

# Subcode Ensemble Decoding of Linear Block Codes

Jonathan Mandelbaum, Holger Jäkel, and Laurent Schmalen

Communications Engineering Lab, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany

jonathan.mandelbaum@kit.edu

**Abstract**—Low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes together with belief propagation (BP) decoding yield exceptional error correction capabilities in the large block length regime. Yet, there remains a gap between BP decoding and maximum likelihood decoding for short block length LDPC codes. In this context, ensemble decoding schemes yield both reduced latency and good error rates. In this paper, we propose subcode ensemble decoding (SCED), which employs an ensemble of decodings on different subcodes of the code. To ensure that all codewords are decodable, we use the concept of linear coverings and explore approaches for sampling suitable ensembles for short block length LDPC codes. Monte-Carlo simulations conducted for three LDPC codes demonstrate that SCED improves decoding performance compared to stand-alone decoding and automorphism ensemble decoding. In particular, in contrast to existing schemes, e.g., multiple bases belief propagation and automorphism ensemble decoding, SCED does not require the NP-complete search for low-weight dual codewords or knowledge of the automorphism group of the code, which is often unknown.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the large block length regime, low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes provide exceptional error-correction performance when decoded with a low-complexity message passing algorithm, often denoted belief propagation (BP) decoding [1]. However, emerging applications for 6G, such as ultra-reliable low-latency and machine-type communications, demand short block length codes [2], [3]. In this regime, LDPC codes with BP decoding exhibit a performance gap compared to maximum likelihood (ML) decoding. Bridging this gap is essential in the search for a unified coding scheme [4], i.e., a single code family that performs well across all block lengths.

Ensemble decoding has demonstrated performance improvements in this regime by improving both latency and error-correction capabilities [5], [6]. They are based on the observation that, for any binary-input memoryless symmetric output channel, the error probability of message-passing decoding depends on the underlying graphical representation of the code and the noise introduced by the channel rather than on the transmitted codeword itself [1, Lemma 4.90]. Ensemble decoding schemes exploit this property by using either an ensemble of varied noise representations or of altered graphs for decoding [5]–[14]. On the one hand, automorphism ensemble decoding (AED), generalized AED (GAED), and endomorphism ensemble decoding (EED) use knowledge of

the code structure to alter the noise representation. For instance, assuming the transmission of a codeword  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$  over an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel, AED uses an automorphism  $\pi$  to map the received word  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{n}$  onto  $\pi(\mathbf{y}) = \pi(\mathbf{x}) + \pi(\mathbf{n})$ , i.e., onto a possibly different codeword  $\pi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{C}$  superimposed with an altered noise representation  $\pi(\mathbf{n})$ . If the automorphism group is known and the effect of its automorphisms are not absorbed by the symmetry of the decoder, AED can improve decoding performance [5], [7], [8]. Other schemes that alter the noise representation are noise-aided ensemble decoding (NED) [9] and saturated belief propagation (SBP) [10]. On the other hand, multiple bases belief propagation (MBBP) and scheduling ensemble decoding (SED) improve performance by leveraging ensembles of different graphs or variants of BP. For instance, MBBP uses a set of equivalent parity-check matrices (PCMs), i.e., different graphs, while SED varies the scheduling of its constituent layered decodings [6], [15]. Yet, MBBP requires the NP-complete search for low-weight dual codewords, severely limiting its application [16], [17].

In this work, we propose subcode ensemble decoding (SCED), a scheme that uses a set of decodings on different subcodes of the code. SCED employs a linear covering in which the union of those subcodes cover the code [18], to ensure that all codewords are decodable. We introduce the *relative coverage* to compare ensemble decoding schemes and to simplify the search for suitable ensembles of a given size. In particular, we demonstrate that generating effective ensembles for SCED of short LDPC codes is straightforward without requiring knowledge of the code structure beyond its PCM or any specific BP decoding requirements (e.g., layered scheduling). Monte-Carlo simulations show that SCED yields improved error correction capabilities compared to AED. Notably, SCED results in gains in terms of error probability compared to stand-alone decoding for a fixed total number of iterations, while offering reduced latency, due to its parallelizable structure in combination with a reduced maximum number of iterations per constituent BP decoding.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In this work, we consider binary linear block codes  $\mathcal{C}(n, k)$  which are  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ . The parameters  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  denote the block length and information length, respectively, and are omitted when clear from the context. Linear block codes can be defined via their non-unique parity-check matrix (PCM)  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m \times n}$ , such that

$$\mathcal{C}(n, k) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n : \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}\} = \text{Null}(\mathbf{H}).$$

This work has received funding from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) within the project Open6GHub (grant agreement 16KISK010) and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101001899).




Fig. 1. Block diagram of SCED using  $K$  different subcodes  $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and their respective decoder  $\text{Dec}_i$ .

A linear subcode  $\mathcal{C}_s(n, k')$  of a code  $\mathcal{C}(n, k)$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{C}_s \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , is a  $k'$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathcal{C}$ , where we assume  $k' \leq k$ . For a proper linear subcode,  $\subseteq$  is replaced by  $\subset$ .

LDPC codes are linear block codes characterized by sparse PCMs. They are typically decoded using variants of BP, such as the sum-product algorithm (SPA) and the (normalized) min-sum algorithm (MSA) [1]. BP decoding operates on the Tanner graph of the code, where messages—typically represented as log-likelihood ratios (LLRs)—are iteratively exchanged along its edges. The Tanner graph is a bipartite graph representation of a PCM comprising two disjoint sets of vertices: variable nodes (VNs) and check nodes (CNs). The VN  $v_j$  corresponds to column  $j$  of the PCM, representing a code bit, while CN  $c_i$  corresponds to row  $i$  of the PCM, representing a parity check. VN  $v_j$  is connected to CN  $c_i$  if  $H_{i,j} = 1$  [1], where  $H_{i,j}$  denotes the element in row  $i$  and column  $j$  of  $\mathbf{H}$ .

### III. SUBCODE ENSEMBLE DECODING

Fig. 1 depicts the block diagram of subcode ensemble decoding (SCED) of an arbitrary linear code  $\mathcal{C}$ . We consider the transmission of a codeword  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$  over an arbitrary channel with output alphabet  $\mathcal{Y}$ . The receiver observes  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$  which is then used as input to  $K$  parallel decoding algorithms  $\text{Dec}_i : \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n, i \in [K] := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ , called *paths*, yielding  $K$  estimates  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i = \text{Dec}_i(\mathbf{y})$ . In contrast to other ensemble decoding schemes, SCED possibly uses proper subcodes  $\mathcal{C}_i \subset \mathcal{C}$  and their respective decoding in every path. The final estimate  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  of SCED is chosen according to an *ML-in-the-list-rule* [5]:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} := \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{L}} L(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $L(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$  denotes the log-likelihood and with list

$$\mathcal{L} := \begin{cases} \{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i : i \in [K], \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathcal{C}\}, & \text{if } \exists i \in [K] : \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathcal{C} \\ \{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i : i \in [K]\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

To potentially decode all codewords, the ensemble of subcodes must constitute a *linear covering* (LC). Following the definition for subspaces of vector spaces in [18], we define the LC of a code  $\mathcal{C}$  as a set of subcodes  $\{\mathcal{C}_i : i \in [K]\}$  with

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^K \mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{C}. \quad (1)$$

### IV. APPROACHES TO CHOOSE SUITABLE SUBCODES

From now on, we consider SCED with all path decodings being BP decoding and we assume  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}$  such that

$\text{Dec}_1 = \text{BP}(\mathbf{H})$ , i.e., the additional paths complement stand-alone BP decoding. Given a PCM  $\mathbf{H}$ , a PCM  $\mathbf{H}_\ell$  of a subcode  $\mathcal{C}_\ell \subset \mathcal{C}$  can be obtained via

$$\mathbf{H}_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H} \\ \mathbf{h}_\ell \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

i.e., by appending at least one arbitrary row  $\mathbf{h}_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_2^{1 \times n}$  to  $\mathbf{H}$ . In the following, we say that  $\mathbf{H}_\ell$  *induces a subcode* to refer to the process of constituting the subcode  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{H}_\ell) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{H})$ .

Note that if  $\mathbf{h}_\ell$  is linearly independent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$ , using (2)  $\mathbf{H}_\ell$  induces a proper subcode  $\mathcal{C}_\ell \subset \mathcal{C}$  with  $\dim(\mathcal{C}_\ell) = k - 1$ . Hence, SCED simplifies the search for rows compared to MBBP by allowing to append rows that are possibly linearly independent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$  avoiding the NP-complete search for low-weight dual codewords. Similarly, by simply appending rows, we avoid searching for sparse PCMs for each subcode and benefit from the originally designed PCMs of LDPC codes, which are well-suited for BP.

*Remark:* Note that by appending a matrix  $\mathcal{H}_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m_\ell \times n}$  rather than the row  $\mathbf{h}_\ell$  in (2), the approach can be generalized to use lower dimensional subcodes. Our simulations show promising results for  $m_\ell = 1$  such that we constrain ourselves to append row vectors, i.e.,  $\mathcal{H}_\ell = \mathbf{h}_\ell$ , in the following.

#### A. Suitable Subcodes for BP Decoding

The performance of BP decoding depends on the structure of the Tanner graph. Typically, graphs related to sparse PCMs with no (or only a few) 4-cycles yield the best decoding performance. With this in mind, we investigate two approaches to sample the rows  $\mathbf{h}_\ell, \ell \in [K] \setminus \{1\}$ , i.e., the rows that, using (2) induce the paths that complement stand-alone BP. Either, we sample the elements of  $\mathbf{h}_\ell$  according to a Bernoulli distribution  $(\mathbf{h}_\ell)_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{B}(p)$ . We choose a small probability  $p$  to obtain sparse rows. If  $\mathbf{h}_\ell = \mathbf{0}$ , we resample  $\mathbf{h}_\ell$  as an all-zero  $\mathbf{h}_\ell$  has no effect on the decoding behavior. Or, we sample rows  $\mathbf{h}_\ell$  with  $w_H(\mathbf{h}_\ell) = d_c$ , where  $w_H$  denotes the Hamming weight, and which introduce no new 4-cycles, i.e., the number of 4-cycles of  $\mathbf{H}_\ell$  equals the number of 4-cycles in  $\mathbf{H}$ .

#### B. Linear Covering of Codes

By employing decodings of the subcodes, not all paths can recover the transmitted codeword  $\mathbf{x}$  since possibly  $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{C}_i$ . Therefore, the question arises if it is beneficial to choose  $\{\mathcal{C}_i : i \in [K] \setminus \{1\}\}$  fulfilling (1), i.e.,  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}, \exists \ell \in [K] \setminus \{1\} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ . This design goal appears reasonable because the error probability of BP decoding and many of its variants is independent of the transmitted codeword. Note that the smallest number of proper linear subcodes to constitute an LC is 3 [18].

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \in \mathbb{F}_2^{1 \times n}$  be two row vectors that are linearly independent of the rows of a PCM  $\mathbf{H}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  and let  $\mathbf{h}_3 = \mathbf{h}_2 + \mathbf{h}_1$ . Using (2), they induce subcodes  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset \mathcal{C}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_3 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ , respectively, such that  $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3\}$  fulfills (1).*

Note that in Theorem 1 only  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  are required to be proper subcodes. Theorem 1 is proven in the appendix. Based

---

**Algorithm 1** Generation of 4-cycle free rows

---

- 1: **Input:** Row weight  $d_c$ , parity-check matrix  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{old}}$
  - 2: **Output:** New row  $\mathbf{h}$  of weight  $d_c$  or failure
  - 3: Initialize  $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow [n]$  or  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{old}}$
  - 4: Initialize  $\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$
  - 5: **while**  $w_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{h}) < d_c$  **do**
  - 6:   **if**  $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$  **then**
  - 7:     **Return** failure
  - 8:   Randomly select  $j \in \mathcal{F}$
  - 9:    $h_j \leftarrow 1$
  - 10:    $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \mathcal{F} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in [m]: H_{i,j}=1} \{\ell \in [n] : H_{i,\ell} = 1\}$
  - 11: **Return**  $\mathbf{h}$
- 

on Theorem 1, we can find an LC by randomly sampling  $\mathbf{h}_1$  and  $\mathbf{h}_2$  and calculating  $\mathbf{h}_3 = \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2$ .

We propose Algorithm 1 to generate a row  $\mathbf{h}$  with row weight  $d_c$  that does not contribute new 4-cycles to  $\mathbf{H}$ . Algorithm 1 employs a set  $\mathcal{F}$  which contains feasible indices of non-zero positions of  $\mathbf{h}$  that yield no additional 4-cycle. It iteratively selects a random  $j \in \mathcal{F}$  and sets  $h_j = 1$  until  $w_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{h}) = d_c$ . After choosing  $j \in \mathcal{F}$ , all indices of possible non-zero positions that would constitute a 4-cycle together with  $h_j$  are removed from  $\mathcal{F}$ . Those indices are given by

$$\bigcup_{i \in [m]: H_{i,j}=1} \{\ell \in [n] : H_{i,\ell} = 1\}.$$

If  $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$  before  $w_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{h}) = d_c$  is obtained, the algorithm fails to find a new row, requiring the procedure to be repeated.

To construct rows that do not necessarily constitute an LC, we initialize  $\mathcal{F} = [n]$ . To sample three rows that result in an LC and do not contribute new 4-cycles, we first run Algorithm 1 for  $\mathbf{h}_1$  and use the resulting  $\mathcal{F}$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{old}}$ , as initialization for Algorithm 1 when sampling  $\mathbf{h}_2$ . Then, appending  $\mathbf{h}_3 = \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2$  to  $\mathbf{H}$  yields no new 4-cycles. Note that this approach results in  $w_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{h}_3) = 2 \cdot d_c$ . Algorithm 1 is greedy and is not guaranteed to find a new row. By iteratively applying Algorithm 1, it is possible to append multiple rows to  $\mathbf{H}$  to constitute even smaller dimensional subcodes.

### C. Maximum-Coverage Heuristic

Next, we are interested in selecting a good ensemble consisting of  $K$  paths out of a larger set of candidate subcodes induced by different appended rows. Notably, such a subset does not necessarily consist of those candidates with the best stand-alone decoding performance, but those collaborating in the best way. To identify a subset of  $K$  candidate paths that yields the best performance in ensemble decoding, we follow the approach used in [17]: select  $c \in \mathbb{N}$  candidates paths and simulate the transmission of  $N$  fixed but arbitrary frames at a specific SNR for all candidates. Next, we construct sets  $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq [N]$ , with  $i \in [c]$ , where  $j \in \mathcal{S}_i$  if the  $i$ th candidate successfully decodes the  $j$ th received word. The task of finding a good ensemble can be modeled as a maximum coverage problem [17], which aims to find a subset  $\mathcal{E} \subset \{\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_c\}$  of cardinality  $|\mathcal{E}| = K$  maximizing  $|\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{E}} S|$  [19]. We refine




Fig. 2. Performance of SCED using the different ensembles and stand-alone decoding for the 5G LDPC code  $\mathcal{C}_{5G}(132, 66)$ .

the approach in [17] as follows: we carry out BP decoding using  $\mathbf{H}$  at an SNR yielding an FER of  $10^{-3}$  until  $N$  frame errors are accumulated. Then,  $j \in \mathcal{S}_i$  if  $\text{Dec}_i(\mathbf{y}_j) = \mathbf{x}_j$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_j$  and  $\mathbf{y}_j$  denote the  $j$ th transmitted codeword and received frame, respectively, i.e., we select  $\tilde{K} := K - 1$  paths that correct as many frames as possible when BP decoding on  $\mathbf{H}$  fails. Together with decoding on  $\mathbf{H}$ , they constitute an ensemble of size  $K$ . Since the maximum-coverage problem is NP-hard, we use the algorithm presented in [17, Algorithm 3].

### D. Comparison

We compare different ensemble constructions at  $\tilde{K} = 3$ , i.e., the smallest size allowing the auxiliary paths to constitute an LC. To this end, we consider the 5G LDPC code  $\mathcal{C}_{5G}(132, 66)$  and sample  $N = 1000$  received words after an AWGN channel at an  $E_b/N_0$  of 4 dB that stand-alone BP decoding using SPA with  $I_{\text{max}} = 32$  could not decode, where  $I_{\text{max}}$  denotes the maximum number of iterations. Note that for the 5G LDPC code, the PCM  $\mathbf{H}$  has dimension  $88 \times 154$  due to message bit puncturing [20]. Using the greedy heuristic, we determine a coverage for  $\tilde{K} = 3$  from  $c = 3000$  candidate rows which are sampled using a Bernoulli distribution with  $p = 4.22\%$  such that in average  $w_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{h}) = 6.5$  (“Ensemble 1”). Interestingly, this optimized set of subcodes—capable of decoding 591 of the 1000 frames—does not constitute an LC. Specifically, among other 10 000 randomly sampled codewords 11.88% are not element of any of the 3 subcodes.

Using  $d_c = 6$ , we run Algorithm 1 to sample 1000 tuples of rows  $(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{h}_3)$  under two conditions: the rows constitute an LC (“Ensemble 2”) and the rows do not constitute an LC (“Ensemble 3”). Note that in “Ensemble 2”, row  $\mathbf{h}_3$  has row weight  $w_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{h}_3) = 12$ . In contrast, “Ensemble 3” does not yield an LC but instead runs Algorithm 1 once per row of the tuple with  $\mathcal{F} = [n]$ , hence benefiting from  $w_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{h}_3) = 6$ . For both cases, we choose the tuple that decodes the most frames (517 and 526 frames, respectively) from the gathered  $N$  frames.

Fig. 2 depicts the frame error rate (FER) over  $E_b/N_0$  of SCED given all three ensembles. All BP decodings use  $I_{\text{max}} = 32$ . Surprisingly, all ensembles yield a gain of about 0.25 dB at an FER of  $10^{-3}$  compared to stand-alone SPA decoding. These results, which we also observed similarly for other codes, suggest that the slightly improved performance

of “Ensemble 1” (no LC,  $\overline{w_H(\mathbf{h}_3)} = 6.5$ ) at an SNR of 4 dB compared to “Ensemble 2” (LC,  $w_H(\mathbf{h}_3) = 12$ ) is not only because the third row has reduced weight. Hence, this indicates that, surprisingly, not all codewords must be element of at least one of the auxiliary subcodes. Therefore, due to its simplicity, we will use the refined maximum-coverage heuristic used for “Ensemble 1” with increased  $c$  in Sec. VI.

## V. COMPARISON TO EXISTING SCHEMES

In [13], we introduced EED which involves  $K$  parallel decoding paths. For each path, a distinct, not necessarily bijective endomorphism  $\tau_i : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  is selected that maps codewords onto a subcode  $\mathcal{C}_i$ , demonstrating some similarity to SCED. In decoding, EED performs three processing steps to mimic the effects of the endomorphisms in the LLR domain and to identify the most probable codeword within the set of possible preimages. Similar to AED, EED samples different endomorphisms to alter the noise representation. In contrast, SCED generates diversity for ensemble decoding by sampling different subcodes and utilizing the different decoding behaviors of the respective subcode. Indeed, subcode decoding can also be applied to EED. However, SCED avoids the processing of EED, which typically results in an information loss [13].

MBBP is another ensemble decoding scheme that improves the decoding performance of BP for algebraic codes in the short block length regime [6]. MBBP consists of  $K$  parallel paths each incorporating a different PCM  $\mathcal{C}$  of the code for BP. To this end,  $K$  distinct and possibly overcomplete PCMs are generated and used to initialize the parallel decodings. However, unlike SCED, MBBP does not allow adding linearly independent rows but uses redundant representations of the kernel of the code. This complicates the search for suitable PCMs, as it relies on the NP-complete search for low-weight dual codewords [16], [17]. Consequently, for SCED, the search for suitable PCMs is simplified because there exist many low-weight rows that are linearly independent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$ .

In [8], the authors show that in order to apply AED to quasi-cyclic (QC) LDPC codes the symmetry in the Tanner graph must be altered to use elements from the QC permutation automorphism group  $\text{Aut}_{\text{QC}}$ . They propose three approaches for breaking the graph symmetry: adding rows, appending a linearly dependent row, or removing rows. The authors mainly consider the last method, due to its simplicity and because all approaches yield similar performance [8]. Interestingly, this approach constitutes decoding using an ambient code  $\mathcal{C}_a \supset \mathcal{C}$ . Because the rows of a QC PCM are equivalent up to QC permutations, removing a row and applying a QC permutation is equivalent to removing one other row, i.e.,  $\forall i \in [m], \pi \in \text{Aut}_{\text{QC}}, \exists j \in [m]$  such that

$$\pi(\mathbf{H}_{\sim i}) = \mathbf{H}_{\sim j}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{H}_{\sim i}$  denotes  $\mathbf{H}$  with the  $i$ th row removed. Hence, we can gather  $c = m$  candidates by removing every row of  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m \times n}$  once, to generate an ensemble of PCMs of ambient codes that yield the same performance as AED when breaking the graph symmetry by removing a row. Thus, we




Fig. 3. Relative coverage as a function of the number of additional paths  $\tilde{K}$

refer to it as a row automorphism ensemble (R-AE). We use it as a comparison in Sec. VI to highlight the possible benefits of decoding on subcodes compared to decoding on ambient codes. Note that (2) also typically breaks the graph symmetry.

## VI. RESULTS

### A. Coverage Characteristics

For code  $\mathcal{C}_{5G}(132, 66)$ , we accumulate  $N = 1000$  frame errors from stand-alone decoding using SPA and MSA, respectively. For MSA, we employ a normalization factor of  $\frac{3}{4}$ . Next, we construct  $c = 35\,000$  candidate rows, using a Bernoulli distribution with  $p = 4.22\%$  as in Sec. IV-D. We denote the collected set subcode ensemble (SCE).

We define the *relative coverage* of a set of auxiliary paths as the ratio of the  $N$  frames they can decode. Note that, after collecting  $N$  received words after the AWGN channel that BP with the original  $\mathbf{H}$  can not decode, the relative coverage enables us to compare the performance of ensembles based on their performance on those  $N$  frames without requiring exhaustive simulations of error rates for each  $\tilde{K}$ . Assuming that the first path employs  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}$ , Fig. 3 depicts the relative coverage as a function of the number of additional paths  $\tilde{K} = K - 1$ . We iteratively increase  $\tilde{K}$  and use the greedy heuristic to obtain optimized ensembles until reaching  $\tilde{K}_{\max}$ , the smallest  $\tilde{K}$  such that the selected candidates collectively cover all patterns that the union of all candidates can decode. Further increasing  $\tilde{K}$  does not yield a larger relative coverage.

For both SPA and MSA, SCE achieves a very high relative coverage exceeding 98% for sufficiently large  $\tilde{K}$ . In contrast, R-AE only achieves a maximum relative coverage of 92.1% and 80.3% for SPA and MSA, respectively. Notably, for the practically relevant MSA, R-AE shows significantly lower relative coverage compared to SCE.

### B. Frame Error Rate Results

For BP decoding, we use an early stopping criterion if the current hard decision of the VNs fulfills  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\lambda_i \leq I_{\max}$  denote the actual number of iterations of BP decoding of the  $i$ th path,  $i \in [K]$ . Assuming that all decodings of an ensemble decoding scheme are executed in parallel, we define the *latency* as  $\max_{i \in [K]} \lambda_i$  and the *complexity* as  $\sum_{i \in [K]} \lambda_i$ . This notion of complexity is reasonable because the number of rows of the different PCMs is comparable. Next, considering a target FER of  $10^{-3}$ , we analyze the performance of SCED for




Fig. 4. Decoder performances for the 5G LDPC code  $C_{5G}(132, 66)$ .




Fig. 5. Decoder performances for the code  $C_{irPEG}(504, 252)$  from [21].

the QC LDPC code  $C_{5G}(132, 66)$  and the irregular LDPC code constructed using progressive edge growth  $C_{irPEG}(504, 252)$  from [21] with unknown automorphism group. Hence, AED is not directly applicable for the code  $C_{irPEG}(504, 252)$ .

To evaluate the performance of SCED, we perform Monte-Carlo simulations using a binary input AWGN channel collecting at least 200 frame errors per data point. For consistency with [8], all BP decodings use  $I_{max} = 32$  unless stated otherwise. For the codes  $C_{5G}$  and  $C_{irPEG}$ , we generate  $c = 35000$  candidates paths with the row entries sampled using a Bernoulli distribution with  $p = 4.22\%$  and  $p = 1.29\%$ , respectively. The notation SCED- $K$  refers to SCED using a total of  $K$  paths, i.e.,  $\tilde{K} = K - 1$  auxiliary subcodes chosen from the  $c$  candidates using the heuristic maximum-coverage combined with the decoding on  $\mathbf{H}$ . Fig. 4-5 show the FER over  $E_b/N_0$  for SCED of both codes with varying ensemble sizes, compared to the respective stand-alone BP decodings.

In Fig. 4, we also include the performance of AED-11, implemented according to [8]. Furthermore, we depict the performance of ensemble decoding using 10 and 43 paths gathered from R-AE using the greedy heuristic combined with decoding on  $\mathbf{H}$ , denoted as R-AED-11 and R-AED-43, respectively. We also provide the performance of ordered statistics decoding with order 4 (OSD-4) from [8] as an estimate of the ML performance. Note that, as expected due to (3), R-AED-11 and AED-11 yield identical performance.

Reflecting the higher relative coverage, SCED consistently yields gains compared to stand-alone BP decoding and AED with equal worst-case latency. In Fig. 4, SCED-11 yield gains of 0.3 dB and 0.1 dB compared to MSA and AED-11,

TABLE I  
QUALITATIVE COMPARISON OF ENSEMBLE DECODING METHODS FOR BP DECODING TAKEN FROM [15] IN COMPARISON TO SCED.

Decoder	Code Requirements	Decoder Requirements	Gain
MBBP	$\gg m$ Min. Weight Checks	-	++
AED	Code Automorphisms	Non-Equivariance	++
SED	-	Layered Decoder	++
NED, SBP	-	-	+
SCED	-	-	++

respectively. Notably, in Fig. 4, while offering significantly reduced latency, SCED-11 achieves a gain of 0.1 dB compared to equal-complexity stand-alone MSA using  $I_{max} = 352$ , denoted as MSA-352. To evaluate the full potential of SCED, we also consider configurations using  $K_{max} = 43$  auxiliary paths. For the 5G LDPC code, SCED-43 significantly outperforms R-AED-43 and reduces the gap to OSD-4 to 0.8 dB.

Finally, for the code  $C_{irPEG}(504, 252)$  the automorphism group is unknown. Nevertheless, SCED ensembles can be designed straightforwardly based solely on the knowledge of the PCM  $\mathbf{H}$ . Fig. 5 demonstrates that SCED-11 yield gains of approximately 0.2 dB compared to both MSA and SPA.

### C. Average Latency & Qualitative Results

As demonstrated, SCED yields a lower worst-case latency compared to AED and stand-alone decoding. Yet, our simulations reveal that the average number of iterations of the BP decoding on the proper subcodes is increased compared to the first path, i.e., when decoding on  $\mathbf{H}$ . This is expected, as in an average of 50% of the cases, the decoding of a proper subcode  $C_i \subset \mathcal{C}$  attempts to decode a codeword  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C} \setminus C_i$ .

Interestingly, when considering the average number of iterations for codewords that belong to the respective subcode, we even observe a decrease in the average number of iterations relative to the first path. Hence, we expect that introducing stopping mechanisms as in [10] can maintain the error correction capabilities and reduce the average number of iterations.

In [15, Table II], the authors qualitatively compare the decoding gains of various ensemble decoding schemes for BP decoding with their requirements on the code and decoding structure. Table I extends this comparison to SCED, demonstrating that SCED achieves significant coding gains without imposing any requirements on the code and decoding structure.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduced SCED, an ensemble decoding scheme that leverages multiple decodings on subcodes of the original code. We discussed the concept of LCs for SCED and observed that, for BP decoding, effective ensembles can be sampled without ensuring that the auxiliary paths constitute an LC. Our results demonstrate that for LDPC codes and BP decoding, SCED achieves improved decoding performance compared to both stand-alone decoding and AED. Notably, SCED does not rely on specific knowledge of the structure of the code and decoding, enabling the straightforward construction of good ensembles and making it easily adaptable to various codes. Extending SCED to other code families, e.g., polar codes, is part of our ongoing research.



## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Richardson and R. Urbanke, *Modern Coding Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [2] M. Shirvanimoghaddam, M. S. Mohammadi, R. Abbas, A. Minja, C. Yue, B. Matuz, G. Han, Z. Lin, W. Liu, Y. Li, S. Johnson, and B. Vucetic, "Short block-length codes for ultra-reliable low latency communications," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 130–137, Feb. 2019.
- [3] S. Miao, C. Kestel, L. Johannsen, M. Geiselhart, L. Schmalen, A. Balatsoukas-Stimming, G. Liva, N. Wehn, and S. T. Brink, "Trends in channel coding for 6g," *Proc. of the IEEE*, vol. 112, no. 7, pp. 653–675, Jul. 2024.
- [4] M. Geiselhart, F. Krieg, J. Clausius, D. Tandler, and S. ten Brink, "6G: A welcome chance to unify channel coding?" *IEEE BITS the Information Theory Magazine*, pp. 1–12, Mar. 2023.
- [5] M. Geiselhart, A. Elkelesh, M. Ebada, S. Cammerer, and S. ten Brink, "Automorphism ensemble decoding of Reed-Muller codes," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 10, pp. 6424–6438, Oct. 2021.
- [6] T. Hehn, J. B. Huber, O. Milenkovic, and S. Laendner, "Multiple-bases belief-propagation decoding of high-density cyclic codes," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 1–8, Jan. 2010.
- [7] M. Geiselhart, J. Clausius, and S. ten Brink, "Rate-compatible polar codes for automorphism ensemble decoding," in *Proc. Int. Symp. on Topics in Coding (ISTC)*, Brest, France, Sept. 2023.
- [8] M. Geiselhart, M. Ebada, A. Elkelesh, J. Clausius, and S. ten Brink, "Automorphism ensemble decoding of quasi-cyclic LDPC codes by breaking graph symmetries," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 1705–1709, Aug. 2022.
- [9] A. Çağrı Arlı and O. Gazi, "Noise-aided belief propagation list decoding of polar codes," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 1285–1288, Aug. 2019.
- [10] P. Schläfer, S. Scholl, E. Leonardi, and N. Wehn, "A new LDPC decoder hardware implementation with improved error rates," in *In Proc. IEEE Jordan Conf. on Applied Electrical Engineering and Computing Technologies (AEECT)*, Amman, Jordan, Nov. 2015.
- [11] T. Hehn, J. B. Huber, S. Laendner, and O. Milenkovic, "Multiple-bases belief-propagation for decoding of short block codes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, Nice, France, Jun. 2007.
- [12] T. Hehn, J. B. Huber, P. He, and S. Laendner, "Multiple-bases belief-propagation with leaking for decoding of moderate-length block codes," in *Proc. Int. ITG Conf. on Source and Channel Coding (SCC)*, Ulm, Germany, Jan. 2008.
- [13] J. Mandelbaum, S. Miao, H. Jäkel, and L. Schmalen, "Endomorphisms of linear block codes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, Athens, Greece, Jul. 2024.
- [14] J. Mandelbaum, H. Jäkel, and L. Schmalen, "Generalized automorphisms of channel codes: Properties, code design, and a decoder," in *Proc. Int. Symp. on Topics in Coding (ISTC)*, Brest, France, Sept. 2023.
- [15] F. Krieg, J. Clausius, M. Geiselhart, and S. ten Brink, "A comparative study of ensemble decoding methods for short length LDPC codes," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.23980>
- [16] A. Vardy, "The intractability of computing the minimum distance of a code," *IEEE Trans. on Inf. Theory*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1757–1766, Nov. 1997.
- [17] K. Kraft, M. Hermann, O. Griebel, and N. Wehn, "Ensemble belief propagation decoding for short linear block codes," in *Proc. Int. ITG Workshop on Smart Antennas (WSA) and Conf. on Systems, Communications, and Coding (SCC)*, Braunschweig, Germany, Feb. 2023.
- [18] P. L. Clark, "Covering numbers in linear algebra," *The American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 119, pp. 65–67, Jan. 2012.
- [19] A. A. Ageev and M. I. Sviridenko, "Approximation algorithms for maximum coverage and max cut with given sizes of parts," in *In Proc. Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO)*, Graz, Austria, Jun. 1999.
- [20] *5G; NR; Physical layer; Data (Release 17)*, 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) Std. TS 38.212, Mar. 2023, version 17.7.0. [Online]. Available: <https://portal.3gpp.org/desktopmodules/Specifications/SpecificationDetails.aspx?specificationId=3214>
- [21] D. J. C. MacKay, "Information theory, inference, and learning algorithms: Codes files," <https://www.inference.org.uk/mackay/CodesFiles.html>, accessed: 2024-12-22.

APPENDIX

We first provide Lemma 1 showing the existence of LCs consisting of 3 proper subcodes, whose proof contains an important construction used in the upcoming proof of Theorem 1:

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$  be a code constituting a  $k$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ . Then there exist 3 proper  $(k - 1)$ -dimensional subcodes  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3$ , such that*

$$\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2 \cup \mathcal{C}_3 = \mathcal{C}. \quad (4)$$

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Consider the basis  $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ , e.g., given by the rows of the generator matrix. Then, the  $(k - 1)$ -dimensional subcodes  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3$  with bases

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1 &= \{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_3, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_2 &= \{\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \mathbf{b}_4, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_3 &= \{\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \mathbf{b}_4, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, fulfill (4).  $\square$

With a method for constructing LCs at hand, we can now prove Theorem 1:

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a binary linear code with PCM  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m \times n}$  and let  $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \in \mathbb{F}^{1 \times n}$  be two row vectors that are linearly independent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$ , but not necessarily mutually independent. Since  $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2$  are linearly independent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$ , appending each of them to  $\mathbf{H}$  according to (2) yields two PCMs denoted as  $\mathbf{H}_1, \mathbf{H}_2$ , respectively, which induce two proper subcodes  $\mathcal{C}_1 \subset \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset \mathcal{C}$ , respectively. Note that the  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  are not necessarily distinct. We distinguish two cases.

**Case 1:** Let  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}_2$ . In this case, appending  $\mathbf{h}_2$  to  $\mathbf{H}_1$  does not change the null space of  $\mathbf{H}_1$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{h}_2$  is linearly dependent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}_1$ . Due to the assumption that both  $\mathbf{h}_1$  and  $\mathbf{h}_2$  are linearly independent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$  and because appending both of them to  $\mathbf{H}$  only increases the rank of the matrix by 1 compared to  $\mathbf{H}$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{h}_3 = \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2$  is linearly dependent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$ . Hence, appending  $\mathbf{h}_3$  to  $\mathbf{H}$  according to (2) induces the subcode  $\mathcal{C}_3 = \mathcal{C}$  and, trivially,  $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3\}$  constitute an LC.

**Case 2:** Let  $\mathcal{C}_1 \neq \mathcal{C}_2$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{h}_1 \neq \mathbf{h}_2$ , since  $\mathbf{h}_1 = \mathbf{h}_2$  would result in Case 1. Note that the assumption  $\mathcal{C}_1 \neq \mathcal{C}_2$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{h}_3 = \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2$  being linearly independent of the rows of  $\mathbf{H}$  since otherwise appending  $\mathbf{h}_2$  to  $\mathbf{H}_1$  would not increase the rank of  $\mathbf{H}_1$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}_2$ . Furthermore, since both subcodes are proper subcodes of dimension  $k - 1$ , i.e.,  $|\mathcal{C}_1| = |\mathcal{C}_2|$ , that are distinct, there exist codewords  $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1 \setminus \mathcal{C}_2 \subset \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2 \setminus \mathcal{C}_1 \subset \mathcal{C}$ . By construction,  $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$  have the properties that<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{b}_1 &= \mathbf{0}, & \mathbf{H}\mathbf{b}_2 &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{h}_1\mathbf{b}_1 &= 0, & \mathbf{h}_2\mathbf{b}_2 &= 0, \\ \mathbf{h}_2\mathbf{b}_1 &= 1, & \mathbf{h}_1\mathbf{b}_2 &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

<sup>1</sup>Note that  $\mathbf{h}_i$  are row vectors, whereas  $\mathbf{b}_i$  are column vectors.

since, otherwise,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H} \\ \mathbf{h}_2 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{0}$$

contradicting the choice of  $\mathbf{b}_1$  and, similarly, for  $\mathbf{b}_2$ .

Since  $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathcal{C}$  and since  $\mathbf{b}_1 \neq \mathbf{b}_2$  which implies that they are linearly independent, there exists a basis

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\}$$

for  $\mathcal{C}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1 &= \{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_3, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\} \\ \mathcal{B}_2 &= \{\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \mathbf{b}_4, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\} \end{aligned}$$

form a basis of  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$ , respectively. Now, choosing  $\mathbf{h}_3 = \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2 \neq \mathbf{0}$  and appending  $\mathbf{h}_3$  to  $\mathbf{H}$  induces a proper subcode  $\mathcal{C}_3 \subset \mathcal{C}$ .

It remains to show that  $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2 \cup \mathcal{C}_3 = \mathcal{C}$ . First, note that all codewords composed of linear combinations within  $\mathcal{B}_1$  or  $\mathcal{B}_2$  alone are already covered by  $\mathcal{C}_1$  or  $\mathcal{C}_2$ . Hence, the remaining codewords  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C} \setminus (\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2)$  are of the form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 + \sum_{i=3}^k \alpha_i \mathbf{b}_i \quad (6)$$

and are, thus, covered by  $\mathcal{C}_3$  since (6) yields:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H} \\ \mathbf{h}_3 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H} \\ \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left( \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 + \sum_{i=3}^k \alpha_i \mathbf{b}_i \right)$$

The first  $m$  rows are equal to zero since  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ , and the last row becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2) \cdot \left( \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 + \sum_{i=3}^k \alpha_i \mathbf{b}_i \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} 0 + 1 + 0 + 1 + 0 + 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to expanding the terms and using (5).  $\square$

*Remark:* Note that, for practical codes, random sampling of rows  $\mathbf{h}_1$  and  $\mathbf{h}_2$  typically results in the second case.