



The evaluation results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Difference of RMSE and EP

Algorithm	Evaluation Index			
	RMSE		EP	
	Laminar flow	core flow	Laminar flow	core flow
LBP	0.31	0.29	0.4138	0.4297
Landweber	0.25	0.26	0.4356	0.4389
Fused	0.22	0.24	0.4395	0.4426

From the table we can see, whether it is from the standard deviation or edge retention, and imaging results of the fusion algorithm is better than LBP algorithm and Landweber algorithm.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, ECT is combined with image fusion technology, for the ECT imaging characteristics and the characteristics that in the wavelet-based image fusion technology the data can be dealt with separately on a different frequency domain, in order to maximize the enhanced the effect of the reconstructed image, richer and accurate information can be extracted from different source images than a single source image.

Acknowledgments. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China(60572153,60972127).

References

- 1 Deyun Chen, Guibin Zheng, Xiaoyang Yu, et al. Image Reconstruction Algorithm Based on Genetic Algorithms for Two-phase flow Electrical Capacitance Tomography System. Electric Machines and Control.pp. 207-211(2003)
- 2 Wuqiang Yang. Design of electrical capacitance tomography sensors ,Measurement Science and Technology. pp.1890-1917(2010)
- 3 Lian Jing, Wang Ke, Li Guangxin. Edge-based image fusion algorithm with wavelet transform. Journal on Communications,pp.19-23(2007)