Subject:

$$\omega_{p} = 0,2\Pi$$
, $\omega_{s} = 0,4\Pi$
 $T_{j} = 2$
 $R_{p} = 1dB$, $A_{s} = 20dB$
 $R_{p} = 1dB$, $A_{s} = 20dB$
 $R_{p} = 1dB$, $R_{p} = 20dB$
 $R_{p} = 1dB$, $R_{p} = 20dB$
 $R_{p} = 1dB$, $R_{p} = 20dB$

$$\Omega_{p} = \frac{2}{T} ban(\frac{\omega_{p}}{2}) = ban(\frac{0,2\Pi}{2}) = ban(0,|\Pi) = 0,3249$$

$$\Omega_{s} = \frac{2}{T} ban(\frac{\omega_{s}}{2}) = ban(0,2\Pi) = 0,72654$$

Bubberworth:
$$|H_{c}(j\Omega)|^{2} = \frac{1}{1 + (\frac{n}{n_{c}})^{2N}} \rightarrow [N=4]$$

Al $\log \left[(10^{10} - 1) / (10^{10} - 1) \right]$

$$N = \frac{\log \left(\left(10^{10} - 1 \right) / \left(10^{10} - 1 \right)}{2 \log \left(\frac{-\Omega p}{\Omega s} \right)}$$

$$H_{\alpha}(s) = \frac{0/6219}{(s^2+0)71085+0,1480)(s^2+0)29445+0,1480)}$$

$$H(3) = H_a \left(\frac{2}{T}, \frac{1-3^{-1}}{1+3^{-1}} \right) = H_a \left(\frac{1-3^{-1}}{1+3^{-1}} \right)$$

 $\omega_{n} = \frac{2}{\pi} ban'\left(\frac{szc.2}{2}\right) = \frac{2}{\pi} ban'\left(\frac{szc.2}{2}\right)$ Poles: - Re et j = 1 (2K+N-1) $N = \log \left[\frac{Rp}{10^{10} - 1} \right] / (10^{10} - 1) \right] = 3,8 \longrightarrow 4$ $2\log \left(\frac{2p}{2} \right)$ 2 - JCP = 0,3847 Wn = 2 ban (0,3847) = 0,2338 H(3) _ 90081684 (3+1)4 (32-0,91673+92352)(32-1,1813+95918) Chebysher; chebysher-I filter have equiripple response in the passband, while chebysher-I lilter have equiripple response in the stopbana Butberworth filters have monotonic response in both bands - chelospher litters provide lower order than bubberworth litters for the some specifications. chebysher-I: |Haya)|= $T_{N}(x) = \begin{cases} Cos(Nos^{1}(x)) & 0 < x < 1 \\ Cosh(Cosh^{-1}(x)) & 1 < x < p \end{cases}$ E = VIO1/20 , A = 10/0/20

	ubject : Date
	chebysher-I filter is related to the chebysher-I filter through a simple
= 6	ransformation. It has monotone passband and an equiripple stopband which
iw	oplies that this filter has both poles and zeros in the s-plane Therefore the
9	roup delay characteristics are better (and the phase response more linear)
n	the pass band than cheby shev-I
	$ H_{\alpha}(j n) ^{2} = \frac{1}{1 + \left[\varepsilon^{2} + \frac{2(n c)}{2}\right]^{-1}}$
1011	
4-	Elliptic low pass filters exhibits equiripple behavior in the passband as
<u>, k</u>	rell as in the stop bound. They are similar in magnitude response characteristics
6	to the FIR equiripple filters. Therefore elliptic filters are opportunititiers in that
	they achieve the minimum order N for the given specifications Cor alternately,
a	chieve the sharpest transition band has the given order N)
7	Trese Pilters are very difficult to analyze and to design.
	1H (1st) 2 = 1
	$\frac{ H_{\alpha}(j\alpha) ^2}{ T ^2} = \frac{ +e^2U_N^2(\frac{s_{\alpha}}{5z_{\alpha}})}{ N ^2}$ $= \frac{ H_{\alpha}(j\alpha) ^2}{ N ^2} = \frac{ H_{\alpha}(j\alpha) ^2}{ N ^2} =$
	North order Joenbian exception.
1+6	
4	2
· -	- Elliptic fitters provide optimal performance in the magnitude-squared respons
Ł	out have highly nonlinear phase response in the passband (which is undesirable)
	V
Q	But berworth filters, have maximally flat magnitude response and require a
	higher-order N (more poles) to achieve the same stopband specification.
	They exhibit a fairly linear phase response in their passband. The chobysher
-	filters have place characteristics that lie somewhere in between In practical
Ų.	cepplications, we do consider Bubberworth as well as thebysher litters, in addition
ĺ	PARCO to elliptic filters. The choice depends on both the filter order
	and phase characteristics. La controls distortion The choice depends on both the filter order influence processing speed and with the complexity

for the 1st Signal pairs linear convolution and circular : 5:	(0.31
-convolution are the same beause -> L=4+4=8	2
P=8+4=12	3
$\Delta = L + P - 1 = 19$ $\Delta \langle N = 2 \rangle$	
out for the 2nd Signal Pairs , L=7+5=12	6
P= 11+5=16	7 .
$\Delta = 2 + 16 - 1 = 27$ $\Delta > N = 21$	9
N = 27-21=6 → poloè ci vi si 66	10
تشل الله الله الله الله الله الله الله ال	11
	12
	14
	15
	16
	17