

References

1. **Zoom In: An Introduction to Circuits**
Olah, C., Cammarata, N., Schubert, L., Goh, G., Petrov, M. and Carter, S., 2020. Distill. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00024.001
2. **Softmax Linear Units**
Elhage, N., Hume, T., Olsson, C., Nanda, N., Henighan, T., Johnston, S., ElShowk, S., Joseph, N., DasSarma, N., Mann, B., Hernandez, D., Askell, A., Ndousse, K., Jones, A., Drain, D., Chen, A., Bai, Y., Ganguli, D., Lovitt, L., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Kernion, J., Conerly, T., Kravec, S., Fort, S., Kadavath, S., Jacobson, J., Tran-Johnson, E., Kaplan, J., Clark, J., Brown, T., McCandlish, S., Amodei, D. and Olah, C., 2022. Transformer Circuits Thread.
3. **Compressed sensing**
Donoho, D.L., 2006. IEEE Transactions on information theory, Vol 52(4), pp. 1289--1306. IEEE.
4. **Local vs. Distributed Coding**
Thorpe, S.J., 1989. Intellectica, Vol 8, pp. 3--40.
5. **Representation learning: A review and new perspectives**
Bengio, Y., Courville, A. and Vincent, P., 2013. IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence, Vol 35(8), pp. 1798--1828. IEEE.
6. **Curve Detectors** [\[link\]](#)
Cammarata, N., Goh, G., Carter, S., Schubert, L., Petrov, M. and Olah, C., 2020. Distill.
7. **Superposition of many models into one**
Cheung, B., Terekhov, A., Chen, Y., Agrawal, P. and Olshausen, B., 2019. Advances in neural information processing systems, Vol 32.
8. **Linguistic regularities in continuous space word representations** [\[PDF\]](#)
Mikolov, T., Yih, W. and Zweig, G., 2013. Proceedings of the 2013 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies, pp. 746--751.
9. **Linguistic regularities in sparse and explicit word representations**
Levy, O. and Goldberg, Y., 2014. Proceedings of the eighteenth conference on computational natural language learning, pp. 171--180.
10. **Unsupervised representation learning with deep convolutional generative adversarial networks**
Radford, A., Metz, L. and Chintala, S., 2015. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06434.
11. **Visualizing and understanding recurrent networks** [\[PDF\]](#)
Karpathy, A., Johnson, J. and Fei-Fei, L., 2015. arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02078.
12. **Learning to generate reviews and discovering sentiment** [\[PDF\]](#)
Radford, A., Jozefowicz, R. and Sutskever, I., 2017. arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.01444.
13. **Object detectors emerge in deep scene cnns** [\[PDF\]](#)
Zhou, B., Khosla, A., Lapedriza, A., Oliva, A. and Torralba, A., 2014. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6856.
14. **Network Dissection: Quantifying Interpretability of Deep Visual Representations** [\[PDF\]](#)
Bau, D., Zhou, B., Khosla, A., Oliva, A. and Torralba, A., 2017. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition.
15. **Understanding the role of individual units in a deep neural network**
Bau, D., Zhu, J., Strobelt, H., Lapedriza, A., Zhou, B. and Torralba, A., 2020. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Vol 117(48), pp. 30071--30078. National Acad Sciences.
16. **On the importance of single directions for generalization** [\[PDF\]](#)
Morcos, A.S., Barrett, D.G., Rabinowitz, N.C. and Botvinick, M., 2018. arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.06959.
17. **On Interpretability and Feature Representations: An Analysis of the Sentiment Neuron**
Donnelly, J. and Roegiest, A., 2019. European Conference on Information Retrieval, pp. 795--802.
18. **High-Low Frequency Detectors**
Schubert, L., Voss, C., Cammarata, N., Goh, G. and Olah, C., 2021. Distill. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00024.005
19. **Multimodal Neurons in Artificial Neural Networks**
Goh, G., Cammarata, N., Voss, C., Carter, S., Petrov, M., Schubert, L., Radford, A. and Olah, C., 2021. Distill. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00030
20. **Convergent learning: Do different neural networks learn the same representations?**
Li, Y., Yosinski, J., Clune, J., Lipson, H., Hopcroft, J.E. and others,, 2015. FE@ NIPS, pp. 196--212.
21. **Feature Visualization** [\[link\]](#)
Olah, C., Mordvintsev, A. and Schubert, L., 2017. Distill. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00007
22. **Adversarial examples are not bugs, they are features**
Ilyas, A., Santurkar, S., Tsipras, D., Engstrom, L., Tran, B. and Madry, A., 2019. Advances in neural information processing systems, Vol 32.

23. Proofs and refutations

Lakatos, I., 1963. Nelson London.

24. Sparse coding with an overcomplete basis set: A strategy employed by V1?

Olshausen, B.A. and Field, D.J., 1997. Vision research, Vol 37(23), pp. 3311--3325. Elsevier.

25. Decoding by linear programming

Candes, E.J. and Tao, T., 2005. IEEE transactions on information theory, Vol 51(12), pp. 4203--4215. IEEE.

26. Exact solutions to the nonlinear dynamics of learning in deep linear neural networks

Saxe, A.M., McClelland, J.L. and Ganguli, S., 2014.

27. In-context Learning and Induction Heads [\[HTML\]](#)

Olsson, C., Elhage, N., Nanda, N., Joseph, N., DasSarma, N., Henighan, T., Mann, B., Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Conerly, T., Drain, D., Ganguli, D., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Johnston, S., Jones, A., Kernion, J., Lovitt, L., Ndousse, K., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S. and Olah, C., 2022. Transformer Circuits Thread.

28. A Mechanistic Interpretability Analysis of Grokking [\[link\]](#)

Nanda, N. and Lieberum, T., 2022.

29. Grokking: Generalization beyond overfitting on small algorithmic datasets

Power, A., Burda, Y., Edwards, H., Babuschkin, I. and Misra, V., 2022. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.02177.

30. The surprising simplicity of the early-time learning dynamics of neural networks

Hu, W., Xiao, L., Adlam, B. and Pennington, J., 2020. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, Vol 33, pp. 17116--17128.

31. A mathematical theory of semantic development in deep neural networks

Saxe, A.M., McClelland, J.L. and Ganguli, S., 2019. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Vol 116(23), pp. 11537--11546. National Acad Sciences.

32. Towards the science of security and privacy in machine learning

Papernot, N., McDaniel, P., Sinha, A. and Wellman, M., 2016. arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03814.

33. Adversarial spheres

Gilmer, J., Metz, L., Faghri, F., Schoenholz, S.S., Raghu, M., Wattenberg, M. and Goodfellow, I., 2018. arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.02774.

34. Adversarial robustness as a prior for learned representations

Engstrom, L., Ilyas, A., Santurkar, S., Tsipras, D., Tran, B. and Madry, A., 2019. arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00945.

35. Delving into transferable adversarial examples and black-box attacks

Liu, Y., Chen, X., Liu, C. and Song, D., 2016. arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02770.

36. An introduction to systems biology: design principles of biological circuits

Alon, U., 2019. CRC press. DOI: 10.1201/9781420011432

37. The Building Blocks of Interpretability [\[link\]](#)

Olah, C., Satyanarayan, A., Johnson, I., Carter, S., Schubert, L., Ye, K. and Mordvintsev, A., 2018. Distill. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00010

38. Visualizing Weights [\[link\]](#)

Voss, C., Cammarata, N., Goh, G., Petrov, M., Schubert, L., Egan, B., Lim, S.K. and Olah, C., 2021. Distill. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00024.007

39. A Review of Sparse Expert Models in Deep Learning

Fedus, W., Dean, J. and Zoph, B., 2022. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01667.

40. A Mathematical Framework for Transformer Circuits [\[HTML\]](#)

Elhage, N., Nanda, N., Olsson, C., Henighan, T., Joseph, N., Mann, B., Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Conerly, T., DasSarma, N., Drain, D., Ganguli, D., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Jones, A., Kernion, J., Lovitt, L., Ndousse, K., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S. and Olah, C., 2021. Transformer Circuits Thread.

41. An Overview of Early Vision in InceptionV1

Olah, C., Cammarata, N., Schubert, L., Goh, G., Petrov, M. and Carter, S., 2020. Distill. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00024.002

42. beta-vae: Learning basic visual concepts with a constrained variational framework

Higgins, I., Matthey, L., Pal, A., Burgess, C., Glorot, X., Botvinick, M., Mohamed, S. and Lerchner, A., 2016.

43. Infogan: Interpretable representation learning by information maximizing generative adversarial nets

Chen, X., Duan, Y., Houthoofd, R., Schulman, J., Sutskever, I. and Abbeel, P., 2016. Advances in neural information processing systems, Vol 29.

44. Disentangling by factorising

Kim, H. and Mnih, A., 2018. International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 2649--2658.

45. **Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition**
Donoho, D.L., Huo, X. and others,, 2001. IEEE transactions on information theory, Vol 47(7), pp. 2845--2862. Citeseer.
46. **Compressed sensing and best k -term approximation**
Cohen, A., Dahmen, W. and DeVore, R., 2009. Journal of the American mathematical society, Vol 22(1), pp. 211--231.
47. **A remark on compressed sensing**
Kashin, B.S. and Temlyakov, V.N., 2007. Mathematical notes, Vol 82(5), pp. 748--755. Springer.
48. **Information-theoretic bounds on sparsity recovery in the high-dimensional and noisy setting**
Wainwright, M., 2007. 2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, pp. 961--965.
49. **Lower bounds for sparse recovery**
Do Ba, K., Indyk, P., Price, E. and Woodruff, D.P., 2010. Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms, pp. 1190--1197.
50. **Neighborly polytopes and sparse solution of underdetermined linear equations**
Donoho, D.L., 2005.
51. **Compressed sensing: How sharp is the RIP**
Blanchard, J.D., Cartis, C. and Tanner, J., 2009. SIAM Rev., accepted, Vol 10, pp. 090748160.
52. **A deep learning approach to structured signal recovery**
Mousavi, A., Patel, A.B. and Baraniuk, R.G., 2015. 2015 53rd annual allerton conference on communication, control, and computing (Allerton), pp. 1336--1343.
53. **Learned D-AMP: Principled neural network based compressive image recovery**
Metzler, C., Mousavi, A. and Baraniuk, R., 2017. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, Vol 30.
54. **Compressed Sensing using Generative Models** [\[HTML\]](#)
Bora, A., Jalal, A., Price, E. and Dimakis, A.G., 2017. Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, Vol 70, pp. 537--546. PMLR.
55. **Average firing rate rather than temporal pattern determines metabolic cost of activity in thalamocortical relay neurons**
Yi, G. and Grill, W., 2019. Scientific reports, Vol 9(1), pp. 6940. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-019-43460-8
56. **Distributed representations**
Plate, T., 2003. Cognitive Science, pp. 1-15.
57. **Compressed Sensing, Sparsity, and Dimensionality in Neuronal Information Processing and Data Analysis** [\[link\]](#)
Ganguli, S. and Sompolinsky, H., 2012. Annual Review of Neuroscience, Vol 35(1), pp. 485-508. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-neuro-062111-150410

Nonlinear Compression

This paper focuses on the assumption that representations are linear. But what if models don't use linear feature directions to represent information? What might such a thing concretely look like?

Neural networks have nonlinearities that make it theoretically possible to compress information even more compactly than a linear superposition. There are reasons we think models are unlikely to pervasively use nonlinear compression schemes:

- The model needs to decompress things before it can compute with them naturally: Most of the computation in the model is linear, so this kind of compression is likely only worth it to save space in the residual stream across many layers before being decompressed to be computed with linearly again.
- They're probably difficult to learn: Nonlinear compression schemes may require finely tuned approximations of discontinuities, and for the compression and decompression to line up, and may be difficult for gradient descent to learn.
- They probably take enough neurons that the benefit over superposition isn't worth it:
 - Representing the piecewise linear functions in the simple example with ReLU neurons using the universal function approximation result that each line segment takes two neurons, would require 12 neurons per Z segment, so only starts to beat linear compression at a combined 36 neurons for the compression and decompression.
 - This comparison has only one hidden dimension and dense features, which is somewhat of a degenerate case for superposition. Superposition is much more powerful for compression of sparse features in many dimensions. We suspect in large models the scaling is in favor of superposition, although this is just intuition and it's possible that scaling nonlinear compression is competitive.