

Detecting Convolutional Codes: A Markovian Approach with LRT and DNN

Harshvardhan Pandey
IIIT Hyderabad
harshvardhan.pandey@research.iiit.ac.in

Pragya Khanna
IIIT Hyderabad
pragya.khanna@research.iiit.ac.in

Arti Yardi
IIIT Hyderabad
arti.yardi@iiit.ac.in

Abstract—Identifying the unknown convolutional code corresponding to the given intercepted data is an important problem in military surveillance and in wireless communication. While a variety of code identification algorithms are available in the literature, the key contribution of our work lies in the novel solution and the corresponding analysis. In this paper, we focus on the situation when the given data corresponds to either of the two potential convolutional codes and the goal is to detect the correct code. We first provide a new interpretation of the convolutional code as a Markov chain, which is more suitable for analyzing the code detection problem. Our problem then gets reduced to identifying between the two Markov chains. We provide the closed-form expressions for the corresponding state transition matrices and estimate the error exponent for the underlying likelihood ratio test (LRT). We also provide a computationally efficient BCJR-based method for computing the likelihoods required for the LRT. We observe that BCJR-based likelihoods suffer from numerical issues for a longer data sequence, and hence, in this case, we design neural networks that have been found to achieve the optimal performance of the LRT.

Index Terms—Convolutional codes, Deep neural networks, Blind reconstruction of channel codes, Adaptive modulation and coding, Wireless communication

I. INTRODUCTION

In modern communication systems, channel coding is essential for ensuring reliable data transmission over noisy communication channels. Convolutional codes are widely used in various applications in satellite and wireless communication [1]. In this work, we consider a situation where the transmitter is using a convolutional code for communication but the receiver does not know it. Given the data received with noise affected, the aim is to identify the convolutional code associated with it. This framework lies in the domain of *covert communication* [2]–[8], where the transmission parameters are not known to the receiver. This problem has various applications in military spectrum surveillance, adaptive modulation and coding (AMC) modules of wireless communication systems, and in cognitive radios [5]–[8].

This problem of identifying the unknown convolutional code corresponding to the received data has been studied in [4]–[16]. While in [4]–[12] various properties of convolutional codes are explored, in [13]–[17], researchers have designed deep neural networks (DNNs) to identify the unknown code. This problem has also been studied for various other channel code families such as cyclic codes [18]–[21],

[21], [22], low-density parity-check (LDPC) [23]–[25], and Turbo codes [26], [27].

In this work, we focus on the situation when the transmitter uses either convolutional code-1 or code-2 for communication and the set of potential codes is known to the receiver (see Fig. 1). The aim is to identify the correct code that corresponds to the given data. The proposed results can be extended to the situation when the potential codes used by the transmitter are more than two. This situation arises in wireless communication with AMC, where typically the set of channel codes used by the transmitter is known to the receiver [5], [28], [29]. For our *convolutional code detection* problem our novel contributions are summarized as follows:

- 1) *Convolutional codes as Markov chains*: We first provide a new interpretation of feed-forward convolutional code as a Markov chain (MC) (Sec. III-B) and also derive the closed-form expressions for the underlying state transition matrices (Lemmas 1, 2). We believe our new MC interpretation is more suitable for analyzing the code detection problem.
- 2) *Likelihood ratio tests (LRT) for detecting convolutional codes*: We formulate our code detection problem as a hypothesis testing problem and propose a solution based on the *optimal* LRTs. We would like to highlight here that most of the existing works use *some* function of the received data for code detection [5], [11], [12], which would lead inferior performance compared to LRTs [30]. We also provide an efficient BCJR-based method for computing the likelihoods required for LRT.
- 3) *Error exponent analysis*: In order to study the performance of our method, we estimate the error exponent by studying the corresponding hypothesis testing between the two Markov chains (Section IV-A and also provide a lower bound on the error exponent (Theorem 1).
- 4) *Novel DNN architecture*: We observe that the BCJR-based likelihoods suffer from numerical issues for a longer data sequence, and hence, in this case, we design novel DNN architecture incorporating Domain Incremental Learning, that has been found to achieve the optimal performance of the LRT (Section V).

Organization: The system model of the code detection problem studied in this work is described in Section II. In

Section III, we propose LRT for the code detection problem and analyze it in Section IV. The proposed method is verified via various simulations in Section V and finally concluded in Section VI.

Notation: Let \mathbb{F}_2 denotes the binary field with elements 0 and 1. A vector is denoted by a boldface letter and its components are denoted by small-case letters. For example, vector $\mathbf{v} = [v_0 \ v_1 \ \dots \ v_{n-1}]$. Random variables (and vectors) are denoted by upper-case letters and their realizations are denoted by the lower-case letters. For example, \mathbf{v} is a realization of a random vector \mathbf{V} .

II. SYSTEM MODEL




Fig. 1: System Model

The system model of the problem studied in this work is illustrated in Fig. 1. We consider the situation when the transmitter uses either convolutional code-1 or code-2 for the communication and the goal is to identify the correct code corresponding to the given noise-affected received sequence. Let $C(k, n, m)$ denote the convolutional code of rate k/n and memory m . A convolutional code is described via the generator sequences denoted by the set of vectors $\mathbf{g}^{(0)}, \mathbf{g}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{g}^{(n-1)}$ [31]. In this work, we assume that both the codes have the same parameters k, n , and m but have different generator sequences. For the sake of simplicity of notation, we ignore the parameters k, n , and m from the notation $C(k, n, m)$ of a convolutional code and denote it by C . The two potential codes used by the transmitter are then denoted C_1 and C_2 .

Let $\mathbf{U}_1^N = \mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2, \dots, \mathbf{U}_N$ be the input message sequence, where $\mathbf{U}_t \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$ is the input at t -th time instant for $t = 1, 2, \dots, N$. We assume that each input message bit is chosen independently according to the Bernoulli(0.5) distribution. This input sequence is either encoded by code C_1 or C_2 . While the encoded sequence of code C_1 is denoted by $\mathbf{V}_1^N = \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2, \dots, \mathbf{V}_N$, the encoded sequence of code C_2 is denoted by \mathbf{W}_1^N , where $\mathbf{V}_t, \mathbf{W}_t \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. In this work, we assume that both the codes are binary feedforward convolutional codes and the transmitter uses both the codes with equal probability.

The encoded sequence is transmitted via the binary symmetric channel (BSC) of crossover probability ϵ to receive the sequence \mathbf{Y}_1^N . Let \mathbf{E}_1^N denote the random vector corresponding to the error introduced by the BSC. For the given received sequence \mathbf{y}_1^N , our goal is to determine the convolutional code corresponding to it. We formulate this

code detection problem as a hypothesis testing problem where the two hypotheses H_1 and H_2 are given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 : \mathbf{y}_1^N &= \mathbf{V}_1^N + \mathbf{E}_1^N \\ H_2 : \mathbf{y}_1^N &= \mathbf{W}_1^N + \mathbf{E}_1^N. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Note that since the transmitter uses both the codes with equal probability, hypotheses H_1 and H_2 are also equally likely.

III. LIKELIHOOD RATIO TESTS FOR CODE DETECTION

By leveraging the structural properties of convolutional codes and the probabilistic nature of the noise, we can derive a decision rule based on the likelihood ratio test (LRT), which provides an optimal solution for distinguishing between the two hypotheses. The following subsections detail the formulation and computation of the LRT for this problem.

Under each hypothesis, the observed sequence \mathbf{Y}_1^N follows a specific distribution determined by the code and noise properties. Let $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_j)$ denote the likelihood of observing \mathbf{Y}_1^N under hypothesis H_j , for $j = 1, 2$. The likelihood ratio test (LRT) determines the hypothesis by comparing the likelihood ratio $\Lambda(\mathbf{Y}_1^N)$ to a threshold τ .

The LRT is expressed as:

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{Y}_1^N) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_1)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_2)} \underset{H_2}{\overset{H_1}{\gtrless}} \tau,$$

where τ is a predetermined threshold. For equally likely hypotheses, $\tau = 1$ minimizes the probability of decision error.

The likelihood $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_j)$ for a convolutional encoder C_j is computed by marginalizing over all possible transmitted codewords $\mathbf{V}_1^N \in C_j$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_j) = \sum_{\mathbf{V}_1^N \in C_j} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | \mathbf{V}_1^N, H_j) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{V}_1^N | H_j).$$

A. Efficient computation of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_j)$ via the BCJR algorithm

To compute $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_j)$ efficiently, the BCJR algorithm leverages the trellis structure of convolutional codes, significantly reducing computational complexity.

The BCJR algorithm computes $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_j)$ using a trellis representation of the encoder. The steps are as follows:

1. *Initialization:* The forward probabilities $\alpha_0(s)$, representing the probability of starting in state s at time 0, are initialized as:

$$\alpha_0(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } s = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2. *Forward Recursion:* The forward probabilities $\alpha_t(s)$, representing the probability of being in state s at time t given $\mathbf{Y}_1^t = (Y_1, \dots, Y_t)$, are computed iteratively:

$$\alpha_t(s) = \sum_{s'} \alpha_{t-1}(s') \cdot \mathbb{P}(s|s') \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y_t|s),$$

where:

- $\mathbb{P}(s|s')$ is the state transition probability from s' to s , determined by the encoder structure.
- $\mathbb{P}(Y_t|s)$ is the probability of observing Y_t given the current state s , typically modelled using the noise distribution (e.g., AWGN).

3. *Backward Recursion:* The backward probabilities $\beta_t(s)$, representing the probability of observing $\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}^N = (Y_{t+1}, \dots, Y_N)$ given the encoder is in state s at time t , are computed iteratively starting from $t = N$:

$$\beta_n(s) = \sum_{s'} \mathbb{P}(s'|s) \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1}|s') \cdot \beta_{t+1}(s').$$

4. *Combining Forward and Backward Probabilities:* The marginal probability of being in state s at time t is given by:

$$\mathbb{P}(s|\mathbf{Y}, H_j) \propto \alpha_t(s) \cdot \beta_t(s).$$

5. *Computing the Likelihood:* The total likelihood $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}|H_j)$ is computed by summing over all possible states at the final time step:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1^N | H_j) = \sum_s \alpha_N(s) \cdot \beta_N(s).$$

B. Describing the convolutional code via Markov chain

In this section, we interpret the encoded sequence as a Markov chain. For convolutional codes, it is known that the output at time t depends on the contents of the memory elements and the present input [1]. This allows one to interpret the contents of the memory as a state of the Markov chain and in turn, interpret convolutional code as a hidden Markov chain. For code detection problem, this interpretation has been used by Dingel et.al. in [9]. We would like to highlight that, our description of the Markov chain is completely different and is more suitable for the hypothesis testing of Eq. (1). We further believe that, with our description analyzing the corresponding probability of the error is more amenable to analysis, which is discussed in Section IV.

Since the discussion of this section is applicable to any convolutional code C_j , for simplicity of notation, we remove the suffix j from C_j and denote a convolutional code by C . Noise-free and noise-affected encoded sequences are denoted by \mathbf{V}_1^N and \mathbf{Y}_1^N respectively. Let \mathbf{S}'_t and \mathbf{S}_t denote the states of our Markov chain interpretation of a convolutional code for noise-free and noise-affected scenarios respectively. The state transition matrices for the noise-free and noise-affected cases are denoted by P' and P respectively. Note that for convolutional codes, the contents of its memory elements are also referred to as a state of the convolutional code [1]. To avoid this ambiguity, we refer to memory contents as a *memory-state* and reserve the word *state* to refer to the states of our Markov chain description of convolutional code which is discussed next.

Let us first consider the noise-free case. For our Markov chain description, we define state \mathbf{S}'_t at time t as the vector

formed by the the sequence of m codewords, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{S}'_t = [\mathbf{V}_{t-m+1} \quad \mathbf{V}_{t-m+2} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{V}_t]. \quad (2)$$

The next state at time t will be

$$\mathbf{S}'_{t+1} = [\mathbf{V}_{t-m+2} \quad \mathbf{V}_{t-m+1} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{V}_{t+1}]. \quad (3)$$

For the code with memory m , note that the output codeword \mathbf{V}_{t+1} at time $(t+1)$ depends only the previous m output codewords $\mathbf{V}_t, \mathbf{V}_{t-1}, \dots, \mathbf{V}_{t-m+1}$. Thus \mathbf{S}'_{t+1} depends only on \mathbf{S}'_t and is conditionally independent of the states before time t . This leads to a first-order Markov chain description for a convolutional code. For the noise-affected case, since \mathbf{Y}_t depends only on \mathbf{V}_t , we can define the state \mathbf{S}_t at time t in a similar fashion as follows

$$\mathbf{S}_t = [\mathbf{Y}_{t-m+1} \quad \mathbf{Y}_{t-m+2} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{Y}_t]. \quad (4)$$

We observe that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t, \mathbf{S}_{t-1}, \dots, \mathbf{S}_0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t, \mathbf{S}_{t-1}, \dots, \mathbf{S}_0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t)$, since \mathbf{Y}_{t+1} only depends on $\mathbf{U}_t, \mathbf{U}_{t-1}, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{t-m+1}$ and the noise vector which is independent of input. Thus, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t, \mathbf{S}_{t-1}, \dots, \mathbf{S}_0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t)$, and our formulated output states form a first-order Markov chain. In traditional literature, convolutional codes are formulated as a Markov chain based on the contents of the shift register. However, in the blind detection framework, we observe noise-affected codewords, making the output state formulation of higher utility.

To construct the transition matrix for the case when $\epsilon = 0$, we observe that an output state only depends on the previous $2m$ message vectors. Thus, every transition only depends on $2m+1$ input vectors. We iterate over all possible $2m+1$ input vectors, maintaining a frequency table corresponding to each transition and normalize the probabilities at the end. Under the assumption that all reachable states are equally likely when $\epsilon = 0$, the transition probabilities when $\epsilon > 0$ can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t) &= \sum_{\mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}'_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}'_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}_t) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}'_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}'_t|\mathbf{S}_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}'_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}'_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_t) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}'_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}'_t|\mathbf{S}_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}'_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_{t+1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_t)} \sum_{\mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}'_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}'_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_t|\mathbf{S}'_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}'_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_{t+1}) \\ &\propto \sum_{\mathbf{S}'_t, \mathbf{S}'_{t+1}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_t|\mathbf{S}'_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}'_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_t) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{t+1}|\mathbf{S}'_{t+1}) \end{aligned}$$

After computing this sum for each entry in the transition matrix, we can normalize the rows. Setting up the problem in such a fashion allows us to analyze the error exponent of the hypothesis testing problem using Markov detection theory.

IV. ANALYZING ERROR EXPONENTS IN THE HYPOTHESIS TESTING

In this section, we will propose an efficient search algorithm for estimating the error exponent and completely characterize the code detection problem for convolutional codes with parameters $k = 1$, $n = 2$, and $m = 2$.

A. Estimating error exponent for code detection problem

For state transition matrices P_1 , P_2 and $u \in [0, 1]$, consider a matrix $M(u)$ defined as $M(u)_{i,k} = P_{1,i,k}^u P_{2,i,k}^{1-u}$. If the spectral radius of $M(u)$ is $\lambda(u)$, then the error exponent I_{err} can be characterized with the optimization problem

$$I_{\text{err}} = - \min_{u \in [0,1]} \ln(\lambda(u)) \quad (5)$$

where $\lambda(u)$ is a convex function of u [32, Sec. 12.2.3]. The convexity allows a fast search algorithm for error exponent computation.

Algorithm 1: Estimate Error Exponent

Input: Transition matrices P_1 , P_2 and threshold δ

Output: Error exponent I_{err}

Initialize $l \leftarrow 0$, $r \leftarrow 1$

while $r - l \geq \delta$ **do**

$u_1 \leftarrow l + \frac{r-l}{3}$

$\lambda(u_1) \leftarrow \text{get_spectral_radius}(M(u_1))$

$u_2 \leftarrow r - \frac{r-l}{3}$

$\lambda(u_2) \leftarrow \text{get_spectral_radius}(M(u_2))$

if $\lambda(u_1) < \lambda(u_2)$ **then**

$r \leftarrow u_2$

end

else

$l \leftarrow u_1$

end

end

$u^* \leftarrow l$

$\lambda(u^*) \leftarrow \text{get_spectral_radius}(M(u^*))$

$I_{\text{err}} \leftarrow -\ln(\lambda(u^*))$

return I_{err}

Using Master's theorem [33, Sec. 4.5], we can show the search requires $\Theta(\log(\frac{1}{\delta}))$ evaluations of spectral radius. For a given state $\mathbf{S}_t = [\mathbf{Y}_{t-m+1} \mathbf{Y}_{t-m+2} \dots \mathbf{Y}_t]$, the next state $\mathbf{S}_{t+1} = [\mathbf{Y}_{t-m+2} \mathbf{Y}_{t-m+3} \dots \mathbf{Y}_{t+1}]$ can take at most 2^n different values which is uniquely determined by \mathbf{Y}_{t+1} . This implies that P^l has at most 2^n non-zero elements per row. Thus, the relative sparsity of the matrix is given by $1 - (\frac{2^n \cdot 2^{nm}}{2^{nm} \cdot 2^{nm}}) = 1 - 2^{n(1-m)}$ which is strictly less than 1 for all $m \geq 2$, and approaches 1 rapidly with increasing n and m . This sparsity can be exploited to speed up the computation of spectral radii significantly.

B. Main results for characterizing the error exponent I_{err}




Fig. 2: Example trellis for $k = 1, n = 2, m = 2$

In this section, we focus on convolutional codes with parameters $k = 1, n = 2, m = 2$ and completely characterize the underlying code detection problem. We believe that these results can be extended to codes of arbitrary parameters, which we plan to do in the future.

The trellis of an example convolutional code with parameters $k = 1, n = 2, m = 2$ is illustrated in Fig. 2. For the analysis, we assume that for the given memory-state if \mathbf{a}_0 and \mathbf{a}_1 are the output codewords for the input 0 and 1 respectively, then there is no other memory-state with \mathbf{a}_0 and \mathbf{a}_1 as the output codewords for the input 0 and 1 respectively, i.e., we assume that *no two memory-states are identical*. Note that when a code has two identical memory states, one can just combine the two states and the corresponding convolutional code can be represented using fewer memory elements. We also assume that for the given memory state, the two output codewords are not the same, i.e., $\mathbf{a}_0 \neq \mathbf{a}_1$. It is important to note that the convolutional codes used in practice are designed to satisfy these conditions since they allow the minimal description of the code and also minimize the corresponding encoder-decoder complexity [1, Sec. 2.5].

We now introduce the notation that is required in this section. Following the notation introduced in Section III-B, P_j^l and P_j denote the state transition matrices for the Markov chain corresponding to the code C_j for the noise-free and noise-affected cases respectively. When the results are true for any convolutional code C_j , for simplicity of notation, we remove the suffix j from C_j and denote a convolutional code by C . Let \mathcal{D}_i be the block code of length ni corresponding to the i -step time evolution of the trellis of code C . In Fig. 2, 3-step time evolution of the trellis of an example code is illustrated. Here, $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$, and \mathcal{D}_3 will be block codes of lengths 2, 4, and 6 respectively. For example, \mathcal{D}_2 will be the linear block code formed by all possible codewords $[\mathbf{v}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{v}_t]$ corresponding to $(t-1)$ -th and t -th time instant. Let the sequence of integers $\{A_0^{(i)}, A_1^{(i)}, \dots, A_{ni}^{(i)}\}$ be the weight enumerator for the code \mathcal{D}_i .

Remark 1. When no two memory-states are identical (see second paragraph of this section), it can be easily seen that




Fig. 3: Comparison of Error Probabilities across BCJR (●) and DNN (▲) with varying N and ϵ .

for $n = 2$, the dimensions of codes $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$, and \mathcal{D}_3 will be 2, 4, and 5 respectively. \square

We shall now characterize the error exponent I_{err} for the hypothesis testing corresponding to our code detection problem. Towards this, in Lemmas 1 and 2, we first characterize the noiseless and noise-affected state transition matrices P' and P respectively for any convolutional code C . In Lemma 3, we provide the conditions when the noise-free state transition matrices P'_1 and P'_2 of two different convolutional codes C_1 and C_2 are the same. In Lemma 4, we show that $P'_1 \neq P'_2$ implies that $P_1 \neq P_2$. Finally in Theorem 1, we provide a lower bound on the error exponent I_{err} . Proofs of all results are provided in the Appendix.

Lemma 1. Any row of P' will be a permuted version of the vector $[0.5 \ 0.5 \ 0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0]$.

Lemma 2. When the noise is introduced by the $BSC(\epsilon)$, any row P will be a permuted version of the vector $[p/2 \ p/2 \ (1-p)/2 \ (1-p)/2 \ 0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0]$, where p is given by

$$p = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{3n} A_j^{(3)} \epsilon^j (1-\epsilon)^{3n-j}}{\sum_{j=0}^{2n} A_j^{(2)} \epsilon^j (1-\epsilon)^{2n-j}}.$$

Further, we have $p = (1-p)$ only when $\epsilon = 0.5$. For any $\epsilon < 0.5$ we have $p > (1-p)$.

Lemma 3. $P'_1 = P'_2$ if and only if C_1 is equivalent to C_2 .

Lemma 4. For $\epsilon < 0.5$, $P'_1 = P'_2$ if and only if $P_1 = P_2$.

Theorem 1. For code C_j , let any row of the state transition matrix P_j is a permuted version of the vector $[p_j/2 \ p_j/2 \ (1-p_j)/2 \ (1-p_j)/2 \ 0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0]$, where the expression for p_j can be derived using Lemma 2, for $j = 1, 2$. Then a lower bound on the error exponent I_{err} for the corresponding LRT will be

$$I_{err} \geq \frac{1}{2}(p_1 - p_2)^2.$$

This bound is strictly positive when C_1 and C_2 have different weight enumerators (Lemma 2).

V. SIMULATIONS

We compare the performance of BCJR-based likelihood ratio test and neural network-based classification on the following two pairs of codes. The generator of the codes is written in the standard octal representation.

- Example 1: $C_1 = [5, 7]$ and $C_2 = [4, 5]$
- Example 2: $C_1 = [11, 5]$ and $C_2 = [7, 10]$
- Example 3: $C_1 = [37, 21]$ and $C_2 = [31, 27]$
- Example 4: $C_1 = [133, 171]$ and $C_2 = [117, 127]$

The comparison in Fig. 3 (a-c) reveals that for shorter block lengths, BCJR and DNN exhibit comparable performance, with the probability of error decreasing as block length (N) increases or crossover probability (ϵ) decreases. However, as block length (N) or crossover probability (ϵ) grows, the DNN consistently outperforms BCJR, showcasing superior scalability and robustness, particularly in scenarios where BCJR encounters numerical instability. Additionally, Fig. 3 (d) demonstrates that the DNN maintains strong performance even when the number of memory elements increases, further emphasizing its adaptability to more complex scenarios.

A. Domain Incremental Learning (DIL) for Encoder Prediction with Variable-Length Codewords

Domain Incremental Learning (DIL) is a learning paradigm in which a model is trained incrementally on data from different “domains” (distinct but related tasks) while retaining knowledge from previously encountered domains. The primary challenge in DIL is to balance stability, which ensures the model remembers what it has already learned, with plasticity, which allows it to adapt to new tasks. DIL is particularly effective in scenarios where retraining from scratch is computationally expensive or memory intensive, and avoids the problem of catastrophic forgetting—where new training overwrites previous knowledge [34].

In our framework, each codeword length is treated as a distinct “domain”, meaning that codewords of different lengths are considered related but separate tasks. We have modeled our problem as a DIL task to address the challenges of space efficiency and time optimization by eliminating the need to re-train from scratch for every new codeword




Fig. 4: Dynamic length-adaptive neural architecture with shared and length-specific components for encoder prediction

length. Instead, our approach enables the reuse of previously learned knowledge while still allowing the system to adapt to new lengths. To achieve this, the architecture consists of two main components:

- **Shared convolutional layers:** These layers are universal and extract features that are consistent across all codeword lengths, ensuring stability and efficient feature reuse.
- **Length-specific batch normalization layers:** These layers are unique to each codeword length and help the model adapt to the specific characteristics of a given length, ensuring plasticity.

In addition to using a task-specific loss to optimize predictions, our framework employs distillation loss, a technique to prevent catastrophic forgetting. Distillation loss works by minimizing the difference between the outputs of a “teacher” model (the frozen version of the model trained on previous codeword lengths) and the “student” model (the updated version being trained on new lengths). This ensures that learning new tasks does not overwrite previously acquired knowledge. A visualization of the proposed architecture is shown in Fig. 4.

Remark 2. *Conventional methods either necessitate retraining the model from scratch for each newly encountered codeword length or require maintaining separate models for every length, both of which are computationally intensive and memory-demanding. In contrast, our approach leverages shared convolutional layers to extract universal features across all lengths, combined with dynamically added length-specific batch normalization layers to adapt to individual codeword lengths. By effectively balancing scalability, effi-*

ciency, and adaptability, our framework significantly reduces memory usage and computational overhead, offering a practical and highly scalable solution for real-world applications with variable-length codewords.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we studied the problem of detecting the correct convolutional code corresponding to the given noise-affected data when the two potential codes used by the transmitter are known. Towards this, we provided a novel interpretation of the convolutional code as a Markov chain. While our new interpretation enabled us to study the code detection problem as a detection between two Markov chains, we believe this interpretation is interesting on its own. As a part of our main results, we provided closed-form expressions for the corresponding state transition matrices, analyzed the error exponents, and designed DNNs that have found to achieve the optimal performance for various examples of convolutional codes.

In the future, we wish to extend our analysis to the situation when the additive white Gaussian noise channel and the binary erasure channel introduce the noise. Extending our ideas to the situation when the set of potential convolutional codes is not known is also of interest.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 1

Recall that for $m = 2$, the present and next states for the noiseless data are $\mathbf{S}'_t = [\mathbf{V}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{V}_t]$ and $\mathbf{S}'_{t+1} = [\mathbf{V}_t \ \mathbf{V}_{t+1}]$ respectively (see Section III-B). Any row of matrix P' corresponds to the fixed present state $\mathbf{S}'_t = \mathbf{s}'_t$ and each element in this row correspond to $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{S}'_{t+1} | \mathbf{S}'_t = \mathbf{s}'_t]$

for all possible values \mathbf{S}'_{t+1} can take. Observe that for the fixed \mathbf{s}'_t , \mathbf{V}_t is also fixed and all possible values that \mathbf{S}'_{t+1} can take corresponds to all possible values \mathbf{V}_{t+1} can take. For $n = 2$, \mathbf{V}_{t+1} can take at most four possible values and hence any row of P' will have at most four non-zero values. Thus any row of P' will be a permuted version of the vector $[p_1 \ p_2 \ p_3 \ p_4 \ 0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0]$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i = 1$.

Consider the block code \mathcal{D}_2 corresponding to the 2-step time evolution of the trellis of code C (see Fig. 2). From Remark 1 we have $\text{Dim}(\mathcal{D}_2) = 4$ and hence all possible 16 paths from the time instant $(t-1)$ to t will correspond to distinct codewords in \mathcal{D}_2 . This implies that a fixed state $\mathbf{s}'_t = [\mathbf{v}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{v}_t]$ would lead to the unique memory-state at time t . From this state, \mathbf{V}_{t+1} will take two distinct equally likely values, leading to the required claim of the lemma.

B. Proof of Lemma 2

For the noise-affected data, the present and next states for $m = 2$ are $\mathbf{S}_t = [\mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{Y}_t]$ and $\mathbf{S}_{t+1} = [\mathbf{Y}_t \ \mathbf{Y}_{t+1}]$ respectively. For the fixed present state $\mathbf{S}_t = [\mathbf{y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{y}_t]$ and $n = 2$, using arguments similar to proof of Lemma 1, any row of P will have at most four non-zero values that correspond to all possible values \mathbf{Y}_{t+1} can take. The state transition probability can be computed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{S}_{t+1} = \mathbf{s}_{t+1} | \mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{s}_t] &= \frac{\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{S}_{t+1} = \mathbf{s}_{t+1}, \mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{s}_t]}{\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{s}_t]} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}\{[\mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{Y}_t \ \mathbf{Y}_{t+1}] = [\mathbf{y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{y}_t \ \mathbf{y}_{t+1}]\}}{\mathbb{P}\{[\mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{Y}_t] = [\mathbf{y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{y}_t]\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

To compute the numerator of Eq. (6), one needs to condition over all possible transmitted codewords $[\mathbf{v}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{v}_t \ \mathbf{v}_{t+1}] \in \mathcal{D}_3$. For the fixed $[\mathbf{y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{y}_t]$, the vector $\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} = [\mathbf{y}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{y}_t \ \mathbf{y}_{t+1}]$ can either be a codeword in \mathcal{D}_3 or not. We next consider these two cases separately:

- Case when $\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}_3$: $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}_3]$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}_3] = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_{t-1}^{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}_3} \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} | \mathbf{v}_{t-1}^{t+1}] \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{v}_{t-1}^{t+1}] \quad (7)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{32} \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{e}_{t-1}^{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}_3] \quad (8)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{32} \sum_{j=0}^{3n} A_j^{(3)} \epsilon^j (1-\epsilon)^{3n-j}, \quad (9)$$

where (a) is obtained since \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} is a codeword in \mathcal{D}_3 only when the error introduced the BSC is also a codeword. In (b), recall that $\{A_0^{(3)}, A_1^{(3)}, \dots, A_{ni}^{(3)}\}$ is the weight enumerator for the code \mathcal{D}_3 .

- Case when $\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} \notin \mathcal{D}_3$: Consider the standard array of the code \mathcal{D}_3 [31, Sec. 3.5]. Since $\text{Dim}(\mathcal{D}_3) = 5$, standard array of \mathcal{D}_3 will have exactly two rows, one for the codewords in \mathcal{D}_3 and the other for the rest of the vectors. When $\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} \notin \mathcal{D}_3$, it will lie in the second row of the standard array. Since all vectors in a row of a standard array are equally likely [35, Sec. III-C], the

probability of such a \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} will be

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}_3] = 1 - \frac{1}{32} \sum_{j=0}^{3n} A_j^{(3)} \epsilon^j (1-\epsilon)^{3n-j} \quad (10)$$

The denominator of Eq. (6), is computed by conditioning over all possible transmitted codewords $[\mathbf{v}_{t-1} \ \mathbf{v}_t] \in \mathcal{D}_2$ and using similar arguments as above for any \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^{t+1} = \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1}] = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{j=0}^{3n} A_j^{(2)} \epsilon^j (1-\epsilon)^{2n-j}. \quad (11)$$

The required expression of the lemma is now obtained using Eq. (9), Eq. (10), and Eq. (11) and from Lemma 1.

It is known that for $\epsilon < 0.5$, the probability that \mathbf{y}_{t-1}^{t+1} is a codeword is strictly greater than the case when it is not a codeword [36] and this implies that $p < (1-p)$. From [36] we have $p = (1-p)$ only when $\epsilon = 0.5$.

C. Proof of Lemma 3

Each non-zero entry in P' corresponds to a vector in \mathcal{D}_3 . Moreover from Lemma 1, we know that each non-zero entry in P' is 0.5. Thus, P' uniquely determines \mathcal{D}_3 and vice versa. In addition, knowing a code C uniquely determines its three-step linear block code \mathcal{D}_3 . For a code with $m = 2$, knowledge of \mathcal{D}_3 is enough to construct the code book for any number of time steps, equivalent to determining C . Thus, a one-to-one mapping exists between valid P' and C (up to equivalence). Consequently, $P'_1 = P'_2$ if and only if C_1 and C_2 are equivalent.

D. Proof of Lemma 4

Since the construction of P only depends on P' and ϵ , for a fixed ϵ , $P'_1 = P'_2 \implies P_1 = P_2$. Let $P^* = \max_{i',k'} P_{i',k'}$. Based on classical results in binary cosets [36], we know that for $\epsilon < 0.5$, $P_{i,k} = P^*$ only when $P_{i,k}$ corresponds to a codeword. Thus, $P_{i,k} = P^* \implies P'_{i,k} = 0.5$ and $P_{i,k} \neq P^* \implies P'_{i,k} = 0$. Consequently $P_1 = P_2 \implies P'_1 = P'_2$.

E. Proof of Theorem 1

Let $M_i(u)$ be the i^{th} row of $M(u)$ and $M_{i,k}(u)$ be the k^{th} entry of this row, then by Gerschgorin circle theorem [37], $\lambda(u) \leq \max_i \sum_k M_{i,k}(u) = \max_i \exp((u-1)D_u(P_{1,i} || P_{2,i}))$, where $D_u(P_{1,i} || P_{2,i}) = \frac{1}{u-1} \ln \left(\sum_k P_{1,i,k}^u P_{2,i,k}^{1-u} \right)$ is the Renyi divergence between the two distributions. The following bound on $D_u(P_{1,i} || P_{2,i})$ is noted:

$$D_u(P_{1,i} || P_{2,i}) \geq \frac{1}{2} u |P_{1,i} - P_{2,i}|^2 \quad (12)$$

where $|P_{1,i} - P_{2,i}| = \sum_k |P_{1,i,k} - P_{2,i,k}|$ [38]. Since $u \in [0, 1]$, $(u-1)D_u(P_{1,i} || P_{2,i}) \leq \frac{1}{2} u(u-1) |P_{1,i} - P_{2,i}|^2$. Exponentiating both sides and invoking the maximum row sum bound, $\lambda(u) \leq \max_i \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} u(u-1) |P_{1,i} - P_{2,i}|^2 \right)$. Now, $\forall u \in [0, 1]$, $\frac{1}{2} u(u-1) \geq \frac{-1}{8}$. Consequently, $\min_{u \in [0,1]} \lambda(u) \leq \max_i \exp \left(\frac{-1}{8} |P_{1,i} - P_{2,i}|^2 \right)$. Thus, $I_{\text{err}} = -\min_{u \in [0,1]} \ln(\lambda(u)) \geq \min_i \frac{1}{8} |P_{1,i} - P_{2,i}|^2$.

Using Lemma 2, $|P_{1,i} - P_{2,i}| \geq 2 \left| \frac{p_1}{2} - \frac{p_2}{2} \right| + 2 \left| \frac{(1-p_1)}{2} - \frac{(1-p_2)}{2} \right| = 2|p_1 - p_2|$. Thus, $I_{\text{err}} \geq \frac{1}{2}(p_1 - p_2)^2$.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Johannesson and K. Zigangirov, *Fundamentals of Convolutional Coding*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 1999.
- [2] B. Bash, D. Goeckel, and D. Towsley, "Limits of reliable communication with low probability of detection on AWGN channels," *IEEE Journal on Sel. areas in commun.*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 1921–1930, September 2013.
- [3] M. R. Bloch, "Covert communication over noisy channels: A resolvability perspective," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2334–2354, 2016.
- [4] E. Filiol, "Reconstruction of convolutional encoders over $\text{gf}(q)$," *Cryptography and Coding*, vol. 1335, pp. 101–109, 1997.
- [5] R. Moosavi and E. G. Larsson, "A fast scheme for blind identification of channel codes," in *Proc. of IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, Houston, Texas, USA, December 2011, pp. 1–5.
- [6] N. Sendrier and M. Bellard, "Reconstruction of constellation labeling with convolutional coded data," in *2012 International Symposium on Information Theory and its Applications*, 2012, pp. 653–657.
- [7] M. Marazin, R. Gautier, and G. Burel, "Blind recovery of k/n rate convolutional encoders in a noisy environment," *EURASIP J. Wireless Commun. Netw.*, vol. 168, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2011.
- [8] A. Tixier, "Blind identification of an unknown interleaved convolutional code," in *Proc. of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Hong Kong, June 2015, pp. 71–75.
- [9] J. Dingel and J. Hagenauer, "Parameter estimation of a convolutional encoder from noisy observations," in *Proc. of ISIT*, Nice, France, June 2007, pp. 1776–1780.
- [10] Y. Ding, Z. Huang, and J. Zhou, "An improved blind recognition method for synchronization position and coding parameters of k/n rate convolutional codes in a noisy environment," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 171 305–171 315, 2020.
- [11] S. Che, M. Zhang, Y. Li, Y. Sun, and H. Lei, "A soft-GJETP based blind identification algorithm for convolutional encoder parameters," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 70, no. 12, pp. 7777–7789, 2022.
- [12] S. Che, M. Zhang, and Y. Li, "A rank-iteration based blind identification method for convolutional codes," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 1252–1256, 2023.
- [13] S. Dehdashtian, M. Hashemi, and S. Salehkaleybar, "Deep-learning-based blind recognition of channel code parameters over candidate sets under awgn and multi-path fading conditions," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1041–1045, 2021.
- [14] X. Qin, S. Peng, X. Yang, and Y.-D. Yao, "Deep learning based channel code recognition using TextCNN," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Dynamic Spectrum Access Networks (DySPAN)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [15] B. Shen, C. Huang, W. Xu, T. Yang, and S. Cui, "Blind channel codes recognition via deep learning," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 2421–2433, 2021.
- [16] J. Wang, C. Tang, H. Huang, H. Wang, and J. Li, "Blind identification of convolutional codes based on deep learning," *Digital Signal Processing*, vol. 115, p. 103086, 04 2021.
- [17] S. Dehdashtian, M. Hashemi, and S. Salehkaleybar, "Deep-learning-based blind recognition of channel code parameters over candidate sets under AWGN and multi-path fading conditions," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 1041–1045, 2021.
- [18] Z. Jing, H. Zhiping, S. Shaojing, and Y. Shaowu, "Blind recognition of binary cyclic codes," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, vol. 2013, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2013.
- [19] D. Jo, S. Kwon, and D. Shin, "Blind reconstruction of BCH codes based on consecutive roots of generator polynomials," *IEEE Communication Letters*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 894–897, May 2018.
- [20] S. Ramabadran, A. S. MadhuKumar, G. Wang, and T. Shang Kee, "Blind reconstruction of Reed-Solomon encoder and interleavers over noisy environment," *IEEE Transactions on Broadcasting*, pp. 1–16, 2018.
- [21] A. Yardi, A. Kumar, and S. Vijayakumaran, "Blind reconstruction of binary cyclic codes from unsynchronized bitstream," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 2693–2706, 2016.
- [22] A. Yardi and S. Vijayakumaran, "Properties of syndrome distribution for blind reconstruction of cyclic codes," *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing*, vol. 31, pp. 23–41, 2020.
- [23] T. Xia and H.-C. Wu, "Novel blind identification of LDPC codes using average LLR of syndrome a posteriori probability," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 632–640, 2013.
- [24] T. Xia, H.-C. Wu, and S. Mukhopadhyay, "LDPC encoder identification in time-varying flat-fading channels," in *2014 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2014, pp. 3537–3542.
- [25] L. Longqing, S. Fangqi, and Z. Jing, "Recovering the parameters of an LDPC code from noisy intercepted sequences," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 29, pp. 617–621, 2022.
- [26] J.-P. Tillich, A. Tixier, and N. Sendrier, "Recovering the interleaver of an unknown turbo-code," in *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2014, pp. 2784–2788.
- [27] P. Yu, J. Li, and H. Peng, "A least square method for parameter estimation of RSC sub-codes of turbo codes," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 644–647, 2014.
- [28] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless communications*. Cambridge university press, 2005.
- [29] N. Devroye, P. Mitran, and V. Tarokh, "Achievable rates in cognitive radio channels," *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 1813–1827, 2006.
- [30] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 1st ed. Wiley, 1991.
- [31] S. Lin and D. Costello, *Error Control Coding*. Prentice-Hall, 2004.
- [32] B. Levy, *Principles of Signal Detection and Parameter Estimation*. New York, USA: Springer, 2008.
- [33] T. Cormen *et al.*, *Introduction to Algorithms*. MIT Press, 1989.
- [34] G. M. van de Ven, T. Tuytelaars, and A. S. Toliais, "Three types of incremental learning," *Nat. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 4, no. 12, pp. 1185–1197, Dec. 2022.
- [35] A. Yardi and S. Vijayakumaran, "Detecting linear block codes in noise using the GLRT," in *Proc. of International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, Budapest, Hungary, June 2013, pp. 4895–4899.
- [36] D. Sullivan, "A fundamental inequality between the probabilities of binary subgroups and cosets," *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 91–94, January 1967.
- [37] S. G. S. Gerschgorin, "Über die abgrenzung der eigenwerte einer matrix," *Izv. Math.*, 1931.
- [38] G. L. Gilardoni, "On pinsker's and vajda's type inequalities for csiszar's f -divergences," *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 5377–5386, November 2010.