

Correction to: “Blind maximum likelihood separation of a linear-quadratic mixture”

Shahram Hosseini, Yannick Deville

Laboratoire d’Astrophysique de Toulouse-Tarbes, Université de Toulouse, CNRS ,
14 avenue Edouard Belin - 31400 Toulouse - France.
shosseini@ast.obs-mip.fr , ydeville@ast.obs-mip.fr

Abstract

An error occurred in the computation of a gradient in [1]. The equations (20) in Appendix and (17) in the text were not correct. The current paper presents the correct version of these equations.

I Summary of [1]

In [1] (see Appendix for an authors’ version of this article), we proposed a maximum likelihood approach for blindly separating a linear-quadratic mixture defined by (Eq. (2) in [1]):

$$x_1 = s_1 - l_1 s_2 - q_1 s_1 s_2 \quad x_2 = s_2 - l_2 s_1 - q_2 s_1 s_2 \quad (\text{I.1})$$

where s_1 and s_2 are two independent sources. The log-likelihood for N samples of the mixed signals x_1 and x_2 reads (Eq. (12) in [1]):

$$L = E_t[\log f_{s_1}(s_1(t))] + E_t[\log f_{s_2}(s_2(t))] - E_t[\log |J(s_1(t), s_2(t))|] \quad (\text{I.2})$$

where $E_t[\cdot]$ represents the time average operator on the N samples, $f_{s_1}(\cdot)$ and $f_{s_2}(\cdot)$ are the probability density functions (pdf) of the sources s_1 and s_2 and J is the Jacobian of the mixture which reads (Eq. (4) in [1])

$$J = 1 - l_1 l_2 - (q_2 + l_2 q_1) s_1 - (q_1 + l_1 q_2) s_2. \quad (\text{I.3})$$

Maximizing the log-likelihood requires that its gradient with respect to the parameter vector $\mathbf{w} = [l_1, l_2, q_1, q_2]$, *i.e.* $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}}$, vanishes. Defining the score functions of the two sources as (Eq. (13) in [1])

$$\psi_i(u) = -\frac{\partial \log f_{s_i}(u)}{\partial u} \quad i = 1, 2$$

we can write (Eq. (14) in [1])

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = -E_t[\psi_1(s_1) \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial \mathbf{w}}] - E_t[\psi_2(s_2) \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial \mathbf{w}}] - E_t[\frac{1}{J} \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}}] \quad (\text{I.4})$$

Rewriting (I.1) in the vector form $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{w})$ and considering \mathbf{w} as the independent variable and \mathbf{s} as the dependent variable, we can write, using implicit differentiation (Eq. (15) in [1])

$$\mathbf{0} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \quad (\text{I.5})$$

which yields (Eq. (16) in [1])

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = -\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \quad (\text{I.6})$$

Note that $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}}$ is the Jacobian matrix of the mixing model. Considering (I.1), we can write (Appendix in [1])

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - q_1 s_2 & -l_1 - q_1 s_1 \\ -l_2 - q_2 s_2 & 1 - q_2 s_1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \begin{pmatrix} -s_2 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -s_1 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

which implies, from (I.6)

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \frac{-1}{J} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - q_2 s_1 & l_1 + q_1 s_1 \\ l_2 + q_2 s_2 & 1 - q_1 s_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -s_2 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -s_1 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{I.7})$$

and yields (Eq. (19) in [1])

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial \mathbf{w}} &= \frac{1}{J} \left[(1 - q_2 s_1) s_2, (l_1 + q_1 s_1) s_1, (1 - q_2 s_1) s_1 s_2, (l_1 + q_1 s_1) s_1 s_2 \right] \\ \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial \mathbf{w}} &= \frac{1}{J} \left[(l_2 + q_2 s_2) s_2, (1 - q_1 s_2) s_1, (l_2 + q_2 s_2) s_1 s_2, (1 - q_1 s_2) s_1 s_2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.8})$$

Using (I.8), we obtain the first two terms of the gradient (I.4). To obtain the third term, we need to compute $\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}}$. This partial derivative was computed inaccurately in [1] so that Equations (20), and thus (17), in [1] are erroneous.

II Correct versions of Equations (20) and (17) in [1]

In [1] we did not consider the implicit dependence of s_1 and s_2 on \mathbf{w} and computed the derivative of J with respect to \mathbf{w} ignoring this dependence. Considering $J = g(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{w}))$, the correct equation for $\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}}$ reads

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}}_{|s \text{ cte}} + \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{s}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \quad (\text{II.1})$$

Equation (20) in [1] only corresponded to the first term on the right side of the above relation which reads, following (I.3), as:

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}}_{|s \text{ cte}} = - \left[l_2 + q_2 s_2, l_1 + q_1 s_1, l_2 s_1 + s_2, s_1 + l_1 s_2 \right] \quad (\text{II.2})$$

We now compute the gradient (II.1) entirely. Considering (I.3), we can write

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{s}} = -[q_2 + l_2 q_1, q_1 + l_1 q_2] \quad (\text{II.3})$$

Using (II.1), (II.2), (II.3) and (I.7) we finally obtain the following equation which must replace the equation (20) in [1]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = & [-(l_2 + q_2 s_2) - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_2/J - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_2/J, \\ & -(l_1 + q_1 s_1) - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1/J - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1/J, \\ & -(l_2 s_1 + s_2) - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_1 s_2/J - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_1 s_2/J, \\ & -(l_1 s_2 + s_1) - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1 s_2/J - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1 s_2/J] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.4})$$

Inserting (I.8) and (II.4) in (I.4), we obtain the following expression for the gradient which must replace Equation (17) in [1]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = & -E_t \left[\left(\psi_1(s_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_2 + \psi_2(s_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_2 \right. \right. \\ & - (l_2 + q_2 s_2) - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_2/J - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_2/J \Big) / J, \\ & \left(\psi_1(s_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1 + \psi_2(s_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1 \right. \\ & - (l_1 + q_1 s_1) - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1/J - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1/J \Big) / J, \\ & \left(\psi_1(s_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_1 s_2 + \psi_2(s_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_1 s_2 \right. \\ & - (l_2 s_1 + s_2) - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_1 s_2/J - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_1 s_2/J \Big) / J, \\ & \left(\psi_1(s_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1 s_2 + \psi_2(s_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1 s_2 \right. \\ & - (l_1 s_2 + s_1) - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1 s_2/J - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1 s_2/J \Big) / J \Big] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.5})$$

References

- [1] S. Hosseini, Y. Deville, Blind maximum likelihood separation of a linear-quadratic mixture, Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Independent Component Analysis and Blind Signal Separation (ICA 2004), pp. 694-701, ISSN 0302-9743, ISBN 3-540-23056-4, Springer-Verlag, vol. LNCS 3195, Granada, Spain, Sept. 22-24, 2004.

APPENDIX: Authors' version of [1]

1 Introduction

It is well known that the independence hypothesis is not sufficient for separating general nonlinear mixtures because of the very large indeterminacies which make the nonlinear BSS problem ill-posed. A natural idea for reducing the indeterminacies is to constrain the structure of mixing and separating models to belong to a certain set of transformations. This supplementary constraint can be viewed as a regularization of the initially ill-posed problem.

In this paper, we study a linear-quadratic mixture model which may be considered as the simplest (nonlinear) version of a general polynomial model. Our main aim is to develop an approach which can be easily extended to higher-order polynomial models. Hence, we propose a recurrent separating structure whose realization does not require the knowledge of the explicit form of the inverse of the mixing model. We develop a rigorous method to identify the parameters of the separating structure in a maximum likelihood framework. The algorithm is developed so that the inverse of the mixing structure is not required to be known. Thus, it can be extended to more general polynomial mixtures.

2 mixing and separating models

Suppose u_1 and u_2 are two independent random signals. Given the following nonlinear instantaneous mixture model

$$x_i = a_{i1}u_1 + a_{i2}u_2 + b_i u_1 u_2 \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (1)$$

we would like to estimate u_1 and u_2 up to a permutation and a scaling factor (and possibly an additive constant). For simplicity, let's denote $s_1 = a_{11}u_1$ and $s_2 = a_{22}u_2$. s_1 and s_2 will be referred to as the *sources* in the following. (1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= s_1 - l_1 s_2 - q_1 s_1 s_2 \\ x_2 &= s_2 - l_2 s_1 - q_2 s_1 s_2 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

in which $l_1 = -a_{12}/a_{22}$ and $l_2 = -a_{21}/a_{11}$ represent the linear contributions of the sources in the mixture, and $q_1 = -b_1/(a_{11}a_{22})$ and $q_2 = -b_2/(a_{11}a_{22})$ represent the quadratic contributions. The negative signs are chosen for simplifying the notations of the separating structure.

Solving the model (2) for s_1 and s_2 leads to the following two pairs of solutions, which may be considered as two direct separating structures:

$$\begin{aligned} (f_1, f_2)_1 &= ((-b_1 + \sqrt{\Delta_1})/2a_1, (-b_2 + \sqrt{\Delta_2})/2a_2) \\ (f_1, f_2)_2 &= ((-b_1 - \sqrt{\Delta_1})/2a_1, (-b_2 - \sqrt{\Delta_2})/2a_2) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: Case when $J > 0$ for all the source values. Distribution of (a) sources, (b) mixtures, (c) output of the first direct separating structure, (d) output of the second direct separating structure.

where $\Delta_i = b_i^2 - 4a_i c_i$, $a_1 = q_2 + l_2 q_1$, $a_2 = q_1 + l_1 q_2$, $b_1 = q_1 x_2 - q_2 x_1 + l_1 l_2 - 1$, $b_2 = q_2 x_1 - q_1 x_2 + l_1 l_2 - 1$, $c_1 = x_1 + l_1 x_2$ and $c_2 = x_2 + l_2 x_1$. It can be easily verified that $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = J^2$, where J is the Jacobian of the mixing model (2) and reads

$$J = 1 - l_1 l_2 - (q_2 + l_2 q_1)s_1 - (q_1 + l_1 q_2)s_2 \quad (4)$$

According to the variation domain of the two sources, three different cases may be considered:

1) $J < 0$ for all the values of s_1 and s_2 . In this case (3) becomes:

$$(f_1, f_2)_1 = (s_1, s_2) \quad (5)$$

$$(f_1, f_2)_2 = \left(-\frac{q_1 + l_1 q_2}{q_2 + l_2 q_1} s_2 - \frac{l_1 l_2 - 1}{q_2 + l_2 q_1}, -\frac{q_2 + l_2 q_1}{q_1 + l_1 q_2} s_1 - \frac{l_1 l_2 - 1}{q_1 + l_1 q_2} \right) \quad (6)$$

Thus, the first direct separating structure in (3) leads to the actual sources and the second direct separating structure leads to another solution, equivalent to the first one up to a permutation, a scaling factor, and an additive constant.

2) $J > 0$ for all the values of s_1 and s_2 . In this case, the first structure leads to the permuting solution, defined by (6), and the second structure to the actual sources (s_1, s_2) . An example is shown in Fig. 1 for the numerical values $l_1 = -0.2$, $l_2 = 0.2$, $q_1 = -0.8$, $q_2 = 0.8$ and $s_i \in [-0.5, 0.5]$.

3) $J > 0$ for some values of the sources and $J < 0$ for the other values. In this case, each structure leads to the non-permuted sources (5) for some values of the observations and to the permuted sources (6) for the other values. An example is shown in Fig. 2 (with the same coefficients as in the second case, but for $s_i \in [-2, 2]$). The permutation effect is clearly visible in the figure. One may also remark that the straight line $J = 0$ in the source plane is mapped to a conic section in the observation plane (shown by asterisks).

Thus, it is clear that the direct structures may be used for separating the sources if the Jacobian of the mixing model is always negative or always positive,




Figure 2: Case when $J > 0$ for some values of the sources and $J < 0$ for the other values. Distribution of (a) sources, (b) mixtures, (c) output of the first direct separating structure, (d) output of the second direct separating structure.

i.e. for all the source values. Otherwise, although the sources are separated *sample by sample*, each retrieved signal contains samples of the two sources. This problem arises because the mixing model (2) is not bijective. This theoretically insoluble problem should not discourage us. In fact, our final objective is to extend the idea developed in the current study to more general polynomial models which will be used to approximate the nonlinear mixtures encountered in the real world. If these real-world nonlinear models are bijective, we can logically suppose that the coefficients of their polynomial approximations take values which make them bijective on the variation domains of the sources. Thus, in the following, we suppose that the sources and the mixture coefficients have numerical values ensuring that the Jacobian J of the mixing model has a constant sign.

The natural idea to separate the sources is to form a direct separating structure using any of the equations in (3), and to identify the parameters l_1 , l_2 , q_1 and q_2 by optimizing an independence measuring criterion. Although this approach may be used for our special mixing model (2), as soon as a more complicated polynomial model is considered, the solutions (f_1, f_2) can no longer be determined so that the generalization of the method to arbitrary polynomial models seems impossible. To avoid this limitation, we propose a recurrent structure shown in Fig. 3. Note that, for $q_1 = q_2 = 0$, this structure is reduced to the basic Héault-Jutten network. It may be checked easily that, for fixed observations defined by (2), $y_1 = s_1$ and $y_2 = s_2$ corresponds to a steady state for the structure in Figure 3.

The use of this recurrent structure is more promising because it can be easily generalized to arbitrary polynomial models. However, the main problem with this structure is its stability. In fact, even if the mixing model coefficients are exactly known, the computation of the structure outputs requires the realization




Figure 3: Recurrent separating structure.

of the following recurrent iterative model

$$\begin{aligned} y_1(n+1) &= x_1 + l_1 y_2(n) + q_1 y_1(n) y_2(n) \\ y_2(n+1) &= x_2 + l_2 y_1(n) + q_2 y_1(n) y_2(n) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where a loop on n is performed for each couple of observations (x_1, x_2) until convergence is achieved.

It can be shown that this model is locally stable at the separating point $(y_1, y_2) = (s_1, s_2)$, if and only if the absolute values of the two eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of (7) are smaller than one. In the following, we suppose that this condition is satisfied.

3 Maximum likelihood estimation of the model parameters

Let $f_{S_1, S_2}(s_1, s_2)$ be the joint pdf of the sources, and assume that the mixing model is bijective so that the Jacobian of the mixing model has a constant sign on the variation domain of the sources. The joint pdf of the observations can be written as

$$f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{f_{S_1, S_2}(s_1, s_2)}{|J(s_1, s_2)|} \quad (8)$$

Taking the logarithm of (8), and considering the independence of the sources, we can write:

$$\log f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1, x_2) = \log f_{S_1}(s_1) + \log f_{S_2}(s_2) - \log |J(s_1, s_2)| \quad (9)$$

Given N samples of the mixtures X_1 and X_2 , we want to find the maximum likelihood estimator for the mixture parameters $\mathbf{w} = [l_1, l_2, q_1, q_2]$. This estimator is obtained by maximizing the joint pdf of all the observations (supposing that the parameters in \mathbf{w} are constant), which is equal to

$$E = f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1(1), x_2(1), \dots, x_1(N), x_2(N)) \quad (10)$$

If $s_1(t)$ and $s_2(t)$ are two i.i.d. sequences, $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ are also i.i.d. so that $E = \prod_{i=1}^N f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1(i), x_2(i))$ and $\log E = \sum_{i=1}^N \log f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1(i), x_2(i))$. The

cost function to be maximized can be defined as $L = \frac{1}{N} \log E$, which will be denoted using the temporal averaging operator $E_t[\cdot]$ as

$$L = E_t[\log f_{X_1, X_2}(x_1(t), x_2(t))] \quad (11)$$

Using (9):

$$L = E_t[\log f_{S_1}(s_1(t))] + E_t[\log f_{S_2}(s_2(t))] - E_t[\log |J(s_1(t), s_2(t))|] \quad (12)$$

Maximizing this cost function requires that its gradient with respect to the parameter vector \mathbf{w} , *i.e.* $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}}$, vanishes. Defining the score functions of the two sources as

$$\psi_i(u) = -\frac{\partial \log f_{S_i}(u)}{\partial u} \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (13)$$

and considering that $\frac{\partial \log |J|}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{J} \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}}$, we can write

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = -E_t[\psi_1(s_1) \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial \mathbf{w}}] - E_t[\psi_2(s_2) \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial \mathbf{w}}] - E_t[\frac{1}{J} \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}}] \quad (14)$$

Rewriting (2) in the vector form $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{w})$ and considering \mathbf{w} as the independent variable and \mathbf{s} as the dependent variable, we can write, using implicit differentiation

$$\mathbf{0} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \quad (15)$$

which yields

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = -\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \quad (16)$$

Note that $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}}$ is the Jacobian matrix of the mixing model. Using (14) and (16), the gradient of the cost function L with respect to the parameter vector \mathbf{w} is equal to (see the appendix for the computation details)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = -E_t \Bigg[& \left(\psi_1(s_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_2 + \psi_2(s_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_2 - (l_2 + q_2 s_2) \right) / J, \\ & \left(\psi_1(s_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1 + \psi_2(s_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1 - (l_1 + q_1 s_1) \right) / J, \\ & \left(\psi_1(s_1)(1 - q_2 s_1)s_1 s_2 + \psi_2(s_2)(l_2 + q_2 s_2)s_1 s_2 - (l_2 s_1 + s_2) \right) / J, \\ & \left(\psi_1(s_1)(l_1 + q_1 s_1)s_1 s_2 + \psi_2(s_2)(1 - q_1 s_2)s_1 s_2 - (s_1 + l_1 s_2) \right) / J \Bigg] \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

In practice, the actual sources and their density functions are unknown and will be replaced by the reconstructed sources, *i.e.* by the outputs of the separating structure of Fig 3, y_i , in an iterative algorithm. The score functions of the reconstructed sources can be estimated by any of the existing parametric or non-parametric methods. In our work, we used a kernel estimator based on third-order cardinal splines. Using (17), the cost function (12) can be maximized by a gradient ascent algorithm which updates the parameters by the rule $\mathbf{w}(n+1) = \mathbf{w}(n) + \mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial \mathbf{w}}$. The learning rate parameter μ must be chosen carefully to avoid the divergence of the algorithm. Note that the algorithm does not require the knowledge of the explicit inverse of the mixing model (direct separating structures (3)). Hence, it can be easily extended to more general polynomial mixing models.

Appendix: details of gradient computation

Considering (2), we can write

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{s}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - q_1 s_2 & -l_1 - q_1 s_1 \\ -l_2 - q_2 s_2 & 1 - q_2 s_1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \begin{pmatrix} -s_2 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -s_1 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

which implies, from (16)

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{s}}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \frac{-1}{J} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - q_2 s_1 & l_1 + q_1 s_1 \\ l_2 + q_2 s_2 & 1 - q_1 s_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -s_2 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -s_1 & 0 & -s_1 s_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial \mathbf{w}} &= \frac{1}{J} \left[(1 - q_2 s_1) s_2, (l_1 + q_1 s_1) s_1, (1 - q_2 s_1) s_1 s_2, (l_1 + q_1 s_1) s_1 s_2 \right] \\ \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial \mathbf{w}} &= \frac{1}{J} \left[(l_2 + q_2 s_2) s_2, (1 - q_1 s_2) s_1, (l_2 + q_2 s_2) s_1 s_2, (1 - q_1 s_2) s_1 s_2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Considering (4)

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = - \left[l_2 + q_2 s_2, l_1 + q_1 s_1, l_2 s_1 + s_2, s_1 + l_1 s_2 \right] \quad (19)$$

(17) follows directly from (14), (18) and (19).