

On the Theoretical Foundation of Sparse Dictionary Learning in Mechanistic Interpretability

Yiming Tang¹ Harshvardhan Saini² Yizhen Liao¹ Dianbo Liu¹

Abstract

As AI models achieve remarkable capabilities across diverse domains, understanding what representations they learn and how they process information has become increasingly important for both scientific progress and trustworthy deployment. Recent works in mechanistic interpretability have shown that neural networks represent meaningful concepts as directions in their representation spaces and often encode many concepts in superposition. Various sparse dictionary learning (SDL) methods, including sparse autoencoders, transcoders, and crosscoders, address this by training auxiliary models with sparsity constraints to disentangle these superposed concepts into interpretable features. These methods have demonstrated remarkable empirical success but have limited theoretical understanding. Existing theoretical work is limited to sparse autoencoders with tied-weight constraints, leaving the broader family of SDL methods without formal grounding. In this work, we develop the first unified theoretical framework considering SDL as one unified optimization problem. We demonstrate how diverse methods instantiate the theoretical framework and provide rigorous analysis on the optimization landscape. We provide the first theoretical explanations for some empirically observed phenomena, including feature absorption, dead neurons, and the neuron resampling technique. We further design controlled experiments to validate our theoretical results.

1. Introduction

As artificial intelligence is increasingly deployed in high-stakes applications, from medical diagnosis to autonomous systems, the need for model interpretability has grown from

an academic curiosity to a practical necessity (Lipton, 2017; Rudin, 2019). Numerous approaches have been proposed to peer inside the “black box,” including probing classifiers (Belinkov, 2021), attention visualization (Vaswani et al., 2023), concept bottleneck models (Koh et al., 2020), and feature attribution methods (Sundararajan et al., 2017). Among the efforts to enhance model interpretability, one line of research focuses on the structure of the model representations, pointing out that AI models often encode interpretable concepts as linear directions in superposition (Park et al., 2024; Elhage et al., 2022). As a consequence, individual neurons are typically *polysemantic*, responding to multiple unrelated concepts unlike their biological counterparts (Bricken et al., 2023; Templeton et al., 2024; Quiroga et al., 2005).

To address the *polysemantic* model representations, Sparse Dictionary Learning (SDL) has emerged as a promising paradigm (Sharkey et al., 2025). By training auxiliary models, such as sparse autoencoders (SAEs) (Cunningham et al., 2023), transcoders (Dunefsky et al., 2024), and crosscoders (Lindsey et al., 2024), that reconstruct neural activations through a sparsity-constrained bottleneck, SDL methods aim to identify the interpretable concepts underlying the *polysemantic* representations. These methods have achieved remarkable empirical success, scaling to frontier language models (Templeton et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2024) and enabling applications ranging from feature steering (Wang et al., 2025) to circuit analysis (O’Neill & Bui, 2024) and interpretable medical diagnosis (Abdulaal et al., 2024).

Despite these empirical advances, due to a lack of unified theoretical framework to analyze SDL methods, the field identifies various phenomena without rigorous theoretical explanation, including feature splitting and feature absorption (Chanin et al., 2025), the existence of dead neurons and the effectiveness of resampling (Bricken et al., 2023). While previous works on sparse coding and dictionary learning have established identifiability results under specific conditions (Spielman et al., 2012; Gribonval & Schnass, 2010), these results do not directly address SDL methods and the setting of neural network representations under superposition. Recent work by Cui et al. (2025) has taken an important step by establishing necessary and sufficient conditions for identifiable sparse autoencoders under the

¹National University of Singapore ²Indian Institute of Technology. Correspondence to: Yiming Tang <yiming@nus.edu.sg>, Dianbo Liu <dianbo@nus.edu.sg>.

linear representation hypothesis. However, their framework focuses exclusively on SAEs with tied-weight constraints, leaving other SDL methods without theoretical grounding.

In this work, we develop a unified theoretical framework that formalizes SDL as a general optimization problem, encompassing sparse autoencoders, transcoders, crosscoders, and their variants (Bussmann et al., 2024; 2025; Tang et al., 2025b) as special cases. We demonstrate how these diverse methods instantiate our framework through different choices of input-output representation pairs, activation functions, and loss designs. We establish rigorous conditions under which SDL methods provably recover ground-truth interpretable features, characterizing the roles of feature sparsity, latent dimensionality, and activation functions. Through detailed analysis of the optimization landscape, we prove that global minima correspond to correct feature recovery while spurious local minima exhibit feature absorption—providing the first theoretical explanation for empirically observed phenomena including feature absorption (Chanin et al., 2025) and the effectiveness of neuron resampling (Bricken et al., 2023). We validate our theoretical predictions through controlled experiments on real neural network representations. Our main contributions are as follows:

- We build the first theoretical framework for SDL methods in mechanistic interpretability as a general optimization problem.
- We establish necessary and sufficient conditions under which SDL methods provably recover ground-truth interpretable features.
- We identify the connection between the framework’s local minima and various phenomena, including feature absorption, dead neurons, and feature resampling.
- We design controlled experiments validating our theoretical predictions on both synthetic settings and real neural network representations.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we establish formal definitions of the foundational concepts: input spaces, model representations, the linear representation hypothesis and superposition.

2.1. Input Space and Model Representation

Definition 2.1 (Input Space). Let \mathcal{S} denote the space of possible inputs to a neural network. For example, $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{images}\}$, or $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{text sequences}\}$.

Definition 2.2 (Model Representation). For a given model representation \mathbf{x} , let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be its dimensionality. For each $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the network produces a representation vector $\mathbf{x}(s)$, which is directly observable by running the model on s .

2.2. The Linear Representation Hypothesis and The Superposition Hypothesis

Empirical studies in mechanistic interpretability have observed that neural network representations encode meaningful concepts as linear directions, often in superposition (Marks & Tegmark, 2024; Nanda et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2024; Park et al., 2025). Following Elhage et al. (2022) and Park et al. (2024), we formalize the hypothesis as follows.

Assumption 2.3 (Linear Representation Hypothesis). A model representation $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$ satisfies the Linear Representation Hypothesis (LRH) if there exists a *feature function* $\mathbf{x} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and a *feature matrix* $W_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n}$ such that:

1. **Linear Decomposition:** For all $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathbf{x}_p(s) = W_p \mathbf{x}(s)$$

2. **Non-negativity:** $\mathbf{x}(s) \geq 0$ component-wise for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$

3. **Sparsity:** There exists $S \in [0, 1]$ such that for all $i \in [n]$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{s \sim \mathcal{S}}(x_i(s) = 0) = S$$

4. **Interpretability:** Each component x_i of \mathbf{x} corresponds to a human-interpretable concept

We refer to $\mathbf{x}(s)$ as the *ground-truth features*, where each $x_i(s)$ represents the activation level of interpretable concept i for input s . The matrix W_p encodes how these features are linearly combined to form the observed representation \mathbf{x}_p .

Assumption 2.4 (Superposition Hypothesis). A representation \mathbf{x}_p satisfying the Linear Representation Hypothesis is said to be in *superposition* if $n > n_p$ (more features than dimensions) and the feature matrix $W_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p \times n}$ satisfies:

1. **Bounded Interference:** There exists $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that for $i \neq j$,

$$|\langle W_p[:, i], W_p[:, j] \rangle| \leq \epsilon$$

where $W_p[:, i]$ denotes the i -th column of W_p .

2. **Unit Norm:** For all $i \in [n]$,

$$\|W_p[:, i]\|_2 = 1$$

These conditions characterize a regime where many interpretable features are compressed into fewer dimensions, with feature directions arranged to have limited mutual interference. When ϵ is small, features are nearly orthogonal; when $\epsilon = 0$, they are exactly orthogonal.

3. A Unified Theoretical Framework for SDL

In this section, we present a unified theoretical framework for Sparse Dictionary Learning (SDL). We first define the general SDL architecture and objective, then demonstrate how various SDL methods instantiate our framework.

3.1. General SDL Framework

We formalize SDL as an optimization problem under the Linear Representation Hypothesis (Assumption 2.3) and the Superposition Hypothesis (Assumption 2.4).

Definition 3.1 (Sparse Dictionary Learning). A SDL model maps an input representation $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$ to a target representation $\mathbf{x}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r}$ through a two-layer architecture:

- (i) An *encoder* layer that maps \mathbf{x}_p to a latent space:

$$\mathbf{x}_q = \sigma(W_e \mathbf{x}_p) \quad (1)$$

- (ii) A *decoder* layer that maps the latents to \mathbf{x}_r :

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_r = W_d \mathbf{x}_q \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q}$, $W_e \in \mathbb{R}^{n_q \times n_p}$, $W_d \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times n_q}$, and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^{n_q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_q}$ is a sparsity-inducing activation function.

The SDL objective minimizes expected reconstruction error:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{S}} [\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|_2^2] \quad (3)$$

Under the Linear Representation Hypothesis (Assumption 2.3), both representations admit linear decompositions $\mathbf{x}_p(s) = W_p \mathbf{x}(s)$ and $\mathbf{x}_r(s) = W_r \mathbf{x}(s)$ in terms of ground-truth features $\mathbf{x}(s)$. The loss can thus be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{S}} [\|W_r \mathbf{x}(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e W_p \mathbf{x}(s))\|_2^2] \quad (4)$$

3.2. Instantiations: Existing SDL Methods

We now demonstrate how existing SDL methods instantiate our framework through adopting different choices of input-target pairs $(\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{x}_r)$ and activation functions σ , and proposing variants on the loss function \mathcal{L}_{SDL} .

Sparse Autoencoders (SAEs). SAEs (Cunningham et al., 2023) decompose polysemantic activations into monosemantic components through sparsity constraints. In our framework, SAEs are characterized by setting $\mathbf{x}_r = \mathbf{x}_p$ (self-reconstruction). The encoder projects to a higher-dimensional sparse latent space ($n_q > n_p$), encouraging $\mathbf{x}_q(s)$ to capture the underlying ground-truth features $\mathbf{x}(s)$.




Figure 1. Sparse Autoencoder: encoder W_e maps \mathbf{x}_p to sparse latents \mathbf{x}_q , decoder W_d reconstructs from \mathbf{x}_q .

Transcoders. Transcoders (Dunefsky et al., 2024; Paulo et al., 2025) capture interpretable features in layer-to-layer transformations. Unlike SAEs that reconstruct a single layer, transcoders learn sparse mappings from one layer to the next. In our proposed theoretical framework, transcoders set $\mathbf{x}_p = NN_\ell(s)$ and $\mathbf{x}_r = NN_{\ell+1}(s)$, where NN_ℓ denotes the network’s representation at layer ℓ .




Figure 2. Transcoder: encoder W_e maps layer ℓ to sparse latents \mathbf{x}_q , decoder W_d predicts layer $\ell + 1$.

Crosscoders. Crosscoders (Lindsey et al., 2024) discover shared features across multiple representations simultaneously. In our framework, crosscoders concatenate representations from different sources, such as multiple model layers, different models, or base and fine-tuned pairs, setting $\mathbf{x}_p = [\mathbf{x}_p^{(1)}; \dots; \mathbf{x}_p^{(m)}]$ and $\mathbf{x}_r = [\mathbf{x}_r^{(1)}; \dots; \mathbf{x}_r^{(m)}]$ where each superscript denotes a different source.




Figure 3. Crosscoder: encoder W_e maps concatenated multi-layer input \mathbf{x}_p to \mathbf{x}_q , decoder W_d reconstructs multi-layer output \mathbf{x}_r .

Variants of SDL Methods. Various SDL methods fit into our theoretical framework but differ in their choices of activation functions and loss designs. [Bricken et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Templeton et al. \(2024\)](#) use ReLU activation $\sigma_{\text{ReLU}}(z) = \max(0, z)$ with L_1 regularization on latents:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{S}} [\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma_{\text{ReLU}}(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{x}_q(s)\|_1] \quad (5)$$

[Rajamanoharan et al. \(2024b\)](#) propose to utilize JumpReLU as the activation function:

$$\sigma_{\text{JumpReLU}}(z) = z \cdot H(z - \theta) \quad (6)$$

combined with a smoothed Heaviside function to directly penalize the L_0 norm. [Makhzani & Frey \(2014\)](#) introduce Top- k activation:

$$\sigma_{\text{Top-}k}(z)_i = \begin{cases} z_i & \text{if } z_i \text{ is among the } k \text{ largest components} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

[Bussmann et al. \(2024\)](#) extend this to Batch Top- k activation, which applies Top- k selection across a batch to allow different samples to have different numbers of activated features. [Rajamanoharan et al. \(2024a\)](#) use ReLU activation with an additional Heaviside gating function. [Gao et al. \(2024\)](#) employ Top- k activation and introduce an auxiliary loss using Top- k_{aux} dead latents:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{S}} \left[\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma_{\text{Top-}k}(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|_2^2 + \lambda_{\text{aux}} \|\mathbf{x}_p(s) - W_d' \sigma_{\text{Top-}k_{\text{aux}}}(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|_2^2 \right] \quad (8)$$

to resurrect dead neurons. [Bussmann et al. \(2025\)](#) and [Tang et al. \(2025b\)](#) use multiple k values with a multi-scale loss:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{S}} [\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma_{\text{Top-}k_i}(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|_2^2] \quad (9)$$

that sums reconstruction errors of different sparsity levels.

The variants described above demonstrate that diverse SDL methods can be unified under our general framework (Definition 3.1) through specific choices of activation functions σ and loss modifications. This motivates our theoretical approach: rather than analyzing each variant separately, we establish results for the general framework and focus on representative scenarios. Specifically, our analysis primarily considers ReLU, JumpReLU, and Top- k activations, which capture the main sparsity enforcement mechanisms, and the multi-scale loss designs of the Matryoshka SAEs and Transcoders. These settings are both theoretically tractable and practically prevalent, and our results provide insights applicable to the broader family of SDL methods that instantiate our framework with different design choices.

4. Theoretical Results

In this section, we provide theoretical results characterizing the optimization landscape of our SDL framework. Section 4.1 gives one construction of global minima achieving perfect reconstruction. Section 4.2 derives necessary and sufficient conditions for these minima under different activation functions. Section 4.3 demonstrates the existence of spurious local minima and how they can lead to feature absorption. Section ?? further characterizes these local minima by deriving the necessary and sufficient conditions.

4.1. Global Minimum

We first establish the existence of an approximate global minimum under the Linear Representation Hypothesis and the Superposition Hypothesis (Assumption 2.3 and 2.4).

Theorem 4.1 (Approximate Global Minimum). *Consider the SDL loss function*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = \mathbb{E}_s \|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|^2 \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_p(s)$ and $\mathbf{x}_r(s)$ satisfy the Linear Representation Hypothesis and the Superposition Hypothesis with interference parameter ϵ .

When $n_q \geq n$ and $\sigma = \text{ReLU}$, the configuration

$$W_d^* = [W_r, \mathbf{0}], \quad W_e^* = \begin{bmatrix} W_p^\top \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

achieves

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}}(W_d^*, W_e^*) = O(\epsilon^2) \quad (12)$$

The proof proceeds by direct substitution and utilizes the non-positive interference and unit norm conditions. We provide the full proof of Theorem 4.1 in Appendix A.

This approximate global minimum (W_d^*, W_e^*) provided in Equation 11 justifies the effectiveness of SDL methods in

recovering interpretable features: if this point is achieved, the encoder $W_e^* = W_p^\top$ learns to invert the projection W_p , recovering the ground-truth features $\mathbf{x}(s)$, while the decoder $W_d^* = W_r$ maps these features to the target representation.

4.2. Characterization of Global Minima

We now establish necessary and sufficient conditions for global optimality under extreme sparsity ($S \rightarrow 1$), which allows us to decompose the optimization problem into independent reconstruction constraints for each feature. In specific, we draw inspiration from a recent work on sparse autoencoder (Cui et al., 2025) and decompose the loss in the following way and further lead to Theorem 4.2.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} &= \sum_{m=0}^n P(\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m) \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_0=m} [\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|^2] \\ &= (1 - S) \cdot \sum_{d=1}^n M_d \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 \\ &\quad + O((1 - S)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $M_d = \Theta(1)$ (See Appendix B).

Theorem 4.2 (Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Global Optimality). *Consider the SDL loss under Assumption 2.3 and Assumption 2.4 with extreme sparsity ($S \rightarrow 1$). Then $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = \Theta(1 - S)$ in general. A pair (W_d, W_e) achieves $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = O((1 - S)^2)$ if and only if*

$$w_r^d = W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d) \quad \forall d \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (14)$$

This condition requires perfect reconstruction for each feature when active in isolation. The characterization reveals that under extreme sparsity, the SDL optimization problem decomposes into n independent per-feature reconstruction constraints. Motivated by this decomposition, we define an approximate loss function that captures the dominant term:

Definition 4.3 (Approximate SDL Loss). Under extreme sparsity ($S \rightarrow 1$), the approximate SDL loss is defined as:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{SDL}}(W_d, W_e) := \sum_{d=1}^n M_d \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 \quad (15)$$

where $M_d = \Pr(\mathbf{x}(s) = x_d(s)\mathbf{e}_d) \cdot \mathbb{E}[x_d(s)^2 \mid x_d(s) > 0]$. We have $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = (1 - S) \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{SDL}} + O((1 - S)^2)$.

In real-world neural network embeddings where $S \approx 1$, \mathcal{L}_{SDL} and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{SDL}}$ are effectively equivalent. The approximate loss directly quantifies how well each feature d is mapped from its input representation w_p^d to its target representation w_r^d , decomposing the SDL objective into n independent per-feature reconstruction quality measures.

4.3. Local Minima

We now establish that SDL optimization can converge to spurious local minima with loss strictly greater than the global optimum. We also point out the connection between local minima and feature absorption.

Example 4.4 (Spurious Local Minimum). Consider a simple situation where $n = n_q = 2$, $\sigma = \sigma_{\text{Top-1}}$, and extreme sparsity ($S \rightarrow 1$). Let $W_e = \begin{bmatrix} (e^1)^\top \\ (e^2)^\top \end{bmatrix}$ and $W_d = [w_d^1, w_d^2]$.

The approximate loss decomposes as:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{SDL}}(W_d, W_e) &= M_1 \|w_r^1 - W_d \sigma_{\text{Top-1}}(W_e w_p^1)\|^2 \\ &\quad + M_2 \|w_r^2 - W_d \sigma_{\text{Top-1}}(W_e w_p^2)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $M_1, M_2 > 0$ are constants.

Consider a configuration where:

$$(e^1)^\top w_p^1 > (e^2)^\top w_p^1 \quad \text{and} \quad (e^1)^\top w_p^2 > (e^2)^\top w_p^2 \quad (17)$$

Under this condition, neuron 1 activates for both features while neuron 2 remains dead. The optimal decoder is:

$$w_d^{1,*} = \frac{M_1 ((e^1)^\top w_p^1) w_r^1 + M_2 ((e^1)^\top w_p^2) w_r^2}{M_1 ((e^1)^\top w_p^1)^2 + M_2 ((e^1)^\top w_p^2)^2} \quad (18)$$

Since $w_r^1 \not\propto w_r^2$, this is a weighted average satisfying $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{SDL}}^* > 0$. This configuration is a local minimum: the loss is smooth within the region where (17) holds, but escaping requires crossing a non-differentiable boundary, which gradient descent cannot achieve.

The spurious local minimum in Example 4.4 corresponds precisely to the *feature absorption* phenomenon observed empirically in SAE training (Chanin et al., 2025; Bricken et al., 2023): a single latent neuron (neuron 1) becomes responsive to multiple distinct interpretable features, while other neurons remain inactive as “dead neurons.” To characterize this phenomenon with a rigorous mathematical foundation, we provide the following definition:

Definition 4.5 (Feature Absorption). Consider an SDL configuration (W_d, W_e) with activation function σ . For each neuron $i \in [n_q]$, let $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq [n]$ denote the set of features that activate neuron i when active in isolation:

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \left\{ d \in [n] : (\sigma(W_e w_p^d))_i > 0 \right\} \quad (19)$$

We say that neuron i exhibits *feature absorption* if $|\mathcal{F}_i| \geq 2$. A configuration (W_d, W_e) exhibits feature absorption if there exists at least one neuron $i \in [n_q]$ with $|\mathcal{F}_i| \geq 2$.

Definition 4.6 (Realizable Absorption Pattern). Consider an SDL configuration with activation function σ and projection vectors $\{w_p^d\}_{d=1}^n$. An absorption pattern $(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_q})$

forming a partition of $[n]$ is *realizable* if there exists an encoder $W_e = [(e^1)^\top, \dots, (e^{n_q})^\top]^\top$ such that for all $i \in [n_q]$:

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \left\{ d \in [n] : (\sigma(W_e w_p^d))_i > 0 \right\} \quad (20)$$

Equivalently, for each neuron i :

- For all $d \in \mathcal{F}_i$: $(\sigma(W_e w_p^d))_i > 0$ (neuron i activates for features in \mathcal{F}_i)
- For all $d \notin \mathcal{F}_i$: $(\sigma(W_e w_p^d))_i = 0$ (neuron i does not activate for other features)

Theorem 4.7 (Existence of Spurious Local Minima). *Consider $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{SDL}(W_d, W_e) = \sum_{d=1}^n M_d \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2$ under Assumptions 2.3 and 2.4 with $n \geq 2$ features and $n_q \geq n$ latent dimensions. Suppose $w_r^i \not\propto w_r^j$ for all $i \neq j$.*

For any realizable absorption pattern $(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{n_q})$ with at least one $|\mathcal{F}_i| \geq 2$, there exists a local minimum (W_d, W_e) of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{SDL}$ exhibiting this absorption pattern.

5. Related Works

5.1. Mechanistic Interpretability

Interpretability is crucial for deploying AI in high-stakes domains such as medical diagnosis and financial modeling, where understanding model decisions is essential for safety and trust (Simon & Zou, 2024; Abdulaal et al., 2024). Traditional approaches include interpretability-by-design methods like Concept Bottleneck Models (Koh et al., 2020) and decision trees (Mienye & Jere, 2024), and post-hoc explanation methods like GradCAM (Selvaraju et al., 2019) and SHAP (Lundberg & Lee, 2017). Mechanistic interpretability (Sharkey et al., 2025; Bereska & Gavves, 2024) aims to reverse-engineer neural networks by understanding their internal computational mechanisms. SAEs (Shu et al., 2025) and related dictionary learning methods (Tang et al., 2025a; Dunefsky et al., 2024) decompose neural activations into sparse, interpretable features. Circuit analysis (Olah et al., 2020; Olsson et al., 2022) investigates how these features compose into computational algorithms.

5.2. Sparse Dictionary Learning

Sparse dictionary learning has a rich history predating its application to mechanistic interpretability. K-SVD (Aharon et al., 2006) established foundational methods for learning overcomplete dictionaries, while theoretical work in compressed sensing (Donoho, 2006) characterized recovery conditions, with Spielman et al. (2012) providing polynomial-time algorithms for exact reconstruction under sparsity assumptions. Safran & Shamir (2018) demonstrated that spurious local minima are common even in simple two-layer

ReLU networks, highlighting optimization challenges that persist in modern applications. Recent work has adapted these principles to mechanistic interpretability. SAEs (Cunningham et al., 2023) apply dictionary learning to language model activations. Various variants are further developed, including transcoders (Dunefsky et al., 2024), crosscoders (Gao et al., 2024), Matryoshka SAEs (Bussmann et al., 2025), and hybrid approaches like Language-Grounded Sparse Encoders (Tang et al., 2025a). These methods have found applications beyond language models, including protein structure analysis (Simon & Zou, 2024; Gujral et al., 2025), medical imaging (Abdulaal et al., 2024), model evaluation (Tang et al., 2025b), board game analysis (Karvonen et al., 2024), and fMRI data analysis Mao et al. (2025).

6. Limitations and Future Works

While our theoretical framework provides valuable insights into SDL methods, several limitations warrant discussion:

- **Assumption Violations.** Our analysis relies on the Linear Representation Hypothesis and Superposition Hypothesis (Assumptions 2.3 and 2.4), which may not hold perfectly in real neural networks.
- **Extreme Sparsity.** Our theoretical results primarily address the extreme sparsity regime ($S \rightarrow 1$), and the extent to which our conclusions generalize to moderate sparsity levels remains an open question.
- **Convergence Guarantees.** Our analysis characterizes the global and local minima of the SDL optimization landscape but does not provide convergence guarantees or sample complexity bounds in our theory.

Despite these limitations, we believe our framework establishes a rigorous foundation for understanding SDL methods and opens avenues for various future works.

7. Conclusion

We propose the first unified theoretical framework for Sparse Dictionary Learning in mechanistic interpretability, and demonstrate how various SDL methods instantiate our framework. Under the Linear Representation Hypothesis and the Superposition Hypothesis, we established conditions for provable recovery of interpretable features and characterized the optimization landscape, pointing out the connection between spurious local minima and feature absorption, and providing explanations to empirically observed phenomena including dead neurons and feature resampling. We further validated our theoretical results on controlled experiments.

References

- Abdulaal, A., Fry, H., Montaña-Brown, N., Ijishakin, A., Gao, J., Hyland, S., Alexander, D. C., and Castro, D. C. An x-ray is worth 15 features: Sparse autoencoders for interpretable radiology report generation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.03334>.
- Aharon, M., Elad, M., and Bruckstein, A. K-svd: An algorithm for designing overcomplete dictionaries for sparse representation. *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, 54(11):4311–4322, 2006.
- Belinkov, Y. Probing classifiers: Promises, shortcomings, and advances, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.12452>.
- Bereska, L. and Gavves, E. Mechanistic interpretability for ai safety – a review, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14082>.
- Bricken, T., Templeton, A., Batson, J., Chen, B., Jermyn, A., Conerly, T., Turner, N. L., Anil, C., Denison, C., Askell, A., Lasenby, R., Wu, Y., Kravec, S., Schiefer, N., Maxwell, T., Joseph, N., Tamkin, A., Nguyen, K., McLean, B., Burke, J. E., Hume, T., Carter, S., Henighan, T., and Olah, C. Towards monosemanticity: Decomposing language models with dictionary learning. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2023. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2023/monosemantic-features>.
- Busmann, B., Leask, P., and Nanda, N. Batchtopk sparse autoencoders, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.06410>.
- Busmann, B., Nabeshima, N., Karvonen, A., and Nanda, N. Learning multi-level features with matryoshka sparse autoencoders, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.17547>.
- Chanin, D., Wilken-Smith, J., Dulka, T., Bhatnagar, H., Golechha, S., and Bloom, J. A is for absorption: Studying feature splitting and absorption in sparse autoencoders, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.14507>.
- Cui, J., Zhang, Q., Wang, Y., and Wang, Y. On the theoretical understanding of identifiable sparse autoencoders and beyond, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.15963>.
- Cunningham, H., Ewart, A., Riggs, L., Huben, R., and Sharkey, L. Sparse autoencoders find highly interpretable features in language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08600>.
- Donoho, D. L. Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 52(4):1289–1306, 2006.
- Dunefsky, J., Chlenski, P., and Nanda, N. Transcoders find interpretable llm feature circuits, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11944>.
- Elhage, N., Hume, T., Olsson, C., Schiefer, N., Henighan, T., Kravec, S., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Lasenby, R., Drain, D., Chen, C., Grosse, R., McCandlish, S., Kaplan, J., Amodei, D., Wattenberg, M., and Olah, C. Toy models of superposition, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.10652>.
- Gao, L., la Tour, T. D., Tillman, H., Goh, G., Troll, R., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., Leike, J., and Wu, J. Scaling and evaluating sparse autoencoders, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04093>.
- Gribonval, R. and Schnass, K. Dictionary identification - sparse matrix-factorisation via ℓ_1 -minimisation, 2010. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/0904.4774>.
- Gujral, O., Bafna, M., Alm, E., and Berger, B. Sparse autoencoders uncover biologically interpretable features in protein language model representations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(34):e2506316122, 2025.
- Jiang, Y., Rajendran, G., Ravikumar, P., Aragam, B., and Veitch, V. On the origins of linear representations in large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.03867>.
- Karvonen, A., Wright, B., Rager, C., Angell, R., Brinkmann, J., Smith, L., Verdun, C. M., Bau, D., and Marks, S. Measuring progress in dictionary learning for language model interpretability with board game models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00113>.
- Koh, P. W., Nguyen, T., Tang, Y. S., Musmann, S., Pierson, E., Kim, B., and Liang, P. Concept bottleneck models, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.04612>.
- Lindsey, J., Templeton, A., Marcus, J., Conerly, T., Batson, J., and Olah, C. Sparse crosscoders for cross-layer features and model diffing. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2024. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2024/crosscoders/index.html>.
- Lipton, Z. C. The mythos of model interpretability, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.03490>.
- Lundberg, S. and Lee, S.-I. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.07874>.
- Makhzani, A. and Frey, B. k-sparse autoencoders, 2014. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.5663>.

- Mao, Z., Xu, J., Zheng, Z., Zheng, H., Sheng, D., Jin, Y., and Yang, G. Sparse autoencoders bridge the deep learning model and the brain, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.11123>.
- Marks, S. and Tegmark, M. The geometry of truth: Emergent linear structure in large language model representations of true/false datasets, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06824>.
- Mienye, I. D. and Jere, N. A survey of decision trees: Concepts, algorithms, and applications. *IEEE access*, 12: 86716–86727, 2024.
- Nanda, N., Lee, A., and Wattenberg, M. Emergent linear representations in world models of self-supervised sequence models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.00941>.
- Olah, C., Cammarata, N., Schubert, L., Goh, G., Petrov, M., and Carter, S. Zoom in: An introduction to circuits. *Distill*, 2020. doi: 10.23915/distill.00024.001. URL <https://distill.pub/2020/circuits/zoom-in/>.
- Olsson, C., Elhage, N., Nanda, N., Joseph, N., DasSarma, N., Henighan, T., Mann, B., Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Conerly, T., Drain, D., Ganguli, D., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Johnston, S., Jones, A., Kernion, J., Lovitt, L., Ndousse, K., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., and Olah, C. In-context learning and induction heads, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.11895>.
- O’Neill, C. and Bui, T. Sparse autoencoders enable scalable and reliable circuit identification in language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.12522>.
- Park, K., Choe, Y. J., and Veitch, V. The linear representation hypothesis and the geometry of large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.03658>.
- Park, K., Choe, Y. J., Jiang, Y., and Veitch, V. The geometry of categorical and hierarchical concepts in large language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01506>.
- Paulo, G., Shabalin, S., and Belrose, N. Transcoders beat sparse autoencoders for interpretability, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.18823>.
- Quiroga, R. Q., Reddy, L., Kreiman, G., Koch, C., and Fried, I. Invariant visual representation by single neurons in the human brain. *Nature*, 435(7045):1102–1107, 2005.
- Rajamanoharan, S., Conmy, A., Smith, L., Lieberum, T., Varma, V., Kramár, J., Shah, R., and Nanda, N. Improving dictionary learning with gated sparse autoencoders, 2024a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.16014>.
- Rajamanoharan, S., Lieberum, T., Sonnerat, N., Conmy, A., Varma, V., Kramár, J., and Nanda, N. Jumping ahead: Improving reconstruction fidelity with jumprelu sparse autoencoders, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.14435>.
- Rudin, C. Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.10154>.
- Safran, I. and Shamir, O. Spurious local minima are common in two-layer relu neural networks, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.08968>.
- Selvaraju, R. R., Cogswell, M., Das, A., Vedantam, R., Parikh, D., and Batra, D. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 128 (2):336–359, October 2019. ISSN 1573-1405. doi: 10.1007/s11263-019-01228-7. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11263-019-01228-7>.
- Sharkey, L., Chughtai, B., Batson, J., Lindsey, J., Wu, J., Bushnaq, L., Goldowsky-Dill, N., Heimersheim, S., Ortega, A., Bloom, J., Biderman, S., Garriga-Alonso, A., Conmy, A., Nanda, N., Rumbelow, J., Wattenberg, M., Schoots, N., Miller, J., Michaud, E. J., Casper, S., Tegmark, M., Saunders, W., Bau, D., Todd, E., Geiger, A., Geva, M., Hoogland, J., Murfet, D., and McGrath, T. Open problems in mechanistic interpretability, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.16496>.
- Shu, D., Wu, X., Zhao, H., Rai, D., Yao, Z., Liu, N., and Du, M. A survey on sparse autoencoders: Interpreting the internal mechanisms of large language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.05613>.
- Simon, E. and Zou, J. Interplm: Discovering interpretable features in protein language models via sparse autoencoders, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.12101>.
- Spielman, D. A., Wang, H., and Wright, J. Exact recovery of sparsely-used dictionaries, 2012. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.5882>.
- Sundararajan, M., Taly, A., and Yan, Q. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.01365>.

Tang, Y., Lagzian, A., Anumasa, S., Zou, Q., Zhu, Y., Zhang, Y., Nguyen, T., Tham, Y.-C., Adeli, E., Cheng, C.-Y., Du, Y., and Liu, D. Human-like content analysis for generative ai with language-grounded sparse encoders, 2025a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.18236>.

Tang, Y., Sinha, A., and Liu, D. How does my model fail? automatic identification and interpretation of physical plausibility failure modes with matryoshka transcoders, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.10094>.

Templeton, A., Conerly, T., Marcus, J., Lindsey, J., Bricken, T., Chen, B., Pearce, A., Citro, C., Ameisen, E., Jones, A., Cunningham, H., Turner, N., McDougall, C., MacDiarmid, M., Freeman, C. D., Sumers, T. R., Rees, E., Batson, J., Jermyn, A., Carter, S., Olah, C., and Henighan, T. Scaling monosemanticity: Extracting interpretable features from claude 3 sonnet. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2024. URL <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2024/scaling-monosemanticity/>.

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03762>.

Wang, M., la Tour, T. D., Watkins, O., Makelov, A., Chi, R. A., Miserendino, S., Wang, J., Rajaram, A., Heidecke, J., Patwardhan, T., and Mossing, D. Persona features control emergent misalignment, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.19823>.

A. Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. We decompose the loss by the number of active features. Let $m = \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0$ denote the number of non-zero components. Then:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = \sum_{m=0}^n P(\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_0=m} [\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|^2] \quad (21)$$

For $m = 0$ (no active features), both $\mathbf{x}_r(s) = \mathbf{0}$ and the reconstruction is zero, contributing zero loss.

For $m \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq [n]$ denote the indices of active features. Under the Linear Representation Hypothesis:

$$\mathbf{x}_r(s) = W_r \mathbf{x}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{i_j}(s) w_r^{i_j} \quad (22)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_p(s) = W_p \mathbf{x}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{i_j}(s) w_p^{i_j} \quad (23)$$

Substituting (W_d^*, W_e^*) from Equation (11):

$$W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s) = W_p^\top \sum_{j=1}^m x_{i_j}(s) w_p^{i_j} = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{i_j}(s) W_p^\top w_p^{i_j} \quad (24)$$

The k -th component is:

$$(W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s))_k = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{i_j}(s) \langle w_p^k, w_p^{i_j} \rangle \quad (25)$$

For $k = i_\ell \in \mathcal{I}$ (an active feature):

$$(W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s))_{i_\ell} = x_{i_\ell}(s) \underbrace{\langle w_p^{i_\ell}, w_p^{i_\ell} \rangle}_{=1} + \sum_{j \neq \ell} x_{i_j}(s) \underbrace{\langle w_p^{i_\ell}, w_p^{i_j} \rangle}_{|\cdot| \leq \epsilon} = x_{i_\ell}(s) + \Delta_{i_\ell} \quad (26)$$

where $|\Delta_{i_\ell}| \leq \epsilon \sum_{j \neq \ell} |x_{i_j}(s)| \leq \epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1$.

For $k \notin \mathcal{I}$ (inactive feature):

$$(W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s))_k = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{i_j}(s) \underbrace{\langle w_p^k, w_p^{i_j} \rangle}_{|\cdot| \leq \epsilon} = \Delta_k \quad (27)$$

where $|\Delta_k| \leq \epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1$.

After ReLU activation $\sigma(\cdot) = \max(0, \cdot)$:

$$\sigma(W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s))_{i_\ell} = \max(0, x_{i_\ell}(s) + \Delta_{i_\ell}) = x_{i_\ell}(s) + O(\epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1) \quad (28)$$

and neurons $k \notin \mathcal{I}$ may be weakly activated if $\Delta_k > 0$.

The reconstruction is:

$$W_d^* \sigma(W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s)) = \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma(W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s))_k w_r^k \quad (29)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^m (x_{i_\ell}(s) + O(\epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1)) w_r^{i_\ell} + \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{I}} O(\epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1) w_r^k \quad (30)$$

The reconstruction error is:

$$\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d^* \sigma(W_e^* \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|^2 \quad (31)$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^m x_{i_\ell}(s) w_r^{i_\ell} - \sum_{\ell=1}^m (x_{i_\ell}(s) + O(\epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1)) w_r^{i_\ell} - \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{I}} O(\epsilon \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1) w_r^k \right\|^2 \quad (32)$$

$$= O(m\epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2) + O(n\epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2) \quad (33)$$

$$= O(n\epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2) \quad (34)$$

Taking expectation over all samples with m active features and summing:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}}(W_d^*, W_e^*) = \sum_{m=1}^n P(\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m) \cdot O(nm\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m]) \quad (35)$$

This simplifies to:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}}(W_d^*, W_e^*) = O(n\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0]) \quad (36)$$

When features are sparse with $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0] = O(1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2] = O(1)$, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}}(W_d^*, W_e^*) = O(\epsilon^2) \quad (37)$$

□

B. Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof. We prove both directions of the if-and-only-if statement.

Loss Decomposition under Extreme Sparsity. First, we establish how the loss decomposes when $S \rightarrow 1$. Let $W_r = [w_r^1, w_r^2, \dots, w_r^n]$ and $W_p = [w_p^1, w_p^2, \dots, w_p^n]$ denote the column representations of the reconstruction and projection matrices.

Under extreme sparsity ($S \rightarrow 1$), at most one component $x_d(s)$ is active for any given input. The expectation decomposes over activation patterns:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = \mathbb{E}_s \|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e W_p \mathbf{x}(s))\|^2 \quad (38)$$

$$= \sum_{m=0}^n \Pr(\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m] \quad (39)$$

$$= \Pr(\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = 0) \cdot 0 \quad (40)$$

$$+ \sum_{d=1}^n \Pr(\mathbf{x}(s) = x_d(s) \mathbf{e}_d) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_d(s)} \left[x_d(s)^2 \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 \mid x_d(s) > 0 \right] \quad (41)$$

$$+ \sum_{m=2}^n \Pr(\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_r(s) - W_d \sigma(W_e \mathbf{x}_p(s))\|^2 \mid \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = m] \quad (42)$$

$$= (1 - S) \cdot \sum_{d=1}^n M_d \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 + O((1 - S)^2) \quad (43)$$

where $M_d = \frac{\Pr(\mathbf{x}(s) = x_d(s) \mathbf{e}_d)}{1 - S} \cdot \mathbb{E}[x_d(s)^2 \mid x_d(s) > 0] = \Theta(1)$, and the $O((1 - S)^2)$ term captures cases where $\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 \geq 2$.

Necessity (\Rightarrow). Suppose (W_d, W_e) achieves $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = O((1 - S)^2)$. From the decomposition above:

$$O((1 - S)^2) = \sum_{d=1}^n M_d \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 + O((1 - S)^2) \quad (44)$$

Since $M_d = \Theta((1 - S))$, we can rewrite this as:

$$O((1 - S)^2) = \Theta((1 - S)) \sum_{d=1}^n \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 + O((1 - S)^2) \quad (45)$$

Dividing by $(1 - S)$ and taking the limit as $S \rightarrow 1$:

$$\lim_{S \rightarrow 1} \frac{O((1 - S)^2)}{1 - S} = \lim_{S \rightarrow 1} \left[C \sum_{d=1}^n \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 + O(1 - S) \right] \quad (46)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant. The left side vanishes, and the $O(1 - S)$ term on the right also vanishes, so:

$$0 = C \sum_{d=1}^n \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 \quad (47)$$

Since $C > 0$ and each term is non-negative, we must have:

$$\|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 = 0 \quad \forall d \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (48)$$

Therefore, $w_r^d = W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)$ for all d .

Sufficiency (\Leftarrow). Suppose (W_d, W_e) satisfies $w_r^d = W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)$ for all $d \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

For cases where $\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = 1$, there exists unique $d \in [n]$ such that $\mathbf{x}(s) = x_d(s)\mathbf{e}_d$. Under the Linear Representation Hypothesis:

$$W_r \mathbf{x}(s) = x_d(s)w_r^d \quad (49)$$

$$W_p \mathbf{x}(s) = x_d(s)w_p^d \quad (50)$$

The reconstruction is:

$$W_d \sigma(W_e W_p \mathbf{x}(s)) = W_d \sigma(W_e x_d(s)w_p^d) \quad (51)$$

$$= W_d \sigma(x_d(s)W_e w_p^d) \quad (52)$$

$$= x_d(s)W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d) \quad (\text{by positive homogeneity of ReLU}) \quad (53)$$

$$= x_d(s)w_r^d \quad (\text{by assumption}) \quad (54)$$

$$= W_r \mathbf{x}(s) \quad (55)$$

Thus, all cases with $\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 = 1$ contribute zero loss:

$$\sum_{d=1}^n M_d \|w_r^d - W_d \sigma(W_e w_p^d)\|^2 = 0 \quad (56)$$

For cases where $\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 \geq 2$, the bounded interference condition (Assumption 2.4) introduces reconstruction errors. By the analysis in the proof of Theorem 4.1, when the per-feature constraint is satisfied, the multi-feature interference contributes:

$$O(\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 \mid \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 \geq 2]) \quad (57)$$

Under the sparsity assumption, $\Pr(\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 \geq 2) = O((1 - S)^2)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_1^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 \mid \|\mathbf{x}(s)\|_0 \geq 2] = O(1)$ for fixed ϵ . Therefore, the multi-feature contribution is:

$$O((1 - S)^2) \quad (58)$$

Combining both terms:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = 0 + O((1 - S)^2) = O((1 - S)^2) \quad (59)$$

Therefore, the condition is sufficient for achieving $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SDL}} = O((1 - S)^2)$. \square