

1 Approach

We are assuming the images are 2-D and carry out Fourier analysis in continuous domain. For given equations,

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x, y) &= f_1(x, y) + h_2(x, y) * f_2(x, y) \\ g_2(x, y) &= h_1(x, y) * f_1(x, y) + f_2(x, y) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Let F_i, G_i, H_i be the Fourier transformations of f_i, g_i, h_i respectively. After applying Fourier transformation on both sides to [1](#), we get

$$G_1(\mu, \nu) = F_1(\mu, \nu) + H_2(\mu, \nu)F_2(\mu, \nu) \quad (2a)$$

$$G_2(\mu, \nu) = H_1(\mu, \nu)F_1(\mu, \nu) + F_2(\mu, \nu) \quad (2b)$$

Now, we can solve for F_1, F_2 by multiplying [2a](#) by H_1 and [2b](#) by H_2 then subtracting these equations from [1](#) and rearranging the terms

$$\begin{aligned} H_1G_1 &= H_1F_1 + H_1H_2F_2 & \Rightarrow & H_1G_1 - (G_2) = H_1F_1 + H_1H_2F_2 - (H_1F_1 + F_2) & \Rightarrow & H_1G_1 - G_2 = H_1H_2F_2 - F_2 & \Rightarrow & H_1G_1 - G_2 = F_2(H_1H_2 - 1) \\ H_2G_2 &= H_2H_1F_1 + H_2F_2 & \Rightarrow & H_2G_2 - (G_1) = H_2H_1F_1 + H_2F_2 - (F_1 + H_2F_2) & \Rightarrow & H_2G_2 - G_1 = H_2H_1F_1 - F_1 & \Rightarrow & H_2G_2 - G_1 = F_1(H_2H_1 - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Now, we can get f_1, f_2 by taking inverse Fourier transform of F_1, F_2 respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x, y) &= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\frac{H_1G_1 - G_2}{H_1H_2 - 1} \right) (\mu, \nu) \\ f_2(x, y) &= \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\frac{H_2G_2 - G_1}{H_1H_2 - 1} \right) (\mu, \nu) \end{aligned} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{pmatrix} F_1(\mu, \nu) = \frac{H_1(\mu, \nu)G_1(\mu, \nu) - G_2(\mu, \nu)}{H_1(\mu, \nu)H_2(\mu, \nu) - 1} \\ F_2(\mu, \nu) = \frac{H_2(\mu, \nu)G_2(\mu, \nu) - G_1(\mu, \nu)}{H_1(\mu, \nu)H_2(\mu, \nu) - 1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{aligned} f_1(x, y) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_1(\mu, \nu) e^{j2\pi(\mu x + \nu y)} d\mu d\nu \\ f_2(x, y) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_2(\mu, \nu) e^{j2\pi(\mu x + \nu y)} d\mu d\nu \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

2 Problem

An issue can arise when the denominator in [4](#) is zero, i.e., $H_1(\mu, \nu)H_2(\mu, \nu) = 1$ for some (μ, ν) . In this section we show that this is indeed possible. Since the blur kernels preserves the brightness of the image, we can assume they are normalized, i.e.,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x, y) dx dy = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |H(\mu, \nu)| \leq 1 \quad \forall (\mu, \nu) \quad (5)$$

Under this assumption, we can see that $H_1(0,0) = H_2(0,0) = 1$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
H(\mu, \nu) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x, y) e^{-j2\pi(\mu x + \nu y)} dx dy &\Rightarrow H(0, 0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x, y) e^{-j2\pi(0x + 0y)} dx dy \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x, y) e^0 dx dy \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(x, y) dx dy \\
H(0, 0) &= 1
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

So at $(\mu, \nu) = (0, 0)$, both F_1, F_2 are undefined due to division by zero.
Hence, the formula given in [1](#) isn't foolproof.