

GLOBAL JOURNAL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY NETWORK, WEB & SECURITY Volume 13 Issue 1 Version 1.0 Year 2013 Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA) Online ISSN: 0975-4172 & Print ISSN: 0975-4350

# BER Performance Evaluation of a Cooperative Wireless Communication System with CDMA Implementation of Fixed Relaying Protocols

# By Muntasir Ahmed, Md. Anwar Hossain, A F M Zainul Abadin & Purno Mohon Ghosh

Pabna Science and Technology University, Pabna, Bangladesh

*Abstract* - In this paper, we investigate a comprehensive study on a simulated cooperative wireless communication system with implementation of code division multiple access (CDMA) technique under Decode-and-Forward (DAF) and Amplify-and- Forward (AAF) relaying protocols. The system under investigation incorporates two digital modulations (BPSK and QPSK) with five major types of signal combining schemes as Equal Ratio Combining (ERC), Fixed Ratio Combining (FRC), Signal-to-Noise Ratio Combining (SNRC), Maximum Ratio Combining (MRC) and Enhanced Signal-to-Noise Combining (ESNRC). Results of BER simulation in AWGN and Raleigh fading channels show that the system provides better performance in AAF relaying protocol as compared to DAF whatever the signal combining scheme is used. In DAF relaying protocol, the system shows most satisfactory performance in SNRC and QPSK digital modulation as finding worst performance in ERC. Information about the average quality shows performance benefits, and a rough approximation about the variation of the channel quality increases the performance even more. The best system performance is achieved when the relay is at equal distance from the sender and the destination or slightly closer to the former.

Keywords : cooperative wireless communication system; code division multiple access (CDMA); amplifyandforward (AAF); decode-and-forward (DAF); equal ratio combining (ERC); fixed ratio combining (FRC); signal-to-noise ratio combining (SNRC); maximum ratio combining (MRC); enhanced signal-to-noise combining (ESNRC).

GJCST-E Classification : C.2.1



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2013. Muntasir Ahmed, Md. Anwar Hossain, A F M Zainul Abadin & Purno Mohon Ghosh. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction inany medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

# BER Performance Evaluation of a Cooperative Wireless Communication System with CDMA Implementation of Fixed Relaying Protocols

Muntasir Ahmed <sup>a</sup>, Md. Anwar Hossain <sup>o</sup>, A F M Zainul Abadin <sup>p</sup> & Purno Mohon Ghosh<sup>w</sup>

Abstract - In this paper, we investigate a comprehensive study on a simulated cooperative wireless communication system with implementation of code division multiple access (CDMA) technique under Decode-and-Forward (DAF) and Amplify-and-Forward (AAF) relaying protocols. The system under investigation incorporates two digital modulations (BPSK and QPSK) with five major types of signal combining schemes as Equal Ratio Combining (ERC), Fixed Ratio Combining (FRC), Signal-to-Noise Ratio Combining (SNRC), Maximum Ratio Combining (MRC) and Enhanced Signal-to-Noise Combining (ESNRC). Results of BER simulation in AWGN and Raleigh fading channels show that the system provides better performance in AAF relaying protocol as compared to DAF whatever the signal combining scheme is used. In DAF relaying protocol, the system shows most satisfactory performance in SNRC and QPSK digital modulation in comparison with worst case in ERC. In AAF relaying protocol, a much better system performance is achieved in FRC and QPSK digital modulation as finding worst performance in ERC. Information about the average quality shows performance benefits, and a rough approximation about the variation of the channel quality increases the performance even more. The best system performance is achieved when the relay is at equal distance from the sender and the destination or slightly closer to the former.

Keywords : cooperative wireless communication system; code division multiple access (CDMA); amplifyand-forward (AAF); decode-and-forward (DAF); equal ratio combining (ERC); fixed ratio combining (FRC); signal-to-noise ratio combining (SNRC); maximum ratio combining (MRC); enhanced signal-to-noise combining (ESNRC).

## I. INTRODUCTION

Wireless communications technologies have seen a remarkably fast evolution in the past two decades. Each new generation of wireless devices has brought notable improvements in terms of communication reliability, data rates, device sizes, battery life, and network connectivity. In addition, the increase homogenization of traffic transports using Internet Protocols is translating into network topologies

that are less and less centralized. In recent years, adhoc and sensor networks have emerged with many new applications, where a source has to rely on the assistance from other nodes to forward or relay information to a desired destination. This implies that many nodes or users can "hear" and receive transmissions from a source and can help relay information if needed. A cooperating node can act as a relay node for a source node. As such, cooperative communications can generate independent MIMO-like channel links between a source and a destination via the introduction of relay channels. In the soon-to-bedeployed fourth-generation (4G) wireless networks, very high data rates can only be expected for full-rank MIMO users. More specifically, full-rank MIMO users must be equipped multiple transceiver antennas. In practice, most users either do not have multiple antennas installed on small-size devices, or the propagation environment cannot support MIMO requirements. To overcome the limitations of achieving MIMO gains in future wireless networks, one must think of new techniques beyond traditional point-to-point communications.

Indeed, cooperative communications can be thought of as a generalized MIMO concept with different reliabilities in antenna array elements. It is a new paradigm that draws from the ideas of using the broadcast nature of the wireless channels to make communicating nodes help each other, of implementing the communication process in a distribution fashion, and of gaining the same advantages as those found in MIMO systems. Such a new viewpoint has brought various new communication techniques that improve communication capacity, speed, and performance; reduce battery consumption and extend network lifetime; increase the throughput and stability region for multiple access schemes; expand the transmission coverage area; and provide cooperation trade-off beyond source-channel coding for multimedia communications.

## II. System Model and Description

The simulated model shown in Fig. 1 consists of three sections such as Source (Transmitting), Relay and Destination (Receiving). In transmitting section, the synthetically generated binary bit stream is passed through channel (FEC) Encoder and subsequently

Author a σ p: Department of Information & Communication Engineering (ICE), Pabna Science and Technology University, Pabna, Bangladesh. E-mails : muntasir\_ice\_ru@yahoo.com,

*E-mail : manwar\_ice@yahoo.com, E-mail : abadin.7@gmail.com Author*  $\mathfrak{O}$  : Department of Electronic & Telecommunication Engineering (ETE), Pabna Science and Technology University, Pabna, Bangladesh. E-mail : pcg2212@gmail.com

multiplied with Walsh Hadamard code. The multiplied binary bit stream is converted into NRZ format data and fed into digital modulator. The digitally modulated signal is transmitted through antenna. The transmitted signal is ultimately received by the receiving antenna in two ways: one is directly transmitted and the other is via Relay. In relaying section, two relaying protocols are used. In Amplify and Forward (AAF), protocol, the received signal is merely amplified and forwarded to the Destination (not shown in the block diagram). In Decode and Forward (DAF) protocol, the received signal is processed through various sections to recover the transmitted bits. The recovered bits are further processed with implementation of CDMA technology. The CDMA signal is ultimately sent up from the Relaying section. In Destination, the two signals are combined using various combining methods and the output of the combiner is multiplied with Walsh Hadamard code. The multiplied data are fed into digital demodulator and subsequently sent to FEC encoder and ultimately, the transmitted bit stream is retrieved.



*Figure 1 :* Block diagram of the cooperative system with channel coding and decoding, modulation and demodulation and fading channel effects considered

The transferred data is a random bipolar bit sequence which is either modulated with Binary Phase Shift Keying (BPSK) or Quadrature Phase Shift Keying (QPSK). QPSK consists of two independent (orthogonal) BPSK systems and therefore has double the data rate compared to BPSK. This fact can be used to compare the performance of a single link channel compared to the one using diversity. While the single link channel uses BPSK the diversity channel, which has to send the data twice, modulates the channel with QPSK which results in the same overall bandwidth for both systems. The channel is modeled considering thermal noise  $z_{s,d}[n]$  (additive complex Gaussian noise), path loss and Rayleigh (block-) fading. For the amplitude path loss  $d_{s,d} \propto 1/R^2$  is assumed which is modeled by the plane-earth model. The fading coefficient  $a_{s,d}[n]$  is

modeled as a zero mean, complex Gaussian random variable with variances  $\sigma^2_{s.d}$  .

$$y_d[n] = \underbrace{d_{s,d}}_{\text{path loss}} \cdot \underbrace{a_{s,d}[n] \cdot x_s[n] + \underbrace{z_{s,d}[n]}_{\text{noise}}}_{\text{noise}} \tag{1}$$

or 
$$y_d[n] = \underbrace{h_{s,d}[n]}_{\text{attenuation}} \cdot x_s[n] + \underbrace{z_{s,d}[n]}_{\text{noise}} = \underbrace{d_{s,d}}_{\text{path loss}} \cdot \underbrace{a_{s,d}[n] \cdot x_s[n]}_{\text{fading}} + \underbrace{z_{s,d}[n]}_{\text{noise}}$$

In (1) s, d denote the sender and the destination,  $x_s[n]$  is the transmitted symbol and  $y_d[n]$  the received symbol. The scalar  $h_{s,d}[n] = d_{s,d} \cdot a_{s,d}[n]$  represents the overall attenuation.

There are two popular implementations to transmit over a wireless network. One is the simple direct link which sends the data only once. The other is the two sender arrangement which sends the data twice

over different antennas. These two standard implementations put the performance of the arrangements used in this work into perspective.

The error probability of a single link transmission is as shown in [1].

$$P_b = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_b}{1 + \gamma_b}} \right) \tag{2}$$

Where  $\bar{\gamma}_b$  denotes the average signal-to-noise

ratio, defined as  $\overline{\gamma}_b = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\sigma^2} E(a^2)$  where  $E(a^2) = a^2$ .

The performance of a two sender transmission with MRC at the receiver can be expressed [1] as

$$P_b = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 - \mu \right)^2 \left( 2 + \mu \right) \quad and \quad \mu = \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\gamma}_b}{1 + \overline{\gamma}_b}} \tag{3}$$

### III. DIVERSITY PROTOCOLS

The cooperative transmission protocols used in the relay station are either Amplify and Forward (AAF) or Decode and Forward (DAF). These protocols describe the processing of the received data at the relay station before the data is sent to the destination.

#### a) Amplify-and-Forward (AAF)

This method is often used when the relay has only limited computing time and or power available or the time delay, caused by the relay to decode and encode the message, has to be minimized. The signal received by the relay was attenuated and needs to be amplified before it can be sent again. In doing so the noise in the signal is amplified as well, this is the main drawback of this protocol.

The incoming signal is amplified block wise. Assuming that the channel characteristic can be estimated perfectly, the gain for the amplification can be calculated as follows:

The power of the incoming signal (1) is given by

$$E\left[\left|y_{r}^{2}\right|\right] = E\left|\left|h_{s,r}\right|^{2}\right] \cdot E\left[\left|x_{s}\right|^{2}\right] + E\left|\left|z_{s,r}\right|^{2}\right] = \left|h_{s,r}\right|^{2}\xi + 2\sigma_{s,r}^{2}$$
(4)

Where *s* denotes the sender, *r* the relay and  $\xi = E ||x_s|^2 |$  denotes the energy of the transmitted signal. To send the data with the same power the sender did, the relay has to use a gain  $\beta$  of

$$\beta = \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{\left|h_{s,r}\right|^2 \xi + 2\sigma_{s,r}^2}} \tag{5}$$

This term has to be calculated for every block and therefore the channel characteristic of every single block needs to be estimated.

#### b) Decode-and-Forward (DAF)

A wireless transmission typically uses digital modulation and the relay has enough computing power, as DAF is most often the preferred method to process the data in the relay. The received signal is first decoded and then re-encoded. So there is no amplified noise in the sent signal, as in the case using an AAF protocol. There are two main implementations of such a system.

The relay can decode the original message completely. This requires a lot of computing time, but has the advantage that an error correcting code could be processed in the relay. If the relay station has not the computer power or is not allowed to fully decode the message, the incoming signal can just be decoded and re-encoded symbol by symbol. So there is no amplified noise in the sent signal, as it is the case using a AAF protocol. Whining this work this second approach is used to get an idea about the raw performance of the DAF protocol.

#### c) Combining Methods

As soon as there is more than one incoming transmission with the same burst of data, the incoming signals have to be combined. In this work the signals are combined only with the current information of the signal and channel. The four used combing methods differ in the knowledge about the channel quality the need to work.

#### i. Equal Ratio Combining (ERC)

This is the simplest combining method, which should only be used if there is no information about the channel quality available or the computing capacity is extremely limited. The incoming signals are just added up before the symbols are detected. Note that you don't need information about the quality of the channel but about the phase shift of the signal which occurs due to fading.

$$y_{d}[n] = y_{s,d}[n] \cdot e^{-\angle h_{s,d}[n]} + y_{r,d}[n] \cdot e^{-\angle h_{r,d}[n]}$$
(6)

The parameters  $y_{s,d}[n]$  and  $y_{r,d}[n]$  denote

the incoming signal from the sender and the relay.

#### ii. Fixed Ratio Combining (FRC)

A much better performance can be achieved when the incoming signals are weighted with a constant ratio, which will not change a lot during the whole transmission. The ration which is described with the parameters  $d_{s,d}$  and  $d_{r,d}$  should represent the average channel quality and therefore should not take account of temporary influences on the channel due to fading or other effects. In this work no algorithm is used to

estimate the optimal ratio. Instead, the best ratio is approximated by simulating different values to get an idea about the potential of this combining method.

$$y_{d}[n] = d_{s,d} \cdot y_{s,d}[n] \cdot e^{-\angle h_{s,d}[n]} + d_{r,d} \cdot y_{r,d}[n] \cdot e^{-\angle h_{r,d}[n]}$$
(7)

### iii. Signal to Noise Ratio Combining (SNRC)

An even better performance can be achieved when precise information about the current state of different channels is known. An often used value to characterize the quality of a link is the SNR, which is used to weight the received signals.

$$y_{d}[n] = SNR_{s,d} \cdot y_{s,d}[n] \cdot e^{-\angle h_{s,d}[n]} + SNR_{r,d} \cdot y_{r,d}[n] \cdot e^{-\angle h_{r,d}[n]}$$
(8)

The estimation of the SNR of a multi-hop link using AAF or a direct link can be performed by sending a known symbol sequence in every block. This sequence is used to estimate the phase shift as well. If the multi-hop link is using a DAF protocol the receiver can only see the channel quality of the last hop. It is assumed that the relay sends some additional information about the quality of the unseen hops to the destination, so the SNR of the multi-hop link can be estimated. Whatever protocol is used, an additional sequence needs to be sent to estimate the channel quality. This results in a certain loss of bandwidth. In the Appendix A it is shown how the SNR is estimated in the simulation.

#### iv. Enhanced Signal to Noise Ratio Combining (ESNRC)

Another plausible combining method is to ignore an incoming signal when the data from the other incoming channels have a much better quality. If the channels have more or less the same channel quality the incoming signals are rationed equally. In a system where just one relay is used this can be expressed as

$$d\left[n\right] = \begin{cases} y_{s,d}\left[n\right] \cdot e^{-\lambda h_{s,d}(n)} & \text{when } \left(SNR_{s,d} / SNR_{s,r,d}\right) > 10 \\ y_{s,d}\left[n\right] \cdot e^{-\lambda h_{s,d}(n)} + y_{s,r,d}\left[n\right] \cdot e^{-\lambda h_{s,r,d}(n)} & \text{when } 0.1 \le \left(SNR_{s,d} / SNR_{s,r,d}\right) \le 10 \\ y_{s,r,d}\left[n\right] \cdot e^{-\lambda h_{s,r,d}(n)} & \text{when } \left(SNR_{s,d} / SNR_{s,r,d}\right) < 0.1 \end{cases}$$
(9)

Using this combining method, the receiver doesn't have to know the channel characteristic exactly. An approximation of the channel quality is enough to combine the signals. Notice that the estimation of the phase shift still needs to be as exact as possible.

# IV. KEY RESULTS

In this section a combination of different combining methods and diversity protocols are analyzed to illustrate their potential benefits. In a first part, it is assumed that the three stations (sender, relay and destination) have an equal distance from each other. In a second part, the location of the relay station is varied to see the effect on the performance for

different location of the relay. In the following table the abbreviations used in the illustrations are described.

Table 1 : At	obreviations	used in	the	following	figures
--------------	--------------	---------	-----	-----------	---------

Abbreviations	Description		
ERC	Equal Ratio Combining		
FRC	Fixed Ratio Combining		
FRC <sub>x:v</sub>	Fixed Ratio Combining		
	x: Weight of the direct link		
	y: Weight of the multi-hop link		
SNRC	Signal-to-Noise Ratio Combining		
ESNRC	Enhanced Signal-to-Noise Ratio Combining		
AAF	Amplify and Forward		
DAF	Decode and Forward		
Distance <sub>x.v.z</sub>	x: Distance between sender and destination		
	y: Distance between sender and relay		
	z: Distance between relay and destination		

#### a) Equidistant Arrangement

The three stations are arranged at the edges of a triangle with a relative length of one. Hence all the channels will have the same path loss and therefore the same average signal-to-noise ratio.



*Figure 2*: Equidistant Arrangement - the three stations are arranged at the edges of a triangle with a length of unity



*Figure 3 :* Comparison of system performance under different combining methods under AAF relaying protocol

2013

In Fig. 1 the effect on the performance of the different combining types using an AAF protocol can be seen. The BPSK single link transmission (2) should demonstrate if there is any benefit at all using diversity, while the QPSK two senders link (3) indicates a lower bound for the transmission.

The first result is that whatever combining type is used, the AAF diversity protocol achieves a benefit compared to direct link. Even the equal ratio combining shows advantages. But compared to fixed ratio combining, the performance looks quite poor. In addition if an intelligent algorithm to calculate the ratio is used, no bandwidth is wasted, in other words the bandwidth is the same than using ERC.

The signal-to-noise ratio combining and the enhanced signal-to-noise ratio combining show roughly the same performance. Remember that for the ESNRC a roughly estimated channel quality for every single block is sufficient in contrast to the SNRC, which needs exact information of the channel quality for every single block, this is a surprising result. It means that the transferred signal in an AAF system contains some information that allows correcting a small difference in the channel quality.

The performance of the combining methods, which have precise information about every single block, is just about one decibel better in SNR than the one using FRC which has just average knowledge of the channel quality. Hence using the AAF protocol, there is no point in wasting lot of computing power and bandwidth to get exact channel information.



#### *Figure 4 :* Comparison of system performance under AAF and DAF relaying protocols with different combining methods

Fig. 2 illustrates the performance of the AAF diversity protocol compared with the DAF protocol. The surprising result is that the AAF diversity protocol always

results in a better performance than the DAF protocol whatever combining type is used.

Using equal ratio combining results in a big difference between the two protocols. While the one using AAF shows a quite good performance already, the one using DAF does not have any benefits compared to the BPSK single link. The reason is that a wrong detected symbol at the relay station is relay difficult to correct at the destination, where the two incoming signals are combined. Hence an incorrectly detected symbol at the relay station will have a fifty percent probability of also being incorrectly detected at the destination.

This stands in contrast with the equal ration combing in a system using AAF. Instead of detecting the symbol at the relay, it is amplified and transmitted to the sender. Normally a symbol that would have been detected wrongly is just "a little bit" wrong. When this symbol is amplified before sent to the destination, it has on average much less energy than the correct symbol coming directly from the sender. There is now a high probability that the incorrect symbol will be corrected by the signal from the direct link, when combined at the destination.

It is now obvious now, why the fixed ration combining shows such a good performance. The direct link has on average the better quality than the multi-hop link, so it is sensible to weight the direct link more by assuming that the multi-hop link is more susceptible to errors than the direct link. It also explains why the optimal ratio in the system using DAF is higher than the one using AAF. The DAF relay sends the wrongly detected symbols with the full power, so it takes much more to correct this wrong powerful symbol.

The ESNRC shows roughly the same performance in an AAF or DAF system. The DAF using system benefits a lot by analyzing every single block. Using this combining method the big disadvantage of the wrongly detected symbol at the relay can be reduced. In the majority of the cases, when a symbol is wrongly detected by the relay, the multi-hop has a much poorer channel quality than the direct link, and therefore will not be considered at all.

It might be sensible to ask now, what the purpose is of making the effort at the relay station to decode and re-encode the data when there is no benefit at all doing that. As mentioned in Sec. III-B an error correcting code can be added to correct wrongly detected symbols at the receiver. This is, as seen before, crucial to get a good performance in a DAF system.

#### b) Moving the Relay

So far, the three stations were positioned were positioned equidistantly and therefore the three channels had all the same average signal-to-noise ratio. In this section the effect is shown when the relay station is moved. Notice, in the following figurers the x-axis denotes always the SNR of the direct link, which can be assumed (without any loss of generality) to have a length of one.



*Figure 5 :* Illustration of the respective position of the relay and destination whose simulation results are presented



*Figure 6*: A significant benefit results when the relay is located between the sender and the destination

The optimal arrangement is shown in Fig. 3 where the relay is placed right between the other stations. This shows the full potential of the used diversity arrangement. The performance is as good as the two sender arrangement. It is a little bit surprising that the resulting performance is not symmetric. The optimal position for the relay is right in the middle or slightly closer to the base station. This tendency to the base station is due to the fact that the noise received at the relay is amplified and therefore should be minimized. Another point that should be paid attention to is the huge benefit compared to the BPSK direct link. To achieve a BER of about 10-2 the SNR is up to eight decibels less than using only a direct link transmission.



*Figure 7* : Illustration of the effect of increasing the distance of the relay from the sender and the destination

Normally there is no relay station available just between the sender and the destination. But how close a mobile station has to be to act as a valuable candidate as a relay station? This is shown in Fig. 4.

The first thing that attracts attenuation is how fast the performance degrades when the distance of the relay increases. By increasing the distance by fifty percent, the resulting performance is roughly the same as the one for a two sender system, which is about three decibels less than the one of the optimal position. The position of the relay, where all three stations are equidistant, results in another 2.5 decibel loss in system performance. This equidistant arrangement still shows an advantage compared to the BPSK single link transmission. This performance degradation continues, when the distance of the relay is increased further. Another fifty percent, results in a situation where there is no useful advantage anymore using the relay link. Notice that the higher diversity level can still be recognized.

#### V. Conclusions

This work has shown the possible benefits of a wireless transmission using cooperative diversity to increase the performance. The diversity is realized by building an ad-hoc network using a third station as a relay. The AAF protocol has shown a better performance than the DAF protocol whatever combining method was used at the receiver. But it must be considered that no error correcting code was added to the transferred signal.

The choice of combining method has a big effect on the error rate at the receiver. When AAF is used at the relay station the easy to implement Equal Ratio Combining (ERC) shows some benefits compared to the single link transmission. If possible the Fixed Ratio Combining (FRC) should be used. This only needs knowledge of the average channel quality, and shows a much better performance than ERC. If knowledge of the current state of the channel quality is available more sophisticated combining methods can be used. The enhanced signal-to-noise ratio combining (ESNRC) has shown a very good performance considering that a rough approximation of the current channel quality is sufficient.

The location of the relay is crucial to the performance. The best performance was achieved when the relay is at equal distance from the sender and the destination or slightly closer to the former. In general the relay should not be to far from the line between the two stations.

#### VI. APPENDIX A: ESTIMATION OF THE SNR

#### a) Estimate SNR Using AAF

Using AAF, the received signal from the relay is

$$y_{r,d} = h_{r,d} x_r + z_{r,d} = h_{r,d} \beta(h_{s,r} x_s + z_{s,r})$$
 (1)

The received power will then be

$$E\left[\left|y_{r,d}\right|^{2}\right] = \beta^{2} \left|h_{r,d}\right|^{2} \left(\left|h_{s,r}\right|^{2} \xi + 2\sigma_{s,r}^{2}\right) + 2\sigma_{r,d}^{2}$$
(2)

So the SNR of the one relay multi-hop link can be estimated as

$$SNR = \frac{\beta^2 |h_{s,r}|^2 |h_{r,d}|^2 \xi}{\beta^2 |h_{r,d}|^2 2\sigma_{s,r}^2 + 2\sigma_{r,d}^2}$$
(3)

#### b) Estimate SNR Using DAF

To calculate the SNR of a multi-hop link using DAF, first the BER of the link is calculated which can then be translated to an equivalent SNR.

The BER of a single link is given in (2). The BER over a one relay multi-hop link can then be calculated as

$$BER_{s,r,d} = BER_{s,r}(1 - BER_{r,d}) + (1 - BER_{s,r})BER_{r,d}.$$
 (4)

To calculate the SNR, the inverse functions of (2) are used.

For a BSPK modulated Rayleigh faded signal this will be

$$SNR = \frac{1}{2} \left[ Q^{-1}(BER) \right]^2$$
 (5)

For a QPSK modulated signal this will change to

$$SNR = \left[ Q^{-1}(BER) \right]^2 \tag{6}$$

# **References** Références Referencias

- 1. John G. Proakis (2001) *Digital Communications,* McGraw-Hill, 4th edition (international).
- 2. J. Nicholas Laneman, David N. C. Tse, & Gregory W. Wornell, (2004) "Cooperative Diversity in

Wireless Networks: Efficient Protocols and Outage Behaviour", IEEE Transactions Inf. Theory, Vol. 50, pp. 3062-3080.

3. M. Yuksel & E. Erkip, (2003) "Diversity in relaying protocols with amplify and forward", *In Proc. of GLOBECOM Communication Theory Symposium*, San Francisco.

# This page is intentionally left blank