

OPTIMUM RECEPTION IN AN IMPULSIVE INTERFERENCE ENVIRONMENT

A. D. SPAULDING
DAVID MIDDLETON



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary

Betsy Ancker-Johnson, Ph. D.
Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS
John M. Richardson, Acting Director



June 1975

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS
STATEMENT OF MISSION**

The mission of the Office of Telecommunications in the Department of Commerce is to assist the Department in fostering, serving, and promoting the nation's economic development and technological advancement by improving man's comprehension of telecommunication science and by assuring effective use and growth of the nation's telecommunication resources.

In carrying out this mission, the Office

- Conducts research needed in the evaluation and development of policy as required by the Department of Commerce
- Assists other government agencies in the use of telecommunications
- Conducts research, engineering, and analysis in the general field of telecommunication science to meet government needs
- Acquires, analyzes, synthesizes, and disseminates information for the efficient use of the nation's telecommunication resources.
- Performs analysis, engineering, and related administrative functions responsive to the needs of the Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, Executive Office of the President, in the performance of his responsibilities for the management of the radio spectrum
- Conducts research needed in the evaluation and development of telecommunication policy as required by the Office of Telecommunications Policy, pursuant to Executive Order 11556

PREFACE

The following report is another in a series of ongoing studies whose general aims are:

- (1) To provide quantitative, statistical descriptions of man-made (and natural) electromagnetic interference.
- (2) To suggest and to guide experiments, not only to obtain experimental data for urban and other electromagnetic environments, but to provide, in addition, standard procedures for assessing such EM environments.
- (3) To determine and predict system performance in these general electromagnetic milieux for the general purposes of spectral management and the establishment of appropriate data bases thereto.

With the help of (1) and (2), the interference characteristics of selected regions of the EM spectrum can be predicted, and with the results of (3), rational criteria of performance can be established for the successful or unsuccessful operations of communication links and systems in various classes of interference. The combination of (1)-(3) provides quantitative procedures for spectral management.

The man-made EM environment, and much of the natural one as well, is basically "impulsive," i.e., has a highly structural character, with noticeable probabilities of large

interference levels, unlike the normal noise processes incoherent in transmitting and receiving elements. This impulsive character of the interference can drastically degrade the performance of conventional systems, which are designed to operate most effectively against the usually assumed normal background noise processes. The present report is devoted to the evaluation of the performance of both optimum and conventional receivers in a broad class of such "impulsive" (mostly man-made) electromagnetic interference. Specifically, class A interference* is considered here, where standard digital signal communications, both coherently and incoherently received, are employed. The new results obtained provide:

- (1) Structures of optimum signal processors in class A EM environments.
- (2) Performance bounds for such processors and performance estimates for similar, conventional receivers for the same communication tasks.

With these results, one has a quantitative basis for system design and comparison, including estimates of sizeable spectral savings potentially available when optimum receivers are employed. In addition, such results provide essential assistance in the design and application of the measuring equipments needed for other important components of spectral management,

* Class A interference is characterized by a bandwidth less than that of the receiver.

viz, assessment of spectral usage, as well as the determination of the general EM environments of urban and other geographical regions.

Finally, we emphasize that it is the quantitative interplay between experimentally verified, analytical model-building of the electromagnetic environment and the evaluation of system performance which provides essential tools for prediction of performance, the development of adequate and appropriate data bases, standardization, and spectral assessment needed for effective management of the spectral-use environment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	1
1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. MODELS OF IMPULSIVE INTERFERENCE	6
2.1 Summary of Empirical Models	8
2.2 Summary of Models of the Interference Process	13
2.3 Middleton's Physical-Statistical Model for Impulsive Interference	24
3. BACKGROUND THEORY AND RESULTS	50
3.1 Elements of Statistical-Decision Theory	50
3.1.1 Hall's Optimum Receiver	57
3.1.2 The Schwartz Algorithm	60
3.1.3 Threshold Receivers	62
3.2 The Assumption of Independent Sampling	66
4. OPTIMUM COHERENT RECEPTION	76
4.1 The Optimum Coherent Receiver	76
4.2 Performance Calculations for Optimum Coherent Receivers	83
4.3 Performance of Sub-optimum Receivers	111
4.4 Coherent Threshold Detection	121
4.4.1 Binary Purely Coherent Signals	121
4.4.2 Interference Discrimination	135
5. OPTIMUM INCOHERENT RECEPTION	139
5.1 Incoherent Threshold Signals	140
5.1.1 Unknown Amplitude and Phase	140
5.1.2 ON-OFF Incoherent Signals	145
5.1.3 Threshold Receiver when Phase Estimation is Used	150
5.2 General Incoherent Signals	154
5.3 Determination of Incoherent Performance	161
5.3.1 Performance of Threshold Receiver for Binary NCFSK	162
5.3.2 Performance of the Optimum ON-OFF Incoherent Receiver	170
5.3.3 Performance of Noncoherent Correlation Receivers in Class A Interference	174
6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	180
7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	185
8. REFERENCES	186
APPENDIX. AN APPROXIMATION TO THE NOISE PROBABILITY DENSITY FUNCTION	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
4.1	Calculated Performance Bound (4.44) for Class A Interference, $A=0.35$, $\Gamma'=0.5 \times 10^{-3}$	95
4.2	Calculated Performance Bound (4.44) for Class A Interference, $A=0.1$, $\Gamma'=10^{-4}$.	100
5.1	The Value of α^* for Various Signal Levels S	171
6.1	Summary of Results	182

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	The pdf of the instantaneous amplitude of the background interference z (class A) when no Gaussian background is present ($\Gamma' = 0$) from (2.58).	36
2.2	The pdf of the instantaneous amplitude of the interference z (class A) for $\Gamma' = 0.001$ from (2.56).	37
2.3	The pdf of the instantaneous amplitude of the interference z (class A) for $\Gamma' = 0.1$ from (2.56).	38
2.4	The envelope distribution [$\text{Prob}(\epsilon > \epsilon_0)$] for class A interference for $A = 0.1$ and various Γ' from (2.56).	39
2.5	The envelope distribution [$\text{Prob}(\epsilon > \epsilon_0)$] for class A interference for $\Gamma' = 10^{-4}$ and various A from (2.59).	40
2.6	The pdf of the instantaneous amplitude of the interference z (class B) for $\alpha = 1.0$ for various A_α from (2.61).	41
2.7	The pdf of the instantaneous amplitude of the interference z (class B) for $A_\alpha = 1.0$ for various α from (2.61).	42
2.8	The envelope distribution [$\text{Prob}(\epsilon > \epsilon_0)$] for class B interference for $\alpha = 1.0$ for various A_α from (2.63).	43
2.9	The envelope distribution [$\text{Prob}(\epsilon > \epsilon_0)$] for class B interference for $A_\alpha = 1.0$ for various α from (2.63).	44
2.10	Comparison of measured envelope distribution (from Bolton, 1972) with the Middleton model, class A, distribution (2.59).	45
2.11	Comparison of measured envelope distribution (from Adams et al., 1974) with the Middleton model, class A, distribution (2.59).	46

Figure		Page
2.12	Comparison of measured envelope distribution of a sample of broadband man-made noise (from Adams et al., 1974) with the Middleton model, class B, distribution (2.63).	47
2.13	Comparison of measured envelope distribution of a sample of broadband man-made noise (from Spaulding and Espeland, 1971) with the Middleton model, class B, distribution (2.63).	48
2.14	Comparison of measured envelope distribution of a sample of atmospheric noise (from Espeland and Spaulding, 1970) with the Middleton, class B, distribution (2.63).	49
3.1	The Hall receiver for a completely known set of binary signals, $s_1(t)$ and $s_2(t)$.	59
4.1	Comparison of theoretical performance in Gaussian noise (from 4.25) and the upper bound (4.35).	89
4.2	The integral $I(\rho)$, (4.36), for the two example cases along with the upper bound $\hat{I}(\rho)$ (4.43 and 4.45).	105
4.3	The upper bound on performance, \hat{P}_e , (4.44) for the three signaling cases for $N = 10$ and $Q = 10$.	106
4.4	The upper bound on performance, \hat{P}_e , (4.44) for the three signaling cases for $N = 10$ and $Q = 100,000$.	107
4.5	The upper bound on performance, \hat{P}_e , (4.44) for the three signaling cases for $N = 100$ and $Q = 100,000$.	108
4.6	The upper bound on performance, \hat{P}_e , (4.44) for the ON-OFF signaling case for $Q = 1000$ and $N = 10, 100, \text{ and } 1000$.	109
4.7	The upper bound on performance, \hat{P}_e , (4.44) for antipodal signaling for $Q = 1000$, $N = 10$ and 100 for the two example interference cases.	110

Figure		Page
4.8	Performance of the correlation receiver (Gaussian optimum receiver) in class A interference (4.50) for $\Gamma' = 10^{-4}$ for various values of the impulsive index A.	116
4.9	Performance of the correlation receiver (Gaussian optimum receiver) in class A interference for $A = 0.35$ for various values of the parameter Γ' .	117
4.10	Measured performance of various receivers with various types of interfering signals as a function of input desired signal to interfering signal ratio (from Mayer, 1972).	118
4.11	Comparison of performance of correlation receiver in class A interference (4.50) with the upper bound on optimum performance (4.44) for $Q = 1000$ and $N = 10$ for antipodal signals.	119
4.12	Comparison of performance of correlations receiver in class A interference (4.50) with the upper bound on optimum performance (4.44) for $Q = 1000$ and $N = 100$ for antipodal signals.	120
4.13	Threshold receiver for purely coherent signals.	123
4.14	The nonlinearity, $-d/dz \ln p_Z(z)$, for the two example cases of class A interference.	125
4.15	Another form of the threshold receiver for purely coherent signals.	126
4.16	Comparison of the estimate on performance for small signal (4.69) with the upper bound on performance (4.44) for $Q = 1000$, $N = 10$, 100 , and 1000 for antipodal signals.	134
4.17	LOBD for the coherent interference discrimination problem.	136
5.1	LOBD for binary NCFSK, slow fading signal, $K = 1$.	144
5.2	A threshold receiver for ON-OFF binary incoherent signaling.	147

Figure		Page
5.3	First order threshold receiver for NCFSK with phase estimation ($\Omega \neq 0$).	152
5.4	Second order threshold receiver for NCFSK with phase estimation.	153
5.5	LOBD for binary NCFSK signals (5.62), $K = 1$.	162
5.6	Performance of threshold receiver for binary NCFSK (from 5.91) and for binary CFSK (from sec. 4.1.1) for class A interference case $A = 0.35$ and $\Gamma' = 0.5 \times 10^{-3}$.	169
5.7	Performance estimate for the optimum incoherent ON-OFF receiver (from 5.94) and the performance bound for the optimum coherent ON-OFF receiver (from table 4.1) for the interference case $A = 0.35$, $\Gamma' = 0.5 \times 10^{-3}$ and for $N = 10$.	172
5.8	Performance estimate for the optimum incoherent ON-OFF receiver (from 5.94) and the performance bound for the optimum coherent ON-OFF receiver (from table 4.1) for the interference case $A = 0.35$, $\Gamma' = 0.5 \times 10^{-3}$ and for $N = 10, 100, \text{ and } 1000$.	173
5.9	Performance of NCFSK correlation receiver (from 5.97) and CFSK correlation receiver (from 4.51) in class A interference for $\Gamma' = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ and $A = 0.01, 0.1, 1, \text{ and } 10$.	175
5.10	Probability of error for incoherent ON-OFF correlation receiver.	176
5.11	Performance of the suboptimum coherent ON-OFF correlation receiver (from 4.51) and the estimated performance of the optimum incoherent ON-OFF receiver (from sec. 5.3.2) for the class A interference case $A = 0.35$, $\Gamma' = 0.5 \times 10^{-3}$, for $N = 100$.	179

GLOSSARY OF PRINCIPAL SYMBOLS

A	The impulsive index for class A interference
A_α	The impulsive index for class B interference
α	A parameter for class B interference
α	A parameter (exponent) used in performance determination
α^*	The optimum value of α
APD	Amplitude probability distribution, $P(\epsilon > \epsilon_0)$
ARE	Asymptotic relative efficiency
a, a_i	Random amplitude of fading signal
A1	Amplitude modulation pulsed
A2	Two-tone pulsed amplitude modulation
A3	Amplitude modulated telephony
A3J	Single sideband voice, suppressed carrier
B_0	Envelope of interference waveform in receiver
$\langle B_0^2 \rangle, \langle B_0^4 \rangle, \dots$	Even moments of received envelope
b	Random level of desired signal in interference discrimination problem
b_0	Subjectively determined threshold
ξ	Characteristic function variable
CFSK	Coherent frequency shift keying
CPSK	Coherent phase shift keying
ϵ	Normalized envelope of interference
ϵ_{rms}	rms of interference envelope
$\epsilon, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2$	Decision variables

$\text{erf}(\cdot)$	Error function
$\text{erfc}(\cdot)$	Complementary error function
E	Signal energy
${}_1F_1$	Confluent hypergeometric function
$F_1(i\xi, t)$	1st order characteristic function
F1	Frequency shift keying
F3	Frequency modulated telephony
$\Gamma(\cdot)$	Gamma function
Γ'	Ratio of Gauss to impulsive noise power
H_1, H_2	Hypotheses for binary detection
$I_i(\cdot)$	i th order modified Bessel function
$J_i(\cdot)$	i th order Bessel function (1st kind)
K	Threshold in likelihood ratio test
λ	Coordinates
$\ell(x)$	The nonlinearity $d/dx \ln p_Z(x)$
L	A parameter given by $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [\ell(x)]^2 p_Z(x) dx$
LOBD	Locally optimum Bayes detector
$\Lambda(\underline{X})$	Likelihood ratio for vector of received data \underline{X}
N	Number of samples
NCFSK	Noncoherent frequency shift keying
ν_T	Average rate of signal generation
ω, ω_0, \dots	Angular frequency
Ω	A parameter in Tikhonov distribution for signal phase
P	Poisson (as subscript)
P + G	Poisson plus Gauss (as subscript)

$P(\epsilon > \epsilon_0)$	Probability envelope ϵ exceeds the level ϵ_0
$p(\cdot)$	Probability density
pdf	Probability density function
$p_z(z)$	pdf of interference
$p(\underline{X} H_1)$	The conditional probability of receiving the data \underline{X} , given H_1
$p_1(\underline{X})$	The denominator of $\Lambda(\underline{X})$
$p_2(\underline{X})$	The numerator of $\Lambda(\underline{X})$
PCM	Pulse code modulation (FM)
ϕ	Correlation between binary signals $S_1(t)$ and $S_2(t)$
ϕ	Phase of desired signal
ϕ_{zz}	The $N \times N$ covariance matrix of the interference z
P_e	Average probability of error
\hat{P}_e	A bound on average probability of error
Q	$\omega_0 T$
q_1, q_2	A priori probabilities
$Q(a, b)$	Marcum's Q function
Q_M	The Q_M function
RE	Relative efficiency
$\rho(\underline{\lambda})$	The process density
$\rho(t)$	Autocovariance function
ρ, ρ_n	A parameter used in performance determination
S	Signal power
SNR	Signal-to-noise ratio

$S_1(t), S_2(t)$	Desired signals
s_{1i}, s_{2i}	Samples of desired signals
$\underline{S}_1, \underline{S}_2$	Vector of samples of desired signals
$\langle \cdot \rangle$	Statistical average
σ_G^2	Variance of Gaussian process
σ_m^2	A variance for class A interference, $\sigma_m^2 = \left(\frac{m}{A} + \Gamma'\right) / (1 + \Gamma')$
T	The detection time
T_s	Time duration of interfering signal
\bar{T}_s	The mean value of T_s
$\underline{\theta}$	Set of random signal parameters
$U(t; \underline{\lambda}, \underline{\theta})$	Generic interference waveform
\underline{X}	A vector of N samples of received waveform
$Z(t)$	The interference process
z	Normalized random interference process