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Abstract—We propose a novel cooperative transmission scheme called Convolutional Network-Coded Cooperation (CNCC) for a network including $N$ users, $M$ relays, and one common destination. The source-relay (S-R) channels are assumed to be Nakagami-$m$ fading, while the source-destination (S-D) and the relay-destination (R-D) channels are considered to be Rayleigh fading. The CNCC scheme exploits a good $(N+M, N, \nu)$ systematic convolutional code with the free distance of $d_{\text{free}}$ over the $GF(2)$ by the network’s nodes. The numerical results demonstrate that the BER of the CNCC scheme is always better than that of the cooperative schemes based on the linear network coding (LNC), with the same network throughput of $R = N/(N+M)$ symbols per channel use (spcu). The results also indicate that its diversity order is very close to $d_{\text{free}}$ for the Nakagami-$m$ fading S-R channels with $m \geq 2$.

Index Terms—Cooperative networks, linear network coding, convolutional network-coded cooperation, diversity order, network throughput.

I. INTRODUCTION

ONE of the most important and intrinsic features of the wireless networks is fading. This phenomenon induces many adverse effects in the networks, and considerably reduces the performance. Diversity is a well-known technique to deal with fading. Cooperative relay-based networks have been proposed to combat fading, by benefiting from the spatial diversity through the relays. Different cooperative transmission schemes have been introduced in the literature. The basic and common shortcoming of these schemes is the reduction of the network throughput. To eliminate this problem, the idea of using network coding in the cooperative networks has been suggested in the recent works.

After its appearance in [1] and later in [2], the linear network coding has been exploited in many different fields due to its capability to increase the network throughput. The more practical and spectral effective version of network coding, physical layer network coding (PLNC), has been proposed in [3]. The authors of [4]–[9] have designed different cooperative transmission schemes based on the LNC to simultaneously improve the diversity order and the network throughput. Specifically, [9] considered a cooperative network with $N$ users and $M$ relays, and proposed an effective cooperative scheme, which has better performance, compared to the other similar schemes, with the diversity order of $M+1$ and the network throughput of $N/(N+M)$ spcu.

In this paper, we introduce a novel Convolutional Network-Coded Cooperation (CNCC) scheme in a cooperative network consisting of $N$ users, $M$ relays, and one common destination. It will be shown that the CNCC scheme has better BER performance and diversity order than the LNC-based cooperative schemes with the same network throughput. The proposed scheme utilizes a good systematic $(N+M, N, \nu)$ convolutional code, where $\nu$ is the constraint length of the code. Hence, the network throughput is equal to the rate of the code, that is, $R = N/(N+M)$ spcu, the same as that of [9].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we represent the network model. In Section III after briefly describing the cooperative transmission scheme based on the LNC, we introduce our proposed scheme. In Section IV, we theoretically evaluate the performance of the CNCC scheme in the ideal S-R channels. We provide the numerical results in Section V, and ultimately, conclude the paper in Section VI.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider a cooperative network in which the $N$ users transmit their independent data to a common destination through the $M$ relays, as shown in Fig. 1. We suppose that each transmitted packet of the users contains $L$ information bits. The transmission process is accomplished through the orthogonal time slots. As a result, one packet is transmitted during each time slot of length $T$ (sec) by one of the users or the relays. The S-D and R-D channels are assumed to be Rayleigh fading channels. We assume that the relays are placed close to the users, and thus, the S-R channels are stronger than the S-D channels. We consider the Nakagami-$m$ fading for the S-R channels. We assume that the nodes of the network have been equipped with the interleaver and the deinterleaver. If these interleavers have a sufficient depth, the successive information bits transmitted from the users and relays can be well assuming to experience independent fading, after being deinterleaved by the corresponding receiver. We also consider the BPSK modulation. The received signals from the $i$-th user and the $j$-th relay in the destination at their corresponding time slots can be written as $y_{s_i, t}(t) = \sqrt{E_b} h_{s_i, t}(t) x_{s_i, t}(t) + n_{s_i, t}(t)$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and $y_{r_j, t}(t) = \sqrt{E_b} h_{r_j, t}(t) x_{r_j, t}(d) + n_{r_j, t}(d)$, $j = 1, \ldots, M$, respectively, where $h_{s_i, t}(t)$ and $h_{r_j, t}(d)$ denote the i.i.d. Rayleigh fading channel coefficients from the $i$-th user ($s_i$) and the $j$-th relay ($r_j$) to the destination, which are assumed to be independent for different $i$ and $j$. $x_{s_i, t}(t)$ and $x_{r_j, t}(d)$ are the transmitted BPSK symbols from the $s_i$ and $r_j$ to the destination, respectively. $n_{s_i, t}(d)$ and $n_{r_j, t}(d)$ are the i.i.d. white Gaussian noise components with zero mean and the same variances of $N_0/2$. $E_b$ denotes the transmitted energy per bit. Similarly, the received signals from the $i$-th user by the $j$-th relay is $y_{s_i, r_j}(t) = \sqrt{E_b} h_{s_i, r_j}(t) x_{s_i, r_j}(t) + n_{s_i, r_j}(t)$, where $h_{s_i, r_j}(t)$ are the i.i.d. Nakagami-$m$ fading channel coefficients. $x_{s_i, r_j}(t)$ and $n_{s_i, r_j}(t)$ denote the transmitted BPSK symbols from the $s_i$ to the $r_j$, and the i.i.d. white Gaussian noise components, respectively. We assume that all the S-R channels have the same average energies, $\bar{h}_{s_i, r_j}^2 = \bar{h}_{r_j, d}^2$, and similarly, for the S-D and R-D channels we have $\bar{h}_{s_i, d}^2 = \bar{h}_{s_i, t}^2$, $\bar{h}_{r_j, t}^2 = \bar{h}_{r_j, d}^2$ for the
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all \(i\) and \(j\). As well known, the path loss has a dominant effect in these average energies, such that \(h_{sr}^{-1} = (d_{sr}/d_{sr})^{-\eta} h_{rd}^{-1} = (d_{sr}/d_{sd})^{-\eta} h_{rd}^{-1}\), where \(d_{sr}\), \(d_{sd}\), and \(d_{rd}\) are the S-R, S-D, and R-D distances. \(\eta\) denotes the path loss exponent.

### III. The Proposed CNCC Scheme

There exists a tradeoff between the network throughput and the users’ diversity order. As a result, the performance of the cooperative schemes is usually compared in terms of these two parameters. In [9] a cooperative scheme based on linear network coding has been proposed, which yields a better tradeoff between diversity order and network throughput compared to the previous ones. The authors of [9] have shown that in a cooperative network with \(N\) users and \(M\) relays, if the generator matrix of a systematic \((N+M, N, M+1)\) maximum distance separable (MDS) block code over a finite field \(GF(q)\) is used as a network coding matrix, the network throughput and the diversity orders of users will be \(N/(N+M)\) spcu and \(M+1\), respectively. However, the MDS codes are required to be designed in the large enough finite fields.

Our motivation for the current work is as follows: In fact, utilization of network coding in a cooperative network can be considered as using a systematic linear block code which performs in the network level by the nodes of the network. Hence, the problem of designing a high performance LNC-based scheme is converted to the problem of designing a good linear \((n, k, d_{\text{min}})\) block code with the rate \(R = k/n\) close to 1 and the maximum possible \(d_{\text{min}}\), where from the Singleton bound, we have \(d_{\text{min}} \leq n - k + 1\). Using a linear code with high rate and high minimum distance will result in a good diversity-throughput tradeoff for the LNC-based cooperative scheme. Though the MDS codes used in [9] reach to the Singleton bound, they should be designed in the large enough finite fields. To achieve the higher diversity with the same network throughput, in the following, we propose a new cooperative transmission scheme based on network coding, which uses the convolutional codes instead of the block codes.

In a cooperative network with \(N\) users and \(M\) relays, the CNCC scheme exploits a good systematic \((N+M, N, \nu)\) convolutional code designed over \(GF(2)\) with the generator matrix as

\[
G(D) = \begin{bmatrix}
I_{N \times N} & P_{N \times M}(D)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(1)

where \(I_{N \times N}\) is the \(N \times N\) identity matrix, and \(P_{N \times M}(D)\) is an \(N \times M\) matrix whose entries are either a polynomial or a rational function of \(D\). The good convolutional codes own the highest free distance among the codes with the same rates and the same constraint lengths. All the \(M\) columns of \(P_{N \times M}(D)\) or some of them are realized in each relay. That is, each relay has a memory equal to the constraint length \((\nu)\) of the convolutional code, and all or some of the \(M\) parity packets of the code can be generated in each relay. Each \(N + M\) columns of the generator matrix (1) is dedicated to one separate time slot with the length of \(T\) (sec). The first user in Fig. 1 transmits (after modulation) its own interleaved packet including \(L\) bits at the first time slot. As a result, the relays decode and deinterleave the received packet from the user 1. At the second to \(N\)-th time slots, the users 2 to \(N\), respectively transmit (similar to the user 1) their own interleaved packets of \(L\) bits at their own orthogonal dedicated time slots, which the relays receive, decode, and then deinterleave them. So, after the \(N\) time slots (related to \(I_{N \times N}\) in the generator matrix (1)), all the \(N\) users have transmitted their own packets to the destination, and the relays have their decoded packets. Now, the parity parts of the generator matrix, i.e. \(P_{N \times M}(D)\), can be generated in the following ways: A. First, all the \(M\) columns of the \(P_{N \times M}(D)\) are realized in all the relays. Then, based on some protocols, the destination selects only one of the relays with the highest R-D channel received SNR to participate. The selected relay computes the \(M\) parity packets, and transmits each interleaved packet of length \(L\) in different time slots. So, the \(M\) parity packets are transmitted in the time slots \(N+1\) to \(N+M\). As a second strategy: B. Each column of \(P_{N \times M}(D)\) is realized in one relay. Hence, each relay \(i\), for \(i = 1\) to \(M\), computes one parity packet according to the \(i\)-th column of matrix \(P_{N \times M}(D)\), and then transmits its own interleaved packet in the time slot of \(N+i\). As a third strategy: C. Instead of \(M\) relays, the network can be implemented by only one relay in which all the columns of \(P_{N \times M}(D)\) are realized. The relay computes the \(M\) parity packets and transmits each one in dedicated time slot as explained above. In this letter, we consider the two last strategies, and leave the first one, which also takes advantage of spatial diversity for our future work. For the second and third strategies, after \(N+M\) time slots, the destination uses the \(N\) packets, received directly from the \(N\) users, and the \(M\) parity packets, received through either strategies B or C, to decode the original transmitted packets of each user. As the \(N\) packets have been delivered to the destination during the \(N+M\) channel uses, the network throughput is \(R = N/(N+M)\) spcu. The receiver at the destination deinterleaves the \(N+M\) received packets, and applies them to the Viterbi decoder to decode the transmitted packets of the \(N\) users. In the CNCC scheme, the diversity order of the users reaches to \(d_{\text{free}}\), when the S-R channels are ideal. When the S-R channels are Nakagami-\(m\) fading, the diversity order reduces but the performance of the CNCC scheme is yet better than the LNC in terms of the BER, as our numerical results indicate. The ideal S-R channels' BER is a lower bound for that of the Nakagami-\(m\) S-R channels. As a result, the diversity order of the users achieved in the ideal S-R channels is an upper bound for that of the users in the Nakagami-\(m\) S-R channels. As an example for the CNCC scheme, consider a network with two users \((N = 2)\) and one relay \((M = 1)\).

We exploit a good systematic \((3, 2, 3)\) convolutional code with the following generator matrix \(G_1(D)\), taken from [10], which
has \( d_{free} = 4 \). Considering the ideal S-R channels, the users achieve the diversity order of \( D = d_{free} = 4 \) in the CNCC scheme, whereas using the linear network coding in such a cooperative network leads to \( D = M + 1 = 2 \).

\[
G_1(D) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & \frac{1}{1+D^2+D^3} \\
0 & 1 & \frac{1}{1+D^2+D^3} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] (2)

IV. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

The general theoretical analysis of the CNCC scheme for the Nakagami-\( m \) S-R channels is complicated due to the memory of the relays, which can cause the error propagation. Hence, in this section, we provide a theoretical analysis for the CNCC scheme when the S-R channels are considered to be ideal. The BER in the non-ideal S-R channels is computed by the simulations. In the ideal S-R channels, the BER of the CNCC scheme is equal to the BER of a good systematic \((N + M, N, \nu)\) convolutional code exploited in the network scale. From [10], the BER of such a code with the free distance of \( d_{free} \) is upper bounded by

\[
P_b \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{d=d_{free}}^{\infty} B_d P_d
\] (3)

where \( P_d \) is the probability of an error event with the Hamming distance of \( d \), and \( B_d \) is expressed in terms of the bit weight enumerating function (WEF) of the code as

\[
B(X) = \sum_{d=d_{free}}^{\infty} B_d X^d = \frac{\partial A(X,W)}{\partial W} \bigg|_{W=1}
\]

where \( A(X,W) \) is the WEF of the convolutional code. From (3), we need to obtain an upper bound for \( P_b \) in the Rayleigh fading channels. For the BPSK modulation and the i.i.d. Rayleigh channel coefficients (due to the interleaved channels), the upper bound of \( P_d \), similar to [11], can be easily obtained as (bound \((a)\))

\[
P_d \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{1+\gamma_{sd}} \right)^{d_1} \left( \frac{1}{1+\gamma_{rd}} \right)^{d_2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{1+\gamma} \right)^{d}
\] (4)

where \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \) are, respectively, the Hamming weights due to the users’ bits and the parity bits with \( d_1 + d_2 = d \). The average received SNRs from the users and the relays at the destination are \( \gamma = \gamma_{sd} = \frac{E_s}{N_0}d_{sd} \) and \( \gamma_{rd} = \frac{E_s}{N_0}d_{rd} \), respectively. The upper bound \((b)\) is due to the fact that \( \gamma \leq \gamma_{rd} \). From (3) and (4), the upper bound of the BER in the CNCC scheme with the ideal S-R channels, and consequently, the achieved diversity order are respectively given by

\[
P_b \leq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{d=d_{free}}^{\infty} B_d \left( \frac{1}{1+\gamma} \right)^d = \frac{1}{2N} B(X) \bigg|_{X = \frac{1}{1+\gamma}},
\] (5)

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

For the numerical evaluation, we consider three cooperative networks under the strategies \( B \) and \( C \): The first with two users \((N = 2)\) and one relay \((M = 1)\), the second with two users \((N = 2)\) and two relays or two parity packets \((M = 2)\), and the third with three users \((N = 3)\) and one relay \((M = 1)\). For the first network, we exploit the good systematic \((3,2,3)\) convolutional code with the generator matrix (2). For the second and the third networks, the good systematic \((4,2,3)\) and \((4,3,3)\) convolutional codes respectively with the following generator matrices have been exploited:

\[
G_2(D) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & \frac{1+D^2+D^3}{1+D+D^3} \\
0 & 1 & \frac{1+D^2}{1+D+D^3} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] (7)

\[
G_3(D) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & \frac{1+D^2+D^3}{1+D+D^3} \\
0 & 1 & \frac{1+D^2}{1+D+D^3} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] (8)

The free distances of \( G_2(D) \) and \( G_3(D) \) are respectively \( d_{free} = 6 \) and \( d_{free} = 4 \). In Fig. 2, we have plotted the BER of the users versus the average SNR \((\gamma)\) for the three aforementioned networks with the ideal S-R channels by simulation. For the comparison, we have also included the plots related to upper bound (5). As can be observed, by the increase of relays, the free distance of the exploited convolutional code increases which results in higher diversity order for the users at the expense of reduced throughput. Moreover, by the increase of the number of users, for the fixed number of relays and for the fixed constraint length, the free distance or the coding gain reduces, while the network throughput increases. As expected, for the ideal S-R channels, the strategies \( B \) and \( C \) perform exactly the same.

For the Nakagami-\( m \) S-R channels in our simulations, we have considered \( d_{sd}/d_{sr} = 5, 10 \) and \( m = 1, 2, 3, \infty \), and the path loss exponent equal to \( \eta = 2 \). Because the relays are very close to the users, we have assumed that \( \gamma = \gamma_{rd} \). As well known, \( m = 1 \) and \( m = \infty \) are respectively related to the Rayleigh fading and AWGN channels. The strategies \( B \) and \( C \) become the same, when we have one relay in the network. In Fig. 3, we have compared the strategies \( B \) and \( C \) in the second network for the Nakagami-\( m \) SR channels. As can be realized, while the both strategies have the same throughput, the strategy \( C \) demonstrates excellent performance (especially in the weak S-R channels) compared to the strategy \( B \) for the ideal interleaved transmission considered. The reason is that when the S-R channels are non-ideal, the decoded packets of the users in the two relays, and consequently, the encoded parity packets might be different from each other, and as a result, in the strategy \( B \), the exploited convolutional code can not work properly. So, among these two strategies, we propose the strategy \( C \) in the CNCC scheme, and we consider this strategy in the following numerical results. The simulation results for the first, second, and third networks under the strategy \( C \) have been plotted respectively in Fig. 4, Fig. 5, and Fig. 6 for the Nakagami-\( m \) S-R channels. In the second and third networks, the LNC scheme can not be implemented over \( GF(2) \) and requires higher fields. As a result, the BER of the LNC scheme has been only plotted in Fig. 4 (the first network)
for the ideal S-R channels. From the results, we can observe that when the S-R channels’ conditions get better (i.e. $m$ increases), or the relays stand closer to the users (i.e. $d_{sd}/d_{sr}$ increases), the performance of the CNCC scheme in terms of the users’ BER enhances and reaches to the BER of the ideal S-R channels with the diversity order of $D = d_{free}$. Fig. 6 shows that for a fixed complexity (i.e. fixed $\nu$), by the increase of the number of $M$ the performance improves (at the expense of the throughput loss), while by the increase of the number of users (increased throughput) the performance decreases. Hence, for avoiding the performance degradation in the CNCC scheme we must increase $\nu$, while in the LNC scheme the higher finite fields must be used for this sake.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we have proposed a new cooperative transmission scheme for a cooperative network with $N$ users and $M$ relays named as the CNCC scheme, with the Nakagami-\(m\) fading S-R channels and Rayleigh fading S-D and R-D channels under the three strategies A, B, and C. The performance of the proposed scheme has been evaluated for the strategies B and C by the simulation, and the strategy A has been left for the future work. Due to the memory in the relays, the strategy C performs much better than the strategy B, despite of having one relay instead of $M$. So, we suggest to use this strategy for the CNCC scheme. For the ideal S-R channels the upper bound on the BER and then the diversity order have been evaluated analytically. Our proposed scheme is most suitable for the networks with the relays close to the sources. Our results indicated that in the Nakagami-\(m\) fading
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