

# Soft-Output Successive Cancellation List Decoding

Peihong Yuan, *Member, IEEE*, Ken R. Duffy, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Muriel Médard, *Fellow, IEEE*,

**Abstract**—We introduce an algorithm for approximating the codebook probability that is compatible with all successive cancellation (SC)-based decoding algorithms, including SC list (SCL) decoding. This approximation is based on an auxiliary distribution that mimics the dynamics of decoding algorithms with an SC decoding schedule. Based on this codebook probability and SCL decoding, we introduce soft-output SCL (SO-SCL) to generate both blockwise and bitwise soft-output (SO).

Using that blockwise SO, we first establish that, in terms of both block error rate (BLER) and undetected error rate (UER), SO-SCL decoding of dynamic Reed-Muller (RM) codes significantly outperforms the CRC-concatenated polar codes from 5G New Radio under SCL decoding. Moreover, using SO-SCL, the decoding misdetection rate (MDR) can be constrained to not exceed any predefined value, making it suitable for practical systems.

Proposed bitwise SO can be readily generated from blockwise SO via a weighted sum of beliefs that includes a term where SO is weighted by the codebook probability, resulting in a soft-input soft-output (SISO) decoder. Simulation results for SO-SCL iterative decoding of product codes and generalized LDPC (GLDPC) codes, along with information-theoretical analysis, demonstrate significant superiority over existing list-max and list-sum approximations.

**Index Terms**—Polar coding, codebook probability, generalized decoding, joint error correction and detection, soft-input soft-output (SISO) decoding.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Reliability in physical layer communication hinges on the frequency of forward error correction decoding errors. Undetected errors occur when the decoder provides a codeword that is distinct from the transmitted one and the system remains unaware of this erroneous decision. Undetected errors can be more harmful than detected errors, which are usually labeled as erasures. Consequently, code and decoder design objectives encompass not only reducing the block error rate (BLER) but also maintaining a low undetected error rate (UER).

Decoding algorithms can be divided into two classes: complete and incomplete. Complete decoders always return a valid codeword and any maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding algorithm essentially belongs to this group. In contrast, an incomplete decoder may provide estimates not fulfilling the conditions of being a member of the underlying code [2, Ch.1]. If that occurs, the receiver is able to detect the error and,

for instance, request a retransmission. Both the Bahl, Cocke, Jelinek and Raviv (BCJR) [3] and belief propagation (BP) decoding algorithms are well-established incomplete decoders as a result of their focus on making bitwise decisions for the coded bits.

The standard method to convert a complete decoder into an incomplete one is to employ a cyclic redundancy check (CRC) outer code, which provides error detection capability after using a complete decoder for the inner code. The addition of the CRC results in a reduced code-rate, and so the CRC should be carefully designed to optimize the trade-off between the BLER and UER. The notion of an optimal incomplete decoding algorithm, introduced in [4], can be viewed as implementing ML decoding followed by a post-decoding threshold test that determines whether to accept or reject the ML decision. This approach is optimal in the sense that there is no other decoding rule that simultaneously gives a lower BLER and a lower UER. The metric for evaluating this test can be efficiently carried out for terminated convolutional codes [5], [6] and well approximated for tail-biting convolutional codes [7] via a modification to the BCJR algorithm.

CRC-concatenated polar codes, as described in [8], [9], result from the serial concatenation of polar codes with outer CRC codes. Successive cancellation list (SCL) decoding [8] is typically used to decode CRC-concatenated polar codes. First, a SCL decoder creates a list of candidate decodings based on the inner polar code. If none of the candidates in the list pass the CRC test, a decoding failure is declared, i.e., an error is detected. Otherwise, the most likely candidate in the list is selected as the final decision, leading to an undetected error if it is not the same as the transmitted message.

Optimal soft-input soft-output (SISO) BCJR decoding of general linear block codes requires complexity that is exponential in the number of redundancy bits. Pyndiah proposed a low complexity algorithm [10] to extract the approximated bitwise soft-output (SO) from a candidate list through list decoding. This approximation is used for parallel concatenated polar codes [11] and product polar codes [12]–[14] based on SCL decoding. BP [15] and soft cancellation (SCAN) [16] decoding of polar codes provide bitwise SO by applying the message passing (MP) algorithm on the polar encoding graph, using flooding-like and successive cancellation (SC)-like schedules, respectively. Soft list decoding [17] starts with an SCL decoding, finds the most likely candidate in the list and performs backwards BP to generate the bitwise SO.

Recently, a blockwise SO measure has been developed for all guessing random additive noise decoding (GRAND) algorithms, e.g. [18], [19], which takes the form of an accurate estimate of the a-posteriori probability (APP) that a single decoding is correct or, in the case of list decoding, the

This paper was presented in part at 2024 IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT) [1].

P. Yuan and M. Médard are with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Network Coding & Reliable Communications Group (e-mails: {phyuan, medard}@mit.edu).

K. R. Duffy is with the Northeastern University Engineering Probability Information & Communications Laboratory (e-mail: k.duffy@northeastern.edu).

This work was supported by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under Grant HR00112120008. (*Corresponding author: Muriel Médard*)

probability that each element of the list is the transmitted codeword or the codeword is not contained in the list [20]. Core to the accuracy of the measure is the approximation that all unidentified codewords are uniformly distributed amongst unexplored sequences. In [21], the bitwise SO is approximated by utilizing the blockwise SO to dynamically adjust the weight between list observation and channel observation.

In this study, we focus on the blockwise and bitwise SO for polar [22] and polar-like codes. The novel contributions of this paper are summarised as follows.

- *Codebook probability of polar-like codes*: By extending the main idea in [20] from a guessing-based search to SC-based tree search, we introduce an approximation of the codebook probability, which is the sum of the probability of all valid codewords given the channel observations.
- *Soft-output SCL (SO-SCL) decoding*: Based on the codebook probability and SCL decoding, we introduced SO-SCL to generate both blockwise SO and bitwise SO.
- *Generalized decoding with SO-SCL*: The blockwise SO generated by SO-SCL accurately matches the probability of the output decision being the transmitted codeword. By availing of that blockwise SO, we demonstrate that dynamic Reed-Muller (RM) codes using generalized decoding significantly outperform CRC-concatenated polar codes using SCL decoding in terms of both BLER and UER. Furthermore, the misdetection rate (MDR) can be constrained to not exceed any predefined value.
- *Iterative decoding with SO-SCL*: Information theoretic and simulation results of iterative decoding for product and GLDPC codes demonstrate the superiority of bitwise SO generated by SO-SCL.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II provides background on the problem. An approximation of the codebook probability of polar-like codes, along with blockwise and bitwise SO derived from the codebook probability, is developed in Section III. Section IV presents numerical results demonstrating the accuracy of the blockwise SO, the performance of generalized decoding based on the blockwise SO, the iterative decoding performance using the bitwise SO, and the information-theoretic consideration of the bitwise SO. Section V concludes the paper.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Notations

In this paper, length- $N$  vectors are denoted as  $x^N = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ , where we write  $x_i$  for its  $i$ -th entry. For completeness, note that  $x^0$  is void. A random variable (RV) is denoted by an uppercase letter, such as  $X$ , and its counterpart, e.g.,  $x$ , is used for a realization. Then, a random vector is expressed as  $X^N = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ . The probability density function (PDF) of a continuous RV and the probability mass function (PMF) of a discrete RV evaluated at  $x$  are denoted as  $p_X(x)$ , where the extensions to the vectors is straightforward. A binary-input discrete memoryless channel (B-DMC) is characterized by conditional probabilities  $P_{Y|C}$ , where the input takes on values in binary alphabet  $\{0, 1\}$  and

the output set  $\mathcal{Y}$  is specified by the considered channel model. For natural numbers, we write  $[a] = \{i : i \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i \leq a\}$ .

### B. Codeword Probability and Codebook Probability

For a binary linear block code, the codebook  $\mathcal{C}$  contains all valid codewords. The codeword  $c^N \in \mathcal{C}$  is transmitted via  $N$  independent uses of a B-DMC  $P_{Y|C}$ .

To avoid ambiguities, we define  $Q_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N)$  as the auxiliary conditional probability of sequence  $b^N$  conditioned on channel observation  $y^N$ , which is not aware of the codebook information, i.e.,

$$Q_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N P_{C|Y}(b_i|y_i),$$

where  $P_{C|Y}(b_i|y_i)$  is given by

$$P_{C|Y}(b_i|y_i) = \frac{P_{Y|C}(y_i|b_i) \cdot P_C(b_i)}{\sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} P_{Y|C}(y_i|a) \cdot P_C(a)}.$$

On the other hand, the standard codeword probability conditioned on the channel observation  $P_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N)$  is aware of the codebook information, i.e.,

$$P_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N) = 0, \quad \forall b^N \notin \mathcal{C}$$

$$\sum_{b^N \in \mathcal{C}} P_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N) = 1.$$

The *codebook probability* is defined as the sum of the auxiliary conditional probabilities of all valid codewords,

$$Q_C(y^N) \triangleq \sum_{b^N \in \mathcal{C}} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N). \quad (1)$$

Note that we have the relationship

$$P_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N) = \frac{Q_{C^N|Y^N}(b^N|y^N)}{Q_C(y^N)}, \quad \forall b^N \in \mathcal{C}.$$

### C. Polar-like Codes and Their Decoding

A binary polar-like code of block length  $N$  and dimension  $K$  is defined by a set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [N]$  of indices with  $|\mathcal{A}| = K$  and a set of linear functions  $f_i, i \in \mathcal{F}$ , where  $N$  is a positive-integer power of 2 and  $\mathcal{F} \triangleq [N] \setminus \mathcal{A}$ . The  $K$ -bit message is mapped onto the subvector  $u_{\mathcal{A}}$  of the input  $u^N$  to the polar transform, where the frozen bits are evaluated as

$$u_i = f_i(u^{i-1}), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (2)$$

Observe that each frozen bit  $u_i$  is either statically set to zero (since the  $f_i$ s are linear) or they change according to the input  $u^{i-1}$ , which are called dynamic frozen bits [23]. This representation unifies various modifications of polar codes, e.g., CRC-concatenated polar codes [8], polar subcodes [23] polarization-adjusted convolutional (PAC) codes [24] and dynamic RM codes [25]. The codeword is then obtained by applying a polar transform as follows

$$c^N = u^N \mathbb{F}^{\otimes \log_2 N}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbb{F}$  denotes the binary Hadamard matrix [22]. We define a set  $\mathcal{U}$  that contains all decoding paths  $u^N$  that satisfy the frozen constraints Eq. (2),

$$\mathcal{U} \triangleq \left\{ u^N \in \{0, 1\}^N : u_i = f_i(u^{i-1}), \forall i \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.$$

Obviously, the codebook of polar codes is given by

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ c^N \in \{0, 1\}^N : c^N = u^N \mathbb{F}^{\otimes \log_2 N}, \forall u^N \in \mathcal{U} \right\}.$$

At the receiver side, SC decoding observes the channel output  $y^N$  and performs a sequential greedy search to obtain decisions as follows

$$\hat{u}_i = \begin{cases} f_i(\hat{u}^{i-1}), & i \in \mathcal{F} \\ \arg \max_{u \in \{0, 1\}} Q_{U_i|Y^N U^{i-1}}(u|y^N \hat{u}^{i-1}), & i \in \mathcal{A} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $Q_{U^N|Y^N}$  denotes an auxiliary conditional PMF induced by assuming that  $U^N$  is uniformly distributed in  $\{0, 1\}^N$ . This implies that  $Q_{U^N|Y^N}$  assumes the frozen bits  $U_{\mathcal{F}}$  to be also uniformly distributed and independent of the message bits  $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Observe that SC decoding computes  $Q_{U_i|Y^N U^{i-1}}(u_i|y^N \hat{u}^{i-1})$  by treating  $U_i$  and all upcoming frozen bits, namely  $U_{i+1}, \dots, U_N$ , as uniformly distributed given the channel observation  $y^N$  and previous decisions  $\hat{u}^{i-1}$ . In other words, the frozen constraints are used to determine which decision to make but don't impact the reliability of the decision. Then, a block error is declared only if  $u_{\mathcal{A}} \neq \hat{u}_{\mathcal{A}}$  since Eq. (2) is already used in decoding via Eq. (4).

SCL decoding [8], [26] tracks several SC decoding paths in parallel. At each decoding phase  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ , instead of making a hard decision on  $u_i$ , two possible decoding paths are continued in parallel threads. The maximum number  $2^K$  of paths implements ML decoding but with exponential complexity in  $K$ . To limit complexity, one may keep up to  $L$  paths at each phase. The reliability of partial decoding path  $v^i$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{U^i|Y^N}(v^i|y^N) \\ = Q_{U^{i-1}|Y^N}(v^{i-1}|y^N) Q_{U_i|Y^N U^{i-1}}(v_i|y^N v^{i-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the right-most term  $Q_{U_i|Y^N U^{i-1}}(\hat{u}_i|y^N \hat{u}^{i-1})$  can be efficiently computed by the standard SC decoding and  $Q_{U^0|Y^N}(\emptyset|y^N) \triangleq 1$  by definition.<sup>1</sup> Note that the frozen constraints are used to determine which decision to make at frozen positions behaving as anchors and are irrelevant to the reliability of the decoding path. At the end of the  $N$ -th decoding phase, a list  $\mathcal{L}_U$  of paths is collected.<sup>2</sup> Finally, the output is the decoding path maximizing the path reliability:

$$\hat{u}^N = \arg \max_{v^N \in \mathcal{L}_U} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N).$$

In addition to SCL decoders, there are other improved SC-based decoders for polar-like codes such as SC stack (SCS) [27], [28], SC-Fano [24], [29] and SC ordered search (SCOS) [30], [31], which employ different search strategies

<sup>1</sup>The term  $-\log Q_{U_i|Y^N}(\hat{u}_i|y^N)$  is called path metric (PM) for SC-based decoding in log-likelihood ratio (LLR) domain [26].

<sup>2</sup>In this work,  $\mathcal{L}_U$  is associated with the list of candidate decisions for  $u^N$ , while  $\mathcal{L}_C$  is associated with the list of candidate decisions for codeword  $c^N$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}_C \triangleq \{c^N \in \{0, 1\}^N : c^N = u^N \mathbb{F}^{\otimes \log_2 N}, \forall u^N \in \mathcal{L}_U\}$ .

on the SC-decoding tree, utilizing the reliability measure in Eq. (5).

#### D. Forney's Generalized Decoding

Forney introduced a generalized decoding rule [4], which relies on a threshold test. The decoder output  $\hat{c}^N$  is accepted if

$$\frac{p_{Y^N|C^N}(y^N|\hat{c}^N)}{\sum_{c^N \in \mathcal{C}} p_{Y^N|C^N}(y^N|c^N)} \geq \frac{2^{NT}}{1 + 2^{NT}}, \quad (6)$$

where the threshold parameter  $T \geq 0$  controls the tradeoff between BLER and UER. Otherwise, the decision is rejected and decoder outputs an erasure flag, resulting in a detected error. Forney's generalized decoding rule is optimal in the sense of minimizing the UER for a given BLER (and vice versa). Since the denominator of Eq. (6) is difficult to compute in general, we may use a suboptimal decoding rule [4], [7], [32] based on list decoding with

$$\frac{p_{Y^N|C^N}(y^N|\hat{c}^N)}{\sum_{c^N \in \mathcal{C}} p_{Y^N|C^N}(y^N|c^N)} \approx \frac{p_{Y^N|C^N}(y^N|\hat{c}^N)}{\sum_{c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} p_{Y^N|C^N}(y^N|c^N)},$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_C$  contains the candidate decisions of codeword  $c^N$  obtained from the list decoding. Clearly, the approximation is precise when the list decoder exhaustively enumerates the entire codebook.

#### E. SISO Decoding

In various applications, the system requires post-decoding bitwise SO, e.g., iterative detection and decoding of multi-input multi-output (MIMO) system, bit-interleaved coded modulation with iterative decoding (BICM-ID), product codes [33] and generalized low-density parity-check (GLDPC) codes [34], [35]. A SISO decoder takes the sum of channel LLRs  $\ell_{\text{ch},i}$ , and a-priori LLRs, denoted as  $\ell_{A,i}$ , as input,

$$\ell_{\text{ch},i} \triangleq \log \frac{p_{Y|C}(y_i|0)}{p_{Y|C}(y_i|1)}, \quad \ell_{A,i} \triangleq \log \frac{P_{C_i}(0)}{P_{C_i}(1)}, \quad i \in [N].$$

An optimal SISO decoder outputs APP LLRs, represented as  $\ell_{\text{APP},i}$ , and extrinsic LLRs, represented as  $\ell_{E,i}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{APP},i} &\triangleq \log \frac{P_{C_i|Y^N}(0|y^N)}{P_{C_i|Y^N}(1|y^N)} \\ &= \log \frac{\sum_{c_i=0, c^N \in \mathcal{C}} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N)}{\sum_{c_i=1, c^N \in \mathcal{C}} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N)} \\ \ell_{E,i} &\triangleq \ell_{\text{APP},i} - \ell_{A,i} - \ell_{\text{ch},i}, \quad i \in [N]. \end{aligned}$$

For an  $(N, K)$  block code, the APP LLRs can be determined using the BCJR algorithm [3] with  $2^{N-K}$  states.

Clearly, APP LLRs can be approximated from a candidate list through list decoding by considering only the list  $\mathcal{L}_C$  instead of the entire codebook  $\mathcal{C}$  (this is called *list-sum* approximation),

$$\ell_{\text{APP},i}^{\text{list-sum}} = \log \frac{\sum_{c_i=0, c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N)}{\sum_{c_i=1, c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N)}. \quad (7)$$




Fig. 1: Example of the SC decoding tree of a polar code with frozen bits  $u_1 = u_3 = 0$ . The whole decoding tree consists of three parts: a) visited leaf: the SC output  $\hat{u}^4 = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ . b) invalid subtrees: the subtree rooted at  $\hat{u}^1 = 1$  and the subtree rooted at  $\hat{u}^3 = (0, 1, 1)$ . c) unvisited subtrees: the subtree rooted at  $\hat{u}^2 = (0, 0)$  and the leaf  $\hat{u}^4 = (0, 1, 0, 1)$ .

Pyndiah proposed a low complexity algorithm [10] to approximate APP LLRs from a list, which is generally deemed suitable for log-domain implementations (this is called *list-max* approximation).

$$\ell_{\text{APP},i}^{\text{list-max}} = \log \frac{\max_{c_i=0, c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N)}{\max_{c_i=1, c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N)}. \quad (8)$$

If there is no competing codeword in  $\mathcal{L}_C$  for the  $i$ -th bit, a predefined saturation value  $\beta$  is required for both list-sum and list-max approximation [10], i.e.,

$$\ell_{\text{APP},i}^{\text{list-max/sum}} = \begin{cases} \ell_{A,i} + \ell_{\text{ch},i} + \beta, & \text{if } \forall c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C, c_i = 0 \\ \ell_{A,i} + \ell_{\text{ch},i} - \beta, & \text{if } \forall c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C, c_i = 1. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

### III. CODEBOOK PROBABILITY OF POLAR-LIKE CODES

Since the polar transform  $c^N = u^N \mathbb{F}^{\otimes \log_2 N}$  is a one-to-one mapping, we have

$$Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N) = Q_{U^N|Y^N}(u^N|y^N).$$

The codebook probability Eq. (1) can be rewritten as the sum of probabilities for all valid decoding paths,

$$Q_U(y^N) = \sum_{v^N \in \mathcal{U}} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N). \quad (10)$$

To compute the exact value of  $Q_U(y^N)$ , a full traversal of the SC decoding tree is required.

Here we introduce a method to approximate the codebook probability of polar and polar-like codes by using SC-based decoding. An SC-based decoding algorithm divides the decoding tree into three parts,

- Visited leaves* denote the valid visited decoding paths of depth  $N$ . Note that we may have more than one visited leaf, e.g., a SCL decoder returns  $L$  visited leaves.

- Invalid subtrees* stands for the subtrees rooted at the nodes which are not visited during the decoding due to the conflict of frozen constraints.
- Unvisited subtrees* are the subtrees rooted at the nodes which satisfy the frozen constraints, but are not visited (usually due to the complexity issues).

Now we define sets  $\mathcal{V}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  containing the visited leaves, the roots of unvisited subtrees, and the roots of invalid subtrees, respectively. For the mini example with SC decoding shown in Fig. 1, we have

$$\mathcal{V} = \{(0, 1, 0, 0)\}$$

$$\mathcal{W} = \{(0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1)\}$$

$$\mathcal{I} = \{(1), (0, 1, 1)\}.$$

The codebook probability  $Q_U(y^N)$  is then written as

$$\underbrace{\sum_{v^N \in \mathcal{V}} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N)}_{\text{(a) all visited leaves}} + \underbrace{\sum_{a^i \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{\substack{v^N \in \mathcal{U} \\ v^i = a^i}} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N)}_{\text{(c) all valid leaves underneath node } a^i} \cdot \underbrace{\sum_{a^i \in \mathcal{I}} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N)}_{\text{(b) all unvisited valid leaves}}.$$

The term (c) describes the sum of probabilities for all valid decoding paths (leaves) underneath node  $a^i$ . By extending the approach [20, Cor.3] from guess-based search to tree search, we assume that the leaves are uniformly distributed underneath the unvisited node  $a^i$ . We have the approximation

$$\text{term (c)} \approx 2^{-|\mathcal{F}^{(i:N)}|} Q_{U^i|Y^N}(a^i|y^N), \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}^{(i:N)}$  denotes the set of indices for the frozen bits in the future, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}^{(i:N)} = \{j : j \in \mathcal{F}, i \leq j \leq N\},$$

and  $|\mathcal{F}^{(i:N)}|$  is the number of frozen bits in the future. The codebook probability Eq. (10) is then approximated by

$$Q_U(y^N) \approx Q_U^*(y^N) \triangleq \underbrace{\sum_{v^N \in \mathcal{V}} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N)}_{\text{sum of prob. for all visited leaves}} + \underbrace{\sum_{a^i \in \mathcal{W}} 2^{-|\mathcal{F}^{(i:N)}|} Q_{U^i|Y^N}(a^i|y^N)}_{\text{approx. sum of prob. for all unvisited valid leaves}}. \quad (12)$$

The algorithm to compute  $Q_U^*(y^N)$  is compatible with all SC-based decoders. During SC-based decoding, when the decoder decides *not* to visit a subtree rooted at the node  $a^i$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ , we accumulate the probability  $2^{-|\mathcal{F}^{(i:N)}|} Q_{U^i|Y^N}(a^i|y^N)$  as the approximated sum of probabilities for all valid leaves underneath node  $a^i$ . For the example in Fig. 1, we have

$$Q_U^*(y^4) = Q_{U^4|Y^4}(0100|y^4) + 2^{-1} \cdot Q_{U^2|Y^4}(00|y^4) + 2^0 \cdot Q_{U^4|Y^4}(0101|y^4).$$

Note that the terms  $Q_{U^2|Y^4}(00|y^4)$  and  $Q_{U^4|Y^4}(0101|y^4)$  are computed by the SC decoder and do not lead to any additional computational complexity in the evaluation of the codebook probability.

$$\ell_{\text{APP},i} \approx \ell_{\text{APP},i}^* = \log \frac{\sum_{c_i=0, c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N) + \phi \cdot P_{C|Y}(0|y_i)}{\sum_{c_i=1, c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N) + \phi \cdot P_{C|Y}(1|y_i)} \quad (16)$$

where  $\phi = Q_U^*(y^N) - \sum_{c^N \in \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N)$

### A. Blockwise Soft-Output

As in [20], we define the probability of *the output decision*  $\hat{u}^N$  being the transmitted codeword as the (exact) blockwise SO of the decision  $\hat{u}^N$ , i.e.,

$$\Gamma(y^N, \hat{u}^N) \triangleq \frac{Q_{U^N|Y^N}(\hat{u}^N|y^N)}{Q_U(y^N)} \quad (13)$$

which is equivalent to the left hand side of Eq. (6). The blockwise SO can be extended from a single decision to a list of candidates.

$$\Gamma(y^N, \mathcal{L}_U) \triangleq \frac{\sum_{v^N \in \mathcal{L}_U} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N)}{Q_U(y^N)}, \quad (14)$$

which describes the probability of *the candidate list*  $\mathcal{L}_U$  contains the transmitted codeword.

Based on the blockwise SO, we apply a threshold test for generalized decoding, i.e., joint error correction and detection,

$$\Gamma(y^N, \hat{u}^N) > 1 - \epsilon. \quad (15)$$

The final decision  $\hat{u}^N$  is accepted when Eq. (15) is satisfied; otherwise, the decoder returns an erasure flag. As  $\Gamma(y^N, \hat{u}^N)$  evaluates the probability of the output decision being correct, the decision rule mentioned above imposes an upper limit of  $\epsilon$  on the MDR, where MDR is defined as the probability of an accepted decision being erroneous, i.e., the ratio between UER and BLER.

### B. Bitwise Soft-Outputs

By using the same approach as described in [21], we approximate the bitwise SO  $\ell_{\text{APP},i}$  and  $\ell_{E,i}$  based on  $Q_U^*(y^N)$  via Eq. (16). The approximated APP LLR  $\ell_{\text{APP},i}^*$  introduces an additional term  $\phi$  to dynamically adjust the weight between list observation and channel observation, where  $\phi$  is the approximated sum of the probabilities for all codewords not in the list, i.e.,

$$\phi \approx \sum_{c^N \in \mathcal{C}, c^N \notin \mathcal{L}_C} Q_{C^N|Y^N}(c^N|y^N).$$

If the candidates in the list are reliable (small  $\phi$ ),  $\ell_{\text{APP},i}^*$  is close to list-max approximation; otherwise (large  $\phi$ ),  $\ell_{\text{APP},i}^*$  is close to the decoder input  $\ell_{\text{ch},i} + \ell_{A,i}$ . Furthermore, Eq. (16) eliminates the need for the saturation value  $\beta$  present in list-sum and list-max approximations Eq. (9).

## IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical results of SO-SCL, demonstrating:

- the accuracy of the approximated blockwise SO,

- the performance of generalized decoding using Eq. (15),
- the iterative decoding performance using Eq. (16),
- the quality of the bitwise SO Eq. (16).

A large collection of polar-like encodings exist [23], [25], [36]–[50]. As the design of polar-like codes is beyond the scope of our work, here we consider polar-like codes with two basic, channel-independent types of information sets,

- 5G polar codes [50]: the information set is selected according to a reliability sequence,
- RM codes [51], [52]: the information set is selected according to the row weight in  $\mathbb{F}^{\otimes \log_2 N}$  [40],

and two types of frozen constraints,

- static frozen bits:  $u_i = 0$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{F}$
- (convolutional) dynamic frozen bits [24] of constraint length 6:

$$u_i = u_{i-2} \oplus u_{i-3} \oplus u_{i-5} \oplus u_{i-6}, \quad i \in \mathcal{F}, i > 6.$$

In general, 5G polar codes and RM codes represent two extreme cases: 5G polar codes perform well under SC decoding, whereas RM codes perform well under ML decoding. Dynamic frozen bits [23] enhance the ML performance of *some* polar-like codes without compromising their SC performance.

### A. Accuracy of the approximated blockwise SO

By using the approximated codebook probability  $Q_U^*(y^N)$ , we denote the approximated blockwise SO for single decision and list of candidates by  $\Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)$  and  $\Gamma^*(y^N, \mathcal{L}_U)$ , respectively.,

$$\Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N) \triangleq \frac{Q_{U^N|Y^N}(\hat{u}^N|y^N)}{Q_U^*(y^N)} \quad (17)$$

$$\Gamma^*(y^N, \mathcal{L}_U) \triangleq \frac{\sum_{v^N \in \mathcal{L}_U} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(v^N|y^N)}{Q_U^*(y^N)}. \quad (18)$$

To evaluate whether the approximated blockwise SO  $\Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)$  matches the probability of the output decision being the correct codeword, we design a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation as follows. In the simulation, the codewords are transmitted over binary-input additive white Gaussian noise (biAWGN) channels. The SO-SCL decoder outputs a decision  $\hat{u}^N$  and blockwise SO  $\Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)$ . We gather blocks with  $1 - \Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)$  within specific ranges,

$$[1, 10^{-0.5}), [10^{-0.5}, 10^{-1}), \dots, [10^{-4.5}, 10^{-5})$$

and compare their BLER to  $E[1 - \Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)]$  (solid lines). For reference, we also show the Forney's approximation

(dashed lines) with list size  $|\mathcal{L}_U| = L'$ ,

$$\Gamma'(y^N, \hat{u}^N) = \frac{Q_{U^N|Y^N}(\hat{u}^N|y^N)}{\sum_{u^N \in \mathcal{L}_U} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(u^N|y^N)}$$

which approximates the codebook probability  $Q_U(y^N)$  as the list probability  $\sum_{u^N \in \mathcal{L}_U} Q_{U^N|Y^N}(u^N|y^N)$ .

Fig. 2 plots the BLER given  $E[1 - \Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)]$  and  $E[1 - \Gamma'(y^N, \hat{u}^N)]$ . The results in Fig. 2 show that  $E[1 - \Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)]$  accurately predicts the BLER of the polar-like codes with dynamic frozen constraints (—○—, —×—, —\*—, —◇—). However,  $E[1 - \Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N)]$  shows a mismatch for polar-like codes with static frozen bits (—○—, —◇—). The main reason is as follows. The approximated codebook probability Eq. (12) relies on the assumption of uniform leaf distribution under the unvisited nodes. However, the static frozen bits (after the first message bit) may disrupt this assumption. Thus, the approximation in Eq. (11) has a mismatch for polar-like codes with static frozen bits. Observe that our approximation yields accurate predictions for (32, 26) static RM code (—○—) because the number of frozen bits following the first message bit is minimal and insufficient to disrupt the assumption of a uniform leaf distribution.<sup>3</sup>

To conclude,  $Q_U^*(y^N)$  provides an accurate approximation of the codebook probability for polar-like codes of any length and rate, if the frozen bits are random linear combinations of previous message bits, as defined in [25, Definition 1]. However,  $Q_U^*(y^N)$  may exhibit a mismatch if the frozen constraints are static or if the constraint length of the convolutional dynamic constraints is too short.

Similar to Fig. 2, Fig. 3 plots the list error rate (LER) given  $E[1 - \Gamma^*(y^N, \mathcal{L}_U)]$ , where the LER is defined as the probability of the transmitted codeword not being in the list. The results show that  $\Gamma^*(y^N, \mathcal{L}_U)$  accurately predicts the LER of the polar-like codes with dynamic frozen constraints.

### B. Joint error correction and detection

We apply a threshold test to the blockwise SO generated by SO-SCL decoding. The most likely candidate  $\hat{u}^N$  in the list is accepted if

$$\Gamma^*(y^N, \hat{u}^N) > 1 - \epsilon,$$

otherwise, the decoder returns an erasure flag indicating a detected error.

Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 show the BLER, UER and MDR of the proposed decision rule based on SO-SCL. For reference, we demonstrate the performance of CRC-concatenated polar codes using SCL [8], [9] with the same list size. If none of the candidates in the list pass the CRC, an erasure flag is returned, indicating that an error has been detected. Our method is compared with 6 bits CRC using  $L = 4$  and 11 bits CRC using  $L = 8$ . The threshold  $\epsilon$  is chosen to achieve a similar MDR to that of CRC-concatenated polar codes. The simulation results show that the proposed method outperforms

<sup>3</sup>Since there are only three frozen bits after the first message bit for the (32, 26) static RM code, the (32, 26) static RM code has very similar properties to the (32, 26) dynamic RM code.




Fig. 2: Approximated blockwise SO vs. BLER of polar-like codes with proposed scheme and Forney's approximation. The proposed method (solid) works with SO-SCL decoding of list size  $L$ , while the Forney's approximation (dashed) works with SCL decoding of list size  $L'$ .

CRC-concatenated polar codes in both BLER and UER. More importantly, the MDR of SO-SCL is restricted to not be higher than  $\epsilon$  (the horizontal line —◇— in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5).<sup>4</sup>

### C. Turbo decoding of product codes and GLDPC codes

As explained in Sec.II-E, APP LLRs can be approximated from a candidate list. The list-sum approximation in Eq. (7), based on SCL decoding, was introduced in [11] for parallel concatenated polar codes. In [12]–[14], the list-max approximation in Eq. (8) is used to decode polar product codes with SCL decoding.

In this section, we show the comparison between the turbo decoder based on SCL with Pyndiah's list-max approximation Eq. (8), and the turbo decoder based on SO-SCL Eq. (16). Both turbo decoders have a maximum iteration number of  $I_{\max} = 20$ . For both turbo decoders, all component codes are initially decoded by an SCL decoder with list size of  $L = 4$ . Then, "SCL, list-max" and SO-SCL extract the bitwise SO by using Eq. (8) and Eq. (16), respectively.

In Fig. 6,7,8, we demonstrate the BLER and bit error rate (BER) of  $(32^2, 26^2)$ ,  $(64^2, 42^2)$  and  $(64^2, 57^2)$  product codes based on static/dynamic RM component codes. The

<sup>4</sup>Note that the MDR of CRC-concatenated polar codes using SCL is influenced by both the CRC size and the list size. The generator polynomial is presented with Koopman's notation [53].




Fig. 3:  $E[1 - \Gamma^*(y^N, \mathcal{L}_U)]$  vs. LER of polar-like codes under SO-SCL decoding with list size  $L$ .




Fig. 4: BLER(solid), UER(dashed), MDR(dotted) vs.  $E_b/N_0$  over the bi-AWGN channel for the (64, 42) dynamic RM code compared to a (64, 42+6) static 5G polar code with an outer CRC-6  $0 \times 30$ . SCL with  $L = 4$ , threshold  $\epsilon = 0.1$ .

truncated union bounds (TUBs) of  $(32^2, 26^2)$  and  $(64^2, 57^2)$  codes are provided. In Fig. 9, we show the performance of a (1024, 640) GLDPC code based on (32, 26) static RM check nodes introduced in [35]. For ‘‘SCL, list-max’’,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  parameters are iteration-dependent taken from [10]. For SO-SCL, the extrinsic LLRs are always scaled by 0.5 for all product codes and 0.6 for the GLDPC code.

Simulation results show that the turbo decoder with proposed SO-SCL significantly outperforms that with list-max




Fig. 5: BLER(solid), UER(dashed), MDR(dotted) vs.  $E_b/N_0$  over the bi-AWGN channel for the (64, 42) dynamic RM code compared to a (64, 42+11) static 5G polar code with an outer CRC-11  $0 \times 710$ . SCL with  $L = 8$ , threshold  $\epsilon = 0.005$ .




Fig. 6: BLER(solid), BER(dashed) vs.  $E_b/N_0$  over the biAWGN channel for the (1024, 676) product code based on (32, 26) static RM codes.

approximation. For the high-rate  $(32^2, 26^2)$  and  $(64^2, 57^2)$  product codes, the performance is close to their TUBs with SO-SCL of list size 4. Note that the component polar-like codes are systematically encoded [54] to reduce the BER.

#### D. Quality of the bitwise SO

In this section, we evaluate the quality of the bitwise SO generated by SO-SCL Eq. (16). To the best of the authors’




Fig. 7: BLER(solid), BER(dashed) vs.  $E_b/N_0$  over the biAWGN channel for the (4096, 1764) product code based on (64, 42) dynamic RM codes.




Fig. 8: BLER(solid), BER(dashed) vs.  $E_b/N_0$  over the biAWGN channel for the (4096, 3249) product code based on (64, 57) static RM codes.

knowledge, no information-theoretically motivated evaluation of SISO decoders has been reported to date. In this work, we demonstrate the quality of bitwise SO by analyzing: 1) BER, 2) generalized mutual information (GMI), and 3) the ensemble iterative decoding threshold. We compare SO-SCL with the list-max approximation Eq. (8), the list-sum approximation Eq. (7), and the BCJR decoder [3].




Fig. 9: BLER(solid), BER(dashed) vs.  $E_b/N_0$  over the biAWGN channel for the (1024, 640) GLDPC code based on (32, 26) static RM check nodes.




Fig. 10: Generalized CN based on an SISO decoder.

**Bit Error Rate:** A bitwise maximum-a-posteriori (MAP) decoder, defined as

$$\hat{c}_{\text{MAP},i} \triangleq \arg \max_{a \in \{0,1\}} P_{C_i|Y^N}(a|y^N)$$

which can be implemented by performing a hard decision on the APP LLRs produced by the BCJR algorithm.

$$\hat{c}_{\text{MAP},i} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \ell_{\text{APP},i} \geq 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } \ell_{\text{APP},i} < 0. \end{cases}$$

The MAP decoder provides an optimal BER by its definition. Higher quality bitwise SO should result in a lower BER.

Tab. I shows the BER of the (32, 26) static RM code by performing a hard decision on the bitwise SO generated by SO-SCL Eq. (16), list-max approximation Eq. (8) and list-sum approximation Eq. (7). For reference, the BER of SCL is also provided. Simulation results show that the SO-SCL performs closer to the optimal MAP decoder than other approximations.

**Generalized Mutual Information:** In systems with iterative processing, a SISO decoder of an  $(N, K)$  code works as a generalized check node (CN) with  $N$  edges. The generalized CN (Fig. 10) takes the channel observation and the a-priori information as input and the outputs extrinsic information. Due to the imperfection of the SISO decoder and the specific structure of the system, a post-processing is required, e.g., Pyndiah introduced iteration-dependent parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  [10] for list-max approximation. In [55], an information-theoretically



TABLE I  
BER OF (32, 26) STATIC RM CODES WITH DIFFERENT SISO DECODERS.

$E_b/N_0$		0 dB	1 dB	2 dB	3 dB	4 dB	5 dB
BER	SO-SCL ( $L = 4$ )	0.093712	0.061758	0.032229	0.011629	0.0027179	0.00037739
	list-max ( $L = 4$ )	0.102810	0.066558	0.034110	0.011980	0.0027626	0.00038120
	list-sum ( $L = 4$ )	0.097503	0.063655	0.032938	0.011685	0.0027188	0.00037792
	SCL ( $L = 4$ )	0.102810	0.066558	0.034110	0.011980	0.0027626	0.00038120
	MAP	0.093537	0.061489	0.032149	0.011582	0.0027080	0.00037664

TABLE II  
1-GMI OF (32, 26) STATIC RM CODES WITH DIFFERENT SISO DECODERS.

$E_b/N_0$		0 dB	1 dB	2 dB	3 dB	4 dB	5 dB
1-GMI	SO-SCL ( $L = 4$ )	0.66733	0.76970	0.87071	0.95215	0.98799	0.99838
	list-max ( $L = 4$ )	0.66553	0.76758	0.86867	0.95092	0.98767	0.99834
	list-sum ( $L = 4$ )	0.66452	0.76677	0.86838	0.95109	0.98772	0.99836
	BCJR	0.67231	0.77658	0.87690	0.95403	0.98829	0.99842

tivated method is proposed to optimize the post-processing,

$$f_{pp}(\ell_E, \delta, \gamma) = \begin{cases} \gamma \text{sign}(\ell_E), & \text{if } \ell_E = \pm\infty \\ \delta \ell_E, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

which includes scaling and saturation for  $\pm\infty$ , such that the 1-GMI [56] is maximized. Note that SO-SCL and BCJR do not necessitate a saturation value.

The generalized CN updates the bitwise LLRs from  $\ell_{ch}^N + \ell_A^N$  to  $\ell_{ch}^N + f_{pp}(\ell_E^N, \delta, \gamma)$  for the next soft-input device. We use 1-GMI to describe the quality of the bitwise SO, i.e.,

$$I_1(C; L_{ch} + f_{pp}(L_E, \delta, \gamma)) = 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \log_2 \left( 1 + e^{-(1-2\cdot C) \cdot (L_{ch} + f_{pp}(L_E, \delta, \gamma))} \right) \right].$$

The simulation is designed as follows. A large number ( $10^6$ ) of codewords are transmitted over a biAWGN channel. Assume that we do not have any a-priori information yet, i.e.,  $\ell_A^N = 0^N$ . The SISO decoder takes only channel LLRs  $\ell_{ch}^N$  as input and outputs the extrinsic LLRs  $\ell_E^N$ . We evaluate the 1-GMI with optimal post-processing after the decoding,

$$\max_{\delta, \gamma} I_1(C; L_{ch} + f_{pp}(L_E, \delta, \gamma)) \quad (19)$$

which describes the correlation between transmitted codeword  $c^N$  and the LLRs  $\ell_{ch}^N + f_{pp}(\ell_E^N, \delta, \gamma)$  delivered to the next soft-input device. The simulation results for the (32, 26) static RM code are demonstrated in Tab. II. We observe that the SO-SCL provides higher 1-GMI than other approximations.

*Ensemble Iterative Decoding Threshold:* In this section, we analyze the iterative decoding threshold of the turbo-like ensembles [57]. We consider a regular GLDPC code ensemble with variable node (VN) degree 2 and all generalized CNs are  $(N, K)$  static RM check nodes [34], [35]. Assume that we have  $2M$  generalized CNs, each of which is connected to  $N$  VNs. Each VN is part of the constraints of 2 generalized CNs. The code length is  $MN$ , and there are a total of  $2M(N - K)$

constraints. The ensemble code rate is given by

$$R = \frac{MN - 2M(N - K)}{MN} = \frac{2K - N}{N}$$

if all of the constraints derived from the generalized CNs are linearly independent.

We find the iterative decoding threshold via Monte Carlo density evolution (MCDE) [58], [59] as follows. We construct a sufficiently long code with  $M = 10^5$ . Assume that the all-zero codeword of length  $MN$  is transmitted over the biAWGN channel. We track the empirical distribution of the a-priori LLRs and the distribution of the post-processed extrinsic LLRs throughout the iterations. The ensemble iterative decoding threshold  $(E_b/N_0)^*$  is defined as the lowest  $E_b/N_0$  for which “the post-processed extrinsic LLRs are all larger than zero” as the number of iterations grows large. The post-processing for each iteration is individually optimized by maximizing the 1-GMI Eq. (19) as in [55]. The a-priori LLRs and channel LLRs are permuted before each iteration to mitigate any dependencies introduced in previous iterations [60].

In Tab. III and Tab. IV, we present the iterative decoding threshold  $(E_b/N_0)^*$  of the previously mentioned GLDPC code ensembles with different SISO decoders. The post-processing for each decoder and each iteration is individually optimized via Eq. (19). We observe that iterative decoding with SO-SCL has a lower  $(E_b/N_0)^*$  than with other approximations.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we proposed a method to approximate the codebook probability of polar-like codes based on SCL decoding. Building upon this codebook probability, we introduced SO-SCL to generate both blockwise SO and bitwise SO.

Simulation results indicate that the blockwise SO accurately matches the probability of the output decision being the transmitted codeword. Dynamic RM codes using generalized decoding that utilizes blockwise SO significantly outperform CRC-concatenated polar codes using SCL decoding in terms

TABLE III  
ITERATIVE DECODING THRESHOLDS FOR THE GLDPC CODE ENSEMBLE WITH (32, 26) STATIC RM COMPONENT CODES.

Algorithm	BCJR	SO-SCL ( $L = 2/4/8$ )			list-max ( $L = 2/4/8$ )			list-sum ( $L = 2/4/8$ )		
$(E_b/N_0)^*$	1.48	1.69	1.58	1.52	2.26	1.88	1.65	2.26	1.86	1.60

TABLE IV  
ITERATIVE DECODING THRESHOLDS FOR THE GLDPC CODE ENSEMBLE WITH (64, 57) STATIC RM COMPONENT CODES.

Algorithm	BCJR	SO-SCL ( $L = 2/4/8$ )			list-max ( $L = 2/4/8$ )			list-sum ( $L = 2/4/8$ )		
$(E_b/N_0)^*$	2.31	2.68	2.54	2.44	3.10	2.76	2.54	3.10	2.75	2.50

of both BLER and UER. More importantly, the MDR can be constrained to not exceed any predefined value.

To enhance the accuracy of bitwise SO, SO-SCL introduces an additional term based on the codebook probability to dynamically adjust the weight between list observation and channel observation. Both the simulation results of iterative decoding for product and GLDPC codes, as well as the information-theoretical analysis, highlight the superiority of SO-SCL over list-max and list-sum approximations.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P. Yuan, K. R. Duffy, and M. Médard, "Near-optimal generalized decoding of polar-like codes," *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2024.
- [2] R. E. Blahut, *Algebraic codes for data transmission*. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- [3] L. Bahl, J. Cocke, F. Jelinek, and J. Raviv, "Optimal decoding of linear codes for minimizing symbol error rate (corresp.)," *IEEE Tran. Inf. Theory*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 284–287, 1974.
- [4] G. Forney, "Exponential error bounds for erasure, list, and decision feedback schemes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 206–220, 1968.
- [5] A. R. Raghavan and C. W. Baum, "A reliability output viterbi algorithm with applications to hybrid arq," *IEEE Tran. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 1214–1216, 1998.
- [6] E. Hof, I. Sason, and S. Shamai, "On optimal erasure and list decoding schemes of convolutional codes," *Int. Symp. Commun. Theory and Applications (ISCTA)*, pp. 6–10, 2009.
- [7] —, "Performance bounds for erasure, list, and decision feedback schemes with linear block codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 3754–3778, 2010.
- [8] I. Tal and A. Vardy, "List decoding of Polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 2213–2226, 2015.
- [9] K. Niu and K. Chen, "CRC-aided decoding of Polar codes," *IEEE Commun. Letters*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 1668–1671, 2012.
- [10] R. Pyndiah, "Near-optimum decoding of product codes: block turbo codes," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 1003–1010, 1998.
- [11] Z. Liu, K. Niu, and J. Lin, "Parallel concatenated systematic polar code based on soft successive cancellation list decoding," *Int. Symp. Wireless Pers. Multimedia Commun. (WPMC)*, pp. 181–184, 2017.
- [12] V. Bioglio, C. Condo, and I. Land, "Construction and decoding of product codes with non-systematic polar codes," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Netw. Conf. (WCNC)*, pp. 1–6, 2019.
- [13] C. Condo, V. Bioglio, H. Hafermann, and I. Land, "Practical product code construction of polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 68, pp. 2004–2014, 2020.
- [14] M. C. Coşkun, "Pre-coded polar product codes," *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2024.
- [15] E. Arkan, "Polar codes: A pipelined implementation," *Int. Symp. Broad. Commun. (ISBC)*, vol. 2010, pp. 11–14, 2010.
- [16] U. U. Fayyaz and J. R. Barry, "Low-complexity soft-output decoding of polar codes," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 958–966, 2014.
- [17] L. Xiang, Y. Liu, Z. B. K. Egilmez, R. G. Maunder, L.-L. Yang, and L. Hanzo, "Soft list decoding of polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 69, no. 11, pp. 13 921–13 926, 2020.
- [18] K. R. Duffy, J. Li, and M. Médard, "Capacity-achieving guessing random additive noise decoding (GRAND)," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 4023–4040, 2019.
- [19] K. R. Duffy, W. An, and M. Médard, "Ordered reliability bits guessing random additive noise decoding," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 4528–4542, 2022.
- [20] K. Galligan, P. Yuan, M. Médard, and K. R. Duffy, "Upgrade error detection to prediction with GRAND," *IEEE Global Commun. Conf. (GLOBECOM)*, 2023.
- [21] P. Yuan, M. Médard, K. Galligan, and K. R. Duffy, "Soft-output (SO) GRAND and iterative decoding to outperform LDPCs," *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv:2310, 2023.
- [22] E. Arkan, "Channel polarization: A method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051–3073, 2009.
- [23] P. Trifonov and V. Miloslavskaya, "Polar subcodes," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 254–266, 2015.
- [24] E. Arkan, "From sequential decoding to channel polarization and back again," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09594*, 2019.
- [25] M. C. Coşkun, J. Neu, and H. D. Pfister, "Successive cancellation inactivation decoding for modified Reed-Muller and eBCH codes," *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 437–442, 2020.
- [26] A. Balatsoukas-Stimming, M. B. Parizi, and A. Burg, "LLR-based successive cancellation list decoding of polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 63, no. 19, pp. 5165–5179, 2015.
- [27] K. Niu and K. Chen, "Stack decoding of polar codes," *Electron. Lett.*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 695–697, 2012.
- [28] V. Miloslavskaya and P. Trifonov, "Sequential decoding of polar codes," *IEEE Commun. Letters*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1127–1130, 2014.
- [29] M.-O. Jeong and S.-N. Hong, "SC-Fano decoding of polar codes," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 81 682–81 690, 2019.
- [30] P. Yuan and M. C. Coşkun, "Complexity-adaptive maximum-likelihood decoding of modified GN-coset codes," *IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pp. 1–6, 2021.
- [31] —, "Successive cancellation ordered search decoding of modified GN-coset codes," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, 2024.
- [32] A. Sauter, B. Matuz, and G. Liva, "Error detection strategies for CRC-concatenated polar codes under successive cancellation list decoding," *Annu. Conf. Inf. Sci. Syst. (CISS)*, 2023.
- [33] P. Elias, "Error-free Coding," *Trans. IRE Prof. Group Inf. Theory*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 29–37, 1954.
- [34] G. Liva, W. E. Ryan, and M. Chiani, "Quasi-cyclic generalized ldpc codes with low error floors," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 49–57, 2008.
- [35] M. Lentmaier, G. Liva, E. Paolini, and G. Fettweis, "From product codes to structured generalized LDPC codes," *Int. ICST Conf. Commun. Netw. China (CHINACOM)*, 2010.
- [36] R. Mori and T. Tanaka, "Performance and construction of polar codes on symmetric binary-input memoryless channels," *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1496–1500, 2009.
- [37] P. Trifonov, "Efficient design and decoding of polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 3221–3227, 2012.
- [38] I. Tal and A. Vardy, "How to construct polar codes," *IEEE Tran. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 6562–6582, 2013.
- [39] M. Mondelli, S. H. Hassani, and R. L. Urbanke, "From polar to reed-muller codes: A technique to improve the finite-length performance," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 3084–3091, 2014.
- [40] B. Li, H. Shen, and D. Tse, "A RM-polar codes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.5483*, 2014.
- [41] T. Wang, D. Qu, and T. Jiang, "Parity-check-concatenated polar codes," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 2342–2345, 2016.
- [42] P. Trifonov and G. Trofimiuk, "A randomized construction of polar subcodes," *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1863–1867, 2017.
- [43] G. He, J. Belliore, I. Land, G. Yang, X. Liu, Y. Chen, R. Li, J. Wang, Y. Ge, R. Zhang, and W. Tong, "Beta-expansion: A theoretical frame-

- work for fast and recursive construction of polar codes,” *IEEE Global Commun. Conf. (GLOBECOM)*, pp. 1–6, 2017.
- [44] A. Elkelesh, M. Ebada, S. Cammerer, and S. Ten Brink, “Decoder-tailored polar code design using the genetic algorithm,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 4521–4534, 2019.
- [45] P. Yuan, T. Prinz, G. Böcherer, O. Iscan, R. Boehnke, and W. Xu, “Polar code construction for list decoding,” *IEEE Int. ITG Conf. Syst. Commun. Coding (SCC)*, pp. 1–6, 2019.
- [46] V. Miloslavskaya and B. Vucetic, “Design of short polar codes for SCL decoding,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 6657–6668, 2020.
- [47] V. Bioglio, C. Condo, and I. Land, “Design of polar codes in 5G new radio,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 29–40, 2020.
- [48] V. Miloslavskaya, B. Vucetic, Y. Li, G. Park, and O.-S. Park, “Recursive design of precoded polar codes for scl decoding,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 7945–7959, 2021.
- [49] M. C. Coşkun and H. D. Pfister, “An information-theoretic perspective on successive cancellation list decoding and polar code design,” *IEEE Tran. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 9, pp. 5779–5791, 2022.
- [50] 3GPP, “NR; multiplexing and channel coding,” *TS 38.212*.
- [51] D. E. Muller, “Application of boolean algebra to switching circuit design and to error detection,” *Trans. IRE Professional Group Electron. Comput.*, no. 3, pp. 6–12, 1954.
- [52] I. S. Reed, “A class of multiple-error-correcting codes and the decoding scheme,” *Trans. IRE Professional Group Inf. Theory*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 38–49, 1954.
- [53] P. Koopman, “Best CRC Polynomials,” accessed: 2023-11-08. [Online]. Available: <https://users.ece.cmu.edu/~koopman/crc/>
- [54] E. Arıkan, “Systematic polar coding,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 860–862, 2011.
- [55] A. Straßhofer, D. Lentner, G. Liva, and A. G. i Amat, “Soft-information post-processing for Chase-Pyndiah decoding based on generalized mutual information,” *Int. Symp. on Topics in Coding (ISTC)*, pp. 1–5, 2023.
- [56] G. Kaplan and S. Shamai, “Information rates and error exponents of compound channels with application to antipodal signaling in a fading environment,” *Arch. Elektron. Übertrag.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 228–239, 1993.
- [57] S. Moloudi, M. Lentmaier, and A. G. i Amat, “Spatially coupled turbo-like codes,” *IEEE Tran. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 6199–6215, 2017.
- [58] Y.-Y. Jian, H. D. Pfister, and K. R. Narayanan, “Approaching capacity at high rates with iterative hard-decision decoding,” *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2696–2700, 2012.
- [59] A. Sheikh, A. G. i Amat, G. Liva, and A. Alvarado, “Refined reliability combining for binary message passing decoding of product codes,” *J. Lightw. Technol.*, vol. 39, no. 15, pp. 4958–4973, 2021.
- [60] D. J. MacKay, “Good error-correcting codes based on very sparse matrices,” *IEEE Tran. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 399–431, 1999.