ensemble under certain conditions, a phenomenon known as *threshold saturation*. In other words, the (exponential complexity) MAP decoding performance of the underlying block code can be achieved by its coupled version with (linear complexity) message passing decoding.

One of the advantages of SC-LDPC codes is that in the coupling process a huge number of absorbing sets in the Tanner graph (TG) are broken [11]. This is the main reason for the remarkable performance in waterfall and error floor regions of their bit error rate curves. Moreover, the memorized

codeword structure and long coupling length make SC-LDPC more sensitive to short cycles. Small cycles and graphical structures like trapping sets and absorbing sets, which often contain short cycles, are known to have a strong influence on the error floor [3]. Constructing SC-LDPC convolutional codes (SC-LDPC-CCs) with the lowest constraint length and free of short cycles such as 4-cycles is a challenging problem.

In [6], a protograph-based method is used to construct some SC-LDPC codes with good performances, using first an *edge-spreading* procedure to couple together a chain of block code protographs, followed by a *graph lifting* using permutation matrices. The decoding latency depends on the product of the *coupling width* and the *graphs lifting factor*, so codes with a small coupling width may result to have a small latency. In [5], to find 4-cycle free SC-LDPC codes, a multi-stage design has been proposed based on a heuristic search and a check-and-flip process for the edge-spreading procedure by decomposing the fully-one base matrix B into $w + 1$ 4-cycle free component matrices. Moreover, they have employed an exhaustive search to find the minimum w , meeting the lower bound of the coupling widths.

In this paper, for a given matrix E of non-negative integers, we deal with two constructions of SC-LDPC codes based on the incidence matrices of the elements of E , dependent on whether the indices of the considered incidence matrices are consecutive or not. Then, we pursue the existence of 4-cycles in the PCM of the constructed codes by some square submatrices in the primary matrix E or its *representative block matrix*. The first representation inherits an explicit construction of 4-cycle free matrix E based on newly defined sequences, called *good sequences* to generate a class of 4-cycle free SC-LDPC codes having minimum coupling widths (in most cases).

II. THE PRELIMINARIES AND DESIGN APPROACHES

Let $B = (b_{i,j})_{p \times q}$, be a non-negative integer matrix with Tanner graph $TG(B)$ containing *check nodes* $\{c_1, \dots, c_p\}$ and *variable nodes* $\{v_1, \dots, v_q\}$ associated to the rows and columns of B , respectively, for which $b_{i,j}$ determines the number of edges between c_i and v_j . Now, associated to B with $\mathcal{G} = TG(B)$, the *spatially coupled* (SC) LDPC code with *base matrix* B can be described as an *edge-spreading* procedure to couple together a chain of \mathcal{G} . In fact, the Tanner graph of the target code can be constructed by first replicating \mathcal{G} as an infinite chain, and then spreading edges from the variable nodes of each copy of \mathcal{G} by connecting them to the check nodes at most w copies of \mathcal{G} after it, i.e $t, t + 1, \dots, t + w$, where w is called *coupling width*. For example, Fig. 2 shows the process of constructing the Tanner graph of an SC-LDPC

Z. Roostaie is a Ph. D student with the Department of Mathematical Sciences, Shahrekord University, P. O. Box 8818634141, Shahrekord, IRAN

Corresponding author: M. Gholami is a Professor in Mathematics with the Department of Mathematical Sciences, Shahrekord University, P. O. Box 8818634141, Shahrekord, IRAN

F. Parvaresh is an Associate Professor in Department of Electrical Engineering University of Isfahan, E-mail: f.parvaresh@eng.ui.ac.ir




Fig. 1. Coupling process of the protograph associated to the base matrix $B = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$

code with coupling width $w = 2$, by coupling $\text{TG}(B)$, in which $B = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$.

It can easily be seen that the above coupling process to construct an SC-LDPC code with the base matrix B corresponds to the decomposition of B into $w + 1$ component matrices B_0, B_1, \dots, B_w of the same size, such that $B = \sum_{i=0}^w B_i$, therefore this construction is not unique in general, and strongly depends on the corresponding decomposition. For example, in Fig. 2, we have $B = B_0 + B_1 + B_2$, in which $B_0 = B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

For the base matrix B with decomposition $B = \sum_{i=0}^w B_i$, it can be seen that the PCM of the corresponding SC-LDPC code is as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(B_0, \dots, B_w) = \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & & & & & \\ B_1 & B_0 & & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & & \\ B_w & B_{w-1} & \ddots & & & \\ & B_w & \ddots & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

In practice, an SC-LDPC code is terminated after a finite number L copies of \mathcal{G} , where L is called the *coupling length*. Then, the following matrix $\mathcal{H}^{(L)}$ can be considered as the PCM of the SC-LDPC code with coupling length L .

$$\mathcal{H}^{(L)}(B_0, \dots, B_w) = \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & & & & & \\ B_1 & B_0 & & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & & \\ B_w & B_{w-1} & \ddots & B_0 & & \\ & B_w & \ddots & B_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \vdots & & \\ & & & B_w & & \end{pmatrix}_{(L+w)p \times Lq}$$

It is important to note that the first and last wp check nodes have a reduced degree, that is, terminating the base graphs causes a small amount of disorder at both ends of the graph, which is a special feature that affects the saturation threshold of SC-LDPC codes [6], [13]-[15].

The constraint length and rate of the SC-LDPC code with PCM $\mathcal{H}^{(L)}$ is $v = p(w + 1)$ and $R^{(L)} = 1 - \frac{(L+w)p}{Lq}$, respectively, and the approximate rate is given by $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} R^{(L)} \triangleq$

$R^\infty = 1 - \frac{p}{q}$. $H^{(L)}$ defines a particular SC-LDPC code, whose girth (denoted by $g(\mathcal{H}^{(L)})$) is the length of the shortest cycle in the corresponding Tanner graph.

III. A DETERMINISTIC APPROACH TO CONSTRUCT A CLASS OF SC-LDPC CODES

For positive integers p, q , $p < q$, let $E = (e_{i,j})_{p \times q}$ be a matrix with entries belonging to the set of non-negative integers and $\mathcal{E} = \{e_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q\}$ be the set of all elements (SOE) of the matrix E . Associated to each element $e \in \mathcal{E}$, the incidence matrix \mathcal{M}_e can be defined as the $p \times q$ binary matrix \mathcal{M}_e whose (i, j) th entry $\mathcal{M}_e(i, j)$ is non-zero, if and only if $e_{i,j} = e$. For the case that $e \notin \mathcal{E}$, we set \mathcal{M}_e to be the $p \times q$ zero matrix. For example, associated with the matrix

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ 4 & 3 & 3 & 0 \\ 4 & 0 & 5 & 5 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

we have the following incidence matrices:

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0100 \\ 0001 \\ 0100 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{M}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0010 \\ 0000 \\ 0000 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{M}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0000 \\ 0000 \\ 0000 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{M}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1001 \\ 0110 \\ 0000 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{M}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0000 \\ 1000 \\ 1000 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{M}_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0000 \\ 0000 \\ 0011 \end{pmatrix}$$

Definition 1: Matrix E is called *4-cycle free* if $e_{i_1, j_1} - e_{i_1, j_2} - e_{i_2, j_2} + e_{i_2, j_1} \neq 0$, for each $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq p$ and $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq q$.

In fact, each 4-cycle free matrix E can be considered as the exponent matrix of a QC-LDPC code with circulant permutation matrix (CPM) size N , where N is large enough [4].

Associated to a matrix $E = (e_{i,j})_{p \times q}$, with SEO \mathcal{E} , we follow a structure for the construction of PCM of a class of SC-LDPC codes.

Design Method. Let $I = \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_w\}$, $i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_w$, be a set of non-negative integers containing \mathcal{E} . For the fully-1 $p \times q$ base matrix B , we follow the design approach by breaking B to the $|I| = w + 1$ component matrices \mathcal{M}_i , $i \in I$, such that $B = \sum_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}_i$. In fact, associated with E , we consider the incidence matrices $\{\mathcal{M}_i, i \in I\} = \{\mathcal{M}_{i_0}, \mathcal{M}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{i_w}\}$ as the target component matrices to define the PCM of the corresponding (p, q) SC-LDPC code to be $\mathcal{H}(E) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{M}_{i_0}, \mathcal{M}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{i_w})$, as defined in Eq. 1.

For positive integer L , $\mathcal{H}^{(L)}(E) = \mathcal{H}^{(L)}(\mathcal{M}_{i_0}, \mathcal{M}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{i_w})$ can be constructed from $\mathcal{H}(E)$ by terminating the matrix after L steps which contain Lq (first) variable nodes and $(L + i_w - i_0)p$ (first) check nodes, starting from the upper-left corner of $\mathcal{H}(E)$. The design rate of the code with PCM $\mathcal{H}^{(L)}(E)$ is at least $1 - \frac{(L + i_w - i_0)p}{Lq}$ which tends to $1 - \frac{p}{q}$, when L enlarges.

Besides the rate, we need to analyze some other properties influencing the error-rate performances, such as the girth. Before, for integers a, b , $a < b$, we set $[a, b]$ to denote the set of all integers between a and b , i.e. $[a, b] = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$.

Theorem 3.1: If $I = [i_0, i_w]$, then the SC-LDPC code with PCM $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is 4-cycle free if and only if E is 4-cycle free.

According to Theorem 3.3) is equivalent to finding SC-LDPC codes with the smallest coupling widths. Then, in Table I, we have tried to find such good sequences, labeled with (a_n) , having the smallest MOE w_3 . In fact, as the outputs show, our results (in most cases) match well with Lemma 4 of [8], which gives a lower-bound on w needed to ensure a 4-cycle-free SC LDPC code. On the other hand, MOE's are the same with the minimum coupling width w_1 of the codes in [5], just for $(p, q) = (5, 10)$ ours is better. Besides, because of the high complexity of the approach used in [5], there is not any report for w_1 , especially when $p + q \geq 15$, while the outputs of Algorithm 1 meet the minimum values up to $q = 16$ and other values also can be easily obtained even for larger p and q not reported in the table.

Example 3.4: For $(p, q) = (3, 6)$, the finite sequence $(0, 3, 2, 0, 0, 1, 3, 0)$ is a good sequence with MOE $w = 3$. Then, Theorem 3.3 can be used to construct the following 4-cycle free matrix E .

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 0 \\ 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ 0 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Now, applying Theorem 3.1, the matrix $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is the PCM of a 4-cycle free SC-LDPC code with coupling width $w = 3$.

Algorithm 1 Generating good sequences

Require: Let w, p and q be given with $p < q$.

$A \leftarrow \{0, 1, \dots, w\}, C_1 = \{c_{1,0}, \dots, c_{1,w}\} \leftarrow A, n_4 \leftarrow 2$

$a_1^{(p,q)} \leftarrow c_{1,0}, l \leftarrow p + q - 1, q_1 \leftarrow True$

while $|C_1| > 0$ and $n_4 \leq l$ **do**

$B \leftarrow \emptyset$

for n_1 from 1 to $n_4 - 2$ **do**

for n_3 from $n_1 + 1$ to $n_4 - 1$ **do**

$n_2 \leftarrow n_1 - n_3 + n_4$

if $n_4 - n_2 < p$ and $n_4 - n_3 < q$ **then**

$B \leftarrow B \cup \{a_{n_2}^{(p,q)} + a_{n_3}^{(p,q)} - a_{n_1}^{(p,q)}\}$

end if

end for

end for

$C_{n_4} \leftarrow A \setminus B$

while $n_4 > 0$ and $|C_{n_4}| = 0$ **do**

$n_4 \leftarrow n_4 - 1$

if $n_4 > 0$ **then**

$C_{n_4} \leftarrow C_{n_4} \setminus \{a_{n_4}^{(p,q)}\}$

end if

end while

if $n_4 > 0$ **then**

$v \leftarrow |C_{n_4}| - 1$ and $C_{n_4} = \{c_{n_4,0}, \dots, c_{n_4,v}\}$

$a_{n_4} \leftarrow c_{n_4,0}$ and $n_4 \leftarrow n_4 + 1$

end if

if $n_4 = l + 1$ **then**

return $(a_n^{(p,q)})_{1 \leq n \leq l}$

end if

end while

Although Theorem 3.1 is useful when I is an interval, we need criteria to check the girth of $TG(\mathcal{H}(E))$ when the

elements of I are not consecutive. For this, we first need some definitions from [5].

Definition 3: Corresponding to the matrix E with SOE \mathcal{E} , $\mathcal{E} \subseteq I = \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_w\}$ and incidence matrices \mathcal{M}_{i_j} , $0 \leq j \leq w$, the *representative block matrix* is defined as follows.

$$B_R(E) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{i_w} & \mathcal{M}_{i_{w-1}} & \dots & \mathcal{M}_{i_0} \\ & \mathcal{M}_{i_w} & \dots & \mathcal{M}_{i_1} \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & \mathcal{M}_{i_w} \end{pmatrix}$$

Referring to Lemma 2 in [5], it can be seen that $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is 4-cycle free if and only if $B_R(E)$ is 4-cycle free. Because, each combination of one, two, or four incidence matrices \mathcal{M}_{i_j} , $0 \leq j \leq w$, that contain a 4-cycle in $\mathcal{H}(E)$ will appear in $B_R(E)$.

Because of the importance of the indices $i \in \mathcal{E}$ of \mathcal{M}_i in the upper-right of $B_R(E)$, hereinafter we consider $B_R^{(I)}(E)$ to be the following matrix.

$$B_R^{(I)}(E) = \begin{pmatrix} i_w & i_{w-1} & \dots & i_0 \\ -1 & i_w & \dots & i_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -1 & -1 & \dots & i_w \end{pmatrix}$$

in which we consider the indices of the zero elements of $B_R^{(I)}(E)$ to be -1. Here, we give a theorem that connects the existence of 4-cycles in $B_R(E)$ with the existence of some square sub-matrices in E .

Theorem 3.5: The SC-LDPC code with PCM $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is 4-cycle free if and only if each 2×2 sub-matrix of the upper-right corner of $B_R^{(I)}(E)$ and each of the square matrices $\begin{pmatrix} a & a \\ b & b \end{pmatrix}$

or $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ a & b \end{pmatrix}$ $a, b \in \mathcal{E}$, does not appear in E .

Proof: Each cycle of length 4 in $TG(\mathcal{H}(E))$ may be occurred in \mathcal{M}_{i_j} , for a $0 \leq j \leq w$, or in the array $(\mathcal{M}_{i_j} \mathcal{M}_{i_k})$, or its transpose, for some $0 \leq j \neq k \leq w$, or in the array $\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{i_j} & \mathcal{M}_{i_k} \\ \mathcal{M}_{i_{j+h}} & \mathcal{M}_{i_{k+h}} \end{pmatrix}$, for some $0 \leq k < j \leq w$ and $1 \leq h \leq w - j$. However, three first cases are not happen because E does not contain the sub-matrix $\begin{pmatrix} i_j & i_j \\ i_k & i_k \end{pmatrix}$ or its transpose, for each $0 \leq j \neq k \leq w$. Besides, the last case may not be considered because $\begin{pmatrix} i_j & i_k \\ i_{j+h} & i_{k+h} \end{pmatrix}$ is a sub-matrix of $B_R^{(I)}(E)$ which is not included in the matrix E . ■

Remark 3.6: It is noticed that the matrix E satisfying Theorem 3.5 is not necessary 4-cycle free, although, $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is 4-cycle free. For example, the following matrix with $I = \{0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$ is a good candidate for Theorem 3.5, i.e. $\mathcal{H}(E)$ is 4-cycle free, while E has some 4-cycles.

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 2 & 5 & 5 & 7 & 3 & 8 \\ 8 & 0 & 8 & 6 & 0 & 7 & 0 \\ 4 & 6 & 7 & 3 & 8 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

For the case that I is an interval containing consecutive elements, Theorem 3.5 is the same as Theorem 3.1.

TABLE I
A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE COUPLING WIDTHS OF THE CONSTRUCTED CODES AND THE CODES IN [4], [5]

p	q	w ₁	w ₂	w ₃	a _n	p	q	w ₁	w ₂	w ₃	a _n		
2	3	1	2	1	(0,0,1,0)	4	5	2	6	2	(0,2,1,2,0,0,2,1)		
	4	2	3	2	(0,0,1,0,2)		6	3	6	3	(1,2,0,3,0,0,2,3,1)		
	5	2	4	2	(0,0,1,0,2,0)		7	4	10	4	(0,2,0,4,4,3,0,1,3,1)		
	6	3	5	3	(0,1,1,3,2,0,3)		8	5	10	5	(0,1,5,2,0,5,0,3,2,4)		
	7	3	6	3	(0,0,1,3,2,0,3,0)		9	5	10	6	(0,2,0,4,5,0,6,6,5,1,3,1)		
	8	4	7	4	(0,2,3,2,0,0,4,1,4)		10	6	10	6	(0,2,5,6,4,0,4,3,0,0,6,1,4)		
	9	4	8	4	(0,4,4,3,1,2,4,0,3,0)		11	-	12	6	(0,0,6,4,3,0,5,1,5,0,3,5,6,0)		
	10	5	9	5	(0,0,1,5,2,4,0,3,2,0,5)		12	-	12	7	(0,0,2,5,0,6,4,1,0,7,3,7,0,0,2)		
	11	5	10	5	(0,5,4,1,3,3,4,0,4,2,5,0)		13	-	16	7	(0,0,7,6,2,0,6,1,4,1,6,0,2,3,7,0)		
	12	6	11	6	(0,2,0,5,1,1,0,3,4,1,5,0,6)		14	-	16	8	(0,6,6,8,2,1,6,4,0,3,7,0,7,8,5,0,0)		
	13	-	12	6	(0,0,1,0,4,1,6,2,0,3,5,0,6,0)		15	-	16	8	(0,0,4,6,7,1,8,3,0,3,8,1,7,6,4,0,0,4)		
	14	-	13	7	(0,6,7,1,5,0,7,3,2,4,7,7,4,2,7)		16	-	16	9	(0,0,3,8,9,1,0,8,5,0,9,2,6,0,7,9,7,3,3)		
	3	4	2	4	2		(0,2,2,0,1,0)	5	6	4	6	4	(0,3,1,2,4,4,1,4,2,3)
		5	2	6	2		(0,2,1,2,0,0,2)		7	4	10	4	(0,1,1,0,4,2,4,0,1,1,0)
6		3	6	3	(0,2,3,0,3,1,0,0)	8	5		10	6	(0,5,4,1,3,6,0,0,1,6,5,2)		
7		3	10	3	(0,3,1,0,0,2,3,0,3)	9	6		10	6	(0,2,6,6,4,5,4,0,6,1,3,6,6)		
8		4	10	4	(0,1,3,2,0,4,4,0,3,0)	10	8		10	7	(0,4,6,0,5,0,7,3,2,0,0,1,4,6)		
9		4	10	4	(0,3,1,2,4,0,4,4,1,0,3)	11	-		12	7	(0,3,7,5,6,1,6,5,7,3,0,0,3,7,5)		
10		5	10	5	(0,1,4,2,1,5,1,3,0,5,5,0)	12	-		12	8	(0,0,6,4,8,2,3,5,0,5,8,1,0,0,7,5)		
11		5	12	5	(0,5,3,5,0,0,4,5,2,1,4,0,5)	13	-		16	8	(0,4,0,1,7,5,8,3,3,8,5,7,1,0,4,0,1)		
12		6	12	6	(0,4,1,0,3,5,6,2,0,6,6,1,6,0)	14	-		16	9	(0,4,9,0,6,1,8,9,2,2,0,9,6,9,5,4,8,0)		
13		-	16	7	(0,7,5,1,3,7,7,2,7,1,4,3,0,6,7)	15	-		16	10	(0,0,1,3,6,10,2,10,1,0,10,8,5,0,9,2,2,3,5)		
14		-	16	7	(0,5,1,7,7,2,0,7,4,6,0,3,7,6,7,0)	16	-		16	10	(0,3,10,7,7,5,1,10,1,0,10,2,6,1,7,8,10,0,5,8)		




Fig. 2. BER performance of the constructed codes versus the codes in [5]

IV. APM-LDPC CODES

Let m be a positive integer and $(s, a) \in \mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_m^*$, for which $\mathbb{Z}_m = \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_m^* = \{a \in \mathbb{Z}_m : \gcd(a, m) = 1\}$. By the *affine permutation matrix (APM)* $\mathcal{I}^{s,a}$ with APM-size m [2], we mean the permutation matrix $(e_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq m-1}$, in which $e_{i,j} = 1$ if and only if $i - ja = s \pmod m$. Especially, $\mathcal{I}^{s,1}$ is a *circulant permutation matrix (CPM)* and briefly is denoted by \mathcal{I}^s . For E in Eq. 4 and coupling length $L = 100$, $\mathcal{H}^{(L)}(E)$ can be considered as the base matrix of an APM SC-LDPC code with lifting degree $m = 100$, rate 0.485 and length 60000, after substituting each 0 and 1 element of the base matrix by the $m \times m$ zero matrix and an $m \times m$ APM matrix $\mathcal{I}^{s,a}$, respectively, such that $(s, a) \in \mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_m^*$ are selected randomly such that the constructed code is 4-cycle free.

Finally, we have used the Sliding window (SW) decoding with different *window size* $W \in \{12, 20\}$ and Standard flooding schedule (FS) decoding in Figure 2 to show the bit-error-rate performance of the constructed 4-cycle free APM-LDPC code against the QC SC-LDPC codes in [5] with

girths 6 and 8, where the maximum-iteration is 100. As the figure shows, the constructed APM SC-LDPC code outperform slightly the QC SC-LDPC codes in [5].

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Lin, D. J. Costello, *Error Control Coding*, Second Edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc, 2004.
- [2] M. Gholami, and M. Alinia, "High-performance binary and non-binary Low-density parity-check codes based on affine permutation matrices", *IET Communications*, vol. 9, no. 17, pp. 2114–2123, 2015.
- [3] M. Karimi, & A. H. Banihashemi, "On characterization of elementary trapping sets of variable-regular LDPC codes", *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp.5188–5203, 2014.
- [4] M. Karimi, & A. H. Banihashemi, "On the girth of quasi-cyclic protograph LDPC codes", *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 59, no. 7, pp.4542–4552, 2013.
- [5] S. Mo, L. Chen, D. J. Costello, D. G. Mitchell, R. Smarandache & J. Qiu, "Designing protograph-based quasi-cyclic spatially coupled LDPC codes with large girth", *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 5326–5337, 2020.
- [6] D. G. Mitchell, M. Lentmaier, & D. J. Costello, "Spatially coupled LDPC codes constructed from protographs", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp.4866–4889, 2015.
- [7] A. E. Pusane, R. Smarandache, P. O. Vontobel, & D. J. Costello, "Deriving good LDPC convolutional codes from LDPC block codes", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp.835–857, 2011.
- [8] M. Battagliani, A. Tasdighi, G. Cancellieri, F. Chiaraluce, and M. Baldi, "Design and analysis of time-invariant SC-LDPC convolutional codes with small constraint length", *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 918–931, Mar. 2018.
- [9] D. J. Costello, L. Dolecek, T. E. Fuja, J. Klierer, D. G. Mitchell, & R. Smarandache, "Spatially coupled sparse codes on graphs: Theory and practice", *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp.168–176, 2014.
- [10] D. G. Mitchell, A. E. Pusane, & D. J. Costello, "Minimum distance and trapping set analysis of protograph-based LDPC convolutional codes", *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 59, no.1, pp.254–281, 2012.
- [11] D. G. Mitchell, L. Dolecek, & D. J. Costello, "Absorbing set characterization of array-based spatially coupled LDPC codes", *In 2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp.886–890, 2014.
- [12] S. Naseri, & A. Banihashemi, "Spatially coupled LDPC codes with small constraint length and low error floor", *IEEE Comm. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 254–258, 2020.
- [13] M. Lentmaier, A. Sridharan, D. J. Costello, & K. S. Zigangirov, "Iterative decoding threshold analysis for LDPC convolutional codes", *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol.56, no. 10, pp.5274–5289, 2010.

- [14] S. Kudekar, T. J. Richardson, & R. L. Urbanke, "Threshold saturation via spatial coupling: Why convolutional LDPC ensembles perform so well over the BEC". *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp.803–834, 2011.
- [15] S. Kudekar, T. Richardson, & R. L. Urbanke, " Spatially coupled ensembles universally achieve capacity under belief propagation". *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp.7761–7813, 2013.