

These results seem to suggest that, at least in some cases, non-uniform superposition can be understood as a *deformation of uniform superposition* and *jumping between uniform superposition configurations* rather than a totally different regime. Since uniform superposition has a lot of understandable structure, but real world superposition is almost certainly non-uniform, this seems very promising!

The reason pentagonal solutions are not on the unit circle is because models reduce the effect of positive interference, setting a slight negative bias to cut off noise and setting their weights to  $\|W_i\| = 1/(1 - b_i)$  to compensate. Distance from the unit circle can be interpreted as primarily driven by the amount of positive interference.

A note for reimplementations: optimizing with a two-dimensional hidden space makes this easier to study, but the actual optimization process to be really challenging from gradient descent – a lot harder than even just having three dimensions. Getting clean results required fitting each model multiple times and taking the solution with the lowest loss. However, there's a silver lining to this: visualizing the sub-optimal solutions on a scatter plot as above allows us to see the loss curves for different geometries and gain greater insight into the phase change.

## Correlated and Anticorrelated Features

A more complicated form of non-uniform superposition occurs when there are correlations between features. This seems essential for understanding superposition in the real world, where many features are correlated or anti-correlated.

For example, one very pragmatic question to ask is whether we should expect polysemantic neurons to group the same features together across models. If the groupings were random, you could use this to detect polysemantic neurons, by comparing across models! However, we'll see that correlational structure strongly influences which features are grouped together in superposition.

The behavior seems to be quite nuanced, with a kind of "order of preferences" for how correlated features behave in superposition. The model ideally represents correlated features orthogonally, in separate tegum factors with no interactions between them. When that fails, it prefers to arrange them so that they're as close together as possible – it prefers positive interference between correlated features over negative interference. Finally, when there isn't enough space to represent all the correlated features, it will collapse them and represent their principal component instead! Conversely, when features are anti-correlated, models prefer to have them interfere, especially with negative interference. We'll demonstrate this with a few experiments below.

### SETUP FOR EXPLORING CORRELATED AND ANTICORRELATED FEATURES

Throughout this section we'll refer to "correlated feature sets" and "anticorrelated feature sets".

**Correlated Feature Sets.** Our correlated feature sets can be thought of as "bundles" of co-occurring features. One can imagine a highly idealized version of what might happen in an image classifier: there could be a bundle of features used to identify animals (fur, ears, eyes) and another bundle used to identify buildings (corners, windows, doors). Features from one of these bundles are likely to appear together. Mathematically, we represent this by linking the choice of whether all the features in a correlated feature set are zero or not together. Recall that we originally defined our synthetic distribution to have features be zero with probability  $S$  and otherwise uniformly distributed between  $[0,1]$ . We simply have the same sample determine whether they're zero.

**Anticorrelated Feature Sets.** One could also imagine anticorrelated features which are extremely unlikely to occur together. To simulate these, we'll have anticorrelated feature sets where only one feature in the set can be active at a time. To simulate this, we'll have the feature set be entirely zero with probability  $S$ , but then only have one randomly selected feature in the set be uniformly sampled from  $[0,1]$  if it's active, with the others being zero.