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We present a new analytical expression for the moment generating function (MGF) of the end-to-end signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of dual-hop decode-and-forward (DF) relaying systems with relay selection when operating over Nakagami-m fading channels. The derived MGF expression, which is valid for arbitrary values of the fading parameters of both hops, is subsequently utilized to evaluate the average symbol error probability (ASEP) of M-ary phase shift keying modulation for the considered DF relaying scheme under various asymmetric fading conditions. It is shown that the MGF-based ASEP performance evaluation results are in excellent agreement with equivalent ones obtained by means of computer simulations, thus validating the correctness of the presented MGF expression.

1. Introduction

Cooperative communication through relay nodes has been shown to be capable of extending the radio coverage and improving the reliability of emerging wireless systems [1–3]. One of the bandwidth efficient dual-hop cooperative techniques combines the decode-and-forward (DF) relaying protocol with relay selection (RS) [4]. The performance of this technique has been studied in [4] over Rayleigh fading channels and in [5–7] for the more general Nakagami-m fading channel model. However, in the latter works analytical expressions for the moment generating function (MGF) of the end-to-end signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) have been presented, which are valid only for the special case where the Nakagami-m-parameter of both hops takes integer values. In [5], the authors based their analysis on the tight approximation for the end-to-end SNR presented in [8], whereas [6, 7] utilized the end-to-end SNR characterization of [9]. Nevertheless, in realistic wireless communication scenarios, estimators for m from field measurement data typically result in arbitrary m values [10]. Moreover, restricting m to only integer values severely limits the advantageous property of the Nakagami-m fading distribution to adequately approximate the Rice and Hoyt ones [11]. Very recently, based on [9], the authors in [12] investigated the error probability of opportunistic DF relaying over Nakagami-m fading channels with arbitrary m.

In this paper, capitalizing on the approach of [8], we present a new closed-form representation for the MGF of the end-to-end SNR of dual-hop DF RS-based systems which is valid for arbitrary-valued parameters for both Nakagami-m faded hops. In addition, the derived expression is utilized to evaluate the average symbol error probability (ASEP) of M-ary phase shift keying (PSK) modulation for the considered relaying scheme. Numerically evaluated ASEP results match perfectly with equivalent results obtained from computer simulations and clearly demonstrate that ASEP is rather sensitive to even slight variations of any of the hops’ fading parameter.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents in brief the corresponding signal and system model. A new closed-form representation for the
MGF of DF with RS over arbitrary Nakagami-\(m\) fading channels is derived in Section 3. An application of the derived expression in evaluating the ASEP performance of M-PSK is demonstrated in Section 4, while closing remarks are provided in Section 5.

2. Signal and System Model

Consider a wireless dual-hop DF cooperative system comprising a source node \(S\), a destination node \(D\), and \(L\) half-duplex relays, each of which is denoted by \(R_k\), \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, L\). During the first transmission time slot, \(S\) broadcasts a symbol to the relays. In the second time slot, the relay with the most favorable channel to \(D\) is selected to transmit, while \(S\) remains silent. Node \(D\) is assumed to possess perfect channel state information so that maximum-likelihood combining of the signals from \(S\) and the selected relay can be employed.

The wireless channels between any pair of system nodes are assumed to be subject to the Nakagami-\(m\) fading distribution [13]. Furthermore, transmission is corrupted by additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) with single-sided power spectral density \(N_0\). The fading parameters for the channels are denoted by \(\{A_p, B_p\}\), with \(p = 1, 2, \ldots, 8\), given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
A_1 & = 2 \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Gamma(\frac{m_{\ell}}{n_t}) \Gamma(\Xi) H_3(1, 1, 1), \\
B_1 & = (m_{3-p,k}, a_{3-p,k}) x,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(a_{1k} = m_{1k}/\bar{Y}_{1k}, a_{2k} = m_{2k}/\bar{Y}_{2k}\), and \(G(c, dx) = \Gamma(c, dx)/\Gamma(c)\), with \(c, d \in \mathbb{R}\), while \(\Gamma(\cdot)\) and \(\Gamma(\cdot, \cdot)\) denote the incomplete Gamma function [14, equation (8.310)] and the upper incomplete Gamma function [14, equation (8.350.2)], respectively. Substituting [5, equation (3)] and (3) into [5, equation (6)] and after some algebraic manipulations, the following expression for the PDF of \(\gamma_{ks}\) is deduced:

\[
f_{y_{ks}}(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{L} \sum_{q=1}^{L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} (1) \Gamma^{m_{pq}}(m_{pk})^{m_{pq}-1} \exp(-a_{pq}x) \\
	imes G[m_{(3-p,k)}, a_{3-p,k} x] \\
	imes G[m_{(3-p,k)}, a_{3-p,k} x],
\]

where symbol \(\sum\) is used for short-hand representation of multiple summations of the form \(\sum_{n_1=1}^{L} \sum_{n_2=1}^{L} \cdots \sum_{n_L=1}^{L} \) with \(n_1 \neq n_2 \neq \cdots \neq n_L\).

In order to derive an explicit expression for the MGF of \(\gamma_{ks}\), which is defined as \(M_{y_{ks}}(s) = \int_{0}^{\infty} f_{y_{ks}}(x) \exp(s x) dx\) [II, equation (1.2)], for arbitrary valid values of both \(m_{1k}\) and \(m_{2k}\), one is required to analytically evaluate integrals that involve combinations of arbitrary powers, exponentials, and \(G(\cdot, \cdot)\) functions. To this end, by expressing all \(G(\cdot, \cdot)\)'s in (4) according to [14, equation (8.354.2)], utilizing [14, equation (8.310)], and performing some rather long but basic algebraic manipulations, one obtains the following explicit expression for \(M_{y_{ks}}(s)\):

\[
M_{y_{ks}}(s) = \prod_{k=1}^{L} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \prod_{i=1}^{L} \frac{1}{\Gamma^{m_{pq}}(m_{pk}) \Gamma(m_{pn})} \\
\times \left\{ a_{1k} \sum_{p=1}^{L} \alpha_p + a_{2k} \sum_{p=1}^{L} \beta_p \right\},
\]

which is valid for \(a_{1k}, a_{2k} \neq s\) for all \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, L\). In (5), parameters \(\alpha_p\) and \(\beta_p\), with \(p = 1, 2, \ldots, 8\), are given by:

\[
\left\{ \alpha_p \right\} = \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Gamma(m_{pn}) \Gamma(\Xi) H_3(1, 1, 1),
\]

3. MGF of DF RS in Nakagami-\(m\) Fading

By differentiating [5, equation (3)], a closed-form expression for the probability density function (PDF) of \(\gamma_{k}\) for any arbitrary value of \(m_{1k}, m_{2k} \geq 0\) can be obtained as follows:

\[
f_{y_{k}}(x) = \frac{2}{\Gamma^{m_{pk}}(m_{pk})} a_{pk} \exp(-a_{pk}x) \\
\times G(m_{(3-p,k)}, a_{3-p,k} x) \\
\times G[m_{(3-p,k)}, a_{3-p,k} x],
\]

where \(a_{1k} = m_{1k}/\bar{Y}_{1k}, a_{2k} = m_{2k}/\bar{Y}_{2k}\), and \(G(c, dx) = \Gamma(c, dx)/\Gamma(c)\), with \(c, d \in \mathbb{R}\), while \(\Gamma(\cdot)\) and \(\Gamma(\cdot, \cdot)\) denote the incomplete Gamma function [14, equation (8.310)] and the upper incomplete Gamma function [14, equation (8.350.2)], respectively. Substituting [5, equation (3)] and (3) into [5, equation (6)] and after some algebraic manipulations, the following expression for the PDF of \(\gamma_{ks}\) is deduced:

\[
f_{y_{ks}}(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{L} \sum_{q=1}^{L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} (1) \Gamma^{m_{pq}}(m_{pk})^{m_{pq}-1} \exp(-a_{pq}x) \\
\times G[m_{(3-p,k)}, a_{3-p,k} x] \\
\times G[m_{(3-p,k)}, a_{3-p,k} x],
\]

where symbol \(\sum\) is used for short-hand representation of multiple summations of the form \(\sum_{n_1=1}^{L} \sum_{n_2=1}^{L} \cdots \sum_{n_L=1}^{L} \) with \(n_1 \neq n_2 \neq \cdots \neq n_L\).

In order to derive an explicit expression for the MGF of \(\gamma_{ks}\), which is defined as \(M_{y_{ks}}(s) = \int_{0}^{\infty} f_{y_{ks}}(x) \exp(s x) dx\) [II, equation (1.2)], for arbitrary valid values of both \(m_{1k}\) and \(m_{2k}\), one is required to analytically evaluate integrals that involve combinations of arbitrary powers, exponentials, and \(G(\cdot, \cdot)\) functions. To this end, by expressing all \(G(\cdot, \cdot)\)'s in (4) according to [14, equation (8.354.2)], utilizing [14, equation (8.310)], and performing some rather long but basic algebraic manipulations, one obtains the following explicit expression for \(M_{y_{ks}}(s)\):

\[
M_{y_{ks}}(s) = \prod_{k=1}^{L} \prod_{l=1}^{L} \prod_{i=1}^{L} \frac{1}{\Gamma^{m_{pq}}(m_{pk}) \Gamma(m_{pn})} \\
\times \left\{ a_{1k} \sum_{p=1}^{L} \alpha_p + a_{2k} \sum_{p=1}^{L} \beta_p \right\},
\]

which is valid for \(a_{1k}, a_{2k} \neq s\) for all \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, L\). In (5), parameters \(\alpha_p\) and \(\beta_p\), with \(p = 1, 2, \ldots, 8\), are given by:

\[
\left\{ \alpha_p \right\} = \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} \Gamma(m_{pn}) \Gamma(\Xi) H_3(1, 1, 1),
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_2 &= -\Gamma(m_{2n}) \Gamma(\Xi) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} a_{1n}^{m_{2n}+i} H_2(m_{2n} + i, 1, 1), \\
\mathcal{A}_3 &= -\frac{2}{11} \Gamma(m_{2n}) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} a_{1n}^{m_{2n}+i} a_{1k}^{m_{2n}+i} H_2(\Xi + i, 1, 1), \\
\mathcal{A}_4 &= \Gamma(m_{2n}) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} a_{1n}^{m_{2n}+i} \left\{ \frac{a_{2k}}{a_{1k}} \right\}^{\Xi+i} H_2(m_{2n} + i, 1, 1), \\
\mathcal{A}_5 &= \Gamma(m_{2n}) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} a_{1n}^{m_{2n}+i} a_{2n}^{m_{2n}+i} H_2(\Xi + i, 1, 1), \\
\mathcal{A}_6 &= \Gamma(m_{2n}) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} a_{1n}^{m_{2n}+i} a_{2n}^{m_{2n}+i} H_2(\Xi + i, 1, 1), \\
\mathcal{A}_7 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}), \\
\mathcal{A}_8 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}) H_2(\Xi + i, 1, 1), \\
\mathcal{A}_9 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}), \\
\end{aligned}
\]

where \(I(\kappa, \lambda)\) is given by

\[
I(\kappa, \lambda) = -\lambda^\kappa H_2(\kappa, 1, 1) F_1\left( \begin{array}{c}
m_{1k} \\
m_{2k}
\end{array} ; \kappa, \kappa + 1; \frac{\lambda}{s - \Xi} \right).
\]

In (10), \(F_1(\cdot)\) represents the Gauss hypergeometric function [14, equation (9.14.2)]. Likewise, for the \(\mathcal{A}_p\)'s and \(\mathcal{B}_p\)'s with \(p = 4, 6, \text{ and } 7\), each infinite series can be ultimately expressed in terms of the Appell hypergeometric function \(F_2(\cdot)\) [14, equation (9.180.2)] as

\[
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_4 &= \Gamma(m_{2n}) \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}), \\
\mathcal{A}_6 &= \Gamma(m_{2n}) \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}), \\
\mathcal{A}_7 &= \Gamma(m_{2n}) \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}), \\
\mathcal{A}_8 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}), \\
\mathcal{A}_9 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, m_{2n}, a_{2n}), \\
\end{aligned}
\]

where \(J(k, \lambda, \mu, \nu)\), with \(\nu \in \mathbb{R}\), is given by

\[
J(k, \lambda, \mu, \nu) = \mu^\kappa \nu^\lambda H_1(k, \lambda, 1)
\]

Finally, by using once more all aforementioned identities, it follows that the \(\mathcal{A}_p\) and \(\mathcal{B}_p\) coefficients can be expressed in terms of the generalized Lauricella function \(F_2^{(3)}(\cdot)\) [15, equation (1.1)], yielding

\[
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_6 &= -a_{1n}^{m_{2n}} a_{2n}^{m_{2n}} \left\{ \frac{a_{2k}}{a_{1k}} \right\} H_2(\Xi, \lambda, \mu), \\
\mathcal{B}_6 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, \lambda, \mu) H_2(\Xi, \lambda, \mu), \\
\mathcal{B}_7 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, \lambda, \mu) H_2(\Xi, \lambda, \mu), \\
\mathcal{B}_8 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, \lambda, \mu) H_2(\Xi, \lambda, \mu), \\
\mathcal{B}_9 &= \left\{ \frac{m_{2n}}{m_{2n}} \right\} (\Xi, \lambda, \mu) H_2(\Xi, \lambda, \mu), \\
\end{aligned}
\]

To this effect, substituting (6), (9), (11), and (13) to (5), a novel expression for \(M_{\gamma D}(s)\) is deduced which is valid for arbitrary \(m_{1k}, m_{2k} \geq 0.5\). It is noted that in Appendices A and B we present MATLAB routines for computational efficient implementations of functions \(F_1(\cdot)\) and \(F_2^{(3)}(\cdot)\), respectively.

Using the previously derived \(M_{Y_D}(s)\) expression, the MGF of \(Y_0\) and by recalling that \(Y_{RS}\) and \(Y_0\) are statistically independent, the MGF of \(Y_0\) is straightforwardly deduced, namely,

\[
M_{Y_D}(s) = \left( \frac{m_0}{\bar{y}_0} \right)^{m_0} \left( \frac{s + m_0}{\bar{y}_0} \right)^{-m_0} M_{Y_{RS}}(s).
\]
The ASEP performance of various modulation schemes for the considered dual-hop DF relaying system with RS over Nakagami-\(m\) fading channels can be directly evaluated using the \(M_{\psi}(s)\) expression and the MGF-based approach presented in [1], Chapter 1. For example, the ASEP of \(M\)-PSK modulation is easily obtained as

\[
\bar{P}_{se} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} M_{\psi}(\theta) \left[ \frac{\sin^2(\pi/M)}{\sin^2(\theta)} \right] d\theta. \quad (15)
\]

Let us assume a relaying system with \(L = 3\) relays, no direct link \(S \rightarrow D\), and the following four asymmetric fading scenarios: (i) Scenario A: \(m_{11} = \Omega_{11} = 0.6, m_{12} = \Omega_{12} = 1.1, m_{13} = \Omega_{13} = 1.7,\) and \(m_{2k} = \Omega_{2k} = 0.7\) for \(k = 1, 2,\) and 3; (ii) Scenario B: \(m_{11} = \Omega_{11} = 1.1, m_{12} = \Omega_{12} = 2.1, m_{13} = \Omega_{13} = 3.1,\) and \(m_{2k} = \Omega_{2k} = 1.1\) for \(k = 1, 2,\) and 3; (iii) Scenario C: \(m_{11} = \Omega_{11} = 1.1, m_{12} = \Omega_{12} = 2.3, m_{13} = \Omega_{13} = 3.8,\) and \(m_{2k} = \Omega_{2k} = 1.8\) for \(k = 1, 2,\) and 3; and (iv) Scenario D: \(m_{11} = \Omega_{11} = 1.6, m_{12} = \Omega_{12} = 3.3, m_{13} = \Omega_{13} = 4.2,\) and \(m_{2k} = \Omega_{2k} = 2.6\) for \(k = 1, 2,\) and 3. The ASEP performance, \(\bar{P}_{se}\), of 8-, 16- and 32-PSK modulation is depicted in Figures 1, 2, and 3, respectively, as a function of the average symbol to noise power, \(E_s/N_0\), over various Nakagami-\(m\) fading conditions. As expected, \(\bar{P}_{se}\) improves with increasing \(E_s/N_0\) and/or decreasing \(M\) and/or increasing any of the fading parameters. Furthermore, all figures clearly depict the excellent agreement between the numerically evaluated ASEP results and the equivalent ones obtained from Monte Carlo simulations. In addition, it is observed that the higher is the \(E_s/N_0\), the more sensitive is \(\bar{P}_{se}\) to slight variations of the fading conditions. More specifically, for the case of 8-PSK modulation, it can be observed that the differences in the \(\bar{P}_{se}\) curves among the four considered fading scenarios for the low \(E_s/N_0\) regime, for example, at 5 dB, are 51\% between Scenarios A and B; 52\% between Scenarios B and C; and 54\% between Scenarios C and D. For the same modulation order, the differences in the high \(E_s/N_0\) regime, for example, at 20 dB, are: 98\% between Scenario A and B; 100\% between Scenario B and C; and 103\% between Scenario C and D. Likewise, for the case of 16-PSK and for \(E_s/N_0 = 5\) dB, the differences in the \(\bar{P}_{se}\) curves for the different scenarios are 23\% between Scenarios A and B; 29\% between Scenarios B and C; and 36\% between Scenarios C and D. For 16-PSK modulation and for \(E_s/N_0 = 20\) dB, the differences among the various \(\bar{P}_{se}\) curves are 84\% between Scenarios A and B; 90\% between Scenarios B and C; and 98\% between Scenarios C and D. Finally, for 32-PSK modulation, it is evident that the \(\bar{P}_{se}\) curves differ at \(E_s/N_0 = 5\) dB: 11\% between Scenarios A and B; 14\% between Scenarios B and C; 19\% between Scenarios C and D whereas, for \(E_s/N_0 = 20\) dB, the \(\bar{P}_{se}\) differences among scenarios are: 46\% between Scenarios A and B; 62\% between Scenarios B and C; and 79\% between Scenarios C and D. It is evident from the above quantitative results that the sensitivity of the ASEP on the fading severity parameter \(m\) is high in all
Function \( F_2 = \text{Appell}(a, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, x, y) \);
\( f_1 = \text{gamma}(c_1) \cdot \text{gamma}(c_2); \)
\( f_2 = \text{gamma}(b_1) \cdot \text{gamma}(b_2); \)
\( f_3 = \text{gamma}(c_1-b_1) \cdot \text{gamma}(c_2-b_2); \)
\( f = f_1 / (f_2 \cdot f_3); \)
\( Q = @(u, v) f \cdot u^{(b_1-1)} \cdot v^{(b_2-1)} \cdot \ldots \cdot ((1-u)^{c_1-b_1-1}) \cdot \ldots \cdot ((1-u \cdot x-v \cdot y)^{a}); \)
\( F_2 = \text{dblquad}(Q, 0, 1, 0, 1); \)

Algorithm 1: MATLAB Program for evaluating \( F_2(\cdot) \).

5. Conclusion

This work was devoted to the derivation of a new analytical expression for the MGF of the end-to-end SNR of dual-hop DF relaying communication systems with RS over Nakagami-\( m \) fading conditions. The presented expression involves well-known generalized hypergeometric functions and is valid for any arbitrary value of the fading parameters of both hops. Using the MGF-based approach, the ASE of \( M \)-PSK modulation for the considered system was evaluated and a perfect match with equivalent computer simulated performance results was shown. More importantly, it was evident that the ASE is sensitive to even slight variations of any of the hops’ fading parameters and particularly for low order modulation schemes and high SNR values.

Appendices

A. MATLAB Program for the Evaluation of \( F_2(\cdot) \)

The Appell hypergeometric function \( F_2(\cdot) \) is defined by the double infinite series given by [14, equation (9.180.2)]. An equivalent expression for \( F_2(\cdot) \) in a double integral form with finite limits is given by [14, equation (9.184.2)]. The latter expression can be easily evaluated using the MATLAB function shown in Algorithm 1.

B. MATLAB Program for the Evaluation of \( F_A^{(3)}(\cdot) \)

The generalized Lauricella function \( F_A^{(3)}(\cdot) \) is expressed according to the triple infinite series given by [15, equation (1.1)]. With the aid of the integral representation for \( F_2(\cdot) \) in [14, equation (9.184.2)], the following triple integral form for \( F_A^{(3)}(\cdot) \) with finite limits is deduced:

\[
F_A^{(3)}(a; b_1, b_2, b_3; c_1, c_2, c_3; x, y, z) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(u, v, w) \, du \, dv \, dw,
\]

where \( a, b_1, b_2, b_3, c_1, c_2, c_3, x, y, z \in \mathbb{R} \) and

\[
f(u, v, w) = \frac{u^{b_1-1} v^{b_2-1} w^{b_3-1} (1-u)^{c_1-b_1} \Gamma(b_1) \Gamma(b_2) \Gamma(b_3) \Gamma(c_1 - b_1) \Gamma(c_2 - b_2)}{\Gamma(b_1 + b_2 + b_3 - b_1 - b_2 - b_3) (c_1 - b_1 - 1)(1 - u w - v y - w z)}. \]

To this effect, the MATLAB function shown in Algorithm 2 evaluates \( F_A^{(3)}(\cdot) \) using (B.1).
Function FA = Lauricella (a,b1,b2,b3,c1,c2,c3,x,y,z);
  f1 = gamma(c1).*gamma(c2).*gamma(c3);
  f2 = gamma(b1).*gamma(b2).*gamma(b3);
  f3 = gamma(c1-b1).*gamma(c2-b2).*gamma(c3-b3);
  f = f1./(f2.*f3);
  Q = @(u,v,w)f.*(u.^((b1-1)).*...((1-u).^((c1-b1-1)).*...((1-u.*x-y.*z).^a);
FA = triplequad(Q,0,1,0,1,0,1);

Algorithm 2: MATLAB Program for evaluating $F_A^{(3)}()$.
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