1. Element-wise attention

In Figure 1, we show additional results with our element-wise attention generation mechanism (section 3.2 in the main paper).
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Figure 1. Element-wise attention results. Each element in the latent vector (here $z_1 - z_3$) can be explained separately with our attention maps, visualizing consistent explanations across different samples.

2. MNIST Dataset

Implementation details and additional results: We resized images in the MNIST dataset to $28 \times 28$ pixels. We train our network only on one digit at a time, and then test the trained model on all other digit classes. We set the learning rate to 0.001 and batch size to 128, with a detailed network architecture shown in Table 1. Here, we present additional qualitative results in Figure 2, where we train with digit “1” and test with digit “5” and “6” respectively. These results correspond to Figure 4 in the main paper.

| Network | Layer | Output Dimensions |
|---------|-------|-------------------|
| Encoder | Conv 2D, $4 \times 4$, 64,2,1 | $14 \times 14 \times 64$ |
|         | ReLU  | $14 \times 14 \times 64$ |
|         | Conv 2D, $4 \times 4$, 128,2,1 | $7 \times 7 \times 128$ |
|         | ReLU  | $7 \times 7 \times 128$ |
|         | Flatten | 6272 |
|         | Linear | 1024 |
|         | ReLU  | 1024 |
|         | Linear | 32 |
| Decoder | Linear | 1024 |
|         | ReLU  | 1024 |
|         | Linear | 6272 |
|         | ReLU  | 6272 |
|         | Unflatten | $7 \times 7 \times 128$ |
|         | ReLU  | $7 \times 7 \times 128$ |
|         | ConvTr 2D, $4 \times 4$, 64,2,1 | $14 \times 14 \times 64$ |
|         | ReLU  | $14 \times 14 \times 64$ |
|         | ConvTr 2D, $4 \times 4$, 1,2,1 | $28 \times 28 \times 1$ |
|         | Sigmoid | $28 \times 28 \times 1$ |

Table 1. Architecture details for the one-class VAE on the MNIST dataset. The notation for “Layer” column is as follows: operation, kernel size $h \times w$, number of filter channels, stride, padding. ConvTr 2D denotes the transpose convolution layer.

3. UCSD Ped1 Dataset

Implementation details and additional results: We resized each input frame from the UCSD Ped1 dataset to $100 \times 100$ pixels, considering each image independently without any temporal knowledge. We set the learning rate to 0.0001 with a batch size of 32 frames for training. A detailed network architecture is shown in Table 2. We show more qualitative results for anomaly localization on UCSD Ped1 in Figure 3. These figures correspond to Figure 5 in the main paper.
4. MVTec-AD Dataset

Implementation details and additional results: All images are resized to $256 \times 256$ pixels. During training, we apply data augmentation with random rotations between $[-30^\circ, +30^\circ]$ and mirroring. We set the learning rate to
0.0001 and batch size to 8 for training. A detailed network architecture is shown in Table 3. We show more qualitative results for anomaly localization on the MVTec-AD dataset in Figure 4. These results correspond to Figure 6 in the main paper.

5. Attention Disentanglement

Implementation details and additional results: We resize input images to $64 \times 64$ pixels. We replace the last convolutional layer in the standard FactorVAE network with two fully connected layers with an output size of 32. A detailed network architecture is shown in Table 4. We do not perform any hyperparameter search and instead use the same training parameters as FactorVAE, which is our baseline. Figures 5, 6, and 7 show additional attention maps generated with FactorVAE [1] trained with our proposed $L_{AD}$ loss (called AD-FactorVAE in the figure) as well as the baseline FactorVAE. These results correspond to Figure 9 in the main paper. As in the main paper, in each figure, the first row shows the input images, and the next 4 rows show results with the baseline FactorVAE and our proposed method. Row 2 shows attention maps generated with FactorVAE by backpropagating from the latent dimension with the highest response, whereas row 3 shows attention maps generated by backpropagating from the latent dimension with the next highest response. Rows 4 and 5 show the corresponding attention maps with the proposed AD-FactorVAE. From these figures, we can note that for each shape (square, ellipse and heart), our proposed method results in better attention separation when compared to the baseline FactorVAE, with high-response regions in different areas in the image.
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Figure 4. Additional qualitative results on the MVTec-AD dataset.
Figure 5. Attention separations of the “Square” shape of Dsprites.

Figure 6. Attention separations of the “Ellipse” on Dsprites.
Figure 7. Attention separations of the “Heart” shape on Dsprites Dataset.
| Network | Layer | Output Dimensions |
|---------|-------|-------------------|
| Encoder | Input Image | 64 × 64 |
| Encoder | Conv 2D, 4 × 4, 32,2,1 | 32 × 32 × 32 |
| Encoder | Conv 2D, 4 × 4, 32,2,1 | 8 × 8 × 64 |
| Encoder | Conv 2D, 4 × 4, 32,2,1 | 16 × 16 × 32 |
| Encoder | Conv 2D, 4 × 4, 32,2,1 | 4 × 4 × 64 |
| Encoder | Conv 2D, 1 × 1, 32,1,0 | 32 |
| Encoder | Conv 2D, 1 × 1, 32,1,0 | 64 |

| Decoder | Input | R^{128} |
|---------|-------|---------|
| Decoder | Conv 2D, 1 × 1, 128,1,0 | 128 |
| Decoder | ConvTr 2D, 4 × 4, 64,1,0 | 4 × 4 × 64 |
| Decoder | ConvTr 2D, 4 × 4, 64,1,0 | 8 × 8 × 64 |
| Decoder | ConvTr 2D, 4 × 4, 64,1,0 | 16 × 16 × 32 |
| Decoder | ConvTr 2D, 4 × 4, 64,1,0 | 32 × 32 × 32 |
| Decoder | ConvTr 2D, 4 × 4, 64,1,0 | 64 × 64 × 1 |

Table 4. Architecture details of the AD-FactorVAE we use for training and testing on Dsprites dataset. The notation for “Layer” column is as follows: operation, kernel size h × w, number of filter channels, stride, padding. ConvTr 2D denotes 2D transpose convolution layer.