

From superposition to sparse codes: interpretable representations in neural networks

David Klindt^{*1}, Charles O’Neill², Patrik Reizinger³, Harald Maurer⁴, and Nina Miolane⁵

¹ *Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY, USA*

² *Australian National University, Canberra, AU*

³ *Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, ELLIS Institute, Tübingen, Germany;*

⁴ *University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany*

⁵ *University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA*

March 4, 2025

1 Abstract

Understanding how information is represented in neural networks is a fundamental challenge in both neuroscience and artificial intelligence. Despite their nonlinear architectures, recent evidence suggests that neural networks encode features in *superposition*, meaning that input concepts are linearly overlaid within the network’s representations. We present a perspective that explains this phenomenon and provides a foundation for extracting *interpretable representations* from neural activations. Our theoretical framework consists of three steps: (1) **Identifiability theory** shows that neural networks trained for classification recover latent features up to a linear transformation. (2) **Sparse coding methods** can extract disentangled features from these representations by leveraging principles from compressed sensing. (3) **Quantitative interpretability** metrics provide a means to assess the success of these methods, ensuring that extracted features align with human-interpretable concepts. By bridging insights from theoretical neuroscience, representation learning, and interpretability research, we propose an emerging perspective on understanding neural representations in both artificial and biological systems. Our arguments have implications for neural coding theories, AI transparency, and the broader goal of making deep learning models more interpretable.

2 Main

Understanding how information is represented in neural networks is a fundamental challenge in both neuroscience and artificial intelligence (AI) (von Helmholtz, 1878; McCulloch and Pitts, 1943; Kleene, 1951; Rosenblatt, 1958; Smolensky, 1990). As AI systems—particularly large language models (LLMs)—become integral to critical domains like healthcare, finance, and security, the need for transparency and interpretability is more urgent than ever (Linardatos et al., 2020; Fan et al., 2021; Gilpin et al., 2018; Leavitt and Morcos, 2020). Neural networks, both biological and artificial,

^{*}Corresponding author: klindt@cshl.edu




Figure 1: **Superposition of neural representations.** **A)** Images generated from GPT-4 prompts: “A”: *an elephant*, “B”: *a pink ball*, and “A and B”: *an elephant and a pink ball*; **B)** Test for additivity: Adding the neural representations (ViT-B/16 (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021)) of the first two images ($f \circ g(\text{“A”})$ and $f \circ g(\text{“B”})$) and the neural representation for the combined image ($f \circ g(\text{“A and B”})$) (c.s.: cosine similarity; each dot corresponds to one dimension of the neural representation); **C)** Real (not AI generated) images of a dog (“Hazel”), a cat (“Nemo”) and both together. **D)** Same analysis as in **B)**, but with the images in **C)**, showing that additivity even holds on natural images. Further examples ($N = 10$, not shown) support that this finding is statistically significant (over a calibrated baseline, i.e., the c.s. of the representations of just “A” and “B”) in neural representation space ($f \circ g$, $p < 10^{-5}$) but not in pixel space (g , $p \approx 0.88$).

encode information in *distributed representations*, where patterns of activity across many units encode complex concepts (Rumelhart et al., 1986). In human cognition, symbolic knowledge emerges from this distributed processing (Fodor, 1975; Chomsky, 2014; Tenenbaum et al., 2011). Similarly, deep learning models generate high-dimensional representations of input data, whether in vision, language, or multimodal systems. But even prior, from classical methods such as Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) to more recent word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013) and GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014), all produce distributed word embeddings by capturing semantic relationships through vector operations. This raises a fundamental question:

How can we relate distributed neural representations back to human-interpretable concepts?

The superposition principle. A key hypothesis is that meaningful concepts are encoded in *superposition*—where multiple features are *linearly combined* in a shared representational space




Figure 2: **Theory and analysis pipeline.** Data (x) arise from interpretable features ($z \in \mathbb{R}^N$) through a nonlinear function (g) and neural representations ($y \in \mathbb{R}^N$) arise from data through another nonlinear function (f). However, because neural representations have lower dimensionality ($M < N$), they overlay interpretable features in *superposition* Elhage et al. (2022). **1)** Identifiability theory establishes that the overall mapping from interpretable features to neural representations must be linear. **2)** Compressed sensing theory shows that sparse coding can *lift* sparse features out of superposition, recovering the original interpretable features up to permutations. **3)** Since the true interpretable features are unknown, we evaluate the success of sparse coding using a permutation-invariant measure of interpretability as a proxy.

(Van Gelder, 1990; Arora et al., 2018; Elhage et al., 2022). This implies that the representation of a combined concept is well approximated by the sum of the representations of its parts. For instance, as shown in Fig. 1, the sum of neural representations for an *elephant* and a *pink ball* approximates the representation of an image containing both. At first glance, this is surprising: a highly nonlinear neural network (generative model) transforms inputs into images and then another highly nonlinear neural network (image embedding) transforms inputs into neural representations, yet *together, these transformations result in an additive representation*. Historically, research on neural representations has distinguished between *local coding* (a single neuron encodes a concept) and *distributed coding* (a concept is represented by patterns across multiple neurons) (Rumelhart et al., 1986; Thorpe, 1989; Quian et al., 2005). Smolensky (1990) formally defined the *superposition principle*:

Definition 1 (Smolensky superposition). A ‘connectionist’ [distributed] representation function Ψ employs the superpositional representation of conjunction (\wedge) if and only if:

$$\Psi\left(\bigwedge_i p_i\right) = \sum_i \Psi(p_i). \quad (1)$$

where $\bigwedge_i p_i$ denotes the conjunction of propositions p_i (e.g., “A” \wedge “B” = “A and B” in Fig. 1).

This implies that the representation of a composite concept is the sum of its individual representations (e.g., $\Psi := f \circ g$ in Fig. 1). This *additivity* property (5) suggests that neural networks encode features *linearly in high-dimensional spaces*. The problem is that such superposed representations are difficult to interpret directly. *Sparse coding* offers a potential solution: by transforming neural activations into sparse codes, we may uncover representations that better align with human-interpretable concepts (Olshausen and Field, 1996). In this perspective, we outline a three-step approach for extracting interpretable codes from distributed neural representations:

Theory and analysis pipeline (see also Fig.2).

1. **Identifiability theory:** Neural networks trained on structured data (provably) *learn to represent latent variables up to a linear transformation*.
2. **Sparse coding:** Compressed sensing theory guarantees under what conditions we can extract (interpretable) *sparse codes from superposition*.
3. **Quantitative interpretability:** Since true latent variables are unknown, we need interpretability metrics as *proxies to evaluate extracted sparse codes*.

3 Interpretable sparse codes from distributed representations

“It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data.”

Sherlock Holmes

We now turn to prior research, all of which can be understood from the perspective of our three-step approach: i) assume linear representations, ii) apply sparse coding, and iii) assess interpretability (qualitative and/or quantitative). Table 1 summarizes key (non-exhaustive) contributions in this area, spanning early matrix factorization techniques to modern deep learning methods.

Prior research in AI. One of the earliest works, (Ritter and Kohonen, 1989) used SVD on word co-occurrence statistics, followed by self-organizing maps (Kohonen, 1982), to extract qualitatively meaningful concepts from word embeddings. Other early works aiming to uncover hidden semantic concepts in language representations include WordICA (Honkela et al., 2003, 2010) and Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) (Blei et al., 2003). WordICA used Independent Component Analysis

Paper	Model	Methods	Finding
(Ritter and Kohonen, 1989)	SVD	SOM	Qualitative interpretability
(Honkela et al., 2010)	SVD	ICA	Qualitative interpretability; matches Brown corpus (Francis and Kucera, 1979)
(Murphy et al., 2012)	SVD	NNSE	Increased interpretability in WIT
(Fyshe et al., 2015)	SVD	compositional NNSE	Similar interpretability as NNSE in WIT, improved phrase prediction
(Faruqui et al., 2015)	GloVe	SC (NN, bin)	Increased interpretability in WIT
(Subramanian et al., 2017)	GloVe, word2vec	k-sparse AE	Higher interpretability than (Faruqui et al., 2015) in WIT
(Jang and Myaeng, 2017)	SVD	NNSE	Identification of semantic categories in HyperLex (Vulić et al., 2017)
(Arora et al., 2018)	GloVe	SC; theory	Increased interpretability in PLT
(Yun et al., 2021)	BERT	SC	Qualitative interpretability
(Bricken et al., 2023)	Transformer	SAE	Qualitative interpretability
(Templeton et al., 2024)	LLM	SAE	Qualitative interpretability
(Juang et al., 2024)	LLM	SAE	Automatic quantitative interpretability

Table 1: **Overview of prior results.** List of prior research on extracting sparse, interpretable codes from a variety of distributed (neural) representations; While the sparse methods and evaluation frameworks (qualitative vs. quantitative) have changed over time, there is a growing consensus that his approach yields more interpretable insights into neural codes. SVD - singular value decomposition; SOM - self-organizing map (Kohonen, 1982); ICA - independent component analysis; NN - non-negative; NNSE - non-negative sparse embedding; SC - sparse coding; bin - binarized; AE - autoencoder; SAE - sparse autoencoder; WIT - Word intrusion task (Chang et al., 2009); PLT - Police lineup task (Arora et al., 2018).

(ICA) to enhance the interpretability of dense word representations, while LDA modeled word probabilities based on latent *topics*, providing a statistical method to group words by thematic content (Snow et al., 2006). Faruqui et al. (2015) applied sparse coding to various word embeddings, including GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014), and demonstrated enhanced interpretability in word similarity tasks. Their work showed that human annotators achieved an average accuracy of 57% on raw embeddings versus 71% on sparse representations in the Word Intrusion Task (WIT). Furthermore, inter-annotator agreement increased from 70% to 77%, indicating more consistent judgments among annotators. Qualitative analysis supported that sparse representations offered clearer, more interpretable groupings. More recently, Zhang et al. (2019) and Yun et al. (2021) applied sparse coding to contextual word embeddings from models like BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). By processing all transformer layers simultaneously, they could analyze semantic differentiation across layers, extending sparse coding applications to contextualized, sentence-level representations. This approach aligns with recent work on *cross-coders* (Lindsey et al., 2024). Their qualitative analyses and interactive visualizations further supported the increased interpretability of sparse representations over neuron-aligned embeddings. Testing on the Brown corpus (Francis and Kucera, 1979), they observed more distinct semantic separations in later transformer layers, alongside the detection of patterns they termed ‘repetitive pattern detectors’, possibly akin to *induction heads* discovered later by Olsson et al. (2022). Lastly, there has been a surge of recent publications utilizing various forms of Sparse Autoencoders (SAEs) to extract interpretable features from Large Language Models (LLMs) (Templeton et al., 2024; Bricken et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2024; Lindsey et al., 2024; Lan et al., 2024; Engels et al., 2024; O’Neill and Bui, 2024; Wu et al., 2024; Rajamanoharan et al., 2024). Recent work has extended SAE methods to multimodal settings – applying techniques such

as PatchSAE (Lim et al., 2024) and universal SAEs (Thasarathan et al., 2025) to models like CLIP, DinoV2, and even demonstration that SAEs can extract interpretable features that align visual and textual modalities (Templeton et al., 2024). The pace of developments in this area is rapid, and keeping up with each new advancement lies beyond the scope of this work. Below, we discuss the limitations of SAEs in terms of computational complexity in sparse inference.

Prior research in neuroscience. A key milestone was achieved by Murphy et al. (2012), who computed non-negative sparse embeddings from word vectors, achieving a significant improvement in interpretability in psychophysical assessments relative to Singular Value Decomposition (SVD). Specifically, they used Non-Negative Sparse Embedding (NNSE), a form of non-negative sparse coding, on word vectors obtained through Positive Pointwise Mutual Information (PPMI, Church and Hanks, 1990). Their approach was tested on three tasks: behavioral experiments (predicting human behavior), neuroscience experiments (predicting fMRI signals), and psychophysics assessments of interpretability. While NNSE and SVD performed similarly on the first two tasks, NNSE notably increased interpretability on the third task, with precision in the interpretability task rising from 46.33% (for SVD at $k = 300$) to 92.33%. Building on these results, Fyshe et al. (2014) integrated neuroscience data to further refine sparse representations, aligning them with semantic patterns reflected in human brain activity. Such cross-modal constraints, derived from neural data, have also been successfully applied in the visual domain (McClure and Kriegeskorte, 2016; Li et al., 2019). In our recent work (Klindt et al., 2023), we observed that virtual neurons—formed as linear combinations of neural activations—can enhance interpretability in artificial networks, on average outperforming individual units in capturing coherent features. These results were consistent across Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and datasets with neural responses to visual images.

4 A mathematical world model of neural representations

We will now establish a mathematical world model to formalize how neural networks encode complex information through superposition. This modeling framework is illustrated in Figs. 2 (informal) and 3A (formal). We assume there are underlying *latent variables* $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ responsible for the observed data (we focus on images, but the theory applies equally to other modalities such as language). These latent variables are likely sparse and high-dimensional, as each image contains only a small subset of all possible objects. To illustrate, consider $z \in \{0, 1\}^N$, where a value of 1 at index 42 might indicate the presence of an elephant in the scene. Optionally, we also assume that they are *interpretable*—meaning that a human could predict how changes in z affect the input (we make this notion quantitative in Section 5.3). For instance, changing z_{42} from 0 to 1 would result in the appearance of an elephant. Various terms have been used in the literature to refer to z , including: *sources* (in ICA) (Hyvärinen et al., 2023), *factors of variation* (representation learning) (Bengio et al., 2013), *latent variables* (probabilistic models) (Kingma, 2013; Rezende et al., 2014; Locatello et al., 2019) (disentanglement research) (Locatello et al., 2019), *features* (neuroscience) (Hubel and Wiesel, 1962; Gross et al., 1972; Barlow, 1972) and (machine learning) (Fukushima, 1969) and (mechanistic interpretability) (Olah et al., 2017), or *concepts* (psychology) (Quian et al., 2005).

Next, we assume a *function* $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ that maps latent variables to data $x = g(z)$. To illustrate that g is a nonlinear function, consider adding latent variables $z_1 + z_2$, e.g., ‘elephant’ + ‘pink ball’, which we can represent as the conjunction ‘elephant’ \wedge ‘pink ball’ in Smolensky’s notation (Equation 1). Feeding this combined input into our generator, $g(z_1 + z_2)$, results in an image containing both objects (compare Fig. 1). In contrast, adding the individual images $g(z_1)$ and $g(z_2)$ yields a blurry mixed image. Thus, $g(z_1) + g(z_2) \neq g(z_1 + z_2)$, indicating that g must be nonlinear. It




Figure 3: **Mathematical world model and neural analogy making.** **A)** The *latent variables* (i.e., *features*, see text) z are nonlinearly mapped to the data $x = g(z)$. The data is nonlinearly mapped to neural representations $y = f(x)$. Under the assumption that $h = f \circ g$ is invertible (and the requirement that all z are important for the task that f is trained to solve), the key insight from identifiability theory is that $h(z) = y$ will be linear (Theorem 1). The neural representation is likely a lower-dimensional representation of the, potentially, high-dimensional latent variables, i.e., $h : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ with $M \ll N$. Under additional assumptions (e.g., z being sparse) (Donoho, 2006), the key insight from compressed sensing theory is that we can perform *sparse coding* to decode sparse codes from the neural representation $y \rightarrow \hat{z}$, allowing us to uniquely identify the true latent variables up to permutations $z \sim_P \hat{z}$. **B)** A generative model (GPT-4) that maps latent variables, here represented as text, to images $g(z) = x$. **C)** A neural representation (ViT-B/16 (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021)) of the generated images $f(x)$, demonstrating analogy making. This shows how concepts combine linearly, at least for this local example, in neural representation space (c.s.: cosine similarity).

is often assumed that g is invertible (Hyvärinen et al., 2023), ensuring that there exists a well-defined map from data x back to latent variables z . We refer to x as *data* or *inputs*.

The previous paragraph makes the crucial assumption (identifiability theory) that the data is generated by randomly drawing latent variables z and passing them through the generative function $g(z) = x$ to obtain the observed data (Hyvärinen and Oja, 2000). The assumption of such a generative model or *data generating process* is somewhat controversial, akin to positing the existence of an ideal Platonic reality (Huh et al., 2024). A much more widely accepted view is that latent variables, or features, can be extracted from the data (Elhage et al., 2022). However, the two perspectives are similar enough so that our theory works in both cases: Specifically, we think of the map $g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ that generates the data and the map $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ as the neural representation and prove that the combined map $h := f \circ g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is linear and invertible. Alternatively, we may think of the map $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ that extracts features from the data, but does not explain all of the data in the sense that it is invariant to certain (noise) ϵ in the data $g(x) = g(\epsilon(x))$; Similarly, the neural representation is invariant to this $f(x) = f(\epsilon(x))$. Now, again, all we need is that the combined map $h := f \circ g^{-1} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is invertible (for g we have to assume this, for f it follows from reaching the global optimum). With this construction, our theory works in both frameworks. However, for this exposition, we will go with the first formalism, because it is easier to explain.

Lastly, we will consider a *representation function* $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ that corresponds to the hidden activity in a biological or artificial neural network, where $y = f(x)$. In most cases, f is also a nonlinear function, which is essential for neural networks to perform complex computations. Typically, f is a real, vector-valued function with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^M$. While this representation can be high-dimensional—akin to the number of neurons in the visual cortex or channels in a modern LLM—it is most likely still lower than the number of possible latent variables in the world, i.e., $M \ll N$.

5 Three steps towards interpretable neural representations

Building on prior observations that sparse coding extracts interpretable concepts from distributed neural representations (Sec. 3) and using our mathematical world model (Sec. 4) as a theoretical foundation, we now walk through the three steps of our theory and analysis pipeline (Sec. 2).

5.1 Step one: Identifiability theory for linear representations

Importantly, the true latent variables behind the data, as well as the generating function g , are unknown to us. All we observe is the generated data x . Our goal is to uncover the true latent variables in the world and understand how our neural networks represent them to perform computations. To aid in this endeavor, we return to the *superposition principle* (Smolensky, 1990; Van Gelder, 1990; Elhage et al., 2022). Superposition can be nicely observed in *neural analogy-making* (Mikolov et al., 2013). For example, using textual descriptions for the latent variables like $z = \text{‘elephant’}$, consider the operation (see Fig. 3B-C):

$$f \circ g(\text{‘elephant’}) + \underbrace{f \circ g(\text{‘pink ball’}) - f \circ g(\text{‘ball’})}_{\approx f \circ g(\text{‘pink’})} \approx f \circ g(\text{‘pink elephant’}) \quad (2)$$

with $g(z) = x$ the generative function and $f(x)$ the neural representation. This implies that there is a direction in representation space corresponding to the concept of ‘pink’, independent of context:

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ g(\text{‘pink’}) &\approx f \circ g(\text{‘pink ball’}) - f \circ g(\text{‘ball’}) \\ &\approx f \circ g(\text{‘pink elephant’}) - f \circ g(\text{‘elephant’}). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The neural representation forms a *superposition* of concepts, such as combining ‘pink’ with ‘elephant’:

$$f \circ g(\text{‘elephant’}) + f \circ g(\text{‘pink’}) = f \circ g(\text{‘pink elephant’}). \quad (4)$$

Datasets such as the Google Analogy Dataset (GA) (Mikolov, 2013) and BATS (Drozd et al., 2016) were developed to evaluate neural analogy-making. Generally, the property

$$f \circ g(z_1) + f \circ g(z_2) = f \circ g(z_1 + z_2) \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (5)$$

is referred to as *additivity*. Together with *homogeneity*, i.e., $f \circ g(\alpha z) = \alpha f \circ g(z)$, $\forall z \in \mathcal{Z}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, these are the two defining features of a *linear function*. In fact, if f and g are continuous (artificial neural networks are usually differentiable), additivity entails homogeneity. Thus, this means that $f \circ g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ is a *linear function*. If $f \circ g$ is linear, this reduces an intractable nonlinear problem (Hyvärinen and Pajunen, 1999) into a well-studied linear problem (Comon, 1994). Essentially, it means that the neural representation f inverts the generative model g up to a linear transformation. These are great news, since we now know that the neural representations are only a linear transformation away from the true latent variables. The key question is, *why does this happen?*

Identifiability up to linear transformations. In this section, we briefly present recent results that prove the linear identifiability of a broad class of neural networks trained to do object recognition (Reizinger et al., 2024). Prior work proved identifiability of nonlinear ICA in certain probabilistic settings and self-supervised learning scenarios (Hyvärinen and Morioka, 2016; Morioka et al., 2021; Hyvärinen and Morioka, 2017; Khemakhem et al., 2020; Klindt et al., 2020; Hyvärinen et al., 2019; Khemakhem et al., 2020; Morioka and Hyvärinen, 2023; Zimmermann et al., 2021). As stated

by Hyvarinen et al. (2019), a key part of identifiability theory work, is the assumption of a data-generating process (DGP), or *world model* in the preceding section. Assuming the cluster-centric DGP in (Reizinger et al., 2024) ($g : \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$); we train a continuous encoder $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ on x , paired with a linear classifier W . In standard supervised learning, we optimize the cross-entropy objective over all possible encoders f and classifiers W . Now, the key theoretical result:

Theorem 1 (Supervised Learning Identifiability (Reizinger et al., 2024)). *Let Assumption 1 in Reizinger et al. (2024) hold, and suppose that a continuous encoder $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and a linear classifier W globally minimize the cross-entropy objective. Then, the composition $h = f \circ g$ is a linear map from \mathbb{S}^{d-1} to \mathbb{R}^d .*

Proof provided in (Reizinger et al., 2024). The significance of this result is that neural networks trained to classify object categories can learn to invert complex, nonlinear generative models of the world, up to linear transformations. Despite the complexity of the generative model, Theorem 1 guarantees that we can recover the underlying variables. This is exciting because it suggests that neural networks may be learning rich representations of the latent variables underlying the world, rather than just memorizing shortcuts to solve a task (Lake et al., 2017; Geirhos et al., 2020).

Limitations and open questions. Our framework assumes sparse latent variables in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , whereas contrastive and supervised learning theories often assume dense latent variables on a hypersphere \mathbb{S}^n (Zimmermann et al., 2021; Reizinger et al., 2024). Some latent variables, such as object pose, exhibit non-Euclidean topology, requiring embeddings in curved manifolds within the latent space (Higgins et al., 2018; Pfau et al., 2020; Keurti et al., 2023). The linear representation hypothesis may hold only approximately in cases where topological constraints prevent a fully linear encoding (Smith, 2024; Engels et al., 2024). Extensions of compressed sensing theory suggest that recovery remains feasible even in these cases (Baraniuk and Wakin, 2009). Furthermore, we might also assume that latent variables are discrete (Park et al., 2024), for which both identifiability (Hyttinen et al., 2022; Barin-Pacela et al., 2024) and compressed sensing (Stojnic, 2010) theory exists. Furthermore, the linear identifiability results (Thm. 1) assumed that the latent variable dimensionality $\dim(\mathcal{Z}) = N$ and that of the neural representation $\dim(\mathcal{Y}) = M$ are matched, i.e., $M = N$. However, a key motivation for looking into superposition and sparse coding was the fact that this is not the case since real-world neural representations often encode many latent variables in a lower-dimensional space ($M < N$) using non-orthogonal directions (Elhage et al., 2022).

5.2 Step two: Compressed sensing and sparse coding

According to the previous section, the superposition principle, which is also the defining feature of a linear function (Illingworth, 1991), is equivalent to the *linear representation hypothesis* (Arora et al., 2016; Park et al., 2024). However, Elhage et al. (2022) recently proposed that the geometry of the layout of the neural representations, i.e., non-orthogonality, is a key feature of *superposition*. If we assume that the latent variables live in $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{R}^N$, then this is a necessary consequence because we are linearly projecting N latent variables down into an M dimensional neural representation (although it can also happen when $M \geq N$). To highlight this additional complexity and align with the recent use of the term, we will extend Smolensky’s definition (Def. 1) of *superposition*:

Definition 2 (Superposition). A representation f of the data $x = g(z)$ with latent variables $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is in *superposition* if $h = f \circ g$ is a linear function and if there are pairs of vectors that are non-orthogonal $h(e_i) \not\perp h(e_j)$, where e_i denote the canonical basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^N .

Thus, a key challenge remains in decoding the sparse (interpretable) concepts from neural representations. For example, the vector $f \circ g(\text{'pink ball'}) - f \circ g(\text{'ball'})$ reveals how the latent variable z ('pink') is represented, but we are limited by manually defining such pairs. To 'lift' (Elhage et al., 2022) these sparse concepts out of superposition, we turn to *compressed sensing* (Beurling, 1939; Donoho, 2006; Gilbert et al., 2002; Candès et al., 2006; Tsaig and Donoho, 2006; Ganguli and Sompolinsky, 2012). Assuming the setting described above, we know that $f \circ g : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ is a linear function. Thus, there exists a matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ (see Fig. 3A) such that

$$f \circ g(z) = \Phi z \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, assuming the distribution over latent variables $z \sim P(Z)$ is sparse (at most K active components) (Donoho, 2006), we can recover the latent variables with high probability if

$$M > \mathcal{O} \left(K \log \left(\frac{N}{K} \right) \right). \quad (7)$$

In compressed sensing we assume knowledge of the linear projection, which is unrealistic, so we have to use *blind compressed sensing* (Gleichman and Eldar, 2011) or *sparse coding* which provides a method to achieve this recovery. It represents data—or, in our setting, neural activations—using a dictionary of basis functions $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ (see Fig. 3A), minimizing both reconstruction error and sparsity. Sparse coding, for a set of neural activations $(y^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^M)_{i=(1, \dots, D)}$, involves two steps:

1. **Sparse inference:** Given a dictionary Θ , estimate the codes $\hat{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for each sample $y^{(i)}$

$$\min_{\hat{z}} \sum_{i=1}^D \|y^{(i)} - \Theta \hat{z}_i\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\hat{z}_i\|_1. \quad (8)$$

2. **Dictionary learning:** Given codes \hat{z} , update the dictionary Θ (fixing norms to avoid collapse)

$$\min_{\Theta} \sum_{i=1}^D \|y^{(i)} - \Theta \hat{z}_i\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N\} : \|\Theta_{:,j}\| = 1. \quad (9)$$

In summary, by applying sparse coding to neural representations, we extract sparse, interpretable codes that can 'lift' neural representations out of superposition (Yun et al., 2021). That is, if $y = f \circ g(z) = \Phi z$ is in *superposition* (Def. 2), then sparse inference should yield back the true latent variables $\hat{z} \sim z$ up to permutations and scaling (Hillar and Sommer, 2015). This approach allows us to map neural representations back to human-interpretable concepts (Arora et al., 2018).

The difficulty with this method is that sparse inference is non-convex (and NP-hard) (Natarajan, 1995), that means there are many possible \hat{z} that *locally* minimize 8. Moreover, for a large dataset (D) this is costly, because (1.) has to be run for every dictionary training step and (2.) for every sample at inference time. Consequently, many sparse coding algorithms have been proposed over the years as can be seen from the sample of methods in Tab. 1. Next, we will discuss one of the most popular recent methods, i.e., *sparse autoencoders* (Ng et al., 2011; Bricken et al., 2023).




Figure 4: **Compressed sensing bounds.** For various embedding sizes (M), the plots show lower bounds for signal reconstruction with high probability (omitting any constant scaling factors) (Donoho, 2006). The boundary between invertible and non-invertible regions is defined by $M = K \log(N/K)$. Shown are embeddings for hidden dimension sizes of models such as `word2vec` (Mikolov et al., 2013), `CLIP` (Radford et al., 2021), and `LLAMA v1` with 6.7B parameters (Touvron et al., 2023).

Sparse autoencoders. To run sparse inference (8), for computational efficiency, especially with large datasets, one can employ *amortized inference* (Kingma, 2013; Rezende et al., 2014). Instead of solving the optimization problem for each $y^{(i)}$, we learn a function ξ that maps inputs directly to their sparse codes $\hat{z}_i = \xi(y^{(i)})$ (Vafaii et al., 2024). When this mapping takes a simple linear-nonlinear form, $\xi(y^{(i)}) = \text{ReLU}(Wy^{(i)} + \beta)$, this is called a *sparse autoencoder* (SAE) (Ng et al., 2011; Bricken et al., 2023), whose computational properties we discuss theoretically below. We will consider setting where sparse signals $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with at most K non-zero entries are projected into an M -dimensional space ($M < N$). Compressed sensing theory guarantees that these signals can be uniquely recovered with sparse coding (Donoho, 2006). However, recent results proved that SAEs fail to achieve optimal recovery (O’Neill et al., 2025). Intuitively, this limitation stems from the architecture of the SAE’s linear-nonlinear encoder, which lacks the necessary complexity to fully recover the high-dimensional (N) sparse representation from the lower-dimensional (M) projection. Equipping SAEs with more expressive (MLP) encoders increases code recovery and interpretability (O’Neill et al., 2025). Suboptimal sparse coding models (such as SAEs) with optimization and inference issues might explain why, empirically, the extracted features are not always unique and universal across models (Paulo and Belrose, 2025), despite theory (Hillar and Sommer, 2015; Olshausen, 2008; Aharon et al., 2006; Hillar and Sommer, 2015).

Limitations and open questions. Recent investigations have scaled up SAEs significantly—Fig. 4 shows the conditions under which compressed sensing theory (7) predicts that codes can be recovered. Our results indicate that simple SAEs cannot achieve optimal recovery, raising the question of what types of sparse coding algorithms can scale to handle tens of millions of sparse codes (Templeton et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2024). Answering this and designing efficient sparse inference algorithms that close the amortization gap is crucial for further progress in decoding high-dimensional neural representations. It is also an open question of how sparse coding methods perform when the input to the model is shifted away from the training data (Paiton et al., 2020; Friedman et al., 2023). Furthermore, Wright and Sharkey (2024) identified feature suppression in SAEs, which is equivalent to the activation shrinkage first described by Tibshirani (1996) as a property of L1 penalties. Numerous

SAE architectures have since been proposed to address this, from gated SAEs (Rajamanoharan et al., 2024) to JumpReLU SAEs (Rajamanoharan et al., 2024).

5.3 Step three: Quantitative interpretability for evaluation

To validate our ability to recover interpretable features up to permutation, we need a quantitative evaluation metric. One approach, common in nonlinear ICA literature, is to simulate data and see how well we recover the true (simulated) features. This is not viable on real data. However, we can make a simple assumption: *the true features are more interpretable than linear combinations of them*. For instance, a neuron selective for elephants is more interpretable than one responding to both elephants and balls. Formally, assume we have a function to measure interpretability $I : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that takes a neuron (i.e., a function on inputs $f_i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) and returns a value between zero (uninterpretable) and one (highly interpretable). The interpretability of a population code, e.g., with M neurons is simply the average $I(f) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_i^M I(f_i)$. By definition, the function extracting latent variables, $g^{-1} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, is maximally interpretable: $I(g^{-1}) = 1$. Now, saying that combinations of features are less interpretable means, for any two distinct $i \neq j$ neurons g_i^{-1}, g_j^{-1} and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$

$$I(ag_i^{-1} + bg_j^{-1}) < 1. \quad (10)$$

Since most linear transformations (except permutations) *mix* feature representations, almost all Θ reduce interpretability: $I(\Theta g^{-1}) < I(g^{-1})$. Especially in superposition with $M < N$ this becomes worse as we are mixing even more concepts into each neuron. Since, $f = \Theta g^{-1}$, that means $I(f) < I(g^{-1})$, i.e., the neurons in our model are less interpretable than the latent variables. The only exception are permutations $P \in S_n$ because the sum is invariant to permutations

$$I(Pg^{-1}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_i^M I(P_i g^{-1}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_i^M I(g_{\pi(i)}^{-1}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=\pi(i)}^M I(g_j^{-1}) = I(g^{-1}) \quad (11)$$

where $\pi(i) = j$ is the single non-zero entry in the i -th row of P . In summary, an interpretability metric invariant to permutations would allow us to assess how well our extracted sparse codes recover the true underlying features. Next, we will discuss such a metric.

Quantitative interpretability methods. Quantitative assessment of interpretability is crucial to move beyond anecdotal analyses (Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017; Leavitt and Morcos, 2020). One approach is to use psychophysics tasks, which assess human understanding of neural network computations (Berardino et al., 2018). These tasks operationalize *interpretability* by testing whether humans can perform tasks that require understanding the model’s output. Understanding is a difficult philosophical concept and yet, to test whether a person has understood something, we can test them on a *behavioral* task that requires understanding (Wittgenstein, 1953). For **language models**, human understanding of neural representations can be tested, for instance, through the *word intrusion task* (WIT), where participants identify an outlier word from a list of related terms. For example, in the set $\{one, two, three, elephant\}$, *elephant* is the intruder. This approach is analogous to the *New York Times Connections Game*. A related task is the *police lineup task* (Arora et al., 2018), where participants identify the true senses of polysemous words from distractors. Each sense is represented by a set of related words, and participants must select the correct sense. This task quantitatively assesses interpretability by comparing human performance to model predictions, using WordNet’s database of polysemous words (Fellbaum, 2010). Beyond representation, we also want to evaluate whether *inference* yields interpretable results. In the *topic intrusion task* (TI) (Chang et al., 2009),

the challenge is to associate input x with the correct unit in the network, based on the population response $f(x)$. The task measures whether the inferred codes are interpretable across various inputs. While WIT tests *specificity*, the TI tasks might be a good operationalization to test *sensitivity*, which has proven to be harder to assess Templeton et al. (2024). For **vision models**, human understanding of neural representations can be tested, for instance, by adapting the *intrusion task* (Ghorbani et al., 2019) or through the two-alternative forced choice task proposed by Borowski et al. (2021). In this task, participants match query images to visual explanations based on unit activations. Our recent work automates this process (Klindt et al., 2023), allowing faster evaluations while maintaining strong correlation with human judgments. This allows scaling vision model interpretability analyses to more than 70 million units from 835 computer vision models (Zimmermann et al., 2024).

Limitations and open questions. At a high level, all of those behavioral assays depend on a human (dis)similarity judgment between two inputs $d_h : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from a dataset (x_1, \dots, x_D) . If d_h were a simple, context-free function, we could conceptualize the problem of human interpretability tests in the following way. We can also define a distance for a scalar representation function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ like $d_f(x_i, x_j) := |f(x_i) - f(x_j)|$. The most interpretable representation maintains the ordering of the data (in human similarity judgments) as much as possible, i.e.,

$$f^* = \operatorname{argmin}_f \sum_{i,j}^D |d_h(x_i, x_j) - d_f(x_i, x_j)| \quad (12)$$

Note, that this can be seen as the stress function in multidimensional scaling (MDS)—with a one dimensional embedding (Mead, 1992; Borg and Groenen, 2007). However, the big problem is that d_h depends on context c as the following example demonstrates. Consider the word intrusion task $\{apple, orange, android\}$. One possible interpretation is that this is about *fruits*, implying that $d_h(apple, orange|c = fruits) < d_h(apple, android|c = fruits)$ (same for orange/apple and orange/android) and, thus, *android* is the intruder. A different possible interpretation is that this is about operating systems (*OS*), implying that $d_h(apple, android|c = OS) < d_h(apple, orange|c = OS)$ (same for android/apple and android/orange) and, thus, *orange* would be the intruder. Presumably, in the word intrusion task (Chang et al., 2009) but also in Borowski et al. (2021)’s visual psychophysics task, humans are able to infer the context from all provided references. This illustrates that interpretability scores based on pairwise human (dis)similarity judgments are insufficient and motivates future research into contextualized similarity metrics.

6 Conclusion

In this perspective paper, we explored the remarkable emergence of *linear representations* in neural networks, despite their inherently nonlinear architectures. We introduced a theoretical framework suggesting that neural networks encode information through *superposition*, in which multiple concepts are linearly and non-orthogonally combined within their representations. Recent theoretical results (Theorem 1, (Hyvarinen et al., 2019; Zimmermann et al., 2021; Reizinger et al., 2024)) show that neural networks trained on classification tasks can learn to invert complex, nonlinear generative models of the world—up to a linear transformation. By drawing connections to compressed sensing (Donoho, 2006; Baraniuk and Wakin, 2009) and sparse coding (Olshausen, 2008; Aharon et al., 2006), we argued that interpretable, sparse codes can be recovered from superposed neural activations. In addition, we highlighted the importance of developing quantitative measures of interpretability through both theoretical frameworks and behavioral tasks (Chang et al., 2009; Borowski et al., 2021; Klindt et al., 2023) to systematically assess the recovered features.

These findings carry significant implications for theories of neural coding and AI transparency. In neuroscience, the longstanding debate between the single neuron doctrine—where individual neurons are thought to encode discrete features (Barlow, 1972; Thorpe, 1989; Hubel and Wiesel, 1962)—and population coding is re-examined in light of our perspective. While some neurons exhibit *clean selectivity / monosemanticity* (Rigotti et al., 2013; Bricken et al., 2023), other studies have shown that meaningful representations arise from distributed, population-level codes, where neurons display *mixed selectivity / polysemanticity* (Klindt et al., 2023). Future work should aim to explain why, for instance, population codes are prevalent in motor control (Mazor and Laurent, 2005) but appear less frequently in visual areas (Saxena and Cunningham, 2019), suggesting that the brain’s coding principles may flexibly balance sparse, *privileged axes* (Khosla et al., 2024) with distributed representations. At the same time, our work has implications for AI transparency, as it grounds interpretability in rigorous theoretical guarantees via nonlinear ICA and sparse coding, we can build models that not only perform well but also offer insights into the underlying joint distributions governing complex natural phenomena (Klindt et al., 2024; Simon and Zou, 2024; Schuster, 2024).

Despite these advances, several important open questions remain. Among the many problems with distributed representations (Fodor and Pylyshyn, 1988), one key challenge is the *binding problem* (Smolensky, 1990; Treisman, 1996; Feng and Steinhardt, 2023; Feng et al., 2024)—how multiple objects and attributes (e.g., “a blue triangle and a red square”) are encoded without simply summing individual representation vectors which would result in a loss of relational information: $f \circ g(\text{“blue”}) + f \circ g(\text{“triangle”}) + f \circ g(\text{“red”}) + f \circ g(\text{“square”})$ is the same as $f \circ g(\text{“blue”}) + f \circ g(\text{“square”}) + f \circ g(\text{“red”}) + f \circ g(\text{“triangle”})$. Moreover, while compressed sensing theory provides guarantees for sparse recovery under ideal conditions, practical recovery in large-scale models remains challenging, necessitating the development of more efficient and scalable sparse coding algorithms (O’Neill et al., 2025). Extending our framework to incorporate latent variables with non-Euclidean geometry or discrete structure (Park et al., 2024; Hyttinen et al., 2022) is also critical for a more complete understanding.

Finally, the connections we have drawn between (nonlinear) ICA and sparse coding are bolstered by both classical work (Olshausen, 2008; Aharon et al., 2006; Hillar and Sommer, 2015) and recent evidence showing that sparse codes extracted from different networks converge on similar concepts (Lan et al., 2024; Chen and Bonner, 2023). Advances in nonlinear ICA and causal inference increasingly rely on sparsity assumptions for identifiability (Klindt et al., 2021; Lachapelle et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024; Zheng and Zhang, 2023), yet extending these results to cover scenarios involving lower-dimensional latent spaces, manifolds, and anisotropy Rusak et al. (2024) remains an open and exciting challenge. In summary, by integrating insights from theoretical neuroscience, representation learning, and interpretability research, our work lays a solid foundation for future studies aimed at deciphering the coding principles of both artificial and biological neural systems, while also advancing the development of transparent and robust AI models.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Sung Ching Liu, Hermanni Hälvä, Aapo Hyvärinen, Habon Issa, Richard Baraniuk, Zeyu Yun, Bruno Olshausen, Roland Zimmermann, Wieland Brendel and Christian Internò for their feedback, suggestions and pointers that helped us in writing this manuscript. Moreover, we thank Trevor Christensen, Alice Rigg, Jake Ward, Josh Engels, Katrin Franke, Nancy Kanwisher, Andreas Tolias, Sophia Sanborn, Xaq Pitkow, Nikos Karantzas, Liam Storan, Randall Balestriero, Alice Bizeul, Attila Juhos, Mark Ibrahim, Daniel Kunin, Clémentine Dominé, Marco Fumero and Feng Chen for helpful discussions on this topic.

References

- [1] Michal Aharon, Michael Elad, and Alfred M. Bruckstein. On the uniqueness of overcomplete dictionaries, and a practical way to retrieve them. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 416(1):48–67, jul 2006. ISSN 0024-3795. doi: 10.1016/j.laa.2005.06.035. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379505003459>.
- [2] Sanjeev Arora, Yuanzhi Li, Yingyu Liang, Tengyu Ma, and Andrej Risteski. A Latent Variable Model Approach to PMI-based Word Embeddings. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:385–399, dec 2016. ISSN 2307-387X. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00106. URL <https://direct.mit.edu/tacl/article/43373>.
- [3] Sanjeev Arora, Yuanzhi Li, Yingyu Liang, Tengyu Ma, and Andrej Risteski. Linear Algebraic Structure of Word Senses, with Applications to Polysemy. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:483–495, dec 2018. ISSN 2307-387X. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00034. URL <https://direct.mit.edu/tacl/article/43451>.
- [4] Richard G. Baraniuk and Michael B. Wakin. Random Projections of Smooth Manifolds. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 9(1):51–77, feb 2009. ISSN 1615-3375, 1615-3383. doi: 10.1007/s10208-007-9011-z. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10208-007-9011-z>.
- [5] Vitória Barin-Pacela, Kartik Ahuja, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and Pascal Vincent. On the identifiability of quantized factors. In *Causal Learning and Reasoning*, pages 384–422. PMLR, 2024.
- [6] H. B. Barlow. Single units and sensation: a neuron doctrine for perceptual psychology? *Perception*, 1(4):371–394, 1972. ISSN 0301-0066. doi: 10.1068/p010371.
- [7] Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8):1798–1828, 2013.
- [8] Alexander Berardino, Johannes Ballé, Valero Laparra, and Eero P. Simoncelli. Eigen-Distortions of Hierarchical Representations, feb 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.02266>. arXiv:1710.02266 [cs].
- [9] Arne Beurling. Sur les intégrales de Fourier absolument convergents et leur application à une transformation fonctionnelle, 1939.
- [10] David M. Blei, Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022, 2003. URL <https://www.jmlr.org/papers/volume3/blei03a/blei03a.pdf?ref=http://githubhelp.com>.
- [11] Ingwer Borg and Patrick JF Groenen. *Modern multidimensional scaling: Theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [12] Judy Borowski, Roland S. Zimmermann, Judith Schepers, Robert Geirhos, Thomas S. A. Wallis, Matthias Bethge, and Wieland Brendel. Exemplary Natural Images Explain CNN Activations Better than State-of-the-Art Feature Visualization, may 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.12606>. arXiv:2010.12606 [cs].

- [13] Trenton Bricken, Adly Templeton, Joshua Batson, Brian Chen, Adam Jermyn, Tom Conerly, Nick Turner, Cem Anil, Carson Denison, and Amanda Askill. Towards monosemanticity: Decomposing language models with dictionary learning. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, page 2, 2023. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2023/monosemantic-features>.
- [14] Trenton Bricken, Adly Templeton, Joshua Batson, Brian Chen, Adam Jermyn, Tom Conerly, Nick Turner, Cem Anil, Carson Denison, Amanda Askill, Robert Lasenby, Yifan Wu, Shauna Kravec, Nicholas Schiefer, Tim Maxwell, Nicholas Joseph, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Alex Tamkin, Karina Nguyen, Brayden McLean, Josiah E Burke, Tristan Hume, Shan Carter, Tom Henighan, and Christopher Olah. Towards monosemanticity: Decomposing language models with dictionary learning. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2023. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2023/monosemantic-features/index.html>.
- [15] Emmanuel J Candès, Justin Romberg, and Terence Tao. Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 52(2):489–509, 2006.
- [16] Jonathan Chang, Sean Gerrish, Chong Wang, Jordan Boyd-graber, and David Blei. Reading Tea Leaves: How Humans Interpret Topic Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 22. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- [17] Zirui Chen and Michael Bonner. Canonical dimensions of neural visual representation. *Journal of Vision*, 23(9):4937–4937, 2023.
- [18] Noam Chomsky. *The minimalist program*. MIT press, 2014.
- [19] Kenneth Church and Patrick Hanks. Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography. *Computational linguistics*, 16(1):22–29, 1990.
- [20] Pierre Comon. Independent component analysis, a new concept? *Signal processing*, 36(3):287–314, 1994. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0165168494900299>. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [21] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding, may 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>. arXiv:1810.04805 [cs].
- [22] David L. Donoho. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, 2006. Publisher: IEEE.
- [23] Finale Doshi-Velez and Been Kim. Towards A Rigorous Science of Interpretable Machine Learning, mar 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.08608>. arXiv:1702.08608 [cs, stat].
- [24] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An Image is Worth 16x16 Words: Transformers for Image Recognition at Scale, jun 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.11929>. arXiv:2010.11929 [cs].
- [25] Aleksandr Drozd, Anna Gladkova, and Satoshi Matsuoka. Word embeddings, analogies, and machine learning: Beyond king-man+ woman= queen. In *Proceedings of coling 2016, the 26th international conference on computational linguistics: Technical papers*, pages 3519–3530, 2016.

- [26] Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Catherine Olsson, Nicholas Schiefer, Tom Henighan, Shauna Kravec, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Robert Lasenby, Dawn Drain, Carol Chen, Roger Grosse, Sam McCandlish, Jared Kaplan, Dario Amodei, Martin Wattenberg, and Christopher Olah. Toy Models of Superposition, sep 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.10652>. arXiv:2209.10652 [cs].
- [27] Joshua Engels, Isaac Liao, Eric J. Michaud, Wes Gurnee, and Max Tegmark. Not All Language Model Features Are Linear, may 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14860>. arXiv:2405.14860 [cs].
- [28] Feng-Lei Fan, Jinjun Xiong, Mengzhou Li, and Ge Wang. On interpretability of artificial neural networks: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Radiation and Plasma Medical Sciences*, 5(6):741–760, 2021.
- [29] Manaal Faruqui, Yulia Tsvetkov, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Noah Smith. Sparse Overcomplete Word Vector Representations, jun 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.02004>. arXiv:1506.02004 [cs].
- [30] Christiane Fellbaum. WordNet. In Roberto Poli, Michael Healy, and Achilles Kameas, editors, *Theory and Applications of Ontology: Computer Applications*, pages 231–243. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2010. ISBN 978-90-481-8846-8 978-90-481-8847-5. doi: 10.1007/978-90-481-8847-5_10. URL https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-90-481-8847-5_10.
- [31] Jiahai Feng and Jacob Steinhardt. How do language models bind entities in context? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17191*, 2023.
- [32] Jiahai Feng, Stuart Russell, and Jacob Steinhardt. Monitoring latent world states in language models with propositional probes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19501*, 2024.
- [33] Jerry A. Fodor. *The language of thought*, volume 5. Harvard university press Cambridge, MA, 1975. URL <https://direct.mit.edu/books/edited-volume/3637/chapter-abstract/121528>.
- [34] Jerry A. Fodor and Zenon W. Pylyshyn. Connectionism and cognitive architecture: A critical analysis. *Cognition*, 28(1):3–71, mar 1988. ISSN 0010-0277. doi: 10.1016/0010-0277(88)90031-5. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0010027788900315>.
- [35] Winthrop Nelson Francis and Henry Kucera. *Brown corpus maunal [ie manual]: Manual of information to accompany a standard corpus of present-day edited American English for use with digital computers*. Department of Linguistics, Borwn University, 1979.
- [36] Dan Friedman, Andrew Lampinen, Lucas Dixon, Danqi Chen, and Asma Ghandeharioun. Interpretability illusions in the generalization of simplified models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03656*, 2023.
- [37] Kunihiko Fukushima. Visual feature extraction by a multilayered network of analog threshold elements. *IEEE Transactions on Systems Science and Cybernetics*, 5(4):322–333, 1969.
- [38] Alona Fyshe, Partha P. Talukdar, Brian Murphy, and Tom M. Mitchell. Interpretable Semantic Vectors from a Joint Model of Brain- and Text- Based Meaning. In Kristina Toutanova and Hua Wu, editors, *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association*

for *Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 489–499, Baltimore, Maryland, jun 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/P14-1046. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P14-1046>.

- [39] Alona Fyshe, Leila Wehbe, Partha P. Talukdar, Brian Murphy, and Tom M. Mitchell. A Compositional and Interpretable Semantic Space. In Rada Mihalcea, Joyce Chai, and Anoop Sarkar, editors, *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 32–41, Denver, Colorado, may 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/N15-1004. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N15-1004>.
- [40] Surya Ganguli and Haim Sompolinsky. Compressed Sensing, Sparsity, and Dimensionality in Neuronal Information Processing and Data Analysis. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 35(Volume 35, 2012):485–508, jul 2012. ISSN 0147-006X, 1545-4126. doi: 10.1146/annurev-neuro-062111-150410. URL <https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-neuro-062111-150410>. Publisher: Annual Reviews.
- [41] Leo Gao, Gabriel Goh, and Ilya Sutskever. Scaling and evaluating sparse autoencoders, jun 2024. URL <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/sparse-autoencoders.pdf>.
- [42] Robert Geirhos, Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen, Claudio Michaelis, Richard Zemel, Wieland Brendel, Matthias Bethge, and Felix A Wichmann. Shortcut learning in deep neural networks. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2(11):665–673, 2020.
- [43] Amirata Ghorbani, James Wexler, James Y Zou, and Been Kim. Towards automatic concept-based explanations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [44] Anna C Gilbert, Sudipto Guha, Piotr Indyk, Shanmugavelayutham Muthukrishnan, and Martin Strauss. Near-optimal sparse fourier representations via sampling. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 152–161, 2002.
- [45] Leilani H Gilpin, David Bau, Ben Z Yuan, Ayesha Bajwa, Michael Specter, and Lalana Kagal. Explaining explanations: An overview of interpretability of machine learning. In *2018 IEEE 5th International Conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*, pages 80–89. IEEE, 2018.
- [46] Sivan Gleichman and Yonina C Eldar. Blind compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(10):6958–6975, 2011.
- [47] Charles G Gross, CE de Rocha-Miranda, and DB Bender. Visual properties of neurons in inferotemporal cortex of the macaque. *Journal of neurophysiology*, 35(1):96–111, 1972.
- [48] Irina Higgins, David Amos, David Pfau, Sebastien Racaniere, Loic Matthey, Danilo Rezende, and Alexander Lerchner. Towards a Definition of Disentangled Representations. *arXiv:1812.02230 [cs, stat]*, dec 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.02230>. arXiv: 1812.02230.
- [49] Christopher J. Hillar and Friedrich T. Sommer. When Can Dictionary Learning Uniquely Recover Sparse Data From Subsamples? *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(11): 6290–6297, nov 2015. ISSN 1557-9654. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2015.2460238. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Information Theory.

- [50] Christopher J. Hillar and Friedrich T. Sommer. When Can Dictionary Learning Uniquely Recover Sparse Data From Subsamples? *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(11):6290–6297, nov 2015. ISSN 1557-9654. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2015.2460238. URL https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/7165675?casa_token=75WtBxUgMQgAAAAA:eek6hgNU40XdBfDgDAT29nt-1xXVndIdsb19XZZLRnKIT8pnv8UHaxNh0KZQUV9pItE5Ifmq1Q. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Information Theory.
- [51] Timo Honkela, Aapo Hyvärinen, and Jaakko Väyrynen. *Emergence of linguistic representations by independent component analysis*. Helsinki University of Technology, 2003. URL <http://research.ics.aalto.fi/publications/jjvayryn/Honkela03tr.pdf>.
- [52] Timo Honkela, Aapo Hyvärinen, and Jaakko J. Väyrynen. WordICA—emergence of linguistic representations for words by independent component analysis. *Natural Language Engineering*, 16(3):277–308, 2010. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.
- [53] David H Hubel and Torsten N Wiesel. Receptive fields, binocular interaction and functional architecture in the cat’s visual cortex. *The Journal of physiology*, 160(1):106, 1962.
- [54] Minyoung Huh, Brian Cheung, Tongzhou Wang, and Phillip Isola. The platonic representation hypothesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07987*, 2024.
- [55] Antti Hyttinen, Vitória Barin Pacela, and Aapo Hyvärinen. Binary independent component analysis: a non-stationarity-based approach. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 874–884. PMLR, 2022.
- [56] A. Hyvärinen and H. Morioka. Unsupervised feature extraction by time-contrastive learning and nonlinear ICA. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS2016)*, Barcelona, Spain, 2016.
- [57] Aapo Hyvarinen and Hiroshi Morioka. Nonlinear ICA of Temporally Dependent Stationary Sources. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 460–469. PMLR, apr 2017. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/hyvarinen17a.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [58] Aapo Hyvärinen and Petteri Pajunen. Nonlinear independent component analysis: Existence and uniqueness results. *Neural networks*, 12(3):429–439, 1999.
- [59] Aapo Hyvarinen, Hiroaki Sasaki, and Richard Turner. Nonlinear ica using auxiliary variables and generalized contrastive learning. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 859–868. PMLR, 2019.
- [60] Aapo Hyvarinen, Hiroaki Sasaki, and Richard Turner. Nonlinear ICA Using Auxiliary Variables and Generalized Contrastive Learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 859–868. PMLR, apr 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v89/hyvarinen19a.html>. arXiv: 1805.08651.
- [61] A. Hyvärinen and E. Oja. Independent component analysis: algorithms and applications. *Neural Networks*, 13(4):411–430, jun 2000. ISSN 0893-6080. doi: 10.1016/S0893-6080(00)00026-5. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893608000000265>.
- [62] Aapo Hyvärinen, Ilyes Khemakhem, and Ricardo Monti. Identifiability of latent-variable and structural-equation models: from linear to nonlinear, may 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.02672>. arXiv:2302.02672 [cs, stat].

- [63] Valerie Illingworth. The Penguin dictionary of physics. *Penguin Books 2nd edition*, 1991. URL <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130000797436622208>.
- [64] Kyoung-Rok Jang and Sung-Hyon Myaeng. Elucidating Conceptual Properties from Word Embeddings. In Jose Camacho-Collados and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, editors, *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Sense, Concept and Entity Representations and their Applications*, pages 91–95, Valencia, Spain, apr 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W17-1911. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W17-1911>.
- [65] Caden Juang, Gonçalo Paulo, Jacob Drori, and Nora Belrose. Open source automated interpretability for sparse autoencoder features, 2024. URL <https://blog.eleuther.ai/autointerp/>. [Accessed 29-09-2024].
- [66] Hamza Keurti, Patrik Reizinger, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Wieland Brendel. Desiderata for Representation Learning from Identifiability, Disentanglement, and Group-Structuredness, jun 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r6C86JjuiW>.
- [67] Ilyes Khemakhem, Diederik Kingma, Ricardo Monti, and Aapo Hyvarinen. Variational Autoencoders and Nonlinear ICA: A Unifying Framework. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2207–2217. PMLR, jun 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/khemakhem20a.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [68] Ilyes Khemakhem, Ricardo Pio Monti, Diederik P. Kingma, and Aapo Hyvärinen. ICE-BeeM: Identifiable Conditional Energy-Based Deep Models Based on Nonlinear ICA. *arXiv:2002.11537 [cs, stat]*, oct 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2002.11537>. arXiv: 2002.11537.
- [69] Meenakshi Khosla, Alex H. Williams, Josh McDermott, and Nancy Kanwisher. Privileged representational axes in biological and artificial neural networks, jun 2024. URL <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.06.20.599957v1>. Pages: 2024.06.20.599957 Section: New Results.
- [70] Diederik P Kingma. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [71] SC Kleene. Representation of events in nerve nets and finite automata. *CE Shannon and J. McCarthy*, 1951.
- [72] David Klindt, Lukas Schott, Yash Sharma, Ivan Ustyuzhaninov, Wieland Brendel, Matthias Bethge, and Dylan Paiton. Towards nonlinear disentanglement in natural data with temporal sparse coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.10930*, 2020.
- [73] David Klindt, Lukas Schott, Yash Sharma, Ivan Ustyuzhaninov, Wieland Brendel, Matthias Bethge, and Dylan Paiton. Towards nonlinear disentanglement in natural data with temporal sparse coding. *ICLR*, 2021.
- [74] David Klindt, Sophia Sanborn, Francisco Acosta, Frédéric Poitevin, and Nina Miolane. Identifying Interpretable Visual Features in Artificial and Biological Neural Systems, oct 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.11431>. arXiv:2310.11431 [cs, stat].
- [75] David A Klindt, Aapo Hyvärinen, Axel Levy, Nina Miolane, and Frédéric Poitevin. Towards interpretable cryo-em: disentangling latent spaces of molecular conformations. *Frontiers in Molecular Biosciences*, 11:1393564, 2024.

- [76] Teuvo Kohonen. Self-organized formation of topologically correct feature maps. *Biological cybernetics*, 43(1):59–69, 1982.
- [77] Sebastien Lachapelle, Tristan Deleu, Divyat Mahajan, Ioannis Mitliagkas, Yoshua Bengio, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and Quentin Bertrand. Synergies between Disentanglement and Sparsity: Generalization and Identifiability in Multi-Task Learning. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 18171–18206. PMLR, jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/lachapelle23a.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [78] Brenden M Lake, Tomer D Ullman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. Building machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 40:e253, 2017.
- [79] Michael Lan, Philip Torr, Austin Meek, Ashkan Khakzar, David Krueger, and Fazl Barez. Sparse Autoencoders Reveal Universal Feature Spaces Across Large Language Models, oct 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.06981>. arXiv:2410.06981.
- [80] Matthew L. Leavitt and Ari Morcos. Towards falsifiable interpretability research, oct 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.12016>. arXiv:2010.12016 [cs, stat].
- [81] Zhe Li, Wieland Brendel, Edgar Walker, Erick Cobos, Taliah Muhammad, Jacob Reimer, Matthias Bethge, Fabian Sinz, Zachary Pitkow, and Andreas Tolias. Learning from brains how to regularize machines. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 4245–4252. Curran Associates, Inc., jul 2019. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33014245. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/70117ee3c0b15a2950f1e82a215e812b-Abstract.html>. Number: 01.
- [82] Hyesu Lim, Jinho Choi, Jaegul Choo, and Steffen Schneider. Sparse autoencoders reveal selective remapping of visual concepts during adaptation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.05276>.
- [83] Pantelis Linardatos, Vasilis Papastefanopoulos, and Sotiris Kotsiantis. Explainable ai: A review of machine learning interpretability methods. *Entropy*, 23(1):18, 2020.
- [84] Jack Lindsey, Adly Templeton, Jonathan Marcus, Thomas Conerly, Joshua Batson, and Christopher Olah. *Sparse Crosscoders for Cross-Layer Features and Model Diffing*, 2024. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2024/crosscoders/index.html>.
- [85] Francesco Locatello, Stefan Bauer, Mario Lucic, Gunnar Raetsch, Sylvain Gelly, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Olivier Bachem. Challenging common assumptions in the unsupervised learning of disentangled representations. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 4114–4124. PMLR, 2019.
- [86] Francesco Locatello, Stefan Bauer, Mario Lucic, Gunnar Raetsch, Sylvain Gelly, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Olivier Bachem. Challenging Common Assumptions in the Unsupervised Learning of Disentangled Representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4114–4124. PMLR, may 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/locatello19a.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [87] Ofer Mazor and Gilles Laurent. Transient dynamics versus fixed points in odor representations by locust antennal lobe projection neurons. *Neuron*, 48(4):661–673, 2005.

- [88] Patrick McClure and Nikolaus Kriegeskorte. Representational Distance Learning for Deep Neural Networks. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 10, dec 2016. ISSN 1662-5188. doi: 10.3389/fncom.2016.00131. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fncom.2016.00131>. Publisher: Frontiers.
- [89] Warren S McCulloch and Walter Pitts. A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in nervous activity. *The bulletin of mathematical biophysics*, 5:115–133, 1943.
- [90] Al Mead. Review of the development of multidimensional scaling methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 41(1):27–39, 1992.
- [91] Tomas Mikolov. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- [92] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space, sep 2013. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3781>. arXiv:1301.3781 [cs].
- [93] Hiroshi Morioka and Aapo Hyvarinen. Connectivity-contrastive learning: Combining causal discovery and representation learning for multimodal data. In *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3399–3426. PMLR, apr 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v206/morioka23a.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [94] Hiroshi Morioka, Hermanni Hälvä, and Aapo Hyvärinen. Independent Innovation Analysis for Nonlinear Vector Autoregressive Process. *arXiv:2006.10944 [cs, stat]*, feb 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10944>. arXiv: 2006.10944.
- [95] Brian Murphy, Partha Talukdar, and Tom Mitchell. Learning Effective and Interpretable Semantic Models using Non-Negative Sparse Embedding. *Proceedings of COLING 2012*, Proceedings of COLING 2012:1933–1950, 2012. URL <https://aclanthology.org/C12-1118.pdf>.
- [96] Balas Kausik Natarajan. Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems. *SIAM journal on computing*, 24(2):227–234, 1995.
- [97] Andrew Ng et al. Sparse autoencoder. *CS294A Lecture notes*, 72(2011):1–19, 2011.
- [98] Chris Olah, Alexander Mordvintsev, and Ludwig Schubert. Feature visualization. *Distill*, 2(11):e7, 2017. URL <https://distill.pub/2017/feature-visualization/>.
- [99] Bruno Olshausen. Sparse coding and ‘ica’. *online*, 2008. URL <https://redwood.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/sparse-coding-ICA.pdf>.
- [100] Bruno A. Olshausen and David J. Field. Emergence of simple-cell receptive field properties by learning a sparse code for natural images. *Nature*, 381(6583):607–609, jun 1996. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/381607a0. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/381607a0>. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [101] Catherine Olsson, Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Nicholas Joseph, Nova DasSarma, Tom Henighan, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Scott Johnston, Andy Jones, Jackson Kernion, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, and Chris Olah. In-context Learning and Induction Heads, sep 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.11895>. arXiv:2209.11895 [cs].

- [102] Charles O’Neill and Thang Bui. Sparse Autoencoders Enable Scalable and Reliable Circuit Identification in Language Models, may 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.12522>. arXiv:2405.12522 [cs].
- [103] Charles O’Neill, Alim Gumran, and David Klindt. Compute optimal inference and provable amortisation gap in sparse autoencoders, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.13117>.
- [104] Dylan M Paiton, Charles G Frye, Sheng Y Lundquist, Joel D Bowen, Ryan Zarcone, and Bruno A Olshausen. Selectivity and robustness of sparse coding networks. *Journal of vision*, 20(12):10–10, 2020.
- [105] Kiho Park, Yo Joong Choe, Yibo Jiang, and Victor Veitch. The geometry of categorical and hierarchical concepts in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01506*, 2024.
- [106] Kiho Park, Yo Joong Choe, and Victor Veitch. The Linear Representation Hypothesis and the Geometry of Large Language Models, jul 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.03658>. arXiv:2311.03658 [cs, stat].
- [107] Gonalo Paulo and Nora Belrose. Sparse autoencoders trained on the same data learn different features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.16615*, 2025.
- [108] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, 2014. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D14-1162.pdf>.
- [109] David Pfau, Irina Higgins, Alex Botev, and Sebastien Racaniere. Disentangling by Subspace Diffusion. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 17403–17415. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/c9f029a6a1b20a8408f372351b321dd8-Abstract.html>.
- [110] Rodrigo Quian, Leila Reddy, Gabriel Kreiman, Christof Koch, and Itzhak Fried. Invariant Visual Representation by Single Neurons in the Human Brain. *Nature*, 435:1102–7, jul 2005. doi: 10.1038/nature03687.
- [111] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision, feb 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020>. arXiv:2103.00020 [cs].
- [112] Senthoooran Rajamanoharan, Arthur Conmy, Lewis Smith, Tom Lieberum, Vikrant Varma, Janos Kramar, Rohin Shah, and Neel Nanda. Improving Dictionary Learning with Gated Sparse Autoencoders, apr 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.16014>. arXiv:2404.16014 [cs].
- [113] Senthoooran Rajamanoharan, Tom Lieberum, Nicolas Sonnerat, Arthur Conmy, Vikrant Varma, Janos Kramar, and Neel Nanda. Jumping ahead: Improving reconstruction fidelity with jumprelu sparse autoencoders, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.14435>.
- [114] Patrik Reizinger, Alice Bizeul, Attila Juhos, Julia E Vogt, Randall Balestrieri, Wieland Brendel, and David Klindt. Cross-entropy is all you need to invert the data generating process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21869*, 2024.

- [115] Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Daan Wierstra. Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in deep generative models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1278–1286. PMLR, 2014.
- [116] Mattia Rigotti, Omri Barak, Melissa R. Warden, Xiao-Jing Wang, Nathaniel D. Daw, Earl K. Miller, and Stefano Fusi. The importance of mixed selectivity in complex cognitive tasks. *Nature*, 497(7451):585–590, 2013. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature12160>. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group UK London.
- [117] H. Ritter and T. Kohonen. Self-organizing semantic maps. *Biological Cybernetics*, 61(4): 241–254, aug 1989. ISSN 1432-0770. doi: 10.1007/BF00203171. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00203171>.
- [118] Frank Rosenblatt. The perceptron: a probabilistic model for information storage and organization in the brain. *Psychological review*, 65(6):386, 1958.
- [119] David E. Rumelhart, Geoffrey E. Hinton, and James L. McClelland. A general framework for parallel distributed processing. *Parallel distributed processing: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition*, 1(45-76):26, 1986. Publisher: Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [120] Evgenia Rusak, Patrik Reizinger, Attila Juhos, Oliver Bringmann, Roland S. Zimmermann, and Wieland Brendel. InfoNCE: Identifying the Gap Between Theory and Practice, jun 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.00143>. arXiv:2407.00143 [cs, stat].
- [121] Shreya Saxena and John P Cunningham. Towards the neural population doctrine. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 55:103–111, 2019.
- [122] Viktoria Schuster. Can sparse autoencoders make sense of latent representations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11468*, 2024.
- [123] Elana Simon and James Zou. Interplm: Discovering interpretable features in protein language models via sparse autoencoders. *bioRxiv*, pages 2024–11, 2024.
- [124] Lewis Smith. The ‘strong’ feature hypothesis could be wrong, 2024. URL <https://www.alignmentforum.org/posts/tojtPCCRpKLSHBdpn/the-strong-feature-hypothesis-could-be-wrong>. AI Alignment Forum.
- [125] Paul Smolensky. Tensor product variable binding and the representation of symbolic structures in connectionist systems. *Artificial intelligence*, 46(1-2):159–216, 1990. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/000437029090007M>. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [126] Rion Snow, Dan Jurafsky, and Andrew Y. Ng. Semantic taxonomy induction from heterogenous evidence. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on computational linguistics and 44th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 801–808, 2006. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P06-1101.pdf>.
- [127] Mihailo Stojnic. Recovery thresholds for l1 optimization in binary compressed sensing. In *2010 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 1593–1597. IEEE, 2010.
- [128] Anant Subramanian, Danish Pruthi, Harsh Jhamtani, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Eduard Hovy. SPINE: SParse Interpretable Neural Embeddings, nov 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.08792>. arXiv:1711.08792 [cs].

- [129] Adly Templeton, Tom Conerly, Jonathan Marcus, Jack Lindsey, Trenton Bricken, and et al. Scaling Monosemanticity: Extracting Interpretable Features from Claude 3 Sonnet, 2024. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2024/scaling-monosemanticity>.
- [130] Adly Templeton, Tom Conerly, Jonathan Marcus, Jack Lindsey, Trenton Bricken, Brian Chen, Adam Pearce, Craig Citro, Emmanuel Ameisen, Hoagy Cunningham Andy Jones, Nicholas L Turner, Callum McDougall, Monte MacDiarmid, Alex Tamkin, Esin Durmus, Tristan Hume, Francesco Mosconi, C. Daniel Freeman, Theodore R. Sumers, Edward Rees, Joshua Batson, Adam Jermyn, Shan Carter, Chris Olah, and Tom Henighan. Scaling Monosemanticity: Extracting Interpretable Features from Claude 3 Sonnet — transformer-circuits.pub. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2024/scaling-monosemanticity/>, 2024. [Accessed 11-02-2025].
- [131] Joshua B Tenenbaum, Charles Kemp, Thomas L Griffiths, and Noah D Goodman. How to grow a mind: Statistics, structure, and abstraction. *science*, 331(6022):1279–1285, 2011.
- [132] Harrish Thasarathan, Julian Forsyth, Thomas Fel, Matthew Kowal, and Konstantinos Derpanis. Universal sparse autoencoders: Interpretable cross-model concept alignment, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.03714>.
- [133] Simon Thorpe. Local vs. Distributed Coding. *Intellectica. Revue de l'Association pour la Recherche Cognitive*, 8(2):3–40, 1989. ISSN 0769-4113. doi: 10.3406/intel.1989.873. URL https://www.persee.fr/doc/intel_0769-4113_1989_num_8_2_873.
- [134] Robert Tibshirani. Regression Shrinkage and Selection Via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 58(1):267–288, jan 1996. ISSN 1369-7412, 1467-9868. doi: 10.1111/j.2517-6161.1996.tb02080.x. URL <https://academic.oup.com/jrsssb/article/58/1/267/7027929>.
- [135] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models, feb 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971>. arXiv:2302.13971 [cs].
- [136] Anne Treisman. The binding problem. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 6(2):171–178, 1996.
- [137] Yaakov Tsaig and David L Donoho. Extensions of compressed sensing. *Signal processing*, 86(3): 549–571, 2006.
- [138] Hadi Vafaii, Dekel Galor, and Jacob L. Yates. Poisson Variational Autoencoder, may 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14473>. arXiv:2405.14473 [cs, q-bio].
- [139] Tim Van Gelder. Compositionality: A connectionist variation on a classical theme. *Cognitive Science*, 14(3):355–384, 1990. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/036402139090017Q>. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [140] Tim Van Gelder. What is the ‘D’ in ‘PDP’? An overview of the concept of distribution. *Philosophy and Connectionist Theory*, pages 33–59, 1990.
- [141] Herman von Helmholtz. *The facts of perception*. The Selected Writings of Hermann von Helmholtz, R. Karl, Ed. Middletown, CT, USA: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1971., 1878.

- [142] Ivan Vulić, Daniela Gerz, Douwe Kiela, Felix Hill, and Anna Korhonen. HyperLex: A Large-Scale Evaluation of Graded Lexical Entailment. *Computational Linguistics*, 43(4):781–835, dec 2017. ISSN 0891-2017. doi: 10.1162/COLI_a_00301. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI_a_00301.
- [143] Ludwig Wittgenstein. *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, hg. GEM Anscombe und R. Rhees, 1953.
- [144] Benjamin Wright and Lee Sharkey. Addressing feature suppression in saes. In *AI Alignment Forum*, page 16, 2024.
- [145] Jeffrey Wu, Leo Gao, Tom Dupré la Tour, and Henk Tillman. *Extracting Concepts from GPT-4*, 2024. URL <https://openai.com/index/extracting-concepts-from-gpt-4/>.
- [146] Danru Xu, Dingling Yao, Sébastien Lachapelle, Perouz Taslakian, Julius von Kügelgen, Francesco Locatello, and Sara Magliacane. A Sparsity Principle for Partially Observable Causal Representation Learning, mar 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08335>. arXiv:2403.08335 [cs, stat].
- [147] Zeyu Yun, Yubei Chen, Bruno A. Olshausen, and Yann LeCun. Transformer visualization via dictionary learning: contextualized embedding as a linear superposition of transformer factors, 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.15949>. arXiv:2103.15949 [cs].
- [148] Juexiao Zhang, Yubei Chen, Brian Cheung, and Bruno A. Olshausen. Word Embedding Visualization Via Dictionary Learning, oct 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03833>. arXiv:1910.03833 [cs].
- [149] Yujia Zheng and Kun Zhang. Generalizing Nonlinear ICA Beyond Structural Sparsity, nov 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.00866>. arXiv:2311.00866 [cs, eess, stat].
- [150] Roland Zimmermann, David Klindt, and Wieland Brendel. Measuring Mechanistic Interpretability at Scale Without Humans. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=M8yBcvRvwn>.
- [151] Roland S. Zimmermann, Yash Sharma, Steffen Schneider, Matthias Bethge, and Wieland Brendel. Contrastive learning inverts the data generating process. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12979–12990. PMLR, feb 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/zimmermann21a.html>. arXiv: 2102.08850.