

**A PRE-PROCESS IMAGE ENHANCEMENT ALGORITHM USING
WIENER AND GABOR FILTER TO OVERCOME FINGERPRINT
IMAGE ACQUISITION PROBLEMS**

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS



PEARLY ADI NEGORO

1112001040

**INFORMATICS DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
BAKRIE UNIVERSITY
JAKARTA
2017**

**A PRE-PROCESS IMAGE ENHANCEMENT ALGORITHM USING
WIENER AND GABOR FILTER TO OVERCOME FINGERPRINT
IMAGE ACQUISITION PROBLEMS**

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

Submitted as one of requirements to obtain bachelor degree (S1)



PEARLY ADI NEGORO

1112001040

**INFORMATICS DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
BAKRIE UNIVERSITY
JAKARTA
2017**

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

**The material in this Undergraduate Thesis is the result of my own work,
and all sources are quoted and cited properly.**

Name : Pearly Adi Negoro

NIM : 1112001040

Signature :

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Pearly', written in a cursive style.

Date : August 21st, 2017

STATEMENT OF APPROVAL


This Undergraduate Thesis was submitted by:

Name : Pearly Adi Negoro
NIM : 1112001040
Department : Informatics
Faculty : Engineering and Computer Science
Title : A Pre-Process Image Enhancement Algorithm Using Wiener
and Gabor Filter to Overcome Fingerprint Image Acquisition
Problems

has been approved by the Board of Examiners and accepted as a partial fulfilment of the requirements to obtain a Bachelor degree in Informatics Department, Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, Bakrie University.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Supervisor : Irwan Prasetya Gunawan, S.T, M.Eng, Ph.D



30/8/17

Examiner I : Berkah I. Santoso, S.T, M.T.I



30/8/17

Examiner II : Hoga Saragih. S.T, M.T, Dr. Prof



Authorized in : Jakarta

Date : August 21st, 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The greatest thankfulness and praises are conveyed to Allah SWT for all the endless blessing and mercy that I could finally finish this undergraduate thesis with the title of “A Pre-Process Image Enhancement Algorithm Using Wiener and Gabor Filter to Overcome Fingerprint Acquisition Problems”. This final project is submitted as the partial fulfillment of the requirements to obtain a Bachelor degree in Informatics Department, Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science, Bakrie University.

During this research there have been many people who have guided, helped and inspired me. Therefore, I also would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following individuals:

1. My supervisor, Dr. Irwan Prasetya Gunawan for the invaluable advice, positive encouragement, and everlasting patience he has provided me throughout the preparation of this thesis.
2. Prof. Hoga saragih for his keen interest on me at every stage of my research. His prompt inspirations, timely suggestions with kindness, enthusiasm, and dynamism have enabled me to complete my thesis.
3. My special gratitude is also dedicated to my beloved parents, Bapak Wartono and Ibu Eny Susilaningsih for their unconditional love, the never-ending-prayers, co-operation, patience, understanding, and encouragement which were the sustaining factors in carrying out the work successfully.
4. My three annoying sisters; Intan Prajawati Sulistyanningrum, Meliana Hana Fatasya, and Refita Chandra Andini. I love you all anyways.
5. Muhamad Lutfi Afandi for his constant encouragement throughout my research period, Alif Hariry for the struggle we shared, and Aulia Syarifuddin for his endless support. Thank you for being such a good friends of mine and making my study in Universitas Bakrie enjoyable and exciting one.
6. Nadia Bella, Leliana Anggraini, Rani Aqeela, Nicky Octavia Wijaya, and Almh. Khairiah Ulfa for all the love and supports.

7. My special thanks are accorded to my ex co-workers at PT. Fit And Health Indonesia who always support me with endless jokes while working on this paper.
8. TIF 2011 for their kind help and co-operation throughout my study period.

Finally, I truly hope that this Undergraduate Thesis can be used as reference in the future and brings benefit to the other parties who need.

Jakarta, August 21st 2017

Pearly Adi Negoro

DECLARATION OF PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

As student of Bakrie University, I hereby:

Name : Pearly Adi Negoro

NIM : 1112001040

Department : Informatics

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, agree and grant Bakrie University a non-exclusive royalty free right for educational and academic endeavour with this Undergraduate Thesis titled:

A PRE-PROCESS IMAGE ENHANCEMENT ALGORITHM USING WIENER AND GABOR FILTER TO OVERCOME FINGERPERINT IMAGE ACQUISITION PROBLEMS

With the granted permission to use this material, Bakrie University is allowed to keep or make digital copy, communicate, and publish this Undergraduate Thesis by providing full acknowledgement of the copyright and the source of the material.

It is understood that copying and publicizing of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without written permission. The original Partial Copyright License attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Bakrie University Archive.

Authorized in: Jakarta

Date: August 21st, 2017

Approved by



(Pearly Adi Negoro)

A PRE-PROCESS IMAGE ENHANCEMENT ALGORITHM USING WIENER AND GABOR FILTER TO OVERCOME FINGERPRINT IMAGE ACQUISITION PROBLEMS

Pearly Adi Negoro¹

ABSTRACT

The use of fingerprint as a biometric on security system has been largely used because it has more advantages than any other access control methods.. Nevertheless, this system still have problems; the acquired fingerprint image is not always giving its best quality because of certain factors. Hence, this study is conducted using spatial and frequency method to develop a better method on fingerprint image enhancement due to image acquisition problems which frequently arise. In this study, I proposed an enhancenment method which includes segmentation, Wiener filter, normalization, ridge orientation estimation, ridge frequency estimation, Gabor filter, and Binarization. Afterwards, the evaluation is conducted by comparing the proposed algorithm with 4 other algorithms; algorithm which only used Gabor filter, algorithm which only used Wiener filter, STFT analysis, and anisotropic filter. To represent the problems which usually appear on fingerprint image acquisition, I used artificial noise which consists of gaussian noise, salt & pepper noise, speckle noise, and motion blur to test the performance of proposed algorithm. The evaluation method used in this study are Mean Square Error (MSE), Peak Signal to Noise Ratio (PSNR), Mean Structural Similarity Index (MSSIM), minutiae detection, and match score. Simulation results showed that the proposed method is the best method which is supported by lower MSE, higher PSNR, higher MSSIM, lower delta minutiae, and higher match score compare to the other methods.

Keywords: Biometric, fingerprint enhancement, Wiener filter, Gabor filter

¹ Undergraduate Student of Information Technology Program at Universitas Bakrie

TABLE OF CONTENT

TABLE OF CONTENT.....	i
LIST OF IMAGES.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF EQUATIONS.....	xx
LIST OF MATLAB CODES.....	xxii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Problems.....	2
1.3 Purpose of Research.....	7
1.4 Scope of Research.....	7
1.5 Benefit of Research.....	8
1.6 Outline of Proposal.....	8
1.7 Summary.....	9
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1 Literature Review.....	10
2.2 Fingerprint Identification.....	14
2.3 Fingerprint Recognition System.....	16
2.4 Pre-Processing on Fingerprint Recognition System.....	18
2.4.1 Segmentation.....	18
2.4.2 Normalization.....	20
2.4.3 Ridge Orientation Estimation.....	21
2.4.4 Ridge Frequency Estimation.....	24
2.4.5 Gabor Filter.....	26
2.4.6 Binnarization.....	31
2.5 Wiener Filter.....	32
2.6 Noise as a Simulated Artifact of Fingerprint Problems.....	35
2.6.1 Gaussian Noise.....	35
2.6.2 Salt & Pepper Noise.....	35

2.6.3	Speckle Noise	36
2.6.4	Motion Blur	36
2.7	Summary.....	37
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD		38
3.1	Research Framework	38
3.2	Tools.....	39
3.3	Data Set.....	40
3.4	Proposed Method	41
3.5	Simulation of Fingerprint Problems	43
3.6	Evaluation Method	43
3.6.1	Mean Square Error (MSE)	43
3.6.2	Peak Signal to Noise Ratio (PSNR)	44
3.6.3	Mean Structural Similarity Index (MSSIM)	44
3.6.4	Minutiae Detection.....	45
3.6.5	Match Score.....	48
3.7	Summary.....	48
CHAPTER IV RESULTS AND ANALYSIS		49
4.1	Methods.....	49
4.1.1	Proposed Method	49
4.1.2	Gabor Method	56
4.1.3	Wiener Method	58
4.1.4	Anisotropic Filter	61
4.1.5	STFT Analysis	63
4.2	Evaluation Results	64
4.2.1	Speckle Noise	64
4.2.2	Salt & Pepper Noise	72
4.2.3	Motion Blur	80
4.2.4	Gaussian Noise	92
4.6.5	Speckle + Salt & Pepper Noise.....	104
4.6.6	Speckle Noise + Motion Blur.....	116
4.6.7	Speckle Noise + Gaussian Noise.....	131

4.6.8	Salt & Pepper Noise + Motion Blur.....	146
4.6.9	Salt & Pepper Noise + Gaussian Noise.....	161
4.6.10	Motion Blur + Gaussian Noise	176
4.3	Discussion	194
4.4	Summary.....	200
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS		201
5.1	Conclusions.....	201
5.2	Future Works	202
REFERENCES.....		204

LIST OF IMAGES

<i>Figure 1 (a) Normal fingerprint (b) Dry fingerprint</i>	4
<i>Figure 2 Acquired fingerprint image with different resolution [4]</i>	5
<i>Figure 3 (a) Valleys & Ridges (b) Ridge termination & ridge bifurcation</i>	15
<i>Figure 4 Enrollment and acquisition of fingerprint image</i>	16
<i>Figure 5 (a) Fingerprint image before segmentation</i>	18
<i>Figure 6 The result of normalization using a desired mean and variance of zero and one, respectively. (a) Original image</i>	20
<i>Figure 7 The orientation of a ridge pixel in the fingerprint [21]</i>	21
<i>Figure 8 Ridge Orientation Estimation at each block [10]</i>	23
<i>Figure 9 (a) Block of fingerprint image (b) Sinusoidal wave along direction normal to local ridge orientation [21]</i>	24
<i>Figure 10 Oriented window of size $l \times w$ [10]</i>	26
<i>Figure 11 (a)1D Sinusoidal wave (b) Gaussian Kernel (c) Corresponding Gabor filter</i>	26
<i>Figure 12 (a) 2D sinusoid oriented at 30° with the x-axis,</i>	27
<i>Figure 13 Results of applying a Gabor filter (a) Original image (b) Gabor filter with $k_x = 0.5$ and $k_y = 0.5$</i>	28
<i>Figure 14 (a) Normal Fingerprint (b) Fingerprint affected by salt & pepper noise (c) Histogram of normal fingerprint</i>	31
<i>Figure 15 (a) Original fingerprint image (b) Binnarized fingerprint image</i>	32
<i>Figure 16 Degradation model [48]</i>	32
<i>Figure 17 (a)Original image (b)Noisy & blurry image (c)Enhanced image using Wiener filter</i>	34
<i>Figure 18 Research Framework</i>	39
<i>Figure 19 Minutiae: Bifurcation (square marker) and ridge ending (circle marker) [55]</i>	46
<i>Figure 20 Minutiae orientation (A. Standar angle, B. FBI/IAFIS angle) [55]</i>	47
<i>Figure 21 (a) Original image (b) Gaussian noise on image with mean of 0 and variance of 0.05</i>	50
<i>Figure 22(a) Noisy image (b) Image after applying Wiener filter</i>	50
<i>Figure 23 (a) Before applying segmentation (b) After applying segmentation (c)Mask result</i>	51
<i>Figure 24 (a) Before applying normalization (b) After applying normalization</i> ..	52
<i>Figure 25 (a) Image orientation (b) Image reliability</i>	52
<i>Figure 26 (a) Image after applying normalization (b) Image frequency</i>	53
<i>Figure 27 (a) Image after applying normalization</i>	54
<i>Figure 28 (a) Image mask (b) Negation of image mask</i>	55
<i>Figure 29 (a)Image after applying Gabor filter</i>	55
<i>Figure 30 (a) Before applying segmentation (b) After applying segmentation (c)Mask result</i>	56
<i>Figure 31 (a) Before applying normalization (b) After applying normalization</i> ..	57
<i>Figure 32 (a) Image orientation (b) Image reliability</i>	57

<i>Figure 33 (a) Image after applying normalization</i>	57
<i>Figure 34 (a) Image after applying normalization</i>	58
<i>Figure 35</i>	59
<i>Figure 36 (a) Image before applying Wiener filter (b) Image after applying Wiener algorithm</i>	60
<i>Figure 37 (a) Image before applying binarization (b) Image after applying binarization</i>	60
<i>Figure 38 (a) Noisy image (b) Orientation estimation image</i>	61
<i>Figure 39 (a) Image before applying anisotropic filter (b) Image after applying anisotropic filter</i>	62
<i>Figure 40 (a) Image before applying binarization</i>	63
<i>Figure 41 (a) Image before applying the filter</i>	63
<i>Figure 42 (a) Speckle noise with variance of 0.05</i>	64
<i>Figure 43 (a) Speckle noise with variance of 0.5</i>	65
<i>Figure 44 Mean Square Error versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	66
<i>Figure 45 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	67
<i>Figure 46 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	68
<i>Figure 47 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i> ...	68
<i>Figure 48 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i> ..	69
<i>Figure 49 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i> .	69
<i>Figure 50 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	70
<i>Figure 51 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	71
<i>Figure 52 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	72
<i>Figure 53 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	72
<i>Figure 54 (a) Salt & pepper noise with density of 0.05 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method</i>	73
<i>Figure 55 (a) Salt & pepper noise with density of 0.5 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method</i>	73
<i>Figure 56 Mean Square Error versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	74
<i>Figure 57 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	75
<i>Figure 58 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	76
<i>Figure 59 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	76
<i>Figure 60 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	77
<i>Figure 61 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	77

<i>Figure 62 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	78
<i>Figure 63 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	79
<i>Figure 64 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	80
<i>Figure 65 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	80
<i>Figure 66 (a) Motion blur with length of 6 and theta of 0° (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method.....</i>	81
<i>Figure 67 (a) Motion blur with length of 15 and theta of 90° (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method.....</i>	81
<i>Figure 68 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	82
<i>Figure 69 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	83
<i>Figure 70 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	83
<i>Figure 71 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	84
<i>Figure 72 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur.....</i>	85
<i>Figure 73 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering motion blur.....</i>	85
<i>Figure 74 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	86
<i>Figure 75 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	87
<i>Figure 76 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering motion blur ...</i>	87
<i>Figure 77 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	88
<i>Figure 78 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	89
<i>Figure 79 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	89
<i>Figure 80 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	90
<i>Figure 81 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur ..</i>	91
<i>Figure 82 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	91
<i>Figure 83 (a) Gaussian noise with mean and variance of 0.05 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter</i>	92
<i>Figure 84 (a) Gaussian noise with mean and variance of 0.5 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter</i>	93
<i>Figure 85 MSE versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	94
<i>Figure 86 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise ..</i>	95
<i>Figure 87 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise..</i>	95
<i>Figure 88 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	96
<i>Figure 89 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise .</i>	97
<i>Figure 90 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	97
<i>Figure 91 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise....</i>	98
<i>Figure 92 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	99

<i>Figure 93 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	99
<i>Figure 94 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	100
<i>Figure 95 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	101
<i>Figure 96 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	101
<i>Figure 97 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	102
<i>Figure 98 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	103
<i>Figure 99 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	103
<i>Figure 100 (a) Speckle + salt & pepper noise with mean and variance and density of 0.05 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis</i>	104
<i>Figure 101 (a) Speckle + salt & pepper noise with mean and variance and density of 0.3 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method</i>	105
<i>Figure 102 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	106
<i>Figure 103 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	107
<i>Figure 104 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	107
<i>Figure 105 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	108
<i>Figure 106 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	109
<i>Figure 107 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	109
<i>Figure 108 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	110
<i>Figure 109 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	111
<i>Figure 110 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	111
<i>Figure 111 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	112
<i>Figure 112 Delta minutiae versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	113
<i>Figure 113 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	113
<i>Figure 114 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	114

<i>Figure 115 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	115
<i>Figure 116 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	115
<i>Figure 117 (a) Speckle noise + motion blur with variance of 0.02, length of 3 and theta of 0°</i>	116
<i>Figure 118 (a) Speckle noise + motion blur with variance of 0.1, length of 12 and theta of 180°</i>	117
<i>Figure 119 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	118
<i>Figure 120 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	119
<i>Figure 121 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	119
<i>Figure 122 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	120
<i>Figure 123 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	121
<i>Figure 124 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	121
<i>Figure 125 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	122
<i>Figure 126 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	122
<i>Figure 127 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	123
<i>Figure 128 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	124
<i>Figure 129 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	125
<i>Figure 130 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	125
<i>Figure 131 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	126
<i>Figure 132 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	127
<i>Figure 133 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	127
<i>Figure 134 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	128
<i>Figure 135 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	129
<i>Figure 136 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	129

<i>Figure 137 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	130
<i>Figure 138 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	130
<i>Figure 139 (a) Speckle noise + Gaussian noise with mean and variance of 0.02 (b) Gabor filter</i>	131
<i>Figure 140 (a) Speckle noise + Gaussian noise with mean and variance of 0.1 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter</i>	132
<i>Figure 141 MSE versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	133
<i>Figure 142 MSE versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	134
<i>Figure 143 MSE versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	134
<i>Figure 144 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	135
<i>Figure 145 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	136
<i>Figure 146 PSNR versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	136
<i>Figure 147 PSNR versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	137
<i>Figure 148 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	137
<i>Figure 149 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	138
<i>Figure 150 MSSIM versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	139
<i>Figure 151 MSSIM versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	140
<i>Figure 152 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	140
<i>Figure 153 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	141
<i>Figure 154 Delta minutiae versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	142
<i>Figure 155 Delta minutiae versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	142
<i>Figure 156 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	143
<i>Figure 157 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	144
<i>Figure 158 Match score versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	144

<i>Figure 159 Match score versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	145
<i>Figure 160 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	145
<i>Figure 161 (a) Salt & pepper noise + motion blur with density of 0.02, length of 3, and theta of 0°</i>	146
<i>Figure 162 (a) Salt & pepper noise + motion blur with density of 0.06, length of 12, and theta of 90° (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method</i>	147
<i>Figure 163 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	148
<i>Figure 164 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	149
<i>Figure 165 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	149
<i>Figure 166 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	150
<i>Figure 167 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	151
<i>Figure 168 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	151
<i>Figure 169 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	152
<i>Figure 170 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	152
<i>Figure 171 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	153
<i>Figure 172 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	154
<i>Figure 173 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	155
<i>Figure 174 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	155
<i>Figure 175 Delta minutiae versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	156
<i>Figure 176 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	157
<i>Figure 177 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	157
<i>Figure 178 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	158
<i>Figure 179 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	159
<i>Figure 180 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	159

<i>Figure 181 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	160
<i>Figure 182 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur</i>	160
<i>Figure 183 (a) Salt & pepper noise + Gaussian noise with mean, variance, and density of 0.06 (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method</i>	161
<i>Figure 184 (a) Salt & pepper noise + Gaussian noise with mean, variance, and density of 0.18</i>	162
<i>Figure 185 MSE versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	163
<i>Figure 186 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	164
<i>Figure 187 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	164
<i>Figure 188 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + Gaussian noise</i>	165
<i>Figure 189 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	166
<i>Figure 190 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	166
<i>Figure 191 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	167
<i>Figure 192 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + Gaussian noise</i>	167
<i>Figure 193 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	168
<i>Figure 194 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	169
<i>Figure 195 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	170
<i>Figure 196 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + Gaussian noise</i>	170
<i>Figure 197 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	171
<i>Figure 198 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	172
<i>Figure 199 Delta minutiae versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	172
<i>Figure 200 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + Gaussian noise</i>	173
<i>Figure 201 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	174
<i>Figure 202 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	174

<i>Figure 203 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	175
<i>Figure 204 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + Gaussian noise</i>	175
<i>Figure 205 (a) Motion blur + Gaussian noise with mean and variance of 0.025, length of 2, and theta of 0° (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method</i>	176
<i>Figure 206 (a) Motion blur + Gaussian noise with mean and variance of 0.1, length of 6, and theta of 90° (b) Gabor filter (c) Wiener filter (d) STFT analysis (e) Anisotropic Filter (f) Proposed method</i>	177
<i>Figure 207 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	178
<i>Figure 208 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	179
<i>Figure 209 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	179
<i>Figure 210 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	180
<i>Figure 211 Overall MSE average of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	180
<i>Figure 212 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	181
<i>Figure 213 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	182
<i>Figure 214 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	183
<i>Figure 215 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	183
<i>Figure 216 Overall PSNR average of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	184
<i>Figure 217 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	185
<i>Figure 218 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	185
<i>Figure 219 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	186
<i>Figure 220 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	187
<i>Figure 221 Overall MSSIM average of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	187
<i>Figure 222 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	188
<i>Figure 223 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	189

<i>Figure 224 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise.....</i>	189
<i>Figure 225 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	190
<i>Figure 226 Overall delta minutiae average of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise.....</i>	190
<i>Figure 227 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	191
<i>Figure 228 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise.....</i>	192
<i>Figure 229 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	193
<i>Figure 230 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	193
<i>Figure 231 Overall match score average of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise.....</i>	194
<i>Figure 232 (a) Original fingerprint image</i>	198
<i>Figure 233 MSE and PSNR for Gabor and proposed method showed a really close result to recover speckle and salt & pepper noise.....</i>	199
<i>Figure 234 Delta minutiae and match score for Gabor and proposed method showed a really clear result that proposed method showed better result to recover speckle and salt & pepper noise</i>	200

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 1 Comparison of the Biometric Technologies [1].....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Table 2 Comparison of PSNR & RMSE Values for Gaussian Noise</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Table 3 Comparison of PSNR & RMSE Values for Salt & Pepper Noise</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Table 4 Comparison of PSNR & RMSE Values for Speckle Noise</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Table 5 Image used in this research</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Table 6 Noise & Degradation function used to overcome fingerprint image acquisition problems</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Table 7 Comparison between NBIS and FpMV application.....</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Table 8 Mean Square Error versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>Table 9 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Table 10 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise ...</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>Table 11 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>Table 12 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>Table 13 Mean Square Error versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>Table 14 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>Table 15 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Table 16 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	<i>78</i>
<i>Table 17 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise</i>	<i>79</i>
<i>Table 18 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	<i>82</i>
<i>Table 19 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>Table 20 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	<i>84</i>
<i>Table 21 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>Table 22 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur.....</i>	<i>86</i>
<i>Table 23 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur.....</i>	<i>87</i>
<i>Table 24 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	<i>88</i>
<i>Table 25 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	<i>89</i>
<i>Table 26 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur ..</i>	<i>90</i>
<i>Table 27 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur</i>	<i>91</i>
<i>Table 28 MSE versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>94</i>
<i>Table 29 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	<i>95</i>
<i>Table 30 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	<i>96</i>
<i>Table 31 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise ..</i>	<i>97</i>
<i>Table 32 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	<i>98</i>

<i>Table 33 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	99
<i>Table 34 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	100
<i>Table 35 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	101
<i>Table 36 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	102
<i>Table 37 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering Gaussian noise</i>	103
<i>Table 38 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	106
<i>Table 39 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	107
<i>Table 40 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	108
<i>Table 41 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	109
<i>Table 42 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	110
<i>Table 43 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	111
<i>Table 44 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	112
<i>Table 45 Delta minutiae versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	113
<i>Table 46 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	114
<i>Table 47 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering speckle + salt & pepper noise</i>	115
<i>Table 48 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	118
<i>Table 49 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	118
<i>Table 50 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	119
<i>Table 51 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	120
<i>Table 52 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	121
<i>Table 53 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	122
<i>Table 54 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	123
<i>Table 55 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	124

<i>Table 56 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	124
<i>Table 57 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	126
<i>Table 58 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	126
<i>Table 59 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	127
<i>Table 60 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	128
<i>Table 61 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	129
<i>Table 62 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering speckle noise + motion blur</i>	130
<i>Table 63 MSE versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	133
<i>Table 64 MSE versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	133
<i>Table 65 MSE versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	134
<i>Table 66 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	135
<i>Table 67 PSNR versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	136
<i>Table 68 PSNR versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	137
<i>Table 69 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	138
<i>Table 70 MSSIM versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	139
<i>Table 71 MSSIM versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	139
<i>Table 72 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	141
<i>Table 73 Delta minutiae versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	141
<i>Table 74 Delta minutiae versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	142
<i>Table 75 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	143
<i>Table 76 Match score versus variance of speckle of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	144
<i>Table 77 Match score versus variance of gaussian of all methods for recovering speckle noise + gaussian noise</i>	145

<i>Table 78 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>148</i>
<i>Table 79 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>148</i>
<i>Table 80 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>149</i>
<i>Table 81 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>150</i>
<i>Table 82 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>151</i>
<i>Table 83 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>152</i>
<i>Table 84 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>153</i>
<i>Table 85 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>154</i>
<i>Table 86 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>154</i>
<i>Table 87 Delta minutiae versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>156</i>
<i>Table 88 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>156</i>
<i>Table 89 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>157</i>
<i>Table 90 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>158</i>
<i>Table 91 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>159</i>
<i>Table 92 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering salt & pepper noise + motion blur.....</i>	<i>160</i>
<i>Table 93 MSE versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>163</i>
<i>Table 94 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>163</i>
<i>Table 95 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>164</i>
<i>Table 96 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>165</i>
<i>Table 97 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>166</i>
<i>Table 98 PSNR versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>167</i>
<i>Table 99 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise.....</i>	<i>168</i>

<i>Table 100 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	169
<i>Table 101 MSSIM versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	169
<i>Table 102 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	171
<i>Table 103 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	171
<i>Table 104 Delta minutiae versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	172
<i>Table 105 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	173
<i>Table 106 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	174
<i>Table 107 Match score versus density of all methods for recovering salt & pepper + gaussian noise</i>	175
<i>Table 108 MSE versus density of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	178
<i>Table 109 MSE versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	178
<i>Table 110 MSE versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	179
<i>Table 111 MSE versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	180
<i>Table 112 PSNR versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	181
<i>Table 113 PSNR versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	182
<i>Table 114 PSNR versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	182
<i>Table 115 PSNR versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	183
<i>Table 116 MSSIM versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	184
<i>Table 117 MSSIM versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	185
<i>Table 118 MSSIM versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	186
<i>Table 119 MSSIM versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	186
<i>Table 120 Delta minutiae versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	188
<i>Table 121 Delta minutiae versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	188

<i>Table 122 Delta minutiae versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	189
<i>Table 123 Delta minutiae versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	190
<i>Table 124 Match score versus mean of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	191
<i>Table 125 Match score versus variance of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	192
<i>Table 126 Match score versus length of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	192
<i>Table 127 Match score versus theta of all methods for recovering motion blur + gaussian noise</i>	193
<i>Table 128 Average MSE for all scenarios</i>	195
<i>Table 129 Average PSNR for all scenarios</i>	195
<i>Table 130 Average MSSIM for all scenarios</i>	196
<i>Table 131 Average delta minutiae for all scenarios</i>	197
<i>Table 132 Average match score for all scenarios</i>	197

LIST OF EQUATIONS

Equation 1	19
Equation 2	19
Equation 3	19
Equation 4	21
Equation 5	22
Equation 6	22
Equation 7	22
Equation 8	23
Equation 9	23
Equation 10	23
Equation 11	23
Equation 12	23
Equation 13	24
Equation 14	24
Equation 15	24
Equation 16	25
Equation 17	25
Equation 18	25
Equation 19	26
Equation 20	28
Equation 21	28
Equation 22	29
Equation 23	29
Equation 24	29
Equation 25	30
Equation 26	30
Equation 27	30
Equation 28	31
Equation 29	33
Equation 30	33

Equation 31	42
Equation 32	42
Equation 33	42
Equation 34	42
Equation 35	44
Equation 36	44

LIST OF MATLAB CODES

<i>Matlab code 1: Add Gaussian noise</i>	49
<i>Matlab code 2: Add Wiener filter to noisy image</i>	50
<i>Matlab code 3: Apply segmentation to im_wiener</i>	51
<i>Matlab code 4: Normalization</i>	51
<i>Matlab code 5: Calculate ridge orientation estimation to normalized image</i>	52
<i>Matlab code 6: Calculate ridge frequency estimation</i>	53
<i>Matlab code 7: Gabor filter</i>	53
<i>Matlab code 8: Binnarization to the image that has been enhanced by Gabor filter</i>	54
<i>Matlab code 9: Negation of mask</i>	54
<i>Matlab code 10: Add negation of mask to binary image</i>	55
<i>Matlab code 11: Apply segmentation to noisy image</i>	56
<i>Matlab code 12: Create point spread function</i>	59
<i>Matlab code 13: Lucy-Richardson</i>	59
<i>Matlab code 14: Add Wiener filter to image enhanced by Lucy-Richardson</i> <i>algorithm</i>	60
<i>Matlab code 15 Binnarization to the image that has been enhanced by Gabor</i> <i>filter</i>	60
<i>Matlab code 16: Calculate ridge orientation estimation to noisy image</i>	61
<i>Matlab code 17: Get all the row and column</i>	62
<i>Matlab code 18: Apply anisotropic filter</i>	62
<i>Matlab code 19: Apply binnarization to the image that had been filtered by</i> <i>Anisotropic filter</i>	62