

## COMPRESSED SENSING

The toy problems we consider are quite similar to the problems considered in the field of compressed sensing, which is also known as compressive sensing and sparse recovery. However, there are some important differences:

- Compressed sensing recovers vectors by solving an optimization problem using general techniques, while our toy model must use a neural network layer. Compressed sensing algorithms are, in principle, much more powerful than our toy model
- Compressed sensing works using the number of non-zero entries as the measure of sparsity, while we use the probability that each dimension is zero as the sparsity. These are not wholly unrelated: concentration of measure implies that our vectors have a bounded number of non-zero entries with high probability.
- Compressed sensing requires that the embedding matrix (usually called the measurement matrix) have a certain “incoherent” structure [45] such as the restricted isometry property [25] or nullspace property [46]. Our toy model learns the embedding matrix, and will often simply ignore many input dimensions to make others easier to recover.
- Features in our toy model have different “importances”, which means the model will often prefer to be able to recover “important” features more accurately, at the cost of not being able to recover “less important” features at all.

In general, our toy model is solving a similar problem using *less powerful* than compressed sensing algorithms, especially because the computational model is so much more restricted (to just a single linear transformation and a non-linearity) compared to the arbitrary computation that might be used by a compressed sensing algorithm.

As a result, compressed sensing lower bounds—which give lower bounds on the dimension of the embedding such that recovery is still possible—can be interpreted as giving an upper bound on the amount of superposition in our toy model. In particular, in various compressed sensing settings, one can recover an  $n$ -dimensional  $k$ -sparse vector from an  $m$  dimensional projection if and only if  $m = \Omega(k \log(n/k))$  [47, 48, 49]. While the connection is not entirely straightforward, we apply one such result to the toy model in the appendix.

At first, this bound appears to allow a number of features that is exponential in  $m$  to be packed into the  $m$ -dimensional embedding space. However, in our setting, the integer  $k$  for which all vectors have at most  $k$  non-zero entries is determined by the fixed density parameter  $S$  as  $k = O((1 - S)n)$ . As a result, our bound is actually  $m = \Omega(-n(1 - S) \log(1 - S))$ . Therefore, the number of features is linear in  $m$  but modulated by the sparsity.<sup>23</sup> This is good news if we are hoping to eliminate superposition as a phenomenon! However, these bounds also allow for the amount of superposition to increase dramatically with sparsity – hopefully this is an artifact of the techniques in the proofs and not an inherent barrier to reducing or eliminating superposition.

A striking parallel between our toy model and compressed sensing is the existence of *phase changes*.<sup>24</sup> In compressed sensing, if one considers a two-dimensional space defined by the sparsity and dimensionality of the vectors, there are sharp phase changes where the vector can almost surely be recovered in one regime and almost surely not in the other [50, 51]. It isn't immediately obvious how to connect these phase changes in compressed sensing – which apply to recovery of the entire vector, rather than one particular component – to the phase changes we observe in features and neurons. But the parallel is suspicious.

Another interesting line of work has tried to build useful sparse recovery algorithms using neural networks [52, 53, 54]. While we find it useful for analysis purposes to view the toy model as a sparse recovery algorithm, so that we may apply sparse recovery lower bounds, we do not expect that the toy model is useful for the problem of sparse recovery. However, there may be an exciting opportunity to relate our understanding of the phenomenon of superposition to these and other techniques.