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Abstract—In this paper, we propose a generalized correlation-delay-shift-keying (GCDSK) scheme for noncoherent chaos-based communications. In the proposed scheme, several delayed versions of a chaotic signal are first produced. Some of them will be modulated by the binary data to be transmitted. The delayed signals will then be added to the original chaotic signal and transmitted. At the receiver, a simple correlator-type detector is employed to decode the binary symbols. The approximate bit error rate (BER) of the GCDSK scheme is derived analytically based on Gaussian approximation. Simulations are performed and compared with the noncoherent correlation-delay-shift-keying (CDSK) scheme in that a reference chaotic signal is embedded in the frequency spectrum, thereby enhancing the data security. The computational complexity of the classifier is applicable to any coherent system. Also, the power spectral density (psd) will be lowered accordingly without affecting the bit error performance. Because of the low psd, the signal can be hidden under the background noise, thus guaranteeing a low probability of detection by unintended parties. In addition, the wide signal bandwidth can provide antijamming capabilities when appropriate demodulation techniques are applied. Such features, namely, low probability of detection and antijamming, are typical characteristics possessed by spread-spectrum communication systems.

Index Terms—Chaos communications, correlation-delay-shift-keying, noncoherent communications.

I. INTRODUCTION

When a narrow-band signal modulates a wide-band carrier, the signal bandwidth will be increased substantially. Also, the power spectral density (psd) will be lowered accordingly without affecting the bit error performance. Because of the low psd, the signal can be hidden under the background noise, thus guaranteeing a low probability of detection by unintended parties. In addition, the wide signal bandwidth can provide antijamming capabilities when appropriate demodulation techniques are applied. Such features, namely, low probability of detection and antijamming, are typical characteristics possessed by spread-spectrum communication systems.

Recently, chaotic signals, having a wide-band nature, have been proposed as carriers for spread-spectrum communications. A number of coherent systems have been suggested and studied [2]–[5]. For a coherent system, an exact replica of the chaotic signal needs to be reproduced at the receiving end. Because robust synchronization techniques are yet to be developed, coherent systems are still not realizable in a practical environment [6].

Noncoherent communication schemes, which do not require the reproduction of the chaotic signals at the receiving end, are more feasible in practice. The first noncoherent chaos-based digital communication scheme, namely, differential chaos-shift-keying (DSCK) scheme, was proposed by Kolumbán et al. [7]. In DSCK, a reference chaotic signal is sent, followed by the same signal modulated by a binary symbol. At the receiver, these two pieces of chaotic signals are correlated. The binary symbol is then decoded based on the sign of the correlator output [5]–[9]. Another noncoherent detection technique, which is applicable to chaos-shift-keying (CSK) modulation scheme, has been proposed by Hasler and Schimming [10]. The technique is based on an optimal classifier which optimizes the bit error rate (BER) by selecting the symbol that minimizes the a posteriori probabilities. The computational complexity of the classifier is further studied by Lau and Tse [11], and an approximate-optimal detection scheme is then proposed [12]. In addition, Tse et al. have reported another noncoherent detector for CSK [13]. The detection principles are formulated on the reconstruction of the return map of the chaotic signals and the regression method.

Besides the aforementioned basic noncoherent detection schemes, a number of DCSK-based derivatives have evolved to further enhance the DCSK scheme. For example, frequency-modulated DCSK (FM-DCSK) has been proposed to overcome the varying bit-energy problem in DCSK [14], [15]. Instead of feeding a chaotic signal into a DCSK modulator, the chaotic signal is applied to modulate the frequency of a sinusoidal carrier, producing a chaotic FM signal. By sending the chaotic FM signal to a DCSK modulator, an FM-DCSK output is produced which has a constant amplitude, and hence constant power and energy per bit duration. Quadrature CSK (QCSK), a multilevel version of DCSK, has been investigated by Galias and Maggio [16]. Based upon the generation of an orthogonal of chaotic functions, QCSK allows an increase in data rate with respect to DCSK, with the same bandwidth occupation. In the DCSK scheme, because of the similarity between the reference and information-bearing chaotic samples, the bit rate of the system can be easily derived. This may not be very desirable if we want to hide the signal away from unintended parties. In the permutation-based DCSK (P-DCSK) scheme [17], a permutation transformation is introduced in the modulator to shuffle the chaotic samples, destroying the similarity between the reference and information-bearing samples in the DCSK system. By doing so, the bit rate is made undetectable from the frequency spectrum, thereby enhancing the data security. Correlation delay-shift-keying (CDSK) scheme is similar to the DCSK scheme in that a reference chaotic signal is embedded in
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the transmitted signal [18]. Unlike in DCSK, however, the reference signal and the information-bearing signal are now added together with a certain time delay in CDSK. As a consequence, each transmitted signal sample includes one reference sample and one information-bearing sample, and the transmitted signal sample is never repeated. Since no individual reference signal is sent, the bandwidth efficiency is improved. Moreover, by eliminating the switch required to perform the switching between the reference chaotic signal and information-bearing signal in the DCSK system, CDSK allows a continuous operation of the transmitter. Also, the transmitted signal is more homogeneous and less prone to interception. However, because the sum of two chaotic signals is sent, more uncertainty (interference) is produced when the received signal correlates with its delayed version at the receiving side. Therefore, the performance of CDSK is worse than that of DCSK.

In this paper, we propose a generalized CDSK (GCDSK) scheme. The transmitted signal is composed of a reference chaotic signal and a number of delayed chaotic signals, some of which are modulated by the data being sent. Such a construction of the transmitted signal allows the transmission of more than one reference signal and more than one information-bearing signal simultaneously. The useful signal component, as well as the interference component, will be enhanced at the receiving side. We show that with appropriate choice of system parameters, the bit error performance of the proposed system improves over the CDSK scheme. The system also inherits the merits of the CDSK system such as being switchless and allowing continuous operation of the transmitter. The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section II, the operation of a baseband implementation of the CDSK system is briefly reviewed, and in Section III, the proposed GCDSK scheme is described.

Assuming a Gaussian correlator output, an approximate BER is derived analytically in terms of the spreading factor, length of delay and the number of delay units. Finally, using the Chebyshev map as the chaotic generator, we perform simulations for the GCDSK system and present the results in Section IV. Besides comparing with the analytical results, the simulation results for the GCDSK scheme are also compared with those of the DCSK and CDSK schemes.

II. REVIEW OF CDSK SCHEME

Fig. 1 shows the transmitter and receiver structures of a CDSK system [18]. Denote the $l$th transmitted symbol by $d_l \in \{-1, +1\}$ and assume that “+1” and “-1” are transmitted with equal probabilities. First a chaotic signal, denoted by $\{x_k\}$, is generated in the transmitter. The transmitted signal, $s_k$, is the sum of the chaotic signal $x_k$ and the delayed version of the signal, $x_{k-L}$, modulated by the symbol $d_l \in \{-1, +1\}$, where $L$ denotes the delay, i.e.,

$$s_k = x_k + d_l x_{k-L}.$$  \hfill (1)$$

Denote the spreading factor by $\beta$, i.e., $\beta$ chaotic signals $s_k$, are sent within one bit duration. Consider the $l$th transmitted symbol $d_l$ and the transmitted signals related to it. For $k = (l-1)\beta + 1 - L, (l-1)\beta + 2 - L, \ldots, l\beta - L$, the transmitted signal equals

$$s_k = x_k + d_l x_{k-L}$$ \hfill (2)

in which the reference signal $x_k$ for the $l$th symbol is embedded, and $d_l \theta$ with $\theta \leq l$ represents the symbol modulating the delayed
chaotic signal component. Further, during the time when \( k = (l-1)\beta + 1, (l-1)\beta + 2, \ldots, l/\beta \), the transmitted signal

\[ s_k = x_k + \frac{d_l x_{k-L}}{d_l x_{k-L}} \text{ information-bearing signal for the } l\text{th symbol} \]

now contains the information-bearing part \( d_l x_{k-L} \) for the \( l \)th symbol. Therefore, by correlating the chaotic signals in these two time intervals, the \( l \)th transmitted symbol \( d_l \) can be decoded.

Assume that the transmitted signal is passed through an additional white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel with a two-sided power spectral density \( N_0/2 \). The received signal, denoted by \( r_k \), is given by

\[ r_k = s_k + \xi_k \]

where \( \xi_k \) denotes the AWGN signal with zero mean and variance \( N_0/2 \). At the receiving side, the received signal correlates with an \( L \)-sample-delayed version of itself within each symbol duration.

The output of the correlator at the end of the \( l \)th symbol duration, denoted by \( y_k \), equals

\[
y_k = \sum_{k=(l-1)/\beta+1}^{l/\beta} r_k r_{k-L} + \xi_k \]

where \( \lambda \), \( \mu \), and \( \nu \) denote the required signal, the intrasignal interference and the noise component, respectively, and are given by

\[
\lambda = d_l \sum_{k=(l-1)/\beta+1}^{l/\beta} x_k^2\]

\[
\mu = \sum_{k=(l-1)/\beta+1}^{l/\beta} \left( x_k x_{k-L} + d_l x_{k-2L} + d_l x_{k-2L} + \xi_k \right) \]

\[
\nu = \sum_{k=(l-1)/\beta+1}^{l/\beta} \left( x_k x_{k-L} + d_l x_{k-2L} + \xi_k \right) \]

Note that in the above equations, the function \( \lfloor x \rfloor \) computes the integral part of \( x \). As in a DCSK system, the required signal in (6) is a time-varying component, depending upon the bit energy of the transmitted signal. The intrasignal interference, similar to the interuser interference in a multiple access system [19], originates from the correlation between the chaotic samples and may contribute positively or negatively to the required signal. The net effect is that more uncertainty on the correlator output is produced. Finally, the noise component comes from the noisy
channel. Based on the correlator output, the symbol is decoded according to the following rule

\[ d_i = \begin{cases} 
+1, & \text{if } y_i > 0 \\
-1, & \text{if } y_i \leq 0.
\end{cases} \quad (9) \]

Because of the additional uncertainty due to the intrasignal interference, the performance of the CDSK system is always lower than that of the DCFSK system. In particular, under a noiseless condition, the correlator for the CDSK receiver produces

\[ y_t = \lambda + \mu \quad (10) \]

Under the same condition, the correlator in the DCSK receiver gives only the required signal component, i.e., \( \lambda \) [6]. By comparing these two expressions, we may conclude that DCSK outperforms CDSK in a noiseless environment.

### III. GCDSK Scheme

#### A. Transmitter Structure

We propose a generalized CDSK (GCDSK) communication system, as shown in Fig. 2. The transmitter contains a chaotic signal generator and \((M-1)\) delay blocks. We assume that \( M > 2 \) because when \( M = 2 \), the GCDSK system degenerates to the CDSK system. Denote the minimum delay by \( L \). The chaotic signals with delays \( L, 3L, 5L, \ldots \), are modulated by the data sequence \( \{d_l\} \), whereas the signals with delays \( 2L, 4L, 6L, \ldots \) are unmodulated. Finally, the transmitted signal is formed by adding the original chaotic signal and all the delayed signals. As in Section II, we define \( \beta \) as the spreading factor, i.e., the number of transmitted signals in each bit duration. During the \( l \)th bit duration, i.e., for time \( k = (l-1)\beta + 1, (l-1)\beta + 2, \ldots, \beta \), the transmitted signal is given by (11), as shown at the bottom of the page, where in each case, the first and second terms represent summation of all the unmodulated and modulated chaotic signals, respectively.

#### B. Receiver Structure

As in Section II, we assume an AWGN channel and we use a similar correlator-type detector. The only difference in the correlator is that only \((\beta - L)\) terms (assuming \( \beta > L \)) will be added in the summation block. Although part of the useful signal component will be lost by summing only \((\beta - L)\) terms, the intrasignal interference component will also be reduced because the appearance of the bit value \( d_{l-1} \) will be avoided in the received signal for \( d_l \). For the \( l \)th symbol, the corresponding output of the correlator equals (12), as shown at the bottom of the page, where

\[ s_k = \begin{cases} 
\sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-2}{2}} x_{k-2mL} + d_l \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-2}{2}} x_{k-(2m+1)L}, & \text{if } M \text{ is even} \\
\sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-1}{2}} x_{k-2mL} + d_l \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-1}{2}} x_{k-(2m+1)L}, & \text{if } M \text{ is odd}
\end{cases} \quad (11) \]

\[ y_t = \sum_{k=(l-1)\beta +1}^{\beta} r_k f_{k-L} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&= \begin{cases} 
\sum_{k=(l-1)\beta +1}^{\beta} \left[ \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-2}{2}} x_{k-2mL} + d_l \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-2}{2}} x_{k-(2m+1)L} + \xi_k \right] \\
\times \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-2}{2}} \left[ x_{k-(2m+1)L} + d_l x_{k-(2m+2)L} + \xi_k \right], & \text{if } M \text{ is even} \\
\sum_{k=(l-1)\beta +1}^{\beta} \left[ \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-1}{2}} x_{k-2mL} + d_l \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-1}{2}} x_{k-(2m+1)L} + \xi_k \right] \\
\times \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{M-1}{2}} \left[ x_{k-(2m+1)L} + d_l x_{k-(2m+2)L} + \xi_k \right], & \text{if } M \text{ is odd}
\end{cases}
\end{align*} \]

\[ = \begin{cases} 
\lambda_{\text{even}} + \mu_{\text{even}} + \nu_{\text{even}}, & \text{if } M \text{ is even} \\
\lambda_{\text{odd}} + \mu_{\text{odd}} + \nu_{\text{odd}}, & \text{if } M \text{ is odd}
\end{cases} \quad (12) \]
\[
\lambda_{\text{ocdl}} = \sum_{k=(1)\beta+L+1}^{1} \beta d_k \left( \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL}^2 \right) + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL}^2 \bigg) \\
\mu_{\text{ocdl}} = \sum_{k=(1)\beta+L+1}^{1} \beta \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL} \right) + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL} + \frac{d_k}{2} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL} \right) \\
\nu_{\text{ocdl}} = \sum_{k=(1)\beta+L+1}^{1} \beta \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL} \right) + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL} + \frac{d_k}{2} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} x_{k-2mL} \right) \\
\text{where } \lambda_{\text{event}}, \mu_{\text{event}}, \nu_{\text{event}} \text{ and } \lambda_{\text{ocdl}}, \mu_{\text{ocdl}}, \nu_{\text{ocdl}} \text{ denote the sets of required signal, the intrasignal interference and the noise component when } M \text{ is even and odd, respectively. Based on the value of } y_t, \text{ the symbol is decoded according to (9). It can be observed that when } L \text{ is small compared to } \beta, \text{ the useful signal component in the GCDSK receiver is approximately } (M - 1) \text{ times larger than that of the CDSK case. Although both the intrasignal interference and the noise component increase compared with the CDSK case, their effect can be compensated by the increase in signal component. Therefore, with appropriate values of } M \text{ and } L, \text{ GCDSK can be designed to outperform CDSK.}
\]

1) Gaussian-Approximated BERS: In our paper, we make use of the Chebyshev map of degree 2 to generate the chaotic signal. The map is given by
\[
x_{k+1} = 2x_k^2 - 1
\]
and its correlation properties have been reported previously [6], [20]. Assuming that the chaotic signal \{x_k\} is stationary, it is readily shown that for a given transmitted symbol \(d_k\), the mean value of the correlator output equals
\[
E[y_t | d_k] = d_k(\beta - L)(M - 1)P_s
\]
where \(E[\cdot]\) represents the expectation operator and
\[
P_s = E \left[ x_k^2 \right].
\]
If the conditional correlator output follows a Gaussian distribution, the approximate BER for the GCDSK system can then be derived analytically and is given by (22), as shown at the bottom of the page (see Appendix A for details), [see (23), shown at the bottom of the page], and the variables \(\alpha, \gamma, P_c\), and the functions \(V_1, V_2, V_3, C_1, C_2\) are defined as in Appendix A.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, we present our findings on the bit error performance of the GCDSK system. We denote the average bit energy by \(E_b\) which can be readily shown equal to
\[
E_b = \beta MP_s.
\]
For various average-bit-energy-to-noise-psd \((E_b/N_0)\) ratios, we simulate the GCDSK system and record the BERs. Also, we compute the approximate BERs using (22). We then compare our results with those derived from the CDSK and DCSK systems whenever appropriate.

A. Effect of Delay \(L\)

First, we investigate the effect of the delay \(L\) on the bit error performance. Fig. 3 plots the BER of the CDSK system together with that of the GCDSK system with \(M = 4\) and 6.

\[
\text{BER}_{\text{GCDSK}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Prob}(y_t \leq 0 | (d_k = +1)) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Prob}(y_t > 0 | (d_k = -1))
\]

\[
= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{1}{2} \text{erfc} \left( \frac{(\beta - L)(M - 1)P_s}{\sqrt{2\text{var}[y_t]}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{erfc} \left( \frac{(\beta - L)(M - 1)P_s}{\sqrt{2\text{var}[y_t]}} \right), & \text{when } L = 1 \\
\frac{1}{2} \text{erfc} \left( \frac{(\beta - L)(M - 1)P_s}{\sqrt{2\text{var}[y_t]}} \right), & \text{when } 2 \leq L < \beta
\end{array} \right.
\]

\[
\text{var}[y_t | d_k] = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
V_1(\beta, M)\text{var} \left[ x_k^2 \right] + V_2(\beta, M)P_s^2 + V_3(\beta, M)P_s \frac{N_0}{2} + (\beta - L) \frac{N_0^2}{4} + 2d_kP_s[C_1(\beta, M) + C_2(\beta, M)], \\
\alpha \left[ V_1(\gamma + 1, M)\text{var} \left[ x_k^2 \right] + V_2(\gamma + 1, M)P_s^2 + V_3(\gamma + 1, M)P_s \frac{N_0}{2} \right] + (L - \alpha) \left[ V_1(\gamma, M)\text{var} \left[ x_k^2 \right] + V_2(\gamma, M)P_s^2 + V_3(\gamma, M)P_s \frac{N_0}{2} \right], & \text{when } L = 1 \\
\left( \begin{array}{l}
(\beta - L) \frac{N_0^2}{4}, \\
\end{array} \right) & \text{when } 2 \leq L < \beta
\end{array} \right.
\]
A spreading factor $\beta$ of 100 is used. It is observed that the bit error performance for the GCDSK system degrades as the delay $L$ increases. As stated in Section III-B, the correlator in the GCDSK receiver computes the sum of $(\beta - 1)$ terms before deciding upon whether the received symbol is a "+1" or "-1." Hence, the correlator output becomes more unreliable when the number of terms reduces due to an increase in $L$, thereby increasing the BER. For the CDSK system, the number of the terms used in the correlator block is fixed at $\beta$ and is independent of the delay $L$. Therefore, the bit error performance of the CDSK system is found to be unaffected by the delay $L$. Comparing the CDSK and GCDSK systems, it can be observed that for the same $E_b/N_0$, the GCDSK system outperforms the CDSK system with delay values up to 50.

In Fig. 4, the simulated BER is plotted against $E_b/N_0$ for the CDSK and GCDSK systems. The spreading factor is kept at 100. Again, it is shown that for a fixed $E_b/N_0$, the BER for the CDSK system is hardly affected by the delay $L$, whereas the BER for the GCDSK system increases as $L$ increases. As expected, the BER for both systems improves with increasing $E_b/N_0$.

### B. Effect of the Number of Delay Blocks

Recall that in the GCDSK transmitter, the signal from the chaos generator is added to $M-1$ delayed chaotic signals (some are modulated by the symbol to be sent) before transmission. In Fig. 5, we plot the simulated BER against $M$. (Note that the CDSK system corresponds to the case where $M = 2$.) A spreading factor $\beta$ of 100 is used. It is shown that for a fixed $E_b/N_0$ value, the BER reaches an optimal value at a certain value of $M$. Specifically, when $M$ increases, the average bit energy and the detected signal component given by (24) and (20), respectively, increase initially. Although the intrasignal interference and the noise power also go up for a given $E_b/N_0$, there is a net improvement in the signal quality initially, thereby improving the BER. As the value of $M$ is further increased beyond the optimal point, the percentage increase in the detected signal component is overshadowed by the degradation due to intrasignal interference and noise. Therefore, the BER starts to degrade for large values of $M$.

### C. Effect of Spreading Factor

Next, we study the effect of the spreading factor on the bit error performance. Fig. 6 plots the simulated BER versus the spreading factor. A delay value $L = 1$ is used. As in other noncoherent chaos-based communication systems, it is observed that the BER improves initially before an optimal point is reached [13], [18]. Apparently, the gain in the signal component is significant as the spreading factor first increases. Further increasing the spreading factor beyond the critical point degrades the performance because the increase in noise component become more prominent. It is also found that for different combinations of $E_b/N_0$ and $M$, the corresponding optimum values of $\beta$ are different.

### D. Comparison of the Simulated and Gaussian-Approximated BERs

Fig. 7 compares the simulated and Gaussian-approximated BERs for the CDSK and GCDSK systems. (See Appendix B for the derivation of the Gaussian-approximated BER for the CDSK system.) A spreading factor of 100 is used. In Fig. 7(a),
Fig. 5. Simulated BER versus $M$ for the CDSK ($M = 2$) and GCDSK systems. $\beta = 100$. (a) $L = 1$. (b) $L = 5$.

Fig. 6. Simulated BER versus spreading factor for the CDSK and GCDSK systems. $L = 1$.

it is observed that for the CDSK system, the simulated and Gaussian-approximated BERs are close when the delay $L$ is

large, which is in good agreement with the results reported by Sushchik et al. [18]. For the GCDSK system with $M = 6$, the discrepancy between the simulated and Gaussian-approximated BERs is quite significant when $E_b/N_0$ is large. When we analyze the statistics of the correlator output from the simulation results, it is found that the conditional means and variances match with those derived in Appendix A. However, the distribution of the conditional correlator output does not follow a Gaussian distribution.

E. Comparison With DCSK System

Fig. 8 plots the simulated BERs of the GCDSK and DCSK systems. For the DCSK system, a spreading factor of $2/\beta = 200$ is used. It can be observed that with a delay $L = 1$ and a spreading factor of $\beta = 100$, the GCDSK system can achieve similar BER performance as the DCSK system. In particular, when $E_b/N_0$ is lower than 16 dB, the GCDSK system slightly outperforms the DCSK one.
In this paper, we develop and study in detail a GCDSK scheme for noncoherent chaos-based digital communications. We also compare the BER of the proposed system with two previously studied noncoherent chaos-based communication schemes, namely, CDSK scheme and DCSK scheme. Results show that the CDSK scheme gives the worst BER and is approximately 2 dB worse than the DCSK scheme. For the GCDSK scheme, the BERs are about the same for $M = 4, 6, 8$, and 10. Its performance is similar to that of the DCSK system and is better for $E_b/N_0$ values below 16 dB.

**V. CONCLUSION**

In this paper, we develop and study in detail a GCDSK scheme for noncoherent chaos-based digital communications. We also compare the BER of the proposed system with two previously studied noncoherent chaos-based communication schemes, namely, CDSK scheme and DCSK scheme. Results show that the CDSK scheme gives the worst BER and is approximately 2 dB worse than the DCSK scheme. For the GCDSK scheme, the BERs are about the same for $M = 4, 6, 8$, and 10. Its performance is similar to that of the DCSK system and is better for $E_b/N_0$ values below 16 dB.

**APPENDIX A**

**DERIVATION OF BERs FOR GCDSK SYSTEM BASED ON SIMPLE GAUSSIAN APPROXIMATION**

All symbols are defined as in Section III. Without loss of generality, we consider the probability of error for the $l$th symbol when all delay units at the transmitter side begin generating chaotic signals. Based on (12)–(18), it is readily shown that for a given transmitted symbol $d_l$, the mean value of $y_l$ equals

$$E[y_l | d_l] = d_l(\beta - L)(M - 1)P_s$$

where $E[.]$ denotes the expectation operator and

$$P_s = E \left[ x_k^2 \right]$$

In the evaluation of the variance of $y_l | d_l$, terms containing $d_l E[2x_k^2x_{k+L}x_{k+2L}]$ appear. For the particular map $x_{k+1} = 2x_k - 1$ that we are using

$$E \left[ x_k^2x_{k+L}x_{k+2L} \right] \begin{cases} \neq 0, & \text{if } L = 1 \\ = 0, & \text{if } L > 1 \end{cases}$$

Thus, we derive the variance of $y_l | d_l$ under two different scenarios: $L = 1$ and $2 \leq L < \beta$. Note that when a different map is used, different nonzero terms containing $d_l$ may appear.

When $L = 1$, the variance of $y_l | d_l$ can be shown equal to

$$\text{var}[y_l | d_l] = V_1(\beta, M)\text{var}[x_k^2] + V_2(\beta, M)P_s^2$$

$$+ V_3(\beta, M)P_s \frac{N_0}{2} + (\beta - L)\frac{N_0}{4}$$

$$+ 2d_l P_s[C_1(\beta, M) + C_2(\beta, M)]$$

where $\text{var}[.]$ denotes the variance operator, and see (29)–(34) at the bottom of the next page. For the case when $2 \leq L < \beta$, we define

$$\gamma = \left[ \frac{\beta - L}{L} \right] + 1$$

$$\alpha = \beta - L - \left[ \frac{\beta - L}{L} \right] L$$

where the function $[.]$ computes the integral part of $\zeta$. The var-
value of $y_t \mid d_t$ can be shown equal to

$$\text{var}[y_t \mid d_t] = \alpha \left[ V_1(\gamma + 1, M) \text{var} [x_k^2] + V_2(\gamma + 1, M)P_s^2 \right. $$

$$ + V_3(\gamma + 1, M)P_s \frac{N_0}{2} \left. + (L - \alpha) \left[ V_1(\gamma, M) \text{var} [x_k^2] \right. ight]$$

$$ + V_2(\gamma, M)P_s^2 + V_3(\gamma, M)P_s \frac{N_0}{2} \right] + (\beta - L) \frac{N_0}{4}. \quad (37)$$

In this case, it can be observed that the variance of $y_t \mid d_t$ is independent of $d_t$.

If $y_t$ follows a Gaussian distribution for a given transmitted symbol $d_t$, the approximate BER of the GDCSK system can be found as shown in (38) at the bottom of the page, where [see (39) at the bottom of the page] and $\text{erfc}(\cdot)$ represents the complementary error function [1].

**APPENDIX B**

**DERIVATION OF BIT ERROR RATES FOR CDSK SYSTEM BASED ON SIMPLE GAUSSIAN APPROXIMATION**

All symbols are defined as in Section II. Without loss of generality, the probability of error for the $l$th symbol is considered.
The derivation is similar to that of the GCDSK system and will not be shown here. In summary, we have (40) and (41), as shown at the bottom of the page, where

\[ \kappa = \beta \frac{1}{L} + 1 \quad (42) \]

\[ \theta = \beta - \frac{\beta}{L} \quad (43) \]

\[ W(\psi) = (\psi - 1)\text{var}\left[x_L^2\right] + (5\psi - 7)P_n^2. \quad (44) \]

Note that for the case \( L > \beta \), the variance of \( y^Td_T \) can be rewritten as

\[ \text{var}(y^T d_T) = \beta \text{var}\left[x_L^2\right] + \frac{3\beta}{4} + E_bN_0 + \beta + \frac{N_0^2}{4} \quad (45) \]

which is independent of \( d_T \) and can be shown equal to that obtained by Sushchik et al. [18]. The only difference is that the value of \( \text{var}(x_L^2) \) is different for different maps (symmetric tent map used by Sushchik et al. and Chebyshev map used here). The Gaussian-approximated BER can then be obtained similarly as in (38).
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