

Linear Convolution

The **linear convolution** of two sequences x_n and y_n is defined by

$$(x * y)_n := \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} x_m y_{n-m}.$$

If one of the sequences, say x_m , has finite duration, say $x_m = 0$ for $m < M_1$ and $m > M_2$, then

$$(x * y)_n := \sum_{m=M_1}^{M_2} x_m y_{n-m}.$$

Let us further suppose that we are interested in the convolution only for $N_1 \leq n \leq N_2$, say for plotting purposes. Then in computing the convolution, the values of the subscript of y , that is, $n - m$, range from $N_1 - M_2$ to $N_2 - M_1$. The point here is that to compute $(x * y)_n$ for $n = N_1, \dots, N_2$ requires only the values x_{M_1}, \dots, x_{M_2} and $y_{N_1 - M_2}, \dots, y_{N_2 - M_1}$. For example, if $M_1 = M_2 = 0$, then we need y_{-M_2}, \dots, y_{N_2} . **[Draw pictures]**

Let us now define $\hat{y}_n := y_n$ for $n = N_1 - M_2, \dots, N_2 - M_1$ and $\hat{y}_n := 0$ otherwise. A graphical argument with y_{n-m}, \hat{y}_{n-m} , and x_m shows that $(x * y)_n$ and $(x * \hat{y})_n$ are equal for $n = N_1, \dots, N_2$. Fortunately, the convolution of two finite-length sequences is easily done with the MATLAB command `z=conv(x, yhat)`. However, since MATLAB computes $(x * \hat{y})_n$ for $n = N_1 - (M_2 - M_1)$ to $n = N_2 + (M_2 - M_1)$, the values $(x * \hat{y})_{M_1}, \dots, (x * \hat{y})_{M_2}$ must be extracted from `z` this can be done with the expression `z(M2 - M1 + 1 : end - (M2 - M1))`.

A nice application of our discussion arises if we approximate the sampled version of (1.14), i.e.,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(n/f_s - \tau)x(\tau) d\tau = \frac{1}{f_s} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} h((n - m)/f_s)x(m/f_s),$$

with a finite sum, say

$$\frac{1}{f_s} \sum_{m=M_1}^{M_2} h((n - m)/f_s)x(m/f_s).$$

Since (1.14) assumes h is bandlimited, it cannot be time limited. However, when only finitely many values of n are of interest, as would be the case for plotting the convolution, we can use `conv` as described.

How Does Circular Convolution with FFTs Compare with conv?

From our theoretical discussion, there is no question that the circular convolution of zero-padded sequences is faster than direct convolution. To see the difference in action, run the following MATLAB script, which computes the linear convolution of two causal, finite-duration sequences by both methods and reports the time taken by each.

```
x=ones(1,2000);
y=ones(1,5000);
tic
N = length(x)+length(y)-1;
N = 2^ceil(log2(N)); % round up to a power of 2
v = ifft(fft(x,N).*fft(y,N));
ffttime = toc;
tic
w = conv(x,y);
convtime = toc;
plot([0:length(v)-1],real(v)); grid on
fprintf('conv takes %g times longer.\n', convtime/ffttime)
```