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Abstract. In this work we consider weighted versions of the generalizations of Alpha divergence measure (Chernoff [8], Amari and Nagaoka [1]) and Beta divergence measures (Basu et al. [4]) for Markov chains and investigate their limiting behavior. This is a continuation of the developments presented in [2], applying the notion of weighted divergence measure (Beliş and Guiasu [5], Guiasu [11], Kapur [12]). This work is continued in [3], where we present generalized Cressie and Read power divergence class of measures and numerically investigate some properties of all these generalized divergence measures and rates.
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1. PRELIMINARIES

In this work we focus on some generalizations of Alpha divergence measure (Chernoff [8], Amari and Nagaoka [1]) and Beta divergence measures (Basu et al. [4]) and rates for Markov chains presented in [2]. For these divergences and rates we consider the associated weighted versions, following the concepts introduced by Beliş and Guiasu [5], Guiasu [11].

As the results on information measures consider only the probability mass function or the probability density function of a random variable without taking into account its value, Beliş and Guiasu [5] highlighted the importance of integrating the quantitative, objective and probabilistic concepts of information with the qualitative, subjective and non-stochastic concept of utility. By considering the two basic concepts of objective probability and subjective utility, they introduced the concept of weighted entropy and thus constructed a shift-dependent information measure with properties similar to those of the Shannon entropy. Afterward Guiasu [11] characterized axiomatically the weighted entropy measure. Di Crescenzo and Longobardi [9] introduced the concept of weighted residual entropy and weighted past entropy. Many other researchers investigated different aspects and generalizations of weighted entropies and divergences; among them, we can cite Bhullar et al. [6], Casquilho [7], Dial and Taneja [10], Kapur [12], Sharma et al. [13], Śmieja [14], Suhov et al. [15, 16], Taneja [17], Taneja and Tuteja [18, 19].

The paper is organized as follows. In the rest of this section we recall from [2] the definitions of generalized Alpha and Beta divergence measures; then, in Section 2 the corresponding weighted generalized divergence measures are presented and the associated rates are obtained.

Let \( (X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be an ergodic time-homogeneous Markov chain with finite state space \( \mathcal{X} = \{1, \ldots, M\} \). For this Markov chain, we consider two different probability laws. Under the first law, let \( p_i = P(X_1 = i), i \in \mathcal{X} \) denote the initial distribution of the chain and \( p_{ij} = P(X_{k+1} = j \mid X_k = i), i, j \in \mathcal{X} \) the associated transition probabilities. Let also \( p_n \) denote the joint probability distribution of \( (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) \), i.e., \( p_n(i_1, \ldots, i_n) = p_{i_1} p_{i_1 i_2} \cdots p_{i_{n-1} i_n} \), were we denoted by \( i_n \) the \( n \)-tuple \( (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \). Similarly we define under the second law \( q_i, q_{ij}, q_n(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \) and \( q_n \). Under this setting of finite state space Markov chains, the Alpha-
Gamma measure between the two models is defined as the Alpha-Gamma measure between the two joint probability distributions \( p_n \) and \( q_n \) (cf. [2]), and is written under the normalized form as

\[
D_{\Delta\Gamma}(p_n, q_n) = \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \log \left( \sum_{i_n \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{p}_n^\alpha(i_n) \tilde{q}_n^{1-\alpha}(i_n) \right),
\]

where

\[
\tilde{p}_n = \tilde{p}_1 \cdot \tilde{p}_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot \tilde{p}_n, \quad \tilde{q}_n = \tilde{q}_1 \cdot \tilde{q}_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot \tilde{q}_n,
\]

with \( \tilde{p}_i, \tilde{q}_j, i, j \in \mathcal{X} \), defined by

\[
\tilde{p}_i = \frac{p_i}{\left( \sum_{i_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n(i_n) \right)^{1/n}}, \quad \tilde{q}_j = \frac{q_j}{\left( \sum_{i_n \in \mathcal{X}} q_n(i_n) \right)^{1/n}}.
\]

Similarly, the Beta-Gamma measure between the two Markov models is defined by (cf. [2])

\[
D_{BG}(p_n, q_n) = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left( \sum_{i_n \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{p}_n(i_n) \tilde{q}_n^{\alpha}(i_n) \right),
\]

where

\[
\tilde{p}_n = \tilde{p}_1 \cdot \tilde{p}_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot \tilde{p}_n, \quad \tilde{q}_n = \tilde{q}_1 \cdot \tilde{q}_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot \tilde{q}_n,
\]

with \( \tilde{p}_i, \tilde{q}_j, i, j \in \mathcal{X} \), defined by

\[
\tilde{p}_i = \frac{p_i}{\left( \sum_{i_n \in \mathcal{X}} p_n^{1+\alpha}(i_n) \right)^{1/(n+\alpha)}}, \quad \tilde{q}_j = \frac{q_j}{\left( \sum_{i_n \in \mathcal{X}} q_n^{1+\alpha}(i_n) \right)^{1/(n+\alpha)}}.
\]

2. WEIGHTED ALPHA AND BETA DIVERGENCE RATES FOR MARKOV CHAINS

In this section we first recall the notions of weighted entropies and divergence measures and then introduce new concepts of weighted Alpha and Beta divergences. Then these measures will be defined for finite Markov chains and the corresponding rates will be obtained.

As mentioned in the Introduction, Beliș and Guiașu [5] introduced the concept of weighted entropy and Guiașu [11] characterized it axiomatically. Let \( p = (p_1, \ldots, p_n) \) be a finite probability distribution corresponding to \( n \) possible states or outcomes and \( w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n) \), be a vector of weights associated with these states, \( w_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, n \).

**Definition 1** (cf. [11]). The weighted Shannon entropy measure is defined by

\[
I^w(p; w) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i p_i \log(p_i).
\]
When considering an absolutely continuous probability measure $\mu$ with a density $p$ with respect to a certain measure $\mu$ and a weight function $w$ assumed to be measurable and positive, then the weighted Shannon entropy measure is defined by

$$I^S(p; w) = -\int w(x)p(x)\log(p(x))d\mu(x). \quad (8)$$

Let us consider $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ and $q = (q_1, \ldots, q_n)$ two finite probability distributions corresponding to $n$ possible states and let $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ be a vector of weights associated with these states, $w_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, with $w_i \neq 0$ for some $i$. It is clear that for real applications, in fact $w_i > 0$ for all $i$, which will be assumed all along this paper.

Note that the weighted Shannon divergence measure (relative entropy) between $p$ and $q$ can be defined as follows.

**Definition 2 (cf. [18]).** The weighted Shannon divergence measure between $p$ and $q$ is given by

$$D^S(p, q; w) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i p_i \log\left(\frac{p_i}{q_i}\right). \quad (9)$$

Kapur [12] defined axiomatically the weighted directed divergence concept. Let us consider $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ and $q = (q_1, \ldots, q_n)$ two finite probability distributions corresponding to $n$ possible states and let $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ be a vector of weights associated with these states, $w_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

**Definition 3 (cf. [12]).** A measure $D(p, q, w)$ is said to be an appropriate measure of weighted directed divergence if the following axioms are fulfilled:

1. It is a continuous function of $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, $(q_1, \ldots, q_n)$ and $(w_1, \ldots, w_n)$.
2. It is permutationally symmetric, i.e. it does not change when the triplets $(p_1, q_1, w_1)$, $(p_2, q_2, w_2)$, ..., $(p_n, q_n, w_n)$ are permuted among themselves.
3. It is always non-negative and vanishes when $p_i = q_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
4. It is a convex function of $(p_1, \ldots, p_n)$, which has its minimum value zero when $p_i = q_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
5. It reduces to a positive multiple of an ordinary measure of weighted directed divergence when all the weights are equal.

Note that the weighted Shannon divergence introduced in Definition 2 does not verify Condition 3 of the Kapur’s definition of a weighted directed divergence. For this reason, Kapur [12] proposed another weighted Shannon divergence measure which satisfies all the above set of axioms of a weighted directed divergence.

**Definition 4 (cf. [12]).** The weighted Shannon directed divergence measure corresponding to the Kullback-Leibler measure is given by

$$D^S_\mu(p, q; w) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \left( p_i \log\left(\frac{p_i}{q_i}\right) - p_i + q_i \right). \quad (10)$$

Note that the weighted Shannon directed divergence measure given in the above definition verifies Condition 3 of the Kapur’s definition of a weighted directed divergence; indeed, one has to factorize by $p_i$ the factor $\left[ p_i \log\left(\frac{p_i}{q_i}\right) - p_i + q_i \right]$ in (10) and then to study the sign of the function $f(t) := \log(t) - t + 1$.

We will introduce now the concepts of weighted Alpha and Beta divergence measures, as well as the
weighted Alpha-Gamma and Beta-Gamma divergence measures.

Let us consider two absolutely continuous probability measures $\mu_p$ and $\mu_q$ with corresponding densities $p$ and $q$ with respect to a certain measure $\mu$ and a weight function $w$ assumed to be measurable and positive.

**Definition 5.** The weighted Alpha and Beta divergence measures are given by

$$
D^w_A(p,q;w) = \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} \left( \int w(x)p^\alpha(x)q^{1-\alpha}(x) - \alpha w(x)p(x) + (\alpha-1)w(x)q(x) \right) d\mu(x);
$$

$$
D^w_B(p,q;w) = \frac{1}{\alpha + 1} \left( \int w(x)q^{1+\alpha}(x) - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)w(x)p(x)q^\alpha(x) + \frac{1}{\alpha}w(x)p^{1+\alpha}(x) \right) d\mu(x).
$$

Note that

$$
D^w_A(p,q;w) = D_A(p,q),
$$

where $p(x) := w(x)p(x)$ and $q(x) := w(x)q(x)$.

Note also that

$$
D^w_B(p,q;w) = D_B(\hat{p},\hat{q}),
$$

where $\hat{p}(x) := w^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(x)p(x)$ and $\hat{q}(x) := w^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(x)q(x)$.

Transforming the weighted Alpha divergence $D^w_A(p,q;w)$ given in Definition 1 (as done in [2] for the Alpha divergence), we obtain the weighted Alpha-Gamma divergence measure

$$
D^w_{AG}(p,q;w) = \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} \log \left( \int p^\alpha(x)q^{1-\alpha}(x)d\mu(x) \right)^{1-\alpha} = D_{AG}(p,q),
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} \log \left( \int \hat{p}^\alpha(x)\hat{q}^{1-\alpha}(x)d\mu(x) \right),
$$

where we have set $\hat{p}(x) = \frac{p(x)}{\int p(x)d\mu(x)}$ and $\hat{q}(x) = \frac{q(x)}{\int q(x)d\mu(x)}$.

Similarly, transforming the weighted Beta divergence $D^w_B(p,q;w)$ given in Definition 1, we obtain the weighted Beta-Gamma divergence measure given by

$$
D^w_{BG}(p,q;w) = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left( \int \tilde{p}^{\alpha}(x)\tilde{q}^\alpha(x)d\mu(x) \right) = D_{BG}(\tilde{p},\tilde{q}),
$$

where we have set

$$
\tilde{p}(x) = \frac{\hat{p}(x)}{\left( \int \hat{p}^{1+\alpha}(x)d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}} \text{ and } \tilde{q}(x) = \frac{\hat{q}(x)}{\left( \int \hat{q}^{1+\alpha}(x)d\mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\alpha}}},
$$

Note that $p$ and $q$, respectively $\hat{p}$ and $\hat{q}$, can be seen as the densities (or mass functions in the discrete case) of corresponding measures $\mu_p$ and $\mu_q$, respectively $\mu_{\hat{p}}$ and $\mu_{\hat{q}}$, with respect to a certain
measure $\mu$. Thus the Alpha and Beta divergence measures $D_A(p, q)$ and $D_B(\hat{p}, \hat{q})$ that appear in (1) and (2), as well as the Alpha-Gamma and Beta-Gamma divergence measures $D_{AG}(p, q)$ and $D_{BG}(\hat{p}, \hat{q})$ that appear in (13) and (14) are well defined.

Let us now focus on weighted divergence measures for Markov chains. We place ourselves in the same framework as in the previous section: $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an ergodic time-homogeneous Markov chain with finite state space $\chi = \{1, \ldots, M\}$ and we consider two different probability laws for this chain, $p_n, p_{ij}, p_n(i_1:n), p_n$ are the corresponding probabilities under the first law, while $q_n, q_{ij}, q_n(i_1:n), q_n$ are the same quantities under the second law. Let us also consider $W(n) = \{w(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \mid (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in \chi^n\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a set of weights associated with the states $\chi^n, \ w(i_1, \ldots, i_n) > 0$; as previously, we denote $w(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$ by $w(i_1:n)$. Let us consider

\begin{align*}
11 1() ()() = \\
11 1() ()() = \\
\end{align*}

We will consider two particular cases of weights, that could be of interest in practice. The first one is

\begin{align*}
11 1() ()() = \\
\end{align*}

where $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_M)$ is a vector of weights associated with the states $\chi = \{1, \ldots, M\}, w_i > 0, i = 1, \ldots, M$. Here $w_i$ is considered as a weight associated to the state $i$, and relation (17) means that the weights are independent. The second case considered is

\begin{align*}
11 1() ()() = \\
\end{align*}

where $w^1 = (w^1_1, \ldots, w^1_M)$ is a vector of weights associated with the states $\chi = \{1, \ldots, M\}, w^1_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, M$, while $w^2 = (w^2_{ij})_{i,j \in \chi}$ is a system of weights associated with $\chi \times \chi, w^2_{ij} \geq 0, i, j \in \chi$. Here $w^2_{ij}$
is considered as a weight associated to the couple of state \((i, j)\) and relation \((18)\) means that the weights have a dependence of a Markov type.

**PROPOSITION 1.**

1. Under the first particular case of weights given in \((7)\):
   - The weighted Alpha-Gamma measure between the two Markov models can be written under the normalized form
     \[
     D_{AG}^w(\mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{q}_n; \mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \log \left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n^{\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n^{1-\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \right),
     \]
     (19)
     where
     \[
     \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n = \tilde{p}_i \tilde{p}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{p}_{i_{n-1}} \tilde{q}_n = \tilde{q}_i \tilde{q}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{q}_{i_{n-1}},
     \]
     with \(\tilde{p}_i\), \(\tilde{p}_j\), \(\tilde{q}_i\) and \(\tilde{q}_j\), \(i, j \in \mathcal{X}\), defined by
     \[
     \tilde{p}_i = \frac{p_i w_i}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{1:n}}(i_{1:n}) \right)^\alpha / n}, \quad \tilde{p}_j = \frac{p_j w_j}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{1:n}}(i_{1:n}) \right)^\alpha / n},
     \]
     (20)
     \[
     \tilde{q}_i = \frac{q_i w_i}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{1:n}}(i_{1:n}) \right)^\alpha / n}, \quad \tilde{q}_j = \frac{q_j w_j}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{1:n}}(i_{1:n}) \right)^\alpha / n}.
     \]
     (21)
   - The weighted Beta-Gamma measure between the two Markov models can be written under the normalized form
     \[
     D_{BG}^w(\mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{q}_n; \mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n^{\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n^{1-\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \right),
     \]
     (22)
     where
     \[
     \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n = \tilde{p}_i \tilde{p}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{p}_{i_{n-1}} \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n = \tilde{q}_i \tilde{q}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{q}_{i_{n-1}},
     \]
     with \(\tilde{p}_i\), \(\tilde{p}_j\), \(\tilde{q}_i\) and \(\tilde{q}_j\), \(i, j \in \mathcal{X}\), defined by
     \[
     \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i = \frac{p_i w_i}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{1:n}}^{1+\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \right)^{1/(n(1+\alpha))}}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_j = \frac{p_j w_j}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{1:n}}^{1+\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \right)^{1/(n(1+\alpha))}},
     \]
     (23)
     \[
     \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_i = \frac{q_i w_i}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{1:n}}^{1+\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \right)^{1/(n(1+\alpha))}}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_j = \frac{q_j w_j}{\left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{1:n}}^{1+\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \right)^{1/(n(1+\alpha))}}.
     \]
     (24)

2. Under the second particular case of weights given in \((18)\):
   - The weighted Alpha-Gamma measure between the two Markov models can be written under the normalized form
     \[
     D_{AG}^w(\mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{q}_n; \mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \log \left( \sum_{i_{1:n} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{p}_n^{\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \mathbf{q}_n^{1-\alpha}(i_{1:n}) \right),
     \]
     (25)
where

\[ \tilde{p}_n = \tilde{p}_{i_1} \tilde{p}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{p}_{i_n}, \quad \tilde{q}_n = \tilde{q}_{i_1} \tilde{q}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{q}_{i_n}, \]

with \( \tilde{p}_i, \tilde{p}_j, \tilde{q}_i \) and \( \tilde{q}_j \) \( i, j \in \mathcal{X}, \) defined by

\[
\tilde{p}_i = \frac{p_{i} w_{i}^j}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/n}}, \quad \tilde{p}_j = \frac{p_{j} w_{j}^g}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/n}},
\]

\[ (26) \]

\[
\tilde{q}_i = \frac{q_{i} w_{i}^j}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/n}}, \quad \tilde{q}_j = \frac{q_{j} w_{j}^g}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/n}}.
\]

\[ (27) \]

\[ \cdot \] The weighted Beta-Gamma measure between the two Markov models can be written under the normalized form

\[ D_{BG}^w(p_n, q_n; w) = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{p}_{i_{1}}(i_{i_{1}}) \tilde{q}_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right), \]

\[ (28) \]

where

\[ \tilde{p}_n = \tilde{p}_{i_1} \tilde{p}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{p}_{i_n}, \quad \tilde{q}_n = \tilde{q}_{i_1} \tilde{q}_{i_2} \cdots \tilde{q}_{i_n}, \]

with \( \tilde{p}_i, \tilde{p}_j, \tilde{q}_i \) and \( \tilde{q}_j \) \( i, j \in \mathcal{X}, \) defined by

\[
\tilde{p}_i = \frac{p_{i} \alpha^j}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/(n+\alpha)}}, \quad \tilde{p}_j = \frac{p_{j} \alpha^g}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} p_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/(n+\alpha)}},
\]

\[ (29) \]

\[
\tilde{q}_i = \frac{q_{i} \alpha^j}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/(n+\alpha)}}, \quad \tilde{q}_j = \frac{q_{j} \alpha^g}{\left( \sum_{i_{n} \in \mathcal{X}} q_{i_{n}}(i_{i_{n}}) \right)^{1/(n+\alpha)}}.
\]

\[ (30) \]

The following result gives the divergence rates of weighted Alpha-Gamma and Beta-Gamma measures, with the weights of the types given in (17) and (18). The proof is similar as the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 from [2] and will not be provided here.

**THEOREM 1.** Under the setting of the present section, we have:

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{AG}^w(p_n, q_n; w) = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \lambda(\alpha), \]

(a)

where \( \lambda(\alpha) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \lambda_n(\alpha) \) (assumed to exist), where \( \lambda_n(\alpha) \) is the largest positive eigenvalue of \( \tilde{R}(n) = (\tilde{R}_g(\alpha))_{i, j \in \mathcal{X}} \), where \( \tilde{R}_g(\alpha) = \tilde{p}_i \tilde{q}_j^\alpha \) with \( \tilde{p}_i \) and \( \tilde{q}_j \) defined in Equations (20) and (21), respectively, if considering the first type of weights given in (17), or in Equations (26) and (27), respectively, if considering the second type of weights given in (18).

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{BG}^w(p_n, q_n; w) = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \lambda(\alpha), \]

(b)

where \( \lambda(\alpha) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \lambda_n(\alpha) \) (assumed to exist), where \( \lambda_n(\alpha) \) is the largest positive eigenvalue of
\( \tilde{R}(n) = (\tilde{r}_v(\alpha))_{i,j \in X} \), where \( \tilde{r}_v(\alpha) = \tilde{p}_l \tilde{q}_l^\alpha \) with \( \tilde{p}_l \) and \( \tilde{q}_l \) defined in Equations (23) and (24), respectively, if considering the first type of weights given in (17), or in Equations (29) and (30), respectively, if considering the second type of weights given in (18).
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