

# Modulation and Coding for the Gaussian Collision Channel

G. Caire, E. Leonardi, E. Viterbo

March 27, 2000

## Abstract

We study signal-space coding for coherent slow frequency-hopped communications over a Gaussian multiple-access collision channel (G-MACC). We define signal sets and interleavers having maximum *collision resistance*. The packet-error probability and the spectral efficiency obtained by these signal sets concatenated with outer block coding and hard (error-only) decoding is evaluated without assuming perfect interleaving. Closed-form expressions are provided and computer simulations show perfect agreement with analysis. The structure of good interleavers is also discussed.

More generally, we present expressions for the information outage probability and for the achievable (ergodic) rate of the G-MACC at hand, under various assumptions on user coding and decoding strategies. Outage probability yields the limiting packet-error probability with finite interleaving depth (delay-limited systems). The achievable rate yields the limiting system spectral efficiency for large interleaving depth (delay-unconstrained systems). Comparisons with other classical multiple access schemes are provided.

**Keywords:** Multiple-Access Collision Channel, Coding and Modulation, Information Outage Probability, Frequency-Hopped Communications.

# 1 Introduction

In the Gaussian multiple-access channel (G-MAC), several senders (users) encode their information messages independently into sequences of real numbers and transmit their signals at the same time. A common receiver gets the superposition of all users signals plus additive Gaussian background noise and detects the individual messages [1]. This channel model serves as perhaps the simplest example of wireless network, where a common resource has to be shared by a population of users (examples are the uplink of a satellite system or the mobile-to-base link of a terrestrial cellular system, in the idealized case of isolated cells and no fading [2]).

The capacity region of the G-MAC is well-known [1] and the modern research trend in the field is to devise low-complexity coding and decoding schemes to approach this limit. For example, [3] shows that all capacity region boundary points can be achieved by single-user coding/decoding and “stripping”, provided that the users split their signals into at most two components whose rate sum is equal to the users’ own rate (the rate-splitting approach). A more classical (and generally suboptimal) approach consists of eliminating multiple-access interference (MAI) by making the user signals orthogonal, like in TDMA/FDMA. The capacity region of the G-MAC with orthogonal access is strictly included in the general capacity region, and it is optimal in the case of equal-rate equal-energy users (symmetric capacity) [1].

In practice, both optimal and orthogonal multiple-access require a good deal of coordination among users, in order to accommodate changing traffic conditions, access requests from new users entering the network and re-allocation of resources (bandwidth and power) of users leaving the network. Users coordination can be achieved at the expenses of additional overhead and complexity, by implementing some protocol on top of the basic G-MAC mechanism.

A simple alternative to user coordination is random access, where no effort is made in order to avoid MAI and other countermeasures are taken to mitigate its effects. A G-MAC with random access shall be referred to as the *Gaussian multiple-access collision channel* (G-MACC). For example, in some packet radio networks users may “collide” (i.e., their signals may overlap in time-frequency) and are informed about an unsuccessful transmission by a feedback channel, so that a re-transmission protocol can be implemented (e.g., the ALOHA

protocol [4, 5, 6]). In other applications, re-transmissions are undesirable or impossible. Then, the effect of collisions can be mitigated by a combination of coding, interleaving and signal processing (see [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15] and reference therein).

The capacity region of a noiseless collision channel without feedback was determined in [16]. In the channel model of [16], users cannot coordinate their transmissions because of unknown transmission delays, that cannot be estimated because of the lack of a feedback channel. Therefore, in [16] collisions are unavoidable. In this work we do not place this restriction. On the contrary, we just assume that a “lazy” system designer did not implement any user coordination protocol nor re-transmission protocol. Moreover, we constrain the network to be equipped with conventional single-user matched filters (SUMF), which treat MAI as additional (white) noise without implementing stripping decoding or other signal-space interference cancellation techniques. Obviously, we do not claim any optimality of this approach. Nevertheless, devising modulation and coding schemes for this channel might be of some interest. Applications are, for example, simple indoor wireless networks with limited-mobility terminals, mobile satellite systems serving a large population of users with “bursty” traffic, or low-rate random access channels for auxiliary operations in cellular systems, such as handoffs and call requests. Moreover, several partially-ordered protocols (e.g., PRMA [17, 18]) have been proposed for integrated voice and data in wireless systems, so that the study of the underlying G-MACC may provide useful insight into more evolved applications [19].

In this paper, we consider a slotted G-MACC with coherent detection and equal-rate equal-energy users. The time-frequency plane is organized in *frames*, and each frame is divided in time-frequency *slots*. Users interleave and transmit their code words over  $M$  (pseudo-)randomly selected slots. Previous analysis of time-frequency hopped systems considered perfect interleaving and infinite signal-to-noise ratio [13, 14]. On the contrary, we distinguish delay-limited systems, for which  $M$  is finite, from delay-unconstrained systems, where perfect interleaving is allowed (i.e.,  $M$  can be made arbitrarily large). Moreover, we take into account the effect of noise.

For this channel, we define a class of multidimensional signal sets having *collision resistance*,

i.e., such that even if some signal components are transmitted during collided slots, correct signal detection is still possible from the uncollided components. A necessary condition for collision resistance is that the components of the signal point are transmitted on different slots. Then, we define a class of interleavers meeting this constraint and we select *good* interleavers in this class. Under some assumptions, the slotted G-MACC belongs to the class of block-interference channels studied in [20], in the case of no delay constraints. In fact, collisions can be regarded as an extreme case of *block fading*, studied in [21, 22]. Thus, it is not surprising that high-diversity signal sets for the fading channel [23, 24] have good collision resistance. We provide a new algebraic construction of high-diversity signal sets based on  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules, and an interesting 4-dimensional example.

The idea of improving the performance of slotted ALOHA by introducing “packet redundancy” is not new (e.g., multicopy ALOHA and its generalizations [25, 26]). Replicating the same packet, as done in previous work, can be seen as the concatenation of an outer code with a trivial repetition inner code and a trivial interleaver. Here, we consider the concatenation of collision resistant signal sets (which can be regarded as inner signal-space coding) with outer block coding (e.g., Reed-Solomon codes) and non-trivial interleaving (Sections 2 and 3). The performance analysis of this scheme is inspired by the work of [14], with the fundamental difference that in our case, because of the finite interleaving depth, symbol errors at the decoder input are statistically dependent, so that the standard analysis of bounded-distance hard decoding [27] does not apply. Nevertheless, we find simple closed-form expressions for the word error probability and for the spectral efficiency achievable by Reed-Solomon outer coding. Our analysis of the error probability provides some useful hints on the design of good interleavers (Section 4).

Finally, we look at the G-MACC from a more idealized point of view and we derive closed-form expressions for its information outage probability [21] (for finite interleaving depth) and for its achievable symmetric rate (for ideal interleaving). We provide comparisons with other conventional access schemes for the G-MACC, such as slotted ALOHA, “Naive” CDMA (NCDMA)

with SUMF and linear MMSE receivers <sup>1</sup> and ideal orthogonal access (Section 5).

Proofs and mathematical details are collected in Appendices A, B, C and D and conclusions and future research directions are pointed out in Section 6.

**Notations and definitions.**

- $\Phi_k^n$  denotes the *combinations set*, i.e., the set of subsets  $\phi \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  of cardinality  $k$  (referred to as “ $n$ -combinations of size  $k$ ”). If  $n \geq k$ ,  $|\Phi_k^n| = \binom{n}{k}$ , otherwise  $\Phi_k^n$  is empty.
- $\Pi_k$  denotes the set of permutations  $\pi$  of  $k$  elements.
- $\Xi_k^n$  denotes the *ordered combinations set*, i.e., the set of vectors  $\xi$  of length  $k$  whose components are distinct elements of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . If  $n \geq k$ ,  $|\Xi_k^n| = k! \binom{n}{k}$ , otherwise  $\Xi_k^n$  is empty. Moreover, there exists a (not unique) one-to-one correspondence  $\Xi_k^n \leftrightarrow \Phi_k^n \times \Pi_k$ .
- $B(n, k, p) \triangleq \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$ .
- “p” and “ae” denote convergence in probability and almost everywhere, respectively [29].
- $\binom{0}{h} = 0^h = \delta_{h,0}$ .
- $1\{A\}$  denotes the indicator function of the event  $A$ .
- $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  denotes the Gaussian pdf with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ .
- $Q(x) \triangleq \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-t^2/2} dt$ .
- $\mathcal{H}(p) \triangleq -p \log_2 p - (1-p) \log_2 (1-p)$  and for a probability vector  $\mathbf{p}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}) \triangleq -\sum_i p_i \log_2 p_i$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Following the terminology of [2], we denote by Naive CDMA an access scheme where all signals overlap in time and frequency and where users are decoded independently. The receiver for NCDMA is formed by a soft-output detector device (e.g., a bank of single-user matched filters, a bank of linear MMSE interference cancelers [10] or a bank of decorrelators [9]) which produces sequences of soft decision variables for each user encoded data stream, followed by a bank of single-user decoders acting independently. No information from a decoder can be fed back to other decoders, as done in a stripping procedure [3, 28].

## 2 Slotted Gaussian multiple-access collision channel

We consider a G-MACC with  $N_u$  users and slotted random access. The time-frequency plane is organized in *frames*. Each frame is partitioned in  $N_s$  time-frequency *slots*. User signals are divided into *bursts* which occupy one slot. Guard bands and guard intervals are inserted in order to make signal bursts approximately time- and band-limited over the slots. Each slot has  $L_s$  *real dimensions* (or *components*) available for the transmission. Users occupy an average number  $g$  of slots per frame and transmit with *information rate*<sup>2</sup>  $R$  bit/dim, so that all users have the same average bit-rate  $R_b = gRL_s/T$  bit/s, where  $T$  denotes the frame duration. Users select their slots randomly and independently, according to a given (pseudo-)random time-frequency hopping code known to the receiver. Following [14], the transmission of each user is modeled as a Bernoulli process [29] with probability  $p = g/N_s$  that a user occupies any given slot. With this model self-collisions are possible even though, in practice, they can be avoided by suitable choices of the hopping codes. Hence, our analysis yields conservative results. The slot collision probability (i.e., the probability that more than one user transmits over the same slot) is given by  $1 - (1 - p)^{N_u - 1}$  [14]. We study the system performance under the assumption of infinite user population ( $N_u \rightarrow \infty$ ) for a fixed ratio  $N_u/N_s = \beta$ . Then, the number of transmitting users in each slot is Poisson distributed [29] with mean  $G = g\beta$  ( $G$  is referred to as the *channel load*), collisions in different slots are i.i.d. and the limiting collision probability is given by

$$P_{\text{col}} \triangleq 1 - \lim_{N_u \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{g\beta}{N_u}\right)^{N_u - 1} = 1 - e^{-G} \quad (1)$$

Let  $W$  denote the system bandwidth. The *system spectral efficiency* is defined as  $\eta \triangleq \frac{N_u R_b}{W}$  bit/s/Hz. In this work, we are interested in the limiting  $\eta$  for  $N_u \rightarrow \infty$  and constant  $N_u/N_s = \beta$ . According to the “2WT-Theorem”, we can approximate  $L_s \approx 2WT/N_s$  and write

$$\eta = 2RG \quad (2)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>In a real system,  $R$  should also take into account the overhead due to guard bands, guard intervals, training sequences for synchronization and channel estimation and suitable higher-level protocol overhead, like user address identifiers, packet numbering, acknowledgements etc.. For simplicity, in the following we shall assume an ideally synchronized system with Nyquist band-limited signals and perfect coherent reception.

## 2.1 Channel models

Because of the complete symmetry of the problem with respect to any user, we can focus on the transmission of a given reference user (say, user 1). As discussed in Section 1, in the G-MACC under analysis the receiver treats MAI as additional noise and does not take any advantage of its structure.

An optimistic assumption is that the demodulator for user 1 behaves as a linear device irrespectively of the MAI power and, for each received burst, provides a sequence of  $L_s$  samples taken at the symbol-rate

$$y_j = x_j + \nu_j + n_j \quad j = 1, \dots, L_s \quad (3)$$

where  $x_j$  is the  $j$ -th component of the signal of user 1,  $\nu_j$  is the  $j$ -th MAI sample and  $n_j$  is the  $j$ -th AWGN sample, i.i.d.  $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, N_0/2)$ . The variance of  $\nu_j$  depends on the number  $K$  of interfering users transmitting over the current slot, which is Poisson distributed with mean  $G$ . The channel model defined by (3) will be referred to as the *variable-power additive noise* (VPAN) channel.

On the contrary, a pessimistic assumption (very common in the analysis of packet-radio networks [5]) is that the demodulator for user 1 is totally impaired by collisions. In this case, the demodulated sample sequence during the current slot can be written as

$$y_j = \alpha(x_j + n_j) \quad j = 1, \dots, L_s \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$  is the *collision* random variable, defined by

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } K > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } K = 0 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The channel model defined by (4) will be referred to as the *on-off* channel.

Coherent demodulation is assumed in the channel models (3) and (4). The real channel models derive from treating separately the in-phase and quadrature components of the signal complex envelope. In model (3), the MAI circular symmetry (i.i.d. in-phase and quadrature components) derives from assuming independent and uniformly distributed carrier phases for all interfering users.

## 2.2 Encoding and interleaving

User information is organized in *packets*. Each packet is independently block-encoded, interleaved, transmitted over a given sequence of slots, demodulated, deinterleaved and decoded. Then, packet-error probability and word-error probability (WER) coincide. Encoding and interleaving is sketched in Fig. 1 and described in the following.

**Encoding.** Without loss of generality, we consider signal-space codes  $\mathcal{X}$  obtained by the concatenation of a block code over an abstract symbol alphabet with a signal set through a labeling map [30]. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a block code of length  $N$  defined over a discrete and finite alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a  $D$ -dimensional signal set (i.e., a discrete and finite set of vectors (signal points) in  $\mathbb{R}^D$ ). Assume that  $|\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{S}|^q$  and let  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a sequence of labeling maps  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^q$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  onto the  $q$ -fold Cartesian product of  $\mathcal{S}$  by itself. Then, the code  $\mathcal{X}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{qDN} : \mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{c}), \quad \forall \mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_N) \in \mathcal{C} \right\} \quad (6)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{c}) = (\mu_1(c_1), \dots, \mu_N(c_N))$  and where the image of  $c_i$  under  $\mu_i$  is the  $qD$ -dimensional real vector

$$\mu_i(c_i) = (\mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+q})$$

(the  $\mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+j}$ 's are  $D$ -dimensional vectors, or signal points, in  $\mathcal{S}$ ). Codes  $\mathcal{X}$  obtained in this way will be denoted briefly by  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ .

**Interleaving.** In general, system requirements impose a maximum transmission *delay*. Then, the interleaving depth, i.e., the number of slots over which a coded packet (code word) is transmitted, cannot be arbitrarily large [21]. We assume that each user code word is interleaved and transmitted over  $M$  distinct slots, we consider a particular code word of the reference user and we number the  $M$  slots over which this is transmitted by  $m = 1, \dots, M$ . Clearly, because of the block-interference model, the word error probability is independent of the actual position of signal components in the slots. Also, slots may contain signal components belonging to several code words, so that the slot length  $L_s$ , the interleaving depth  $M$  and the code word length






Figure 1: Encoding and interleaving

$qDN$  can be chosen quite freely.<sup>3</sup> For the following analysis, all what matters is the unordered assignment of the  $qDN$  signal components of transmitted code word to the corresponding  $M$  slots. Thus, for codes  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ , we represent interleavers by an associated array  $\mathbf{M}$  of size  $qN \times D$  with elements in  $\{1, \dots, M\}$  such that the  $\ell$ -th component of the  $k$ -th signal in the code word, denoted by  $s_{k,\ell}$ , is sent over the slot indexed by the  $(k, \ell)$ -th element of  $\mathbf{M}$ . The  $k$ -th row of  $\mathbf{M}$  specifies the sequence of slots over which signal  $\mathbf{s}_k$  is transmitted.

Table 1 gives an array  $\mathbf{M}$  for  $M = 6$ ,  $D = 3$ ,  $q = 1$  and  $N = 20$ , and an interleaver associated with  $\mathbf{M}$ . For example, the components of signal  $\mathbf{s}_{13}$  are transmitted over slots 2, 3 and 6, as specified by the 13-th row of  $\mathbf{M}$ . By permuting arbitrarily the order of the signal components in each slot, we obtain equivalent interleavers all corresponding to the array  $\mathbf{M}$  (we can say that an array  $\mathbf{M}$  is representative of a class of equivalent interleavers).

### 3 Collision-resistant signal sets

In this section we analyze the system from the point of view of a single reference user. We focus on the transmission of  $D$ -dimensional signals  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$  over the on-off channel. We consider the channel output  $\mathbf{y}_k$  corresponding to the transmission of a single signal  $\mathbf{s}_k$  without specifically indexing the user and, for simplicity of notation, we drop the time index  $k$ . Moreover, we assume that the components  $(s_1, \dots, s_D)$  of  $\mathbf{s}$  are transmitted over  $D$  different slots, indexed by  $j = 1, \dots, D$ , and we denote by  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_D)$  the collision pattern over these slots. Then, we can rewrite (4) as

$$y_j = \alpha_j(s_j + n_j) \quad j = 1, \dots, D \quad (7)$$

We assume that the receiver has perfect knowledge of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  (perfect channel state information (CSI)). Then, the ML decision rule for the detection of  $\mathbf{s}$  is

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{j=1}^D |y_j - \alpha_j s_j|^2 \quad (8)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>For example, in the GSM full-rate standard, encoded packets corresponding to speech frames of 20ms are interleaved over  $M = 8$  TDMA slots, and each slot contains symbols from 4 different packets [31].

$s_1$	1	2	3
$s_2$	1	2	4
$s_3$	1	2	5
$s_4$	1	2	6
$s_5$	1	3	4
$s_6$	1	3	5
$s_7$	1	3	6
$s_8$	1	4	5
$s_9$	1	4	6
$s_{10}$	1	5	6
$s_{11}$	2	3	4
$s_{12}$	2	3	5
$s_{13}$	2	3	6
$s_{14}$	2	4	5
$s_{15}$	2	4	6
$s_{16}$	2	5	6
$s_{17}$	3	4	5
$s_{18}$	3	4	6
$s_{19}$	3	5	6
$s_{20}$	4	5	6

$M$

$M$										
1	$s_{1,1}$	$s_{2,1}$	$s_{3,1}$	$s_{4,1}$	$s_{5,1}$	$s_{6,1}$	$s_{7,1}$	$s_{8,1}$	$s_{9,1}$	$s_{10,1}$
2	$s_{1,2}$	$s_{2,2}$	$s_{3,2}$	$s_{4,2}$	$s_{11,1}$	$s_{12,1}$	$s_{13,1}$	$s_{14,1}$	$s_{15,1}$	$s_{16,1}$
3	$s_{1,3}$	$s_{5,2}$	$s_{6,2}$	$s_{7,2}$	$s_{11,2}$	$s_{12,2}$	$s_{13,2}$	$s_{17,1}$	$s_{18,1}$	$s_{19,1}$
4	$s_{2,3}$	$s_{5,3}$	$s_{8,2}$	$s_{9,2}$	$s_{11,3}$	$s_{14,2}$	$s_{15,2}$	$s_{17,2}$	$s_{18,2}$	$s_{20,1}$
5	$s_{3,3}$	$s_{6,3}$	$s_{8,3}$	$s_{10,2}$	$s_{12,3}$	$s_{14,3}$	$s_{16,2}$	$s_{17,3}$	$s_{19,2}$	$s_{20,2}$
6	$s_{4,3}$	$s_{7,3}$	$s_{9,3}$	$s_{10,3}$	$s_{13,3}$	$s_{15,3}$	$s_{16,3}$	$s_{18,3}$	$s_{19,3}$	$s_{20,3}$

Table 1: Example of interleaver structure with  $M = 6$ ,  $D = 3$ ,  $q = 1$  and  $N = 20$ .

This corresponds to selecting the minimum distance of the received point from the points of a signal set  $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  obtained by projecting  $\mathcal{S}$  over a  $(D - k)$ -dimensional subspace generated by the  $D - k$  axes corresponding to the non zero  $\alpha_j$ 's. In order to avoid systematic errors (i.e., detection errors even for arbitrarily large SNR) in the presence of  $k < D$  collisions, we require that the points in  $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  are distinct, for all  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  with Hamming weight  $W(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^D \alpha_j > 0$ . Then, we have the following

**Definition** — A  $D$ -dimensional signal set  $\mathcal{S}$  has *collision-resistance*  $k$  if its projections on all  $(D - k)$ -dimensional coordinate subspaces have  $|\mathcal{S}|$  points, i.e.,  $|\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})| = |\mathcal{S}|$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  of weight  $W(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \geq D - k$ . □

In this paper, we are interested in maximum collision resistant (MCR)  $D$ -dimensional signal sets, i.e., with collision resistance equal to  $D - 1$ . The minimum Hamming distance of such signal sets must be  $D$ . A similar requirement is imposed in the design of *high diversity* signal sets for the fading channel where the minimum Hamming distance between any two signal vectors is called *modulation diversity* [23, 24].

A desirable property of interleavers is that the components of each signal  $\mathbf{s}$  in the code word are transmitted over  $D$  distinct slots. We have the following

**Definition** — Consider the  $qN \times D$  array  $\mathbf{M}$  associated with an interleaver. The interleaver is MCR if all rows of  $\mathbf{M}$  are (not necessarily distinct) vectors from the ordered combinations set  $\Xi_D^M$ . □

In the following, we restrict our treatment to MCR interleavers. The array  $\mathbf{M}$  of an MCR interleaver can be generated randomly, by selecting i.i.d. with uniform probability  $qN$  vectors  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \Xi_D^M$  and by writing them by rows. We refer to randomly generated MCR interleavers as RMCR interleavers. We shall make use of the following fact, which is an immediate consequence of the *Strong Law of Large Numbers* [29]

**Fact 1** — For given  $D$  and  $M \geq D$ , consider a sequence of RMCR interleavers for increasing

block length  $N$ , with associated array  $\mathbf{M}_N$ . For any given  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \Xi_D^M$ , let  $f_N(\boldsymbol{\xi})$  be the fraction of rows of  $\mathbf{M}_N$  equal to  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ . Then,  $f_N(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} 1/(D! \binom{M}{D})$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

### 3.1 Error probability of MCR signal sets

The error probability analysis is complicated by the fact that, in general,  $\mathcal{S}$  and its projections  $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  are not *geometrically uniform* [32]. We can *symmetrize* the problem with respect to all collision patterns of the same weight by averaging over all possible component permutations  $\pi \in \Pi_D$ . A component permutation  $\pi$ , if applied to a vector  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_D)$ , yields the permuted vector  $\pi\mathbf{s} = (s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, s_{\pi(D)})$ . The *union bound* [7] on the symbol error probability  $\overline{P}(e|k)$  conditioned on the number  $k$  of collided components and averaged over all  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\pi \in \Pi_D$  is given by

$$\overline{P}(e|k) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|D!} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_D} \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{s}} \neq \mathbf{s}} P(\pi\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \pi\hat{\mathbf{s}}|k), 1 - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \right\} \quad (9)$$

where the second term of the above minimum corresponds to the error probability with random selection of a signal in  $\mathcal{S}$ , and where we define the conditional *pairwise error probability* [7]

$$P(\pi\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \pi\hat{\mathbf{s}}|k) \triangleq Q \left( \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{E} \sum_{j=1}^{D-k} |s_{\pi(j)} - \hat{s}_{\pi(j)}|^2}{2N_0}} \right) \quad (10)$$

In (10), we assume that  $\mathcal{S}$  has unit average energy per dimension and that each signal component is scaled by  $\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}$  before transmission, so that the SNR is  $\mathcal{E}/N_0$ .

Notice that  $\overline{P}(e|k)$  depends on  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  only through its weight  $W(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = D - k$ . Since  $k$  is binomially distributed, the average symbol error probability is given by

$$P(e) = \sum_{k=0}^D B(D, k, P_{\text{col}}) \overline{P}(e|k) \quad (11)$$

By using (9) in (11) we obtain an upper bound on  $P(e)$ .

### 3.2 Construction of MCR signal sets

Good MCR signal sets have large squared Euclidean distance (SED) between points  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$  projected on the  $W(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ -dimensional coordinate subspace determined by  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ , for all  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ . In

particular, we define the (normalized) minimum SED given  $k$  collided components as

$$d_k^2 \triangleq \min_{\pi \in \Pi_D} \min_{\mathbf{s} \neq \hat{\mathbf{s}}} \sum_{j=1}^{D-k} |s_{\pi(j)} - \hat{s}_{\pi(j)}|^2 \quad (12)$$

For each  $k$ , the exponential behavior as  $\mathcal{E}/N_0 \rightarrow \infty$  of  $\bar{P}(e|k)$  is determined by  $d_k^2$ , in the sense that  $\bar{P}(e|k) = O(e^{-d_k^2 \mathcal{E}/(4N_0)})$ . Hence, a practical design criterion for good MCR signal sets is to maximize  $d_k^2$  for all  $k = 0, \dots, D - 1$ . We now give some examples of 4-dimensional MCR signal sets of size 16, having spectral efficiency 1 bit/dim.

**Example 1 — The PAM(16,4) signal set.** A simple MCR signal set is a repetition code of length 4 over the 1-dimensional 16-PAM signal set  $1/\sqrt{85}\{\pm 1, \pm 3, \dots, \pm 15\}$ . The resulting 4-dimensional constellation with normalized average energy per dimension, denoted by PAM(16,4), is made of 16 points equally spaced along the main diagonal of a hypercube. The minimum SED of the projections are  $d_0^2 = 0.188$ ,  $d_1^2 = 0.141$ ,  $d_2^2 = 0.094$  and  $d_3^2 = 0.047$ .  $\diamond$

**Example 2 — The RH(16,4) signal set.** An MCR signal set can be obtained by applying a suitable rotation to a 4-dimensional hypercube with vertex coordinates  $(\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1)$ . In particular, the rotation matrix

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.4857 & 0.7859 & -0.2012 & -0.3255 \\ -0.7859 & 0.4857 & 0.3255 & -0.2012 \\ 0.2012 & 0.3255 & 0.4857 & 0.7859 \\ -0.3255 & 0.2012 & -0.7859 & 0.4857 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

was found in [24] to give maximum collision resistance and to maximize the minimum *product distance* within a certain family of rotation matrices. The obtained signal set, denoted by RH(16,4), has minimum SED 4. It is interesting to note that not all the  $(D - k)$ -dimensional projected constellations are equivalent. The four 1-dimensional projections have minimum SED = 0.003. The six 2-dimensional projections, shown in Fig. 2, have three minimum SEDs, namely 0.586, 0.422 and 0.205 and the four 3-dimensional projections all have minimum SED = 1.530.  $\diamond$

**Example 3 — The Z(16,4) signal set.** Here, we show an example of a general algebraic construction which enables to obtain good MCR signal sets. Further details and examples

can be found in [33]. Let  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  be the ring of integers modulo 16 and consider the  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ -module  $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}_{16}G$ , with  $G = [g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4]$  (i.e., the set of vectors  $\mathbf{z} = zG$ , with  $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{16}$ , which can be seen as a  $(4, 1)$  linear code over  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$  with generator matrix  $G$  [34]). If the elements of  $G$  have a multiplicative inverse in  $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ , then the minimum Hamming distance of  $\Lambda$  is 4. The resulting MCR signal set  $\mathcal{S}$  is obtained by applying componentwise the mapping  $\mathbb{Z}_{16} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $s = 2z - 15$  to all  $\mathbf{z} \in \Lambda$ , and by normalizing the average energy per component.

The signal set can be optimized by selecting  $G$  (e.g., with  $G = [1, 1, 1, 1]$  we obtain PAM(16,4)). The choice  $G = [1, 3, 5, 7]$  proves to be particularly good. The resulting signal set, denoted by  $Z(16,4)$ , has minimum SED 3.012. The four 1-dimensional projections have minimum SED = 0.047. The six 2-dimensional projections, shown in Fig. 3, have two different minimum SEDs, namely 0.471 and 0.377 and the four 3-dimensional projections all have minimum SED = 1.647.  $\diamond$

Fig. 4 shows  $\bar{P}(e|k)$  vs.  $E_b/N_0$  for the signal sets PAM(16,4), RH(16,4) and  $Z(16,4)$ , for  $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ . The error curves of  $Z(16,4)$  are more uniformly spaced in the useful SNR range, thus resulting in a more graceful performance degradation as the number of collisions increases.




Figure 2: The 6 two-dimensional projections of  $\text{RH}(16,4)$  of Example 2.






Figure 3: The 6 two-dimensional projections of  $Z(16,4)$  of Example 3.




Figure 4:  $\bar{P}(e|k)$  vs.  $E_b/N_0$  for the MCR signal sets PAM(16,4), RH(16,4) and Z(16,4), for  $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ . The curves of PAM(16,4) and Z(16,4) for  $k = 3$  coincide, as these signal sets have the same 1-dimensional projections.

## 4 Concatenated coding with hard decoding

In this section we evaluate the word-error probability of concatenated coding schemes  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  over the on-off channel, where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $D$ -dimensional MCR signal set, MCR interleaving with finite depth  $M$  is employed and the receiver is formed by a symbol-by-symbol hard detector (SBSHD) followed by a  $t$ -error correcting decoder.<sup>4</sup> In the following,  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$  denotes the transmitted code word,  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{qN})$  is the corresponding signal sequence,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_{qN})$  is the sequence of detected signals at the output of the SBSHD and  $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = (\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_N)$  is the corresponding symbol sequence at the decoder input.

The WER  $P(w)$  after bounded-distance error-only hard decoding is given by [27]

$$P(w) = \sum_{h=t+1}^N P(h) \quad (14)$$

where  $P(h)$  is the probability that  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  differ in  $h$  positions. Then, the key quantity to be evaluated next is  $P(h)$ .

Let  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M)$  be the collision pattern occurring over the  $M$  slots spanned by the transmission of  $\mathbf{x}$ . Consider the  $i$ -th detected symbol  $\hat{a}_i$  and the corresponding detected signals  $(\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{q(i-1)+1}, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{s}}_{q(i-1)+q})$ . The detection error events  $\{\mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+j} \neq \hat{\mathbf{s}}_{q(i-1)+j}\}$  (for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q$ ) are statistically independent if conditioned on  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ . Then, the probability of  $h$  errors given  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  can be written in general as

$$P(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{\phi \in \Phi_h^N} \prod_{i \in \phi} P(e_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \prod_{i \notin \phi} (1 - P(e_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha})) \quad (15)$$

where the events  $e_i = \{\hat{a}_i \neq c_i\}$  have conditional probability

$$P(e_i|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \triangleq 1 - \prod_{j=1}^q (1 - P(\mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+j} \neq \hat{\mathbf{s}}_{q(i-1)+j}|\boldsymbol{\alpha})) \quad (16)$$

The desired  $P(h)$  can be obtained by averaging  $P(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  over  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  and over  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

In general,  $P(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  is difficult to evaluate. Then, we shall compute the expectation of  $P(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  over the ensemble of all labeling maps  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and over all sequences of random component

---

<sup>4</sup>Schemes making use of side reliability information on the SBSHD outputs, and/or error and erasures decoding are left for future investigation.

permutations  $\pi \in \Pi_D$ . From a standard random-coding argument [1], there exist a sequence of labeling maps and component permutations such that the resulting concatenated coding scheme performs at least as good as the average. It is immediate to check that the expected  $P(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  is given by

$$\bar{P}(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{\phi \in \Phi_h^N} \prod_{i \in \phi} \left[ 1 - \prod_{j=1}^q (1 - \bar{P}(e|k_{q(i-1)+j})) \right] \prod_{i \notin \phi} \prod_{j=1}^q (1 - \bar{P}(e|k_{q(i-1)+j})) \quad (17)$$

where  $\bar{P}(e|k)$  is upper-bounded in (9) and where  $k_{q(i-1)+j}$  is the number of collided components for the signal transmitted in position  $q(i-1)+j$  of the coded sequence. Clearly,  $k_{q(i-1)+j}$  is a function of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ . For a given interleaver, the evaluation of (17) is still prohibitively complex for large  $N$ . Moreover, the result would depend on the particular interleaver. In order to overcome these difficulties, we shall consider the average performance over all RMCR interleavers and an easily-computable expression which closely approximate the performance of *good* MCR interleavers (we will clarify the concept of good interleavers later on).

### 4.1 Average over RMCR interleavers

By averaging  $\bar{P}(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  over the ensemble of RMCR interleavers we obtain an upper bound on the performance of the best MCR interleaver. With RMCR interleaving, the slots over which each signal  $\mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+j}$  is transmitted are given by the  $(q(i-1)+j)$ -th row of the interleaver array, independently randomly selected from the ordered combinations set  $\Xi_D^M$ . It is immediate to show that, for a given  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  of weight  $W(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = M - c$ , the number of collisions  $k_{q(i-1)+j}$  is a random variable conditionally distributed as  $P_{M,D}(k|c)$ , given by

$$P_{M,D}(k|c) = \begin{cases} \frac{\binom{c}{k} \binom{M-c}{D-k}}{\binom{M}{D}} & \text{if } \max\{0, D - M + c\} \leq k \leq \min\{c, D\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Since the slot selection for different signals is independent, the  $k_{q(i-1)+j}$ 's in (17) are conditionally independent. Then, by averaging over the RMCR interleaver ensemble, after some algebra we obtain

$$\bar{P}_{\text{ave}}(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = B(N, h, 1 - (1 - \bar{P}(e|c))^q) \quad (19)$$

where  $\overline{P}(e|c)$  is given by

$$\overline{P}(e|c) = \sum_{k=0}^D P_{M,D}(k|c) \overline{P}(e|k) \quad (20)$$

Finally, since  $\overline{P}_{\text{ave}}(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  depends only on the number of collisions  $c$  rather than on the particular collision pattern  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  and since  $c$  is binomially distributed, we have

$$\overline{P}_{\text{ave}}(h) = \sum_{c=0}^M B(M, c, P_{\text{col}}) B(N, h, 1 - (1 - \overline{P}(e|c))^q) \quad (21)$$

By using (21) in (14), we obtain the desired WER average bound.

For small  $M$  this bound might be loose, in the sense that it is easy to find interleavers performing significantly better than the average. Intuitively, good interleavers are such that, for all  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  of weight  $M - c$  with  $c \geq D$ , the number of positions  $i$  for which  $k_{q(i-1)+j} = D$  (for  $j = 1, \dots, q$ ) is minimum. In fact, if  $k_{q(i-1)+j} = D$ , the signal  $\mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+j}$  has all collided components and the SBSHD chooses at random  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{q(i-1)+j} \in \mathcal{S}$  with uniform probability, so that the probability that  $\hat{a}_i \neq c_i$  is large. Then, a good interleaver minimizes the number of “very probable” symbol errors at the decoder input. In the random ensemble with small  $M$ , bad interleavers dominate the average performance. However, as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , from Lemma 2 of Appendix A, we have that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \overline{P}_{\text{ave}}(h) = B(N, h, 1 - (1 - P(e))^q) \triangleq \overline{P}_{\text{iid}}(h) \quad (22)$$

where  $P(e)$  is given in (11).  $\overline{P}_{\text{iid}}(h)$  corresponds to independent collisions, i.e., perfect interleaving and can be obviously obtained if  $M \geq qND$ . The limit (22) shows that the average interleaver performs as good as the best one for large interleaving depth, and that bad interleavers in the ensemble are asymptotically irrelevant.

## 4.2 Approximation for good interleavers

If the block length  $N$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfies  $N = L \binom{M}{D}$  for some integer  $L$ , a good interleaver can be explicitly constructed by writing the elements  $\phi$  of the combinations set  $\Phi_D^M$  as a row of  $\mathbf{M}$ ,

for all  $\phi \in \Phi_D^M$ , and by repeating each row formed in this way exactly  $qL$  times.<sup>5</sup> In this way, exactly  $qL$  signals are transmitted over the same set of  $D$  out of  $M$  slots, such that the  $q$  signals  $(\mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{q(i-1)+q})$  corresponding to the  $i$ -th symbol are transmitted over the same set of  $D$  slots. The number of symbols having signal completely collided is equal to  $NP_{M,D}(D|c)$  for all patterns  $\alpha$  of weight  $M - c$ . In this way, the maximum number of “very probable” symbol errors over the ensemble of all collision patterns is minimized (a minimax approach to the interleaving design).

**Example 4 — Good interleaver.** Table 1 gives an example of such situation with  $M = 6, D = 3, q = 1$  and  $N = \binom{M}{D} = 20$ . If one collision occurs in any one of the 6 slots, then exactly  $NP_{M,D}(1|1) = \binom{5}{2} = 10$  symbols are hit in one component. If two collisions occur in any two slots, then exactly  $NP_{M,D}(1|2) = 2\binom{4}{2} = 12$  symbols are hit in one component and  $NP_{M,D}(2|2) = \binom{4}{1} = 4$  symbols are hit in two components. If three collisions occur, 9 symbols are hit in one component, 9 in two components and 1 in three. With 4 collisions, 4, 12 and 4 symbols are hit respectively in one, two and three components. With 5 collisions, 10 symbols are hit in two components and 10 in three. With 6 collisions no symbol is received.  $\diamond$

The WER for interleavers of the above type can be computed *exactly* as follows. For a given  $\alpha$ , define the index set

$$\mathcal{J}_k(\alpha) \triangleq \left\{ i \in \{1, \dots, N\} : k_{q(i-1)+j} = k, j = 1, \dots, q \right\}$$

$\mathcal{J}_k(\alpha)$  contains the indexes of symbols whose corresponding signals have exactly  $k$  collided components. By construction,  $|\mathcal{J}_k(\alpha)| = NP_{M,D}(k|c)$ , which depends on  $\alpha$  only through its weight  $M - c$ . Define  $L_{k|c} \triangleq |\mathcal{J}_k(\alpha)|$  and let  $H_k$  be the number of symbol error events  $\{\hat{a}_i \neq c_i\}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{J}_k(\alpha)$ . Then, since after conditioning with respect to  $\alpha$  the symbol error events are statistically independent,  $H_k$  is binomially distributed as

$$P(H_k = h|\alpha) = B\left(L_{k|c}, h, 1 - (1 - \overline{P}(e|k))^q\right) \tag{23}$$

---

<sup>5</sup>Actually,  $\phi$  is an *unordered* set while the rows of  $\mathbf{M}$  are *ordered* vectors. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the elements of  $\phi$  are written in lexicographic order. By permuting the rows elements, we obtain different interleavers with the same MCR property.

Moreover, the  $H_k$  are conditionally statistically independent, given  $\alpha$ . Since  $\{\mathcal{J}_k(\alpha) : k = 0, \dots, D\}$  is a partition of the index set  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  for all  $\alpha$ , the total number of symbol errors is given by the sum  $H = \sum_{k=0}^D H_k$ . Then,

$$\overline{P}_{\text{good}}(h|\alpha) \triangleq P(H = h|\alpha) \tag{24}$$

can be computed easily by convolving the binomial distributions given in (23) for  $k = 0, \dots, D$  and given  $c$ .

Unfortunately, the condition that  $\binom{M}{D}$  divides  $N$  is often too restrictive. Then, for general  $N, M$  and  $D$ , a search for optimized interleavers is needed. Intuitively, we expect that good interleavers behave as close as possible to the case where  $\binom{M}{D}$  divides  $N$ , even if this condition is not satisfied. Driven by this argument, we can approximate the performance of any good interleaver by assuming the existence of an interleaver such that, for all  $\alpha$  of weight  $M - c$ , the size of  $\mathcal{J}_k(\alpha)$  is as close as possible to  $NP_{M,D}(k|c)$  (that in general is not integer). In particular, let

$$L_{k|c} = [NP_{M,D}(k|c)] + e_{k|c} \tag{25}$$

where  $[\cdot]$  denotes rounding to the closest integer and  $e_{k|c} \in \mathbb{Z}$  is chosen such that  $\sum_{k=0}^D L_{k|c} = N$  and  $\sum_{k=0}^D |e_{k|c}|$  is minimum. Then, from the same argument leading to (24), by convolving the binomial distributions defined by (23) for the  $L_{k|c}$ 's given in (25) we obtain the desired approximation for good interleavers.

As a consequence of Fact 1 in Section 3, for RMCR interleavers with large  $N$ , any given  $M$ -combination of size  $D$  appears on the rows of the interleaver array approximately the same number  $qN/\binom{M}{D}$  of times. Then, for large block length  $N$  any RCMR interleaver can be turned into a good interleaver (i.e., an interleaver such that its actual  $\overline{P}(h|\alpha)$  is close to  $\overline{P}_{\text{good}}(h|\alpha)$  for all  $\alpha$ ) by simple row reordering.

**Example 5** — Consider  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mu \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the Reed-Solomon (RS) code with parameters (15, 11, 5) over GF(16) and  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{Z}(16, 4)$  (in this case,  $q = 1$ ). Fig. 5 shows WER vs.  $E_b/N_0$  obtained by Monte Carlo simulation and closed-form analysis, with interleaving

depth  $M = 8$  and  $P_{\text{col}} = 0.1$ . The average bound (AVE) agrees perfectly with the simulation (SIM) obtained by generating a different RMCR interleaver for each transmitted code word. The bad interleaver of Table 2 (left) performs significantly worse than the average, while the hand-designed good interleaver of Table 2 (right) outperforms the average. The approximation (GOOD) obtained via (25) is very close to the actual performance of the good interleaver.  $\diamond$

**Example 6** — Fig. 6 shows the WER vs.  $E_b/N_0$  for  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the shortened RS code with parameters (210, 168, 43) over GF(256) and  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{Z}(16, 4)$  (in this case,  $q = 2$ ). The code information rate is  $R = 0.8$  bit/dim. The curves for finite  $M$  are obtained by the approximation for good interleavers described above. For  $M = D = 4$ , the error probability curve presents five flat regions (“plateaus”) and four rapidly decreasing regions (“steps”). The  $c$ -th plateau, for  $c = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ , corresponds to the SNR region where the signals experiencing  $\geq c$  collided components are wrongly detected with high probability, and the signals with  $< c$  collided components are correctly detected with high probability. The 0-th and the 4-th plateaus correspond to the regions where the system is either completely noise-limited or completely interference-limited, respectively. As  $M$  becomes larger than  $D$ , the number of plateaus and steps increases until they become indistinguishable, since there are more and more ways of placing  $c$  collisions over  $M$  slots, each of which occurs with smaller and smaller probability. We observe that, by increasing  $M$ , both a coding gain at intermediate SNR and a lower error floor at large SNR are achieved, at the price of a larger delay.

The WER obtained by the same RS code with conventional binary antipodal modulation (2PAM) can be computed, for any interleaving depth  $M$ , by one of the methods described in [35]. For comparison, Fig. 6 shows the case of  $M = 4, 16$  and of perfect interleaving. It is apparent that the use of MCR signal sets yields very large performance improvements with respect to conventional non-collision resistant signal sets. Such bad performance of RS-coded 2PAM might be surprising, but it can be easily understood if we notice that, in the case of perfect interleaving and large SNR, the probability of a symbol error at the decoder input is close to the collision probability  $P_{\text{col}} = 0.1$ , and that high-rate RS codes are efficient for much



8	7	6	4
8	7	6	4
8	7	6	4
8	7	5	3
8	7	5	3
8	7	5	3
8	7	5	3
8	7	5	3
8	7	5	3
8	7	5	3
8	6	5	2
8	6	4	2
8	6	4	2
8	6	4	2
7	6	4	1
7	6	4	1

2	5	1	4
5	3	6	7
1	4	6	8
5	1	8	6
1	5	4	6
6	7	3	1
3	2	8	7
3	5	2	6
5	4	3	7
1	7	3	8
8	5	6	7
1	5	4	8
6	5	2	4
2	1	7	8
7	5	1	8

Table 2: Arrays  $\mathbf{M}$  for the bad (left) and the good (right) interleavers of Example 5.

smaller symbol error probabilities (normally,  $\leq 10^{-3}$ ). On the contrary, with  $D$ -dimensional MCR signal sets, perfect interleaving and large SNR, the symbol error probability is close to  $P_{\text{col}}^D$  (in our case,  $10^{-4}$ ).




Figure 5: WER vs.  $E_b/N_0$  for the RS-encoded scheme of Example 5, with  $M = 8$  and  $P_{col} = 0.1$ .




Figure 6: WER vs.  $E_b/N_0$  for the RS-encoded scheme of Example 6, with  $M = 4, 8, 16, 32$  and  $\infty$  (perfect interleaving) and  $P_{\text{col}} = 0.1$ . For comparison, the WER of the same RS code with conventional 2PAM is shown for  $M = 4, 16$  and  $\infty$ .

### 4.3 Spectral efficiency of RS-encoded MCR signal sets

In this section we study the spectral efficiency  $\eta$  of RS-encoded MCR signal sets used over the G-MACC, in the limit for large SNR. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a  $D$ -dimensional MCR signal set of size  $|\mathcal{S}|$ . Then, from the MCR property, assuming that the SBSHD makes a random choice if all components of the received signal are collided, we have

$$\lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} \overline{P}(e|k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k < D \\ 1 - 1/|\mathcal{S}| & \text{if } k = D \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Since we are interested in the performance of long codes with good interleavers, we shall use the WER approximation described in the previous section, which can be achieved asymptotically as  $N$  increases. From the convolution of the binomial distributions defined by (23) and from (26), we can show that

$$\lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} \overline{P}(h|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = B(L_{D|c}, h, p_q) \quad (27)$$

for all  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  of weight  $M - c$ , where we define  $p_q \triangleq 1 - |\mathcal{S}|^{-q}$ . Consider a RS code with parameters  $(N, N - 2t, 2t + 1)$ . Then, as  $\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty$ , the limiting WER is given by

$$\lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} P(w) = \sum_{c=0}^M B(M, c, P_{\text{col}}) \sum_{h=t+1}^{L_{D|c}} B(L_{D|c}, h, p_q) \quad (28)$$

As in [14], we may compute the WER limit for large block length and fixed code rate. Since the RS code alphabet size increases with  $N$ , for fixed  $|\mathcal{S}|$  the number  $q$  of signals for each code symbol grows to infinity as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Then,  $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} p_q = 1$  and

$$B(L_{D|c}, h, 1) = 1\{h = L_{D|c}\} \quad (29)$$

In other words, for large SNR and block length, a code word having  $c$  collided slots is affected by exactly  $L_{D|c}$  symbol errors. Let  $r = 1 - 2t/N$  be the RS code rate. From (25),  $\frac{1}{N}L_{D|c} \rightarrow P_{M,D}(D|c)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{h=N(1-r)/2+1}^{L_{D|c}} 1\{h = L_{D|c}\} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} 1\{N(1-r)/2 + 1 \leq L_{D|c}\} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} 1\left\{(1-r)/2 + \frac{1}{N} \leq \frac{1}{N}L_{D|c}\right\} \\ &= 1\{(1-r)/2 < P_{M,D}(D|c)\} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Finally, by using the above limit in (28) we get

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} P(w) = \sum_{c=0}^M B(M, c, P_{\text{col}}) 1\{(1-r)/2 < P_{M,D}(D|c)\} \quad (31)$$

In the case of perfect interleaving ( $M \rightarrow \infty$ ), from Lemma 2 of Appendix A we obtain

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} P(w) = 1\{(1-r)/2 < P_{\text{col}}^D\} \quad (32)$$

(the above limit holds for all  $P_{\text{col}}^D \neq (1-r)/2$ . If  $P_{\text{col}}^D = (1-r)/2$  with  $0 < P_{\text{col}} < 1$ , it can be shown that the limit of  $P(w)$  is equal to  $1/2$ ).

The asymptotic spectral efficiency for large SNR, subject to a WER (i.e., packet-error) probability not larger than  $\epsilon$ , is given by

$$\eta = \begin{cases} 2G \frac{\log_2 |\mathcal{S}|}{D} r & \text{if } P_{\infty}(w) \leq \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } P_{\infty}(w) > \epsilon \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where  $P_{\infty}(w)$  is given either by (28) for finite  $N, M$ , or by (31) for  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and finite  $M$  or by (32) when  $N, M \rightarrow \infty$ . For given  $G$ , there exists an optimal code rate  $r^*(G)$  maximizing  $\eta$ . The maximum  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  can be obtained graphically, by taking the envelope of all the curves defined by (33), for  $r \in [0, 1]$ . In the case of perfect interleaving, from (32) and (1) we get explicitly the optimum code rate as

$$r^*(G) = \max \{1 - 2(1 - e^{-G})^D, 0\} \quad (34)$$

## 4.4 Results

Fig. 7 shows  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for the shortened RS family with parameters  $(210, 210 - 2t, 2t + 1)$  over GF(256) concatenated with a MCR signal set with  $D = 4$  and  $|\mathcal{S}| = 16$  (e.g., any of the signal sets of Examples 1,2 and 3), for  $t$  ranging from 0 to 104,  $M = 32$  and desired maximum WER  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ . As expected, the optimum code rate  $r^*(G)$  is a decreasing function of  $G$ .

Fig. 8 shows the maximum  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for asymptotically large  $N$ , MCR signal sets with  $D = 4$  and  $|\mathcal{S}| = 16$ , different values of  $M$  and desired maximum WER  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ . These curves are obtained from (31) and (33), by optimizing  $r$  for each  $G$ . The curve for  $M \rightarrow \infty$  (obtained from (34)) is shown for comparison.




Figure 7:  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for the shortened RS family with parameters  $(210, 210 - 2t, 2t + 1)$  over  $GF(256)$ , with a 4-dimensional MCR signal set of size 16, maximum WER constraint  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$  and interleaving  $M = 32$ . The value of  $t$  is reported next to each curve.




Figure 8: Maximum  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for infinitely long RS codes, with a 4-dimensional MCR signal set of size 16, maximum WER constraint  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$  and different interleaving depths. The code rate is optimized for each value of  $G$ .

## 5 Outage probability and achievable rate

Both channel models (3) and (4) fall in the class of *block-interference channels* studied in [20, 21, 22]. These channels may or may not behave ergodically (or more in general, be *information stable*) depending on the delay constraint. In particular, ergodicity does not hold if  $M < \infty$  [21].

From the very general approach of [36] (details are given in Appendix B), by letting the code block-length  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and  $M$  fixed and finite, we obtain the *instantaneous mutual information*  $I_M$  of the  $M$ -slot channel spanned by the transmission of a user code word. Being a function of the collision pattern,  $I_M$  is a random variable. Following [21], we define the *information outage probability* as

$$P_{\text{out}}(R) \triangleq P(I_M < R) \quad (35)$$

$P_{\text{out}}(R)$  is equal to the WER averaged over the random coding ensemble of rate  $R$  and over all collision patterns, for  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and fixed  $M < \infty$  [37, 36]. In our system,  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  yields the limiting packet-error probability under a given delay constraint.

From the same general approach, by letting first  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain the achievable rate ergodic  $I_\infty$ . This yields the limiting spectral efficiency of delay-unconstrained systems.

In the rest of this section, we present expressions for  $I_M$ ,  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  and  $I_\infty$  under different assumptions on the user signal set (or input distribution) and on the type of decoding. Proofs are collected in Appendix C. These results serve as a baseline comparison of different coding and decoding schemes.

### 5.1 VPAN channel with Gaussian inputs

User codes are independently generated according to a Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{E})$ . With the channel model (3) and perfect CSI, the instantaneous mutual information is given by

$$I_M = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{E}}{K_m \mathcal{E} + N_0/2} \right) \quad (36)$$

where the  $K_m$ 's are i.i.d. Poisson distributed with mean  $G$ . The exact evaluation of the outage probability is difficult if not impossible in general. However, we can find upper and lower



bounds by defining two appropriate lattice random variables [29]  $I_{\text{up}}$  and  $I_{\text{lo}}$  such that

$$P(I_{\text{up}} \leq x) \geq P\left(\frac{1}{2M} \log_2(1 + \mathcal{E}/(K_1\mathcal{E} + N_0/2)) \leq x\right) \geq P(I_{\text{lo}} \leq x)$$

and by computing the  $M$ -fold convolution of their probability mass distributions. We shall not give further details about this method because of space limitations. Also, from Jensen's inequality we can write

$$I_M \geq \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M K_m \mathcal{E} + N_0/2} \right) \quad (37)$$

so that  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  can be upperbounded by the probability that the RHS of the above inequality is less than  $R$ .

The delay-unconstrained achievable rate is given by

$$I_\infty = E \left[ \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{E}}{K_1 \mathcal{E} + N_0/2} \right) \right] \quad (38)$$

## 5.2 On-off channel with Gaussian inputs

User codes are generated as before. With the channel model (4) and perfect CSI, the instantaneous mutual information is given by

$$I_M = \frac{M - c}{2M} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{2\mathcal{E}}{N_0} \right) \quad (39)$$

where  $W(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = M - c$  and  $c$  is the number of collisions in the pattern  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M)$ . Since  $I_M$  is a non-increasing function of  $c$ , and  $c$  is binomially distributed, the outage probability can be computed as

$$P_{\text{out}}(R) = 1 - \sum_{c=0}^{c'} B(M, c, P_{\text{col}}) \quad (40)$$

where  $c'$  is the largest  $c$  such that  $I_M \geq R$ .

The delay-unconstrained achievable rate is given by

$$I_\infty = \frac{1 - P_{\text{col}}}{2} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{2\mathcal{E}}{N_0} \right) \quad (41)$$

### 5.3 On-off channel, MCR signal sets with soft decoding

In this case, user codes  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  are obtained by randomly generating  $\mathcal{C}$  with i.i.d. components, uniformly distributed on  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  with i.i.d. components, uniformly distributed on the set of all one-to-one mappings  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^q$ . With RMCR interleaving, we obtain

$$I_M = \frac{1}{D} \left\{ \log_2 |\mathcal{S}| - \sum_{k=0}^D P_{M,D}(k|c) F_S(\mathcal{E}/N_0, k) \right\} \quad (42)$$

where  $P_{M,D}(k|c)$  is given in (18), and where we define

$$F_S(\mathcal{E}/N_0, k) \triangleq E_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{n}, \pi} \left[ \log_2 \left( \sum_{\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{S}} \exp \left( \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{j=1}^{D-k} (2\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}(s'_{\pi(j)} - s_{\pi(j)})n_j - \mathcal{E}|s'_{\pi(j)} - s_{\pi(j)}|^2) \right) \right) \right] \quad (43)$$

( $E_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{n}, \pi}[\cdot]$  denotes expectation with respect to  $\mathbf{s} \sim$  uniform over  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $n_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N_0/2)$  and  $\pi \sim$  uniform over  $\Pi_D$ ). The expectation in (43) can be evaluated numerically (e.g., by Monte Carlo simulation). Again,  $I_M$  depends only on the number of collisions  $c$ . Since  $I_M$  is non-increasing in  $c$ ,  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  can be computed by (40).

The delay-unconstrained achievable rate is given by

$$I_\infty = \frac{1}{D} \left\{ \log_2 |\mathcal{S}| - \sum_{k=0}^D B(D, k, P_{\text{col}}) F_S(\mathcal{E}/N_0, k) \right\} \quad (44)$$

### 5.4 On-off channel, MCR signals with hard decoding

User codes are generated as before. The concatenation of a modulator for the discrete and finite signal set  $\mathcal{S}$  with the G-MACC and with a SBSHD, conditioned on the collision pattern  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ , can be regarded as a discrete conditionally memoryless channel (DMC). In order to simplify the problem, we may consider the average of all transition probabilities with respect to all labeling maps and component permutations, for given  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ . It is immediate to show that the resulting *average* DMC is symmetric [1] with transition probabilities

$$P_k(\hat{\mathbf{s}}|\mathbf{s}) = \begin{cases} 1 - \bar{P}(e|k) & \text{if } \hat{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s} \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|-1} \bar{P}(e|k) & \text{if } \hat{\mathbf{s}} \neq \mathbf{s} \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

From the convexity of the information density with respect to the channel transition probability and from Jensen's inequality, this yields a lower bound on  $I_M$  and  $I_\infty$ .

We can interpret (45) as the transition probability assignment of a DMC depending on the channel "state"  $k$ , i.e., on the number of collisions  $k$  occurred in the transmission of signal  $\mathbf{s}$ . If the knowledge of  $k$  for each transmitted  $\mathbf{s}$  is available, we say that the decoder has perfect CSI. The instantaneous mutual information is given by

$$I_M = \frac{1}{D} \left\{ \log_2 |\mathcal{S}| - \overline{P}(e|c) \log_2(|\mathcal{S}| - 1) - \sum_{k=0}^D P_{M,D}(k|c) \mathcal{H}(\overline{P}(e|k)) \right\} \quad (46)$$

where  $\overline{P}(e|c)$  is defined in (20). The resulting outage probability can be computed again from (40).

The delay-unconstrained achievable rate is given by

$$I_\infty = \frac{1}{D} \left\{ \log_2 |\mathcal{S}| - P(e) \log_2(|\mathcal{S}| - 1) - \sum_{k=0}^D B(D, k, P_{\text{col}}) \mathcal{H}(\overline{P}(e|k)) \right\} \quad (47)$$

where  $P(e)$  is given in (11).

Interestingly, in Appendix D we show that the same  $I_M$  and  $I_\infty$  are achieved by a decoder having no CSI. This is in agreement with the result of [20], showing that for a block-interference channel with  $M \rightarrow \infty$  blocks of length  $N/M < \infty$ , the capacity without CSI converges to the capacity with perfect CSI as the ratio  $N/M$  increases. However, the result of [20] cannot be used in our case since it holds under an ergodic assumption ( $M \rightarrow \infty$  and  $N/M$  finite), while our result needs no ergodicity ( $M$  finite and  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ).

## 5.5 Results

Fig. 9 shows  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  vs.  $E_b/N_0$  in the cases of VPAN channel with Gaussian inputs (G-vpan, upper (UB) and lower (LB) bounds), on-off channel with Gaussian inputs (G-onoff), MCR signals with soft decoding (MCR-soft) and MCR signals with hard decoding (MCR-hard), for  $R = 0.8$ ,  $P_{\text{col}} = 0.1$  and  $M = 4$ . Fig. 10 shows analogous results for  $M = 32$ . In the case of MCR-soft and MCR-hard, we consider  $\mathcal{S} = Z(16,4)$ . Then,  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  in the case of MCR-hard can be compared with the actual performance of RS-encoded schemes given in Fig. 6. For

$M = 4$ ,  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  is very close to the actual WER attained by RS codes, while for  $M = 32$  optimum coding and decoding yields a potential gain of about 3 dB at WER=  $10^{-2}$  and 5 dB at WER=  $10^{-4}$ .

The spectral efficiency with finite interleaving, subject to a maximum outage (i.e., packet-error) probability constraint  $\epsilon$ , is given by  $\eta = 2GR^*(G)$ , where  $R^*(G)$  is the maximum information rate for which  $P_{\text{out}}(R) \leq \epsilon$ . Figs. 11 and 12 show  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for  $M = 4$  and 32, respectively,  $E_b/N_0 = 20$  dB and  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ . The curves labeled by ‘‘G-vpan (JLB)’’ are obtained by using the Jensen’s inequality lower bound (37).

The spectral efficiency with perfect interleaving is given by  $\eta = 2GI_\infty(G)$ , where  $I_\infty(G)$  is  $I_\infty$  calculated for channel load equal to  $G$ . We can compare the performance of the schemes considered in this paper with other simple multiple-access schemes such as: i) ideal orthogonal access; ii) slotted (S-) ALOHA; iii) NCDMA with SUMF or linear MMSE receiver.

The spectral efficiency of ideal orthogonal access with Gaussian inputs is

$$\eta_{\text{orth}} = \min\{G, 1\} \log_2(1 + 2\mathcal{E}/N_0) \quad (48)$$

This is also the symmetric capacity of the system. With S-ALOHA and infinite user population, the average number of delivered packets per slot is  $Ge^{-G}$  [5]. With Gaussian inputs, the resulting spectral efficiency is

$$\eta_{\text{aloha}} = Ge^{-G} \log_2(1 + 2\mathcal{E}/N_0) \quad (49)$$

Finally, NCDMA with direct-sequence spreading has spectral efficiency  $\eta = N_u R_b/W = 2N_u R/L$ , where  $L$  is the number of chips per symbol. As  $N_u \rightarrow \infty$  with  $N_u/L = G$ , under the assumption of independent and random selection of the spreading sequences and of Gaussian inputs, the spectral efficiency of NCDMA can be obtained in closed form from the results of [12]. For the SUMF receiver we have

$$\begin{cases} G = \frac{1}{\gamma} - \frac{N_0}{E_b \log_2(1+\gamma)} \\ \eta_{\text{sumf}} = G \log_2(1 + \gamma) \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

and for the linear MMSE receiver we have

$$\begin{cases} G = (1 + \gamma) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma} - \frac{N_0}{E_b \log_2(1+\gamma)} \right) \\ \eta_{\text{mmse}} = G \log_2(1 + \gamma) \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

The above equations give  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  in parametric form, where the parameter  $\gamma$  is the signal-to-interference ratio at the SUMF or MMSE receiver output, respectively. For a given  $E_b/N_0$ , the spectral efficiency limit for high channel load (i.e., for  $G \rightarrow \infty$  or, equivalently, for  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ ) is

$$\lim_{G \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{\text{sumf}} = \lim_{G \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{\text{mmse}} = \frac{1}{\log 2} - \frac{1}{E_b/N_0} \quad (52)$$

Fig. 13 shows the spectral efficiencies  $\eta_{G-\text{vpan}}, \eta_{G-\text{onoff}}, \eta_{\text{MCR-soft}}, \eta_{\text{MCR-hard}}, \eta_{\text{orth}}, \eta_{\text{aloha}}, \eta_{\text{sumf}}$  and  $\eta_{\text{mmse}}$  vs.  $G$  for perfect interleaving and  $E_b/N_0 = 20$  dB. Fig. 14 shows analogous results for  $E_b/N_0 = 30$  dB.  $\eta_{\text{MCR-soft}}$  and  $\eta_{\text{MCR-hard}}$  have been computed for  $Z(16,4)$ .

The spectral efficiency loss of collision-type access with respect to (optimal) orthogonal access is evident. Interestingly, S-ALOHA and the VPAN channel with Gaussian inputs have very similar maximum  $\eta$ . As  $G \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\eta_{\text{aloha}}$  is vanishing while  $\eta_{G-\text{vpan}}$  converges to a positive value. This limit is hard to compute. However, from Jensen's inequality we have that it is lowerbounded by the limit spectral efficiency of NCDMA given in (52). NCDMA with linear MMSE receiver approaches optimal orthogonal access for  $G < 1$ , while its performance is close to the SUMF for  $G > 1$ .

Encoded MCR signals achieve a large fraction of the maximum spectral efficiency achievable with signal sets carrying 1 bit/dim and ideal orthogonal access (about 84 % (MRC-soft) and 70 % (MRC-hard) for  $E_b/N_0 = 20$  dB, and about 98 % for both schemes for  $E_b/N_0 = 30$  dB). Interestingly, there exists a range of  $G$  such that  $\eta_{\text{sumf}}$  is below both  $\eta_{\text{MCR-soft}}$  and  $\eta_{\text{MCR-hard}}$ . Then, for sufficiently large interleaving, encoded MCR signals with slotted random access (without retransmissions) can compete with conventional CDMA with SUMF receiver in terms of spectral efficiency.




Figure 9:  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  vs.  $E_b/N_0$  for  $R = 0.8$  bit/dim  $P_{\text{col}} = 0.1$  and  $M = 4$ .




Figure 10:  $P_{\text{out}}(R)$  vs.  $E_b/N_0$  for  $R = 0.8$  bit/dim  $P_{\text{col}} = 0.1$  and  $M = 32$ .




Figure 11:  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for  $M = 4$ , maximum outage probability  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$  and  $E_b/N_0 = 20$  dB.






Figure 12:  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for  $M = 32$ , maximum outage probability  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$  and  $E_b/N_0 = 20$  dB.




Figure 13:  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for perfect interleaving and  $E_b/N_0 = 20$  dB.




Figure 14:  $\eta$  vs.  $G$  for perfect interleaving and  $E_b/N_0 = 30$  dB.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper we studied signal-space coding and interleaving for coherent slow frequency-hopped communications over a G-MACC. We characterized signal sets and interleavers having maximum *collision resistance* and we gave some explicit constructions. We analyzed the performance of these signal sets concatenated with outer block coding and hard (error-only) decoding in terms of packet-error probability and spectral efficiency, without assuming perfect interleaving. Computer simulations show perfect agreement with analysis. Our error probability analysis yields some useful intuitions about the structure of good interleavers.

Also, we obtained expressions for the information outage probability and for the achievable (ergodic) rate of the G-MACC under various assumptions on coding and decoding. Outage probability yields the achievable packet-error probability with finite interleaving and large block length. The achievable rate yields the system spectral efficiency for large interleaving depth.

From these results we can conclude that slow frequency-hopped random access with appropriate signal-space coding and interleaving might be a valid alternative to other conventional multiple-access schemes, like S-ALOHA and NCDMA with SUMF receiver. In particular, the spectral efficiency of slow frequency-hopped random access is very similar to that of S-ALOHA, without requiring feedback and retransmission (but at the expenses of a much longer interleaving delay). NCDMA with SUMF is suited for a high channel load with low-rate uniform traffic (its maximum spectral efficiency is achieved for  $G \rightarrow \infty$ ). On the contrary, frequency-hopped random access, S-ALOHA and NCDMA with MMSE receiver achieve their maximum spectral efficiency for finite  $G$ . Hence, these schemes are more suited for lower channel load with high-rate traffic.

We conclude by listing a few topics for further research:

- By comparing the MCR-hard outage probability with the WER of actual RS-encoded MCR signals we see that there is a significant potential coding gain of optimal schemes with respect to bounded-distance error-only decoding, that increases as the interleaving depth gets large. Then, more advanced hard-decoding schemes (e.g., involving errors and

erasures) should be considered and the analysis presented in this work should be extended to such schemes.

- By comparing MCR-soft and MCR-hard outage probabilities, we observe the potential gain obtained by soft decoding. In particular, trellis-codes [30], suited for soft Viterbi decoding, could be constructed over MCR signal sets.
- Actual wireless channels are affected by time and frequency selective fading. Extensions of the results of this work to fading channels would be of great interest. Preliminary results can be found in [38].
- In fading channels the users are not received with the same power. Then, a signal burst may survive to a collision provided that the interference signal is sufficiently faded. This so called “capture effect” has been investigated for S-ALOHA [39, 40] and should be taken into account in an extension of this work.
- Both the results in terms of WER of actual RS-encoded schemes and in terms of outage probability show that the user code information rate must be optimized depending on the channel load  $G$ . Then, adaptive coding schemes which vary the user code rate depending on the channel load should be considered.
- In partially ordered reservation protocols like PRMA [17], users access the channel randomly on the unreserved slots and place reservations in order to transmit a sequence of packets, then release their slots. These protocols are particularly sensitive to collisions in the first slot (the one with random access), since these usually cause an unsuccessful reservation request. Then, adding signal-space redundancy in order to protect this slot might improve the overall protocol performance, as shown in [19]. In general, the joint optimization of partially ordered protocols and signal-space coding is a very interesting problem.

## A Useful limits

In this Appendix we state two lemmas and a corollary which are extensively used throughout this paper. Because of space limitations and since they are mainly technical, we only sketch the proofs.

**Lemma 1.** For all  $x \in (0, 1)$  and  $0 \leq k \leq D$ , we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\binom{xM}{k} \binom{M(1-x)}{D-k}}{\binom{M}{D}} = B(D, k, x)$$

□

The proof follows by upper and lower bounding the binomial coefficients using Stirling's approximations (see [41, Appendix A.3]).

**Lemma 2.** Let  $f(x_0, \dots, x_D)$  be a piecewise continuous function  $\mathbb{R}^{D+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then, for all  $p \in (0, 1)$ , such that  $f$  is continuous in  $(B(D, 0, p), \dots, B(D, D, p))$ , we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{c=0}^M B(M, c, p) f(P_{M,D}(0|c), \dots, P_{M,D}(D|c)) = f(B(D, 0, p), \dots, B(D, D, p))$$

□

The proof follows by applying Lemma 1 and the Laplace-DeMoivre theorem [29], and by noting that  $B(D, k, p)$  is continuous for all  $p \in [0, 1]$ .

**Corollary 1.** Let  $f(x_0, \dots, x_D)$  be a continuous function  $\mathbb{R}^{D+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let  $X$  be a binomial random variable distributed as  $P(X = c) = B(M, c, p)$  and define

$$g(X) \triangleq f(P_{M,D}(0|X), \dots, P_{M,D}(D|X))$$

and  $\bar{g}(p) = f(B(D, 0, p), \dots, B(D, D, p))$ . Then,

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} g(X) \stackrel{p}{=} \bar{g}(p)$$

□

The proof follows from Chebyshev inequality [29], by showing that  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} E[g(X)] = \bar{g}(p)$  and that  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} E[|g(X) - \bar{g}(p)|^2] = 0$ . Both these limits follow from the continuity of  $f$  and from Lemma 2.

## B Achievable rates

The achievable rates  $R$  for a channel with input  $n$ -sequence  $\mathbf{x} \sim q(\mathbf{x})$ , output  $\mathbf{y}$  and transition probability  $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$  satisfy [36]

$$R \leq \underline{I}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \quad (53)$$

where  $\underline{I}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$  is the *inf-information rate*, defined as the *liminf in probability* of the normalized *information density* [36]

$$i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{n} \log_2 \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})}{p(\mathbf{y})} \quad (54)$$

Consider the case where a code word  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_N)$ , with  $\mathbf{s}_i \in \mathcal{S}$  (a  $D$ -dimensional signal set), is transmitted on the G-MACC with an arbitrary deterministic MCR interleaver of depth  $M$  slots, and denote by  $\mathbf{z}_i$  the received  $D$ -dimensional channel output corresponding to the transmission of  $\mathbf{s}_i$ , so that  $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N)$ . For a fixed collision pattern, let  $p_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{s})$  denote the transition pdf the channel with input  $\mathbf{s}$  and output  $\mathbf{z}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \Xi_D^M$  defines the  $D$  slots over which  $\mathbf{s}$  is transmitted. If the signals  $\mathbf{s}_i$  are selected i.i.d. over  $\mathcal{S}$  according to an arbitrary probability distribution  $q(\mathbf{s})$ , the information density can be written as

$$i(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \Xi_D^M} f_N(\boldsymbol{\xi}) i_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}; \mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}) \quad (55)$$

where  $f_N(\boldsymbol{\xi})$  is the fraction of the occurrences of  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  in the interleaver array, where  $N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = f_N(\boldsymbol{\xi})N$  and where we define

$$i_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}; \mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}) \triangleq \frac{1}{DN_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}} \log_2 \frac{p_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{z}_i|\mathbf{s}_i)}{\sum_{\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{S}} p_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{z}_i|\mathbf{s}')q(\mathbf{s}')}$$

For all  $f_N(\boldsymbol{\xi}) > 0$ , from the *Weak Law of Large Numbers* [29], as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$i_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}; \mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{N_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}) \xrightarrow{p} E \left[ \frac{1}{D} \log_2 \frac{p_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{s})}{\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} p_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{z}|s')q(s')} \right] \triangleq I_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbf{z}) \quad (56)$$

We define the *instantaneous mutual information*  $I_M$  as the limit in probability as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  of the information density for given collision pattern and  $M$ . From Fact 1 in Section 3, (55) and (56) we obtain

$$I_M = \frac{1}{D! \binom{M}{D}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \Xi_D^M} I_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbf{z}) \quad (57)$$

The achievable ergodic rate  $I_{\infty}$  is obtained as the limit in probability (if it exists) of  $I_M$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ .

## C Proofs

**Proof of (36) and (38).** In this case,  $D = 1$  and  $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}$ . With the channel model (3), the collision pattern is defined by the  $(K_1, \dots, K_M)$ , where  $K_{\xi}$  is the number of interferers in slot  $\xi = 1, \dots, M$ . We have  $p_{\xi}(z|s) = \mathcal{N}(s, K_{\xi}\mathcal{E} + N_0/2)$ , so that

$$I_{\xi}(s; z) = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{E}}{K_{\xi}\mathcal{E} + N_0/2} \right) \quad (58)$$

Then, (36) follows immediately. Since the  $K_{\xi}$ 's are i.i.d. Poisson distributed with mean  $G$ , we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} I_M \stackrel{p}{=} E[I_1]$$

and (38) follows.

**Proof of (39) and (41).** Again,  $D = 1$  and  $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}$ . With the channel model (4), the collision pattern is defined by the  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M)$ , where  $\alpha_{\xi} = 0$  if slot  $\xi = 1, \dots, M$  is collided and  $\alpha_{\xi} = 1$  if it is not. We have  $p_{\xi}(z|s) = \mathcal{N}(\alpha_{\xi}s, N_0/2)$ , so that

$$I_{\xi}(s; z) = \frac{\alpha_{\xi}}{2} \log_2 (1 + 2\mathcal{E}/N_0) \quad (59)$$



Then, (39) follows immediately. Since the  $\alpha_\xi$ 's are i.i.d. Bernoulli distributed with mean  $P_{\text{col}}$ , we have

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} I_M \stackrel{p}{=} E[I_1]$$

and (41) follows.

**Proof of (42), (44) (46) and (47).** In this case,  $\mathcal{S}$  is an MCR  $D$ -dimensional signal set. The channel transition pdf's are  $D$ -variate Gaussian

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{s}) = \prod_{j=1}^D \mathcal{N}(\alpha_{\xi_j} s_j, N_0/2) \quad (60)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_D) \in \Xi_D^M$ . For  $\mathbf{s}$  uniform over  $\mathcal{S}$ , we have

$$I_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{s}; \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{D} \left\{ \log_2 |\mathcal{S}| - E_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{n}} \left[ \log_2 \left( \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \exp \left( \frac{\alpha_{\xi_j}}{N_0} \sum_{j=1}^D (2\sqrt{\mathcal{E}}(s'_j - s_j)n_j - \mathcal{E}|s'_j - s_j|^2) \right) \right) \right] \right\} \quad (61)$$

By summing over all  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \Xi_D^M$  and dividing by  $D! \binom{M}{D}$  we immediately obtain (42). The convergence in probability of  $I_M$  to  $I_\infty$  given in (44) follows immediately from Corollary 1 of Appendix A, since  $I_M$  is a continuous (linear) function of the probabilities  $P_{M,D}(k|c)$  for  $k = 0, \dots, D$ .

The proof of (46) and of (47) follows the same path of (42) and (44), provided that we use the symmetric DMC transition probabilities (45) instead of the transition pdf (60).

## D Mutual information without CSI

In this section we prove the claim made in Section 5 that  $I_M$  and  $I_\infty$  given in (46) and in (47) are obtained also if the decoder ignores the number of collided components  $k$  for each transmitted  $D$ -dimensional signal.

Let  $L_\phi$  denote the number of signals transmitted over the slots indexed by  $\phi \in \Phi_D^M$ . Clearly, for each RMCR interleaver and block length  $N$  we have  $\sum_{\phi \in \Phi_D^M} L_\phi = N$ . Given a collision pattern  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  of weight  $W(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = M - c$ , all the signals suffering from  $k$  collisions are transmitted over a DMC with transition probability given by (45).

The decoder is not allowed to use this information for decoding (no CSI). However, it can group the  $L_\phi$  signals corresponding to the  $\phi$  and use the fact that all the signals belonging to the same group have the same (unknown) number of collided components. Because of this grouping, a code word can be seen as a sequence of *super-symbols* of dimension  $DL_\phi$ , for  $\phi \in \Phi_D^M$ . Each super-symbol is transmitted over the *super-channel* obtained by the  $L_\phi$ -th extension of the original DMC.

For simplicity, we let  $q_k = \overline{P}(e|k)$  and  $p_k = q_k/(|\mathcal{S}| - 1)$ . Since the DMCs treated here are symmetric, we identify their channel transition probability matrix by its first row (the other rows are permutations of the first). Then, the transition probability of the DMC defined by (45) has first row

$$\mathbf{p}_k = (1 - q_k, \underbrace{p_k, \dots, p_k}_{|\mathcal{S}|-1 \text{ times}})$$

The first row of the transition probability matrix of the  $L$ -th extension of this DMC is given by the  $L$ -fold Kronecker product of  $\mathbf{p}_k$  by itself, denoted by  $\mathbf{p}_k^{\otimes L}$ . With no knowledge of  $k$  at the decoder, the super-channel transition probability is a mixture of the possible transition probabilities for  $k = 0, \dots, D$ , where the mixing is with respect to the conditional distribution of  $k$  given  $c$ , i.e., with respect to  $P_{M,D}(k|c)$  given in (18). The resulting transition probability of the  $\phi$ -th super-channel is given by

$$\mathbf{p}^{(L_\phi)} \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^D \mathbf{p}_k^{\otimes L_\phi} P_{M,D}(k|c) \quad (62)$$

From Fact 1, with RMCR interleaving  $L_\phi/N \xrightarrow{\text{ae}} 1/\binom{M}{D}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , for all  $\phi$ . Then, the transition probabilities (62) are asymptotically equal. By letting  $L = N/\binom{M}{D}$  and  $\mathbf{p}^{(L)}$  denoting this common transition probability, we obtain

$$I_M = \frac{1}{D} \left\{ \log_2 |\mathcal{S}| - \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}^{(L)}) \right\} \quad (63)$$

After some algebra, by applying the Laplace-DeMoivre theorem [29], we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} H(\mathbf{p}^{(L)}) &= \overline{P}(e|c) \log_2(|\mathcal{S}| - 1) + \\ &+ \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^D P_{M,D}(k|c) \log_2 \left[ \sum_{k'=0}^D \left( q_{k'}^{q_k} (1 - q_{k'})^{1-q_k} \right)^L P_{M,D}(k'|c) \right]^{1/L} \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

The above limit can be computed by noting that for all  $k' \neq k$ ,

$$q_{k'}^{q_k} (1 - q_{k'})^{1 - q_k} \leq q_k^{q_k} (1 - q_k)^{1 - q_k}$$

since the relative entropy  $D((1 - q_k, q_k) \parallel (1 - q_{k'}, q_{k'}))$  is non-negative [1]. Then, for each  $k$ , the term with  $k' = k$  exponentially dominates the sum inside the logarithm in (64). We obtain

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} H(\mathbf{p}^{(L)}) = \bar{P}(e|c) \log_2(|\mathcal{S}| - 1) + \sum_{k=0}^D P_{M,D}(k|c) \mathcal{H}(q_k)$$

By using the above result in (63) we obtain (46). Consequently, also (47) can be achieved without CSI.

## References

- [1] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- [2] A. Wyner, "Shannon-Theoretic Approach to a Gaussian Cellular Multiple Access Channel," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. 40, No. 6, pp. 1713 – 1727, Nov. 1994.
- [3] B. Rimoldi and R. Urbanke, "A Rate-Splitting Approach to the Gaussian Multiple-Access Channel," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 364–375, March 1996.
- [4] N. Abramson, "THE ALOHA SYSTEM – Another Alternative for Computer Communications," *AFIPS Conference Proc., 1970 Fall Joint Computer Conference*, Vol. 37, pp. 281 – 285, 1970.
- [5] L. Kleinrock and S. Lam, "Packet Switching in a Multiaccess Broadcast Channel: Performance Evaluation," *IEEE Trans. on Commun.*, Vol. COM-23, No. 4, pp. 410 – 423, April 1975.
- [6] E. Lutz, "Slotted ALOHA Multiple Access and Error Control Coding for Land Mobile Satellite Networks," *International Journal of Satellite Communications*, Vol. 10, pp. 275 – 281, 1992.

- [7] J. Proakis, *Digital communications*. 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995.
- [8] A. Viterbi, *CDMA – Principles of Spread Spectrum Communications*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1995.
- [9] R. Lupas and S. Verdú, “Linear Multiuser Detectors for Synchronous Code-Division Multiple Access,” *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-35, pp. 123 – 136, Apr. 1989.
- [10] U. Madhow and M. Honig, “MMSE Interference Suppression for Direct-Sequence Spread-Spectrum CDMA,” *IEEE Trans. on Commun.*, Vol. 42, No. 12, pp. 3178 – 3188, Dec. 1994.
- [11] S. Verdú and S. Shamai, “Spectral Efficiency of CDMA with Random Spreading,” submitted to *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Aug. 1998.
- [12] D. Tse and S. Hanly, “Linear Multiuser Receivers: Effective Interference, Effective Bandwidth and Capacity,” *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 641 – 657, March 1999.
- [13] M. Pursley, “Frequency-Hop Transmission for Satellite Packet Switching and Terrestrial Packet Radio Networks,” *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-32, No. 5, pp. 652 – 667, Sept. 1986.
- [14] S. Kim and W. Stark, “Optimum Rate Reed-Solomon Codes for Frequency-Hopped Spread-Spectrum Multiple-Access Communication Systems,” *IEEE Trans. on Commun.*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 138 – 144, Feb. 1989.
- [15] A. Grant and C. Schlegel, “Collision-Type Multiple-User Communications,” *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. 43, No. 5, pp. 1725 – 1735, Sept. 1997.
- [16] J. Massey and P. Mathys, “The Collision Channel Without Feedback,” *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-31, No. 2, pp. 192 – 206, March 1985.

- [17] D. Goodman, R. Valenzuela, K. Gayliard and B. Ramamurthi, "Packet Reservation Multiple Access for Local Wireless Communications," *IEEE Trans. on Commun.*, Vol. 37, pp. 885 – 890, Aug. 1989.
- [18] S. Nanda, D. Goodman and U. Timor, "Performance of PRMA: A Packet Voice Protocol for Cellular Systems," *IEEE Trans. on Vehic. Tech.*, Vol. 40, pp. 585 – 598, Aug. 1991.
- [19] G. Caire, E. Leonardi and E. Viterbo, "Improving performance of wireless networks using collision resistant modulations," proc. of *Globecom '98*, Sidney, Australia, 8 – 12 Nov., 1998.
- [20] R. McEliece and W. Stark, "Channels with Block Interference," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 44–53, Jan. 1984.
- [21] L. Ozarow, S. Shamai, and A. D. Wyner, "Information Theoretic Considerations for Cellular Mobile Radio," *IEEE Trans. Vehic. Tech.*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 359–378, May 1994.
- [22] G. Kaplan and S. Shamai (Shitz), "Error Probabilities for the Block-Fading Gaussian Channel," *A.E.Ü.*, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 192–205, 1995.
- [23] J. Boutros, E. Viterbo, C. Rastello, and J. C. Belfiore, "Good lattice constellations for both Rayleigh fading and Gaussian channel," *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, pp. 502–518, vol. 42, no. 2, March 1996.
- [24] J. Boutros and E. Viterbo, "Signal Space Diversity: a new power and bandwidth efficient diversity technique for the fading channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol. 44, No. 4, July 1998.
- [25] E. Wong and T-S. Yum, "The Optimal Multicopy ALOHA," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, Vol. 39, No. 6, pp. 1233 – 1236, June 1994.
- [26] Y. Leung, "Generalized Multicopy ALOHA," *IEE Electronics Letters*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 82 – 83, Jan. 1995.

- [27] G. Clark and J. Cain, *Error-Correction Coding for Digital Communications*, New York: Plenum Press, 1981.
- [28] M. Varanasi and T. Guess, "Bandwidth-Efficient Multiple-Access via Signal Design for Decision-Feedback Receivers: Towards an Optimal Spreading-Coding Trade-Off," *proc. of Globecom '97, Communication Theory Mini-Conference*, Phoenix, AZ, Nov. 3 – 8, 1997.
- [29] P. Billingsley, *Probability and measure*, New York: Wiley, 1986.
- [30] D. Forney Jr. and M. Trott, "The Dynamics of Linear Codes over Groups: State Spaces, Trellis Diagram and Canonical Encoders," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-39, No. 5, pp. 1491–1514, Sept. 1993.
- [31] T. Rappaport, *Wireless Communications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- [32] D. Forney Jr., "Geometrically Uniform Codes," *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, Vol. IT-37, No. 5, pp. 1241–1260, Sept. 1991.
- [33] M. Graferath and E. Viterbo, "Algebraic Construction of Good Collision Resistant Signal Sets," *Proceedings of the Workshop on Coding and Cryptography*, pp. 213–224, Paris, Jan. 1999
- [34] G. Caire and E. Biglieri, "Linear Block Codes over Cyclic Groups," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Vol. 41, No. 5, pp. 1246 – 1256, Sept. 1995.
- [35] M. Chiani , "Error Probability for Block Codes with Block Interference," *ICC '96*, pp. 97–100, London, UK, Nov. 1996.
- [36] S. Verdú and T. S. Han, "A General Formula for Channel Capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 1147–1157, July 1994.
- [37] G. Caire, R. Knopp and P. Humblet, "System capacity of F-TDMA cellular systems," *IEEE Trans. on Comm.*, Vol. 46, No. 12, pp. 1649–61, Dec. 1998.

- [38] G. Caire, E. Leonardi and E. Viterbo, "Collision Resistant Modulation," *Proceedings of ICT '98*, Porto Carras, Greece, 22 – 25 June 1998.
- [39] I. Habbab, M. Kaverhad and C.-E. Sundberg, "ALOHA with Capture Over Slow and Fast Fading Radio Channels with Coding and Diversity," *IEEE Jour. on Select. Areas on Commun.*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 79 – 88, Jan. 1989.
- [40] J. Arnbak and W. van Blitterswijk, "Capacity of Slotted ALOHA in Rayleigh-Fading Channels," *IEEE Jour. on Select. Areas on Commun.*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 261 – 269, Feb. 1987.
- [41] S. Roman, *Coding and Information Theory*, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1992.