

MASSIVE ACTIVATIONS IN HYBRID LINEAR ATTENTION LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS: PRE-ATTENTION SPIKES AND INTER-SPIKE PLATEAUS

Zunhai Su^{1,2*} Bohan Sun^{1,3*} Xialie Zhuang^{1†} Shuibai Zhang^{1†} He Xiao⁴ Jing Xiong⁴
Hengyuan Zhang⁴ Zhongzhu Zhou⁵ Tiantian Zhang⁶ Ngai Wong^{4‡} Chuan-Wei Kuo^{1‡}

¹StartLux ²Tsinghua University ³University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

⁴The University of Hong Kong ⁵University of Sydney ⁶Columbia University

ABSTRACT

Hybrid linear attention large language models (HLA LLMs) combine the efficiency of linear attention with the modeling capacity of full attention, yet how layerwise hybridization reshapes their internal activation dynamics remains poorly understood. Massive activations (MAs), whose emergence and cross-layer evolution are closely coupled to the underlying attention mechanisms, offer an informative lens into these dynamics. We present the first systematic study of MAs in layer-interleaved HLA LLMs and uncover two architecture-aligned morphologies: MAs consistently spike immediately before full attention layers, forming *pre-attention spikes* (PAS), and can persist through intervening linear attention layers, giving rise to *inter-spike plateaus* (ISP). As full attention becomes denser, successive PAS become increasingly connected through ISP, ultimately recovering the stable MA morphology of full attention LLMs. We establish the recurrence of this organization across five linear attention architectures, six hybridization configurations, five data domains, and representative open-source hybrid models spanning 1.2B to 397B total parameters. Controlled pretraining of GDN-based hybrids at scales up to 1.3B shows that both morphologies emerge early and respond asymmetrically to output gating: full attention output gating strongly attenuates their absolute magnitudes without eliminating their layerwise organization, whereas removing GDN gates yields comparatively modest amplification. Mechanistically, our systematic-outlier analysis supports a shared lifecycle account governed by the timing of MA cancellation. PAS follows a localized *write-sink-cancel* process, while the extended persistence of ISP is consistent with delayed cancellation. At the full attention limit, this account recovers the stable MA morphology characteristic of full attention LLMs. Our code is available at <https://github.com/StartLuxLabs/Massive-Activations-HLA>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Softmax attention enables Transformers to model expressive, content-dependent interactions across the entire context (Vaswani et al., 2017; Team et al., 2025c; 2026c;b; 2025b). However, its computational and memory costs grow quadratically with context length, making long-context modeling prohibitively expensive (Tay et al., 2022; Su et al., 2026a; 2025a; Su & Yuan, 2025). Linear attention reduces these costs through efficient recurrent computation, but its fixed-size state restricts modeling capacity, particularly for recall-intensive tasks (Yang et al., 2023; 2025b). Hybrid linear attention (HLA) LLMs address this trade-off by interleaving linear attention layers with full attention layers, combining recurrent efficiency with the modeling capacity of attention. Layer-interleaved hybrid architectures have become increasingly common in modern LLMs, as exemplified by Qwen3-Next, Qwen3.5, Kimi Linear, Kimi K3, Zamba, and Nemotron-H (Yang et al., 2025a; Team et al., 2025a; 2026a; Blakeman et al., 2025; Glorioso et al., 2024).

*Zunhai Su and Bohan Sun contributed equally to this work.

†Xialie Zhuang and Shuibai Zhang jointly led this project.

‡Ngai Wong and Chuan-Wei Kuo are the corresponding authors.




Figure 1: **MA morphology across hybrid configurations in Gated DeltaNet HLA models.** MAs form *pre-attention spikes* (PAS) immediately before full attention layers. As full attention becomes denser, MAs increasingly persist between successive PAS, forming *inter-spike plateaus* (ISP) and ultimately converging to the stable morphology characteristic of full attention LLMs. The models are from the M-A-P Hybrid Linear Attention Research suite (Wang et al., 2025).

Despite their growing adoption, how HLA architectures reshape internal activation dynamics remains poorly understood. Of particular interest are *massive activations* (MAs), a sparse set of hidden-state entries that exceed typical activation values by several orders of magnitude and concentrate at specific token positions (Sun et al., 2024). Prior work attributes both their emergence and their close coupling with attention sinks to structural properties of softmax-based Transformers (Su et al., 2026b; Xiao et al., 2024; Sun et al., 2026; An et al., 2025; Su & Yuan, 2025). Together, these findings establish MAs as a distinctive signature of internal Transformer dynamics and an informative probe of layerwise computation. Yet their behavior beyond conventional full attention LLMs remains largely unexplored, raising a central question: *How does hybridization shape MA dynamics in HLA LLMs, and what do these dynamics reveal about their internal computation?*

In this work, we systematically investigate MAs in layer-interleaved HLA LLMs. Through extensive inference-time characterization spanning five linear attention architectures, six hybridization configurations, and five data domains (Section 3), we uncover a previously unrecognized, hybridization-dependent layerwise organization of MAs that differs qualitatively from that of full attention LLMs. As illustrated in Figure 1, MAs consistently intensify immediately before full attention layers, forming what we term *pre-attention spikes* (PAS). As full attention becomes denser, MAs increasingly persist between PAS, giving rise to *inter-spike plateaus* (ISP). At the full attention limit, these spikes and plateaus merge into the characteristic morphology of full attention LLMs, in which MAs remain relatively stable across most intermediate layers. We further observe the same architecture-aligned organization in representative open-source linear attention and state-space hybrids, including Qwen3.5, Kimi Linear, Nemotron-H, and Zamba2, spanning 1.2B to 397B total parameters (Yang et al., 2025a; Team et al., 2025a; Blakeman et al., 2025; Glorioso et al., 2024).

Beyond this inference-time characterization, controlled pretraining traces the emergence of PAS and ISP and reveals asymmetric effects of full attention and GDN output gating (Section 3.6 and Appendix D). We further apply systematic-outlier analysis to their cross-layer evolution, connecting the PAS–ISP transition to the stable MA morphology of full attention models (Section 4). Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We present the first systematic study of MAs in layer-interleaved HLA LLMs and uncover two architecture-aligned morphologies: *pre-attention spikes* (PAS) and *inter-spike plateaus* (ISP). Extensive evaluation demonstrates their recurrence across architectures, hybridization configurations, model scales, and input domains.
- Controlled pretraining of GDN-based hybrids at scales up to 1.3B shows that PAS and ISP emerge early and consolidate during optimization. Full attention output gating strongly attenuates their absolute magnitudes without eliminating their layerwise organization, whereas removing GDN output gates produces comparatively modest amplification.

- We develop a shared systematic-outlier account organized by MA cancellation timing. PAS follows a localized *write-sink-cancel* process, while the extended persistence of ISP is consistent with delayed cancellation; at the full attention limit, this account recovers the stable MA morphology of full attention LLMs.

2 PRELIMINARIES ON HYBRID LINEAR ATTENTION MODELS

HLA LLMs. Consider an autoregressive language model comprising L pre-normalized residual blocks. Given a length- T sequence of hidden states $\mathbf{X}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$, the ℓ -th block computes

$$\mathbf{H}^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{X}^{(\ell-1)} + \text{Mixer}^{(\ell)} \left(\text{Norm}_{\text{mix}}^{(\ell)} \left(\mathbf{X}^{(\ell-1)} \right) \right), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{H}^{(\ell)} + \text{FFN}^{(\ell)} \left(\text{Norm}_{\text{ffn}}^{(\ell)} \left(\mathbf{H}^{(\ell)} \right) \right), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{X}^{(\ell)}$ denotes the residual-stream representation after block ℓ . In an HLA LLM, $\text{Mixer}^{(\ell)}$ is instantiated as full attention for $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}}$ and as linear attention otherwise, where $\mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}} \subseteq \{1, \dots, L\}$ indexes the full attention layers. Letting $L_{\text{FA}} = |\mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}}|$, we define the *hybridization ratio* as $\rho = L/L_{\text{FA}}$; thus, a $\rho:1$ configuration contains one full attention layer per ρ sequence-mixing layers. Larger ρ corresponds to sparser full attention, whereas $\rho = 1$ recovers a full attention model.

Full Attention Layers. Omitting multi-head notation, full attention computes

$$[\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}] = \mathbf{X}[\mathbf{W}_Q, \mathbf{W}_K, \mathbf{W}_V], \quad \text{FA}(\mathbf{X}) = \text{softmax} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^\top}{\sqrt{d_h}} + \mathbf{M} \right) \mathbf{V}\mathbf{W}_O, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{M}$ is the additive causal mask. Full attention enables direct, content-dependent interactions with all preceding tokens but incurs quadratic complexity in T .

Linear Attention Layers. Linear attention replaces pairwise token interactions with a fixed-size recurrent state. A canonical recurrent formulation is

$$[\mathbf{q}_t, \mathbf{k}_t, \mathbf{v}_t] = \mathbf{x}_t[\mathbf{W}_Q, \mathbf{W}_K, \mathbf{W}_V], \quad \mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + \mathbf{k}_t^\top \mathbf{v}_t, \quad \mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{q}_t \mathbf{S}_t \mathbf{W}_O. \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_t$ is the recurrent state and $\mathbf{F}_t$ governs state retention. Linear attention variants differ in their state-transition and update rules, but all maintain states whose size is independent of sequence length, enabling linear-time sequence processing without a growing KV cache.


By interleaving full and linear attention across depth, HLA LLMs combine complementary sequence-mixing mechanisms whose interaction may reorganize internal computation across layers. How this interaction shapes activation dynamics remains poorly understood, motivating our study of the layerwise organization of MAs. A broader discussion of linear and hybrid linear attention, together with related work on MAs in LLMs, is provided in Appendix A.

3 MASSIVE ACTIVATION DYNAMICS IN HYBRID LINEAR ATTENTION MODELS

3.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

Analysis Roadmap. We first develop an attention-sink-guided procedure for reliably identifying and tracking MA tokens across layers (Section 3.2). We then characterize PAS across linear attention architectures (Section 3.3) and ISP across hybridization ratios (Section 3.4). Next, we test whether the same organization recurs in large-scale linear attention and state-space hybrids (Section 3.5). Finally, controlled pretraining experiments trace the emergence of both morphologies and isolate their response to output gating (Section 3.6).

Evaluation Inputs. We use “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*” as the running example. To assess cross-domain consistency, we additionally evaluate general prose from WikiText-103, scientific writing from Scientific Papers, mathematical reasoning from GSM8K, Python code from CodeSearchNet, and multilingual text from FLORES-200 (Merity et al., 2016; Cohan et al., 2018; Cobbe et al., 2021; Husain et al., 2019; Costa-Jussà et al., 2022).



(a) Best magnitude rank among the top-3 consensus sink tokens across layers. Larger bubbles indicate better magnitude-sink alignment.

(b) Frequency with which the maximally activated token changes between adjacent layers, averaged across input samples.

Figure 2: **Magnitude-sink correspondence in 1.3B HLA LLMs at a 12:1 hybridization ratio.** Compared with the full attention Transformer, HLA models exhibit less consistent alignment between attention sinks and magnitude-ranked tokens (left), together with more frequent switching of maximally activated tokens across layers (right). Gold boxes mark full attention layers.

M-A-P Model Suite. For controlled comparisons of inference-time MA behavior, we use the publicly released M-A-P model suite from Wang et al. (2025). Our analysis covers five representative linear attention architectures—RetNet, HGRN, Gated Linear Attention (GLA), DeltaNet, and Gated DeltaNet (GDN)—across multiple hybridization ratios and two parameter scales, 340M and 1.3B, under a unified pretraining recipe.¹ Together, these architectures span fixed-decay, input-dependent gating, and delta-rule state-update mechanisms (Sun et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; 2024; 2025b). Further checkpoint and pretraining details are provided in Appendix B.1.

3.2 ATTENTION-SINK-GUIDED TRACKING OF MASSIVE ACTIVATIONS

Magnitude Ranking Loses Alignment with Attention Sinks in HLA LLMs. Prior work detects MAs by selecting the hidden state entries with the largest absolute magnitudes at each layer (Sun et al., 2024). Subsequent studies show that these activations are not merely numerical anomalies but a key component of a systematic outlier mechanism in Transformers; tokens carrying MAs frequently attract a disproportionate share of attention mass and coincide with attention sinks (An et al., 2025; Sun et al., 2026; Su & Yuan, 2025; Su et al., 2026b). In full attention LLMs, this alignment between numerical magnitude and functional attention behavior makes layerwise magnitude ranking a useful proxy for tracing MAs across depth. Our empirical analysis, however, reveals a previously overlooked fragility under hybridization.

As shown in Figure 2, attention sink tokens exhibit lower and less stable magnitude rankings across depth in HLA LLMs than in the full attention baseline, while the maximally activated token switches more frequently between adjacent layers. We therefore complement magnitude ranking with attention behavior, using consensus attention sinks as stable, attention-derived token anchors.

Consensus Attention Sinks as Token Anchors. For each input x , let $\mathbf{A}_x^{(\ell,h)} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$ denote the causal attention matrix of head h in full attention layer ℓ , where $A_{x,q,t}^{(\ell,h)}$ is the attention probability assigned by query token q to source token t . We identify the dominant consensus sink as

$$t_x^* = \arg \max_{1 \leq t < T} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}}|H|\mathcal{Q}_t|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}}} \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_t} A_{x,q,t}^{(\ell,h)}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_t = \{q : q > t\}. \quad (5)$$

Averaging across layers and heads suppresses local fluctuations, while normalization by $|\mathcal{Q}_t|$ accounts for variation in the number of valid queries across source positions.

Sink-Conditioned Activation Tracing. We fix the identified token position and trace its maximum absolute hidden-state activation across model depth as $m_{x,t_x^*}^{(\ell)} = \|\mathbf{X}_{x,t_x^*}^{(\ell)}\|_\infty = \max_j |X_{x,t_x^*,j}^{(\ell)}|$. This procedure preserves token identity while allowing the maximally activated feature to evolve across depth. The attention distribution determines only which token is tracked; whether and how strongly that token exhibits an MA remains determined by its activation magnitude.

¹<https://huggingface.co/collections/m-a-p/hybrid-linear-attention-research>




Figure 3: **Pre-attention spikes across linear attention architectures.** First-token MA trajectories are shown for 1.3B models under a fixed 12:1 hybridization ratio. Across all five HLA architectures, the first token, a prevalent attention sink, develops pronounced activation maxima immediately before full attention layers. A full attention Transformer is included as a reference. All checkpoints are drawn from the M-A-P Hybrid Linear Attention Research suite (Wang et al., 2025).

3.3 MASSIVE ACTIVATION DYNAMICS ACROSS LINEAR ATTENTION ARCHITECTURES

For the qualitative analysis, we hold the model scale and hybridization ratio fixed at 1.3B parameters and 12:1, respectively, varying only the linear attention mechanism.

Qualitative Observations. Our analysis yields two main observations. First, across the examined models and inputs, attention sinks occur primarily at the initial input token, punctuation or delimiter tokens such as newlines, periods, and commas, and semantically light function words such as *the*, *is*, *of*, and *in*. These preferences closely mirror the token categories previously associated with MAs (Sun et al., 2024). Because the first token is the most prevalent sink position, we focus on its MA dynamics in the main analysis; results for other token positions are provided in Appendix B.2.

Second, despite substantial differences in their recurrent state-transition mechanisms, HLA models constructed with all five linear attention backbones exhibit the same structural regularity. As shown in Figure 3, sink-associated activations develop pronounced local maxima immediately before full attention layers. We term these architecture-aligned maxima *pre-attention spikes* (PAS). The PAS morphology recurs across all five M-A-P evaluation domains, with architecture- and scale-dependent variations detailed in Appendix B.3.

Quantitative Analysis. To quantify the positional consistency of PAS, we identify a consensus sink token t_x^* for each input x using Equation 5. Let $m_{x,t}^{(\ell)} = \|\mathbf{X}_{x,t}^{(\ell)}\|_\infty$ denote the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of token t at layer ℓ for input x . For each full attention layer $f \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}}$, let $\mathcal{B}_f$ denote the contiguous block of linear attention layers immediately preceding f , with $f - 1 \in \mathcal{B}_f$. Given an evaluation set $\mathcal{D}$, we define the *sink-spike alignment rate* as

$$\text{Align}(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}||\mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}}} \mathbf{1} \left[f - 1 \in \arg \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{B}_f} m_{x,t_x^*}^{(\ell)} \right], \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{1}[\cdot]$ denotes the indicator function. This metric measures the proportion of input-layer pairs involving full attention for which the consensus sink attains its maximum activation over the preceding linear attention block at layer $f - 1$. We evaluate the metric on 500 inputs, with 100 drawn from each of the five domains, and report both domain-specific results and their macro-average. As shown in Table 1, macro-average pre-attention localization remains consistently high across all ten architecture-scale pairs. Additional comparisons with non-sink tokens, the first token, and a random-layer baseline confirm that consensus sinks exhibit significantly stronger PAS localization and peak prominence than non-sink controls. Additional control results and paired-bootstrap significance checks are provided in Appendix B.5.

Table 1: **Sink-spike alignment rates in M-A-P HLA models (%)**. Results are reported for different linear attention backbones under the 12:1 hybridization ratio. Each entry denotes 1.3B/340M, and Overall is the macro-average across the five evaluation domains.

Linear Attention	WikiText	Scientific Papers	GSM8K	CodeSearchNet	FLORES	Overall
RetNet	99.5 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	99.9 / 100.0
HGRN	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0
GLA	100.0 / 99.5	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 98.5	100.0 / 99.6
DeltaNet	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 98.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 99.5	100.0 / 99.5	100.0 / 99.4
GDN	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0	100.0 / 100.0

3.4 MASSIVE ACTIVATION DYNAMICS ACROSS HYBRIDIZATION RATIOS

We next isolate the effect of hybridization by holding the linear attention backbone fixed and varying $\rho \in \{24, 12, 6, 3\}$, where $\rho = L/L_{\text{FA}}$ denotes the number of sequence-mixing layers per full attention layer, as defined in Section 2. Pure linear attention and full attention models serve as the two limiting reference configurations.

Qualitative Observations. The comparison reveals two main patterns. First, Figure 1 illustrates this behavior using GDN as a representative example: PAS persist across all examined hybrid configurations, while their layerwise morphology varies systematically with the hybridization ratio. When full attention is sparse, PAS are sharply localized and separated by pronounced activation troughs. As full attention becomes denser, the intervening activations remain progressively more elevated, bridging successive PAS into sustained regions that we term *inter-spike plateaus* (ISP).

Second, the onset of ISP varies across linear attention architectures. As shown in Figure 19 in Appendix B.4, ISP begins to emerge at the 6:1 ratio in DeltaNet, whereas comparable inter-spike persistence appears primarily at 3:1 in GDN. At the full attention limit, the distinction between individual PAS and intervening ISP disappears, yielding a model-wide plateau that spans most of the network depth and recovers the characteristic MA morphology of conventional full attention LLMs. This limiting behavior connects the distinct PAS-ISP organization of HLA LLMs to the stable MA dynamics observed in full attention models.

Quantitative Analysis. To quantify the persistence of MAs between adjacent PAS, we use the input-specific consensus sink token t_x^* and activation magnitude $m_{x,t}^{(\ell)} = \|\mathbf{X}_{x,t,:}^{(\ell)}\|_\infty$. Let $\mathcal{I}_{\text{FA}} = \{f_1 < \dots < f_K\}$ denote the ordered full attention layers and $p_i = f_i - 1$ their corresponding pre-attention layers. For each adjacent pair of PAS, we define $\mathcal{J}_i = \{\ell : p_i < \ell < p_{i+1}\}$ as the set of layers strictly between them. Given an evaluation set $\mathcal{D}$, we define the *inter-spike retention score* as

Table 2: **Inter-spike retention scores in M-A-P HLA models (%)**. Each entry denotes 1.3B/340M, macro-averaged across five domains with 100 inputs per domain.

Linear Attention	12:1	6:1	3:1
RetNet	18.8 / 36.8	60.0 / 69.8	85.4 / 87.2
HGRN	7.2 / 5.0	40.2 / 49.6	92.5 / 81.2
GLA	27.3 / 31.9	51.7 / 61.6	88.0 / 88.1
DeltaNet	23.1 / 46.5	44.6 / 82.8	84.4 / 99.8
GDN	18.4 / 39.7	26.6 / 45.2	77.8 / 86.7

$$\text{ISR}(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{J}_i|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{J}_i} \min \left(1, \frac{m_{x,t_x^*}^{(\ell)}}{\min(m_{x,t_x^*}^{(p_i)}, m_{x,t_x^*}^{(p_{i+1})})} \right). \quad (7)$$

This metric measures the activation retained throughout the inter-spike interval relative to the weaker of the two adjacent PAS. Clipping each ratio at one prevents activations exceeding this reference level from disproportionately increasing the score. Values near zero indicate substantial inter-spike decay, whereas values near one indicate a sustained ISP. We evaluate ISR on 500 inputs, with 100 drawn from each of the five domains, and report the macro-average across domains. As shown in Table 2, inter-spike retention consistently increases with full attention density across architectures and model scales. Paired bootstrap analysis and a companion analysis of absolute inter-spike activation further support this trend; complete results and uncertainty estimates are provided in Appendix B.5.




Figure 4: **MA dynamics in representative large-scale pretrained hybrid models.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token in “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*” across model depth. Red dashed lines mark layers immediately preceding full attention, while green dotted lines mark full attention layers. Additional checkpoints and input domains are provided in Appendix C.2.

3.5 EVALUATION ON LARGE-SCALE PRETRAINED HYBRID MODELS

To determine whether PAS and ISP extend beyond the controlled M-A-P suite, we evaluate 12 publicly available checkpoints from Kimi Linear, Qwen3.5, Nemotron-H, and Zamba2. These models span 1.2B to 397B total parameters, linear attention and state-space mixers, periodic and nonuniform attention schedules, and both base and instruction-tuned variants.

The four families provide complementary tests of the phenomenon. Kimi Linear combines Kimi Delta Attention with periodic global MLA layers, while Qwen3.5 interleaves Gated DeltaNet with output-gated full attention in a fixed 3:1 pattern. Nemotron-H combines Mamba-2 with sparse, partly nonuniform self-attention, whereas Zamba2 periodically inserts shared Transformer blocks into a Mamba2 backbone (Team et al., 2025a; Yang et al., 2025a; Blakeman et al., 2025; Glorioso et al., 2024). This collection enables comparisons across post-training stages, model scales, sequence-mixing mechanisms, and full attention schedules. Detailed architectures, layer schedules, and checkpoint information are provided in Appendix C.1. Figure 4 shows six representative checkpoints; results for all checkpoints and input domains are provided in Appendix C.2. The comparison yields four main findings:

- **Consistency across post-training stages.** The matched Kimi Linear Base and Instruct checkpoints retain closely aligned PAS locations and ISP boundaries despite differences in activation magnitude, showing that the PAS–ISP organization persists across this pair.
- **Recurrence across model scales.** Across the evaluated Qwen3.5 checkpoints, PAS and ISP remain aligned with full attention placement despite non-monotonic variation in their prominence and magnitude, indicating that layerwise morphology is more stable than amplitude across these model sizes.
- **Recurrence across sequence mixers.** PAS and ISP occur in both linear attention and state-space hybrids. Their consistent alignment with full attention suggests that this organization is associated with layer-interleaved hybridization and is not restricted to a particular linear-time sequence mixer.
- **Consistency across domain inputs.** Across representative inputs from five domains, PAS locations and ISP spans remain stable while their magnitudes vary, suggesting that hybrid architecture primarily organizes their layerwise positions, whereas input content modulates their strength.

Together, these results show that PAS and ISP recur as architecture-aligned forms of MA organization across the evaluated large-scale hybrid models.




Figure 5: **PAS emergence and response to output gating under controlled pretraining.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth at successive 1B-token checkpoints for a 340M GDN model trained using the Flash Linear Attention framework (Yang & Zhang, 2024), with full attention placed at layer 12. PAS emerges early and strengthens during pretraining. Full attention output gating attenuates but does not eliminate PAS, whereas removing the native GDN output gates moderately increases its magnitude.

3.6 CONTROLLED PRETRAINING STUDIES OF PAS AND ISP

Controlled Pretraining Models. We use controlled pretraining to examine how PAS and ISP emerge during optimization and how output gating in full attention and GDN layers regulates their development. Using the Flash Linear Attention framework (Yang & Zhang, 2024), we train 24-layer GDN-based models from scratch at the 340M and 1.3B scales.² Within each comparison, we vary only the targeted layer placement or gating intervention while holding all other architectural and training settings fixed. Complete training recipes are provided in Appendix D.1. The trained checkpoints are publicly available at <https://huggingface.co/startlux-models/Massive-Activations-HLA>.

Training-Time Emergence of PAS and ISP. To study PAS, we insert a single full attention layer at an early, middle, or late depth in a 24-layer GDN model and evaluate the representative middle-layer configuration at both the 340M and 1.3B scales. For ISP, we train 340M and 1.3B models with a 3:1 hybridization ratio. Throughout pretraining, we trace first-token MA trajectories at regular intervals: every 1B tokens for the 340M models and every 5B tokens for the 1.3B models. Across all three 340M placements and the corresponding 1.3B middle-layer configuration, PAS consistently forms immediately before the full attention layer and shifts predictably with its placement. In the representative layer-12 configuration shown in Figure 5a, PAS is already visible after 1B training tokens and becomes progressively more pronounced and stable. The ISP trajectory in Figure 13a likewise emerges early and consolidates during optimization. Together, these results show that both morphologies develop systematically during pretraining rather than being artifacts of selected pre-trained checkpoints. Further experimental results and detailed analyses of PAS and ISP are provided in Appendices D.3 and D.4, respectively.

Effects of Output Gating. Recent work shows that element-wise output gating can eliminate MAs and their associated attention sinks in full attention Transformers (Su et al., 2026b; Qiu et al., 2026). We therefore test two complementary interventions in HLA LLMs: adding output gates to full attention layers and removing the native gates from GDN layers. Full attention output gating markedly attenuates PAS, although a small pre-attention peak persists throughout training (Figure 5b). By contrast, removing GDN output gates produces only a moderate increase in PAS magnitude (Figure 5c). The ISP trajectories exhibit the same asymmetry: gating full attention markedly reduces the plateau, whereas removing GDN gates has a comparatively modest effect (Figure 13).

Despite being applied to fewer layers, full attention output gates produce larger changes in both morphologies. This disproportionate response indicates that full attention plays a central role in organizing MA dynamics, while GDN gating mainly modulates their propagation. Nevertheless, weak PAS and ISP persist and become increasingly visible during training, showing that output gating attenuates rather than eliminates the architecture-aligned organization. Consistently, Qwen3.5 models with native full attention output gating still exhibit both morphologies (Figures 20c–20f; Appendix C.2). Further controlled results are provided in Appendix D.5.

²<https://github.com/fla-org/flash-linear-attention>




Figure 6: **Localized write-sink-cancel lifecycle underlying PAS.** A representative 1.3B GDN model with a 12:1 hybridization ratio is shown. A large outlier is written immediately before full attention and subsequently reduced by an opposite-signed update. Detailed fixed-coordinate evidence is provided in Appendix E.1.

4 A SYSTEMATIC-OUTLIER ACCOUNT OF PAS AND ISP

The preceding analyses characterize MA morphology in HLA LLMs but leave its cross-layer origin unresolved. Building on the systematic-outlier framework in (An et al., 2025; Su & Yuan, 2025; Su et al., 2025b), we trace signed outlier dynamics across layers and verify a representative PAS at a fixed token-feature coordinate, relating its evolution to attention-sink behavior. Together with recurring layerwise patterns across models, this analysis supports a shared lifecycle account organized by MA cancellation timing: localized cancellation produces PAS, while the extended persistence of ISP is consistent with delayed cancellation. The following sections present the fixed-coordinate evidence for PAS and the broader evidence for this account.

4.1 PRE-ATTENTION SPIKES: LOCALIZED WRITE-SINK-CANCEL

A Systematic-Outlier Account of PAS. By extending systematic-outlier analysis from full attention LLMs to HLA LLMs, we provide a mechanism-level account of PAS. Across linear attention architectures and hybridization configurations, PAS consistently appears as a coordinated cross-layer event rather than an isolated numerical fluctuation. Figure 6 illustrates this lifecycle in a representative 1.3B GDN model with a 12:1 hybridization ratio. Pronounced MAs repeatedly arise immediately before full attention and dissipate during subsequent computation. The signed decomposition reveals a characteristic write-cancel pairing: the pre-attention layer writes a large outlier into the residual stream, while a subsequent opposite-signed update substantially cancels it. The recurrence of this signed write-cancel structure across models supports a systematic lifecycle underlying PAS.

Fixed-Coordinate Verification of Write-Sink-Cancel. To verify that this rise and fall reflect the evolution of the same outlier rather than switches among independently selected layerwise maxima, we examine the PAS preceding the full attention layer $f = 12$ in the same model. Let t^* denote the consensus sink token, and let $j^* = \arg \max_j |X_{t^*,j}^{(f-1)}|$ denote its maximally activated feature at the corresponding pre-attention layer. We trace the signed activation and module-level updates at this fixed coordinate through the subsequent computation. Figures 14–16 in Appendix E.1 separately visualize outlier formation, attention-sink coupling, and dissipation.

The analysis reveals three stages. First, the pre-attention layer writes an extreme value into the residual stream. Second, during full attention, token t^* receives a disproportionate share of attention from subsequent queries and acts as an attention sink. Third, a subsequent opposite-signed update at the same coordinate substantially cancels the outlier, causing the PAS to dissipate. Together, these stages establish the representative PAS as a localized *write-sink-cancel* event linking fixed-coordinate outlier dynamics to full attention sink behavior. Its recurrence is further supported by layerwise systematic-outlier analyses across M-A-P hybrids with diverse linear attention mechanisms and large-scale open-source linear attention and state-space hybrids (Appendix E.2).




Figure 7: **ISP as a delayed-cancellation regime of the systematic-outlier lifecycle.** A large outlier written immediately before full attention remains prominent across the intervening linear attention layers and is followed by an opposite-signed update as the plateau dissipates.

4.2 INTER-SPIKE PLATEAUS: EXTENDED OUTLIER PERSISTENCE

A Shared Lifecycle Distinguished by Cancellation Timing. The preceding analysis establishes PAS as a localized *write-sink-cancel* event. Extending the signed systematic-outlier analysis to ISP reveals a corresponding pattern that unfolds over substantially greater depth. As shown in Figure 7, a large outlier is written immediately before full attention, remains prominent throughout the intervening linear attention layers, and is followed by a later opposite-signed update as the plateau dissipates. This correspondence supports interpreting PAS and ISP as two temporal regimes of a shared systematic-outlier lifecycle. Within this account, rapid cancellation confines the outlier to a localized PAS, while the extended persistence of ISP is consistent with delayed cancellation across the inter-spike interval. Cancellation timing, rather than a separate formation pattern, therefore provides a unified account of the two morphologies. Systematic-outlier analyses across M-A-P hybrids and large-scale open-source linear attention and state-space hybrids further support this recurring pattern; complete results are provided in Appendix E.2.

Connection to the Full Attention Limit. The hybridization-dependent transition observed in Section 3.4 admits a unified interpretation through cancellation timing. As full attention becomes denser, the increasing persistence that connects successive PAS through ISP is consistent with progressively deferred cancellation. At the full attention limit, this progression recovers the stable MA morphology characteristic of conventional full attention models. Within the cancellation-timing account, PAS, ISP, and persistent full attention MAs form a continuum of increasing outlier persistence. Determining what regulates cancellation timing, and whether transient PAS and persistent ISP support distinct computational roles, remains an important direction for future work.

5 CONCLUSION

We presented the first systematic study of massive activations in layer-interleaved HLA LLMs and identified two architecture-aligned morphologies: *pre-attention spikes* (PAS) and *inter-spike plateaus* (ISP). Extensive inference-time analyses demonstrate their recurrence across the evaluated architectures, hybridization configurations, model scales, and input domains, while controlled pre-training shows that both emerge early and are attenuated, but not eliminated, by full attention output gating. Mechanistically, PAS and ISP follow a shared systematic-outlier lifecycle distinguished by cancellation timing: prompt cancellation localizes MAs as PAS, whereas delayed cancellation sustains them across layers as ISP. At the full attention limit, this progression recovers the stable MA morphology of conventional full attention LLMs. Together, these findings establish MAs as an informative lens for understanding hybrid attention and motivate further investigation into the factors governing cancellation timing and its computational implications.

6 ETHICS STATEMENT

This research adheres to established ethical standards in the field. All data used in experiments were obtained from publicly available sources or with appropriate permissions, and no sensitive or personally identifiable information was utilized. LLMs were used to assist with language editing and research-workflow organization; all experimental procedures, reported results, and scientific claims were independently verified and approved by the authors. The authors have taken care to ensure that the research findings are accurate, unbiased, and presented responsibly, with consideration for potential societal impacts.

7 REPRODUCIBILITY STATEMENT

The appendix documents the evaluated checkpoints, datasets, analysis metrics, controlled-pretraining configurations, hyperparameters, and benchmark protocols used in this work. We will release the analysis code and configuration files needed to reproduce the reported measurements at the repository linked in the abstract.

REFERENCES

- Yongqi An, Xu Zhao, Tao Yu, Ming Tang, and Jinqiao Wang. Systematic outliers in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.06415*, 2025.
- Simran Arora, Aman Timalsina, Aaryan Singhal, Benjamin Spector, Sabri Eyuboglu, Xinyi Zhao, Ashish Rao, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. Just read twice: closing the recall gap for recurrent language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05483*, 2024.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, pp. 7432–7439, 2020.
- Aaron Blakeman, Aarti Basant, Abhinav Khattar, Adithya Renduchintala, Akhiad Bercovich, Aleksander Ficek, Alexis Bjorlin, Ali Taghibakhshi, Amala Sanjay Deshmukh, Ameya Sunil Mahabaleshwarkar, et al. Nemotron-h: A family of accurate and efficient hybrid mamba-transformer models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.03624*, 2025.
- Ruisheng Cao, Mouxiang Chen, Jiawei Chen, Zeyu Cui, Yunlong Feng, Binyuan Hui, Yuheng Jing, Kaixin Li, Mingze Li, Junyang Lin, et al. Qwen3-coder-next technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.00729*, 2026.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Arman Cohan, Franck Dernoncourt, Doo Soon Kim, Trung Bui, Seokhwan Kim, Walter Chang, and Nazli Goharian. A discourse-aware attention model for abstractive summarization of long documents. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pp. 615–621, 2018.
- Marta R Costa-Jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, et al. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*, 2022.
- Jorge Gallego-Feliciano, S Aaron McClendon, Juan Morinelli, Stavros Zervoudakis, and Antonios Saravanos. Hidden dynamics of massive activations in transformer training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03616*, 2025.

- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, et al. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation. *Zenodo*, 2021.
- Paolo Glorioso, Quentin Anthony, Yury Tokpanov, Anna Golubeva, Vasudev Shyam, James Whittington, Jonathan Pilault, and Beren Millidge. The zamba2 suite: Technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15242*, 2024.
- Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.
- Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Simeng Sun, Samuel Kriman, Shantanu Acharya, Dima Rekish, Fei Jia, Yang Zhang, and Boris Ginsburg. Ruler: What’s the real context size of your long-context language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06654*, 2024.
- Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. Codesearchnet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09436*, 2019.
- Tom Kwiakowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:453–466, 2019.
- Aonian Li, Bangwei Gong, Bo Yang, Boji Shan, Chang Liu, Cheng Zhu, Chunhao Zhang, Congchao Guo, Da Chen, Dong Li, et al. Minimax-01: Scaling foundation models with lightning attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.08313*, 2025.
- Opher Lieber, Barak Lenz, Hofit Bata, Gal Cohen, Jhonathan Osin, Itay Dalmedigos, Erez Safahi, Shaked Meir, Yonatan Belinkov, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, et al. Jamba: A hybrid transformer-mamba language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19887*, 2024.
- Colin Lockard, Prashant Shiralkar, and Xin Luna Dong. Openceres: When open information extraction meets the semi-structured web. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 3047–3056, 2019.
- Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. Pointer sentinel mixture models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07843*, 2016.
- Guilherme Penedo, Hynek Kydlíček, Anton Lozhkov, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Leandro Von Werra, Thomas Wolf, et al. The fineweb datasets: Decanting the web for the finest text data at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:30811–30849, 2024.
- Zhen Qin, Songlin Yang, and Yiran Zhong. Hierarchically gated recurrent neural network for sequence modeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:33202–33221, 2023.
- Zihan Qiu, Zekun Wang, Bo Zheng, Zeyu Huang, Kaiyue Wen, Songlin Yang, Rui Men, Le Yu, Fei Huang, Suozhi Huang, et al. Gated attention for large language models: Non-linearity, sparsity, and attention-sink-free. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:100092–100118, 2026.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. Know what you don’t know: Unanswerable questions for squad. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 784–789, 2018.
- Zeru Shi, Zhenting Wang, Fan Yang, Qifan Wang, and Ruixiang Tang. A single layer to explain them all: Understanding massive activations in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.08504*, 2026.
- Zunhai Su and Kehong Yuan. Kvsink: Understanding and enhancing the preservation of attention sinks in kv cache quantization for llms. In *Second Conference on Language Modeling (COLM 2025)*, 2025.

- Zunhai Su, Zhe Chen, Wang Shen, Hanyu Wei, Linge Li, Huangqi Yu, and Kehong Yuan. Rotatekv: Accurate and robust 2-bit kv cache quantization for llms via outlier-aware adaptive rotations. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence Article No.: 690, Pages 6200 - 6208*, 2025a.
- Zunhai Su, Qingyuan Li, Hao Zhang, Weihao Ye, Qibo Xue, YuLei Qian, Yuchen Xie, Ngai Wong, and Kehong Yuan. Unveiling super experts in mixture-of-experts large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations 2026, 118323-118354*, 2025b.
- Zunhai Su, Rui Yang, Chao Zhang, Yaxiu Liu, Yifan Zhang, Wei Wu, Jing Xiong, Dayou Du, Xialie Zhuang, Yulei Qian, et al. Oscar: The occam’s razor for extreme kv cache quantization in llms and beyond. *Under review*, 2026a.
- Zunhai Su, Hengyuan Zhang, Wei Wu, Yifan Zhang, Yaxiu Liu, He Xiao, Qingyao Yang, Yuxuan Sun, Rui Yang, Chao Zhang, et al. Attention sink in transformers: A survey on utilization, interpretation, and mitigation. *Under review*, 2026b.
- Mingjie Sun, Xinlei Chen, J Zico Kolter, and Zhuang Liu. Massive activations in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17762*, 2024.
- Shangwen Sun, Alfredo Canziani, Yann LeCun, and Jiachen Zhu. The spike, the sparse and the sink: Anatomy of massive activations and attention sinks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.05498*, 2026.
- Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, Yuqing Xia, Jilong Xue, Jianyong Wang, and Furu Wei. Retentive network: A successor to transformer for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08621*, 2023.
- Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Dara Bahri, and Donald Metzler. Efficient transformers: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(6):1–28, 2022.
- Kimi Team, Yu Zhang, Zongyu Lin, Xingcheng Yao, Jiaxi Hu, Fanqing Meng, Chengyin Liu, Xin Men, Songlin Yang, Zhiyuan Li, et al. Kimi linear: An expressive, efficient attention architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26692*, 2025a.
- Kimi Team, Tongtong Bai, Yifan Bai, Yiping Bao, Jianfeng Cai, Xinyuan Cai, Peizhou Cao, Yuxuan Cao, Ziwei Chai, Y Charles, et al. Kimi k3: Open frontier intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.24653*, 2026a.
- Meituan LongCat Team, Anchun Gui, Bei Li, Bingyang Tao, Bole Zhou, Borun Chen, Chao Zhang, Chengcheng Han, Chenhui Yang, Chi Zhang, et al. Introducing longcat-flash-thinking: A technical report. *LongCat LLM Technical Report*, 2025b.
- Meituan LongCat Team, Bei Li, Bingye Lei, Bo Wang, Bolin Rong, Chao Wang, Chao Zhang, Chen Gao, Chen Zhang, Cheng Sun, et al. Longcat-flash technical report. *LongCat LLM Technical Report*, 2025c.
- Meituan LongCat Team, Anchun Gui, Bei Li, Bingyang Tao, Bole Zhou, Borun Chen, Chao Zhang, Chen Gao, Chen Zhang, Chengcheng Han, et al. Longcat-flash-thinking-2601 technical report. *LongCat LLM Technical Report*, 2026b.
- Meituan LongCat Team, Bin Xiao, Chao Wang, Chengjiang Li, Chi Zhang, Chong Peng, Hang Yu, Hao Yang, Haonan Yan, Haoze Sun, et al. Longcat-next: Lexicalizing modalities as discrete tokens. *LongCat LLM Technical Report*, 2026c.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Dustin Wang, Rui-Jie Zhu, Steven Abreu, Yong Shan, Taylor Kergan, Yuqi Pan, Yuhong Chou, Zheng Li, Jibin Wu, Ge Zhang, et al. A systematic analysis of hybrid linear attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06457*, 2025.

- Guangxuan Xiao, Yuandong Tian, Beidi Chen, Song Han, and Mike Lewis. Efficient streaming language models with attention sinks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pp. 21875–21895, 2024.
- He Xiao, Qingyao Yang, Dirui Xie, Wendong Xu, Zunhai Su, Runming Yang, Haobo Liu, Wenyong Zhou, Zhengwu Liu, and Ngai Wong. Exploring layer-wise information effectiveness for post-training quantization in small language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pp. 15753–15764, 2026.
- An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025a.
- Songlin Yang and Yu Zhang. FLA: A triton-based library for hardware-efficient implementations of linear attention mechanisms. <https://github.com/fla-org/flash-linear-attention>, 2024. GitHub repository.
- Songlin Yang, Bailin Wang, Yikang Shen, Rameswar Panda, and Yoon Kim. Gated linear attention transformers with hardware-efficient training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06635*, 2023.
- Songlin Yang, Bailin Wang, Yu Zhang, Yikang Shen, and Yoon Kim. Parallelizing linear transformers with the delta rule over sequence length. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37:115491–115522, 2024.
- Songlin Yang, Jan Kautz, and Ali Hatamizadeh. Gated delta networks: Improving mamba2 with delta rule. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pp. 29687–29707, 2025b.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pp. 4791–4800, 2019.
- Hengyuan Zhang, Xinrong Chen, Zunhai Su, Xiao Liang, Jing Xiong, Wendong Xu, He Xiao, Chaofan Tao, Wei Zhang, Ruobing Xie, et al. Beyond outliers: A data-free layer-wise mixed-precision quantization approach driven by numerical and structural dual-sensitivity. *Under review*, 2026a.
- Hengyuan Zhang, Zhihao Zhang, Mingyang Wang, Zunhai Su, Yiwei Wang, Qianli Wang, Shuzhou Yuan, Ercong Nie, Xufeng Duan, Qibo Xue, et al. Locate, steer, and improve: A practical survey of actionable mechanistic interpretability in large language models. *Computer Science Review*, 62:101011, 2026b.

APPENDIX CONTENTS

A	Related Work	16
A.1	Linear Attention and Hybrid Linear Attention Models	16
A.2	Massive Activations in Large Language Models	16
B	MA Dynamics in the M-A-P Model Suite	16
B.1	Model Suite and Pretraining Details	16
B.2	MA Dynamics across Token Positions	17
B.3	MA Dynamics across Input Domains	18
B.4	MA Dynamics across Linear Attention Backbones and Hybridization Ratios	18
B.5	Statistical Controls and Uncertainty	18
C	MA Dynamics in Large-Scale Pretrained Hybrid Models	20
C.1	Model Families and Evaluated Checkpoints	20
C.2	MA Dynamics across Models and Input Domains	21
D	Controlled Pretraining Studies of PAS and ISP	21
D.1	Experimental Setup and Analysis Overview	21
D.2	Downstream Evaluation Protocol	22
D.3	Training-Time Emergence of PAS	23
D.4	Training-Time Emergence of ISP	24
D.5	Effects of Output Gating on PAS and ISP	25
E	Additional Systematic-Outlier Analyses of PAS and ISP	27
E.1	Fixed-Coordinate Systematic-Outlier Analysis of PAS	27
E.2	Cross-Model Systematic-Outlier Analyses	29

A RELATED WORK

A.1 LINEAR ATTENTION AND HYBRID LINEAR ATTENTION MODELS

Linear attention replaces pairwise token interactions with recurrent state updates, enabling linear-time sequence processing with fixed-size states. Representative architectures include RetNet, which introduces decay-based retention; HGRN and GLA, which improve state control through hierarchical and input-dependent gating; and DeltaNet, which employs delta-rule updates to selectively modify associative memory (Sun et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; 2024). GDN further augments the delta rule with data-dependent forgetting, while closely related state space models such as Mamba achieve similar efficiency through selective state transitions (Yang et al., 2025b; Gu & Dao, 2023). Because fixed-size states can limit precise recall, recent LLMs increasingly interleave recurrent mixers with full attention layers. Representative examples include Jamba and Nemotron-H, which combine Mamba with full attention; MiniMax-01, which combines Lightning Attention with softmax attention; Qwen3-Next and Qwen3.5, which interleave GDN with gated attention; and Kimi Linear, which combines Kimi Delta Attention with Multi-Head Latent Attention (Lieber et al., 2024; Blakeman et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025; Cao et al., 2026; Team et al., 2025a). These hybrid architectures achieve favorable performance–efficiency trade-offs, but their internal activation dynamics remain poorly understood.

A.2 MASSIVE ACTIVATIONS IN LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

MAs were first identified as extremely sparse hidden-state outliers whose magnitudes exceed typical activations by several orders of magnitude. They persist across layers, remain largely invariant to input content, and function as implicit bias terms closely associated with attention sinks (Sun et al., 2024). Subsequent work connects MAs to a broader system of activation, weight, and attention outliers; traces their sources to super experts in MoE LLMs; and links their cross-layer evolution to attention sinks (An et al., 2025; Su et al., 2025b; Su & Yuan, 2025). Recent analyses further identify pre-normalization as central to the coupling between MAs and attention sinks, trace their emergence to RMSNorm and FFN computation, and explain their propagation through residual connections (Sun et al., 2026; Shi et al., 2026). Beyond their mechanistic role, MAs create a challenging numerical regime for low-bit inference (Zhang et al., 2026b). Although distinct from conventional channel-wise outlier features, their extreme magnitudes broaden the tensor dynamic range; under activation or KV cache quantization, a small number of such values can dominate shared scales, reduce the resolution available to typical values, and amplify quantization error. This challenge motivates outlier-aware transformations and sink-preserving KV cache quantization methods (Zhang et al., 2026a; Xiao et al., 2026; Su et al., 2025a; 2026a; Su & Yuan, 2025). Training-time studies additionally show that MAs emerge along predictable, architecture-dependent trajectories (Gallego-Feliciano et al., 2025). Despite this progress, existing work has focused almost exclusively on full attention LLMs, leaving MAs in HLA LLMs largely uncharacterized.

B MA DYNAMICS IN THE M-A-P MODEL SUITE

B.1 MODEL SUITE AND PRETRAINING DETAILS

Our inference-time analysis uses 52 pretrained checkpoints from the model suite released by Wang et al. (2025). The evaluated checkpoints span five linear attention architectures—RetNet, HGRN, GLA, DeltaNet, and GDN—at two parameter scales, 340M and 1.3B. For each architecture and scale, we consider four hybridization configurations and a pure linear attention baseline, together with a full attention Transformer reference at each scale. All evaluated checkpoints are publicly available through the M-A-P Hybrid Linear Attention Research collection.³

Linear Attention Families. The five architectures considered in our analysis span vector-valued recurrence, matrix-valued associative memory, input-dependent retention, and delta-rule state updates. They differ primarily in the structure of their recurrent states, the mechanisms governing

³<https://huggingface.co/collections/m-a-p/hybrid-linear-attention-research>

Table 3: Linear attention architectures evaluated in our inference-time analysis. The architectures differ in state structure, retention mechanism, and update rule.

Architecture	State Structure	Retention Mechanism	Update Rule
HGRN	Vector	Input-dependent forgetting	Gated recurrence
RetNet	Matrix	Fixed exponential decay	Outer-product accumulation
GLA	Matrix	Input-dependent decay	Gated outer-product accumulation
DeltaNet	Matrix	No explicit decay	Delta-rule correction
GDN	Matrix	Input-dependent forgetting	Gated delta-rule correction

Table 4: Hybridization configurations considered in our inference-time analysis. All models comprise 24 sequence-mixing layers.

Configuration	ρ	Linear Attention	Full Attention
Full attention	1	0	24
Hybrid-3:1	3	16	8
Hybrid-6:1	6	20	4
Hybrid-12:1	12	22	2
Hybrid-24:1	24	23	1
Pure linear attention	∞	24	0

information retention, and the rules used to incorporate new information. HGRN maintains a compact vector-valued state controlled by input-dependent forget gates. RetNet employs a matrix-valued state with fixed exponential decay. GLA replaces fixed decay with input-dependent multiplicative gates, allowing retention to vary across tokens and state dimensions. DeltaNet applies the delta rule to correct existing key-value associations rather than unconditionally accumulating new outer products. GDN combines delta-rule correction with input-dependent forgetting, enabling flexible control over state retention and overwriting. Table 3 summarizes these distinctions.

Hybridization Configurations. All evaluated models comprise 24 sequence-mixing layers. Within each model family, we hold the linear attention architecture fixed while varying the number of full attention layers, enabling controlled comparisons of how hybridization shapes MA dynamics.

We define the hybridization ratio as $\rho = L/L_{\text{FA}}$, where $L = 24$ is the total number of sequence-mixing layers and L_{FA} is the number of full attention layers. A $\rho:1$ configuration therefore contains one full attention layer per ρ sequence-mixing layers. Larger values of ρ correspond to sparser full attention. The evaluated checkpoints cover four hybrid configurations, with $\rho \in \{3, 6, 12, 24\}$. We additionally include a full attention Transformer with $\rho = 1$ and, by convention, a pure linear attention model corresponding to $\rho = \infty$. Together, these configurations span the spectrum from exclusively full attention to exclusively linear attention.

Original Pretraining Recipe. All checkpoints were pretrained from scratch on FineWeb-Edu (Penedo et al., 2024) using implementations from the Flash Linear Attention library (Yang & Zhang, 2024). Within each parameter scale, all architectures and hybridization configurations share the same training corpus and optimization recipe, minimizing variation unrelated to the sequence-mixing architecture or full attention density. The 340M models were trained on 20B tokens with a global batch size of 50K tokens, whereas the 1.3B models were trained on 100B tokens with a global batch size of 1M tokens. Both scales were optimized using AdamW with a cosine learning-rate schedule. Table 5 summarizes the original pretraining configurations.

The shared architecture depth and pretraining recipe make this suite a controlled testbed for comparing MA dynamics across linear attention architectures, hybridization ratios, and model scales.

B.2 MA DYNAMICS ACROSS TOKEN POSITIONS

To complement the first-token analysis in the main text, we examine all eight token positions in the running example, “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*” For each token, we trace its maximum absolute hidden-state activation across depth in GDN models under pure linear attention, the 24:1,

Table 5: Original pretraining configurations of the checkpoints used in our inference-time analysis.

Configuration	340M	1.3B
Number of layers	24	24
Training corpus	FineWeb-Edu	FineWeb-Edu
Training tokens	20B	100B
Global batch size	50K tokens	1M tokens
Optimizer	AdamW	AdamW
Learning-rate schedule	Cosine	Cosine
Implementation	Flash Linear Attention	Flash Linear Attention

12:1, 6:1, and 3:1 hybrid configurations, and full attention. The resulting trajectories are presented in Figure 17. Red dashed lines mark layers immediately preceding full attention, while green dotted lines mark full attention layers. Pronounced MAs concentrate at attention-sink positions, particularly the initial token, “Summer,” and the first period. These tokens exhibit the same ratio-dependent organization identified in the main analysis: isolated PAS arise under sparse full attention, become progressively connected through ISP as full attention becomes denser, and ultimately approach the stable MA morphology of the full attention model. By contrast, tokens that do not serve as attention sinks exhibit neither pronounced PAS nor ISP. For this running example, these results show that PAS and ISP emerge selectively at sink-associated positions, supporting the use of the first token as a representative anchor in the main analysis.

B.3 MA DYNAMICS ACROSS INPUT DOMAINS

We examine whether PAS depends on the semantic content or domain of the input. For the running example and representative inputs from WikiText-103, Scientific Papers, GSM8K, CodeSearchNet, and FLORES-200 (Merity et al., 2016; Cohan et al., 2018; Cobbe et al., 2021; Husain et al., 2019; Costa-Jussà et al., 2022), we trace the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across five HLA architectures at the 1.3B scale and a fixed 12:1 hybridization ratio. A full attention Transformer is included as a reference. The resulting trajectories are presented in Figure 18.

Despite substantial differences in content, structure, language, and tokenization, these representative inputs exhibit qualitatively similar layerwise MA organization. Across all five linear attention backbones, sink-associated activations attain pronounced maxima immediately before full attention layers. These visualizations are consistent with the domain-level sink–spike alignment rates in Table 1, computed over 100 inputs per domain, providing quantitative evidence that PAS is robust across input domains.

B.4 MA DYNAMICS ACROSS LINEAR ATTENTION BACKBONES AND HYBRIDIZATION RATIOS

We complement the cross-backbone analysis with within-family comparisons that characterize how MA dynamics vary with the hybridization ratio. Figure 19 presents results for GDN, DeltaNet, GLA, HGRN, and RetNet at both the 1.3B and 340M parameter scales. For each backbone and scale, we trace the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token, “Summer,” across model depth. The figure compares configurations containing 0, 1, 2, 4, 8, or 24 full attention layers among the 24 sequence-mixing layers, corresponding to pure linear attention, the 24:1, 12:1, 6:1, and 3:1 hybrid configurations, and a full attention Transformer, respectively. Red dashed lines mark layers immediately preceding full attention, while green dotted lines mark full attention layers.

B.5 STATISTICAL CONTROLS AND UNCERTAINTY

We complement the main M-A-P analysis with token and layer controls for sink–spike alignment and bootstrap uncertainty for both alignment and ISR. All analyses use the same 500 inputs as the main experiments, with 100 inputs from each of the five evaluation domains. Confidence intervals are obtained from 10,000 stratified bootstrap resamples, sampling inputs with replacement within each domain before recomputing the macro-average.

Table 6: **Token controls for PAS localization and prominence in M-A-P HLA models.** Each entry reports 1.3B/340M under the 12:1 hybridization ratio, macro-averaged over five domains with 100 inputs each. Alignment is reported in percent; peak excess is measured in $\log_2$ units using Equation 8. Non-sink denotes the average over tokens outside the top three consensus sinks.

Linear Attention	Alignment (%)			Peak Excess ($\log_2$)		
	Sink	Non-sink	First Token	Sink	Non-sink	First Token
RetNet	99.9 / 100.0	57.1 / 71.5	99.9 / 100.0	2.70 / 2.70	0.07 / 0.18	2.69 / 2.62
HGRN	100.0 / 100.0	93.3 / 84.3	100.0 / 100.0	4.32 / 4.83	0.52 / 0.41	4.32 / 4.83
GLA	100.0 / 99.6	75.9 / 69.4	100.0 / 99.7	3.70 / 3.18	0.21 / 0.17	2.34 / 2.81
DeltaNet	100.0 / 99.4	57.6 / 40.8	99.8 / 99.9	2.86 / 0.89	0.04 / -0.08	2.85 / 1.01
GDN	100.0 / 100.0	81.2 / 93.5	100.0 / 100.0	3.04 / 2.01	0.28 / 0.54	3.03 / 2.01

Controls for Sink-Spike Alignment. For each input, we aggregate received attention across all full attention layers and select the consensus sink as in Equation 5. We compare it with two token controls: the first token and the average over eligible tokens outside the top three consensus sinks. We also include a random-layer baseline, which selects uniformly among the 11 layers in each preceding linear attention block and therefore has an expected alignment rate of $1/11 = 9.1\%$.

Because the binary alignment rate records only the location of the blockwise maximum, we additionally define the continuous *peak excess*

$$E_{x,t,f} = \log_2 \frac{m_{x,t}^{(f-1)}}{\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{B}_f \setminus \{f-1\}} m_{x,t}^{(\ell)}}. \quad (8)$$

A positive value indicates that the pre-attention activation exceeds every earlier activation in the block; one unit corresponds to a twofold increase over the strongest earlier layer.

Table 6 shows that consensus sinks are more strongly localized and substantially more prominent than the non-sink controls. Across all ten architecture-scale pairs, the sink-minus-non-sink alignment gap ranges from 6.5 to 58.6 percentage points, while the peak-excess gap ranges from 0.97 to 4.42 $\log_2$ units; every paired 95% bootstrap confidence interval excludes zero. The first-token control is often comparable to the consensus sink, reflecting that the initial position is itself the dominant sink for most inputs. Thus, the controls establish that PAS concentrates at sink-associated positions relative to generic tokens.

Uncertainty of the ISR Trend. We assess the monotonic ISR trend in Table 2 with a paired stratified bootstrap, matching each input across adjacent hybridization ratios. All 20 architecture-scale comparisons increase with denser full attention. The 12:1 $\rightarrow$ 6:1 increases range from 5.5 to 44.5 percentage points, and the 6:1 $\rightarrow$ 3:1 increases range from 17.0 to 52.3 points; all paired 95% confidence intervals exclude zero. This analysis confirms that the reported rise in relative inter-spike persistence is consistent across inputs rather than being driven by a small subset of examples.

Absolute Inter-Spike Activation. Because ISR normalizes each inter-spike activation by its adjacent PAS, we additionally report the unnormalized mean activation magnitude

$$A_{\text{ISP}}(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{J}_i|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{J}_i} m_{x,t_x^*}^{(\ell)}. \quad (9)$$

This companion statistic measures absolute plateau amplitude, rather than retention relative to the neighboring spikes. Table 7 shows that denser full attention increases mean absolute inter-spike activation in 19 of the 20 adjacent-ratio comparisons; the only exception is the 12:1 $\rightarrow$ 6:1 transition for 340M GDN. All ten 6:1 $\rightarrow$ 3:1 comparisons increase substantially. Thus, the normalized ISR trend is generally accompanied by stronger absolute activation, but the two measures are not interchangeable: ISR captures plateau persistence relative to adjacent PAS, whereas A_{ISP} captures its absolute amplitude.

Table 7: **Mean absolute inter-spike activation in M-A-P HLA models.** Each entry denotes 1.3B/340M and is macro-averaged across five domains with 100 inputs per domain. Values are computed using Equation 9; comparisons are meaningful within an architecture and scale because activation scales differ across checkpoints.

Linear Attention	12:1	6:1	3:1
RetNet	25.2 / 15.9	102.7 / 23.2	236.8 / 89.1
HGRN	14.7 / 8.5	132.8 / 70.2	368.9 / 165.5
GLA	37.8 / 13.1	71.4 / 20.9	360.5 / 89.7
DeltaNet	42.4 / 35.4	85.2 / 57.1	405.6 / 290.4
GDN	33.4 / 19.7	34.0 / 16.3	304.4 / 122.8

Table 8: **Large-scale pretrained hybrid models used for cross-model evaluation.** Mixer counts exclude MLP-only layers where applicable. Parameter counts denote total parameters; $A \times B$ indicates approximately x B activated parameters.

Model Family	Linear-Time Mixer	Hybridization Pattern	Evaluated Checkpoints
Kimi Linear	Kimi Delta Attention	20 KDA and 7 global MLA layers; approximately 3:1	48B-A3B Base and Instruct
Qwen3.5	Gated DeltaNet	Three GDN layers followed by one gated full attention layer	35B-A3B Base and Instruct; 122B-A10B; 397B-A17B
Nemotron-H	Mamba-2	Mamba-2 and self-attention interleaved with separate MLP layers	8B, 47B, and 56B Base
Zamba2	Mamba2	Mamba2 backbone with periodically inserted shared Transformer blocks	1.2B, 2.7B, and 7B

C MA DYNAMICS IN LARGE-SCALE PRETRAINED HYBRID MODELS

C.1 MODEL FAMILIES AND EVALUATED CHECKPOINTS

To test whether the architecture-aligned MA organization extends beyond the controlled M-A-P suite, we evaluate 12 publicly available checkpoints from four large-scale hybrid model families. As summarized in Table 8, these models span 1.2B to 397B total parameters and cover linear attention and state-space mixers, periodic and nonuniform hybridization patterns, and both base and instruction-tuned checkpoints.

Kimi Linear. Kimi Linear replaces most full attention layers with Kimi Delta Attention (KDA), a linear attention mechanism based on the gated delta rule. Its 27-layer sequence-mixing stack contains 20 KDA layers and seven global Multi-Head Latent Attention (MLA) layers, arranged in an approximately 3:1 pattern with an additional MLA layer at the end. We evaluate matched 48B-A3B base and instruction-tuned checkpoints to assess the stability of PAS and ISP under post-training (Team et al., 2025a).

Qwen3.5. Qwen3.5 interleaves Gated DeltaNet with full softmax attention in a fixed 3:1 pattern: every three GDN layers are followed by one full attention layer. The 35B-A3B, 122B-A10B, and 397B-A17B checkpoints contain 40, 48, and 60 sequence-mixing layers, including 10, 12, and 15 full attention layers, respectively. These full attention layers employ element-wise output gating, making Qwen3.5 particularly relevant to our controlled gating analysis. We evaluate matched base and instruction-tuned 35B-A3B checkpoints together with the larger 122B-A10B and 397B-A17B variants (Yang et al., 2025a).

Nemotron-H. Nemotron-H arranges Mamba-2, self-attention, and MLP modules as separate layers. The 8B and 56B configurations contain 24/4 and 54/10 Mamba-2/self-attention layers, respectively. The compressed 47B checkpoint retains a nonuniform schedule of 45 Mamba-2 and five self-attention layers. Nemotron-H therefore complements the fixed periodic designs above with sparser and partly irregular full attention placement (Blakeman et al., 2025).

Zamba2. Zamba2 interleaves a Mamba2 backbone with hybrid blocks containing shared Transformer attention. The 1.2B, 2.7B, and 7B configurations contain 38, 54, and 81 layer positions, including six, nine, and thirteen hybrid blocks, respectively. These blocks occur approximately once every six layers. The 1.2B model repeatedly invokes one shared Transformer block, whereas the 2.7B and 7B models alternate between two shared blocks; layer-specific adapters specialize their repeated use across depth (Glorioso et al., 2024).

Together, these families cover linear attention and state-space hybrids, periodic and nonuniform full attention placement, shared and unshared attention modules, multiple parameter scales, and distinct post-training stages. This diversity allows us to test whether PAS and ISP reflect a general property of layer-interleaved hybrid architectures rather than a particular mixer or model family.

C.2 MA DYNAMICS ACROSS MODELS AND INPUT DOMAINS

Figure 20 presents the complete MA tracing results for the checkpoints summarized in Table 8. For each checkpoint, six trajectories cover the running example, “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*”, and representative inputs from five domains: general prose from WikiText-103, scientific writing from Scientific Papers, mathematical reasoning from GSM8K, Python code from CodeSearchNet, and multilingual text from FLORES-200 (Merity et al., 2016; Cohan et al., 2018; Cobbe et al., 2021; Husain et al., 2019; Costa-Jussà et al., 2022). Each trajectory traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth. Red dashed lines mark layers immediately preceding full attention, while green dotted lines mark full attention layers.

Consistency across Matched Post-Training Stages. The matched base and instruction-tuned checkpoints of Kimi Linear and Qwen3.5 exhibit closely aligned PAS locations and ISP spans. Their activation magnitudes differ, but the correspondence between PAS–ISP organization and full attention placement remains largely intact in both matched pairs.

Recurrence across Model Sizes. Across Qwen3.5, Nemotron-H, and Zamba2 checkpoints of different sizes, PAS and ISP remain aligned with full attention placement even as their magnitude and prominence vary. Because magnitude has no consistent monotonic relationship with parameter count, the layerwise morphology is more stable across these checkpoints than its numerical amplitude.

Recurrence across Sequence Mixers. PAS and ISP recur in both linear attention hybrids, represented by Kimi Linear and Qwen3.5, and state-space hybrids, represented by Nemotron-H and Zamba2, despite their distinct sequence-mixing mechanisms. Across both classes, PAS occur immediately before full attention layers, while ISP extend across portions of the intervening linear-time sequence-mixing blocks. This cross-backbone consistency supports an association with layer-interleaved hybridization rather than a particular recurrent state-transition or update rule.

Cross-Domain Consistency. Within each checkpoint, the running example and five domain-specific inputs produce closely aligned PAS locations and ISP spans despite substantial differences in language, structure, and semantic content. Within these representative inputs, domain variation primarily affects activation magnitude, while layerwise MA organization remains stable.

Taken together, these results extend the evidence for PAS and ISP beyond the controlled M-A-P suite. Across the evaluated model families, sizes, post-training stages, sequence mixers, and representative domain inputs, full attention placement remains the most stable organizer of where PAS arise and how ISP extend across depth.

D CONTROLLED PRETRAINING STUDIES OF PAS AND ISP

D.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

Model Architecture. We conduct controlled pretraining experiments using the Flash Linear Attention framework (Yang & Zhang, 2024). All models comprise 24 sequence-mixing layers and use Gated DeltaNet (GDN) as the linear attention backbone. We consider two parameter scales, 340M

and 1.3B. To instantiate each hybrid configuration, we replace selected GDN mixers with full attention while holding all other architectural components fixed. This controlled design isolates the effects of full attention placement and density from changes in model depth, width, or feed-forward architecture. The trained checkpoints are publicly available at <https://huggingface.co/startlux-models/Massive-Activations-HLA>.

Training Recipe. Following the optimization settings of prior GLA and GDN studies (Yang et al., 2023; 2025b), we train all models from scratch on FineWeb-Edu (Penedo et al., 2024). We use AdamW with a sequence length of 4,096, weight decay of 0.01, and gradient clipping at 1.0. The learning rate is linearly warmed up from 3×10^{-5} to 3×10^{-4} and then decayed to 3×10^{-5} using a cosine schedule. Unless otherwise specified, the 340M models are trained on 10B tokens with a global batch size of 0.5M tokens and a 0.5B-token warmup, whereas the 1.3B models are trained on 50B tokens with a global batch size of 2M tokens and a 1B-token warmup.

Analysis and Evaluation Overview. Our controlled study proceeds in three stages. First, we characterize the emergence of PAS across full attention placements and model scales (Section D.3). Second, we trace the formation and consolidation of ISP in a representative GDN model with a 3:1 hybridization ratio (Section D.4). Third, we isolate the role of output gating through two complementary interventions: adding element-wise output gates to full attention layers following gated attention (Qiu et al., 2026), and removing the native output gates from GDN layers (Section D.5). Alongside these morphology analyses, we evaluate the trained models on language modeling, commonsense reasoning, and in-context retrieval benchmarks following Yang et al. (2025b). These evaluations contextualize changes in PAS and ISP with downstream model capability. The complete evaluation protocol and benchmark descriptions are provided in Section D.2.

D.2 DOWNSTREAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL


We evaluate all models from our controlled pretraining experiments on language modeling, commonsense reasoning, and in-context retrieval benchmarks. Unless otherwise specified, we follow the evaluation protocol adopted in the Gated DeltaNet study (Yang et al., 2025b).

Language Modeling. We evaluate next-token prediction on WikiText-103 and report perplexity, with lower values indicating better language modeling performance (Merity et al., 2016).

Commonsense Reasoning. We assess zero-shot performance on HellaSwag, PIQA, and ARC-Easy, which test plausible event completion, physical commonsense, and grade-school scientific reasoning, respectively (Zellers et al., 2019; Bisk et al., 2020; Clark et al., 2018). All evaluations are conducted using the Language Model Evaluation Harness (Gao et al., 2021). We report length-normalized accuracy for HellaSwag and accuracy for PIQA and ARC-Easy.

Real-World In-Context Retrieval. We evaluate recall-intensive performance on SWDE, FDA, SQuAD, and Natural Questions (NQ). SWDE assesses structured relation extraction from semi-structured web pages, while FDA assesses key-value retrieval from PDF documents (Lockard et al., 2019; Arora et al., 2024). SQuAD and NQ evaluate question answering over natural-language contexts (Rajpurkar et al., 2018; Kwiatkowski et al., 2019). Because our models are pretrained rather than instruction-tuned, we adopt the cloze-completion format of Arora et al. (2024), aligning these tasks with the next-token prediction objective. Inputs are truncated to a maximum context length of 2,048 tokens, and retrieval accuracy is reported for each benchmark.

Synthetic In-Context Retrieval. We additionally evaluate the three single-needle NIAH variants from RULER, denoted NIAH-1, NIAH-2, and NIAH-3 (Hsieh et al., 2024). NIAH-1 tests passkey-style retrieval from repeated distractors, NIAH-2 tests numerical-value retrieval from an essay context, and NIAH-3 increases the difficulty by replacing the target value with a UUID. Each task requires the model to recover the value associated with a target key embedded in a distractor context. All variants are evaluated at a fixed context length of 4,096 tokens using exact-match accuracy.



(a) PAS configuration with a single full attention layer at layer 12. (b) ISP configuration with a 3:1 hybridization ratio.

Figure 8: **Training loss for representative PAS and ISP configurations.** Both curves are obtained from 1.3B GDN models trained on 50B tokens. The PAS configuration contains a single full attention layer at layer 12, whereas the ISP configuration interleaves eight full attention layers with 16 GDN layers under a 3:1 hybridization ratio.




Figure 9: **PAS formation across full attention placements.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth at successive 1B-token checkpoints for a 340M GDN model containing a single full attention layer. PAS remains weak under early placement, becomes pronounced at the middle placement, and reaches its largest magnitude under late placement. Full attention placement therefore determines not only where PAS forms but also how prominently it develops.

D.3 TRAINING-TIME EMERGENCE OF PAS

Experimental Setup. We study PAS formation by inserting a single full attention layer into an otherwise homogeneous 24-layer GDN model. At the 340M scale, we consider three insertion points—layers 4, 12, and 20—representing early, middle, and late full attention placements. All three models are trained from scratch on 10B tokens using the controlled pretraining recipe described in Section D.1. To trace the emergence and evolution of PAS, we record the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth at 1B-token intervals. At the final checkpoint, we compute the sink–spike alignment rate and evaluate downstream performance. For the representative layer-12 placement, we additionally train a 1.3B counterpart on 50B tokens, recording its trajectory every 5B tokens, to examine whether the same PAS organization recurs at a larger model scale and training budget.

Results. Figure 8a confirms stable optimization of the 1.3B layer-12 configuration through 50B tokens. Figure 9 compares PAS formation across early, middle, and late full attention placements, while Figure 10 provides the corresponding cross-scale comparison. Table 9 reports the final sink–spike alignment rates and downstream performance. The output-gating variants in the lower block are analyzed separately in Section D.5.

The completed experiments yield three main observations. First, PAS consistently localizes immediately before the inserted full attention layer, but its magnitude depends strongly on placement depth. As shown in Figure 9, placement at layer 4 produces only a weak local maximum, whereas




Figure 10: **PAS formation across model scales.** Both models contain 24 sequence-mixing layers with a single full attention layer at layer 12. This comparison examines whether the layer-localized PAS organization observed at the 340M scale persists in the 1.3B model.




Figure 11: **PAS dynamics under output-gating interventions.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth at successive 1B-token checkpoints for a 340M GDN model with a single full attention layer at layer 12. The standard model develops a pronounced PAS. Adding an output gate to the full attention layer markedly attenuates the spike without eliminating it, whereas removing the native GDN output gates moderately increases its magnitude.

layer 12 produces a pronounced spike and layer 20 yields the strongest PAS. Within these controlled configurations, deeper full attention placement produces substantially stronger PAS.

Second, PAS emerges early and recurs at the larger scale. In the 340M layer-12 configuration, it is already visible after 1B training tokens and becomes progressively sharper and more stable thereafter. The 1.3B trajectory shows a weak precursor at 5B tokens, a pronounced PAS by 10B, and persistent localization immediately before full attention through 50B tokens. Both scales achieve a final sink-spike alignment rate of 100%, showing that the architecture-aligned position recurs despite differences in model scale, training budget, and activation profile.

Third, full attention placement substantially affects retrieval performance despite having little effect on the final sink-spike alignment rate. All three configurations achieve near-perfect alignment and comparable language-modeling and commonsense performance. Nevertheless, the middle and late placements outperform the early placement on most real-world and synthetic retrieval benchmarks.

D.4 TRAINING-TIME EMERGENCE OF ISP

Experimental Setup. We study ISP formation using 24-layer GDN models with a fixed 3:1 hybridization ratio, in which eight full attention layers are interleaved with 16 GDN layers. At the 340M scale, the model is trained from scratch on 10B tokens following the controlled pretraining recipe described in Section D.1. To trace the emergence and evolution of ISP, we record the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth at 1B-token intervals. At the final checkpoint, we compute the inter-spike retention score and evaluate downstream performance. We additionally train a 1.3B counterpart on 50B tokens, recording its trajectory every 5B tokens, to examine whether the same inter-spike organization recurs at a larger model scale and training budget.

Table 9: **PAS and downstream performance under controlled pretraining.** FA Layer reports the one-based index of the full attention layer among the 24 sequence-mixing layers. Align. denotes the sink-spike alignment rate (%).

(a) PAS alignment, language modeling, and real-world retrieval									
Variant	Scale	FA Layer	Tokens	Align.	PPL	FDA	SWDE	NQ	SQuAD
GDN	340M	4/24	10B	99.53	14.00	8.02	20.21	14.95	25.30
GDN	340M	12/24	10B	100.00	13.78	60.43	40.49	19.61	32.81
GDN	340M	20/24	10B	100.00	13.84	53.71	35.80	21.10	35.42
GDN	1.3B	12/24	50B	100.00	9.79	66.58	45.36	23.57	36.96
GDN-NoOutGate	340M	12/24	10B	100.00	13.96	49.86	41.77	19.61	34.32
GDN-GatedFA	340M	12/24	10B	100.00	13.80	53.38	34.21	18.37	31.70

(b) Synthetic retrieval and commonsense reasoning									
Variant	Scale	FA Layer	Tokens	NIAH-1	NIAH-2	NIAH-3	HellaSwag	PIQA	ARC-E
GDN	340M	4/24	10B	57.40	27.20	2.40	38.92	65.61	50.72
GDN	340M	12/24	10B	61.80	97.00	25.80	39.61	65.56	50.17
GDN	340M	20/24	10B	90.60	87.20	69.00	39.04	64.42	52.27
GDN	1.3B	12/24	50B	99.40	93.60	2.60	53.37	70.40	60.06
GDN-NoOutGate	340M	12/24	10B	80.40	94.40	39.40	38.87	65.78	49.33
GDN-GatedFA	340M	12/24	10B	41.60	16.80	30.80	39.73	65.13	50.63

Results. Figure 8b confirms stable optimization of the 1.3B ISP configuration through 50B tokens, while Figure 13a traces the 340M first-token activation trajectory throughout pretraining. Figure 12 provides the corresponding cross-scale comparison, and Table 10 reports the final inter-spike retention scores and downstream performance. The lower block of the table contains the output-gating variants analyzed separately in Section D.5.

The completed runs yield two main observations. First, ISP emerges early during pretraining and becomes progressively more pronounced and stable across subsequent checkpoints. An elevated activation region between adjacent PAS is already visible at the first recorded checkpoint after 1B training tokens and gradually consolidates into a sustained plateau.

Second, the same organization recurs at 1.3B. In the larger model, a broad plateau becomes evident over the early checkpoints and remains aligned with the interleaved full attention schedule through 50B tokens, although its absolute magnitude evolves non-monotonically during training. The final ISR increases from 90.56% at 340M to 94.47% at 1.3B, supporting strong relative retention at both scales without implying a controlled scaling effect. Together, the trajectories and final ISR values establish ISP as a learned training-time morphology that recurs across the two evaluated scales rather than a peculiarity of selected pretrained checkpoints.

D.5 EFFECTS OF OUTPUT GATING ON PAS AND ISP

Experimental Setup. We examine how output gating regulates PAS and ISP using the representative 340M configurations from Sections D.3 and D.4. The PAS configuration is a 24-layer GDN model with a single full attention layer at layer 12, whereas the ISP configuration uses a 3:1 hybridization ratio, interleaving eight full attention layers with 16 GDN layers. All models are trained from scratch on 10B tokens under the same controlled recipe.

For each configuration, we construct two variants while holding all other architectural components fixed. GDN-GATEDFA adds element-wise output gates to the full attention layers following gated attention (Qiu et al., 2026), while retaining the native GDN gates. Conversely, GDN-NOOUTGATE removes all GDN output gates while leaving full attention ungated. These interventions isolate the module-specific effects of output gating. We record the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth at successive 1B-token checkpoints and, at the final checkpoint, compute sink-spike alignment for PAS and inter-spike retention for ISP.




Figure 12: **ISP formation across model scales.** Both models contain 24 sequence-mixing layers and use a 3:1 hybridization ratio. The persistent inter-spike organization recurs in the completed 1.3B model despite differences in activation magnitude and training budget.




Figure 13: **ISP dynamics under output-gating interventions.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across model depth at successive 1B-token checkpoints for a 340M GDN model with a 3:1 hybridization ratio trained on 10B tokens. The standard model develops a sustained ISP. Adding output gates to the full attention layers markedly reduces its absolute magnitude, although a weak inter-spike plateau remains visible and persists throughout training. Removing the native GDN output gates instead moderately increases the plateau magnitude.

Results. Figures 11 and 13 compare the evolution of PAS and ISP under the standard configuration and the two gating interventions. Tables 9 and 10 report the corresponding morphology metrics and downstream performance. Because ISR measures retention relative to adjacent PAS rather than absolute plateau magnitude, we assess ISP magnitude from the activation trajectories and use ISR to quantify its persistence.

The comparison yields three main observations. First, adding output gates to full attention substantially attenuates the absolute magnitudes of PAS and ISP without eliminating their layerwise organization. Weak spikes and plateaus persist and become increasingly visible during pretraining: the trajectories retain a low-magnitude plateau, while ISR confirms continued inter-spike persistence. Consistently, Qwen3.5 models with native full attention output gating still exhibit both morphologies (Figures 20c–20f).

Second, removing the native GDN output gates increases PAS and ISP magnitudes, with a more visible effect on the plateau, but the changes remain smaller than those induced by full attention gating. This asymmetry indicates that GDN gating modulates MA amplification and propagation through the intervening layers without determining PAS or ISP formation.

Third, gating the substantially fewer full attention layers produces larger changes in the absolute activation trajectories than removing gates from all GDN layers. The effect therefore depends more on gate placement than gate count, indicating that full attention plays a central role in organizing MA dynamics: gating full attention strongly reduces PAS and ISP magnitude, whereas modifying GDN gating has a comparatively modest effect.

Table 10: **ISP and downstream performance under controlled pretraining.** All configurations contain 24 sequence-mixing layers and use a 3:1 hybridization ratio. ISR denotes the inter-spike retention score (%). ISR measures retention relative to adjacent PAS magnitudes rather than absolute plateau magnitude; cross-variant comparisons should therefore be interpreted cautiously.

(a) ISP retention, language modeling, and real-world retrieval								
Variant	Scale	Tokens	ISR	PPL	FDA	SWDE	NQ	SQuAD
GDN	340M	10B	90.56	13.74	54.62	39.68	21.63	38.40
GDN	1.3B	50B	94.47	9.80	64.82	45.92	24.90	40.65
GDN-NoOutGate	340M	10B	96.48	13.78	49.32	39.33	21.82	35.25
GDN-GatedFA	340M	10B	99.48	13.68	65.12	40.49	21.32	36.60

(b) Synthetic retrieval and commonsense reasoning								
Variant	Scale	Tokens	NIAH-1	NIAH-2	NIAH-3	HellaSwag	PIQA	ARC-E
GDN	340M	10B	78.60	99.40	63.60	39.56	65.67	50.93
GDN	1.3B	50B	96.00	100.00	90.00	53.36	71.55	61.11
GDN-NoOutGate	340M	10B	57.20	48.20	14.20	39.57	66.16	50.25
GDN-GatedFA	340M	10B	61.00	98.20	5.00	39.38	66.00	50.34




Figure 14: **Fixed-coordinate analysis of PAS formation.** At (t^*, j^*) , layer 11 produces an extreme update that writes a large outlier into the residual stream immediately before full attention.

E ADDITIONAL SYSTEMATIC-OUTLIER ANALYSES OF PAS AND ISP

E.1 FIXED-COORDINATE SYSTEMATIC-OUTLIER ANALYSIS OF PAS

We examine the PAS immediately preceding the full attention layer $f = 12$ in a representative 1.3B GDN model with a 12:1 hybridization ratio. Following Section 4.1, let t^* denote the consensus sink token and $j^* = \arg \max_j |X_{t^*, j}^{(f-1)}|$ its maximally activated feature at the corresponding pre-attention layer. We fix this token–feature coordinate and trace its signed activation and module-level updates through three stages: outlier formation, attention-sink coupling, and cancellation. Figures 14, 15, and 16 provide detailed evidence for these stages, respectively.

Outlier Formation. Figure 14 shows that the pre-attention layer produces an extreme update at the fixed coordinate, writing a large outlier into the residual stream immediately before full attention. This localization establishes that PAS arises from a concentrated update at a specific token–feature coordinate rather than a diffuse increase across tokens or features.




Figure 15: **Coupling between PAS and full attention sink behavior.** During full attention at layer 12, token t^* receives a disproportionate share of attention from subsequent query positions and acts as the dominant attention sink.




Figure 16: **Fixed-coordinate analysis of PAS cancellation.** At the same coordinate (t^*, j^*) , layer 12 produces a large opposite-signed update that substantially cancels the incoming outlier and causes PAS to dissipate.

Attention-Sink Coupling. As shown in Figure 15, token t^* receives a disproportionate share of attention from subsequent query positions during full attention at layer 12, acting as the dominant attention sink. This correspondence links the fixed-coordinate outlier to sink behavior in full attention computation.

Outlier Cancellation. Figure 16 traces the same fixed coordinate through the subsequent computation. At layer 12, a large opposite-signed update substantially cancels the incoming outlier, sharply reducing its residual-stream magnitude and causing PAS to dissipate.

Together, these fixed-coordinate analyses establish outlier formation, attention-sink coupling, and cancellation as successive stages of a coherent PAS lifecycle rather than unrelated extreme values arising across adjacent layers.

E.2 CROSS-MODEL SYSTEMATIC-OUTLIER ANALYSES

This appendix extends the mechanism analysis in Section 4 with layerwise systematic-outlier visualizations for both the controlled M-A-P suite and large-scale open-source hybrid models. All visualizations use the running example, “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*”, and trace the first token, “Summer,” across model depth. Each figure presents the layerwise MA magnitude together with the signed residual input, attention update, FFN update, and block output evaluated at each layer’s dominant feature. The upper trajectory characterizes the formation and persistence of PAS and ISP, while the signed decomposition reveals the module-level updates associated with the dominant outlier at each layer. Because the dominant feature is selected independently at each layer, these visualizations provide layerwise evidence of recurring write–cancel structure rather than fixed-coordinate continuity, which is examined separately in Appendix E.1.

Controlled M-A-P Models. We first analyze the 1.3B models from the M-A-P suite (Wang et al., 2025), covering GDN, DeltaNet, GLA, HGRN, and RetNet under 24:1, 12:1, 6:1, and 3:1 hybridization ratios. Because the full attention limit is independent of the linear attention backbone, its common reference pattern is shown once in Figure 21. The corresponding hybrid results are presented in Figures 22–26.

Across backbones and hybridization ratios, the decompositions reveal a recurring architecture-aligned pattern: dominant outliers arise immediately before full attention and are subsequently accompanied by opposite-signed updates. As full attention becomes denser, activations remain elevated across progressively larger portions of the inter-spike intervals, consistent with delayed cancellation and the transition from isolated PAS to sustained ISP. At the full attention limit, the localized spikes and intervening plateaus merge into the persistent MA morphology characteristic of conventional full attention LLMs. These results complement the hybridization-ratio analyses in Section 3.4 and Appendix B.4, providing cross-model support for a cancellation-timing account that connects PAS, ISP, and the full attention morphology.

Large-Scale Open-Source Hybrid Models. We next examine three Qwen3.5 checkpoints and three Nemotron-H checkpoints in Figures 27 and 28, respectively. Qwen3.5 interleaves Gated DeltaNet layers with output-gated full attention, whereas Nemotron-H combines Mamba-2 state-space layers with full attention. Despite their distinct sequence mixers, model scales, and layer schedules, both families exhibit recurring outlier amplification near full attention boundaries and extended high-activation regions between them.

The Qwen3.5 results show that native full attention output gating attenuates but does not eliminate the architecture-aligned MA organization, while the Nemotron-H results extend its recurrence beyond linear attention backbones to state-space hybrids. Together with the controlled M-A-P analyses, these observations support the recurrence of architecture-aligned outlier dynamics and their cancellation-timing interpretation across the evaluated layer-interleaved hybrid architectures.







Figure 17: **MA dynamics across token positions in GDN.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of one token in “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*” across pure linear attention, the 24:1, 12:1, 6:1, and 3:1 hybrid configurations, and full attention. The attention-sink positions, “Summer” and the first period, exhibit pronounced PAS and increasingly connected ISP as full attention becomes denser, whereas non-sink positions exhibit neither morphology. This figure extends the first-token analysis in Section 3.3; detailed token-wise discussion is provided in Appendix B.2.




(e) Token 4: “Winter”



(f) Token 5: “is”




(g) Token 6: “cold”




(h) Token 7: “.”


Figure 17: MA dynamics across token positions in GDN (continued).



(a) Running example: “Summer is warm. Winter is cold.”




(b) General prose from WikiText-103.




(c) Scientific writing from Scientific Papers.


Figure 18: **MA dynamics across input domains in the M-A-P model suite.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across depth for five 1.3B HLA architectures under a fixed 12:1 hybridization ratio, with a full attention Transformer included as a reference. Across the running example and five representative domain-specific inputs, PAS consistently emerge immediately before full attention layers. This figure extends the cross-domain analysis in Section 3.3; detailed discussion is provided in Appendix B.3.



(d) Mathematical reasoning from GSM8K.



(e) Python code from CodeSearchNet.



(f) Multilingual text from FLORES-200.

Figure 18: MA dynamics across input domains in the M-A-P model suite (continued).







Figure 19: **MA dynamics across hybridization ratios in the M-A-P model suite.** Each panel traces the maximum absolute hidden-state activation of the first token across pure linear attention, the 24:1, 12:1, 6:1, and 3:1 hybrid configurations, and full attention. Across architectures and model scales, isolated PAS become progressively connected through ISP as full attention becomes denser. This figure extends the hybridization-ratio analysis in Section 3.4; detailed discussion is provided in Appendix B.4.




(e) GLA, 1.3B



(f) GLA, 340M



(g) HGRN, 1.3B



(h) HGRN, 340M

Figure 19: MA dynamics across hybridization ratios in the M-A-P model suite (continued).






Figure 19: MA dynamics across hybridization ratios in the M-A-P model suite (continued).




(a) Kimi-Linear-48B-A3B-Base




(b) Kimi-Linear-48B-A3B-Instruct

Figure 20: **MA dynamics in large-scale pretrained hybrid models.** Each checkpoint panel presents first-token activation trajectories for the running example and five domain-specific inputs. The results are grouped by model family to enable controlled comparisons across post-training stages, parameter scales, and linear attention versus state-space backbones. PAS and ISP remain aligned with the hybrid layer arrangement across these settings, while their absolute magnitudes vary across checkpoints and inputs. Detailed cross-model analysis is provided in Appendix C.2.




(c) Qwen3.5-35B-A3B-Base




(d) Qwen3.5-35B-A3B

Figure 20: MA dynamics in large-scale pretrained hybrid models (continued). The matched Qwen3.5-35B Base and instruction-tuned checkpoints exhibit similar PAS locations and plateau spans, despite differences in absolute activation magnitude.




(e) Qwen3.5-122B-A10B




(f) Qwen3.5-397B-A17B


Figure 20: MA dynamics in large-scale pretrained hybrid models (continued). Qwen3.5 checkpoints at the 122B and 397B scales preserve the architecture-aligned PAS–ISP organization, although their activation magnitudes and plateau profiles differ.



(g) Nemotron-H-8B-Base-8K




(h) Nemotron-H-47B-Base-8K




(i) Nemotron-H-56B-Base-8K


Figure 20: **MA dynamics in large-scale pretrained hybrid models (continued).** Nemotron-H checkpoints at the 8B, 47B, and 56B scales exhibit PAS- and ISP-like activation patterns aligned with the placement of full attention layers, extending the observed organization to state-space hybrids.



(j) Zamba2-1.2B



(k) Zamba2-2.7B



(l) Zamba2-7B

Figure 20: **MA dynamics in large-scale pretrained hybrid models (continued).** Zamba2 checkpoints from 1.2B to 7B parameters further demonstrate that architecture-aligned spike and plateau morphologies recur across model scales within this state-space hybrid family.




Figure 21: **Layerwise systematic-outlier pattern in the 1.3B full attention Transformer from the M-A-P suite.** In the full attention limit, MAs remain sustained across much of the model depth, recovering the stable morphology toward which PAS and ISP progressively converge as full attention becomes denser.




Figure 22: Layerwise systematic-outlier patterns across hybridization ratios in 1.3B GDN models from the M-A-P suite. This figure extends the hybridization-ratio analysis in Section 3.4; additional results and discussion are provided in Appendices B.4 and E.2.




Figure 23: Layerwise systematic-outlier patterns across hybridization ratios in 1.3B DeltaNet models from the M-A-P suite. This figure extends the hybridization-ratio analysis in Section 3.4; additional results and discussion are provided in Appendices B.4 and E.2.




Figure 24: Layerwise systematic-outlier patterns across hybridization ratios in 1.3B GLA models from the M-A-P suite. This figure extends the hybridization-ratio analysis in Section 3.4; additional results and discussion are provided in Appendices B.4 and E.2.




Figure 25: Layerwise systematic-outlier patterns across hybridization ratios in 1.3B HGRN models from the M-A-P suite. This figure extends the hybridization-ratio analysis in Section 3.4; additional results and discussion are provided in Appendices B.4 and E.2.




Figure 26: Layerwise systematic-outlier patterns across hybridization ratios in 1.3B RetNet models from the M-A-P suite. This figure extends the hybridization-ratio analysis in Section 3.4; additional results and discussion are provided in Appendices B.4 and E.2.




Figure 27: **Layerwise systematic-outlier patterns in large-scale Qwen3.5 linear attention hybrid models.** Each panel traces the first-token MA trajectory for “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*” together with its signed module-level decomposition. Across the evaluated scales and post-training stages, the dominant MA transitions remain systematically aligned with full attention placement. PAS and ISP persist despite the native output gating in Qwen3.5. This figure extends Section 3.5; additional results are provided in Appendices C.2 and E.2.




Figure 28: **Layerwise systematic-outlier patterns in large-scale Nemotron-H state-space hybrids.** Each panel traces the first-token MA trajectory for “*Summer is warm. Winter is cold.*” together with its signed module-level decomposition. Across the evaluated checkpoints and layer schedules, dominant outlier amplification and opposing updates recur near full attention boundaries, extending the observed architecture-aligned pattern beyond linear attention backbones to hybrids interleaving Mamba-2 and full attention. This figure complements the analysis in Section 3.5; additional results across input domains are provided in Appendix C.2.