

# Modified OSD Algorithm with Reduced Gaussian Elimination

Marc Fossorier, Mahdi Shakiba-Herfeh and Huazi Zhang  
Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd

January 2024

## Abstract

In this paper, the OSD algorithm is modified to perform a limited GE with  $O(N^3 \min\{R, 1-R\}^3)$  complexity for an  $(N, K)$  linear block code of rate  $R = K/N$ .

*Index terms*- decoding, soft decision decoding, ordered statistic decoding, linear codes.

# 1 Introduction

Soft decision maximum likelihood decoding (MLD) of linear block codes can be achieved by several approaches. Some decoders depend on the particular code considered and become code dedicated, while others are universal and can be applied to a large class of codes. In this work we are interested in this latter class.

Several soft decision decoding approaches are developed in conjunction with the most reliable basis (MRB), which is defined as the set of the most reliable independent positions (MRIPs), hence forming an information set. In these approaches each considered error pattern is subtracted from the hard decision of the MRIPs and the corresponding codeword is reconstructed by encoding the corresponding information sequence. The precursor work of [1] considers error patterns restricted to the MRB in increasing a-priori likelihood. In [2] the errors patterns are processed in a deterministic order within families of increasing Hamming weight. This algorithm is referred to as ordered statistic decoding (OSD) and the efficiency of these two MRB methods as well as similar ones is compared in [3].

A major drawback of MRB methods is the use of a Gaussian elimination (GE) to put the generator matrix of the code considered into systematic form with respect to the MRB for encoding the MRIPs. For an  $(N, K)$  linear block code of rate  $R = K/N$ , the complexity of GE is  $O(N^3 \min\{R, 1 - R\}^2)$ . In this work, we present an alternate method with a reduced GE in  $O(N^3 \min\{R, 1 - R\}^3)$  complexity. The main idea is to separate the information positions from the parity positions of the original representation of the code in both the MRB and its dual least reliable basis (LRB). As a result the original information positions also in the MRB do not need to be considered by the GE in G-space decoding. Similarly the original parity positions also in the LRB do not need to be considered by the GE in H-space decoding.

## 2 Review of OSD

The OSD algorithm consists of two main parts [2]: (1) construction of the MRB; and (2) systematic reprocessing of candidate codewords expressed in the MRB.

The MRB is constructed as follows:

- (a) Order the reliabilities associated with the hard decisions of the received values in

decreasing order, which defines a first permutation  $\lambda_1$ .

- (b) Apply  $\lambda_1$  to the received sequence and to the columns of the generator matrix associated with the code considered. Let  $\mathbf{y}_1$  and  $G_1$  denote the resulting received sequence and generator matrix, respectively, and let  $I_1 = \{0, N - 1\}$  be the corresponding indexing. We have

$$|y_{1,i}| \geq |y_{1,j}| \quad (1)$$

for  $i \in I_1, j \in I_1$  and  $i < j$ .

- (c) Perform a GE on  $G_1$  from left to right. The dependent columns found during the GE are then permuted after the last independent column found to obtain a matrix  $G_2$  in systematic form, which defines a second permutation  $\lambda_2$ .
- (d) Apply  $\lambda_2$  to the permuted received sequence  $\mathbf{y}_1$ , which defines a second permuted received sequence  $\mathbf{y}_2$ .

For an  $(N, K)$  linear block code, the MRB consists of the  $K$  positions corresponding to the (leftmost) set of independent columns found in step (c). Note that if  $\mathbf{c}_2$  represents a codeword in the code defined by  $G_2$ , then  $\lambda_1^{-1}(\lambda_2^{-1}(\mathbf{c}_2))$  represents the corresponding codeword in the original code, where  $\lambda_j^{-1}$  represents the inverse permutation to  $\lambda_j$ .

Once the MRB has been identified, the order- $i$  OSD algorithm is conducted as follows:

- (a) For  $0 \leq l \leq i$ , make all possible changes of  $l$  of the  $K$  most reliable bits in the hard decision decoding of the permuted noisy received sequence  $\mathbf{y}_2$ ;
- (b) For each change, encode these  $K$  bits based on  $G_2$  (in systematic form), and compute the decoding metric associated with each constructed codeword;
- (c) Select the most likely codeword among the  $L(i) = \sum_{l=0}^i \binom{K}{l}$  constructed candidate codewords.

Each value of  $l$  determines the reprocessing phase- $l$  of order- $i$  reprocessing. Note finally that an equivalent dual implementation of OSD based on the processing of the parity check matrix of the code considered rather than its generator matrix is also possible [4].

### 3 OSD with Reduced GE

#### 3.1 Generator Matrix

Let  $G_{REF}$  be a reduced echelon form of the code considered, so that the  $K$  columns of identity belong to  $G_{REF}$ . Let  $B_K$  be the location set of the  $K$  identity columns of  $G_{REF}$  and let  $P_{N-K}$  be the location set of the  $N - K$  parity positions of  $G_{REF}$ . Note that  $G_{REF}$  does not have to be the generator matrix  $G$  used for encoding but both  $G$  and  $G_{REF}$  define the same codebook.

For  $0 \leq a < b < N$ , define  $I_1([a, b])$  as the set of consecutive indices  $\{a, a+1, \dots, b\} \subseteq I_1$ ,  $I_1$  being the set of indices after ordering defined in Step-(b) of the construction of the MRB in Section 2.

Define:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{K,MR} &= B_K \cap I_1([0, K - 1]), \\ B_{K,LR} &= B_K \cap I_1([K, N - 1]), \\ P_{N-K,MR} &= P_{N-K} \cap I_1([0, K - 1]), \\ P_{N-K,LR} &= P_{N-K} \cap I_1([K, N - 1]). \end{aligned}$$

We observe

$$|B_{K,LR}| = |P_{N-K,MR}| \leq \min\{K, N - K\}, \quad (2)$$

If  $\lambda_2$  is the identity function, then  $I_1([0, K - 1])$  and  $I_1([K, N - 1])$  correspond to the MRB and LRB, respectively.

This separation suggests that in  $\lambda_1(G_{REF})$ , the GE does not have to be applied to  $B_{K,MR}$ . As a result, the GE is applied to a  $K \times (|B_{K,LR}| + N - K)$  submatrix. The identity part of the obtained systematic form may not correspond to the MRB due to the dependency occurrences, but the discrepancy between the two bases should remain small. Then the decoding presented in Section 2 can be applied.

Alternatively, GE can be applied to only the  $|B_{K,LR}|$  rows with all-0 vector in the MRPs of  $B_{K,MR}$ . In that case we obtain

$$G'_2 = \begin{bmatrix} I_{|B_{K,MR}|} & P_{11} & 0 & P_{12} \\ 0 & I_{|B_{K,LR}|} & P_{21} & P_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Note that due the occurrence of dependent columns during the construction of  $I_{|B_{K,LR}|}$ , the dimensions of  $P_{12}$ ,  $P_{21}$  and  $P_{22}$  in (3) depend on the number of dependency occurrences.

For  $K < N - K$ , based on [4] we obtain the parity check matrix of the code defined by  $G'_2$  as

$$H'_2 = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} & I_{|P_{N-K,MR}|} & 0 \\ Q_{21} & 0 & Q_{22} & I_{|P_{N-K,LR}|} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

### 3.2 Decoding Algorithm

Let  $\mathbf{y}' = (y'_0, y'_1, \dots, y'_{N-1})$  be the ordered received sequence corresponding to  $G'_2$  in (3) and  $\mathbf{z}' = (z'_0, z'_1, \dots, z'_{N-1})$  the corresponding hard decision decoding. We decompose

$$\mathbf{z}' = (\mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}}, \mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}}) \quad (5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}} &= (z'_0, z'_1, \dots, z'_{|B_{K,MR}|-1}), \\ \mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}} &= (z'_{|B_{K,MR}|}, z'_{|B_{K,MR}|+1}, \dots, z'_{K-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Order-0 decoding is achieved as follows:

- Compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}'_{\mathbf{MR}} &= \mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}} \begin{bmatrix} I_{|B_{K,MR}|} & P_{11} & 0 & P_{12} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (\mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}} \quad \mathbf{c}'_{11} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{c}'_{12}). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

- and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}'_{\mathbf{LR}} &= (\mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}} + \mathbf{c}'_{11}) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{|B_{K,LR}|} & P_{21} & P_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (\mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}} + \mathbf{c}'_{11} \quad \mathbf{c}'_{21} \quad \mathbf{c}'_{22}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

- Order-0 decoding outputs the codeword

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}'_0 &= \mathbf{c}'_{\mathbf{MR}} + \mathbf{c}'_{\mathbf{LR}} \\ &= (\mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}} \quad \mathbf{z}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}} \quad \mathbf{c}'_{21} \quad \mathbf{c}'_{12} + \mathbf{c}'_{22}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Phase- $j$  reprocessing is achieved based on the  $K$ -tuples

$$\mathbf{e}' = (\mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}}, \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}}) \quad (9)$$

as error patterns, with  $w_H(\mathbf{e}') = j$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}} &= (e'_{0}, e'_{1}, \dots, e'_{|B_{K,\mathbf{MR}}|-1}), \\ \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}} &= (e'_{|B_{K,\mathbf{MR}}|}, e'_{|B_{K,\mathbf{MR}}|+1}, \dots, e'_{K-1}). \end{aligned}$$

- Compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{MR}} &= \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}} \begin{bmatrix} I_{|B_{K,\mathbf{MR}}|} & P_{11} & 0 & P_{12} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (\mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{MR}} \quad \mathbf{e}'_{11} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{e}'_{12}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

- and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{LR}} &= (\mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}} + \mathbf{e}'_{11}) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{|B_{K,\mathbf{LR}}|} & P_{21} & P_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (\mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{K},\mathbf{LR}} + \mathbf{e}'_{11} \quad \mathbf{e}'_{21} \quad \mathbf{e}'_{22}). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

- Phase- $j$  decoding outputs the codeword

$$\mathbf{c}'_j = \mathbf{c}'_0 + \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{MR}} + \mathbf{e}'_{\mathbf{LR}}. \quad (12)$$

Consequently OSD based on  $G'_2$  in (3) is achieved with a two stage decoding.

OSD based on  $H'_2$  in (4) is also achieved with a two stage decoding based on the approach described in [4].

### 3.3 Complexity

To obtain  $G'_2$  in (3), GE is applied to a  $(|B_{K,\mathbf{LR}}|) \times (|B_{K,\mathbf{LR}}| + N - K)$  matrix, with  $|B_{K,\mathbf{LR}}| \leq N - K$  from (2). Hence its complexity becomes  $O((N - K)^3)$ . Similarly  $H'_2$  in (4) is obtained with complexity  $O(K^3)$ . Therefore the complexity of GE in this two stage approach becomes  $O(N^3 \min\{R, 1 - R\}^3)$ .

Based on Section 3.2, the complexity to determine each codeword is roughly doubled compared to that of the original OSD of [2].

### 3.4 Generalization

The two stage decoding based on  $G'_2$  or  $H'_2$  can be generalized into more stages to further reduce the complexity of GE. For example the generator matrix corresponding to three stages is

$$G'_3 = \begin{bmatrix} I_{|B_{K,MR}|} & P_{11} & P_{12} & 0 & P_{13} \\ 0 & I_{|B_{K,LR}|-\alpha} & P_{21} & P_{22} & P_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & I_\alpha & P_{31} & P_{32} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

with a GE of complexity

$$(N - |B_{K,MR}|) \cdot (|B_{K,LR}| - \alpha) \cdot |B_{K,LR}| + (N - K + \alpha) \cdot \alpha^2. \quad (14)$$

**Example 3.1** Consider a (256,128) binary linear code and assume  $|B_{K,LR}| = |P_{N-K,MR}| = 64$ .

- The complexity of full GE is:  $256 \times 128 \times 128 = 4,194,304$ .
- The complexity of two stage reduced GE is:  $192 \times 64 \times 64 = 786,432$ .
- The complexity of three stage reduced GE with  $\alpha = 34$  is<sup>1</sup>:  $192 \times 30 \times 64 + 162 \times 34 \times 34 = 555,912$ .
- The complexity of three stage reduced GE with  $\alpha = |B_{K,LR}|/2 = 32$  is:  $192 \times 32 \times 64 + 160 \times 32 \times 32 = 559,992$ .

We note that this multi stage approach in conjunction with the decoding algorithm of Section 3.2 can be applied to the MRB construction as well. In that case the  $O(N^3 \min\{R, 1-R\}^2)$  complexity of GE can be reduced by a constant. In [5] a similar structure that also reduces the complexity of GE by a constant is used in conjunction with LC-OSD.

### 3.5 Restricted Complexity Decoding Algorithm

Without loss of generality, the matrix  $\lambda_1(G_{REF})$  can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{G}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} I_{|B_{K,MR}|} & \tilde{P}_{11} & 0 & \tilde{P}_{12} \\ 0 & \tilde{P}_{21} & I_{|B_{K,LR}|} & \tilde{P}_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> $\alpha = 34$  is obtained by a simple optimization of (14).

For large  $N - K$ , (2) implies that the reduced GE may still be quite complex. To further control the size of the reduced GE, we propose to bound the number of reprocessed rows to  $B_{max}$ . Therefore for  $|B_{K,LR}| > B_{max}$ ,  $\tilde{G}_2$  in (15) can be put in the following form with column permutations:

$$\tilde{G}_2^B = \begin{bmatrix} I_{K-B_{max}} & \tilde{P}_{11}^B & 0 & \tilde{P}_{12}^B \\ 0 & \tilde{P}_{21}^B & I_{B_{max}} & \tilde{P}_{22}^B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

with

- $\tilde{P}_{11}^B$ :  $(K - B_{max}) \times B_{max}$ ,
- $\tilde{P}_{12}^B$ :  $(K - B_{max}) \times (N - K - B_{max})$ ,
- $\tilde{P}_{21}^B$ :  $B_{max} \times B_{max}$ ,
- $\tilde{P}_{22}^B$ :  $B_{max} \times (N - K - B_{max})$ .

The reduced GE of Section 3.1 can be applied to the last  $|B_{max}|$  rows of  $\tilde{G}_2^B$  in (16). Then the two stage decoding of Section 3.2 can be performed based on the obtained matrix.

The dual approaches for low rate codes can be developed in a straightforward way based on reprocessing in H-space [4]. The parity check matrix corresponding to (16) is defined by

$$\tilde{H}_2^B = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Q}_{11} & I_{|P_{N-K,MR}|} & \tilde{Q}_{12} & 0 \\ \tilde{Q}_{21} & 0 & \tilde{Q}_{22} & I_{|P_{N-K,LR}|} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

## 4 Simulation Results

### 4.1 BCH(127,113)

Figure 1 compares the word error rate (WER) of the order-2 decoding algorithm with reduced GE of Section 3.2 ( $N - K = 14$ ), its restricted complexity versions of Section 3.5 with  $B_{max} = 7$  and  $B_{max} = 5$  and the Chase algorithm-2 with  $p = 7$  (referred to as CA2(7)); this algorithm considers all  $2^7$  test error patterns with support in the  $p = 7$  LRPs [6]. We found that all recorded errors for the reduced GE decoding algorithm of Section 3.2 are MLD errors, so that these simulations provide also a lower bound on MLD. At low SNR, all algorithms but that with  $B_{max} = 5$  have their simulated WERs on top of the MLD lower bound; a loss of 0.05 dB is observed for  $B_{max} = 5$ . At high SNR, all algorithms but that with  $B_{max} = 5$  and CA2(7) have their simulations on top of the MLD lower bound; a loss 0.015 dB and 0.055 dB is observed for  $B_{max} = 5$  and CA2(7), respectively.




Figure 1: Simulation results for the BCH(127,113) code.

## 4.2 BCH(511,493)

Figure 2 compares the WER of the order-2 decoding algorithm with restricted complexity of Section 3.5 for  $B_{max} = 6$ ,  $B_{max} = 9$  and  $B_{max} = 12$ , the algorithm CA2(9) and a tight lower bound on MLD. The curve of the algorithm with  $B_{max} = 12$  is nearly on top of that of the lower bound on MLD. We observe a loss of about 0.05 dB for the algorithm with  $B_{max} = 9$  and CA2(9). The loss for the algorithm with  $B_{max} = 6$  is about 0.25 dB.

## 5 Conclusion

Efficient near MLD decoders for short linear codes have been considered in some ultra reliable low latency communications (URLLC) scenarios. OSD seems a good candidate due to its good performance and efficient software implementation. However its hardware imple-




Figure 2: Simulation results for the BCH(511,493) code.

mentation is not friendly, mostly due to the GE part. The reasons are:

- The number of steps/cycles is not deterministic and subject to the dependency occurrences when constructing the MRB.
- Sorting a large number of values is not area efficient.
- GE involves cubic complexity and quadratic memory.

Consequently these results achieve savings for both software and hardware implementations with good performance trade-offs.

## References

- [1] B. G. Dorsch, “A Decoding Algorithm for Binary Block Codes and J-ary Output Channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 20, pp. 391–394, May 1974.
- [2] M. P. C. Fossorier and S. Lin, “Soft-Decision Decoding of Linear Block Codes Based on Ordered Statistics,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 41, pp. 1379–1396, Sep. 1995.
- [3] A. Valembois and M. P. C. Fossorier, “A Comparison between “Most-Reliable-Basis Reprocessing” Strategies,” *IEICE Trans. Fundam.*, vol. E85-A, pp. 1727-1741, Jul. 2002.
- [4] M. Fossorier, S. Lin and J. Snyders, “Reliability-Based Syndrome Decoding of Linear Block Codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 44, pp. 388- 398, Jan. 1998.
- [5] J. Liang, Y. Wang, S. Cai and X. Ma, “A Low-Complexity Ordered Statistic Decoding of Short Block Codes,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 27, pp. 400-403, Feb. 2023.
- [6] D. Chase, ‘A Class of Algorithms for Decoding Block Codes with Channel Measurement Information,’ *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 18, pp. 170–182, Jan. 1972.