

# Increasing Trust in Language Models through the Reuse of Verified Circuits

Philip Quirke<sup>1</sup> Clement Neo<sup>1</sup> Fazl Barez<sup>1,2</sup>

## Abstract

Language Models (LMs) are increasingly used for a wide range of prediction tasks, but their training can often neglect rare edge cases, reducing their reliability. Here, we define a stringent standard of trustworthiness whereby the task algorithm and circuit implementation must be verified, accounting for edge cases, with no known failure modes. We show that a transformer model can be trained to meet this standard if built using mathematically and logically specified frameworks. In this paper, we fully verify a model for  $n$ -digit integer addition. To exhibit the reusability of verified modules, we insert the trained integer addition model into an untrained model and train the combined model to perform both addition and subtraction. We find extensive reuse of the addition circuits for both tasks, easing verification of the more complex subtractor model. We discuss how inserting verified task modules into LMs can leverage model reuse to improve verifiability and trustworthiness of language models built using them. The reuse of verified circuits reduces the effort to verify more complex composite models which we believe to be a significant step towards *safety* of language models.

## 1. Introduction

Transformer-based large language models (LLMs) are powerful (Barak et al., 2022) yet largely inscrutable due to their complex, nonlinear interactions in dense layers within high-dimensional spaces. Given this complexity, their deployment in critical settings (Zhang et al., 2022) highlights the need for understanding their behavior. Many argue that making these models interpretable is key to their safe use (Hendrycks & Mazeika, 2022).

Mechanistic interpretability focuses on demystifying and

<sup>1</sup>Apart Research <sup>2</sup>Department of Engineering Sciences, University of Oxford. Correspondence to: Fazl Barez <fazl@robots.ox.ac.uk>.




Figure 1. An overview of our methodology: (1) We trained a perfectly accurate 6-digit integer addition model. (2) We reverse-engineered the model to find the algorithms that were implemented to perform addition. (3) We inserted the addition model into a new model, by copying the weights of the attention heads and MLPs (in brown) into the larger model during initialisation. (4) We then train the new model on 80% subtraction and 20% addition questions. (5) We find that the resulting model reuses the inserted addition circuits for both addition and subtraction questions.

validating the algorithms behind model weights, translating complex computations into more human-understandable components (Raukur et al., 2022). This understanding aids in predicting model behavior in new situations and fixing model errors.

In creating and training a model, we would ideally want the model to have a very high standard of accuracy and trustworthiness. We aim to achieve this by holding the model to a standard that we term *known-good*. A model performing a task is *known-good* if:

1. The model’s algorithm for the task and the mechanisms it implements (the “circuits”) are understood.
2. All possible edge cases have been identified and tested. As a heuristic, the model should be able to perform the task one million times without error (“1M Q accuracy”).
3. The model has no known failure modes.

However, exhaustive testing of a model task may be infeasible. For instance, the of adding two 5-digit integers (e.g., 12345+67890) has ten billion possible variations. Some tasks can be conceptualized within an existing formal framework that allows identification of **all** edge cases the model must handle. For example, in 5-digit addition, the most uncommon edge case is  $55555+44445=100000$ , which requires a carry bit to cascade through all digits, occurring in only 0.002% of cases. A known-good model must incorporate algorithms to manage all known edge cases. A known-good model would hence have verified <sup>1</sup> circuits that perform the task perfectly.

In this paper, we detail the development and interpretation of a known-good model for addition. Our findings indicate that the model constructs a specific circuit for each edge case, with these circuits sharing intermediate results. We confirm the validity of the entire set of circuits, ensuring they cover all identified edge cases. The model achieves a very low training loss and can do one million predictions without error. Overall it is a known-good model.

Additionally, we develop a “mixed” model capable of both addition and subtraction, incorporating the known-good addition model. This mixed model extensively reuses the addition circuits for both operations and learns new circuits, facilitating the interpretation of the model’s algorithm. This approach marks progress toward a known-good model for both addition and subtraction.

Hence, our main contributions are three-fold:

- A trustworthy known-good 5-digit addition model, with an algorithm extensible to n-digits.
- A 6-digit addition and subtraction model that reuses established addition circuits for both operations, indicating steps toward a known-good model for these tasks.
- A proof of concept for enhancing the trustworthiness of a larger model by integrating a smaller known-good transformer model.

<sup>1</sup>In this paper ‘verified’ has the mechanistic interpretability meaning that a specific group of interconnected neurons within a neural network reliably and causally contributes to the model’s output in a meaningful, understandable way, with supporting empirical evidence .

## 2. Related Work

Mechanistic interpretability aims to reverse engineer neural networks to find interpretable algorithms that are implemented in a model’s weights (Olah et al., 2020). To better represent these algorithms, Elhage et al. (2021a) introduced a mathematical framework to represent how transformer attention heads can work with each other to implement complex algorithms.

To explain how (not where) a model algorithm is implemented, Jenner et al. (2023) recommends documenting a low-level computation graph (causal abstraction), with a mapping from the graph to the model nodes that implement the computation, with experimentation verification.

Investigative techniques such as ablation interventions, activation unembeddings (nostalgebraist, 2020), and sparse autoencoders (Nanda, 2023; Cunningham et al., 2023), underpinned by the more theoretical frameworks (Elhage et al., 2021b; Geva et al., 2022), provide tools to help confirm a mapping.

**Investigating pre-trained LMs on Arithmetic.** Even though basic arithmetic can be solved following a few simple rules, pre-trained LMs often struggle to solve simple math questions (Hendrycks et al., 2021). Stolfo et al. (2023) used causal mediation analysis to investigate how large pre-trained LMs like Pythia and GPT-J performed addition to solve word problems.

It is also possible to improve a model’s arithmetic abilities through training data enrichment. Liu & Low (2023) used supervised fine tuning (including enriched training data) to convert LLaMA 7B to Goat - a model that is “Good at Arithmetic Tasks” including addition and subtraction. They also showed the model’s performance relied in part on LLaMA’s consistent tokenization of digits.

**Studying Toy Models for Arithmetic.** Doing mechanistic interpretability on toy transformers can help to better isolate clear, distinct circuits given the highly specific experimental setup for the model studied. Nanda et al. (2023) studied modular addition in a one-layer transformer (where each number was represented by a distinct token) to better understand training dynamics.

Quirke & Barez (2024) detailed how a 1-layer, 3-head transformer model performed 5-digit addition questions. It showed a rare edge case (e.g. “77778+22222=100000” where a “carry 1” cascades through 4 digits) that the model couldn’t handle - showing the importance of understanding and testing all edge cases for trustworthiness.

Michaud et al. (2023) posits that many natural prediction problems decompose into a finite set of knowledge and skills that are “quantized” into discrete chunks (quanta). Models must learn these quanta to reduce loss. They posit

that “understanding a network reduces to enumerating its quanta.” [Schaeffer et al. \(2023\)](#) provides useful ways to measure quanta in mathematical prediction problems.

### 3. Methodology

A transformer model may learn an addition algorithm that differs significantly from the traditional human process. Here we define an alternative mathematical framework for addition, showing it is equivalent to the traditional process and so is mathematically correct. Then we show that our model implements this alternative framework.

#### 3.1. Mathematical Framework

Consider the task of adding two  $n$ -digit numbers together. Let us define the first number as  $D = \{D_{n-1}, D_{n-2}, \dots, D_0\}$  and the second number as  $D' = \{D'_{n-1}, D'_{n-2}, \dots, D'_0\}$ . The resulting answer can be represented as  $A = \{A_n, A_{n-1}, \dots, A_0\}$ . For an illustrative example, see Figure 2.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 \mathbf{D} & + & \mathbf{D}' & = & \mathbf{A} \\
 \boxed{\begin{array}{cccccc} 3 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 7 \\ \text{D4} & \text{D3} & \text{D2} & \text{D1} & \text{D0} \end{array}} & + & \boxed{\begin{array}{cccccc} 8 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 3 \\ \text{D'4} & \text{D'3} & \text{D'2} & \text{D'1} & \text{D'0} \end{array}} & = & \boxed{\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & 1 & 5 & 6 & 0 & 0 \\ \text{A5} & \text{A4} & \text{A3} & \text{A2} & \text{A1} & \text{A0} \end{array}} \\
 \text{P0} & \text{P1} & \text{P2} & \text{P3} & \text{P4} & \text{P5} & \text{P6} & \text{P7} & \text{P8} & \text{P9} & \text{P10} & \text{P11} & \text{P12} & \text{P13} & \text{P14} & \text{P15} & \text{P16} & \text{P17}
 \end{array}$$

Figure 2. For 5-digit addition, our model has 12 input (aka question) and 6 output (aka answer) token positions. We name the question tokens D4, .. D0, and D’4, .., D’0 and the answer tokens A5, .., A0. For n-digits, we use the terms  $D_n$ ,  $D'_n$  and  $A_n$ .

[Quirke & Barez \(2024\)](#) documented a 1-layer 3-head transformer model that answered n-digit addition questions with 99% accuracy. The model implemented three addition sub-tasks. Our model uses two of those sub-tasks *SA* (Base Add) and *SC* (Make Carry 1) defined as:

$$SA_n = (D_n + D'_n) \bmod 10 \quad (1)$$

$$SC_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (D_n + D'_n) \geq 10, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The third addition sub-task in their model, *SS* (Use Sum 9), had built-in accuracy limitations, meaning their model was accurate for questions where a carry bit cascades over two digits (e.g. 00044+00056=000100), but inaccurate if a carry bit cascades over 3 or more digits (e.g. 44444+55556=100000).

To answer 44444+55556= with 100000, a model must predict the first answer digit A5 as 1 in token position P12. This suggests a model must implement a “carry cascade”

circuit, combining “carry” information from all five digits, and completing the calculation by P12. We introduce a digit-level categorization called TriCase:

$$D_n.ST = \underbrace{\text{TriCase}}_{(D_n, D'_n)} = \begin{cases} ST10 & \text{if } (D_n + D'_n) \geq 10, \\ ST9 & \text{if } (D_n + D'_n) = 9, \\ ST8 & \text{if } (D_n + D'_n) \leq 8. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The TriCase output values are the essential “single-digit carry” information:

- If  $D_n.ST = ST10$ , the digit-pair **always** causes a *SC*,
- if  $D_n.ST = ST9$ , the digit-pair will cause an *SC* if the preceding digit-pair sum generates an *SC*, and
- if  $D_n.ST = ST8$ , the digit-pair **never** causes an *SC*.

We introduce the “two-digit carry cascade” function, TriAdd, that combines the TriCase output from two sequential digits ( $D_{n-1}$ ) to ( $D_n$ ) by integrating the values of ( $D_n.ST$ ) and ( $D_{n-1}.ST$ ). This function can be represented as bigram mappings and yields two distinct outputs (details in App. F):

$$\underbrace{\text{TriAdd}}_{(D_n.ST, D_{n-1}.ST)} = \begin{cases} ST10 & \text{if } D_n.ST = ST10 \\ & \text{or } D_n.ST = ST9 \\ & \text{and } D_{n-1}.ST = ST10, \\ ST8 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Finally, we introduce the recursive “m-digit carry cascade” function  $D_n.ST_m$ , which combines TriAdd “carry” data across ( $m$ ) digits:

$$D_n.ST_m = \begin{cases} \underbrace{\text{TriAdd}}_{(D_n.ST, D_{n-1}.ST_{m-1})} & \text{if } m > 2, \\ \underbrace{\text{TriAdd}}_{(D_n.ST, D_{n-1}.ST)} & \text{if } m = 2. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The value  $D_n.ST_{n+1}$  provides perfectly accurate “cascading carry” data for  $D_n$ , as it integrates TriCase data all the way back to and including  $D0.SC$ . In 5-digit addition, the accurate values are  $D4.ST5$ ,  $D3.ST4$ ,  $D2.ST3$  and  $D1.ST2$ . For example  $A5 = D4.ST5 = \text{TriAdd}(D4.ST, \text{TriAdd}(D3.ST, \text{TriAdd}(D2.ST, \text{TriAdd}(D1.ST, D0.ST))))$ . If our model calculates and uses these values appropriately, it is accurate. Figure 3 shows how our model’s algorithm combines the ([Quirke & Barez, 2024](#)) *SA* and *SC* sub-tasks with the  $D_n.ST$  and  $D_n.ST_{n+1}$  sub-tasks to give an accurate algorithm.




Figure 3. Our 5-digit addition model only uses 9 token positions (P8 to P16) to predict answers. In P8 to P11 it calculates all  $D_n.ST$  (single-digit carry) values and combines them into perfectly accurate  $D_n.ST_{n+1}$  (cascading carry) values. In P11, D4.ST5 gives the first answer digit A5 as 1 or 0. From P12, the remaining answer digits are calculated one by one with perfect accuracy by combining Base Add (SA), Make Carry (SC) calculations with the pre-calculated  $D_n.ST_{n+1}$  values. In effect, the model enhances the 99% accurate (Quirke & Barez, 2024) algorithm with a new circuit (the grey boxes) calculating cascading-carries to “fix” the 1% inaccuracy. This algorithm generalises to n-digits.

### 3.2. Question Difficulty and Frequency

To analyze question difficulty, we categorized questions by the complexity of the computation required to solve the question, as shown in Tab. 1. The categories are arranged according to the number of digits that a carry bit has to cascade through.

Table 1. We categorise addition questions into non-overlapping “calculation complexity” quanta, ordered by increased computational difficulty (and decreasing occurrence frequency). Five-digit addition questions quanta are  $S0$  to  $S5$ . Ten-digit addition question quanta are  $S0$  to  $S10$ .  $S10$ ’s frequency is  $\sim 3 \times 10^{-4}$  showing the need to enrich training data for rare edge cases.

Name	Contains	Example	Freq
$S0$	SA	11111+12345=23456	$\sim 5\%$
$S1$	SA,SC	11111+9=22230	$\sim 21\%$
$S2$	SA,SCx2	11111+89=22300	$\sim 34\%$
$S3$	SA,SCx3	11111+889=23000	$\sim 28\%$
$S4$	SA,SCx4	11111+8889=30000	$\sim 11\%$
$S5$	SA,SCx5	11111+88889=100000	$\sim 2\%$

### 3.3. Techniques

In investigating the circuits of the model, we want to understand what each attention head or MLP layer is doing across each token position, and how it relates to our mathematical framework. Hence, we define a *node* as the

computation done by an attention head or MLP layer for a given token position.

**Mean ablation.** To find out how the model depends on the output of a node, we replace the output of that node with the vector that is the mean of all of its outputs across its batch.

**Attention Patterns.** To find out what the model attends to at that node, we take the attention pattern at that token position and take the significant tokens attended to ( $> 0.01$  post softmax).

## 4. Experiments

### 4.1. Training & Investigating Five-Digit Addition Model

**Training the model.** The 5-digit 1-layer addition model in Quirke & Barez (2024) achieved an accuracy of  $\sim 99\%$ . Our preliminary experiments indicated that a 2-layer, 3-head model was the smallest configuration capable of achieving fully accurate addition (see App. D for alternative configurations tested).

This configuration effectively doubled the computational power compared to the 1-layer model. Moreover, a 2-layer model introduces the capability to “compose” the attention heads in novel ways, facilitating the implementation of more complex algorithms (Elhage et al., 2021b).

By enriching the training dataset with more instances of rare edge cases, the 5-digit 2-layer model attained a training loss of  $\sim 2.3 \times 10^{-8}$  after 30 thousand training batches. This model demonstrated a 1M Q accuracy (details in App. C).

**Investigating the model.** To gain insights into the model’s predictive behavior, we conducted an investigation focusing on its activity during prediction calculations. Ablation experiments targeting the nodes revealed that the model depends only on nodes located in token positions P8 to P16, as illustrated in Figs 4 and 5. Across these nine positions, the model uses 36 nodes, comprising 21 attention heads and 15 MLP layers. The effects of node ablation on our complexity and answer-impact metrics were analyzed (see Figs 6 and 7), providing insight into the specific computations performed at each node.

For each answer digit  $A_n$  using test questions corresponding to the ST8, ST9 and ST10 categories, we performed Principal Component Analysis (PCA) on the nodes yielding interpretable results. Specifically nine “node and answer-digit” combinations (see Figs 14 and 15) showed strong clustering of the questions aligned to the ST8, ST9 and ST10 categories.

The algorithm predicts the first answer digit, A5, at position P11. A5, which is always 0 or 1, is the most challenging to predict as it may rely on a long carry cascade (e.g. 55555+44445=100000). An accurate algorithm must

## Increasing Trust in Language Models through the Reuse of Verified Circuits




Figure 4. This map shows the % of enriched questions that fail when we ablate each node in the **5-digit** 2-layer 3-head addition model. The model only uses nodes in token positions P8 to P16 (i.e. tokens D'2 to A1). No attention heads in layer 1 are used. Lower percentages correspond to rarer edge cases. The grey space represents nodes that are not used by the model.




Figure 5. This map shows the input tokens each attention head attends to at each token position. At token position P11 the model predicts the first answer digit A5. All digit pairs (e.g. D2 D'2) are attended to by P11.

compute this cascade using the nodes located in positions P8 to P11. As illustrated in Figure 5, these nodes attend to all digit pairs from D4 D'4 to D0 D'0. Additionally, the PCA data, as shown in Figures 14 and 15, suggest that these nodes produce tri-state outputs.

After our first two algorithm hypotheses failed testing (see App. G and H), we discovered that the model utilizes a minimal set of “make carry” information, leading to the development of the TriCase quanta.

The model performs  $D_n.ST$  using bigrams (see App. F) to map two input tokens to one result token e.g. “6” + “7” = ST10. In positions P8 to P11, the model does  $D_n.ST$  calculations on all digit pairs from D4 D'4 to D0 D'0.

For a specific 5-digit addition model instance, we mapped the algorithm to individual nodes. Using ablation interventions, we verified each node’s role in executing the expected algorithmic step. Figure 1 diagrams the algorithm, while App. I details each nodes purpose for this model instance. The model adheres to all known constraints and accurately calculating all six answer digits.

In summary, we concluded that the specific instance of the 5-




Figure 6. This map shows the simplest (lowest complexity) quanta S0, S1, etc impacted when we ablate each node in the **5-digit** 2-layer 3-head addition model. To answer S0 questions, only the S0 nodes are used. To answer S1 questions, S0 and S1 nodes are used, etc.




Figure 7. This map shows the answer digit(s) A0 .. A5 impacted when we ablate each useful node in the **5-digit** 2-layer 3-head addition model. The “column per digit” pattern in the last 6 columns mirrors the 1-layer model’s pattern. Cells containing values like A5.2 (in position P10) are used in multiple prediction steps to calculate multiple answer digits e.g. A2 to A5.

digit addition model documented above is reliably accurate, well-understood, well-functioning and so known-good.

Whereas the Quirke & Barez (2024) model used 21 nodes to achieve 99% accuracy, this model uses 36 nodes to achieve 100% accuracy. That is a 71% increase in size to achieve the final 1% of accuracy.

### 4.2. Case Study: Extending to n-Digit Addition

All instances of the 5-digit addition model we trained appear to utilize the same algorithm, but validation was labor intensive as each model may have slight implementation differences. For example, a given model might alter the specific nodes used for sub-tasks, or split a sub-task across two nodes.

To investigate the use of this algorithm more widely, and accelerate our research, we generalized our training and testing framework to handle addition with n digits, 1 to 3 layers, and 2 to 4 heads. We also modified the answer format to include a '+' token (e.g. 111111+222222=+0333333) and employed a different optimizer. We trained a range of




Figure 8. This map shows the sub-tasks found in a **6-digit** 2-layer 3-head **addition** model. There is an  $D_n.ST$  sub-task for each digit by P14 as required for a “cascading carry” circuit. Some sub-tasks (e.g. A2.SA in P18) are implemented across two nodes. Overall the sub-tasks found align to the Figure 3 algorithm.

addition models (Refer App.E). These models all have very low loss and demonstrate 1M Q accuracy.

To automate n-digit testing, we implemented a declarative approach to describing each sub-task. For example, a sub-task can be described as primarily attending to question digits D2 and D’2, influencing answer digit A3, impacting S0 but not S1 complexity questions, with a specific PCA result, and an specific ablation test. Using the declaration, our framework automatically searches for and identifies nodes performing sub-tasks, storing the results in a json file.

An algorithm hypothesis (e.g the one described in section 4.1) is then described in terms of the sub-tasks that must exist in the model and their inter-relationships. For example, our algorithm description states (in part) that the model must implement  $D_n.ST$  sub-tasks for each question digit before the ‘=’ token. We implemented an n-digit algorithm hypothesis declaration framework and a way to test the declaration against the sub-tasks found in the model, and map the results (Refer Figure 8.)

We applied this technique to the addition models in App.E. We showed the 1-layer model duplicated the [Quirke & Barez \(2024\)](#) algorithm. We showed that each of the 6-digit 2-layer models implemented the logical extension of the algorithm in Figure 3.

Given these models have 1M Q accuracy, and they implement the same algorithm, we can state these specific 6-digit models are known-good.

### 4.3. Case Study: Extending the model for subtraction

To explore the reuse of known-good models, we developed a larger (6-digit 3-layer 4-head) model capable of performing both addition and subtraction. We enriched the (infinite) training dataset with rare subtraction edge cases.

Before it was trained, this new “mixed” model was initialized with the weights from an known-good (6-digit 2-layer 3-head) addition model. Specifically, the first 2 layers, first 3 heads, etc of the mixed model were

initialized with the addition model weights. To facilitate its learning of subtraction while maintaining its pre-inserted addition circuits, we trained the mixed model with a dataset comprising 80% subtraction and 20% addition problems. This approach resulted in a model achieving 1M Q accuracy for both addition and subtraction tasks. (Attempts to “freeze” the inserted attention heads and/or MLP layers from the addition model by periodically copying their weights back into the mixed model every 100 training epochs, however, led to decreased accuracy. Refer App.M.)

The model must distinguish between addition and subtraction questions. We define an “operator” sub-task OPR to locate nodes that attend to the question “+” or “-”. Figure 10 shows 13 OPR nodes.

An addition ( $a + b =$ ) question’s answer is always positive. A subtraction ( $a - b =$ ) question’s answer is positive if  $a > b$  else it is negative. An accurate model must calculate  $D >= D'$  to accurately predict the first answer token as “+” or “-”. We define a digit-level “greater than” sub-task as  $D_n.GT = 1$  if  $D_n > D'_n$ , 0 if  $D_n = D'_n$ , else -1. Using this sub-tasks, and using a 4 digit example,  $D >= D'$  can be calculated as  $D3.GT=1$  or  $(D3.GT=0$  and  $(D2.GT=1$  or  $(D2.GT=0$  and  $(D1.GT=1$  or  $(D1.GT=0$  and  $D0.GT=1)))$ . Figure 10 shows six  $D_n.GT$  nodes in a mixed model. When these nodes are ablated the answer changes sign.

Similar looking positive-answer (e.g. 100009-100000=+0000009) and negative-answer (e.g. 100009-200000=-0999991) subtraction questions can give answers that differ at many digit positions. Positing that the first answer token (a “+” or “-”) is useful in later token calculations, we defined a sub-task SGN for nodes that **attend** to the predicted answer sign. Figure 10 shows 14 SGN nodes in a mixed model.

We posited that the model has overlapping but distinct circuits for the three question classes “addition” (prefix S), “positive-answer subtraction” (prefix M) and “negative-answer subtraction” (prefix N). Fig.9 shows that 29 nodes are used in all three question classes. Some nodes are specific to one class.

By replacing addition’s “carry one” concept with subtraction’s “borrow one” concept, we define M and N class sub-tasks and complexity measures that parallel the existing S ones (see Tables 2 and 3 and App. L).

Table 2. We define “positive-answer subtraction” and “negative-answer subtraction” sub-tasks that parallel the addition sub-tasks.

Name	+ve Sub	-ve Sub	Definition	Like
Base Diff	$MD$	$ND$	$D_n - D'_n \% 10$	$SA$
Borrow One	$MB$	$NB$	$D_n - D'_n < 0$	$SC$
TriCase	$MT$	$NT$	TBD	$ST$

## Increasing Trust in Language Models through the Reuse of Verified Circuits




Figure 9. This map of the **mixed** model shows whether each of the 98 nodes are used to answer addition (S), positive-answer subtraction (M) and/or negative-answer subtraction (N) questions. The 48 nodes initialized pre-training with the smaller **addition** model are shown with a red border. Of these 48 nodes, 39 have been generalized to calculate two or three questions classes.

Table 3. We define “positive-answer subtraction” and “negative-answer subtraction” calculation complexity quanta that parallel the addition quanta.

+ve Sub	Contains	-ve Sub	Contains	Like
$M0$	$MD$	N/A	N/A	$S0$
$M1$	$MD, MB$	$N1$	$ND, NB$	$S1$
$M2$	$MD, MB \times 2$	$N2$	$ND, NB \times 2$	$S2$
$M3$	$MD, MB \times 3$	$N3$	$ND, NB \times 3$	$S3$
$M4$	$MD, MB \times 4$	$N4$	$ND, NB \times 4$	$S4$

We extended our n-digit automatic-search to cover these new sub-tasks and quanta. We discovered that 12 inserted nodes that performed  $SA$  in the addition model, perform  $SA$ ,  $MD$  and  $ND$  in the mixed model. (Refer Figure 10.) These three sub-tasks are similar in that each performs a mapping from 100 input cases ( $10 D_n \times 10 D'_n$ ) to 10 output cases (0..9). The mixed model “upgraded” these nodes to be polysemantic during training. Similarly, some  $SC$  addition nodes became polysemantic and now process  $SC$ ,  $MB$  and/or  $NB$ .

The model has some addition-specific and subtraction-specific nodes. Figure 11 focuses on P18 where A2 is finalized. We posit that the 2 subtraction-specific nodes “select” the appropriate output of the polysemantic nodes based on the OPR and SGN values. Ditto for the 2 addition-specific nodes.

While the mixed model has 1M Q accuracy for both addition and subtraction tasks, the algorithm implementation is not fully understood and has not been documented. We cannot yet assert that it is known-good.




Figure 10. For the **6-digit** 3-layer 4-head **mixed** model, this map shows nodes known to perform the sub-tasks Base Add (SA), Make Carry (SC), Base Diff (MD and ND), Borrow One (MB and NB), Greater Than (GT), Operator (OPR) and Sign (SGN). More sub-tasks remain to be identified. Many nodes are polysemantic performing multiple sub-tasks for different question classes e.g. P17LOH1 performs A3.SA, A3.MD and A3.ND for the S, M and N question respectively.

Node	Impact	Algorithm sub-task	Attends to	Add Complex	Sub Complex	Neg Complex	Fail %
P18LOH0	A2	A1.SC A1.MB A2.NB	D'1 D1	S123	M123		6
P18LOH1	A2	A2.SA A2.MD A2.ND	D'2 D2	S01234	M0123	N1234	44
P18LOH2	A2	A2.SA A2.MD A2.ND	D'2 D2	S012345	M0123	N1234	58
P18LOH3	A2	OPR SGN	OPR		M0123	N1234	12
P18LOMLP	A2			S012345	M0123	N1234	50
P18L1H0	A2		A3 D'2 D'1		M123		2
P18L1H1	A2		= D'1 A3 D'2		M012	N34	2
P18L1H2	A2	OPR	=	S01234			11
P18L1H3	A2	SGN	= A3	S12345			3
P18L1MLP	A2			S01234	M0123	N2	23
P18L2MLP	A2			S2	M0123		7

Figure 11. For the **6-digit** 3-layer 4-head **mixed** model, this map shows facts gathered pertaining to the P18 nodes that predict A2/ The blue columns show the three question types and the complexity impacted when the nodes are ablated. Nodes P18L1H1/H2 only impact addition questions. Nodes P18LOH0/H1 only impact subtraction questions.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we successfully trained a 5-digit 2-layer 3-head addition model that we have verified as known-good. Our investigation revealed that a 6-digit 2-layer 3-head addition model follows the same algorithmic principles, albeit with some implementation variations.

A significant aspect of our work was demonstrating component reuse. We achieved this by integrating an existing addition model into a new “mixed” model designed for both addition and subtraction tasks. This integration allowed us to leverage our in-depth understanding of the addition model’s algorithm to unravel the workings of the mixed model. Our findings indicate that the mixed model employs the nodes of the inserted addition model for conducting both addition and subtraction computations.

This paper lends support to the assertion by [Michaud et al. \(2023\)](#) that many natural prediction problems can be broken down into a finite set of “quanta” computations. These quanta are essential for models to learn in order to minimize loss. Furthermore, it aligns with the concept that comprehending a network’s functionality is fundamentally about identifying and understanding its sub-quanta.

## 6. Limitations and Future Work

Our research opens up several promising avenues for future exploration. A key objective is to establish the mixed model as known-good by reverse-engineering its algorithm implementation and validating it through experimental methods. Additionally, we aim to develop a comprehensive model that proficiently handles addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, ensuring its status as known-good.

Currently, our approach requires significant human effort, which may not be feasible for large-scale applications. However, we believe applying this method to critical tasks, such as logical reasoning involving both simple (e.g., AND, OR) and more complex operators (e.g., Converse, Inverse), is justified. This could lead to the creation of more known-good transformer models, potentially extending to frameworks for ethical decision-making.

A promising finding of our research was the successful insertion of a known-good model into a larger, untrained model while retaining its functionality. We think it might be feasible to embed a compact known-good model into an existing Large Language Model (LLM) to enhance its trustworthiness. Previous studies ([Stolfo et al., 2023](#); [Kruthoff, 2024](#)) found nodes in LLMs that were responsible for inaccuracies mathematical calculations. Given our findings, it might be possible to replace these nodes with known-good ones. While this poses an engineering challenge, research by ([Voita et al., 2023](#)) and ([Hu et al., 2021](#)) indicates the presence of “spare” neurons in LLMs and the potential for integrating small-scale modifications to fix erroneous circuits in LLMs.

Moreover, developing methods to incorporate compact known-good models into LLMs, whether untrained or trained, could democratize AI Safety research. It enables small teams to focus on specific functional areas, crafting component models to a defined quality standard for integration into various LLMs.

Our automated framework for discovering the location of algorithm sub-tasks in models, sped up our research. Some mixed model sub-tasks are still not understood well enough.

We made progress on a declarative language to describe how an algorithm is implemented by combining sub-tasks

(including stating permissible variations) and a framework to automatically test a described algorithm against a specific model. Further work is required to fully realize its potential.

These frameworks can be re-used to ensure that known-good components retain their functionality when integrated into LLMs. One-third of this framework is specific to our maths models - the remainder is generic and reuseable on other types of models.

## Impact Statement

Our work aims to explain the inner workings of transformer-based language models, which may have broad implications for a wide range of applications. A deeper understanding of generative AI has dual usage. While the potential for misuse exists, we discourage it. The knowledge gained can be harnessed to safeguard systems, ensuring they operate as intended. It is our sincere hope that this research will be directed towards the greater good, enriching our society and preventing detrimental effects. We encourage responsible use of AI, aligning with ethical guidelines.

## References

- Barak, B., Edelman, B. L., Goel, S., Kakade, S. M., Malach, E., and Zhang, C. Hidden progress in deep learning: Sgd learns parities near the computational limit. *ArXiv*, abs/2207.08799, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:250627142>.
- Cunningham, H., Ewart, A., Riggs, L., Huben, R., and Sharkey, L. Sparse autoencoders find highly interpretable features in language models, 2023.
- Elhage, N., Nanda, N., Olsson, C., Henighan, T., Joseph, N., Mann, B., Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Conerly, T., DasSarma, N., Drain, D., Ganguli, D., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Jones, A., Kernion, J., Lovitt, L., Ndousse, K., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., and Olah, C. A mathematical framework for transformer circuits. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2021a. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2021/framework/index.html>.
- Elhage, N., Nanda, N., Olsson, C., et al. A mathematical framework for transformer circuits. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2021/framework/index.html>, 2021b.
- Geva, M., Caciularu, A., Wang, K. R., and Goldberg, Y. Transformer feed-forward layers build predictions by promoting concepts in the vocabulary space, 2022.
- Hendrycks, D. and Mazeika, M. X-risk analysis for ai research. *ArXiv*, abs/2206.05862, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.05862>.

[//api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:249626439](https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:249626439).

Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Kadavath, S., Arora, A., Basart, S., Tang, E., Song, D., and Steinhardt, J. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.

Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models, 2021.

Jenner, E., Garriga-alonso, A., and Zverev, E. A comparison of causal scrubbing, causal abstractions, and related methods. <https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/uLMWMeBG3ruoBRhMW/a-comparison-of-causal-scrubbing-causal-abstractions-and>, 2023.

Kruthoff, J. Carrying over algorithm in transformers, 2024.

Liu, T. and Low, B. K. H. Goat: Fine-tuned llama outperforms gpt-4 on arithmetic tasks, 2023.

Michaud, E. J., Liu, Z., Girit, U., and Tegmark, M. The quantization model of neural scaling, 2023.

Nanda, N. One layer sparse autoencoder. <https://github.com/neelnanda-io/1L-Sparse-Autoencoder>, 2023.

Nanda, N., Chan, L., Lieberum, T., Smith, J., and Steinhardt, J. Progress measures for grokking via mechanistic interpretability, 2023.

nostalgebraist. interpreting gpt: the logit lens. <https://www.alignmentforum.org/posts/AcKRB8wDpdaN6v6ru/interpreting-gpt-the-logit-lens>, 2020.

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. <https://distill.pub/2020/circuits/zoom-in>.

Quirke, P. and Barez, F. Understanding addition in transformers. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2310.13121.pdf>.

Raukur, T., Ho, A. C., Casper, S., and Hadfield-Menell, D. Toward transparent ai: A survey on interpreting the inner structures of deep neural networks. *2023 IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning (SaTML)*, pp. 464–483, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:2511104722>.

Schaeffer, R., Miranda, B., and Koyejo, S. Are emergent abilities of large language models a mirage?, 2023.

Stolfo, A., Belinkov, Y., and Sachan, M. A mechanistic interpretation of arithmetic reasoning in language models using causal mediation analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 7035–7052, 2023.

Voita, E., Ferrando, J., and Nalmpantis, C. Neurons in large language models: Dead, n-gram, positional, 2023.

Zhang, A., Xing, L., Zou, J., and Wu, J. C. Shifting machine learning for healthcare from development to deployment and from models to data. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, 6:1330 – 1345, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:250283181>.

## A. Appendix: Terminology

These terms and abbreviations are used in this paper and the associated Colabs and python code:

- **Pn** : Model (input or output) token position. Zero-based. e.g. **P18**, **P18L1H0**
- **Ln** : Model layer n. Zero-based. e.g. **P18L1H2**
- **Hn** : Attention head n. Zero-based. e.g. **P18L1H2**
- **Mn** : MLP neuron n. Zero-based
- **PnLnHn** : Location / name of a single attention head, at a specified layer, at a specific token position
- **PnLnMn** : Location / name of a single MLP neuron, at a specified layer, at a specific token position
- **D** : First number of the pair question numbers
- **Dn** : nth numeric token in the first question number. Zero-based. D0 is the units value
- **D'** : Second number of the pair question numbers
- **D'n** : nth token in the second question number. Zero-based. D0 is the units value
- **A** : Answer to the question (including answer sign)
- **An** : nth token in the answer. Zero-based. A0 is the units value. The highest token is the “+” or “-” answer sign
- **Amax** : The highest token in the answer. It is always the “+” or “-” sign
- **S** : Prefix for Addition. Think S for Sum. Aka ADD.

- **SA** : Basic Add. An addition sub-task. An.SA is defined as  $(D_n + D'_n) \% 10$ . e.g.  $5 + 7$  gives 2
- **SC** : Make Carry. An addition sub-task. An.SC is defined as  $D_n + D'_n \geq 10$ . e.g.  $5 + 7$  gives True
- **SS** : Make Sum 9. An addition sub-task. An.SS is defined as  $D_n + D'_n == 9$ . e.g.  $5 + 7$  gives False
- **ST** : TriCase. An addition sub-task. Refer paper 2 for details
- **ST8, ST9, ST10** : Outputs of the ST TriCase sub-task. Refer paper 2 for details
- **M** : Prefix for Subtraction with a positive answer. Think M for Minus. Aka SUB
- **:** Basic Difference. A subtraction sub-task. An.MD is defined as  $(D_n - D'_n) \% 10$ . e.g.  $3 - 7$  gives 6
- **:** Borrow One. A positive-answer subtraction sub-task. An.MB is defined as  $D_n - D'_n < 0$ . e.g.  $5 - 7$  gives True
- **MZ** : Make Zero. A positive-answer subtraction sub-task. An.MZ is defined as  $D_n - D'_n == 0$ . e.g.  $5 - 5$  gives True
- **MT** : TriCase. A positive-answer subtraction sub-task.
- **MT1, MT0, MT-1** : Outputs of the MT TriCase sub-task.
- **N** : Prefix for Subtraction with a negative answer. Think N for Negative. Aka NEG
- **ND** : Basic Difference. A negative-answer subtraction sub-task. An.ND is defined as  $(D_n - D'_n) \% 10$ . e.g.  $3 - 7$  gives 6
- **NB** : Borrow One. A negative-answer subtraction sub-task. An.NB is defined as  $D_n - D'_n < 0$ . e.g.  $5 - 7$  gives True
- **NZ** : Make Zero. A negative-answer subtraction sub-task. An.NZ is defined as  $D_n - D'_n == 0$ . e.g.  $5 - 5$  gives True
- **NT** : TriCase. A negative-answer subtraction sub-task.
- **GT** : Greater Than. A (positive-answer or negative-answer) subtraction sub-task. Dn.GT is defined as  $D_n > D'_n$ . e.g.  $3 > 5$  gives False
- **OPR** : Operator. A sub-task that attends to the + or - token in the question (which determines whether the question is addition or subtraction).
- **SGN** : Sign. A sub-task that attends to the first answer token, which is + or -

- **PCA** : Principal Component Analysis
- **EVR** : Explained Variance Ratio. In PCA, EVR represents the percentage of variance explained by each of the selected components.

## B. Appendix: Model Configuration

Addition, subtraction and mixed (addition and subtraction) training experiments were done in a Colab notebook named. The Colab runs on a T4 GPU. Training takes up to 35 mins. The key parameters (which are all configurable) are:

- **n\_layers = 2**: Number of layers. Commonly 1, 2 or 3
- **n\_heads = 3**: Number of attention heads. Commonly 3 or 4
- **n\_digits = 5**: Number of digits in the addition question. Commonly 5 or 6

Each digit is represented as a separate token. (Liu & Low, 2023) state that LLaMa’s “remarkable arithmetic ability ... is mainly attributed to LLaMA’s consistent tokenization of numbers”. The model’s vocabulary contains 14 tokens (0, ..., 9, +, -, =, \*, /) to enable this and planned future investigations.

Training uses a new batch of data each step (aka Infinite Training Data) to minimise memorisation. Depending on the configuration, each training run processes 1 to 4 million training datums. For the 5-digit addition problem there are 100,000 squared (that is 10 billion) possible questions. So the training data is much less than 1% of the possible problems.

Addition and subtraction include rare edge cases. For example, the *SS* cascades (e.g.  $44445+55555=100000$ ,  $54321+45679=1000000$ ,  $44450+55550=10000$ ,  $1234+8769=10003$ ) are exceedingly rare. The data generator was enhanced to increase the frequency of all known edges cases. This was necessary to decrease the model loss.

Validation test data covering all edge cases was manually constructed. These test cases are not used during training.

The Colabs are available at [https://github.com/PhilipQuirke/verified\\_transformers](https://github.com/PhilipQuirke/verified_transformers)

## C. Appendix: Addition Model Loss

The 1-layer model is not very accurate (see Tab. 4). With 2 layers the model gains accuracy (see Tab. 5). The model uses `batch_size = 64`, `n_heads = 3`, `lr = 0.00008`, `weight_decay = 0.1`. The loss function is simple:

- Per Digit Loss: For “per digit” graphs and analysis, for a given answer digit, the loss used is negative log likelihood.
- All Digits Loss: For “all answer digits” graphs and analysis, the loss used is the mean of the “per digit” loss across all the answer digits.

Table 4. Results for **1-layer** 3-head model with 5, 10 & 15 digits

No. digits	5	10	15
Training batches	20K	20K	20K
Loss	0.008314	0.040984	0.031746
Heads used	15	29	46
MLPs used	6	11	16

Table 5. Results for **2-layer** 3-head model with 5 & 10 digits

No. digits	5	5	10	10
Training batches	20K	30K	20K	30K
Loss	2.7e-6	<b>2.3e-8</b>	9.4e-5	1.2e-4
Heads used	21	19	57	51
MLPs used	15	15	27	28

The 2-layer, 5-digit model trained over 30 thousand batches has a final training loss of  $\sim 2.3 \times 10^{-8}$ .

## D. Appendix: Addition Model Shape Choice

While we wanted a very low loss addition model, we also wanted to keep the model compact - intuiting that a smaller model would be easier to understand than a large model. Here are the things we tried to reduce loss that **didn't** work:

- Increasing the frequency of hard (cascading  $SS$ ) examples in the training data so the model has more hard examples to learn from. This improved training speed but did not reduce loss.
- Increasing the number of attention heads from 3 to 4 or 5 (while still using 1 layer) to provide more computing power.
- Changing the question format from “12345+22222=” to “12345+22222equals” giving the model more prediction steps after the question is revealed before it needs to state the first answer digit.
- With  $n\_layers = 1$  increasing the number of attention heads from 3 to 4.
- Changing the  $n\_layers$  to 2 and  $n\_heads$  to 2.

The smallest model shape that did reduce loss significantly was 2 layers with 3 attention heads

## E. Appendix: Experimental models

Experiment were performed on 14 models. The resulting models and related output is stored on HuggingFace at <https://huggingface.co/PhilipQuirke/VerifiedArithmetic>.

### E.1. Training

For each model the 'VerifiedArithmeticTrain' Colab notebook generates two files:

- A “XXXXXXX.pth” file containing the model weights
- A “XXXXXXX\_train.json” file containing configuration information and training loss data

A model name like `add_d5_l2_h3_t30K_s372001` can be “read” as: Performs addition,  $n\_digits=5$ ,  $n\_layers=2$ ,  $n\_heads=3$ ,  $training\_epochs=30K$ ,  $training\_seed=372001$ .

These files are available on HuggingFace for these models:

#### E.1.1. 5-DIGIT AND 6-DIGIT DIGIT ADDITION MODELS

- `add_d5_l1_h3_t30K_s372001`: Fails on 1M Qs. Reproduces Paper 1 model. Can predict S0, S1 and S2 complexity addition questions.
- `add_d5_l2_h3_t15K_s372001`: Succeeds on 1M Qs. Training loss is  $9e-9$
- `add_d6_l2_h3_t15K_s372001`: Succeeds on 1M Qs.
- `add_d6_l2_h3_t20K_s173289`: Succeeds on 1M Qs.
- `add_d6_l2_h3_t20K_s572091`: Succeeds on 1M Qs.

#### E.1.2. 6-DIGIT SUBTRACTION MODEL

- `sub_d6_l2_h3_t30K_s372001`: Fails on 1M Qs.

#### E.1.3. 6-DIGIT MIXED MODEL

- `mix_d6_l3_h4_t40K_s372001`: Fails on 1M Qs. Training loss is  $8e-09$

#### E.1.4. 6-DIGIT MIXED MODELS INITIALIZED WITH 6-DIGIT ADDITION MODEL

- `insl_mix_d6_l3_h4_t40K_s372001`: Succeeds on 1M Qs for Add and Sub.
- `insl_mix_d6_l3_h4_t40K_s173289`: Fails on 1M Qs.  $AvgFinalLoss=1.6e-08$ . 936K for Add, 1M Qs for Sub
- `insl_mix_d6_l3_h3_t40K_s572091`: Fails on 1M Qs.  $AvgFinalLoss=1.8e-08$ . For 099111-099111= $+0000000$  gives  $-0000000$ .
- `insl_mix_d6_l3_h4_t50K_s572091`: Fails on 1M Qs.  $AvgFinalLoss=2.9e-08$ . 1M for Add. 300K for Sub. For 000041-000047= $-0000006$  gives  $+0000006$ .

E.1.5. 6-DIGIT MIXED MODEL INITIALIZED WITH 6-DIGIT ADDITION MODEL. RESET USEFUL HEADS EVERY 100 EPOCHS.

- ins2\_mix\_d6\_l4\_h4\_t40K\_s372001: Fails on 1M Qs. Training loss is 7e-09.

E.1.6. 6-DIGIT MIXED MODEL INITIALIZED WITH 6-DIGIT ADDITION MODEL. RESET USEFUL HEADS & MLPs EVERY 100 EPOCHS.

- ins3\_mix\_d6\_l4\_h3\_t40K\_s372001: Fails on 1M Qs.

## E.2. Analysis

For each model the 'VerifiedArithmeticAnalysis' Colab notebook generates two files:

- A "XXXXXX\_behavior.json" file containing generic "behavior" facts learnt about the model by the Colab e.g. P18L0H0 attends to tokens D3 and D'3
- A "XXXXXX\_maths.json" file containing "maths-specific" facts learnt about the model by the Colab e.g. P18L0H0 performs the A3.SC sub-task.

## F. Appendix: TriAdd Implementation

TriAdd transfers data from  $(D_{n-1})$  to  $(D_n)$  by integrating the values of  $(D_n.ST)$  and  $(D_{n-1}.ST)$ . This function can be represented as nine bigram mappings with three possible outputs.

Table 6.  $D_n.TriAdd$  can be calculated from  $D_n.ST$  and  $D_{n-1}.ST$  through nine bigram mappings and yielding the three distinct outputs ST8, ST9 and ST10

	$D_n.ST = ST8$	ST9	ST10
$D_{n-1}.ST = ST8$	ST8	ST9	ST10
$D_{n-1}.ST = ST9$	ST8	ST9	ST10
$D_{n-1}.ST = ST10$	ST8 *	ST10	ST10

Note that in the case  $D_n.ST = ST9$  and  $D_{n-1}.ST = ST10$ , the answer is indeterminate. The result could be ST8 or ST9 but importantly it can not be ST10. We choose to use ST8 in our definition, but ST9 would work just as well.

## G. Appendix: Addition Hypothesis 1

Given the 2-layer attention pattern's similarity to 1-layer attention pattern, and the above evidence, our first (incorrect) hypothesis was that the 2-layer algorithm:

- Is based on the same SA, SC and SS operations as the 1-layer.

- Uses the new early positions to (somehow) do the SS calculations with higher accuracy than the 1-layer model.
- The long double staircase still finalises each answer digit's calculation.
- The two attention nodes in the long double staircase positions do the SA and SC calculations and pull in SS information calculated in the early positions.

If this is correct then the 2-layer algorithm successfully completes these calculations:

- $A0 = D0.SA$
- $A1 = D1.SA + D0.SC$
- $A2 = D2.SA + (D1.SC \text{ or } (D1.SS \ \& \ D0.SC))$
- $A3 = D3.SA + (D2.SC \text{ or } (D2.SS \ \& \ D1.SC) \text{ or } (D2.SS \ \& \ D1.SS \ \& \ D0.SC))$
- $A4 = D4.SA + (D3.SC \text{ or } (D3.SS \ \& \ D2.SC) \text{ or } (D3.SS \ \& \ D2.SS \ \& \ D1.SC) \text{ or } (D3.SS \ \& \ D2.SS \ \& \ D1.SS \ \& \ D0.SC))$
- $A5 = D4.SC \text{ or } (D4.SS \ \& \ D3.SC) \text{ or } (D4.SS \ \& \ D3.SS \ \& \ D2.SC) \text{ or } (D4.SS \ \& \ D3.SS \ \& \ D2.SS \ \& \ D1.SC) \text{ or } (D4.SS \ \& \ D3.SS \ \& \ D2.SS \ \& \ D1.SS \ \& \ D0.SC)$

Our intuition is that there are not enough useful nodes in positions 8 to 11 to complete the A5 calculation this way. So we abandoned this hypothesis.

## H. Appendix: Addition Hypothesis 2

Our second (incorrect) hypothesis was that the 2-layer algorithm has a **more compact** data representation, so it can pack more calculations into each node, allowing it to accurately predict A5 in step 11.

We claimed the model stores the sum of each digit-pair as a single token in the range "0" to "18" (covering 0+0 to 9+9). We name this operator  $D_n.T$ , where T stands for "token addition":

- $D_n.T = D_n + D'_n$

The  $D_n.T$  operation does not understand mathematical addition. Tab. 7 shows how the model implements the T operator as a bigram mapping.

$D_n.T$  is a compact way to store data. Tab. 8 show how, if it needs to, the model can convert a  $D_n.T$  value into a one-digit-accuracy SA, SC or SS value.)

Our notation shorthand for one-digit-accuracy these "conversion" bigram mappings is:

Table 7. Implementing the T operator as a bigram mapping from 2 input tokens to 1 result token.

$D_n$ vs $D'_n$	0	1	...	4	5	...	8	9
0	0	1	...	4	5	...	8	9
1	1	2	...	5	6	...	9	10
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
4	4	5	...	8	9	...	12	13
5	5	6	...	9	10	...	13	14
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
8	8	9	...	12	13	...	16	17
9	9	10	...	13	14	...	17	18

 Table 8. Converting a  $D_n.T$  value into a SA, SC or SS value.

$D_n.T$	$D_n.SA$	$D_n.SC$	$D_n.SS$
0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0
...	...	...	...
8	8	0	0
9	9	0	1
10	0	1	0
...	...	...	...
17	7	1	0
18	8	1	0

- $D_n.SA = (D_n.T \% 10)$  where  $\%$  is the modulus operator
- $D_n.SC = (D_n.T // 10)$  where  $//$  is the integer division operator
- $D_n.SS = (D_n.T == 9)$  where  $==$  is the equality operator

The  $D_0.T$  value is perfectly accurate. But the other  $D_n.T$  values are **not** perfectly accurate because each is constrained to information from just one digit. We define another more accurate operator  $D_n.T2$  that has “two-digit accuracy”.  $D_n.T2$  is the pair sum for the nth digit plus the carry bit (if any) from the n-1th digit T:

- $D_n.T2 = D_n.T + D_{n-1}.SC$

$D_n.T2$  is more accurate than  $D_n.T$ . The  $D_n.T2$  value is always in the range “0” to “19” (covering 0+0+0 to 9+9+MakeCarry). Tab. 9 show how the model can implement the T2 operator as a mapping.

Following this pattern, we define operators  $D_n.T3$ ,  $D_n.T4$  and  $D_n.T5$  with 3, 4 and 5 digit accuracy respectively:

- $D_n.T3 = D_n.T + (D_{n-1}.T2 // 10)$  aka  $D_n.T + D_{n-1}.SC2$
- $D_n.T4 = D_n.T + (D_{n-1}.T3 // 10)$  aka  $D_n.T + D_{n-1}.SC3$

 Table 9. Calculating  $D_n.T2$  from  $D_n.T$  and  $D_{n-1}.T$ 

$D_n.T$	$D_n.T2$ if $D_{n-1}.SC==0$	$D_n.T2$ if $D_{n-1}.SC==1$
0	0	1
1	1	2
...	...	...
9	9	10
10	10	11
...	...	...
17	17	18
18	18	19

- $D_n.T5 = D_n.T + (D_{n-1}.T4 // 10)$  aka  $D_n.T + D_{n-1}.SC4$

The value  $D_4.T5$  is perfectly accurate as it integrates  $SC$  and cascading  $SS$  data all the way back to and including  $D_0.T$ . The values  $D_1.T2$ ,  $D_2.T3$ ,  $D_3.T4$  are also all perfectly accurate. If the model knows these values it can calculate answer digits with perfect accuracy:

- $A_1 = D_1.T2 \% 10$  with zero loss
- $A_2 = D_2.T3 \% 10$  with zero loss
- $A_3 = D_3.T4 \% 10$  with zero loss
- $A_4 = D_4.T5 \% 10$  with zero loss
- $A_5 = D_4.T5 // 10$  with zero loss

Tab. 10 shows how the hypothesis 2 mathematical framework is applied and Figure 12 shows how this maps to the model. There are nodes that the model needs that this framework does not use, so our hypothesis is not 100% right.

 Table 10. Accurately predicting  $A_5$  in step 11 and  $A_4$  in step 12 using addition hypothesis 2

Calculation	Node
$D_1.T = D_1 + D'1$	P9.L0.H1 and P9.L0.MLP
$D_2.T = D_2 + D'2$	P8.L0.H1 and P8.L0.MLP
$D_1.T2 = D_2.T + (D_1.T + (D_0 + D_0') // 10) // 10$	P10.L0.H1 and P10.L0.MLP
$D_3.T4 = D_3 + D'3 + D_2.T3 // 10$	P11.L0.H1
$D_4.T = D_4 + D'4$	P11.L0.H2
$D_3.SC3 = D_3.T4 // 10$	P11.L0.MLP
$A_5 = (D_4.T + D_3.SC3) // 10$	P11.L1.MLP
$D_4.T5 = D_4.T + D_3.T4 // 10$	P12.L0.H0
$A_4 = D_4.T5 \% 10 // 10$	P12.L0.MLP

In this hypothesis, **all** the answer digits are perfectly calculated using the nodes in positions 8 to 11. This




Figure 12. The 5-digit 2-layer integer addition model algorithm under hypothesis 2

hypothesis 2 is feasible, elegant and compact - reflecting the authors (human) values for good code.

Experimentation shows the model does not implement this hypothesis. It retains the long staircase SA calculations in positions 11 to 16. Why? Two reasons suggest themselves:

- Hypothesis 2 is too compact. The model is not optimising for compactness. The long staircase is discovered early in training, and it works for simple questions. Once the overall algorithm gives low loss consistently it stops optimising.
- Hypothesis 2 accurately predicts **all** answer digits in step 11 - reflecting the authors (human) values for good code. The model is not motivated to do this. It just needs to accurately predict A5 as 1 or 0 in step 11 and A4 in step 12 - nothing more.

We abandoned this hypothesis.

### I. Appendix: Addition Hypothesis 3

The hypothesis 3 pseudo-code was derived iteratively by obtaining experimental results and mapping them to mathematical operations. Figure 13 shows the pseudo-code as a diagram. Some of the experiments and mappings were:

- Ablation experiments show that the A5 value is **accurately** calculated in prediction step 11 using 5 attention heads and 5 MLP layers. The pseudo-code accurately calculates A5 while constraining itself to this many steps.
- Ablating the nodes one by one shows which answer digit(s) are reliant on each node (Ref Figure 7). Most

interestingly, ablating P10.L0.H1 impacts the answer digits A5, A4, A3, A2 (but not A1 and A0). This node is used in the calculation of A5, A4, A3, A2 in prediction steps 11, 12, 13 and 14. These relationships are constraints that are all obeyed by the pseudo-code.

- The pseudo-code has 4 instances where  $D_n.ST$  is calculated using TriCase. PCA of the corresponding nodes (P8.L0.H1, P9.L0.H1, P11.L0.H2 and P14.L0.H1) shows tri-state output for the specified  $D_n$ . (see Figure 14).
- The pseudo-code has 4 instances where compound functions using TriCase and TriAdd to generate tri-state outputs. PCA of the corresponding nodes (P11.L0.H1, P12.L0.H1 and P13.L0.H1) shows tri-state output for the specified  $D_n$ . (see Figure 14).
- Activation patching (aka interchange intervention) experiments at attention head level confirmed some aspects of the calculations (see § J for details).
- The pseudo code includes calculations like D1.ST which it says is calculated in P9.L0.H1 **and** P9.L0.MLP. Ablation tells us both nodes are necessary. For the attention head we use the PCA results for insights. We didn't implement a similar investigative tool for the MLP layer, so in the pseudo-code we attribute the calculation of D1.ST to both nodes.
- For P10.L0.H1, the attention head PCA could represent either a bi-state or tri-state output (see Figure 15). The MLP layer at P10.L0.MLP could map the attention head output to either a bi-state or tri-state. We cannot see which. The pseudo-code shows a tri-state calculation at P10.L0.MLP, but with small alterations the pseudo-code would work with a bi-state output.
- For P15.L0.H1 the attention head PCA could represent either a bi-state or tri-state output (see Figure 15). The pseudo-code shows a bi-state calculation D0.SC at P15.L0.H1, but with small alterations the pseudo-code would work with a tri-state output.
- The calculation of D1.ST2 in P14.L0.H1 is a interesting case. The model needs D1.ST2 for A2 accuracy. The model could simply reuse the accurate D1.ST2 value calculated in P10. Activation patching shows that it does not. Instead the P14 attention heads calculate D1.ST1 from D1 and D'1 directly, and only relies on the P10.D1.ST2 value in the case where  $D1.ST2 \neq D1.ST$ . That is, the calculation is "use P14.D1.ST1 value else use P10.D1.ST2 values". This aligns with the model learning the P10.D1.ST calculation early in training (for 90% accuracy) and later learning that P10.D1.ST2 contains additional information it can use to get to 100% accuracy.

Table 11. Pseudo-code for accurately predicting all answer digits, with mappings to the model nodes that implement the pseudo-code, for a specific 5-digit model instance.

Value	Value calculated as	Nodes used
D2.ST	TriCase(D2, D'2)	P8.L0.H1 and P8.L0.MLP
D1.ST	TriCase(D1, D'1)	P9.L0.H1 and P9.L0.MLP
D1.ST2	TriAdd(D1.ST, TriCase(D0, D'0))	P10.L0.H1 and P10.L0.MLP
D3.ST4	TriAdd(TriCase(D3, D'3), TriAdd(D2.ST, D1.ST2))	P11.L0.H1
D4.ST	TriCase(D4, D'4)	P11.L0.H2
D4.ST5	TriAdd(D4.ST, D3.ST4)	P11.L0.MLP
<b>A5</b>	(D4.ST5 == 10)	P11.L1.MLP
D4.SA	(D4 + D'4) % 10	P12.L0.H0 + H2
D3.ST4	TriAdd(TriCase(D3, D'3), TriAdd(D2.ST, D1.ST2))	P12.L0.H1
<b>A4</b>	(D4.SA + (D3.ST4 / 10)) % 10	P12.L0.MLP and P12.L1.MLP
D3.SA	(D3 + D'3) % 10	P13.L0.H0 + H2
D2.ST3	TriAdd(D2.ST, D1.ST2)	P13.L0.H1
<b>A3</b>	(D3.SA + (D2.ST3 / 10)) % 10	P13.L0.MLP and P13.L1.MLP
D2.SA	(D2 + D'2) % 10	P14.L0.H0 + H2
D1.ST2	(D1 + D'1) / 10 + P10.D1.ST2 *	P14.L0.H1
<b>A2</b>	(D2.SA + (D1.ST2 / 10)) % 10	P14.L0.MLP and P14.L1.MLP
D1.SA	(D1 + D'1) % 10	P15.L0.H0 + H2
D0.SC	(D0 + D'0) / 10	P15.L0.H1
<b>A1</b>	(D1.SA + D0.SC) % 10	P15.L0.MLP and P15.L1.MLP
<b>A0</b>	(D0 + D'0) % 10	P16.L0.H0 + H2 P16.L0.MLP and P16.L1.MLP

### J. Appendix: Addition Interchange Interventions

To test the hypothesis 3 mapping of the mathematical framework (casual abstraction) to the model attention heads, various “interchange interventions” (aka activation patching) experiments were performed on the model, where

- A particular claim about an attention head has selected for testing.
- The model predicted answers for sample test questions, and the attention head activations were recorded (stored).
- The model then predicted answers for more questions, but this time we intervened during the prediction to




Figure 13. Our 5-digit integer addition question has 12 question tokens ( $D_n, D'_n$ ) followed by 6 answer tokens ( $A_n$ ). This *known-good* 2-layer 3-head model can perform one million predictions without error. The model’s algorithm co-ordinates computation across 9 token positions ( $P_n$ ) using 19 attention heads ( $H_n$ ) and 15 MLP layers. Three attention heads produce intermediate results that are reused in multiple prediction steps e.g. P10.L0.H1 is reused in 4 prediction steps to calculate answer digits A5 to A2.

override the selected attention head activations with the activations from the previous run.

Using this approach we obtained the findings in Tab. 12.

### K. Appendix: Six-Digit Addition

We trained a very low loss 6-digit Addition model. We compared the 5-digit and 6-digit model algorithms. Figures 6 and ?? are very instructive. So are Figures 7 and 18. We concluded that the 6-digit model used the same logical algorithm as the 5-digit model. There were some implementation differences:

- The models selected different attention heads in the early positions to do the same logical calculations.
- The 5-digit model used 2 attention heads per digit to do the SA calculation, whereas 6-digit model only uses one (and so is more compact).
- The PCA trigrams have difference appearances in the

Table 12. Interchange Interventions experiments used activation patching to test the claims addition hypothesis 3 made for each attention head. Experimental results are consistent with hypothesis 3 for all nodes.

Nodes	Claim: Attention head(s) perform ...	Finding: Attention head(s) perform a function that ...
P8.L0.H1 and MLP	$D2.ST = \text{TriCase}(D2, D'2)$ impacting A4 and A5 accuracy	Based on D2 and D'2. Triggers on a D2 carry value. Provides carry bit used in A5 and A4 calculation.
P9.L0.H1 and MLP	$D1.ST = \text{TriCase}(D1, D'1)$ impacting A5, A4 and A3 accuracy	Based on D1 and D'1. Triggers on a D1 carry value. Provides carry bit used in A5, A4 and A3 calculation.
P10.L0.H1 and MLP	$D1.ST2 = \text{TriAdd}(D1.ST, \text{TriCase}(D0, D'0))$ impacting A5, A4, A3 and A2 accuracy	Based on D0 and D'0. Triggers on a D0 carry value. Provides carry bit used in A5, A4, A3 and A2 calculation.
P11.L0.H1 and MLP	$D3.ST4 = \text{TriAdd}(\text{TriCase}(D3, D'3), \text{TriAdd}(D2.ST, D1.ST2))$ impacting A5 accuracy	Based on D3 and D'3. Triggers on a D3 carry value. Provides carry bit used in A5 calculations.
P11.L0.H2 and MLP	$D4.ST = \text{TriCase}(D4, D'4)$ impacting A5 accuracy A4	Based on D4 and D'4. Triggers on a D4 carry value. Provides carry bit used in A5 calculation.
P12.L0.H0+H2 and MLP	$D4.SA = (D4 + D'4) \% 10$ impacting A4 accuracy A4	Sums D4 and D'4. Impacts A4.
P13.L0.H0+H2 and MLP	$D3.SA = (D3 + D'3) \% 10$ impacting A3 accuracy	Sums D3 and D'3. Impacts A3.
P14.L0.H0+H2 and MLP	$D2.SA = (D2 + D'2) \% 10$ impacting A2 accuracy	Sums D2 and D'2. Impacts A2.
P14.L0.H1 and MLP	$(D1 + D'1) / 10 + P10.D1.ST2$ info impacting A2 accuracy	Calculates P10.D1.ST1 but add P10.D1.ST2 info when $D1.ST \neq D1.ST2$ . Impacts A2
P15.L0.H0+H2 and MLP	$D1.SA = (D1 + D'1) \% 10$ impacting A1 accuracy	Sums D1 and D'1. Impacts A1.
P15.L0.H1 and MLP	$D0.SC = (D0 + D'0) / 10$ impacting A1 accuracy	Triggers when $D0 + D'0 > 10$ . Impacts A1 digit by 1
P16.L0.H0+H2 and MLP	$D0.SA = (D0 + D'0) \% 10$ impacting A0 accuracy	Sums D0 and D'0. Impacts A0.

two models. Figures 14 and 19.

- For 6-digits, for A2 (only), the SA calculation is done in P18, but the SC calculation is not in P18. This is unique. The 6-digit model has optimized out the SC and instead relies solely on the accurate  $D1.ST2$  value (and so is more compact).

## L. Appendix: Six-Digit Subtraction

Integer subtraction (e.g.  $654321-789012=-0134691$ ) and integer addition have similarities. Subtraction is conceptually more complex than integer addition. While  $a + b$  and  $b + a$  give the same answer, generally  $a - b$  and  $b - a$  give difference answers. In human subtraction the algorithm used to calculate  $a - b$  changes depending on whether  $a > b$  or  $a < b$ .

In our transformer-based models, Subtraction and Addition have some similar quanta. For example:

- In addition, the first answer digit is always and “1” or “0” and this token is the hardest to calculate accurately

because of the “cascading carry 1” edge case. In subtraction, the first answer token is always “+” or “-” and this token is the hardest to calculate accurately because of the “cascading borrow 1” edge case.

- If  $a > b$  then the algorithm to calculate  $a - b$  and  $a + b$  have strong structural similarities, allowing per-digit calculations with one sub-task moving data between digits (“carry 1” or “borrow 1”)
- If  $a < b$  then the algorithm to calculate  $a - b$  can use the mathematical identity that  $1a - b = -(b - a)$ . Our intuition is that the model will calculate if  $a < b$ , and if so will reuse the  $a > b$  circuit, then negate the answer.

We created a very-low-loss 6-digit addition model. Figure ?? shows the lowest quanta impacted when ablating each node. We created a “mixed operations” model (6-digit, 3-layer, 4-head) to do both Addition and Subtraction. We initialized the untrained model with the addition model and trained it (with 80% subtraction and 20% addition questions) to be very low loss. This mixed model can predict one million addition and one million subtraction questions without error.




Figure 14. For 5-digit addition, for these attention heads, for exactly 1 answer digit  $A_n$  each, PCA shows these interpretable results. The dot colours show the TriCase value of each question. The PCA data and TriCase quanta are both tri-state and strongly correlated.




Figure 15. For 5-digit addition, for these attention heads, for exactly 1 digit  $A_n$  each, PCA shows these interpretable results. The PCA and TriCase data are strongly correlated, but the PCA data has 2 states.



Figure 16. This map shows the % of questions that fail when we ablate each node in the 6-digit 2-layer 3-head addition model. The model only uses nodes in token positions P11 to P20. Lower percentages correspond to rarer edge cases. The grey space represents nodes that are not useful.




Figure 17. This map shows the input tokens each attention head attends to at each token position. The model predicts the first answer digit A6 in token position P14, and all digit-pair sums (e.g. D2 D'2) are attended to in P11 to P14. Note the similarity to Figure 5.




Figure 18. This map shows the **answer digit(s)** A0 .. A5 impacted when we ablate each useful node in the **6-digit** 2-layer 3-head **addition** model. Note the similarity to Figure 7.

To investigate what classes of questions the model is always getting wrong, we expanded our existing addition-specific metrics, to include subtraction-specific question categorisations (see Sec. 4.3. Figures 21 and 22 maps these quanta against nodes showing which are used for addition and subtraction.

The model contains a new sub-task that stands out: The algorithm relies on calculations done at token position P0, when the model has only seen one question token! What information can the model gather from just the first token? Intuitively, if the first token is a “8” or “9” then the first answer token is more likely to be a “+” (and not a “-”). The model uses this heuristic even though this probabilistic information is sometimes incorrect and so will work against the model achieving very low loss.

### M. Appendix: Mixed Model Initialization

We experimented with three approaches to re-using the trained addition model in the “mixed” (addition and subtraction) model:

- Initialize Only: Initialize the untrained mixed model with the addition model weights before training begins.
- Freeze Attention: As per “Initialize Only”, but also every 100 training epochs recopy the attention head weights from the addition model into the partially-trained mixed model.
- Freeze All: As per “Initialize Only”, but also every 100 training epochs recopy the entire addition model (attention heads and MLP layers) into the partially-trained mixed model.




Figure 19. For 9 attention heads, for exactly 1 answer digit  $A_n$ , each, PCA shows these interpretable results for the 6-digit Addition model. The 3 dot colours show the TriCase value of each question. The PCA data and TriCase quanta are both tri-state and strongly correlated.

Our intuition was that “Initialize Only” would give the mixed model the most freedom to learn new algorithms, but that the “Freeze Attention” and “Freeze All” approaches would make the resulting trained mixed model easier to interpret (as we could reuse our addition model insights).

After experimentation we found that the “Initialize Only” approach was the only one that quickly trained to be able to do both addition and subtraction accurately. We concluded that the other two methods constrains the model’s ability to learn new algorithms too much.

We also experimented with “where” in the model we inserted the addition (6-digit, 2-layer, 3-head) model into the slightly larger (6-digit, 3-layer, 4-head) mixed model. That




Figure 20. The per-digit log-loss curves for a 6-digit 3-layer 4-head mixed model trained to perform subtraction and addition after being initialized with a very low loss addition model.




Figure 21. This map shows the simplest **complexity** quanta S0, S1, etc used in each useful node of the **6-digit** 3-layer 4-head **mixed** model when doing **addition** questions.

is, do we initialize the first 2 layers or the last 2 layers of the mixed model? Also do we initialize the first 3 attention heads or the last 3 attention heads of the mixed model? Our intuition was that initializing the first layers and heads would be more likely to cause the model to re-use the addition circuits adding interpretability, so we used this approach.



Figure 22. This map shows the simplest **complexity** quanta M0, M1, etc used in each useful node of the **6-digit** 3-layer 4-head **mixed** model for **subtraction** questions with positive answers.




Figure 23. This map shows the **answer digit(s)** A0 .. A7 impacted when we ablate each useful node in the **6-digit** 3-layer 4-head **mixed** model. A7 is the sign of the answer and calculated first. Note the similarity to the 5 and 6-addition Figures 7 and 18.