

# Performance Metrics for Systems with Soft-Decision FEC and Probabilistic Shaping

Tsuyoshi Yoshida, *Member, IEEE*, Magnus Karlsson, *Fellow, OSA; Senior Member, IEEE*,  
and Erik Agrell, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—High-throughput optical communication systems utilize binary soft-decision forward error correction (SD-FEC) with bit interleaving over the bit channels. The generalized mutual information (GMI) is an achievable rate in such systems and is known to be a good predictor of the bit error rate after SD-FEC decoding (post-FEC BER) for uniform signaling. However, for probabilistically shaped (nonuniform) signaling, we find that the GMI, even if normalized with the signal entropy, is less correlated with the post-FEC BER. We show that the mutual information based on the distribution of the single bit signal, and its asymmetric log-likelihood ratio, are better predictors of the post-FEC BER. In simulations over the Gaussian channel, we find that the prediction accuracy, quantified as the peak-to-peak deviation of the post-FEC BER within a set of different modulation formats and distributions, can be improved more than 10 times compared with the normalized GMI.

**Index Terms**—Bit error rate, bitwise decoding, forward error correction, generalized mutual information, modulation, mutual information, optical fiber communication, probabilistic shaping.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Performance metrics are key in the design, evaluation, and comparison of communication schemes. In optical systems, the bit error rate (BER) of the received data is traditionally the most important metric to quantify the performance. In modern optical communications, the BER requirement is typically  $< 10^{-15}$ . After forward error correction (FEC) was introduced, it became desirable to find other performance metrics than the received BER after FEC decoding, the so-called *post-FEC BER*. This is because measurements or simulations of very low BER after FEC decoding are time-consuming and of less general significance as they only apply to the chosen FEC code. In addition, FEC decoder hardware is usually not available in most laboratories.

For this purpose, the BER before the decoder, the *pre-FEC BER*, or the Q-factor derived from this BER value, became common to predict the post-FEC BER [1]. These metrics work reasonably well with hard-decision FEC decoding and binary modulation in each dimension, such as on-off keying, binary phase-shift keying, or quaternary phase-shift keying.

The deployment of coherent detection with digital signal processing [2] made modulation formats more complex and diverse, and soft-decision (SD) FEC became widely utilized [3]. In such systems, the pre-FEC BER is insufficient to predict the post-FEC BER, especially for the purpose of comparing different modulation formats. The mutual information (MI) as a metric was introduced in optical communications in [4] and was considered for other channels in, e.g., [5], [6]. The MI is well suited for optical systems using coded modulation

with nonbinary FEC codes or bit-interleaved coded modulation (BICM) with iterative demapping. However, even if such schemes work well in theory, practical optical systems often use bitwise receivers, i.e., BICM without iterative demapping, due to the simpler implementation, and the MI does not accurately predict the post-FEC BER of BICM schemes [7]. Instead, Alvarado *et al.* proposed the generalized MI (GMI) as a performance metric in optical communications with binary SD-FEC and bitwise decoding [7].

Shaping is now receiving wide interest in the optical communications community, as a means to close the gap between achievable rates with common uniform quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM) formats and the capacity-achieving nonuniform input distribution [8]–[13]. In this paper, we investigate, for the first time, how well certain information-theoretic metrics can predict the post-FEC BER in probabilistically shaped systems with binary FEC codes and bitwise SD decoding. It turns out that the GMI is not as accurate metric in this case as with uniform signaling, not even after normalization with the signal entropy. A metric recently proposed in [13] will be discussed as well. Numerical simulations show that two other metrics, based on the distribution of the single bit stream and the conditional distribution of log-likelihood ratios (LLRs or L-values), have significantly better correlation with the post-FEC BER.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PERFORMANCE METRICS

In this section, the system model is described and the considered performance metrics are introduced.

### A. System model with nonuniform signaling

Fig. 1 shows the system model under consideration, which is the state-of-the-art configuration described in [8]. The source data stream, consisting of independent, uniform bits, is processed in a distribution matcher and converted into a nonuniform bit sequence  $A$ . The binary FEC encoder treats  $A$  as information bits and creates the bit sequence  $B$  by inserting parity bits. When nonuniform (probabilistically shaped) signaling is used, the FEC encoding has to be systematic. Interleaving can be included in the encoder, but the nonuniform distribution must not be changed by encoding or interleaving. The bit sequence  $B$  is demultiplexed into  $m$  parallel bit tributaries (bit channels)  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m$  used for  $2^m$ -PAM mapping to the symbol  $X$ . The received PAM symbol  $Y$  from the optical channel is demapped to the bit tributaries' LLRs  $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_m$ . These are multiplexed into a single LLR




Fig. 1. System model for nonuniform PAM signaling with bit-interleaved binary SD-FEC.

sequence  $L$  and decoded. The decoder jointly processes all bit tributaries. The decoded bit sequence  $D$  is finally recovered by the distribution dematcher. Bit errors have to be eliminated before distribution dematching to avoid error propagation. This system model can apply also to uniform signaling by removing the distribution matcher and the dematcher.

### B. Performance metrics for uniform signaling

The BER after FEC decoding,  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}}$ , and before decoding,  $\text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$ , are defined as, resp.,

$$\text{BER}_{\text{post}} = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} P_{A,D}(b, 1-b), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{BER}_{\text{pre}} = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} P_{B, \text{sign}(L)}(b, (-1)^{1-b}), \quad (2)$$

where  $P$  denotes the joint probability of the indicated random variables.  $\text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$  has a one-to-one relation to the Q-factor via  $Q = \sqrt{2} \text{erfc}^{-1}(\text{BER}_{\text{pre}})$  for discussions of system margin. The normalized GMI  $I_g$  is defined via the mutual information  $I(B_i; L_i)$  between  $B_i$  and  $L_i$  as

$$I_g = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m I(B_i; L_i). \quad (3)$$

The LLRs  $L_i$  are in general

$$L_i = \log \frac{\sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^m, b_i=0} P_B(\mathbf{b}) p_{Y|B}(y | \mathbf{b})}{\sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^m, b_i=1} P_B(\mathbf{b}) p_{Y|B}(y | \mathbf{b})}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{B} = [B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m]$ ,  $p_{Y|B}(y | \mathbf{b})$  is the real-valued channel assumed in the demapper [11, eq. (9)–(11)]. To predict  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}}$  in the case of uniform signaling with a binary FEC and bitwise SD decoding,  $I_g$  is better than  $\text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$  [7].

Throughout this paper, the receiver assumes a Gaussian  $p_{Y|B}$ . In this case, the GMI of a uniform signal set can be estimated from the ensemble of transmitted bits  $B_i(j)$  at time index  $j$  and the corresponding LLRs  $L_i(j)$  over  $n_s$  symbols as [7, eq. (30)]

$$I_g \approx \hat{I}_g = 1 - \frac{1}{mn_s} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_s} f(B_i(j), L_i(j)), \quad (5)$$

$$f(\beta, \lambda) = \log_2(1 + \exp(-(-1)^\beta \lambda)). \quad (6)$$

The function  $f(B_i(j), L_i(j))$  can be regarded as the information loss of the sampled bit. Once ensemble representations of  $B_i(j)$  and  $L_i(j)$  are provided, these ensembles can be joined into ensemble representations of  $B(k)$

and  $L(k)$  simply by disregarding the channel index  $i$  and using sample index  $k$ . The statistical relations between  $B$ ,  $L$ , and their corresponding tributaries  $B_i$  and  $L_i$  are  $P_B(b) = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m P_{B_i}(b)$ ,  $p_L(l) = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m p_{L_i}(l)$ , and  $p_{B,L}(b, l) = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m p_{B_i, L_i}(b, l)$ . This is because  $I_g = I_s$  for uniform signaling [14, Theorem 4], where

$$I_s = I(B; L). \quad (7)$$

is called *single-bit MI (SMI)* in this paper. An estimate of the SMI can be obtained from the transmitted bits  $B(k)$  and the corresponding LLRs  $L(k)$  as

$$\hat{I}_s = 1 - \frac{1}{mn_s} \sum_{k=1}^{mn_s} f(B(k), L(k)). \quad (8)$$

### C. Performance metrics for nonuniform signaling

As metrics for nonuniform signaling,  $I_g$  and  $I_s$  need to be renormalized in order to span the range  $[0, 1]$ . To this end, (3) and (7) are replaced by the more general expressions

$$I_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m I(B_i; L_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^m H(B_i)}, \quad (9)$$

$$I_s = \frac{I(B; L)}{H(B)}, \quad (10)$$

where  $H(\mathcal{B}) = -\sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} P_B(b) \log_2 P_B(b)$  is the entropy of the discrete variable  $\mathcal{B}$ .

We further consider the information quantity from an SD-FEC decoder operation, which works based on the hard-decision value  $\text{sign}(L)$  and the reliability  $|L|$ . If  $|L|$  is large, there will be less probability to flip the hard-decision value. Thus, the *asymmetric LLR*

$$L_a = (-1)^B L \quad (11)$$

which is included in (6), is an important quantity, as it accounts for both the sign and the magnitude of the LLR. The distribution

$$p_{L_a}(l) = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} P_B(b) p_{L|B}((-1)^b l | b), \quad (12)$$

where  $p_{L|B}(l | b) = (1/P_B(b)) \sum_{i=1}^m p_{B_i, L_i}(b, l)$ , should be as asymmetric as possible for better decoding performance.<sup>1</sup> Then, we can quantify the asymmetry of  $L_a$  by the *asymmetric information (ASI)*

$$I_a = 1 - h(L_a | |L_a|) = 1 + h(|L_a|) - h(L_a), \quad (13)$$

which is defined in  $[0, 1]$ , where  $h(\mathcal{A}) = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \log_2 p_{\mathcal{A}}(a) da$  is the differential entropy of the continuous variable  $\mathcal{A}$ .

All metrics defined for nonuniform signaling can be applied to uniform signaling having symmetric distributions ( $P_B(0) = P_B(1) = 1/2$  and  $p_{L|B}(l | 0) = p_{L|B}(-l | 1)$ ), because it is just a special case of nonuniform signaling. In this case,  $\sum_{i=1}^m H(B_i) = m$ ,  $H(B) = 1$ ,  $h(L) = 1 + h(|L_a|)$ , and  $h(L | B) = h(L_a)$ . Therefore, (10) and (13) are identical and  $I_g = I_s = I_a$ .

<sup>1</sup>The distribution (12) can be obtained by setting  $b = 0$  in the distribution of ‘‘symmetrized’’ LLRs in [14, eq. (19)].




Fig. 2. Simulated post-FEC BER as a function of (a) pre-FEC BER  $BER_{pre}$ , (b) normalized GMI  $I_g$ , (c) normalized SMI  $I_s$  and (d) ASI  $I_a$ .

TABLE I  
8-PAM SIGNAL PARAMETERS FOR SIMULATION.

Condition	Uni.	Nonuni. (i)	Nonuni. (ii)	Nonuni. (iii)
$\sum_{i=2}^m N_{B_i}/N_s$	2	1.788	1.934	1.979
$\sum_{i=1}^m H(B_i)$	3	2.841	2.960	2.996
$H(B)$	1	0.9832	0.9968	0.9997

### III. SIMULATIONS

Here we will compare the above performance metrics as indicators of the post-FEC BER. We apply *probabilistic amplitude shaping* [8], which is the current state-of-the-art shaping scheme in optical communication [11]. Three nonuniform distributions based on 64-QAM were simulated by applying probabilistic shaping to 8-PAM in each dimension. To generate these distributions, a constant-composite distribution matcher was employed [9], [10], where the output block length  $N_s$  was set to 1024. The probabilities used are the same as in [12, Table I (a)–(c)], and some measures of their nonuniformity are indicated in Table I. PAM mapping is based on Gray code.  $B_1$  is sign-bit, and  $B_2, \dots, B_m$  are amplitude-bits.  $B_1$  carries the uniform information bits of the PAM symbol or FEC parity bits.  $N_{B_i}$  shows the number of the input bits of bit tributary  $B_i$  to distribution matcher per block. As benchmarks, uniform signaling of 16-QAM and 64-QAM was also simulated. As SD-FEC codes, we utilized the standardized DVB-S2 binary low-density parity check codes [15], having a codeword length of 64800. The examined code rates  $R_c$  were  $2/3$ ,  $3/4$ ,  $5/6$ , and  $9/10$ . 500 codewords were tested in each configuration. The optical channel was assumed to be Gaussian with the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) varied with 0.1 dB granularity. The FEC

decoder's internal calculation precision was floating-point with 20 decoder iterations. The estimates in (5) and (8) are only valid for uniform signaling, so to obtain  $I_g$  and  $I_s$  practically, we calculated them from (9) and (10), resp, while  $I_a$  was calculated from (13). To estimate these three quantities, the corresponding differential entropies were calculated as in [16, Sec. 8.3] from discretized versions of the LLRs  $L_i$ ,  $L$ , and  $L_a$ , whose distributions were estimated using histograms.

The results are shown in Fig. 2, where it is desirable that all curves for the same code rate should be close to each other, if the quantity on the horizontal axis is to be useful to predict the post-FEC BER. For most of the metrics, the difference due to modulation format and nonuniformity tends to increase at lower code rates  $R_c$ . According to Fig. 2(a),  $BER_{pre}$  works surprisingly well for these signal sets and will provide guidelines for real system performance. Fig. 2(b) shows that the normalized GMI  $I_g$  is not a good metric for nonuniform signaling. The required  $I_g$  for nonuniform signaling is clearly less than that for uniform signaling to achieve the same  $BER_{post}$  value such as  $10^{-4}$ . The differences would be even larger with  $I_g$  calculated from (3) rather than (9), since the normalization factor  $\sum_{i=1}^m H(B_i) < m$  with nonuniform signaling. Fig. 2(c) indicates that the normalized SMI  $I_s$  is better correlated with  $BER_{post}$  for nonuniform signaling than  $I_g$ . This is a benefit of changing the treatment from parallel bit channels into a single bit sequence, which is what the FEC encoder and decoder will see. Finally, Fig. 2(d) shows that the ASI performs better than the other metrics by using the asymmetric distribution of the LLR  $L_a$ . To predict  $BER_{post}$  for nonuniform signaling, it is therefore more efficient




Fig. 3. Comparison of prediction accuracy for (a) the three metrics at  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}} = 10^{-4}$ , and (b) the post-FEC BER variation  $\Delta\text{BER}_{\text{post}}$  around  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}} = 10^{-4}$  among the studied cases.

to use the single marginalized distribution of  $L_a$  than the entropy sum based on the individual bit channels' distribution, as for  $I_g$ .

The extension of normalized GMI proposed in [13] is  $(\sum_{i=1}^m I(B_i; L_i) + m - H(X))/m$ . While it takes on quite similar values as  $I_a$  in the regimes of practical interest, we note that its target set is  $[1 - H(X)/m, 1]$  for  $\text{SNR} \in [0, \infty]$ , which is different from the above metrics that lie within  $[0, 1]$ .

Fig. 3 summarizes the prediction accuracy at  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}} = 10^{-4}$ . Fig. 3(a) compares the information quantities  $1 - \text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$ ,  $I_g$ ,  $I_s$ , and  $I_a$ . Relatively large deviations are mainly seen for nonuniform signaling (especially case (i), which is the most nonuniform) with the GMI metric. When considering all signals at the same BER, the maximum metric variations in Fig. 3(a) are 0.0026, 0.015, 0.0048, and 0.0020 for  $1 - \text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$ ,  $I_g$ ,  $I_s$ , and  $I_a$ , respectively. Note that the prediction accuracy for  $1 - \text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$ ,  $I_g$ , and  $I_s$  tends to decrease for low  $R_c$  or strong shaping, whereas the accuracy for  $I_a$  does not. In comparisons of coding, shaping, and modulation schemes, a difference of several percent spectral efficiency tends to be relevant [11], so a prediction variation in  $I_g$  (0.015 in this case) may potentially affect such a comparison. Fig. 3(b) shows the relative BER variation  $\Delta\text{BER}_{\text{post}} = \text{BER}_{\text{post,max}}/\text{BER}_{\text{post,min}}$  around the specific metric value that gives  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}} = 10^{-4}$  on average. Thus  $\Delta\text{BER}_{\text{post}}$  is a measure of the correlation between  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}}$  and the chosen metric. The maximum  $\Delta\text{BER}_{\text{post}}$  is  $10^{1.9}$ ,  $10^{4.1}$ ,  $10^{1.5}$ , and  $10^{0.73}$  for  $\text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$ ,  $I_g$ ,  $I_s$  and  $I_a$ , resp.  $I_a$  is clearly the best metric having more than 10 times better accuracy than  $\text{BER}_{\text{pre}}$  and  $I_g$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have compared performance metrics to predict the post-FEC BER with binary SD-FEC in systems with probabilistic shaping. The normalized GMI has a prediction variation of more than  $10^4$  around  $\text{BER}_{\text{post}} = 10^{-4}$  with a low-density parity check code for nonuniform signaling. By employing the

proposed SMI and ASI metrics, the variation can be reduced to 30 and 5, respectively. While the prediction variation of normalized GMI and SMI increases in the case of lower  $R_c$  or stronger shaping, the variation by ASI does not seem to depend thereon. Thus, once we know the ASI limit for a certain FEC code, we can infer the practical achievable rate by only calculating the ASI without FEC decoding.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] ITU-T, "Forward error correction for submarine systems," 2000. [Online]. Available: [www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-G.975](http://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-G.975)
- [2] K. Roberts *et al.*, "Performance of dual-polarization QPSK for optical transport systems," *J. Lightw. Technol.*, vol. 27, no. 16, pp. 3546–3559, Aug. 2009.
- [3] F. Chang, K. Onohara, and T. Mizuochi, "Forward error correction for 100 G transport networks," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. S48–S55, Mar. 2010.
- [4] A. Leven, F. Vacondio, L. Schmalen, S. ten Brink, and W. Idler, "Estimation of soft FEC performance in optical transmission experiments," *IEEE Photon. Technol. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 20, pp. 1547–1549, Oct. 2011.
- [5] L. Wan, S. Tsai, and M. Almgren, "A fading-insensitive performance metric for a unified link quality model," in *IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conf.*, Las Vegas, NV, Apr. 2006.
- [6] M. Franceschini, G. Ferrari, and R. Raheli, "Does the performance of LDPC codes depend on the channel?" *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 2129–2132, Dec. 2006.
- [7] A. Alvarado, E. Agrell, D. Lavery, R. Maher, and P. Bayvel, "Replacing the soft FEC limit paradigm in the design of optical communication systems," *J. Lightw. Technol.*, vol. 33, no. 20, pp. 4338–4352, Oct. 2015.
- [8] G. Böcherer, F. Steiner, and P. Schulte, "Bandwidth efficient and rate-matched low-density parity-check coded modulation," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 4651–4665, Dec. 2015.
- [9] P. Schulte and G. Böcherer, "Constant composition distribution matching," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 430–434, Jan. 2016.
- [10] P. Schulte. A fixed-to-fixed length distribution matcher in C/MATLAB. [Online]. Available: <http://www.beam.to/ccdm>
- [11] F. Buchali, F. Steiner, G. Böcherer, L. Schmalen, P. Schulte, and W. Idler, "Rate adaptation and reach increase by probabilistically shaped 64-QAM: an experimental demonstration," *IEEE Photon. Technol. Lett.*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 1599–1609, Apr. 2016.
- [12] T. Fehenberger, D. Lavery, R. Maher, A. Alvarado, P. Bayvel, and N. Hanik, "Sensitivity gains by mismatched probabilistic shaping for optical communication systems," *IEEE Photon. Technol. Lett.*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 786–789, Apr. 2016.
- [13] J. Cho *et al.*, "Trans-Atlantic field trial using probabilistically shaped 64-QAM at high spectral efficiencies and single-carrier real-time 250-Gb/s 16-QAM," in *Proc. Opt. Fiber Commun. Conf. (OFC)*, Los Angeles, CA, Mar. 2017, p. Th5B.3.
- [14] M. Ivanov, C. Häger, F. Brännström, A. Graell i Amat, A. Alvarado, and E. Agrell, "On the information loss of the max-log approximation in BICM systems," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3011–3025, 2016.
- [15] European Telecommunications Standards Institute, "Second generation framing structure, channel coding and modulation systems for broadcasting, interactive services, news gathering and other broadband satellite applications; Part 1 (DVB-S2)," ETSI Standard EN 302 307-1 V1.4.1, Nov. 2014. [Online]. Available: [www.dvb.org/standards](http://www.dvb.org/standards)
- [16] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2006.