

A Message-Passing Receiver for BICM-OFDM over Unknown Clustered-Sparse Channels

BY PHILIP SCHNITER*

Please direct all correspondence to Prof. Philip Schniter, Dept. ECE,
The Ohio State University, 2015 Neil Ave., Columbus OH 43210, e-mail:
schniter@ece.osu.edu, phone 614.247.6488, fax 614.292.7596.

This work has been supported in part by NSF grant CCF-1018368 and
DARPA/ONR grant N66001-10-1-4090, and an allocation of computing time
from the Ohio Supercomputer Center.

July 16, 2018

Abstract

We propose a factor-graph-based approach to joint channel-estimation-and-decoding (JCED) of bit-interleaved coded orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (BICM-OFDM). In contrast to existing designs, ours is capable of exploiting not only sparsity in sampled channel taps but also clustering among the large taps, behaviors which are known to manifest at larger communication bandwidths. In order to exploit these channel-tap structures, we adopt a two-state Gaussian mixture prior in conjunction with a Markov model on the hidden state. For loopy belief propagation, we exploit a “generalized approximate message passing” (GAMP) algorithm recently developed in the context of compressed sensing, and show that it can be successfully coupled with soft-input soft-output decoding, as well as hidden Markov inference, through the standard sum-product framework. For N subcarriers and M bits per subcarrier (and any channel length $L < N$), the resulting JCED-GAMP scheme has a computational complexity of only $\mathcal{O}(N \log_2 N + N 2^M)$. Numerical experiments show that our scheme yields BER performance within 1 dB of the known-channel bound and 4 dB better than decoupled channel-estimation-and-decoding via LASSO.

}

1 Introduction

When designing a digital communications receiver, it is common to model the effects of multipath propagation in discrete time using a convolutive linear channel that, in the slow-fading scenario, can be characterized by a fixed impulse response $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^{L-1}$ over the duration of one codeword. When the communication bandwidth is sufficiently low, the “taps” $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^{L-1}$ are well modeled as independent complex Gaussian random variables, resulting in the “uncorrelated Rayleigh-fading” and “uncorrelated Rician-fading” models that

have dominated the wireless communications literature for many decades [?]. For receiver design, the Gaussian tap assumption is very convenient because the optimal estimation scheme is well known to be linear [?]. As the communication bandwidth increases, however, the channel taps are no longer well-modeled as Gaussian nor independent. Rather, they tend to be heavy-tailed or “sparse” in that only a few values in $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^{L-1}$ have significant amplitude [?, ?, ?, ?]. Moreover, groups of large taps are often clustered together in lag j . These behaviors are both a blessing and a curse: a blessing because, of all tap distributions, the independent Gaussian one is most detrimental to capacity [?], but a curse because optimal channel estimation becomes non-linear and thus receiver design becomes more complicated.

Recently, there have been many attempts to apply breakthrough non-linear estimation techniques from the field of “compressive sensing” [?] (e.g., LASSO [?, ?]) to the wireless channel estimation problem. We refer to this approach as “compressed channel sensing” (CCS), after the recent comprehensive overview [?]. The CCS literature generally takes a *decoupled* approach to the problem of channel estimation and data decoding, in that pilot-symbol knowledge is first exploited for sparse-channel estimation, after which the channel estimate is used for data decoding. However, this decoupled approach has been shown to be suboptimal when the taps are non-Gaussian [?].

The considerations above motivate a *joint* approach to structured-sparse-channel-estimation and decoding that offers both near-optimal decoding performance and low implementation complexity. In this paper, we propose exactly such a scheme. In particular, we focus on orthogonal frequency-division multiplexing (OFDM) with bit-interleaved coded modulation (BICM), and propose a novel factor-graph-based receiver that leverages recent results in “generalized approximate message passing” (GAMP) [?], soft-input/soft-output (SISO) decoding [?], and structured-sparse estimation [?]. Our receiver assumes a clustered-sparse channel-tap prior constructed using a two-state Gaussian mixture with a Markov model on the hidden tap state. The scheme that we propose has only $\mathcal{O}(N \log_2 N + N 2^M)$ complexity, where N denotes the number of subcarriers and M denotes the number of bits per subcarrier, facilitating large values of N and channel length $L < N$ (e.g., we use $N=1024$ and $L=256$ for our numerical results). For rich non-line-of-sight (NLOS) channels generated according to the IEEE 802.15.4a standard [?], our numerical experiments show bit error rate (BER) performance within 1 dB of the known-channel bound and 4 dB better than decoupled channel-estimation-and-decoding via LASSO.

We now place our work in the context of existing factor-graph designs. Factor-graph based joint channel-estimation and decoding (JCED) has existed for more than a decade (see, e.g., the early overview [?]). To calculate the messages passed among the nodes of the factor graph, first instincts suggest to apply the standard “sum-product algorithm” (SPA) [?]. Exact SPA on the JCED factor graph is computationally infeasible, however, and so it must be approximated. For this, there are many options, since many well-known

iterative inference algorithms can themselves be recognized as SPA approximations: the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm [?], particle filtering [?], variational Bayes (or “mean-field”) techniques [?], and even steepest descent [?]. Moreover, because the JCED factor graph is loopy, even exact SPA is not guaranteed to yield the correct output distributions. It is perhaps not surprising that, amidst this uncertainty about exact SPA and its “best” approximation, a number of factor-graph designs for JCED over frequency-selective channels have been proposed (e.g., [?, ?, ?, ?]).

Our approach differs from existing factor-graph JCED designs in that it uses 1) an apriori sparse (i.e., non-Gaussian) channel-tap prior, 2) a clustered (i.e., non-independent) channel-tap prior, and 3) a state-of-the-art SPA approximation known as “generalized approximate message passing” (GAMP), which has been rigorously analyzed and shown to yield asymptotically exact posteriors as $N, L \rightarrow \infty$ [?]. In fact, we conjecture that the success of our method is due in large part to the principled approximations used within GAMP. We also note that, although we focus on the case of clustered-sparse channels, our approach could be applied to non-sparse (i.e., Gaussian) or non-clustered (i.e., independent) channel-taps or, e.g., non-sparse channels with unknown length L [?], with minor modifications of our assumed channel prior.

Finally, we mention that this work is an evolution of our earlier work [?, ?] that was limited to an exactly sparse channel, that did exploit clustering, and that was based on the “relaxed belief propagation” (RBP) algorithm [?], which has higher implementation complexity than GAMP. For example, the JCED scheme proposed in [?, ?] has complexity $\mathcal{O}(NL + N2^M)$, which grows in the channel length L .

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section ? we detail our assumptions on the OFDM system and the channel prior, and provide an illustrative example of clustered-sparse behavior with the IEEE 802.15.4a channel model. In Section ? we detail our GAMP-based JCED approach, in Section ? we report the results of our simulation study, and in Section ? we conclude.

Throughout the paper, we use the following notation. \mathbb{R} denotes the field of reals and \mathbb{C} the complex field. $(\cdot)^*$ denotes conjugate and $\text{Re}(\cdot)$ extracts the real part. Furthermore, $\delta(\tau)$ denotes the Dirac delta waveform while $\{\delta_n\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$ denotes the Kronecker delta sequence. Also, $\langle j \rangle_N$ denotes j -modulo- N , \star convolution, and \propto denotes equality up to a scaling. We use boldface capital letters like \vec{B} to denote matrices and boldface small letters like \vec{b} to denote vectors. $\mathcal{D}(\vec{b})$ constructs a diagonal matrix from the vector \vec{b} and \vec{I} denotes the identity matrix. For matrices and vectors, $(\cdot)^{\text{textsf{T}}}$ denotes transpose and $(\cdot)^{\text{textsf{H}}}$ denotes conjugate transpose. When x_j is a realization of random variable X_j , we write $x_j \sim X_j$ and use $E_{X_j}\{x_j\}$ to denote the mean, $\langle \text{macro} | \text{var} \rangle_{X_j}\{x_j\}$ the variance, $p_{X_j}(x_j)$ the pdf, and $p_{X_j|D_j}(x_j|d_j)$ the pdf conditioned on the event $D_j=d_j$. Sometimes we omit the subscript when there is no danger of confusion, yielding, e.g., $E\{x_j\}$, $\langle \text{macro} | \text{var} \rangle\{x_j\}$, $p(x_j)$ and $p(x_j|d_j)$. $\mathcal{CN}(x; \hat{x}, \mu) \triangleq (\pi\mu)^{-1} \exp(-\mu^{-1}|x -$

$\hat{x}|^2)$ denotes the circular Gaussian pdf with mean \hat{x} and variance μ^x . In fact, we often use (\hat{v}_j, μ_j^y) when referring to the mean and variance of V_j .

2 System Model

2.1 The BICM-OFDM model

We consider an OFDM system with N subcarriers, each modulated by a QAM symbol from a 2^M -ary unit-energy constellation \mathcal{S} . Of the N subcarriers, $N_{\text{pilot}} p$ are dedicated as pilots,¹ and the remaining $N_{\text{data}} d \triangleq N - N_{\text{pilot}} p$ are used to transmit a total of $M_{\text{train}} t$ training bits and $M_{\text{data}} d \triangleq N_{\text{data}} d M - M_{\text{train}} t$ coded/interleaved data bits. The data bits are generated by encoding $M_{\text{info}} i$ information bits using a rate- R coder, interleaving them, and partitioning the resulting $M_{\text{code}} c \triangleq M_{\text{info}} i / R$ bits among an integer number $Q \triangleq M_{\text{code}} c / M_{\text{data}} d$ of OFDM symbols. We note that the resulting scheme has a spectral efficiency of $\eta \triangleq M_{\text{info}} d R / N$ information bits per channel use (bpcu).

In the sequel, we use $s^{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^M\}$ to denote the k^{th} element of the QAM constellation, and $\vec{c}^{(k)} \triangleq [c_1^{(k)}, \dots, c_M^{(k)}] T$ to denote the corresponding bits as defined by the symbol mapping. Likewise, we use $s_i[q] \in \mathcal{S}$ for the QAM symbol transmitted on the i^{th} subcarrier of the q^{th} OFDM symbol and $\vec{c}_i[q] \triangleq [c_{i,1}[q], \dots, c_{i,M}[q]] T$ for the coded/interleaved bits corresponding to that symbol. We use $\vec{c}[q] \triangleq [\vec{c}_0[q], \dots, \vec{c}_{N-1}[q]] T$ to denote the coded/interleaved bits in the q^{th} OFDM symbol and $\vec{c} \triangleq [\vec{c}[1], \dots, \vec{c}[Q]] T$ to denote the entire (interleaved) codeword. The elements of \vec{c} that are apriori known as pilot or training bits will be referred to as \vec{c}_{pt} . The remainder of \vec{c} is determined from the information bits $\vec{b} \triangleq [b_1, \dots, b_{M_{\text{info}} i}] T$ by coding/interleaving.

To modulate the q^{th} OFDM symbol, an N -point inverse discrete Fourier transform (DFT) $\vec{\Phi} H$ is applied to the QAM sequence $\vec{s}[q] = [s_0[q], \dots, s_{N-1}[q]] T$, yielding the time-domain sequence $\vec{\Phi} H \vec{s}[q] = \vec{a}[q] = [a_0[q], \dots, a_{N-1}[q]] T$. The OFDM waveform $a(t)$ is then constructed using L -cyclic-prefixed versions of $\{a_j[q]\}$ and the transmission pulse $g_t(\tau)$:

$$a(t) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{j=-L}^{N-1} a_{\langle j \rangle_N}[q] g_t(t - jT - q(N+L)T), \quad (1)$$

with T denoting the baud interval (in seconds) and $L < N$.

The waveform $a(t)$ propagates through a noisy channel with an impulse response $h(\tau)$ that is supported on the interval $[\tau_{\min}, \tau_{\max}]$, resulting in the receiver input waveform

$$r(t) = v(t) + \int_{\tau_{\min}}^{\tau_{\max}} h(\tau) a(t - \tau) d\tau, \quad (2)$$

1. For our GAMP decoder, we recommend $N_{\text{pilot}} p = 0$; see Section ?.

where $v(t)$ is a Gaussian noise process with flat power spectral density N_o . We note that a time-invariant channel is assumed for simplicity. The receiver samples $r(t)$ through the reception pulse $g_r(\tau)$, obtaining

$$r_j[q] = \int r(t) g_r(jT + q(N+L)T - t) dt, \quad (3)$$

and applies an N -DFT $\vec{\Phi}$ to each time-domain sequence $\vec{r}[q] = [r_0[q], \dots, r_{N-1}[q]]^T$, yielding the frequency-domain samples $\vec{\Phi} \vec{r}[q] = \vec{y}[q] = [y_0[q], \dots, y_{L-1}[q]]^T$ for $q = 1 \dots Q$.

Defining the pulse-shaped channel response $x(\tau) \triangleq (g_r \star h \star g_t)(\tau)$, it is well known (e.g., [?]) that, when the support of $x(\tau)$ is contained within the interval $[0, LT)$, the frequency domain observation on the i^{th} subcarrier can be written as

$$y_i[q] = s_i[q] z_i[q] + v_i[q], \quad (4)$$

where $z_i[q] \in \mathbb{C}$ is the i^{th} subcarrier's gain and $\{v_i[q]\}$ are Gaussian noise samples. Furthermore, defining the uniformly sampled channel "taps" $x_j[q] \triangleq x(jT + q(N+L)T)$, the subcarrier gains are related to these taps through the DFT:

$$z_i[q] = \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \Phi_{ij} x_j[q]. \quad (5)$$

In addition, when $(g_r \star g_t)(\tau)$ is a Nyquist pulse, $\{v_i[q]\}_{\forall i, q}$ are statistically independent with variance $\mu^v = N_o$.

To simplify the development, we assume that $Q = 1$ in the sequel (but not in the simulations), and drop the index $[q]$ for brevity.

2.2 A clustered-sparse tap prior

Empirical studies [?, ?, ?, ?] have suggested that, when the baud rate T^{-1} is sufficiently large, the channel taps $\{x_j\}$ are "sparse" in that the tap distributions tend to be heavy tailed. The same empirical studies suggest that large taps tend to be clustered in the lag domain. Furthermore, both the sparsity and clustering behaviors can be lag-dependent, such as when the receiver's timing-synchronization mechanism aligns the first strong multipath arrivals with a particular reference lag j . A concrete example of these behaviors will be given in Section ?.

Since our message-passing-based receiver design is inherently Bayesian, we seek a prior on the taps $\{x_j\}$ that is capable of representing this lag-dependent clustered sparsity. For this purpose, we assume a two-state Gaussian mixture (GM2) prior,²

$$p(x_j) = (1 - \lambda_j) \mathcal{CN}(x_j; 0, \mu_j^0) + \lambda_j \mathcal{CN}(x_j; 0, \mu_j^1), \quad (6)$$

where $\mu_j^0 \geq 0$ denotes the variance while in the “small” state, $\mu_j^1 > \mu_j^0$ denotes the variance while in the “big” state, and $\lambda_j \triangleq \Pr\{d_j=1\}$ denotes the prior probability of x_j being in the “big” state. Here, we use $d_j \in \{0, 1\}$ to denote the hidden state, implying the state-conditional pdf $p(x_j | d_j) = \mathcal{CN}(x_j; 0, \mu_j^{d_j})$.

For example, if x_j was presumed to be a “sparse” tap, then we would choose $\lambda_j \ll 1$ and $\mu_j^1 \gg \mu_j^0$ in (?). If, on the other hand, x_j is presumed to be (non-sparse) Rayleigh-fading, we would choose $\lambda_j = 1$ and set μ_j^1 equal to the tap variance, noting that μ_j^0 becomes inconsequential. If x_j is presumed to be Nakagami-fading or similar, we could fit the GM2 parameters $[\lambda_j, \mu_j^0, \mu_j^1]$ appropriately using the EM algorithm, as described in [?, p. 435]. The GM2 prior has been used successfully in many other non-Gaussian inference problems (see, e.g., [?]), and our premise here is that the GM2 model achieves a good balance between fidelity and tractability when modeling channel taps as well.

To capture the big-tap clustering behavior, we employ a hidden Markov model (HMM). For this, we model the tap states $\{d_j\}_{j=0}^{L-1}$ as a Markov chain (MC) with switching probabilities $p_j^{01} \triangleq \Pr\{d_{j+1}=0 | d_j=1\}$ and $p_j^{10} \triangleq \Pr\{d_{j+1}=1 | d_j=0\}$. Here, $p_j^{01} < 0.5$ implies that the neighbors of a big x_j tend to be big, and $p_j^{10} < 0.5$ implies that the neighbors of a small x_j tend to be small. We note that $\{p_j^{01}, p_j^{10}\}_{j=0}^{L-1}$ must be consistent with $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=0}^{L-1}$ in that the following must hold for all j :

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{j+1} & 1-\lambda_{j+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_j & 1-\lambda_j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1-p_j^{01} & p_j^{01} \\ p_j^{10} & 1-p_j^{10} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Although we allow correlation among the tap states, we assume that the tap *amplitudes* are conditionally independent, i.e., $p(x_{j+1}, x_j | d_{j+1}, d_j) = p(x_j | d_j) p(x_{j+1} | d_{j+1})$. Our experiences with IEEE 802.15.4a channels (see below) suggest that this is a valid assumption.

We emphasize that the model parameters $\{\lambda_j, p_j^{01}, p_j^{10}, \mu_j^1, \mu_j^0\}$ are allowed to vary with lag j , facilitating the exploitation of apriori known lag-dependencies in sparsity and/or clustering.

2.3 An illustrative example: IEEE 802.15.4a channels

As an illustrative example of the clustered-sparse tap behavior described above, we generated realizations of the tap vector $\vec{x} \triangleq [x_0, \dots, x_{L-1}]^T$ from channel impulse responses $h(\tau)$ generated according to the method specified in the IEEE 802.15.4a “ultra-wideband” standard [?], which uses the Saleh-Valenzuela model [?]

$$h(\tau) = \sum_{c=0}^C \sum_{k=0}^K h_{k,c} e^{j\phi_{k,c}} \delta(\tau - T_c - \tau_{k,c}), \quad (8)$$

2. The message passing algorithm described in Section ? can also handle non-Gaussian mixtures and/or mixtures with more than two terms.

where C denotes the number of clusters, T_c the delay of the c^{th} cluster, K the number of components per cluster, $\{\tau_{k,c}\}$ the relative component delays, $\{h_{k,c}\}$ the component amplitudes, and $\{\phi_{k,c}\}$ the component phases. In particular, the 802.15.4a standard specifies the following.

<error|compound labelitemi>The cluster arrival times are a Poisson process with rate Λ , i.e., $p(T_c | T_{c-1}) = \Lambda \exp(-\Lambda (T_c - T_{c-1}))$. The initial cluster delay $T_0 \geq \tau_{\min}$, as seen by the receiver, is a function of the timing synchronization algorithm.

<error|compound labelitemi>The component arrivals are a mixture of two Poisson processes: $p(\tau_{k,c} | \tau_{k-1,c}) = \beta \lambda_1 \exp(-\lambda_1 (\tau_{k,c} - \tau_{k-1,c})) + (1 - \beta) \lambda_2 \exp(-\lambda_2 (\tau_{k,c} - \tau_{k-1,c}))$ with $\tau_{0,c} = 0$.

<error|compound labelitemi>The component energies obey

$$E\{|h_{k,c}|^2\} = \frac{\exp(-T_l/\Gamma - \tau_{k,l}/\gamma)}{\gamma [(1 - \beta) \lambda_1 + \beta \lambda_2 + 1]}, \quad (9)$$

where Γ is the cluster decay time constant and γ is the intra-cluster decay time constant.

<error|compound labelitemi>The amplitudes $\{h_{k,c}\}$ are i.i.d Nakagami with m -factors randomly generated via i.i.d $m \sim \mathcal{N}(m_0, \hat{m}_0^2)$.

<error|compound labelitemi>The phases $\{\phi_{k,c}\}$ are i.i.d uniform on $[0, 2\pi)$.

<error|compound labelitemi>The number of clusters, C , is Poisson distributed with mean \bar{C} , i.e., $p(C) = (\bar{C})^C \exp(-\bar{C}) / (C!)$.

<error|compound labelitemi>The number of components per cluster, K , is set large enough to yield a desired modeling accuracy.

Beyond the above specifications, we assume the following.

<error|compound labelitemi>The parameters $\{\Lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \beta, \Gamma, \gamma, m_0, \hat{m}_0, \bar{C}\}$ are set according to the 802.15.4a “outdoor NLOS” scenario [?].

<error|compound labelitemi> $K=100$ components per cluster are used.

<error|compound labelitemi>The pulses $g_t(\tau)$ and $g_r(\tau)$ are square-root raised cosine (SRRC) designs with parameter 0.5.

<error|compound labelitemi>The system bandwidth equals $T^{-1} = 256$ MHz.

<error|compound labelitemi>The number of taps (and CP length) was set at $L = 256$ (implying a maximal delay spread of 1 μsec) in order to capture all significant energy in $h(\tau)$.

<error|compound labelitemi>The initial delay was generated via $T_0 = L_{\text{pre}}T + \tilde{T}_0$, where $L_{\text{pre}}=20$ and where \tilde{T}_0 is exponentially distributed with mean T , i.e., $p(\tilde{T}_0) = \Lambda_0 \exp(-\Lambda_0 \tilde{T}_0)$ for $\Lambda_0 = 1/T$. Here, L_{pre} was chosen so that $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^{L_{\text{pre}}}$ captures the “pre-cursor” energy contributed by the pulse shape, while Λ_0 models a positive synchronization uncertainty.

We now show results from an experiment conducted using 10000 realizations of the tap vector \vec{x} . In Fig. ?, we show histograms of $\text{Re}(x_j)$ for lags $j \in \{5, 23, 128, 230\}$. There it can be seen that the empirical distribution of $\text{Re}(x_j)$ changes significantly with lag j : for pre-cursor lags $j < L_{\text{pre}}$, it is approximately Gaussian; for near-cursor lags $j \approx L_{\text{pre}}$, it is approximately Laplacian; and, for post-cursor lags $j \gg L_{\text{pre}}$, it is extremely heavy-tailed. In Fig. ?, we show a typical realization of \vec{x} and notice clustering among the big taps. For comparison, we also plot an empirical estimate of the power-delay profile (PDP) $\vec{\rho} \triangleq [\rho_0, \dots, \rho_{L-1}]^{\text{(textsf)}}T$ in Fig. ?, where $\rho_j \triangleq E\{|x_j|^2\}$.

Next, we fit the GM2 parameters $\{\lambda_j, \mu_j^0, \mu_j^1\}_{j=0}^{L-1}$ using the EM algorithm, as described in [?, p. 435]. The resulting big-variance profile $\vec{\mu}^1 \triangleq [\mu_0^1, \dots, \mu_{L-1}^1]^{\text{(textsf)}}T$ and small-variance profile $\vec{\mu}^0$ are shown in Fig. ?, while the sparsity profile $\vec{\lambda} \triangleq [\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{L-1}]^{\text{(textsf)}}T$ is shown in Fig. ?. Not surprisingly, the best-fit GM2 parameters also change significantly with lag j . In particular, as j becomes larger, the variance ratio μ_j^1 / μ_j^0 increases while the big-tap-probability λ_j decreases, corresponding to an increase in sparsity. Meanwhile, there exists a peak in λ_j near $j = L_{\text{pre}}$ that results from synchronization.

Next, we empirically estimated the switching probabilities $\vec{p}^{01} \triangleq [p_0^{01}, \dots, p_{L-1}^{01}]^{\text{(textsf)}}T$ and \vec{p}^{10} . To do this, we first detected the hidden state vector $\vec{d} \triangleq [d_0, \dots, d_{L-1}]^{\text{(textsf)}}T$ underlying each realization of \vec{x} by comparing each element x_j to the maximum a-posteriori (MAP) threshold [?] (shown in Fig. ?). From these detected states, estimates of \vec{p}^{01} and \vec{p}^{10} were then computed by counting the number of switches (at each fixed lag j) over the 10000 realizations. From the plots in Fig. ?, we see that the switching probabilities are lag-dependent as well.

Finally, using our estimates of \vec{d} , we computed the normalized conditional correlation

$$\frac{E\{x_{j+1} x_j^* \mid d_{j+1} = 1, d_j = 1\}}{\sqrt{E\{|x_{j+1}|^2 \mid d_{j+1} = 1, d_j = 1\} E\{|x_j|^2 \mid d_{j+1} = 1, d_j = 1\}}}$$

and found that the magnitude was < 0.1 , validating our assumption of conditionally independent tap amplitudes.

In summary, we have seen that IEEE 802.15.4a channels do indeed yield taps with the lag-dependent clustered sparsity described in Section ?. Moreover, we have shown how the GM2-HMM parameters can be estimated from realizations of \vec{x} . Next, we propose an efficient factor-graph based approach to joint channel-estimation and decoding (JCED) for BICM-OFDM using the GM2-HMM prior proposed in Section ?.

<putFrag | hist | Histograms of $\text{Re}(x_j)$ for lags $j \in \{5, 23, 128, 230\}$, with “tight” axes. With synchronization delay $L_{\text{pre}}=20$, note that the histogram appears Gaussian for $j < L_{\text{pre}}$, Laplacian for $j \approx L_{\text{pre}}$, and very sparse for $j \gg L_{\text{pre}}$. [4.45]>

`<putFrag|realization|`A sample realization of channel taps $\{x_j\}$ generated from the IEEE 802.15.4a model with SRRC pulse shaping. Also shown is the empirically estimated PDP, best fits of the GM2 parameters $\{\mu_j^0, \mu_j^1\}$, and the MAP threshold for detecting the hidden state d_j given the tap value x_j .
`|4.45| <psfrag*|channel realization|b|b|1.0| <psfrag*|lag [baud]|>[[0.7]lag j [baud]]`

`<putFrag|gm2|`Empirically estimated statistics on the tap-states $\{d_j\}$. Top: $\lambda_j \triangleq \Pr\{d_j=1\}$, middle: $p_j^{01} \triangleq \Pr\{d_{j+1}=0 | d_j=1\}$, bottom: $p_j^{10} \triangleq \Pr\{d_{j+1}=1 | d_j=0\}$. The red dashed line shows the synchronization reference, $j = L_{\text{pre}} = 20$.
`| 4.45 | <psfrag* | lambda | b|b|0.7|lambda_j <psfrag* | p01 | >[[0.7]p_j^{01} <psfrag*|p10|>[[0.7]p_j^{10} <psfrag*|lag [baud]|>[[0.7]lag j [baud]]`

3 Joint Channel Estimation and Decoding

`<putFrag | factor_graph_noncoh_clust |`Factor graph of the JCED problem for a toy example with $M_{\text{texts}} i = 3$ information bits, $N_{\text{texts}} p = 1$ pilot subcarrier (at subcarrier index $i = 3$), $M_{\text{texts}} t = 2$ training bits, $M = 2$ bits per QAM symbol, $N = 4$ OFDM subcarriers, and channel impulse response length $L = 3$.
`| 3.5 | <psfrag* | SISO | B|B|0.50|SISO decoding <psfrag* | relaxed | B|B|0.50|GAMP <psfrag* | MC | B|B|0.50|MC <psfrag* | b1 | B|B|0.8|b1 <psfrag* | b2 | B|B|0.8|b2 <psfrag* | b3 | B|B|0.8|b3 <psfrag* | b4 | B|B|0.8|b4 <psfrag* | c11 | B|B|0.7|c_{0,1} <psfrag* | c21 | B|B|0.7|c_{1,1} <psfrag* | c31 | B|B|0.7|c_{2,1} <psfrag* | c41 | B|B|0.7|c_{3,1} <psfrag* | c12 | B|B|0.7|c_{0,2} <psfrag* | c22 | B|B|0.7|c_{1,2} <psfrag* | c32 | B|B|0.7|c_{2,2} <psfrag* | c42 | B|B|0.7|c_{3,2} <psfrag* | m1 | b|B|0.8|M_0 <psfrag* | m2 | b|B|0.8|M_1 <psfrag* | m3 | b|B|0.8|M_2 <psfrag* | m4 | b|B|0.8|M_3 <psfrag* | s1 | B|B|0.8|s_0 <psfrag* | s2 | B|B|0.8|s_1 <psfrag* | s3 | B|B|0.8|s_2 <psfrag* | s4 | B|B|0.8|s_3 <psfrag* | y1 | B|B|0.8|y_0 <psfrag* | y2 | B|B|0.8|y_1 <psfrag* | y3 | B|B|0.8|y_2 <psfrag* | y4 | B|B|0.8|y_3 <psfrag* | x1 | B|B|0.8|x_1 <psfrag* | x2 | B|B|0.8|x_2 <psfrag* | x3 | B|B|0.8|x_3 <psfrag* | d1 | B|B|0.8|d_1 <psfrag* | d2 | B|B|0.8|d_2 <psfrag* | d3 | B|B|0.8|d_3 <psfrag* | uni | >[B|0.50] uniform prior <psfrag* | info | >[B|0.50] info bits <psfrag* | code | >[B|0.50] code & interlv <psfrag* | pt | >[B|0.50] pilots & training <psfrag* | bits | >[B|0.50] coded bits <psfrag* | map | >[B|0.50] symbol mapping <psfrag* | QAM | >[B|0.50] QAM syms <psfrag* | y | >[B|0.50] OFDM observ <psfrag* | chan | >[B|0.50] channel taps <psfrag* | gm | >[B|0.50] sparse prior <psfrag* | st | >[B|0.50] tap states <psfrag* | m | >[B|0.50] cluster prior >`

Our goal is to infer the information bits \vec{b} from the OFDM observations \vec{y} and the pilot/training bits $\vec{c}_{\text{texts}}^{\text{pt}}$, without knowing the channel state \vec{x} . In particular, we aim to maximize the posterior pmf $p(b_m | \vec{y}, \vec{c}_{\text{texts}}^{\text{pt}})$ of each info bit. To exploit prior knowledge that \vec{x} is clustered-sparse, we

employ the GM2-HMM prior described in Section ?. As a result, the info-bit posterior can be decomposed into the following product of factors:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \text{left eqn} \mid p(b_m \mid \vec{y}, \vec{c}_{\text{(texts f) pt}}) &= \\
\sum_{\vec{b}_{-m}} p(\vec{b} \mid \vec{y}, \vec{c}_{\text{(texts f) pt}}) &\propto \sum_{\vec{b}_{-m}} p(\vec{y} \mid \vec{b}, \\
\vec{c}_{\text{(texts f) pt}}) p(\vec{b}) & \\
= \int_{\vec{x}, \vec{s}, \vec{d}, \vec{c}, \vec{b}_{-m}} & p(\vec{y} \mid \vec{s}, \\
\vec{x}) p(\vec{x} \mid \vec{d}) p(\vec{d}) & p(\vec{s} \mid \vec{c}) p(\vec{c} \mid \vec{b}, \\
\vec{c}_{\text{(texts f) pt}}) p(\vec{b}) & \\
= \int_{\vec{x}} \sum_{\vec{d}} \prod_{j=0}^{L-1} & p(x_j \mid d_j) p(d_j \mid d_{j-1}) \sum_{\vec{s}} \prod_{i=0}^{N-1} p(y_i \mid s_i, \\
\vec{x}) & \\
\times \sum_{\vec{c}} p(s_i \mid \vec{c}_i) & \sum_{\vec{b}_{-m}} p(\vec{c} \mid \vec{b}, \\
\vec{c}_{\text{(texts f) pt}}) \prod_{m=1}^{M_{\text{(texts f) i}}} & p(b_m), \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{b}_{-m} \triangleq [b_1, \dots, b_{m-1}, b_{m+1}, \dots, b_{M_{\text{(texts f) i}}}]^{\text{(texts f) } T}$. This factorization is illustrated by the *factor graph* in Fig. ?, where the round nodes represent random variables and the square nodes represent the factors of the posterior exposed in (?).

3.1 Background on belief propagation

Although exact evaluation of the posteriors $\{p(b_m \mid \vec{y}, \vec{c}_{\text{(texts f) pt}})\}$ is computationally impractical for the problem sizes of interest, these posteriors can be approximately evaluated using *belief propagation* (BP) [?] on the loopy factor graph in Fig. ?. In textbook BP, beliefs take the form of pdfs/pmfs that are propagated among nodes of the factor graph via the *sum/product algorithm* (SPA):

1. Say the factor node f is connected to the variable nodes $\{v_a\}_{a=1}^A$. The belief passed from f to v_b is $p_{f \rightarrow v_b}(v_b) \propto \int_{\{v_a\}_{a \neq b}} f(v_1, \dots, v_A) \prod_{a \neq b} p_{v_a \rightarrow f}(v_a)$, given the beliefs $\{p_{v_a \rightarrow f}(\cdot)\}_{a \neq b}$ recently passed to f .
2. Say the variable node v is connected to the factor nodes $\{f_1, \dots, f_B\}$. The belief passed from v to f_a is $p_{v \rightarrow f_a}(v) \propto \prod_{b \neq a} p_{f_b \rightarrow v}(v)$, given the beliefs $\{p_{f_b \rightarrow v}(\cdot)\}_{b \neq a}$ recently passed to v .
3. Say the variable node v is connected to the factor nodes $\{f_1, \dots, f_B\}$. The posterior on v is the product of all recently arriving beliefs, i.e., $p(v) \propto \prod_{b=1}^B p_{f_b \rightarrow v}(v)$.

When the factor graph contains no loops, SPA-BP yields exact posteriors after two rounds of message passing (i.e., forward and backward). But, in the presence of loops, convergence to the exact posteriors is not guaranteed. That said, there exist many problems to which loopy BP has been successfully applied, including LDPC decoding [?], inference on Markov random fields [?], and compressed sensing [?, ?, ?, ?, ?]. Our work not only leverages these three past successes, but unites them.

3.2 Background on GAMP

An important sub-problem within our larger bit-inference problem is the estimation of a vector of independent possibly-non-Gaussian variables \vec{x} that are linearly mixed via $\vec{\Phi} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times L}$ to form $\vec{z} = \vec{\Phi} \vec{x} = [z_0, \dots, z_{L-1}]^T$, and subsequently observed as noisy measurements \vec{y} through the possibly non-Gaussian pdfs $\{p_{Y_i|Z_i}(\cdot|\cdot)\}_{i=0}^{N-1}$. In our case, (?) specifies a GM2 prior on x_j and (?)—given the finite-alphabet uncertainty in s_i —yields the non-Gaussian measurement pdf $p_{Y_i|Z_i}$. This “linear mixing” sub-problem is described by the factor graph shown within the middle dashed box in Fig. ?, where each node “ y_i ” represents the measurement pdfs $p_{Y_i|Z_i}$ and the node to the right of each node “ x_j ” represents the GM2 prior on x_j .

Building on recent work on multiuser detection by Guo and Wang [?], as well as recent work on message passing algorithms for compressed sensing by Donoho, Maleki, and Montanari [?, ?], Rangan proposed a so-called *generalized approximate message passing* (GAMP) scheme that, for the sub-problem described above, yields posteriors that become asymptotically exact as $N, L \rightarrow \infty$ [?]. The main ideas behind GAMP are the following. First, although the beliefs flowing leftward from the nodes $\{x_j\}$ are clearly non-Gaussian, the corresponding belief about $z_i = \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \Phi_{ij} x_j$ can be accurately approximated as Gaussian, when L is large, using the central limit theorem. Moreover, to calculate the parameters of this distribution (i.e., its mean and variance), only the mean and variance of each x_j are needed. Thus, it suffices to pass only means and variances leftward from each x_j node. It is similarly desirable to pass only means and variances rightward from each measurement node. Although the exact rightward flowing beliefs would be non-Gaussian (due to the non-Gaussian assumption on the measurement channels $p_{Y_i|Z_i}$), GAMP approximates them as Gaussian using a 2nd-order Taylor series, and passes only the resulting means and variances. A further simplification employed by GAMP is to approximate the *differences* among the outgoing means/variances of each left node, and the incoming means/variances of each right node, using Taylor series. The GAMP algorithm³ is summarized in Table ?.

3. To be precise, the GAMP algorithm in Table ? is an extension of that proposed in [?]. Table ? handles circular *complex-valued* distributions and *non-identically* distributed signals and measurements.

`<putTable|gamp|The GAMP Algorithm|`

<i>definitions:</i>	
$p_{Z_i Y_i}(z y; \hat{z}, \mu^z) = \frac{p_{Y_i Z_i}(y z) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}, \mu^z)}{\int_{z'} p_{Y_i Z_i}(y z') \mathcal{CN}(z'; \hat{z}, \mu^z)}$	(D1)
$g_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) = \frac{1}{\mu^z} (E_{Z_i Y_i}\{z y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\} - \hat{z})$	(D2)
$g'_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) = \frac{1}{\mu^z} \left(\frac{\langle \text{macro} \text{var} \rangle_{Z_i Y_i}\{z y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\}}{\mu^z} - 1 \right)$	(D3)
$p_{X_j}(x; \hat{r}, \mu^r) = \frac{p_{X_j}(x) \mathcal{CN}(x; \hat{r}, \mu^r)}{\int_{x'} p_{X_j}(x') \mathcal{CN}(x'; \hat{r}, \mu^r)}$	(D4)
$g_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r) = \int_x p_{X_j}(x; \hat{r}, \mu^r)$	(D5)
$g'_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r) = \frac{1}{\mu^r} \int_x x - g_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r) ^2 p_{X_j}(x; \hat{r}, \mu^r)$	(D6)
<i>initialize:</i>	
$\forall j: \hat{x}_j(1) = \int_x p_{X_j}(x)$	(I1)
$\forall j: \mu_j^x(1) = \int_x x - \hat{x}_j(1) ^2 p_{X_j}(x)$	(I2)
$\forall i: \hat{u}_i(0) = 0$	(I3)
<i>for</i> $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$	
$\forall i: \hat{z}_i(n) = \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \Phi_{ij} \hat{x}_j(n)$	(R1)
$\forall i: \mu_i^z(n) = \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} \Phi_{ij} ^2 \mu_j^x(n)$	(R2)
$\forall i: \hat{p}_i(n) = \hat{z}_i(n) - \mu_i^z(n) \hat{u}_i(n-1)$	(R3)
$\forall i: \hat{u}_i(n) = g_{\text{out},i}(y_i, \hat{p}_i(n), \mu_i^z(n))$	(R4)
$\forall i: \mu_i^u(n) = -g'_{\text{out},i}(y_i, \hat{p}_i(n), \mu_i^z(n))$	(R5)
$\forall j: \mu_j^r(n) = (\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{ij} ^2 \mu_i^u(n))^{-1}$	(R6)
$\forall j: \hat{r}_j(n) = \hat{x}_j(n) + \mu_j^r(n) \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{ij} \hat{u}_i(n)$	(R7)
$\forall j: \mu_j^x(n+1) = \mu_j^r(n) g'_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}_j(n), \mu_j^r(n))$	(R8)
$\forall j: \hat{x}_j(n+1) = g_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}_j(n), \mu_j^r(n))$	(R9)
<i>end</i>	

3.3 Joint estimation and decoding using GAMP

We now detail our application of GAMP to joint channel-estimation and decoding (JCED) under the GM2-HMM tap prior, frequently referring to the factor graph in Fig. ?.

Because our factor graph is loopy, there exists considerable freedom in the message passing schedule. Roughly speaking, we choose to pass messages from the left to the right of Fig. ? and back again, several times, stopping as soon as the messages converge. Each of these full cycles of message passing will be referred to as a “turbo iteration.” However, during a single turbo iteration, there may be multiple iterations of message passing *between* the

GAMP and MC sub-graphs, which will be referred to as “equalizer” iterations. Furthermore, during a single equalizer iteration, there may be multiple iterations of message passing *within* the GAMP sub-graph, while there is at most one forward-backward iteration *within* the MC sub-graph. Finally, the SISO decoding block may itself be implemented using message passing, in which case it may also use several internal iterations. The message passing details are discussed below.

At the start of the first turbo iteration, there is total uncertainty about the information bits, so that $\Pr\{b_m=1\}=\frac{1}{2}\forall m$. Thus, the initial bit beliefs flowing rightward out of the coding/interleaving block are uniformly distributed. Meanwhile, the pilot/training bits are known with certainty.

Coded-bit beliefs are then propagated rightward into the symbol mapping nodes. Since the symbol mapping is deterministic, the corresponding pdf factors take the form $p(s^{(k)}|\vec{c}^{(l)})=\delta_{k-l}$. The SPA dictates that the message passed rightward from symbol mapping node “ \mathcal{M}_i ” takes the form

$$p_{\mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow s_i}(s^{(k)}) \propto \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0,1\}^M} p(s^{(k)}|\vec{c}) \prod_{m=1}^M p_{c_{i,m} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i}(c_m) \quad (12)$$

$$= \prod_{m=1}^M p_{c_{i,m} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i}(c_m^{(k)}), \quad (13)$$

which is then copied forward as the message passed rightward from node s_i (i.e., $p_{\mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow s_i}(s^{(k)}) = p_{s_i \rightarrow y_i}(s^{(k)})$).

Recall, from Section 3, that the symbol-belief passed rightward into the measurement node “ y_i ” determines the pdf $p_{Y_i|Z_i}$ used in GAMP. Writing this symbol belief as $\vec{\beta}_i \triangleq [\beta_i^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_i^{(2^M)}]$ for $\beta_i^{(k)} \triangleq p_{s_i \rightarrow y_i}(s^{(k)})$, equation (13) implies the measurement pdf

$$p_{Y_i|Z_i}(y|z) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \beta_i^{(k)} \mathcal{CN}(y; s^{(k)}z; \mu^v). \quad (14)$$

From (14), it is shown in Appendix A that the quantities in (D2)-(D3) of Table 1 become

$$g_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) = \frac{1}{\mu^z} \hat{e}_i(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \quad (15)$$

$$g'_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) = \frac{1}{\mu^z} \left(\frac{\mu_i^e(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)}{\mu^z} - 1 \right) \quad (16)$$

for

$$\xi_i^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \triangleq \frac{\beta_i^{(k)} \mathcal{CN}(y; s^{(k)}\hat{z}, |s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v)}{\sum_{k'} \beta_i^{(k')} \mathcal{CN}(y; s^{(k')}\hat{z}, |s^{(k')}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v)} \quad (17)$$

$$\zeta^{(k)}(\mu^z) \triangleq \frac{|s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z}{|s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v} \quad (18)$$

$$\hat{e}^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \triangleq \left(\frac{y}{s^{(k)}} - \hat{z} \right) \zeta^{(k)}(\mu^z) \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{e}_i(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \xi_i^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \hat{e}^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \quad (20)$$

$$\mu_i^e(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \xi_i^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \left(|\hat{e}^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) - \hat{e}_i(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)|^2 + \frac{\mu^v \zeta^{(k)}(\mu^z)}{s^{(k)}} \right) \quad (21)$$

where $\vec{\xi}_i \triangleq [\xi_i^{(1)}, \dots, \xi_i^{(2^M)}]^T$ characterizes the posterior pmf on s_i under the channel model $z_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(\hat{z}, \mu^z)$. Likewise, from (?), it is shown in Appendix ? that the quantities (D5)-(D6) take the form

$$g_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r) = (\alpha_j \gamma_j^1 + (1 - \alpha_j) \gamma_j^0) \hat{r} \quad (22)$$

$$g'_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r) = \alpha_j (1 - \alpha_j) (\gamma_j^1 - \gamma_j^0)^2 |\hat{r}|^2 / \mu^r + \alpha_j \gamma_j^1 + (1 - \alpha_j) \gamma_j^0, \quad (23)$$

for $\gamma_j^0(\mu^r) \triangleq (1 + \mu^r / \mu_j^0)^{-1}$, $\gamma_j^1(\mu^r) \triangleq (1 + \mu^r / \mu_j^1)^{-1}$, and

$$\alpha_j(\hat{r}, \mu^r) \triangleq \frac{1}{1 + \left(\underbrace{\frac{\lambda_j}{1 - \lambda_j} \frac{\mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^1 + \mu^r)}{\mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^0 + \mu^r)}}_{\mathcal{L}^{\text{apri}}_j \mathcal{L}^{\text{ext}}_j(\hat{r}, \mu^r)} \right)^{-1}}. \quad (24)$$

Above, $\mathcal{L}^{\text{apri}}_j$ is the apriori likelihood ratio $\frac{\Pr\{d_j=1\}}{\Pr\{d_j=0\}}$ on the hidden state, $\mathcal{L}^{\text{ext}}_j(\hat{r}, \mu^r)$ is GAMP's extrinsic likelihood ratio, and $\alpha_j(\hat{r}, \mu^r)$ is the corresponding posterior probability that $d_j = 1$.

Using (?)-(?), the GAMP algorithm in Table ? is iterated until it converges. In doing so, GAMP generates (a close approximation to) both the conditional means \hat{x} and variances $\vec{\mu}^x \triangleq [\mu_0^x, \dots, \mu_{L-1}^x]^T$ given the observations \vec{y} , the soft symbol priors $\vec{\beta} \triangleq [\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{L-1}]^T$ and the sparsity prior $\vec{\lambda}$. Conveniently, GAMP also returns (close approximations to) both the conditional means \hat{z} and variances $\vec{\mu}^z$ of the subchannel gains \vec{z} , as well as posteriors $\vec{\xi} \triangleq [\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{L-1}]^T$ on the symbols \vec{s} .

Before continuing, we discuss some GAMP details that are specific to our OFDM-JCED application. First, we notice that, to guarantee that the variance $\mu_i^u(n)$ in (R5) is positive, we must have $\mu_i^e < \mu_z$ in (?). Since this is not necessarily the case during the first few GAMP iterations, we clip μ_i^e at the value $0.99 \mu^z$, where 0.99 was chosen heuristically. Second, due to unit-modulus property of the DFT elements Φ_{ij} , step (R2) in Table ? simplifies to $\mu_i^z(n) = \sum_j \mu_j^x(n)$ and (R6) simplifies to $\mu_j^r(n) = (\sum_i \mu_i^u(n))^{-1}$. With these simplifications, the complexity of GAMP is dominated by either the matrix-vector products $\sum_j \Phi_{ij} \hat{x}_j(n)$ in (R1) and $\sum_i \Phi_{ij}^* \hat{u}_i(n)$ in (R7), which can be implemented using a $N \log_2 N$ -multiply FFT when N is a power-of-two, or by the calculation of $\{\hat{e}_i, \mu_i^e\}_{i=0}^{N-1}$ in (?)-(?), which requires $\mathcal{O}(N 2^M)$ multiplies. Thus, GAMP requires only $\mathcal{O}(N \log_2 N + N 2^M)$ multiplies per iteration.

After the messages within the GAMP sub-graph have converged, tap-state beliefs are passed rightward to the MC sub-graph. In particular, the SPA dictates that GAMP passes tap-state likelihoods or, equivalently, the extrinsic likelihood ratios $\mathcal{L}_j^{\text{ext}}$. Since the MC sub-graph is non-loopy, only one iteration of forward-backward message passing is performed,⁴ after which the resulting tap-state likelihoods are passed leftward back to GAMP, where they are treated as tap-state priors $\vec{\lambda}$ in the next equalizer iteration. This interaction between the GAMP and MC sub-blocks can be recognized as an incarnation of the structured-sparse reconstruction scheme recently proposed by the authors in [?].

When the tap-state likelihoods passed between GAMP and MC have converged, the equalizer iterations are terminated and messages are passed leftward from the GAMP block. For this, SPA dictates that a symbol-belief propagates leftward from the y_i node with the form

$$p_{s_i \leftarrow y_i}(s) \propto \int_z \mathcal{CN}(y_i; s z, \mu^v) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}_i, \mu_i^z) \quad (25)$$

$$= \mathcal{CN}(y_i; s \hat{z}_i, |s|^2 \mu_i^z + \mu^v), \quad (26)$$

where (\hat{z}_i, μ_i^z) play the role of soft channel estimates. The SPA then implies that $p_{\mathcal{M}_i \leftarrow s_i}(s) = p_{s_i \leftarrow y_i}(s)$.

Next, beliefs are passed leftward from each symbol-mapping node \mathcal{M}_i to the corresponding bit nodes $c_{i,m}$. From the SPA, they take the form

(error|compound lefteqn)

$$\begin{aligned} & \propto \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \sum_{\vec{c}: c_m = c} p(s^{(k)} | \vec{c}) p_{\mathcal{M}_i \leftarrow s_i}(s^{(k)}) \prod_{m' \neq m} p_{c_{i,m'} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i}(c_{m'}) \\ & = \sum_{k: c_m^{(k)} = c} p_{\mathcal{M}_i \leftarrow s_i}(s^{(k)}) \frac{\prod_{m'=1}^M p_{c_{i,m'} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i}(c_{m'}^{(k)})}{p_{c_{i,m} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i}(c)} \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_{c_{i,m} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_i}(c)} \sum_{k: c_m^{(k)} = c} p_{\mathcal{M}_i \leftarrow s_i}(s^{(k)}) p_{\mathcal{M}_i \rightarrow s_i}(s^{(k)}) \quad (28)$$

for pairs (i, m) that do not correspond to pilot/training bits. (Since the pilot/training bits are known with certainty, there is no need to update their pmfs.)

Finally, messages are passed leftward into the coding/interleaving block. Doing so is equivalent to feeding extrinsic soft bit estimates to a soft-input/soft-output (SISO) decoder/deinterleaver, which treats them as priors. Since SISO decoding is a well-studied topic [?, ?] and high-performance implementations are readily available (e.g., [?]), we will not elaborate on the details here. It suffices to say that, once the extrinsic outputs of the SISO decoder have been computed, they are re-interleaved and passed rightward from the coding/interleaving block to begin another turbo iteration.

⁴ Message passing on the MC factor graph is a standard procedure. For details, we refer the reader to [?, ?].

These turbo iterations continue until either the decoder detects no bit errors, the soft bit estimates have converged, or a maximum number of iterations has elapsed.

4 Numerical Results

In this section, we present numerical results that compare our GAMP-based JCED scheme to decoupled channel-estimation and decoding (DCED) based on pilot-aided linear MMSE (LMMSE) channel estimates, LASSO channel estimates [?], and perfect channel state information (CSI).

4.1 Setup

For all results, we used irregular LDPC codes with codeword length ≈ 10000 and average column weight 3, generated (and decoded) using the publicly available software [?], with random interleaving. We focus on the case of $N=1024$ subcarrier OFDM with 16-QAM (i.e., $M=4$) operating at a spectral efficiency of $\eta=2$ bpcu. For bit-to-symbol mapping, we used multilevel Gray-mapping [?], noting recent work [?] that conjectures the optimality of Gray-mapping when BICM is used with a strong code. In some simulations, we used $N_{\text{pilot}} > 0$ pilot-only subcarriers and $M_{\text{data}} = 0$ interspersed training bits, whereas in others we used $N_{\text{pilot}} = 0$ and $M_{\text{data}} > 0$. When $N_{\text{pilot}} > 0$, the pilot subcarriers were placed randomly and modulated with (known) QAM symbols chosen uniformly at random. When $M_{\text{data}} > 0$, the training bits were placed at the most significant bits (MSBs) of uniformly spaced data-subcarriers and modulated with the bit value 1.

Realizations of the tap vector $\vec{x}[q]$ were generated from IEEE 802.15.4a outdoor-NLOS impulse responses and SRRC pulses, as described in Section ?, and *not* from the GM2-HMM prior used by GAMP. The tap vectors generated for our simulations are thus as realistic as one can hope to obtain in software. All reported results are averaged over ≥ 1000 channel realizations (i.e., $\gtrsim 10^7$ info bits).

The GM2-HMM parameters $\vec{\mu}^0, \vec{\mu}^1, \vec{p}^{01}, \vec{p}^{10}$ used in GAMP were fit from 10000 realizations of the tap-vector \vec{x} using the procedure described in Section ?. In doing so, we implicitly assume⁵ that the receiver has been designed for outdoor scenario, and we leverage the prior information made available by the extensive measurement campaign conducted for the IEEE 802.15.4a standard [?]. For JCED-GAMP, we used a *maximum* of 20 turbo iterations, 5 equalizer iterations, 15 GAMP iterations, and 25 LDPC decoder iterations, although we stress that these maxima were seldom (if ever) reached.⁶

5. If, instead, we knew that the receiver would be used in a different operating scenario, then we could generate representative realizations of \vec{x} for that scenario and fit the GM2-HMM parameters accordingly. Furthermore, one could optimize the receiver for any desired balance between “typical” and “worst-case” operating conditions by simply choosing appropriate training realizations \vec{x} .

6. For example, after the second turbo iteration, it is typical to see only a single equalizer iteration and a single GAMP iteration.

4.2 Comparison with DCED schemes

Given set of tap estimates $\{\hat{x}[q]\}_{q=1}^Q$, the following procedure was used to implement DCED. First, the subcarrier estimates $\hat{z}[q] = \vec{\Phi} \hat{x}[q]$ were computed, from which the (genie-aided empirical) variance $\hat{\mu}^z[q] \triangleq \|\hat{z}[q] - \bar{z}[q]\|_2^2 / N$ was calculated. Then, using the soft channel estimates $\{\hat{z}[q], \hat{\mu}^z[q]\}_{q=1}^Q$, leftward SPA-BP on the factor graph in Fig. ? was performed exactly as described in Section ?, ensuring that the soft channel estimates were fairly/optimally used for SISO decoding.

To compute the LMMSE tap-vector estimate $\hat{x}_{\text{?lmmse}}[q]$, the pilot symbols $\vec{s}_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle \text{pt}}[q] \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p}}$ and pilot subcarrier observations $\vec{y}_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle \text{pt}}[q] \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p}}$ were used as follows:

$$\hat{x}_{\text{?lmmse}}[q] = \vec{A}^{(\text{textsf})} H[q] (\vec{A}[q] \mathcal{D}(\vec{\rho}) \vec{A}^{(\text{textsf})} H[q] + \mu^v \vec{I})^{-1} \vec{y}_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle \text{pt}}[q], \quad (29)$$

where $\vec{\rho}$ denotes the PDP, $\vec{A}[q] \triangleq \mathcal{D}(\vec{s}_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle \text{pt}}[q]) \vec{\Phi}_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle \text{pt}}$, and $\vec{\Phi}_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle \text{pt}} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p} \times L}$ denotes the matrix constructed from the pilot rows and the first L columns of the N -DFT matrix.

To compute a pilot-based LASSO⁷ tap estimate $\hat{x}_{\text{?lasso}}[q]$, we invoked the celebrated SPGL1 algorithm [?] with the measurement matrix $\vec{A}[q]$ and a genie-optimized tuning parameter.⁸ We note that, due to the two genie-aided steps, the performance attained by LASSO is somewhat optimistic.

4.3 BER versus the number of pilot subcarriers $N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p}$

Figure ? shows bit error rate (BER) versus the number of pilot subcarriers $N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p}$ at $E_b/N_o = 11$ dB and a fixed spectral efficiency of $\eta = 2$ bpcu. In this and other figures, “GAMP-# MC-5,” refers to JCED-GAMP with # turbo iterations⁹ and 5 equalizer iterations, whereas “GAMP-#” alone indicates that the MC block was disconnected (i.e., there was no attempt to exploit tap clustering).

The curves in Fig. ? exhibit a “notched” shape because, as $N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p}$ increases, the code rate R must decrease to maintain the fixed spectral efficiency $\eta = 2$ bpcu; while an increase in $N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p}$ generally makes channel estimation easier, the reduction in R makes data decoding more difficult. For all schemes under comparison, Fig. ? suggests that the choice $N_{\langle \text{textsf} \rangle p} \approx 224$ is optimal under the chosen operating conditions. Overall, we see JCED-GAMP significantly outperforming both DCED-LMMSE and DCED-LASSO even

⁷ The criterion employed by LASSO [?] is equivalent to the one employed in “basis pursuit denoising” [?].

⁸ The performance of LASSO/SPGL1 is highly dependent on the value of a tuning parameter that determines the tradeoff between the estimate’s sparsity and the residual’s variance. To optimize this tradeoff, for each realization, SPGL1 was invoked over a dense grid of tuning parameters, and the one that minimized NMSE (with respect to the true channel) was chosen.

⁹ “GAMP-fin” refers to JCED-GAMP after convergence. The number of turbo iterations it takes to converge is realization- and E_b/N_o -dependent.

after one turbo iteration. Moreover, we see a noticeable gain from the use of the MC block during the first two turbo iterations, and after turbo convergence if too few pilots are used (i.e., $N_{\text{pilot}}p < 224$). $\langle \text{putFrag} | \text{ber}_{\text{vSNP}} | \text{BER}$ versus number of pilot subcarriers $N_{\text{pilot}}p$, for $E_b/N_o=11$ dB, $M_{\text{pilot}}t=0$ training bits, $\eta=2$ bpcu, and 16-QAM. $\langle \text{psfrag}^* | N_p | t | [0.9] N_{\text{pilot}}p \rangle \langle \text{psfrag}^* | \text{average BER} | \rangle [0.9] \text{BER} \langle \text{psfrag}^* | M=4, \text{SNR}=14\text{dB}, \text{bpcu}=2 | \rangle [0.9]$

4.4 BER versus E_b/N_o

Figure ? shows BER versus E_b/N_o using $N_{\text{pilot}}p=224$ pilot subcarriers (as suggested by Fig. ?) and $M_{\text{pilot}}t=0$. There, we see DCED-LASSO performing about 5 dB from perfect-CSI, and DCED-LMMSE performing significantly worse. Remarkably, we see JCED-GAMP performing within 1 dB of soft decoding under perfect-CSI (and within 1.5 dB after only 2 turbo iterations). The proximity of the perfect-CSI and JCED-GAMP BER traces confirms that the proposed GM2-HMM prior does an excellent job of capturing the lag-dependent clustered-sparse characteristics of the true channel taps. Consistent with Fig. ?, we see that JCED-GAMP benefits significantly from the use of the MC block during the initial turbo iterations, and less significantly after turbo convergence. $\langle \text{putFrag} | \text{ber}_{\text{vSNRNP}} | \text{BER}$ versus E_b/N_o , for $N_{\text{pilot}}p=224$ pilot subcarriers, $M_{\text{pilot}}t=0$ training bits, $\eta=2$ bpcu, and 16-QAM. $\langle \text{psfrag}^* | N_p | t | [0.9] N_{\text{pilot}}p \rangle \langle \text{psfrag}^* | \text{average BER} | \rangle [0.9] \text{BER} \langle \text{psfrag}^* | E_b / N_o \text{ [dB]} | \rangle [0.9] E_b / N_o \text{ [dB]} \langle \text{psfrag}^* | M=4, N_p=224, M_t=0, \text{bpcu}=2 | \rangle [0.9]$

4.5 BER versus the number of interspersed training bits $M_{\text{pilot}}t$

Although $N_{\text{pilot}}p > 0$ pilot subcarriers are required for DCED channel estimation, JCED can function with $N_{\text{pilot}}p=0$ as long as $M_{\text{pilot}}t > 0$ interspersed training bits are used. To illustrate this fact, Fig. ? shows BER versus $M_{\text{pilot}}t$ at $E_b/N_o=10$ dB, a fixed spectral efficiency of $\eta=2$ bpcu, and $N_{\text{pilot}}p=0$. There we see that there is a relatively wide tolerance on $M_{\text{pilot}}t$, although the value $M_{\text{pilot}}t \approx 450$ appears best when convergence speed is taken into account. Moreover, we can see a small but noticeable BER improvement when the MC block is used. More importantly, by comparing the BER performance in Fig. ? to that in Fig. ? at $E_b/N_o=10$ dB, we see that the BER is about $6 \times$ lower in Fig. ?. Thus, we conclude that the use of interspersed training bits is more efficient than the use of dedicated pilot subcarriers. A similar observation was made in [?, ?] under somewhat different channels and message passing algorithms. $\langle \text{putFrag} | \text{ber}_{\text{vSMt}} | \text{BER}$ versus number of interspersed training bits $M_{\text{pilot}}t$, for $E_b/N_o=10$ dB, $N_{\text{pilot}}p=0$ pilots subcarriers, $\eta=2$ bpcu, and 16-QAM. $\langle \text{psfrag}^* | M_t | t | [0.9] M_{\text{pilot}}t \rangle \langle \text{psfrag}^* | \text{average BER} | \rangle [0.9] \text{BER} \langle \text{psfrag}^* | M=4, \text{SNR}=13\text{dB}, \text{bpcu}=2 | \rangle [0.9]$

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a factor-graph approach to joint channel-estimation and decoding (JCED) for BICM-OFDM that combines recent advances in message-passing algorithms for structured-sparse signal reconstruction [?, ?] and SISO decoding [?]. Different from existing factor-graph approaches to JCED, ours is able to exploit the lag-dependent clustered sparsity that typifies channel taps under large communication bandwidths, such as those that result from pulse-shaped communication over IEEE 802.15.4a channels. For this purpose, we proposed the use of a two-state Gaussian mixture prior with a Markov model on the hidden tap states. The implementation complexity of our JCED scheme is dominated by $\mathcal{O}(N \log_2 N + N 2^M)$ multiplies per GAMP iteration, facilitating the application to systems with many subcarriers N and channel taps $L < N$. Experiments with IEEE 802.15.4a channels showed BER performance within 1 dB of the known-channel bound, and about 4 dB better than the LASSO-based “compressed channel sensing” approach. These experiments also suggested that, for JCED, the use of interspersed training bits is more efficient than the placement of known bits in dedicated pilot subcarriers.

(appendices)

6 Derivation of GAMP Functions $g_{\text{out},i}$ and $g'_{\text{out},i}$

In this appendix, we derive the GAMP quantities $g_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ and $g'_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ given in (?)-(?).

From (D1), we have that

$$E_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\} = \frac{1}{p_{Y_i}(y)} \int_z p_{Y_i|Z_i}(y|z) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}, \mu^z), \quad (30)$$

where $p_{Y_i}(y) \triangleq \int_z p_{Y_i|Z_i}(y|z) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}, \mu^z)$. From (?), we rewrite $p_{Y_i|Z_i}(y|z)$ as

$$p_{Y_i|Z_i}(y|z) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \frac{\beta_i^{(k)}}{s^{(k)}} \mathcal{CN}\left(z; \frac{y}{s^{(k)}}, \frac{\mu^v}{|s^{(k)}|^2}\right), \quad (31)$$

so that

$$\int_z p_{Y_i|Z_i}(y|z) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}, \mu^z) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \frac{\beta_i^{(k)}}{s^{(k)}} \int_z \mathcal{CN}\left(z; \frac{y}{s^{(k)}}, \frac{\mu^v}{|s^{(k)}|^2}\right) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}, \mu^z) \quad (32)$$

$$p_{Y_i}(y) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \frac{\beta_i^{(k)}}{s^{(k)}} \int_z \mathcal{CN}\left(z; \frac{y}{s^{(k)}}, \frac{\mu^v}{|s^{(k)}|^2}\right) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}, \mu^z). \quad (33)$$

Using the property that

$$\mathcal{CN}(x; \hat{\theta}, \mu^\theta) \mathcal{CN}(x; \hat{\phi}, \mu^\phi) = \mathcal{CN}\left(x; \frac{\hat{\theta}/\mu^\theta + \hat{\phi}/\mu^\phi}{1/\mu^\theta + 1/\mu^\phi}, \frac{1}{1/\mu^\theta + 1/\mu^\phi}\right) \mathcal{CN}(0; \hat{\theta} - \hat{\phi}, \mu^\theta + \mu^\phi), \quad (34)$$

we can rewrite

(error|compound lefteqn)

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \frac{\beta_i^{(k)}}{s^{(k)}} \mathcal{CN}\left(0; \frac{y_i}{s} - \hat{z}, \frac{\mu^v}{|s^{(k)}|^2} + \mu^z\right) \int_z \mathcal{CN}\left(z; \frac{\frac{y}{s^{(k)}} \frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{\hat{z}}{\mu^z}}{\frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{1}{\mu^z}}, \frac{1}{\frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{1}{\mu^z}}\right) \quad (35)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \frac{\beta_i^{(k)}}{s^{(k)}} \mathcal{CN}\left(\frac{y_i}{s}; \hat{z}, \frac{\mu^v}{|s^{(k)}|^2} + \mu^z\right) \frac{\frac{y}{s^{(k)}} \frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{\hat{z}}{\mu^z}}{\frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{1}{\mu^z}} \quad (36)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \beta_i^{(k)} \mathcal{CN}(y_i; s^{(k)} \hat{z}, |s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v) \left(\underbrace{\left(\frac{y}{s^{(k)}} - \hat{z} \right) \frac{|s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z}{|s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v}}_{\triangleq \hat{e}^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)} + \hat{z} \right) \quad (37)$$

and, using the same procedure, we get

$$p_{Y_i}(y) = \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \beta_i^{(k)} \mathcal{CN}(y_i; s^{(k)} \hat{z}, |s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v). \quad (38)$$

With $\xi_i^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ defined in (?), equations (?) and (?) and (?) combine to give

$$E_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\} = \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \xi_i^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) (\hat{e}^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) + \hat{z}). \quad (39)$$

Finally, from (?) and the definition of $g_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ in (D2), equation (?) follows immediately.

From (D1), we have that

$$\langle \text{macro} | \text{var} \rangle_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\} = \frac{1}{p_{Y_i}(y)} \int_z |z - E_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\}|^2 p_{Y_i|Z_i}(y|z) \mathcal{CN}(z; \hat{z}, \mu^z). \quad (40)$$

Similar to (?), we can write

(error|compound lefteqn)

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \frac{\beta_i^{(k)}}{s^{(k)}} \mathcal{CN}\left(0; \frac{y_i}{s} - \hat{z}, \frac{\mu^v}{|s^{(k)}|^2} + \mu^z\right) \\
 &\quad \times \int_z |z - E_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\}|^2 \mathcal{CN}\left(z; \frac{\frac{y}{s^{(k)}} \frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{\hat{z}}{\mu^z}}{\frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{1}{\mu^z}}, \frac{1}{\frac{|s^{(k)}|^2}{\mu^v} + \frac{1}{\mu^z}}\right). \quad (41)
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the change-of-variable $\tilde{z} \triangleq z - E_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\}$, and absorbing the $s^{(k)}$ terms as done in (?), we get

(error|compound lefteqn)

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \beta_i^{(k)} \mathcal{CN}(y_i; s^{(k)} \hat{z}, |s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v) \\
 &\quad \times \int_{\tilde{z}} |\tilde{z}|^2 \mathcal{CN}\left(\tilde{z}; \hat{e}^{(k)} + \underbrace{\hat{z} - E_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\}}_{=-\hat{e}_i}, \frac{\mu^v \mu^z}{|s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v}\right) \quad (42)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \beta_i^{(k)} \mathcal{CN}(y_i; s^{(k)} \hat{z}, |s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v) \left(|\hat{e}^{(k)} - \hat{e}_i|^2 + \frac{\mu^v \mu^z}{|s^{(k)}|^2 \mu^z + \mu^v} \right). \quad (43)
 \end{aligned}$$

Using $\xi_i^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ defined in (?) and $\zeta^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ defined in (?), equations (?) and (?) and (?) combine to give

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle \text{macro} | \text{var} \rangle_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\} &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^M} \xi_i^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \left(\frac{\mu^v \zeta^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)}{|s^{(k)}|^2} + \left| \hat{e}_i(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) - \hat{e}^{(k)}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \right|^2 \right). \quad (44)
 \end{aligned}$$

which is rewritten as $\mu_i^e(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z) \triangleq \langle \text{macro} | \text{var} \rangle_{Z_i|Y_i}\{z | y; \hat{z}, \mu^z\}$ in (?). Finally, plugging $\mu_i^e(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ into the definition of $g'_{\text{out},i}(y, \hat{z}, \mu^z)$ in (D3), we immediately obtain (?).

7 Derivation of GAMP Functions $g_{\text{in},j}$ and $g'_{\text{in},j}$

In this appendix, we derive the GAMP quantities $g_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r)$ and $g'_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r)$ given in (??)-(?).

From (D4)-(D6), we note that $g_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r)$ and $\mu^r g'_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r)$ are the mean and variance, respectively, of the pdf

$$\frac{1}{Z_j} p_{X_j}(r) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r}, \mu^r), \quad (45)$$

where $Z_j \triangleq \int_r p_{X_j}(r) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r}, \mu^r)$. Using (??) together with the definition of $p_{X_j}(\cdot)$ from (??), we find that

(error|compound lefteqn)

$$\begin{aligned} &= \lambda_j \mathcal{CN}(r; 0, \mu_j^1) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r}, \mu^r) + (1 - \lambda_j) \mathcal{CN}(r; 0, \\ &\quad \mu_j^0) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r}, \mu^r) \\ &= \lambda_j \mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^1 + \mu^r) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r} \gamma_j^1(\mu^r), \mu^r \gamma_j^1(\mu^r)) \\ &\quad + (1 - \lambda_j) \mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^0 + \mu^r) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r} \gamma_j^0(\mu^r), \mu^r \gamma_j^0(\mu^r)), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

for $\gamma_j^0(\mu^r) \triangleq (1 + \mu^r / \mu_j^0)^{-1}$ and $\gamma_j^1(\mu^r) \triangleq (1 + \mu^r / \mu_j^1)^{-1}$. This implies that

$$Z_j = \lambda_j \mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^1 + \mu^r) + (1 - \lambda_j) \mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^0 + \mu^r). \quad (47)$$

Thus, the mean obeys

$$g_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r) = \frac{1}{Z_j} \int_r r p_{X_j}(r) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r}, \mu^r) \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \underbrace{\frac{\lambda_j \mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^1 + \mu^r)}{Z_j}}_{=\alpha_j(\hat{r}, \mu^r)} \gamma_j^1(\mu^r) \hat{r} + \\ &\quad \underbrace{\frac{(1 - \lambda_j) \mathcal{CN}(\hat{r}; 0, \mu_j^0 + \mu^r)}{Z_j}}_{=1 - \alpha_j(\hat{r}, \mu^r)} \gamma_j^0(\mu^r) \hat{r}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

yielding (??), where a straightforward manipulation relates the expression for $\alpha_j(\hat{r}, \mu^r)$ above with its definition in (??).

Since, for the pdf in (??), $g_{\text{in},j}$ is the mean and $\mu^r g'_{\text{in},j}$ is the variance, we can write

$$\mu^r g'_{\text{in},j}(\hat{r}, \mu^r) = \frac{1}{Z_j} \int_r |r|^2 p_{X_j}(r) \mathcal{CN}(r; \hat{r}, \mu^r) - |g_{\text{in},j}|^2 \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \alpha_j (|\hat{r} \gamma_j^1|^2 + \mu^r \gamma_j^1) + (1 - \alpha_j) (|\hat{r} \gamma_j^0|^2 + \mu^r \gamma_j^0) - |\alpha_j \gamma_j^1 \hat{r} + \\ &\quad (1 - \alpha_j) \gamma_j^0 \hat{r}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

which can be simplified to yield (??).

Bibliography