

In other chapters, I've been using the notation $\llbracket \dots \rrbracket$ for **oriented intervals** defined as:

$$\llbracket a, b \rrbracket = [a, b) \ominus [b, a) \quad (1)$$

Only one of the non-oriented (traditional) intervals $[a, b) = \{x | a \leq x < b\}$ or $[b, a) = \{x | b \leq x < a\}$ will be non-empty. The multiplicity of $\llbracket a, b \rrbracket$ will be +1 or -1 between a and b depending. This gives us some nice properties like:

$$\llbracket a, b \rrbracket = \ominus \llbracket b, a \rrbracket \quad (2)$$

$$\llbracket a, c \rrbracket = \llbracket a, b \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket b, c \rrbracket \quad (3)$$

The convolution of two functions is defined by:

$$(F * G)(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F(\tau) G(t - \tau) d\tau \quad (4)$$

If F and G are the sum of disjoint sub-functions f_1, f_2, \dots and g_1, g_2, \dots then:

$$(F * G)(t) = \sum_i \sum_j \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_i(\tau) g_j(t - \tau) d\tau \quad (5)$$

So we only need to worry about convolving “one-piece” functions then we take the sum of all pairs. So for two one piece functions:

$$F(t) = \begin{cases} f(t) & t \in [a_f, b_f) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad G(t) = \begin{cases} g(t) & t \in [a_g, b_g) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

the typical approach would be to commute F and G so that $b_f - a_f < b_g - a_g$ so that:

$$(F * G)(t) = \begin{cases} \int_{a_f}^{x-a_g} f(\tau) g(t - \tau) d\tau & (a_f + a_g) \leq t < (b_f + a_g) \\ \int_{a_f}^{b_f} f(\tau) g(t - \tau) d\tau & (b_f + a_g) \leq t < (a_f + b_g) \\ \int_{x-b_g}^{b_f} f(\tau) g(t - \tau) d\tau & (a_f + b_g) \leq t < (b_f + b_g) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

However with hybrid functions we can (regardless of relative length) write:

$$\begin{aligned} (F * G)(t) = \mathcal{R}_+ & \left(\left(\int_{a_f}^{t-a_g} f(\tau) g(t - \tau) d\tau \right)^{\llbracket a_f+a_g, b_f+a_g \rrbracket} \right. \\ & \oplus \left(\int_{a_f}^{b_f} f(\tau) g(t - \tau) d\tau \right)^{\llbracket b_f+a_g, a_f+b_g \rrbracket} \\ & \left. \oplus \left(\int_{t-b_g}^{b_f} f(\tau) g(t - \tau) d\tau \right)^{\llbracket a_f+b_g, b_f+b_g \rrbracket} \right) (t) \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Let F, G be defined as:

$$F = f_1^{(-\infty, -1)} \oplus f_2^{[-1, 1)} \oplus f_3^{[1, \infty)} \quad (8)$$

$$G = 0^{(-\infty, -1)} \oplus g_1^{[-1, 0)} \oplus g_2^{[0, 1)} \oplus 0^{[1, \infty)} \quad (9)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} (f_2 * g_1)(t) = \mathcal{R}_+ \left(\left(\int_{\llbracket -1, t+1 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(t - \tau) d\tau \right)^{\llbracket -2, 0 \rrbracket} \right. \\ \oplus \left(\int_{\llbracket -1, 1 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(t - \tau) d\tau \right)^{\llbracket 0, -1 \rrbracket} \\ \left. \oplus \left(\int_{\llbracket t, 1 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(t - \tau) d\tau \right)^{\llbracket -1, 1 \rrbracket} \right) (t) \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we wanted to calculate the exact value at -0.5 . The point is in both $\llbracket -2, 0 \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket -1, 1 \rrbracket$ once and in $\llbracket 0, -1 \rrbracket$ with multiplicity negative one. After +-reducing we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (f_2 * g_1)(-0.5) &= \int_{\llbracket -1, .5 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(-0.5 - \tau) d\tau - \int_{\llbracket -1, 1 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(-0.5 - \tau) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{\llbracket -.5, 1 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(-0.5 - \tau) d\tau \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_{\llbracket -1, .5 \rrbracket \ominus \llbracket -1, 1 \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket -.5, 1 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(-0.5 - \tau) d\tau \quad (12)$$

$$= \int_{\llbracket -.5, .5 \rrbracket} f_2(\tau) g_1(-0.5 - \tau) d\tau \quad (13)$$

Note that the terms in (11) are not directly evaluable; g_1 may not be well-defined outside of $\llbracket -1, 0 \rrbracket$. However, since the integrands are all identical, we can collect all the terms and the offending domains cancel.

But there is a potential problem that I've been fudging over when computing $(f_3 * g_1)$ or any interval with infinite bounds. (7) gives the bounds $\llbracket 0, \infty - 1 \rrbracket$, $\llbracket \infty - 1, 1 \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket 1, \infty + 0 \rrbracket$. By treating $\infty - 1 = \infty$, the numbers again cancel so that we have $(f_3 * g_1)(2) = \int_{\llbracket 2, 3 \rrbracket} f_3(\tau) g_1(t - \tau) d\tau$. I'm not sure if this is *actually* a problem or not. This paper was making it out to be a problem, but that might only be due to the worrying about $b_f - a_f < b_g - a_g$ (which we can ignore). I'd like to avoid breaking it into 12 cases; it doesn't seem like the right way.

Algorithms for symbolic linear convolution:

http://ptolemy.eecs.berkeley.edu/publications/papers/94/symbolic_convolution/asilomar94.pdf