

HW 5

$$1. \quad g_1 = f_1 + h_2 * f_2$$

$$g_2 = h_1 * f_1 + f_2$$

take fourier transform of these equations. By convolution property and linearity

$$G_1 = F_1 + H_2 F_2 \quad - (1)$$

$$G_2 = H_1 F_1 + F_2 \quad - (2)$$

multiply (2) by H_2 and subtract:

$$G_1 - H_2 G_2 = F_1 - H_1 H_2 F_1$$

$$F_1 = \frac{G_1 - H_2 G_2}{1 - H_1 H_2}$$

back substituting, we get

$$F_2 = \frac{G_2 - H_1 G_1}{1 - H_1 H_2}$$

clearly $f_1 = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(F_1)$ (inverse fourier transform)

$$f_1 = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\frac{G_1 - H_2 G_2}{1 - H_1 H_2} \right)$$

similarly

$$f_2 = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\frac{G_2 - H_1 G_1}{1 - H_1 H_2} \right)$$

Problem about formula 8

In expressions of both F_1 and F_2 , the denominator is $1 - H_1 H_2$.

This means that the Fourier transform of the images of the original scene blows up if $H_1 H_2 = 1$, which is clearly incorrect, ~~the~~ since they are by themselves, natural images.

The condition $H_1 H_2 = 1$ ~~not~~ means that H_2 is the inverse filter of H_1 .

Intuitively, this could (approximately) be the case in a real system, since blurring the reflection in one case and blurring the scene outside a in another seem to be like "inverse" operations.

If the camera hardware is such that this "intuitive inversion" assumption is true, then our formulae are rendered useless.